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Chapter I

Research on Voluntary Organizations

Motivation for the Research

This Ph.D. dissertation on the empirical reality and the perception of work in voluntary welfare organizations (VWOs) in Sweden represents, to my knowledge, one of the first thorough sociological studies of work in voluntary organizations. Looking more specifically at the research on the nonprofit sector, we see that there are many proposals and research plans, but few systematic and comprehensive qualitative studies on how work is performed and perceived by the workers themselves in these unique “hybrid organizations” that combine paid and unpaid workers.

A wide sociological understanding is necessary to explain the approach I propose here. My intent is to draw a parallel between the historical development of two sociological fields, the sociology of work and the multidisciplinary research field dealing with the nonprofit sector.

The crisis faced by most of the industrialized countries at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s had political and economic roots. In the political field, a series of labor conflicts spread across the industrialized countries. At about the same time, the oil shock of 1973 followed by high inflation, low growth and higher unemployment, undermined the world economy. Many countries were hit by sustained high unemployment until the mid-1980s, and in some cases again from the end of the 1990s to the present, showing that the market could not supply jobs for all.
This important loss of taxable earnings for the welfare states resulted in major cutbacks in public spending, and layoffs of civil servants followed in the 1980s. This shrinkage showed that the welfare state could not expand indefinitely, patching the employment holes left by the market. The turmoil called the balance between economy and politics into question.

These issues mobilized an impressive number of sociologists who focused their attentions on the phenomenon of work. Many of them, disappointed in both the market and the state as employers, warned, and still warn, of the social damage caused by depriving a large portion of the population of meaningful, productive, and socially rewarding activity. Mass unemployment and the welfare state failures seem to have given birth to both a research field on the nonprofit sector and to the debate on the so-called "end of work." I briefly review these two fields and show how they relate to the object my research.

The field of research investigating the organizational sphere lying between the state and the market attracted many social scientists during the social unrest of the late 1960s and became a major field of research in sociology and political science. These scholars were looking for alternatives to the state and the market as both economic (employer) and political (social movement) agents, and as mediums of social integration. Gradually, they observed that the social movements of the 1960s were turning into permanent organizations quite independent from both the state and the market. The nonprofit sector encompasses a multiplicity of organizations with very different goals stretching from religious congregations to animal rights activist organizations, from women's shelters to entomology groups, from trade unions to football clubs, federations of sight impaired people, etc. Regardless of their different goals, they share common characteristics,
including some formal structural elements, private and self-governance, and nonprofit ethos (no profits returned to owners or directors of the organization) (Salamon and Anheier 1996a:16).

Research on the nonprofit sector has generated sociological work on the political dimension of collective behavior and the capacity of voluntary organizations to mobilize people and resources (see for example (Smelser 1962; Tilly 1978). Economists have assessed the economic role and what share of the economy these organizations represent (Salamon and Anheier 1996a). Management theorists have looked at their internal structure (Pearce 1993). Sociologists and philosophers have considered the questions of altruism and the motivations of volunteers (see for example Jeppsson Grassman 1997; Wolfe 1989).

The most comprehensive and systematic empirical investigation of the nonprofit sector was carried out by the Johns Hopkins comparative nonprofit sector project in the 1990s. Salamon and a large group of researchers carried out a comprehensive international study of some 22 countries, including Sweden. Their study revealed the economic importance of the sector to a wider audience (Salamon and Anheier 1996a; Salamon and Anheier 1996b; Salamon and Anheier 1997; Salamon and Anheier 1999).

One fundamental issue at the root of this field of research was a concern for the sociology of work, the question of how individuals leave the private sphere to be active in the public sphere. The core sociological question about the centrality of work in society has since the 19th century been tied to an understanding of capitalism (see Émile Durkheim and Karl Marx). In periods of mass unemployment, sociologists have expressed doubts about the market's capacity to supply jobs for all. One important debate that has taken place since the

This debate slowly became connected with the development of the nonprofit sector. The discussion evolved around the questions of mass unemployment, the erosion of gainful employment and, the shortcomings of the for-profit sector. But here was a sector employing and mobilizing a significant number of people. The question was whether voluntary organizations and volunteering offer an alternative form of work? However, research dealing specifically with the work characteristics and employment potential of voluntary organizations are to be found only in a few disparate European policy-oriented investigations.

The legitimacy of an analysis of the employment potential of voluntary organizations has been posed by one of the lead researchers of the Johns Hopkins project. The nonprofit sector could fulfill an economic function by "smooth[ing] down adjustments induced by life-cycle changes or by economic crises" (Priller, Zimmer et al. 2000:130). Along the same lines, Anheier proposed a research agenda to tackle both the concepts of labor market and work and the recognition of new
work forms varying from volunteering to fully paid work (Schneider and Anheier 2000:15-16).

In France, voluntary organizations are alternative for providing young people with their first work experience (Ferrand Bechman 1997; Ferrand Bechman 1998). A public youth employment program, *les emplois jeunes*, introduced in 1997, has created more than 80,000 nonprofit sector jobs—80% paid for by the state—in the fields of sports, welfare, culture, community services, and family services (Bezat 1998). The French term *économie sociale* implies an economy of solidarity in which voluntary organizations are both social integrators and productive units.

On the empirical side, the European Union has measured the employment opportunities of the nonprofit sector in Spain, Italy, and Germany. They indicated that in the 1990s, employment in the nonprofit sector grew in Italy and Spain, while it stagnated in Germany after 20 years of growth (cf. Sauer 2000). The reports recommended that the public authorities, through legal reforms, support job creation in voluntary organizations and that voluntary organizations fill social niches neglected by public actors (NETS 1998). Some authors pointed out that historical-contextual factors should be considered to explain national variations in size and structure (Lundström and Svedberg 2003; Salamon and Anheier 1998). For example, the principle of subsidiarity in Germany and the tradition established by the popular mass movements in Sweden would be such factors. The principle of subsidiarity means that “the state should only undertake direct responsibility in social issues if smaller entities, such as voluntary organisations or the family, cannot adequately meet local demand.” (Priller, Anheier et al. 1997:5).
Again in Germany, the PDS (leading party in the former GDR) has started to implement nonprofit-sector subsidized jobs in two east German states as replacements for welfare or low-paid jobs (see discussion in Werner 1999). Furthermore, Schumacher started a much-needed rethinking of the elasticity of the concept of work. Schumacher cited examples of the various combinations of paid and unpaid work in environmental organizations (Schumacher 2001). However, these initiatives seem less relevant for the Nordic countries, where the nonprofit sector generates a very small proportion of paid jobs (SOU1999:84 1999).

Coming from management theory, the most relevant work on voluntary organizations is Pearce (1993), who compared in detail the organizational work of volunteers in both voluntary and nonprofit employee-dominated organizations. However, in this discipline, the main interest remains the improvement of the organization's managerial techniques, brushing aside broader social implications, such as the new work forms surfacing in voluntary organizations (see Schumacher 1999).

Three findings show the importance of connecting employment and voluntary organization:

1) The nonprofit sector is an economic force in many countries, including Sweden. As shown by the Johns Hopkins Project, the nonprofit sector accounts for an "average 4.6 percent of the gross domestic product, and nonprofit employment is nearly 5 percent of all nonagricultural employment" (Salamon and Anheier 1999:8). In other words, a significant number of people are carrying paid work in the sector, especially in the United States and in Northern European countries.
2) The high proportion of volunteers, especially in welfare voluntary organizations, creates a unique workplace, compared to public and for-profit organizations, but one that is affected by uncertain roles. The absence of work contracts and wages force managers to adopt new managerial techniques with volunteers (Pearce 1993).

3) Voluntary organizations are value-driven organizations. As previously shown by Max Weber and social movement theorists, voluntary organizations have very different purposes than public and for-profit organizations. To the extent that they have charismatic leaders or a highly motivated group of founders—at least in the foundation phase—voluntary organizations fight for ideals ranging from universalist to particularist ideals (Olsson 1999). In this sense, workers in voluntary organizations may contribute to the activities of the civic sphere. Voluntary organizations, like sects, often evolve, as Weber described, from strongly interiorized founding values to a colder and more rational organization of work.

My dissertation is an attempt to bridge the gap between the "end of work" debate and the empirical reality of voluntary work by looking at the work dimension of Swedish voluntary welfare organizations at an organizational micro-level. More concretely, I intend to investigate work settings and work attitudes in voluntary organizations mainly from the individual actors' own perspective. Survey data complement this qualitative approach.

One way to bridge that gap is to broaden the concept of work beyond its definition as classic productive activity. The notion of work now is restricted to, and monopolized by, the wage-earner model (activity carried out in exchange for remuneration) (see Dubin 1958; O'Toole 1973). Work indeed produces the tools needed for our domination of nature, but this process also makes and remakes the
world in which we live and defines our "being together," the collectivity (concept of action in Arendt 1970 chapter 5). In this sense, work is an activity that builds the polis, contributing to the common good. This work, is not limited to the market, but takes place in a broader societal context, and can therefore also take place in VWOs. A considerable amount of scholarly work has pointed to the civic potential of the nonprofit sector in terms of active citizenship focusing on the common good (Beck 1999a; Brown, Kenny et al. 2000; Giddens 1999).

This study of Swedish voluntary welfare organizations (VWOs) represents an interesting case. Sweden has one of the most comprehensive welfare states and its unique nonprofit sector is characterized by 1) the tradition of popular mass movements in which members are central and the real owners of the organization, 2) large membership and volunteering, but low employment levels, 3) the dominance of the fields of culture and recreation, and the relatively marginal role of welfare (Lundström and Wijkström 1997). I chose the welfare field because, despite its small size, I believe that it contributes to civic involvement and addresses pressing social problems compared to the field of sport and recreation. Volunteers engaged in helping their neighbors in a volunteer bureau have a greater impact on social problems than do volunteer football coaches, although Putnam (2000) would argue that volunteering in a football club contributes as much to social capital as does social volunteering. Nevertheless, while social capital “refers to connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam 2000:19), the organizations chosen here specifically address social problems, not only prevention. The visits to the isolated elderly help to alleviate exclusion.
This dissertation is at the crossroads of sociology of work, research on the nonprofit sector, and organizational analysis. I intend to address the work situation of voluntary organization workers at the organizational level as well.

The concrete questions arising from this research problem are:

1) How is work organized in voluntary organizations?
2) What is the internal dynamic between contract workers (employees) and non-contract workers (volunteers)?
3) What value and meaning do volunteers and employees attach to their work?
4) What connection do workers in voluntary welfare organizations make between their professional lives and voluntary work?
5) Is there a trend towards professionalization of voluntary organizations?
6) Can work in voluntary organizations contribute to social integration and civic life?

Addressing these questions may—though not within the limited framework of this dissertation—eventually help to tackle questions such as: Is full employment still possible? If so, in what form? Should it be restricted to the wage-earner model? What does high unemployment mean for our democratic life? What role can the non-profit sector play? What about all the hopes emerging from the so-called "civil society"?

The dissertation will be divided into seven chapters. The rest of Chapter 1 presents a literature review. I first present sociological work on voluntary organizations at both the macro (the social function of these organizations) and the micro level (internal organizational dynamic) and point out at the shortcomings in the prevailing approaches. Chapter 2 describes the Swedish nonprofit sector’s history, size, funding, configuration, legal character, relationship to the state,
specifically the field of welfare, and finally a short look at new trends affecting the sector.

Chapter 3 deals with the conceptual framework of the study and examines the main concepts of organization and paid and voluntary work. The present debate in sociology and philosophy on the meaning and future of gainful employment is addressed. Paid work has been seen as a societal integrator, the centerpiece of human life. However, this view has been challenged.

The reader will also find in Chapter 4 a two-fold methodology concerning both a series of 38 interviews with voluntary welfare organization (VWO) workers and a quantitative survey of VWOs.

Chapter 5 describes the structure, history, goals and orientations, and organization of work of four Swedish VWOs: 1) a children’s rights organization; 2) a women’s center; 3) a volunteer bureau; and 4) a humanitarian organization.

Chapter 6 presents the analysis. Work in voluntary welfare organizations is influenced not only by the popular mass movements (folkrörelser), which are the foundation model of all Swedish voluntary organizations, but also by paradigms emerging out of the public and for-profit sectors. The public paradigm shapes permanently voluntary welfare organizations through the action of paid workers who often have public sector work experience. Work in voluntary organizations is partly integrated into the regular labor market (for-profit paradigm) and interfaces emerge between volunteering and professional life. The private sphere also interferes with volunteering.

Finally, Chapter 7 questions the real independence of voluntary welfare organizations and looks at the implications. The results indicate that these organizations, influenced by the market and the state, do not, as certain authors imagined (Gorz 1980; Méda 1995),
fully represent a “space of freedom.” However, they can fulfill other functions, such as countering exclusion and reinforcing the social link.

Research on Voluntary Organizations

Despite the fact that study of the work of volunteers and employees in voluntary organizations has been neglected, there is an impressive literature on these organizations produced by economists, historians, political scientists, sociologists, psychologists, and scholars of religious studies. These scholars have addressed a series of questions at the level of the nonprofit sector, the voluntary organization, and its membership. I review here the literature on the nonprofit sector that helps to understand my sociological object: the work of volunteers and employees in voluntary organizations. For the sake of simplicity, I reduce the three levels addressed in the literature to a simple macro-micro categorization:

1) The macro-level research understands voluntary organizations either as social movement, economic unit, or political actor.
2) Micro-level work describes the internal dynamic of voluntary organizations and tries to understand the volunteer and his or her motivations. This approach introduces both an organizational and individualist perspective to the research on the nonprofit sector.

Macro Analysis

One approach has been to consider voluntary organizations as units of social movements, and to study their capacity to mobilize members politically. In this context, the study of the Swedish *folkräelser*, and its special focus on democratic structure and volunteering, will be addressed specifically in the next chapter on the Swedish sector.
The study of so-called new social movements such as the feminist, ecological, or countercultural movements has yielded an immense literature, by far by far larger than that on the nonprofit sector. A social movement is "a collective attempt to further a common interest or secure a common goal, through collective action outside the sphere of established institutions" (Giddens 1999:511). Scholars in this field of research have often understood social movements as political actors.

As social movements, with their informal structures, mature they become more bureaucratic. In the social sciences, the study of the former leads at some point to the investigation of the latter. Adam, McCarthy and Zald (1988) use the term social movement organization (SMO) to label the "carriers of the mature movement" (Adam, McCarthy et al. 1988:716). For example, Swedish voluntary welfare organizations originate from the reformist popular mass-movements (folkrörelser) (Wijkström and Lundström 2002).

However, the evolution from social movement to voluntary organization is not always automatic. In some cases, the movement may be illegal (e.g., anarchistic Black Block) or too ephemeral to acquire the social legitimacy enjoyed by voluntary organizations. Legitimacy comes with advantages such as tax exemption.¹

This field of social movements has generated scholarly work, mostly in the United States, on the political dimension of collective behavior and its capacity to mobilize resources (see, for example Smelser 1962; Tilly 1978). The term "resources" is here understood in a broad sense, encompassing land, labor, and capital as in the Marxian framework, but also authority, social status, and personal initiative. Voluntary organizations mobilize their member or volunteer resources in order to be successful in carrying out their goals. Garner and Zald (1985) have
stressed the SMOs’ high level of "rationality" in adopting processes of recruitment and organizational forms of mobilization.

While Europeans studying social movements (Touraine, Habermas or Melucci) have tied together history and identity formation in their conceptualizations (Eyerman and Jamison 1991:15), their American counterparts have focused on the analysis of the strategies of collective mobilization (Cohen 1985).

In the Nordic countries, the relation between the welfare state and the nonprofit sector has been a main interest (Henriksen and Ibsen 2001). Contributions in this area have proven useful to understanding some elements of the Swedish nonprofit sector such as voluntary organizations as mediums of social integration, the role of specific social movements in the emergence of voluntary welfare organizations, and their connections to the welfare state.

Voluntary Organization as Social Integrator
In the social movement literature, voluntary organizations are often seen as an opportunity for marginalized social groups to participate in public life (see, for example, SOU1999:84 1999). Durkheim developed the analysis of intermediary structures, stressing the necessary role of professional organizations (trade unions) in the development of organic solidarity in *De la division du travail social*. The French sociologist foresaw that these organizations could play an important role as main agents of social integration in an atomized industrial society (1991).

In an innovative social-movement approach addressing the issue of new possibilities of active citizenship, Brown et al. (2000) attempted to draw the main sociopolitical orientations of the nonprofit sector or, more specifically, of its basic elements, the voluntary welfare organizations. In their complex and changing interrelations with the state and the market, voluntary organizations adopt various
approaches for the provision of welfare. Drawing on an Australian national study of voluntary welfare providers such as neighborhood houses, childcare centers, support organizations, and self-help groups, the authors defined various "organizational frameworks that attempt to describe, justify and promote different approaches to welfare management" (Brown et al. 2000:1). The principal ones are the activist, charity, market, and welfare state industry frameworks, plus several frameworks made up of a combination of those four. The book has the advantage of contextualizing directly the issue of voluntary organizations in a broader sociopolitical context. The authors assessed the political role of these organizations in the national debate on issues such as policy-making, civic engagement, and the provision of welfare (Brown et al. 2000). It is a valuable contribution to discussion of the role of voluntary organizations as mediums and actors of social and civic integration.

Voluntary Organizations as Significant Economic Units
Research on the nonprofit sector first focused on sketching out its socioeconomic contours in order to assess its social and economic significance. A series of questions were raised by policy makers about the importance of this largely understudied "sector" at the beginning of the 1990s. How many organizations are active? What economic role could they play? What share of the economy do they represent? What employment potential do they have? Some of these questions have been answered by the international Johns Hopkins nonprofit sector project (JHP). Over 150 researchers gathered an extensive set of data to map out and compare the nonprofit sectors in a first phase on 7 countries (including Sweden) in 1994, and on 22 countries (excluding Sweden) in a second phase in 1995.
First, I present the general results of the JHP dealing with employment and the economy. The data for Sweden are presented in the next chapter (Lundström and Wijkström 1997). The JHP assessed the economic size of the sector in terms of expenditures and jobs, measured the fields of activity covered by voluntary organizations, and the organizations' sources of funding, etc, (Anheier and Salamon, 1996; Anheier and Salamon, 1997; Anheier and Salamon, 1999; Anheier, Salamon et al., 1999). The most significant results of this research are:

- The nonprofit sector is a significant economic force: the nonprofit sector in 22 countries represents 1.1 trillion US dollars in expenditures accounting for 4.6% of their GDP.
- Important national variations concerning the size of the sector. The nonprofit sector is more developed in advanced industrial nations, when considering the share of total employment and including volunteers. Western European countries like the Netherlands (12.5%), Ireland (11.5%), Belgium (10.5%), Israel (9.2%) lead the pack, while Central and Eastern European countries lag behind: Czech Republic (1.7%), Hungary (1.3%), Slovakia (0.9%) and Romania (0.6%).
- The sector is diversified but health, research, education, social services and culture and recreation predominate.

Other figures also show the significance of nonprofit sector employment and voluntary work (Priller and Zimmer 2000b):

- When including the voluntary workers and calculating their contribution in terms of full-time equivalent employment, the nonprofit sector's share of the GDP rises to 5.7%. It represents 7.1% of the overall employment in all countries, 4.9% without volunteers.
- The number of employees generated by the nonprofit sector compares advantageously with various industrial sectors in all the countries surveyed. With 19 million employees, this “small” sector almost
reaches the level of the transport sector with more than 22 million employees (see Graph 1.1).

*Graph 1.1*

Nonprofit Employment in 22 Countries compared with Employment in some For-profit Fields, 1995 (in Millions)

![Graph showing nonprofit and for-profit employment comparison]

Source: (Salamon and Anheier 1999)

The German contribution to the Johns Hopkins project has especially focused on employment issues. Job creation in the nonprofit sector had previously been overestimated. Indeed, the panacea for mass-unemployment in Europe will not come from the nonprofit sector (Sauer 2000). Regarding employment in the German nonprofit sector, Sauer (2000) noticed two major trends. Since Germany is based on a model of welfare that is heavily dependant on the nonprofit sector for the provision of services, and the nonprofit field of welfare has already been professionalized for many years (Salamon and Anheier 1998), professionalization appears as a major feature of the overall sector (Sauer 2000). Voluntary organizations such as Caritas and the German Red Cross play a central role in health and social services. A highly
institutionalized nonprofit field of welfare in Germany fits the principle of subsidiarity that gives “preference to nonprofit over public provision of core welfare services” (Priller and Zimmer 2000a:2).

Second, flexible working schedules are becoming more and more common in the German nonprofit sector, including a mixture of full-time, part-time, and less than part-time (less than 15 hours a week) work schedules (Sauer 2000). By being a precursor to new forms of employment and by investigating new fields of activity (Priller and Zimmer 2000b), the nonprofit sector can contribute significantly to solving the problems of the labor market in Germany and elsewhere in Europe, but not by miraculously creating many jobs (Sauer 2000).

Even so, voluntary work plays an essential democratic role in the nonprofit sector and should not be sacrificed at the altar of full-employment (Priller and Zimmer 2000b). Many organizations surveyed foresee growth, particularly in part-time work. However, legislative efforts have to be made to avoid the pauperization of nonprofit sector employment (Billiglohnsektor) (Sauer 2000). The concentration of low-paid female workers threatens the development of the sector (Rückert-John 2000).

I assume that the danger of ghettoization of the nonprofit sector, feared in Germany, can have a direct impact on the motivation of employees to work. For the same reason, the general financial devaluation of the sector would discourage competent candidates, and voluntary organizations would become an "occupational trap" for people not able to integrate into the regular labor market. Furthermore, I think that these "nested" or captured people would have a negative impact on the capacity of the sector to innovate.

However, the impressive Johns Hopkins project is not without flaw. Despite its indisputable empirical contributions, the project overlooks
all questions of altruism and volunteering motivation (NETS 1998). It also remains tied to its economics-based approach (Brown et al. 2000) and its American bias (NETS 1998). Indeed, the starting point of the project is the American nonprofit sector, which is much more developed than in Europe. In the United States, some voluntary organizations have occupied a central position in the provision of services in health and education, to the point of replacing the state in some areas. In Europe, these organizations have a more complementary role "in regard to a stronger welfare state" (NETS 1998:4).

With a perspective toward employment, the European Commission DGXII has undertaken a similar but more focused project. Their studies have assessed the propensity of the Spanish, Italian and German nonprofit sectors to create new employment opportunities. The results show a young and eclectic sector in Italy, immature in Spain, and well established but stagnant in Germany (NETS 1998). Even though some conclusions of the national reports find that the nonprofit sector could not generate new employment opportunities, the authors pointed to the legal context and encouraged European legislators to adopt laws favorable to voluntary organizations (NETS 1998).

Micro Analysis
The micro organizational analysis of voluntary organizations has attracted both sociologists and management theorists (see for example Eckardstein and Mayerhofer 2003; Pearce 1993).

Robert Michels (1981) conducted one of the first and most influential studies in this field with his analysis of internal organizational processes of pre-WWI German socialist parties. Organizations are strategic actors that are transformed by their own
leadership and structure. The development of the modern bureaucratic structure leads to the routinization of the original funding drive. A charismatic leadership incarnates the original goals. However, a small group of leaders, an oligarchy, in the long run becomes more intent on maintaining its own power than achieving its previous social goals (Michels 1981). This study is especially useful in understanding the process of professionalization in voluntary organizations.

Jone L. Pearce (1993), an organizational management scholar, has perhaps provided the most comprehensive study of the organizational behavior of volunteers. Her thorough analysis of the organizational behavior of unpaid workers is important for understanding work in voluntary organizations. Despite the fact that her empirical work dates back to 1977, her analysis of the organizational location of volunteers is helpful in the sense that it provides a sort of "middle-range" theory. She undertook a study of 14 organizations in Connecticut and New York City, comparing employee-staffed and volunteer-staffed organizations producing the same services. She showed how much these two staff structures have an impact on work and work attitudes.

A central element of her organizational study was how the uncertain position of volunteers in the organization affects their relation to their work. A combination of five factors can explain this. First, volunteers usually lack fixed temporal assignments. In most cases, volunteers perform part-time work and do discontinued tasks (part-of-the-job) (Pearce 1993:37).

Second, the absence of formal work contracts greatly restricts the coercive power of managers. Volunteers are volatile, and an organizational yoke that is too tight can easily cause them to leave. Smoother forms of control, such as interpersonal influence, have to be
used to avoid alienating volunteers. However, this approach has the disadvantage of defining their work tasks very vaguely.

Third, volunteers can easily revoke their commitment. Since they do not rely on volunteering to make a living, volunteers certainly lose less when leaving the organization than employees would.

Fourth, volunteering is perceived as a peripheral activity. Other life spheres such as family or gainful employment are often prioritized over an activity that appears to many like a hobby or free-time activity. The general perception suggests that volunteers do not associate strongly with their voluntary commitment, that they do not take pride in their engagement. These perceptions, true or not, undermine the position of volunteers in the organization.

Fifth, the status of volunteers is uncertain. The definition of tasks advantages employees; volunteers are often there to "patch the holes" (Pearce 1993:152).

It is interesting to note that a series of these organizational problems seem to find their root in the understaffing problems of the American voluntary organizations surveyed. For example, Pearce related that in certain organizations, the voluntary workforce is often chosen as a last resort when it turns out that the employees can no longer manage all the tasks on their own. Volunteers are often not the first option. In the Swedish context, the situation is simply the opposite: in the folkrörelser tradition (see Chapter 2) the members own the organization through a voting right and are invited to contribute actively through volunteering. They are not there as a last recourse, but as the core element. Another problem caused by understaffing is the formation of a strong powerful clique and a large group of loosely connected occasional contributors. We can easily imagine that the clique shows greater work commitment than the peripheral workers.
Pearce also looked at commitment and work attitudes. Her results showed more positive workplace attitudes among volunteers than among employees. The volunteers themselves reported higher job satisfaction and greater involvement than employees who are more calculating about their commitment (Pearce 1993: 11, 21). Furthermore, volunteers considered to be more committed to their work than employees (Pearce 1993:36). She interpreted these differences as an attempt by volunteers to compensate for their uncertain position in the organization. Why would a volunteer stay despite lack of satisfaction and motivation? Employees can more easily justify attitudes that are more negative and lower commitment since they can always pull out the “need to make a living” argument.

The employee-volunteer relationship is seen as an uneven equation between the pay of employees versus the self-sacrifice of volunteers. In this view, "The volunteers and employees in most of these organizations treated one another with great care and deference. Employees placed volunteers (especially founders) on pedestals and praised their self-sacrifice (and often were more than a little protective and paternalistic)” (Pearce 1993:146). Employees may praise volunteers, but according to the thesis of Michels (1981) and Weber (1978) on oligarchical and hierarchical trends in organizations, they do so knowing that they are actually the ones “running the show,” especially in more professionalized organizations.

Despite, her subtle analysis, Pearce’s study remains very much within the narrow framework of management theory. This field is concerned almost exclusively with organizational efficiency. Practitioners search for organizational flaws and propose remedies to improve the organization.
Karr (1999) added to the discussion of the devalued voluntary work. She proposed a modeling of the valuation of voluntary work conditioned by the status of volunteers in the organization. She showed that the lower the organizational status of the worker, the less his or her work is valued. More abstractly, the value attributed to work is directly and negatively affected by the absence of work contract between the volunteers and the organization.

However, the management theorists have not been the only ones working on the micro organizational issues of voluntary organizations. Sociologists and political scientists have also been doing so. Despite questionable methodology and too small a number of cases, a European project conducted by the Italian organization Lunaria has raised a series of interesting issues regarding work in voluntary organizations (Lombardi 1999). They have claimed that two founding principles of voluntary organizations create a more favorable work environment, this is, a far more “employment friendly” understanding of the nonprofit work environment than what Pearce reported (Pearce 1993).

The first principle is that unemployment motivates people to found their own organizations and create their own jobs. Consequently, they have a strong interest in creating a comfortable work environment. This affirmation is, however, contested by Jeppsson, Grassman, and Svedberg (Jeppsson Grassman and Svedberg 1999), who found that socially marginalized people (e.g., the unemployed) are not only disconnected from the labor market, but also from other social arenas such as community associations and neighborhood contacts, etc. Their “social isolation” therefore makes them unlikely to mobilize the resources necessary to create a job in the nonprofit sector.
Second, a voluntary organization with a benevolent mission also has to be consistent to create, or at least to be more sensitive to, the working conditions of its workers. However, this also has drawbacks. Managerial control is slack, leading to organizational weaknesses such as vague distribution of tasks on top of the traditional problems of the nonprofit sector, namely, limited funding (Lombardi 1999). This can later bring about heavier workloads and little job security.

Lombardi (1999) compared public and nonprofit sectors with the assumption that voluntary organizations are more flexible, closer to the grass roots, and adopt a more realistic time horizon than the public sector. This is most likely because they are simply much smaller than public organizations.

Concerning work satisfaction, it is claimed that turnover and work satisfaction vary with the function performed and the social category of the workers (Lombardi 1999). Therefore, the higher the educational level of a voluntary organization worker, the higher is the probability he or she will leave the organization. Inversely, people with lower educational levels and those having difficulty integrating into the normal labor market would tend to stay longer. In addition, workers performing more innovative tasks such as developing a training program show greater work satisfaction than the workers serving the coffee, or limited to routine work.

Finally, Lombardi (1999) ended with a version of Michel's (1981) organizational dilemma applied to voluntary organization. Growth can lead the organization to drift from its original mission, a situation that hurts volunteers who cherish the original mission. Growth can also result in an imbalance between volunteers (members) and employees. An organization built for volunteers is not necessarily adapted for employees.
In Sweden, Lars-Erik Olsson (1999) has conducted one of the few micro-level studies proposing a sociological micro analysis. His thesis describes the various establishment phases of a voluntary organization supporting people suffering from HIV-AIDS. He showed how a group of committed people seeks to tackle a shared social concern—here HIV-AIDS—by funding a formal institution. Olsson (1999) has shown how a charismatic leader or a highly motivated group of founders can—at least in the foundation phase—encourage voluntary organizations to fight for ideals ranging from the universalist to the particularist. The development process of the organization thus has an important impact on the level of commitment of the workers, both employees and volunteers. I conclude this review of the various approaches by looking at the psychosocial approach of work.

Organizational Dynamics and the Role of Work

Many micro-level investigations have studied the volunteer as such and his or her relation to political, psychosocial, and economic dimensions of volunteering. The deterministic explanations advanced by these studies regarding the motivations of volunteers are often not satisfactory. Psychosocial studies of motivation have been quite interesting and go beyond the claim that volunteers follow their class interest, etc.

Tilly (1978), at the end of the 1970s, was one of the first researchers to interview volunteers. He tried to explain the personal motivations and social background conducive to participation in social movements. He realized how successful social movements were in pursuing their own goals, and therefore also the political character of volunteering. According to him, "social movements are vehicles for a political socialization process." (Eyerman and Jamison 1991:25).
The sociologist of religion, Robert Wuthnow, has written extensively on altruism and volunteering, adopting the individual as the starting point of his analysis. He surveyed and interviewed a large number of Americans on their religious and economic beliefs and values, which he published in *God and Mammon in America* (Wuthnow 1994). He interpreted religious volunteering in the context of a paradox in the American ethos between greed and altruism. He claimed that today religious volunteering serves a therapeutic function in postindustrial society. In *Acts of Compassion*, Wuthnow (1991) looked at the volunteers' inner motivations. He observed a contradiction between altruism and the individualist demands of modern (American) society. He sought to make sense of altruism by asking volunteers why they made such a commitment. Surprisingly, volunteers mentioned self-interest and self-expression. They did not explain their commitment by referring to sacrifice or empathy, but claimed that it made them feel good. They had the chance to express caring feelings in these organizations, which is not the case in “cold” business and state bureaucracies. Wuthnow regretted the absence of "moral horizon.”

The volunteers he interviewed did not seem able to state a truth that transcends their individual experience. The introspective, therapeutic function of volunteering cannot answer his pledge for social justice. A compassionate volunteering should become the norm. In Sweden, one of the few studies on the psychosocial motivations of volunteers and the meaning of volunteering has shown a mixture of altruistic and egoistic motivations (Jeppsson Grassman 1997).

The socio-demographic character of volunteering is especially useful for describing volunteering patterns. There is an over-representation of certain social categories of people drawn to volunteering. For example, female pensioners often volunteer instead of staying home.
alone, a pattern that is very different from young male students, who are trying to gain work experience through community work (Jeppsson Grassman 1994). These patterns help one to understand the interface between volunteering and other life spheres.

The doctoral dissertation of Ulrike Schumacher (2001) takes a similar approach and is also at the junction of the sociology of work and research on the nonprofit sector. She created a typology of combinations between volunteering and other life spheres, mostly gainful employment, based on case studies of nonprofit environmental organizations in Berlin, Germany. Particularly interesting here was that she deliberately and conscientiously integrated nonprofit sector issues and volunteering with the debate on the future of work. She claimed that an interface allows a transfer of forms (procedures, methods) or contents (skills) between voluntary commitment and other life spheres, such as gainful employment or private life. For example, Martine uses her professional skills as a food analyst in a voluntary biological farming organization where she volunteers. Schumacher defined five ideal types that demonstrate the significant economic and social meaning of volunteering:

1) Mutual reinforcement: the level of voluntary commitment is positively correlated to the level of professionalization. For instance, a voluntary experience leads to a permanent job, or a civil officer at the immigration board also deals with similar issues as a volunteer.

2) Complementarity: voluntary work becomes a complementary and meaningful leisure activity. For instance, volunteering may be a way to satisfy curiosity, an interest in other areas such as environmental issues, the elderly, etc., that are not part of a professional course.

3) Linking: voluntary work links periods of unemployment or absence from the active workforce to periods of steady gainful employment. It
is often the case that the "volunteer" takes part in government programs to increase his or her employability.

4) Compensation: voluntary work can fulfill certain employment functions (personal autonomy, use of personal skills) that are not satisfied in a regular paid job. Usually individuals performing more technical or routine work with lower responsibility try to compensate by volunteering.

5) Alternative: voluntary work can become an alternative to gainful employment during transitional life phases such as retirement (exit from the working life) or education (preparation to the working life).

As seen especially in Point 5, Schumacher stressed that these types, that you can all find in the same organization, depend greatly on the individual's life phase (i.e., education, family formation and dissolution, career, and retirement).

Points 1, 3, 4, and 5 are most relevant to this dissertation for the relation between gainful employment and volunteering. The type 2, though, sheds an interesting light on the meaning of leisure (see Chapter 2, the conceptual discussion of leisure). Needless to say, the types may be different in the nonprofit welfare field where the "charity" element is usually at the center of voluntary motives.

Priller and Zimmer (2001) concluded from Schumacher’s study (1999) that no single pattern explains the relationship between volunteering and gainful employment in voluntary organizations. Instead, a series of rationales, motives linked to the individual (involving age, life situation, etc.), and organizational factors (organizational structure suitable for using volunteers) as well as the social context (unemployment rate) combine to link civic engagement and paid work, frequently in the very same organizations. Furthermore, the categories of paid work and volunteering are not
exclusive or limited to certain functions. Paid workers can fulfill certain tasks during regular paid work while performing other tasks during unpaid overtime. The managers of voluntary organizations must often resort to flexible organizational arrangements. One could also easily imagine a volunteer performing tasks originally allocated to paid staff. Schumacher called for a redefinition of the concept of employment, more adapted to the new realities of high unemployment and civic engagement (Schumacher 2001). In sum, she offers a good sociological reflection on making sense of the actors' orientations.

Volunteering can represent a career path for various individuals. As proposed by Schmid and Gazier (2002), the linking function (Schumacher 1999; Schumacher 2001) is especially promising in the actual labor market, which tends to exclude more and more people. They evaluated that voluntary organizations could offer a transitional activity between periods of inactivity or partial inactivity (education, retirement, pregnancy, unemployment, self-employment), and full-time gainful employment.

The primary concern of the German authors cited is mass unemployment and the search for alternative forms of work (Priller and Zimmer 2000b; Schmid and Gazier 2002; Schumacher 2001). A Swedish study also links employment and volunteering, but was chiefly interested in the democratic character of unpaid work: in a governmental report on civic engagement, Jeppsson, Grassman and Svedberg (1999) looked at factors contributing to social volunteering. As noted above, they found that employment is conducive to volunteering; unemployment, to the contrary, generates social apathy. In other words people who are already active do more, and those who are less active will do less.
The Shortcomings of Prevailing Approaches
Most of the studies presented above neglected to address work empirically, its settings, and its meaning to employees and volunteers in voluntary organizations. Except for Schumacher (1999; 2001), no one follows up at the empirical level on the connection between the voluntary sector and the debate on the future of work. A deep understanding of the organizational mechanism is often lacking. For example, they generally overlooked the essential character of voluntary organizations, that it is a hybrid workplace of employees and volunteers, a situation often leading to strong organizational dilemmas. However, the only micro level approach to understanding the hybrid character of voluntary organizations, namely that of Pearce (1993), lacked an assessment of the sociological implications and consequences of this hybridism for the new definition of work. Furthermore, the management perspective is less relevant for Swedish voluntary organizations since its economistic perspective clearly overlooks the democratic structure and the central role of the member. In the nonprofit management literature, volunteers are seen as a form of manageable subordinate staff, where the same management techniques apply to them as to employees (Eckardstein and Mayerhofer 2003). Even though such an approach provides an interesting analytical framework for VWOs that rely mostly on employees, as is the case in Germany or in the Anglo-Saxon countries, it falls short in explaining Swedish VWOs, in which the active member is considered the true owner of the organization.

I remain critical of some parts of the social movements approach, including the fact that it takes social movements as a starting point. This level of abstraction is often unnecessarily high for speaking of individuals' motivations. The social movements are too often described
as unitary entities, monolithic blocks, as if all its members, volunteers and employees were as united as ants in an anthill. By overlooking the individual as the departure point of movements and organizations, it becomes difficult to explain individuals’ behavior. It is necessary to open the "black box" of social movements and look at their human components, here, two differentiated categories of employees and volunteers and their interactions.

It is also interesting that the social movements literature has paid little attention to the voluntary character of these organizations. The fact that volunteers constitute the major part of these organizations is not taken into account. This has a considerable impact on the means the organization uses to achieve its goals. It certainly makes a big difference to work with volunteers who usually have a much looser tie to the organization and work part-time, than to work only with employees. In order to keep their volunteers, the managers of voluntary organizations must often walk a thin line between tight organizational control and total *laisser-aller*.

Regarding the organizational literature, one can criticize their economic vision or their incapacity to transcend the strict organizational frame. The macro organizational approach "puts too much emphasis on the quantitative character of the nonprofit organization reducing them to ‘job pots.’” Opposing this approach, others have defined nonprofit organizations as non-employment socialization space" (Defourny, Favreau et al. 1998a:340). This is the discourse of Gorz (1980), for example, who saw the dangers of heteronomy (control from outside), and commodification with the institutional transformation of the nonprofit sector as a massive employment provider. This is a position clearly counter to the German
debate on job creation in the nonprofit sector (Priller and Zimmer 2001), supported especially by economists.

This dissertation takes an individualist approach: what do the actors say about their own actions? What meaning do they construct out of what they do? I seek primarily to address the organizational and psychosocial features of volunteering in social voluntary, but not from the starting point of mass employment, as the German authors tend to do. I am interested in the intrinsic social character of volunteering and to see whether it can be linked to the broad social debate on the future of work.

The only exception to the shortcomings I have cited is Schumacher’s (1999; 2001) and others (Davis 2000; Defourny, Favreau and Laville 1998a; Defourny, Favreau et al. 1998b; Dubin 1958) study. She successfully linked both "end of work" and nonprofit sector. It is therefore interesting to see how this dynamic is shaped, what are the functions linking employment and volunteering in a different welfare model, i.e., in the social-democratic "world" (Esping-Andersen 1990) of Sweden.
Chapter II

The Swedish Nonprofit Sector

In Sweden, the precedence of the *folkrörelser* tradition has not permitted an Anglo-Saxon concept such as nonprofit sector to really impose itself. The movements strictly considered as *folkrörelser* are the free churches, the labor and temperance movements and emerged in the 19th century. The term *nonprofit sector* appeared only recently with the EU’s promotion of social economy. Therefore, Swedish scholars have favored the term *ideell sektor* (which could be loosely translated as “idea-oriented sector”) or *föreningslivet* (life of associations) to expand their investigations beyond the handful of historical *folkröelser* organizations. These designations focus on the fundamentally democratic character of these organizations; however, they have no equivalent in English. Despite being a more neutral expression, the term *nonprofit sector* allows more easily comparisons with other national sectors as it was done with the Johns Hopkins project (Salamon and Anheier 1996b).

I present here a description of the Swedish nonprofit sector: its history, size, funding, configuration, legal character, and its relationship to the state. Then I look specifically at the field of welfare, and I conclude the chapter with new trends affecting the sector.

The following description of the characteristics of the Swedish sector supports the position that national variations in size and structure are best explained by historical-contextual factors [Salamon, 1998 #148; Lundström, 2003 #121. The public organization and provision of welfare has been very determinant for the nonprofit field of welfare. The two main factors to explain the Swedish nonprofit sector are thus
the Swedish state and the *folkrörelser* tradition (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

History

This following brief historical account will help illuminate the specificity of the Swedish nonprofit sector. We can divide this history in three periods represented by three types of voluntary organizations: 1) the era of charity organizations, roughly between 1810 and the 1870s; 2) popular mass movements (*folkrörelser*) from the 1870s to WWII and finally; 3) the welfare state and contemporary voluntary organizations from WWII up to the 1990s. There are no strict historical separations between one type of organization and another; the charity organizations did not suddenly disappear in 1870. Different types of voluntary organizations overlapped at different times. The aim is simply to stress the original contribution of a certain type of organization at a particular moment in history.

Charity Organizations

A new social era began in Sweden after the disastrous Napoleonic wars and the coup of 1809. The collapse of the feudal system left a vacuum (Jansson 1985), especially in the field of welfare, where corporations and guilds took care of their members in case of sickness and other hardships. The widespread proletarization of the rural classes often led to extreme poverty. Great Britain had reacted to the social distress resulting from the industrial revolution with a series of private philanthropic initiatives. Industrialization reached Sweden significantly later and the British charities were rapidly copied. During the first decades of the 19th century, Sweden was a poor country plagued with important social cleavages and the combination of a demographic and
agricultural crisis (Koblik 1975). Because its centralized government was in no way capable of addressing the widespread social problems, it supported the foundation of voluntary associations that sought to support local authorities in the field of poor relief (Jansson 1985; Qvarsell 1993).

Contrary, to the folkrörelser that emerged towards the end of the same century, these philanthropies were not inclusive and open; rather, they likened clubs for members of the good society, for the elite of the emerging capitalist society" and aimed to help the “deserving poor” of the working class (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:66). Their members were mostly upper- or middle-class women who dealt with the working class people, whom they saw as passive recipients, and not as engaged partners: "In practice, persons from the working class could not be members of these associations, and the charity organizations were built on an ideology that honored bourgeois ideals," i.e., the redemptive feelings of devotion, self-sacrifice, generosity, enlightenment, etc. (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:57). This has been illustrated in Swedish literature in August Strindberg's “Röda Rumet,” (The Red Room) and in the figure of the English female volunteer, Lady Bountiful, in the play The Beaux Stratagem by George Farquhar.

Care was not directed to an anonymous mass of indigents. Many Swedish organizations adopted the Eberfeldt system, i.e., a Christian attitude stressing the importance of a personal connection between the giver and the beneficiary that fosters responsibility. For the first time, social work was individualized—casework was introduced, and the organizations could open a file, classify, and follow-up on every poor person they dealt with.

Inspired by the London Charity Organization, the Charity Organization Society of Stockholm (Föreningen för välgörenhetens
ordnande - FVO) was founded by a female aristocrat at the beginning of the 20th century as an umbrella organization to coordinate voluntary and public poor relief (Sjögren 1999). The FVO favored the containment of poverty instead of its elimination, and began to practice casework based on this idea of “help to self-help” (Sjögren 1999).

Despite the welfare state, the charity model has not totally disappeared from the Swedish landscape. Some charity organizations have managed to find a niche in the field of welfare. Such is the case of the Christian-based Stockholm City Mission and their work with homeless people, and prostitutes, etc, (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

Folkrörelser

A defining moment in the history and shaping of the Swedish nonprofit sector was the emergence of the popular mass-movements during the last decades of the 19th century. They created a tradition that has largely contributed to making this sector so distinctive, compared with the Anglo-Saxon model.

Koblik (1975) has interpreted the folkrörelser as a popular reaction to the rapid industrialization, widespread poverty, and political conservatism of the second half of the 19th century. However, while the charities were more part of an “offensive liberalism” attempting “to transform the subjects of the feudal state into citizens of a capitalist nation” (Jansson 1985:279), the folkrörelser aimed at gaining expanded freedoms, economic rights and security, and less privilege for the well-off (Micheletti 1995). The folkrörelser refer to three main movements: the labor movement, the free churches, and the temperance movement, which shared a common opposition to the social order of that time (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:117). The latter two were directly
imported from the United States as a result of bonds created by the recent Swedish emigrants. Most of these movements were founded in the last three decades of the 19th century: the main temperance organization IOGT at the end of 1870s; the Swedish Salvation Army in 1882; and the Pentecostal movement around 1900. Among the organizations of the labor movement, the Social Democratic Party (SAP) emerged at the end of the 1880s, and the main Swedish union LO at the end of the 1890s. By about 1920, labor unions had a membership of 830,000, which meant that one-third of Swedes were unionized. These organizations established a structure for important future movements, including the adult education institutions and sport associations.

The sociologist E. H Thörnberg probably coined the term *folkrörelser* in 1943, defining them as general social movements in which people meet and connect for three purposes: agitation, preaching or advocacy (*förkunnelse*), and leadership (Thörnberg 1943). Later the democratic principle of inclusiveness, openness, and democracy appeared at the core of the idea of *folkrörelser*: nobody was to be excluded (*utesluten*) from these “common associations” (*gemenskapen* in Swedish, *Gemeinschaft* in German) (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:75), and “the association should be available and open to everybody in the society”⁴ (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:82, my translation). These preschools (*förskolor*) of democracy (Heckscher 1951) have an obligation to build a democratic structure so that “every member has the same opportunity to propose and influence decisions”⁵ (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:90, my translation).

Two interesting examples of *folkrörelse* are the National Association of Pensioners (*Pensionärernas Riksorganisation*, PRO) and the temperance organization, the International Organization of Good Templars (IOGT-NTO). The former embodied the importance of
inclusion values such as “expressive and socially integrative aspects” (Lundström and Svedberg 2003:228). The latter appeared after the merging of several temperance organizations, and the IOGT-NTO became the largest of the folkrörelser. Its members were working class people who aimed through volunteerism to promote the principle of reciprocity, a principle fundamentally different from upper-class benevolence. The IOGT-NTO developed a solidarity approach based on reciprocal help: for the members and by the members. In this approach, the alcoholic is no longer a passive recipient of the welfare from the wealthy, but is accepted as a peer by other members—he is an asset to the organization. He both receives support and contributes to the organization. This was an important change for volunteering in Sweden compared with the early charity approach.

Today, the term folkrörelser has an almost “magical” connotation for most Swedes, implying positive civic engagement, an essential contribution to Swedish democratic life (Wijkström and Lundström 2002). It is seen as the democratic organization characterizing a widespread and significant Swedish social movement. Specifically, the folkrörelser should have a democratic structure, a wide national basis, and representation from the major regions of Sweden (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:89-90). At the core of the organization is the member. Membership refers to both an ideal of participation, a means of having impact on public debate and on society as a whole, as well as to a structure (list of members, meetings, membership fees) (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:93).
Building of the Welfare State and Contemporary Voluntary organizations

From WWII to the 1990s, the development of voluntary organizations was strongly linked to the building of the welfare state. The welfare state emerged out of a coalition between the SAP and the Agrarian party in 1933, and was secured by the Saltsjöbadet agreement of 1938 between LO and the federation of employers SAF. From then on, the state built up its own extensive system and took over many fields of activity, especially in education, health, and social services at the expense of voluntary organizations. This, coupled with improvement of living standards, rendered superfluous many voluntary welfare organizations, especially the charities (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:122).

Contrary to common assumptions, more state involvement did not mean less democratic activity in Sweden. During the emergence of social democracy, one observes a rise in the number of members and volunteers in their organizations (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:123-124). The memberships of certain *folkrörelser* such as unions and voluntary sports organizations grew, while temperance organizations and free churches declined between 1940 and 1970. At the end of 1970s, 9 Swedes out of 10 belonged to an organization (SOU1987:33 1987).

A new wave of voluntary welfare organizations based on the self-help principle emerged after WWII, including voluntary organizations for disabled people, school cooperatives, parents associations, and sports movements. Later, at the end of the 1950s, identity organizations started to emerge that promoted personal integrity and respect, and demanded recognition: patient-rights, cultural organizations, peace, women, and environmental movements (Micheletti 1995). These
modern organizations represent a formalization and hierarchization of the ideals of the popular mass movement.

Forced to redefine their role, and despite the fact that Swedish VWOs today play a marginal role in the service sector, compared with Germany, USA, and Great-Britain, they have invested in other sub-fields and created niches, and some organizations played an avant-garde role in such areas as home care and visits to people suffering from loneliness, and still have a significant impact on social integration (Wijkström and Lundström 2002).

Others turned to advocacy, lobbying for the social group they represented. Very characteristic of contemporary Swedish VWOs is the combination of interest organization and reciprocal help (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:125).

Today, the link--even the integrative processes--between voluntary organizations, especially VWOs, and the state are based on the setting of state subsidies and participation in decision-making (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:125). State funding is granted on the basis of recognition of a group as a folkrörelser, which means that the state considers that the organization contributes positively to democratic life, or in rarer cases, that its services are unique and indispensable (e.g., Stockholm City Mission). This “labeling” process has been institutionalized over time, and it has made possible a stable source of funding for many voluntary organizations. The folkrörelser tradition and its requirements for a democratic structure has made more difficult the integration into the Swedish organization landscape of organizations imported from other national traditions, such as Greenpeace and Alcoholic Anonymous (Ahrne 1994).

In addition, the research and information that VWOs produce and gather have played a significant role in the design of social policy
The issue of the relationship between the state and the nonprofit sector is addressed in greater detail below.

Size and Funding

The size of the Swedish nonprofit sector was initially underestimated. Early measurements concluded that this sector was small if not insignificant compared with those in other industrial countries (Boli 1991; Boli 1992; James 1989). Later studies showed that the reality was more complex. True, the field of welfare is small in terms of the relative number of persons employed in the sector, but viewed in terms of total number of volunteers, time volunteered, and total membership, it a large sector by international standards (Wijkström and Lundström 2002).

First, though smaller than similar sectors in other countries (see Table 2.1), it does account for over 4 percent of the Swedish GDP. The Swedish nonprofit sector therefore represents a significant part of the economy of this country.

Table 2.1

Nonprofit Sector Expenditures as Percentage of GDP in Sweden and Some Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>4.1 (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.7 (1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:157)
Membership Figures
Very high membership figures in both absolute and proportional terms, is another distinctive aspect of the organizations in the Swedish nonprofit sector compared with those of other industrial countries. The country ranks in the top three, with the Netherlands and Norway, according to an extensive study of 40 countries (Curtis, Baer et al. 2001). Lundström and Wijkström (1997) estimated that there were 32 million members in Sweden. Reflecting the configuration of the sector, membership is more concentrated in cultural and recreational organizations and in fields other than social services (see Table 2.2).

Table 2.2
Distribution of Membership, Main Fields and Social Services in Swedish Nonprofit Sector, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture and Recreation</th>
<th>32.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, Advocacy and Politics</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Cooperation</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor and Business</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:168).

Despite the purported decline in civil society around the turn of the 21st century, the Swedish membership figures do not show dramatic loss. Between 1985 and 1998, there was a net increase of 13 percent in 195 important voluntary organizations. Of course, older folkrörelser decreased by 37 percent, but new types of VWOs based on identity or advocacy increased their membership by 21 percent (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:188).
Employment
Despite the more than 100,000 persons employed in the sector in 1997, and the addition of some 25,000 after the separation of church and state in 2000, it remains small internationally and domestically (Kulturdepartementet 1999). In 1992, they represented only 2.3 percent of the total workforce in full-time equivalents, compared to around 6 percent in France, Germany, and the US (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:151). It is important to note here that Sweden represents a low-professional status sector compared with other industrialized countries.

Furthermore, a very low proportion of employees are concentrated in the field of welfare (see Table 2.3). They represented a low 36 percent of all nonprofit sector employees in 1992, compared with 89 percent in the Netherlands, 66 percent in Finland, and 56 percent in Norway (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:166).

**Table 2.3**
Distribution of Workforce by Field in Swedish Nonprofit Sector, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Research</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:151)

Funding
In general, the Swedish nonprofit sector proved to be more independent of state funding than was the case in other countries (see Table 2.4) in 1992. In fact, more than 70 percent of all the organizations’ income were either self-generated or came from private donations (see tables 2.4 and 2.5).
Table 2.4

Sources of Income of Voluntary organizations in Sweden and Some Countries, in percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Sector Payments</th>
<th>Earned Income</th>
<th>Private Giving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great-Britain</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Wijkström and Lundström 2002:171)

Table 2.5

Sources of Income of Voluntary Organizations in Sweden, in Percentage, 1992

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earned Income</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Payments</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Giving</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:145)

Funding in the field of welfare comes mainly from state fund (71 percent) (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:169).

Volunteering

If one considers the amount of volunteering provided in the sector, Sweden has a large sector. When compared with three other European countries--Germany, France, and Italy--the large amount of unpaid volunteer time in Sweden is striking. The calculation of voluntary work
performed in 1992 was equivalent to the labor of 228,804 persons employed full-time, which translates into thirty-six full-time workers per 1,000 citizens. With a percentage of full-time workers of 3.6 percent, Sweden ranks first; France comes in significantly behind with 2.5 percent while Germany has a figure of 2.1 percent (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:173). In another study, Swedes are at least as engaged as the top-of-the-list Dutch and British, and significantly more engaged than Germans and the Irish (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:193). As expected, this volunteering is concentrated in the field of culture and recreation (44.5 percent of all volunteering), while social services represent only 4.7 percent (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:145).

The Swedish level of professionalization was among the lowest in terms of proportion of employees among the total of paid and unpaid workers. That can be explained by the fact that fields not requiring many qualified workers, such as in the field of sport and recreation, compared with the field of healthcare, for example, dominate the Swedish nonprofit sector. In sum, the Swedish nonprofit sector is distinctive by its size, its source of revenue, large organizational membership, and extensive volunteering, but also by its low employment level.

Motivation
Jeppsson Grassman understands volunteering as a process stretching over a certain time with periods of deepening or shrinking involvement. She has postulated that the reason a person starts to volunteer may not be the same as the reason that person continues to pursue it (Jeppsson Grassman 1997:92). She lists a series of motivations for volunteering: the recognition that the society is not able to fulfill specific social needs (such as childcare), life crisis (such as the death of a child), desire to invest oneself in a meaningful activity, or happenstance, that is, a first
volunteering experience leading to new volunteering opportunities. However, she concedes that motivations are multiple and quite difficult to separate from one another. She ends up restating the debate between whether volunteer work is a goal in itself or a means (Jeppsson Grassman 1997:100). The question is: do people volunteer because they simply like it (egoism), or because they think it is necessary to help people (altruism)? She concludes that it might be a mixture of the two. Contrary to expectations of an era of egoistic volunteering, the respondents she met can still relate to altruism, they still have the desire to influence and change things for the better (Jeppsson Grassman 1997:109).

Nevertheless, the decreasing membership in traditional folkrörelser shows the decline of idea-driven (or altruistic) volunteering, and the emergence of new types of organizations, suggesting more “self-interested” patterns of volunteering (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

Configuration of the Nonprofit Sector

As mentioned above, early studies of the nonprofit sector were limited to service-producing organizations (healthcare, compulsory education, and social services). These studies too simplistically contrasted national sectors in which the state plays a different role, with what they saw as a totally state-dominated Swedish sector. For them, the presence of such a comprehensive state was incompatible with a strong nonprofit sector. Boli and James (Boli 1991; Boli 1992; James 1989), specifically, showed only a superficial understanding of the Swedish sector. Lundström, Wijkström, and Svedberg (Lundström and Svedberg 2003; Lundström and Wijkström 1997) rectified the picture by clearly establishing the distinctive character of the Swedish nonprofit sector. As I have shown above, the unique historical development of this sector
explains why its structure and organization are so different from those of the United States or continental Europe.

Boli and James (Boli 1991; Boli 1992; James 1989) contented themselves with a tautological equation: comprehensive provision of public welfare equals low provision of nonprofit welfare, in other words, more state means less nonprofit sector. However, do Swedish VWOs play a role other than providing services? More significantly, what about the importance of nonprofit sector in other fields? The reality is that the fields of labor and business, sports, and culture and recreation are important in sheer numbers of volunteers, members, and total expenditures (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:243) (see Table 2.6).

In Sweden, the field of sport and recreation is now seen as a *folkrörelser*, in the sense of its positive impact on public health and participation in democratic life (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:139).
Table 2.6

Distribution of Nonprofit Sector Expenditures by Fields in Sweden, in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor and Business</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Research</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Housing</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Advocacy and Politics</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not elsewhere classified</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:140)

Field of Welfare

The Swedish equivalent of the Encyclopedia Britannica defines welfare as “a general term for the life conditions of human beings. A description of these conditions is usually based on an evaluation of their financial situation, health, education, work situation and housing situation” (Nationalencyklopedin 2003 my translation). It therefore bears on the general vision of well-being, and in this sense aims at the common good. Welfare organizations cover a great variety of activities,
including provision of services (e.g., childcare, advice, education, accommodation, health care, crisis care), mutual support (e.g., self-help, health and education), and advocacy (e.g., rights groups, pressure groups). Sports clubs make up a large chunk of total volunteering in Sweden (Jeppsson Grassman and Svedberg 1999), but I exclude this research because it does not fit directly the above definition of welfare.

The field of nonprofit welfare represents a unique case. This small part of the entire sector in terms of employees and services delivered, funded primarily by the state, however, plays a strategic role in the nonprofit sector as a whole and in the design of social policy in particular. Welfare is made possible by social work: “the practical work performed to solve social problems primarily at both the individual and community levels” (Holgersson 2000:16 my translation).

In this sense, the term could apply both to the public or nonprofit sector, but with the professionalization of the Swedish welfare state, it is applied above all to the civil service. However, a significant number of nonprofessionals are also active. Social volunteering has suffered from working-class mistrust, a reputation gained from the time of the charity organizations. However, in the 1990s social volunteering was publicly rehabilitated (Qyarsell 1993:236). A governmental report stated in 1987 that voluntary engagement has “a great role in the renewal of the Swedish welfare” (SOU1987:33:14).

In Sweden, there is “a parallel between the evolution of social democracy into a political power and the development of social work into a profession” (Holgersson 2000:16 my translation). As we will see below on the relationship between the state and the nonprofit sector, public responsibility for the comprehensive organization and extensive professionalization of social work has always had a significant impact on VWOs.
The fact that in Swedish one refers to social work also as "empathy work" (omsorgarbete) illustrates that the public welfare organizations favor a holistic view of care. According to the Swedish social services law of 2000, “treatment should not limit itself to the symptom, but act to root out the problem and see whether other social resources can be used” (Holgersson 2000:86 my translation). Indeed, Swedish social workers assume a broader role than in Anglo-Saxon countries.

Following the Swedish legalistic tradition, the approach to social services focused early on social rights (Holgersson 2000). Civil servants with a legal education defined systematically the treatment procedures that social workers had to follow (Holgersson 2000 pp.112-113). The professionalization of social work came relatively late to Sweden, imported from North America. For example, casework was adopted in the 1950s to standardize social work, but because it consistently tended to discriminate against certain underprivileged groups, this method was dropped 20 years later (Holgersson 2000; Pettersson 2001). Social work education was integrated into the university system at the end of the 1970s and developed a series of social work specialties specific to Sweden, such as those in the field of home care (Holgersson 2000:115).

Legal Framework and Tax Exemption

The not-for-profit principle is defined in Swedish law, and organizations may benefit from tax exemption. Foundations are also legally defined and therefore benefit from the same privilege. However, surprisingly in such a regulated country, there is still at present no legal definition of voluntary organization (ideell förening). In Germany, a legal definition gives VWOs a specific role in the system of welfare provision in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. In Sweden, the absence
of legal status makes difficult the assignation of a clear social role for these organizations, and consequently tends to leave them at the fringes.

Legally there are four major legal types of general “nonprofit organizations.” Voluntary associations (*ideella föreningar*) represent the lion’s share of the entire sector (see Table 2.7). The Swedish literature strongly differentiates between the membership system and the voting right of *ideell* associations, and the absence of a membership system in the case of foundations (*stiftelse*) (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:15).

*Table 2.7*
Distribution of Operating Expenditures by Legal Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Form</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ideell</em> Associations</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Associations</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Ownership</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Lundström and Wijkström 1997:143)

A legal innovation enacted in 2001 required more accounting transparency. Voluntary organizations with assets exceeding 100,000 euros (1.1 million Swedish crowns) have to follow certain accounting regulations. Never before were there any requirements on the way voluntary organizations reported their assets and debts (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:24).

Relationship Nonprofit Sector-State in the Field of Welfare
To analyze the link between the nonprofit and public sectors in the field of welfare, one needs to define two distinct entities. It is not an
easy task since the balance of power is so uneven. On the one hand, a very dominant social democratic welfare state, active at almost all levels of society, which shapes the organization of all social services; on the other hand, a small nonprofit field characterized by a pro-state tradition and processes of integration with the public sector (Lundström and Svedberg 2003). In this sense, can we speak of fusional relationship? Or emulation of the second by the first? In any case, the question of the true independence of the nonprofit field should be addressed.

The dominant theme in the Nordic literature regarding the link between the two sectors is that the first “is highly determined by the welfare state and political interests” (Henriksen and Ibsen 2001:18). Norwegian authors have characterized this relationship as one of nearness and dependence (Selle and Kuhnle 1992). What has really shaped the nonprofit sector is the public takeover of its missions or tasks, and the way in which the state controls the welfare field (Henriksen and Ibsen 2001:18).

In studies of the field of welfare, Nordic authors speak of cooperation rather than confrontation (Wijkström and Lundström 2002). Historically, this may be explained by the fact that VWOs could not provide the same level of service quality and extensive coverage as can a state provider. Therefore, and as we saw earlier in this chapter, the building of the welfare state led to a public takeover in that field. The state assumed the main responsibility. Even with little left to chew on, the folkrörelser approved the takeover, they knew that this form of state was the ultimate solution for solving many social issues and poverty problems across the board, the only guarantee of universal programs (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:220). Consequently, they
early began to cooperate with the public sector (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:147).

Overall, the main stance of the ever-present social democratic governments concerning VWOs has been “complement not replacement” (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:205). The nonpublic organizations were allowed to play a role but only as long as they respected the state’s prerogatives and leadership. The democratic role of the nonprofit sector was recognized, and state grants were given to a wide range of organizations (from immigrant associations to environmental organizations) on the grounds of their positive contributions to society (samhällsnyttan) and their organizational structure, which respected democratic principles (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:220).

The traditional façon de faire of successive Swedish governments when dealing with what appeared to be a significant new social problem has been to favor public solutions. Nonprofit alternatives have been considered only when the first option would have proven impossible (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:220) or perhaps too expensive.

A deep-rooted mistrust for nonpublic solutions has always been high among social democrats (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:206). The lack of interest of the political elite in the nonprofit sector (Wijkström and Lundström 2002) has often left that sector in a position of dependency, living off the crumbs left by the state. And as such, the large-scale public sector has hardly paid much attention to the interests of the Lilliputian nonprofit field of welfare. Nevertheless, a small number of small-scale, self-run nonprofit service providers such as for home care, daycare, or schools do exist (see, for example, Pestoff 1998).

This leads me to believe that the state exerts a monopolistic power over the field of welfare and allows the intrusion of other actors only
under certain conditions. VWOs established their competence on certain subfields by scrupulously defining the “social problem,” (or can even problematize a social situation, e.g., the loneliness of elderly people) and prove that they have the knowledge and the resources to address it adequately. This uphill need to persuade the government means that VWOs must mobilize important discursive and ideological resources, often with the help of professionals. The expertise of some organizations is highly regarded, which enabled them to become involved in political decision-making. For example, the advocacy conducted by the National Association of Pensioners (PRO), which has a very large membership, has led to their increasing integration with the state, “into both the official system of referral prior to decision-making on the national level, and the so-called pensioners’ councils on the municipal and country level” (Lundström and Svedberg 2003:228).

However, the general orientation of the relationship took a new turn in the 1990s. Qvarsell (1993:236) has claimed that dependence became interdependence when mass-unemployment and rising public deficits forced the Swedish state to seek less costly welfare provisions and turned in part to voluntary welfare organizations.

Henriksen and Ibsen (2001:18) do not go as far as speaking of interdependence, but state that dependence has been reinforced at the level of the practices, and since the Nordic public sectors have adopted new management techniques and efficiency ideology, that has also significantly discolored on VWOs. General expectations about cost, quality management, and efficiency are higher at the same time, the new ideology favored privatization and outsourcing (Henriksen and Ibsen 2001:18).

In the case of Norway, the trend toward privatization led first to the recognition the nonprofit alternative for the delivery of social services.
Then, during a period of budget austerity, the nonprofit alternative was praised for its capacity to bring down the costs of social services (Selle 2001). This had a great legitimizing effect.

The nonprofit sector found a new legitimacy in Sweden as well when the national SAP government proposed a “folkrörelse policy” in its 2002 budget proposal. In this document, they stated that voluntary organizations would “develop, deepen, and widen democracy” (Justitiedepartementet 2002). The government recognized that VWOs could play a significant role in breaking the isolation of certain social groups and helping them to integrate.

The nonprofit actors themselves do not recognize their dependence or even the cooptation problem as an issue, . In a survey, most VWO representatives answered “no” to the question: Does governmental action represent any threat to your autonomy? (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:223). When they compared their situation to that in other countries, they defined their relations to decision makers as good and close, both at a formal and informal level (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:223).

Though there is no evidence in the literature, it may be assumed that the public effect on the nonprofit sector left serious spots not only on the externalities, but also on the internal configuration of voluntary organizations and on the balance of power within the organization. Greater professionalization certainly gives a prime position to professionals at the expense of members/volunteers. The new public management probably pushes VWOs to hand over tasks to similar categories of professionals: VWO managers deal with public managers, a cross-sector standardization of occupations. In this sense, the emulation of public skills and techniques is probably the safest way for VWOs to acquire public resources.
New Trends in the Swedish Nonprofit Sector

In the last decade or so, a series of economic, societal, and technological elements have changed both the internal and external environment of most of the voluntary organizations, and challenge the *folkrörelser* tradition.

More Voluntary Organizations -- Fewer Members

The number of organizations is increasing, while the population is demographically stagnant. Ahrne and Papakostas (Ahrne and Papakostas 2002) observe that what they call the “social landscape” is becoming increasingly densely populated by all kinds of organizations. Many old organizations have survived into the new century, but at the same time many new ones are emerging. One explanation is that the inertia of the old organizations regarding new realities gives an opportunity to new organizations, especially voluntary ones, to develop a niche in the landscape. In the 1990s, they responded to a need for community-building and active participation (Micheletti 1995).

A first consequence of this was a parallel increase in the interactions and interdependence between organizations, but also in competition. Nowadays, organizations acquire resources through contacts with other organizations. For example, member-based organizations rely more on other organizations and less on membership fees. VWOs compete to get grants from state and counties. For example, 80 percent of the revenues of 9 out of 13 aid organizations like Diakonia or Forum Syd come from the state, and the portion of membership fees is decreasing from 20 percent in the 1960s to 10 percent in 1990s (Ahrne and
Conservative parties depend on donations from companies and sports associations, and on the selling of products.

Another effect of this trend is the marginalization of human input, especially of members. The new communications technology eases coordination substantially, and few persons are needed to perform tasks that before required an army of volunteers. An increasing proportion of individuals commit themselves in a very limited way to a multiplicity of organizations, instead of committing themselves fully to one or two (Ahrne and Papakostas 2002).

Marketization
Swedish VWOs borrow from the marketing and economic jargon more commonly now than previously (Wijkström and Lundström 2002). This takes place at the expense of the traditional and inclusive folkrörelser discourse. For example, the yearly report of Save the Children (Rädda Barnen) stated in 2000 that one of its goals was to increase of its brand name (varumärke) (Rädda Barnen 2000). “Brand name” is a marketing concept. By placing itself in a position of brand name marketing, the VWO clearly seeks out public support, social recognition (in order to receive grants, private donations), but does not rely on membership fees and development. It no longer sees itself as a pot of democracy spreading its message against child molestation, but a market actor, offering a service and competing to receive the public’s attention.

According to Ahrne and Papakostas (2002), the organizations need new kinds of resources. Symbolic resources that can be traded against financial resources become more valuable than the acquisition of human capital in the folkrörelser tradition (i.e., increasing membership). For example, the expertise of a nonprofit women’s
shelter in hosting battered women is recognized, and it can therefore receive project grants from the public authorities.

Service-oriented Voluntary Organizations
There is clearly an actual trend where voice organizations or advocacy organizations tend to deliver services.

The spending cuts of the 1990s in the field of welfare changed the structure of public grants given to VWOs. In the sense that it is less based on general grants awarded for the democratic character of the organization, its democratic structure, but more on project-based grants, where the organization deliver services to certain populations. For example, the Federation of Sight-Impaired People (*Synskadades Förbundet*) has taken on all the training and education formerly assumed by the state. Other examples can be found in the development of women’s shelters and parents’ cooperatives organized to run kindergartens (Wijkström and Lundström 2002). VWOs hire people, they can offer like for-profit organizations retribution against work, but they have also the advantage of being able to offer special types of products such as trust, collective goods (Wijkström and Lundström 2002:100-103). VWOs accepted this new contract culture, but also focused more on private donations, this has been defined as a movement towards the Anglo-Saxon model and greater professionalization. (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

Do these developments mean that Swedish distinctiveness is slowly eroding? Alternatively, are they only marginal variations in a still dominant social democratic model?
Chapter III

Work, Volunteering and Organization: Conceptual Discussions

This chapter addresses conceptual challenges regarding the object of this study. The first challenge is to integrate the notion of voluntary work into the general, historical concept of work. The history of work and contemporary trends show that work, as it is conceived of today, is a child of the Industrial Revolution (Méda 1995). In addition, I will show that the division between work and volunteering as a free-time activity is largely inappropriate. Historically, the concept of work has varied greatly from the contempt felt by ancient Greece for manual activity through its rehabilitation in the medieval monasteries, and finally to its glorification by the Industrial Revolution. A historical perspective shows the inadequacy of the work/leisure division, and makes possible the conceptual connection between gainful employment and volunteering.

Furthermore, contemporary factors involving the economic fluctuations and technological breakthroughs in the labor market pose challenges to the wage-earning model. First, mass unemployment has led to a work supply crisis and a problem of social integration. Second, the increase in public transfers as a portion of the total individual income reduces the share coming from earnings. Third, new work attitudes have emerged, first embraced by the generation of 1968. Finally, the advanced capitalist economy generates new forms of work, more fragmented, more service-oriented and less production-oriented.

After examining the notion of work, I will consider more systematically the issue of volunteering and its relation to professional
life. I will then address the question of the motivations for volunteering, which help, in the absence of a work contract, to clarify the bond between the unpaid worker and the voluntary organization. Two apparently opposite motivations will be discussed: altruism and egoism. Despite the empirical difficulty in disentangling the two, altruism emerges conceptually as the more significant here.

The Concept of Work

Before conceptually connecting volunteer work and paid work, we have to look at the dominant definitions of work offered by the sociology of work. From some 20 definitions of work compiled by Karlsson (1986:45-48), the dominant variables of work that emerge are money, exchange, and material production, and not unpaid contribution, sociability and services.

Marx's focus on industrial production strongly oriented his definition of work toward the transformation of nature, leaving aside services: “Labor is first of all a process between man and nature, a process by which man, through his own actions, mediates, regulates and controls the metabolism between himself and nature” (Marx 1977:283).

The central economic character of work is a dominant theme in the literature: activity producing a value in exchange for remuneration (Dubin 1958; O'Toole 1973). The inclusion of unremunerated work, such as household work, has appeared more recently in the definition of work (Tilly and Scott 1987).

In a well-respected sociology handbook, work is defined in these terms: "the (paid) carrying out of tasks requiring the expenditure of mental and physical effort, which has as their objective the production of goods and services that cater to human needs” (Giddens 1997:491).
Work contains six characteristics: money, activity level, variety, temporal structure, social contact, and personal identity (Giddens 1997:513-514).

These definitions embody the division between work and free time developed since the Industrial Revolution. This division probably characterized 1950s American suburbia, where wage earning stood at the center of social existence and free time and volunteering at the periphery. The full-time, male white or blue-collar breadwinner embodied what it meant to work, while his wife was probably engaged at the church, in neighborhood service, or in reading circles, and represented the other side of this division. Wage-earning and volunteering appeared complementary, but they were not: without the first, the second cannot exist. Social time is invested in productive work; if it creates sufficient wealth it can liberate time for “nonproductive activities” like volunteering.

To go beyond this asymmetrical relation, a the brief overview of the concept of work will put into perspective this dominant vision of work, and challenge the equation work equals wage-earning and possibly break the work/free time division.

The Invention of Work: Historical Evolution

Concrete labor generating the means of subsistence has always been intrinsic to human societies, but modern society has put the economic category of abstract work, the precondition for the “wealth of the nations,” on a pedestal. An overview of the historical character of work is crucial for a contextualized understanding of the meaning of this productive activity in our contemporary society.

First Societies and Antiquity: Beyond the Productive Value of Work
Before the Industrial Revolution what human beings considered a central activity was mostly not related directly to the production of the means of subsistence. This was especially true in the case of the first societies. The prevalence of an “unseen world” incarnated in nature and in things (Malinowski 1984) makes us realize how much our contemporary conception of work, with its extensive harnessing of nature by human power, was possible only in a desacralized world.

For the first societies, the notion of abstract work made no sense. The organization of their societies evolved around activities related to the “unseen world,” and not the production of the means of subsistence. For example, a ritualized system of exchange (kula) was absolute central for the social organization of the Trobriand Islanders of the South Pacific. This system consisted of the exchange of shell necklaces and bracelets between tribes (Malinowski 1984). The more often the objects had been exchanged, the greater their value. The exchanger gained social power in the process and as a result would be provided with essential goods and women. This exchange ritual was fundamental for the Trobriand Islanders, not the production of bracelets and necklaces.

A second important distinction is that work was not separated from social relations, especially the family. Until as late as the 19th century, economies were all immersed in social relations: work was generally performed as a member of the family grouping, not as an anonymous worker (Polanyi 1968). Worker was not a status as such nor was work a real category of the tribal economy (Godelier 2001).

Finally, work was less important because less time was devoted to it than in industrialized societies. Anthropologists have observed that due to the absence of profit in the first societies, they in general worked
less, less regularly, and less monotonously than in industrialized societies (Godelier 2001).

Work did not exist as a general economic category (“abstract work” of Marx) in ancient Greece, but rather, a multiplicity of specific activities were connected to various professions. The concept of work was based on the Greeks’ hierarchical religious system (Méda 1995). On Earth live the mortals in a fallible world, in Heaven live the Gods in a perfect world. The goal of the mortals was to resemble the divine perfect world and escape perpetual necessity.

The main stratification of activities was based on the level of dependence to the men or things required to carry them out. We know that in ancient Greece, independent and free endeavors related to theoría and logos—reason and contemplation—were highly valued because of their closeness to the divine world.

Following this logic, the ergon of the artisan—the shaping of material—occupied a lower level. Despite mastering a certain technique, his position was not enviable since his living depended on selling his services to the undistinguished masses. At the bottom of the hierarchy, pónos (cf. with the French peine, toil, here degrading physical activities) was done by the slaves in the domestic and reproduction realm—the “invisible sphere” opposite to the bright lights of the public agora.

This stratification was made possible only by slavery, liberating a small fringe of the population for the activities of philosophy and politics. However, element differentiating work in ancient Greece from its contemporary form was its personalization, its binding to the status of its producer:

The example of Ancient Greece (...) shows what was missing in [the category] of work to become a central category. The artisan and even more the slave could not be conceived of as producers of social
value: their situation what one of service provider, their production what strictly seen as use value, immediate value to whom it was directly intended. It was therefore excluded in such personalized relationships to compare occupations and that emerge a common measure in the line of Marx's abstract work. If the artisans are citizens it is not because of their work relations, it is beyond that and despite of them. (my translation Mottez 2001).

The notion of work did not evolve much during the Roman Empire (Méda 1995). Rank or blood determined what type of work one did. As in ancient Greece, the presence of a large working force in servitude exempted Roman citizens from doing unvalued physical work. A recent study of the Ancient Roman economy shows how the perception of work had an impact on the economic and technological development of the empire (Schiavone 2003). As such, slavery was not economically irrational; it was as productive and as profitable as free work. Yet, it confirmed the elite in their pejorative view of work, and led to a refusal to devise socially and intellectually useful activities. Coupled with a dependence on slavery, it kept work in constant marginality (Schiavone 2003). It has even been claimed that the Roman disinterest in work contributed to the fall of its Empire (Schiavone 2003).

Middle Ages and Reformation: A New Stratification of Activities

Christian predominance during the Middle Ages subjected economic life to moralism, and represented an obstacle to a new conception of work. However, a reinterpretation of religious texts brought a new understanding of manual work, followed gradually by a new valuation that emerged towards the end of the Middle Ages (Méda 1995).

The conception of work dominant during the Middle Ages was elaborated at the end of the Roman empire. St. Augustine (354-430) drew a parallel between divine achievement and the reality of human work, which made him call human work opus Dei (the work of God). Even if he valued intellectual activities over manual work, "honest
manual labor" performed by peasants and artisans kept the spirit focused on God and kept the laborer from idleness and laziness.

Méda (1995) noticed two important changes regarding the medieval category of work. First, between the 8th and 9th century there was a significant reevaluation of work based on an ideology of productive effort, mainly in the fields of agriculture and technology. Second, between the 12th and 13th century, the Catholic Church considerably decreased the number of professions it declared illicit, and partly tolerated interest loans (Méda 1995:56).

Slowly there appeared a rational organization of productive activities necessary for human needs (Méda 1995:58). Some productive activities came to be considered socially useful. As Max Weber showed, an important breakthrough was about to happen with the building of monastic life. Monks showed the way to an honorable life, that the glorification of God could be achieved through, and not in spite of, manual work. It was another way to keep the spirit focused on God.

The Reformation also had a major impact on the evolution of the notion of work. A change of ethos appeared with the value placed on of mundane activities by Luther and Calvin (Méda 1995). The first Protestants fundamentally transformed the worldly quest for Heaven. Luther’s 95 Theses instilled a profound doubt about the believer’s own worthiness, one’s own salvation could not be secured simply by praying to icons. The Christian was forced to face God alone, without the support of the community, assuming full individual responsibility for life on Earth at the time of the Judgment. Therefore, the believer had to curb his or her life according to the Divine. Worldly asceticism appears as “relentless hard work oriented to the future” (Sennett 1998:104). \(^9\)
Industrialization and the 19th Century: The Centrality of Work

Despite signs of change, the defining moment appeared during the industrial revolution, when labor became a citizen’s duty to produce value in exchange for remuneration: "For the past two centuries we have belonged to societies built on work. Gainful employment has become the principal means for individuals to acquire revenue and therefore to make a living.” (Méda 1995:8, my translation). This was new.

Adam Smith’s presentation in *The Wealth of the Nations* confirmed that work emerged conceptually at the core of collective wealth by creating or adding value to goods. The world had become desacralized; the great force of capitalism was about to be unleashed and Smith explained how work could be used for that productive purpose.

However, the path to a new conception of abstract work addressed first the question of exchange. In a system based on the exchange of goods, how does one compare and value them? How can all productive activities be put on the same ontological level for evaluation? The theoretical unification of work holds a key: "work is described as homogenous substance identical in all time and space" (Méda 1995:62). From then on, work became the unit of measure for exchange, the common denominator for all goods. Work in the abstract therefore became divisible, quantifiable. Each individual now contributed to the “wealth of the nation” through work. This mass of work could be freely exchanged for remuneration, and became merchandise like any other, freed from dependence relationships.

According to Méda (1995), Smith did not reduce work to an economic category, but invented a new category that subsumed what he considered productive activity: "work means therefore productive work, i.e., work performed on exchangeable material goods, from which
added value is always visible and measurable” (Méda 1995:68). Consequently, the invention of work derived from an "external" concern (exchange and wealth) and was not endogenous to work itself (a practical study of human productive activities) (Méda 1995).

More than the concept of work, the empirical reality of human work greatly affects its character. The technological boost of the 18th century required an increasing quantity of human and mechanical work (Méda 1995), and industry increasingly turned independent farmers and artisans into wage earners. Wage earning became more than an extensive social phenomenon, it opened the door to a new and central form of socialization. Already during the French revolution, an official report foresaw the emerging relation between workers and the society: "If one has the right to say to the society: ‘support me’, then the society has also the right to answer back: ‘give me your workforce’”. (Assemblée nationale constituante 1995).

Finally, even philosophy glorified work as a new form of emancipation. John Locke claimed that work gives men the opportunity to use their own bodies for productive activities and develop their independence with the alienable right of property. Thanks to work, human beings can live autonomously by using their capacities: "work is the name for human activity, performed autonomously, allowing the individual to make a living” (Méda 1995:70).

However, the tension between this liberating potential of work and its harsh reality, often performed in factories under very difficult conditions, appeared starkly during the 19th century. The idea of emancipation was refined and expanded by Hegel (1959), who understood work (Arbeit) as the transformation of nature by the human spirit. In this process, the spirit improves its understanding of itself, revealing its potentialities and increasing the range of its activity.
Work is then mankind’s and every individual’s self-recognition and self-realization in a dialectical process. By performing an activity, the worker reveals his or her possibilities.

Marx differentiated between emancipating work and alienating work: “Labour seems a quite simple category. The conception of labour in this general form—as labour as such—is also immeasurably old. Nevertheless, when it is economically conceived in this simplicity, 'labour' is as modern a category as are the relations which create this simple abstraction” (Marx 1973:103). Marx shared the agnostic view of Hegel that humankind is its own creator and, through the individual contribution to production human beings are bond to that essential collective process that is exchange. However, the modern modes of production and the quest for capital have created alienated work. The tension between real and alienated work can be solved through a revolution of the modes of production.

For Saint-Simon, everyone's work is a voluntary contribution to society's progress (Saint-Simon 1966). The socialist movements claimed that “true work” and not capital should be remunerated, and that the freedom to sell one's workforce was not enough. The right to work appeared as a new rallying cry. The revolt of 1848 and the 1871 Paris Commune symbolized that work had become a social link and the key to self-realization (Méda 1995).

Contemporary Challenges to the Wage-Earning Model
This overview has shown how work has become the cornerstone of our society, but history does not stop and work continues to change. Contemporary factors contribute to the erosion of the wage-earning model erected by the Industrial Revolution, a form of work that became the dominant model in industrialized countries for a majority of the
population after WWI. These factors emerged along 3 axes: the supply of work, attitudes towards work, and new forms of work.

Supply of Work
Over the last decade or so the sociology of work has begun to focus on the question of employment and its distribution (Erbès-Seguin 1999). The centrality of work has been challenged through the debate on the capacity of industrial societies to provide employment for all. Mass unemployment affected and still affects many advanced economies. It is still unclear whether the emergence of new technologies has had a major impact on unemployment. However, the development of the welfare state during the 20th century, and increasing public transfers has decommodified work, which has weakened the wage-earning model. Finally, the repercussions of the work supply crisis have lead to a growing social deficit among the unemployed population.

Mass Unemployment
Mass unemployment has put the question of the supply of work in the forefront. Rates of employment vary greatly among developing economies, but mass unemployment has hit almost all OECD countries at one point or another since the 1970s (OECD 2004). Though, the situation in Sweden has largely improved over the last 5 years to a level that many characterize as full employment, and the United Kingdom and the United States benefit from relatively low levels, such is not the case in continental Europe (OECD 2004). Despite a drop in the late 1990s, unemployment rates have been going up since 2002. The average unemployment rate in the European Union during the summer of 2003 reached over 8%; in the main economies of the European Union such as Germany, Italy, and France rates flirt now with 10% (see Table 3.1).
Table 3.1
Unemployment Rates, Sweden and European Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OECD 2004)

High rates of unemployment have sparked an ongoing debate since the mid-1990s among social scientists on the market's capacity to supply jobs for all. Jeremy Rifkin’s highly publicized *The End of Work* (1995) makes the claim that the workforce will continue to diminish irreversibly because of computer and telecommunication technologies. Contrary to the postwar Fordist equation (more human and technical work means higher productivity), production now takes place at the cost of the marginalization of human work (Aronowitz and DiFazio 1994; Erbès-Seguin 1999; Rifkin 1995). The causes vary: extensive automation causing a marginalization of human work in the manufacturing, service, and agricultural sectors (Rifkin 1995), or it is due to the globalization of production and exchanges (Erbès-Seguin 1999).

This conclusion has been contested. For example, according to Castells (Castells 2000:280), “there is no systematic structural relationship between the diffusion of information technologies and the evolution of employment levels in the economy as a whole.”. As for the “end of work,” it might just be the crisis of the wage-earning model (Erbès-Seguin 1999). The full-employment era between the end of WWII and the early 1970s had obscured the difference between work and wage earning; mass-unemployment has revealed the difference (Grawitz 2001:166). For example, social work will be in great demand
with an aging population more dependent on services, but the question is what form of work will it be?

Public Transfers and the Welfare State
The socialist movements understood the tension between the harsh reality of work and the ideal of emancipating work. During the 20th century, the welfare state was built, partly, by promising to seek a balance between the unavoidable sale of one’s labor and emancipation. Social policy should increase the quality of life by affording health insurance, unemployment insurance, pensions, family allowances, and social housing. The welfare state has decreased the dependence on the market, as illustrated by ongoing decommodification (Esping-Andersen 1990): citizens receive more financial resources from the state and less from the market. Consequently, the welfare state partly eroded the centrality of the wage earner model. Overall, public social transfers have been increasing during the 20th century (Méda, 1995).

One form of decommodification has been unemployment benefits. In times of full employment, it represents a temporary form of financial aid, but during long periods of mass unemployment, unemployment benefits or social welfare may represent the main source of income for significant life periods. Consequently, high unemployment increases the portion of total revenues that public transfers represent and decreases the wages portion. This is especially true in Sweden, where public transfers represent a substantial part of earnings. Data shows a stabilization of the proportion these transfers between 1991 and 2001. They largely hovered around 30% of the earnings of Swedish households, while the remaining 70% came from paid work and capital earnings (Statistics Sweden 2003).
Social Deficit
Work is seen as pivotal to social integration: "For two centuries, we have belonged to societies built on work. Gainful employment has become the principal means for individuals to acquire income.... However, work is also an essential and basic social relation." (my translation Méda 1995:8). As shown by Durkheim, the division of labor "binds durably the workers through a system of rights and duties" (my translation Durkheim 1911:403), in which unions contribute to socialize and integrate the individuals in the system of production, and as such access the society as a whole. The socialist movements, including the Swedish democratic movement, had as a core dogma the idea of work as social bond. Full employment was a key component of folkhemmet, a way to guarantee to all a decent and honorable life. Indeed, the program contained in Ernst Wigforss’s 27 points for full employment and democratic economy set the tempo for the post-WWII social democratic Erlander government (Isaksson 2000).

However, if paid work is an identity marker, the other side of the coin is that unemployment means social exclusion. In periods of mass unemployment, this has turned into an accumulating social deficit. Consequently, social scientists have started looking beyond the wage-earning model for social inclusion alternatives to compensate for this market failure. This debate has been especially heated in Germany recently. I will address these questions in greater detail in the last chapter.

New Work Attitudes
The utilitarian approach says that, the financial reward is so decisive, work is a necessity, a duty. Yet, workers do not unconsciously fulfill their routine work tasks like the automat-like worker interpreted by Charlie Chaplin on the assembly line of Modern Times. They are also
engaged in a reflexive process over the value of their productive activity that results in positive or negative attitudes.

The work ethic is usually associated with very positive attitudes. Weber referred to the work ethic as a sense of duty: "It is an obligation which the individual is supposed to feel and does feel towards the content of his professional activity" (Weber 1978:54). Or the process is more important than the result: "Labor must (...) be performed as if it were an absolute end in itself, a calling" (Weber 1978:62). Concretely, punctuality, hard work, long hours, thrift, and honesty defined the work ethic of the first capitalists. In sum, the work ethic is the "self-disciplined use of one's time and the value of delayed gratification" (Sennett 1998:98). However, the contemporary reality of work reveals the idealistic character of such a view. During the last decades, unilateral commitment to work has been one factor of the wage earning model heavily challenged. The post-war generation generated new expectations regarding work, and in addition, the advanced form of capitalism eroded the sense of temporal attachment and loyalty to the company. Let us look first at the new work attitudes.

The generation of 1968 redefined our relationship to work. They generally showed higher individual expectations towards paid work. They questioned its centrality--personal identity goes beyond professional status, and work time should be reduced or curbed in the interest of other life priorities (Inglehart 1990). However, mass unemployment may modify that trend and reassert the priority of work.

Self-realization at Work
The material well-being enjoyed by many societies after WWII has triggered a value shift towards a greater focus on self-realization, a change that has permeated all spheres of society, including the realm of
work (Inglehart 1997). Individual expectations at the workplace are mounting. While the 19th-century socialist movements fought for acceptable working conditions and against long and exhausting hours, now the demand is recognition of the human being beyond the worker. Work should also contribute to individual emancipation and self-realization.

Drawing on the results of the World Value Survey, Inglehart compared attitudes towards work in different types of society. In developing countries, having work is essential just to “survive,” while “in economically more developed societies, people place greater emphasis on work as a source of personal satisfaction.” (Inglehart 1997:16). In societies of well-being, people expect a humane workplace, comfortable work environment, social contact, etc, but more importantly, stimulating tasks allowing self-fulfillment, emancipation, and the possibility to realize one’s own potential. I doubt that these wishes have been met for a majority of workers, but it remains an important ideal.

Identity beyond Work
The attitudes of the societies of well-being, or what might be termed postmaterialist values, have also affected identification with work. The 1968-generation challenged the exclusive personal identification with professional status in Western countries, stressing the importance of friends and leisure at the expense of work (Inglehart 1997:17). A world liberated from human work, a society of leisure, was a popular theme at the end of the 1960s and during the 1970s (Dumazedier 1967). Sociologically, the prediction failed, but the attitude remained: work represents only one variable in a life constellation in which lifestyle, leisure, family, and religion are all identity markers. Moreover, the identification with work has being damaged by the end of the Marxist
vision in which workers embody the progress of humanity (Méda, 1995). The 1980s praised the virtues of the domestic sphere (cocooning, home entertainment, gardening, etc.) (cf. Méda, 1995).

Work Time and the “Other” Times
The labor movement’s fight for shorter hours has raged since at least the 19th century, when workers likened the industrial demands on them to modern slavery. The battle for the eight-hour day, free weekends, and paid holidays represented very important gains achieved by the trade unions in most countries through the last part of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century (Encyclopedia Britannica 2002).

However, the contemporary demand for shorter hours is of a different kind. The postmaterialist attitude is that work is one form of time, an important one, but not necessarily the central one, and should cohabit with a series of “times” devoted to relatives, sports, volunteering, religion, travel, etc. The reforms undertaken by the socialist Jospin government in France in 2000, which reduced the standard week from 39 to 35 hours was partly an attempt to address that demand (Chartier 2002). This reform represented an increased flexibility and individualization of time management (individualization des rythmes de vie). The work week could now be squeezed into four days, leaving three days for very different types of activity. It represented a break in the industrial 5-day, 40-hour work week in which everybody works at the same time and for the same length of time. It allowed greater flexibility for individuals with varying working needs during different life cycles. Indeed, this reform partly answered new problems emerging with the feminization of the workforce, such as the dilemma of balancing full time work versus family needs, felt with more acuity by professional women (Chartier 2002). Along these lines, public initiatives referred to as “times in the city,” have been taken by
some French and Italian municipal authorities to adapt public services schedules to the difficult balance work and family.

The debate on the reduction of the work week has recently been active in other countries such as Sweden, where the problem of “burnout” has worried many trade unions and politicians. However, since the work week seems to be extending in many other countries, it is difficult to know whether the French model will be emulated elsewhere or will remain an anomaly.

New Forms of Work
Advanced capitalist societies have seen the emergence of new forms of work since the 1990s. The telecoms, information technology, the networking environment have contributed to an acceleration of the labor process. Scholars such as Sennett (1998) and Méda (1995) have underscored the alienating character of contemporary forms of work. The fragmented work of the new capitalism with its downsizing, disposable workforce, and sudden and continuous relocations have had devastating consequences on the self, undermining people’s perception of themselves as worthy members of society (Sennett 1998). In Arendt’s (1970) wake, many scholars have denounced what they see as dehumanizing work, limiting our capacity of self-realization and all centered on the productive process (Arendt 1970; Aronowitz and DiFazio 1994; Gorz 1988; Méda 1995; Rifkin 1995; Sennett 1998).

Fragmented Work
The contemporary wage earner is facing a fragmented work process: project-based, short-term contracts, outsourcing, relocation, etc, that makes working conditions change as fast the tasks (Sennett 1998). The worker is more isolated in this labor process, executing the tasks at
home, or frequently changing working environments and colleagues, etc.

The age of flex-timers (Castells, 2000) is the expression of this piece work. Part-time workers have increased their numbers significantly in all OECD countries between 1983 and 1998 except Denmark and the United States (Castells 2000:283). Non-standard forms of employment represent about 40% of all employment in many countries (Castells 2000:285).

This represents the “individualization of labor in the labor process” (Castells 2000:282). As this author said, “Overall, the traditional form of work, based on full-time employment, clear-cut occupational assignments, and a career pattern over the life-cycle is being slowly but surely eroded away” (Castells 2000:291). Most the jobs are occupied by “a disposable labor force that can be automated and/or hired/fired/offshored, depending upon market demand and labor costs” (Castells 2000:295-296). In sum, “a more fundamental process has been triggered by informational work: the disaggregation of labor, ushering in the network society” (Castells 2000:302).

For Sennett, the new capitalism based on information technology tends to create a labor process based on teamwork and scheduled task work (Sennett 1998). The effect of this new trend is a new work ethic that dissolves individual responsibility and the mastering of one's own time (Sennett 1998), a reality that comes closer to the circumstances of volunteering: little responsibility and more flexibility.

For a well-known business consultant such as William Bridges (1994), the organizational structure focuses more on skills than on jobs. The organization ceases to follow the manufacturing-based model with traditional jobs, but should adopt new flexible employment models where everybody is a “contingent worker,” where organizations are
constantly changing and the skills they need change rapidly (Bridges 1994).

Immaterial Work
Much of the work done by people today has intangible, immaterial quality. Technological and organizational innovations have triggered a shift “from direct production to indirect production, from cultivation, extraction and fabrication to consumption services and management work” (Castells 2000:243) followed by a “rapid rise of managerial, professional, and technical jobs” (Castells 2000:244). In other words, in our advanced economies, the service sector is crowding out agriculture and manufacturing. The service sector has been growing slowly but steadily for two or three decades, while both other sectors have been declining. In 2000, services represented 72.7% of the workforce in Sweden, while it reached 74.1% in Canada and 74.3% in the United States, though the figure was lower in Germany with 63.8% (OECD). Within the service sector, growth has been mostly noticeable in the field of producer services\(^1\). Yet, social services in the 1990s represented between 20% and 25% of all employment in the G-7 economies (Castells 2000:228) and, not surprisingly, health services in particular are expanding. People deal with services, while machines play an increasing role in manufacturing and agriculture.

This process is under way in the core labor force of the information-based economy (Castells, 2000): these information-based managers or “symbolic-analysts” (Reich 1993) are software developers, Web entrepreneurs, publicists, journalists, academics and spin doctors, who are responsible for forms, meaning, symbols, brands, and concepts.

Workers should not be oriented towards the production of material, but towards the manipulation of the data about the material (Bridges 1994). Value is created through soft products, such as software: “Value
added is mainly generated by innovation, both of process and products” (Castells 2000:258).

Voluntary Work

After this section on work, we can address the complex concept of voluntary work in a new context and place it within a larger framework. As we saw, the division between work and free time is not as strict as one might imagine. The question in this chapter is whether volunteering is a form of productive activity like paid work. It appears now that voluntary work has important productive, social, and democratic dimensions.

I broadly define voluntary work as meaningful and socially or otherwise productive activity performed on a free basis and oriented towards others, particularly strangers, within the framework of a formal organizational framework without significant remuneration.

First, I chose the term “voluntary work” because it is neutral, more so than, for example, the Swedish term ideellt arbete--work contributing to the pursuit of ideals, which refers to ideological motivations and imply political engagement. Voluntary work can be simply philanthropic and not only deal with “fighting for a cause.” In this dissertation I use interchangeably the terms voluntary work, voluntarism, and volunteering.

The first question regarding voluntary work is its apparent inherent contradiction. On the one hand, voluntary work is socially productive and can be professionally significant, serving as a springboard for one’s career. On the other hand, voluntary work is unremunerated, performed during leisure time, and not subject to necessity. In other
words, "organizational volunteering is inherently contradictory in nature. It is ‘work’--working within a formal structure to provide a service to others--and it is a ‘leisure activity’--something done whenever convenient because it is personally rewarding" (Pearce 1993:9). For example, a British charity organization, the London Community Service Organisation (CSO), referred to volunteers as “men and women of leisure” (Bosanquet and Yeo 1973:68). Gorz has underscored this freedom, arguing that volunteering represents a normative alternative to paid work in societies affected by mass unemployment. He praised the fact that volunteering incarnates a sphere of freedom in a world dominated by a strictly utilitarian approach to human activity. Volunteering is free from heavy bureaucratic rules and the economic rationale (Gorz 1988). Is voluntary work thus leisure or productive activity? Since organizational volunteering is not leisure, but a form of work, it cannot be entirely free, i.e., the decision to volunteer is a decision without coercion but within a context of constraints.

To what extent is organizational voluntary work like “traditional work”? Using the six characteristics of paid work defined above, we can say that volunteering shares five characteristics out of six: activity level; variety; temporal structure; social contact; and personal identity.

Volunteering provides activities of different levels and kinds--though at a lower degree than paid work--a relative temporal structure, social contacts and finally, as Weber (1972) argued, it contributes to personal identity.

A central element is the organizational character of volunteering. An attempt to define who is a volunteer has differentiated between a pure type of volunteering (Pole A) from a broadly defined type of volunteering (Pole B) is instructive, yet partly misleading (see Figure 3.2). The typology below has the virtue of forcing us to refine our
object, organizational volunteering oriented towards strangers or “unpaid work provided to parties to whom the worker owes no contractual, familial, or friendship obligations (Tilly and Tilly 1994:291).

Table 3.2
Poles of Volunteering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Volunteering</th>
<th>Pole A</th>
<th>Pole B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary nature of the act</td>
<td>Free will</td>
<td>Coerced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Paying for one’s own expenses</td>
<td>Remuneration less than the value of the work or service provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality of the context</td>
<td>Being active in a formal organization</td>
<td>Helping friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries of volunteering</td>
<td>Strangers</td>
<td>Volunteers themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Cnaan, Handy et al. 1996)

I disagree with the proposal of Jeppsson Grassman and Svedberg (see 1999) to include “helping friends” or family members, defined by the label “informal sector,” in the definition of voluntary work. Without denying the extensive reality of informal help, my object is of a different kind. Furthermore, it conflates very different types of work with very different motivations and responding to different social constrains (family versus philanthropy).

Finally, I would like to stress the socially productive character of volunteering outside the market. By socially productive I mean that it is a “human effort that adds use value to goods and services” (Tilly and Tilly 1994:291), contributes to social capital and to the vigor of the social ties, but is not valued like any other product of our economy. Tilly and Tilly (1994:291) have located various productive activities along a horizontal axis of percent of labor for sale, and a vertical axis of
control of labor process (see Figure 3.2). Here, paid labor is at the top of the figure, voluntary work is at the bottom. This classification exposes clearly the decommodifying character of voluntary work. The private labor markets with professionals and laborers sell their work, while volunteers do not perform work for remuneration.

Figure 3.2
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Source: (Tilly and Tilly 1994:291)
Volunteering and Professional Life

At an abstract level, social organizational volunteering and gainful employment both contribute to social production. Gainful employment generates products and creates wealth; social volunteering strengthens social ties and consolidates the democratic fabric. Concretely, social volunteering and paid work are not strictly separate because in many cases the same person does both (e.g., a paramedic volunteers at a women center’s crisis line). But what are the interfaces between the two activities at the individual level? What role does or can volunteering play in professional life?

Schumacher (2001) defined a series of interfaces at which forms (procedures, methods) or contents (skills) are transferred between gainful employment and volunteering. Concretely, this investigation of individual professional paths shows that volunteering is anchored in professional life and can often fulfill functions not covered by gainful employment.

1) Mutual reinforcement: the level of voluntary commitment is positively correlated to the level of professionalization. For instance, a volunteering experience leads to a permanent job. This interface is an example of complementarity. Skills can be used interchangeably in both poles and are not insulated from one another. Therefore, volunteering can increase the employability (e.g., organizational skills, working in an organization, being a representative on a board, coordination) of someone having difficulties in the labor market (Schmid and Gazier 2002).

2) Linking: Voluntary work links periods of unemployment or absence from the active workforce to periods of steady gainful employment. It
is often the case that the "volunteer" takes part usually in governmental measures to increase employability.

This shows the limits of the market. Voluntary organizations offer opportunities for practical work experience that cannot satisfy by for-profit organizations. Not all the functions dealing with the preparation to a productive activity may be filled up by the traditional labor market.

3) Compensation: Voluntary work can fulfill certain employment functions (personal autonomy, use of personal skills) that are not satisfied in a regular paid job. Usually, individuals performing more technical or routine work with lower responsibility tend to seek this compensation in volunteering.

Studies on work attitudes show that the individual expectations towards paid work are greater today (Inglehart 1997). Different aspects of self-realization are not satisfied in the context of gainful employment, but within a voluntary organization. The ideal types of connection vary greatly with the individual’s life phases:

4) Alternative: Voluntary work can become an alternative to gainful employment during certain life phases, particularly transitional phases such as retirement or education.

In sum, these interfaces seem to indicate that volunteering can play a certain role because the wage earning model 1) drops functions that it used to offer due mainly to mass unemployment, and 2) cannot satisfy the relatively new individual expectations associated with paid work.

Motivations

Social actors endow their actions with meaning. Making sense of this meaning is part of the delicate task of qualitative sociology. Some actions are easier to understand than others. Such is the case with paid
work: there is no mystery about the motives for working for remuneration. In our society the daily struggle for survival has been channeled into pay for work. Paid work is well explained by liberal theories.

However, can the same theory account for volunteering on the basis that it is a productive activity like any other on the market? Some authors have tried to apply the same understanding to volunteering, claiming that a voluntary work market is comparable to the standard labor market where “admission to and performance in this market is conditional on ‘qualifications’” (Wilson and Musick 1997:695). Motivation is a dependent variable and altruism is not a “theoretical assumption,” but simply the independent variable, a form of cultural capital, (Wilson and Musick 1997:694). Quoting David Horton Smith, they add that, “the essence of volunteerism is not altruism, but rather the contribution of services, goods, or money to help accomplish some desired end, without substantial coercion or direct remuneration” (Smith and Elkin 1981:33).

This approach is open to several criticisms. First, I consider this integrated theory (Wilson and Musick 1997) to be highly deterministic, applied to a social realm that extends far beyond the borders of the economy. This approach reduces volunteering to the narrow frame of liberal economic thinking dating back from the Industrial Revolution (Polanyi 1968), while broader concepts should be designed to take into account the new realities of work.

Second, the main objection is that it runs counter to our object, i.e., Swedish VWO. Here, membership is central and volunteering is a membership right. Qualifications are not required to volunteer. Swedish organizations are rather indiscriminate in their selection of their volunteers. However, there are some cases where selection as
volunteer is conditional on qualifications, such as is the case with the Stockholm City Mission. Yet, we cannot generally speak of a contingent volunteering market.

Third, from an economic point of view, there are no immediate or distant material incentives to volunteer. Contrary to the United States, Swedish volunteering rarely leads to career opportunities and valued by employers. On the contrary, there are material disincentives; volunteers sometimes mention the money they pay from their own pocket while volunteering (transportation, small purchases for an event, food for a meeting at home, etc).

A much more subtle analysis than is provided by liberal economic theories is necessary to understand the motivations for volunteering. Before looking at types of motivations, it is necessary to mention that one has to distinguish between sustained volunteering and first-time volunteering. In the latter case, a single hour given at the cultural association engages only for a short time and entails very few constraints.

As such, volunteering can be a goal in itself, but various authors suggest a series of functions: 1) protective or therapeutic functions when someone faces anxiety or inner conflict; 2) enhancement function, the opportunity to give sense to one’s life and increase self-esteem; 3) the understanding function, the opportunity to use one’s skills or the opportunity to take part in interesting activities; 4) career function, the opportunity to increase professional qualifications; and finally 5) the social function, the opportunity to “fit in” or benefit from social interactions (Clary, Snyder et al. 1996; Jeppsson Grassman 1997; Wilson and Musick 1997).

The notion of value, for oneself or for others, and not material incentive, appears dominant here (Clary, Snyder and Stukas 1996).
The altruist dimension or a sense of social mission drives many individuals. Firstly, this aim can be investment in fields neglected by the public sector, such as the problem of homelessness. The goal can also be the improvement of the conditions of a social group (women, handicapped, etc). Finally, the objective can be religious, as is frequent in the United States (Wuthnow 1991), but very rare in Sweden (Jeppsson Grassman 1997).

In my opinion the integrated theory of Wilson and Musick (1997) does not satisfy our attempt to understand volunteering in its essence because it excludes the agency and motivations of the actor. The complexity of these various motivations makes it difficult to differentiate them (Jeppsson Grassman 1997), but it reflects the multiplicity of interests of the human nature. Consequently, I favor an approach that does not a priori impose motivations upon the actors, but instead seeks first to listen to them. Only then, can the sociologist start the process of interpretation.

Organization:
As we saw in Chapter 1 very little contemporary organizational literature deals adequately with voluntary organizations and their non-contract workers. They usually do not address the generic tension engendered by the combination of voluntarism and organizational constraints. Therefore, borrowing from the definition of contract-based organizations is misleading for the conceptual understanding of voluntary welfare organization.

One way to tackle this issue is to go back to the basics, the very nature of the organization. Ahrne (1994) developed the idea of organizational dilemma, the framework and the operation of an organization is "a set of limitations and opportunities" where
members/employees provide their knowledge and labor in exchange for organizational resources (Ahrne 1994). The work contract binds the employee and the employer and gives the employer the right to direct the employee. It is an exchange of time management for financial remuneration (le Grand, Szulkin et al. 1996).

As such, voluntary organizations face strong limitations compared to other types of organizations. First, their nonprofit nature limits the use of financial rewards for its workers. It is a problematic situation for employees, who often suffer from lower wages, limited potential for promotion, no bonuses, etc. Despite these financial limitations, voluntary organizations have to apply organizational constraints to survive as organizations. The heads of voluntary organizations have to establish a certain level of authority over volunteers and paid staff. Faced with unpaid workers who largely decide about their own work tasks and schedules, managers of voluntary organization are limited in the authority they can exercise. Instead, soft control, such as persuasion, becomes essential.

In sum, Ahrne’s dilemma is particularly exacerbated by the difficult limitations inherent in voluntary organizations compared with for-profit or public organizations. A partial resolution to the dilemma comes from a deeper understanding of the rewards and opportunities, where personal motivations mix with organizational values. There are also material opportunities, but these play a marginal role: organizations offer parties, small boat trips to thank volunteers.

The human relations approach considers the organization as a microcosm in which constituents’ interactions result in specific outcomes. Focusing on the organization's internal mechanisms, voluntary organizations are creators of social rewards and informal
networks (Roethlisberger and Dickson 1981), social identification, and participation in collective purpose (Jahoda 1982).

Along these lines, functionalists have proposed that organizations in general are integrative units of the social system, creating solidarity ties among members of local communities (Talcott Parsons in Rocher 1972). We have observed that they give excluded social groups the opportunity to take part in the life of the community.

However, this integrative, adaptive, and open character tends to erode with time. The literature on the evolution of organizations offers insights into this trend among VWOs. The analysis of Max Weber (1996) of the gradual dissolution of religious sects explains this process well. After their founding, the followers’ emotional attachment to the leader and/or his mission fuels charismatic authority (cf. pre-phase in Olsson 1999). Religious, social, or moral values, not economic motives, cause adherents to join. However, the modernization process, according to Weber (1978), transforms the charismatic legitimacy into an “iron cage” or, more precisely, a legal-rational framework. Then abstract rules, as a new form of authority, confer legitimacy on the leadership. Rigidity appears when charisma becomes routinized into a certain order, an arrangement eventually accepted by the members, though at the cost of a growing discrepancy between them and the leaders of the voluntary organizations (Michels 1981). This development is accompanied by the growing presence of paid professionals.

In order to last, to be efficient, and have a continuing impact on society, voluntary organizations often have to hire qualified workers. For example, we showed above that British charity organizations relied strictly on devoted volunteers during the Middle Ages, and started to
hire paid staff during the 19th century, and finally adopted legal-rational methods (casework) in the 20th century.

By contrast, the *folkrörelser* tradition and the predominance given to the grassroots have generated suspicions among leaders of Swedish VWOs concerning professionalization, especially careful to avoid a widening democratic gap between members and leaders. This question is discussed at greater length in Chapter 6.
Chapter IV

Methodology

In this section, I define briefly some important concepts used in my research. I then present the research design of my qualitative analysis.

Nonprofit Sector

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the precedence of the folkrörelser tradition has not permitted the Anglo-Saxon concept of nonprofit sector to impose itself in Sweden. Swedish scholars and actors use the terms ideell sektor (idea-driven sector) or the broader föreningslivet (life of associations), a term that is much larger than folkrörelser. These designations focus on the fundamentally democratic character of the organization, but unfortunately, their idiosyncratic character makes it more difficult to compare them with other national sectors.

Internationally, the research field dealing with such organizations is relatively recent, and so how it is conceptualized is still open to debate and varies according to the national preference.

The nonprofit sector exists in relation to the other two sectors: the for-profit and the state sectors (see Figure 4.1). Indeed, the nonprofit sector becomes meaningful only in relation to the state and the “market.” The organizations composing this full-fledged sector have goals and functions that are not totally incompatible with the other two sectors. I see two politically and economically complementary functions. First, despite its rejection of profit as its main organizational goal, the nonprofit sector makes an important contribution to overall economic activity. It represents a significant portion of the GDP (4.6 percent) in 22 countries surveyed (Salamon and Anheier 1999).
Second, politically a large number of advocacy organizations (e.g., organizations of patients, etc.) are oriented towards the political arena, and they are clearly a force the state has to reckon with. Recently, civil society movements have claimed legitimacy and even at times challenged democratically elected representatives.

Figure 4.1
Relations between the Three Main Sectors

There are so many competing labels designating the sector that it hinders a consensus among social scientists. I discuss some of them here. For about ten years, the label "civil society" made a breakthrough in the scholarly literature, in the media, and among the public. For Arato and Cohen, civil society is “a sphere of social interaction between economy and state, composed above all of the intimate sphere (especially the family), the sphere of associations (especially voluntary associations), social movements, and forms of public communication” (Cohen and Arato 1992:IX).
In Sweden, according to a well-accepted definition of Karin Busch Zetterberg, civil society includes the family, neighborhood and community life, and the voluntary sector (Trägårdh 1999). This term goes far beyond the object of this dissertation. It encompasses a much larger sphere than what we focus on here, and second, its strong normative orientation (Ahrne 1998) renders its relatively neutral use problematic. Furthermore, the normativity of the concept has led to the position where highly hierarchical or large voluntary organizations may not be considered civil enough to belong to the civil society (Ahrne 1998). Finally, in Sweden, contrary to the US, this concept has been seen as a politically-loaded concept used by liberal thinkers to challenge the welfare state (Trägårdh 1999).

The French import économie sociale pertains to another reality. An actor of the social economy stresses the principle of solidarity, obvious in the case of association, but it can also be a capitalist organization such as cooperatives, mutual insurance companies and associations (Encyclopedia Universalis, 2001). However, the stress on économie leaves aside the whole question of volunteering and, as such, the concept has not been enthusiastically adopted by scholars outside the French-speaking world.

Sometimes the term "informal sector" is used, but it is usually limited to non-organizational entities such as the family, the household, etc. The term “voluntary sector” could be appealing since it stresses the unpaid human input, but it implies the exclusion of organizations without volunteers.

Anglo-Saxon scholars have established the term "nonprofit sector." This label is a negative definition referring to private—but not-for-profit—and non-governmental entities. It is similar to "third sector," which is a general catchall label defining what the sector is not, but not
clearly what it is. The designation "third sector" could hence include many different organizations between the state and the market, such as foundations.

Voluntary Organization

A voluntary organization is very different from a for-profit organization that aims to generate profits for its owners. Beyond narrow financial interests, voluntary welfare organizations have wide and multiple objectives stretching from social, sometimes spiritual and universalist goals (e.g., changing and shaping the social or environmental reality) to particularistic objectives (e.g., gaining recognition as a social group).

The traditional Swedish term "förening" stresses more of the collective character of the organization than do the English equivalents: “a number of individuals (or legal entities), in an organized form and for a defined period of time or for the present, work together towards a common objective" (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:15).

The broad term "nonprofit organization" has a legal meaning relating to the benefits of tax exemption in pursuing aims not motivated by profit. I favor the label "voluntary organization" because it stresses the importance of voluntary work, which is not always constant across the entire nonprofit sector, such as in foundations. The Johns Hopkins project has developed a systematic, yet very formal, five-point definition of the sector:

1) Formal, i.e., institutionalized to some extent;
2) Private, i.e., institutionally separate from government;
3) Nonprofit distribution, i.e., not returning profits generated to their owners or directors;
4) Self-governing, i.e., equipped to control their own activities;
5) Voluntary, i.e., involving some meaningful degree of voluntary participation, either in the actual conduct of the agency’s activities or in the management of its affairs.
(Salamon and Anheier 1996b:16)

Moreover, I have specifically chosen the field of welfare where some authors draw a sociological distinction between nonprofit and voluntary welfare organizations. They argue that VWOs are the representatives of a strong social tradition that offer free social services and are based on a solidarity principle, usually among marginalized social categories (NETS 1998).

Finally, Weber (1972) notes that voluntary organizations act at two levels: internally on its members (constituents) and externally on society through propaganda and conflict. My approach in this dissertation is the internal organizational level and the interaction between the constituents. In the following section of this chapter, I propose a categorization of these constituents.

Categorization of Organizational Constituents:
Work in VWOs is understood here from the point of view of a workplace where interactions between different types of workers take place. The distinctive organizational status of each category of workers shapes their interaction. This affects the overall productive organizational process. The hybrid character of voluntary organizations (paid/unpaid workers) rests on the variability of the work contract. The constituents’ expectations change greatly depending on whether they belong to the category of noncontract worker (volunteer) or contract worker (employee). These expectations shape the relationship that I propose to investigate.
Despite the fact that the variety of working arrangements in the nonprofit sector makes the categorization of workers difficult (Priller and Zimmer 2000b), I map out the categories of constituents on the basis of their work roles. Evidently, remuneration remains the pivotal factor. For the employee, the organization may be simply an opportunity to make a living; for the volunteer, an institution to reach collective goals. This essential difference has important consequences at the level of commitment and responsibility, access to decision-making, and work continuity. Based on such different motivations, their expectations are far apart, if not sometimes contradictory. Therefore, voluntary welfare organizations have to adopt alternative forms of management to face these divergent expectations.

I propose here a categorization of the active constituents of voluntary welfare organizations based on the Swedish case. In quantitative terms, the contribution of volunteers largely outweighs the input of employees in the nonprofit field of welfare. Approximately 73 percent of the total time worked in the sector is done by volunteers, and only 27 percent by employees\(^\text{12}\) (Lundström and Wijkström 1997:174).

The categorization I propose consists of two main categories--paid and unpaid workers--each subdivided in two. In the first case, there are the semi-employee and the professional cadre, in the second case, the board member and the daily-helper. Finally, there is the member, who as such, is not automatically part of the work structure, but who has a significant impact on it. We will also note that these categories have a different meaning if one refers to the Anglo-Saxon type of organizations or to the *folkrörelser* type.
1 Employees
The work contract establishes the employment status by formally defining the agreement between the organization and the employee. Concretely, employees can perform a great variety of tasks, but they deal more with direct social inputs and administrative work than do volunteers, according to a Swedish study (SOU1993:82 1993). The employee is the cornerstone of the Anglo-Saxon type of voluntary organization, while his/her position is (or should be) marginal in a folkrörelser. As such, the concept of employee and its corollary, the work contract, poses a series of dilemmas with regard to the concept of voluntary organizations as we saw in Chapter 3.

The contract binds the employees to provide a specific work input and to assume important responsibility. Consequently, the organization expects them to play more of a central role than volunteers. Through their daily presence, employees give a sense of continuity to the voluntary organization. Yet, at the same time, the salary has the effect of potentially limiting work motivation to a strictly instrumental dimension, i.e., sustenance. This attitude contradicts the mission of VWOs based on identification and the pursuit of non-profit objectives. How can the voluntary organization develop loyalty and commitment to its values among people who are not working on a purely voluntary basis? In order to reduce this discrepancy, and to increase commitment on the part of employees, some voluntary organizations encourage them to become support members. Within the category of employees, one can further distinguish between semi-employees and professional cadres.
1.1 Semi-Employee:
The semi-employee is hired for a limited period of time. They are usually not involved in core decision-making. In many cases, they benefit from public employment programs ranging from approximately six months to two years in Sweden. The state pays their full salary, or most of it, while the organization covers the rest. Often the nonprofit sector is more adapted to their needs and qualifications than is the for-profit or public labor market. Therefore, the semi-employee may be caught in a situation of semi-dependence towards the voluntary organization.

Semi-employees thus have an ambiguous role in the organization. They have clear tasks and duties, but no essential responsibilities and are only there for a limited time. In organizations where various volunteers and employees work side-by-side, semi-employees may end up in a gray zone between volunteers and the professional cadres. Indeed, for many constituents, it is not clear if semi-employees are insiders or semi-outsiders (Pearce 1993). The organization faces the dilemma of fully integrating them in the work structure, but losing them after a relatively short period of time, or solely relying on professional cadres for a longer-lasting, continuous work input.

1.2 Professional Cadre:
McCarthy and Zald (Zald and McCarthy 1987) call “cadre” the workers involved in decision-making, coordination, directing, etc. Contrary to the other constituents of the organization, they benefit from some form of tenure—or at least, as long as the organization’s budget holds out. This tenure is usually part of a career path and held on the grounds of knowledge gained through formal education or experience, often acquired as a volunteer. They personify the structure of the
organization, providing direction and continuity, and they are responsible for the day-to-day work input. Their work continuity represents a challenge for the members, formally steering the organization’s voluntary components.

2. Volunteers
There are two types of volunteers who complement each other: elected representatives and daily helpers.

2.1 Elected Representative
McCarthy and Zald (Zald and McCarthy 1987) called them nonprofessional cadres (*förtroendevalda* in Swedish). The voluntary organization usually holds a general meeting each year in which the members elect a board that determines the general orientation of the organization. This administrative body is constituted of at least these three elected representatives: chair, secretary, and treasurer. Additionally, representatives of other constituents such as the employees or the volunteers can join them. As board members, their work contribution is very intermittent, and they are therefore not involved in the day-to-day work. They often combine this volunteering with full-time gainful employment. The representative is the guarantor of the legal and democratic character of the organization. Since they are also involved in lobbying and fund-raising, they assume an external political role. Internally, they fulfill the function of employer, providing a framework for paid staff.

2.2 Daily Helper:
The daily helpers are the main workforce of the voluntary organization, the providers of services and are usually not involved in decision making. The daily helpers are the most flexible category of worker, assuming a great variety of tasks. From serving coffee to visitors, to
visiting elderly people at home or organizing activities, they are the ones who are solidly in contact with the recipients. Their work schedule ranges from a few hours a week to the equivalent of a part-time job, depending on their initiative and availability. The most engaged hold two positions: daily helper and elected representative. Some organizations I have investigated, such as the City Mission (Stadsmissionen), require that daily helpers complete specific training before providing social services.

3. Member
Members are not automatically part of the working process since most of them are “passive” and do not contribute directly to the organization’s work input. However, in the *folkrörelser* type of organization, the member is not only the founding element, but also its *raison d'etre*. As such, the organizations encourage their members to take an active part, to volunteer.

This contrasts with the Anglo-Saxon type of voluntary organization in which the member is seen more as a resource (names, manpower, personalities, money) (Lundström and Wijkström 1997). For example, many American organizations consist almost exclusively of formal or "paper" members with no voting rights: buy your membership card and wait for our newsletter every month! Consequently, we stress the difference in the importance of these two types of volunteers have on their organization: the contribution of the “active member” (*folkrörelser*) weighs more heavily than the volunteer who is not a member (Anglo-Saxon).
Choice of Organizations

Three factors were considered in selecting the organizations: the size and the age of the organization, and the type of organization (member-based or not). All of these active welfare organizations are member-based, which is the case with a large majority of VWOs. Consequently, I have chosen two organizations (the humanitarian and children’s rights organizations) associated directly with the *folkrörelser*, usually large and older organizations, as well as two smaller and more recent organizations (women’s center and volunteer bureau). Three out of four organizations are based in Stockholm. To avoid an urban-centric sample, I performed 11 interviews at a humanitarian organization based in a smaller town, Växjö (pop. 73,770 in 1999) in the southern region of Kronoberg.

Interviews

The procedure I followed to gain access to my respondents was based on the method of Lofland and Lofland (Lofland and Lofland 1995) for entering social settings. The interviews were carried out according to main standards of qualitative methodology (Kvale 1996; Lofland and Lofland 1995).

The snowball sample: advantages and disadvantages.
I chose the so-called snowball sample to select the respondents for my semi-structured interviews. First, I contacted the organization's manager and asked him or her to refer volunteers and employees to me to interview. Second, I followed the list, but when I fell short of respondents, I simply asked another interviewee to direct me to another worker, and so on. This sampling method had the advantage of being straightforward and providing an adequate number of respondents. However, it has the disadvantage of potentially limiting the data
gathered to a certain range of opinions because the respondents referring each other may share similar opinions. The results may be biased if a group of respondents is in strong conflict with certain coworkers and tries to keep the researcher from accessing members of the "opposite group."

However, this is not a problem when the population is smaller or equal to number of respondents I need. In this case, I interviewed everyone independent of personal recommendations. Furthermore, I tried to avoid this pitfall by relying on various respondents for recommendations. By going from one person to recommend to another one, one reaches a diversity of opinions. In one case, I had to rely entirely on the manager of the humanitarian organization for the selection of all my respondents because I was only able to visit this city in the south of Sweden once and took two days to complete all the interviews.

Individual interview versus group interviews:
I favored individual interviews to group interviews for two reasons. First, the topics discussed had to do with personal views and the "organizational" view. Some persons are hesitant to express views on their and their workmates' commitment and work attitudes in the presence of other people they work with. Second, the issues discussed might have a negative effect on the perception their superiors or colleagues have of their work.

Preserving the identity of the respondents: not naming the organizations.
Due to the individualist methodology of the present research, I decided not to reveal the identity of my respondents. To publish publicly their attitudes towards their work could result in negative
reactions from employers or workmates. For the same reason, I do not name the organizations of my respondents. The small size of some of these voluntary organizations would make the respondents easily identifiable if the organization were named. I consider it sufficient to describe the structure, history, field of activity, etc, of the voluntary organization without being specific.

Interaction empirical knowledge-theory
As Merton (Merton 1967) shows in his book on middle-range theory, there is a constant flux, feedback, and readjustment between the theoretical framework and the empirical findings. I bear this in mind in this dissertation. Since this field of research has been under-researched, it was not possible to start with a very specific testable hypothesis. My pre-interviews with persons in charge of various voluntary organizations regarding the general orientation of their organization turned out to be especially useful in getting familiar with the working structure of voluntary organizations at large and gradually developing the research questions. For example, the role of members in these organizations is a constant theme among the practitioners as well as Swedish researchers. I had to consider this reality in designing a categorization of workers in voluntary organizations. I have tried to do so here. Some early findings changed the theoretical framework and this framework oriented the findings at a later stage.

Carrying out the interviews
I usually met the respondents at their workplace or in very few occasions at the respondent's home. Since the women’s center was restricted to women, I had to find alternatives. In this case I did the interviews in a neutral place, i.e. in the study room of a public library,
or once at the university. I taped the interviews, summarized, categorized them by theme, and transcribed selected parts.

All of the interviews, except one in English, were conducted in Swedish. A certain amount of translation from Swedish into English was necessary during the writing process, especially for the quotes in the analysis (Chapter 6). The slippage of content occurring in this case does not represent a significant methodological challenge because this research is not based on a semantic analysis in which the researcher looks for sense beyond the literal meaning. Instead, I accepted the respondents’ accounts literally.

I completed a total of 38 semi-directed interviews over two years from 2000 to 2001, ranging from 15 minutes to 90 minutes, in average 60 minutes in four organizations. I carried out nine interviews in each of the following organizations: the children’s rights organization, the volunteer bureau\textsuperscript{13}, the women’s center, and I completed 11 interviews at the humanitarian organization.

How did I conduct the interviews?

I usually had a first contact with a coordinator or supervisor, then I went to the workplaces to meet volunteers and employees. Weeks, even months, passed between the interviews with the respondents of the same organization, though the organization in Växjö was an exception. I spent two days there and conducted 11 interviews. Table 1 presents the distribution of the respondents.
**Table 4.1**

Distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of worker14</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily helper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected representative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination: daily-helper/elected representative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overrepresentation of women is typical of voluntary organization: “the present social care volunteering in Sweden is to a great extent carried out by women aged 60-75” (Jeppsson Grassman 1994:59). The fact that the voluntary sector is strongly feminized should not be overlooked. Some studies have shown the different work attitudes of women compared to men. Women tend to see the workplace as a realm for cooperation and socialization (Jeppsson Grassman 1994:32), while men are more competitive and goal oriented.

Finally, questions on work attitudes were multifaceted. They concerned: 1) actual work behavior (e.g., overtime, punctuality, sick leave, and the capacity to work spontaneously on short notice); 2) workers’ appreciation of their own behavior (e.g., reliability and commitment to the organization); and 3) the workers’ overall evaluation of the work process (e.g., gratification, autonomy, and creativity).

**Quantitative Data: Survey**

Quantitative data presented in Chapter 6 originates from a survey conducted between spring 1999 and spring 2000. It was initiated at the
School of Social Inquiry, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia by Kevin Brown, Sue Kenny and Brian Turner in 1996. In light of the "changing nature of the welfare state" (Brown et al. 2000:126) and the search for alternative forms of active citizenship, the project sought to understand the nonprofit sector's "operating frameworks" (Brown et al. 2000:69) or sociopolitical orientations. Consequently, the School of Social Inquiry undertook a wide survey of the Australian sector, and then, in a second stage, expanded the objective in a comparative study with a post-communist state, Russia, and a traditional social democratic welfare state, Sweden. Deakin University appointed me to complete the Swedish part of the project in 1998.

The goal of the Swedish survey was to select 200 Swedish voluntary welfare organizations. The choice to restrict the sample to voluntary welfare organizations was based on their proximity to typical areas of activity within the welfare state. The organizations selected were not all from distinct federations. We chose local or regional organizations, in some cases, two district organizations would belong to the same federation.

Persons in charge of voluntary organizations were contacted, including: project leaders; coordinators; information divisions; accountants; presidents of the associations; etc. The respondents were mostly employees, but on some occasions various workers or board representatives discussed the questions together to come up with answers. As our response rate of 65 percent (refusal: 15 percent; no response: 20 percent) happened to be lower than expected, the original list was completed later in 1999 with a random selection of organizations from counties’ listings of voluntary organizations. Despite the fact that men represent a minority in this field, they are nonetheless overrepresented in positions of authority. The final result
included questionnaires from Stockholm (122), Västerås (60) and Gällivare (31), plus the four main organizations of the qualitative section Stockholm (3) and Växjö (1).

The survey questionnaire touched a number of organizational issues, including resources, foundation date, size, main source of funding, and the composition of the organization in terms of paid and unpaid workers and number of hours worked. The respondents are then asked to answer a series of statements with the usual: totally disagree, disagree, agree, totally agree and do not know. The statements deal with the importance of members for the organization, the use of new managerial techniques, competition in the sector, leadership, professionalization, and the relationship between the organization and the state.

Furthermore, over the course of the Deakin research in 1998 and 1999, my Australian colleagues and I conducted some 20 semi-directed interviews in different parts of Sweden with the coordinators of mostly small voluntary welfare organizations (Brown 2001; Chartrand 2000). With Sue Kenny we went to Uppsala and Stockholm. With Kevin Brown we went to Gällivare in the North and to Västerås on Lake Mälaren. Looking back now, I consider these interviews to have been a sort of pre-study for my own dissertation investigation. The questions of the pre-study dealt with active citizenship, and I was not involved in the analysis of the data. However, this pre-study allowed me to familiarize myself with the organizations, to visit them, to learn about their problems their structure, and also to improve my interviewing skills. Consequently, at several points, I will briefly strengthen a point by referring to this pre-study.
Chapter V

Case Studies of Four Swedish Voluntary Welfare Organizations

This chapter presents the characteristics of the four VWOs chosen for this study. About 10 respondents were interviewed at each of them. In selecting the organizations, I paid attention to structural factors affecting the work settings: democratic structure, main goals, numerical balance, the work arrangement between employees and volunteers, funding, and finally the structure of decision-making. All four organizations are member-based, representing the dominant trend among Swedish voluntary welfare organizations. We can divide them into two general types of organizations. First, two organizations are directly associated with the *folkrörelser*: the children’s rights organization is large and institutionalized, the small and local humanitarian organization is the creation of a *folkrörelse*. Second, two younger smaller local organizations that could characterized as “late-modern” (Lundström and Svedberg 2003): a women’s center and a volunteer bureau. Table 5.1 details the size of these four organizations.
Table 5.1
Size of the Selected Voluntary Welfare Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Children’s Rights</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>Volunteer Bureau</th>
<th>Women’s Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>85000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>1200 (board members)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49 (3 board members)</td>
<td>68 (23 board members)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children’s Rights Organization

Brief history
This VWO represents the Swedish branch of an international organization founded in 1919 in England to counter the humanitarian catastrophe of WWI on children. The founders quickly exported the idea to Sweden, where a sister organization was quickly established the same year. The devastation of WWII increased the need for such an organization, and it grew steadily thereafter. Its year of foundation is late for it to be considered a folkrörelser. Most of the popular social movements coalesced during the late 19th century. However, this organization is in line with the movement because of its focus on membership, the centrality of the members, and a broad social mission15. Despite its volunteer-based character, the organization has become highly professionalized and has more than 300 employees today.

Main Goals
This VWO aims at improving child welfare following the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. They act by developing
of knowledge about children’s conditions and needs, sponsoring practical development and support programs, disseminating expertise, and advocacy oriented towards public opinion and decision-makers. The activities of this organization are split geographically: in Sweden, it plays mostly an informative role; in developing countries it sets up direct help and aid programs.

Size
This is one of Sweden’s biggest VWOs with 85,000 members, at least 1,200 board members, 358 employees locally and abroad, plus a large number of private and institutional donors.

Workforce

Employees
The organization employs a large number of professionals. The head office employs 145 directly, while some 25 employees are sent to developing countries, where they are supported locally by 188 local employees. In Sweden, the employees concentrate on research, support of volunteers, coordination of aid in developing countries, and diffusion of information. In the developing countries, they are in charge of direct aid and help to children.

Work Insurance-unionization
The employees of the organization are unionized (SACO) and enjoy protection similar to that of civil servants. Moreover, as in most of the VWOs, volunteers are insured when performing certain tasks, especially when helping people. This insurance is covered by the organization. It is different to Germany, where the members themselves, through the membership fees, often assume the insurance.
Volunteers
The organization has at least 1200 board members in approximately 300 local groups. A clear enumeration of the precise number of volunteers is difficult. First, local groups remain purely administrative bodies with no service provision and their special events get the support of uncounted occasional daily helpers. The absence of a service provision at the local level helps the organization dispense with a large unpaid workforce. Therefore, it follows the *folkrörelser* ideal of relying on the active membership, i.e., members active in the organization’s structure (boards), and not using volunteers to provide services.

The organization does not require volunteers to participate in any training before becoming active. They pay their membership fees and can immediately run for a local, regional, or national board position.

Activities
The local boards are responsible for various fundraising and public awareness activities. Local and regional offices manage a series of activities and tasks (Nordberg 1999a; Nordberg 1999b), the main one being fundraising, which includes the manning of moneyboxes in public places, bake sales and sales of clothes, and lotteries or tombolas. Passive fundraising refers to placing a moneybox at the cash register of a grocery store, for example. Fundraising in public places is done in association with public awareness activities (*opinionsbildning*). Information is distributed, sometimes at schools, and demonstrations, seminars, and lectures are organized. Though less frequent the organization also solicits support from politicians and civil servants. Recruitment is also a task of members.

Organization of paid and unpaid workers
Due to the large size of the professional part of the organization, the head office (employees) and the local units (volunteers) function like parallel institutions. From my observations, I can say that there are few direct permanent contacts between the people in the field and the people in the offices. Actually, there is only one employee per region (organization developer) who supports and assists actively and permanently the work of local units.

Members
This organization enjoys the support 85,000 members, who are considered the owners of the organization through their voting rights at the local, regional, and national levels. However, only a very small percentage of them is active.

Decision-Making Structure

*Figure 5.2*

The Children’s Rights Organization
The local units are the basic entities of the organization. Each member has the right to vote. They can vote for their local board members and for the delegates to the organization’s general annual meeting at the unit’s annual meeting. Every member can run as board member or delegate. The local boards are composed of at least four persons. At the general annual meeting, only the 100 local delegates have the right to vote for the general board. This board is composed of a president, a vice-president, a treasurer, 11 members, 3 substitutes, and 3 “called-in” (adjungerade) members representing the employees. The general board appoints a secretary-general, who is responsible for the head office and for hiring staff according to the decisions of the board (see Figure 5.2).

The employees have limitations concerning their participation in the democratic structure. An employee cannot become a delegate or a board member. Furthermore, regional offices are intermediary structures. Politically, they are creatures of the local units. Local delegates elect the board of the regional office, whose goal is to support the work of the local units and to facilitate contact between them and the head office. Finally, auditors are present at every level of the organization.

Finances
The revenues of the organization totaled of €50 million (461 million sek) in 2000. Of that total amount, donations €23 million (211 million sek) represented the largest share, followed by €14 million (128 million sek) in public subsidies, mainly from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the European Union, and the
Swedish State Inheritance Fund. Finally, capital income came to €9 millions (84,5 million sek).

Women’s Center

Based in Stockholm, the women’s center I investigated is composed of two different legal entities. First, a nonprofit organization in which volunteers provide support and legal advice, either by phone (hotline) or in person, to victims of gender violence. Second, a foundation offers accommodations to victims of gender violence and their children. Despite the legal separation, the board of the voluntary organization has primary administrative responsibility over the foundation.

Brief history

Compared to the folkrörelser, this organization is of a new kind and is a relatively recent development. However, they share in common that they both consider membership to be central, and they believe in the idea of self-help, in this case women helping women.

The center was founded in 1978 as part of the feminist movement. Defending their organizational independence, they decided first to rely solely on voluntary and not professional input. The philosophy was “by women and for women,” and they set about realizing this ideal in meetings and a crisis hotline. Their public activities were aimed at increasing awareness. Over time and through public funding the center evolved into a more permanent structure with two or three paid employees who managed a shelter that offered short and medium-term accommodations to battered women and their children.
Main Goals
The goal of the center is to support women victims of violence, rape, harassment, abuse, or threat. It provides a hotline and temporary accommodations for the victims and their children.

Size
For such a strictly local organization without even a regional presence, with 400 members and 68 volunteers, it is certainly the largest of its kind in Sweden. It has only four actual employees, which demonstrates the reliance it places on volunteerism.

Workforce

Employees
The paid coordinator is in charge of administration, finances, and external contacts. She also applies for grants, attends different committees, and participates in the training of new volunteers.

At the foundation, two employees (house assistants) help the female hosts and their children, make contact with the authorities and, similarly to the volunteers in the evenings, service the hotline during daytime.

Volunteers
The volunteers receive about 25 hours of training before being permitted to answer the crisis hotline.

Work Insurance-unionization
The fact that the nonprofit sector in the field of welfare is small and tends to copy the work conditions found in the public sector explains the high unionization rate in the nonprofit sector. Here, the salaries of
the shelter’s employees (*husassistent*) are equivalent to those paid to social workers (*socialsekreterare*) with equivalent responsibilities who are unionized.

Organization of paid and unpaid workers
The clear predominance of members over employees is obvious in this organization. The action of the many committees tends to limit the latitude of the employees, and especially of the coordinator. There is a tension between the many responsibilities that the employees have to assume as permanent workers and the leeway allowed to the members. What accounted for this organizational contradiction? Compared with the simple logistics of the hotline, the shelter is a much costlier structure and requires higher outlays. For this reason, it may have appeared more suitable to create a foundation. However, the shelter could not rely solely on volunteers, but needed a more permanent workforce and then hired permanent employees. According to some of my respondents, this decision was not unanimous. It was contrary to the wishes of many members, who wanted the organization to continue to rely completely on volunteers. However, during the evenings the hotline can work solely with volunteers. The employees have come to feel that they are essential and needed, but not really wanted by the members.

Members
The organization has 399 members who pay a fee of €9 (100 sek) per year in exchange of a voting right and a newsletter about the center’s activities. Additionally, two feminist organizations are also corporate members, but with no voting rights. Some 68 volunteers give an average of one night per month in support the hotline service.
Decision-Making Structure
The organization’s board is composed of 23 persons, including a co-opted nonvoting member who is a paid employee of the board (see Figure 5.3). A board meeting takes place approximately 7 times a year and elects a president, vice-president, treasurer, and secretary, who receive honoraria, as well as auditors (the foundation has its own auditing firm). The foundation (accommodations) employs four paid workers: two full-time, one part-time, and one temporary project-based employee. Furthermore, an occasional professional psychologist is paid to relieve the pressure on the hotline volunteers.

Figure 5.3
The Women Center

Annual Meeting  ➔  Board  ➔  Foundation

Volunteer-based committees that reinforce the coordination as well as the democratic life of the organization supplement the administrative structure of the shelter. These include a coordination committee, information committee, charter committee, responsibility group (*ansvarsgruppen*) in charge of communication, statistics and
continuous training, and finally a committee in charge of cultural activities. The responsibility group plays an important role in the professionalization of volunteers, although it is itself led by volunteers. In this case, volunteer members inform attendants about new issues affecting women and lead the newcomers through the training. Through this, the organization regulates the quality of the service provided.

The main service provided by the voluntary organization is the hotline, which is divided into three branches: standard phone support offered by nonprofessional volunteers, legal counseling offered mostly by law students, and a youth hotline for women between 18 and 30. The head of the center is the board. The charter clearly states that the members and not the employees must retain control.

Finances
The center has an overall budget of nearly €468,000 (4,3 million sek). Of this sum, only a small share, €42,000 (390,000 sek) goes to the voluntary organization (hotline) while the biggest share, €424,000 (3,9 million sek) serve to run the foundation (accommodations). The main sponsors of the organization as a whole are the city and the region of Stockholm, with a total grant of over €337,000 (3,1 million sek).

Volunteer Bureau: Neighborhood Service
The Swedish volunteer bureau could be defined as a late-modern voluntary organization, locally based--an ad-hoc arrangement initiated by the public sector and the nonprofit sector (Lundström and Svedberg 2003). The volunteer bureau, with only one permanent employee, is the least professionalized of all four organizations. It is the organization
with the most family-like atmosphere. With warm venues and homey decorations, people often gather to eat cake and drink coffee. The bureau not only provides help to lonely elderly people, but also provides meaningful activity for volunteers, who often suffer from loneliness themselves. The organization arranges excursions, housework sessions and social gatherings for these volunteers.

Brief history
This bureau was initiated and is funded by the local authorities to encourage social volunteering, increase cooperation with civil society, and provide a complement to public welfare. The idea first came from the social agency of the city of Stockholm in 1993. The model was copied from Norway, which took it first from Great Britain. The public sector was faced with deficit problems at the beginning of the 1990s. Outsourcing some specific social services to voluntary organizations would help the agency save money (Forslund 1996).

This bureau represents a new kind of organization far different from the 
folkrörelser. It limits itself to a narrow mission, addressing specific social needs (loneliness in the elderly) which are not identity-related. The role of the membership is not as central. Instead, only people active in the organizations become members; they do not become members first and then volunteer. This bureau remains more of an exception than a norm in Sweden. So far, there are only a handful of such volunteer bureaus in the country.

Main Goals
This voluntary organization aims at promoting social volunteering in a way that can complement social services provided by the public sector. Moreover, its objective is also to support self-help and strengthen social
ties at the local level. Specifically, the volunteers of the center try to alleviate the loneliness of elderly people in this district of Stockholm.

Size
Since this center has no ambition to extend its operations beyond the district level, the number of people involved at the center remains limited. This organization has more the scope and the size of a social club, where a small number of regular visitors socialize on a regular basis, than of a professional client organization.

Workforce

Employees
There are two part-time employees. The coordinator is a former civil servant who worked in the field of domestic help. The semi-employee who has no previous experience in the field, belongs to an employment program and supports the work of the coordinator. Their task is mostly to make contact between volunteers and persons in need, to offer social or cultural activities for volunteers, to develop contacts with other organizations in the same field, and to gather statistics on the productivity of the center.

Volunteers
The organization listed 47 persons involved actively in 2001. Their level of commitment ranges greatly. Some volunteers spend two to three hours each month, while some spend more than 10 hours a week and act much like support staff. The volunteers of the bureau are mostly women (often pensioners looking for an active life) or women with free time during the evenings or weekends (Grossman 1995). They are themselves, according to the paper, “in need of social contacts
and volunteering is therefore a way to fulfill this need” (Grossman 1995:6), and they are usually from a lower middle-class background. According to a local newspaper called Reportage, they are either unemployed people, young pensioners or people with difficulties integrating into the labor market.

The volunteers have ways of dealing with the loneliness of residents of the district. These include:

- Sporadic aid (punktinsatser), in which they follow elderly people at the hospital or the dentist
- Visiting or taking care of errands (watering the plants when the person is gone or checking the mail), taking them to the theater or on walks. In this case, they contact each other, not the center.
- Regular contacts between volunteers and people suffering from loneliness
- Interest groups, depending of the interests and capacities of the local residents, initiating and organizing activity groups (housework for example).

As part of an overall goal of promoting social integration, the bureau works also to foster the integration of immigrants into the Swedish society. The semi-employee uses part of her work time for that purpose, visiting and developing contacts with immigrant organizations and organizing joint activities, etc. There are also activities and services offered by the volunteers to the public.

1) Weekly activities: the organization opens its doors and welcomes the public to drink coffee, read the newspaper, borrow books, Buy second-hand books, decoration items, etc. make photocopies and fax at a reasonable price
2) Services, including cultural evening to promote social integration of immigrants and fundraising activities organized by volunteers for the benefit of volunteers. For example, they organize bake or knitting sales. In return, they use this money for their own activities, including excursions and parties, among other things, as a way for the volunteer bureau to thank them.

Screening
The bureau pays attention to potential volunteers, and if necessary excludes people who lack the qualities they are seeking (Grossman 1995). For example, someone who asked for money from one elderly person was ejected from the bureau (Grossman 1995). It is absolutely forbidden to accept money as a volunteer.

Work Insurance-unionization
The coordinator of the bureau has a lower wage than comparable function in the public sector and is unionized.

Organization of paid and unpaid workers
The division of tasks is clear and the risk of conflict due to overlapping work is minimal. The employees do the coordination at the venues, while the volunteers are dispatched on the field to the clients.

Members
As we said earlier, in this organization members are by definition volunteers, and those who want to be active are considered members of the organization. They pay a nominal membership fee and have full rights to elect board members at the annual meeting.
Decision-Making Structure
Similar to the structure of many democratic organizations, the members have a right to elect who they want on the board. This board then directs the organization. However, there is one major difference in this case. Since there are no membership fees and there is only one public source of funding, this democratic prerogative is altered. Obviously, the bureau’s members have to take into account the views of the public agency, or risk not being funded, leaving them no choice but to close down. The membership fees normally serve to strengthen the independence of the organization’s members. This is not the case here. The board is elected by the members and composed of a treasurer, a president, a vice-president and between one and three other members, including a representative of the volunteers.

Finances
The budget of the bureau is limited to one public source, the district authorities of the city of Stockholm. In 1998 these subsidies reached €35,000 (325,000 sek) per year.

Humanitarian Organization
Brief history
This organization is similar in size and scope to the volunteer bureau. It is a small VWO in a small town in the south of Sweden created and run by the Swedish Red Cross. Volunteers provide moral and practical support to refugees. This support takes the form of simple meetings where the refugee has a chance to discuss the psychological difficulties of settling in a new country. After WWII, when the counties and the regional government took over the Red Cross's health care, childcare,
and elderly care functions, the organization turned its focus to international work. However, in the last decade, due in part to state budget limitations, the renewed domestic role of the Red Cross has been redirected towards dealing with the loneliness of handicapped and elderly people through home visits, transport, and the organization of social activities. The Red Cross’s diverse activities include hotlines, information and treatment centers for people infected by the HIV, treatment centers for victims of torture (Qvarsell 1993:229), etc. At the same time, its international work remains humanitarian relief and development.

Some actors in the local nonprofit sector realized that many refugees and immigrants had psychological problems because they do not have access to certain social resources. The idea emerged of a center to train volunteers to support immigrants and refugees. The center opened in 1994 with one full-time coordinator. As was the case with the volunteer bureau, this organization is part of the new wave of VWOs of the 1990s that are more single-issue oriented and address a specific social need. However, the Red Cross, which is in charge of this center, has been associated with the folkrörelser.

Main Goals
The center seeks to support refugees and immigrants with psychological problems. It aims at shortening their psychological treatment time in the public sector, being a complement to public institutional resources, and finally, easing and shortening the time of their integration.
Size
This is a small organization, with only one permanent, full-time employee and a semi-employee, reflecting its local character and the limited resources available in a small town. The number of volunteers is approximately 50, while the “members” also include the equivalent number of refugees receiving support, for a total of about 100.

Workforce

Employees
The organization has three employees, a project leader (projektledare), who acts more as board president, a coordinator, and a temporary secretary. Their tasks are similar to those of the employees of the volunteer bureau. The coordinator trains the volunteers, makes the contacts with the refugees/immigrants, and discusses the work plan, the approach proposed by the volunteer. The project leader takes care of the planning and funding of the organization. The secretary takes phone calls and helps the coordinator.

Volunteers
Requirements for becoming a Volunteer
According to their brochure, a volunteer needs personal qualities such as commitment, knowledge, and the capacity to supervise (handlening). At our center there is “no working schedule and no working titles, but instead everybody does what he or she is good at and everybody has fun” (p. 7 of the center’s brochure16). It makes it sound easier than it is in reality. Control is an essential part of an organizational structure, and there is some element of constraint that is integral to volunteering.

Volunteers must possess nonverbal qualities such as respect and the ability to listen and understand. There is no defined work
procedure (p. 16 of the center’s brochure). Simple qualities such as the ability to communicate and being present can build up trust and mutual confidence. The center favors a holistic approach for the relationship between the supporter and the one supported. Therefore, personal maturity and interior peace (p. 22 Brochure) are also required. All persons interested in becoming active receive training from the co-coordinator. After training, volunteers can also possible follow up with continuing education.

Training
There are 8 days of training for the volunteers divided as follow:
- the policy of RK regarding immigrants and refugees
- Presentation of world conventions and Swedish policy, the project of the center
- Process of asylum, cultural adaptation
- County bureau for asylum seekers (flyktningmottagande)
- Religious aspects
- Psychological services for refugees and immigrants
- Working methods: privacy, working methods, ethics, methodology of the communication between the refugee and the volunteer
- Meeting with experienced volunteers

Activities
The center has special reception hours for young people, massage, cultural events, and thematic evenings.

Work Insurance-unionization
The salary level varies from one employee to the other compared to what civil servants earn. The project leader earns more than an equivalent job in the public sector, while the coordinator earns less
than her previous position as a civil servant on the Swedish Migration Board. They are unionized and have work protection.

Organization of paid and unpaid workers
The tasks of employees and volunteers are clearly defined. The employees arrange, organize, and dispatch, and the volunteers are active in the field with refugees/immigrants.

Members
There is no special membership at this center. The members of the Red Cross are also members of the center.

Decision-Making Structure
The center has no independent power structure. There is no specific board or charter for the center, the center is under the responsibility of the Swedish Red Cross, which is itself led by a democratically elected board. Furthermore, the direction of the center is set by a committee (ledningsgruppen) constituted of the Red Cross and the Church of Sweden.

Control
As the brochure of the center states, the engagement is purely voluntary, but volunteers must respect work and ethical rules, such as humane treatment, respect, and privacy. Despite the independence of volunteers, they must discuss their plans for the refugee/immigrant with the co-coordinator and get her approval. In this sense, according to the brochure, there is an ethical contract between the volunteer and the center.
Finances
The total yearly budget of the organization is €54,000 (500,000 sek) per year.
Chapter VI

Three Sectorial Paradigms of Paid and Unpaid Work

I present in this chapter the analysis of the findings of my research. It proposes a model to explain work in voluntary welfare organizations. The model should not mislead the reader on the type of research conducted. The testing of a model implies that the data are built to answer specific questions. Then, the data substantiates the model following a systematic and exhaustive account of the variables. This is adopted by quantitative researches, but such is not the case here.

Here I present qualitative and exploratory research, supported by secondary quantitative data. In the absence of a predefined model the framework is built along general ideas and the resulting model could be called ad hoc. How do we determine the validity of the model? The answer depends on the explanatory power of the model, whether this model allows me to explain a broad range of observations.

Most of the empirical data presented in this chapter are qualitative in nature, although I also use quantitative data to support some arguments. I believe it is valuable to use different types of data--a sort of triangulation approach--to support an argument, especially in the case of an exploratory study without predefined hypothesis. This approach implies, furthermore, the interplay between micro empirical results and macro or structural elements. Because of this, this chapter presents an analysis of qualitative data from 38 semi-directed interviews with employees and volunteers in the four Swedish voluntary welfare organizations presented in Chapter 5.

To explain the model, we need to start with the big picture. The nonprofit sector is far from autonomous, but, being the smallest sector, constantly interacts with the public and for-profit sectors (see Figure
4.1), sometimes to its advantage, sometimes not. The balance between the sectors and the social location of the nonprofit sector varies from country to country, depending on historical and structural factors (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

We can briefly illustrate this by comparing the German and the Swedish sector. The principle of subsidiarity has shaped the German nonprofit welfare sector so that it is structurally imbedded in the system of providing public services (Priller 2001). This approach integrates nonprofit and public welfare. It differs from the structural independence of the Swedish sector, emerging from a strong and independent folkrörelser tradition that put a greater emphasis on democracy and the role of members (Lundström and Svedberg 2003).

We associate this historical development with a paradigm of an endogenous model of work arrangement in voluntary organizations. This paradigm does not represent a narrow category, but corresponds to an encompassing model with ramifications at many organizational levels, in this case, the definition and hierarchy of organizational roles, interfaces of the organization with the other sectors or spheres, etc. We are fully aware that the folkrörelser is a specific historical movement, and that not all VWOs originate from it. However, we have chosen the folkrörelser as a paradigm because it has over time developed such a strong appeal, to the point that it now represents the dominant paradigm in Swedish voluntary organizations (see Chapter 2). However, it is not sufficiently dominant to go unrivalled. Voluntary welfare organizations face a series of “external challenges.” First, in the field of welfare, the public sector is overwhelmingly dominant as norm setter and main funding agent of nonprofit welfare. Second, the VWO, despite its social character, remains a “productive unit” (of services, of volunteering, etc) integrated in the overall labor market. In sum, VWOs
are influenced, “colonized” (cf. Habermas 1984) by “external” paradigms embodied by the public and for-profit sectors. Each organizational paradigm proposes a system of organization, work settings, and organizational roles. The main difference is the use of the work contract to bind the workers to the organization.

The public paradigm is associated with the values of bureaucracy, hierarchy, continuous and sustainable work, professionalization. Due to a heavy dependence on public subsidies and the importance of manpower from public agencies to voluntary organizations, VWOs tend to emulate the functioning of public agencies in the use of statistics, standardization of work, restraining working schedules, etc. The for-profit approach adds the pressure of the labor market and the consumption model.

The differences between the folkrörelser paradigm and its counterparts generate tensions. In this chapter, my interviews and data on the work settings in VWOs will concretely illustrate these tensions. The different paradigms exert external and internal pressures on voluntary welfare organizations and shape individual attitudes towards work. My stance is that organizational factors have a major impact on work, more than for example, individual motivations.

I have divided this chapter into four parts, each representing an influence determining work in voluntary welfare organizations, namely, three sector paradigms and the private sphere. I formulated these ideal-types in Table 6.1, which serves to differentiate them conceptually before the presentation of the empirical results.

Four organizational forms influence the work settings of voluntary welfare organizations: an endogenous folkrörelser paradigm, three heterogeneous forces composed of two paradigms (public and for-profit), and a social sphere (intimate or familial). Note that the
intimate sphere is not part of Table 6.1, though it represents a counterweight to volunteering and as such also influences VWOs. However, it does not carry a model of work organization, like the three paradigms that are the center of my study.

Table 6.1
Work Aspects of the Folkrörelser, Public and For-Profit Paradigms in VWOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Folkrörelser</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>For-Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Work Category</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>Semi-employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Individual Work</td>
<td>Discontinuous, unsustainable</td>
<td>Continuous, sustainable</td>
<td>Continuous, sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Solidarity/Reciprocity</td>
<td>Sustenance</td>
<td>Sustenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Centrality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the Volunteer</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Potential Wage-Earner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>High Autonomy</td>
<td>Low Autonomy</td>
<td>Low Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trend</td>
<td>Democratization</td>
<td>Professionalization</td>
<td>Productivization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Holistic</td>
<td>Technical/ Specialization</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Power</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the folkrörelser paradigm represents the endogenous model, the founding matrix of Swedish voluntary welfare organizations. The distinctive work category of the paradigm is active membership and volunteerism. Volunteer workers take a very different stance towards the centrality, sustainability, and continuity of their work compared with paid workers, a division that shapes the contradiction between the two. The volunteer’s motivation could be described as one of solidarity and reciprocity. Moreover, the impact of the folkrörelser paradigm is greater autonomy for the volunteer, but, perhaps more surprisingly,
also for the employees. Finally, the more holistic approach of volunteers differentiates itself from the technical and specialized methods of VWO employees.

Second, the public paradigm is the major heterogeneous influence on VWOs. Voluntary welfare organizations are dependent on public funding and must follow public norms, and as a result tend to emulate the public sector and its organization of work. Consequently, the public paradigm triggers a process of professionalization in VWOs. We can say that the employee is the work category of the paradigm, an employee whose motivation is sustenance, and who contributes by ongoing and sustainable work. The perception of voluntary work is also different from that in the *folkrörelser* paradigm, in that the volunteer is not seen first and foremost as a member but as a worker to be managed. The public paradigm also transforms the definitions of work categories; the member is not recognized as an owner but as a worker, or even as a recipient. This divide shapes work relations between volunteers and members, but also their attitudes, commitment, and mutual appreciation. The public model reduces the autonomy of volunteers and employees by imposing a tighter organization of work, work tasks distribution, and a greater form of control.

Third, the for-profit paradigm has less overall influence than the public model, but it seems to become a growing influence on voluntary organizations. The work category of semi-employment, defined as temporary employment resulting mainly from public employment programs (see Chapter 4), belongs to this paradigm. It embodies the effect of the labor market on VWOs. As in the public paradigm, the work input regulated by a work contract is ongoing and reliable. There are pressures from the economy to make the experience of volunteering relevant for the labor market, to make it part of or to link it to
professional life. Volunteers, dispersed in multiple organizations, makes that voluntary work also gradually likens economic behavior, such as consumption (“light volunteering”). In sum, the for-profit paradigm introduces a process of productivization to the VWO, giving it a function within the capitalist frame.

Fourth, the private sphere is not a work paradigm, but remains an influential force, often modulating volunteering in VWOs. Family needs, for example, often interfere with volunteering.

The Folkrörelser Paradigm
The folkrörelser paradigm makes voluntary welfare organizations unique. Even if the recent trends show a different reality, the folkrörelser paradigm is dominant in voluntary organizations. However, volunteering, as peripheral social activity, generates a radically different relation to work and greater autonomy for volunteers and employees. Members represent the core of the organization in this paradigm, but this ideal struggles with the importance of the employees. The volunteers I met were motivated by social altruism and the reciprocity of the exchange. Finally, I differentiate the holistic approach of volunteers to the technical and specialized method of employees.

Peripheral Character of Volunteer
The distinctiveness of the folkrörelser paradigm in relation to work and work settings is mainly embodied in the active member, the volunteer. The absence of work contracts creates looser attachments to the organization compared to the situation of the employee.

Volunteering cannot be reduced solely to a free-time activity such as a hobby, but remains a socially peripheral activity (see Chapter 3). It does not represent an identity marker. Volunteering is considered secondary to family and job. Commitment can be casual: “many people
regard volunteering as a ‘trial act’ and will not weigh the costs and benefits of volunteering before joining as thoroughly as they would if they were considering paid employment” (Pearce 1993:160). This explains a form of individual work that is discontinuous and often lacks sustainability. It is not to say, however, that VWOs are not sustainable as organizations and are therefore short-lived. On the contrary, many important voluntary organizations in Sweden such as the Swedish Red Cross or Save the Children have existed for more than 50 years.

Continuity
Volunteers are the champions of discontinuous work, as part-time workers, they are often assigned discontinuous tasks that are “part-of-the-job” (Pearce 1993:37). The large majority of volunteers I interviewed invested only a few hours a week, sometimes less. At the volunteer bureau, I met two pensioners who volunteered the equivalent of a part-time job, i.e., more than 10 hours per week.

To understand the idea of discontinuity, imagine a public agency open 40 hours per week. Most of the employees of this agency work 40 hours per week, so the open hours correlate with the number of hours worked. The women’s center had long open hours, including day and evening shifts. Yet, the volunteers invested on average 5 hours per month. Over a long period of time, the same small but regular engagement is continuous and contributes to the functioning of the center. However, volunteers cannot readily keep up with such a pace over time. In comparison, a full-time employee can complete tasks over several days.

This discontinuity may create dissonance between volunteers and paid workers. For example, at the children’s rights organization, volunteers are, for the most part, excluded from regular work processes
performed by professionals, and are limited to activities “maintaining their own administrative infrastructure” (Gaskin and Smith 1995:40).

Another example is the crisis line at the women’s center, which is serviced by employees during the day and volunteers in the evening. One of the semi-employees described the situation during daytime: “There is always someone who answers.” However, the evening shift is not as regular: “the center is so big, there are so many, and the human factor plays a big role. Sometimes you (a volunteer) forget to show up for the hotline, or you come too late, because they come after their ordinary work.” Here, the regularity with which the employees perform overtakes the discontinuous performance of volunteers (cf. Pearce 1993). It is perceived as a flaw; the semi-employee concluded that volunteers are not as reliable as employees.

The women who volunteer once a month are not a reliable contact for the women who need them: they comes and go, and cannot take urgent cases day in, day out. Sometimes the volunteers make the initial contact on crisis line. But, when a woman leaves her home and moves to the center, only an employee can offer continuous presence during this stressful time.

Sustainability
Volunteering and its inherent volatility is characteristic of the folkrörelser paradigm. By contrast, the work contract, by imposing institutional obstacles, makes an employee’s departure more difficult. Volunteers are clearly not as dependent; they leave an organization more easily and suffer fewer consequences compared to employees. The volunteer may lose friends or break with a social network, but will not suffer immediate financial loss, or the stigma of being unemployed. For a volunteer, there may be many potential reasons to quit, including
a reduction in available time, disagreements with another organization member, transition to a new life-phase such as retirement. Over the years, the desire to volunteer may decline. Many older volunteers mentioned getting worn out. One long-time 70-year-old volunteer at the children’s rights organization said he wanted to decrease his commitment because, “there is not enough time” ("tiden räcker inte").

Our survey shows that volunteers are more volatile than employees. Turnover is significantly higher among the unpaid workers (see Table 6.2). Overall, this table shows a net gain of 2.62 workers. While the number of employees is static (0.13), “fresh blood” comes primarily from volunteers (2.49). Pearce (1993) observed a similar trend.

Table 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover Among Employees and Volunteers: Average Number of People Joining or Leaving the Organization within the last 6 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number Joining</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number Leaving</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Loss/Gain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others explain decreased commitment by the desire to invest time in other fields and other voluntary organizations. A very engaged 70-years-old volunteer I met at the volunteer bureau told me that she plans to cut her hours because she is involved in so many other organizations and has a growing interest in cultural issues. The young woman who founded the hotline for young women anticipated continuing but that would depend mainly of her other activities. She had free time when we spoke, but she planned to cut her hours if she
got busy again. We will come back to the trend towards multisided, peripheral volunteering in the section on the for-profit paradigm below.

Autonomy
One strong characteristic of the folkrörelser paradigm is the autonomy enjoyed by volunteers, and to a certain extent by employees. In the absence of work contracts, unpaid workers enjoy a greater autonomy and the ability to decide how much time, when, and even what tasks they perform than do paid workers. Due to the size of the VWOs, their hierarchy is not as top-heavy, and the constraints are not as compelling as in public organizations. The employees I met noted fundamental difference in their degree of autonomy compared with the public sector.

Volunteers
From a management perspective, it appears that the power of coercion is weak in voluntary organizations and cannot really stop volunteers from choosing the tasks they like the most (direct service-oriented tasks) and neglecting other tasks (coordination, paperwork) (Pearce 1993:129). The volunteers in my study said that they enjoyed the absence of a clear hierarchy, as is the case in the public sector, a finding corroborated by employees.

This following example shows that employees recognize the autonomous character of volunteers. The coordinator of the humanitarian organization told me that it is not desirable to control the work of volunteers to closely because, “they don’t like to be bossed around.” Instead, she favored creating a framework in which they can do their work while enjoying a certain freedom. She added that no employee could really set volunteers' schedules, but only ask them to
respect the ethical rules set for interactions with the refugees, yet no volunteer I met mentioned these rules during the interviews. An experienced volunteer at the humanitarian organization claimed that volunteers decide for themselves and nobody else: "Nobody can point at you and say do this, do that. It is all of your own volition." Almost all of the volunteers said that they enjoyed their autonomy in the organization. Many of them repeated, "it is voluntary after all." Volunteers are active because they want to be there, because they have time, and no one forces it upon them.

Indeed, I observed that volunteers in three of the four organizations I studied tended to decide for themselves where and when they worked. At the volunteer bureau, the volunteers decided when to visit their contacts. Only the women’s center had defined work schedules with fixed monthly hours for the crisis hotline volunteers.

On the other hand, volunteers were excluded from doing certain tasks. For example, in none of the organizations I visited I did see volunteers doing administrative paperwork. At the humanitarian organization, the volunteers limited themselves to contacts with the refugee, meeting at their convenience. They reported the meeting to the center, but the statistics required by the funding agencies were left to the coordinator. The most involvement I saw in administrative tasks was the elderly woman at the volunteer bureau who substituted for few hours when the coordinator was absent; took phone calls, checked the list of appointments, and corrected them. Interestingly, volunteers did not express a desire to do these tasks.

At the humanitarian organization, the volunteers were permitted to meet the refugees at home, at the organization office, at a café, etc. There was no specific work schedule, and some volunteers spent 2 hours a week while others invested 1 or 2 days a week. Volunteers also
seemed to have great latitude regarding the activities with the refugees. It seems that for the center, the contact was more important than its form.

This section does not suggest that volunteers enjoyed total freedom. There were constraints on the volunteers; such organizations are rarely able tailor themselves perfectly to individual needs. Despite that, it is interesting to note that the volunteers made no mention of these organizational constraints. Instead, they tended to legitimize their engagement by stressing their autonomy in the voluntary organization (cf. Pearce 1993).

Employees
The autonomy instilled by the *folkrörelser* in voluntary organizations is not limited to volunteers; it has an impact on paid employees as well, especially when compared with the public sector. Paid workers are under the supervision of the elected board without an ongoing physical presence and not part of a tight hierarchical chain of command with a day-to-day surveillance. The employees with experience in the public sector stress that they enjoy a greater leeway in voluntary organizations.

This was the case with the two main employees of the humanitarian organization. The coordinator when comparing her present job with her previous position on the immigration board felt that she has more autonomy to make decisions. She did not have to defend an official line the way she did as a civil servant when she had to support the national immigration policy. For the main project manager, working at the humanitarian organization had clear advantages over her position as a civil servant in the public sector. She gained greater autonomy and she enjoyed the local recognition of being a Red Cross officer.
Furthermore, she earned some hundreds euros more per month than did her civil counterparts. She did not feel she was sacrificing her salary for this autonomy. However, she said that she would not work for this organization if the wages were too low. However, one professional staff member at the volunteer bureau accepted a substantial pay cut from her former salary as civil servant in order to work in a freer and more stimulating work environment. This increase in autonomy may in some cases balance lower pay. This could be one of the advantages of voluntary organizations. This is, however, not the case across all organizations. Bigger, more established voluntary organizations, do not offer the same levels of autonomy (cf. Michels 1981).

Contradictory Roles
Employees may enjoy more autonomy, but the member-centered *folkrörelser* paradigm also creates strong constraints on paid workers. Each paradigm shapes the power balance between working categories (see Chapter 4). The *folkrörelser* model, based on volunteering, challenges the role of employees, who embody the public paradigm.

Employee and Member
Voluntary organizations can become inbred. They usually turn to one of their volunteers when hiring their first employee. However, the transition to paid work is not easy and fundamentally transforms the bond a worker has to the organization. Work contracts have a distancing effect that may generate malaise. This was the case at the women’s center. The coordinator, a long-time activist, told me that members and employees felt suspicious and distrustful of each other, something she felt when she was a volunteer:

“Now it’s better but at the beginning the members feared that the employees would take over. There are unrealistic
expectations and demands in voluntary organizations. The people on the board are there because they're involved with the cause, it doesn't mean they're good managers, good employers. (...) I have a supervision board that is not always professional enough, which gives me problems, because it is also a workplace. In Sweden there are work laws (...) and they have to be applied. (...) I know better about running the organization. I know the center I am in, I know my staff and know about what needs we have. I think it’s bad to deal with abusive language (maktspråk), power games. I have no energy for abusive language. I want straight talk. I don’t need to be liked.”

Additionally, the status of employee creates role ambiguities in organizations where the organizational life is more adapted to members than to employees. This is particularly the case in a strongly member-dominated organization such as the women’s center. Internal social activities aimed at strengthening the ties between members are not particularly suited to employees, though as an integral part of the organization they are invited. Indeed, after a full day of work, an evening event, such as party, represents (unpaid) overtime for the employees. The coordinator remarked about the Christmas party that "It felt like a duty, it wasn’t fun. (...) But if I didn’t attend, I think they would have gotten annoyed and bitter.”

Solidarity and Reciprocity
We said above that an understanding of volunteers’ motivations had to go beyond the usual economic cost-benefit analysis. Stating that volunteers exchange their work for non-material values produced by VWOs simply overlooks the importance of altruism. This factor is essential to volunteering and, without saying that egoism and the desire for power do not exist, the social form of altruism, i.e., solidarity, lies at the core of the folkrörelser ideal.

Altruism has traditionally been associated with the figure of the Good Samaritan, the unconditional giver and the redemptory religious
act of tending the poor (Bremner 1994). However, my Swedish volunteers talked about social utility, and not about religious motivations. None of the respondents referred to their commitment as a “sacrifice.” Sweden is considered one of the most secular societies in the world. Altruism appears in an internal survey of the children’s rights organization on the advantages of being a volunteer. A little more than the majority of respondents reported as an advantage the opportunity to develop social contacts with other members or outsiders. From a more personal perspective, a little less than a majority mentioned the satisfaction of knowing that one is needed. Finally, only a few stated that engagement was an opportunity for personal development.

One female volunteer told me in one of my interviews that it is gratifying to work at the volunteer bureau and help others, but at the same time stressed that this commitment was not unilateral, that an exchange takes place, “Because we are volunteering, we have to get something back. Instead of money, we get back friendship, trust.” Reciprocity is therefore privileged at the expense of a charity-like unilateral help approach.

In my interviews, the volunteers at the humanitarian organization explained their commitment by different factors, but more importantly by the reciprocal character of the exchange. Volunteers described volunteering in terms of friendship and reciprocity. They are usually thankful to have this opportunity to expand their horizons, and even for some, to realize oneself through meaningful new contacts. Communication was at the center of their contribution, and as two volunteers put it, it is always reciprocal:

“I know that I will receive something. Communication is never one-sided, it is always two persons. Moreover, you learn from other people’s experiences and how they stand towards various decisions, you don’t know everything in life
(...) I think that the more people you meet, the richer becomes your life[S20].”

One volunteer referred to “her refugee” in similar terms: “I get much from her and she gets much from me.” The information brochure of the human rights organization is very telling about how the organization stresses non-financial rewards such as social contact and a familial environment.

The center’s decorations welcome guests by giving a homey feeling (hemkänsla) very different from a public office. The brochure sums it up: “No diagnosis, no prescriptions, no treatment, but we are here, we listen, we take time and show empathy.”

A sense of contribution to the community and society is attached to this reciprocity. Many of my respondents referred to this aspect, even though public support for social volunteering has not always been high in Sweden, because it has been suspected of undermining the welfare state’s main responsibility for social services (Westerberg 1999). The respondents often mentioned the need to do something socially useful and, especially true of the pensioners, to remain socially useful. As a female pensioner at the humanitarian organization told me, “I retired a bit too early. I stopped working at the age of 60 and had lots of time left. Then I wanted to use that time for something good. Not just rest, relax and take it easy but wanted to do something positive. Maybe something that has an impact.”

The altruism I describe here refers to this desire to turn to the other, be socially useful, develop an exchange, etc. This appeal to the common good is a fundamental element of the folkrörelser paradigm, but is not present in the other two paradigms. The solidarity or social altruism can be differentiated from religious altruism, which is characteristic of the charity approach (see Chapter 2).
Volunteers’ Holism vs. Professionals’ Technical/Specialization

Despite the resistance encountered in Sweden from public authorities and the from society at large, volunteers deliver social services, but obviously differently from civil servants. Their approach stresses reciprocity, human contact, simplicity, equal exchange, and personal warmth, in sum a holistic approach that differs from the technical and specialized approach of civil servants.

Public professionalism stresses a value-neutral distance. By contrast, volunteers at the humanitarian organizations I studied often referred to their refugee client as a “friend,” and not as a patient, beneficiary, or recipient. Some volunteers mentioned that Swedes are hesitant to open their door to strangers. Foreigners often lack personal contact with native Swedes and suffer from isolation. Many volunteers I met invited the refugee home with them, and often really integrated him or her in their family life for celebrations, excursions, etc.

A telling case of the integrative approach is that of a volunteer and a young African female refugee. They established a very strong relationship. The refugee was invited to take part in family activities. The volunteer extended her support to the entire family, including the husband of the contact. Finally, the relationship became so strong that the refugee and the volunteer traveled to Africa to meet the family of the refugee.

A volunteer with an Asian background who worked as a nurse stressed the unique character of volunteering: “From what I understand (...) (the refugees) who come here (...) cannot get this support anywhere else but here. (...) simply human kindness (medmänskligt) and empathy if they need. They may need professional help, and they receive some, but here what we give is more like human kindness. (...)"
just somebody who wants human contact of some sort, who is listening
and tries to understand. (...) volunteers offer what civil servants
cannot: simple empathy, warm personal contact.” For her, this
volunteering gives a sense of security to the refugee: “I think it is really
important they (the refugees) can come here and feel safe.”

Then, she compared this with the approach of the public sector:

“public authorities have timetables, rules, and regulations.
Here it is freer. Here, humanitarianism comes first. Even if
there are rules - it's got to be, otherwise nothing works - it is
not like a public administration with opening hours. Here
you can reach someone almost 24 hours.”

Another female volunteer in the training phase in the same
organization adds: “From what I understand, they come here (...) but
this type of help, they get it only here nowadays (...) just empathy and
human kindness (medmänskligt). (...) somebody who wants human
contact, to listen and try to understand.”

When the first volunteer compares her job as a nurse with her
volunteering, she feels more on the same footing as a volunteer than as a nurse:

"I think there is a difference. When we work there (at the
hospital), we have certain responsibilities, but when we
spend time (volunteering) with people you don't have
responsibility. You spend time together on a reciprocal
level, equal level. (...) you don't tell them what to do[S23].
(...) We spend time with each other as persons not as
professionals. It's more like friendship. We (the volunteers)
don't provide the solutions but give little support, human
contact at an equal level. It's not like a civil servant
justified to orient patients based on organized expertise
knowledge."
The Public Paradigm

Despite a strong *folkrörelser* tradition, we have nevertheless to take into account the hybrid character of the VWO's work environment. The core difference between volunteers and employees is the work contract.

The influence of the public paradigm starts with the attempt to impose a contract-based form of management on VWOs. As we saw above, this is a challenge resisted by the *folkrörelser* paradigm at different levels and one that creates work role tensions. This form of management tries to shape volunteers into a submissive workforce, or sometimes treat them as recipients. As we saw, the volatility of volunteering is antagonistic to contract-based management. A form of organizational constraint, a control is active, despite the ingrained autonomy of volunteers. Moreover, voluntary organizations are financially dependent on the public sector and tend to emulate its work organization. One strong form of emulation is professionalization, which tends to marginalize the members.

Why do I associate professionalization with the public paradigm and labor market with the for-profit paradigm? The answer in the first case is that VWO's professionalism is strongly tinted by the public sector as many employees and volunteers have public professional experience. In the second case, VWOs are integrated into the labor market and it represents a pressure from the overarching capitalist economy.

At another level, the public paradigm is illustrated by the relationship, work attitudes, commitment, and mutual appreciation of volunteers and employees. Different forms of work distribution reveal the balance existing between the two work categories, i.e., the equilibrium between the public and *folkrörelser* paradigms.

A very interesting contribution by Jone L. Pearce (1993), the organizational management scholar, focused on the “ambiguities”
introduced by volunteering in nonprofit organizational structures. Her analysis of the organizational behavior of unpaid workers in 14 employee-staffed and volunteer-staffed community organizations provides a rare and insightful understanding of the internal dynamic of VWOs. Her main finding is that volunteers, because of their lack of organizational anchorage, engender a great deal of uncertainty in the organization. This type of approach does not provide a sociological explanation, but at least, it is revealing of the points of tension between the two paradigms.

VWO’s Dependence and Emulation

The public paradigm influences the work performed in voluntary welfare organizations. For example, the type of funding determines certain working techniques. The main source of revenues partly reveals the paradigm influencing the organization: public funding is the public paradigm, and private donations encourage a for-profit model by stressing marketing and a financial relation with the organization, while membership fees maintain a folkrörelser model.

In our survey, 47 percent of VWOs responded that their main source of funding came from a public source. However, the fact that among the possible answers, county and national state were proposed as two alternatives leads us to believe that this percentage is in reality even higher. The respondents may have split public funding between the two; had they been added they would have emerged as the main source.

What work techniques does public funding generate? I present two short examples. First, the public grants application process necessitates that the grant seeker meet bureaucratic requirements (e.g., statistics on number of members, number of service acts provided, etc). Both grantee and grantor units have to speak the same language determined
by the grantor. We may assume that a knowledgeable, experienced, educated professional social worker submitting the grant request would have a greater probability of getting the grant than a simple layman, a volunteer (see also Chartrand 2002).

As a result, the volunteer bureau gathers statistics about the number of "contacts" made by volunteers, a process many coordinators found painful. Support can then be assessed in quantitative terms, a form more easily treated by public organizations. Furthermore, it serves to legitimate financial public support of a voluntary organization: this organization has an impact on the ground because it supports X number of persons, mobilizes Y number of volunteers, etc.

Historically, the charity approach had a focus on the moral character of care, nowadays the focus is on the quantification of contacts. This shows that public funding promotes a public type of professionalization within voluntary organizations.

Professionalization and the Role of Members
The social phenomenon of professionalization is broad, covering the societal, sectorial and internal aspects of organizations. We will here discuss some dimensions of professionalization. Note that the decision to place professionalization under the public paradigm umbrella is based on the recognition that in the case of VWOs, it is strongly tinted by the public sector. While on a broader level, professionalization does not have in general a particular public character.

Professionalization in the field of welfare is associated with social sector performed by civil servants. As a result, social volunteering and VWOs are often considered amateurish. However, voluntary welfare organizations are increasingly professional as a result of hiring of paid workers, but also because of the contribution of volunteers with
relevant experiences. For these reasons, I propose below a new definition of professionalization that includes volunteers. The consequences of professionalization are multiple. Some of these emerged from our interviews. The most interesting one for our purpose is the marginalization of members. Finally, our survey reveals that despite the evidence, VWO’s representatives tend to deny growing professionalization, a reaction that may be attributed to a defense of a *folkrörelser* paradigm under siege.

The standard definition of professionalization refers to qualifications such as a certified training and expertise that can be exchanged for higher wages than unqualified work (see also Weber 1978:111). We will first discuss its macro implications before looking more closely at its organizational dimension.

First, at the macro level, Max Weber showed that that all kinds of organizations follow a similar development of professionalization. VWOs are no exception. In a brief paper on voluntary organizations, Weber (1972) held that professionalization is part of an organizational response to counter the unavoidable effect of the loss of "substance” over time and the erosion of the original *Weltanschauung* (see also Weber 1978). A permanent professional structure with daily mechanisms and repetitive *façons de faire* allows the “substantially diminished organization” to still function efficiently as a social actor. It is, in other words, an adaptive survival strategy for organizations in an increasingly differentiated world.

Due to public dominance in the field of welfare, a public standard is usually used to describe professionalization. Here the “welfare professionals” are the public social workers who have a monopoly in that field. This has also been used to undermine voluntary organizations and the work of volunteers. If social volunteering equals
amateurism, then the Swedish nonprofit field of welfare must be considered “unprofessional” because of its small proportion of employees compared to other European countries such as Germany or the Netherlands (see Chapter 2). This has been echoed in the negative public perception of social volunteering (see Chapter 2) and in the literature: relying on volunteers supposedly makes it impossible to do long-term planning and to coordinate action between different organizations (Research 2002).

Consequently, the “amateurism” argument has been used by public welfare agencies to limit nonprofit initiatives. I found such examples in my interviews. The coordinator of the humanitarian organization stated that the public authorities are making sure that volunteers do not step on their turf. At the foundation stage, the idea of involving volunteers in moral support to refugees was met with resistance, even mistrust, from public actors at the local level. Even today, this coordinator recalls how they reacted:

"Is it really something volunteers can do? And look where we are today, everybody recognizes that we answer a need. [the organization] emerged out of a fight! They said: “volunteers doing psychological support, no! They will only come and mess up!” And then it was really for us to make sure what we did became something serious, to keep us at a certain level, to be a complement, not step on the civil servants’ turf but to be a voluntary complement.”

However, and despite these accusations of amateurism, the increasing professionalization of the Swedish voluntary organizations is now undeniable. The first sign of professionalization was the coming of paid employees in organizations that had relied solely on volunteers. In Sweden the number of paid employees is increasing in the nonprofit sector as well (SOU1999:84 1999:117). The field of welfare also seems to increase the number of employees, as Table 6.2 of our survey shows above, even in organizations traditionally based almost exclusively on
members (e.g., temperance organizations, labor organizations, etc.). Today, organizations tend to rely more on nonhuman resources (informational, financial) that necessitate a more qualified, knowledgeable workforce and fewer unqualified workers (Ahrne and Papakostas 2002).

At the level of work techniques the effects of professionalization are multifold. In Anglo-Saxon countries voluntary organizations have adopted advanced management techniques and practices such as auditing with the help of professional accountants and the use of statistics for funding applications. The women’s center in this study required the services of an auditing firm.

The most visual sign of professionalization was in the building of the children's rights organization. After going through the front door, two secretaries equipped with headsets sitting behind high reception desks welcome you. There is no further access to the building without a card or an invitation. The ground floor is a large open space and is used for exhibitions and conferences. The volunteers' contact officers work in a section of that ground floor. The other employees work in the upper floors in regular offices.

Voluntary organizations also accumulate knowledge and build expertise in certain fields of the sector leading to public recognition (seat on governmental committees, involvement in the design of social policy).

Finally, one more sign of professionalization is the contribution of volunteers themselves. Contrary to the main assumption that equates them with amateurs and despite an impermanent and discontinuous work input, I think that the competence of volunteers based either on personal or professional experience could be likened to a new form of professionalism. The knowledge of children brought by a retired
teacher volunteering in a children’s rights organization, or the intimate understanding contributed by an immigration officer add much to the qualifications of a voluntary organization for refugees. There is often an underestimated pool of knowledge and experience among volunteers. In sum, I refer to *professionalization as a trend toward reliance on expertise and experience, whether it comes from volunteers or paid workers.* It is clear, however, that due to the volatile nature of volunteering, their professionalism cannot be optimally exploited by the organization, although it remains a valuable asset.

At an organizational level, the overall adoption of professionalization has created tensions with the original goals of voluntary organizations. This is a complex topic and we will not go into details here, but an interesting example appeared in the French press in 2002 that, I think, well illustrates this strain. On the front page of the newspaper *Libération*, the president of the major French NGO, *Action contre la faim*, resigned denouncing the excessive professionalization, the widening gap between the size of the NGOs, the high salary of professional cadres, and the original mission to be active on the field. She denounced the fact that the main concern of these organizations is to lobby and to raise awareness using elaborate marketing techniques rather than to extend their action on the field. In doing so, the NGOs maintain the myth about their voluntary character and deceive donors about their excessive professionalization (Merchet 2002). This example illustrates the clash between professionalization generated by the donors’ demand for efficiency, a significant impact on the field and a competitive humanitarian market, and the nonprofit paradigm, in this case a French form of *folkrörelser* paradigm.

For our purpose, the main impact of the hiring of employees is the marginalization of members, particularly as owners of the organization.
The work contract represents a distancing, a rupture of the bond between the member and the organization, a formalization of the exchange principle, and finally, a commodification of the individual worker. This distancing creates a dissonance with the democratic principle of the voluntary organization. In order to minimize this distancing, some voluntary organizations require their employees to become supporting members of the organization.

Moreover, professionalization is not a neutral system of ideas and knowledge, but has a political function, advantaging one group, qualified paid workers, at the expense of the grassroots (Bourdieu 1984):

“The constitution of a socially recognized corps of experts (...) which is now coming about through the gradual professionalization of voluntary, philanthropic or political associations, is the paradigmatic form of the process whereby agents tend (...) to satisfy their group interests by deploying the legitimate culture with which they have been endowed by the education system to win the acquiescence of (...) classes excluded from legitimate culture, [by] producing the need for and rarity of [that culture].” [Bourdieu, 1984 #185@153].

While Bourdieu’s (1984) theory with its class analysis has a clear Marxist twist, such an approach is not relevant to Sweden. Here, one could claim an antagonism between grassroots, suffering a setback, and the owner of relevant and legitimate bureaucratic expertise, the professionals. Paid professionals have affected the work process at the expense of members and volunteers. Volunteers become increasingly less involved in day-to-day decision-making and are assigned alternative tasks such as fundraising and the maintenance of the democratic structure (e.g., in the children’s rights organization). I even saw in Gällivare, during my pre-study, volunteers relegated to serving coffee in a self-help organization for people suffering from mental problems, while support was in the hands of paid professionals.
In this sense, employees tend to monopolize resources. For example, at the children’s rights organization, employees had greater access to resources than volunteers. They had decent offices, the latest computers, and budgets to produce high-quality research, lobbying material, and travel accounts. In comparison, volunteers had no computers of copy machines and met at home because district offices had no venues for them. Unconsciously or not, the work setting is designed to put the resources in the hands of the regular, paid workforce.

We can say that overall, professionalization goes against the interest of volunteers/members. What is their or the organizational reaction to it? What are their responses to the increased hiring of professionals and the pressures to train volunteers?

Amusingly, historical texts show that the introduction of paid staff in voluntary organizations has always created worries concerning their increasing and irreversible importance gained at the expense of members. In 1879, in reaction to a motion to hire a paid secretary in every district committee of the London Charity Organisation Society, someone pointed out that “paid secretaries were a bad thing since paid officers tend to kill voluntary work.” The conclusion of a 1882 report on that motion concluded on the irreversible character of paid work that “the more capable the Secretary was, the greater became the mass of work which he attracted to the office, and the more difficult it became for him to be withdrawn” (Bosanquet and Yeo 1973:241).

To assess this issue we asked the coordinators survey questions about professionalization (see Table 6.3). Note that the paid or unpaid character of the respondent is not specified here. When asked on the phone to participate, they claimed to be the coordinator/person in charge. Furthermore, the survey questions do not distinguish between
volunteers and members, but because in the *folkrörelser* tradition the volunteer must be an active member, the distinction is not as important in Sweden. The answers show a general reluctance about professionalization by denying the primary role of employees in the management and leadership of VWOs.

*Table 6.3*

Answers about Professionalization, the Role of Members and Volunteers, in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is better to leave voluntary planning to professionals rather than to members.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The best voluntary organizations are run by members.</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The more participation from members in the planning and organization of a community organization, the less efficient that organization tends to be.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Even with full funding we would still use volunteers.</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Without volunteers our organization could not operate.</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Volunteers should be seen as trainees and receive training.</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Our staff needs more professional training.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, 70.7% of the respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly with the idea that planning is better left in the hands of professionals (Question 1). Moreover, 66.7% agreed or agreed strongly with the statement that the best voluntary organizations are run by members (Question 2). Finally, a high 74.4% of respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statement that member management is inefficient (Question 3).

Even if the status of the respondents is undefined, we can assume that a significant portion of them are employees. In that case, don’t these responses undermine their position in the organization, as paid coordinators, by claiming that members could manage the organization? The ambivalence expressed by employees may be explained by the counterbalancing impact of the folkrörelser paradigm to the inroads made by professionalization. The endogenous model still imbues the organizations ideologically and promotes skepticism concerning the positive character of the contributions of paid employees. According to that model, the delicate position of paid employees, as we saw above, makes them unlikely to state that professionals are simply more competent to run an organization. The folkrörelser paradigm instills a taboo on the marginalization of members.

Along similar lines, the general answer from the respondents was that members central to voluntary welfare organizations, whatever the conditions. A strong 66.9% agreed or agreed strongly with the statement that even with full funding they would still use volunteers (Question 4). Furthermore, a majority of respondents (58.0%) strongly agreed that without volunteers their organization could not operate (Question 5). This indicates that, unlike in the United States where
some organization leaders reported accepting volunteers only when faced with understaffing, a lack of funding is not a main determinant for having volunteers (Pearce 1993). On the contrary, Swedish voluntary organizations are funded adequately to avoid using volunteers as stopgaps.

Volunteers are more than central, they are also an enriching factor for some employees. Two paid coordinators at the volunteer bureau and the humanitarian organization mentioned how stimulating it is to work with volunteers. The first accepted a substantial pay cut from her former salary as civil servant in order to work in a freer, more stimulating work environment. The second stressed how much daily contact with volunteers enriched her life.

Finally, professionalism is not solely associated with paid workers; volunteers can also improve their skills and knowledge through continuous training. Therefore, the process of professionalization is a process whereby organizations increasingly rely on expertise coming from paid or unpaid workers. We asked whether volunteers should be seen as trainees and receive more training (Question 6), and the answer was not clear-cut: 58.8% of respondents agreed or agreed strongly. This could represent a rejection of the first part of the question (volunteers should not be seen as trainees), they should not be subordinated to employees as the term “trainee” implies. Overall the respondents did not deny that continuing education is profitable for members, in keeping with a long Swedish tradition of adult education.

A similar ambivalence, though smaller, was perceived in the answer about the training of employees (Question 7). A clear majority of respondents (65.6%) agreed or agreed strongly that their staff needs more training, although there was some reluctance to increase the level of competence, as 23% of respondents disagreed or disagreed strongly.
In my interviews, the general question about training volunteers led to general disapproval. As one board member put it, “Training is good, but we should keep it as voluntary (ideel) as possible.” This refusal seems to underscore the fear of excessive professionalization where VWOs become more selective and screen their volunteers. By selecting volunteers with relevant experience, such as people who work or worked with children in schools, the voluntary organization goes against the folkrørelser principle of inclusiveness. Any member of the movement can contribute in one way or another to the organization. The member no longer has a right to volunteer simply on the basis of a common background with the recipients (women help women, alcoholics help alcoholics). This principle comes into disrepute with increasing screening.

However, VWOs that require longer periods of training exist. Their purpose is to increase the qualifications of volunteers before they deal with clients. For example, the City Mission of Stockholm requires 6 months of training before volunteers work with clients. The women’s center requires 12 evenings of training over a period of three months. This shows attempts to reduce the random character of volunteering and to standardize it.

Contradictory Roles
The category of employee, here embodying the public paradigm, modifies deeply the voluntary organization. It alters fundamentally the organizational location of the member/volunteer and even redefines his or her role.
Member or Voluntary Worker
Should unpaid workers be seen as members or voluntary workers?: "As association members, they are “owners” of the organization; as "direct service volunteers," they are workers obligated to perform in accordance with directives and subject to performance surveillance” (Pearce 1993:151).

Staff tend to see volunteers as workers (Pearce 1993), though the member-centered folkrörelser tradition tempers this trend (Lundström and Svedberg 2002). In response, volunteers claim to be the owners, a stance that makes them more valuable (Pearce 1993). This need for legitimization does not, unfortunately, make the impression of a confident member-centered model. It seems to be a defensive reaction against the pressure exercised by the professional structure. How else can one explain that attitude?

This was the case at the children’s rights organization, where volunteers felt marginalized by the professional structure that was imposed. During my interviews, many of the volunteers interviewed attempted to legitimize themselves as owners of the organization, and maintained that the employees should serve and not run the organization. As an experienced volunteer at the children’s rights organization said, "It is in our charter, we should be a folkrörelse. If you take that away, it will be like a public administration.”

However, the discourse was very different at the humanitarian organization. There volunteers did not speak of ownership. The absence of a strong folkrörelser model turned volunteers into “volunteer servants.” The feelings of inferiority reached its climax when they showed appreciation for the stability provided by paid employees. As one volunteer in this organization offered, “hopefully there is a paid coordinator to give us a sense of security in what we do”; an unpaid coordinator would not be able to provide that security. She
added that “we would have had the impression of disturbing her during her free time, while when she gets paid for it, it is ok.”

Member or Recipient:
Since we have focused on the VWOs’ workforce, we have neglected to address the issue of their recipients. The public paradigm tends to blur the line between members/volunteers and external recipients of services. The professional tends to treat all non-employees as persons in need, “clients.” As we saw above, members do not let themselves be relegated to that “inferior” role.

However, this blurring also depends on organizational orientation, how the organization directs its attention. Some of my organizations, such as the children’s rights organization, were clearly more outward oriented: “there are us the volunteers and there are the children, the recipients.”

Sometimes the division is not so clear, as in the case of a self-help organization official working with people with psychological problems whom I met in the north of Sweden during my pre-study. They avoided making a distinction between client and provider; their motto is, “help your fellow human being to help yourself.” Other voluntary organizations follow a similar tendency. Their inclusive nature makes them welcome members who need support and help.

Some organizations blur the line between the two structures. The familial approach adopted by the volunteer bureau has paternalistic overtones that do not fit the folkrörelser approach, receiving volunteers the same way it receives recipients. The warm, familial, homey atmosphere of the office tended to erase the line between recipients and volunteers. They had no reception desk, no staff-only area, mainly a big round table where volunteers socialized with non-volunteers--that
was the whole idea at the foundation of the bureau, to break isolation. One of their workers I interviewed, an unemployed woman with an non-Swedish background put more stress on the social contacts at the venues than her occasional voluntary contributions. I also met a daily helper there, an 80-year-old volunteer at the volunteer bureau. She visited an old, blind lady and read to her. She told me that she volunteers because she does not want “to stay home and get bored.” Thus, the visits broke the solitude of both the volunteer and the recipient; it was beneficial for both of them, even though in theory one was helping the other.

Some author claim that all volunteers are recipients, that "volunteers are also a kind of client (...) in a more indirect sense, since the participation itself must serve volunteers' intrinsic or intangible needs" (Pearce 1993:151). This is certainly an exaggeration. It is clear that many volunteers appeal to the common good and practice social altruism, and do not fulfill only “intrinsic needs.”

Control: the Organizational Constraint
Another aspect that emerges with the public paradigm is with the issue of management and control. The volunteers have a great deal of autonomy, but as Ahrne (1994) showed, the other side of the organizational equation, the constraints, is vaguely defined in VWOs. How can power be exercised without financial remuneration? As we said earlier, the work contract clarifies the question of control and legitimizes authority, but the directors of nonprofit organizations are compelled to find special arrangements, combining the inputs of both paid and unpaid workers in one single work structure.

Comparing, the contract-based situation of the paid worker vis-à-vis the voluntary organization, and the contract-free situation of the
volunteer, the situation of the former appears more symmetrical than that of the latter. The paid worker trades ongoing and reliable work and accepts a superior authority over his or her work in exchange for a salary and access to organizational resources. In the second case, the asymmetry comes from the indistinct character of the return on a discontinuous and volatile work input. The volunteer receives no pay, and we do not know about the access to organizational resources.

In all the organizations except one covered in this research, employees coordinates a staff composed of volunteers. The answer of the professional structure to asymmetry is to restrict volunteers’ access to organizational resources. This was particularly obvious at the children’s rights organization where volunteers only had limited admittance to the head office. In the organizations I visited, volunteers had to ask the employee’s permission to use administrative equipment such as computers, faxes, and copy machines. They were not automatically given access to these tools to fulfill their tasks. Only in the humanitarian organization did I see a designated workplace with a computer for the volunteers. The *modus vivendi* in the other organizations was that volunteers could use the workplace facilities, but only as a “favor.”

This is one form of restriction applied by employees on the volunteers. Otherwise, their power is limited and forces them to adopt smoother forms of constraint. Clearly, the administrators cannot use the same control tools as in the regular labor market, as "the control of potentially unreliable volunteers is achieved primarily through interpersonal influence, appeals to shared values, and selection of task and domain" (Pearce 1993:128). As Weber has shown, an appeal to values carries great weight in organizations founded on a specific social mission: “Volunteers will follow directives and conform to formal
controls when they believe that these acts are necessary to achieve organization goals” (Pearce 1993:170, see also 115). As we said above, in many organizations, if not all, bonuses such as excursions, recreational trips and celebrations are offered to thank the volunteers.

The main employees of the humanitarian organizations recognized the limits imposed by working with volunteers compared with paid staff. Volunteers can easily leave a VWO if working conditions do not please them. In sum, the Ahrne (1994) equation for volunteers comes down to less opportunity and fewer constraints.

The coordinator of the women’s center agreed about its limited power. As she told me, “I am not interested in power. (...) More people can influence their own work situation and do her work tasks, the less the boss meddles in it, the better the staff works. (...) I trust that my staff can take care of it.”

Volunteer-Employee Relations

Work Attitudes and Commitment

The analysis of attitudes towards work and commitment in VWOs should pay attention to its hybrid character where volunteers and employees cohabit. Each differently defines its own attitudes and commitment in regard to the other. This asymmetry is first observable in the attitude of volunteers where they are pushed to define their work role in relation to the dominant professional structure. The volunteers I interviewed offered an almost stereotyped picture of their work. A great majority of them expressed total enthusiasm for the organization and their work. They almost all answered positively the question about work satisfaction in the organization.

On the other hand, the employees have a more tempered attitude. They brought up the inherent problems of their organization and
offered a more systematic and balanced valuation of their work: lack of organization, long working hours, problems managing volunteers, etc.

I also asked my respondents to compare the commitment of paid and unpaid workers. Volunteers did not claim to be more committed than employees. There were no significant differences between the two categories on this point.

However, management theorist Pearce (1993) observed more positive workplace attitudes and higher commitment expressed by volunteers than by employees. The volunteers themselves reported greater satisfaction and commitment than did employees, who tended to be more calculating about their involvement.

The apparent asymmetry in attitude may be partly explained by a psychological phenomenon. Without the constraints of the contract, volunteers can afford to express their true feelings towards their work because they have less fear of consequences (Pearce 1993:88). A very dissatisfied volunteer can hardly justify remaining active, while a discontented employee may not express such discontent for fear of losing his or her job. Yet the management theorist proposes a compensation thesis: volunteers tend to compensate for their non-contract status by claiming a higher commitment level than employees (Pearce 1993).

This economist approach does not consider that the asymmetry in attitudes expressed may be due to the hybrid character of the organization and is not inherent to all organizations. For example, a voluntary organization staffed only by volunteers does not face this asymmetry because it avoids the internal disparity between employees and volunteers.

However, it is true that volunteers express a certain malaise with the organizational structure. There are clear limits to the control exerted
on volunteers, but the professional structure has shaped the organizational environment to the disadvantage of volunteers. In the long term, the organization becomes less adapted to volunteers. This process is more obvious in older organizations, such as the children’s rights organization, than in younger organizations (cf. Olsson 1999). In sum, there seems to be a process of compensation by volunteers to answer to a more and more professional-oriented structure.

Distribution of Work Tasks
One possible form of control is through the distribution of work tasks. The four VWOs studied have adopted different types of control, reflecting the balance between a predominant public paradigm, with its professional structure, and a folkhörrelser paradigm. I see three main types of work distributions: a parallel mode at the children’s rights organization, an overlapping mode at the women center, and unilateral coordination at the humanitarian organization and the volunteer bureau. The reactions of employees and volunteers, their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with these modes is especially revealing about the balance between the two paradigms. The clash between two strong paradigms coexisting in one organization generates the most dissatisfaction.

Parallel Distribution
The parallel system, seen in the children’s rights organization, separates volunteers in charge of maintaining the local administrative structures, and employees occupied with tasks requiring more professional input, such as in this case planning and coordinating projects in developing countries. This system tends to favor a public model of work organization where paid staff monopolizes direct service activities such as coordination of foreign work, lobbying, etc, and limits
the direct work input of volunteers to the “[maintenance] of their own administrative infrastructure” (Gaskin and Smith 1995:40).

This mode of distribution has created a great deal of dissatisfaction among volunteers in this highly professionalized organization. They criticize the absence of communication between local volunteers and employees, who are concentrated at the head office. The general view from the volunteers I met was that their paid counterparts are remote, even arrogant, and do not recognize the importance of the work accomplished at the local level. One elderly volunteer criticized the absence of openness and called the organization’s head office a “fortress,” since as volunteer, he has to go through a security check and needed a special badge to access the levels where the employees work.

Unilateral Coordination

The distribution of work tasks in the two smaller organizations, the volunteer bureau and the humanitarian organization, was simple: only one or two full-time employees coordinated a group of volunteers responsible for all direct services.

This mode of distribution reportedly created little tension. Here, the role of volunteers was clearly channeled in direct service provision. Volunteers had a limited but specific role, they did not simply fulfill tasks that employees did not have time to complete.

The absence of a strong *folkrörelser* paradigm seems to explain the absence of claims for more responsibility. The *folkrörelser* paradigm was weak because these two VWOs were not founded by the grassroots. The humanitarian organization was the creation of a board of the Red Cross, and the volunteer bureau was the initiative of a public agency. Consequently, the volunteers did not have as much of a sense of ownership, but saw volunteering in this organization as an opportunity. The coordination model generally triggers positive comments from
volunteers. A long-time volunteer at the humanitarian organization expressed it clearly when she told me that, “(the coordinator) is just always there for us. (...) She continually organizes information sessions and we meet a couple of times every term. It is really good. But for me the best is that she is not a volunteer but an employee (...) For me it is really important. Had she been a volunteer here, I would not have thought it was good. In that case, I would have thought: ‘we’re disturbing her’. All of that would be during her free time, but now I know she is paid. If you take few hours of her time per week, because she is paid, then you have the right to go and ask if you have problems, you can ask, you can turn to her and talk. I would not have that sense of security with a volunteer. You cannot organize that with a volunteer. We are volunteers, we can come when we want and they welcome us as we are, but we need someone who is not a volunteer.”

The employees realized that their task was mainly to facilitate the work of volunteers. The main project manager of the humanitarian organization said she was there to set a framework in which volunteers can fulfill their work tasks. In our case, the main project manager stressed the simple and clear distribution of work. She emphasized that employees in their voluntary organizations are useful to create the conditions of voluntary work, which is actually one of the main principles of the Red Cross. All volunteers showed satisfaction with the work distribution. They did not feel that the coordinator imposed upon them too much.

Overlapping
The overlapping model created dissatisfaction among both volunteers and employees because they share similar work. This was the case at the women’s center. There is a strong voluntary structure tending to marginalize the power of employees, but there was also a considerable
provision of services necessitating a permanent and ongoing professional input.

The professional structure, even when marginalized, has always had a significant impact on the shaping of the organization and as such triggers reactions from the volunteers. For example, both paid and unpaid workers are responsible for answering the crisis line, the employees during the daytime and the volunteers during the evenings. Many unpaid workers expressed the concern that because of the employees’ daytime shift, they took fewer phone calls in the evening. Women seemed to prefer speaking to an employee than to a volunteer. The coordinator of the center expressed frustration with what she considered a lack of professionalism on the voluntary board. This last model clearly represents a mixed distribution of work, combining both *folkrörelser* and public paradigms.

**Mutual Appreciation**
As with the distribution of work, the tension between paradigms is also illustrated by the mutual valuation of work by paid and unpaid workers. The reaction of volunteers to the presence of employees is particularly important with regard to the balance between the *folkrörelser* and the public paradigm in VWOs.

During my interviews, employees were very positive about the work of volunteers and hardly mention irritations. Most, employees had only good words to describe volunteers: responsible, reliable, and punctual. They complimented their efforts, even showing admiration for their contributions. The paid coordinator of the volunteer bureau said that she found gratification in her work because of volunteers: “I’m happy I stopped working at the social agency (socialbyrån) and work with volunteers to get back the JOY in what I do!”
This praise may be sincere, though one has to realize that there is an obstacle to open criticisms of members/volunteers by employees, namely, that in the *folkrörelser* paradigm, the members are the true owners of the organization. It is difficult to imagine that employees would easily criticize the people who hired them. The volunteers’ appreciation of their paid workmates was, however, less unanimous, and discontent often stemmed from the organization of work.

At the children’s rights organization, many volunteers deplored the way professionals shaped the organization. At the women center, the strong voluntary model made employees suspect for many of the volunteers/members. Founded by the members, the hiring of employees led to criticism and was seen as undermining the democratic character of the organization.

These differences in mutual appreciation have been explained by economic arguments. Though the employees praise the volunteers, it is not without second thoughts: "The volunteers and employees in most of these organizations treated one another with great care and deference. Employees placed volunteers (especially founders) on pedestals and praised their self-sacrifice (and often were more than a little protective and paternalistic)” (Pearce 1993:146). However, the praise is tinted with a sense of superiority, as if the volunteers’ contribution were not as valuable. Karr (2000) has claimed that the appreciation of work in VWOs depends of its paid or unpaid character because “when volunteers and employees perform similar tasks, paid work is perceived as more valuable than the work undertaken for free (...). In addition, we would expect that paid staff members would receive higher evaluations for their contributions and have greater influence within the groups” (Karr 2000:7). A scholar referred to a difference in mode of compensation:
“(this) appears to have quite profound effects on how the work is structured for these different kinds of workers, on their own and others’ expectations concerning their actions in the workplace, and even on how they are expected to think and feel about their organization and its work. This absence of pay for organizational work seems to remove a psychologically important rationale and, therefore, creates uncomfortable dissonance for participants and observers. The dissonance is resolved through explanations that do not depend on money, but the indeterminacy and ideological character of these explanations do not fully resolve the uncertainty”(Pearce 1993:9)

For example, at the women’s center, women in need tended to call more during the day when employees were on duty. This signal (they come at night and get only few calls, for example) caused volunteers to feel that their work was not as important as employees’ work. Many of my voluntary respondents stressed their engagement in the VWO in a way hardly seen among employees. In Pearce’s (1993) interpretation, volunteers compensate for the perceived low value of their work by stressing their work commitment. However, the question of the value of voluntary work is more meaningful in Anglo-Saxon countries than in Sweden, where unpaid work was already well recognized through the folkrörelser tradition (Wijkström and Lundström 2002).

We may generalize about the organizational variations in mutual appreciation among paid and unpaid workers. Low mutual appreciation, as expressed chiefly by volunteers, and even open conflicts between paid and unpaid workers, reflect a clash between the public and folkrörelser paradigms. These conflicts are concentrated in organizations in which both paradigms are strong as we observed in two of our four organizations, the children’s rights organization and the women center.

How can one explain the absence of such conflicts at the humanitarian organization and the volunteer bureau? Here, the folkrörelser paradigm was weak because higher-level structures
(respectively, the Red Cross and a public agency) founded these two VWOs and not the grassroots. As a result, the volunteers did not feel a strong sense of ownership, but instead saw the organization as a service offered to them.

In sum, the absence of pay is the dividing line between employees and volunteers in the way they relate to the organization. Research has shown that volunteers’ implied altruism undermines the legitimacy of their paid counterparts: “volunteers in nonprofit organizations undermine their executives’ abilities to ensure good performance by their direct personal connections to the board, by contributing to a ‘clubby’ environment with social rather than service goals, by seeing paid jobs as a source of patronage, and by encouraging the general expectation of altruism that undermines the use of performance-based incentives with paid staff.” (Pearce 1993:28). I observed a situation of this kind, the frustration of an employee at the women’s center towards the general direction set by the volunteers. Her professional abilities were undermined, and she felt greatly constrained in her work, was seen with suspicion by members, and as a consequence was left out of important decisions.

The For-Profit Paradigm

As we have seen, the sphere of volunteering is far from autonomous or immune from external influences such as the for-profit model. Two elements associated with the for-profit paradigm are the labor market and the consumption society. Here, I may simplify somewhat by categorizing the labor market in the for-profit paradigm. However, the for-profit sector represents, after all, the main share of the overall economy. The first impact is that volunteers create their own arrangements, or simply relate volunteering to their professional life.
For example, the work category of semi-employee is introduced in VWOs to satisfy the needs of the labor market. Second, the consumption society introduces a new form of volunteering, peripheral or “lite” volunteering, a form of engagement differing greatly from the traditional voluntary contribution associated with the *folkrörelser* paradigm.

Peripheral Volunteering
The multiplication and diversification of organizations over the past decades has meant a diminishing reliance on human resources and a greater dependence on material, financial, informational, and coordination resources (Ahrne and Papakostas 2002).

The transmission of information and the linkage between the members used to be the organizational tasks requiring a significant number of voluntary contributions. Nowadays, the telecommunications shrink the number of volunteers needed for such tasks (Ahrne and Papakostas 2002:155). The reduction in the demand for volunteers added to the fact that these organizations cover a greater range of interests, has resulted in multiple memberships, multiple volunteering. Instead of active members, new categories of membership appear, such as the support member. The women’s center has adopted such a category for men (who may not come to the center) and corporations and associations. The support member pays a fee, receives the newsletter, and can attend some activities, but has no voting right.

The category of daily helper represents this looser form of volunteering. The new types of voluntary organizations have been described as a late-modern movement generating this looser form of volunteering (Lundström, 2002). The daily helper’s link to the organization has similarities to the relation clients have with for-profit
organizations: short-term commitment, membership à la carte, and no strong sense of attachment, etc. The market for volunteering satisfies a range of cultural, charitable, political needs. This represents a shift from the traditional commitment in the *folkrörelser*, consisting of a strong sense of loyalty to the organization and significant personal commitment as it was the case in the labor movement.

In my interviews, the reason for declining volunteerism was regularly explained by multiple volunteering and changing interests. An older, very engaged volunteer at the volunteer bureau told me that her commitment will decline because she is involved in so many other organizations and has a growing interest for volunteering in the cultural issues.

Peripheral volunteering generates strong organizational differences with regular volunteering. For example, a volunteer I interviewed who was both a daily helper and an elected representative spent about 15 hours a week at the volunteer bureau. She had a different sense of belonging than the treasurer who spent only 2-3 hours per month on her tasks and attended a board meeting once a month. Some volunteers spoke of the unreliability of other volunteers working at the crisis line. A retired and very committed volunteer at the children’s rights organization disparaged the importance that unpaid workers would place on volunteering: “The others are reliable, but they don't have as much time for "a proper commitment (ordentligt engagemang).” You can read between the lines: “commitment like in the good old days.”

Peripheral volunteering also creates confusion within the organization itself. Volunteers drag friends and relatives to help out at the organization without being formally registered. Many organizations do not keep an official list of volunteers to clearly differentiate between
regular volunteers and outsiders (Pearce 1993). Thus, it is difficult to know who is “in” the organization and who is not. All four of my organizations reported keeping some sort of register of official statistics. However, daily helpers did not seem to be consistently included.

The paid coordinator of voluntary work at the children’s rights organization specifically cited the problem of continuous volunteering for new kinds of activities: “With the exception of board members (routine work), there is no list of volunteers for spontaneous events (punktinsatser) (...). The goal was to encourage a greater number to contribute on a regular basis for spontaneous events, a continuous voluntary work for more activities.”

Peripheral members are not an organic part of an organization and are often considered as substitutes (Pearce 1993:112). This can represent a threat to the cohesion of the organization if it ends up being “an activist core and a periphery of partially-involved members” (Pearce 1993:154). A small group of people, which may also include truly committed volunteers, comes to monopolize control of the organization.

Professional Life and Work in VWOs
Professional life has repercussions on VWOs. The employees and semi-employees have a professional life by definition, but volunteers also have links with it, lying between the labor market and the folkrörelser paradigm. I present a series of four interfaces between professional life and work in VWOs, mainly inspired by the work of Schumacher (2001): mutual reinforcement, linking, compensation and alternative.
Mutual Reinforcement (Career Path)

For many volunteers, civic engagement is positively correlated with their level of qualification in their professional life. They may gain professionally from volunteering and vice-versa. Knowledge, contacts, etc, can be transferred from one sphere to the other, reinforcing their qualifications.

Many of the volunteers I interviewed also worked professionally in the field of welfare. Civic engagement represented the opportunity of having a more personal impact on the field. The vice-president of a local section of the children’s rights organization was a paid official of a nonprofit adult education institution. She saw connections between her paid work and her social engagement, especially because she was being paid to work with volunteers. She enjoyed the fact that the voluntary organization offers a more flexible work environment.

Even more evident was the case of two volunteers at the women’s center who were previously employees of other women organizations. They considered their volunteering to be naturally linked to their professional life.

Moreover, the president of the board of the volunteer bureau was an officer in the administration of a public elderly care facility. She told me that she used her political contacts to help the voluntary organization.

A final example is the case of the treasurer of the volunteer bureau who was also a paid counselor in a voluntary organization. Her employer helped cooperatives to start up. Here, volunteering and work are closely intertwined: “sometimes I don’t know if it is work or not,” she said.
Volunteering as Link
The for-profit sector seeks to address certain flaws of the labor market and for that purpose has turned to the inclusive work environment of voluntary welfare organizations. Theories have emerged that see VWOs filling a special economic function. Voluntary welfare organizations as "transitional labor market" (Schmid and Gazier 2002) could ease the social deficiencies of the labor market, particularly mass unemployment. The organization would provide a transitional activity period in voluntary organizations to people with low employability or to persons unable at certain times of their life to pursue a full professional life in the regular labor market, (Schmid and Gazier 2002). This would eventually lead to gradual integration in the regular labor market. Voluntary work could link periods of unemployment, absence from the labor market to periods of steady gainful employment.

I observed many cases of such linkages during my investigation. First, unemployed people are active at the volunteer bureau and the children’s rights organization. One volunteer at the women's center saw this commitment as a way to gain experience and eventually be paid for working in the field of women’s welfare, as she did some years ago abroad. Here, volunteering is a way to stay active and avoid becoming out of touch with the labor market. a jobless semi-employee at the volunteer bureau, who was first a volunteer, told me that “I don’t want to be sitting at home doing nothing and feel bad (mär dåligt).”

Finally, a temporary employee at the women’s center who took a leave of absence from her regular job as a paramedic explained how the experience she gained as a volunteer was instrumental in getting this job. She found this more stimulating than her regular position. She expected to resume volunteering after the leave at the women center.

The link can also take the form of temporary employment in VWOs. Semi-employees are participants of employment measures such as
ALU or lönebidrag. People with low qualifications, handicaps, or sickness, often have difficulties finding work in the private sector. They are sent to the voluntary organizations to gain experience and eventually integrate, or reintegrate, into the labor market. However, they contribute to the organization like any other worker, though their motivations are usually not the same. The absence of real choice (they are “placed”) makes them conceptually more similar to employees than to volunteers. By aiming at increasing their employability, the semi-employee represents the intervention of the labor market and overall the capitalist economy in VWOs.

In a previous study, I met an injured worker who worked as a secretary for a Greek cultural organization in Uppsala. I also met two semi-employees taking parts in employment programs, one at the humanitarian organization and one at the volunteer bureau. In some cases, participation in the employment program superseded any real interest in the mission of the organization. She took phone calls and organized meetings and appointments. In the case of the secretary of the human organization, it was not clear that she really identified with the mission of the organization; for her it is rather instrumental in reintegrating the labor market.

The tasks done by semi-employees vary. At the volunteer bureau, the semi-employee did practically the same job as the coordinator, taking phone calls and dispatching volunteers. She sometimes replaced the main coordinator.

The ambiguous role of semi-employee tends to clash with both the folkrörelser and public paradigms. The position of semi-employee is uncomfortable; caught between employees and members, their contribution is ongoing, but unlike the volunteer, only for a short to medium period of time. This poses a structural dilemma for the
coordinators: should semi-employees perform overtime, should they take part in training programs, staff meetings, etc. like permanent employees?

The ambiguous role of the semi-employee has led certain organizations to reject this kind of contribution. The board of the volunteer bureau decided to stop employing them because their contribution was too short-lived and they could not integrate them well enough in the structure. When a VWO hires and trains a semi-employee who leaves after six months or a year, they feel that everything they invested in this person vanishes. The board felt that this contribution offers more disadvantages than advantages.

Volunteering as Compensation
Voluntary work can also fulfill certain personal needs (personal autonomy, use of personal skills, personalization of the contact, broadening horizons) that are not satisfied in a regular paid job. Sometimes, wage-earners performing more technical or routine work with lower responsibility tend to seek this compensation in volunteering.

As we said above, some of the volunteers I interviewed were professionally active in the same field such as welfare or immigration. Their volunteering was motivated by the greater autonomy associated with volunteering. For civil servants active in the field of welfare, volunteering can represent an opportunity to have a different contact with the people. A female volunteer at the humanitarian organization worked in the same field for the immigration board and taught Swedish as second language. She stressed that volunteering gave her the chance to be involved more as a person and not simply as a civil servant. And an employee working at the women’s center told me that she lacked
stimulation in her ordinary job as a paramedic, and that volunteering
gave her the opportunity to do something she believed in.

The case of a translator, board member, and crisis line volunteer at
the women’s organization is interesting. She wanted to get in touch
with a different, tougher side of the society that she did not come in
contact with at work or elsewhere. It is a way to be useful and descend
from the ivory tower: “It’s a humane approach, being interested in
people in general. Then I think it is interesting how… how we solve our
problems, how human interactions are. I thought first that I wouldn’t
want to work with sick people. They are beaten down (*slagna*) both
psychologically and physically. As a woman I can understand some of
it, even though I was not attacked, raped, or abused. (...) I think it is
important. When one has been up in the ivory tower, it’s important to
reach a balance in the world. (...) I can take it a bit seriously. It’s a
commitment but it’s the most important. I don’t live just for that. It
gives me something. It gives some sort of satisfaction, because I do
something different than having it nice (laughter).”

Volunteering as Alternative
Voluntary work can also become an alternative to gainful employment,
a way to be active during certain unsalaried life phases such as
retirement or education. I propose two subtypes: 1) volunteering as
introduction to the professional life; and 2) extension to professional
life.

Introduction to Professional Life
Volunteering to gain experience is more common in Anglo-Saxon
countries, Germany, and France than in Sweden, where volunteering is
mainly an activity of the elderly (Jeppsson Grassman 1994). Since
young people represent a very small fraction of volunteers involved in
the field of welfare, I found only one case of volunteering as an introduction to professional life, namely, the young volunteer who initiated the youth hotline at the women’s center. She mentioned that the skills developed on the board could eventually serve her in her professional life. Yet, she did not intend to pursue a professional career in women’s associations.

Extension to Professional Life

My study shows numerous examples of pensioners maintaining socially meaningful activity through social volunteering in Sweden (Jeppsson Grassman 1994). Retirement seems to create an existential hole that volunteering partly fills. As one pensioner volunteer at the children’s rights organization put it, “Other activities like golf are useless. It’s better to help children.” An elderly daily helper at the volunteer bureau said, “I don’t like to be home alone.” The social dimension is important, but as well as the mere opportunity of investing oneself into a meaningful activity.

The Private Sphere

Volunteering has not become an autonomous sphere like the for-profit sector. As we showed, it is easily affected by external factors, such as the private sphere, with which volunteering is particularly intertwined.

The modern private sphere lies outside the sphere of productive activities, and has no model work organization like the for-profit or public paradigms. Yet, volunteering comes in contact with the private sphere precisely because of its socially peripheral character. Voluntary work is not an autonomous sphere like the labor market; it is wrongly associated with unimportant leisure (see Chapter 3).

Volunteering is often associated with a free-time activity. With part-time and irregular schedules, voluntary activities such as board
meetings often take place outside the standard 9 to 5 workday. It can also take place at home. There is no venue for the local board members of the children’s rights organization; they meet in a home. They also make phone calls from home. The volunteers of the humanitarian organization often meet refugee clients at home.

Many volunteers see their role as belonging more to the private sphere than to the civic or productive sphere. Therefore, it does not make sense for many of them to compare gainful employment with volunteering. For them, you cannot compare making a living with making, developing, and maintaining friendships.

A female volunteer at the humanitarian organization created such a strong tie with the refugee she helped that she became part of the family: “It feels like she is a family member. It does not feel like a job I have, no she is part of it. Even if we don’t meet very, very often, but on some occasions, it feels she is always there.” This merging between private and volunteering was frequent among volunteers of this organization. Another volunteer said about her refugee, "I'm like a mum for her."

Consequently, many volunteers I met reported that they "could not draw clear boundaries between their volunteer work from the rest of their lives" (Pearce 1993:38). Both elected representatives and daily helpers felt a certain difficulty in making a strict separation between volunteering/work and private life. It was easier for employees to separate both. An older male volunteer at the children’s rights organization told me that, “I don’t really have time for my private life, I just manage reading the newspapers. I consider other things (his volunteering) more important. It depends what you prioritize in life.”

Volunteering can also become very intertwined with friendship. For example, one semi-employee at the volunteer bureau told me that she
recruited many of her friends to volunteer with her. When she went to volunteer, it was like going to meet her friends. Another elderly daily helper regularly visited elderly ladies at home and many of these “contacts” became friends. She said she would keep visiting them regardless of the volunteer bureau.

The other side of the coin is that external concerns (e.g., health, financial, family matters, etc.) have a greater effect on volunteering than paid work (Pearce 1993:100). A volunteer at the humanitarian organization wanted to take a break from volunteering when she became a grandmother. The fact that some volunteers do not show up for the crisis line is often related to their family. Most of the time volunteering is less important than family.

Sometimes the family has to remind the volunteer of this. Many volunteers expressed that at some point when they invested significantly in volunteer activities, their family or personal life suffered. A female volunteer at the humanitarian organization told me that she invested so much time in her first young refugee that her sons felt left out. Now she does not invite her contacts to come to her home: "I keep my family out of it."

Final Comments
To close this chapter, we can say again that voluntary welfare organizations are strongly affected by the type of work organization, and shaped by paradigms other than the folkrörelser model. The public paradigm permanently shapes VWOs by introducing the category of employee; the for-profit paradigm anchors them in the labor market and in professional life. At another level, the private sphere interferes with volunteering. In sum, the paradigms established in more dominant sectors than the nonprofit sector shape the
organization, but take advantage of the idiosyncrasies of the voluntary model.

Moreover, despite the attempt to establish self-contained paradigms, distinctive overarching categories, one realizes that there are no hermetic separations between them. For example, does volunteering by the elderly have more to do with the extension of professional life (for-profit paradigm) than with the fulfillment of needs not satisfied in the private sphere? It is partly both. Why use paradigms when we cannot clearly separate them? They certainly helped to refine our understanding of the phenomenon of work in VWOs, even if they accentuated certain characteristics.

What is the power balance between the paradigms? There are no indications of major efforts to transform VWOs in Sweden into “job pots” as in Germany (Bürgerarbeit), and draw VWOs towards the for-profit paradigm. Nor is there any movement to deinstitutionalize them, which would increase the influence of the private sphere on VWOs. The dependence of VWOs on the public sector is so important that to speak of a public/folkrörelser paradigm would almost make sense. This corresponds with the historical evolution of the welfare state, where the folkrörelser played a major role. Examples of overlapping work distribution, emulation, and blurring between clients and members are forms initiated by this merging between the two paradigms.

This conclusion certainly challenges the ideal of an independent sector, and of voluntary organizations as spaces of freedom and personal volition. It seems that social voluntary work is evolving into new terrain, more connected to the overall organizational environment. Some interesting questions arise from this: Can they really fulfill some labor-market functions? Do they contribute to social integration or strengthen the social link?
Chapter VII

Social Volunteering, Freedom, and the Polis

The results presented in Chapter 6 clearly show that heterogeneous forces significantly shape voluntary welfare organizations and, more generally, the nonprofit sector. This analysis places VWOs in the context of the influence that the public and for-profit sectors have on them, and gives a new understanding of their social functions. Volunteering and voluntary organizations have generated great expectations regarding social function, specifically, their role in political action. I present in this chapter two types of expectations and evaluate them in the light of my results. First, voluntary organizations are seen as potential spaces of freedom, and second, social volunteering as a force that contributes significantly to democratic life and the strengthening of social ties.

Social Volunteering as Space of Freedom

The ideal of volunteering and voluntary organizations as a sphere freed from the constraints of the state and the for-profit sectors emerged from the critique of the wage-earning model. Méda (1995) held that the wage-earning model reduced work to its economic dimension and promoted the unequal relationship between employee and employer. Work is today not organized to be an end in itself and to emancipate the worker. It has lost all relation to the “being together,” the link between the individuals and the community, and in this sense, the political dimension.
Arendt (1970) observed that work is ruled purely by the logic of technological development. The wholeness of productive activity is lost through its division and decomposition (Weber 1996). In sum, the products of our work are valued and refined but its social and political functions are completely neglected (Arendt 1970).

Consequently, voluntary organizations and volunteering appear as a liberating alternative: "Volunteer settings are among the few social settings in which there is a genuine freedom to construct social relationships without the constraints of tradition or economic pressures." (Pearce 1993:79). Gorz (1980) saw in “civil society” a space liberated from the alienating excesses of the state and the economy, and for Arendt (1970), it was a human activity free from the realm of necessity. Voluntary organizations are deliberately founded by actors, outside of economic interests or bureaucratic constraints, and in which they engage in disinterested social interactions.

Our results only partly corroborate this perception. First, the volunteers’ holistic approach certainly contributes to this liberty to some degree. It is more flexible and open compared with the technical, specialized approach of professionals. The best example in my study is the humanitarian organization. The volunteer I met did not restrict her contacts her African refugee client to specific scheduled meetings; her client could call her at any time. Moreover, the volunteer not only provided support to the refugee, but extended this support the whole family. Many other volunteers in this organization were much more available than civil servants dealing with refugees.

Second, voluntary organizations offer more autonomy to their workers than do public or for-profit organizations. Volunteers tend to be more autonomous creatures, but we discovered that voluntary organizations give a greater level of autonomy to employees as well.
The board, i.e., the immediate supervisor, is not present to maintain close and daily supervision.

However, it is clear that our results do not support the idea of “freedom” quite as lyrically as expressed by Gorz (1980) and Méda (1995). They considered VWOs and the nonprofit sector to be free from the influences of the state and the market. We clearly demonstrated the contrary. The folkrørelser is changing under the influence of the for-profit and public paradigms.

First, the defense of the folkrørelser paradigm clearly by volunteers signals that they experience themselves a model of organization in the process of change. During my interviews, many of the volunteers strongly stressed their legitimacy as owners of the organization, and maintained that the employees should serve and not run the organization. An experienced volunteer at the children’s rights organization said, "It is in our charter, we should be a folkrørelse. If you take that away, it will be like a public administration.” Volunteers mentioned the constraints that developed in the organization, and reacted by saying: "it is voluntary after all."

VWOs as a whole cannot be viewed as a sphere free of constraints. Inherent to the organization itself are a series of elements that limit the freedom of its workers, even if they are not as dominant as in other sectors. As Ahrne (1994) showed, organizations offer possibilities and limitations for both employees and volunteers. Social volunteering takes place in an organizational environment that requires certain logistics and infrastructure that only formal organizations can provide. The children’s rights organization is a good example. Here volunteering was mostly directed towards maintaining the democratic structure of the organization, an important task requiring an army of 1200 board members. Volunteers have to cope with organizational
necessities such as work patterns, training, schedules, registration.

In Sweden, the voluntary welfare organization is not immune to the public paradigm. Its dependence on and marginalization by the public paradigm means greater limitations. The best example is the restrictions imposed on the work of volunteers at the volunteer bureau and the humanitarian organization by public authorities in order to preserve their fields of operation. The for-profit and the public paradigms influence strongly these organizations, they cannot claim to be truly autonomous and to have created true space of freedom. Social volunteering becomes a peripheral activity, not a priority, when it interferes with professional or family necessities. We saw examples of this at the women’s center, where members volunteering for the crisis line routinely failed to come in when family obligations conflicted.

However, constraints and the influence of other paradigms, do not automatically have a negative impact on social volunteering. The fact that young Swedes rarely engage in social volunteering seems to be linked to the absence of constraints. In Anglo-Saxon countries, private employers view favorably experience as a volunteer in the field of welfare; it implies maturity and initiative. In Sweden, the independence from the market (decommodification), seems to limit this incentive to do social volunteering. However, personal financial concerns (great dependence from labor market) often lead to disaffection among volunteers (Robichaud 1998). In sum, a certain moderate pressure can be beneficial for volunteering, while too much pressure is not.

Constraints of Professionalization
The main source of constraint for VWOs comes from the process of professionalization and specialization. Pushed to the limit, it can be counterproductive and harm the original aims of the organization. In
complex post-industrial societies, the extensive use of new technology and its widespread impact has led to negative side effects, such as the increase of the general risk level (Beck 1999b).

The world constructed by the Industrial Revolution was based on the separation and autonomy of spheres. Today, this process generates techniques and standardization in every sphere. The conclusion is that there is no promised sphere of freedom, liberated from bureaucracy and commodification, as Gorz (1980) suggests.

The field of bioscience provides interesting examples (Abenhaïm 2003). We have observed a growing number of epidemics in the last years: AIDS, SARS, asbestosis, legionnaire’s disease, mad cow disease, etc. This is not directly because of the emergence of a pathological agents, but because exposure to the underlying agents has increased, mainly due to technological advances. Hepatitis B has spread because of the massive use of blood transfusions. Increasing toxicity rates in France are largely caused by overmedication. SARS spread rapidly due to the greater mobility of people, a side effect of globalization.

We can also observe secondary effects in the field of welfare, and here professionalization plays a role. At a macro level, the comprehensive Swedish welfare state has reshaped society. Public social workers have been instrumental in this reshaping. The state apparatus has provided universal benefits and increased the general level of welfare, but it has also decreased citizens’ dependence on the arbitrariness of the family and the market (decommodification). The adverse side effects are loneliness, feelings of alienation, and urban anonymity. This has to do with the development of the welfare state and large-scale, highly professional bureaucracy and its value-neutral intervention.
At the micro level, the process of professionalization deeply transforms VWOs into more constraining structures. An increased formalization of work practices in voluntary organizations threatens the inherent value of freedom associated with volunteering in these organizations (Staggenborg 1988). As noted by Ahrne and Papakostas (2002), the moment the first paid employee is hired, the work structure changes permanently, becoming more bureaucratic and hierarchical. This trend reinforces the limitations and challenges the idealistic picture of a free sphere. Studies have shown that professionalization leads to a division of work that has a negative impact on the mobilization of volunteers (Robichaud 1998).

However, the increasing professionalization of voluntary organizations threatens its approach to tackling problems partly caused by the welfare state. The strength of VWOs is their capacity to develop personal contacts in a holistic approach, which attenuates this sense of alienation and exclusion. Many see the presence of volunteers as a defect, a sign of amateurism. But volunteering is an asset of voluntary welfare organizations, and they risk losing their relevance by emulating public agencies. Their size, flexibility, and the local dimension of their action give them the advantage of offering services locally. Therefore, there may be advantages to favoring a low-tech, low-professionalization approach in the field of welfare. VWOs cannot be immune to public and for-profit influences, but should see these differences as strengths and not as weaknesses.

Social Volunteering as True Activity of the Polis?
The same voices that refer to a space of freedom also claim that volunteering and the nonprofit sector can be synonymous with true
political activity, not perverted by economic or bureaucratic imperatives. The work of Hannah Arendt (1970) has inspired this reflection. In the contemporary world dominated by concerns for utility and necessity, there is little room left for true involvement in community building.

She defined human activity according to three dimensions: labor, work, and action. Labor is all the activities necessary for the maintenance of the species, the realm of necessity, including eating, reproduction, and childcare. Work takes part in the process of accumulation, productive forces, and the realm of economics. Action, however, is human activity devoted to the public domain, the "human condition of plurality" (Arendt 1970: 263). The most important human task is "to offer mortals a dwelling place more permanent and more stable than themselves" (Arendt 1970: 7).

The contemporary forms of work (mainly wage earning) are not useful in the construction of this dwelling space, this social bond. It has turned into a vain technological quest, a never-ending refinement of the tools of our reproduction. Contemporary forms of work have actually eroded our social bonds and the world of politics (Arendt 1970).

The question is how to resist this technologization of the world and restore a true political dimension in contemporary societies (Méda 1995; Arendt 1970; Gorz 1980). Most of our energies are concentrated on work, consumable and short-term production. Aristotle said that the realms of necessity and utility do not foster the freedom to fully participate in the life of the city (see Chapter 3). In the 20th century, even the state has shown very little concern for building the polis, since it has focused rather on the regulation of the accumulation of wealth.

In the final part of her book, Méda (1995) offered new alternatives
that rely on social voluntary work to address the vision of work as social integrator. The principle she laid out subordinates economics to politics by restricting economics to the production of wealth, creating more space for the creation of "social wealth." Time spent outside the economic sphere would reinforce the social link, our natural heritage, relations between individuals; there would be more free time for focusing on friendship in the public space, but also in the private by improving kinship. More people could be involved in political action, involved in the "choices of the good society."

I think that social volunteering could have a significant role to play in this agenda. If voluntary organizations do not clearly represent a sphere of freedom, as we saw above, they could nevertheless contribute to this community building. This would depend on the type of volunteering one refers to. Volunteering for economic purposes such as housing cooperatives or joint ownership belongs to the realm of necessity. In many cases, however, larger ambitions are involved: a vision of the world and a contribution to the community and the strengthening of its ties. The example of the volunteer bureaus shows how this exchange of services and mutual support reinforces social relations between neighbors. Home visits strengthened ties in the district of Stockholm. They created new personal links, and in this sense they contributed to building a sense of community.

At the humanitarian organization, the action of the volunteers helped develop social ties as well. It contributed to breaking loneliness among both volunteers and refugees. It mobilized people who were currently idle, such as pensioners and unemployed people. Furthermore, it helped to integrate refugees into the larger community and to undercut isolation or ghettoization. In that case, the volunteers engaged freely in the social arena of the polis.
As free activity, liberated from the chains of subsistence, voluntary work has the potential to build for active citizenship (Brown et al. 2000). My results may indicate that social volunteering contributes to the *polis* by the act of participation in the democratic process. Indeed, the voluntary function of board member in a voluntary welfare organization allows individuals to exercise administrative functions, and eventually to have a free say in the public domain through their organization. Voluntary welfare organizations belong, more than any other voluntary organizations such as sports clubs, to the public realm.
Notes

1 In Sweden, the great majority of them are officially registered and benefit from tax exemption.
2 Religious volunteering can also be motivated by personal interest. In Great Britain, for example, parents seek to send their children to religious schools because they have a better reputation than public schools. Going to church and volunteering in the religious community help parents gain admission of their children. Many parents become very involved before the time comes to choose a school (West and Hind 2003).
3 Literally, it is a combination of popular (folk) and movements (rörelser).
4 “förening ska vara öppen och tillgängliga till alla människor i samhället.”
5 “Alla medlemmar ska ha samma möjlighet att föreslå verksamhet och påverka beslut.”
6 “Samlande benämning på människors levnadsförhållanden. En beskrivning bygger som regel på en redovisning av deras ekonomi, hälsa, utbildning, bostadsförhållanden och arbetsförhållanden.“
7 I refer to people who providing moral and practical support to certain social categories such as disabled people, immigrants, pupils, etc. (they are called stödfamiljer, kontaktpersoner in Swedish) in exchange for a small subvention from the state.
8 This is obviously contrary to the present German discussion related to mass unemployment, in which Bürgerarbeit, work in the voluntary sector, represents a solution to social exclusion.
9 Worldly here refers especially to manual activities, and not contemplation or prayer, and represented one step, but only one, on the path to Salvation.
11 “the strategic services of the new economy, the providers of information and support for the increase in the productivity and efficiency of firms.” (Castells, 2000, p.227).
12 These figures are based on Full-Time Equivalents (FTE), i.e., hours worked within a year in a full-time job (1840 hours = 46 weeks at 40 hours).
The aim of the center is to exchange services and help among neighbors of the same district. For instance, volunteers visit and accompany elderly people to various appointments (doctor, dentist, etc.).

See definition in chapter II

The movements strictly considered as folkrörelser are the free churches, the labor and temperance movements and emerged in the 19th century. This children’s rights organization was founded later, but has followed the folkrörelser tradition.

In order to preserve the anonymity of the organization, the complete reference cannot be given.

Attitude is defined here as "the predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object, or aspect of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner" (Katz, 1960:168).

Arbetslivsutveckling is an employment program that is limited in time.

A state wage subsidy that covers part of the salary of an employee with reduced work capacity.