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While library institutions and youth services professionals debate the fine points of volunteerism, young people’s volunteer participation has been carving out an increasingly justified claim for recognition and research.1 Recent studies on volunteering in the United States demonstrate that between one-third to one-half of young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five participate in volunteer activities. And as one journalist recently observed, “Volunteering in record numbers, young people became the super-force of the Obama campaign.”2 This participation rate is outstripping that of previous generations.3 A reported 15.5 million teenagers contributed over 1.3 billion service hours in the United States during 2004.4 Young people’s motivations for volunteering vary greatly. Some volunteer at their schools or religious organizations to visit distant and impoverished countries to build houses and feed the poor. Others work in elementary schools as tutors. Young people develop personal relationships with the infirm and elderly in hospitals and nursing homes. Many do so under organizational umbrellas such as AmeriCorps and Teach for America. Other recognized sites for youth volunteerism are labor unions, political campaigns, and sports clubs. Yet, although libraries have increasingly taken note of the importance of youth participation, we have very little data or research upon which to rely for analysis, training, planning, evaluation and assessment, or outcomes, or even raw data to tell us the extent to which young people offer their volunteer energies to help improve library service in their communities.5

As a consequence of this lack, few of the activities that constitute a successful volunteer program are systematically addressed in our professional scholarship, in library school courses, or in staff development workshops. Furthermore, in neither the literature on youth volunteerism in general nor the literature recognizing successful community partnerships between schools and other institutions as part of youth development initiatives do libraries of any kind appear on the radar as community partners.6

Youth development evaluators identify three basic components of volunteer youth involvement: the intensity, or how much; the duration, or how often; and the breadth, or the range of activities and tasks.7 This study examines the records of a mid-size urban public library to assess the first component for volunteer participation patterns. Using a conventional approach to providing volunteer opportunities, it examines the intensity of young adult (YA) participation over time, how the intensity of this labor compares with that of adult volunteer labor, and elucidates what library administrators can learn from the study.

The findings illustrate a degree of public value that may frequently be underappreciated by libraries, supervisors, and administrators. They suggest that library staff may benefit from better volunteer administration skills and planning. But they may also reveal a potential for libraries to more powerfully connect young people with their libraries and communities.

Methods

To collect a sufficient dataset from which to observe substantial patterns about the intensity of young adult volunteer experience across an entire institution, a public library system operating a sizable number of branch facilities was required. For this study, the subject institution—Oakland Public Library (OPL)—is a library operating fifteen branch libraries, a separate tool-lending facility, a bookmobile, and a main library. Oakland has a multicultural population of approximately 420,000 and encompasses approximately seventy-eight square miles making it a moderate-sized urban environment.8

After obtaining authorization for access to library records, written monthly reports from branch managers and main library department heads were examined in detail for a contiguous twenty-four-month period, January 2005 through December 2006.9 The library’s managerial reports document all major activity for their respective facilities and units. These reports are submitted to the system’s administrative services office for the collection and assessment of the data for use in library annual reports, planning, grants, and evaluation. In addition to recording volunteer activity, these managerial reports also document many other conventional service metrics such as monthly circulation statistics, programming activities and
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To yield comparative adult and YA volunteer analysis, however, the subject library was required not only to have documented statistics of volunteer activity, but also to have systematically segregated YA from adult volunteer participation. Not all libraries or library systems collect or delineate data in this manner.

During the twenty-four-month period in which data were collected, OPL separated out the volunteer labor donated to the library by adults and YAs, thereby allowing not only comparative intergenerational analysis but detailed analysis across two full and contiguous calendar years. Manager-reported YA volunteer data were compiled retrospectively for all branches and the main library for each month in 2005 and 2006. Although the library was in the process of building a stronger YA professional service profile during this period (i.e., hiring new YA specialist librarians), no systematic volunteer training had begun. No special or new volunteer programs were launched or under consideration. There was no administrative mandate specific to volunteer opportunities or participation. And the library was not operating with any additional resources or grants. Thus these figures represent something of a benchmark or baseline snapshot of the ordinary operations of a moderate-size urban library system.

Methodological Challenges

Given the dearth of research on library YA volunteerism, an inaugural study such as this one predictably raises more questions than it answers. As rich and chronologically comprehensive as the statistical data presented here are, there are, as always, mitigating methodological challenges at play. For instance, because the staff of the subject library had not received particular training or instruction about the importance of keeping volunteer statistics, there likely were inconsistencies in the library system’s managerial documentation.

One example of this inconsistent interpretation of volunteer participation can be seen in how some operations or line staff considered or documented particular activities or tasks. More specifically, was participation in a monthly Teen Advisory Group (TAG) meeting categorized as a volunteer activity or a program? Because most conceptualizations of both of these groups contribute meaningfully to YA service enhancements, there might be a good argument that they are volunteer activities. On the other hand, there is little evidence that libraries conventionally record TAG participation as volunteer activity. Conversely, some adult activities might not have been counted, such as attendance at monthly Friends or library board meetings. Other inconsistencies can arise because of normal staffing, personnel, and training challenges.

Another inconsistency is that monthly branch manager reports themselves may be irregular or unreliable sources of information. One branch manager, for instance, reported an unlikely zero hours of YA volunteering over the entire twenty-four month period. Some branch managers and staff members may not consistently or accurately recognize or record YA volunteer participation in general. Another branch manager did not report any volunteer activity at all (adult or YA) for six successive months during the period under study.

In addition, because only selective quantitative data are collected on volunteer experiences from this particular institution, there are several factors about which we do not learn but that might prove valuable in identifying staff training or planning requirements. We do not learn, for example, if young people contributed their time individually or as part of peer or other organized groups. We can only speculate about the motives that initiated the volunteering activity and whether these young people were completing community service requirements for school or an extracurricular organization such as the Girl or Boy Scouts, YouthBuild, Americorps, or any number of other locally based organizations. Neither is it clear to what degree they were just volunteering. Nor do we learn about the relative participation of youth by gender, race, social class background, or even age (beyond designation as “adult” or “YA”). Branch manager reports did not record how or why these particular young people elected to offer their volunteer energies at a specific library location or at any library at all. Also, we do not learn how the library or administration recognized or thanked the young people who donated so much of their time to the library, the duration of their involvement with the library, what specific tasks they performed, or what the young people who volunteer make of their experiences.

Finally, it seems reasonable to conclude that branch manager reports undercounted volunteer statistics for YAs. During the period under study here, for example, there were a potential 384 discrete monthly branch manager reports on volunteer statistics for YA participation (16 branch locations multiplied by 24 months). Of that possible total, 161 instances occurred in which a monthly report recorded zero YA volunteer hours. This is sufficient reason to consider that the data reported by branch managers and examined in this study are on the conservative side of actual YA volunteer participation and intensity between 2005 and 2006.

Despite these methodological challenges to collecting and evaluating data on YA volunteer contributions in libraries, there remains much insight to glean from the twenty-four months of recorded managerial statistics available here.

Findings

Young Adult Volunteers in Branches

After a detailed examination of the subject library’s monthly branch managers’ reports for the consecutive twenty-four months in 2005 and 2006, a better picture of
Among the most surprising findings in this study is just how high this participation intensity is compared with adult volunteer participation over the same time period. Briefly stated, the library recorded a YA contribution of 61 percent of all volunteer labor across the entire institution during the study’s time frame.

Young Adult Volunteers across the Branch System

For the year 2005, the total of all branch volunteer participation was reported as 9,074 hours, 41 percent (3,757 hours) of which was contributed by YAs. In 2006, the reported volunteer participation across all branch facilities increased to 9,437 hours, increasing youth participation to 47 percent (4,431 hours) of the total. Together the two years yielded an average young adult participation of 44 percent of the branch system’s total volunteer profile.

Although there is a great deal of month-to-month variation across these two years of data, when examined against the conventional school calendar, a more predictable ebb-and-flow pattern of volunteer intensity emerges for YA participation. In both 2005 and 2006, during the traditional summer vacation months, as well as during the December intersession, YAs contributed relatively more volunteer hours compared to their participation during the rest of the year. In 2005, for instance, June and July drew 49 percent (436 hours) and 53 percent (786 hours) participation respectively, and December drew 51 percent (328 hours). The data for the traditional nonschool months reveal that YA figures equal or surpass adult volunteer participation by a considerable margin. During June, July, and December 2005, and June, July, and August 2006, YA percentages either equaled or bettered their elder volunteer counterparts. In June 2005, YAs contributed a full 66 percent of all branch volunteer hours.

Not surprisingly, these nonschool-month participation figures contrast with the months in which most conventional schools are in session. Nevertheless, even the lowest percentages of reported YA volunteer participation during this two-year period remained respectable. At no point was YA volunteering much lower than 30 percent of all branch participation. The lowest level of participation discovered during the period studied occurred in August and September 2005 (27 percent and 28 percent, respectively). In September 2005, YA volunteering contributed, for example, a very respectable 28 percent of all branch volunteering (194 hours versus 685 hours contributed by adults), and in 2006, YA participation in September through December averaged 32 percent of all branch volunteering participation (678 hours compared to 2,138 hours for adults).

Young Adult Volunteers at the Main Library

As strong a presence as YAs’ volunteer intensity had in this fifteen-branch system, their contributions dominated in the main library’s activity. During the same twenty-four-month period, YAs contributed a staggering total of 78.5 percent (13,261 hours) at the main library. The main library’s YA total volunteer yield was 80 percent (7,021 hours) in 2005 and 77 percent (6,240 hours) in 2006. Similar to the ebb and flow of the branch volunteer experience, the largest percentage of YA participation occurred during the months when most YAs were not in school. The highest percentage reported by the main library manager—90.1 percent (1,427 hours)—occurred in July 2005; the 2006 volunteer peak—85 percent (677 hours)—occurred in August.

Even at its lowest ebb, the main library’s YA volunteer intensity profile proved robust, never slipping below 55 percent (321 hours), which was the percentage in March 2006. The lowest 2005 percentage was reported in September—57 percent (210 hours).

Combined Branch and Main Library Volunteerism

When combined, all manager-reported branch and main library volunteer hours for 2005 and 2006 show that YA volunteers contributed far more than did their elders during this benchmark period. The data show a two-year overall average of 61 percent (10,778 and 10,698 hours) respectively. The system’s highest total months for YA participation occurred during summer, in June and July 2005, resulting in 70 percent and 72 percent (1,457 and 2,213 hours) respectively, and in June 2006, in which 76 percent (1,593 hours) of the library’s volunteer effort was donated by the community’s young people.

It is interesting to note that between the fifteen branch libraries and the main library during the time period under examination, the latter attracted considerably more YA volunteer participation: 44 versus 78.5 percent. The total...
hours reveal a far heavier intensity of YA volunteer participation: 8,188 hours in branches for 2005–6 versus 21,476 hours at the main library.

The relative intensity of participation of YAs increased during those months in which young people were not attending school. Nevertheless, their volunteer participation intensity appeared strong and consistent throughout the year. And during the out-of-school months they were the library’s largest source of volunteers.

Throughout the period in which these data were reported, it is clear that YAs contributed a surprising and substantial amount of volunteer effort to OPL. Indeed, if the young people who contributed the reported 21,476 hours to this library in 2005–6 had been paid only the current federal minimum wage of $6.55 per hour, this collective YA philanthropy would have made a contribution of some $140,608.

**Discussion: Implications for Library Management**

Library administrators in particular can take full advantage of a thriving YA volunteer program. First, aside from the resources required to gather sufficient information and develop a training program, volunteer management is a very cost-efficient endeavor in relationship to many other YA programs. Second, a successful program engenders a higher profile within the community for value-added youth opportunities and highlights greater public value for the library in the community. Among the positive dimensions of this heightened community profile are the workplace preparedness and public service opportunities it offers youth. Another positive dimension is the higher profile the library gains in seeking competitive fund development opportunities by demonstrating a legacy of strong intergenerational services. Third, a successful YA volunteer program deploys the most recent innovations in youth development principles, in which youth become participants in an integrative service model rather than simply recipients. Furthermore, if well integrated, a successful YA volunteer program is capable of incorporating youth throughout many or all organizational divisions of an institution as young people observe, job shadow, and mirror professional and paraprofessional staff in their daily duties. And finally, the most recent research on comprehensive youth services reveals that young people and librarians both value volunteer opportunities as among the very most desired offerings—young people value volunteering above such conventional services as Internet access, book talks, author visits, and reference services, among many others.

This longitudinal quantitative study teaches us that young people constitute a significant, if overlooked, pool of volunteer labor for public libraries. But many questions remain. There are several areas in which libraries can dramatically improve their knowledge base so that future program development may receive more professional treatment and attention. One area is how the YA volunteer experience might appear in the organization’s strategic plan. Another is how library administrators might track recruitment patterns of YA volunteers, for example, as outreach to youth-serving community organizations might easily improve volunteer program planning and increase the development of community partnership opportunities. This would not only assist in understanding the broader community network from which young users come to the library but also provide insight into the kinds of motivations and expectations young people bring to their volunteer experiences.

Another arena of YA volunteer program management and administration calling for greater attention is the degree of consistency in data collection that libraries might institute in the future. Better documentation on how library administrators define YA volunteer tasks and how YA volunteer counts are represented would be useful. Other potential planning tasks include orientation, preparation and training, collaboration between library staff, and the development of volunteer tasks suitable for both the library and YAs. Libraries must also include program evaluation. But planning, delivering, and evaluating any program are easier when all parties begin with the same basic ground rules, assumptions, and metrics.

A third arena of YA volunteer management for future consideration is developing opportunities across a wide array of diverse workplace tasks and skills through which youth would gain exposure to and familiarity with experiences such as direct customer service interactions, inventory control, time management, interview techniques, among many others. Libraries might begin to explore a variety of outcome measures here as well. Although it is certainly true that some libraries offer a range of more complex tasks than others, the professional literature confirms that almost all of the duties assigned to YA volunteers are tasks that staff find easier to explain and manage, including repetitive clerical tasks—stamping, cleaning, simple shelving of library materials, and preparing materials for children’s programs,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total All Volunteer Hours (Adults &amp; YA)</th>
<th>Total YA Volunteer Hours</th>
<th>Percent of YA Volunteer Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8,729</td>
<td>7,021</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8,125</td>
<td>6,240</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined Years</th>
<th>Total YA Volunteer Hours</th>
<th>Percent of YA Volunteer Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005–6</td>
<td>21,476</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These kinds of tasks are assigned to YA volunteers because they can be quickly taught and monitored. Although these simple tasks and roles do offer young people access to potentially valuable volunteer opportunities, they can do more. Libraries seldom systematically ask questions about how to maximize or enrich YA volunteers’ experiences beyond keeping them busy during slower work times.

Thus, rather than asking what YA volunteers can do for libraries, the better question might be to ask what libraries can do to enhance experiences and opportunities for YA volunteers. Library managers would do well to consider their local youth populations and circumstances and ask themselves what kinds of skills, exposures, and tangible rewards YA volunteers might most benefit from in preparing for the workplace and the paid labor market.

Such an examination could inaugurate a wide, community-based conversation among many of the library’s civic partners, such as local officials, business leaders, educators, and other service providers. Upon identifying, articulating, and integrating those skills into a comprehensive volunteer regimen, a more standard volunteer experience should emerge in contrast to the ad hoc nature of tasks YA volunteers have almost universally encountered in the past.

Thus the data from this study raise a variety of new questions for future research. Closely connected to the kinds of tasks libraries commonly ask YA volunteers to perform, administrators and managers should ask if libraries are exploiting these experiences, opportunities, efforts, and hours to the best advantage of young people:

- Are tasks, skills, capacities, exposure opportunities, concepts of workplace readiness, youth development, and workplace safety raised in such a way as to prepare young people to transfer them into the labor force?
- How are library staff prepared, trained, and supported in offering volunteer opportunities? How are current practices documented and evaluated?
- How closely does the allocation of library resources (time, training, and other support) align with the library’s claims of valuing volunteer contributions?
- How are current practices profiled and marketed to the community?
- What are the best metrics by which to evaluate library volunteer opportunities and program offerings?

Finally, although this study offers a unique analysis of quantitative benchmark data for one institution, there are other benefits from engaging in more comparative analyses with other library systems or other community institutions serving youth:

- What leads young people to volunteer in a library in the first place?
- What do young people like and dislike about their experiences as library volunteers?
- How does their experience help them in their other activities?
- How would they recommend improving the experience?

The figures reported and examined in this study mask the administrative and strategic components that facilitated these obviously successful volunteer opportunities for young people in these library environments. Thus we do not learn a great deal about staff needs for working specifically with YA volunteers as opposed to adults; how they established or evaluated the tasks their young volunteers performed; or their thoughts about discovering the degree to which young people contributed to the library’s overall volunteer profile. Neither do we learn why the main library in this study has so much greater a percentage of YA volunteers than the branches do.
Conclusion

YA volunteers continue to present themselves to libraries. Recent research suggests that young people are offering their labor in ever-larger numbers to many institutions. They ask for things to do, and they are looking for ways to contribute. Yet, other than producing long lists of tasks to show how libraries use this labor, we know very little about the actual experiences of young people as library volunteers, about staff as facilitators of this experience, or about the managerial questions at play.

Libraries are nearly ideal venues in which young people can play meaningful roles as volunteers. Although the branch manager reports under review here do not include a long narrative evaluation of youth volunteers by library managers, we do know that young people are recognized for their meaningful contributions. One branch manager noted that “teens (volunteers) are a big factor in the success of the Juvenile Summer Reading Game which signed up 900 kids in the first few weeks.”17 Another manager also recognized the contribution youth made to valued programming efforts: “Children’s summer reading statistics were higher than last year’s numbers . . . teen volunteers did a great job running both the children and teen’s programs.”18

Libraries exist in most communities throughout the nation and therefore are readily accessible to young people. The kinds of work conducted in libraries offer relatively safe working conditions. Professional and paraprofessional library youth staff are dedicated to serving as mentors, sponsors, and volunteer supervisors. Young volunteers can perform many functions that enable paid staff to conduct higher-level duties. Positive volunteer experiences in the library can help recruit new career professionals because they offer young people official roles in the library that expose them to and inform them about careers in public service.19 Offering young people high-profile and quality volunteer opportunities helps demonstrate the public value of the library to the community. And a successful YA volunteer program helps build positive intergenerational experiences between youth and adults.

William Damon has recently written, “Not only is volunteering character-building . . . it is also a good source of sparks of interest that may develop into a life purpose.”20 Working with volunteers—young or old—is time-consuming, and libraries have traditionally offered volunteer opportunities largely to accomplish tasks for which paid staff are unable to devote necessary time. But irrespective of the amount of time consumed working with volunteers, when libraries offer a more systematic volunteer model (program structures, definitions, documents, relationships, evaluations), they can become a community’s powerhouse of YA volunteer experience.
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