

The history and dilemmas of Volunteer Centres in Norway

Paper for the conference

VOLUNTEERING INFRASTRUCTURE & CIVIL SOCIETY

Rotterdam, April 2008

Håkon Lorentzen and Line Dugstad
Institute for Social Research, Oslo, Norway
hlr@socialresearch.no, ldu@socialresearch.no

Introduction

When the Norwegian Volunteer Centres were established in 1991, they were described as a «solution without a problem» (Lorentzen, Andersen and Brekke 1995:20). Neither user groups, particular problems nor political challenges forwarded this idea. The centrals were the result of a general political will to find volunteers that were willing to engage, particularly within the social field. In the late 1980's, the Government wanted to mobilize volunteers, but did not know what kind of incentives that should be used. The result was an open-ended, bottom-up program, without clear ideas about functions or roles of governmental-funded volunteering. The term *voluntary centre* (frivillighetssentral) was applied to encircle the multitude of local experiments that were established. The general idea was that these experiments should be funded by governmental money, but community initiatives and ideas from below were supposed to fill the centrals with content and structure.

The first centres were established in 1991, and since then their number increased from 91 to more than 260. The original *bottom up* structure has been dominant, the centres have been permitted to develop models of their own, adapted to local traditions and their owner's will. But in a recently launched white paper (St. meld nr. 39 (2006-2007) the Government presents, for the first time, a more specified description for the roles and functions of the voluntary centres. The Government's intentions are related to the term *community centres* (nærmiljøsentral) a concept that lacks a more precise definition. Still, the government's idea is that these centres shall work across public service sectors, like health/social services, activities for the elderly, youth and other age groups. They should also relate to cultural activities, as well as environmental ones. According to the white paper, centres should function as «...a coordinating link between voluntary associations and activities, and between the public and voluntary sector'. The centrals should also '*... promote voluntary engagement and function as a partner between community initiatives and local authorities*» (St. meld nr. 39 (2006-2007), s. 204).

In this paper, our main intention is to present history of Voluntary Centres in Norway. The political context of this history is a welfare state where a clear line of demarcation between *state* and *civil society* used to be absent. After 17 years administration of voluntary centres the government now wants to alter the basic functions of the centrals. This policy change brings up some unanswered questions about what the term community centre should mean, and what kind of policy instruments the government should use to reach the goals.

Firstly, we will present some brief outlines of the background and history of the voluntary centres in Norway. Focus is placed upon ownership structures, activities and services. We will also present data that illustrates how the Government's visions of the centres has changed since they were established in 1991. Finally, we will compare the visions of future *community centres* with today's realities: How dramatic are the necessary course changes that has to be done to fulfill Government's ambitions?

Volunteer Centres: The idea

Norway is a country of less than 5 million inhabitants in the outskirts of Europe, a non-EU member whose national wealth is primarily based on oil, gas and fisheries. Norway belongs to the family of Nordic welfare countries, long governed by social democratic regimes with a strong emphasis on collective and egalitarian values, on state responsibilities towards poor and marginal groups and a high degree of state intervention in the welfare field,. The ideas about «voluntary» efforts have traditionally been associated with religious, temperance, labor class and philanthropic activities. The basic vision of the social democrats was, for a long time, to replace philanthropy with state-financed, value-neutral and professionalized welfare services. Between 1920 and 1970 one could observe an element of hostility by the social democrats towards philanthropic welfare solutions. The social democratic welfare regime that emerged after 1945 largely replaced philanthropic activities by public welfare services, and the idea of the welfare state as primarily «good» is accepted by all political parties.

In spite of this, voluntary work has for more than 900 years hold a strong position in the Nordic countries. In terms of volunteer share of civil society workforce organization, Sweden and Norway rank as number one and four out of 35 countries. This ranking indicates that in Nordic countries civil society is less professionalized than most other countries, it is still volunteers that keep up the activities.

The years between 1980 and 1990 brought a shift in social democrats' deeply rooted antagonism towards voluntary activities. Several reasons seem to lie behind. Important ideological impulses came with the new liberalism of Thatcher and Reagan, arguing a need for a broader spectrum of welfare activities than those provided by the state. A second, less visible motive was the growing acknowledgement of mutual dependence between public and

civil welfare resources. Not even the oil-financed welfare budgets in Norway can stand the pressure from a never-ending stream of public welfare demands. Professions and politicians realize that civil welfare resources should be activated, but how? And without supporting philanthropic and liberal ideologies to challenge the government's responsibilities for people's welfare? After 50 years of belief in the all-embracing responsibilities of the state, a re-introduction of civic responsibilities was no easy undertaking. This is where the history of the volunteer centres begins.

In 1988, the Government launched the first White Paper on the role of the voluntary sector in Norway (NOU 1988:17). A positive analysis of the voluntary sector's welfare functions was presented, but the government did not really understand how governmental goodwill should be converted into policies. Voluntary organizations expected some kind of political gain, and in the absence of a defined strategy, the Minister of Health and Social Affairs in 1990 arranged a *hearing*, a meeting where representatives of voluntary welfare associations were encouraged to present their assumed innovative contributions to welfare problems (Lorentzen et. al. 1995:10-13). Here, the Norwegian Red Cross suggested that in some way or other the government ought to stimulate the manifold of community-based, voluntary activities. The Red Cross was inspired by the US model of voluntary *clearinghouses*, local *centres* that mediate between users and volunteers on the one hand, and the multitude of local associations on the other. In this way people who wanted to help could be connected to either users or associations who already needed more volunteers.

The suggestion from Red Cross was met with welcome by the political parties, the Government and the volunteer associations. As a result of the hearing, the Norwegian Parliament in 1991 decided to grant 90 million NOK to a three year pilot program with Volunteer Centres (Lorentzen and Røkeberg 1998:7). But the public funds were not locked to a certain way of organizing the volunteer centre, for instance the clearinghouse-model that Red Cross suggested. Instead the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in 1991 made an open announcement of the public funds in media. Both the announcement text and the instruction for how to operate a Volunteer Centre that the Government formulated, indicated that the Government did not want to strongly regulate the organizing and operating of the volunteer centres in the pilot program. The program was launched as an «experiment in testing practical models», no way of operating and organizing was presented as «better» or «correct» as long as the central benefited civil activities. The idea was that the Government through a diversity

of pilot centrals could gather experiences on best ways of mobilizing volunteers. However, the public funds were earmarked *new activity* – they should not go to ordinary activity in voluntary associations or compensate for existing public units, but function as an agency and meeting point where volunteers, associations, local authorities and people in need of help could meet. Both the announcement text and the guidelines made clear that the volunteer centres should focus on *caring activities*. In this way the Volunteer Centres were places inside The Ministry of Health and Social Affairs domain, but still outside the public responsibility. Voluntary organizations, municipalities, congregations and individuals were allowed to apply for public grants. The idea was that local initiatives should shape activities according to local culture, norms and practices.

The result of this process was around 285 applications, of which 96 were selected and granted support for a trial period of three years (Lorentzen et. al 1995:11). After the three years, volunteer centres were accepted by the National assembly as permanent institutions, and from 1991 to 2006, the number of centres increased from 96 to around 274 (Dugstad and Lorentzen 2007:15). Mediating between public and civil ownership, between civil enthusiasm and professional responsibilities, they surely enough deserve a status as *hybrids*.

The three first years of the centres' existence were by the Government regarded as a test period, and in 1994 the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs proposed to the national assembly that grants would be reduced. This proposal was perceived as a threat to the existence of the centrals and to the workplace of the coordinators. During the first months of 1994 a rather intense lobby campaign was brought into action. All coordinators contacted their local representatives to the National assembly, arguing continued national grants for the centrals. In March 1994, the Governments proposal of reduced grants was rejected by the national Assembly. The lobbying campaign was a success, and later these national grants were increased considerably as the number of centrals went up.

National and regional conferences as well as the well coordinated lobbying campaign created a rather dense social network among the coordinators. The lobby campaign created a need for a unified argumentation, a shared perception of what centres are good for, their contribution to welfare and civil society. From being anchored in community practice and culture, the centres gradually developed a common identity and also a common profile of practices.

Basic structure

The first 96 centres reflected the government's formula of «one paid administrative leader, an office and a telephone». The Ministry of Health and Social Affairs required every centre to have a governing board. Apart from this, the idea of a voluntary centre stood forth as empty, a solution without a defined problem, ready to be filled with local activities.

When the idea of volunteer centres was launched in 1991, some voluntary associations wondered if there would be enough volunteers to go round. However, as table 1 shows the centres recruited volunteers from a different age group than pre-existing voluntary associations:

Table 1: Age distribution among volunteers, per cent. 1996

	All organizations*	vol. Humanitarian and social organizations.*	Volunteer Centres
Below 24 years	13	8	9
25–49 years	59	48	33
50–66 years	20	27	30
67 yrs and older	8	17	28
Total	100	100	100
N =	537	230	761

Source: *Medborgerundersøkelsen* (The citizenship survey) 1990.

When compared to «traditional» voluntary associations, centre volunteers were recruited among the *elderly* part of the population, mainly it seems, because they were open only during normal working hours. Also another type of selection of volunteers took place. Table 2 shows that the percentage of volunteers with ordinary jobs in the paid labor market, were considerably lower in the volunteer centres than the rest of the voluntary sector.

Table 2: Share of employed volunteers in different age groups. Per cent.

	24 years younger	or 25–44 years	45–66 years	67 years or older
All voluntary organizations*	59	91	73	9
Humanitarian and social organizations*	51	86	70	5
Volunteer centres	14	55	41	3

* Source: *Medborgerundersøkelsen*, (the citizenship survey) 1990.

Table 2 shows that the volunteer centres recruited a significantly higher share of their volunteers from outside the labor market, than the ordinary voluntary associations. In Norway, a high percentage of volunteers are active in sports cultural, hobby music and youth associations where activities mainly take place in the evenings or weekends. «Leisure time» is a term complementary to paid work, but at the centres' voluntary activities were mainly performed by those outside the paid labor market. One may therefore say that the centres, open as they were at daytime, filled a need for those without paid employment.

Table 3 shows the main activities in the volunteer centres in 1997:

Table 3: Activities at volunteer centres, 1997. Total figures and per cent

	N =	Per cent
Self-help	192	11
Social care ⁱ	647	38
Personal service/excursions ⁱⁱ	397	23
Leisure/hobby activities	346	20
Phone services/counseling ⁱⁱⁱ	127	8
Sum	1709	100

What tables 1, 2 and 3 tell us is that the volunteer centres seemingly recruited volunteers from groups and social strata that were underrepresented in ordinary voluntary associations. On the other side, the centre activity profiles do not meet government criteria either in terms of range or innovation. Although some activities were new and innovative, most activities were well known and tried, particularly those run by pensioners' associations and social/humanitarian voluntary organizations. Activities can broadly be classified as 1) material or emotional assistance, and 2) leisure and community activities.

Studies of the pilot program in the beginning of 1990s showed that *mobilizing* volunteers was the main goal for the majority of centres (Lorentzen et. al. 1995:27): About 40 per cent of the Volunteer Centres stated mobilizing as the only goal, while 40 per cent stated *mobilizing and coordinating* as goals. Coordinating means an aim to create a better collaboration between local associations and/or local authorities. About nine of ten Volunteer Centres stated in 1994 that the centre arranged activities together with local associations (Lorentzen et. al.1995:159). Only a minority of the centres, about 13 per cent, stated in the pilot period that the centre aimed to *pass on* users and volunteers to existing local associations (Lorentzen et. al. 1995:27). A study of the actual activity in the centres showed that passing on users and volunteers never became an important task in the pilot period (Lorentzen et. al.1995:160-161). Instead the main operation seemed to be establishing and organizing activities, especially social- and caring activities (Lorentzen et. al.1995:161-162).

Ownership of volunteer centres

Since the start in 1991, the Norwegian Volunteer Centres have been organized into different ownership forms. Table 4 presents self-reported ownership forms, as they were reported in 2006 (Dugstad and Lorentzen 2007). Below, the structure of ownership forms in 1991/92, 1997 and 2006 are compared.

Table 4: Self-reported ownership forms, 1991/92, 1997 og 2006

Totals (per cent)

	2006	1997	1991/92
Cooperation association	37 (14)	16 (10)	-
Foundations	52 (19)	24 (14)	4 (4)
Associations	59 (22)	38 (23)	37 (39)
Congregation or religious organization	15 (5)	15 (9)	20 (21)
Municipal ownership	101 (37)	73 (44)	35 (36)
Other/not defined	10 (4)		
Totals:	274	166	96

Table 4 shows that the percentage of foundations as well as cooperation associations have increased. In 2006, one third – 33 per cent – were organized within these two forms, compared to only four per cent in 1991. The number of centres organized as associations went down during the same period, from 39 to 22 per cent. As for the centres owned by municipalities, a small decrease of 7 percentage points can be observed. Also the number of «religious» organized centres shows a relative fall, since no new centres of this kind has been established after 1997. The overall picture points towards a stable relation between approximately one third of the centres being owned by municipalities, and one third of civic ownership forms.

In academic literature, it is often assumed that voluntary – or civil – activities carry advantages compared to those of other sectors: the *state* (or public agencies), the *market* (or for-profit firms) and *kin/family*. Most often, comparative advantages are assumed to be connected to the civil sector's ability to mobilize unpaid labor; to produce services people can trust; to engage neighbors in community welfare activities; to raise empathy and moral engagement for those worse off; and to include marginal or vulnerable groups in collectives (Berger and Neuhaus 1977 and 1996, Hansmann 1987, Salamon, Sokolowski and List, 2003).

Most often, it is also assumed that these comparative qualities are threatened or challenged when the «logics» of the other spheres penetrate civil society (Habermas 1992, Salamon 1987). In order to preserve their qualities, civil activities ought to keep their distance to public authorities, «cooperation, but at an arms lengths distance» (Wolfenden 1978). If they get too close, empathy and enthusiasm will be usurped by formal and inflexible solutions with bureaucratic governance.

The thesis of comparative advantages of the civil sector rests on an assumption that is most often regarded as a self-evident truth by social scientists: That civil sector provides something that is basically *different* from what is produced by state and market. Civil structures mediate qualities or properties which are absent or weak in «state» and «market». While «state» ideally represents bureaucracy, professions, legal authority, and a mandate to use physical force to enforce rules, civil structures are based on moral obligations, citizen initiatives, donations and collective action, economies based on idealism rather than profit-making. Civic virtues and civic organizations can be seen as complementary; merging civil and state activities will, more or less inevitably, lead to a breakdown of these qualities. According to ideas presented above, one would expect voluntary, public or for profit ownership in some way or other to affect the performance of welfare agencies. And consequently that when similar welfare services are produced by different institutions, their ownership form, in some way or other, will put some kind of distinctive stamp upon the production. But when testing this assumption on the Norwegian volunteer centres, Lorentzen and Røkeberg (1998) did not find any strong correlation between ownership form – as autonomous, voluntary and municipal – and the activity profiles of the centres. On the contrary, they found a striking degree of *similarity*, a finding that, in this case, seems to negate the thesis of comparative advantage.

In spite of low correspondence between ownership forms and activities, several arguments have been raised against municipally owned centres. As public authorities make attempts to mobilize volunteers on their own, they transcend the borderline between the public and civil sector. Most often, volunteering is something that takes place within voluntary associations and not within public units. Municipal ownership was, in many ways, an experiment that transcended the borderlines between public and civil sector. When the reform was implemented, no explicit ideas about the integration of public and civil resources existed. As a consequence, voluntary centres developed as hybrid units, with a loose and multi-faceted

governance structure, adapted to local conditions. Somewhat, paradoxically, this loose and undetermined structure may have a main reason to their success. Centres appeared as a type of 'glue' between public, civil and private resources. But a loose structure may also have some disadvantages. Questions like: «Where are the responsibilities placed?» and «What are the real purpose?» may be difficult to answer.

New Visions

The hybrid character of the centres can be contrasted to governmental intentions of maintaining the sector-specific advantages of civil service providers outside the public welfare sector. Stortingsmelding nr. 16 (1993-94) summed up the history of the Norwegian volunteer centres and proposed that the administration of the centres should be transferred from the Ministry of Health and social affairs to an *independent organ* for voluntary activities and organizations (St. meld. nr. 16 (1993-94) p. 24-25). The proposal was supported by the majority of representatives in the *Storting* (the Norwegian Parliament) and from 1995 *FRISAM* was established as the national umbrella institution voluntary activities. This organ was supposed to be independent, but financially and administratively it became the responsibility of the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs.

The purpose of this unit was to stimulate, coordinate and develop voluntary activities in Norway. The unit consisted of an organ where different voluntary organs could meet and discuss matters of common interest (the *kontaktforum*), and a *centre* responsible for information and competence-building. In addition the centre became responsible for the governments' administration of the Volunteer Centres. As the governments' representative towards the centres, as well as the voluntary sector's interests organ towards the state, also *FRISAM* was positioned as a *hybrid*, which, after some time created tensions and conflicts. Strangely enough, the Volunteer Centres were not granted status as voluntary associations which was a basic precondition for membership in the *kontaktforum*. This reflects the common opinion of the centres as organs outside the voluntary sector.

As an umbrella organization *FRISAM* existed in ten years. I June 2004 the Government decided to establish a new coordinating unit for the voluntary sector in the Ministry for Cultural and Church affairs. This decision was anchored in a white paper «Relations between the State and Voluntary Associations» (St. meld. nr. 27 (1996-97)) from 1997 and the

additional paper from the new government in 1998 (St. meld. nr. 44 (1997-98)). The conclusion was that the Governments general policies towards the voluntary sector across sector-oriented departments are weak and should be strengthened. Subsidies were apparently distributed in different ways in different departments. This made it unnecessary problematic and cumbersome for the associations which constantly met different practice in different departments and public institutions. Also the nationwide associations called for a «general voluntary politic».

A committee was appointed by the Government to consider the need for coordination across departments, and in their conclusion in 2004 they recommended to unite the departments' funds to civil associations. As a result the Ministry for Cultural and Church affairs was given responsibility for all governmental contribution to civil associations. FRISAM was dismantled and the people who worked with Volunteer Centres were moved to the department. This again clarified the centrals close connection to the public administration, as opposed to the civil sphere. From 2005 and up to this day a division in the Ministry for Cultural and Church affairs has coordinated and divided subsidies to the Volunteer Centres.

The same year as FRISAM was dismantled, the Government launched they would give 1,4 million NOK to a new independent secretariat for the civil associations and in February 2005 the new umbrella organization *Frivillighet Norge* was established. The organization was established without any connection to the public administration and three years later – in February 2008 – it has 154 associations as members. In *Frivillighet Norge* developing a mutual political platform for the member associations has brought forth a new discussion about the Norwegian Volunteer Centres. Both in its own political platform and in its suggestions to a new white paper the umbrella organization call for an elaboration on what is the centrals' role and function. The umbrella organization claim that several of its member associations experience that the municipal owned Volunteer Centres are more rivals than collaborators. The Norwegian Volunteer Centres are not accepted as members of *Frivillighet Norge*.

The general idea in the beginning of the pilot program in 1991 was that the Volunteer Centres should develop deeply rooted in their local environment without strong directives from the public administration. Consequently the centrals have had a great degree of freedom to anchor their operation in the wishes, interests and needs of the local initiator(s). After the pilot

program period in the early 1990s the project with local Volunteer Centres was never formally summed up, and no conclusion was reached on what seemed to be the best way to organize and operate a central. As a result, the Norwegian Volunteer Centres continued to develop in different directions.

In a recently launched white paper (St.meld nr. 39 (2006-2007)) the Government for the first time presents a more specified description for the role and function of the Volunteer Centres. *Volunteer Centres* are described as *Community centres* (nærmiljøsentral). The centrals' main role is to coordinate people, organizations and local authorities. The central should not primarily establish and arrange its own activities, but support both new initiatives and existing activities and projects, stimulate participation and voluntary work in the local community.

What does the government put into the term *community centre*? The white paper (St. meld nr. 39 (2006-2007) p. 204-205) gives some indications:

- «The intention is that these centrals should cover a wide range of leisure- and community activities, as well as social caring activities».
- «The Governments goal is to develop sector-transcending community centres».
- «In every community you find many local associations, each with their own goals and values. But most of them share a superior goal; to make good communities where the inhabitants can be active and have influence. Here, the Volunteer Centres should picture themselves as coordinators between associations, volunteers and local authorities».
- «The coordinating role does not imply that centrals should take over administrative tasks from associations, but motivate for local volunteer commitment and interaction between voluntary and public activities».
- « The Volunteer Centres can, for example, offer information and knowledge to voluntary associations. In this way the centres can help developing the associations, and the volunteers can use their time to work directly into their own field of interest».
- «The Government will continue to support municipal owned Volunteer Centres (...) Still it is challenging for municipal owned centrals to be aware that they are operating voluntary activities within municipal structures».

These citations indicate what we see as the general *vagueness* of governmental intentions.

Dilemmas for the future

Since Volunteer Centres vary in form and content, the degree of correspondence between government ideals of *community centres* and present structures also vary. Some centrals function almost like a community centre already, while the practice of some is at distance from the governments' intentions. As illustrated above, the centrals have different ownership forms; some are classified as civil ones, while others are owned by the municipality. For some centrals, the Governments' ambitions will not necessarily imply changes, neither in ownership nor the way they operate. Others may have to make considerable changes to fit into the model of a community centre. Changes can occur if the leadership of the central on their own decides to change the course, or if the granting authority work out framework conditions which turns the centrals into desirable organizations.

The hybrid character of the centres – as something in relation to both public and civil spheres – has been a characteristic dilemma since the project was launched 17 years ago. Are they public units, or do they belong to the voluntary sector?

We can observe that any attempt to change the classification for the centrals as either public or civil will be debated. If they are classified as *civil* units, a tension occurs between the centres and existing voluntary associations which may experience them as rivals. But if the centres are classified as *public* units, fundamental questions about a public unit using unpaid voluntary workers to solve problems within the welfare state, can be brought up.

If the government should want to change the way voluntary centres function, what kind of tools are at the governments' disposal for this purpose? To which degree may the government force a voluntary activity into a new type of practice? Here, we see the contours of *governance* – as a usable tool box for changing the course of centrals.

The role as community centres may also bring the central into the interest sphere of existing local umbrella organizations which today undertake coordinating functions within local, civil fields. We can find such coordinating units among organizations for the elderly, cultural associations, sports associations, migrants, youth associations and others. A plausible scenario here is one of *conflict* between existing coordinating structures and the emerging community centres.

References:

Berger, Peter L. and Richard John Neuhaus (1977), *To Empower People. The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy*. Washington D.C.: The AEI Press

Berger, Peter L. and Richard John Neuhaus (1996), *To Empower People. From state to Civil Society*. Washington D.C.: The AEI Press

Dugstad, Line and Håkon Lorentzen (2007), Sivile eierformer. Med frivillighetssentralene som case. ISF rapport 2007:008. Oslo: Institutt for samfunnsforskning

Habermas, Jürgen (1992), *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Mass: MIT Press

Hansmann, Henry (1987), Economic Theories of Nonprofit Organization. Walter W. Powell (ed), *The Nonprofit Sector*. New Haven: Yale University Press

Lorentzen, Håkon, Rolf K. Andersen og Jan-Paul Brekke (1995), *Ansvar for andre. Frivillighetssentralen i norsk velferdspolitik*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Lorentzen, Håkon and Toril Røkeberg (1998), *Hvem bør eie frivillighetssentralene? Virkninger av eierskap for drift, styring og innhold*. ISF rapport 1998:014. Oslo: Institutt for samfunnsforskning.

NOU 1988:17 *Frivillige organisasjoner*

Salamon, Lester M. (1987), Of Market Failure, Voluntary Failure and Third-Party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* 16:29- 49.

Salamon, Lester, Wojciech Sokolowski and Regina List (2003), *Global Civil Society. An Overview*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University

St.meld. nr. 16 (1993-94), *Lat ikke graset gro mellom grannar. Om videreføring av arbeidet med frivillighetssentraler.*

St. meld. nr. 27 (1996-97) *Om statens forhold til frivillige organisasjoner*

St. meld. nr. 44 (1997-98) *Tilleggsmelding om statens forhold til frivillige organisasjoner.*

St. meld. nr. 39 (2006-2007) *Frivillighet for alle*

Wolfenden, Lord (1978), *The Future of Voluntary Organizations. Report of the Wolfenden Committee.* London: Croom Helm

ⁱ 'Social care' include collective activities for particular groups, like elderly people, migrants, unemployed or other. Excursions, camps, entertainment, concerts, and all kinds of networking activities are placed here.

ⁱⁱ The term 'personal service' includes situations where one volunteer performs some kind of practical assistance to another, called the *user*. House painting, community transport, minor domestic repairs, mowing the lawn, snow shoveling and similar activities belong here.

ⁱⁱⁱ This category rooms all kind of leisure and hobby activities, related to culture, song and music, gardening sports and games.