Volunteering

Lesley Hustinx, Femida Handy, and Ram A. Cnaan

Introduction: The state of the art and beyond

In recent decades, there has been a burgeoning interest in the study of volunteering, and the number of publications devoted to volunteering has grown exponentially. The study of volunteering is inherently interdisciplinary and represents a rich diversity of questions and perspectives. At the basis is a common fascination with the phenomenon, which appears as a paradox in certain disciplines, while others see it as a natural part of social life or a matter of personality. For example, given the underlying assumptions of the self-interested rational homo-sapiens in economics, why would any rational individual make an effort and undertake to bear costs of an activity that provides no material gains to him or her? Thus, economists set out to do a cost-benefit analysis of volunteering for individuals, paying attention to material and nonmaterial benefits that may compensate for the cost of volunteering to resolve this otherwise irrational behavior (Handy et al. 2000). Sociologists and political scientists, on the contrary, view volunteering as an expression of core societal principles such as solidarity, social cohesion, and democracy (Putnam 2000; Wuthnow 1998). And psychologists have identified a prosocial personality type, that is, a durable set of predispositions that distinguish volunteers from non-volunteers (Musick and Wilson 2008).

Volunteering is a complex phenomenon that is not clearly delineated and it often spans a wide variety of types of activities, organizations, and sectors. Studies of volunteering typically focus on unique and discrete sub-sets of volunteers who perform diverse tasks ranging from sitting on governance boards to stuffing envelopes (Cnaan et al. 1996). In addition, volunteering continues to be a social construct with multiple definitions; and what is understood as volunteering is a matter of public perception (Handy et al. 2000; Meijs et al. 2003). As a consequence, the boundaries between what definitely constitutes volunteering and what does not are permeable. Thus, the very definition of volunteering is elusive, and there are limits to the ability to generalize the findings of many excellent studies. At the same time, the diversity of perspectives and approaches demonstrate the richness and versatility of the scholarship on volunteering.

The study of volunteering has resulted in a number of established frameworks. For example, one of the most agreed upon aspects of volunteer research is that people with higher social and economic status tend to volunteer more (Wilson 2000). David Horton Smith (1994) conceptualized this phenomenon as the "dominant status model." Those with high socioeconomic statuses have higher rates of volunteering and they also tend to occupy more prestigious positions and fulfill more meaningful tasks in the organization. Sociologists Wilson and Musick (1997) have advanced an "integrated theory of volunteering" based on three assumptions: that volunteering is productive work that requires human capital; it is done

collectively and as such needs social capital; and finally, it is "ethically" guided and hence it requires cultural capital. Using data from the Americans' Changing Lives panel study; they indeed found evidence for this "resource model." In a recent publication, Musick and Wilson (2008) offer advanced discussions of key resources for volunteer participation based on an extensive review of scholarship in the field.

While our understanding of volunteerism is greatly indebted to these seminal frameworks, it should be recognized that there are a number of important limitations. First, existing research is biased towards explaining the supply of volunteers. The core interest is to predict *who* volunteers – the determinants of volunteering, and *why* people volunteer – the motivations to volunteer and benefits of volunteering (Handy and Hustinx 2009). Thus, the focus lies essentially on micro-structural theories and models, viewing volunteering primarily as an individual behaviour, explainable by individual structural and cultural features (Penner and Finkelstein 1998; Sokolowski 1996; Wilson 2000). As yet, the organizational and institutional context of volunteering remains ill understood.

Second, prevailing explanations of volunteering are directed toward uniformity and stability. Because of the core interest in explaining participation in volunteering (yes/no), the complex reality of volunteering is commonly studied by means of a unidimensional measure, as if it were a uniform and robust entity (Cnaan and Amrofell 1994; Cnaan et al. 1996). In addition, the phenomenon is treated as a stable factor, not taking into account how the nature of involvement may change through the different phases of organizational socialization (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008; Lois 1999) and over time (Hustinx and Lammertyn 2003; Lorentzen and Hustinx 2007; Wuthnow 1998). Prevailing frameworks developed when the dominant trends were the more traditional types of volunteering and may fail to capture the newer trend of episodic volunteering (MacDuff 2004; Cnaan and Handy 2005) with more short-term and individualized types of involvement, for instance where individuals do all their volunteering over the Internet, or take trips to foreign lands and incur substantial costs to volunteer in exotic locations.

Recently, an increasing number of scholars have been broadening the scope of their observations to include contextual determinants of volunteering, and to focus more on the dynamics and changes in volunteering. For example, Omoto and Snyder (2002) have advanced a conceptual model of the "context and process of volunteerism." It characterizes volunteering "as a phenomenon that is situated at, and builds bridges between, many levels of analysis and that unfolds over time" (Omoto and Snyder, 2002, p. 847). Thus we need to consider multiple levels of analysis (individual, interpersonal, organizational, broader societal level) for different stages in the life course of volunteers (i.e., antecedents, experiences, and consequences).

In this chapter, we examine emerging theories and new directions in volunteering research, to account for the multilayered and dynamic nature of volunteering. First, micro-structural explanations of volunteering – the antecedents – have been supplemented with macro-structural theories and analyses. Second, recent research has provided more insight into the actual process and experiences of volunteering beyond the conventional unidimensional understanding. Third, we note that the profile of the volunteer and the nature of volunteering are undergoing radical changes because of broader social changes; and we observe new trends with concomitant

innovations in volunteer management. Next, the third sector itself is changing as a result of a changing public policy, raising the question – what will be the influence of sector wide changes on the experience of volunteering? Finally, in the light of these sector changes, new methods of social accounting have emerged that expand traditional financial statements of nonprofits to account for volunteer labor. These address the question of the value of volunteering – that is, what volunteerism is worth.

Antecedents of volunteering: Toward a macro-structural theory

Until recently, the complex question of how the larger socio-cultural context, or the macro-system, impacts individual volunteering has received little attention among scholars in the field (Hodgkinson 2003; Wilson 2000). It however is imperative to situate these micro-level attributes in the broader social, structural, and cultural context of volunteering. Volunteer activities are embedded in interpersonal relationships with other volunteers, paid staff, and recipients of the services, as well as in specific organizational programs and settings, and broader societal characteristics and dynamics. Kulik (2007a; 2007b), in an attempt to understand volunteering across different service organizations in Israel, uses an "ecological systems model" (Bronfenbrenner 1979), which explains human behavior as influenced by a continuing process of "mutual interactions" between individuals and their environment. It represents a multilayered system of ecological variables at different levels, from the "ontogenic" system including variables related to the individual (sociodemographic variables and personality traits), over the micro system (family and volunteer context) to the macro system (social norms and values, institutions).

Recently, the comparative study of volunteerism at the macro level has gained momentum. An increasing number of studies are devoted to explaining cross-national differences in volunteer participation above and beyond individual-level determinants. Such macro-structural theories concentrate on the opportunity structures or social conditions that facilitate or impede volunteering (Salamon and Sokolowski 2003). It is assumed that the three types of capital (i.e., human, social, and cultural) that predict volunteering at the individual level (Wilson and Musick 1997) are also important resources at the country level (Parboteeah et al. 2004). Key context variables that have been identified as relevant in explaining differences in the amount and type of volunteering between countries are economic (national economic development), political (stability and level of democracy, welfare state regimes), and cultural (values, religion) factors (Curtis et al. 1992; Hodgkinson 2003; Ruiter and De Graaf 2006; Schofer and Fourcade-Gourinchas 2001; Salamon and Sokolowski 2003).

One of the most systematic contributions to the development of a macro-structural theory of volunteering is based on the social-origins theory put forward by Salamon and Anheier (1998) and Salamon, Sokolowski, and Anheier (2000). This theory explains the size and development of

the nonprofit sector as an outcome of broadly defined power relations among social classes and social institutions. It differentiates among four different regimes – Liberal, Social-Democratic, Corporatist, and Statist – with corresponding levels of government social welfare spending and nonprofit sector size ranging from high to low. At one end, in the Liberal model or regime low government spending on social welfare services is associated with a relatively large nonprofit sector mainly focused on service provision. At the opposite end is the Social Democratic model in which, high government spending on social welfare results in a limited role for nonprofit service-provision, but a larger role for the expression of political, social, or recreational interests. In addition, Corporatist and Statist models also exist, both characterized by strong states, with the state and nonprofits partnering in the Corporatist model, while the state retains the upper hand in many social policies in the Statist model.

Using the social-origins theory for understanding cross-national variation, more recent work by Salamon and Sokolowski (2001; 2003) argued that the amount and type of volunteering in a country would also depend on the nature of the regime, that is, the larger the size of the nonprofit sector, the greater the volunteer participation. Thus, they hypothesized that "the amount of volunteering in countries with strong liberal or corporatist traditions is generally larger than in those with statist and social-democratic traditions" (Salamon and Sokolowski, 2001, p. 14). However, the authors observed that the relationship between nonprofit regime and the structure of volunteering is more complex. For example, they noted that some Scandinavian countries with strong government involvement in social welfare have a smaller nonprofit sector but relatively higher rates of volunteering. Hence, there is a need to examine whether volunteers play service or expressive roles in different regimes to understand their effect on volunteering. Yet, in general, these authors expect the nonprofit regime model to help explain cross-country variation in the amount of volunteering.

The process of volunteering: Styles, stages, and transitions

While the bulk of volunteering research has focused on the determinants of participation in volunteering, a more in-depth and dynamic understanding of the volunteer process is lacking. Here we explore the two new frameworks that seek to provide more complexity and dynamism. First, it should be recognized that volunteering is an inherently multidimensional phenomenon. Existing research has focused on manifold aspects of volunteering: length of service, intensity of involvement, organizational commitment, motivation to volunteer, and so on. Although there is a sense of complexity, few studies have explored the interplay among these separate variables. For example, Pearce (1993) coined a basic distinction between "core" and "peripheral" volunteers and described their differential organizational experiences on the basis of a number of structural (e.g., formal office, intensity of involvement) and cultural (e.g., dedication to the organization) features. Although no formal role distinctions between both groups existed, Pearce found that core volunteers took an interest in the organization and usually, but not always, held a formal

office. They provided the time and commitment that was necessary for the coordination of the organization, and were considered "the leadership." In contrast, members of the periphery were less involved. They spent less time on the organization's activities and were less informed about them.

A more recent account of the multidimensional nature of volunteering was offered by Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003). These authors advanced a new analytical framework of "styles of volunteering" (the SOV Construct) based on three criteria. First, the nature of volunteering is essentially multidimensional (motivations, frequency of volunteering, types of activities, etc.). Second, volunteering is a multilayered phenomenon that requires multiple levels of analysis (structural and cultural, but also the level of the individual volunteer, the organization, and the broader context). Finally, volunteering is a multiform reality. Various volunteer characteristics intertwine in systematic and multiple ways. In an empirical study of Red Cross volunteers in Flanders (Belgium), Hustinx (2005) found five distinct styles of volunteering that reflected complex and distinct interactions among multiple structural and cultural indicators of volunteering. Volunteers with similar levels of participation could perform highly diverging volunteer roles and embrace heterogeneous motivational and attitudinal dispositions. Hustinx for instance identified two completely different categories of board members, which were both significantly more involved in a number of vital volunteer activities (e.g., coordination of meetings, decision making, and organization of activities, administrative tasks, training, and lecturing), but despite their comparable job responsibilities, differed greatly in their intensity of involvement (episodic and limited hours versus unrestricted) and motivational-attitudinal dispositions (formal and distant versus unconditional but also critical towards the organization).

While these frameworks consider the multifaceted and multidimensional nature of volunteering, other frameworks have focused on the dynamic nature of the volunteer experience. Omoto and Snyder (2002) conceptualized the volunteer process or "life cycle of volunteers" in terms of three broad stages: antecedents, experiences, and consequences; thereby treating the complex stages and transitions involved in the volunteer experience itself as a single category. A new differentiated and more complex model of the process of volunteering, called the Volunteer Stages and Transitions Model (VSTM), was advanced by Haski-Leventhal and Bargal (2008). The VSTM identifies five distinct phases (nominee, newcomer, emotional involvement, established volunteering, and retiring), four transitions (entrance, accommodation, affiliation, renewal), and two kinds of turnover (early ejection and exit at the end) within the process of organizational socialization. The authors explain transitions between the phases and detail the process, experiences, and emotions involved in each phase as they are reflected in different aspects of volunteer work: "On the one hand, VSTM binds together motivation, satisfaction, rewards, and costs that until now have been studied separately. On the other, it differentiates these aspects according to the phases of volunteering and does not just categorize them generally" (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008, p. 97).

Haski-Leventhal and Bargal conducted an ethnographic study of volunteers working for at-risk youth in Israel, and indeed found that all volunteers went through several phases, involving deep changes and shifts in their activity, perceptions, attitudes, emotions, and relationships with others. Furthermore, different aspects of volunteering (activity and training, emotions,

relationships with other players; motivation and commitment; attitudes and perceptions, costs and benefits) were differently described by each of the groups of volunteers (newcomers, active volunteers, and established volunteers) suggesting the transitions predicted in their model (Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008).

Volunteering and social change: Emergence of the reflexive volunteer

A recent and more narrative stream of theorizing deals with the consequences of broader social changes on the nature of volunteering (Eckstein 2001; Jakob 1993; Hustinx and Lammertyn 2003; Lorentzen and Hustinx 2007; Wuthnow 1998). Such theories combine analysis of context and process of volunteering, reflecting upon the apparent shift in the way in which people participate in volunteering as a result of broader processes of modernization, secularization, and individualization. These changes are commonly grasped in terms of a transition from "traditional" or "collective" to "modern" or "individualized" types of involvement. Important dimensions along which the face of volunteering is assumed to be changing are the shift from habitual and dedicated involvement towards more episodic or one-off volunteer efforts, more self-interested motivations, and weaker organizational attachments (for a discussion, see, among others, Cnaan and Handy 2005; Gaskin 1998; Handy et al. 2006; Hustinx 2001; 2008; MacDuff 2004; Rehberg 2005; Wollebæk and Selle 2003; Wuthnow 1998).

From a sociological point of view, recent changes in volunteering could be framed in a broader process of "human development" (Inglehart and Welzel 2005) that breeds self-expressive values at the expense of traditional authorities and collective frames of reference. Today's volunteers are more autonomous and self-conscious actors articulating their own views and preferences – hereby challenging traditional organizational structures. Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003) coined the notion of "reflexive volunteering" to conceptualize the shift from former heteronymous or collective monitoring of agents to the autonomous, active, and permanent self-monitoring of individual life courses and lifestyles. Reflexive volunteering is fundamentally entrenched in the active (re-)design of individualized biographies and lifestyles (Hustinx 2008). The notion of a "biographical match" refers to the idea that individualized conditions and volunteer experiences have to be reconciled in an active way: motivation, occasion, and opportunity have to match in a particular biographical stage or situation (Kühnlein and Mutz 1999). The biographical match can be analytically decomposed in a subjective-cultural willingness and an objective-structural availability to volunteer (Hustinx and Lammertyn 2003; Meijs et al. 2006).

Trends in volunteering

Recent literature has reflected upon the ways in which the volunteer labor supply shifts in response to these biographical changes. Modern volunteers often prefer short term volunteering assignments or discrete task-specific volunteering projects, which commit them to particular tasks or times rather than traditional long-term assignments, which involve a greater commitment to the organization itself. Such volunteering, termed "episodic volunteering" (MacDuff 1994) has been rising significantly in recent years, and an increasing number of studies are devoted to understanding the phenomenon (Cnaan and Handy 2005; Handy et al. 2006; Hustinx et al. 2008).

One of the new and more episodic types of volunteering is "Virtual Volunteering." Rapid changes in technology have enabled many individuals, in particularly technologically savvy youth, to assist organizations without being physically present. The opportunity to "volunteer in your pajamas" significantly widens the scope of volunteer opportunities available. Indeed, nonprofits across the globe are now increasingly relying on virtual volunteers for tasks such as translating, managing on-line website content, organizing campaigns, fundraising, sending out information and communications to members, conducting on-line research, and providing on-line mentoring. The Internet thus changes the way both organizations and their volunteer programs operate in a radical way.

According to Cravens (2006), the Internet is used to effectively reach out to volunteers and targets a variety of audiences. For many organizations, the Internet has been a successful way of attracting volunteers who have not responded to the usual recruitment methods of volunteering. This applies in particular to those introverted individuals who may hesitate to get involved because of social anxiety about going to new places and working among strangers (Handy and Cnaan 2007), to the disabled, or those who lack transportation. Thus, virtual volunteering has presented many opportunities to those who want to volunteer without having to leave the comfort of their homes and to who want to flexibility in their volunteer hours.

Another successful type of episodic volunteering involves traveling outside of one's country to volunteer in foreign locations. Such volunteering, which often combines volunteering with tourism, is called "voluntourism." It brings volunteers to foreign countries for a period of anywhere between a week to a few years. Volunteer assignments vary depending upon the interests of the volunteer and the needs of the host organization, but commonly include projects related to ecological preservation or social and economic development (Sherraden et al. 2006; 2008).

In the past, travel to volunteer typically meant a significant investment of time - generally requiring people to spend several months or even years supporting a project, and often took the form of missionary work through one's religious congregation or outreach programs through government supported initiatives such as the Peace Corps (USA) and CUSO (Canada). The new trend of voluntourism reflects many of the same concerns which have lead to episodic volunteering, allowing individuals to combine their vacation time with service activities while still holding full-time employment in their countries of residence. This new trend again reflects the responses to life style changes and diminished long-term loyalty to any one organization or cause.

This sort of volunteer project has an appeal that resonates with tourists of all ages who are seeking a deeper understanding of the places they visit and the opportunity to experience life in less widely traveled regions. In a recent study of individuals who had participated in a volunteer vacation, participants were asked their main motive for participating in each of their volunteer tourism trips. Although respondents gave more than one motive for going on their trip, the primary and most often quoted motive was that participants "desired a new experience" (Carter 2008, p71).

A third new trend is that of volunteering by employees of large corporations, where the employer provides support and often initiates projects. Such volunteering often arises as part of corporate initiatives aimed at meeting their social responsibilities to the communities in which they exist and which support their businesses. One of the ways many corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives are carried out is through employer-supported volunteering (ESV) programs. Sometimes ESV programs are supported by employers by giving incentives to recruit employees to company sponsored projects, and at other times, the company simply provides approval and support, tangible or otherwise, for employee initiated community projects (Meinhard et al. 2009).

In a study of Canadian ESV programs, Easwaramoorthy et al. (2006, p. iii) note that "the most common forms of [volunteer] support are adjusting work schedules (78%), providing time-off without pay (71%), and allowing access to company facilities and equipment (70%)." Other forms of ESV initiatives mentioned in the literature include: corporate sponsorship of events such as fundraising runs/walks, where employees' participation is encouraged thorough corporate teams (Hall et al. 2007; Rog et al. 2004); forming partnerships or liaising with local volunteer centers (Easwaramoorthy et al. 2006); forming long-term partnerships with community agencies to share expertise through the volunteering of their employees (Rog et al. 2004); providing resources and allowing volunteers to use company equipment or facilities for their programs (NSGVP 2004); modifying work hours or giving time off for employee volunteers (Easwaramoorthy et al. 2006); and honoring volunteers for exemplary community work and rewarding them by donating to their organization of choice (Graff 2004).

Innovations in volunteer management

Innovations in volunteer management are often very specific to the kinds of organization. Certain well tried and true volunteer management techniques are ubiquitous and form the backbone of all volunteer programs and are no doubt impacted by what volunteers do in the organization, why they come to volunteer, and the intensity of their participation. Two recent books by Liao-Troth (2008) and Gazley and Dignam (2008), are practitioner-based volumes, with innovations in volunteer management. They pay close attention to the perennial "what's in it for my work?"-demands from busy practitioners.

Liao-Troth's (2008) edited volume, *Challenges in Volunteer Management*, presents many examples of managing volunteers in different contexts and underscores the well-founded argument that there exists no one way that is best to manage volunteers, a point we agree with given the increasingly diverse and individualized nature of volunteering. Meijs and Ten Hoorn (2008) point out that volunteers often have conflicting goals: volunteers prefer to have efficiently run, successful organizations with clear inputs and effective task assignments. At the same time, they want flexibility, fun, and respect for what they are willing to accomplish in their leisure time. How to balance these needs? They offer varying management styles that help with this question that is dependant on whether the organization is run by volunteers versus paid staff and that is dependant on whether the nonprofit is organized for mutual support, service delivery, and campaigning.

In their book, *The Decision to Volunteer*, Gazley and Dignam (2008) direct their response management of volunteers based on their findings of the "why" people volunteer – and "who" volunteers. This suggests that innovative management practices need to be preceded with a thorough understanding, of not only the organizational goals but also of the volunteers (Liao-Troth and Dunn 1999). Furthermore, volunteer participation rates can be used to calculate the value of volunteering to the organization; this would give managers insights into the resources being invested in its volunteer programs and the return on that investment – a topic we return to later in this chapter. Gazley and Dignam (2008) also suggest that information from those who do *not* volunteer or who *quit* volunteering is useful to isolate management practices that may be unfriendly to volunteering, and create new ways that allow non-volunteers to volunteer.

In a recent article, Meijs and Brudney (2007) approach volunteer management using the metaphor based on a "slot machine." They define a volunteer scenario as a combination of the "Assets" of a volunteer, the "Availability" of volunteers, and a particular volunteer "Assignment" offered by the organization. Their management techniques seek to optimize "winning" volunteer scenarios – that is equivalent to getting AAA on the slot machine and winning the prize. The focus on the three A's is useful in designing strategies in the changing world of volunteers (as described above). The model offers flexibility of adaptation in a variety of organizational contexts and from multiple perspectives.

Volunteering and third sector change

The previous section looked at changes in volunteering through the sociological lens of broad social transformations, and how these processes affect the availability and willingness of volunteers. A different stream of recent research has focused on another dimension of macro changes, namely at the level of the third sector and its relation to the other sectors. As we have discussed above, macro-structural theories of volunteering have demonstrated that the amount and type of volunteering vary across the different nonprofit regimes. However, little is

understood so far about how changes in these regimes affect settings, practices, and experiences of present-day volunteers.

Lie and Baines (2007) highlight the importance of understanding the impact of reforms in the voluntary sector on organizations and individuals who participate in them. The authors note that the role of the voluntary sector has been increasingly mainstreamed, particularly in English-speaking countries, "where governments aim to harness the energies of voluntary agencies and charitable bodies to supplement the state and the private sector" (Lie and Baines 2007, p. 227). Indeed, international scholarship has been pointing to a historically new process of institutional hybridization in the classical mixed welfare provision (Bode 2006; Brandsen et al. 2005). A basic observation relates to the increasing privatization of the public–private mix. There is a fundamental openness towards the market as a social service deliverer, and the state is more frequently involved in buying and regulating commercial services. Market principles also intrude the public sector, and nonprofit organizations are increasingly confronted with a new contract culture based on competitive tendering, outsourcing, and output performance (Bode 2003; Evers and Laville 2004; Freise et al. 2006; Lewis 2004).

A second rationale behind the intensifying relationships between the statutory sector and the voluntary sector has to do with public policy geared towards promoting civic renewal and reinvigorating civic life (Lie and Baines 2007; Milligan and Fyfe 2005; Musick and Wilson 2008). Volunteering is increasingly seen as a means through which citizenship and civic responsibility can be resuscitated. Indeed, recently there has been an increasing involvement of "third parties" (Haski-Leventhal et al. 2010), such as governments, corporations, and institutions of higher education, in the promotion of volunteerism, the mobilization of volunteers and the organization of their activities.

As yet, the consequences of these sector-wide changes for the nature and experience of volunteering are ill understood, and little is written about how these changes are likely to be perceived by volunteers. In their study of older volunteers in the north of England, Lie and Baines (2007) found that the changing organizational strategies can be disempowering, and that there is an increasing misfit between the volunteering role and the essential nature of what volunteering means to the volunteers. Bloom and Kilgore (2003), in a case study of American middle-class volunteers providing social support to families in poverty (as part of the US administration's neoliberal agenda), concluded that while these services may bring meaning to lives of the volunteers, the problems and needs of families in poverty are too complex and rooted in society-wide structural inequalities, hence cannot be addressed by volunteers, who risk frustration and disappointment. Recent ethnographic study on volunteering in hybrid organizational settings in the US, revealed that the growing emphasis on short-term contracting, competition, and output-orientation result in a stronger formalization and top-down steering of volunteer activities (Eliasoph 2009). As a result, the emphasis shifts to the measurement of activities and results, and to organizing short-term projects with a predictable success rate. Volunteers are approached in a more instrumental way, and lose their authentic and spontaneous character. Within hybrid organizations, volunteers develop weak ties, and in some cases, their efforts are useless and even destructive.

The value of volunteering: What is it worth?

Given the ubiquitous nature of volunteering, it is easy to assume that it must have some social or personal value. However, more complex is the question of what that value is and of who derives it. In this section, we discuss the recent methods for addressing the question of what volunteerism is worth. This question becomes all the more important given nonprofit's increasing role and responsibility in the delivery of public services.

Scholars of social accounting have made many cogent arguments suggesting that nonprofits that do not make visible the invisible contribution of volunteers are in fact doing their organizations a disservice in the long run (Mook et al. 2007a; 2007b; and see Mook's chapter in this volume). Such scholars have attempted to promote a method of social accounting that expands the traditional financial statements of organizations to take account of volunteer labor. If volunteers create value, then it must be made visible to the volunteers; to the organization; to the funders; and finally, to the general public. As part of a growing pressure for accountability and transparency in the voluntary sector, and reflecting the increasing demands on its limited resources, more and more volunteer program coordinators are being asked to explain their program expenditures and justify their program budget requests.

Ideally speaking, nonprofits should seek to input volunteer labor until the marginal benefits to the NGO are equal to the marginal costs of volunteer labor. However, many real-world factors complicate the achievement of this idealistic equilibrium. For example, calculations are hard to make in the absence of some accounting methods that allows nonprofits to measure all of the costs and benefit entailed in the use of volunteer labor. Furthermore, organizational constraints may limit the use of volunteers even when they may be cost effective (e.g., union regulations, which prevent volunteers from encroaching upon work done by paid labor). Other benefits of the use of volunteer labor, such as spillover benefits to the community (e.g., volunteers act as goodwill ambassadors for the organization in the community), may be difficult if not impossible to accurately measure.

The Expanded Value Added Statement (EVAS) developed by Laurie Mook and her colleagues (Mook et al. 2007a; 2007b) is one recent tool available to capture the value created by nonprofits which captures the contribution of its multiple stakeholders. It recognizes the uniqueness of the nonprofit contribution by focusing on both economic and social impacts, instead of just the "bottom line" of financial surpluses or deficits. The EVAS is able to identify key aspects of a nonprofit's functioning that is not apparent from conventional financial statements alone. Although acknowledging the debate on how to value the volunteer hour, the authors suggest that volunteer labor is valued at what it would cost the organization to replace its volunteers with paid staff and continue the services currently provided by a volunteer.

The Expanded Value Added Statement builds on the Value Added Statement. For example, the value added created by a ice-cream making company is calculated by taking the difference between the price the ice-cream is sold for and cost of the materials that went into making the ice-cream (milk, cream, sugar, nuts, fruits, flavors, etc). However, the Value Added Statement

only concentrates on those items that have established market values and does not include other items such as social and environmental services. Organizations have social impacts as well as economic ones. Thus the EVAS adapts the Value Added Statement. For example, in the case of nonprofits, the EVAS statement will include the non-market value of using volunteers. The EVAS is not intended to replace existing financial statements but rather to be presented alongside them. By synthesizing traditional financial data with other data, the EVAS is another instrument for integrating the dynamics of an organization and one that shows great potential for focusing attention on value creation and use.

The adoption of new accounting models such as the EVAS is a complex process and may represent a challenge, in part because it requires detail information on volunteer hours and tasks and of the low availability published values of volunteer time which could potentially be used as a replacement values. However, simply accounting for volunteer hours in the financial statements as an important asset and value-added will go a long way in producing accurate statements for those nonprofits which rely on volunteers, and toward acknowledging and honoring the volunteer role as a valuable resource in the production of services.

Conclusion: A kaleidoscopic view

In this chapter, we have examined emerging theories and new directions in volunteering research. These theories and studies represent, on the one hand, multi-level perspectives that try to understand volunteering in complex interaction with the organizational and institutional context. On the other hand, they embody more process-oriented approaches that focus on the experience of volunteering, as it changes through different stages of organizational socialization, and as a consequence of broader societal and sector-wide transformations. These frameworks offer an indispensable and complementary angle to the more unidimensional and static approaches of established research on determinants of, and reasons for volunteering.

This review demonstrates that, as research on volunteering further expands, it tends to grow in its diversity of questions and viewpoints, and to reflect the complex and dynamic nature of volunteering more precisely. Indeed, rather than one clear image, the study of volunteers and volunteering represents a multi faceted and brilliant kaleidoscopic picture. Whether examined under a microscope – for micro level studies, or with a telescope – for macro level studies, we find that the instrument really is a kaleidoscope, which gives us different pictures each time the field of vision shifts, and in each, there is color, clarity, and coherence.

The metaphor of the kaleidoscope is powerful and inspiring. The kaleidoscopic nature of volunteering makes it difficult to pin down the phenomenon as it takes a myriad of forms, its colors reflected by the mirrors that are the organizations in which volunteering takes place, the varying management approaches and degrees of support volunteers receive, and the cultural and institutional contexts in which volunteering occurs. At the same time, a kaleidoscopic view of volunteering recognizes that the answer to central questions like who is a volunteer, why they volunteer, and how best to manage volunteers, remains elusive as it is meant to be. Just as the images and colors change in the kaleidoscope, by a mere movement of the instrument, so do the

changing nature of our societies impact the trends, issues, and challenges that arise and affect volunteers in all sectors and all settings (Merrill 2006). These "movements" are further impacting the nature of volunteering as seen in the kaleidoscope. With new trends in volunteering, such as episodic volunteering, virtual volunteering, and tourism volunteering we find new colors in the evolving kaleidoscope, and the journey for researchers and practitioners continues to be fascinating with many new perspectives to be revealed and innovative managerial approaches to be offered.

References

Brudney, J. L., and Gazley, B. (2006). Moving ahead or falling behind? Volunteer promotion and data collection. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 16(3), 259–276.

Bloom, L. R., and Kilgore, D. (2003). The volunteer citizen after welfare reform in the United States: An ethnographic study of volunteerism in action. *Voluntas*, 14(4), 431–454.

Bode, I. (2003). A new agenda for European charity: Catholic welfare and organizational change in France and Germany. *Voluntas*, 14(2), 205–225.

Bode, I. (2006). Disorganized welfare mixes: Voluntary agencies and new governance regimes in Western Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 16(4), 346–359.

Brandsen, T., Donk, W. van de, and Putters, K. (2005). Griffins or chameleons? Hybridity as a permanent and inevitable characteristic of the third sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 28(9), 749–765.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Carter K.A.(2008) Volunteer Tourism: An Exploration of the Perceptions and experiences of Volunteer Tourists and the Role of Authenticity in Those Experiences

A Master of Applied Science Dissertation Lincoln University

Accessed June 29, 2009 at
http://researcharchive.lincoln.ac.nz/dspace/bitstream/10182/526/3/carter_mapplsc.pdf

Cnaan, R. A., and Amrofell, L. M. (1994). Mapping volunteer activity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(4), 335–351.

Cnaan, R. A., and Handy, F. (2005). Towards understanding episodic volunteering. *VIO – Vrijwillige Inzet Onderzocht*, 2(1), 29–35.

Cnaan, R. A., Handy, F., and Wadsworth, M. (1996). Defining who is a volunteer: Conceptual and empirical considerations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 25(3), 364–383.

Cravens , J. (2006). Involving international online volunteers: Factors for success,

organizational benefits, and new views of community. *Journal of Volunteer Administration* 24 (1)1-23

Easwaramoorthy, M., Barr, C., Runte, M., and Basil, D. (2006). *Business Support for Employee Volunteers in Canada: Results of a National Survey*, Toronto, Imagine Canada.

Eckstein, S. (2001). Community as gift-giving: Collectivistic roots of volunteerism. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 829–851.

Eliasoph, N. (2009). Comparing top-down civic projects and grassroots voluntary associations. *Voluntas* (Forthcoming).

Evers, A., and Laville, J.-L. (2004). Social services by social enterprises: On the possible contribution of hybrid organizations and a civil society. In A. Evers and J.-L. Laville (eds) *The Third Sector in Europe* (pp. 237–255), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Freise, M., Hallmann, T., and Zimmer, A. (2006). *Dritter Sektor als Hoffnungsträger? Bürgerengagement und New Public Management*. (*Third sector as a refuge? Civic engagement and new public management.)* In H. Voesgen (ed.) *Brückenschläge – Neue Partnerschaften zwischen institutioneller Erwachsenenbildung und bürgerschaftlichem Engagement,* (*Building bridges – New partnerships between adult education and civic engagement)* Bielefeld, Bertelsmann Verlag GmbH & Co. KG.

Gazley, B., and Dignam, M. (2008). *The Decision to Volunteer: Why People give their Time and How you can Engage Them*, Washington, DC, ASAE and the Center for Association Leadership.

Graff, L. (2004). *Making a Business Case for Employer-Supported Volunteerism*, Ottawa, Volunteer Canada.

Hall, M., Easwaramoorthy, M., and Sandler, W. (2007). *Business Contributions to Canadian Communities: Findings from a Qualitative Study of Current Practices*, Toronto, Imagine Canada.

Handy, F., Brodeur, N., and Cnaan, R. A. (2006). Summer in the island: Episodic volunteering. *Voluntary Action*, 7(3), 31–46.

Handy, F., and Cnaan, R. A. (2007). The role of social anxiety in volunteering. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 18(1), 41–58.

Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Ascoli, U., Meijs L. C. M. P., and Ranade, S. (2000). Public perception of "Who is a volunteer": An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross-cultural perspective. *Voluntas*, 11(1), 45–65.

Handy, F., and Hustinx, L. (2009). Review Essay. The why and how of volunteering. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 19(4), 549-558.

Haski-Leventhal, D., and Bargal, D. (2008). The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations*, 61(1), 67–102.

Haski-Leventhal, D., Meijs, L. C. P. M., and Hustinx, L. (2010). The third party model: Enhancing volunteering through governments, corporations and educational institutes. *Forthcoming in Journal of Social Policy*, 39(1), PROVIDE PAGE NUMBERS?

Hustinx, L. (2008). I quit, therefore I am? Volunteer turnover and the politics of self-actualization. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *39* (2), 236-255.

Hustinx, L. (2005). Weakening organizational ties? A classification of styles of volunteering in the Flemish Red Cross. *Social Service Review*, 79(4), 624–652.

Hustinx, L., Haski-Leventhal, D., and Handy, F. (2008). One of a kind? Comparing episodic and regular volunteers at the Philadelphia Ronald McDonald House. *International Journal of Volunteer Administration, XXV* (3), 50-66.

Hustinx, L., and Lammertyn, F. (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological modernization perspective. *Voluntas*, 14(2), 167–187.

Hodgkinson, V. A. (2003). Volunteering in global perspective. In P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds) *The Values of Volunteering* (pp. 35–53), New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Inglehart, R., and Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Jakob, G. (1993). *Zwischen Dienst und Zelbstbezug (Between service and self-centeredness: A biographical-analytical study)*, Opladen, Leske + Budrich.

Kühnlein, I., and Mutz, G. (1999). Individualisierung und Bürgerschaftliches Engagement in der Tätigkeitsgesellschaft (*Individualization and civic engagement in the work society*). In E. Kistler, H.-H. Noll, and E. Priller (eds) *Perspektiven Gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalts. Empirische Befunde, Praxiserfahrungen, Messkonzepte (Perspectives on Social Integration. Empirical Findings, Practical Experiences, and Measurement Concepts*) (pp. 291–306), Berlin, Sigma.

Kulik, L. (2007a). Predicting responses to volunteering among adolescents in Israel: The contribution of personal and situational variables. *Voluntas*, 18(1), 35–54.

Kulik, L. (2007b). Explaining responses to volunteering: An ecological model. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(2), 239–255.

Lewis, J. (2004). The state and the third sector in modern welfare states: Independence, instrumentality, partnership. In A. Evers and J.-L. Laville (eds) *The Third Sector in Europe* (pp. 169–187), Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

Liao-Troth, M. (ed.) (2008). *Challenges in Volunteer Management*, Charlotte, NC, Information Age.

Lie, M., and Baines, S. (2007). Making sense of organizational change: Voices of older volunteers. *Voluntas*, 18(3), 225–240.

Lois, J. (1999). Socialization to heroism: Individualism and collectivism in a voluntary search and rescue group. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62(2), 117–135.

Lorentzen, H., and Hustinx, L. (2007). Civic involvement and modernization. *Journal of Civil Society*, 3(2), 101–118.

MacDuff, N. (2004). *Episodic Volunteering: Organizing and Managing the Short-Term Volunteer Program*, Walla Walla, WA, MBA Publishing.

Meijs, L. C. P. M., and Brudney, J. L. (2007). Winning volunteer scenarios: The soul of a new machine. *International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, XXIV(6), 68–79.

Meijs, L. C. P. M., Handy, F., Cnaan, R. A., Brudney, J. L., Ascoli, U., Ranade, S., Hustinx, L., Weber, S., and Weiss, I. (2003). All in the eyes of the beholder? Perceptions of volunteering across eight countries. In P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds) *The Values of Volunteering: Cross Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 19–34), New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Books.

Meijs, L. C. P. M., and Ten Hoorn, E. (2008). No "one best" volunteer management and organizing: Two fundamentally different approaches. In M. Liao-Troth (ed.) *Challenges in Volunteer Management* (pp. 29-50), Charlotte, NC, Information Age.

Meijs, L. C. P. M., Ten Hoorn, E. M., and Brudney, J. L. (2006). Improving societal use of human resources: From employability to volunteerability. *Voluntary Action*, 8(2), 36–54.

Meinhard, A., Handy, F., and Greenspan, I. (2009, forthcoming). Corporate participation in the social economy: Employer-supported volunteering programs. In L. Mook, J. Quarter, and S. Ryan (eds) *Why the Social Economy Matters* (pp. 291-318). Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

Merrill, M. V. (2006). Global trends and the challenges for volunteering. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 24(1), 9–14.

Milligan, C., and Fyfe, N. F. (2005). Preserving space for volunteers: Exploring the links between voluntary welfare organizations, volunteering and citizenship. *Urban Studies*, 42(3), 417–433.

Mook, L., Handy, F., and Quarter, J. (2007a). Reporting volunteer labour at the organizational level: A study of Canadian nonprofits. *Voluntas*, 18(1), 1–17.

Mook, L., Quarter, J., and Richmond, B. J. (2007b). *What Counts: Social Accounting for Nonprofits and Cooperatives*, London, Sigel Press.

Musick, M. A., and Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A Social Profile*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press.

Omoto, A. M., and Snyder, M. (2002). Considerations of community: The context and process of volunteerism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(5), 846–867.

Parboteeah, K. P., Cullen, J. B., and Lim, L. (2004). Formal volunteering: A cross-national test. *Journal of World Business*, 39(4), 431–441.

Pearce, J. L. (1993). *Volunteering: The Organizational Behavior of Unpaid Workers*, New York, Routledge.

Penner, L. A., and Finkelstein, M. A. (1998). Dispositional and structural determinants of volunteerism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(2), 525–537.

Rehberg, W. (2005). Altruistic individualists: Motivations for international volunteering among young adults in Switzerland. *Voluntas*, 16(2), 109–122.

Rog, E., Pancer, S. M., and Baetz, M. C. (2004). *Corporate Volunteer Programs: Maximizing Employee Motivation and Minimizing Barriers to Program Participation*, Toronto, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy.

Ruiter, S., and De Graaf, N. D. (2006). National context, religiosity, and volunteering: Results from 53 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 71(2), 191–210.

Salamon, L. M., and Anheier, H. K. (1998). Social origins of civil society: Explaining the nonprofit sector cross-nationally. *Voluntas*, 9(3), 213–248.

Salamon, L. M., and Sokolowski, S. W. (2001). *Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Evidence from 24 Countries*. Online: www.jhu.edu/~ccss/Publications/pdf/cnpwp401.pdf

Salamon, L. W., and Sokolowski, S. W. (2003). Institutional roots of volunteering: Toward a macro-structural theory of individual voluntary action. In P. Dekker and L. Halman (eds) *The Values of Volunteering* (pp. 71–90), New York, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Salamon, L. M., Sokolowski, S. W., and Anheier, H. K. (2000). *Social Origins of Civil Society: An Overview*. Online: www.jhu.edu/~ccss/Publications/pdf/cnpwp38.pdf

Schofer, E., and Fourcade-Gourinchas, M. (2001). The structural contexts of civic engagement: Voluntary association membership in comparative perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 806–828.

Sherraden, M. S., Lough, B., and McBride, A. M. (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *Voluntas*, 19(4), 395–421.

Sherraden, M. S., Stringham, J., Sow, S. C., and McBride, A. M. (2006). The forms and structure of international voluntary service. *Voluntas,* 17(2), 163–180.

Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(3), 243–263.

Sokolowski, S. W. (1996). Show me the way to the next worthy deed: Towards a microstructural theory of volunteering and giving. *Voluntas*, 7(3), 259–278.

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

Wilson, J., and Musick, M. A. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 694–713.

Wuthnow, R. (1998). *Loose Connections: Joining Together in America's Fragmented Communities*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.