The Unlikely Altruist: Practices of Exclusion in Volunteer-Based Social Work

Lærke Bonnesen, Ph.D. Fellow
Roskilde University
lbonnesen@ruc.dk

Abstract

Despite the benevolent image of the voluntary sector, social inequalities in volunteerism persist. In this research article, I present empirical findings from observations of and interviews with volunteers and staff in a Danish non-profit organization that strives for "inclusive volunteering." Even here, I find that organizational gatekeepers in the form of paid volunteer supervisors and core volunteers make use of three different exclusionary practices which create barriers for participation for younger and working-class volunteers: non-recruitment, informal exclusion, and formal exclusion. These exclusionary practices are seemingly utilized in the attempt to translate abstract notions of "the ideal volunteer" based on aspirant volunteers' social status.

Keywords: Volunteerism, exclusion, inequality, social class, youth

Introduction

Public perceptions of the voluntary sector tend to imagine volunteer work as possessing many of the desirable qualities that the commercial labor market does not: those of a non-hierarchical, open, fair, inclusive, and fertile breeding ground for social network creation across social boundaries. Policymakers in Europe, the US, and elsewhere celebrate a benevolent image of volunteerism (Dean, 2013; Dekker & Halman, 2003). Despite this, research on volunteerism consistently demonstrates that patterns of participation in volunteering mirror social inequalities found in the traditional labor market (Wilson, 2012). White, well-educated high earners midway through life are among the most likely to volunteer their spare time, at least as far as volunteering in formal organizations goes (Wilson, 2012; Smith, 1994; Fridberg, 2014).

This skewed participation pattern may represent a problem for social equality, as studies reveal that those who participate in formal volunteering yield private returns on their engagement in the form of higher employability, widened social networks, new skills and knowledge, and improved health, among other things (Musick & Wilson, 2008). Inequality in access to volunteering has the potential to exacerbate existing structures of inequality in society, creating a self-reinforcing process of accumulated privilege. Furthermore, volunteers most often seem to flourish in the company of peers (socially, racially, and economically speaking), as has been confirmed by the so-called "homogeneity thesis" (Musick & Wilson, 2008). Thus, a high degree of homogeneity in voluntary organizations may jeopardize the role that volunteering can potentially play in providing the many "promised" goods unlikely to be produced by for-profit organizations – such as social cohesion, inclusive participation, and empowerment.

Despite these threats to equality in volunteerism, very few scholars have taken on the task of unravelling the social processes that facilitate social stratification within the voluntary sector. This is primarily due to the tendency of many studies on volunteering to adopt a rather static approach, focusing on the here-and-now, thus neglecting a processual perspective on volunteer work. Furthermore, a predominantly individualistic approach to the study of volunteering further overlooks organizational dynamics that render civic engagement improbable for some societal groups. Examples of studies which are both time-static and individual-focused include prominent pieces of literature on volunteering such as Bekkers (2005) and Wilson & Musick (1997). Omoto & Snyder's (1995) "volunteer process model"—a novel contribution with three stages of volunteer involvement (antecedents, experiences, and consequences) as well as three different levels of investigation (individual, organizational, and societal)—is one example of scholarly attention to processual as well as contextual factors contributing to individual volunteer involvement. But most empirical research guided by the model has, in the authors' own words, "focused on only one level of analysis" (the individual) (Omoto, Snyder & Hackett, 2010, p. 1707).

The present study sets out to investigate the social practices within organizations that may create barriers to civic engagement for some societal groups while paving the road to participation for others. It does so by posing these questions: What—and who—makes for an "ideal" volunteer? And which social practices translate these ideals into social reality by including some citizens in social volunteer work while excluding others? I am interested in the organizations that act as gatekeepers to volunteer positions: my purpose, thus, is to investigate the kinds of social practices (at an organizational level) that facilitate an enduring and rewarding volunteering experience for some societal groups and not for others.

The research questions have been investigated through a case study of volunteer-based social work at three different project locations in a rather large youth organization in Denmark. I have interviewed and observed volunteers and volunteer supervisors at the three locations for one and a half consecutive years.

My intention with this study is to investigate the social and organizational practices that exclude "unfavorable" volunteers from participation, as well as the social logic—the concept of the "ideal volunteer"—that serves as the ethical foundation for such exclusionary practices. In my analyses, I have found social class and age to be useful social categories in the process of understanding exclusion from volunteer participation—but the practices leading up to the exclusion of aspiring volunteers may well be applicable to other social categories, such as ethnicity, gender, or disability.

Theoretical Foundations

During past decades, the discipline of volunteerism studies has been established as an independent and flourishing field within the social sciences. Most theoretical definitions of (formal) volunteering tend to emphasize features such as free choice, lack of material compensation, the productive nature of the work performed (helping strangers or a cause), as well as the formalized organizational context of the work (e.g. Snyder & Omoto, 2008; Dekker & Halman, 2003). Politically, volunteerism is an increasingly popular topic for policymakers of all ideological convictions, as the act of volunteering has become a widespread "solution" to a range of societal problems, such as political apathy, unemployment, or welfare service deficits (Hogg & Baines, 2011).

Inequality in volunteerism

In 2012, around 35% of the Danish population had participated in volunteer work during the past year (Fridberg, 2014). This share is rather high in comparison with that of other European nations (McCloughan, Batt, Costine, & Scully, 2011) as well as when compared to American volunteer rates (United States Department of Labor, 2016).

But this relatively high civic participation rate masks a high degree of unevenness regarding

Danes' propensity to volunteer: While an impressive 44% of 36- to 45-year-old adults report having volunteered in 2012, only 24% of 16- to 25-year-old youths did the same. And while half (51%) of Danes holding a university degree claim to have volunteered within the past year, this is true for just one-quarter (26%) of unskilled workers (workers who hold no formal educational qualifications) (Fridberg, 2014). In other Western countries, volunteer participation patterns are similarly tilted towards the middle-aged, highly educated, high-earning and able-bodied members of the ethnic majority (Musick & Wilson, 2008).

Although most scholars agree that the unequal distribution of volunteering propensity is no coincidence, there have been different theoretical attempts to explain why this is the case. The single most influential theory in recent years is undoubtedly the so-called "integrated" theory of volunteer work proposed in 1997 by the American sociologists Marc Wilson and John Musick (Wilson & Musick, 1997). The theory argues that three key types of resources—human, social, and cultural capital—are needed in volunteer work, thus attracting individuals who are affluent in these forms of capital. Thus, the integrated theory of volunteering treats volunteer recruitment as a fairly "straightforward" process involving the demand and supply of objectively desirable resources. In opposition to this view of the "objective" nature of social inequality in volunteerism, I argue that different social practices will produce inequality patterns of different kinds and different degrees. As in other parts of society, social inequality in volunteering is socially constructed and thus potentially changeable. Although this is not a groundbreaking insight, the social constructivist view does, however, direct our attention to the social practices that produce and sustain social inequality. It is thus surprising that so few authors have addressed the subject of *how* social inequalities in volunteer work come to exist.

Some scholars have sought to empirically examine the circumstances of "unlikely" groups of volunteers, such as working-class or unemployed citizens, ethnic minorities, young people, the elderly, and refugees. Yap, Byrne, and Davidson (2010), in a study of refugees in the United Kingdom, found that volunteering is used as a means to "transcend" the negative stigma of being a refugee. Baines and Hardill (2008) argued that volunteering can provide a basis for mutual support in a disadvantaged, jobless community in the UK. Tang, Morrow-Howell, and Hong (2009) argued that certain means of institutional facilitation (e.g. flexibility in assigning roles and tasks, providing transportation, etc.) are especially crucial for older volunteers of lower socioeconomic status. And as early as 1983, Gay and Hatch found unemployment to be a detriment to recruitment into volunteer work, as voluntary organizations and their volunteers would regard the unemployed as less resourceful and less competent. A new report on volunteering in the Danish population, requisitioned by the Danish Ministry of Social Affairs, concluded that citizens who are permanently out of the labor force are less likely to volunteer, though when they do, they are typically involved in voluntary social work (Rambøll, 2017).

However, only a few of such studies have applied a process perspective to the study of "unlikely" volunteers and inequality in volunteerism. One exception is Dean (2016) who found that public policy on youth volunteering in the UK has unintentionally reinforced structural access barriers for working-class youths.

Thus, there are two main gaps in our knowledge base with regards to inequality in volunteerism: Firstly, past studies have tended to employ a predominantly individualistic approach to the study of *who* volunteers with a focus on individuals' resources and motivations—persuading us that social inequality in volunteerism is, first and foremost, a "natural" byproduct of individual actions. Secondly, many studies more often paint a static portrait of the social composition of the voluntary sector—vital knowledge provided by quantitative cross-sectional studies, but thus neglecting a process perspective which could provide insights into *how* this very picture comes about.

In the following subsection, I argue that the theoretical concept of *social exclusion* is highly relevant for understanding exactly how barriers to civic engagement come to exist.

Social exclusion in volunteer work

Social exclusion is obviously not a phenomenon unique to the voluntary sector. However, the public perception seems to be that exclusion is an evil more easily escaped in volunteer work than in other parts of society. Perhaps for this reason, other research areas within the social sciences have more readily acknowledged the need for a processual understanding of the social dynamics that foster social segmentation. This is especially true in literature in human resources and organizational studies where one can find several fruitful studies, for example, on social inequality in recruitment processes, often in relation to gender (see Koivunen, Ylöstalo, & Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, 2015; Acker, 2006).

But most kinds of work—volunteering included—entail hierarchical forms of organization, and—as David Pocock noted as early as the 1950s—social exclusion is a generic trait of all social hierarchies (Allman, 2013). This logic further points us to the fact that *all* organizations produce and reproduce some forms of social inequality. Joan Acker (2006) proposed a theory of "inequality regimes," arguing that all human organizations— even those committed to promoting diversity and inclusivity, such as the present case organization— embrace practices that nourish social inequality. Importantly, different organizations may differ in the kinds of inequalities they sustain and the degrees to which they do so.

For Acker (2006), recruitment processes are a typical way in which organizations produce and maintain systematic inequalities. The professional and personal qualities that organizations explicitly or implicitly value in employees are socially constructed and oftentimes based on existing societal stratifications. These notions of the "ideal worker"—or the "ideal volunteer"—play a major part in determining who gets included and excluded

in the labor market (Acker, 2006; Koivunen et al., 2015)—or in volunteer opportunities.

The theory of inequality regimes is relevant to the academic study of social exclusion because the identification of the specific exclusionary practices happening within an organization can help in defining its unique inequality regime. But the concept of "exclusion"—used theoretically in many fields within the social sciences, such as sociology, psychology, and anthropology—is criticized for its "contested" nature and lack of definitional consistency (Taket et al., 2009). Coined in 1970s France ("*les exclus*"), the concept now denotes many kinds of barriers to participation in different societal spheres, such as the labor market, politics, or civil society. Common to most definitions of social exclusion is the idea that non-participation must be involuntary for the excluded group or individual (Bak, 2012). As such, the (unequal) distribution of power is central to an understanding of social exclusion.

Many renowned scholars have theorized upon social exclusion or related concepts, such as Max Weber's (1968) theory on "social closure," or Erving Goffman's (1963) famous work on social stigma. Despite the immense scholarly interest in the concept, a lack of definitional clarity impedes its empirical utility.

Social exclusion can be viewed as a state or a process (or both). Whereas quantitative studies define social exclusion mostly in static terms, qualitative studies tend to employ a process-oriented understanding of the concept. In the present paper, the concept of social exclusion is conceptualized as the latter: Someone can clearly *be* excluded from volunteering, but *how* this comes to be is the dominant focus of this analysis. Hence, in this study, the focus is on exclusionary practices.

Furthermore, inclusion/exclusion is not to be regarded as a dichotomy, but as a continuum along which lie many degrees of inclusion and exclusion. One may, for example, differentiate between "core" and "peripheral" members of a volunteer group, while still others are banned from participation altogether. In the present article,

exclusionary practices are viewed as those that reject or marginalize individual members or entire social groups from full participation in volunteerism. Although full-on rejection is always involuntary (aspiring volunteers are "dismissed" from volunteer service), some forms of exclusion may be subtler (as when volunteer group members are marginalized to the periphery of the social group). The first kind of exclusion can be termed "formal exclusion," while the second and more subtle kind of exclusion can be referred to as "informal."

Social class and age as status markers

In the course of analyzing the empirical material, inequality in access to volunteering presented itself via age- and class-based forms of exclusion. Thus, in the following subsection, the concepts of youth and social class will be addressed briefly.

Inequality in access to core volunteering positions in the case organization were, firstly, *class-based.* The subject of social class has been developed by a number of authors across the social sciences throughout the past two centuries, the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1984) perhaps being the most renowned modern theorist on social class. In modern Danish society, it is meaningful to make use of Bourdieu's (1984) distinction between three "layers" of class structure, consisting, broadly, of a *working*, a *middle*, and an *upper* class (Juul, 2012).

Secondly, the low social status of youth participants seemed especially relevant to some exclusionary practices in the case organization. Though there is no theoretical consensus on a clear age demarcation of youth, most studies tend to focus on adolescence and early adulthood as life stages characterized by "in-betweenness"—less marked by dependency than childhood, but still deprived of many of the citizenship rights associated with adulthood (Furlong, 2013).

Both working-class affiliation and youth are marked by a lower social standing in general society—in part because of a deficiency in what Bourdieu (1984) denoted as "symbolic capital"— and this is accompanied by a lack of participation in civil society. In Denmark, as well as in many other countries, young people and working-class citizens are under-represented in the voluntary sector (Fridberg, 2014; Musick & Wilson, 2008). Because volunteer work is expected to increase employability and direct at-risk individuals towards more socially acceptable behavior, volunteerism comes to serve as a political vehicle for the "self-improvement" of low-status citizens, such as young people (Dean, 2016) and the unemployed (Baines & Hardill, 2008).

Methodological Reflections

In the present study, data has been collected intensively over one-and-a-half consecutive years in 2015 and 2016 in cooperation with a single Danish organization, referred to as "the organization". Single-case studies are well-known for their ability to generate deep knowledge and track causal processes but are often criticized for their low generalizability. But case studies need not suffer from a lack of generalization potential; though statistical inference is certainly a virtue of large quantitative studies, an informed case selection can pave the way for broader relevance of the analytical findings in a case study (Gerring, 2008).

As previously stated, Denmark features a relatively high rate of volunteering, internationally, which logically entails that, on a sheer aggregate level, a large proportion of the population is included in some form of volunteer work. Additionally, the case organization performs social work, an area within the voluntary sector somewhat more diverse with regards to educational backgrounds and gender than other areas, such as sports or health (Overgaard, Petrovski, & Hermansen et al., 2015). At an institutional level, the organization is explicitly dedicated to "inclusive volunteering" and creating equal opportunities for civic engagement for people from diverse backgrounds. These things considered, I argue that the organization selected for empirical analysis makes for a "least likely" case for observing practices of social exclusion in volunteerism. Thus, the findings put forward in this paper may be of relevance to other voluntary organizations as well.

The specific methods used in the data production for this study are semi-structured individual interviews with nine volunteers as well as overt participatory observation at three project locations. Initial interviews were rather unstructured (though the interview questions were all related to the informants' voluntary engagements) with a focus on themes that informants themselves seemed passionate about or preoccupied with. Later interviews became increasingly structured, as thematic similarities (of social exclusion in volunteering) emerged and became apparent. Thus, the data collection process moved from inductive to increasingly deductive. Interviews often followed sessions of observation, as participatory observation paved the way for a contextual understanding of the volunteer groups and activities, which proved beneficial for conversations with interviewees.

The local projects were part of a nation-wide social care program for children and youths at risk of social isolation, with all day-to-day activities run by volunteers. The three projects were selected to reflect different geographical areas of Denmark— from the small provincial village to the large provincial city. Interviewees were sampled with an eye toward including a variety of participants with regards to formal positions in the volunteer groups, gender, age, and socio-economic status. Thus, of the nine volunteer interviewees, three served managing functions, three were male, two were unemployed, and three were formally unskilled. In total, I have qualitative data from 11 visits to the local projects (each visit lasting between three to five hours) and 12 hours of recordings from personal interviews with nine volunteers. Furthermore, I hosted a focus group interview in the fall of 2016 with three volunteer supervisors who are employed full-time as staff at the organization's main offices. Their task portfolios featured overall facilitation of local projects as well as tending to volunteer recruitment and retention.

Qualitative data analysis was conducted with the help of standard computer software (NVivo), with coding of sequences of transcriptions from interviews and summaries of field notes that were

related to inclusionary or exclusionary practices and processes in the voluntary work. For practical reasons, I take a person's occupation and education level as indicative of their membership in specific social classes. Initially, all participants at the three local project locations I studied were mapped with regards to their formal occupations and educational backgrounds.

Empirical Analysis

The following analysis will strive to shed light on the kinds of practices that exclude volunteers from voluntary social work.

The case organization—a brief description

The organization that is the empirical foundation of this paper is a youth organization with local branches in several parts of Denmark. It is a non-profit, democratically governed, private organization with international roots that performs social care work for children and young people, mostly targeting disadvantaged children and adolescents through homework clubs, summer camps, and the like.

To implement its many diverse projects all over Denmark, the organization relies almost exclusively on volunteer labor, in addition to around 40 paid staff members and a couple of dozen student assistants and interns in the organization's main offices who facilitate and support local projects, recruit new volunteers, and so forth. The official organization is explicitly dedicated to "inclusive volunteering" and is outspoken about creating equal opportunities for civic engagement for people from different socioeconomic backgrounds, and especially for young people.

The increased sense of the importance of inclusive volunteering has clearly had an impact in the specific volunteer program studied for this paper. Here, it seems that the organization has succeeded in recruiting a share of "atypical" volunteers (e.g. lower-skilled or very young volunteers). The program offers after-school activities for disadvantaged children and youths

in different project locations in Denmark, three of which I followed over the duration of this study.

Analysis of social exclusion of volunteers in the organization

During my observations at the three project locations in the organization, as well as through personal interviews, I learned of several examples of exclusion of volunteers—both aspirant and long-term members. These examples of exclusion varied largely in degree. Only a few of these cases of exclusion were of the "formal" kind: three applicants were formally rejected as volunteers despite explicitly applying to volunteer jobs—one from each project location. Certainly, becoming excluded as a volunteer is not an either/or phenomenon; it can happen along a gradually descending continuum, from highly included and respected team-member to non-participating non-volunteer.

Studying the cases of social exclusion of varying degrees, it seems rather obvious that those most at risk of exclusion generally enjoyed a lower social standing in society. Specifically, it seemed, relatively younger participants seldom enjoyed the informal status of "core" volunteers, and working-class volunteer applicants were more likely to become formally excluded from the projects. All three formally excluded volunteer applicants encountered during the research period had been affected by long-term unemployment, had a working-class family background, and/or lacked formal educational qualifications.

Before proceeding with a presentation of the exclusionary practices encountered in the case organization, an analysis of the social logics that pave the way for exclusionary processes is offered in the following subsection.

Fuel for inequality: "The ideal volunteer" and logics of social exclusion

As in Joan Acker's (2006) work on inequality regimes in organizations, the notion of the "ideal worker"—here the "ideal volunteer"—is central to an understanding of exclusion of volunteers in the present analysis. The volunteer ideal represents an organizational logic that can morally justify practices of inclusion and exclusion within an organization.

The notion of the "ideal volunteer" was reflected in the organization's discourse on recruitment and retention among volunteers and supervisors. Because the ideal was highly shared among individual volunteers, paid supervisors, and across project locations, and because it seems to converge with widespread notions of "the Volunteer" in society, I will argue that what I have learned during my time in the organization about the ideal volunteer, and the practices of exclusion that it fuels, can carefully be generalized to other non-profit organizations.

The ideal volunteer is a Janus head, consisting of two axes of socially desirable qualities of volunteers: firstly, motivations, and, secondly, skills. I elaborate on these in order below.

Motivational ethics

In interviews with volunteers and supervisors at the organization, many types of incentives seemed to motivate interviewees in their volunteer work—both those that could be considered "other-serving" (or altruistic) and some more "self-serving" (or egoistic).

What seemed to matter for the social value of a volunteer was the (perceived) motivational orientation of that person: The individual's motivations had to seem primarily and authentically *altruistic* (what is often referred to as a *pro-social* orientation) for fellow volunteers and supervisors to fully accept that volunteer as a "core" group member. Self-serving incentives, such as adding experiences to one's resumé, developing one's professional skills, socializing with peers, or tending to one's own family needs were clearly second-rate incentives that could be accepted only if they were secondary to other, more altruistic motivations. Volunteers who seemed to value the companionship of fellow volunteers a little "too much" were consistently disparaged as a "coffee club," and volunteers who had joined the projects by way of their own children being recipients of the organization's services/benefits were often suspected of tending too much to their own self-interest:

I think that Johanna and I, we are generally very interested in the kids. I have a feeling that [the other volunteers] come here just because they have their own kids here. (Female volunteer with managing functions, no children of her own involved in the project)

But I'm not like a real volunteer. I'm here because I have kids in this after-school club. (Female volunteer, answering my initial request for an interview)

This volunteer provided this answer despite having worked in the kitchen making afternoon snacks for the child recipients, with no special contact with her own children during all of the times I had come to visit.

When asked about what good qualities a volunteer needed, most volunteers emphasized altruistic motivations and would reply with something similar to this:

The main thing actually is that you need to care about the children. You should want to be there for them. (Male volunteer)

In short, pro-social incentives needed to be primary. And importantly, volunteers and supervisors were convinced that the supply of "altruistic motivations" was unequally distributed among volunteers. Notably, working-class volunteers were regarded as unlikely altruists and were often suspected of volunteering for the "wrong" reasons. For example, one female volunteer pondered about the motives of a young aspirant volunteer:

I'm just not sure she really cares about the children—I mean, whether she wants to spend time with the younger kids and do some activities here, or if she's actually just in it to hang out with us [the older volunteers]. (Female volunteer)

Additionally, paid volunteer supervisors seemed to find the recruitment of especially working-class men challenging:

Because…they were, like, these technical college scooter-guys, you know? And, well, they really needed a place for themselves. That was their main agenda. So, in a way, you can get them on board… But I think that maybe the carrot needs to be a bit bigger than full-scale altruism. (Volunteer supervisor)

I know that we need to accommodate volunteering for atypical volunteers. But, I mean, isn't it okay that we can't make room for everyone? My volunteers should feel that it's a good time and want to engage. And, well, I just don't think that dude from technical college thinks that. He probably thinks that some other things are cooler than volunteering. (Volunteer supervisor)

It isn't the purpose of this analysis to judge whether the class-based assumptions of volunteers and supervisors are correct or not, or whether working-class volunteers are indeed more "self-serving" in their incentives to engage. However, what is of importance to the present analysis is that there is a widespread focus on ethical dispositions in defining the "ideal volunteer" and that the general assumptions about the unequal distribution of such ethical motivations seem to be working in favor of middle-class inclusion and working-class exclusion in volunteerism.

The finding that altruistic motivations are expected of "ideal" volunteers isn't new. In defining the essence of volunteering, central theories on volunteer resources highlight a certain ethical disposition: Wilson & Musick's 1997 "integrated theory" of volunteering identifies ethical resources as one of three main capitals that enable volunteer engagement: "The volunteer-recipient relationship

is an ethical one," they claim (Wilson & Musick, 1997, p. 695). In other words: motivations matter.

Qualifications ethics

Whereas ethical incentives, one could argue, are defining of and somewhat unique to volunteerism, the notion of the ideal volunteer in the organization also meant that supervisors expected volunteers to possess qualities and resources similar to those in demand on the traditional labor market. One property high in demand was, notably, *initiative*—the ability to demonstrate leadership and solve tasks independently:

> Well, in this project, there are basically two kinds of people, right? There are those alpha-types that take charge of tasks—and then there are beta-types that just follow and don't start anything up themselves. (Male volunteer on the skills needed to perform volunteer work)

Another skill in high demand was that of *professionalism*, as, for instance, reflected in regular work attendance and respect for central rules and norms, such as the duty of confidentiality. Volunteers were—perhaps unsurprisingly—generally unhappy about fellow volunteers who seemed unwilling or unable to take the volunteer work as seriously as they would a paid job. Similarly, volunteers and supervisors often stressed certain specialized and pedagogical qualifications as a prerequisite for caring for the children and young people who were recipients of the project activities:

> Henry, he is one of those kids with ADHD. And that's why Marianne has started here [as a volunteer]. I've shanghaied her to, like, help me handle those kinds of kids […] Marianne is a former pediatric nurse, and that's just great. I know what [the other rank-and-file volunteers] might be thinking "Why is she using her more than she's using us? Aren't we good enough?"

But we need somebody with a broader perspective […] Marianne is amazing with the kids. She knows exactly what it's all about. (Female volunteer with managing functions.)

Overall, it was clear that a person's position in the for-profit labor market reflected itself in the opportunities that they enjoyed as part of their volunteer work. For example, one unemployed woman applying to become a volunteer at one project location was eventually formally excluded because the remaining volunteers did not believe that she could contribute enough to the daily tasks. One female volunteer described the grounds for the exclusion with reference to the applicant's long-term unemployment:

> It's nothing personal. It has nothing to do with her person, but more to do with her situation. That she's all the way out there where there's no possibility of returning to an ordinary job. (Female volunteer)

In all three cases of formal exclusion that I witnessed during my time in the organization, volunteers at the three project locations followed a similar line of reasoning when explaining these formal dismissals: that the applicants in question were not resourceful enough to contribute adequately to the work performed in the projects, and that inclusion would require an absorption of volunteer resources—whether hours and/or energy—that they wouldn't or couldn't spare to support the "weak" volunteers. A male volunteer with managing responsibilities at one project location put it the following way:

> [Volunteer applicant] didn't belong here. Someone had to keep an eye on him constantly. He needed a lot of support to do things. Then I said, "Well, we're not doing that." We couldn't have resources going from the kids to him—he's supposed to be a help and not an inconvenience. I mean,

we have some 70 kids to take care of here—that's enough, you know? We can't keep an eye on adults, too.

The reasoning seems to be that the benevolent resources of volunteers are earmarked for supporting those who belong to the official target group, i.e. the service recipients—here defined as (disadvantaged) children and young people. Thus, the imperative to help and support that is expected to define volunteer engagement does not necessarily extend beyond the specified cause of the project. In this way, volunteer work is, first and foremost, defined as a *productive* activity with an "output" goal as the guiding work principle. Although this instrumental logic may not be the first thing on most people's minds when thinking of volunteerism, some scholars have reached similar conclusions—notably Wuthnow (1991), who argued that a main function of the volunteer role is to "limit compassion," e.g. to a specific subgroup of care recipients.

Summing up, the "ideal volunteer" is defined, firstly, by the "right" set of motivations (i.e. altruism), and, secondly, the "right" skill set. Volunteers are expected to possess certain resources on arrival that, in part, mirror those found on the traditional labor market, such as independent initiative or professional skills. In this way, patterns of inequality in volunteerism come to reflect those of the traditional labor market, as large quantitative studies have tended to find. On the other hand, I find that the assumed ethical motivations of volunteers—as reflected in their (perceived) incentives to engage—help justify gatekeepers in pushing working-class citizens out of volunteerism: the middle-class gatekeepers (core volunteers and paid supervisors) seem unconvinced about the altruistic motives of working-class applicants. In this way, the recruitment ideals governing volunteer work in the organization seem to reflect the intermediary position of non-profit or third-sector organizations noticed elsewhere in the literature (Evers, 1995). Specifically, this intermediary position is reflected in the duality of the purposes of third-sector organizations, in that

they are altruistically motivated, as is unpaid work performed in the private sphere, but also "output-maximizing'," converging to the logic governing paid work performed in private or public companies.

Discourses on the "ideal volunteer" provide an organizational logic that fuels concrete practices that include or exclude volunteers and aspiring volunteers from joining or continuing with the organization. In the following section, I analyze those practices.

Practices of social exclusion in volunteer work

Overall, the many ways of excluding would-be volunteers observed in the local projects seemed to converge in three basic forms of exclusion: *non-recruitment*, *informal exclusion*, and *formal exclusion.* Common to all three different forms of exclusion is the reasoning that young or working-class volunteers are lacking in personal and professional resources as well as pro-social dispositions. The three categories of practices will be described and substantiated below.

Non-recruitment

Non-recruitment was perhaps the subtlest of exclusion mechanisms, as recruiters would direct their recruitment efforts towards middle-class volunteers. This was done in an (often implicit) attempt to adhere to the common volunteer ideals described in the previous section. Paid volunteer supervisors were often predominantly in charge of formal recruitment processes, and, furthermore, as authoritative organizational representatives, were expected to abide by official organizational policies for inclusive volunteering. For these reasons, non-recruitment was the most common exclusion strategy practiced by supervisors, as it is subtle and therefore less identifiable as an inequality-producing mechanism. As one volunteer supervisor told me:

It's more who we actively turn to [in recruitment]. Because, often, if [undesirable volunteer applicants] come to us, we can't just say, "we can't accommodate you." (Volunteer supervisor)

There are basically two ways of averting direct recruitment of undesirable volunteers: one is through *contact-avoidance* and the other is through *network recruitment*. *Contact-avoidance* is a mostly unintentional recruitment strategy which evades contact with potentially undesirable applicants. For example, placing advertisements for volunteer jobs where they were unlikely to be spotted by working-class applicants (often on specific volunteer recruitment websites that supervisors were aware were mostly used by middle-class applicants), or promoting volunteer job openings at places mostly frequented by middle- or upper-class citizens, such as institutions of higher education. Though other recruitment efforts—such as Facebook-advertisements, which provided for a more diverse recruitment outcome—were also undertaken in this case organization, contact-avoiding recruitment meant that especially working-class volunteers became unlikely applicants.

Network recruitment is a very common—official or unofficial—staffing strategy in the private sector as well as in volunteerism. People with wider social networks have higher volunteering rates, as they are more likely to be invited into volunteer organizations (Wilson, 2012). The potential "dangers" of the network recruitment strategy are well-known; for example, the effects of social network recruitment can reinforce social stratification in society (Korpi, 2001). In the case organization, network recruitment was a way to guide recruitment efforts in the direction of desirable future volunteers, as valued core volunteers were more likely to enjoy extensive social networks and recruit new volunteers similar to themselves. Though initiated by supervisors, the organization's actual recruitment efforts were in fact placed in the hands of volunteers. In some instances, network recruitment could yield more inclusive results, as when working-class volunteers recruited new volunteers from their own social circles.

It wasn't that volunteer supervisors didn't make efforts to recruit atypical volunteers. A number of attempts were made, and the supervisors focused a lot of efforts on facilitating youth volunteering. But volunteer supervisors were in a jam between two sets of principles that didn't always correspond: the official policies of the organization supporting inclusive volunteering and an ideal of the resourceful and altruistic volunteer. Although supervisors were entrusted with the task of implementing abstract organizational visions for inclusive volunteer recruitment and retention, they also perceived themselves as responsible for composing volunteer groups that were "productive" and "functional" in practice. These different goals were, to some extent, perceived as irreconcilable by supervisors.

Perhaps because of this tension, supervisors (and volunteers) commonly distinguished between "weak" and "strong" volunteers; this terminology seemingly allowed all organizational participants to talk about social class without directly addressing social inequality. During my time in the organization, it became quite clear that *weak* referred to working-class volunteers and *strong* referred to middle-class volunteers. And although the project locations studied for this research did include a great number of *weak* volunteers, the projects were only perceived as "sustainable" by supervisors if they consisted of a majority of *strong* volunteers. One supervisor said:

> If you have an excessive number of weak volunteers, well, then the whole thing implodes! Then it becomes unsustainable, and they have a hard time doing the work that's required. (Volunteer supervisor)

Informal forms of exclusion

Whereas formal exclusion is a common practice in the public and for-profit sector, with dismissals of employees and rejection of job applicants that are found unsuitable for job vacancies, informal forms of exclusion might be more common in the non-profit sector. In voluntary organizations, as in the organization studied for this research, rejecting willing volunteer applicants directly might be viewed as acting in opposition to core organizational values of inclusivity and equality. In the organization studied, I noted a plethora of informal ways of excluding volunteers.

Here, I focus on those practices that organizations have some degree of control over. Although these exclusionary processes didn't seem strategic in the intentional sense, they served exclusionary ends nonetheless.

Though there are undoubtedly many informal ways of marginalizing members of social groups, I will elaborate on two concepts that are related to informal exclusion practices at an organizational level: *economic costs* and *recipient retention.*

Economic concerns can present obstacles to volunteer participation for less affluent citizens. Half of the interviewed volunteers talked in some length about personal economic difficulties that could stand in the way of volunteer engagement. A need to spend time earning money does not necessarily match well with providing unpaid labor.

Though it is difficult for an organization to battle negative views on volunteerism that exist in some societal groups, an organization can take steps to dismantle the potential economic costs endured by volunteers. Such costs will likely be a bigger hurdle for working-class or younger volunteers to overcome. As one 40-year-old middle-class volunteer told me during an interview:

> We [volunteers] have to pay for the daily stuff we need for the kids [child recipients] and then wait for [the organization] to reimburse us. Oftentimes, we must wait quite a while. That's something we can handle—*our* family can handle it, you know? (Female volunteer)

Delays in economic reimbursement for volunteer expenses were referenced by all but one working-class volunteer as a frustration, as it could often be difficult to have larger amounts of money owed to you, especially by the end of the month. One male working-class volunteer stated:

> I must say that this has been one of the biggest challenges so far, and it's something that angers me a bit.

> You know, we pay out of our own pockets most of the time. And then it goes something like, 'Well, has the money been repaid yet? No, not today…' And then you have something like two times 2-300 DKK [equals to approximately 60-100 USD] missing in your bank account, you know? We can't keep doing that. (Male volunteer).

After having paid for volunteer-related items, such as equipment or food, volunteers were instructed to send the receipt and a signed reimbursement form to the organization. Some, especially younger and inexperienced volunteers, found the system of expense reimbursement difficult to understand and use, sometimes presenting a hindrance to reclaiming volunteer expenses in practice. So, although in theory no volunteer was required to endure any economic costs while volunteering for the organization, the oftentimes prolonged wait before reimbursements were made, coupled with the somewhat complex reimbursement system, made economic costs very real for especially working-class or younger volunteers.

The second informal exclusionary practice is referred to as *recipient retention.* This practice takes place when service recipients are retained in "client"—and thus subordinate—positions instead of being allowed to transition to more powerful, and potentially empowering, volunteer positions. In the case organization, in the spirit of inclusive volunteering, there was a major focus on the transition from *service recipient*—meaning the disadvantaged children and adolescents who were the official target group of the volunteer program—to *volunteer*—meaning the (adult) helpers who organized and hosted activities in the local projects. The official intention was to open doors to volunteering for at-risk youths, in this way aiding them in transcending their vulnerable life situations. But, in practice, the transition from recipient to volunteer proved strenuous. In some projects, adolescents were invited to become

"junior volunteers," or they were positioned in such subordinate roles in practice. Although they were sometimes given the title of "volunteers," this title didn't always translate into actual influence or an interesting task portfolio. In most cases, the youth "volunteers" were not invited to volunteer staff meetings, nor did they have much say in selecting their own tasks. In actuality, they functioned like service recipients with slightly more responsibilities, but were still referred to as volunteers. One adult volunteer talked about a young recipient who had expressed a desire to become a volunteer when she turned 15:

> We [the adult volunteers] were discussing if she could be sort of a half-way volunteer. Because she wanted to become a volunteer here, but, if so, we felt that she shouldn't be allowed to join our meetings. We were thinking something like a "junior-senior" solution or something like that. (Female volunteer)

Still other youth recipients were denied the volunteer title altogether, as they weren't deemed "ready" or "fit" for the role of a volunteer. The tension between ideals of equality in volunteerism and the fundamentally unequal relationship between the volunteer (with the connotation *powerful*) and the recipient (with the connotation *powerless*) are not unfamiliar within the literature on volunteerism: In their seminal book *Volunteers: A Social Profile,* Musick and Wilson (2008) noted that "volunteers must have needy people with whom to connect" (p. 423), but that the subordinate position of clients can make volunteers "feel uncomfortable" (p. 438). Thus, volunteers in the studied case organization needed disadvantaged children and youths whom they could help (a fact which became ever-so evident when some project locations were temporarily lacking recipients)—but when helping some recipients might in fact entail providing them with substantial volunteer opportunities, the volunteer-recipient divide proved difficult to cross.

Formal exclusion

Formal exclusion was the most straightforward example of social exclusion observed in the case organization, as volunteer applicants were dismissed from participation altogether when they were deemed *too* unfit for the role as volunteers. Though formal exclusion was not a common practice in the case organization, it did happen—and when it did, it usually spurred some controversy among volunteers and organizational staff. The rather intense debates following the rejection of two formally excluded aspirant volunteers seem to support the claim that it is no easy task to dismiss the contributions of willing would-be volunteers. Again, the ethos seemed to be that there should be "room for everyone;" but sometimes this roominess clashed with the social expectations associated with the notion of the ideal volunteer—notably the expectation that volunteers should supply projects with valued resources and not absorb those very resources themselves.

But not everyone was equally at risk of formal exclusion: the practice exclusively befell working-class aspirants. Younger volunteers were not necessarily accepted as full volunteers, but they could usually be included in the periphery of the projects to some degree, e.g. as service recipients or junior volunteers. Thus, those most at risk of formal exclusion were adults (25-30+ years old) with a working-class affiliation. The reasons for this difference in exclusion strategies affecting youths and working-class citizens appear to be twofold: First of all, as a youth organization, the case organization caters mostly to younger age groups. This means that the organization is more likely to be inclusive towards younger volunteers than other non-profit organizations in the voluntary sector are. Secondly, mainstream societal discourses on youth, particularly those rooted in developmental psychology and that emphasize *transition* and *growth* (i.e. maturing, development, "coming of age") as the defining features of adolescence and early adulthood (Gabriel, 2013) contributed to an expectation of *developmental potential* for younger participants, but not equally of older ones, among

established volunteers and supervisors. They were thus willing to grant younger volunteers a chance to grow into common volunteer expectations—while older volunteers were more or less expected to walk through the door with all resources and qualifications ready at hand. Younger volunteers with a working-class background were more often provided the opportunity of time to at least partially "transform" their social class; the same opportunity was rarely afforded to older working-class volunteer applicants.

All in all, although the projects of the organization could accommodate all youth participation in some form, exclusion of older volunteers tended to be more final. Younger participants often served marginal roles (as junior volunteers, "interns," or, most often, recipients) within projects, but were rarely barred from participation altogether. Young middle-class participants served roles as "volunteers-in-the-making," while working-class adolescents found it hard to overcome the class divide and transcend the role of recipient. Relatively older middle-class individuals (20-25+ years old) served as models of ideal volunteerism, while older working-class volunteers were harder to include in projects in any role—they were too old to be service recipients, and too disadvantaged to supply valued volunteer resources.

In Table 1, the (ideal-type) social positions of participants in the organization are displayed.

Summary and concluding remarks

In the preceding analysis I have sought to shed light on some of the social and organizational practices as well as the social logics and ethical dispositions that exclude some volunteers from voluntary social work, ultimately paving the way for social inequality in volunteerism.

As presented in the introductory sections to this paper, many quantitative studies have found a high degree of inequality in volunteerism based on features such as age, occupation, gender, education, ethnicity, race, and disability. Such inequalities have the potential to exacerbate existing societal divisions because volunteers tend to benefit personally from their civic engagement. Furthermore, social inequalities in volunteering are a problem when one considers the great political expectations to the ability of the voluntary sector to include diverse social groups, create community, and build "network bridges" across social boundaries. The sector might not be capable of meeting such expectations if the representation of certain societal groups in volunteerism is too low. Thus, it should be of political and academic interest to dissect the political, social, and organizational practices that exclude and include citizens in volunteer work. However, despite the fact that social inequalities in access to volunteering are well-known, for the most part, the literature on volunteerism has neglected to apply a process-perspective to the (re)production of social inequalities in volunteer

Table 1. *Intersectional social positions of participants in the organization*

		AGE GROUP	
		Young (~< 20 y.o.)	**Older (~ 20-25+ y.o.)**
SOCIAL CLASS	**Working class**	Low-status service recipient: *Legitimate claim to support.* Purpose: *Resource development.*	Low-status non-volunteer: *Illegitimate claim to support.* Purpose: *Resource absorption.*
	Middle class	Volunteer apprentice: *Peripheral volunteer.* Purpose: *Resource development.*	Attractive volunteer: *Core volunteer.* Purpose: *Resource provision.*

work. Establishing new knowledge on how social biases in volunteerism come to exist may present opportunities for organizations and policymakers who wish to support an inclusive approach to civic engagement.

In the present paper, I have followed a least-likely case for social exclusion, namely a Danish youth organization with institutional priorities grounded in visions of inclusivity. Based on interviews with volunteers, interviews with paid volunteer supervisors, and participatory observations at three project locations, I have identified three general types of exclusionary practices—non-recruitment, informal exclusion, and formal exclusion—that give rise to social inequality in voluntary organizations based on social class and age.

While these social practices are clearly also found in other types of organizations, for example in private companies, what is special about non-profit voluntary organizations, I argue, is the social reasoning that substantiates these exclusionary practices and guides their use. On the one hand, notions of the "ideal volunteer" entail expectations to labor market–relevant capabilities. Based on such abilities, young participants and working-class aspirants are often weighed and found wanting, thus creating 'spill-over' inequality from the traditional labor market into the realms of unpaid voluntary labor. On the other hand, the volunteer ideal requires that volunteers have altruistic motivations for participating. Thus, the social expectations connected to the ideal volunteer are double-edged. This double-edged quality of the volunteer role, I argue, reflects the intermediary position of formalized volunteer work: not quite at home in the private sphere, but not quite native to the conventional labor market either. Thus, ideals for volunteer work draw on logics found in both spheres, resulting in double-demands on volunteers.

Coupled with social assumptions based on social class and age—e.g. about the sorts of incentives that motivate working-class and middle-class volunteers—the notion of the ideal volunteer

steers organizational gatekeepers (notably both paid volunteer supervisors and unpaid core volunteers) towards social practices that enable different kinds of exclusion for different social groups. While, for example, young people were more likely to suffer informal kinds of exclusion in the studied case organization (being left in peripheral or powerless positions on volunteer projects), working-class adults were simply less likely to be recruited or formally accepted at all. Thus, to prevent certain forms of inequality in non-profit organizations from blossoming, one needs to pay close attention to the social logics and assumptions held in the organization, including assumptions about ideal participation and assumptions about the motivations and resource-affluence of different socio-ethnic groups. As the productive nature of the work performed in the case organization (aiding disadvantaged children with after-school activities) seemed to result in higher demands on the resources of volunteers, one might expect social organizations with a focus on peer-to-peer activities (i.e. where volunteers are part of the target group) to be somewhat more inclusive towards working-class volunteers. This might present an interesting hypothesis for future research to investigate.

Although policymakers and laymen may expect the voluntary sector to display benevolent qualities missing in the for-profit sector, patterns of inequality in volunteerism come to mirror those found within the traditional labor market. Previous research has confirmed the existence of a "civic core" of middle-class citizens who serve as the backbone of many voluntary organizations (Dean, 2016); the findings in the present study may contribute to explaining why this is the case.

For organizations with purely productive goals, social exclusion may not present problems at all. But for social organizations aiming to build community or bridge the class divide, or for policymakers eager to promote volunteerism as a road to social cohesion, exclusionary practices may present a real problem in need of careful reflection. One rather radical solution to inequality

in volunteerism might be to dismiss the discourse on volunteering altogether and focus on concepts like *participation* or *community-building* instead. This approach might present a rather different set of obstacles, and it might prove equally exclusionary. Nevertheless, as this research reveals, applying the discourse of volunteering invokes a specific set of notions about the "ideal volunteer" in which there may not always be room for the "unresourceful" or the "unlikely altruists." In any case, it seems that social equality in civic participation doesn't come for free—it requires systematic work at different levels of an organization. The identification of exclusionary practices within organizations presents a first step towards more inclusive volunteering.

References

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender and Society, 20*(4), 441–464.

Allman, D. (2013). The sociology of social inclusion. *SAGE Open*, *3*(1), doi: 10.1177/2158244012471957

Baines, S., & Hardill, I. (2008). 'At least I can do something': The work of volunteering in a community beset by worklessness. *Social Policy and Society, 7*(3), 307–317.

Bak, C. K. (2012). Definitioner og målinger af social eksklusion: En kritisk begrebsmæssig og metodologisk gennemgang [Definitions and measurements of social exclusion: A critical and methodological review]. *Dansk Sociologi, 23*(3), 79–102.

Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology, 26*(3), 439–454.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* (Richard Nice, Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dean, J. (2013). Manufacturing citizens: The dichotomy between policy and practice in youth volunteering in the UK. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 35*(1), 46–62.

Dean, J. (2016). Class diversity and youth volunteering in the United Kingdom: Applying Bourdieu's *habitus* and cultural capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 45*(1), 95S–113S.

Dekker, P., & Halman, L. (2003). Volunteering and values: An introduction. In P. Dekker & L. Halman (Ed.), *The values of volunteering: Cross-cultural perspectives.* New York, NY: Kluwer Academic.

Fridberg, T. (2014). Udviklingen i frivilligt arbejde 2004–2012 [Trends in volunteer work 2004–2012]. SFI—Det Nationale Forskningscenter for Velfærd.

Furlong, A. (2013). Youth and the life course. *Youth Studies: An introduction.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gabriel, F. (2013). *Deconstructing youth: Youth discourses at the limits of sense.* Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gay, P., & Hatch, S. (1983). Voluntary work and unemployment. *Research and Development Series*, no. 15. Manpower Services Commission.

Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection for case-study analysis: Qualitative and quantitative techniques. In J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady & D. Collier (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology.* NY: Oxford University Press.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma. Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* NY: Simon & Schuster. s

Hogg, E., & Baines, S. (2011). Changing responsibilities and roles of the voluntary and community sector in the welfare mix: A review. *Social Policy & Society, 10*(3), 341–352.

Juul, J. S. (2012). *Det danske klassesamfund. Inddeling af befolkningen i sociale klasser.* Arbejderbevægelsens Erhvervsråd [*The Danish class society. The division of the population into social classes*]. The Economic Council of the Labour Movement.

Koivunen, T., Ylöstalo, H., & Otonkorpi-Lehtoranta, K. (2015). Informal practices of inequality

in recruitment in Finland. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 5*(3), 3–21.

Korpi, T. (2001). Good friend in bad times? Social networks and job search among the unemployed in Sweden. *Acta Sociologica, 44*(2), 157–170.

McCloughan, P., Batt, W. H., Costine, M., & Scully, D. (2011). *Participation in volunteering and unpaid work.* European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(4), 671–686.

Omoto, A. M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J. D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality, 78*(6), 1703–1734.

Overgaard, C., Petrovski, E., &Hermansen, J. (2015). Volunteer care workers: A case for challenging resource theories on volunteering. Conference paper for the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action's 44th annual conference.

Rambøll (2017). *Frivillighedsundersøgelsen 2017* [*The National Volunteerism Survey 2017*]. Report requisitioned by the Danish Ministry of Social Affairs. Retrieved from: https://socialministeriet.dk/media/19009/rapport_frivillighedsundersoegelsen_2017.pdf

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

Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (2008). Volunteerism: Social issues perspectives and social policy implications. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 2*(1), 1–36.

Taket, A., Crisp, B. R., Nevill, A., Lamaro, G., Graham, M., & Barter-Godfrey, S. (2009). Introduction. *Theorising social exclusion.* Oxon, England: Routledge.

Tang, F., Morrow-Howell, N., & Hong, S. (2009). Inclusion of diverse older populations in volunteering: The importance of institutional facilitation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38*(5), 810–827.

United States Department of Labor. (2016). *Volunteering in the United States, 2015.* Data report released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Retrieved from: https://www.bls.gov/news.release/volun.nr0.htm

Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society. An outline of interpretive sociology.* New York: Bedminster Press.

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 41*(2), 176–212.

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

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Yap, S. Y., Byrne, A., & Davidson, S. (2010). From refugee to good citizen: A discourse analysis of volunteering. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 24*(1), 157–170.