

This article is an attempt to address a perceived gap in the large and growing body of literature about volunteering. It argues that this literature has tended to neglect the variety of organisational contexts in which volunteering take place, and draws on two pieces of ongoing research to identify four distinct models of how volunteers are involved in small voluntary organisations. It concludes by discussing some of the implications of these findings for the practice and theory of volunteering.

One size does not fit all: four models of involving volunteers in small voluntary organisations

Colin Rochester, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics

Introduction

The establishment of an Institute for Volunteering Research and the launch of its new journal are important milestones in the development of a significant body of UK literature about the theory and practice of volunteering. The three decades since the publication of the Aves Report (1969) and the establishment of The Volunteer Centre UK (now the National Centre for Volunteering) have seen a steady stream of publications for practitioners and a rather more modest trickle of academic work, which provide a solid basis on which the new enterprise will be able to build. Researchers and practitioners can also draw on the extensive and substantial material produced over much the same period in North America.

There is, however, a major gap in this body of literature, academic and practitioner, British and North American: it does not take sufficient account of the variety of organisational arrangements within which voluntary action takes place. Volunteering takes place among family and friends at one end of the spectrum, in large bureaucratic organisations at the other, and in a variety of organisational contexts between these two extremes. The present article argues that the motivation of volunteers and the ways in which their work can be organised effectively will vary according to the location along that spectrum of the organisational context in which the work is undertaken. It offers a contribution towards filling the gap in

the existing literature by presenting four models of how volunteers are involved in voluntary organisations, drawn from two ongoing studies of organisations with few staff (no more than four full-time equivalent) or none.

Existing literature

The literature concentrates very heavily on four principal themes: measuring the overall extent of voluntary action; defining volunteering; understanding the motivations of those who volunteer; and looking at the organisation and management of the work of volunteers.

We have a wealth of information from major surveys conducted by the National Centre for Volunteering (Field and Hedges, 1984; Lynn and Davis Smith, 1991; Davis Smith, 1998) about the numbers of people involved in volunteering, their demographic profile, the scale of their involvement, the kinds of activities in which they are engaged, and the fields in which they are active. But beyond making a basic distinction between formal volunteering undertaken in an organisational context and informal or personal acts of service to others, these surveys do not provide us with a map of the various contexts within which volunteering takes place.

These and other surveys undertaken in the UK between 1976 and 1990 provided very varying estimates of the extent of voluntary action. Although some of these variations can be attributed to differences in methodology, they also reflect the lack of a common definition of what was being measured (Davis

Smith, 1992). Nor are problems of definition solely a British phenomenon: Cnaan and his colleagues (1996) have noted the absence of any attempt to define volunteering in much of the extensive US literature. Cross-national comparisons have in particular proved extremely difficult. A recent discussion of the problems involved in 'comparative studies which aim to measure the extent of volunteering and explain the differences in levels of volunteering in different countries' (Lyons et al, 1998) suggests that the difficulties may be explained by a fundamental difference of perspective about the phenomenon that is being studied. Those working within the first of these perspectives - 'the non profit sector paradigm' - see volunteering as an activity based on altruism or philanthropy that is found in organisations which deliver public services. The alternative 'civil society paradigm' views voluntary action as collaborative activity 'to meet shared needs and address common concerns' and focuses on exclusively voluntary, member-benefit associations.

The largest body of writing about volunteering - especially in the US - deals with the key questions of motivation: 'why they come' and 'why they stay'. By 1990 Cnaan and Goldberg-Glen had already identified more than two hundred articles on this theme and had distilled from them twenty-eight different reasons for volunteering. There is abundant evidence that the motivations of volunteers can be a complex mixture of the instrumental and the expressive and that they can change

over time. We know something about the circumstances under which people become volunteers: they will be more likely to volunteer if they are asked to take on a specific task and if their fellow employees, family or friends are already involved in voluntary action (Thomas and Finch, 1990). We can trace a link between life circumstances and motivation: younger volunteers may be interested in the value of the experience to their career, while older people may take up volunteering in response to a change in their lives, such as the loss of a partner (Moore, 1996; Tihanyi, 1991). On the other hand, we know little about the importance of the organisational context in determining why people volunteer (Tihanyi, 1991; Rochester, 1992).

The fourth major theme in the literature of volunteering is a concern with the organisation and management of volunteers. This appears to be driven by two main concerns. On the one hand, volunteers are seen as valuable human resources which need to be deployed efficiently and effectively in order that the goals of the organisation can be achieved. On the other, they are seen as people with their own needs and aspirations which the organisation has to meet if it is to retain their services (Hedley, 1992). In response, many voluntary agencies have adopted a bureaucratic approach to the organisation of volunteering, and a model of good practice has been developed which informs much of the prescriptive literature. This involves treating the volunteer as an unpaid

employee whose role is specified in a job description and whose rights and responsibilities are defined in a written agreement between him/her and the organisation. Although the value of this 'workplace model' has been challenged (Davis Smith, 1995), it continues to influence and inform the practice of many agencies.

The organisational context

With the important exception of Lyons and his colleagues' identification of the undisclosed alternative paradigms that underpin attempts to measure the extent of volunteering, the principal themes in the literature pay scant attention to the variety of organisational contexts in which voluntary action takes place. These range across the whole spectrum of human activity from the private, informal world of family and friends to the highly formalised bureaucracy with its detailed 'rule book' and its sharply differentiated statuses and functions. A good deal of volunteering takes place at the bureaucratic end of this spectrum: some of it in statutory agencies such as hospitals and social services departments, and some in the large, formally organised voluntary agencies which share many of the characteristics of the governmental bureaucracy. However, much voluntary action also takes place nearer the other end of the range, where groups of people with common interests or problems band together in self-help groups or grassroots associations to produce a collective response to perceived needs. And between these two poles, there are a variety of ways in which social needs and community

interests are addressed by different combinations of volunteers and paid staff.

There appear to be two implicit assumptions in the literature which could explain why the diversity of ways in which volunteering is experienced receives little attention. The first of these is the view that 'volunteering is volunteering', that what is being measured or described is essentially the same activity, regardless of context. The second, which is perhaps more potent, is the tendency to work within the 'non-profit paradigm' (Lyons et al, 1998). This is unsurprising, given the thrust of UK social policy towards a greater role for voluntary agencies in providing social welfare, and the resulting adoption of the managerial language of effectiveness and efficiency by much of the sector (Commission on the Future of the Voluntary Sector, 1996). In such a climate, volunteers are seen primarily as people who make an unpaid contribution to the work of a voluntary agency under the supervision and control of paid staff, and the workplace model is the accepted means of organising their activities. As a result, we have a body of literature that does not disaggregate voluntary action at various points on the organisational spectrum described above, and which tends to assume that the motivation of volunteers on the one hand and the ways their work can be organised on the other do not vary according to the organisational context of their work.

Four models

Two ongoing pieces of empirical research undertaken by the LSE's Centre for Voluntary Organisation have made possible the identification of four models of volunteer involvement, suggesting that the differences between organisational contexts have important implications for how voluntary action can be encouraged, supported and organised. The first of these pieces of research is a project funded by the Lloyds TSB Foundation of England and Wales aimed at building the capacity of small voluntary agencies. The first stage of this project has involved identifying the key organisational challenges facing small voluntary agencies (defined as those with no more than four full-time staff or their equivalent) through interviews and focus groups with trustees and staff of agencies in two localities and with those who fund their work or support them in other ways (Rochester, 1998a). The second piece of research has focused on community sector organisations that are entirely dependent on voluntary effort. Funded by the Charities Aid Foundation, it aims to develop a framework for identifying the nature and value of the contribution made by organisations of this kind to our collective life and living conditions (Rochester, 1998b).

The second of these two studies is clearly framed by the 'civil society paradigm'. The idea of the 'community sector' has provided a rallying call and a badge of identity for organisations which have felt neglected or excluded by the prevailing view that the voluntary sector is largely

composed of service-providing agencies that are professionally staffed and formally structured. The research has mapped a complex patchwork of benefits accruing from the activities of community sector organisations both to their members and to the wider community. It distinguishes between 'passive' and 'active' members and the inner core of 'leaders', and finds, not surprisingly, that the benefits of participation in terms of personal development and social education increase in proportion to the member's level of activity: 'The more you put in, the more you get out.' Activists tended to become involved initially in specific activities - such as starting a parent and toddler group for the benefit of their own and other people's children - and found increasing satisfaction in taking on greater responsibilities. They felt they were doing 'something useful', they reported that they had opportunities to do things - such as running a community centre - they would otherwise never have experienced, and they said that they were expressing a deeply held belief about the importance of community.

The focus of the small agencies study is on the hybrid bodies which are found on the cusp between the association that is entirely dependent on the voluntary efforts of its members and the fully-fledged non-profit agency where the great majority of the work is undertaken by paid staff. These organisations can be distinguished from voluntary associations because they employ staff to undertake some or all of their operational activities (Billis, 1993). But

unlike larger agencies, their staff teams are not large enough to meet the full range of demands on the organisation and are too small to be organised in a straightforward formal hierarchy.

The research identified ten organisational challenges that posed distinctive dilemmas for small agencies, and looked at some of the ways in which the organisations had responded to them. One of these was the 'challenge of involving volunteers', which included issues about recruitment and retention; maximising involvement; providing support and supervision; and defining volunteer roles and setting boundaries to their commitment. These problems were common to the great majority of the agencies studied, but the responses to them varied according to the roles played by volunteers in the different organisations.

Responses to the challenge of involving volunteers - like the responses to the other organisational challenges identified in the study - followed one of two broad approaches. The first was to adopt some of the systems used in larger agencies, which involve reducing uncertainty by defining roles and responsibilities and clarifying expectations by developing written policies and procedures. The alternative approach was based on the desire to retain the informal characteristics of an organisation in which flexibility is prized and where relationships between individuals are seen as more important than defining their roles and the responsibilities of the positions they occupy (Rochester, 1998c).

An analysis of the different roles played by volunteers in the organisations covered by the two studies, and of the application of the above-mentioned strategies to the organisation of their work, led to the identification of four distinctive kinds of volunteer involvement in small voluntary organisations. These are:

1. *The service delivery model*, where the lion's share of the operational activities of the organisation are carried out by volunteers.
2. *The support role model*, where the role of the volunteer is to support and supplement the work of the paid staff.
3. *The member/activist model*, where all roles are played by volunteers.
4. *The co-worker model*, where the differences in role and distinctions of status between paid staff and volunteers are unclear.

The service delivery model

This model is characterised by unambiguous organisational arrangements and a clear distinction between the roles of volunteers and paid staff. Volunteers are recruited to carry out predetermined and specified tasks, such as providing support to the victims of crime or mediating in disputes between neighbours. The role of paid staff in bodies of this kind is essentially one of recruiting, training, deploying and supporting the work of these front-line workers.

Questions of volunteer motivation are also relatively straightforward. Although those coming forward will be in sympathy with the organisation's mission, it is likely that they will also be attracted by the nature of the activity involved. This may be for reasons of personal development or as a preparation for specific kinds of employment, notably in the provision of advice and counselling services.

There is little difficulty, moreover, in applying the template of the 'workplace model' to the organisation and management of the volunteers in an agency of this kind. The work to be undertaken and the skills and personal qualities required can be specified to a significant degree and form the basis of a selection process similar to that used for paid staff. Potential volunteers can understand the relevance and importance of a formal interview process and the need for character references. And expectations of the nature, range and scale of their contribution to the work of the agency are clear and explicit.

Many organisations of this kind invest quite heavily in an initial training process, which is made possible by the practice of recruiting volunteers in batches rather than singly. This initial training has a number of functions and benefits. As well as equipping the recruits with the skills and knowledge required for their role, the training period inducts them into the language and culture of the organisation and enables them to form appropriate relationships with its paid staff and other

volunteers. It also serves as a final selection process: those who complete the course have demonstrated not only their capability but also their commitment to the agency and its work.

Once they have been trained, the volunteers can look to the paid staff to organise the workload so that they have enough to do to keep them interested but not so much that it becomes a burden. They can expect regular support and supervision on a one-to-one basis and opportunities to exchange experiences with their fellow volunteers. And they may be able to undertake further training to equip them to take on more complex work that involves greater responsibility.

The role of the governing body also tends to be unambiguous: although it is common for the operational volunteers to be represented on the governing body, the distinction between the roles of management committee member and service-delivering volunteer is quite clear. In fact, although it is not uncommon for former service users to become volunteers, or for management committee members to assist with the recruitment and training of the volunteer service-deliverers, the service delivery model is characterised by the clarity and distinctiveness of the roles played by the major elements in the organisation: the users, the service delivery volunteers, the staff and the committee.

The support role model

While the service delivery model is based on an assumption that it is appropriate

for the operational activities of the agency to be undertaken by volunteers, the support role model is found in organisations where this responsibility has been given to paid staff. In order to maximise the time that staff can spend on these activities, volunteers are recruited to play a variety of support roles. They may, for example, act as receptionists, secretaries, administrators or bookkeepers.

In theory, these volunteer 'jobs' may appear to share some of the characteristics of those found in the service-delivery model: the tasks the agency needs to be undertaken and the skills and qualities required to carry them out can be specified with some clarity and in some detail. In practice, however, the situation tends to be more complex. Small agencies lack the resources to conduct major recruitment exercises for two or three ancillary voluntary workers, while the supply of potential recruits with relevant skills and experience is in any case limited. Organisations are more likely to draw on personal contacts to recruit people who are willing to 'lend a hand' and appear to have the ability or potential to contribute in some way to the support needs of the agency.

In the support role model, therefore, at least some volunteers are involved in part because of a direct request for help from a friend, colleague or acquaintance. Others offer their services because they have had experience of the agency and its work, perhaps as a user or a relative of someone who had received services

from it. These points of contact provide opportunities for people with a range of motivations to become involved. These motivations may include a change in life circumstances, such as retirement from paid work or a reduction in the responsibility for child care. In some cases, volunteering of this kind may provide a bridge into paid work. Unlike the service delivery model, where the experience offers the chance to acquire, develop or demonstrate specific skills or competence, the benefits of involvement in a support role may be more general, in the form of improved self-confidence or the demonstration of an ability to work regularly and reliably.

The application of the 'workplace model' to the organisation and management of volunteers in support roles has a number of limitations. The exact scope and nature of the 'job' to be done by a volunteer of this kind is not completely predetermined, but a product of the fit between the tasks the agency needs doing and the ability of the volunteer to undertake them which is negotiated between the two parties. The agreement reached may then need to be renegotiated from time to time as the agency's needs change and the capacity of the volunteer develops. Training will tend to be ad hoc and may be based largely on the 'stand by Nelly' method. Arrangements for support, supervision and appraisal may range from the very informal to the quite tightly structured, depending to a large extent on the culture of the agency, the nature of the work to be done and the needs of the volunteer.

On the whole, the roles of the various elements in the agency - staff, volunteers, committee and users - are separate and distinct, as with the service delivery model. There is, however, one possible area of complexity or ambiguity. Among those who volunteer in support roles may be people who are already involved with the organisation as members of its governing body. Alternatively, volunteers may extend their commitment to the agency by joining the committee. In these circumstances they have to shift between very different roles: as committee members, they are the employers of the paid staff who manage their work as volunteers.

The member/activist model

The third model appears at first sight to be less complex than the others because it lacks one of the four organisational elements: the paid staff. It is the phenomenon defined by Billis (1993) as an association, a group of people who have come together to pursue a common goal, have drawn a boundary around themselves by distinguishing between members and non-members, and have adopted a set of rules by which their affairs are regulated. The goals are pursued and the operational activities are conducted by the members themselves, and not delegated to a separate group of staff, paid or unpaid.

Thus, all the organisational roles are undertaken by the members acting in a voluntary capacity. This is not to say, however, that the work is shared widely or equally: one can easily distinguish between, on the one hand, passive

members who support the aims of the organisation with their name and their subscription and on the other, those who play an active part in its work. And within the latter category, there is a further distinction to be made between the majority and the inner group of very active volunteers on whom the association is heavily dependent.

It is commonly suggested that membership of an association is based on an exchange relationship in which the member secures certain benefits in return for his or her contribution (Knoke and Prensky, 1984; Lansley, 1996). Certainly, any association that failed to deliver some benefits to its members would have difficulty in retaining their involvement, but the notion of exchange tends to suggest that organisations of this kind exist solely for the benefit of their members. Many associations, however, exist to secure public benefits as well as member benefits; indeed, balancing the two concerns is seen as a key challenge for those who lead them (Harris, 1998). Nor does the notion help us to understand the motivation of those who make up the inner core and other active members.

Part of the reason for their involvement is to secure direct benefits. Mothers help to start a parent toddler group because they want their own children to have the stimulus and the social contact with others. Many then find that their active involvement is bringing other advantages in terms of personal development, social education and enhanced feelings of self-esteem. This

can lead to an upward spiral in which successful activity encourages increasing levels of involvement with greater and greater rewards. In addition to these instrumental and expressive personal motives, moreover, many activists are driven by a deeper set of values about the importance of active citizenship and the idea of community.

Involvement in these kinds of organisation can be seen as a journey with an unknown destination. Except in the very short term, the role to be played by any member activist cannot be defined in advance; it will be developed over time in the light of experience, personal growth and reflection. The organisation and management of the work is less about selection, formal training, putting clear boundaries around roles and responsibilities and providing supervision, and more about inviting people to find out what contribution they can make, offering opportunities for personal and social learning and providing mutual support.

Associations are also characterised by high levels of organisational ambiguity. There is no clear-cut division between those who 'own' the organisation, those who undertake its work and those who benefit from its activities - they may in fact be one and the same. As a result, there can be problems over reconciling the pursuit of long-term goals with meeting the immediate needs of individual members, setting priorities, controlling the work of member volunteers (Harris, 1998) and with over-commitment and 'burn-out'.

The co-worker model

The fourth model has something in common with the support role model in that the work of the organisation's staff needs to be supplemented by the efforts of volunteers if the total activities of the agency are to be covered. The difference, however, is that the division of labour is less straightforward and the distinctions of role and of status are blurred. Tasks and responsibilities are allocated through a process of discussion and negotiation which takes full account of the knowledge and skills of each individual in the team - paid staff and volunteers alike - and of the amounts of time they are able to commit to them.

'Co-worker' volunteers share some of the characteristics of member activists. They are not recruited in order to undertake a specific and predetermined set of tasks, or chosen on the basis that they possess the particular skills and qualities required for that role. They participate in the work of the organisation because they identify strongly with its aims and purposes and are prepared to contribute to the collective effort needed to achieve them. The extent to which they remain actively involved may well depend on the extent to which they receive personal and social benefits from the involvement, but much of the initial impetus to take part tends to flow from a commitment to the organisation's mission. Activism of this kind may be rooted either in personal experience of a social need or in deeply held social and political values.

It is not uncommon for the paid staff in organisations of this kind to share the

motivation, commitment and values of their volunteer co-workers. In a situation where the agency does not have sufficient resources to pay all of its activists, they may be seen as the fortunate minority who are receiving a salary in return for the kind of activities they previously undertook in a voluntary capacity.

In theory, the work of the volunteer co-workers (and their paid colleagues) is organised and managed by a non-hierarchical team or collective. But while there are no visible 'managers' and no overt 'management', there are leaders within the team, usually - but not always - drawn from the paid staff. The style of leadership used has been described by Elsdon (1995; pp 144-5) as 'nurturing and enabling' rather than based on 'dominant authority', and 'exerted modestly by example rather than . . . aggressively by demands'. It is exercised at a considerable cost to the key member of staff who takes on the role. Unlike the senior staff member in the first two models, she or he may have to accept that her or his commitment to the organisation is relatively unbounded and that the distinction between their work and their personal life is blurred.

There are also major problems of ambiguity in the governance system of such an agency. If the distinction between the roles of paid staff and volunteers is unclear, so is that between both those groups and the members of the governing body, especially where the volunteer co-workers are also active members of the committee.

Summary: some key differences

These models illustrate the huge diversity in the ways in which volunteering is experienced and in which unpaid work may be organised. Some of the key differences appear to be:

Differences in how volunteers become involved

There are three main variations here. Volunteers may be recruited by an open process to carry out specific tasks and selected according to their ability to meet the demands of these roles (Model One). Or they may be recruited to take on some of the 'non-operational' work of the organisation through a process of networking, and given a role if they appear to have the potential to help with some aspects of the work to be done (Model Two). Or they may be encouraged to associate themselves with the aims and purposes of the organisation and given a series of opportunities to play a more active part in its work in a role that will be defined to a large extent by the volunteer herself or himself (Models Three and Four).

Differences in motivation for volunteering

Although the motivation to volunteer is a complex phenomenon, the emphasis on particular reasons to become a volunteer and to stay involved can be seen to vary. Some become involved because of the nature of the task to be performed and its potential relevance to paid employment (Model One). Others are motivated by the need to feel they are doing something useful, both in terms of the task itself and the purpose of the organisation (Model Two). Others become

involved in order to develop or maintain a particular service or activity (Models Three and Four) and remain active as a result of the opportunities they find for personal growth and development (Model Three).

Differences in the organisation and management of the work

The work of the volunteers in Model One is organised and managed according to the 'workplace model'. The work to be done and the 'conditions of service' are the subject of an explicit agreement comparable to a contract of employment; formal training is provided; there is a clear set of arrangements for support and supervision; and there may even be opportunities for 'promotion'. By contrast, Model Three and Four organisations operate on very different principles and according to a completely different set of 'rules', where roles are negotiated and subject to change rather than fixed and specified in advance. Here, training is seen in terms of the personal development of the individual rather than equipping the work force to tackle certain tasks. Similarly, management concepts such as control and supervision are alien to these kinds of organisation, which operate on the basis of teamwork and personal leadership. Model Two agencies can be located between these two ends of the spectrum. The role played by volunteers is defined to the extent that important areas of work are reserved for the paid staff. Within that boundary too, decisions about the actual tasks to be carried out by an individual volunteer may be a matter of negotiation, but will

in the end be taken by paid staff. Training may address both the needs of the agency for specific skills and the aspirations of the individual volunteer for self-improvement. And crucially, the paid staff will take responsibility for monitoring and supervising the work of the volunteers.

Differences in the governance system

The final set of differences identified by the models concerns the relationship of the volunteers to the governing body of the organisation. (The members of the management committee are themselves volunteers, but it is beyond the scope of the present article to examine their role in detail.) Again, Model One can be placed at one end of a spectrum, where the differentiation of role between the volunteers and the management committee and the relationship between them is fairly unambiguous. At the other end of the spectrum we find Model Three, where the members of the governing body, the volunteers carrying out the work of the organisation and some at least of those using its services are one and the same. A similar degree of ambiguity is found in Model Four. Again, Model Two falls between these two extremes; to a considerable extent, roles are clear and distinct yet there are important areas of ambiguity.

Conclusion: implications for practice and theory

The four models described here are offered as a means of achieving a better understanding of the variety of organisational arrangements through which voluntary action takes place. Such

an understanding is crucial to addressing two key issues in the practice of volunteering. The first of these is the objective adopted by successive governments, among others, of securing the involvement of a larger proportion of the population in volunteering, 'active citizenship' and community action. The recognition that there is no single approach to involving people in voluntary action is an essential precondition for adopting methods that are appropriate to the particular organisational context in which volunteering is to take place. And successful recruitment or involvement strategies will also take account of the different emphases in the motivation of people to get involved with specific kinds of organisation.

The second key issue for practice is how volunteering can be organised so as to maximise not only the contribution made by voluntary effort to the organisation and the achievement of its goals, but also the sense of personal satisfaction and the perceived benefits of the experience to the volunteer. One acknowledged way of tackling this challenge has been to adopt the workplace model and it is clear that such an approach is appropriate to some organisational contexts. On the other hand, it is clear from the models presented here that this is only part of the answer. In some situations, the limitations of the approach may need to be recognised and a modified version will be appropriate. In others, a completely different approach based on another set of rules will be required.

The importance for the practice of volunteering of understanding the variety of organisational arrangements for voluntary action is twofold: to help us increase the numbers involved in volunteering and make the experience more rewarding for all the parties concerned. What then are the implications for the academic study of voluntary action? The models presented here are put forward tentatively, and in any case are drawn from a limited section of the whole spectrum of organisational arrangements - confined firstly to the voluntary sector and secondly to small organisations with few or no paid staff. They are offered not as a final word on the subject but with a view to establishing the importance of studying the organisational context of volunteering. If, as I hope, this case has been made, there are three immediate implications. The first of these is for the design of future surveys of the extent of voluntary action: we need to know not only who is doing what but also under what circumstances. The second is for the study of the motivation to volunteer: here we need to know much more about the reasons why people become involved in different kinds of volunteering, and to what extent this is due to personal psychology on the one hand and social situation on the other. The third, and perhaps most demanding, is the need to develop our understanding of the organisational behaviour of volunteers and the people with whom they interact in different institutional arrangements. Then, and only then, will we begin to understand the complex phenomenon of voluntary action in all its rich diversity.

References

- Aves, G. (1969), *The Voluntary Worker in the Social Services: Report of a Committee jointly set up by NCSS and NISWT under the Chairmanship of Geraldine M. Aves*, Allen and Unwin.
- Billis, D. (1993), *Organising Public and Voluntary Agencies*, Routledge.
- Cnaan, R., and Goldberg-Glen, R. (1990), 'Motivation to Volunteer in Human Services' in *Supplement to the Proceedings of the 1990 ACAS Conference Vol 1*, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics.
- Cnaan, R., Handy, F., and Wadsworth, M. (1996), 'Defining Who Is a Volunteer: Conceptual and Empirical Considerations', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 25 (2), pages 364-383.
- Commission on the Future of the Voluntary Sector (1996), *Meeting the Challenge of Change: Voluntary Action into the 21st Century*, NCVO.
- Davis Smith, J. (1992), 'What We Know About Volunteering: Information from the Surveys' in Hedley, R., and Davis Smith, J. (eds), *Volunteering and Society: Principles and Practice*, NCVO.
- Davis Smith, J. (1995), 'Should Volunteers be Managed?' in Billis, D., and Harris, M. (eds), *Voluntary Agencies: Challenges of Organisation and Management*, Macmillan.
- Davis Smith, J. (1998), *The 1997 National Survey of Volunteering*, Institute for Volunteering Research.

- Elsdon, K. (1995), *Voluntary Organisations: Citizenship, Learning and Change*, NIACE.
- Field, J., and Hedges, B. (1984), *A National Survey of Volunteering*, Social and Community Planning Research.
- Harris, M. (1998), 'Doing it Their Way: Organisational Challenges for Voluntary Associations', *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27 (2), pages 144-158.
- Hedley, R. (1992), 'Organising and Managing Volunteers' in Hedley, R., and Davis Smith, J. (eds), *Volunteering and Society: Principles and Practice*, NCVO.
- Knoke, D., and Prensky, D. (1984), 'What Relevance do Organization Theories have for Voluntary Associations?', *Social Science Quarterly* 65 (1), pages 3-20.
- Lansley, J. (1996), 'Membership Participation and Ideology in Large Voluntary Organisations: The Case of the National Trust', *Voluntas* 7 (3), pages 221-240.
- Lynn, P., and Davis Smith, J. (1991), *The 1991 National Survey of Volunteering in the UK*, The Volunteer Centre UK.
- Lyons, M., Wijkstrom, P., and Clary, G. (1998), 'Comparative Studies of Volunteering: What is Being Studied', *Voluntary Action* 1 (1), pages 45-54.
- Moore, D. (1996), *Action or Anarchy? A Study of Volunteers/Staff Relationships in a Campaigning Organisation*, MSc dissertation, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics.
- Rochester, C. (1992), 'Community Organisations and Voluntary Action' in Hedley, R., and Davis Smith, J. (eds), *Volunteering and Society: Principles and Practice*, NCVO.
- Rochester, C. (1998a), *Small Voluntary Agencies: Organisational Challenges and Responses*, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics.
- Rochester, C. (1998b), *Social Benefits: Exploring the Value of Community Sector Organisations*, Research Report 3, Charities Aid Foundation.
- Rochester, C. (1998c), *Neither Fish nor Flesh nor Good Red Herring: Exploring the Organisational Features of Small Voluntary Agencies*, Paper presented to the 1998 annual meeting of ARNOVA, Seattle.
- Thomas, A., and Finch, H. (1990), *On Volunteering: A Qualitative Research Study of Images, Motivations and Experiences*, The Volunteer Centre UK and SCPR.
- Tihanyi, P. (1991), *Volunteers: Why They Come and Why They Stay*, Case Study 1, Centre for Voluntary Organisation, London School of Economics.