



EMERGING AREAS OF VOLUNTEERING

ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series
Volume 1, Number 2
Second Edition

Funded by The UPS Foundation

Jeffrey L. Brudney, Editor
University of Georgia
School of Public and International Affairs
Department of Public Administration and Policy
Athens, GA 30602-1615

© 2005 Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action

The *ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series* is a publication of the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA).

Excerpts of more than 100 words from this publication may not be reproduced without permission.

ARNOVA Executive Office
340 West Michigan Street, Canal Level -- Suite A
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 684-2120
Fax: (317) 684-2128
Website: www.arnova.org



CROSS-NATIONAL VOLUNTEERING: A DEVELOPING MOVEMENT?

Justin Davis Smith
Angela Ellis
Georgina Brewis

This chapter reviews the extent and nature of cross-national volunteering and takes a critical look at ways in which it is emerging as a powerful force in globalised civil society. It argues that there has been an absolute increase in the number of people volunteering outside their own national boundaries and tangible changes in the nature of this activity, with a move to more mutually beneficial forms of cross-national engagement, alongside a somewhat contradictory growth in short-term, 'vacation' or 'tourism' volunteering. The chapter looks at both the benefits and drawbacks of cross-national volunteering for the key stakeholding groups – the volunteers; the sending and receiving organisations; and the host community – and concludes with some recommendations for policy and practice.

Introduction

The technological and communications revolutions of the past decade have enabled more and more people to engage with social and environmental issues on a global scale. As people have become less constrained by national boundaries their interest in global issues has increased, and this, combined with a world-wide upsurge of interest in volunteering, has led to a rapid growth in cross-national forms of voluntary action (Sherraden, 2001; Iriye, 2002).

The movement of volunteers from one country to another is not a new phenomenon. Its roots can be traced back at least as far as the mid-nineteenth century when the Red Cross first started sending volunteers overseas (Beigbeder, 1991). It has become closely associated in recent years with such well-known sending organisations as the Peace Corps, United Nations Volunteers and Voluntary Service Overseas. What is new, however, is the recent dramatic increase in the scale of cross-national volunteering, and the form such activity has taken.

This chapter reviews the extent and nature of cross-national volunteering and takes a critical look at ways in which it is emerging as a powerful force in globalised civil society. It argues that there has been an absolute increase in the number of

people volunteering outside their own national boundaries and tangible changes in the nature of this activity, with a move to more mutually beneficial forms of cross-border engagement, alongside a somewhat contradictory growth in short-term, 'vacation' or 'tourism' volunteering. The chapter concludes with some recommendations for policy and practice.

What is Cross-National Volunteering?

Simply defined, cross-national volunteering is any form of volunteering that involves people traveling from one country to another to volunteer. Cross-national volunteering can be classified according to a number of characteristics, which help to define the phenomenon more precisely. These dimensions include: geographical scale; function; direction; level of government involvement; and time scale.

Geographical Scale. The first classifier is geographical scale – the level at which the volunteering is operating and the scale at which it is organised geographically. Cross-national volunteering can usefully be divided into two main types: trans-national and international volunteering. The two types can be distinguished by the degree of exchange and cooperation that takes place across national boundaries. McBride, Benitez and Sherraden (2003, p. 10), for example, draw a distinction between international service programmes which “send people from the home country to other countries,” and trans-national programmes which involve exchange “between two or more countries,” and “where the servers are expected to spend service time in a host country as well as their country of origin.” “Cross-national volunteering” is much wider in scope than “cross-national service”, and includes shorter-term, more informal forms of participation, but the same distinctions can be drawn.

Function. The second classifier is function. Cross-national volunteering can be seen to operate on a development continuum from emergency relief work (e.g. building shelters for victims of natural disasters or refugees), through filling skill shortages in the host country on a short-term basis (e.g. teaching science), to sustainable development and conservation work (e.g. training science teachers and conservation officers).

McBride, Benitez and Sherraden (2003) found that the most common areas of service among trans-national programmes were human and social services (91%), followed by education (86%), personal development (86%) and cultural integration (86%). Within international service programmes the most common forms of service were education (85%), human and social services (80%) and community development (75%).

Direction. Closely connected to the above, the third classifier of cross-national volunteering is direction -- whether volunteers are moving North to North; North to South; South to South; or South to North⁸ – a characteristic which often reflects the

⁸ We are using the terms North and South to refer broadly to the industrialised nations of the North and the developing nations of the South.

underlying ethos or development aims of the programme. The shift in the direction of cross-national volunteering, away from the traditional North to South model toward a South to South and even a South to North model, is one of the most significant developments in this area in recent years. We return to this issue below.

Level Of Government Involvement. Fourthly, cross-national volunteering activities can be classified by the degree to which national governments are involved, on both the sending and receiving ends. Schemes range from those that are totally government-led to those that are led solely by the voluntary sector (Davis Smith, 2002). Some governments have launched their own programmes (sometimes as alternatives to military service); others provide funding to voluntary sector programmes; while others see their role primarily in terms of developing a supportive legislative framework to facilitate such activity. Some governments, of course, have shown no interest in cross-national volunteering or, indeed, any other sort of volunteering.

Evidence suggests that government involvement may be less significant in cross-national volunteering than in other forms of volunteering. In their study of 210 civic service programmes from around the world, McBride, Benitez and Sherraden (2003) found that 95% of the trans-national programmes, and 92% of the international service programmes, were administered by voluntary agencies, whereas 52% of national service programmes were administered by government agencies.

The motivations for governments to get involved in cross-national volunteering are mixed. They include a desire to provide an alternative to compulsory military service (Davis Smith, 2002) and to maintain a national presence abroad, for example, by using volunteers to improve people's image of the sending nation. Jedlicka (1990) argues that the latter was especially pertinent during the Cold War, when Peace Corps volunteers were seen as a non-military means to wage an ideological battle. Cross-national volunteering is also seen as a way of helping governments to deliver on broader policy agendas, such as increasing levels of active citizenship and/or enhancing youth development (Daftary & McBride, 2004).

Duration. The fifth classifying feature is time scale – whether the cross-national volunteering takes place on a short-term basis (for example, for one day or one week) or a long-term basis (for example, for one or two years). The evidence suggests that most activity is likely to be between about four and seven months. McBride, Benitez and Sherraden (2003), for example, found that 91% of international service programmes had an average duration of 6.6 months, while the average for 71% of the trans-national programmes was slightly shorter at 4.4 months. However, given the rise in vacation volunteering opportunities in recent years, which we discuss below, it is likely that the average duration of cross-national volunteering overall is likely to be slightly shorter.

Developments in Cross-National Volunteering

Cross-national volunteering has been shaped by wider societal changes taking place within both sending and recipient countries over the past several decades.

These include changes in development paradigms, with greater emphasis on long-term sustainability in place of short-term relief; a rapid increase in the number of professional development workers and agencies operating in developing countries; and significant improvements in communications technology and transport (see for example, United Nations Volunteers, 1989; Salamon, 1995; Iriye, 2002).

Three key developments can be identified in cross-national volunteering in recent years. First, a rapid expansion has occurred in the number of volunteering programmes operating across national boundaries, with a parallel increase in the number of people taking part in such programmes. Second, a shift in the pattern and direction of cross-national programmes has taken place, in particular a move away from the traditional North to South model toward an alternative South to South model and a South to North model. Third, and intrinsically linked to this shift in direction, is a re-thinking and re-formulation of the underlying ethos of cross-national volunteering.

Growth In Numbers Engaging In Cross-National Volunteering. Although there is little hard evidence available on the true extent of cross-national volunteering world-wide, most estimates point to an absolute increase in the number of people taking part, an increase which has taken place during three identifiable 'waves' in recent history.

Cross-national volunteering has a long history. As Tarrow (1998) argues, long before the development of modern communications technology, we saw the diffusion of a number of volunteer movements across national borders (see also Kekk & Sikkink, 1998). Arguably, cross-national volunteering started with religious missionaries in the late 18th century (Daftary & McBride, 2004). By 1900, for example, British voluntary societies supported 10,000 missionaries overseas (Porter, 1999).

It was not until the early years of the twentieth century, however, that cross-national volunteering developed into a sizeable movement. Beigbeder (1991) pinpoints the First World War as the catalyst to such activity -- the voluntary response to devastation caused by World War I saw a significant increase in the number of people going beyond their own national boundaries to volunteer their services. The 1920s saw the establishment of several programmes to develop cross-national volunteering, for example, Service Civil International (SCI), which was set up to promote volunteering as an alternative to military service and to organise trans-national workcamps across Europe and India.

Cross-national volunteering grew steadily from this initial burst of activity in the 1920s, until the late 1950s and early 1960s when a number of factors (notably war, improvements in transport and communication, and de-colonisation) combined to produce another 'explosion' in scale (Capeling Aleckija, quoted in United Nations Volunteers, 2001). The 1960s saw the formation of several long-term overseas programmes, including, most significantly, the US Peace Corps in 1961. Meanwhile, the Cold War stimulated thousands of volunteers from both sides of the Iron Curtain to work together in camps and on projects in an attempt to increase international solidarity (Gillette, 1968). The 1960s (at least, in the United Kingdom) also saw

for the first time significant numbers of people taking 'years out' from full-time education (Jones, 2004). In 1965 the Overseas Development Institute estimated there were about 17,000 international volunteers working on about 160 programmes (Moyes, 1966). By 1968, it was estimated that the figure had grown to 20,000 long-term volunteers, operating out of 200 organisations in 12 countries and located in over 100 developing countries and territories (Gillette, 1968). Since the terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September 2001 applications for the Peace Corps have reportedly doubled.

Up-to-date figures are hard to come by, but evidence suggests that a third dramatic increase in cross-national volunteering has taken place in the past decade, fuelled by such factors as the decline in compulsory military service and a growing interest in volunteering *per se* throughout the world (Davis Smith, 2002). The United Nations International Year of Volunteers in 2001, for example, was celebrated in over 130 countries (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2002). In 1990 United Nations Volunteers estimated that there were some 33,000 international volunteers working on a global basis, 90% of whom were from Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries (Beigbeder, 1991). Between 1999 and 2000, Voluntary Services Overseas reported an increase in applications of 59% over the previous two years, and an increase in the number of volunteers sent overseas of 17% (Thomas, 2001). In 2003 United Nations Volunteers reported a record year for overseas volunteers. Research on 'Gap Year' activities⁹ found that in the UK alone in 2004 there were 800 organisations offering overseas volunteering placements in 200 countries. Together, these offered around 350,000 placements each year (Jones, 2004).

Reflecting the increase in the number of cross-national volunteers, there has been an increase in the number of countries engaging in cross-national volunteering. In the 1950s and 60s, it was predominantly former colonial powers and the most economically developed countries which sent international volunteers. In recent years, however, a wider variety of countries, including Korea, China, Philippines, Kenya and India, have established programmes, with varying degrees of state involvement (see for example, Voluntary Service Overseas, undated).

Patterns Of Movement. A second significant development in cross-national volunteering in recent years has been the change in the direction of movement of volunteers between countries. Traditionally, the flow of cross-national volunteers was from countries in the North to those in the South. Recently, however, there has also been an increase in the numbers of people from countries in the South volunteering either in other countries in the South or in countries in the North. Although United Nations Volunteers established the Domestic Development Service as early as 1976 to encourage South to South volunteering, and 70% of their 5,635 volunteers in 2003 were from the South, it is only within the past decade that other programmes have begun to follow suit (see Andrienasolo and Leigh in United Nations Volunteers,

⁹ Jones, A. (2004) defines 'Gap Years' as "any period of time between 3 and 24 months which an individual takes 'out' of formal education, training or the workplace, and where the time out sits in the context of a larger career trajectory" (p.8).

2001; United Nations Volunteers, 2004). In 1999, Voluntary Service Overseas introduced a South to South volunteering programme, which is now operating in Kenya, India and the Philippines (Voluntary Service Overseas, 2001).

A linked development has been the growth in trans-national volunteering, whereby volunteers from one country are increasingly taking part in exchanges with people from other countries and volunteering side-by-side with people of other nationalities. The North American Community Service programme (NACS), for example, was first piloted in 2002 as an initiative to place young people from Mexico, the US and Canada together in community service programmes in each of the three countries, with the aim of fostering the development of North American co-operation and awareness. Similarly, the US-Russia Volunteer Initiative (USRVI) was launched in 2004 with the aim of engaging both Russian and American citizens, organisations, and businesses in co-operative volunteer activities through short-term (approximately six-week) bilateral exchanges.

The Changing Ethos Of Cross-National Volunteering. The above changes in patterns of cross-national volunteering reflect broader changes in the ethos of the volunteering movement, away from a view of volunteering as a 'gift relationship' toward an emphasis on volunteering as a form of 'exchange'. In recent years there has been a growing awareness that the volunteer and host community relationship is not one of active 'giver' and passive 'receiver,' but one of mutually beneficial exchange in which the volunteer receives as much (if not more) than they give (Daftary & McBride, 2004).

Reflecting this change in ethos, the 1960s model of cross-national volunteering, as advocated by writers such as Gillette (1968), in which relatively unskilled young people from the North were promoted as a solution to the perceived 'middle-level manpower gap' in the South, has also been challenged. There has been a move on the part of sending organisations to recruit people with specific skills to volunteer in 'strategy driven' roles reflecting a new commitment to long-term goals of sustainable development (Daftary & McBride, 2004).

At the same time, however, there have also been a number of contradictory developments. In particular these more positive changes within cross-national volunteering have to some extent been undermined by the growth of 'volunteer tourism' or 'volunteer vacations' and the mass-market approach to packaging cross-national volunteering as an integral part of gap years. Such developments apply particularly to young people who are increasingly taking a year 'out' of education, but also include older people who may be looking for a career change or a career break or who have reached retirement.

Cross-national volunteering is increasingly being seen as a cheap way to travel, as a quick and 'easy' way to immerse oneself in another culture, as a career break, or as a form of career development. At this writing, some organisations readily admit that their programmes are more geared toward providing experience, travel opportunities and skills building for the volunteers than they are toward providing benefits for the host communities.

A plethora of organisations now offer short-term volunteering opportunities for

people with one to four weeks to spare and often demand that volunteers essentially cover all the costs themselves, as with a vacation or holiday. For example, since 1982 Conservation Volunteers Australia has been sending international volunteers (now around 1,200 annually) on conservation holiday experiences. Their short-term programme sends Australian volunteers to places such as California, Montana, Mexico, Costa Rica and New Zealand on two to four week packages (Davies, 2002).

Implicit within this growth of volunteer tourism and mass-market, cross-national volunteering has been a change in people's motivations for engagement. As Brown (2003) argues, "In five years the gap year has metamorphosed from a radical activity of a rebellious student generation into an obligation that must be fulfilled by ambitious future professionals. It had spawned in the process a lucrative commercial market providing tourist style trips." The ethos behind individual cross-national volunteering schemes and people's motivations to get involved are likely to influence significantly the nature and outcomes of such programmes in the future.

Key Issues within Cross-National Volunteering

Two key issues face the cross-national volunteering movement. The resolution of these issues will to some extent determine whether or not the movement continues to thrive and develop over the next decade. The first is the thorny issue of who is the principal beneficiary – the volunteer or the host community – which returns us to some of the underlying philosophical and ethical issues regarding such programmes. The second concerns the issue of access and whether or not cross-national volunteering can be seen as an open, democratic movement, or the preserve of an educated elite from the developed world.

Who Benefits And How? One of the major issues facing the cross-national volunteering movement is the impact of participation – who (if anyone) is benefiting from cross-national volunteering, and in what ways? As Daftary and McBride (2004) argue, "While there may be positive effects of international service, there are undoubtedly potential negative effects as well, marked by elitism, state interests and imperialism" (p. 3).

Individual volunteers. The evidence suggests that it may be the volunteers themselves who gain the most from cross-national volunteering (McBride, Benitez & Sherraden, 2003). Certainly cross-national volunteers can derive many benefits from their experience, from hard and soft skills, to personal development, cultural awareness and increasing appreciation of the importance of active citizenship (Thomas, 2001; Davis Smith, 2002). However, several factors are serving to limit these potentially positive impacts. Research on returned volunteers by Thomas (2001), for example, found that while cross-national volunteering can increase an individual's skills, once they had returned home these skills went largely unrecognised by employers: "The majority of volunteers did not feel they were able or had the opportunity to exploit the volunteering experience in the work place" (p. 43).

In addition to being unable to realise the full benefit of their new skills, Thomas (2001) found that for many volunteers the process of "returning to the UK had not

been easy" (p. 42). Indeed, the difficulties that volunteers face when returning home have led to the establishment in the UK of an association called Returned Volunteer Action, which seeks to ease the process of return by encouraging returned volunteers to reflect on their experiences and by persuading sending organisations to provide greater support for them when they arrive home.

Receiving And Sending Organizations. Organisations involved in cross-national volunteering, at both the sending and receiving ends, report benefits from engagement in such programmes. Evaluations of the European Voluntary Service Programme (Structure of Operational Support for the European Voluntary Service, 1999, 2000), a European trans-national volunteering programme for young people established by the European Commission in 1998, draw attention to the multiple benefits accruing to participating agencies. Those involved in recruiting and sending volunteers overseas saw the programme as a learning experience, and an opportunity for inter-cultural learning, for finding new partners, and for sharing information and expertise. Those involved in hosting or receiving the volunteers drew attention to the enhanced human resource capacity and the opportunities for partnership that work developed.

However, both sets of agencies also identified drawbacks from involvement. Both criticized excessive bureaucracy and 'form-filling' and delays in payment, which often resulted in the agencies being out-of-pocket. Receiving agencies, especially small ones, were particularly critical of shortfalls in funding with two-thirds saying that they were unable to raise complementary funds to cover the costs of board and lodging for volunteers. Sending agencies expressed concerns about the quality of some of the host organisations to which volunteers had been dispatched and the lack of sufficient quality control mechanisms. For their part, receiving agencies complained about a conflict of aims between those who saw the main focus of the programme on the young people and those who saw it as on the help the young people can give.

Host communities. A similar issue of the balance between positive and negative impacts is also evident with regard to host communities. An evaluation of Voluntary Service Overseas' English Language Programme in China pointed to considerable achievements for the local community in terms of the development of human capital through the acquisition of English language skills and new styles of teaching (Lusk & Rogers, 2001). Similarly, an evaluation of the North American Community Service (NACS) pilot found the programme had been successful in forging closer links between participating countries by challenging negative perceptions volunteers might hold about other countries (Sherraden & Benitez, 2003).

However, while cross-national volunteering can act as a positive force for change in host communities, there is a body of opinion that suggests that in some instances it may do more harm than good. In particular, more traditional forms of international volunteering, whereby volunteers from the North deliver 'development' to the South, can serve to reinforce a sense of dependency between the 'receiving' and 'giving' nations (Returned Volunteer Action, 1991). Rather than challenging the status quo, cross-national volunteering may simply be serving to reinforce it: "... the transfer of skills and resources which volunteer practice embodies also carries with it a tendency to further embed economically dependent countries into the current status quo of international relations" (Returned Volunteer Action, 1991, Preface).

In addition, the way in which cross-national volunteering is promoted by organisations to potential new volunteers, and the principles on which it is sometimes based, serve to reinforce these notions of dependency. As Simpson (2004) points out, the gap-year industry roots the legitimacy of their programmes in an over-simplistic concept of the 'third world' where there is a 'need' to be met by young unskilled international labour. Thomas (2001) argues that these issues are heightened by a general lack of knowledge and understanding on behalf of the volunteers: "... specific knowledge about developing countries and international volunteering programmes is often vague and sometimes wrapped up in imagery of a colonial past" (p. 25). This problem is intensified as often the volunteers receive allowances much higher than local wages, live in far better accommodations than local people and may employ servants to perform domestic chores (Roberts, 1995).

Sending volunteers overseas can also serve to create or reinforce inequalities and rivalries between communities within a host country, for example, if one district or village receives more volunteers or foreign aid than another (Sherraden & Benitez, 2003). Too great a dependence on foreign volunteers can also make a country vulnerable if the sudden withdrawal of international volunteers is demanded by the outbreak of, say, war or terrorist attacks. For instance, the Nigerian civil war in 1967 necessitated the withdrawal of all 170 Voluntary Service Overseas volunteers from the country, the vast majority of whom were teaching in state schools and represented a substantial element within Nigerian education (Adams, 1968, p. 215).

Accessibility. A second issue relates to the accessibility of international volunteering opportunities and the extent to which opportunities for engagement are open to people from different countries and different population groups within countries. As has been noted above, recent developments have led to more and more countries getting involved in cross-national volunteering. Thomas (2001) argues that international volunteering can now rightly be seen as a global phenomenon. This claim is backed up by evidence from the United Nations, which found that of the 5,635 mid-career professionals who served with United Nations Volunteers in 2003, 70% were from developing countries (United Nations Volunteers, 2004). Other commentators, however, argue that such developments have been slow to take off, and that cross-national volunteering opportunities are still very much the preserve of citizens of the developed world (see, for example, McBride, Benitez & Sherraden, 2003).

Attempts to widen access have been hampered by variations between countries in the legal status of volunteers, and differential systems in place for national insurance, which have served to disadvantage volunteers from some countries. The European Voluntary Service programme, for example, has been bedevilled by problems caused by the fact that in some countries volunteers are covered by social security regulations, but in others they are excluded (Davis Smith, 2002).

On an individual level, in countries in both the North and South, access to cross-national volunteering tends to be restricted to people from higher socio-economic groups. Many cross-national volunteering programmes have selection criteria that work against more inclusive schemes. McBride, Benitez & Sherraden (2003), for

example, found that 91% of trans-national and 73% of international programmes had age criteria for inclusion, while a significant number also had skills and language criteria. Cross-national volunteering is also prohibitively expensive for many people, restricting participation to the more affluent. Jones (2004) found that a typical fee for overseas volunteering placements from UK organisations was between £500 to £2000. Evidence suggests that these criteria, and other factors, are restricting the diversity of participants. Braham (1999), for example, describes international volunteers as primarily middle-class. Similarly, Jones (2004) found that participants on Gap Years in the UK were predominantly white, females, and from relatively affluent, middle class backgrounds.

Steps have been taken to ensure that cross-national volunteering becomes more open to all. For example, schemes such as those provided by Raleigh International, a UK-based youth development organisation that places volunteers around the world, offer subsidised places to volunteers from the host countries. Yet, however well-intentioned such schemes may be, different treatment of volunteers on the same programme may cause problems and reinforce dependent relationships. For example, the American volunteers taking part on the NACS pilot received \$100 dollars a week more than the Mexican and Canadian volunteers, leading to resentment amongst many participants (Sherraden & Benitez, 2003).

Conclusion

Although not new in itself, cross-national volunteering has emerged in recent years as an increasingly significant form of volunteerism -- both in terms of scale and impact. Fuelled by a world-wide interest in volunteering, changing development paradigms, and the move in a number of countries to replace compulsory military service with a voluntary, community-based alternative, the number of cross-national volunteering programmes and the range of different countries offering such programmes have risen significantly.

Alongside the expansion of such programmes, the past couple of decades have also witnessed a fundamental shift in the ethos and philosophy of cross-national volunteering, away from a focus on emergency relief toward a model more in tune with the sustainable aims of contemporary development practice. Symptomatic of this shift has been the move away from the traditional North to South model of engagement toward an alternative South to South, South to North and trans-national model. However, accompanying these more positive developments has been a trend toward the expansion of mass market, volunteer tourism, which has threatened to reinforce some of the power imbalances of the past. In addition, despite the best efforts of a number of sending organisations to open up access to cross-national volunteering to a broader constituency, it remains the case that most volunteers engaged abroad (particularly from the developed world) are drawn from more economically developed and better-educated segments of the community.

What of the implications for policy and practice? Inter-governmental agencies such as the United Nations and the Council of Europe can do more to encourage the take-up of cross-national volunteering by a wider range of countries, particularly

from less economically developed regions of the world. National governments, similarly, can do more to stimulate the development of such programmes, either by establishing them themselves or by funding the voluntary sector to deliver them. Governments also have an important role to play in providing a supportive legislative framework in which volunteering can flourish, and in looking for ways to better harmonise social security and national insurance regulations to ensure that volunteers from certain countries are not disadvantaged economically when traveling overseas.

Sending organisations, meanwhile, need to reflect on ways of widening participation in such programmes and on providing more effective support to volunteers, both whilst abroad and upon returning home, to ensure the benefits of engagement are maximised for all stakeholders -- the volunteers, the host community and the sending and receiving agencies.

Finally, there is a need for more research in this field, particularly into the impact of cross-national volunteering on the various stakeholders -- the volunteers, the sending organisations and the host community -- and on the relationship between programme design, and underlying ethos, and the realisation of these benefits. Only then will we be fully able to evaluate the extent, effects, and implications of cross-national volunteering.

References

- Adams, M. (1968). *VSO: The story of the first ten years*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Anheier, H., & Salamon, L. (2001). *Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Initial comparisons* (Civil Society Working Paper 10). London: London School of Economics, Centre for Civil Society.
- Beigbeder, Y. (1991). *The role and status of international humanitarian volunteers and organisations: The right and duty to humanitarian assistance*. London: Dordrecht.
- Braham, M. (1999). *Volunteers for development: A test of the post-materialist hypothesis in Britain, c.1965-1987* (Discussion Papers in Economic and Social History, No. 30). Oxford: University of Oxford.
- Brown, P. (2003, September 16). Mind the gap: The student year out may do more harm than good. *The Guardian*. Retrieved July 2004, from <http://education.guardian.co.uk/students/gaoyear/story/0,12763,1037642,00.html>
- Council of Europe. (2000). *European convention on the promotion of a transnational long term voluntary service for young people* (European Treaty Series No. 175). Retrieved June 23, 2004, from <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Reports/Html/175.htm>
- Daftary, D., & McBride, A. M. (2004). *International service: Diplomacy, aid, development, or self-service?* (Working Paper). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Davies, J. (2002). Research notes: Exploring open spaces and protecting natural places. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 1(2&3), 173-180.
- Davis Smith, J. (2002). *Civic service in Western Europe*. Paper presented at

- the IANYS Conference, Argentina.
- Gillette, A. (1968). *One million volunteers: The story of volunteer youth service*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Institute for Volunteering Research. (2002). *IYV global evaluation*. Retrieved July 2004, from www.worldvolunteerweb.org
- Irish, I., & Simon, K. (2002, July 10). *Legal issues affecting volunteering*. Paper presented at the Fifth ISTR Conference, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Iriye, A. (2002). *Global community: The role of international organisations in the making of the contemporary world*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jedlicka, A. (1990). *Volunteerism and world development: Pathway to a new world*. New York: Praeger.
- Jones, A. (2004). *Review of gap year provision* (Research Report No. 555). London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Keck, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lusk, D., & Rogers, S. (2001). *English and disadvantage: A study of the impact of VSO's ELT programme in China*. London: VSO.
- McBride, A., Benitez, C., & Sherraden, M. (2003). *The forms and nature of civic service: A global assessment*. St. Louis, MO: Washington University in St. Louis, Center for Social Development, Global Service Institute.
- Moyes, A. (1966). *Volunteers in development*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Porter, A. (Ed.). (1999). *The Oxford history of the British Empire: The nineteenth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Returned Volunteer Action. (1991). *For whose benefit? Racism and overseas development work*. London: Returned Volunteer Action.
- Roberts, G. (1995). *Handbook for development workers overseas*. London: Returned Volunteer Action.
- Salamon, L. (1995). *The global associational revolution: The rise of the third sector on the world scene*. London: Demos.
- Sharma, A., & Bell, M. (2002). *Beating the drum of international volunteering? Exploring motivations to volunteer among black and Asian communities* (MRS Conference Paper 31). Retrieved from <http://www.trbi.co.uk/research2002/Anjul&Matthew.PDF>
- Sherraden, M. (2001). *Developing transnational social policy: A North American community service programme* (Working Paper 01-10). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development, Global Service Institute.
- Sherraden, M., & Benitez, C. (2003). *North American community service pilot project* (Research Report). St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development.
- Simpson, K. (2004). 'Doing development': The GAP year, volunteer-tourists and a popular practice of development. *Journal of International Development*, 16(5), 681-692.

- Structure for Operational Support. (1999). *European voluntary service: The hosting organisations perspective*. Brussels: Structure for Operational Support.
- Structure for Operational Support. (2000). *European voluntary service: The sending organisations perspective*. Brussels: Structure for Operational Support.
- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, G. (2001). *Human traffic: Skills, employers and international volunteering*. London: Demos.
- United Nations Volunteers. (2004, June 15). *Expanding the reach of volunteering* (Press Release). Retrieved July 2004, from http://www.unv.org/infobase/news_releases/2004/04_06_15AR.htm
- Voluntary Service Overseas. (n.d.). *The role of volunteers in international development* (Position Paper). Retrieved June 2004, from <http://www.vso.org.uk/publications/positionpapers/>
- Voluntary Service Overseas. (2001). *Southern volunteer programmes: Learning review of the 'South to South pilot.'* London: Volunteer Service Overseas.
- Woods, D. (1981). International research on volunteers abroad. In D. H. Smith and F. Elkin (Eds.), *Volunteers, voluntary associations and development* (pp.196-206). Leiden: Brill.