



**UN**

**Volunteers**

inspiration in action

# **The Evolution of International Volunteering**

**Benjamin J. Lough, Ph.D.**

**University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

# The Evolution of International Volunteering

Written for presentation at the International Volunteer Service Exchange Conference, 12-13 October 2015, Beijing, China

Author: Benjamin J. Lough, Ph.D.  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Published by United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme  
Bonn, Germany

## About UNV

The United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme is the UN organisation that contributes to peace and development through volunteerism worldwide. Volunteerism is a powerful means of engaging people in tackling development challenges, and it can transform the pace and nature of development. Volunteerism benefits both society at large and the individual volunteer by strengthening trust, solidarity and reciprocity among citizens, and by purposefully creating opportunities for participation.

[www.unv.org](http://www.unv.org)

UNV is administered by the United Nations  
Development Programme (UNDP)



## Historical Evolution of International Volunteering

International volunteering, also historically referred to as “export volunteering” and “overseas volunteering” began as a movement in the early 20th century under the umbrella of enlightenment education, religious instruction, and disaster recovery [1]. In reaction to the damage and devastation caused by World War I, workcamp movements and early missionary service were the first expressions of international service on a large scale. In the 1920s, international workcamps and volunteer armies were established as peaceful alternatives to war. One of the oldest international volunteer service organisations, Service Civil International, was established in 1934 to promote international understanding and to reconstruct areas devastated by disaster and war [2]–[4].

During the era of development following decolonisation, states and transnational social organisations sent volunteers to help the former colonial territories to develop economically. Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, camps of volunteers grew as non-governmental organisations mobilised young people to supply emergency assistance and economic relief to newly independent countries [5]. This movement paralleled the growth of large transnational institutions, including the Bretton Woods institutions of 1944 and the United Nations in 1945. It was within this system of international cooperation that most of the government-sponsored international volunteer cooperation organisations (IVCOs) began to emerge.

While the reasons for launching government-sponsored international volunteer organisations during the late 1950’s and early 1960’s varied, a principal aim was to meet the need for technical skills and “middle-level manpower” in developing countries [6, p. 2]. In response to requests for development assistance from newly-independent countries, the United Nations designated the 1960s as the First Development Decade [6]. At the same time, the international community was deliberating how to get more youth engaged and participating in development activities. Youth from industrialised countries were beginning to organise and express interest in applying their skills towards the development effort [7].

Initially, governments and NGOs were sceptical of involving young volunteers in development activities [6], [8]. Despite this initial uncertainty, many factors paved the way for volunteer participation by young people. First, the importance of social impact became a topic of serious consideration by the development community—adding a new dimension to the earlier focus on economic impact [4]. Second, assistance was particularly needed in rural locations where elite national officials and foreign experts were typically unwilling to live and work. In contrast, young volunteers were often prepared to live a simple life at lower tiers of a development project hierarchy. Third, national policies in many industrialised countries called for young people to be educated in the politics and cultures of other nations [8], [9]. Finally, volunteers were viewed by aid agencies as relatively skilled generalists that were a less-expensive alternative to development experts [8].

Many of the contemporary government-sponsored IVCOs began as comparatively small-scale service programs with foundations in international work-camping activities [4]. Existing IVCOs were originally sponsored by private donors or were fundamentally university study-service programs [10]. During the early ‘60s legislation authorising governmental resources to support international voluntary services lifted many of the previously poorly-financed IVCOs from marginal to mainstream organisations. Between 1964 and 1968, multiple Inter-Agency Meetings on Youth were held to discuss schemes for international

voluntary service by young people. Less than a decade later, 22 countries were financing an international volunteer program [6].

The insertion of government money into international volunteer initiatives strongly politicised the movement, and the governmentalisation of IVCOs was initially viewed with scepticism [11]. Nonetheless, with a few exceptions the majority of non-governmental IVCOs received the vast majority of their funding from national governments by 1970 [4]. As illustrated in Table 1 (see Appendix), many of the newly established IVCOs that began as NGOs or quasi-governmental organisations were later incorporated as governmental agencies.

Civic action for global peace and anti-war movements throughout the late 1970s increased public awareness of global affairs, including a desire for many young people to serve in a volunteer capacity across national borders. In response to popular demand, it was during this Second Development Decade that many smaller private and voluntary sector IVCOs began to proliferate. These non-governmental organisations relied on private funding and typically provided more flexible alternatives to the two-year model. Médecins Sans Frontières—established in 1971, and Habitat for Humanity—established in 1976, are two of the many large non-governmental volunteer organisations (primarily from the US, Germany, UK, France, Japan, and Scandinavian) that emerged during this era [12]. By 1981, there were 125 recognised volunteer sending organisations—many of which were non-governmental [13]. Often, volunteers with these programs paid a significant portion of their own expenses [4]. By 1982, more than 55,000 recorded export volunteers were serving across these organisations (see Table 2 in the Appendix) [14]. Because the variety and complexity of international volunteer organisations swelled during the 1970s, this paper focuses primarily on the evolution of large government-supported IVCOs.

Established in 1971, the United Nations Volunteer (UNV) programme was created to mobilise qualified volunteers to participate in UN projects. UNV emerged as an important model for South-South cooperation and a key international support organisation for information exchange and triangular cooperation. In 1979, UNV's relationship officially began in the Asia and Pacific region [15], and in 1981 UNV began a formal partnerships with the Government of the People's Republic of China [16].

By the late 1980s, neoliberal reforms led to a general retrenchment in official development assistance (ODA). Reforms across industrialised countries resulted in a general reduction in the state's role to promote development combined with the promotion of market mechanisms to advance liberal democratic values [17], [18]. For many IVCOs, a reduction in government-support resulted in their lowest levels of volunteer-sending since their founding years. Throughout the 1980s, many IVCOs with core funding from governments were compelled to raise additional funding from the private sector as they expanded their reach to non-governmental sponsors [19].

Changes in development philosophy also affected IVCOs' growth and development. During the 1980s, there was growing scepticism about the virtue of international technical cooperation combined with an interest in the role of civil society and citizen participation [15], [20]. The importance of human development and people-centred approaches gained prominence beyond earlier concentrations on infrastructure, industrialisation, and rural development [19]. In response, IVCOs and their sponsoring governments devised new methods to strengthen grassroots participation, local self-help, and domestic involvement in development [21]. Perhaps the greatest change to the missions of IVCOs in the 1980s was a more targeted emphasis on capacity building corresponding with a growing interest in

domestic development and national volunteering. As governments' placed a greater reliance on the voluntary sector to provide services, international volunteers were more appreciated as actors that could effectively delivery aid—particularly in rural areas. Throughout the '80s and '90s, IVCOs were gradually more recognised as valuable agents of people-centred and participatory approaches to development work [12].

For many IVCOs, the 1990s were years of experimentation and diversification. New models of specialised short-term volunteer placements were institutionalised within many existing programs [21]. Likewise, South-South and South-North placements were integrated across a wider variety of IVCOs [22]. Possibilities for diaspora volunteer programs were explored and eventually developed. Although prior experiments with national volunteers as counterparts had proven difficult in the past, these partnerships were given more serious thought and investment and began to take root. In conjunction with the domestic focus and experimentation that began in the '80s, the UNV National Volunteer program was launched in 1991 and grew quickly throughout the '90s [21].

KOICA Overseas Volunteer (KOV), also emerged in 1991 as Korean ODA programs sought to strengthen capacity building and training as a function of their grant aid and technical cooperation programs [23]. Consistent with other IVCOs that began to experiment with South-North cooperation in the 1990s, KOICA implemented a human resource exchange by inviting leaders from the low-income countries to receive training and capacity development in Korea [24].

Beginning with the new century, the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and associated poverty reduction framework became the central orientation employed by IVCOs and other technical cooperation organisations. Donors began placing higher expectations on IVCOs to demonstrate the distinctive contributions international volunteers contribute to MDG targets. As a result, organisational frameworks for research, evaluation, and results-based management became a new area of focus for many IVCOs in the 2000s.

In 2001, the UN International Year of the Volunteer volunteering (IYV) placed volunteering in the spotlight as an operative strategy to reduce poverty, to prevent and rebuild after disasters, and to facilitate social integration and social inclusion [15]. Although much of the focus was on domestic and national volunteering, stakeholders also paid greater attention to international volunteering as a result of IYV and the follow-up efforts of IYV+10 in 2011.

Innovations in communication and information technology also proliferated during the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Internet-based tools were developed to recruit and support traditional forms of international volunteering and to develop new forms of volunteering. The availability of Internet technology also revolutionised IVCOs' training and communication capacities. Online campaigns made it easier for international volunteers to advocate for global causes and to participate in global development efforts, even without leaving their home country [25]. In 2000, UNV started an Online Volunteers program as a way for volunteers to contribute to peace and development projects using Internet technology [15]. Social networks and online communities also made it easier for volunteers to stay connected and to continue their work with partner organisations after returning home [26].

The rise of corporate social responsibility in the 21<sup>st</sup> century has also opened new opportunities for IVCOs and international volunteers. Many government-sponsored IVCOs strengthened partnerships with private companies that began in the '90s—further diversifying their portfolios with corporate sponsorship. Others began strengthening

connections with corporations through company-sponsored volunteering as a channel for social programming and training [27]–[30]. Diaspora volunteering also continued to rise from earlier levels as IVCOs recruited highly skilled volunteers to use their skills and expertise through volunteer service in their countries of origin [31]–[33].

In the past few years, and particularly since the economic recession in 2008, multiple donor or sending countries have adopted a liberal economic philosophy towards international volunteering. Scholars have highlighted five key ways that this philosophy is influencing IVCOs in the contemporary context. First, many governments are no longer willing to provide core funding to IVCOs and have instituted a competitive contracting system. Second, international volunteering is increasingly commoditised with an intentional increase in private and corporate sector engagement. Third, there has been a heavy promotion of short-term international volunteering from Northern countries—primarily with young people and older adults. Fourth, governments are funding international service programs that strive to develop marketable skills of volunteers—sometimes without a comparable investment in the development of host communities in the Global South [18], [34], [35]. Finally, an audit culture or “new managerialism” demands that programs demonstrate concrete impact on volunteers or host communities in order to receive continued funding [18], [36], [37]. Each of these trends will be illustrated in greater detail throughout this paper.

Fifteen years into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, contemporary IVCOs are challenged to realign their activities and measures with the new UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). While the implications of this agenda will not likely be understood until years in the future, IVCOs and international voluntary service networks (IVSNs) are organizing to raise the profile of international volunteers’ distinctive contributions to the SDGs [38]. The following section reviews the important role that IVSNs have played in the historic evolution and organisation of international volunteering for development.

## History of International Voluntary Service Networks

International voluntary service networks (IVSNs) coordinate the work of IVCOs operating in different countries, and play an important facilitative role [39]. The first of these networks at the international level was the Coordination Committee for Voluntary Workcamps [now the Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS)]. CCIVS was organised during the UNESCO-sponsored Conference of Organisers of International Workcamps in 1948 to facilitate the organisation of youth participating in international workcamps through non-governmental organisations [4], [40].

The substantial governmental resources poured into international volunteering during the 1960s produced a previously unprecedented level of organisation and scholarly attention [8]. In response, a second IVSN for global cooperation emerged in the 1960s to coordinate governmental and government-financed IVCOs. In 1962, the US Peace Corps convened an intergovernmental conference that brought together disparate government-financed bilateral IVCOs. During this conference, the conveners established the International Peace Corps Secretariat [later the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service (ISVS)] [6].

In collaboration, and occasional competition, with CCIVS and ISVS, UNV was given a mandate by the UN General Assembly in 1976 to facilitate volunteering for development at a broad scale [20]. As a result of this mandate, UNV assumed many functions of an IVSN in

early years. The following section elaborates on the historic development of UNV and its connection with old and new IVSNs.

### The Creation of Volunteers in the UN System

Corresponding with the formation and government-financing of many bilateral IVCOs in the early '60s, the United Nations introduced a resolution making an argument for the use of volunteers in UN programs [41]. The initial case was primarily a financial argument. The funds available for technical cooperation were insufficient to meet the needs of newly independent countries, and it was believed that young volunteers could provide experts with added support at a comparatively low cost to UN agencies [6]. If volunteers were used to support UN projects, however, the initial proposal suggested that sending governments would be required to cover all costs of placing volunteers.

Over the next five years, discussions at multiple inter-agency meetings continued to debate whether young volunteers could be used effectively in development projects. When advocates made the initial case for placing qualified volunteers in development projects, they emphasised that volunteers with generalist skills cost one-tenth the price of experts [8], [42]. While the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) and UNESCO, in particular, wanted to increase the use of volunteers in their technical cooperation activities, legal and technical requirements prevented volunteers from being formally integrated [6].

During the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ad Hoc Inter-Agency Meeting on Youth in 1965, participants agreed to continue studying the integration of young volunteers in UN technical cooperation activities. However, they also agreed to consider ways to support CCIVS as a method of “strengthening the appropriate institutions for the coordination of international voluntary service by youth, especially with regard to the exchange of information between ‘sending’ and ‘receiving’ organisations and countries through a form of clearing-house” [6, p. 10].

In 1967, CCIVS and ISVS both met separately to consider how they might strengthen their roles as sources of knowledge and coordination of international volunteering organisations. They also discussed how they might facilitate the placement of young international volunteers in UN projects. A significant barrier to this process was a stipulation from a prior UN Resolution, which stated that UN funds could not legally be used in any way to support volunteers. Despite this limitation, a considerable number of international volunteers from bilateral IVCOs were informally assisting with UN projects but with limited protections or assurances from sponsoring organisations [6].

It wasn't until the 4<sup>th</sup> Inter-Agency Meeting on Youth in 1968 that participants agreed to “consider seriously the possibility of establishing an international association (or) Corps of Volunteers for work in technical cooperation projects assisted by the United Nations and agencies” [6, p. 11]. During this same year, CCIVS hosted the Sixteenth Conference of Organisers of International Voluntary Service. During this conference representatives adopted a resolution to institute a “Clearing-House of Volunteers for Development” to broker the matching of qualified volunteers with host-government approval and support [6].

Later in 1968, as CCIVS, ISVS, and bilateral volunteer agencies considered how to best use volunteering in UN projects, they met resistance from some countries that worried about accepting too many volunteers from any single country. As a result, they put forth three key recommendations: (1) the number and variety of sending countries should be expanded beyond the handful of developed countries that were then sending volunteers,

(2) multinational teams should be formed and supervised by UN experts, and (3) international volunteers should be paired with a national counterpart to build capacity and strengthen national volunteerism [6], [43]. These principles were later reinforced through a 1970 feasibility study to investigate the possibility of creating an International Corps of Volunteers for Development [6].

Following the feasibility study, proposals from the UN Secretary-General suggested a three-pronged collaboration between volunteers, governments, and NGOs through the proposed clearing-house mechanisms of ISVS (governmental or government-supported) and CCIVS (non-governmental) IVSNs or directly through the UN system [6]. UN administration ultimately decided to establish the three-pronged collaboration within the UN system, and the General Assembly officially established UNV to recruit and facilitate volunteers for UN projects in 1970. Initially, UNV relied on ISVS, CCIVS and the existing bilateral IVCOs to recruit volunteers [11]. After a slow start, UNV discontinued recruitment efforts from bilateral IVCOs in 1974 and started recruiting independently—largely because Northern IVCOs were unable to recruit qualified volunteers from developing countries [6].

In 1976, the UN General Assembly adopted two additional resolutions that expanded UNV's mandate to facilitate volunteering for development. The first resolution designated UNV as the central administrator of youth programs, which were receiving less attention as the technical skills requested by host governments drove up the average age of volunteers. Because economic stagnation had reduced opportunities for young people to participate in meaningful employment, UNV was asked to encourage youth enterprises, to strengthen governmental policy supporting national youth volunteer programs, and to bolster leadership training programs that aimed to strengthen youths' participation in development [6]. While UNV was given the mandate to coordinate youth programs, CCIVS also maintained a strong focus on international youth volunteering and was easily the most representative global network of privately-supported NGOs in this space. In 1983, CCIVS had 115 member organisations, a third of which were from African, Asian and Latin American countries [44].

A second 1976 UN General Assembly resolution expanded UNV's mandate to support Domestic Development Service (DDS) or volunteering by local community groups [6], [43], [45]. The justification behind this thrust was that, unless national development moves towards greater self-reliance, international volunteering and other forms of external technical assistance would be limited and unsustainable. In conjunction with the partner resolution in 1976, many of the domestic development services were youth-focused and worked with universities and national youth services programs [21]. These two resolutions combined significantly changed UNV's role as a global facilitator of volunteering and a broker of domestic volunteering for development.

UNV's convening and coordinating role was further emphasised in the Sana's Declaration of 1982—a High-Level Symposium that brought together government leaders, directors of bilateral IVCOs, and UN officials to celebrate UNV's tenth anniversary. Thought leaders believed that UNV could be doing more to support the collaboration and coordination of international and domestic volunteering. The 1982 Sana's Declaration explicitly recommended that:

*[1] UNV convene periodic intergovernmental meetings...in an effort to review with [stakeholders], the development of international volunteer service;*

*[2] UNV further develop its role as a focal point for international volunteer cooperation by convening at least once a year consultative meetings of participating organisations from industrialised and developing countries;*

*[3] UNV further develop its range of documentation services on international volunteerism [6, p. 46].*

With UNV's recommendations to coordinate knowledge and documentation on international volunteering, ISVS dissolved in 1976 [13], [46]. In 1973, ISVS produced its final global statistical directory of volunteer and development service organisations [47], UNV took over many of the coordinating roles of ISVS and produced similar directories in 1977 and 1982 [14]. In 1985, CCIVS also produced a directory of organisations for long-term voluntary service, which included a listing of both national and export volunteer programs [48]. UNV and CCIVS both eventually discontinued tracking IVCOs as they grew in variety and complexity throughout the '80s and '90s [14], [49].

The role of UNV as a convening force and a focal point for volunteering was further solidified in 2001 in the wake of the UN International Year of the Volunteer. In 2002 a further General Assembly resolution invited UNV to develop an Internet-based resource to coordinate and facilitate the distribution of knowledge on volunteering. Soon after, UNV set up the World Volunteers Web. [21].

It was also during the year 2000 that the International FORUM on Development Service (now the International Forum for Volunteering in Development) opened membership to IVCOs from around the globe. For the prior 36 years, Forum had been limited to European-based agencies. In 2002, Forum assumed responsibility for the Annual Heads of International Volunteer Co-operation Organisations conference.<sup>1</sup> Today, Forum and UNV share complementary roles and responsibilities for convening, advocating, and disseminating knowledge on volunteering for development. Beginning in the early 2000s, Forum has become the most prominent contemporary global IVSN for government-sponsored international volunteer co-ordinating organisations.

The Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service (CCIVS) also continues to operate as a central coordinator and convener of non-governmental workcamps and youth service programs that promote development goals [44]. In CCIVS's first 40 years, its memberships grew five-fold—from 23 organisations in 1948 to 115 organisations in 1983 [20]. However, it was not until 1960 that organisations outside of Europe or North America joined its network. In 2015, CCIVS reported 185 members within its network operating in every liveable continent [50]. Many national and regional networks also facilitate national and international service activities within countries and across geographic regions.

## Evolution of International Volunteer Cooperation Practices

From a historic perspective, we know a fair amount about the evolution of IVCOs' forms and modalities from the 1960s through the mid-1980s. The missions of ISVS and CCIVS ensured that regular comparative studies, statistical reports, and other scholarly works collated information on IVCOs across countries. This task was made far easier by the comparably small scale of IVCOs in early years. By the late 1980s, comparative reports and

---

<sup>1</sup> This meeting was first held in 1996 as the Conference of International Volunteer Sending Organisations (IVSO) [55]

statistics on IVCOs were rare, and far less scholarly attention was being paid to international volunteering.

In his review of the progression of international voluntary services since the mid-1950s, Gillette (1972), touched on five significant changes: (1) a major expansion of government-sponsored programs, (2) innovation in the variety of voluntary programs and volunteers' activities, (3) a wider geographic distribution of international volunteering, (4) a greater stress on social development and capacity building alongside economic development and modernisation, and (5) greater collaboration and cooperation among IVCOs linked to higher professional standards and more equitable distribution of volunteers' allowances and benefits.

This section reviews the practices identified by Gillette during the first two UN Development Decades as well as other practices that have changed over the years. It discusses changes to policy and funding priorities, the scale and size of IVCOs, and changes to the duration, direction, and multinationality of international volunteer placements. Differences in the qualities of volunteers, including age, gender, and skills are also explored. Lastly, the section investigates adjustments to the management of international volunteers, including trainings, reimbursements, protections, and the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer programs.

### Policy Objectives and Activities

During the First Development Decade (1960-70) the policy objectives of most IVCOs could be summarised under two broad areas. The first objective focused on cross-cultural knowledge and building peaceful relations between countries. IVCOs focused heavily on peace-related roles and on establishing common interests and understandings among people of different cultures [20], [51], [52]. The second objective focused on filling the need for skilled human capital in underdeveloped areas. IVCOs viewed their role as supplementing the work of governments, and applying volunteers' efforts to supply middle-level manpower where needed to fill vacancies in organisations [53], [54].

In the 1960s, most volunteers had generalist skills, and education was a primary area of work [4]. However, different IVCOs had some degree of specialisation by sector. For instance, Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV) and the German Development Service (now GIZ) focused heavily on agriculture and forestry [55], the Norwegian Volunteer Service focused largely on medical services, and VSO and the US Peace Corps prioritised education [56, pp. 191, 193]. By the 1970s, areas of activity had diversified for all government-sponsored IVCOs. Although education still accounted for the majority of volunteers' activities, the percentage of volunteers working in agricultural and rural development had risen as high as 25-30% for some IVCOs. Health services, engineering, and other technical and industrial crafts were also on the rise [2], [8]. According to the ISVS World Statistical Directory, only 26% of export volunteers reported education as their field of work by 1973, followed closely by health (22%), community development/social work (13%), and agriculture (11%) [57].

As the acceptable methods of "doing development" changed over time, the objectives prioritised by IVCOs followed suit. While volunteers initially focused largely on filling gaps in services through their own labour, they eventually diversified their focus towards strengthening civil society and building capacity for domestic development services. International volunteers were viewed as catalysts to strengthen civic engagement generally, but particularly via their work with young people in host countries [6], [22]. The

policy intent for many IVCOs in the '70s was to strengthen local youth engagement in domestic volunteer activities [4].

Dorothea Woods, in her 1971 report about the future patterns of volunteers in community development estimated that the cooperation between international and national volunteers was the most propitious way to accomplish sustainable community development. This reflected a wider belief at the time about the critical link between national and international volunteer programs [4]. This link was strengthened through a number of UN declarations and assemblies. During the 16th Conference of Organisers of International Voluntary Service in 1968, CCIVS in partnership with UNESCO drafted the first Universal Charter of Volunteer Service. Key messages from this charter recognised the importance of mutuality, equitable international cooperation, and working to support the growth of local and national volunteer programs [58].

In connection with strengthening national civic engagement, international volunteers often sought to influence youth to participate in radical political commitments—particularly during the 1970s [2]. As external agents, volunteers were seen as catalysts to instigate change to the social and political order [2], [59]. While many international volunteers engaged in activism and mobilisation during the '70s, scholars and government leaders questioned whether this was an appropriate role for international volunteers—seeing this as a local responsibility and a potential danger to intergovernmental political relations [60].

Most government-sponsored IVCOs were able to avoid policy language that formally tied their operations to their government's foreign policy objectives. However, history suggests that IVCOs often supported objectives that aligned with their government's political priorities despite having no hard legislative mandate to do so. Among the major government-sponsored IVCOs, Germany's Development Service (now GIZ) was one of the only early programs that was explicitly bound by legislation to implement projects according to the German government's foreign policy objectives [8].

By the late 1980s and 1990s, IVCOs had begun focusing more efforts toward technical assistance during times of emergency as a broad policy objective. The Kathmandu Declaration of 1991 emphasised international and national volunteers' comparative effectiveness in disaster preparedness, humanitarian relief, and rehabilitation. A number of IVCOs and national volunteer organisations joined an effort with UNV to develop a roster of qualified volunteers in anticipation of crises. Likewise, with numerous armed conflicts in the '90s some IVCOs strengthened their involvement in humanitarian and post-conflict work and recovery [21]. This proved to be a priority activity for UNVs. Today, the majority of UNVs serve in peacekeeping operations and related field support activities [61].

IVCOs with a focus on disaster preparation and recovery have continued to grow since the 1990s. As one modern example, disaster preparation and response has become a major thrust of the European Union's Aid Volunteer Programme, launched in 2015 to deploy over 4,000 volunteers from the European Union to build capacity in anticipate of crises and disasters [62]. Related efforts have been discussed among members of the African Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [63].

## Scale and Funding

When international volunteer programs began growing in the late 1950s the demand for volunteers with mid-level and technical skills far exceeded the supply of available volunteers. Initially, the number of volunteers that IVCOs were able to send abroad was

limited by the availability of funding. Beginning in the early 1960s governments began to pour significantly more funding into international volunteer organisations, which were previously supported exclusively by non-governmental sources. For example, although Australia's Volunteer Graduate Scheme was officially incorporated as the Overseas Service Bureau in 1961, the Australian Government only began providing funding to the Bureau and its associated Australian Volunteers Abroad program in 1965 [64]. A similar history is associated with Canada's CUSO, and the UK's VSO programs. Other organisations such as JOCV and the Norwegian Volunteer Service began as full-fledged governmental programs.

Governmental financial support for IVCOs was partly motivated by competition for bilateral volunteer positions. When the US Peace Corps was established in 1961, the substantial commitment and financial backing provided by the US government significantly altered existing expectations about the costs of volunteers. For example, the Peace Corps was launched with a \$30 million budget from the government, while VSO at the time was operating on a £10,000 budget [19]. In addition, a number of IVCOs including CUSO and VSO required host countries to pay for a significant portion of the cost of volunteers and to provide volunteers with living expenses [15]. In contrast, all costs of Peace Corps volunteers were covered by the US government. As a result, Peace Corps volunteers were far less costly to requesting governments. This led to a fear in the 1960s that "three out of every four [volunteers] will be American" [19, p. 55]. In order to maintain fair demand for volunteers, it became necessary for sending governments to progressively cover more of the volunteers' costs. For instance, when CUSO was first established in 1961, they would only supply volunteers to host countries if the country governments were willing to pay full costs. Over time, CUSO began to pay a portion of the volunteers' in-country costs in order to maintain requests from developing countries [8].

As early as 1974, most large-scale IVCOs in the US and Europe obtained nearly 100% of their budget from sending governments—with the exception of British and Canadian IVCOs, which still obtained around 50% to 70% of their funding from non-government sources [8]. In the case of CUSO and UNV, greater than 30% of their budgets were covered by host country governments in 1974, either in cash or kind [8]. In addition, UNV received around a quarter of its budget from non-governmental sources towards a Special Voluntary Fund to cover pre-service and travel costs of volunteers from the Global South [8].<sup>2</sup>

As programs grew over the next two decades, and more and more skilled nationals entered the workforce, the number of requests for international volunteers gradually levelled off to the point where the supply of volunteers began to exceed demand for volunteers [8], [65]. For many IVCOs, the number of volunteers recruited and deployed in the field was at their highest level in the mid- to late-1960s. By the mid-1970s, however, many IVCOs had more available funds than qualified volunteer applicants. As one example, by 1974 the US Peace Corps had a pool of over 30,000 qualified applicants but only had 6,500 requests from host countries for volunteers—even when all costs for the volunteers were covered by the US government [8].

By the 1980s the demand for international volunteers began to further decline for many bilateral IVCOs. This movement coincided with a reduction in official development assistance expenditures in many Northern countries, which included funding for international volunteer programs. Budget cuts were further exacerbated by higher average costs of volunteers. Although expenses per volunteer during the first decade was

---

<sup>2</sup> In comparison, UNV received less than 10% of total contributions from partner countries in 2013 [61].

significantly higher than in later years due to the larger scale of the growing programs, many of these cost savings were offset by higher allowances and fringe benefits provided to increasingly professionalised volunteers [4].

While it is difficult to track the global prevalence of international volunteering after 1982 (when the last global statistical directory was published), the number of international volunteers in the field was putatively at their lowest level in the mid-1980s in conjunction with lower demand and reduced funding. In order to strengthen their position, many IVCOs returned to earlier strategies of raising significant portions of their budget from the private sector. For example, by 1988 13% of funding for VSO came from non-government sources, compared to 18% by 1990, and 22% by 1993 [19].

By the mid-1990s, governmental funding for many IVCOs were up to earlier levels of commitment. Funding from private-sector relationships developed during the previous decade was also added to this pot. As a result, the supply of international volunteers increased during the 1990s through the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. For many IVCOs in the early 2000s, volunteer placements reached their highest levels since the early years [21].

In recent history, internationalisation and globalisation have been driving demand for a labour force that is better prepared to work in international contexts and with populations from various nations and cultures. Against this backdrop governments from many nations—particularly in the Global North—are altering funding patterns and priorities for international service to better prepare young people. Particularly over the past decade, national governments began increasing grants to a wide variety of private volunteer sending organisations [66]. For instance, in the UK, Germany, Canada, the US, and Australia, government grants are now provided to commercial, civil society and faith-based organisations to facilitate short- and long-term international volunteer placements. This has sparked a global debate about whether government funding may be creating a supply of international volunteers without a commensurate demand for these volunteers in host communities [67]. These trends are discussed in greater detail later in this paper.

### Duration of Volunteer Placements

One of the most easily distinguishable differences between early and later models of international volunteering was a lengthening of the duration of service [4]. In the '50s and '60s, volunteers typically served over the course of a single summer or for medium-term lengths of several months [4]. As governments began to invest financially in IVCOs during the '60s, IVCOs began to converge on relatively similar program models that included a two-year placements with a technical assistance orientation, living stipends, and a subsidised benefits package [68].

Although short-term service was viewed as appropriate for domestic volunteers, a service duration of less than two years was considered inappropriate for international volunteers because shorter durations was viewed as limiting volunteers' capacity to integrate within the structure and culture of a requesting country [65]. By 1977, nearly all volunteers with government-sponsored IVCOs served for two years not including 11 to 19 additional weeks of training [8], [19]. There were exceptions to this rule, however. For example, volunteers with the World University Service of Canada (WUSC) had the option to serve for one year with possible extensions.

As the two-year model became nearly universal across government-sponsored IVCOs, critics began contesting whether this was indeed the best practice. They argued that in many instances highly skilled and technical volunteers were not needed in projects for

long durations. Consequently, this would often result in an underutilisation of volunteers for technical cooperation activities. In the 1982 Sana's Declaration, government leaders recommended that among other IVCOs, "UNV examine the possibility of instituting more flexibility in terms for length of assignments" in order for sponsors to use volunteers more widely in governmental and UN programs [6, p. 47]. Since the 1980s, a variety of IVCOs have begun to investigate and implement alternative options.

Although the two-year model is still a common duration for government-sponsored programs, there is a much wider variety of options available for volunteers today. Privately-funded organisations have been facilitating short-term international volunteering since the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century; however, this was relatively uncommon for government-funded IVCOs until recent decades. Government funding for short-term "professional" or "skills-based" volunteers are far more common than they were at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, as are short-term placements by young people [34]. As will be discussed later, corporate volunteers and skilled older adults with short- to medium- term availability are also increasingly recruited to provide specialised technical assistance in areas such as technology, agriculture, health, capacity building, etc.

### Directionality of Volunteer Cooperation

During the First Development Decade, industrialised countries deployed volunteers primarily to economically developing countries where they had historical relations—most frequently to post-colonialized states [69]. As early as the 1960s, critiques of the dominant North-South model began to disparage international volunteering as being paternalistic, colonial and culturally imperialistic—though these voices were marginal at the time [11]. Bilateral agencies were generally unable or unwilling to facilitate South-South or South-North volunteering. Many believed that volunteers from the Global South would have little to contribute to the industrialised North. As one discussant at a 1974 conference asserted: "It is unrealistic to assume that people from developing countries have the type of technical expertise that would be required in the developed countries" [65, p. 39].

There were a few early exceptions the dominant North-South model. During the 1960s, UNESCO helped facilitate "middle-level cultural manpower" to industrialised countries, where young volunteers from newly independent countries would serve as musicians, storytellers, artists, dancers, etc. [4]. Likewise, an early movement in Voluntary Service Overseas brought a small number of volunteers from less developed countries to do social work with vulnerable populations in the UK [4]. The only notable exception for South-South technical development at a large-scale was the UNV.

UNV continues to be distinguished through its universal selection and placement of volunteers across the Global South and North. Under the resolution that established the UNV program in 1970, provisions stipulated that the UN system would "utilize volunteers recruited and serving on as wide a geographical basis as possible" [6, p. 36]. Thereafter committed to South-South development cooperation, UNV financed the recruitment of qualified volunteers from the South through the establishment of a trust fund of voluntary contributions from governments, NGOs and other private actors [6]. By the end of 1982, 80% of UN Volunteers were from developing countries—representing 75 nationalities [6]. The vast majority of these volunteers served in other developing countries. Across the years, this proportion has remained virtually unchanged. In 2014, 81% of UN Volunteers were from the Global South, and 60% of UN Online Volunteers were from the Global South [45].

With UNV paving the way for progressive South-South development cooperation at a large scale, scholarship on international volunteering in the late 1970s viewed the one-sided North-South approach at a critical crossroad [65]. In 1977, Pinkau reviewed trends over the past 20 years of international volunteer cooperation, and postulated that distinctions between giving and receiving development services would inevitably diminish because the predominant unidirectional sending model was inconsistent with progressive development thinking, which prioritised equitable development.

Although the North-South model has not diminished as predicted by Pinkau, a number of contemporary IVCOs have instituted programs for South-South volunteer cooperation. UNV continues to primarily facilitate South-South cooperation. Progressio, a small IVCO in the UK, also now draws more than half of its volunteers from the Global South. The Norwegian government's Fredskorpset program has begun implementing progressive policies to support Southern volunteers in the early 2000s, as has the UK governments' experimental Voluntary Service Overseas Southern Volunteer Program [5], [22]. Many IVCOs like the Swiss Unité and the German Weltwärts programs have a handful of South-South and South-North placements—though these remain a small portion of their overall portfolio [70].

A small fraction of volunteers also participated in South to North cooperation by the late 1970s—though many believed that the direction of technical cooperation should change more rapidly. Proponents argued that volunteers from the North did not have a monopoly on new ideas and innovative practices. In addition, there was a growing recognition that international volunteers gain capacity and skills that they can draw on after returning to their home countries, which inequitably benefits Northern countries more than countries in the Global South [26]. South-North exchanges were also seen to exemplify the reciprocal sharing and solidarity that is often viewed as a significant benefit of international service. Despite a generalised recognition of the virtues of South to North volunteer cooperation, this remains an under-practiced and under-funded practice model.

The majority of international volunteers across the globe continue to serve from a North to South model. Although the variety of countries that send and receive international volunteers has greatly expanded over the past 60 years, the typical international volunteer in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century primarily comes from countries in Europe, North America, and Asia (i.e. Japan and Korea) and are sent to countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, South and Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America [71].

### Multinationality and Volunteer Counterparts

Although international workcamps in the 1930s and 1940s were often composed of groups of volunteers from multiple nations, it was uncommon for government-financed IVCOs to sponsor volunteers from a country beyond their own. In the 1960s, a number of bilateral IVCOs began experimenting with bi-national and multinational teams. A few of the perceived advantages of multinational teams was a reduction in overtly political overtones and assumptions, a less bureaucratic working style at the program level, and greater improvisation and innovation within the team. On the other hand, multinational teams were often less likely to receive financing for projects, and volunteers were more likely to be engaged in projects that were inconsistent with their own government's priorities [2].

As early as 1967, UNESCO and UNICEF were considering ways to better integrate young international and national volunteers in teams. UNESCO had significant previous

experience working with volunteer workcamps in collaboration with CCIVS and non-governmental organisations. Drawing upon this experience, UNESCO stipulated three principles they would require to use international volunteers in their projects. First, volunteers should always participate in teams that include young people from multiple countries. Second, volunteers should be recruited from bilateral government-supported IVCOs as well as non-governmental organisations. Third, qualified technicians and less-skilled students should be recruited together as part of a working team. With these basic other criteria in place, UNESCO began to receive teams of volunteers in the late 1960s [6].

Parallel to this movement ISVS developed a pilot project in 1969, which would be implemented by a handful of participating government-sponsored IVCOs. The goal of this pilot was to test challenges and opportunities arising from multinational teams. Previous experience indicated that difficulties could arise from differences in financial allowances, protections, work regulations, roles in a project hierarchy, training and preparation received, and perceived differences in skills and abilities—particularly when pairing volunteers from the Global North and South [8].

Because this effort was coordinated by ISVS, a wide variety of bilateral IVCOs participated in multinational schemes, which paired national and international volunteers. However, they did so on a highly limited basis [10]. Although many administrators asserted that greater collaboration between domestic and international volunteer agencies would be beneficial, they found that locating a national counterpart was a limiting factor [65]. As described by Pinkau, “As most foreign technical assistance assignments are designated to provide skills not available in the receiver country, finding a counterpart is like seeking a person who does not exist”. Because volunteers also tended to cluster with others of their same nationality and background, it was often difficult to overcome the “rural / urban, educated / uneducated, wealthy / poor...” divisions between national and international volunteers [10, p. 39].

After five years of experimenting with multinational teams, most IVCOs had abandoned the “counterpart” or “twinning” concept as unrealistic by the 1980s. As the skill levels of domestic volunteers improved over time or were increasingly validated by foreign volunteers and IVCOs, the counterpart concept was revisited in later years. Although the practice is still comparatively uncommon, the UK’s International Citizen Service (ICS) is one example of a current mainstream program that explicitly pairs young people from the UK with young volunteers in the Global South. As a multilateral agency, UNV was the only IVCO historically that maintained a truly multinational mission and program as a policy priority—though volunteers typically worked independently [8].

Over the past five years, we have seen greater efforts to develop multinational volunteer experiences and exchanges. In 1998, Dick Bird predicted that, “just as in the 1960s there was a groundswell for an international UN volunteer corps, so if the European Union continues on its current trajectory, the pressure to Europeanise volunteer sending will increase [19, p. 197]. Bird’s prediction has been realised across a number of collaborative platforms. For example, the European Union invested nearly 150 million Euros in 2014 to fund an EU Aid Volunteers program until the year 2020. In 2010, we also saw the establishment of the African Union Youth Volunteer Corps for South-South development cooperation across the African Union. More recently, in 2013 the Association of Southeast Asian Nations announced the ASEAN Youth Volunteer Program (AYVP), and the 2014 Asia-Pacific Peace and Development Service Alliance met to discuss ways to increase South-South volunteer exchanges across Asia and the Pacific. With the exception of UNV, which has long

been a model for multinational collaboration, international volunteering is no longer limited to sponsorship by individual governments.

### Age and Skill level of Volunteers

A secondary reason for the establishment of government-supported IVCOs historically was to support young people in response to unemployment needs [4], [10]. As a result, most volunteers that participated in international volunteering in the 1950s were in their late teens or early twenties [4], [34]. When international volunteer cooperation began in force in the early 1960s, many young people from industrialised countries with generalist skills wanted to apply their education and skills abroad as volunteers. Some volunteers were university graduates while others had technical training and practice experience but little post-secondary education [6].

By the early 1970s, countries were requesting specialists and more highly skilled professionals. In a large feasibility study commissioned by the UN in 1970 to study the creation of an international volunteer corps, government representatives reported favouring young people with apprenticeship training or specialised technical and trade school education over graduates of generalist university programs [6]. Because volunteers' skills needed to remain consistent with the qualifications dictated by requesting governments, this gradually drove up the average age and technical qualifications of volunteers serving with most IVCOs. Consequently, the early focus on young people was incompatible with a demand for more technical and professional volunteers and those with more basic technical or teaching skills were rarely selected for assignments [8], [11], [19]. As one indicator, the average age for volunteers across IVCOs rose from 23 years in the mid-1960's to nearly 27 years in 1980 [19], [72].

Beyond having the required skills, holding a formal educational degree eventually became a minimal requirement for many bilateral IVCOs. As early as 1972, 96% of Peace Corps volunteers had at least some post-secondary education [4]. For some, this upward trend was seen as a departure from original intentions to engage youth in development projects and programs, and was viewed as an exclusionary policy [8]. Despite this concern, such a trend was perhaps inevitable considering that requesting-country demand for international volunteers narrowed alongside the development of greater national capacity.

The trend toward increasing specialisation and age continued for many IVCOs until the early 1990s, after which it levelled off. By 1990, the average age for international volunteers was well over 30 for many IVCOs and 38 for UN Volunteers [21]. Consistent with more qualified and specialised services, volunteers also began to receive higher allowances [73]. With more specialised volunteers, countries were also able to request volunteers for shorter-term assignments, and began doing so in the 1990s.

Exceptions to the recruitment of older volunteers are worth noting. The US Peace Corps and a number of other IVCOs consistently maintained a policy to place young graduates abroad. Also, while the age of volunteers for longstanding programs has risen over the years, parallel programs have also emerged to support short-term international service for young people [18], [34]. One of the oldest of such programs, Canada World Youth (CWY), has exclusively facilitated international volunteering since its founding in 1971. Others, such as the Norwegian Volunteer Service (now FK Norway) restructured their programs to allow greater participation by young people after recognising they no longer enabled young people to volunteer [34].

For many IVCOs focused on technical cooperation, it wasn't until the late 1990s when experimentation and innovations with separate youth volunteer schemes emerged and the average age of volunteers began to drop. Key reasons for this trend are twofold. First, young volunteers were often unwilling to serve for two years and were demanding more flexible arrangements. Second, governments and donors began to more explicitly program to develop marketable skills and "global citizenship" in young volunteers, which they believed could be accomplished in shorter time periods [34], [74].

Since the late 1990s, international service for young people has expanded in many countries including Germany, France, Japan, Korea, the UK and the US. A few examples of public programs illustrate recent growth. In the 1990s VSO started a shorter-term (6 to 12 month) youth-based volunteer scheme that accounted for 10% of their program by the late 1990s [19]. The UK government also launched the International Citizen Service program in 2011, which aimed to send 3,000 new volunteers per year until the year 2015 [34]. Likewise, Germany's Weltwärts program launched in 2008 started with a target to place 10,000 new young volunteers per year across borders (Jöcker, 2010). In addition, Korea's KOICA set an annual target to increase 5,000 young international volunteer placements per year from 2009 to 2013. Consistent with UNV's mandate to support youth development, in 2012 UNDP established a UNV Youth Volunteer Trust Fund to support a UN Youth Volunteer Programme.

In addition to expanding youth-based international volunteering, the other end of the age spectrum has also been growing in recent years. Skilled retired professionals are increasingly being recruited by IVCOs to serve abroad [75]. In 1990 the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) launched its Senior Volunteers program, which recruits people between the ages of 40 and 69 [55]. Likewise, Peace Corps started their Response program in 1995 to dispatch short-term returnees—many who are older adults, and KOICA dispatched their first group of Senior Volunteers aged 50 or older in 2004 [76]. As one measure of change, in 1961 only 1% of Peace Corps volunteers were over age 50—compared to 7% in 2012 [77]. In comparison with youth-based programs, however, the participation of older adults in international volunteering is still only a small fraction of total volunteers sent abroad.

In summary, although a trend toward more specialised skills and experiences during the first decades of international volunteering limited IVCOs' ability to involve young people in development projects, new programs evolved to include young people in new ways. As Allum [34] synopsised, "The supply of young people for the opportunity to engage abroad was scarcely diminished simply because of changes in demand" (p. 6). Because youth-based international volunteering is often viewed as "supply-oriented" rather than "demand-oriented", involving young international volunteers in development is not universally supported, and has been a topic of much debate and criticism over the years [18], [27], [35], [78], [79].

## Gender of Volunteers

It is worth mentioning that the gender ratio of international volunteers has also changed significantly over time. When government-sponsored IVCOs emerged during the 1960s, they rarely recruited women. By 1976, however, women accounted for between 26% and 36% of international volunteers across the major IVCOs. One notable exception was UNV, which was only able to recruit 17% of women volunteers by 1976 [8]. When a comparative assessment of IVCOs was completed during the same year, no IVCOs in the

study had ever appointment a female director, deputy director, or country representative [8].

As with formal employment, the push for gender equality significantly changed the gender ratio of international volunteers over time. In 1985 the number of female Peace Corps volunteers exceeded male volunteers for the agency's first time in its history [80]. Today, it is uncommon for male volunteers to outnumber female volunteers in any mainstream IVCO. For example, by 2013 the majority (more than 60%) of UN Volunteers, Australian Volunteers International, and Peace Corps Volunteers were female [61], [77], [81]. In addition, many contemporary IVCOs are managed by female directors and country representatives.

## Volunteer Training

Among the few IVCOs that provided training to young international volunteers in early years, including Service Civil International, nearly one in three of volunteers reportedly did not have the training or skills required to work successfully in community development [2]. However, the standard for volunteer training changed quickly during the First Development Decade. While volunteer training practices had always been diverse across organisations, by the mid-1960s most IVCOs shared common training themes including 10-12 weeks of intensive language development, instruction in teaching, cross-cultural training, country studies, project preparation, and specific technical skills [82].

During the 1960s, training programs primarily focused on how volunteers could effectively promote social change. By the 1970s, however, task-centred or role-centred training became priority training methods [2]. Such trainings focused on how volunteers could perform a particular job within a specific culture or situation. This movement coincided with the greater specialisation of voluntary tasks and activities during the 1970s.

Preparation and orientation for a volunteer assignment were initially provided within the sending country. In the case of the US and Canada, training was completed in collaboration with universities [53], [83], whereas IVCOs in continental Europe remained largely separate from post-secondary educational institutions and training was completed in-house [2], [8], [10]. By the 1970's the ISVS reported a general preference among member IVCOs that training should be performed in the country where volunteers were deployed [2]. Among countries that involved universities in the preparation of volunteers, these training partnerships had largely ended on a large scale by the mid-1970s, with more and more IVCOs proving training in the host country [8]. In line with this preference, over the course of the first ten years many IVCOs migrated training to local communities and organisations in the hosting country. Only a few IVCOs maintained training in the sending country or adopted a mixed model where volunteers were trained in both sending and hosting countries [8]. In addition, volunteers typically received sustained training and support by both sending and partner organisations during their placement.

Although no contemporary studies have compared training requirements or expectations across IVCOs, anecdotal assessment suggests that the standards for duration of formal trainings and preparation of volunteers have changed little since the 1970s. However, the topics and format of training have evolved continually—adapting to the contemporary needs and issues of the time. Today, training programs include a more specific focus on safety, security, and risk management issues relevant to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. These topics were not apparent in early training modules. In addition, most present-day

training programs now include a combination of online components combined with in-person reflection and dialogue.

### Reimbursements and Protections

Recognizing that international volunteers could not save money during their period of volunteer service, and that many volunteers would not have employment prospects immediately upon returning, the 1968 Universal Charter on Volunteer service recommended that all IVCOs help returned volunteers by providing employment opportunities, re-settlement allowances, and other forms of social security [58].

Although there was great variation between organisational policies during the First Development Decade (see [84]), IVCOs provided more equitable protections as early as 1975. All IVCOs evaluated during a 1977 study provided volunteers with a basic living allowance to ensure their living conditions were healthy and safe. In addition, all IVCOs guaranteed health care and life insurance, and the majority of IVCOs provided additional liability, disability, and accident insurance [8]. Today, long-term volunteers typically receive a stipend during their service and an award or fellowship after they finish their assignment—particularly if they volunteer with a government-supported IVCO [68].

The greatest disparity in guaranteed protection historically has been between domestic and international volunteer development programs. Domestic volunteers typically receive far few protections, even when serving in counterpart with international volunteers. This has long been a source of concern to many practitioners because international volunteers' allowances and fringe benefits were seen to economically position them above their local counterparts [4]. As volunteers began receiving stipends from IVCOs, their allowances ultimately became comparable to the incomes of middle-level skilled local counterparts in many developing countries. This raised questions regarding whether compensation was too high for maintaining the status of "volunteer" [84]. Because reimbursements, stipends, and protections are still incongruent across international volunteer organisations, lack of equity continues to be discussed in contemporary dialogue.

Certain protections offered to international volunteers have increased over time. These protections are associated with heightened publicity about dangerous and vulnerable situations that volunteers are exposed to, along with a perceived increase in external threats. Contemporary IVCOs offer a suite of services and protections designed to safeguard volunteers, along with systems for collecting and communicating information to minimise potential threats. These safety and security practices begin with the screening and selection of volunteers and continue through training and development, housing practices, and protections for volunteers' physical and psychological well-being [85].

### Evaluation and Management

In the earlier years of international volunteering, evaluation received very little attention in comparison with contemporary requirements [2], [86]. Early international volunteer programs had minimal regulations or guidelines from sending countries for the implementation of projects. Although IVCOs kept track of inputs such as the number of volunteers and basic descriptions of projects and challenges, few IVCOs kept track of outputs or outcomes. While host countries would typically specify goals and project priorities, volunteers usually had wide latitude to determine how best to achieve these goals. Likewise, the provision of funds by governments were often provided with minimal

budget oversight, approval, or reporting requirements [8]. In Pinkau's assessment of multiple IVCOs in 1977, no IVCOs in the assessment used measures of performance to consistently determine the quality and impacts of their volunteers' services. Pinkau found that the US Peace Corps was the only program that regularly tracked the number of people served by volunteers or estimated potential beneficiaries. Early reports from ISVS suggested that rigorous evaluation was not necessary because volunteers were assumed to be the best judges of the results of their work [53].

Overall accountability for project outcomes has changed dramatically over time, along with the distribution of authority and organisational structures related to results-based management. While early approaches to evaluation and management undoubtedly resulted in low accountability, it also allowed more space for volunteers to reciprocally negotiate project goals and methods in collaboration with local communities. As IVCOs became more professionalised during the 1970s, record keeping and reporting requirements resulted in more complicated administrative procedures that continued to grow in complexity over the next two decades [18], [87].

Since the late 1990s, an environment of results-based management has dominated foreign aid mechanisms, which has placed increasing pressure on IVCOs to document volunteers' contributions to development goals. The term "new managerialism" is applied to describe how the management of aid programs have changed over time [87]. New managerialism of volunteer services embraces an array of donor activities and requirements including a focus on measuring impact to demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency, insistence on transparent and accountable records, and a reduction in core funding toward competitive contracting for grants [18].

Throughout the 2000s, IVCOs sought to measure and demonstrate international volunteers' contributions to the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). With the advent of the post-2015 development agenda, many IVCOs in collaboration with IVSNs are working to develop measures to demonstrate the contribution of volunteering to the new UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [38], [88], [89]. Without documentation, it can no longer be assumed, as purported by ISVS in early years, that volunteers are best suited to judge the results of their work [53].

## Conclusion

Reflecting on the future of international volunteering, the 1968 Universal Charter of Volunteer Service recognised that international volunteering would inevitably change over time. As the Charter counselled: "New generations of volunteers and their organisations should always remember the spirit of the pioneers of voluntary service. Yet they must never be afraid to re-align their work in response to modern, scientific, technological and social progress" [58, p. 3].

Although many structures and methods of international volunteering have changed substantially across generations, the spirit and essence of international volunteering remains unchanged. As people-centred development actors that operate within a relational framework of development, volunteers continue to make tangible contributions to social and economic development [90]. Volunteers are still viewed as remarkably useful in rural and underserved areas, where it is often difficult to attract domestic or international experts [5], [91]. Although the relationship components to peace and social development are sometimes undervalued by technical development programs, communities in the Global

South consistently validate the importance of international volunteers in development projects and programs [92], [93].

Additional musing on the potential of volunteer service provide a sense of direction for future efforts. In 1967, Michael von Schenck, the then Secretary General of the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service wrote:

*If our development efforts reach their goal, there will come a time when the need for export development work, including export volunteers, will cease to exist, this being the very target of the common efforts...there will be countries which will sooner or later turn from importing volunteers to exporting them. [94, p. 24]*

Over the past 60 years, only a small handful of of volunteer “importing” countries that have become “exporting” countries at a significant scale. However, this should not diminish the progress obtained through field’s refocus on domestic development services in the mid-1970s, nor the decidedly progressive decision to emphasise national capacity-development. Recent movements by China, Thailand, Brazil, and other countries to develop bilateral international volunteer programs are hopeful measures of progress. On the other hand, enduring disparities between countries highlight the value of volunteers’ continued focus on capacity development. Furthermore, policies that support trends toward South-South and South-North volunteering can quicken the pace of growth as volunteers enhance their skills and networks by contributing to sustainable development.

Surviving IVCOs have adapted to the needs and challenges that emerged over the past 60 years. Going forward, it is critical that new forms and models of volunteer service maintain the distinctive spirit and contribution that volunteers bring to development efforts. As Dick Bird penned in his historical review of VSO: “This is the art of survival—adapting to changing times but hanging on tight to the essence you want to outlast them” [19, p. 194]. Because change is inevitable, new models of service in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century can either pull us backwards or push us forward. By promoting models that embody principles of equity, reciprocity, shared learning and mutual benefit we have the opportunity to further progress international volunteers’ contributions to peace and sustainable development.

## Appendix

Table 1: Long-term bilateral international volunteer cooperation organisations in operation by 1970

Organisation	Est.	Country	No.*	Structure	Finance
<b>Australian Volunteers Abroad</b>	1962	Australia	112	NGO	Comb.
<b>Austrian Youth Council for Development Aid &amp; Austrian Volunteer Service</b>	1961	Austria	169	NGO	Comb.
<b>Belgian Committee for Volunteer Service Overseas</b>	1957	Belgium	546	NGO	Comb.
<b>National Committee of Volunteer Brigades</b>	1965	Bulgaria	77	NGO	Comb.
<b>Canadian University Service Overseas (CUSO)</b>	1961 1920s	Canada	1,415	NGO	Comb.
<b>World University Service (WUSC)</b>					
<b>Danish Volunteer Service (DUU)</b>	1963	Denmark	202	NGO	Govt.
<b>Friendship Brigades</b>	1964	Germany (E.)	66	Govt.	Govt.
<b>German Volunteer Service (DED)</b>	1963	Germany (W.)	1,016	Quasi-	Govt.
<b>Association for Learning and Helping Overseas (AKLHÜ)</b>			564	NGO	Comb.
<b>Finnish Volunteer Service</b>	1965	Finland	19	Govt.	Govt.
<b>French Association of Volunteers for Progress</b>	1963	France	470	NGO	Govt.
<b>Volunteer for Cooperation (alternative to military service)</b>	na		6,700	Govt.	Govt.
<b>Moshav Movement Volunteers (informal movement)</b>	na	Israel	21	Quasi-	Comb.
<b>Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers (JOCV)</b>	1965	Japan	351	Govt.	Govt.
<b>Liechtenstein Development Service</b>	1965	Liechtenstein	3	Quasi-	Comb.
<b>Organisation of Netherlands Volunteers (SNV)</b>	1965	Netherlands	346	Quasi-	Govt.
<b>Volunteer Service Abroad (VSA)</b>	1962	New Zealand	111	NGO	Comb.
<b>Norwegian Volunteer Service</b>	1963	Norway	127	Govt.	Govt.
<b>Operation Brotherhood International</b>	1963	Philippines	99	NGO	Govt.
<b>Swedish Volunteer Service (SVS)</b>	1963	Sweden	204	Govt.	Govt.
<b>Swiss Volunteers for Development</b>	1964	Switzerland	88	Govt.	Govt.
<b>Arbeitsgemeinschaft für den Einsatz junger Berufsleute in Entwicklungsländern (AJBE)</b>			276	NGO	Comb.
<b>Committee of Youth Organisations</b>	1956	Soviet Union	13	NGO	Comb.
<b>The British Volunteer Program</b>	1958	United Kingdom	1,579	NGO	Comb.
<b>Voluntary Service Overseas</b>	1958				
<b>United Nations Association</b>	1943				
<b>International Voluntary Service</b>	1931				
<b>Catholic Institute for International Relations</b>	1940				
<b>Peace Corps</b>	1961	United States	8,695	Govt.	Govt.

\*No. indicates the number of long term volunteers serving as of January 1970. Source: *ISVS Statistical Summary of Volunteer Service*. Geneva: International Secretariat for Volunteer Service. 1970. [Year established is based off other historical documents]

Table 2: Export volunteers by World region, 1973-1982

Region	Number of export volunteers		
	1973	1977	1982
Africa	0	31	380
Asia and S. Pacific (except Japan)	920	464	1,443
Japan		599	1,073
Canada	8,556	2,045	2,542
United States		8,227	11,599
Europe (except France)	14,436	7,496	10,434
France		12,302	12,109
Latin America and the Caribbean (except Cuba)	6	24	946
Cuba		unspecified	15,000
<b>Total in 1982</b>	<b>23,918</b>	<b>31,188</b>	<b>55,526</b>

Source: UNV World Statistical Directory of Volunteer and Development Service Organisations (1977, 1982)

## Acronyms

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AYVP	ASEAN Youth Volunteer Program
CCIVS	Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service
CUSO	Canadian University Service Overseas (now Cuso International)
CWY	Canada World Youth
DDS	Domestic Development Services
DED	Deutscher Entwicklungsdienst (German Development Service)
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FORUM	International FORUM on Development Service (now International Forum for Volunteering in Development)
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Corporation for International Cooperation)
ICS	International Citizen Service
ISVS	International Secretariat for Volunteer Service
IVCO	International Volunteer Co-operation Organisations
IVSN	International Volunteer Service Networks
IYV+10	International Year of the Volunteers +10 (years)
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JOCV	Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers
KOICA	Korea International Cooperation Agency
KOV	KOICA Overseas Volunteer
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
ODA	Official Development Assistance
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas
WUSC	World University Service of Canada

## References

- [1] D. H. Smith and F. Elkin, "Volunteers, voluntary associations, and development: An introduction," *Int. J. Comp. Sociol.*, vol. 21, no. 3–4, pp. 151–162, 1981.
- [2] D. E. Woods, *Volunteers in community development*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, UNESCO, 1971.
- [3] Service Civil International, "Historical overview," *SCI International Archives*, 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.archives.sciint.org/history/developement-of-sci.html>. [Accessed: 29-Aug-2015].
- [4] A. Gillette, "Aims and organization of voluntary service by youth," *Community Dev. J.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 99–129, 1972.
- [5] P. Devereux, "International volunteering for development and sustainability: Outdated paternalism or a radical response to globalisation," *Dev. Pract.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 357–370, 2008.
- [6] UNV, *United Nations Volunteers: History and concept*. Geneva: United Nations Volunteers, 1985.
- [7] J. M. Bridgeland, H. Wofford, K. F. F. Quigley, and J. A. Milano, "A call to peace: Perspectives of volunteers on the Peace Corps at 50," Civic Enterprises, National Peace Corps Association, and Peter D. Hart Research Associates, Washington DC, 2011.
- [8] I. Pinkau, *Service for development: An evaluation of development services and their cooperative relationships*, Volume I. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development, 1977.
- [9] Y. Okabe, "Political origins of the Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers, 1960–1965: Why the state sends young volunteers abroad," Tokyo, 2014.
- [10] D. E. Woods, "The university and voluntary services," Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, Paris, 1974.
- [11] P. Henderson, *Development in voluntary service*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, 1971.
- [12] L. Ehrichs, "'Volunteering' in development: A post-modern view," World Volunteer Web, 2000.
- [13] D. E. Woods, "International research on volunteers abroad," in *Volunteers, voluntary associations, and development*, D. H. Smith and F. Elkin, Eds. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1981, pp. 196–206.

- [14] UNV, *UNV World statistical directory of volunteer and development service organizations*. Geneva: United Nations Volunteers, 1982.
- [15] UNV, "Report of the Administrator on the evolution of the role and function of the United Nations Volunteers programme since its inception," Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services, New York, 2013.
- [16] United Nations Volunteers, "UNV in China: 30 years of collaboration," Bonn, 2013.
- [17] W. E. Murray and J. D. Overton, "Neoliberalism is dead, long live neoliberalism? Neoliberalism and the international aid regime of the 2000s," *Prog. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 307–19, 2011.
- [18] N. Georgeou, *Neoliberalism, development, and aid volunteering*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- [19] D. Bird, *Never the same again: A history of VSO*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1998.
- [20] CCIVS, *New trends in voluntary service*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, 1984.
- [21] United Nations Volunteers, *Report of the Administrator on the evolution of the role and function of the United Nations Volunteers programme since its inception*. New York: Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services, 2013, p. DP/2013/34.
- [22] B. Plewes and R. Stuart, "Opportunities and challenges for international volunteer co-operation," International FORUM for Development Service, Fitzroy, Australia, 2007.
- [23] KOICA, "20 Years of KOICA: 1991~2010," Gyeonggi-do, Korea, 2011.
- [24] KOICA, "20 Years of KOICA: 1991~2010," Korea International Cooperation Agency, Gyeonggi-do, Korea, 2011.
- [25] D. Lewis, "Globalisation and international service: a development perspective," *Volunt. Action*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 13–25, 2005.
- [26] J. Machin, "The impact of returned international volunteers on the UK: A scoping review," Institute for Volunteering Research, London, 2008.
- [27] A. Jones, "Theorising international youth volunteering: training for global (corporate) work?," *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 530–544, 2011.
- [28] G. Hills and A. Mahmud, "Volunteering for impact: Best practices in international corporate volunteering," FSG Social Impact Advisors, Pfizer Inc., & the Brookings Institution, 2007.

- [29] K. Allen, M. Galiano, and S. Hayes, "Global companies volunteering globally," International Association for Volunteer Effort Global Corporate Volunteer Council, Dulles, Virginia, 2011.
- [30] R. Leigh, C. Giesing, M. J. León, D. Haski-Leventhal, B. J. Lough, J. M. Mati, D. H. Smith, and S. Strassburg, "State of the World's volunteerism report: Universal values for global well being," United Nations Volunteers (UNV), Bonn, Germany, 2011.
- [31] M. Stuart and D. V Russell, "Engaging the Diaspora as volunteers in international development," *Philanthr.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2011.
- [32] A. Terrazas, "Connected through service: Diaspora volunteers and global development," Migration Policy Institute, Washington DC, 2010.
- [33] OECD, "Partnership for democratic governance. The contribution of Diaspora return to post conflict and fragile countries," Organization for Economic Development, Paris, 2010.
- [34] C. Allum, "Youth international volunteering and development: An opportunity for development, international understanding or social inclusion?," International FORUM on Development Service, Ottawa, Canada, 2012.
- [35] J. M. Mati and H. Perold, "Youth volunteer exchange programs in Southern and Eastern Africa: Models and effects," VOESASA, Johannesburg, 2011.
- [36] M. Baillie Smith and N. Laurie, "International volunteering and development: Global citizenship and neoliberal professionalisation today," *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.*, vol. 36, pp. 545–559, 2011.
- [37] K. D. Lyons, J. Hanley, S. Wearing, and J. Neil, "Gap year volunteer tourism: Myths of global citizenship?," *Ann. Tour. Res.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 361–378, 2012.
- [38] M. Haddock and P. Devereux, "Documenting the contribution of volunteering to the SDGs: The challenges and opportunities of universal SDGs," *forthcoming*, 2015.
- [39] M. S. Sherraden, J. Stringham, S. Costanzo, and A. M. McBride, "The forms and structure of international voluntary service," *Volunt. Int. J. Volunt. Nonprofit Organ.*, vol. 17, pp. 163–180, 2006.
- [40] CCIVS, "White paper on international voluntary service: Global strategies for global challenges," Paris, 2011.
- [41] Representatives of the United States, *Use of Volunteer Workers in the Operational Programmes of the United Nations and Related Agencies*. 1961, p. E/TAC/109.
- [42] I. Pinkau, "Costs of overseas volunteers for development," International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, Washington D.C., 1970.

- [43] Y. Beigbeder, *The role and status of international humanitarian volunteers and organizations: The right and duty to humanitarian assistance*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.
- [44] CCIVS, *White paper on international voluntary service: Global strategies for global challenges*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, 2011.
- [45] UNV, "United Nations Volunteers - Report of the UNDP administrator to the Executive Board: Annex 1. Statistical overview on UN Volunteers," 2014. [Online]. Available: [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/ExecutiveBoard/2014/Annual-session/English/dp2014-13\\_Annex\\_1.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/ExecutiveBoard/2014/Annual-session/English/dp2014-13_Annex_1.pdf).
- [46] I. Pinkau, "A comparative evaluation of volunteer development services: Their nature, effectiveness, policy issues, and cooperative relationship," in *Volunteers, voluntary associations, and development*, D. H. Smith and F. Elkin, Eds. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill, 1981, pp. 57–74.
- [47] ISVS, "ISVS World statistical directory of volunteer and development service organisations," International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, Genève, 1973.
- [48] CCIVS / UNESCO, *Directory of organisations for long-term voluntary service*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, 1985.
- [49] UNV, *World statistical directory: Volunteer and development service organizations*. Geneva: United Nations Volunteers, 1977.
- [50] CCIVS, *CCIVS directory of member organizations*. Paris: Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, 2015.
- [51] D. Newell, *Volunteer service for peace; Account of an international consultation held May 27-29, 1970 at Feldafing, Germany*. Genève: International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, 1970.
- [52] U. Udochuku, *Volunteer service and development, social change and conflict*. Geneva: International Peace Academy and the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, 1971.
- [53] W. J. H. Kouwenhoven, *Volunteered-aided community development: ISVS consultant report*, Internatio. Washington DC: International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, 1966.
- [54] M. Adams, *Voluntary Service Overseas: The story of the first ten years*. London: Faber and Faber, 1968.
- [55] JOCV, *40 years of grassroots participation*. Tokyo: Japan International Cooperation Agency, 2005.

- [56] A. Gillette, *One million volunteers: The story of volunteer youth service*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968.
- [57] ISVS, "ISVS World statistical directory of volunteer and development service organisations," Genève, 1973.
- [58] CCIVS / UNESCO, "The universal charter of volunteer service," Coordinating Committee for International Voluntary Service, Paris, 1968.
- [59] B. J. Lough, *Balancing donor priorities and the civil society function: A challenge for modern IVCOs*. Ottawa, Canada: International Forum for Volunteering in Development, 2015.
- [60] C. Ball, J. M. Hammer, and V. Yeghiayan, "Voluntarism: The real and emerging power," ACTION, Washington D.C., 1976.
- [61] UNV, "Statistical and financial information for 2013," United Nations Volunteers, Bonn, Germany, 2014.
- [62] European Commission, "EU Aid Volunteers," 2014. [Online]. Available: [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/georgieva/hot\\_topics/european\\_humanitarian\\_voluntary\\_corps\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/georgieva/hot_topics/european_humanitarian_voluntary_corps_en.htm). [Accessed: 04-Sep-2015].
- [63] E. Etim, "African Union Youth Volunteer Corps," in *IVCO 2011: Valuing Volunteering*, 2011.
- [64] Australian Volunteers International, "History," 2015. [Online]. Available: <http://www.australianvolunteers.com/volunteer/why-volunteer-with-avi/history.aspx>. [Accessed: 27-Aug-2015].
- [65] C. Ball, J. M. Hammer, and V. Yeghiayan, "Voluntarism: The real and emerging power," Washington D.C., 1976.
- [66] B. J. Lough and C. Allum, "Effects of neoliberal adjustments on government-funded international volunteer cooperation organizations," *Dev. Pract.*, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 908–919, 2013.
- [67] SAGE Net, Ed., *International volunteering in Southern Africa: Potential for change?* Bonn: Scientia Bonnensis, 2012.
- [68] C. Allum, *International volunteering and co-operation: New developments in programme models*. Montreal, Canada: International FORUM on Development Service, 2007.
- [69] A. Jones, "Review of gap year provision," Department for Education and Skills: School of Geography, Birkbeck College, University of London, London, 2004.

- [70] Unité, "50 Jahre personelle entwicklungszusammenarbeit," Unité, Bern, 2015.
- [71] A. M. McBride, M. Sherraden, C. Benítez, and L. Johnson, "Civic service worldwide: A preliminary assessment.," in *Service enquiry: Service in the 21st century*, First., H. Perold, S. Stroud, and M. Sherraden, Eds. Johannesburg: Global Service Institute and Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa., 2003, pp. 3–17.
- [72] I. Pinkau, *An evaluation of development services and their cooperative relationships*. Washington DC: Society for International Development, 1978.
- [73] I. Pinkau, "Living allowances and arrangements for overseas volunteers," Washington D.C., 1969.
- [74] B. McMillon, D. Cutchins, and A. Geissinger, *Volunteer vacations: Short-term adventures that will benefit you and others*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 2009.
- [75] B. J. Lough, X. Xiang, and S. Kang, "Skills-based international volunteering among older adults from the US," *Adm. Soc.*, 2014.
- [76] KOICA, *Opening a new era of happiness for all humanity: Korea's official development assistance white paper*. Seoul: Korea International Cooperation Agency, 2014.
- [77] Peace Corps, "Fast Facts," 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://www.peacecorps.gov/about/fastfacts/>.
- [78] B. Edwards, L. Mooney, and C. Heald, "Who is being served? The impact of student volunteering on local community organizations," *Nonprofit Volunt. Sect. Q.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 444–461, 2001.
- [79] L. A. Graham, E. M. Mavungu, H. Perold, K. Cronin, L. Muchemwa, and B. J. Lough, "International volunteers and the development of host organisations in Africa: Lessons from Tanzania and Mozambique," in *International volunteering in Southern Africa: Potential for change?*, SAGE Net, Ed. Bonn, Germany: Scientia Bonnensis, 2012, pp. 31–59.
- [80] Peace Corps, "Peace Corps history: A proud history, an ever-changing World," 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://www.peacecorps.gov/about/history/>. [Accessed: 31-Aug-2015].
- [81] AVI, *A year in review summarised financial report 2013-2014*. Melbourne: Australian Volunteers International, 2014.
- [82] ISVS, "Volunteer manpower for development: Final report, ISVS World Assembly Meeting," International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, Washington D.C., 1967.
- [83] D. R. Shea, "The preparation of Peace Corps Volunteers for overseas service: Challenge and response," *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 365, pp. 29–45, 1966.

- [84] I. Pinkau, "Living allowances and arrangements for overseas volunteers," International Secretariat for Volunteer Service, Washington D.C., 1969.
- [85] A. Fee, "The role of human resources in protecting expatriates: Insights from the international aid and development sector," *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, vol. forthcoming, 2015.
- [86] R. Zúñiga, *Evaluation and research of volunteer service organizations; An account of and ISVS workshop in cooperation with the German Foundation for Developing Countries and the German Volunteer Service*. Washington DC: International Secretariat for Volunteer Service (ISVS), 1969.
- [87] N. Georgeou and S. Engel, "The impact of neoliberalism and new managerialism on development volunteering: An Australian case study," *Aust. J. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 297–311, 2011.
- [88] V. J. Seelig and B. J. Lough, *Strategic directions for global research on volunteering for peace and sustainable development. (CSD Workshop Report No. 15-45)*. St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Center for Social Development, 2015.
- [89] P. Devereux and K. Guse, "MDGs, sustainable development goals and the post 2015 agenda: Opportunities for consolidating the recognition of volunteerism," Ottawa, 2012.
- [90] P. Devereux, "International volunteers: cheap help or transformational solidarity toward sustainable development," Murdoch University, Perth, 2010.
- [91] J. Rehnstrom, "Development cooperation in practice: The United Nations Volunteers in Nepal," United Nations University, Tokyo, 2000.
- [92] B. J. Lough, "Participatory research on the contributions of international volunteerism in Kenya: Provisional results," International FORUM on Development Service, Fitzroy, Australia, 2012.
- [93] H. Perold, E. M. Mavungu, K. Cronin, L. Graham, L. Muchemwa, and B. J. Lough, "International voluntary service in Southern African Development Community (SADC): Host organisation perspectives from Mozambique and Tanzania," Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (VOSESA), Johannesburg, 2011.
- [94] M. von Schenck, "The future of volunteer service," *Volunt. action*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 20,24, 1967.



**UN**

**Volunteers**

inspiration in action