VOLUNTEER STEWARDSHIP MANAGEMENT MODELS FOR VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

Author(s)

Lucas C.P.M. Meijs

Author(s) contact details

Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam

lmeys@rsm.nl

+31 (0) 10 4081921

Author(s) biography (50 words)

Prof. Dr. Lucas Meijs (1963) is professor of "Strategic Philanthropy and volunteering" at RSM, Erasmus University, the Netherlands. He research focuses on volunteer management, corporate community involvement and service learning . He has served for six years as the first non North-America editor of *Nonprofit and voluntary Sector Quarterly.*

Author(s) ORCID ID

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9213-2833

Abstract 100-200 words

> **Commented [KS1]:** Please add a short abstract

Most events depend on volunteers. But not all events should manage volunteers in the same way. In general, Mega Events, certainly when they organized every time in different locations, should apply a programme management approach in which volunteers have less autonomy and are placed in well defined assignments. Smaller local events, certainly if they are organized frequently, should apply a member management approach that gives volunteers more freedom to create their own assignments. Next to that, event volunteer manager should develop strategies to engage with the new providers of access to volunteer energy such as corporations, educational institutes, family volunteering and single volunteers. These dual or shared volunteer management systems offer easy recruitability but might influence the autonomy of the event organization.

Introduction

Although already in the late 1960s and early 1970s volunteer management attracted attention (Brudney et al., 2016), volunteer administration and management still adopts a Human Resource Management (HRM) (Studer and von Schnurbein, 2013) approach based upon the metaphor of the workplace (see also Safrit and Schmiesing (2012). This HRM perspective is being supplemented with attention to paid staff-volunteer relations, the development of general management support from the non-profit organisation, and the perspective of community involvement in general (Brudney, Meijs, and Van Overbeeke, 2019). This has lead to the development of a contingency approach in which is understood that the management of volunteers should differ between contexts (Rochester, 1999). Brudney and Meijs (2014) show that there is indeed a large collection of contingency models based upon the characteristics of either the volunteer, or the program and organization.. Volunteer-focused criteria relate to such factors as the motivations of volunteers, their willingness to commit time, and their connection to the organization. Program/organization criteria are for example, the structure, type, and mission of the organization. Combining volunteer and organisational factors leads to a creative perspective that combines HRM principles with citizen participation and engagement that drive volunteerism: the 'ratchet model' (Brudney and Sink, 2017). They claim that volunteer managers, depending on the situation should or could tighten (more HRM) or loosen up (a more informal, participative approach) (Brudney and Sink, 2017). The underlying idea for this chapter is that in Mega Events volunteer management in many cases can be rather tight but that in smaller local events the systems ratchet must be loosened. Likewise, there might be some external developments asking for some loosening up.

For understanding external developments and the balancing of tightening and loosening the volunteer management systems, the recent developed volunteer stewardship model (Brudney, Meijs, and Van Overbeeke, 2019) will be used. This model recognizes that the value chain of volunteering has two steps. In the first step, volunteer involving organizations access volunteer energy. Volunteer energy is the resource underlying the potential to volunteer (Brudney and Meijs, 2009). In the second step, this potential is guided into effective volunteering.According to Brudney, et all (2019) access to volunteer

energy can be typified as a private resource or a common pool. Private resource access means that the potential volunteer is previously connected to the recruiting volunteer organization itself such as being a member in a membership organization (see Tschirhart, 2006) or connected to a sending third party (home) organization (Haski-Leventhal, Meijs, and Hustinx 2010), for example community and/or service learning by educational institutes or corporate volunteering by companies. Private access starts with a list of people of which the organization knows how to contact them. Common pool access means that potential volunteer has weak ties with or even has no prior knowledge of the organization. Common pool acces starts with some general communication to unknown audiences. Guidance provided to volunteers is either unitary, when home and host organization are the same or shared when the home organization is for example a company while the host organization is for example an event using volunteers. Mega events in many cases already have volunteers send to them and operate implicitly on shared systems, while smaller local events might be based upon one local organization that uses both regular organizational volunteers and occasional episodic volunteers that participate in every event again (Macduff, 2005).

Combining access and guidance, Brudney, Meijs, and Van Overbeeke (2019) present a 2x2 matrix for volunteer management or stewardship. The first cell can be characterized as "membership management" (private resource access, guidance provided by the host membership organization). A second model can be characterized as "service delivery or program management" (common pool access, guidance by the host service organization). The two other models incorporate new forms in which two organizations and two managers share the volunteers. The third, "secondary management model" is based on non-volunteer involving third parties (see Haski-Leventhal et al, 2010) where access to the volunteers is restricted (to company employees or students), but two organizations provide guidance. In the last "intermediary management model", volunteers are accessed from throughout the broader community, for example, as in a public media campaign for an event like a National Day of Service (see e.g. Compion, Jeong, Cnaan, and Meijs, 2020). Seen from the four different volunteer stewardship models of Brudney et al (2019) event volunteering might involve all four models; these will be discussed below.

Table 1. Volunteer Stewardship Framework (Brudney et al, 2019, p 73)

		Access to Volunteer Energy	
		Private resource	Common pool
Guidance of Volunteers	Unitary	- Membership Model - Examples: Membership association, self-help group	- Service Model - Examples: Volunteer service-delivery program in a nonprofit organization or government agency
	Shared	- Secondary model - Examples: Corporate volunteer program, school-based volunteer program	- Intermediary Model - Examples: Volunteer center, "voluntourism" agency

The first section of this chapter deals with the two traditional unitary guidance approaches membership versus program /service delivery management of volunteers. This discussion will be placed in the perspective of the tightening and loosening of the 'ratchet' (Brudney and Sink, 2017). The second section will shed some light on the role of event volunteer managers in the two shared guidance approaches. Given the need for large groups of episodic volunteers, volunteer managers of events will make use of the intermediary model and secondary to be able to contact potential volunteers leading to additional challenges and tasks to do. But, maybe secondary organizations can

be very important in providing more skill-based volunteers such as treasures provided by accountancy firms. The chapter finishes with an outlook of the possibilities for the future.

Membership management and program management

Handy (1988) and Meijs (1997) show that mission, in the simplest form service delivery, mutual benefit/support or campaigning, is an important contingency factor for volunteer management. Based upon mission,Meijs and Hoogstad (2001) (see also Meijs & Karr, 2004) developed two different styles of management of volunteers: membership management and program management. In this typology management systems focus either on the volunteers themselves (membership management) or on specific operational tasks (program management). Membership management is loose, while in program management volunteer systems are tightened.

For mega events most volunteer management approaches can be seen as rather focussed on the organizational perspective applying a program management system. First, almost all events attract episodic volunteers, individuals who engage in one-time or short-term volunteer opportunities (Cnaan & Handy, 2005; Macduff, 1990) which is also a global trend (Hyde, Dunn, Scuffham, & Chamber, 2014). Indeed, episodic volunteering is quite common in sporting events (Filo, Funk, & O'Brien, 2008a, 2008b; Hamm, MacLean, & Misener, 2008; Fairley, Kellet and Green, 2007; Kodama, Doherty, & Popovic, 2013; Koutrou, & Pappous, 2016; Vetitnev, Bobina, & Terwiel, 2018) and fundraising events (Beder & Fast, 2008; Wood, Snelgrove, & Danylchuk, 2010) but also in religion (see e.g. Cnaan, Heist and Storti, 2017). Cnaan and collegues recently published a literature review covering episodic volunteering in events (Cnaan et al, 2021).

Mostly episodic volunteers want to be managed in a program management approach, which sometimes becomes extreme or very tight when the volunteer accept less autonomy in their volunteering than usually ongoing volunteers would (Maas, Meijs and Brudney, 2020). This is the organizational field of mega-events that are large scale one-time events organized by a special organization or authority attracting visitors and mass media attention. Often, such as the Olympic

Games, these mega events change location every time. Mega events are can be seen as similar to national days of service (NDS) (Maas et al, 2020; Compion et al, 2020), an example of the intermediary management model to be discussed in the next section,.

Second, in contract many (smaller) events (Non Mega Events see Taks, Chalip and Green, 2015) are organized by an ongoing local organization that organizes the same event every year. Sometimes the local event organization is part of an organization that runs activities on a weekly basis, such as when the local athletic association organizes the yearly local marathon. In this case volunteers might see themselves much more as volunteer-members than in the mega events that even might move location. These organizations likely will and must apply the membership approach, as some volunteers are regular volunteers within the organization or the volunteers are occasional volunteers that participate every year in the same event (Macduff, 2005). Occasional volunteers are known to the event organization from previous years which makes recruitment easier but also might pose other challenges in management as the volunteers might have their own opinion on how to run things.

It is clear that the two forms of volunteer management are likely combined in events as Rochester (2018, 36) argued that always many projects have a core of "highly committed serious leisure volunteers who formed the 'inner group of willing people'" being assisted by a host of episodic volunteers (see also Meijs (2004) for a description of the two systems in a political party). Again, in mega events the core is more detached from the (potential) volunteers than in small local events.

[1]So, membership management starts with the possibilities, wants and needs of the volunteers. The idea of membership management is to start with the preferences of the volunteers by asking each member what he or she wants to do. It resembles a team approach to building a car in which team members can perform all tasks. In this membership approach, management is based upon strong

---

[1] The sections on membership and program management are based upon Meijs and Hoogstad (2001) and Meijs & Karr (2004).

personal links between the manager and the volunteers, leading to accepting management based upon authority instead of power. This yields a strong organizational culture with shared norms and values, which help to establish organizational control (Pearce, 1993). At the same time, this management approach does not support the idea that volunteers can be disciplined or "fired" if they do not perform. Recognition comes from peers, not from external forces. According to Meijs and Karr (2004, p178) the strong point of membership management is its capability "of generating broad, multifaceted involvement of volunteers, leading perhaps to a greater overall satisfaction with the volunteer experience." In the membership approach the management systems are loose instead of tightened (Brudney and Sink, 2017).

By contrast, the program management model operates much like an assembly line for building a car or the classical workplace approach to volunteer management as described above. The model begins with needs assessment from the organization. These needs are translated into tasks for the volunteers to perform. Because the organizational perspective is the starting point, it becomes much more feasible to control or reject volunteers. Although program management is unlikely to yield great loyalty on the part of volunteers, it can attract many volunteers based upon a volunteer scenario approach combining the needed availability and assets to what volunteers are willing to bring (Meijs and Brudney, 2007).

Membership management might generate broad, multi-faceted involvement of volunteers. By focusing first on the volunteers (who are treated as members and have a large sense of belonging to the organization) and their goals, the membership-managed organization shapes itself to the needs and desires of its volunteers. Through careful attention from a social perspective to who is to be admitted to membership or volunteering, it guards against the introduction of members whose goals may be contrary to those of the existing membership. This leads to a very 'our breed of volunteers' and a difficulty in working with diversity. Because it is tailor-made to the specifications of their own ideas, it would be difficult for a member or volunteer to find such a good fit with any other organization. Because the costs of both entry and exit are high, the membership-managed organization may cultivate considerable loyalty among its individual members. Entry costs are high because people

need to develop social ties and trust with the organization (typically this is done by all kind of social activities with existing volunteers). Exit costs are high because people loose long-time friendships while leaving. By these means a strong organizational culture is developed. For events this leads to less need for formal training and introduction. But also former event-volunteers might still be seen as special guest of the event (part of the 'family') or, in the case of an ongoing organization that also organizes an event, be regular volunteers with the core organization. Organizing an event in a membership approach is a repeating action for almost all volunteers, not only the organizers. However, membership management does not always provide a stable basis for the continuity of an event. While individual volunteers may indeed remain loyal to the event for long periods of time, the events and organization itself risks stagnation and eventually extinction. While the extensive and prolonged involvement of all volunteers, both the core organizers as the occasional episodics provides continuity to the organization, it makes it very difficult to adapt to environmental changes or even demographic shifts in the people that want to participate in the event.. In some cases the core organizing volunteers are even more 'old fashioned' or traditional than the occasional volunteers while the occasional volunteer is outdated compared to the diversity in the population and the changes in the event that needs to be made. Because of this, the membership-managed organization may eventually face a slow and painful death! Consider the example of traditional sport organizations that continue to organize tournaments during holidays that externals see as really outdated.

Program management, on the other hand, has a clear eye toward continuity for the event . The general focus on carefully specified tasks already guards against any one volunteer becoming indispensable. The limited scope of involvement expected of any volunteer facilitates both the entry and exit of volunteers, who may affiliate with the event organization only for the purpose of performing one specific, time-limited task. This is of course extremely evident when the event moves geographically. Because the tasks to be accomplished take priority over the aims of the volunteers performing them, the program-managed organization is capable of maintaining smooth, consistent operations, also in different locations. Because each task is, for the most part, a self-contained unit, changes in response

to new developments in the event involves only the reworking of single components rather than an overall shift in ideology or traditions. The program-managed organization is resilient and flexible.

Program management will not cultivate –loyalty on the part of volunteers. People who join an event organization in order to participate in just the event or those focused on specific activities are less likely to identify themselves as members of the organization than are those whose involvement is broader (see Karr, 2001). A program-managed organization is dependent on the availability of fresh supplies of volunteers, thus risking high turnover, impersonality, and co-optation. This is, again, no problem at all for the mega events that move location every time and are fashionable to volunteer for. It might even make their volunteer management easier as volunteers indeed will expect to be instructed (see Maas et al 2020). But it also will lead to higher recruitment and coordination costs that might be difficult to carry for small local event organizers.

Connecting to the shared management models: Intermediary and Secondary

The intermediary and secondary models are those in which the volunteer management process is shared between two organizations. The first manager is located in a home, sending theme such as, in the case of the intermediary model, a volunteer centre, thematic organizations such as single volunteers[2] or family volunteering[3], or national days of service (see e.g. Compion et al, 2020, Maas et al, 2020 print) . In the secondary model, the home organization is a third party like companies and educational institutes (Haski-Leventhal, 2010). The difference between intermediary and secondary is that in the latter the volunteers are organizational members of this third party (e.g. employees or students). The second manager is located in a host, receiving and placing organization such as an event organizer or a regular nonprofit agency. For the host organizations, such as an event organization, these sending organization form an additional or even new entrance to volunteer energy (Brudney and Meijs, 2009) and support recuitability. Compion et al (2020) describe how Mandela

---

[2] https://www.singlevolunteers.org/
[3] https://www.doinggoodtogether.org/volunteer-together-local

Day attracts people that never volunteered before. Krasnopolskaya, Roza and Meijs (2016) show that in Russia corporate volunteering is a very prominent way to attract volunteers. According to Brudney et al (2019) there is limited research on volunteer management in the shared models in leading handbooks or review articles. However they do find some literature applying the volunteer management perspective to corporate volunteering (for example, Tschirhart, 2005; Roza, Shachar, Meijs, & Hustinx, 2017) or service learning and court-referred volunteering (Haski-Levethal, et al, 2010), and volunteer centers (Bos, 2014; Osborne, 1999) and a more specific one (Follman, Cseh, and Brudney, 2016) on volunteer programs in several national parks in the United States.

According to Brudney et al (2009) the shared models are in many cases based upon a, sometimes implicit, 'hyphen' approach. This approach is based on combining volunteering with another activity in the busy schedules/agendas of prospective volunteers to enable and pressure them to volunteer (Hustinx and Meijs, 2011). Indeed, most shared models that 'hyphen' two activities (e.g. dating and volunteering (single-volunteers), learning and volunteering (service-learning), holidaying and volunteering (volunteer tourism)) are clear examples of the two strategies, enablement and pressure, used by communities and organizations to re-embed volunteering (Hustinx and Meijs, 2011). Enablement is aimed at improving and enlarging the availability of potential volunteers by indeed creating a 'if you can't beat them, join them strategy'. Pressure is aimed at creating an additional reason, mostly instrumental, for organizations access their members, employees or students to ask them to volunteer. An interesting example is corporate volunteering in which companies can decide that they simply facilitate the individual volunteering of employees by allowing some rescheduling or enforce the team building societal volunteering projects and see the time as worktime, but companies can decide to publish or not publish about this to create more or less instrumental value for the company (Meijs, Tschirhart, Ten Hoorn, and Brudney, 2009).

The managers of the event volunteers in the shared models do not only have management issues of working with volunteers in their home (event) organization but also need to collaboration and develop partnerships with the host organizations or develop themes themselves In case of the secondary model, there will be a relation, maybe even a contract, in which the home and host organizations

define who will volunteer and under which conditions. Sometimes nonprofit organizations face difficulties in negotiating this contract as for example there are (perceived) power imbalances between the home and host organization such as in corporate volunteering (Roza, Shachar, Meijs, & Hustinx, 2017). For the intermediary model it might be that the event organizer creates assignment that are good for family volunteering, e.g. giving water bottles to athletes or cleaning up an area, or that a specific attractive for singles, like cooking together and having a party afterwards. But having said this, the shared models are a promising reality for volunteer managers in events as they give easy access to more and different volunteers. Haski-Leventhal et al (2010) call this recruitability.

In order to achieve the full benefits of the shared models, the manager(s) have to combine the instrumental use of volunteers for two organizations. For the event organization the instrumental benefit is clear: without the volunteers there is no event or at least it would be much more expensive or less embedded in society. But for the home organization or theme this is more diverse although for every 'hyphen' it is clear. Obviously, the intended instrumental result for a single-volunteers organization are happy couples afterwards, for family volunteering quality time and the transfer of family habits and for service learning the achievement of learning objectives. But in the case of e.g. corporate volunteering this might be different as corporate volunteering programs can have multiple goals that even might differ between volunteering opportunities (Roza, 2016). Clearly the volunteer jobs will be different if the corporate goal is to achieve teambuilding, a positive image or individual development for employees. The volunteer manager of the event safes time and effort on recruiting volunteers but maybe spends some more time on creating the instrumental goals.

Conclusion

Generally spoken volunteer management in events is very straightforward. Events are one of the organizational contexts in which an organizational focused program management approach (Meijs and Hoogstad, 2001) is very applicable. This program management can even be tightened more (Brudney and Sink, 2017) in the case of mega scale events that have no problem attracting plenty volunteers. This is even more so when these events move location every time such as with the Olympic Games. However, (yearly) recurring local events organized by ongoing local (volunteer) organizations might

have a different relation with their volunteers. As these occasional volunteers (Macduff, 2005) have a history with the event and the organization, they might have ideas about how to do their work themselves. This creates a reasons to loosen the management approach and introduce more membership elements.

Next to this the emergence of the dual or shared volunteer stewardship models create new challenges for the event volunteer manager. On the one hand these organizations (secondary models) or themes (intermediary) 'hyphen' the volunteering to another obligation in the schedule of the potential volunteer and make recruitment easier. But at the same time, they add another layer of instrumental goals to the volunteer involvement. It is not only the volunteer that might have an instrumental goal such as creating a vitae item, there is also a third party like an educational institute or a company having objectives. For example, in order to achieve service learning goals of a university course, the student-volunteers actually have to learn something. And if the learning is taken seriously it might mean that they are not totaly capable of performing good enough yet. Likewise, if corporate volunteering is meant to support team building, the social aspects might intrude on the volunteer activities.

References

Beder, J., & Fast, J. (2008). Episodic volunteering: Why people walk/run for charity. *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 25*(3), 3-13.

Bos, C.M. van den (2014, Maart 06). *Using Volunteering Infrastructure to Build Civil Society.* Erasmus University Rotterdam (250 pag.) (Arnhem: Stichting Rijnstad).

Brudney, J. L.; Lee, Y.J.; Bin Afif, S.A.; Ockenden, N; and Sillah, A. (2016). "Formal Volunteer Service Programs." Pages 330-348 in David Horton Smith, Robert A. Stebbins, and Jurgen Grotz (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Volunteering, Civic Participation, and Nonprofit Associations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brudney, Jeffrey L., and Hayley K. Sink. (2017). "Volunteer Management: It All Depends." (2017). Pages 204-222 in Jessica K.A. Word and Jessica E. Sowa (eds.) The Nonprofit Resource Management Handbook: From Theory to Practice. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brudney, J. L., Meijs, L. C., & van Overbeeke, P. S. (2019). More is less? The volunteer stewardship framework and models. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 30*(1), 69-87.

Brudney, J. L. & Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2014). Models of Volunteer Management: Professional Volunteer Program Management in Social Work. *Human Service Organizations Management, Leadership & Governance, 38*(3), 297-309. DOI: 10.1080/23303131.2014.899281

Brudney, J. L., & Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2009). It ain't natural: toward a new (natural) resource conceptualization for volunteer management. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.* Vol. 38 (4), pp. 564–581.

Cnaan, R. A., & Handy, F. (2005). Towards Understanding Episodic Volunteering. *Vrijwillige Inzet Onderzocht [Volunteering Researched], 2* (1), 29-35.

Cnaan, R. A., Meijs, L., Brudney, J. L., Hersberger-Langloh, S., Okada, A., & Abu-Rumman, S. (2021). You Thought That This Would Be Easy? Seeking an Understanding of Episodic Volunteering. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1-13.

Cnaan, R. A., Heist, H. D., & Storti, M. H. (2017). Episodic volunteering at a religious megaevent: Pope Francis's visit to Philadelphia. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 28*(1), 85-104.

Compion, S., Jeong, B. G., Cnaan, R., & Meijs, L. (2020). Mobilising episodic volunteers for Mandela Day. *Voluntary Sector Review.*

Fairley, S., Kellett, F., & Green, C. (2007). Volunteering abroad: Motives for travel to volunteer at the Athens Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management 21*(1), 41-57.

Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., O'Brien, D. (2008b). The meaning behind attachment: Exploring camaraderie, cause, and competency at a charity sport event. *Journal of Sport Management 23*(3), 361 – 87.

Filo, K. R., Funk, D. C., O'Brien, D. (2008a). It's really not about the bike: Exploring attraction and attachment to the events of the Lance Armstrong Foundations. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*(5), 501-525.

Follman, J., Cseh, M., & Brudney, J. L. (2016). Structures, challenges, and successes of volunteer programs co-managed by nonprofit and public organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 26*(4), 453-470.

Hamm, S., MacLean, J., & Misener, K. (2008). Understanding the commitment and motivation of large sporting event volunteers. *International Journal of Volunteer Administration, 25*(3), 26-38.

Handy, C. (1988). *Understanding voluntary organizations, how to make them function effectively from the author of understanding organizations.* Penguin Books, London.

Haski-Leventhal, D., Meijs, L.C.P.M., & Hustinx, L. (2010). The third party model: enhancing volunteering through governments, corporations and educational institutes. *Journal of Social Policy, 39*(1), 139–158.

Hyde, M. K., Dunn, J., Scuffham, P. A., & Chamber, S.K. (2014). A systematic review of episodic volunteering in public health and others contexts. *BMC Public Health, 14*(992).

Kodama, E., Doherty, A., & Popovic, M. (2013). Front line insight: An autoethnography of the Vancouver 2010 volunteer experience. *European Sport Management Quarterly, 13*(1), 76-93.

Koutrou, N., & Pappous, A. S. (2016). Towards an Olympic volunteering legacy: Motivating volunteers to serve and remain – a case study of London 2012 Olympic Games volunteers. *Voluntary Sector Review, 7*(3), 269-291.

Krasnopolskaya, Irina, Lonneke Roza, and Lucas CPM Meijs (2016). "The relationship between corporate volunteering and employee civic engagement outside the workplace in Russia." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 27.2: 640-672.

Macduff, N. (1990). Episodic volunteers: Reality for the future. *Voluntary Action Research*, Spring, 15-17.

Macduff, N. (2004). *Episodic volunteering: Organizing and managing the short-term volunteer program*. Walla Walla, WA: MBA Publishing.

Maas, S. A., Meijs, L. C., & Brudney, J. L. (2020). Designing "National Day of Service" Projects to Promote Volunteer Job Satisfaction. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 0899764020982664.

Meijs, L. C. P. M. (1997). *Management van vrijwilligersorganisaties*. NOV Publikaties, Utrecht.

Meijs, L.C.P.M., & Hoogstad, E. (2001). New ways of managing volunteers: Combining membership management and programme management. *Voluntary Action*, *3*(3), 41-61.

Meijs, Lucas C.P.M. & Linda Bridges Karr. (2004). Managing volunteers in different settings: Membership and Programme Management. In: Stebbins, Robert A. and Margaret Graham. (eds). 2004. *Volunteering as Leisure/Leisure as Volunteering*. CABI publishers, Oxfordshire. pp. 177–193.

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

Meijs, L. C. P. M., Tschirhart, M., Ten Hoorn, E. M. and Brudney, J. L. (2009), 'The effect of design elements for corporate volunteer programs on volunteerability', *The International Journal of Volunteer Administration*, 26: 23–32.

Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2004). 'Campaigning organisaties in verandering'. In: Vrijwillige Inzet Onderzocht (1) 1. P. 34-44.

Osborne, S. P. (1999). Volunteer Bureaux and the promotion and support of volunteering in local communities in England. London, *Voluntary Action Institute for Volunteering Research -*, *1*, 67-84.

Pearce, J. L. (1993). Volunteers: The organizational behavior of unpaid workers. London/New York: Routledge.

Rochester, C. (1999). One size does not fit all: Four models of involving volunteers in voluntary organizations. *Voluntary Action, 1* (2), 47-59.

Rochester, C. (2018). *Trends in volunteering*. Belfast: Volunteer Now.

Roza, L., Shachar, I., Meijs, L., & Hustinx, L. (2017). The nonprofit case for corporate volunteering: a multi-level perspective. *The Service Industries Journal*, *37*(11-12), 746-765.

Roza, L. (2016). *Employee Engagement In Corporate Social Responsibility*. ERIM / Erasmus University, Rotterdam, The Netherlands (No. EPS-2016-396-ORG).

Safrit, R. D., & Schmiesing, R. (2012). Volunteer models and management. *The Volunteer Management Handbook, 2nd ed., edited by TD Connors*, 3-30.

Studer, S., & Von Schnurbein, G. (2013). Organizational factors affecting volunteers: A literature review on volunteer coordination. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, *24*(2), 403-440.

Taks, M., Chalip, L., & Green, B. C. (2015). Impacts and strategic outcomes from non-mega sport events for local communities. *European sport management quarterly*, *15*(1), 1-6.

Tschirhart, M. (2005). Employee volunteer programs. In J. L. Brudney (ed.), *Emerging Areas of Volunteering.* Indianapolis: Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action.

Tschirhart, M. (2006). Nonprofit membership associations. In Powell, W.W., & Steinberg, R.S. (Eds.), *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed., 523-541). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Vetitnev, A., Bobina, N., & Terwiel, F. A. (2018). The influence of host volunteer motivation on satisfaction and attitudes toward Sochi 2014 Olympic Games. *Event Management, 22*(3), 333-352.

Wood, L., R. Snelgrove , R. & Danylchuk, K. (2010). Segmenting volunteer fundraisers at a charity sport event. *Journal of Nonprofit Public Sector Marketing 22*, 38 – 54.