

ANNEXES

Key terms

ANNEX

1

▶ VOLUNTEERISM, VOLUNTEERING AND VOLUNTARY ACTIVITIES

A wide range of activities undertaken of free will, for the general public good, for which monetary reward is not the principal motivating factor (UNGA 2002).

▶ FORMAL VOLUNTEERING

Voluntary activity undertaken through an organization, typified by volunteers making an ongoing or sustained commitment to an organization and contributing their time on a regular basis (UNV 2015a, p. xxv).

▶ INFORMAL VOLUNTEERING

Voluntary activities done directly, unmediated by any formal organization that coordinates larger-scale volunteer efforts (UNV 2015a, p. xxv).

▶ COMMUNITY

A group of people who may or may not live within the same area, village or neighbourhood, who may or may not share similar culture, habits and resources and who are exposed to the same threats and risks, such as disease, political and economic issues and natural disasters (IFRC 2014, p. 10).

▶ RESILIENCE

An inherent as well as acquired condition achieved by managing risks over time at the individual, household, community and societal levels in ways that minimize costs, build capacity to manage and sustain development momentum and maximize transformative potential (UNDP 2013, p. 34).

ANNEX 2 Volunteering by country

The global estimates used in this report are extrapolated from data on formal volunteering from 62 countries and from data on informal volunteering from 40 countries (see UNV 2018a for further details).

Table A2.1 Volunteering by country, 2016 (or closest year available)*

Country or territory	Population aged 15 or older	Formal volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Informal volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Total volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Source**	
		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Formal	Informal
Argentina	20,401,738	121,310	53,426	67,884	343,831	114,280	229,552	465,141	167,706	297,435	a	a
Armenia	2,107,000	8,352	3,946	4,406	18,207	6,365	11,842	26,559	10,311	16,248	a	a
Australia	19,263,000	422,330	144,218	278,111	532,651	205,769	326,882	954,981	349,987	604,993	a	a
Austria	7,246,000	233,961	138,374	95,587	200,141	78,579	121,562	434,102	216,953	217,149	b	f
Belgium	9,329,000	130,000	89,554	40,446	-	-	-	130,000	89,554	40,446	b	f
Brazil	44,460,000	535,048	227,009	308,039	1,165,018	332,975	832,043	1,700,066	559,985	1,140,081	a	f
Bulgaria	6,172,000	7,909	3,736	4,172	191,998	92,360	99,639	199,907	96,096	103,811	a	a
Cameroon	12,345,286	24,887	13,846	11,041	306,766	134,004	172,762	331,653	147,850	183,803	e	a
Canada	29,280,000	1,111,818	485,003	626,815	931,348	366,102	565,246	2,043,166	851,105	1,192,061	e	a
Chile	14,344,000	164,864	69,948	94,916	375,866	107,427	268,440	540,730	177,375	363,355	a	a
China	1,132,960,000	3,913,290	1,961,151	1,952,139	7,826,580	3,922,303	3,904,277	11,739,870	5,883,454	5,856,416	e	e
Colombia	34,310,000	474,362	151,457	322,905	899,050	256,959	642,092	1,373,412	408,416	964,996	e	a
Croatia	3,586,000	29,412	13,896	15,516	116,463	57,281	59,182	145,875	71,177	74,698	c	a
Cyprus	676,000	18,615	6,631	11,984	19,082	8,550	10,531	37,697	15,181	22,516	c	f
Czech Republic	8,936,000	26,413	12,479	13,934	290,215	142,739	147,476	316,628	155,218	161,410	e	a
Denmark	4,714,000	114,187	79,129	35,058	160,328	90,200	70,128	274,515	169,329	105,186	e	a
Egypt	60,664,000	17,335	6,175	11,161	1,712,398	767,312	945,086	1,729,734	773,487	956,247	d	f
Estonia	1,100,000	8,130	3,841	4,289	35,725	19,596	16,129	43,855	23,437	20,418	e	e
Ethiopia	11,354,772	40,484	22,524	17,960	235,482	129,254	106,228	275,966	151,778	124,188	c	a
Finland	4,562,000	85,165	47,509	37,656	107,372	47,743	59,629	192,537	95,252	97,285	d	f
France	52,578,000	1,072,000	604,626	467,374	1,817,327	452,181	1,365,146	2,889,327	1,056,806	1,832,520	d	f
Germany	70,070,000	1,405,981	828,649	577,332	1,941,587	892,394	1,049,193	3,347,568	1,721,043	1,626,525	c	f
Ghana	16,751,141	57,899	36,600	21,299	810,590	436,370	374,221	868,490	472,970	395,520	e	a
Greece	9,247,000	194,891	104,353	90,538	217,639	88,006	129,633	412,530	192,358	220,171	e	e
Hungary	8,252,000	11,315	6,673	4,642	208,418	79,257	129,161	219,733	85,930	133,803	e	a
India	805,087,343	2,254,104	1,523,331	730,773	3,273,742	1,587,303	1,686,439	5,527,846	3,110,634	2,417,212	e	a
Iran, Islamic Republic of	59,022,000	535,604	190,783	344,821	476,014	236,700	239,313	1,011,618	427,484	584,135	b	f
Ireland	3,612,000	59,920	33,158	26,761	72,353	29,257	43,096	132,273	62,416	69,857	e	e
Israel	6,000,000	38,039	13,550	24,490	169,366	75,891	93,474	207,405	89,441	117,964	f	a
Italy	52,070,000	597,390	283,905	313,486	1,075,634	318,340	757,294	1,673,024	602,245	1,070,780	d	a
Japan	110,770,000	1,051,237	544,046	507,191	801,560	467,551	334,009	1,852,797	1,011,596	841,201	d	f
Kenya	24,528,927	113,873	63,356	50,517	609,516	266,253	343,263	723,389	329,609	393,780	c	f
Korea, Republic of	43,017,000	249,472	34,101	215,372	63,180	36,853	26,327	312,652	70,953	241,699	e	f
Kyrgyzstan	4,079,000	3,055	1,443	1,612	132,474	65,156	67,318	135,529	66,599	68,930	e	e

- Not available.
- Variances are due to rounding for the purposes of this table.
- ** Key to sources:
 - a. Based on time use survey data and population data for ages 15 years and older.
 - b. Based on data from the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project.
 - c. Based on time projection.
 - d. Based on regression.
 - e. Based on local reports.
 - f. Based on regional averages and population data for ages 15 years and older.

Volunteering by country, 2016 (or closest year available)* (continued)

Country or territory	Population aged 15 or older	Formal volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Informal volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Total volunteering (full-time equivalent)			Source**	
		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Formal	Informal
Latvia	1,655,000	14,253	6,734	7,519	62,924	28,173	34,751	77,177	34,907	42,270	e	f
Lithuania	2,483,000	3,093	1,461	1,632	128,735	63,477	65,258	131,828	64,938	66,890	d	a
Luxembourg	460,000	18,070	9,675	8,394	10,827	4,378	6,449	28,896	14,053	14,843	d	a
Malta	361,000	8,396	4,495	3,900	8,497	3,436	5,061	16,892	7,931	8,961	a	a
Mexico	88,409,000	651,895	350,630	301,265	3,922,324	948,677	2,973,647	4,574,218	1,299,307	3,274,912	e	e
Moldova, Republic of	2,987,000	3,965	1,382	2,582	120,424	60,576	59,847	124,388	61,959	62,429	b	f
Mongolia	2,023,000	12,639	4,868	7,772	26,971	17,948	9,023	39,610	22,815	16,795	f	a
Morocco	24,965,000	54,539	19,427	35,112	704,702	315,771	388,930	759,241	335,198	424,042	c	f
Mozambique	12,590,105	2,238	1,245	993	312,850	136,661	176,188	315,088	137,907	177,181	a	a
Netherlands	13,874,000	488,632	226,053	262,579	326,540	132,042	194,499	815,172	358,094	457,078	c	f
New Zealand	3,626,000	133,799	51,688	82,111	100,264	38,733	61,531	234,063	90,421	143,642	b	f
Norway	4,247,000	138,769	79,018	59,751	102,756	52,286	50,471	241,525	131,304	110,221	f	a
Pakistan	111,515,000	266,377	154,785	111,592	173,599	55,420	118,179	439,976	210,205	229,771	b	f
Palestine, State of	2,836,000	25,736	9,167	16,569	137,234	54,747	82,488	162,970	63,914	99,056	e	f
Panama	2,833,000	61,314	21,642	39,672	67,653	17,282	50,371	128,967	38,924	90,043	f	a
Peru	23,450,000	215,101	123,125	91,975	529,306	146,376	382,930	744,406	269,501	474,905	a	f
Philippines	64,936,000	337,694	217,907	119,787	411,100	182,308	228,793	748,794	400,214	348,580	b	f
Poland	30,962,000	215,710	103,297	112,413	1,241,790	642,486	599,304	1,457,500	745,782	711,718	e	f
Portugal	8,866,000	109,904	33,540	76,364	99,287	25,816	73,472	209,191	59,355	149,836	f	a
Romania	16,793,000	49,417	23,347	26,070	545,387	268,243	277,145	594,804	291,590	303,215	a	a
Serbia	6,060,000	24,022	11,349	12,673	198,987	111,726	87,262	223,009	123,075	99,934	b	f
Slovakia	4,591,000	7,637	3,608	4,029	149,102	73,334	75,768	156,739	76,942	79,797	e	f
Slovenia	1,758,000	11,996	5,668	6,329	42,476	27,026	15,450	54,472	32,693	21,779	e	e
South Africa	38,981,000	120,176	57,756	62,419	211,191	47,150	164,041	331,366	104,906	226,460	b	f
Spain	38,965,000	240,704	105,817	134,887	1,148,733	412,808	735,925	1,389,437	518,626	870,812	a	a
Sweden	7,257,000	269,849	155,963	113,886	175,584	83,798	91,786	445,432	239,761	205,672	a	f
Switzerland	6,995,000	107,033	57,310	49,723	164,635	66,573	98,063	271,668	123,883	147,785	e	a
Thailand	55,238,000	103,847	70,508	33,339	738,505	388,665	349,840	842,353	459,173	383,179	f	a
Tunisia	8,491,000	146,743	52,270	94,473	239,680	107,399	132,282	386,424	159,669	226,754	e	a
Turkey	57,870,000	47,378	16,876	30,502	1,633,531	731,972	901,558	1,680,909	748,848	932,060	e	a
Uganda	17,101,419	137,097	76,277	60,820	424,951	185,630	239,321	562,048	261,907	300,141	b	f
United Kingdom	52,499,000	1,123,091	480,942	642,149	1,510,364	662,004	848,360	2,633,455	1,142,946	1,490,509	a	a
United States of America	250,801,000	6,241,525	2,692,445	3,549,080	7,801,906	2,101,571	5,700,335	14,043,431	4,794,016	9,249,415	e	f
Uruguay	2,744,000	49,298	21,509	27,788	113,903	31,765	82,138	163,201	53,274	109,927	b	a

ANNEX

3

Countries that have introduced policies, legislation or other measures on volunteering

This annex lists countries that have introduced policies, legislation or other measures specific or relevant to volunteering.

These data are based on a survey of secondary sources conducted by a consultant in September 2017 through UNV field units and regional offices. This information was then supplemented with inputs from Member States gathered for the UN Secretary-General's reports on volunteering covering the period 2008–2018.ⁱ

These data build on the analysis of volunteering policies and legislation presented by UNV in 2009 (UNV, 2009). Updates or information on additional policies and legislation can be sent to unv.swvr@unv.org

A: Countries found to have introduced policies, legislation or other measures specific or relevant to volunteering **before 2008** (23 countries):ⁱ

- > **Africa:** Burkina Faso, Senegal, United Republic of Tanzania.
- > **Asia and the Pacific:** Indonesia, Philippines, South Korea.
- > **Europe and Central Asia:** Belgium, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Kosovoⁱⁱ, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Switzerland.
- > **Latin America and the Caribbean:** Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Nicaragua, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

B: Countries found to have introduced or updated policies, legislation or other measures specific or relevant to volunteering **since 2008** (68 countries):

- > **Africa:** Benin, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Côte D'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Africa, Togo, Zambia.
- > **Arab States:** Egypt, Lebanon, Tunisia.
- > **Asia and the Pacific:** Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Fiji, India, Japan, Myanmar, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam.
- > **Europe and Central Asia:** Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Georgia, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lithuania, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom.
- > **Latin America and the Caribbean:** Argentina, Bolivia, Plurinational State of Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Panama.
- > **North America:** Canada, United States of America.

C: Countries reported to be **drafting** policies, legislation or other measures specific or relevant to volunteering at the time of compiling this review (4 countries):

- > Angola, Liberia, Paraguay, United Arab Emirates.

i. Where countries have subsequently supplemented, updated or revised policies they are not listed in this category but are listed under B or C.
ii. All references to Kosovo should be understood to be in the context of United Nations Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).

Field research methodology

ANNEX

4

The qualitative field research that informed this report followed an ethnographic and comparative case study design which allowed the research team to assess how volunteerism challenges or contributes to the adaptive strategies practised by resilient communities.

The research had two objectives:

- to identify the distinctive characteristics of volunteerism that help or hinder the target community's capacity to cope and adapt during adverse events; and
- to identify policies and norms that have supported or discouraged volunteerism for community resilience.

PREPARATIONS

Research team

The research team was led by a senior writer/researcher who was responsible, in partnership with the project coordination team, for research design, data analysis and report writing.

The senior writer/researcher also supervised the technical research team, which consisted of four regional research mentors who provided support and quality assurance to the volunteer field researchers (figure A4.1).

The field research teams comprised international and national volunteers who conducted research activities in communities in 15 countries, including designing community research plans, arranging and conducting data collection, coding, analysis, validation and country reporting. Local volunteers and partner agencies provided logistical and other support for the field teams.

To standardize the research process, the technical research team produced a 60-page field manual, *Community-Based Analysis of Volunteer Impacts on Community Resilience*, which was provided to each of the field research teams during an initial four-day training. The technical and field research teams were supported by an administrative team based at UNV headquarters along with UNV technical staff, UNV field units and partner agencies.

Table A4.1 Composition of the technical and field research teams

SENIOR WRITER/RESEARCHER			
RESEARCH MENTOR	RESEARCH MENTOR	RESEARCH MENTOR	RESEARCH MENTOR
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	Egypt	Malawi	China
Burundi	Greece	Sudan	Myanmar
Guatemala	Netherlands	Tanzania, United Republic of	Philippines
Madagascar	Russian Federation		Sri Lanka

Selection of communities

The participating communities were selected through an open call for concept notes from interested partner organizations in September–November 2017. Partner organizations were encouraged to submit suggestions for field research communities based on the following specific criteria:

- *Resilience, adaptability and self-sufficiency.* Communities where volunteers are adapting to environmental, social and economic change and demonstrating improved capacity for local self-sufficiency.
- *Impact.* Communities where volunteer engagement has led or can lead to improved community well-being, social cohesion, peace or increased participation.
- *Community empowerment.* Communities where volunteer initiatives are demonstrating local community leadership and empowerment of local people.
- *Partnerships.* Communities where volunteer initiatives are forging effective partnerships with governments, the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders.
- *Innovation and transferability.* Communities where volunteer initiatives are demonstrating new approaches that will offer best practices of potential relevance to other communities.
- *Empowerment of women and social inclusion.* Communities where volunteer initiatives promote the equality and empowerment of women and marginalized groups.
- *Ownership.* Communities where a diverse group of volunteers (international, national and local) are working together.

In addition to these criteria, the selection of communities prioritized a regional and thematic balance, diversity of volunteering models and clear added value of different levels of engagement (community, local authorities, national policy and so on).

A total of 15 geographic areas were selected based on the concept notes submitted. Up to that point, the areas were determined largely by external actors (partners). Once on the ground, field researchers worked with stakeholders to identify communities of interest within each area, particularly those where individuals and groups were experiencing shocks and stresses. The working assumption was that any community would have examples of volunteerism that could be studied and thus could be selected by the volunteer researchers. As

such, some researchers ultimately selected communities where UNV and research partners were not working. The limitations of the community selection are discussed below.

Conceptual framework

The working conceptual framework aimed to understand how a distinctive, person-centred volunteerism approach could affect the adaptive structures and processes of communities (either positively or negatively) beyond other resilience approaches. The research aimed to investigate whether, in addition to humanitarian efforts, the distinctive characteristics of volunteering could demonstrate the value and challenges of local participation, assuming that resilience is not truly possible or sustainable without local engagement and participation. It also examined the complementary value and challenges of external actors supporting local participation. The initial conceptual framework was considered a work in progress; the final conceptual framework was refined through discussions with experts and the research teams and upon considering results from practical participatory assessments on the ground.

Interview and focus group guidelines

Most interviews and focus groups were conducted in line with a semi-formal interview guide. The first part of the guide asked participants to identify the distinctive characteristics of volunteerism that help or hinder their adaptive capacities. The second part asked participants to identify the impact of different groups of volunteers on the policies and norms that affect their ability to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from and adapt to adverse events.

After participants identified distinctive characteristic of volunteerism, the field researchers asked for specific examples of how these characteristics had manifested in preparation for, during or after adverse events. The field researchers then prompted participants to consider different forms of volunteerism and different groups of volunteers in terms of socio-demographic characteristics.

The final section of the interview guide sought to uncover the ways in which a particular area's policies and social norms support or discourage volunteerism to help the community adapt to adverse events, again disaggregated by different types of volunteers and groups.

RESEARCH ETHICS

UNV developed a research ethics procedure based on guidance and advice from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Office of Research – Innocenti. It was evaluated by an internal review board comprising SWVR Expert Advisory Group members and UNV's evaluation specialist. The approach was deemed low risk as it involved collecting

data on community-level activities and trends rather than individual or household data. Several restrictions were placed on engagement with participants in line with this approach:

The research will only cover questions regarding trends, issues and responses at the community level. It will not look at household or individual-level data. The research will not involve minors (as per local definitions) nor persons with mental health issues or learning difficulties for whom an additional duty of care should be afforded. The research will not directly cover traumatic events of violence or abuse which may be harmful for participants. Research activities will not specifically target vulnerable sub-groups (e.g. victims of domestic violence) where identifying and participating as such could bring further harms to individuals.

UNV internal guidance, "Research Ethics Procedure" (2017), p. 8

A simplified guidance note was circulated to research volunteers outlining the principles of ethical research, research ethics procedures (including training and induction), research planning and implementation, and reporting of ethics concerns. Training was given on consent, confidentiality and anonymity during the in-person training to field researchers. Subsequently, all field researchers and the local volunteers who supported them were required to complete UNICEF's online "Ethics in Evidence Generation" course and to email their completion certificates to UNV prior to completing the research plan. Field researchers were then required to use this information to carry out and submit a harms and benefits analysis and mitigation plan as part of their work. Any issues were to be reported to UNV either directly or via the research mentors, with the requirement that they be dealt with in real time and noted in the community research reports.

DATA COLLECTION

Before collecting the data, the field researchers obtained informed consent and agreed on a common understanding of key terms. The field research teams, in some cases in collaboration with partner organizations, were responsible for identifying key individuals who were knowledgeable about vulnerabilities and resilience in the communities. Ideally, at least two separate key informant interviews were completed in each field survey location. The format of these interviews was more flexible than the semi-formal interview process used for the focus group discussions, thereby providing space for interviewers to probe and explore more deeply. Focus group discussion participants were identified through a snowball approach, with field researchers following up on ideas and issues arising from previous conversations.

The field researchers conducted all interviews and focus groups together, and local teams regrouped each day to share and reflect on their experiences and challenges. At the end

of the day, all statements were entered into a standardized recording file and were reviewed together to support continuous improvement and consistency in information quality. Field researchers were given ideas of how to draw out different perspectives from groups of participants, including those traditionally least heard in decision-making processes, understanding that these ideas could be adapted to the context. For example, a combination of focus group discussions selected or self-selected by age and gender were carried out.

A number of measures were put in place to ensure data quality, including standardized instructions for data collection, ongoing checks by the research mentors, use of a real-time cloud platform for sharing data and codes between field researchers and mentors, daily debriefings among the research teams and regional weekly meetings among researchers. All field researchers and mentors also met for a three-day workshop within their region midway through their fieldwork to share and discuss methods and initial findings and to ensure that all researchers maintained a consistent approach to data collection.

DATA ANALYSIS

Primary analysis of the data in each community was completed using an iteratively standardized coding scheme prepared by the technical research team during regular consultations with the field research teams.

Coding scheme

The development of the coding scheme followed a participatory household economy approach. Although the technical research team provided the field researchers with a standardized coding scheme for cross-comparison (coding down), the scheme and the research process were flexible enough to allow for the emergence of codes from the local contexts (coding up). In this way, communities and local informants were involved in developing codes and additional methods.

The initial coding scheme was based on a thorough literature review (Lough, 2017), and the theory and conceptual framework established a basic hierarchy in the standardized codes. Qualitative analysis was ongoing, even as data were being collected. Field researchers coded one description of a discrete activity or outcome per row in their recording file spreadsheets, copying in the text associated with each code. Each statement was coded to three questions to facilitate easier data interpretation and disaggregation. When a statement warranted more than one code, the field researchers copied that statement into a separate row on the recording file and assigned it an additional code.

Each statement also received a disaggregation code to describe the type of volunteerism, the relevant gender and age group (if applicable) and so on. If no disaggregation code was needed, the field researchers left that cell blank. If no available code in the standardized coding scheme adequately represented the idea underlying the statement, the field researchers developed an additional code, which was then added to the standardized coding scheme following consultation with the technical research team. The technical research team added 12 codes to the initial coding scheme based on consultations with the field research teams during data collection.

Extrapolation of coding frequencies

Once all the data had been collected, the codes were sorted and mapped to charts and tables so that the findings could be presented in community report cards and research reports. This process included disaggregation by categories such as gender, type of stress or shock experienced and volunteerism type, and it was completed after the data were sorted to see whether any strong trends or differences emerged. Findings were discussed at validation workshops and other standalone validation events in the communities to assist in understanding the reasons behind the priorities and scores that emerged.

INTERPRETING THE FINDINGS

The field researchers interpreted the data iteratively and categorized and coded the data to inductively develop a thematic analysis. Once they had coded and sorted all the data, they began organizing the data into similar categories, such as supportive policies and norms, restraining policies and norms, distinctive attributes, volunteer activities, volunteer outcomes and implications for suggested improvements. After deciding on the main thematic categories, the field researchers compared the results with what they had expected (that is, with the original research objectives, questions and conceptual framework). They then summarized their main findings in a community report, which included a set of standard reporting sections. This process yielded 15 final community reports that outlined the key themes and findings from the field research.

Validating the findings

After preparing a draft report of their findings, the field researchers asked community members, programme staff and others with knowledge of the research context to critically review the initial analysis, recommendations, learnings and conclusions. The field research team organized validation workshops and standalone validation events with local communities and stakeholders, which involved convening a meeting or series of meetings in the research area. Ideally, participants included community representatives from each

of the survey locations, field research team members and representatives from local organizations, although this was not the case with every community. In some cases a separate meeting was held for community members who were less literate and for whom results had to be presented differently. In some field research communities, the researchers produced a written report card summarizing the results. However, a written summary was not shared in all communities, and validation in several communities was largely verbal. Based on feedback from the validation process, the field researchers revised the community reports and submitted them to the senior writer/researcher.

Integrating the findings

The senior writer/researcher took a number of steps to integrate the findings from all 15 communities into a draft report. First, the senior writer/researcher and research mentors met weekly to discuss the newly emerging and ongoing findings from each of the 15 communities. Detailed notes from these meetings, combined with emerging field data, informed the initial findings and messaging of the draft report. The senior writer/researcher also participated in a regional meeting to discuss emerging findings with the research mentors and field researchers. Following the completion of the field research, the senior writer/researcher and the UNV team received a copy of all community reports and coded field data. These reports and data informed the bulk of the summative analysis that led to the final analyses.

The senior writer/researcher collated all of the individual codes from the community reports and the field data. These data were used to populate three heatmap tables representing the key shocks and stresses, the volunteer distinctiveness codes and the primary policies and norms influencing voluntary action (annex 7). With the community reports following a generally standardized format, the senior writer/researcher also collated conclusions from the individual communities section by section to inform the summative analysis on each topic. The quotations included in the final report are taken from the community reports, from the coded datasheets or directly from translated transcripts.

LIMITATIONS

Study design

The most frequently cited constraint on the research for this report was limited time. This was often due to unexpected delays in deployment and travel combined with important holiday periods such as Ramadan. These delays resulted in the field researchers having less time to spend in the communities prior to and during the research period, which meant that many of the field researchers conducted fewer interviews and focus groups than they had originally planned.

Because not all of the information gathered was based on a large sample size, in some communities it was difficult to draw general conclusions. Likewise, analysis from communities cannot be considered to be representative of the entire country.

Furthermore, the communities that were selected skewed the data towards evidence from Africa and Asia, leaving communities in Europe, the Arab States and Latin America and the Caribbean less represented and communities in North America and Australia omitted altogether. Financial limitations also skewed the research sample towards those participants who lived near the central setting of a country, resulting in less representation from those in isolated areas.

Finally, reliance on volunteers and volunteer-involving organizations as a source of data about volunteer activities and their impacts on communities may have biased the findings towards a more positive portrayal of volunteerism's contribution to enhancing community resilience. However, because the site of research was not always the same as the site of intervention by partners and because communities largely talked about the significance of their own efforts, this bias may have been less than anticipated.

Data collection

Time was also cited as a key limitation in data collection. Long travel times, bad weather and other events during the fieldwork affected the research. For instance, two earthquakes occurred in Guatemala, heavy rainfall created logistical challenges in Tanzania and snowfall in the Russian Federation affected the scheduling of focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

In several cases the researchers noted difficulty conveying the purpose of the study to participants. For instance, in Sudan field researchers overheard that participants had been asked by community leaders to exaggerate their stories in some focus group discussions in order to "receive more aid". People's uncertainty about the research objectives also affected their trust in the researchers. For example, field researchers in Egypt sometimes found it difficult to make it clear to participants that the focus group discussions were not evaluations of volunteering programmes, while in the Philippines participants in focus group discussions were worried about attending because of ongoing security threats.

Security, privacy and confidentiality concerns in some communities may have contributed to bias. Some cohorts, particularly women and young people, were less able or less expected to speak in group exercises. This was counteracted in some communities by arranging women-only and youth-only focus group discussions. In the Russian Federation, the lack of participation by people with disabilities was also noted. In Sudan, the questionnaires had to be pre-approved by the government's Humanitarian Aid Commission.

Finally, language and translation were major constraints in many regions. Language barriers required the scheduling of meetings around the availability of translators, limiting the timing of the field research. Furthermore, the requirement to translate findings meant that despite researchers' efforts to achieve clarification or validation of translated responses, the meaning of the intended information may have been misconstrued in its interpretation. For instance, in Burundi, where the language is reportedly very rich, field researchers believed that some nuances were not fully captured.

Data analysis

Despite the orientation, midpoint regional training meetings and regular ongoing training sessions, some field researchers found it challenging to code and interpret the data. Some field researchers had had limited exposure to qualitative research, and, apart from the practice training sessions, this was their first time coding data. This was more evident in some communities than others. Although all coding results were reviewed by the research mentors to ensure high quality, the process was far more time consuming and challenging in some communities.

For one community report, the field researchers did not write up the summaries of the focus group discussions and key informant interviews until several weeks after the events. This led to complications with analysis and interpretation and raised questions about data validity and reliability. Although evident negligence of the research protocol or process was rare, this example is indicative of other potentially hidden challenges that are likely when aggregating results second-hand across a range of contexts.

ANNEX 5 Key informant interviews and focus group discussions

Some 110 focus group discussions were conducted across the 15 field research communities (table A5.1). On average, focus groups consisted of nine people, and 57 per cent of participants were female. Some 174 key informant interviews were also conducted, and 44 per cent of participants were female. A total of 21 informal interviews also informed the findings, though not all informal interviews were tracked. All participants were aged 18 or older.

- na Not applicable.
- a. Informal interviews were not tracked in each community.
- b. Total may not equal sum of values in preceding columns because some individuals may have participated more than once.

Table A5.1 Focus group discussions and key informant interviews

Country	Focus group discussions				Key informant interviews		Informal interviews	Total participants
	Number	Average size	Men	Women	Men	Women		
Bolivia, Plurinational State of	6	7.2	17	26	3	4	na	56
Burundi	9	10.0	39	51	12	3	8	109
China	6	6.3	11	27	12	14	4	64
Egypt	6	13.5	21	60	4	3	na	81
Greece	5	5.4	11	16	2	5	na	34
Guatemala	8	7.3	34	24	11	8	na	77
Madagascar	8	7.8	26	36	9	2	0	78
Malawi	10	16.1	117	44	6	4	7	171
Myanmar	12	8.3	50	49	8	5	na	112
Netherlands	1	7.0	0	7	1	4	na	12
Philippines	8	10.8	28	58	8	9	0	103
Russian Federation	5	7.2	18	18	4	3	na	45
Sri Lanka	9	10.7	14	82	10	7	na	113
Sudan	7	7.6	29	24	2	2	0	59
Tanzania, United Republic of	10	7.4	22	52	5	4	2	83
TOTAL	110	8.8	437	574	97	77	na	1,195

Field research communities

ANNEX

6

Table A6.1 Field research communities, by country

1	Bolivia, Plurinational State of	Puerto Yumani is an indigenous community of the Tacana culture in the municipality of Rurrenabaque. The main economic activity is agriculture. The area is highly vulnerable to natural disasters, particularly flooding. Other issues facing the community include lack of clean drinking water, poor access to health care, land ownership disputes and natural resource extraction.
2	Burundi	Yaranda is one of the 29 districts of Kirundo Province in north-eastern Burundi. It is an ethnically diverse rural community with a population of 7,590. The area has only basic infrastructure and services, with low levels of education. Most of the population is engaged in farming. Yaranda is prone to natural disasters, particularly drought. Food shortages and sometimes famine are a major stress on the population. Yaranda has experienced substantial out-migration as community members have fled to Rwanda and Tanzania.
3	China	Xinzhuang is a peri-urban village in Changping District on the outskirts of Beijing. It has around 2,000 residents. The main economic activity is agriculture. Xinzhuang lacks adequate public services for waste and sanitation, and garbage disposal has a major negative impact on health and the environment. Xiaguangli is located in Chaoyang District in central Beijing and has around 8,000 residents. It was once the residential area for families of employees of a state-owned factory, and many residents are elderly people who used to work in the factory. Major problems facing the community include low-quality housing and infrastructure.
4	Egypt	Zeinhom is a low-income neighbourhood in the Al-Sayida Zeinab district of Cairo. It has a population of approximately 20,000. Much of the research in Zeinhom focused on the Qal'et el Kabsh community, which faces many socioeconomic and environmental challenges related to low levels of education and limited access to basic social services along with poor infrastructure and overcrowding.
5	Greece	The 6th City District Council area, one of the two poorest districts of Athens, has a large number of refugees and migrants, many of whom have arrived since 2014 and face many challenges, including access to basic social services. It also suffers from high unemployment, particularly among young people and migrants.
6	Guatemala	Caserío El Edén in the municipality of Comitancillo, department of San Marcos, has a poverty rate of 90.7 per cent and an extreme poverty rate of 44.1 per cent. It is a Mam indigenous community of the Maya ethnic group and has a population of 656. More than half the population is aged under 18, and the main economic activity is agriculture. The community sits at an altitude of 2,300–3,300 metres above sea level and is highly vulnerable to natural disasters. Access to the community is difficult, with roads impassable during the rainy season.
7	Madagascar	The community of Milenaka is in the district of Toliara II, region of Atsimo-Andrefana, in south-western Madagascar. It is an inland rural community comprising 14 <i>fokontany</i> (villages) that are often 2–3 kilometres from a paved road. The population is around 23,000, most of whom are from the Masikoro ethnic group and 38 per cent of whom are aged under 18. The main economic activity is agriculture. Key stresses facing the local population include unstable employment, poor access to clean water and security issues (often cattle theft).
8	Malawi	Dzaleka refugee camp is located in Dowa district in central Malawi, about 47 kilometres north of Lilongwe. It was established in 1994 and is home to more than 30,000 refugees and asylum seekers, half of them children, from nine countries (mostly the Great Lakes Region – namely, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Rwanda). Population density is about 6,000 people per square kilometre. The community faces many challenges, including poverty, unemployment, inadequate access to education, food insufficiency, poor shelter and housing, gender-based violence, and crime.

ANNEX

6

Field research communities (continued)

Table A6.1 Field research communities, by country

9	Myanmar	Kyaikhto Township is one of 10 townships in Mon State, which is located along the south-east coast of Myanmar and has an ethnically diverse population that has been subject to inter-ethnic conflict. In Kyaikhto Township agriculture is the main economic activity, although natural resource extraction has increased in recent years. The township has high unemployment and limited access to basic social services, poorly developed infrastructure and high vulnerability to natural disasters, particularly flooding. Women face substantial challenges to engaging in civic activity, and gender discrimination and gender-based violence are widespread problems.
10	Netherlands	Moerwijk is a neighbourhood of The Hague, a city on the western coast of the Netherlands. It has a high foreign-born population (49 per cent) as well as many elderly residents. Since 2014 Moerwijk has seen an increase in immigrants, many of them from Eritrea and Syria. Moerwijk faces high unemployment and poverty as well as tensions within the community caused by cultural differences.
11	Philippines	Panguil Bay and Illana Bay are two rural regions in the Lanao del Norte area of Mindanao. Lanao del Norte suffers from substantial environmental stresses, including overfishing and mangrove deforestation, which affect fishing, the main economic activity. Communities in the region are also highly vulnerable to flooding. Another major stress is the ongoing conflict across Mindanao.
12	Russian Federation	Zakamie is part of the Russian Federation's Republic of Tatarstan and consists of small towns and rural areas. It has an overall population of 300,000, with people of Chuvash, Russian and Tatar ethnicity. Key stresses facing the region's population include unemployment and outward migration (with many young people migrating to Kazan or Moscow in search of jobs), economic inequality, drug addiction and organized crime.
13	Sri Lanka	Ketawaththa is a community of six villages with a population of 1,062 in the Meegahakiula Division in Uva Province. Meegahakiula is one of the poorer divisions in Sri Lanka, and Ketawaththa is one of the very poor communities in Sri Lanka. The main economic activity is agriculture, although women are employed in agriculture only during the rainy season. Poverty, caused by a lack of stable income sources, drought and low education levels, is a huge stress factor facing the community.
14	Sudan	Dagag is a village 15 kilometres from El Fasher, the capital of North Darfur State. Dagag has a population of 2,800, and most community members maintain their livelihoods through farming. The average individual income is very low, around \$2 a day. There is no electricity or running water in Dagag. Research was also conducted in Gedail Wagief, the closest village to Dagag that is near a freshwater source, after it became clear that access to water was one of the most urgent concerns in Dagag.
15	Tanzania, United Republic of	Msimbu ward consists of seven villages in Kisarawe District in the Pwani Region and is about 45 kilometres from Dar es Salaam. Most Msimbu villagers make their living from agriculture and poultry raising. The community's greatest stresses are lack of access to health care and education.

Heatmaps

ANNEX

7

Tables A7.1 and A7.2 are heatmaps showing the codes identified across the 15 communities for: shocks/stresses; distinctive attributes of volunteerism; and policies and norms influencing voluntary action. The codes are arranged in descending order of frequency, with those most mentioned (in red) at the top and those least mentioned (in yellow) or not mentioned (clear) towards the bottom.

Table A7.1 Heatmap of key shocks/stresses identified in the 15 field research communities

Shock/stress	Field research community*														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Chronic poverty and food insecurity	Red			Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red		Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Lack of access to water	Red		Red		Yellow		Yellow		Yellow		Red	Red			
Lack of education	Red			Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red		Yellow			Yellow	Red		Yellow
Conflict and insecurity or crime	Yellow			Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow		Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red
Unavailability of health care	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow			Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow
Poor governance or corruption	Yellow								Red	Yellow					Red
Unemployment	Yellow	Red		Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow			Yellow	Red	Red	Red
Poor infrastructure, roads or electricity					Red		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	
Extreme weather patterns, heavy rain, flooding, cyclones or landslides	Yellow		Yellow				Yellow	Yellow	Red		Yellow	Red			
Severe drought, desertification, or soil degradation or depletion	Red			Red			Yellow				Yellow				
Pollution								Yellow	Yellow	Red			Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Unaccompanied or separated children						Red									
Drug addiction or alcoholism		Yellow	Yellow			Yellow		Yellow							Red
Culture shock or language barriers	Yellow	Red													
Paperwork, bureaucracy or slow systems		Yellow								Yellow				Yellow	
Mass emigration or out-migration				Yellow					Yellow					Red	
Deforestation				Yellow					Yellow		Yellow	Yellow			
Sexual and gender-based violence						Yellow			Yellow			Yellow			
Overfishing								Yellow							

* Legend: 1 Sudan 2 Netherlands 3 Bolivia 4 Burundi 5 Tanzania 6 Malawi 7 Sri Lanka 8 Philippines 9 Myanmar 10 China 11 Guatemala 12 Madagascar 13 Egypt 14 Greece 15 Russia

Table A7.2 Heatmap of distinctive attributes of volunteerism identified in the 15 field research communities

Attribute	Field research community*														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Connective	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Self-organizing	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
Enhanced trust	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
Speed of response	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
Fostered solidarity	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red
Frontline availability	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow
Creative and innovative	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red
Collaborative relations	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Filling gaps	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Flexible	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
New opportunities	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Capacity-building	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Co-productive partnerships	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Access to vulnerable people	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Amateur	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Inclusive	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Local knowledge	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Exclusive	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Personal resources	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Advice and mentoring	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Friendly	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Encouraging	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Preferred	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Influential	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Novel skills	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Resources	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Cost-effective	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Motivations	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Energetic	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Scale of mobilization	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Exploited	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Reciprocal help	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Open and welcoming	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Advocacy mentality	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Committed	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Open to risk	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Viewed as outsiders	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Hindered public investment	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Fostered dependency	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Tolerant	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow

* Legend: 1 Sudan 2 Netherlands 3 Bolivia 4 Burundi 5 Tanzania 6 Malawi 7 Sri Lanka 8 Philippines 9 Myanmar 10 China 11 Guatemala 12 Madagascar 13 Egypt 14 Greece 15 Russia

Heatmaps (continued)

ANNEX 7

Table A7.3 Heatmap of primary influencing policies and norms identified in the 15 research communities

Policy/norm	Field research community*														
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Cultural norms	Red		Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Red		Red	Red	Red	Red	Red
Local focal point	Yellow	Red	Red		Yellow	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Red		Yellow	Yellow
Formal structure	Yellow	Red			Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red		Yellow	Yellow
Funding	Yellow	Red			Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red		Yellow		Yellow	Red
Gender equity	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow			Yellow
Gender roles	Yellow	Yellow			Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow				Yellow
External expectations	Yellow			Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow			Yellow	Yellow
Job insecurity	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Red				Yellow
Legal issues	Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow			Yellow
Legitimacy	Yellow			Yellow	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow
Partnership								Red	Yellow						
Recognition					Yellow		Yellow							Yellow	Yellow
Risk of exploitation	Yellow			Yellow	Yellow		Yellow			Yellow		Yellow			
Safety											Yellow				
Sanctions							Yellow			Yellow					
Sentiments	Yellow		Yellow	Yellow								Yellow			
Stigma	Yellow			Yellow											
Training															Yellow
National programmes									Yellow						
Visa problems	Yellow														
Unemployment								Yellow		Yellow			Yellow		
Incentives				Yellow											
Social engagement			Yellow	Yellow											

* Legend: 1 Sudan 2 Netherlands 3 Bolivia 4 Burundi 5 Tanzania 6 Malawi 7 Sri Lanka 8 Philippines
9 Myanmar 10 China 11 Guatemala 12 Madagascar 13 Egypt 14 Greece 15 Russia

FIGURES

Figure 1	Scope and approach of this report	7
Figure 1.1	Scope of chapter 1	10
Figure 1.2	The global volunteer workforce exceeds the number of people employed in more than half of the 10 most populous countries, 2016	12
Figure 1.3	Majority of volunteering globally is informal	12
Figure 1.4	Total full-time equivalent volunteering by region	13
Figure 1.5	Informal volunteering exceeds formal volunteering in all regions	14
Figure 1.6	Women take on the majority of all volunteering globally	14
Figure 1.7	Women's share of total volunteering is higher across all regions except Asia and the Pacific	15
Figure 1.8	Women take on the majority share of informal volunteering across all regions	15
Figure 1.9	Volunteerism and citizen engagement are common threads across the post-2015 international frameworks and processes	19
Figure 1.10	Global coverage of volunteering policies and legislation, 2018	20
Figure 2.1	Scope of chapter 2	24
Figure 2.2	Number of field research communities where different types of volunteer activity are taking place	25
Figure 2.3	Different types and configurations of volunteerism in communities	26
Figure 2.4	What communities value about volunteerism for resilience	30
Figure 2.5	Relevance of volunteerism for marginalized people and groups	43
Figure 3.1	Scope of chapter 3	56
Figure 3.2	Thresholds and limitations of local volunteerism	56
Figure 3.3	The complementarity of efforts of local and external actors can strengthen volunteerism for community resilience	57
Figure 3.4	Collaborations with external actors can strengthen local volunteering	58
Figure 3.5	Local volunteers inform and support different types of collaborations to enhance resilience	64
Figure 4.1	Priority actions for mutually reinforcing volunteerism and resilience	76
Figure 4.2	Scope of chapter 4	77
Figure 4.3	Building an ecosystem for resilience	78
Figure 4.4	'Volunteerism Support Standard', Russian Federation	79
Figure 4.5	A community compact for resilience	86
Figure 4.6	Contribution of volunteers according to Voluntary National Reviews, 2017	89
Figure 4.7	Optimizing the relationship between volunteerism and resilience	93

TABLES

Table 2.1	How the human connections of local volunteerism enhance or limit community resilience	39
Table 2.2	How the self-organization of local volunteerism enhances or limits community resilience	45
Table 3.1	The value and limitations of local-external collaborations	71
Table 4.1	Recommendations to ensure that volunteerism remains a renewable resource for communities	95
Table A2.1	Volunteering by country, 2016	102
Table A4.1	Composition of the technical and field research teams	105
Table A5.1	Focus group discussions and key informant interviews	110
Table A6.1	Field research communities, by country	111
Table A7.1	Heatmap of key shocks/stresses identified in the 15 field research communities	113
Table A7.2	Heatmap of distinctive attributes of volunteerism identified by the 15 field research communities	114
Table A7.3	Heatmap of policies and norms influencing volunteering identified in the 15 research communities	115

BOXES

Box 1	Features of community resilience	2
Box 2	Selection of the 15 communities for data collection	6
Box 1.1	Who is a volunteer?	11
Box 2.1	Exchanging knowledge on gender-based violence in Myanmar	27
Box 2.2	Expressing solidarity by mobilizing volunteers in Darfur	32
Box 2.3	German volunteers welcome and resettle refugees	34
Box 2.4	Volunteer interpreters connect refugee communities	37
Box 2.5	The tangible benefits of women's involvement in disaster planning	50
Box 2.6	Volunteers contribute to early warning systems in Burundi	52
Box 3.1	The critical role of voluntary community health promotion workers	61
Box 3.2	Linking diverse skills and knowledge through online volunteering	62
Box 3.3	Using open-source software to monitor and report during crises	66
Box 3.4	Cross-community volunteering to protect shared natural resources	67
Box 3.5	Data collected by volunteers hold polluters to account in China	68
Box 4.1	Youth volunteers as peacebuilders	82
Box 4.2	Promoting equal access through regulation	84
Box 4.3	Developing a national youth volunteering infrastructure in India	85
Box 4.4	A participatory methodology for developing a community compact for resilience	88
Box 4.5	Integrating volunteering into peace and development: the plan of action for the next decade and beyond, 2016–2030	90
Box 4.6	Online platform serves urban volunteers in Indonesia	91
Box 4.7	Breaking down access barriers for Australian volunteers with disabilities	92

ANNEX

9

Acronyms

LIST OF ACRONYMS

2030 Agenda	2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development
HLPF	High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organization
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
StatsSA	Statistics South Africa
SWVR	State of the World's Volunteerism Report
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNV	United Nations Volunteers

NOTES

1. Mohan and Stokke 2000.
2. WEF 2017.
3. UNISDR 2015.
4. Institute for Economics and Peace 2017.
5. Gates and others 2016.
6. UNISDR 2015.
7. WEF 2018.
8. UNDP 2015a.
9. IFRC 2014.
10. Quintan and others 2015.
11. Joseph 2002.
12. Schipper and Langston 2015.
13. Simonsen and others 2014.
14. De Coning 2016.
15. Oxley 2013.
16. De Weijer 2013.
17. UNV 2011.
18. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
19. UNV 2016.
20. DuBois and others 2015.
21. WHO 2017.
22. ODI 2015.
23. Graham 2017.
24. Fernandez, Barbera and van Dorp 2006.
25. Burns and Howard 2015.
26. Seelig and Lough 2015.
27. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
28. Burns and others 2015.
29. Church and others 2018, Loos and others 2015, UNV 2017a.
30. Norris and others 2008.
31. UNV 2014.
32. UNGA 2015a.
33. Lee 2015.
34. UNV 2015a.
35. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
36. Whittaker and others 2015.
37. Helsloot and Ruitenbergh 2004.
38. Mohan and Stokke 2000.
39. Fernandez, Barbera and van Dorp 2006.
40. Sauer and others 2014.
41. Sherraden and others 2008.
42. Helsloot and Ruitenbergh 2004.
43. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
44. Oxley 2013.
45. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
46. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
47. Enarson and Chakrabarti 2009.
48. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
49. Enarson and Chakrabarti 2009.
50. UNGA 2014.
51. UNV 2018a.
52. Salamon and Sokolowski 2001.
53. Petriwskyj and Warburton 2007.
54. UNV 2011.
55. UNGA 2002.
56. Wilson and Janoski 1995.
57. Cordingley 2000.
58. UNV 2011.
59. Salamon, Sokolowski and Haddock 2011.
60. UNV 2018a.
61. ILO 2013.
62. UNV 2018a.
63. UNV 2018a.
64. Based on more precise data than previous global estimates and covering a far larger share of the world's population (72 per cent), these updated estimates are lower than estimates in the 2011 SWVR, which estimated volunteering at 140 million full-time equivalent workers.
65. UNV 2018a.
66. OECD 2015.
67. Salamon and others 2017.
68. Salamon and others 2017.
69. Hong and others 2009.
70. Salamon and others 2017.
71. UNV 2018a.
72. Morrow-Howell and others 2015.
73. Gonzales, Matz-Costa and Morrow-Howell 2015.
74. African Union Commission 2017.
75. Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation Association of Volunteer Centers 2016.
76. UNV 2011.
77. UNV 2011.
78. OCHA 2013.
79. Meier 2013.
80. ITU 2017.
81. UNV 2017b.
82. UNV 2018b.
83. UNDP 2015b.
84. UNDP 2015b.
85. IFRC 2016a.
86. Allen and others 2011.
87. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
88. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
89. UNV 2011.
90. Scolobig and others 2015.
91. Bennett, Foley and Pantuliano 2016.
92. Maly 2014.
93. De Weijer 2013.
94. UNV 2011.
95. UNV 2015a.
96. UNV 2011.
97. Brown 1999.
98. UNV 2017b.
99. Butcher and Igartúa 2016.
100. Lee and Brudney 2012.
101. Serna 2010.
102. Jastrzab and others 2006, Wilson 2000, Lee and Brudney 2012, Serna 2010.
103. Lee and Brudney 2012.
104. Serna 2010.
105. Norris and others 2008.
106. Lough and Oppenheim 2017.
107. Kramer, Brewer and Hanna 1996.
108. Flach 2003.
109. UNV 2011.
110. UNGA 2015a.
111. UNV 2016.
112. Jeannotte 2003, Collins 2009, Mollica 2017, Moran 2016.
113. Fordham and others 2011.
114. Ostrom 2003.
115. UNDP 2014.
116. Hausman, Hanlon and Seals 2007.
117. Brunie 2010.
118. USAID 2006.
119. UNDP 2014.
120. Anheier and Kendall 2002.
121. Portocarrero and Sanborn 2003.
122. Riad, Norris and Ruback 1999.
123. Manzo and Perkins 2006.
124. Manzo and Perkins 2006.
125. Dynes 2005.
126. Aldrich and Meyer 2014.
127. IFRC 2014.
128. DuBois and others 2015.
129. Cattani and others 2005.
130. Kumar and others 2012.
131. Masten and others 2009.
132. Norris and others 2008.
133. Fordham and others 2011.
134. Perkins, Hughey and Speer 2002.
135. Jastrzab and others 2006.
136. Berkes and Ross 2013.
137. Whittaker and others 2015.
138. McEntire 2014.
139. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
140. Scolobig and others 2015.
141. Stadelmann-Steffen 2011.
142. UNDP 2016.
143. Oxley 2013.
144. UNSC 2000.
145. Shepherd and others 2013.
146. Fothergill and Peek 2004.
147. Shepherd and others 2013.
148. Fothergill and Peek 2004.
149. Eriksen and O'Brien 2007.
150. Akter and Mallick 2013.
151. Pournik, Chung and Miller 2012.
152. Pournik, Chung and Miller 2012.
153. Smyth and Sweetman 2015.

NOTES

154. The World Bank Group 2011.
155. Marcus and Harper 2014.
156. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
157. Alexander and Sagromola 2014.
158. Battle 2015.
159. Masten 2014.
160. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
161. Whittaker and others 2015.
162. Whittaker and others 2015.
163. Whittaker and others 2015.
164. Sauer and others 2014.
165. Sauer and others 2014.
166. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
167. Thormar and others 2010.
168. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
169. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
170. Thormar and others 2014.
171. Benedek, Fullerton and Ursano 2007.
172. UNGA 2016.
173. USAID 2006.
174. De Coning 2016.
175. Berkes and Ross 2013.
176. Oxley 2013.
177. Simonsen and others 2014.
178. Scolobig and others 2015.
179. Simonsen and others 2014.
180. Mohan and Stokke 2000.
181. Shatkin 2016.
182. OCHA 2014.
183. Allen 2006.
184. Shieh and Deng 2011.
185. Lough 2014, Lough 2016, Devereux 2010.
186. Lough and others 2011, Jones and Brassard 2012, VSO 2002.
187. Butcher and Einolf 2016.
188. UNV 2017b.
189. Baillie Smith, Laurie and Griffiths 2017.
190. UNV 2015a.
191. UNV 2015a.
192. Ilitchev 2015.
193. Pournik, Chung and Miller 2012.
194. UNV 2016.
195. Cohn 2008, Theobald and others 2015, Thornhill and others 2017.
196. Bonney and others 2014.
197. Chen and others 2013.
198. Goodchild and Glennon 2010.
199. European Commission 2015.
200. Bannister 2015.
201. Butcher and Einolf 2016.
202. Arnold and de Cosmo 2015.
203. UNV 2015a.
204. Fordham and others 2011.
205. Aldrich and Meyer 2014.
206. Poortinga 2012.
207. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
208. IFRC 2016b.
209. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
210. Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care 2009.
211. Carstensen 2016.
212. Eiser and others 2012.
213. Martineau 2016.
214. Olu and others 2016.
215. Eiser and others 2012.
216. Ayeb-Karlsson and others 2016.
217. Ferris 2007.
218. Lattu 2008.
219. Sherraden and others 2008.
220. Schipper and Pelling 2006.
221. Wilson and Musick 1999.
222. Brudney and Meijs 2009.
223. UNV 2018b.
224. Al-Krenawi and Graham 2001.
225. Winterich and others 2013.
226. Brown and Zahrlly 1989.
227. Crilly, Ni and Jiang 2016.
228. Volunteer Canada 2017.
229. OECD 2010.
230. World Vision 2012.
231. UNSC 2015.
232. Le Masson, Norton and Wilkinson 2015.
233. UNDP 2011.
234. Volunteer Canada 2017.
235. UNSC 2015.
236. USAID 2006.
237. Pournik, Chung and Miller 2012.
238. Le Masson, Norton and Wilkinson 2015.
239. UNGA 2016b.
240. UNGA 2016c.
241. Hazeldine and Baillie Smith 2015.
242. UNV 2017a.
243. UNDP 2011.
244. UNDP 2011.
245. UNGA 2016.
246. Agenda for Humanity 2016.
247. Mbiza and Mwanthi 2017.
248. UNGA 2015b.

REFERENCES

- African Union (AU) Commission (2017). *AU Roadmap on Harnessing the Demographic Dividend through Investments in Youth*. Addis Ababa.
- Agency for Strategic Initiatives (2017). *Best practices to the standard of support of volunteerism in regions*. Available at asi.ru/social/volunteers/best_practices.pdf
- Agenda for Humanity (2016). *The Grand Bargain. A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need*. Geneva.
- Akter, Sonia, and Bishawjit Mallick (2013). The poverty–vulnerability–resilience nexus: Evidence from Bangladesh. *Ecological Economics*. 96(C): 114–124.
- Aldrich, Daniel P., and Michelle A. Meyer (2014). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 59(2): 254–269.
- Alexander, David, and Silvio Sagromola (2014). *European and Mediterranean Major Hazards Agreement (EUR-OPA). Guidelines for Assisting People with Disabilities During Emergencies, Crises and Disasters*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Allen, Katrina M. (2006). Community-based disaster preparedness and climate adaptation: Local capacity-building in the Philippines. *Disasters*. 30(1): 81–101.
- Allen, Kenn, Monica Galiano and Sara E. Hayes. (2011). *Global companies volunteering globally*. Dulles, Virginia: IAVE.
- Anheier, Helmut, and Jeremy Kendall (2002). Interpersonal trust and voluntary associations: Examining three approaches. *British Journal of Sociology*. 53(3): 343–362.
- Arnold, Margaret, and Sergio de Cosmo (2015). *Building Social Resilience: Protecting and Empowering those Most at Risk*. Washington, DC: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery.
- Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (2009). *Preventing Falls and Harm From Falls in Older People: Best Practice Guidelines for Australian Community Care*. Canberra.
- Ayeb-Karlsson, Sonja, and others (2016). A people-centred perspective on climate change, environmental stress, and livelihood resilience in Bangladesh. *Sustainability Science*. 11(4): 679–694.
- Baillie Smith, Matt, Nina Laurie and Mark Griffiths (2017). South–South volunteering and development. *The Geographical Journal*. 184(2): 158–168
- Bannister, Tom (2015). *International Volunteer Service Exchange Conference – Beijing 2015: Conference Report*. UNV and Beijing Volunteer Service Federation.
- Battle, Dolores E. (2015). Persons with communication disabilities in natural disasters, war, and/or conflict. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 36(4): 231–240.
- Benedek, David M., Carol Fullerton and Robert J. Ursano (2007). First responders: Mental health consequences of natural and human-made disasters for public health and public safety workers. *Annual Review of Public Health*. 28: 55–68.
- Bennett, Christina, Matthew Foley and Sara Pantuliano (2016). *Time to Let Go: Remaking Humanitarian Action for the Modern Era*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute.
- Berkes, Fikret, and Helen Ross (2013). Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach. *Society & Natural Resources*. 26(1): 5–20.
- Bonney, Rick, and others (2014). Next steps for citizen science. *Science*. 343(6178): 1436–1437.
- Brown, Eleanor (1999). The scope of volunteer activity and public service. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 62(4): 17–42.
- Brown, Eleanor, and Jan Zahry (1989). Nonmonetary rewards for skilled volunteer labor: A look at crisis intervention volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 18(2): 167–177.
- Brudney, Jeffrey L., and Lucas C.P.M. Meijs (2009). It ain't natural. Toward a new (natural) resource conceptualization for volunteer management. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 38(4): 564–581.
- Brunie, Aurélie (2010). Household awareness of what to do in a disaster: A social capital approach. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. 28(1): 59–86.
- Burns, Danny, and Jo Howard (2015). What is the unique contribution of volunteering to international development? *IDS Bulletin*. 46(5): 1–4.
- Burns, Danny, and others (2015). *The Role of Volunteering in Sustainable Development*. Kingston upon Thames and Brighton: VSO
- International and Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
- Butcher, Jacqueline, and Christopher J. Einolf (eds.) (2016). *Perspectives on Volunteering. Voices from the South*. Cham: Springer.
- Butcher, Jacqueline, and Gustavo Verduzco Igartúa (2016). *Acción Voluntaria y Voluntariado en México*. México DF: Fundación Telefónica México.
- Carstensen, Nils (2016). Understanding and supporting community-led protection. *Forced Migration Review* 53: 4–7.
- Cattan, Mima, and others (2005). Preventing social isolation and loneliness among older people: A systematic review of health promotion interventions. *Ageing & Society*. 25(1): 41–67.
- Chen, Justine, and others (2013). Public-private partnerships for the development of disaster resilient communities. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 21(3): 130–143.
- Church, Sarah P., and others (2018). Beyond water data: Benefits to volunteers and to local water from a citizen science program. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*. 1–21.
- Cohn, Jeffrey P. (2008). Citizen science: Can volunteers do real research? *BioScience*. 58(3): 192–197.
- Collins, Francis L. (2009). Volunteering, social networks, contact zones and rubbish: The case of the 'Korean Volunteer Team'. In: *Everyday Multiculturalism*, Amanda Wise and Selvaraj Velayutham (eds.). 216–236. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cordingley, Sha (2000). The definition and principles of volunteering. In: *Volunteers and Volunteering*, Jeni Warburton and Melanie Oppenheimer (eds.). 73–82. Leichhardt: Federation Press.
- Crilly, Donal, Na Ni and Yuwei Jiang (2016). Do-no-harm versus do-good social responsibility: Attributional thinking and the liability of foreignness. *Strategic Management Journal*. 37(3): 1316–1329.
- De Coning, Cedric (2016). From peacebuilding to sustaining peace: Implications of complexity for resilience and sustainability. *Resilience*. 4(3): 166–181.
- Devereux, Peter (2010). *International Volunteers: Cheap Help or Transformational Solidarity Toward Sustainable Development*. PhD thesis. Perth: Murdoch University.

REFERENCES

- De Weijer, Frauke (2013). *Resilience: A Trojan Horse for a New Way of Thinking?* Discussion Paper 139. Maastricht: European Centre for Development Policy Management.
- DuBois, Marc, and others (2015). *The Ebola Response in West Africa: Exposing the Politics and Culture of International Aid*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Dynes, Russell R. (2005). *Community Social Capital as the Primary Basis for Resilience*. Newark: Disaster Research Center, University of Delaware.
- Eiser, Richard J., and others (2012). Risk interpretation and action: A conceptual framework for responses to natural hazards. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 1(1): 5–16.
- Enarson, Elaine, and P. G. Dhar Chakrabarti (eds.) (2009). *Women, Gender and Disaster: Global Issues and Initiatives*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Eriksen, Siri H., and Karen O'Brien (2007). Vulnerability, poverty and the need for sustainable adaptation measures. *Climate Policy*. 7(4): 337–352.
- European Commission (2015). Citizen scientists map air pollution with smartphones. *Science for Environment Policy*. 405. Brussels.
- Fernandez, Lauren S., Joseph A. Barbera and Johan R. van Dorp (2006). Spontaneous volunteer response to disasters: The benefits and consequences of good intentions. *Journal of Emergency Management*. 4(5): 57–68.
- Ferris, Elizabeth G. (2007). Abuse of power: sexual exploitation of refugee women and girls. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 32(3): 584–591.
- Flach, Frederic (2003). *Resilience: Discovering a New Strength at Times of Stress*. Hobart, NY: Hatherleigh Press.
- Fordham, Maureen, and others (2011). *Leading Resilient Development: Grassroots Women's Priorities, Practices and Innovations*. New York: UNDP and GROOTS International.
- Fothergill, Alice, and Lori A. Peek (2004). Poverty and disasters in the United States: A review of recent sociological findings. *Natural Hazards*. 32(1): 89–110.
- Frankenberger, Tim, and others (2012). *Enhancing Resilience to Food Security Shocks in Africa*. Discussion Paper. Tucson: TANGO International.
- Gates, Scott, and others (2016). *Trends in Armed Conflict, 1946–2014*. Oslo: Peace Research Institute Oslo.
- Gonzales, Ernest G., Christina Matz-Costa and Nancy Morrow-Howell (2015). Increasing opportunities for the productive engagement of older adults: A response to population aging. *Gerontologist*. 55(2): 252–261.
- Goodchild, Michael F., and J. Alan Glennon (2010). Crowdsourcing geographic information for disaster response: A research frontier. *International Journal of Digital Earth*. 3(3): 231–241.
- Government of Montenegro, Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare (2011). *Law on Volunteering*. Available at www.mrs.gov.me/ResourceManager/FileDownload.aspx?rid=161703&rType=2&file=Law%20on%20Volunteering.doc
- Government of Spain, Ministry of the Presidency and Territorial Administration (2015). *Ley 45/2015, de 14 de octubre, de Voluntariado, Ministerio de la Presidencia, Relaciones con las Cortes e Igualdad*. Available at www.boe.es/buscar/act.php?id=BOE-A-2015-11072
- Graham, David A. (2017). Why ordinary citizens are acting as first responders in Houston. *The Atlantic*, 28 August. Available at www.theatlantic.com
- Hahn, Erin, David Blazes and Sheri Lewis (2016). Understanding how the 'open' of open source software (OSS) will improve global health security. *Health Security*. 14(1): 13–18.
- Hausman, Alice J., Alexandra Hanlon and Brenda Seals (2007). Social capital as a mediating factor in emergency preparedness and concerns about terrorism. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 35(8): 1073–1083.
- Haworth, Billy, and Eleanor Bruce (2015). A review of volunteered geographic information for disaster management. *Geography Compass*. 9(5): 237–250.
- Hazeldine, Shaun, and Matt Baillie Smith (2015). *Global Review on Volunteering Report*. Geneva: IFRC.
- Helsloot, Ira, and Arnout Ruitenber (2004). Citizen response to disasters: A survey of literature and some practical implications. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 12(3): 98–111.
- Hong, Song-lee, and others (2009). Engaging older adults in volunteering. Conceptualizing and measuring institutional capacity. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 38(2): 200–219.
- Hustinx, Lesley, and Frans Lammertyn (2003). Collective and reflexive styles of volunteering: A sociological modernization perspective. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 14(2): 167–187.
- Iltchev, Alexander (2015). *Implementing the HIPPO Report: Sustaining Peace as a New Imperative?* Policy Brief 5. Stockholm: International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations.
- Institute for Economics and Peace (2017). *Global Peace Index 2017. Measuring Peace in a Complex World*. Sydney.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2014). *IFRC Framework for Community Resilience*. Geneva.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2016a). *IFRC Annual Report 2016*. Geneva.
- International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) (2016b). *World Disasters Report. Resilience: Saving Lives Today, Investing for Tomorrow*. Geneva.
- International Labour Organization (ILO) (2013). *Resolution Concerning Statistics of Work, Employment and Labour Underutilization*. Adopted by the Nineteenth International Conference of Labour Statisticians. Geneva.
- International Telecommunication Union (ITU) (2017). *Measuring the Information Society Report 2017. Volume 2. ICT Country Profiles*. Geneva.
- Jastrzab, JoAnn, and others (2006). *Serving Country and Community: A Longitudinal Study of Service in AmeriCorps*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc.
- Jeannotte, Sharon M. (2003). Singing alone? The contribution of cultural capital to social cohesion and sustainable communities. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 9(1): 35–49
- Jones, Emma Louise, and Caroline Brassard (2012). *Creating Sustainable Impact through Short-term Volunteering in Asia: An Analysis of Singapore International Foundation's Health Capacity Building Projects in Indonesia, Vietnam and Cambodia*. Singapore: Singapore International Foundation.
- Joseph, Miranda (2002). *Against the Romance of Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Karakayali, Serhat, and Olaf Kleist (2016). *EFA-Studie 2: Strukturen und Motive der Ehrenamtlichen Flüchtlingsarbeit (EFA) in Deutschland*. Berlin: Berliner Institut für Empirische Integrations und Migrationsforschung, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin.
- Kramer, Roderick M., Marilynn B. Brewer and Benjamin A. Hanna (1996). Collective trust and collective action: The decision to trust as a social decision. In: *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Roderick M. Kramer and Tom Tyler (eds.). 357–389. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kumar, Santosh, and others (2012). Social support, volunteering and health around the world: Cross-national evidence from 139 countries. *Social Science & Medicine*. 74(5): 696–706.
- Lattu, Kirsti (2008). *To Complain or Not to Complain: Still the Question. Consultations with Humanitarian Aid Beneficiaries on Their Perceptions of Efforts to Prevent and Respond to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse*. Geneva: Humanitarian Accountability Partnership.
- Le Blond, Josie, and Gordon Welters (2017). *Refugees Give German Town's Residents New Life Perspective*, 11 May. Available at www.unhcr.org.
- Lee, Jung-eun (2015). Disciplinary citizenship in South Korean NGOs' narratives of resettlement for North Korean refugees. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 38(15): 2688–2704.
- Lee, Young-joo, and Jeffrey L. Brudney (2012). Participation in formal and informal volunteering. Implications for volunteer recruitment. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 23(2): 159–180.
- Le Masson, Virginie, Andrew Norton and Emily Wilkinson (2015). *Gender and Resilience*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Loos, Jacqueline, and others (2015). Challenges for biodiversity monitoring using citizen science in transitioning social-ecological systems. *Journal for Nature Conservation*. 26: 45–48.
- Lough, Benjamin J. (2014). Complementary contributions of international volunteers to development: Evidence from Kenya. *Voluntaris*. 2(2): 8–37.
- Lough, Benjamin J. (2016). *Global Partners for Sustainable Development: The Added Value of Singapore International Foundation Volunteers*. Singapore: Singapore International Foundation.
- Lough, Benjamin J. (2017). *Literature Review for the State of the World's Volunteerism Report 2018* [unpublished]. Bonn: UNV.
- Lough, Benjamin J., and others (2011). Capacity building contributions of short-term international volunteers. *Journal of Community Practice*. 19(2): 120–137.
- Lough, Benjamin J., and Willy Oppenheim (2017). Revisiting reciprocity in international volunteering. *Progress in Development Studies*. 17(3): 197–213.
- Maly, Elizabeth (2014). Towards a people-centered housing recovery after the triple disaster. In: *Human Security and Japan's Triple Disaster. Responding to the 2011 Earthquake, Tsunami and Fukushima Nuclear Crisis*, Paul Bacon and Christopher Hobson (eds.). 108–126. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Manzo, Lynne C., and Douglas D. Perkins (2006). Finding common ground: The importance of place attachment to community participation and planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*. 20(4): 335–350.
- Marcus, Rachel, and Caroline Harper (2014). *Gender Justice and Social Norms – Processes of Change for Adolescent Girls. Towards a Conceptual Framework 2*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Martineau, Fred P. (2016). People-centred health systems: Building more resilient health systems in the wake of the Ebola crisis. *International Health*. 8(5): 307–309.
- Masten, Ann S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development*. 85(1): 6–20.
- Masten, Ann S., and others (2009). Resilience in development. In: *Oxford Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Shane Lopez and Charles Snyder (eds.). 117–131. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mbiza, Elisah, and Clara Mwanthi (2017). *NEAR – Network for Empowered Aid Response. Update on Progress Since the World Humanitarian Summit*. Nairobi: Network for Empowered Aid Response.
- McEntire, David A. (2014). *Disaster Response and Recovery: Strategies and Tactics for Resilience*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Meier, Patrick (2013). Human computation for disaster response. In: *Handbook of Human Computation*, Pietro Michelucci (ed.). 95–104. New York: Springer.
- Ministry of Education and Science of Russian Federation Association of Volunteer Centers (2016). *Methodical manual for the executive authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation and educational organizations on the development of volunteerism* [Методическое пособие для органов исполнительной власти субъектов Российской Федерации и образовательных организаций по вопросам развития волонтерского движения].
- Mohan, Giles, and Kristian Stokke (2000). Participatory development and empowerment: The dangers of localism. *Third World Quarterly*. 21(2): 247–268.
- Mollica, Caitlin (2017). The diversity of identity: Youth participation at the Solomon Islands Truth and Reconciliation Commission. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. 71(4): 371–388.
- Moran, Ry (2016). Truth, sharing and hearing: The Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission and the challenge of civic engagement. In: *The Limits of Settler Colonial Reconciliation*, Sarah Maddison, Tom Clark and Ravi de Costa (eds.). 177–191. Singapore: Springer.
- National Research Council (2012). *Disaster Resilience. A National Imperative*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Norris, Fran H., and others (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capacities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 41(1): 127–150.
- Olu, Olushayo, others (2016). Strengthening health disaster risk management in Africa: Multi-sectoral and people-centred approaches are required in the post-Hyogo Framework of Action era. *BMC Public Health*. 16(1): 691.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010). *Conflict and Fragility. Do No Harm. International Support for Statebuilding*. Paris.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2011). *How's Life? Measuring Well-being*. Paris.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2015). *How's Life? 2015: Measuring Well-being*. Paris.
- Ostrom, Elinor (2003). Toward a behavioral theory linking trust, reciprocity, and reputation. In: *Trust and Reciprocity: Interdisciplinary Lessons for Experimental Research*, Elinor Ostrom and James Walker (eds.). 19–79. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (2015). *Humanitarian Europe? Report on a Roundtable Meeting on the Humanitarian and Policy Responses to the 2015 Refugee and Migrant Movements through Lesbos, Greece and into the European Union*. London.
- Oxley, Marcus C. (2013). A "People-centred Principles-based" Post-Hyogo Framework to Strengthen the Resilience of Nations and Communities. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 4: 1–9.
- Pasteur, Katherine (2011). *From Vulnerability to Resilience. A Framework for Analysis and Action to Build Community Resilience*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Paul, Bimal, and Harun Rashid (2016). *Climatic Hazards in Coastal Bangladesh. Non-Structural and Structural Solutions*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Perkins, Douglas D., Joseph Hughey and Paul W. Speer (2002). Community psychology perspectives on social capital theory and community development practice. *Journal of the Community Development Society*. 33(1): 33–52.
- Petriwskyj, Andrea M., and Jeni Warburton (2007). Redefining volunteering for the global context. A measurement matrix for researchers. *Australian Journal on Volunteering*. 12(1): 7–13.
- Poortinga, Wouter (2012). Community resilience and health: The role of bonding, bridging, and linking aspects of social capital. *Health & Place*. 18(2): 286–295.
- Portocarrero, Felipe S., and Cynthia Sanborn (2003). *De la Caridad a la Solidaridad: Filantropía y Voluntariado en El Perú*. Lima: Universidad del Pacífico.
- Pournik, Milad, Jaeeun Chung and Barbara Miller (2012). *Gender Inclusion for Social Resilience: A Key Factor in Disaster Reduction, Relief, and Recovery*. Occasional Paper 2. Washington, DC: Elliot School of International Affairs, George Washington University.
- Quinlan, Allyson E., and others (2015). Measuring and assessing resilience: Broadening understanding through multiple disciplinary perspectives. *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 53(3): 677–687.
- Riad, Jasmin K., Fran H. Norris and R. Barry Ruback (1999). Predicting evacuation in two major disasters: Risk perception, social influence, and access to resources. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 29(5): 918–934.
- Salamon, Lester M., and Wojciech Sokolowski (2001). *Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Evidence from 24 Countries*. Working Paper of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies.
- Salamon, Lester M., Wojciech Sokolowski and Megan A. Haddock (2011). Measuring the economic value of volunteer work globally: Concepts, estimates, and a roadmap to the future. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*. 82(3): 217–252.
- Salamon, Lester M., and others (2017). *Explaining Civil Society Development. A Social Origins Approach*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sauer, Lauren M., and others (2014). The utility of and risks associated with the use of spontaneous volunteers in disaster response: A survey. *Disaster Medicine and Public Health Preparedness*. 8(1): 65–69.
- Schipper, Lisa, and Lara Langston (2015). *A Comparative Overview of Resilience Measurement Frameworks: Analysing Indicators and Approaches*. Working Paper 422. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Schipper, Lisa, and Mark Pelling (2006). Disaster risk, climate change and international development: Scope for, and challenges to, integration. *Disasters*. 30(1): 19–38.
- Scolobig, Anna, and others (2015). Towards people-centred approaches for effective disaster risk management: Balancing rhetoric with reality. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 12: 202–212.
- Scope Global (2016). *Disability Empowerment Skills Exchange: Process and Outcomes of the Pilot Initiative*. Available at www.scopeglobal.com
- Seelig, Vera J., and Benjamin J. Lough (2015). *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.
- Serna, María Guadalupe (2010). La diversidad y el contexto cambiante del voluntariado en México. *Espiral (Guadalajara)*. 16(47): 141–172.
- Sharifi, Ayyoob, and Yoshiki Yamagata (2016). Principles and criteria for assessing urban energy resilience: A literature review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 60(C): 1654–1677.
- Shatkin, Gavin (2007). *Collective action and urban poverty alleviation: Community organizations and the struggle for shelter in Manila*. Hampshire.
- Shepherd, Andrew, and others (2013). *The Geography of Poverty, Disaster and Climate Extremes in 2030*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Sherraden, Margaret S., Benjamin J. Lough and Amanda Moore McBride (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. 19(4): 395–421.
- Shieh, Shawn, and Guosheng Deng (2011). An emerging civil society: The impact of the 2008 Sichuan earthquake on grass-roots associations in China. *The China Journal*. 65: 181–194.
- Simonsen, Sturle Hauge, and others (2014). *Applying Resilience Thinking. Seven Principles for Building Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems*. Stockholm: Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University.
- Snik, Frans, and others (2014). Mapping atmospheric aerosols with a citizen science network of smartphone spectropolarimeters. *Geophysical Research Letters*. 41(20): 7351–7358.
- Smyth, Ines, and Caroline Sweetman (2015). Introduction: Gender and resilience. *Gender & Development*. 23(3): 405–414.
- Stadelmann-Steffen, Isabelle (2011). Social volunteering in welfare states: Where crowding out should occur. *Political Studies*. 59(1): 135–155.
- Taniguchi, Hiromi, and Leonard D. Thomas (2011). The influences of religious attitudes on volunteering. *Voluntas*. 22(2): 335–355.
- The Jakarta Post (2014). Volunteering made easy with 'Indorelawan.org'; 13 October. Available at www.thejakartapost.com
- Theobald, Elinore J., and others (2015). Global change and local solutions: Tapping the unrealized potential of citizen science for biodiversity research. *Biological Conservation*. 181: 236–244.
- The World Bank Group (2011a). *Gender and Climate Change: Three Things You Should Know*. Washington, DC.
- The World Bank Group (2011b). *World Report on Disability*. Washington, DC.

- Thormar, Sigridur B., and others (2010). The mental health impact of volunteering in a disaster setting. A review. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*. 198(8): 529–538.
- Thormar, Sigridur B., and others (2014). The impact of disaster work on community volunteers: The role of peri-traumatic distress, level of personal affectedness, sleep quality and resource loss on post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms and subjective health. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*. 28(8): 971–977.
- Thornhill, Ian, and others (2017). Prioritising local action for water quality improvement using citizen science; A study across three major metropolitan areas of China. *Science of the Total Environment*. 584 (Supp. C): 1268–1281.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2011). *Towards Human Resilience: Sustaining MDG Progress in an Age of Economic Uncertainty*. New York.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2014). *Human Development Report 2014. Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. New York.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2015a). *The Dead Sea Resilience Agenda*. Available at www.undp.org.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2015b). *Volunteerism in China's South-South Cooperation: Promoting a Holistic Development Agenda*. Issue Brief. New York.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2016). *Human Development Report 2016. Human Development for Everyone*. New York.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2017). *Story Competition: Shughel Shabab*. Available at www.arabstates.undp.org
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2001). *Support for Volunteering. Report of the Secretary-General*. A/56/288. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2002). A/RES/56/38. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. *Recommendations on Support for Volunteering*. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2014). *The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet. Synthesis Report of the Secretary-General on the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda*. A/69/700. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2015a). A/RES/70/129. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. *Integrating Volunteering into Peace and Development: The Plan of Action for the Next Decade and Beyond*. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2015b). A/RES/70/1. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2016a). *Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit. Report of the Secretary-General*. A/71/353. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2016b). A/RES/71/256. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. *The New Urban Agenda: Quito Declaration on Sustainable Cities and Human Settlements for All*. New York.
- United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) (2016c). A/RES/71/243. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. *Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review of Operational Activities for Development of the United Nations System*. New York.
- United Nations (2015a). *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030*. Available at www.unisdr.org
- United Nations (2015b). *Paris Agreement*. Available at www.unfccc.int
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) (2015). *Making Development Sustainable: The Future of Disaster Risk Management. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction*. Geneva.
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (2013). *Humanitarianism in the Network Age*. New York.
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) (2014). *Position Paper: Resilience*. New York.
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (2000). Resolution adopted by the Security Council at its 4213th meeting, on 31 October 2000. S/RES/1325. New York.
- United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (2015). Resolution adopted by the Security Council at its 7573rd meeting, on 9 December 2015. S/RES/2250. New York.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2009). *Laws and Policies Affecting Volunteerism since 2001*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2011). *State of the World's Volunteerism Report. Universal Values for Global Well-being*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2014). *UNV Issue Brief: Environmental Sustainability and Volunteerism*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2015a). *State of the World's Volunteerism Report. Transforming Governance*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2015b). Association des Agriculteurs Professionnels du Cameroun (AGRIPO). Available at www.onlinevolunteering.org
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2016). *Rebuilding with the Community after a Disaster: Volunteer Engagement in the 2015 Nepal Earthquake*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2017a). *Volunteerism and Youth Employment in Cambodia*. Phnom Penh.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2017b). *Annual Report 2016. Volunteer Solutions for Sustainable Development*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2018a). *The Scope and Scale of Global Volunteering: Current Estimates and Next Steps*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2018b). *Global Trends in Volunteering Infrastructure*. Bonn.
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme (2018c). *Community-Based Analysis of Volunteer Impacts on Community Resilience*. Bonn. (forthcoming)
- United Nations Volunteers (UNV) programme, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and Indian Ministry of Youth Affairs and Sports (2017). *State of Youth Volunteering in India*. New Delhi.
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (2006). *Livelihoods & Conflict. A Toolkit for Intervention*. Washington, DC.
- Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) (2002). *The Role of Volunteers in International Development*. Kingston upon Thames.

REFERENCES

- Volunteer Canada (2017). *Canadian Code for Volunteer Involvement*. Ottawa.
- Whittaker, Joshua, Blythe McLennan and John Handmer (2015). A review of informal volunteerism in emergencies and disasters: Definition, opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 13: 358–368.
- Wilson, John (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26(1): 215–240.
- Wilson, John, and Mark Musick (1999). The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems*. 62(4): 141–168.
- Wilson, John, and Thomas Janoski (1995). The contribution of religion to volunteer work. *Sociology of Religion*. 56(2): 137–152.
- Winterich, Karen Page, Vikas Mittal and Karl Aquino (2013). When does recognition increase charitable behavior? Toward a moral identity-based model. *Journal of Marketing* 77:121–134.
- World Economic Forum (WEF) (2017). *The Global Risks Report 2017*. 12th Edition. Geneva.
- World Economic Forum (WEF) (2018). *The Global Risks Report 2018*. 13th Edition. Geneva.
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2011). *World Report on Disability*. Geneva.
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2017). *Building Resilience: A Key Pillar of Health 2020 and the Sustainable Development Goals. Examples from the WHO Small Countries Initiative*. Copenhagen.
- World Vision (2012). *Minimum Inter-Agency Standards for Protection Mainstreaming*. Middlesex, United Kingdom.