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Abstract:

This paper begins to explore the motivations and experiences of people who volunteer. It seeks to examine the literature currently available regarding volunteering and explore its application to work with young people. Drawing upon desk-based research this paper will introduce current theories and perspectives on the value of volunteering, particularly in women’s lives. It seeks to delve beneath the usual altruistic and selfless responses, invoked by responding to the vulnerability or needs of young people, to explore the value of volunteering to the adult female volunteer (Wilson & Musick, 1999). This is set against the backdrop of current social policy, such as The Big Society Agenda and the Localism Act (2011). Areas for further research in this subject are also identified.
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Introduction

Public services in England, in all their guises but particularly youth work, are under threat due to funding cuts (Butler, 2013; Harding, 2014) and a changing policy landscape (Davis, 2013). Sector leaders have already been challenged to champion youth work and to explain the difference it can make to the young people who access it, something which, it is claimed, they have failed to do (Hillier, 2011). In turn sector leaders’ claim that the difficulties in ‘evidencing’ the value of youth work are due to the costs involved and the challenges of measuring the outcomes of work with young people (ibid) due to its focus on process (Allen et al, 2011).

A more holistic exploration of the value of youth services in general may enable an identification of, if not a measureable outcome, an understanding of the broader contribution youth work makes to society. That is, recognition of the benefit and significance to the adults who become involved through volunteering.

Youth work has long been associated with volunteering in England; whether that is due to the voluntary nature of youth work, the opportunities created ‘through’ youth work for young people to volunteer or through its place within the voluntary sector (Smith, 2013). Jeffs and Smith argue that ‘youth work was born, and remains fundamentally a part, of civil
society. It is wrapped up with associational life, community groups and voluntary organizations' (2010, p.3). Women as philanthropists and practitioners, as well as work with young women have played an integral part in the story of youth work (Nicholls, 2012) and they clearly have a huge part to play in its future.

It is important to note that ‘women’ as a group have a dynamic and varied range of identities. Whilst this paper explores the motivations of women who do volunteer it is, in fact, more concerned with the welfare and inequality of opportunity of experience of those who don’t. Whilst this paper clearly centres its focus on women, it is also interested in the experiences of all groups who have an unequal opportunity to volunteer. As Nicholls (2012) states, women play an integral role in the class struggle and where they experience inequality, oppression or discrimination it is often alongside other groups in society or as part of multiple oppressions (Thompson, 2012).

**Types of volunteering**

Academics and practitioners classify types of volunteering and different volunteering opportunities in a range of ways (Bowen et al, 2009; Goic & Jeroncic, 2007), but for the purposes of this paper volunteering will be sub-divided into two types, formal and informal volunteering. This particular subdivision seems especially apt to work with young people given its philosophies and traditions.

Formal volunteering can be defined as ‘giving unpaid help through a group, club or organisation’ (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014). It sits in contrast to informal volunteering activity, which can be defined as ‘giving unpaid help as an individual to people who are not relatives’ (Cook, 2011). Therefore in these definitions the notion of ‘formal’ or ‘informal’ is related to the relationship or structure between the volunteer and the recipient/s of their volunteering, the former being through a formal relationship with an organisation or group and the latter being an informal relationship between the volunteer and recipient/s. An example of which might be a long-term agreement to drive a neighbour to the shops or to cut a neighbour’s lawn.

**Who volunteers?**

Figures for formal volunteering have been collected by the UK Government for a number of years through a range of surveys such as the Citizenship Survey 2001-2011, and more recently the Community Life Survey, from 2012 onwards. There has been a recent increase in the number of people formally volunteering at least once a year or once a month (see Table 1). Whilst these figures appear to be positive they need to be seen within the context
of the fact that annual volunteering rates in 2011 were at their lowest level since 2001 (Cook, 2011).

Table 1: Formal Volunteering Statistics (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014)

The Community Life Survey 2012-13 reports an increase in volunteering within the last year up to 72%. However, in this new survey the figures amalgamate formal and informal volunteering (The Cabinet Office, 2014) with some respondents participating in both.

Figure 1: Headline findings from 2012-13 Community Life Survey (The Cabinet Office, 2014)

Between 1997 and 2007 the average number of hours spent volunteering by individuals dropped by 30% (Low et al, 2007). In the sphere of work with young people, but in the public services generally, this decade was a period of relatively high levels of Government
spending, at least in comparison to those under the previous Conservative Governments (Diamond, 2013). The decrease in levels of volunteering throughout this time has been cited as one of the drivers for the Coalition Governments’ Big Society Agenda and the Localism Act (2011) which will be discussed later in this paper.

‘Evidence also suggests that there is a trend towards more episodic volunteering’ (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014). This means a change from regular volunteering, such as would have been completed at a youth work session once a week to perhaps helping out on the club trip once a term or year. Ultimately this may be affected by a number of things, but the reduction in public services as a result of post-banking crisis austerity measures (Smith, 2013) may have had the biggest impact. Firstly, through the closure of projects where people can volunteer regularly and secondly the reduction in services may have increased the caring responsibilities and informal volunteering that people are doing. Finally, changes in the job market, as discussed later in this paper, may limit the amount of time individuals have to give. More episodic volunteering is likely to affect the impact or value of the experience to the individual, as many of the benefits, as discussed later, are not available in short, one off experiences.

Table 2: Gender of formal volunteers (Citizenship Survey 2008-9)

wymer (n.d.) states that:

‘In regards to volunteering, females generally volunteer in greater numbers than males (Wymer and Samu 2002). There are other sex differences in volunteering
with regards to the amount of time volunteering, the frequency of volunteering, motives for volunteering, interest in volunteering, the nature of the volunteer organization, and volunteer commitment.’

Whilst there may be some perceptions that women are more inclined to volunteer than men (Kurtzleben, 2013; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011) there is little difference, just 4%, between the rate of men and women’s formal volunteering. This is supported by the most up to date Government figures in the Community Life Survey 2012-13.

Similar trends to the figures in Table 2 are seen in the US (Kurtzleben, 2013) and Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011) where the statistics show a 7% and 4% variance respectively. However, ‘headlines’ in both these countries report that women volunteer more than men.

Whilst ‘psychological research has found that women score higher on most measures of the traits, motivations, and values that predict helping others’ (Einolf, p.1092, 2011) it is clear from the above figures that this does not massively affect formal volunteering. However, Einolf also states that ‘women are more likely to help family and friends’ (p.1092, 2011) which reinforces the differences between the genders in motivations for volunteering and the type and nature of the volunteering participated in as identified by Wymer (n.d.) above.

Further research is needed to explore gender differences in motivation as well as considering whether men and women’s voluntary work is perceived in different ways by others. For example, is women’s volunteering seen as a generally social activity (especially for adult women / mothers) in comparison to young people and men’s volunteering being about developing and sharing work place skills?

![Table 3: Ethnicity of formal volunteers](image)

Table 3: Ethnicity of formal volunteers (Department for Communities and Local Government Citizenship Survey 2008-9)
Though the figures in Table 3 shows an 8% difference between the rates of volunteering amongst white and BME adults, it should be noted that different ethnic groups show different rates of formal volunteering. Furthermore, factors such as socio-economic classification, age, geography and income also affect rates of volunteering (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014) therefore these figures should not be accepted at face value.

Figures show that individuals between the ages of 35-49 are most likely to formally volunteer (47%) whereas younger volunteers were relatively more likely to volunteer informally. One third of people with a long-term limiting illness or disability formally volunteered (32%) compared with 43% of those with no long-term limiting illness or disability (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014).

In their study Bartels, Cozzi and Mantovan (2013) identified that there was an increase in voluntary activity post retirement in those who had not volunteered and where previously full-time employed. Not surprisingly perhaps, they also identified that younger people were particularly motivated to volunteer ‘as this enhances their human capital and prospects of a higher income’ (Bartels et al, 2013, p.341). Motivations for volunteering will be explored in more detail later in this paper.
The figures in Table 4 clearly illustrate that those from higher socio-economic status backgrounds are more likely to volunteer. The reasons for and implications of this will be explored in greater detail later in this paper.

‘The more educated the group, the more likely its members are to volunteer. However, that doesn't necessarily mean that knowledge leads to benevolence. Rather ... it’s because people with more education tend to have more income. People who have lower incomes may work more hours or multiple jobs to make ends meet, for example, and therefore have less time for volunteering’ (Kurtzleben, 2013, p.1)

Where do people volunteer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport/exercise</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/arts/social clubs</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/schools</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside school activities</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and Social Welfare</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/neighbourhood groups</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, animals</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Volunteering sectors (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014)

Table 5 illustrates the range of sectors in which people formally volunteer. It is clear that youth work and work with young people are represented in a number of these ‘sectors’.

1 Office for National Statistics identify 8 employment classes as follows: 1, Higher managerial, administrative and professional occupations; 2, Lower managerial, administrative and professional occupations; 3, Intermediate occupations; 4, Small employers and own account workers; 5, Lower supervisory and technical occupations; 6, Semi-routine occupations; 7, Routine occupations and 8, Never worked and long-term unemployed.
Clearly further research is needed to explore whether people volunteer in these sectors solely because they want to or whether there is some ‘best fit’ whereby people also need to make a judgement based on the voluntary opportunities available. Further research is also needed to explore whether there is an age or gender imbalance across the sectors and indeed if there is any differences between the types of volunteering activities completed in these sectors, which will be discussed next.

Table 6: Activities volunteered for (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014)

The data in Table 6 represents formal volunteering only. Most of the activities in Table 6 are relevant to the types of work undertaken by volunteers in youth work settings. Further research is needed to explore differences between gender, age and socio-economic groups experiences to investigate whether there is any imbalance in the take up of different types of activity undertaken and whether there are any particular barriers to certain groups volunteering for certain activities. Whilst this is not an area of discussion for this article, these ‘activity areas’ potentially identify topics for training and development for those volunteering in work with young people as well as an area for policy development.
**Informal volunteering**

The figures presented in the tables so far in this article are for formal volunteering. They therefore do not represent any informal volunteering activity.

Those who informally volunteered at least once a year increased slightly in 2010-11 (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014) to 55%. However, the figures for the previous year showed informal volunteering had reached a nine year low after reaching 68% in 2005, when it was at its highest level since 2001. 29% of people informally volunteered on a monthly basis in 2010-11 (Institute for Volunteering Research, 2014) which was the same as in the previous year. Interestingly, this was the lowest level of informal volunteering per month since 2001.

Unfortunately, these figures are not broken down in the same way as those for formal volunteering, so it is impossible to ascertain whether informal volunteering is participated in, in the same way. However, this is an area which needs to be explored more fully. If there is a different distribution between genders or socio-economic classification for example, then the types of experience being had, including the levels of support being received may well differ. Furthermore perceptions of these two types of volunteering need to be explored, both from the perspective of those volunteering and other key stakeholders. Is informal volunteering seen as being as valuable as formal volunteering and is it as likely to produce the same positive outcomes as perceived in formal volunteering opportunities as discussed next? Furthermore, does informal volunteering act as a barrier or a catalyst to formal volunteering?

**The benefits of volunteering**

Volunteering has many benefits but the main identified throughout the literature (Bartels et al, 2013; Dolnicar & Randle, 2007) are the development of Human and Social Capital and public good, or ‘civic virtue’ (Smith, 2001).

Human Capital refers to ‘the properties of individuals’ (Smith, M. K., 2001, 2007) whereas Social Capital ‘refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them’ (Smith, 2001). Civic virtue has been defined by Brennan as ‘the capacity to discern the true public interest and a motivation to act in the public interest’ (1997, p.259).

*For the individual – Human Capital*
We can see from the above figures that men and women volunteer more or less equally. Yet it is likely that men and women may volunteer in different types of settings for different reasons (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2010). We can also see that people from higher socio-economic groups are more likely to volunteer, the reason for this Kurtzleben (2013) has identified as being the fact that people who earn more are more likely to have the time to volunteer than the less well paid. However, this does not take in to consideration differing attitudes to volunteering between and across different age, gender, class and ethnic groups.

Volunteering has long been linked to altruism, the act of caring for others with no expectation of reward for oneself. For many, volunteering adheres to the characteristics of ‘pure’ or ‘warm glow’ altruism (Andreoni, 1990), particularly informal volunteering. However, Bartels et al (2013) argue that the main group of volunteers, those who are in full time, well paid employment are ‘impure’ altruists (Andreoni, 1990) as they make decisions as to whether the value of volunteering is ‘worth’ the time being given to it.

Academics, professionals and individuals themselves have identified the benefits of volunteering to the individual (Low et al, 2007; Murray, 2013). Low et al. classify the top 5 benefits that volunteers identified for themselves:

‘a sense of satisfaction from seeing the results’ (97%), ‘I really enjoy it’ (97%), ‘it gives me a sense of personal achievement’ (88%), ‘meet people and make friends’ (86%), ‘gives me the chance to do things that I am good at’ (83%)’ (p.61, 2007).

These correlate to the 10 reasons identified by Murray (2013) but to which he adds, learn new skills, teach others, network, build your resume, rise above the crowd, gain work experience, help build something bigger than yourself and strengthen your health. Whilst Murray focuses on the professional development opportunities available through volunteering, he also identifies a number of ‘softer’ outcomes of benefit to the individual.

This is supported by research quoted by the Institute for Volunteering Research (2014), who found that 87% of employers thought volunteering had a generally positive effect on career progression, particularly for people aged 16-25. The same research also identified that 30% felt that volunteering was only relevant if linked directly to the field of work. This illustrates the need for a wide range of good formal volunteer opportunities being available across the sectors so that individuals can volunteer in a setting and perform a role which will explicitly meet their needs. Whilst not overtly addressed by this research, these responses from employers suggest that informal volunteering will not positively impact on an individual’s employability in the same way as formal volunteering. Given that more women volunteer informally than men, they will be adversely affected by this.
Despite the generally available lists of reasons to volunteer which have been identified by Low et al (2007) and Murray (2013), an individual’s identity is just as likely to be a factor in whether or not they are likely to volunteer:

‘personal characteristics have positive effects on the individual decision to volunteer: education, belonging to any religion, liking the neighborhood, having children, being married, being male, and having an interest in politics.’ (Bartels et al, 2013, p.344)

‘All of these variables together create a complex picture of individuals with multiple motivations for volunteering’ (Bartels et al, 2013, p.341). The outcome of volunteering, whatever the motivation, is a development in individuals’ skills and confidence and ultimately their human capital.

**Social capital building**

The process of volunteering through formal groups and societies offers great opportunities for the individuals concerned to develop their social capital. ‘Social capital makes it easier for people to link their own identity and interests with those of their community. As social capital declines, civic engagement falls’ (Wilson & Musick, 1998, p.799). In Scotland, informal volunteering is perceived to be a key element of social capital:

‘[it] refers to a wide range of different kinds of mutual help and co-operation between individuals within communities, for example babysitting for a friend or checking on an elderly neighbour. While research indicates that formal volunteering impacts positively on informal volunteering, there is not yet a clear consensus on the extent of its influence in relation to other factors, or how this process occurs’ (The Scottish Government, 2006).

What is also not clear is whether informal volunteering has a positive or negative impact on individual’s ability to volunteer formally and thus participate more broadly in the social life of their community.

Putnam states that social capital comprises of the "features of social life—networks, norms, and trust—that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives” (Putnam, 1995, p.664). Whilst Wilson & Musick assert that ‘social capital helps over-come the "free-rider" problem that bedevils organizers and recruiters trying to mobilize individual effort to achieve collective goals’ (Wilson & Musick, 1998, p.799). It can be argued that there is also a greater benefit to the individual in developing their ‘social capital’.

By participating in formal volunteering activities they will meet like-minded people and, as Murray (2013) states develop their network. For those entering the world of work with young people, they will also enter in to a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).
Whether they wish to further their career in the youth workforce or not, they are likely to be working alongside members of the same place or interest-based community, and are likely to benefit from the strengths of their colleagues networks (ibid).

‘Health, parenting, education, skills and poverty influence the opportunities for individuals and the outcomes of their lives’ (ESRC, 2014). The circumstances into which people are born and their early experiences potentially define the rest of their lives. ‘Social mobility is the extent to which where you end up, in terms of income or social class, is not determined by where you started’ (All-party parliamentary group on social mobility, 2012). Whilst youth work can be seen to have a role in developing the life chances of young people, as stated previously it can also have a positive impact on the adults who volunteer. This may be particularly true, but is not limited to, those who decide to gain their professional qualification through higher level study.

For society – civic virtue

Wilson and Musick state that ‘in a healthy civil society, "civic engagement" is high’ (1998, p.799). Therefore society benefits from the process of volunteering by more than just its economic contribution, though there was an estimated £22.7 billion bonus to the UK economy from formal volunteering in 2007-08 (UK Civil Society Almanac, 2009). It also benefits from the process of people volunteering; ‘those who belong to groups are happier and healthier than those who do not; and ... neighbourhoods where there is community activity tend to be safer and economically active’ (Smith, 2013).

However, this is not surprising in view of the fact that the groups who currently appear to volunteer the most are those who are better paid. Perhaps the more pertinent question is which came first? Are neighbourhoods where there is community activity safer and more economically active because people have developed the human and social capacity through volunteering or are the people who earn more, and can therefore afford to live in better areas (i.e. those that are safer) the people who have the time to volunteer? It could be argued that this group might be more inclined to volunteer as they are more likely to own their own homes and therefore have a greater stake-hold in their local communities.

Throughout this paper it has been recognised that certain groups are more likely to volunteer. Having identified some of the ‘benefits’ of volunteering to the individual it is clear that those who currently volunteer are not the people that would really see the greatest advantage. In fact, the groups of people who are most in need of developing their human and social capital are the least likely, at present, to volunteer.

‘Citizens with more skills and experience are more prone to volunteer and are more effective at it. Indeed, a key problem of voluntary work is getting other people than just “the usual suspects” to participate’ (Bartels et al, 2013, p.342).
Social Policy

The figures and debates already presented in this article should be viewed against the backdrop and context of the post banking crisis austerity measures in state-sponsored services (Smith, 2013). In a review of relevant literature, Bartels et al identified that volunteers had ‘to make a decision between allocating their time to working in the market or to volunteering’ (2013, p. 341). The post banking crisis has had various consequences which will have a knock-on effect for individuals. These include:

- **Zero hour contracts**
  
  An increase in the use of zero hour and temporary contracts is likely to further exacerbate the inequality in volunteering between those who are well paid, and likely to be higher skilled, and those who are on these types of working contracts. By limiting people’s opportunity to volunteer these contracts may also limit individuals’ ability to develop new skills, new networks, affect social mobility and the well-being that volunteering brings generally.

- **Austerity measures**
  
  Austerity measures brought in to place since 2010 have had a particular impact on women (Poverty and Social Exclusion, 2012) and whether directly linked or not, there has been an increase in pay inequality over the last decade (Palmer, 2011). Given that work commitments are identified as the greatest barrier to volunteering (National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2014a; Kurtzleben, 2013) it is clear that women and the lowest paid members of society will be most affected by austerity measures and therefore so too will their ability to volunteer.

- **Reduction in services**
  
  A reduction in services and changes in the policy landscape inevitably has an effect on the number of services able to offer volunteering opportunities and potentially had an effect on the quality of those experiences (Vaitilingam, 2009). ‘All volunteering and volunteers need support ... underpinned by effective volunteer management and principals of good practice including recognition’ (National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 2014b).

This last point introduces one of the main counter-government policy viewpoints regarding the role of the state and social policy and volunteering. ‘The Big Society is currently dictating the belief that public expenditure impairs volunteering’ (Bartels et al, 2013, p.342) as such the current UK Government argues that if the state heavily intervenes, for example by funding all services to capacity, then volunteers are ‘crowded out’ by the state as they are neither wanted nor have the drive to volunteer.
‘The debate on volunteering has paid insufficient attention to the relationship between public spending and volunteering. The importance of this relationship is highlighted by the British government’s “Big Society” plan, which asserts that an increase in volunteering will compensate for the withdrawal of public agencies and spending. This idea is based on the widely held belief that a high degree of government intervention decreases voluntary activities.’ (Bartels et al., 2013, p.340).

The Coalition Government’s policy initiatives are predicated on the idea that too much government funding inhibits community action and grass roots volunteering (Bartels et al., 2013, p.349). The Localism Act (2010) was established with this in mind. However, as Wilson & Musick (1998) argue that you need high levels of social capital to successfully volunteer, once again certain societal groups find themselves in a complex position and the people that ‘need’ community action and grass roots volunteering the most to build their human and social capital can’t volunteer or develop their own services as they don’t have the high levels of capital that is needed to do so. It also potentially means that the communities which had been identified with some level of ‘need’ by local authorities and relevant organisations and were in receipt of services are most likely to lose these facilities but have community members that are least able, for the range of reasons already stated, to re-establish these services from scratch i.e. set up youth projects to fill the gap.

During the general election of 2010 politicians and policy makers focused their attention on attracting the votes of ‘mumsnet’ - mum’s on a middle income (Campbell and Childs, 2010). As a result it would not be surprising if their policies fail groups of women that fall outside this demographic. One must also question whether low SES women and their fellow non-volunteers are actually being disempowered and switched off by the very organisations, structures and policies responsible for facilitating their volunteering as a result of such strategies (Bartels et al, 2013). In fact, despite Government belief in the ‘crowding out’ theory and the establishment of the Localism Act (2010) to support the Big Society agenda, Bartels et al’s (2013) research suggests an alternative correlation. Their results found ‘that volunteering is likely to decline when government intervention decreases and that a collaborative approach to sustaining volunteering is needed’ (Bartels et al, 2013). This is due to the fact that when there is strong infrastructure in place people felt that they were contributing to something that was worthwhile, something that was likely to continue and that they were adding value to. What Bartels et al’s (2013) research suggests is that there is an element of ‘collaborative advantage’ (Dickinson & Peck, 2008, p.39) perceived in this approach.

A final role for policy in this area is to reduce or eliminate the barriers to volunteering. Research undertaken by Institute for Volunteering Research identified the top five barriers to volunteering as being:
‘not enough spare time’ (82%), ‘put off by bureaucracy’ (49%), ‘worried about risk/liability’ (47%), ‘don’t know how to find out about getting involved’ (39%), ‘not got the right skills/ experience’ (39%)’ (2014).

The number one reason, ‘not enough spare time’, would certainly resonate with the idea that people with lower paid jobs and caring duties have less free time to volunteer (Kutzleben, 2013). The others all underpin the notion that volunteers can be supported through the bureaucracy, protected from the risk and liability, and supported to learn the skills needed by organisations, across the sectors, with a robust approach to engaging and supporting their volunteers.

Further questions

Whilst this paper has tried to explore the motivations and experiences of people who volunteer in relation to recent research, current literature and the recent policy landscape, it is clear that the process has highlighted many questions still to be answered and new areas to be examined.

The first task is to continue to explore the literature currently available regarding volunteering in other fields of work and nations and investigate its application to work with young people. At this stage much of the research currently done in other fields explores individuals and groups motivation for volunteering and giving (Dolnicar & Randle, 2007; Ward & Mckillop, 2011) and issues around recruitment and retention (Barraza, 2011; Wysong & Maellaro, 2013). Furthermore the research tends to be focused on attracting more of the same groups of people to volunteer rather than examining how to support wider participation in volunteering activities in groups who do not currently volunteer in high levels. This is particularly pertinent to women who do not currently volunteer but who would benefit from doing so in all the ways discussed in this paper.

Secondly, there is work to be done to examine and collate data regarding the statistics on the adults who volunteer in work with young people. Are there a greater proportion of women, BME and low SES volunteers? If so, why? If not, what are the barriers faced by members of these groups wishing to volunteer in work with young people? Whatever the statistics how can we make volunteering in youth work even more positive for these groups and should their inclusion in the youth workforce be an important aim for relevant policy makers? Finally, how can we build an evidence base to support claims of youth work’s broader contribution to society?

Lastly, some work needs to be done to explore the differences and similarities between formal and informal volunteering opportunities. Is the learning different and therefore are the positive outcomes different for volunteers? Are certain groups more likely to access one
or other form of volunteering? And finally, is there some sense that informal volunteering is less ‘valued’ or is less likely to realise the benefits discussed in this paper?

**Conclusion**

Whilst the government are collecting data on volunteering via the Community Life Survey, much of the focus is on those currently volunteering. Further consideration needs to be given to the large groups of people who would ‘benefit’ from volunteering but for whom the barriers are currently insurmountable.

Volunteering should not be seen solely as a means to an ends to get individuals back to work or to deliver services traditionally, and perhaps more appropriately, provided by local authorities. However, as this paper has identified, volunteering can support individuals to increase their human and social capital. Furthermore, it can develop and augment civic life more generally. Youth work, by engaging young people in voluntary activity and through employing volunteers in a range of varied roles, has an important contribution to make.
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