

8-13-2020

A continuum of university student volunteer programme models

Kirsten Holmes

Megan Paull

Debbie Haski-Leventhal

Judith MacCallum

Maryam Omari
Edith Cowan University

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013>



Part of the [Business Commons](#), and the [Education Commons](#)

[10.1080/1360080X.2020.1804658](https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1804658)

This is an **Accepted Manuscript** of an article published by Taylor & Francis in JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT on 13/08/2020, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1804658>.

Holmes, K., Paull, M., Haski-Leventhal, D., MacCallum, J., Omari, M., Walker, G., ... Maher, A. (2020). A continuum of university student volunteer programme models. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(3), 281-297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2020.1804658>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/9508>

Authors

Kirsten Holmes, Megan Paull, Debbie Haski-Leventhal, Judith MacCallum, Maryam Omari, Gabrielle Walker, Rowena Scott, Susan Young, and Annette Maher

A Continuum of University Student Volunteer Program Models

Introduction

This paper examines the different ways in which university student volunteering is organised at universities and how this reflects the ways in which universities use and promote volunteering to their students. University student volunteering has grown substantially, particularly in Western countries (Holmes, 2009; Hustinx, Meijis, Handy & Cnaan, 2012; Smith et al., 2010). Given its multiple benefits, student volunteering is promoted by governments (DPMC, 2011; Green, 2018; Holmes, 2009; Holdsworth & Brewis, 2013), universities (Holdsworth & Quinn, 2010) and employers (Ghose & Kassam, 2014). Student volunteering can occur inside a curriculum setting through formal placements (e.g. work-integrated learning and/or internships - WIL) or through extracurricular programs (Paull et al., 2015).

There are, however, substantial gaps in our knowledge of this phenomenon, and calls for more research in the field (Barton, Bates & O'Donovan, 2019; Holdsworth & Quinn, 2010; Hustinx et al., 2012). In particular, there is limited research on ways in which student volunteering is organised. This limitation, coupled with the diverse terminology used to describe the phenomenon (Paull et al., 2015), constrains our ability to conduct comparative research on university student volunteering. Additionally, most research has focused on the student volunteers' experiences (Barton et al., 2019; Handy Hustinx, Cnaan & Kang, 2009; Haski-Leventhal et al., 2008), rarely examining the other actors in this relationship being universities (Holdsworth & Quinn, 2010) and the community organisations that host student volunteers (Edwards, Mooney & Heald, 2001; Gazley, Littlepage & Bennett, 2012).

To help address this gap, we conducted a mixed methods study of how student volunteering at Australian universities is organised, revealing a range of models for volunteer programs. We have placed these models on a continuum from student-managed to university-organised, to explain the different roles student volunteering plays within the universities in this study.

This paper begins by examining why universities encourage their students to volunteer, and then presents the limited extant research on how university student volunteer programs are organised. We then outline the methods for conducting this study, after which we present the continuum and each of the nine models identified. Finally, we explore trends and implications for university student volunteer programs.

Student volunteering

Many universities in Western countries promote student participation in activities referred to as ‘student volunteering’, ‘service learning’, and ‘community service’ (Smith et al., 2010). The variety of terms have been traced to differing academic disciplines, potential employers, universities, and national and jurisdictional environments (Grant-Smith & McDonald, 2018). For example, students have long undertaken unpaid internships and practical experience on vocational programs to develop their skills and professional competencies (Sattler, Wiggers & Arnold, 2011), with volunteer activities also having a long history.

Published research on university student volunteer programs is dominated by Western studies despite its being a global phenomenon (Haski-Leventhal et al., 2008). North American research shows a history of students volunteering for community service through service learning (Edwards et al., 2001; Gazley et al., 2012). This is typically a form of experiential learning, involving community service often through volunteering (Parker et al., 2009), and

incorporating reflective learning linked to the university's mission to provide service to the community (Bernardo, Butcher & Howard, 2012). UK research has identified that students traditionally establish their own volunteer organisations, in the absence of any formal university program (Brewis & Holdsworth, 2011), prior to the government providing funding programs from the early 2000s (Holmes, 2009). In Western countries, the impetus for student volunteer programs has come from varied stakeholders including governments, communities, students and universities, with some debate about inclusion of student volunteering as a compulsory requirement for course credit (Grant-Smith & McDonald, 2018; Henderson, Brown, & Pancer, 2019';Smith et al., 2010).

Why do universities promote student volunteering?

Researchers have identified many benefits from student volunteering (Barton, Bates & O'Donovan, 2019; Smith et al. 2010). These benefits have increasingly led universities to promote and organise volunteer opportunities for their students (Green, 2018).

Universities are encouraged to incorporate volunteer and service-learning programs in order to build well-rounded citizens (Cherwitz, 2005; Whitley & Yoder, 2015) and as part of their role in preparing students for post-university life (Carino, 1996; McFadden, 2017). Cooper (2014) identified that interest in community engagement and responsible citizenship encourages institutions to promote service learning through volunteering. Such programs can help reduce the barriers between the university and the community (Thomson, Smith-Tolken, Naidoo & Bringle, 2011). Indeed, universities may support volunteer programs to promote a positive reputation within the community (Braunsberger & Flamm, 2013).

Student volunteering is also seen as a means for universities to enable students to develop graduate capabilities (Jardine 2018; O'Connor, Lynch & Owen, 2011). This is a more recent trend (Green, 2018), which aligns with the promotion of WIL within the curriculum (Scott & van Etten 2013; Grant-Smith & McDonald, 2018) as increasing the employability of graduates globally is of growing importance (Smith, Bell, Bennett & McAlpine, 2018). In Australia, government policies have made student outcomes and graduate employment key performance indicators for universities (Campbell, Cooper, Rueckert & Smith, 2019). Further, with students incurring substantial costs of courses, universities seek to offer students opportunities such as volunteer programs to increase their employability on graduation (Barton et al., 2019).

Research has also shown that universities promote student volunteering because of the reported benefits such as life skills and increased personal development (Cunningham, Tunch & Gallacher, 2013). Other benefits promoted include developing networks, increased status, workplace experience, educational or vocational qualifications and skill or experience recognition (Anderson & Green, 2012; Johnson et al., 2017).

Extant research has identified substantial benefits for both universities and students from engaging in student volunteer programs. Universities can harness these benefits in promotional material and capture them for students via an additional transcript, certificate of achievement or award (Holdsworth & Brewis 2013). Research has also identified some pitfalls associated with student volunteering, with concerns being expressed about the motivations of student volunteers (Veres, Eva & Cavanagh, 2019), and the need for universities to carefully navigate their involvement in volunteering and related activities to ensure quality outcomes (Barton, Bates & O'Donovan, 2019). It is important for universities,

students and host organisations, to take an informed approach to the organisation of university student volunteering.

Organising university student volunteering

Despite the benefits accrued to universities through their students participating in volunteering, there is very little research on how university volunteer programs are organised. Meijs and Hoogstad (2001) posited two types of volunteer programs: the program management model and the membership model. These are organised very differently, with the program management model adopting a top-down approach, where the program is designed and volunteers recruited to the roles needed, in contrast to the membership management model where the program is designed around volunteer interests.

In universities, volunteering that forms a part of a student's core program has typically been organised by the specific faculty, following a top down approach. Service learning programs are also usually faculty-organised either within a specific school as part of the curriculum (Andrew, 2011) or centrally across the whole university (Rose, 2017). These are often established as part of a study program rather than as an extra-curricular activity (Parker et al., 2009). Students are also encouraged to volunteer, with universities promoting opportunities outside of, but not connected to the university (Holdsworth & Quinn, 2012).

In the UK, student volunteer programs have traditionally followed the bottom up approach and been established by students (Brewis & Holdsworth, 2011). Government funding provided directly to universities led to a move from the dominant model of student-led programs to a partnership approach with the university or student union offering a broker service recruiting students for third party organisations outside of the university (Brewis &

Holdsworth, 2011). This mirrored a move to provide accreditation for volunteer participation (Brewis & Holdsworth, 2011). Brewis and Holdsworth (2011) identified three models of university student volunteering: The broker model, whereby the university acts as a conduit to volunteer opportunities, but does not organise direct activities; individual modules linked to academic programs; and student-led societies. While many university volunteer programs are student driven, studies suggest that university leadership is crucial in operating a successful program (Bernardo et al., 2012) and university support for student volunteering leads to better outcomes for the students (Holdsworth & Quinn, 2010), and the community (Mackenzie, Hinchey & Cornforth, 2019).

This literature review shows that with increased interest in university student volunteering, there is substantial variation in the forms and conceptualisations of student volunteer activities at universities. While both universities and students see value in student volunteering there is little guidance for university managers on the different ways programs can be organised and by whom, for whom as well as the required resources. In order to better understand university student volunteering, this study sought to investigate the ways in which student volunteering was organised at universities in Australia and identify the different models of student volunteering.

Method

This study sought to examine the ways in which student volunteering is organised at universities in Australia and how this reflects the ways in which universities use and promote volunteering to their students. A mixed methods research design was considered appropriate to answer the research question by combining data from the publicly available websites of all universities in Australia with more detailed interview data (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2017).

First, a matrix of university student volunteering was developed using a spreadsheet following Miles, Huberman and Saldana's (2014) guidelines for the use of matrices in qualitative research. The data were collected from a desk audit of publicly available information on university websites for data on student volunteering. The desk audit was undertaken during the period of November 2013 to January 2014, with a range of university websites being revisited in September 2016 and July 2019 and all Australian universities (40 at the time of study) were included.

Initially we searched using the term 'volunteering, with subsequent searches using the terms work integrated learning (WIL), work experience, service learning, industry and field placement, overseas volunteering, practicum, internship, and community service. These terms had been identified in the literature as associated with student volunteering, even when they were not strictly voluntary (Cunningham et al., 2013; Gazley et al., 2012; Sattler et al., 2011; Scott & van Etten 2013). All data referring to volunteering at each university was captured in the spreadsheet including phrasing and language used, connection to curriculum, location in the website, references to learning, any indication as to who organised it (e.g guild); how it was recognised. The wording used was noted verbatim and we also recorded references to policies even if not publicly accessible.

The matrix was constructed using an iterative process involving analysis by the researchers and an independent expert panel to model the complexities surrounding the organisation of university student volunteer programs (Nadin & Cassell, 2004). The initial matrix consisted of an extensive spreadsheet (using Excel) containing 300 plus entries direct quotes collected

from the university websites reflecting language used to describe volunteer programs, benefits, rewards, positions, organisation and any other references to volunteering.

Initially, two members of the project team immersed themselves in the data, reading and re-reading the data entries, following the approach typically taken in qualitative data analysis (Miles et al., 2014). This initial analysis re-categorised the programs into four groups based on how they were managed: centrally within the university, within a faculty, by students or by an external organisation.

The spreadsheet and the initial classification were presented first to the project team for code checking (King & Horrocks, 2010). Next, the representatives of student volunteer programs at four universities who served as an 'expert panel' were asked to comment on the credibility and authenticity of the findings (King & Horrocks, 2010). Discussions with the expert panel enabled the researchers to further refine the framework and develop the continuum of nine models presented in this paper. Updating the matrix in 2016 and 2019 was more challenging than the original exercise as details about student volunteering were increasingly password protected. The findings draw on the 2013 data, highlighting where a substantial change was identified in the 2019 review.

The desk audit was followed by 60 semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders from six Australian universities to elicit further details about how the models operated. We used the matrix to identify universities with different models, and where we could gain access for face to face interviews. Interviewees included student volunteers (n = 18), university staff involved in program management and strategic decisions about volunteer programs (n = 25), host organisation and peak body representatives (n= 17). University staff at each university and peak body representatives were directly approached for interviews. Student volunteer and host organisations participants were identified through snowball

recommendations. Face to face interviews were conducted by the project team using a set of interview schedules – developed for each stakeholder - to ensure consistency in approach (King & Horrocks, 2010). All interviews were recorded and transcribed with the informed consent of participants with transcripts de-identified for analysis in accordance with approval from the lead university’s Human Research Ethics Committee (XXXXXX University HREC 2014/007).

Data analysis

The interview data were analysed in two stages at a workshop involving the project team. Each member conducted within case analysis of data from one university, followed by cross-case analysis by everyone across the six universities (Eisenhardt, 1989). Initial coding was followed by a search for themes in an iterative process, which was then compared with the interview data. The models generated by the combined data from the matrix and the interviews were presented to stakeholder workshops around Australia for feedback. The findings are based on this presentation of the models, supplemented by data from the interviews, using direct quotes to illustrate the models verified via the expert panel and workshop feedback.

Findings

The terms ‘volunteer’ and ‘volunteering’ was searched and yielded a range of policies, calls for volunteers, reports of student activities, and details of programs being established, promoted or facilitated by universities, including service learning and community participation activities. The audit found enormous variation in the terminology used to describe volunteering (to be cited after blind review). The data analysis identified nine models of student volunteer programs and these models are presented on a continuum of

increasing structure in terms of the university's involvement in the program (Figure 1). The models varied from the university simply providing details on volunteering opportunities to students, through to an integrated centralised system across the university. Mapping showed a mixture of programs at each university, and while each had a dominant model, many also had a secondary model.

-Insert Figure 1 about here

Integrated model across faculties and university

The integrated model coordinates all volunteer opportunities both on and off campus within one administrative framework. Macquarie University set up the Professional and Community Engagement (PACE) program in 2010, as a means of integrating all related units under one umbrella (Macquarie University, 2016). The community-university partnership was a key focus.

One of the big things that PACE strives to do is to kind of bring down the walls between university and community, so the community is part of the university and the university becomes part of the community, so working with partner organisations to find a need or an area that they want to develop and try and match that with the student or staff capabilities that we have at Macquarie, and try and find a middle ground there where it's mutually beneficial. (University volunteer program manager)

In 2019, Macquarie’s website highlights the PACE experience which engages students “in real world learning activities with organisations across Australia and around the world” and ‘all important practical experience employers really value’ (Macquarie University, 2019). PACE is not limited to volunteering. As the program has grown, PACE has changed from some students completing a mandatory ‘volunteer’ component to receive their degree (Macquarie University, 2016), to all undergraduate degrees including at least one PACE unit (Macquarie University, 2019). The fully integrated model needs to be well-funded and incorporated into the university’s operations, but also requires agility and flexibility to adapt to stakeholders’ needs and to changing circumstances. There is the potential for such programs to become overly bureaucratic and lose momentum where other activities are given priority status.

Student-university partnership programs

In partnership programs, students work with paid university staff to deliver volunteer programs. These programs often began as student-driven. The ‘Curtin Volunteers!’ organisation at Curtin University was originated by students but subsequently incorporated into the university structure and run as a partnership between volunteer student managers and paid university staff (Curtin Volunteers!, 2016).

Before [without paid] staff members...There may or may not be someone in the office. If a volunteer comes into the office with a question or with a working with children check that they need us to fill out, there may not be someone in the office. So there was just that real lack of consistency and proper communication, I guess.

(Student volunteer manager)

Their mission is ‘to provide volunteering and leadership opportunities’ which enhance the ‘student experience and benefits the wider community’ (Curtin Volunteers!, 2019). The challenges of partnership programs such as these include managing or retaining the balance of power in the relationship in such a way as to keep the essence and vitality of the original partnership.

Centrally-administered programs, with little or no input from students

Centrally administered programs across and external to the university are organised by paid university staff. At Edith Cowan University, the volunteer program is part of the university’s careers and employability services and is closely aligned with enabling students to develop employability skills (ECU, 2019). The program is run by paid university staff, with minimal student input. The situating of volunteer participation alongside other university support programs such as careers is noted by this student volunteer:

The career prospects and the actual learning and reinforcing of my studies and actually learning on-the-job and gaining that experience which I could put on my CV. So there were two really fantastic benefits. And I always knew that volunteering or work experience for your career is invaluable because you get practical hands-on experience and it’s so good. (Student volunteer)

University controlled programs allow the program to be varied to suit the changing needs of the university, but must remain vigilant about remaining engaged with the students.

Faculty-based program linked to a specific discipline

In faculty-based programs, a faculty, not the central administration, facilitates or promotes volunteering within their area. In 2016 RMIT University ran a volunteer student ambassadors program within their College of Business where current students support new students to help

them settle into the university (RMIT, 2016). In 2019 it appears this program had evolved to become university-wide and any RMIT student can become involved (RMIT, 2019).

Discipline specific programs, however, are still evident in other universities, with some remaining faculty-based due to the specific discipline focus of their activities:

Volunteering happens within the medical centre ... they've got a health promotion wing that involves volunteers. (University volunteer manager)

There is a balance to be achieved between a need for discipline specific arrangements and university-wide activities, with some focussed activities being important to specific graduate outcomes.

Student-driven programs including student-run volunteer hubs

Student-driven programs are entirely organised by students. In these, a student-centred guild, union or organisation facilitates the volunteering opportunities. One example is Arc at the University of New South Wales (Arc @ UNSW), a student-led nonprofit organisation (UNSW 2016), established in 2006 to provide non-academic programs for students. Arc offers over 30 on- and off-campus student volunteer programs, including tutoring high school students, working with community organisations, one-day events and trips for other students. This model is likely to exist in some form in most universities where students engage and are seeking to engage in student life. University support and encouragement of such activities requires arrangements for matters such as governance and insurance to be clearly articulated.

Broker model

The broker model operates with university staff or students identifying volunteer opportunities in the community and connecting students with these organisations. The broker service may operate one way – i.e. recruits students for an off-campus organisations – or both

ways, sourcing appropriate opportunities for students. We did not find explicit reference to the broker model within our matrix but our interviews revealed that one of our sampled universities operated this model. This illustrates that universities may operate multiple models and also reveals the value of the mixed methods approach as the websites may not showcase all the university's programs. In this instance the broker model operates one-way, with staff assessing the opportunities at the voluntary organisation and then sourcing suitable students:

Depending on the organisation, using [voluntary organisation] as an example, we meet with the staff from [voluntary organisation]. We discuss what opportunities might be arising, what's involved in those and determine whether we think that would be a good fit for the students. If so then that would then become part of the program, we'd try and find students to fill that. (University volunteer manager).

Community organisations in this scenario can be somewhat at the mercy of the recruitment process at the university unless they put other recruitment strategies in place.

Independent (one-off) project

One-off projects can exist alongside other models but can also be the only source of volunteer opportunities on campus for students and encourage volunteering on an occasional, or one-off basis. Curtin University's John Curtin Weekend follows this model, with students volunteering on a range of projects over 6 weekends in October and November each year and sits alongside other volunteer programs at the university

With over 500 volunteers traveling to more than 40 participating regional towns and metropolitan sites to work on a range of initiatives, the experience offered by John Curtin Weekend (JCW) is unique. (Curtin Volunteers!, 2019).

The JCW is still part of a bigger program, where the project changes from year to year, and other projects arise where a student or a staff member sets up a project based on an interest or a contact of their own. Often the success of a project is not carried forward into the future in the way the JCW program has managed.

External program operating at the university

A volunteer-involving organisation or broker organisation operates on campus and provides volunteer opportunities to students. Examples include Australian Indigenous Mentoring Experience (AIME), a nonprofit organisation that provides mentoring programs for indigenous students operating across multiple universities (AIME, 2019).

A big part of AIME also is that sharing the story of Aboriginal success with the wider community. So positive story and experiences of the great things that are happening in Aboriginal Australia, we have the power to share that with people at university, staff, students, whether they're in the program or not. (University partner organisation representative)

AIME is a success story, but universities have an obligation to be cautious about which programs operate on campus and how these are monitored.

Information-only model

In this model, the university actively encourages students to volunteer and provides information about off-campus opportunities. The model organise any programs or engage in formal partnerships with volunteer-involving organisations. The University of Melbourne promotes volunteering to their students as a means '...to take your skills out into the community and contribute to a cause you are passionate about...' (University of Melbourne, 2016). The university provides a web page with links to volunteer broker services, including the national volunteer website 'Go Volunteer'. The university website also offers advice on selecting a volunteer placement and provides a list of volunteer rights and responsibilities. In

2019 the wording is ‘Volunteering provides an opportunity for you to develop professional networks, gain real-life experiences and build your skills.’ (University of Melbourne, 2019). This reflects a shift in focus from volunteering in order to connect with the community, to volunteering for students to gain skills and increase their employability. The information only model is low cost, but also low yield in terms of the university having any feedback about its success. In addition, universities need to ensure appropriate screening prevents students from inadvertently accessing volunteer opportunities which might be detrimental to them or don’t fit the university’s values.

Volunteer program models in operation

The data revealed that several models could operate simultaneously at any university but typically one model dominated in each university. We identified the primary model at each university via the matrix. The most frequently occurring primary model was the centrally-administered program (N =13) with the information only model coming second (N = 9). Many universities also had external volunteer-involving organisations operating programs on campus.

The mapping exercise identified no patterns based on state or location, whether metropolitan, rural or regional. There were no identifiable patterns relating to type of university. The diversity of volunteering programs appeared to be largely historical, due to volunteer programs being established in different parts of the university for different purposes over a period of time.

In response to the complexity of models in operation at universities, some universities may be moving towards a more integrated approach to managing their volunteer programs. This

seems to be driven by a university strategy which either encourages or mandates a ‘volunteer’ component for all the university’s students. The integrated approach also facilitates recognition of student volunteering through a developmental transcript - consistent with government policy on presentation of graduation statements (AHEGS) Department of Education, 2019).

A lack of integration can result in some students having a formal record of their volunteer activity to show employers, while others at the same university do not. This is particularly important given the change in emphasis in the public messaging from community connectedness to employability evident in university websites. At the time of the original mapping exercise, 28 of the universities signalled some formal recognition for volunteer activity while 12 universities did not indicate this on their website. All universities with an integrated model provide formal recognition, while universities where volunteering is through one-off projects and events may not.

In addition to a transcript, another form of recognition for volunteering was a university award – for example a ‘Vice-Chancellor’s award’ - which acknowledged volunteering as well as other activities. Recognising student volunteering with a formal transcript dates back over fifteen years in some universities (Murdoch University, 2002), with the policy at the government level only dating back to 2013 (Department of Education, 2019). Fourteen universities required minimum hours of volunteering for the attainment of the award. These varied from 20 to over 100 hours over a specified period of time.

The data revealed no consensus in the language used by universities to describe student volunteer programs. ‘Service’ was rarely mentioned. Rather, ‘leadership’ and ‘community

engagement' were the two most frequently used terms. 'Civic engagement', 'global citizenship' and 'sustainability' were also in evidence. Employability was an important factor, with work integrated learning (WIL) described as a major motivation from the university's perspective for volunteering at 15 of the universities:

You just have students that are walking out of your university who are employable and they are civic-minded, employable human beings rather than just people with a bit of paper who are knocking on the same doors that everyone else is. (University volunteer program manager)

The names given to the awards for volunteering illuminate how volunteering is viewed by the university's senior management. Six awards included the term 'leadership', six included 'community', with seven of the awards named after the university such as the New England Award (University of New England, 2020).

Discussion

The volume of information publicly presented on the university websites is testament to the level of interest in university student volunteering, the limited consensus, and the dynamic nature of the activity (Hustinx et al., 2012). The development of the continuum identified few patterns but did identify the different factors involved in university volunteer programs as well as highlight key trends in student volunteering and the way it is organised. Key factors affecting the type of model in use included how far the university and/or students were involved in managing the program; whether the program was disciplinary focused or generic; and how far external organisations and the community were involved. Centralisation of models has been highlighted. There are a number of universities that had integrated the various volunteer programs within one model. This is more akin to a federalised rather than centralised model, but both enable formal recognition of students' volunteer activities.

The nine models identified here build on earlier work in the field (Brewis & Holdsworth, 2011). Student-driven and student-led programs were evident at a quarter of universities and there was a very small number of student-staff partnership programs. There was also evidence of universities enabling external organisations to operate on campus, although this was not the dominant model at any university and tended to take place alongside other programs.

While central or integrated models dominated in the matrix, the method used for identifying this information is likely to have influenced the findings. University websites tend to be centrally-managed so centrally-organised volunteer activities are likely to have prominence over other programs. As universities have moved towards more centralised forms of administration (Yates et al., 2017), it is likely that they will correspondingly develop a more centralised approach to their volunteer programs.

It is notable that nearly a quarter of the universities had websites indicating the information-only model. Some of these universities still offered students an additional award if they completed volunteer hours, which is interesting given no assistance was provided for students in finding volunteering. Questions arise as to how the university records and verifies volunteer hours when not directly involved.

As discussed, there was no consensus around the language used by universities to describe student volunteer programs (to be cited after review). While it was anticipated that 'employability' would be frequently associated with such programs (Cunningham et al., 2013; Green, 2018; Prentice & Robinson, 2010), the external discourse on university

websites in 2013 more typically referred to ‘leadership’ and ‘community engagement’. Perhaps the drive towards employability means that to differentiate themselves, student volunteers may need to focus beyond ‘employability’ to ‘leadership’. The 2019 update of the matrix identified that while details about student volunteering within the university were increasingly password protected, the information, which was publicly available focused on volunteering to enhance employability rather than leadership. It is unclear whether this is a change in focus for universities or reflects the priorities of universities’ market of potential students.

Finally, the focus of universities is on students as volunteers, not the beneficiaries of voluntary activity. The language used emphasises how volunteering can help students develop and learn skills (Brewis & Holdsworth, 2011; Ghose & Kassam, 2014), aligning with ‘leadership’ and ‘employability’ rather than ‘service’. These findings contrast strongly with Canada and the US, where service is reported as a significant dimension (Smith et al., 2012). The findings may reflect the different national nuances of volunteer definitions and may require further research. The emphasis on the volunteer rather than the beneficiaries, however, reflects the extant literature, where the student is the focus (Gazley et al., 2012).

While university websites emphasise how and why students should volunteer, the differing models raise questions around how much choice students have. In some cases, student volunteering is mandatory. We argue this is not volunteering as defined by the national body on volunteering in Australia, Volunteering Australia (2016). Some models offer their students more varied volunteer opportunities than others. Of course, students can choose to volunteer outside the university in a wide range of roles and organisations. Not all university volunteer awards or transcripts mentioned such volunteering which leads to the question of whether

students could be disadvantaged for choosing to volunteer outside university programs. These are lines of enquiry for further research.

Conclusions

The value of presenting a continuum of models of Australian university student volunteering can be seen at a number of levels, particularly as both the Australian Government and universities have promoted volunteering to their students, leading to substantial growth in university student volunteering in the past decade. Nine models of student volunteer programs were identified from an information only approach to the centralised integrated model.

The mapping exercise was limited to the publicly available information on university websites at a single point in time, and the outcome is indicative of the major types in operation, as confirmed by the 2019 review. The diversity of approaches across Australian universities speaks to the organic growth of university student volunteering, as universities seek engagement with the community. For universities themselves this mapping could be of significant strategic interest. The identification of the various models offers the opportunity for comparison and a more considered approach to development of programs. Important to this is the development of a common language and understanding. Volunteering peak bodies and volunteer involving organisations interacting with universities as student volunteering evolves, will benefit from shared language, and mutual expectations of how programs operate. Exploration in password protected areas of university websites is likely to yield operational data on the more nuanced aspects of university student volunteering as it evolves to meet university, student and community needs.

Student volunteering is a very dynamic field and models are evolving in a competitive environment, as the 2019 update illustrates. This changing environment could be understood through continuing the longitudinal approach in this study, repeating the matrix methodology periodically to detect trends. The development of models is often historical as well as influenced by the university's mission, strategy, leadership and resources. Further investigation could examine influences on the development of the dominant model at each university.

As universities seek to graduate students who are able to engage with the community in meaningful ways beyond employment, university student volunteering is one avenue to this aim. Greater understanding of this complex and dynamic activity is required for universities to be able to effectively navigate the road ahead.

References

- AIME. (2019). *About AIME*. Retrieved from <https://aimementoring.com/about/>
- Anderson, P., & Green, P. (2012). Beyond CV building: The communal benefits of student volunteering. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 3(2), 247–256. 10.1332/204080512X649388
- Andrew, M. (2011). Reshaping educational experience by volunteering in the community: Language learners in the real world. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 25. Retrieved from <http://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr25/andrew.htm>
- Barton, E., Bates, E., & O'Donovan, R. (2019). 'That extra sparkle': students' experiences of volunteering and the impact on satisfaction and employability in Higher Education. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(4), 453-466. <https://doi-org.libproxy.murdoch.edu.au/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1365827>
- Bernardo, M., Butcher, J., & Howard, P. (2012). An international comparison of community engagement in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32, 187-192. 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2011.04.008
- Braunsberger, K., & Flamm, R. (2013). A mission of civic engagement: undergraduate students working with nonprofit organizations and public sector agencies to enhance societal wellbeing. *Voluntas*, 24, 1-31. 10.1007/s11266-012-9289-6
- Brewis, G., & Holdsworth, C. (2011). University support for student volunteering in England: Historical development and contemporary value. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9, 165-176. 10.1007/s10805-011-9129-0
- Campbell, M., Cooper, B., Rueckert, C., & Smith, J. (2019). Reimagining student employability: a case study of policy and practice transformation. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(5), 500-517.
- Carino, L. (1996). The role of universities in voluntarism in the 21st century. *Australian Journal on Volunteering*, 1(2), 27-33.

- Cherwitz, R. (2005). A new social compact demands real change, connecting the university to the community. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 37(6), 48–49.
- Cooper, J. (2014). Ten years in the trenches: Faculty perspectives on sustaining service learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 37(4), 415–428.
10.1177/1053825913513721
- Creswell, J., & Plano-Clark, V. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Cunningham, S., Tunch, O., & Gallacher, D. (2013, April). *Empowering bioscience students to develop employability skills through volunteering – Voices of experience*. Paper presented at the HEA STEM Annual Conference, Birmingham.
- Curtin Volunteers! (2019). *John Curtin Weekend*. Retrieved from <https://students.curtin.edu.au/experience/volunteering/john-curtin-weekend/>.
- Curtin Volunteers! (2016). *Curtin Volunteers! (CV!)*. Retrieved from <http://life.curtin.edu.au/leadership-and-community/cv.htm>
- Davis Smith, J. (2000). Volunteering and social development. *Voluntary Action*, 3(1), 9-23.
- Department of Education. (2019). *Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement*. Retrieved from <https://docs.education.gov.au/node/34131>
- Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC). (2011). *National Volunteering Strategy*. Canberra: Office of the Not-for Profit Sector.
- Edith Cowan University (ECU). (2019). Volunteering. Retrieved from <https://www.ecu.edu.au/careers-and-employability-services/volunteering>
- Edwards, B., Mooney, L., & Heald, C. (2001). Who is being served? The impact of student volunteering on local community organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 444-461. 10.1177/0899764001303003

- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550. 10.5465/amr.1989.4308385
- Gazley, B., Littlepage, L., & Bennett, T. (2012). What about the host agency? Nonprofit perspectives on community-based student learning and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(6), 1029-1050. 10.1177/0899764012438698
- Ghose, T., & Kassam, M. (2014). Motivations to volunteer among college students in India. *Voluntas*, 25(1), 28-45. 10.1007/s11266-012-9327-4
- Grant-Smith, D., & McDonald, P. (2018). Ubiquitous yet ambiguous: An integrative review of unpaid work. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20, 559-578. 10.1111/ijmr.12153
- Green, P. (2018). Volunteering in the higher education curriculum: the politics of policy, practice and participation. PhD Thesis: University of Wolverhampton.
- Handy, F., Hustinx, L., Cnaan, R., and Kang, C. (2009). A cross-cultural examination of student volunteering: Is it all about résumé building? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(3), 498-523. 10.1111/ijmr.12153
- Haski-Leventhal, D., Cnaan, R., Handy, F., Brudney, J., Holmes, K., Hustinx, L., Kang, C., Kassam, M., Meijs, L., Ranade, B., Yamauchi, N., Yeung, A., & Zrinscak, S. (2008). Students' vocational choice and voluntary action: A 12-nation study. *Voluntas*, 19(1), 1-21. 10.1007/s11266-008-9052-1
- Henderson, A., Brown, S. D., & Pancer, S. M. (2019). Curriculum requirements and subsequent civic engagement: is there a difference between 'forced' and 'free' community service?. *The British journal of sociology*, 70(4), 1297-1322.
- Holdsworth, C., & Brewis, G. (2013). Volunteering, choice and control: A case study of higher education student volunteering. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(2), 204-219. [10.1080/13676261.2013.815702](https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.815702)

- Holdsworth, C., & Quinn, J. (2010). Student volunteering in English higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(1), 113–127. 10.1080/03075070903019856
- Holdsworth, C., & Quinn, J. (2012). The epistemological challenge of higher education student volunteering: “Reproductive” or “deconstructive” volunteering. *Antipode, 44*(2), 386-405. 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2011.00844.x
- Holmes, K. (2009). Volunteering, citizenship and social capital: a review of UK government policy. *Journal of Leisure, Tourism and Events Policy Research, 1*(3), 265-269. 10.1080/19407960903204398
- Hustinx, L., Meijjs, L., Handy, F., & Cnaan, R. (2012). Monitorial citizens or civic omnivores? Repertoires of civic participation among university students. *Youth & Society, 44*, 95. 10.1177/0044118X10396639
- Jardine, A. (2018). Nurturing university students to be socially responsible citizens: An examination of two approaches to volunteering. In D. Shek and R. Hollister (Eds.), *University social responsibility and quality of life* (pp.121-133). Singapore: Springer.
- Johnson, J., Giannoulakis, C., Felver, N., Judge, L., Pierce A., & Scott, B. (2017). Motivation, satisfaction, and retention of sport management student volunteers. *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 9*(1), 1-27. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/18129>
- King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. London: Sage.
- Macquarie University. (2016, September 1). *About PACE*. Retrieved from http://mq.edu.au/about_us/offices_and_units/professional_and_community_engagement/
- Mackenzie, S. L., Hinchey, D. M., & Cornforth, K. P. (2019). A public health service-learning capstone: Ideal for students, academia and community. *Frontiers in Public Health, 7*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00010>

- Macquarie University. (2019). *PACE experience*. Retrieved from <https://students.mq.edu.au/experience/practical-experience/pace-experience>
- McFadden, A. (2017). Amplifying student learning through volunteering, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 14, (3), Article 6. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol14/iss3/6>
- Meijs, L., and Hoogstad, E. (2001). New ways of managing volunteers: combining membership management and programme management. *Voluntary Action*, 3(3), 41-61.
- Miles, M., Huberman, M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A methods handbook*. London: Sage Publications.
- Murdoch University. (2019). *Volunteer/ Development transcript*. Retrieved from https://askmurdoch.custhelp.com/app/askmurdoch/answers/detail/a_id/1486/~/volunteer%2Fdevelopmental-transcript
- Nadin, S., & Cassell, C. (2004). Using data matrices. In C. Cassell and G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organisational research* (pp. 271-287). London: Sage.
- O'Connor, K., Lynch, K., & Owen, D. (2011). Student–community engagement and the development of graduate attributes. *Education + Training*, 53(2/3), 100–115. 10.1108/004009111111115654
- Parker, E., Myers, N., Higgins, C., Oddson, T., Price, M., & Gould, T. (2009). More than experiential learning or volunteering: a case study of community service learning within the Australian context. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28(6), 585-596. 10.1080/07294360903161147

- Paull, M., Scott, R., MacCallum, J., Walker, G., Omari, M., Haski-Leventhal, D., & Holmes, K. (2015). University student volunteering: what's in a name? *Third Sector Review*, 21(2), 49-74.
- RMIT. (2016, September 1). *College of Business student ambassadors program*. Retrieved from: <http://www1.rmit.edu.au/browse;ID=s0hgnsbajadh>.
- RMIT. (2019). *Student ambassadors*. Retrieved from <https://www.rmit.edu.au/students/life-and-work-opportunities/volunteering/student-ambassadors>
- Rose, J. (2018). Developing and sequencing community engagement and experiential education: A case study of urban geography teaching and research. *The Professional Geographer*, 70(2), 305-310. 10.1080/00330124.2017.1366786
- Sattler, P., Wiggers, R., & Arnold, C. (2011). Combining workplace training with postsecondary education: The spectrum of Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) opportunities from apprenticeship to experiential learning. *Canadian Apprenticeship Journal*, 5. Retrieved from <http://journals.sfu.ca/caj/index.php/caj-jca/article/view/74/131>
- Scott, R., & van Etten, E. (2013). Environmental and conservation volunteering as workplace integrated learning for university students. *Issues in Educational Research*, 23(2), 242–257.
- Smith, M., Bell, K., Bennett, D., & McAlpine, A. (2018). *Employability in a global context: Evolving policy and practice in employability, work integrated learning, and career development learning*. Wollongong: Graduate Careers Australia. 10.6084/m9.figshare.6372506
- Smith, K., Holmes, K., Haski-Leventhal, D., Cnaan, R., Handy, F., & Brudney, J. (2010). Motivations and benefits of student volunteering: Comparing regular, occasional, and

non-volunteers in five countries. *Canadian journal of nonprofit and social economy research*, 1(1), 65.

University of New England. (2020). *The New England Award*. Retrieved from

<https://www.une.edu.au/current-students/graduation/new-england-award>

Thomson, A., Smith-Tolken, A., Naidoo, A., & Bringle, R. (2011). Service learning and community engagement: a comparison of three national contexts. *Voluntas*, 22, 214-237.

10.1007/s11266-010-9133-9

University of Melbourne. (2019). *Voluntary work*. Retrieved from

<https://careers.unimelb.edu.au/students/jobs-and-opportunities/internships-work-experience-and-mentoring/voluntary-work>

UNSW. (2016). *Arc UNSW student life*. Retrieved from <http://www.arc.unsw.edu.au/>

Veres, J. C., Eva, N., & Cavanagh, A. (2020). “Dark” student volunteers: commitment, motivation, and leadership. *Personnel Review*. DOI 10.1108/PR-02-2019-0085

Volunteering Australia. (2016). *Definition of volunteering*. Retrieved from

<http://www.volunteeringaustralia.org/policy-and-best-practise/definition-of-volunteering/>

Whitley, C., & Yoder, S. (2015). Developing social responsibility and political engagement:

Assessing the aggregate impacts of university civic engagement on associated attitudes and behaviors. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 10(3), 217-233.

10.1177/1746197915583941

Yates L., Woelert P., Millar V., O’Connor K. (2017). *Knowledge at the Crossroads?*

Singapore: Springer. 10.1007/978-981-10-2081-0_12