Centering the Voices of Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in Discussions of Traditional Volunteerism

MPP Professional Paper

In Partial Fulfillment of the Master of Public Policy Degree Requirements
The Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs
The University of Minnesota

Jacklyn Caroline Cooney
14 June 2021

Signature below of Paper Supervisor certifies successful completion of oral presentation ***and*** *completion of final written version:*

Professor Christina Ewig, Paper Supervisor	**10 May 2021** Date, oral presentation	**14 June 2021** Date, paper completion
Professor Deborah Levison, Second Committee Member Signature of Second Committee Member, certifying successful completion of professional paper		**14 June 2021** Date, paper completion

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

I am grateful for the Minnesota Alliance for Volunteer Advancement in letting me participate in their inclusivity research in which this professional paper is based upon. Secondly, and most importantly, I want to thank and acknowledge all of the participants who provided their time, energy, and voices in the listening sessions. This professional paper would not have happened without these community conversations and insights. Lastly, I would like to thank Dr. Christina Ewig and Dr. Deborah Levison for their continuous support and feedback on my many, many drafts.

PREFACE

Statement of Positionality

This working paper is neither a ten-step plan nor a best practices manual. It's a starting point. It is a thirty-something-page recognition that the nonprofit sector can foster an unwelcoming environment to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC). It is a space to center the experiences, hesitancies, and frustrations of BIPOC individuals who volunteer in Minnesota. It is a needed dialogue of why BIPOC volunteers feel disengaged with larger, traditional nonprofit organizations. The purpose is to inform and motivate volunteer administrators and managers to reflect (and hopefully begin acting) on how their organizational structures and operations uphold systemic racism in volunteer engagement.

Volunteerism is still collectively characterized by the white experience. Too many research articles fail to separate the experiences of BIPOC volunteers from their white counterparts. We need more thorough studies of the barriers and structures in place that prevent BIPOC volunteers from engaging with larger service organizations. That is why this paper is built upon the insights of Minneapolis BIPOC volunteers who were gracious enough to join in a number of listening sessions facilitated by the Minnesota Alliance for Volunteer Advancement.

This paper is written by a middle-class twenty-five-year-old white woman from Minnesota. I am neither a BIPOC individual nor an expert in eliminating systemic oppression. However, that does not excuse me from fighting for racial equity. I have a responsibility to challenge the norms that benefit and prioritize white individuals, especially when they relate to my studies and work. I am trying to elevate the voices of BIPOC volunteers as part of the larger discussion about racial inequity in volunteerism. For this reason, to be faithful to these experiences detailed by BIPOC individuals, I will rely on their voices as much as possible.

1.

Introduction

In 2017 alone, Minnesota had over 1.9 million volunteers providing more than 137 million hours of service (CNCS, 2018b). The state ranks second nationally in overall volunteer participation rates, and this leadership is attributed to the extensive volunteering found in the Twin Cities area (Minneapolis – St. Paul – Bloomington, MN-WI Metro Area). The Twin Cities ranks first among cities nationally, with 46.3 percent of all residents having volunteered in 2017 (CNCS, 2018a). Specifically, close to 1.4 million residents volunteered more than 92.1 million hours of service (CNCS, 2018a). Yet, these rankings are generalized to the larger population and overlook differences in how Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) volunteer and engage with their communities in the state. While both white and BIPOC Minnesotans frequently volunteer, they do so in different ways.

The nonprofit sector, which routinely uses large numbers of volunteers in its operations[1], is predominantly staffed by white individuals (Johnson & Kappelides, 2021). This is especially true for larger service organizations. Moreover, when more than 88 percent of volunteer managers are white, it easy to see why 'traditional' volunteering lacks diverse volunteer cohorts (Johnson & Kappelides, 2021).[2] Even though white volunteers dominate this organized, nonprofit niche, that does *not* mean that BIPOC individuals are not volunteering (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). They are just choosing to volunteer elsewhere – in their communities, faith institutions, and local BIPOC-led organizations among others.

[1] The metro and state volunteer service are worth an estimated $2.2 billion locally and $3.3 billion statewide (CNCS, 2018a; 2018b).

[2] Traditional (or formal) volunteering relates to any unpaid activities that are performed for or through an organization, commonly a nonprofit service entity.

Volunteers are in control of where they give their energy, time, and expertise. However, when organizations uphold significant barriers that prevent BIPOC participation, the volunteering sector remains segregated. This is problematic as larger organizations, especially those that serve minorities and communities of color, lose the connections, expertise, and representation that BIPOC volunteers would bring. The disconnect between BIPOC volunteers and traditional organizations is why the Minnesota Alliance for Volunteer Advancement (MAVA) has increasingly prioritized racial equity research in their programming this past year. In order to better advise and create trainings around inclusive volunteer recruitment and engagement, MAVA facilitated listening sessions with local BIPOC volunteers to better understand their volunteer experiences in the state. The concerns, frustrations, and experiences shared by the participants are the foundation of this paper and future equity work within the traditional volunteering sector.

2.

Background Studies

Volunteering is defined as any unpaid labor that individuals might provide to others. People may volunteer for altruistic and egotistical reasons (or both simultaneously). Volunteer activities are organized in a variety of ways through local community initiatives and formal organizational channels (i.e., traditional service organizations). However, volunteerism research does not reflect the full extent of all these volunteer opportunities.

Existing research routinely limits the types of volunteer activities reported as well as generalizes conclusions across the collective volunteer base. This can possibly mask BIPOC-specific volunteer motivations and activities. There has been an increased effort in the state of Minnesota to implement inclusive volunteer recruitment and engagement practices. The success

of this transition is at risk though if organizations are unable to identify and subsequently address barriers that dissuade BIPOC engagement. This may leave traditional service organizations unable to successfully build diverse and representative volunteer bases in Minnesota.

Research Oversights

National volunteerism research commonly reports only "formal" volunteering hours. The recorded activities would be those completed for or through an organization or association (United States Census Bureau, 2017). Additionally, it can be considered as volunteering with an entity that has a (most-likely paid) volunteer manager leading the volunteer program. This tendency arose because volunteerism research is frequently tied to nonprofit sector studies – the annual *Health of the U.S. Nonprofit Sector* report published by Independent Sector being one. It also occurs because reporting informal volunteering activities can be highly subjective. Informal volunteering is characterized by any volunteer activities completed outside of an organizational realm, commonly through organic community relations and initiatives. The extent of this participation can be difficult to quantify and many may not even consider it as volunteer work to report (Boyle & Sawyer, 2010).

The exclusion of informal volunteering avenues and community initiatives biases research towards formal volunteering, and specifically volunteering completed in partnership with traditional service organizations. If research does not include all instances of volunteering, there is a possibility of underreporting the full extent of volunteer engagement (Boyle & Sawyer, 2010). It also leaves researchers unable to accurately compare differences in the type and frequency of volunteering among volunteer bases.

Much of the research, in its reporting, conclusions and recommendations, also lacks any specific racial comparisons (e.g. Do Good Institute, 2018; Eisner et al., 2009; Garner & Garner,

2011; Hager et al., 2004; Waters & Bortree, 2012; Connors & Ebrary, Inc., 2012). This biases findings toward white volunteer experiences and patterns. The U.S. Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), an entity responsible for national volunteerism research, does not disaggregate volunteer demographics in its findings reporting. Generalizations occur in reports even when demographic data is collected. For example, in a twenty-two-page report analyzing the decline of volunteering between 2002 to 2015, the authors failed to include any race-specific trends, even though that information was included in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey dataset (Do Good Institute, 2018). The report emphasizes a concerning decline in volunteer participation across the United States, yet, fails to detail if the decline is universal across all age groups, genders, and races. This is problematic as demographic comparisons would be helpful in targeted recruitment and engagement strategies. This homogenization of volunteers is further evident in the *Volunteer Management Handbook* which does not include any racial considerations in volunteer management practices (Connors & Ebrary, Inc., 2012). The lack of interest in potential racial differences suggests that researchers assume that BIPOC and white individuals volunteer in similar ways. However, this leaves any unique BIPOC volunteer experiences to be potentially ignored. For example, in a study looking at volunteer motivation, satisfaction, and frustration levels in connection to the retention of volunteers in traditional service organizations, there was no race specific analysis within the sample to see if experiences varied between racial volunteer groups (Garner & Garner, 2011).

These research errors are not simplistic statistical oversights. The tendency to ignore intergroup and intragroup racial differences leads to incomplete and misrepresented conclusions. This is compounded if minority volunteers are more likely to volunteer informally or differently and are subsequently undercounted and underrepresented in volunteerism research. Nesbit

(2017) argues for race specific analysis and comparison as she found that white individuals were significant more likely to volunteer for civic and environmental organizations (compared to Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics) and for advocacy groups and political parties (compared to Asians and Hispanics). Further, other research indicates white individuals formally volunteering at higher rates than of any other racial group (e.g., Gonzales et al., 2016; Musick et al., 2000). This is in part to research that found that white individuals are more likely to be asked to volunteer formally by traditional service organizations (Hodgkinson & Weitzman, 1996). These concerns are legitimatized as smaller research studies have begun to find substantial intergroup differences in the volunteer experiences when Asian, Black, and Hispanic volunteer sample groups are compared to white counterparts (Lee & Moon, 2011; Latting, 1990; Smith et al., 1999). The differences found are meaningful and should be addressed for more responsive and representative strategies to be utilized in the volunteer field.

It is important to note, however, that the BIPOC volunteer experience is not universal. There are most likely undiscovered intergroup differences between BIPOC racial groups as well as varying intragroup differences depending on other demographic characteristics. The subsequent findings are just a small glimpse in showing the varied experience of volunteers of color throughout the United States.

BIPOC-Specific Findings

There are a slowly growing number of volunteer research studies that identify and compare experiences and motivations across various racial groups in the United States (e.g. Nesbit et al., 2020; Nesbit, 2017; Wang et al., 2013). However, there are a few limitations to these findings. These studies rely heavily on survey methodology which can lead to generalizations among BIPOC volunteers due to sampling and self-selection biases (Wilson,

2012; Boyle & Sawyer, 2010). Secondly, the research at times homogenizes the BIPOC experience or favors select racial minority groups. The research frequently compares individual racial groups to only white counterparts, excluding any interracial group comparisons to be identified (e.g., Lee & Moon, 2011; Latting, 1990; Smith et al., 1999). The oversight is troubling as the BIPOC volunteer experience is not uniform. Sundeen et al. (2007) found that unlike for Chinese and Filipino immigrants in the United States, Asian Indian immigrants were not more likely to volunteer with increases in their education levels. In another study, Sundeen et al. (2009) found that for all racial groups except Black immigrants, full-time employment had a negative effect on volunteering, while being married with children had a positive effect for all immigrants except Asian ones. Additionally, age had a positive effect on volunteering for Hispanic immigrants, but a negative effect for white immigrants (Sundeen et al., 2009).

Regardless, existing research has reported differences in volunteer priorities and activities between volunteers of color and their white counterparts. While the unique experiences of various volunteers of color should not be homogenized, there are similarities in findings and priorities across various racial and ethnic groups. Research indicates that BIPOC individuals are more likely to volunteer for altruistic reasons as explained by a heightened sense of responsibility to their communities. This is evident as they seem to favor volunteer activities that interact with individuals and organizations in their own communities. Additionally, while BIPOC individuals do volunteer formally at times, there is a distinct preference towards volunteering in more informal manners through their faith associations and community initiatives.

A sense of responsibility to their communities was clearly identified in one study. It found that the Black participants in a Big Brother / Big Sister program were significantly more

likely to attribute their motivations to altruistic reasons – "It's my turn to help" and "It's my duty to contribute to my community" – compared to the white volunteers who reported more egotistical motivations (Latting, 1990). Latting concluded that the Black volunteers prioritized the satisfaction of children and teenagers engaged in the program over individual reward or skill building for the volunteer (Latting, 1990). Latting identified a sense of responsibility that the Black volunteers had towards the program participants "based on an underlying norm of caring and responsibility for the Black community" itself (Latting, 1990; p. 123). This is similar to research conducted in Mexico that found that volunteer work was considered an act of solidarity which "presupposes the existence of a community to which one has specific duties" (Butcher, 2010; p. 18). These similar findings indicate that Black and Mexican volunteers seek to specifically serve those of similar backgrounds, not any formal organization itself.

One study found that Korean immigrants to the U.S. were more likely to volunteer with ethnic organizations (86 percent) over mainstream ones (18 percent) (Lee & Moon, 2011). The findings suggested that ethnic and mainstream organizations were substitutive, and that participants either volunteered at one or the other, but not both. The greater participation with ethnic organizations was attributed in part to barriers presented by mainstream organizations. One was a language barrier between the immigrant volunteers and the mainstream institutions (Lee & Moon, 2011). Another was a perception that many mainstream organizations still see Asian immigrants as recipients of the organizational services rather than contributors (Lee & Moon, 2011). While these barriers provided additional context, a sense of community obligation was the most significant factor in Korean immigrants favoring ethnic organizations. Volunteers prioritized the building of social capital within their communities when giving their time (Lee & Moon, 2011). This prioritization is similar to the Black motivations found by Latting, providing

evidence that many Black and Korean volunteers considered their volunteer work to be part of a greater responsibility to their communities.

A sense of community responsibility seems to influence how BIPOC individuals choose to predominantly volunteer – they do so through volunteering with informal, rather than formal organizations. Informal volunteer initiatives commonly arise in response to community needs – childcare, neighborhood cleanup, shopping or driving community members, etc. Further, given that faith associations rarely have a paid volunteer manager nor a formalized volunteer program, volunteering through churches and parishes is commonly regard as informal.

A connection between a sense of responsibility to one's community and subsequent informal volunteer has been identified in multiple studies (e.g. Wilson & Musick, 1997; Wuthnow, 1991; Wilson, 2012). Wilson & Musick (1997) argued that "obligations have a more powerful influence on informal helping than they do on formal volunteer work" (p. 700). They suggested that BIPOC volunteers may favor informal community initiatives because of their personalized sense of obligation to their communities and those of shared backgrounds. The preference is reflected by a number of studies that reported significantly lower rates of participation with formal organizations for BIPOC volunteers (e.g., Sundeen et al., 2009; Wilson, 2000). This disparity could be partially attributed to differing levels of familiarity between volunteers and those being served. Wuthnow (1991) theorizes that the formalized volunteer sector lacks a sense of obligation toward specific work and individuals. The work, instead, is categorized as a generalized desire to help others. In contrast, informal volunteering has an increased likelihood of familiarity between the volunteers and those being served (Amato, 1990). This suggests an intersection between community responsibility and informal initiatives among BIPOC volunteers. This is further supported by Fieldhouse & Cutts (2010) that detailed that

racial minority identity leads to higher instances of community participation, and Guterbock & London (1983) who reasoned that BIPOC participation is attributed to a higher sense of wanting to advance and build their own communities.

This intersection of obligation and informal volunteering is evident in where BIPOC individuals volunteer. One study found that Black volunteers focus more on unmet needs and local activities in their communities – e.g., lack of human services and political initiatives (Wilson, 2000). There also is a tendency for Black individuals to volunteer for and through their faith associations (Wilson, 2000). This supports earlier research that found that Black faith associations and churches are popular avenues for volunteering, more so than for their white counterparts (e.g., Sundeen, 1992; Musick et al., 2000). Another study found that Black volunteers were also more likely to volunteer in neighborhood associations and initiatives (Portney & Berry, 1997). All these activities would be characterized as informal volunteering.

The popularity of informal volunteering also occurs within Hispanic communities. Royce & Rodriquez (1999) found that Hispanic individuals volunteered by caring and helping family friends, and neighbors, as well as volunteering for and through the Catholic church. Similarly, Smith et al. (1999) detailed how Mexican parents and families in the San Francisco Bay area frequently volunteered for their Catholic churches and schools. Additional studies similarly found that Hispanic individuals were more likely to volunteer within kin groups and/or with informal groups and initiatives compared to their white counterparts (Segura et al., 2001; Sundeen et al., 2009). An increased rate of volunteering within their faith associations has also been reported through the years (e.g., Cortes, 1995; Smith et al., 1999; Sundeen et al., 2007). Wang et al. (2013) reported that religious attendance had a stronger effect on volunteer participation for Hispanic respondents compared to their non-Hispanic counterparts.

Volunteerism research does indicate that there is overlap in volunteer motivations and preferences among various racial groups. Specifically, a sense of responsibility to one's community seems to be a significant motivator in volunteer activities. Additionally, there seems to be a preference among volunteers of colors for informal volunteer activities. However, these findings cannot be universally adopted as the broader collection of racial specific volunteer studies can vary depending on sample characteristics, the measure of volunteerism, and the variables and controls that are included in the methodology (Wilson, 2012). Lastly, while motivations seem similar, there is little research identifying the specific barriers that volunteers of color contend with regarding formal service organizations. While Lee & Moon (2011) detailed a language barrier preventing formal engagement, that finding cannot be applied across all BIPOC volunteers.

Why This Matters

The methodological oversights that limit what volunteer activities are reported and ignore the unique perspectives of volunteers of color are problematic. Biased conclusions can lead to BIPOC volunteers to be underreported and underutilized by traditional service organizations. If formal volunteering in Minnesota remains ignorant towards BIPOC volunteer preferences, traditional service organizations will continue struggling to recruit and sustain a diverse and representative volunteer base. This is problematic as BIPOC volunteers are key resources in service delivery to minority individuals and communities. Green (1982) argues a case for increased representation and cultural sensitivity in service delivery research. He argues that minority practitioners should be utilized as brokers between the organization agencies and the minority individuals and communities being served (Green, 1982). He further concludes that these representative mediators are more apt to successfully advocate for their community

members, and that BIPOC clients prefer working with individuals of shared backgrounds (Green, 1982).

While representation matters for both clients and volunteers, traditional service organizations don't seem to know how to successfully recruit and retain minorities (Latting, 1990). Latting (1990) argues that this is due to the insufficient knowledge that organizations have about the true BIPOC-specific motivations, preferences, and characteristics influencing volunteer activity. This arises because the sector still predominantly assumes that white and BIPOC individuals volunteer in similar ways. However, as detailed above, that is not always the case.

Minnesota has a large and thriving volunteering sector. However, traditional service organizations have long acknowledged a struggle in recruiting and mobilizing BIPOC volunteers (Joyslin, 2020). This research seeks to better identify and understand why BIPOC volunteers in Minnesota choose not to volunteer through traditional service organizations. This is problematic because BIPOC volunteers are highly motivated in helping their communities and those of shared backgrounds and would be a key resource in trust and relationship building between organizations and those being served.

If traditional volunteer organizations want to build more diverse and inclusive volunteer bases, they need to identify and address any barriers that hinder participation by BIPOC volunteers. Otherwise, BIPOC individuals will continue to favor informal and community volunteer work and formal organizations will not be able to utilize the skills, expertise, and community relationships that BIPOC individuals have to offer those being served. The state volunteerism sector needs to consider their program operations in race-specific ways; however, they can only do that if they have information about the Minnesota BIPOC volunteer experience.

This paper seeks to fill the information gap by detailing the experiences of a number of Minneapolis BIPOC volunteers. This research cannot be fully representative nor is it seeking to provide a concrete action plan. It is a beginning point in prioritizing and elevating BIPOC voices if the formal sector truly seeks to incorporate more inclusive volunteering frameworks and initiatives.

3.

Study Background & Methodology

The Minnesota Alliance for Volunteer Advancement (MAVA) is the largest professional membership organization for volunteer administrators and managers in the state. Launched in 2001, MAVA provides research, resources, and trainings in order to maximize volunteer engagement and mobilization among its 800+ members. I began an internship with MAVA in September 2020 and worked directly with the equity and inclusion manager at the time. Therefore, I was able to participate in this listening session project through its implementation and its data analysis.

. The purpose of this study is to better understand why Black, Indigenous, and People of Color volunteer for large service organizations in very small numbers relative to their proportion of the population in Minneapolis. Through conversations with their members, MAVA had identified a significant disparity in BIPOC volunteer engagement among their larger and traditional member organizations. This 'traditional' volunteering is commonly characterized as any unpaid work that occurs through an organization, usually under a staffed volunteer administrator or manager (i.e., the Red Cross, Second Harvest Heartland). The lack of representation is problematic as MAVA "strives to enhance communities…by supporting those

who lead volunteers," and that mission statement is at risk when volunteer organizations fail to utilize a diverse and inclusive volunteer base.

By failing to recruit and engage BIPOC volunteers, organizations will not benefit from the experiences, knowledge, and skills of BIPOC individuals and communities. This is especially concerning when organizations use white volunteers to serve predominantly BIPOC individuals and families. MAVA knows that there is a large and active number of BIPOC individuals that forgo traditional organizations and instead volunteer locally and with smaller BIPOC organizations. In order to better understand the disparity between the rates of participation, MAVA sought to facilitate a discussion with BIPOC volunteers about their experiences and viewpoints regarding 'traditional' organizations. The goal of these sessions was to identify any barriers, concerns, and frustrations that BIPOC individuals have about volunteering with traditional service organizations. MAVA wanted to know both where the participants choose to volunteer and their motivations behind those decisions. Specifically, MAVA sought to:

1) Identify barriers to participation; and
2) Learn about alternative volunteerism structures that are created by and for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color

The centering of the BIPOC experience is the first step for MAVA to subsequently craft more equitable manuals, trainings, and practices that benefit and elevate BIPOC volunteers. While MAVA seeks to eventually develop inclusive trainings and practices for organizations to utilize, the study itself was not focused on solutions.

In order to take a more specific look at racial inequity in volunteerism, MAVA conducted eight virtual listening sessions. The hour and half sessions occurred between Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 and were facilitated by I. Collins, an independent systems redesign consultant based

in St. Paul. BIPOC individuals were asked to detail their current volunteer activities and motivations, and most importantly their reasonings for why they avoid traditional volunteering opportunities. The listening session format was selected purposefully to elevate the participants as the experts. The experiences and recommendations they provided will in turn be used to guide the discussions in building racially equitable trainings and systems in volunteerism. For their participation, each was compensated with a $75 gift card.

The listening sessions were open to anyone who were at least 18 years of age and either live, work, or attend school in the city of Minneapolis. They also had to sign consent forms that allowed MAVA to record the sessions and use their feedback anonymously in future reports. Additionally, and most importantly, the participants had to be people who "helped others in your community (family, relatives, neighbors, etc.) or volunteered with a group or organization." The participants were not randomly selected. The event posting was shared on MAVA's website and with their members, and from there, word of mouth and secondary sharing occurred. See Appendix A for the event posting. Everyone who responded was invited to participate if they were eligible and until session spots were filled. Sessions were limited to eight participants to allow for easier discussion and participation.

There were 40 BIPOC volunteers who participated in the listening sessions. Each participant was asked to report their racial and gender identities, age, educational attainment, and household income in a survey. Table 1 provides the demographic breakdowns of all the participants. The unequal row sums occurred as each participant was able to select “prefer not to respond” for every question. The majority of participants were highly educated Black women under 55 years of age.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Listening Session Participants. Individual racial identity, age, sex, educational attainment, and household income were asked in the survey at the beginning of each session. All forty of the participants had a "prefer not to answer" response option for each question. The vast majority of participants were highly educated, Millenial, Black women.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents			
Racial Identity			
Black	**Latino/a**	**Asian**	**Multiracial**
25	6	3	6
Ages			
18 - 25	**26 - 39**	**40 - 55**	**55+**
5	17	12	5
Gender Idenity			
Women	**Men**	**Non-Binary**	
29	8	1	
Educational Attainment			
High School Diploma	**Associate's Degree**	**Bachelor's Degree**	**Graduate Degree**
7	3	17	12
Household Income			
Less than $30,000	**$30,000 - 49,999**	**$50,000 - 74,999**	**More than $75,000**
10	6	12	9

* **Source**: MAVA

Participants provided information in two ways. The first was a survey that was administered at the beginning of each session. The survey asked about demographic characteristics, the frequency of helping and volunteering, their general motivations behind their participation, and their connections to volunteer opportunities. See Appendix B for the survey questions. While the survey provided key context, the majority of the reporting is based upon participants’ direct quotes in response to facilitated questions. Each of the subsequent questions were asked at each session:

1. Volunteerism is defined as: contributing time to an organization to assist other people or a greater cause, such as the environment or affordable housing. What is your definition of volunteerism?
2. If you could redefine volunteerism, what would you include in the definition? What might you exclude from the definition and why?
3. What drives you to give your time and energy to a cause? What is the source for your desire to serve?
4. What detracts you / deters you from volunteering?
5. As we think of our current surroundings and the events of our world, what might we do to ensure volunteerism is equitable across race/ethnicities? What does racial equity look like, feel like to you?
6. What are your suggestions to MAVA on their systems change efforts?

The answers to these questions and the discussion that they sparked were subsequently coded in order to identify major themes that were consistent across all the listening sessions.

There are several limitations to the study design. First, the sample cohort is not fully representative of the experiences of BIPOC volunteers in Minnesota. Our sample did not have a single individual who identified as Indigenous, and the majority of the participants were Black women. The sample size was quite small, was self-selected, and was limited to Minneapolis participants who already volunteered in some way. Additionally, while grouped under the acronym BIPOC, the experiences cannot be applied to all BIPOC volunteers. Therefore, the listening sessions can only provide a glimpse into the experiences of BIPOC volunteers. Lastly, while all the sessions have detailed discussion notes, only the first three sessions (out of eight)

were recorded. While the themes and content are referenced, only direct quotes from the recorded sessions are included in this report.

4.

A Glimpse into the BIPOC Volunteer Experience

The experiences shared by the listening session participants both supplement previous research conclusions as well as provide more information about the motivations, concerns, and barriers that influence their volunteer habits. There was a universal consensus that the participants felt a disconnect with traditional service organizations and their activities. The disconnect is attributed to both barriers that prevent engagement as well as negative experiences that threaten current and future involvement. BIPOC volunteers know that the traditional volunteer sector was built by white individuals in the early 1900s and has not been amended to include BIPOC volunteers in meaningful ways. BIPOC individuals then have little desire to volunteer with these predominantly white traditional organizations.

Similar to the literature, all of the participants identified a prioritization of helping and volunteering within their communities. They volunteered frequently: half of all the respondents gave their time at least weekly, if not more. The large majority identified that their participation stemmed from a sense of obligation they feel to communities that have raised, welcomed, and sustained them. Common reasons for volunteering were it being a means to give back to their communities and that it could easily be them on the other side needing help. Participants in session five were clear that community volunteerism was a duty. A different session participant described this mentality as being "about the village, if the village has a problem, you have a problem" (S16 – Session 3; 27:20). Others noted that the idea of giving back had been engrained in them since childhood. However, while more than half of all the participants volunteered in

various ways – through their faith associations, children's school and club programs, community initiatives, etc. – only a few across all the sessions were currently volunteering with traditional service organizations. Those who did, detailed their vetting processes and reasons for doing so. One said she was solely participating because her daughter's team needed a coach, while another said she volunteered on election day as it was "important to see someone who looks like me there" (I0 – S2; 30:54). Both indicated their participation was an example of fulfilling an unmet need in their community that they could fulfill, and not because they felt a sense of desire to work with the individual organization itself. The hesitancy and lack of desire to interact with traditional service organizations was a significant and constant theme across every listening session.

The simplest reason as to why the participants did not work with traditional organizations is that they do not need these entities to volunteer. The participants were already volunteering elsewhere within their local communities. While this was touched upon in all the sessions, it was particularly evident in the first one. When detailing their individual definitions of volunteering, one respondent described "that when I think of volunteering, it doesn't have to be attached to organizations" (D2 – Session 1; 14:30). He further expanded that volunteering was "contributing time to other people…not necessarily through an organization" (D2 – Session 1; 15:20). A second followed by defining a volunteer as "an individual [who] provides assistance" commonly "outside the official avenues of organizations or groups that are recognized by society" (K3 – Session 1; 15:35; 16:17). Similarly, a third concluded that volunteering "doesn't necessarily always have to be tied to being a part of an organization. To me, it simply means giving your time and effort to someone in your community or area" (Ha4 – Session 1; 16:32). This general sentiment is also reflected in participants' choices to volunteer through their individual faith

associations, schools and youth programs, and local BIPOC-led organizations in their neighborhoods and communities. Community events and initiatives shared by family and friends were also common volunteer avenues. They did not need traditional organizations to facilitate their volunteering efforts. It also reinforces the tendency for BIPOC volunteers to stay within their communities when volunteering instead of seeking out other external formal volunteer programs.

The respondents also perceived formal organizations to be generally inaccessible and unfamiliar. The formal terminology of "organization" was off-putting to some of the participants. One respondent shared that for many, "when they see the words "organization," they don't identify with those institutions because they have been stigmatized of that type of vocabulary, so they automatically strike it out of their realm of possibility" (K3 – S1; 19:46). Another individual detailed that "it is very difficult to find volunteers from communities of color because they associate "organization" or "nonprofit" [as] buzzwords" that don't seem oriented to BIPOC individuals (W5 – S1; 22:24). These connotations are one reason preventing BIPOC engagement with traditional service organizations.

A general hesitancy about traditional organizations was compounded when the participants perceived that formal organizations seem more concerned with their operations than of those being served. Influenced by their community responsibility, participants characterized volunteering as heavily focused on the individuals and communities being served. This focus is why the participants favored working with local volunteer initiatives. These avenues of volunteering are extensions of their community life. In discussions about the purpose of volunteering the respondent who made the village reference further detailed that volunteering is a "service, it is this idea of caring about another person, and connecting on that level" (C11 –

Session 2; 3:55). In the same session, another respondent characterized her volunteer work as "community building," and another volunteered to "help my specific community" (T9 – S2; 14:40; K7 – Session 2; 30:30). This consideration was not unique to that listening session. As in a different one, a respondent characterized volunteering as a "sense of community, participating because of your community, because of the greater good" (Y13 – Session 3; 18:34). These discussions emphasized that when volunteering, these participants see their individual selves (and their interests) as second to those being served. One participant expanded on this and said that when volunteering is considered as "just this thing that makes me feel good…[volunteering] feels problematic to me. It is about the need of the community or the people I am serving" (C11 – Session 2; 10:10). These values were mentioned in all the listening sessions. They were reflective of a popular mentality of being a conscious member "of the collective…[that] connects them all together" based upon a foundation of selfless care (C11 – Session 2; 3:55). However, the participants feel that traditional organizations do not prioritize this same mentality.

A large number of participants feel that the organizations are too focused on their overhead and their reputations, losing sight of those they are serving: "it is more for themselves, more so then for the people [being served]" (D2 – Session 1; 24:50). In another session, a participant detailed how volunteering is commonly advertised as 'giving back,' which that participant felt was coded for "[white people] coming into our community telling us what we need and what we should have" (S16 – S3; 43:12). At least one person in every session reported that traditional organizations seemed more focused on their reputations and the motivations of their volunteers, leaving those being served as a lower priority. This perception is misaligned with why and how BIPOC volunteers participate and it subsequently poses a barrier to participation. One respondent said she has to constantly "make sure what I am doing is actually

for the cause, and not something going on behind closed doors. Factoring all those things in can make it hard to rally the troops and go volunteer" (C6 – Session 2; 36:16). Participants also worried about volunteering with organizations that fail to elevate the voices of those being served in discussions of service delivery. It was identified as a "disconnect between what people need and what organizations think they need to give" (S16 – Session 3; 21:54). The BIPOC participants valued those being served and they were not interested in volunteering in spaces where they feel like that is overlooked.

Another common theme identified in all of the sessions was how the racial disparity between the BIPOC participants and the predominantly white staff of the service organizations poses a barrier to involvement. All participants said they would rather volunteer for organizations where both the staff, volunteer, and client bases were of similar or more diverse backgrounds. Participants in all the listening sessions detailed how white organizations can be exploitative of the time and energy of BIPOC volunteers. One individual described these frustrations:

> "Why should I give back when all my life and generations, the country has taken, taken, taken. [Organizations] find it hard to understand. Many of the organizations that want volunteers, the gatekeepers do not look like the people giving the free service. They are taking from us, the gatekeepers and administrators are white, getting paid. There is a disconnect there" (S16 – Session 3; 15:50).

This racial disparity was noticeable to all the participants. They all acknowledged that the volunteer sector being "so white" is the most significant barrier to their involvement (D2 – Session 1; 43:45). They feel like the lack of diversity within these traditional organizations creates an unwelcome space and is not worth their time and energy.

The select few respondents who had volunteered with traditional organizations reported feeling tokenized during those experiences. One detailed a feeling of being "stock people…Everything Black related, everything STEM related. I've become the token that becomes used" regarding her participation in mentorship programs (C6 – Session 2; 39:56). Another respondent expanded that these organizations are "always looking for female, Black, somebody of color" to fill some arbitrary quota instead of trying to implement inclusive recruitment strategies consistently (Y11 – Session 2; 37:21). Their participation felt more important for the pamphlet photo than for their skills and experiences. This sense of tokenism was exacerbated when the traditional service organizations never engaged with them in meaningful ways to recruit and engage more BIPOC individuals. These frustrations led a number of participants to disengage entirely with traditional service organizations. Even among those participants that have not volunteered with formal organizations, the majority acknowledged that the fear of tokenism prevented them from interacting with organizations.

The participants also detailed that along with being tokenized, they feel burdened with increased responsibility when they are one of the few BIPOC volunteers. One participant detailed being responsible for all the BIPOC teenagers in a mentorship program, a number much greater than those mentored by white volunteers. A respondent characterized it as "being double taxed, triple taxed, burdened to bear that what we didn't ask for" in their volunteer work and responsibility (D14 – Session 3; 34:00). The burden of relationship building extends beyond those being served. In four listening sessions, respondents shared being tasked with recruiting other BIPOC volunteers without staff involvement or support. This phenomenon was detailed as "primarily white organizations [will] bring BIPOC individuals to the table. We will come to the table, we will collaborate. But then we do the work, we build the relationships, build the

connections" in order to rectify the organization's failure in attaining a diverse volunteer base (Y13 – Session 3; 33:00). One respondent detailed that while she is "part of a niche community" where she is an "expert in," it doesn't mean she should be solely relied on in their volunteering efforts (M10 – Session 2; 41:14). The burden of responsibility is exacerbated when the organizations are perceived as doing nothing "to try to find BIPOC volunteers" (T9 – Session 2; 52:57). A theme across all the listening sessions was organizations need to recognize that if BIPOC volunteers are so important in program delivery, that they either need to increase their recruitment efforts to alleviate the workload or find some way to compensate the work being done.

The frustrations of tokenism and unnecessary burdens were compounded given the lack of compensation for volunteers of color. The participants were universally frustrated that white staff and organizations require and burden their expertise and efforts yet continue to "profit off your unpaid work" (He1 – Session 1; 49:50). It was referenced as a "dichotomy, [white staff] are getting a big salary, with a big budget. Yet [they] want our free labor to do the job" (S16 – Session 3; 46:43). This was similarly addressed in another session as organizations having a "history of extorting free labor [from BIPOC individuals]" when there are white staff members "getting paid for that in the organization" (D2 – Session 1; 45:21). All the participants said that they would be more inclined to work with traditional organizations if their staff was more representative and diverse. Until these organizations commit to inclusivity and racial equity in their own staffing and organizational practices, or find meaningful ways to compensate this unpaid labor, the participants said they will continue to have little interest in providing their unpaid time, skills, and expertise: "We need tangible, tangible, not just symbolic gestures" (S16 – Session 2; 48:36).

5.

Takeaways

Both the literature and the listening sessions findings provide context as to why and where BIPOC individuals volunteer. Similar to the findings of studies on volunteerism elsewhere, every participant in this Minneapolis study detailed a strong sense of responsibility to their individual communities. The participants' volunteer activities also showed a preference for informal initiatives, local organizations, and faith groups. This is similar to the literature findings, especially those that detailed faith institutions as a leading avenue of volunteer engagement. While these findings are important, they cannot fully explain why BIPOC volunteers forgo traditional volunteerism.

The participants identified barriers, concerns, and frustrations with traditional volunteerism that haven't been extensively studied before. These novel findings are important as the literature oversimplifies and generalizes the preferences of BIPOC volunteers. The studies detail a preference of informal and local initiatives. The participants, however, do not consider these volunteer avenues as just a preference, but as the only realistic option.

Two main themes arose in why traditional organizations are not considered as an option to the participants. The participants detailed how their perceptions of the operations and values of these traditional organizations dissuade them from interaction. They also reported that when do they do participate, their experiences only reinforce that the traditional volunteerism sector was neither formed for nor adapted for BIPOC individuals. These perceptions, concerns, and experiences are why the participants, and many BIPOC volunteers in general, choose to forgo traditional volunteer opportunities.

The barriers – organizational perception, lack of staff diversity, and a failure to compensate the volunteer work – limit the freedom of choice of BIPOC volunteers with respect

to where they can volunteer. It also hinders traditional organizations from benefiting from the skills and expertise unique to these individuals. BIPOC volunteers are dedicated and altruistic to those in need, and traditional organizations do a disservice to themselves when they fail to prioritize and engage with this volunteer base. The main takeaway is that without meaningful restructuring and engagement that fosters a more welcoming space for BIPOC volunteers, the status quo will remain.

The listening sessions provided a glimpse of various experiences of BIPOC volunteers in the state. While there was a limited sample size, the experiences and thoughts detailed were consistent across all the sessions. While the majority of the participants were Black women, the the experiences of the few Latinx, Asian and multi-racial participants were similar to the larger cohort. However, future research and investigation needs to be completed in order to gain a better understanding of any inter- and intragroup differences among volunteers of color, especially in regards to Indigenous volunteers. MAVA seeks to help build more inclusive and representative volunteer bases among their members, and the broader state sector as well. But in order to implement any meaningful and effective strategies, we had to first identify the concerns and barriers that BIPOC volunteers have. We acknowledge that these listening sessions are limited, but they set a precedent that will center the voices of BIPOC volunteers in future work.

6.
What's Next?

The listening sessions are a beginning point for MAVA and its members to restructure the traditional volunteerism sector to be more inclusive in its volunteer recruitment and engagement practices. They sought to identify the barriers that dissuade BIPOC volunteer engagement so they can then develop meaningful strategies that traditional service organizations

can implement in their diversity and equity work. While the listening sessions did not specifically ask about solutions, many were discussed among the participants. These recommendations are not exhaustive and will not solve the diversity issue entirely in traditional volunteerism. They should instead be considered as potential opportunities for organizations to engage with in their equity and diversity work.

Recommendation #1. The first recommendation is that traditional organizations need to implement BIPOC-specific recruitment strategies.

They need to "be specific in [their] ask" for BIPOC volunteers (D2 – Session 1; 1:18:20). Many respondents perceive volunteer recruitment to be tailored to white individuals and more focused on organizational operations. If traditional organizations want BIPOC volunteers, they need to specifically ask for BIPOC volunteers. They also need to clearly detail why BIPOC individuals should get involved, who they are serving, and what "what we are showing up to do" (D2 – Session 1; 1:06:33). BIPOC volunteers are motivated by those needing help, not by any organizational obligation. Traditional organizations need to "show the volunteer the communities that they serve" in non-exploitative ways as BIPOC volunteers will be more likely to engage when they identify with those being served (W5 – Session 1; 1:09:50). In order to boost recruitment, organizations could seek out and partner with BIPOC faith associations and other local groups. These specifications would show potential BIPOC volunteers that organizations both recognize and seek out their value and expertise in their volunteer work.

Recommendation #2. The second recommendation is to elevate BIPOC volunteers as both experts and facilitators between those being served and the organization.

Organizations need to find novel ways to include BIPOC volunteers in meaningful and appropriate ways. BIPOC volunteers feel like traditional organizations frequently are

disconnected “between what people need and what organizations think they need to give” (S16 – Session 3; 21:54). To counter this, organizations could create volunteer committees where BIPOC volunteers could identify blind spots in organizational operations and advocate for the unmet needs of those being served. When creating new volunteer roles for BIPOC individuals, organizations will have to be cognizant of the potential burdens of the work, especially if they cannot find means to compensate the volunteers– whether it be monetary or skill development.

Recommendation #3. A third recommendation is committing to racial equity work among its current staff and volunteer base, and future hires. Without this work, the first two recommendations will have an increased likelihood of failure.

Traditional organizations are perceived as another aspect of systemic racism in the lives of BIPOC volunteers. Traditional organizations will need to acknowledge the power disparity between white staff and BIPOC volunteers and consciously prevent implementing exploitative practices and roles. Participants won’t “feel comfortable” until these organizations commit to inclusive practices for both their BIPOC volunteers and their BIPOC clients. BIPOC volunteers “haven’t seen equity work,” and anti-bias and anti-racism trainings would be a key first step in committing to inclusive practices (C6 – Session 2; 56:53). While the trainings are a necessary first step, the staff and board of these traditional organizations need to be more representative and diverse. If the gatekeepers remain predominantly white, any equity work will be considered illegitimate in the long-term as the sector will still compensate white people for the unpaid work of BIPOC volunteers.

These three recommendations are not exhaustive of all that needs changing in traditional volunteering sector. These organizations are currently perceived as unwelcoming and burdensome to BIPOC volunteer participant in a multitude of ways. Organizations will have to

consciously reframe how they promote and center their work as well as how they engage their volunteers. They need to develop and implement BIPOC-specific recruitment and engagement strategies if they want to foster diverse and inclusive volunteer bases. However, in order to develop those strategies, the sector needs to partner with more BIPOC volunteers and BIPOC organizations to "backtrack and work to align with [a] future equitable vision" (C6 – Session 2; 58:20). The problems of traditional volunteerism in Minnesota cannot be solved without the expertise of BIPOC volunteers. It is time for a new beginning where traditional service organizations "walk the walk and talk the talk" in their organizational and volunteer operations (D14 – Session 3; 41:10).

Appendix A

Listening Session Posting

Virtual Listening Session on Helping Others - 3/17, 4-5:30pm

Participants Needed for Listening Sessions on Helping Other People! $75 gift card provided

Do you help people in your community? Maybe you help people cook, take care of family, organize celebrations, drive friends to work and more. Are you a Black, indigenous or person of color? The Minnesota Association for Volunteer Administration (MAVA) would love to hear from you about your experiences, and we will pay you with a $75 gift card for your time, energy and ideas.

For this session we are looking to hear from BIPOC men, along with participants of any gender identity who identify as Indigenous/Native, Hmong, or Latinx.

More Information

Join MAVA for 1.5 hour listening sessions about volunteering and helping others in your community. Listening sessions will take place virtually in October 2020. You will have multiple times and dates to choose from. You can only join one time.

We will not share your name or personal information. Only your words and ideas will be used in a report we will create. You will receive a $75 gift card (Cub, Target or Walmart) after the session by mail or email.

Please join us if:

- You help others in your community (family, relatives, neighbors, etc.) or volunteer with a group or organization
- You are willing to share your ideas and experiences
- You are a man who is Black, indigenous or person of color AND/OR you are a person of any gender identity that is Indigenous/Native, Hmong, or Latinx.
- You are 18 years of age or older
- You live, work or attend school in the city of Minneapolis (you do not need to have an office in Minneapolis, but you can do business there)
- You have a device, such as a computer, tablet or phone, and internet connection to listen and talk to other people in a 1.5 hour session

If you would like to join, please register for one of our listening sessions here or email Lisa Joyslin at ljoyslin@mavanetwork.org to sign up for a session.

About this Project

MAVA is conducting research on racial equity in volunteerism. We have identified areas of systemic racism in traditional volunteer structures, and would like to 1) identify additional barriers to participation and 2) learn about alternative volunteerism structures that are created by and for Black, indigenous and people of color.

We will use the information we gain to create an initial report and training on building racially equitable systems for volunteerism. Ideas shared by listening session participants will be cited in the report, but will be anonymous. MAVA is happy to provide all listening session attendees with copies of our report so you can see the research to which you are contributing.

MAVA would like to thank the Minneapolis Foundation for funding this initiative.

About MAVA

MAVA's mission is to connect, engage, support and advocate for volunteer engagement leaders and their organizations to positively impact communities. Learn more at www.mavanetwork.org.

Appendix B

Listening Session Survey Questions

Section 1: Participant Info

1. **What is your name (First, Last)?**
   (Text box)
2. **Primary email address?**
   (Text box)
3. **How did you hear about this listening session?**
   Facebook post/group
   Twitter post
   Instagram post/story
   Other social media
   Email
   Friends and family
   Other (text box)
4. **What is your age range?**
   Under 18
   18-25
   25-39
   40-55
   55-69
   70+
5. **How do you identify yourself?**
   American Indian or Alaska Native
   Asian
   Black or African American
   Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   White
   Multi-Racial
   Other (text box)
6. **Are you Hispanic or Latinx?**
   Yes
   No
7. **What is your gender identity?**
   Female
   Male
   Non-Binary
   Trans/transgender
   Gender Fluid
   Self-identify
   Prefer not to respond
   Other (text box)
8. **What is your highest level of education?**
   Have not graduated high school
   High school diploma
   Associates degree
   Bachelor's degree
   Master's degree
   Doctorate
9. **What is your household income?**
   Less than $30,000 annually
   30,000-50,000 annually
   50,000-75,000 annually
   75,000-125,000 annually
   More than $125,000 annually
10. **Where do you live (city and county)?**
    (Text box)

Section 2: Helping Others

11. Do you spend time helping other people in your community?
Yes
No

12. If yes, why do you help other people? (Select All That Apply)
There is a need
I enjoy helping
I want to make my community better
No one else will do it
The people I help also help me

13. If you help other people, how often do you do so?
Several times a year
At least once a month
At least once a week
More than once a week

Section 3: Volunteering

14. Do you spend time volunteering with a group or nonprofit?
Yes
No

15. If yes, why do you volunteer?
(Select All That Apply)
There is a need
I enjoy helping
I want to make my community better
No one else will do it
I have received help from the group/organization
Other (text box)

16. If you volunteer, how often do you do so?
Several times a year
At least once a month
At least once a week
More than once a week

17. How do you or would you get connected to volunteer opportunities?
(Select All That Apply)
Heard about it from a friend or family member
Learned about it at a community event
Organization's website or online volunteer opportunity search
Poster or community flyer
Through my place of worship or another group I'm involve with
Other (text box)

18. Are you interested in volunteering at an organization to support your work in the community?
Yes – I already volunteer
Yes – but I am not volunteering currently
No – not interested
Other (text box)

Section 4: Gift Card Distribution Info

19. **Which store would you like to receive your $75 gift card from?**
    CUB FOODS
    TARGET
    WALMART

20. **How would you like your gift card delivered?**
    EMAIL (not available for Cub gift cards)
    MAIL (not available for Walmart gift cards)

21. **Please provide the mailing address or email address where your gift card should be sent?**
    (Text box)

Works Cited

Amato, P. (1990). Personality and Social Network Involvement as Predictors of Helping Behavior in Everyday Life. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53: 31-43.

Boyle, MP., & Sawyer, JK. (2010). Defining Volunteering for Community Campaigns: An Exploration of Race, Self Perfections, and Campaign Practices. *Journal of Community Practice*, 18(1), 40-57.

Bureau of Labor Statistics – U.S. Department of Labor. (2016). *Volunteering in the United States – 2015* [News release]. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/volun.pdf.

Butcher, J. (2010). Conceptual framework for volunteer action and acts of solidarity. In J. Butcher (Ed.), *Mexican Solidarity: Citizen participation and volunteering* (pp. 1-32). New York, NY: Springer.

CNCS – Corporation for National and Community Service. (2018a). Volunteering in America: Cities. Retrieved from https://americorps.gov/sites/default/files/document/Volunteering_in_America_Cities_508.pdf.

CNCS – Corporation for National and Community Service (2018b). Volunteering in America: States. Retrieved from https://americorps.gov/sites/default/files/document/Volunteering_in_America_States_508.pdf.

Connors, TD., & Ebrary, Inc. (2012). *The Volunteer Management Handbook: Leadership Strategies for Success* (2nd ed., [Wiley Nonprofit law, finance, and management series]). Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley.

Cortes, M. (1995). Three strategic questions about Latino philanthropy: How heritage, gender, wealth, and values influence philanthropy. In C. Hamilton & W. Ilchman (Eds.), *Cultures of Giving II* (pp. 23-40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Do Good Institute. (2018). *Where Are America's Volunteers? A Look at America's Widespread Decline in Volunteering in Cities and States*. University of Maryland – School of Public Policy. Retrieved from https://dogood.umd.edu/sites/default/files/2019-07/Where%20Are%20Americas%20Volunteers_Research%20Brief%20_Nov%202018.pdf.

Eisner, D., Grimm Jr, RT., Maynard, S., & Washburn, S. (2009). The New Volunteer Workforce. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 7(1), 32.

Fieldhouse, E., & Cutts, D. (2010). Does Diversity Damage Social Capital? A Comparative Study of Neighbourhood Diversity and Social Capital in the US and Britain. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 43(2), 289-318.

Garner, JT., & Garner, LT. (2011). Volunteer an Opinion: Organizational Voice and Volunteer Retention in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(5), 813-28.

Gonzales, E., Shen, H-W., Wang, Y., Martinez, LS., & Norstrand, J. (2016). Race and Place: Exploring the Intersection of Inequity and Volunteerism Among Older Black and White Adults. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 59(5), 381-400.

Green, JW. (1982). *Cultural Awareness in the Human Services*. (Prentice-Hall series in social work practice). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Guterbock, TM., & London, B. (1983). Race, Political Orientation, and Participation: An Empirical Test of Four Competing Theories. *American Sociological Review*, 48(4), 439-53.

Hager, M., Brudney, J., Urban Institute, & Corporation for National Community Service. (2004). *Volunteer Management Practices and Retention of Volunteers*.

Hodgkinson, VA., & Weitzman, MA. (1996). *Giving and volunteering in the United States: Findings from a national survey*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Johnson, T., & Kappelides, P. (2021). *Volunteer Management Progress Report*. VolunteerPro.

Latting, JK. (1990). Motivational Differences Between Black and White Volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 19(2), 121-36.

Lee, Y-J., & Moon, S-G. (2011). Mainstream and Ethnic Volunteering by Korean Immigrants in the United States. *Voluntas (Manchester, England)*, 22(4), 811-30.

Joyslin, L. (2020, June 19). *Recognizing Racism in Volunteer Engagement.* News / Articles. https://www.mavanetwork.org/content.aspx?page_id=5&club_id=286912&item_id=55066.

Musick, M., Wilson, J., & Bynum, WB. (2000). Race and formal volunteering: The differential effects of class and religion. *Social Forces*, 78(4), 1539-70.

Nesbit, R. (2017). Advocacy Recruits: Demographic Predictors of Volunteering for Advocacy-Related Organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 28(3), 958-87.

Nesbit, R., Paarlberg, LE., & Compton, ME. (2019). Who is my neighbor? The effect of community racial in-group representation and residential isolation on volunteering. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 8(5), 918-36.

Portney, KE., & Berry, JM. (1997). Mobilizing Minority Communities: Social Capital and Participation in Urban Neighborhoods. *American Behavioral Scientist*¸40(5), 632-44.

Royce, AP., & Rodriquez, R. (1999). From personal charity to organized giving: Hispanic institutions and values of stewardship and philanthropy. In L. Wagner & A. Deck (Eds.), *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, no 24. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Segura, GM., Pachon, H., & Woods, H. (2001). Hispanics, social capital, and civic engagement. *National Civic Review*, 90(1), 85-96.

Smith, B., Shue, S., Vest, JL., & Villarreal, J. (1999). *Philanthropy in communities of color*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Sundeen, RA. (1992). Differences in personal goals and attitudes among volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, (21), 271-91.

Sundeen, RA., Garcia, C., & Raskoff, SA. (2009). Ethnicity, acculturation, and volunteering to organizations a comparison of African Americans, Asians, Hispanics, and Whites. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(6), 929-55.

Sundeen, RA., Garcia, C., & Wang, L. (2007). Volunteer behavior among Asian American groups in the United States. *Journal of Asian American Studies*, 10(3), 243-81.

United States Census Bureau. (2017). *Current Population Survey, September 2017 Volunteering and Civic Life* [Technical document]. United State Department of Commerce. Retrieved from https://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/cps/techdocs/cpssep17.pdf.

Wang, L., Yoshioka, CF., & Ashcraft, RF. (2013). What Affects Hispanic Volunteering in the United States: Comparing the Current Population Survey, Panel Study of Income Dynamics, and the AIM Giving and Volunteering Survey. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 24(1), 125-148.

Waters, D., & Bortree, DS. (2012). Improving volunteer retention efforts in public library systems: how communication and inclusion impact female and male volunteers differently. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17(2), 92-107.

Wilson, J. (2000). Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 215-40.

Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(2): 176-212.

Wilson, J., & Musick, M. (1997). Who cares? Toward an integrated theory of volunteer work. *American Sociological Review*, 62(5), 694-713.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of Compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves*. (Book collections on Project MUSE). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.