Introduction

David H. Smith (USA) with Robert A. Stebbins (USA)

Formal volunteering takes place in an overwhelming variety of membership associations (MAs) worldwide, as well as in volunteer service programs (VSPs). MAs focus on every topical area, idea, belief, issue, and problem in contemporary nations having non-totalitarian political regimes. In writing/compiling this Handbook, the editors are acting on their belief that MAs are the central, vital, and driving force of the global Voluntary Nonprofit Sector (VNPS) – its “soul” and the roots of its values, passions, and ethics (Eberly and Streeter 2002; Rothschild and Milofsky 2006; Smith 2017b). While the review chapters written for this volume are intended to be objective, scientific treatises, we Editors are motivated significantly by our values and passions for MAs and their volunteers, acting in their leisure time, and what they do for the world. Not all of MA impacts are beneficial for people and societies in general (see Handbook Chapters 52 and 54), but most impacts are beneficial in the longer term in our view (see Handbook Chapters 52 and 53; Smith 2017b).

Four themes are covered in this chapter: (1) The interdisciplinary field of voluntaristics (Smith 2013, 2016a) is one intellectual context of the Handbook. (2) There is a huge global scope and variety of MAs. (3) Most voluntaristics scholars tend to ignore MAs. (4) Volunteering can be viewed as unpaid productive work, but more nuanced, value-driven, and humanistic views better represent volunteering as satisfying leisure in people's lives.

The Palgrave Handbook of Volunteering, Civic Participation, and Nonprofit Associations reviews research on volunteering, civic participation, and voluntary, nonprofit MAs, as its title indicates, and does so in the theoretical context of voluntaristics research (Smith 2013, 2016a). Smith (2013) has suggested using the term voluntaristics (or altruistics) to refer to the global, interdisciplinary field of research on all kinds of phenomena related or referring to the voluntary, nonprofit sector (VNPS). Voluntaristics is a label that is analogous to the term linguistics, referring to the scholarly study of all human languages. Smith now prefers the term voluntaristics over the other new term he has suggested,
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Altruistics (Smith 2013, 2016a), and over all other terms, including the term philanthropy, which is too narrow, conventional, and elitist.

A. Voluntaristics as an interdisciplinary field of research and emergent interdiscipline

[Note: The following Sub-Section #1 quotes from Smith (2016a), with permission.]

Voluntaristics research includes the study of both collective and individual phenomena of the VNPS and harks back to the early definitions of voluntary action research by Smith (1972a; see also Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972a). Rochester (2013) has recently called for a renewal of the concept of voluntary action, in order to have a more ample and balanced view of the VNPS and its phenomena.

The following is a brief overview of the subject matter or phenomena of interest in voluntaristics research:

(a) Voluntaristics studies the VNPS itself as a whole in various nations, examining it over time and through various historical transformations, sometimes qualifying as civil society. Voluntaristics research gives attention to VNPS relations with other sectors, such as the household/family sector, the business/for-profit sector, and the government/public sector (Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs 1975; Cornuelle 1965; Ehrenberg 1999; Florini 2000; Frumin and Imber 2004; Gunn 2004; Levitt 1973; Lewis 1999; O’Neill 2002; Rochester 2013; Salamon 1999, 2003; Smith, Baldwin, and White 1988; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972a; Van Til 2015 [see also Handbook Chapters 2 and 3]).

(b) Voluntaristics studies the various main types of nonprofit organizations (NPOs), as highly complex formal groups, in the VNPS. But voluntaristics also studies looser collectivities, such as social networks, informal groups, and semi-formal groups, which may collectively be termed informal nonprofit groups (NPGs) in the VNPS. Smith (2015a, 2015b) argues that the two main types of formal groups in the VNPS are voluntary associations or MAs and nonprofit agencies (NPAs) or voluntary agencies (Volags).

MAs by definition have a membership that ultimately controls the group, and MAs usually serve their members, not non-members or the general welfare and public interest (Smith 2015a). Local, all-volunteer MAs, called grassroots associations (GAs), are the most common type of MAs in every society ever studied carefully, from ten millennia ago to the present (Smith 1997b, 2000, 2014, 2015a). In MAs, the ultimate power is bottom-up, residing with the members who elect top leaders.
By contrast, NPAs usually have no members, but operate mainly with paid staff as employees, and often have a VSP, as a department that supplies volunteers to help achieve the NPA's goals (Smith 2015b [see also Handbook Chapter 15]). NPAs mainly serve non-member recipients and often the general welfare and public interest in their society. However, the power is top-down in NPAs (not bottom-up, as in MAs). The board of directors or trustees makes all major policy decisions and with VSP volunteers having essentially no power (Smith 2015b).

The often-used/cited structural-operational definition of the VNPS put forth by Salamon (1992:6), and identically by Salamon and Anheier (1992:125), is far too narrow, focusing only on highly structured and formally registered and/or incorporated NPOs. This definition omits the vast majority of NPGs in the world, which are usually small, informal, all-volunteer, unincorporated, unregistered GAs (Smith 2014). The structural-operational definition also ignores all of individual volunteering and citizen participation as voluntary action (Cnaan and Park 2016; Smith 1975, 1981, 1991, 1993a, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 2000, 2004, 2010a, 2014; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972a; Van Til 2015 [see also Handbook Chapters 9 and 31]), which is simply unacceptable to anyone who knows and appreciates the VNPS.

Voluntaristics studies the many and various types of volunteering and citizen participation by individual persons, whether done as individuals not acting as members of any organized group or context (termed informal volunteering; see Handbook Chapter 9), or done as members of some group or organization (termed formal volunteering; Cnaan and Park 2016; Rochester 2013; Smith 1975, 1981, 1991, 1993a, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 2000, 2004, 2010a, 2014; Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin 1972a; see also Handbook Chapters 3 and 31). Cnaan and Park (2016) make by far the most comprehensive inventory of types of citizen participation ever published, including formal volunteering, association participation, charitable giving, pro-environmental behaviors, various political and social behaviors, and supporting or helping others (informal volunteering).

Their definition of civic participation is as follows:

We define civic participation/engagement as any activity of any individual, alone or with others, that is performed outside the boundaries of the family and household that directly or indirectly attempts to promote the quality of life of others, and that may make the community or society a better place to live in.

Smith's (2016b) currently preferred definition of volunteering is similar in many ways to Cnaan and Park's definition of citizen participation, but takes a smaller scale view of the intended positive outcomes. Smith defines the relevant term as follows:
Volunteering is defined as any activity of any individual, alone or with others, as a solitary act or as a member of some informal group or formal organization, that is performed without compulsion/coercion and mainly without direct remuneration/payment that directly or indirectly attempts to improve the satisfactions and quality of life of one or more others outside the boundaries of the immediate family and household.

(p. 1)

B. Definition, scope, and variety of membership associations and associational volunteers

MA s exist in an overwhelming variety of forms, structures, sizes, and geographic scopes.

In the Handbook Appendix, MA s, or simply associations, are defined as follows:

*association (voluntary association, membership association, nonprofit association)*

A relatively formally structured *nonprofit group that depends mainly on *volunteer *members for *participation and activity and that usually seeks *member benefits, even if it may also seek some *public benefits (cf. Smith 2015a). Associations nearly always have some degree of formal structure, but most of them are informal groups, not organizations (see *formal group; Smith 1967). An association is frequently referred to as a “voluntary association,” but some scholars recently have termed them “membership associations” or “nonprofit associations,” as in this Handbook’s title. Associations are the most common type of nonprofit organization in the United States (Smith 2000:41–42) and in all other nations or earlier types of societies ever studied. Their total numbers are never reflected accurately in government statistics and registries of nonprofit organizations. Hence, many scholars unknowingly make false statements about “all nonprofit organizations” or “the nonprofit sector” based on samples from such incomplete government NPO registries. Many other scholars simply ignore associations because of their myopic focus only on nonprofit agencies with paid staff.

By definition, MA s use the “associational form of organization,” essentially being groups defined by having a membership that controls the group leadership, with *bottom-up* power, rather than the *top-down* power present in nonprofit agencies (Smith 2015a, 2015b), as in business corporations and government agencies. In the Handbook Appendix, this special, democratic form of organization is defined as follows:
associational form of organization

Manner of operating a *group (Smith 1967) that usually involves having *official members who are mostly *volunteers, some elected *formal non-profit leaders, often a *board of directors with *policy control, financial support mainly from annual *dues or donations (but may also include *fees and occasionally *grants), often one or more *committees as part of the *leadership, and regular face-to-face meetings attended by active *official members and informal participants. Form used in *associations, *transnational associations, *national associations, *state associations, and *grassroots associations (Smith 2000).

Among the various types of formal volunteers that exist, active as part of some sponsoring group or organization, by far the most important and frequent globally are association volunteers, not volunteers in Volunteer Service Programs (VSPs) as the volunteer departments of many paid-staff-based, nonprofit agencies (Smith 2015b). This Handbook mainly focuses on association volunteers, although some other types of volunteers are also treated briefly: informal volunteers in Handbook Chapter 9; stipended volunteers in Handbook Chapters 10 and 11; tourist volunteers in Handbook Chapter 12; online/virtual volunteers in Handbook Chapter 13; spontaneous/crisis volunteers in Handbook Chapter 14; and volunteers in VSPs in Handbook Chapters 15–17.

In the Handbook Appendix, association volunteers, often labeled as active members of associations (vs. inactive/passive/nominal members), are defined as follows:

active member (of an association)

A member of a *nonprofit group who regularly provides *services that help meet the *operative goals of that group (Smith 2000:7), also termed technically an “analytic member.” Any active member of an association is an associational volunteer. Contrasts with inactive members (passive members, nominal members, “paper” members) who do nothing except pay dues/fees to the group. Also termed an association volunteer or associational volunteer. Often overlooked by scholars and lay people who only consider volunteer service programs, ignoring associations as the principal global context of *formal volunteering for the past 10,000 years (Smith 1997).

As suggested in the title of our Handbook, other terms like civic participation or civic engagement (basically synonyms) also capture the kind of usually (but not always) pro-social behavior and activities that are a prime focus of this volume. In the Handbook Appendix, civic engagement is defined as follows:
civic engagement (civic participation, civic involvement, community involvement)

1. Act or result of performing local voluntary action based on a felt civic duty, responsibility, or obligation (see civic obligation/responsibility) fulfilled by working toward amelioration of a community concern. Such terms as citizen engagement and civil engagement are, at bottom, synonymous with civic engagement, as variations of the first term. Other synonyms alter the second term, using involvement or participation.

2. Recently, the term civic engagement (or synonyms as above) has been used more broadly by some to include all forms of volunteering, formal and informal, and other participation (as social involvement or social participation), whether focused on a community concern or not, political or not (e.g., Cnaan and Park 2016).

Based on the current global population and the estimated global prevalence of seven associations per thousand population, Smith (2014) estimated that there are about 56 million nonprofit groups (NPGs) in total worldwide at present, including both MAs and NPAs. Of these, about 49 million (roughly 88%) are GAs. An estimated one billion people now are members of one or more MAs, and even more will become members sometime during their lifetimes. The estimated income of all NPGs in the world was at least USD 4.2 trillion in 2011, which is equivalent to the fourth rank among nations in GDP. The cumulative monetary value of time contributed by active MA members as volunteers was at least USD 500 billion in 2005, according to one research-based estimate (see Handbook Chapter 44). MAs also have cumulative global incomes and assets in the hundreds of billions of US dollars. Many associations strongly support the economic systems and economic development in their own nations and globally.

There are MAs, especially GAs, focused on every topical area, idea, belief, issue, and problem in contemporary nations having non-totalitarian political regimes. Beginning mainly 10,000 years ago as social clubs, MAs now tackle every type of problem and potential benefit for members or for the larger society, often having significant societal and historical impacts (Smith 2017b). Sometimes these impacts are unintentionally negative or harmful to members or non-members or both, but MAs can also be intentionally harmful (Smith 2017a). The members of MAs mainly participate during their leisure time, as serious leisure, and sometimes as casual leisure (Stebbins 1996, 2007). But MAs can, and often do, serve economic and occupational needs and goals, as well as conventional political, social movement (activist), religious, health, education, social welfare, self-help, economic development, and indulgent leisure needs and goals.

Most MAs in any nation are conventional and law-abiding, but some break the law on a long-term basis as deviant voluntary associations (DVAs; Smith
2017a). However, social movement associations in particular, though initially seen as DVAs, often turn out to be the positive “dark energy” of the VNPS (op. cit.). Such DVAs frequently foster positive social innovation and sociocultural change in their own nations and sometimes in the world as a whole (e.g., Smith 2017a). Governments and businesses mainly run and control the world, but certain DVAs change the world permanently, including changing government regime structures and entire national business and economic systems. Smith (2017b) documents extensively such impacts of MAs in his forthcoming review article. Although “values, passions, and ethics” are central in the VNPS, as Rothschild and Milofsky (2006) have argued, NPAs almost never have such powerful, far-reaching, and historical impacts as do certain MAs.

Voluntary, nonprofit MAs constitute a persisting and persistent third force to be reckoned with in the world, and in every contemporary nation, beyond governments and the business sector. MAs are “the soul of civil society,” as Eberly and Streeter (2002) have pointed out usefully. Nonprofit agencies and foundations are simply not. This crucial, innovative force of MAs can even be active in totalitarian dictatorships, where some independent MAs usually exist underground in secrecy. Many MAs as Deviant Voluntary Associations (DVAs) have overthrown such totalitarian or authoritarian regimes of emperors, kings, juntas, and other dictators (cf. Smith 2017a, 2017b).

MAs as a whole cannot sensibly be ignored as irrelevant, weak, or unimportant, however small specific MAs may be, however many MAs are in existence at a given time in a given nation, and however much MA existence and activities are apparently controlled or suppressed by the government. MAs are a key form of human group that has unlimited potential, for both good and bad societal outcomes and impacts, as history has clearly demonstrated (Smith 2017a, 2017b).

C. Membership associations are neglected by many voluntaristics scholars

Paid-staff NPAs serving non-members have a much shorter history than MAs, dating back only 2,500 years or so (Smith 2015b:261–262), rather than at least 10,000 years, and perhaps 25,000 years in a few cases (Anderson 1971). Smith (2015b) writes the following about early NPAs [quoted here with permission of the author]:

The first NPA in history was probably the museum of Ennigaldi-Nanna, founded c.530 BC by a Babylonian princess in Ur, now Iraq (Smith 2015b:262). Other very early NPAs were the first hospital at the Temple of Aesclepius at Epidaurus in Greece, from c.430 BC (ibid. p. 261), while Plato’s Academy in Athens was likely the first proto-college, from c.387 BC (ibid.). There are several other examples of early NPAs of various types,
such as libraries, monasteries (but not religious congregations, which are associations), secondary schools, colleges, universities, almshouses, and orphanages. However, NPAs have existed in substantial numbers for only the past two centuries (Chambers 1985; Critchlow and Parker 1998; Harris and Bridgen 2007; Katz 1986; Smith 1997b, 2015b:262; Smith, Stebbins, and Grotz 2016:chapter 1).

Generally, when studying NPOs, voluntaristics scholars have focused mainly on NPAs as the largest, most visible, bright matter of the NPO universe, much as early astronomers focused only on apparently brighter stars and close planets in the solar system. This astrophysical myopia has subsequently been corrected by astronomers, leading to the current view that the more visible, bright, and reflective matter of the universe (stars, planets, moons, asteroids, comets, gas, etc.) constitutes only about 4% of all the matter estimated to be actually present (Nicholson 2007; Panek 2011). By contrast, the dark matter of the universe, of unknown composition at present – hence the term dark – is estimated to account for about 23% of the matter-energy of the universe, with the rest (73%) being dark energy, also of unknown composition at present (Panek 2011:12).

Smith (2000:12–15) developed an astrophysical metaphor as well as a map-making metaphor to help convey to readers both the myopia and the inadequate comprehensiveness of the research and theory by most voluntaristics scholars. Smith (1997c) has referred to GAs as “the Dark Matter Ignored in Prevailing ‘Flat-Earth’ Maps of the Sector.” Smith (1997a) titled a related article, “Grassroots Associations Are Important: Some Theory and a Review of the Impact Literature.” In a later publication, Smith (2000:chapter 9) provides many examples of the impact of GAs, which were updated in Smith (2010a). Similarly, in his chapter in the International Encyclopedia of Civil Society, Smith (2010b) expands his review of research on the impact of MAs to cover supra-local MAs. In the present Handbook, Chapters 52 and 53 review research regarding the impact of volunteering and association participation on the volunteer-participant, while Smith (2017b; see also Smith 2017a) focuses on all other kinds of impact – in particular, on long-term and historical impacts on the larger society, which are often ignored.

When defined very restrictively, as by Salamon (1999) and identically by Salamon and Anheier (1992), so-called NPOs omit nearly all of the NPOs in the world and in any nation – GAs, and many all-volunteer or unincorporated supra-local MAs. Based on empirically grounded estimates by Smith (2000:42) and Smith (2014), drawing on extensive prior research by himself and others, the widely used Salamon–Anheier definition of the VNPS and NPOs omits about 88% of the NPOs (mostly GAs) in the United States and similarly 88% of all GAs worldwide. The Salamon and Anheier NPO/VNPS narrow definition thus omits virtually all of the world’s nearly 50 million GAs, as the most common type of NPO in all of the past ten millennia all over the earth, very rarely
incorporated or government-registered. However, this narrow definition also omits the many supra-local MAs that have few or no paid staff and that lack formal incorporation or government registration. Unincorporated and non-government-registered NPAs are also omitted (Smith 2000:38), amounting to additional millions of NPOs worldwide. Moreover, the Salamon and Anheier definition also omits all those NPGs that are fundamentally deviant MAs, as DVAs (Smith 2017a), often operating secretly or underground to avoid being smashed by government, hence never initially incorporated or registered with the government. Nevertheless, DVAs have fostered revolutions, civil wars, guerrilla wars, and terrorist attacks, and have changed history in many countries (Smith 2017b).

The narrow Salamon and Anheier structural-operational definition of the VNPS and NPOs adheres to the bureaucratic fallacy in their total omission of voluntary action by individuals. In taking this approach, those authors are implicitly asserting that only NPOs undertake actions in the VNPS, not individuals, which is clearly incorrect. Their approach to studying the VNPS and NPOs would have us do the following as voluntaristics scholars:

(a) Ignore the humane core values, passion, and commitment of individuals that have motivated volunteering, civic participation, and social movement organizations (SMOs) in prior centuries (e.g., Colby and Damon 1992; Eberly and Streeter 2002; O’Connell 1983; Rothschild and Milofsky 2006; Wuthnow 1991; see also Handbook Chapters 17, 24, and 36).

(b) Ignore the transformative and charismatic leaders who have invented and established the many innovative types of NPOs in the past ten millennia (e.g., Barker et al. 2001; Bryson and Crosby 1992; De Leon 1994; Stutje 2012; see Handbook Chapters 1 and 36), including the social movements and SMOs that have helped create positive socio-cultural change in the past 200+ years.

(c) Ignore all of the other kinds of influences on volunteering, civic participation, and social movement, individual activism besides motivations, including thus biology, social statuses and roles, and various geographic levels of social context (e.g., Musick and Wilson 2008; Smith 1994; see Handbook Chapters 25–31).

(d) Ignore informal volunteering, with no NPO, or even any MA/GA, involved, even though informal volunteering pre-dated formal volunteering by over 100,000 years, and perhaps 190,000 years (see Handbook Chapters 9 and 51). Although neglected in the Salamon and Anheier definition of the VNPS, informal volunteering was estimated by Salamon et al. (2011) to be twice as frequent as formal volunteering in many nations studied.

(e) Ignore informal social networks and social capital in relation to volunteering, civic participation, and MAs, especially GAs (see Handbook Chapters 6 and 7).
Fortunately, the very recent work of a group of European voluntaristics scholars, led by Salamon, has finally redressed most of the imbalance by including individual, formal, and informal volunteering in their recent consensus definition of the VNPS (see http://thirdsectorimpact.eu). Their definition still omits SMOs, political activism, protest activity, and DVAs (Smith 2017a, 2017b), but is now mostly in line with the definitions of voluntary action and the VNPS suggested by Smith, Reddy, and Baldwin (1972a) 44 years ago. “Better late than never.”

D. Volunteering as unpaid productive work or more?

The volitional conception of volunteering clashes with the economic conception (Stebbins 2013). The latter is largely descriptive, portraying volunteering as, at bottom, intentionally productive unpaid work. One problem with this blanket depiction is that by no means all such work is voluntary, as seen clearly in the domain of non-work obligation (here activities are by definition disagreeable, the agreeable ones being essentially leisure; Stebbins 2009:chapter 1). Moreover, since they are essentially leisure, some other kinds of unpaid work hardly resemble paid work. Still, the economic conception does steer attention to an important sphere of life beyond employment and livelihood.

Note further that the unpaid work in question is intentionally productive. In volunteering, volunteers intend to generate something of value for both self and other individuals, including their group or community, if not a combination of these. Such volunteer work is supposed to produce results, thereby showing the utility of volunteering. But now, on the explanatory level, the definitional ball gets passed to leisure.

Stebbins (2013) presented the following definition of the work–leisure axis of volunteering. For him, volunteering is

un-coerced, intentionally-productive, altruistic activity framed in socio-cultural-historical context and engaged in during free time. It is also altruistic activity that people want to do and, using their abilities and resources, actually do in either an enjoyable or a fulfilling way (or both). If people are compensated, the amount of payment in cash or in-kind is significantly less-than-market-value.

The free time in which all this unfolds constitutes the temporal context of leisure: those hours not spent performing either paid work or unpleasant, non-work obligations. Activity (and core activity) is substituted for work in this definition, because the first is the more precise term for what people do in and get from their leisure and volunteering (Stebbins 2009). The adjective intentionally-productive is added to distinguish the beneficial social
consequences of volunteering, which are absent in some kinds of leisure (e.g., walking in a park, reading for pleasure or self-improvement, people watching from a sidewalk cafe).

E. Plan of this Handbook

Part I, bearing on the historical and conceptual background of volunteering and nonprofit MAs, opens with a chapter on the ten-millennium-long (or in some cases longer) history of associations and formal volunteering. This leads to one chapter on theories of association and volunteering and then another on typologies and classifications. Chapters 4 and 5 examine, respectively, leisure and time use perspectives on volunteering and volunteering in relation to other leisure activities. Chapter 6 examines associations and social capital, while Chapter 7 reviews research on associations and social networks. The final chapter of Handbook Part I, Chapter 8, discusses hybrid associations.

In Handbook Part II, we explore in depth the major analytic aspects and types of volunteering. Chapter 9 studies informal, unorganized volunteering. The rich variety of volunteering in the 21st century is evident in Chapters 10 and 11 on, respectively, stipended (partially paid) transnational and stipended national service volunteering. Chapter 12 looks into voluntourism, or volunteer tourism, which is followed by a chapter on volunteering online. Spontaneous volunteering in emergencies is the subject of Chapter 14. The nature of volunteering is further addressed in the final two chapters of Part II – bearing on the many volunteer service programs (VSPs) and the changing nature of VSP volunteering.

With parts I and II as background, the Handbook turns in Part III to the major activity areas (or goal and purpose types) of volunteers and volunteering. In Chapters 17 through 24 the contributors focus separately on eight of these, constituting a reasonably complete survey of the main types of such volunteering. One criterion underlying our decision to include them was the presence of enough theory, research, and application to justify a chapter.

In Part IV, the Handbook moves to the enduring question of volunteer motivation: why people start, continue, and/or stop volunteering. In broad terms, this section centers on the many motivational conditions (personal, genetic, social) that lead people to engage in this activity. These conditions are considered separately in Chapters 25 through 31. Chapter 31 discusses how far we have come in pulling together theoretically the contents of the preceding six chapters, presenting a new, comprehensive S-Theory, invented by Smith. The theory was tested and has performed well using data from an interview survey of a large, national sample of adult Russians in 2014.
Part V of the Handbook moves to a more descriptive level in studying the internal structures of associations. The chapter titles (Chapters 32–37) show just how involved this issue is. These associations may be local or grassroots micro-associations. They may be supra-local and national associations, as meso-associations. The transnational associations or INGOs are seen as macro-associations. Governance and internal structure and leadership and management are the subjects of Chapters 35 and 36. Chapter 37 discusses the life cycles of individual associations.

Handbook Part VI brings us to the practical realm of leading or serving on the board of nonprofit MAs. There are several internal processes of associations (Chapters 38–44). They include acquisition and retention of members, attraction of resources, and prevention of over-bureaucratization and mission drift. Self-regulation is critical to successful associations. Additionally, there are matters of accountability, information and technology, and the economic bases of associational operations.

Handbook Part VII examines the external environments of associations. Chapter 45 focuses on civil liberties and freedoms as variable association contexts, while Chapter 46 discusses pluralism, corporatism, and authoritarianism as alternative government regime contexts of associations. Legal, registration, and various tax issues are considered in Chapter 47. Associations also have relationships (some of them collaborative) with other groups (see Chapter 48). Chapter 49 focuses on public perceptions of, and trust in, associations and volunteers, followed by a chapter that examines the prevalence of associations across territories, and that rounds out this part of the Handbook.

All this brings us to Part VIII – the scope, trends, and impacts of associations. Chapter 51 provides extensive global data on the scope of and trends in associations and volunteering. The main impacts considered are those on volunteers. The nature and impacts of misconduct and associational deviance are also examined.

In conclusion, Handbook Part IX, we focus on some general theoretical conclusions and on needed future research, as this concern emerges from our overall conclusions. There is a wealth of research reported in this Handbook, which, however, shows vividly how much more there is to do.
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