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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the impact of volunteer tourism on the international tourist engaging in volunteer work in South Africa. A staged methodological design is adopted in this research. The first stage provides conceptual clarification of the term volunteer tourism, using grounded theory. Then a quasi-experimental study was carried out to collect data from volunteer tourists undertaking community and wildlife (including conservation) projects in South Africa. It consists of a standardised web-based personality inventory (IPIP-NEO) completed prior to, post, and one to two years following the volunteer vacation to measure personality changes in 15 core traits. A control group was used to enhance the validity of the scientific method. Thereafter, personal interviews were conducted to gain insight into the volunteering experience and any resulting changes in the volunteers’ day-to-day lives.

This study’s findings point to significant changes in seven traits; some of these traits have not been previously identified by the literature and therefore broaden our understanding of the impact on the tourist. Additionally, while confirming some of the changes found in other studies, the findings of this study also point to some significant contrasts. Many of the changes identified were evident in the volunteer’s daily lives through their ‘personal circumstances’, ‘behaviour’, ‘emotions’, ‘confidence’, ‘values’, ‘knowledge or skills’ and ‘attitudes’. The experiences which the volunteers attributed to their changes were: active, involved, responsible, participatory, immersive and interactive, and whether they met volunteers’ expectations; influenced by: age, gender, project type and length of stay.

The findings address a number of shortcomings in the volunteer tourism literature by providing statistical evidence of change; a better understanding of how change appears in participants' everyday lives; and identifies some additional elements that influence change in the visitor, adding to knowledge of Engagement Theory. These findings can therefore contribute theoretically; and practically to tourism marketing, program design and volunteer satisfaction.
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INTRODUCTION

During the last decade, consumers, governments, destinations and volunteer tourism providers have all shown a growing interest in volunteer tourism and for different reasons.

An increasing number of consumers want to experience a new kind of tourism, one rich in authentic culture by interacting with the ‘other’ as part of their tourism experiences (Birdwell, 2011; Mittelberg and Palgi, 2011; Zahra, 2011). Additionally, Millennials, those aged 18 to 29, stated clear preferences for experiences that are ‘fun’ and ‘entertaining’ - the tourism aspect of volunteer tourism – as well as experiences that are ‘participatory’, ‘immersive’, ‘interactive’ and ‘hands-on’ (Delaware North Companies Parks and Resorts and PGAV Destinations, 2011); along with satisfying their altruistic desire to ‘help’ and to ‘give back’ (Brown, 2005; Coghlan, 2006a, 2006b; Wearing, 2001). As will be seen in the following literature review, these motives are complex because of individual differences and the numerous reasons people provide for wanting to engage in volunteer tourism. Nevertheless, an increasing number of consumers are showing an interest in this type of tourism (Benson, 2011).

One such motive for participating in volunteer tourism is personal growth; European social policy recognises personal growth is not only driven from formal and informal education and training but also from the engagement in cultural and social experiences; and that youth work and volunteering opportunities offer young people the chance to develop their confidence, motivation and skills (see, for example, Commission on the Future of Volunteering, 2008; The Scottish Government, 2007). Additionally, Cheallaigh, Doets, Hake and Westerhuis (2002) point out that personal development can be motivating and lead to the acquisition of learning attitudes and skills that are essential to the workplace and vital to social cohesion, equality, active citizenship, cultural diversity and general well-being.

Therefore governments are expressing an interest in their citizens volunteering abroad because of these benefits to society: encouraging good citizenship at home (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Machin, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005);
volunteers gain important skills such as social abilities (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007); it builds employability (Machin, 2008; McBride, Lough and Sherraden, 2010; Wearing, 2001); enhances well-being (McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Van Willigen, 2000; Wilson and Musick, 2000); increases trust (Bailey and Russell, 2010; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007); increases self-confidence (Mittelberg and Palgi, 2011; Wearing, 2001); increases tolerance and the ability to get on with other people (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007); develops responsibility (Heron, 2011); and it has been found to contribute economically (Volunteering Development Scotland, 2009). As a result, in addition to The British Youth in Action programme and Lifelong Learning initiatives, the Coalition Government announced the creation of International Citizen Service (ICS) to ‘give thousands of our young people, those who couldn’t otherwise afford it, the chance to see the world and serve others’ (Birdwell, 2011:9). Similarly, the Canadian government inaugurated the Youth Employment Strategy to develop responsible and engaged global citizens (Heron, 2011).

Destinations and volunteer tourism providers are also interested in volunteer tourism because of its potential profitability and the financial benefits gained from foreign exchange; volunteers often spend more and stay for longer than general tourists (TRAM, 2008; Govender and Rogerson 2009). Furthermore, volunteer tourism can offer a sustainable solution to poverty related problems, for example, by providing shelter. In so doing, volunteers use their knowledge, skills and will-power to build houses, and they contribute financially to the projects too (Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004). Volunteer tourism also offers opportunities to teach visitors about the destination and ‘other’ through a less commoditised form of tourism (Wearing and Grabowski, 2011).

There are therefore apparent benefits that can be derived from volunteer tourism but one must also recognise that such benefits are potential and not inevitable impacts of volunteer tourism. In fact, volunteer tourism has the potential to produce negative impacts on the individuals and communities involved (Guttentag, 2009). As a consequence, there is a growing interest in the negative impacts of volunteer tourism, such as, the exploitation of local people, using volunteers rather than paid local labour, and the loss of traditional culture and values (Guttentag, 2011; Simpson, 2004). These negative impacts highlight the importance of service
programmes being demand-led by the needs of the communities abroad, with careful selection of activities that are appropriate to the target group but which also provide community benefits (Birdwell, 2011; Wearing and Grabowski, 2011). The following section outlines the aims of this study within the context of this growing interest in volunteer tourism.

The aims of this study
The aims of this study are to investigate whether international volunteer tourism changes participants undertaking community and wildlife (including conservation) projects through the Aviva organisation in South Africa. Initially this will involve providing conceptual clarification of volunteer tourism because, as will be seen from the following literature review, there is no universal definition of the term and there is a multiplicity of allied notions with similar themes, such as, eco-, sustainable, participatory and responsible tourism, to name just a few. In order to provide a better understanding of volunteer tourism, a grounded theory study will be carried out to provide a new definition of volunteer tourism. This method is popular for generating new theory (Allan, 2003; Bakir and Bakir, 2006; Dick, 2005; Patton, 1990). Primary data were collected from 109 web-based questionnaires supplemented by secondary data from the other sources, such as, testimonials from volunteer tourists, academic and other literature.

In addition, the study’s objectives were:

- To broaden our understanding of the impacts of volunteer tourism by investigating changes to people’s personality traits – those characteristics which ‘tell what (a person) will do when placed in a given situation’ (Cattell, 1965:117-118). Hence, the study will contribute to the body of knowledge of impacts such as increased awareness of other people and environments (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001); personal development, such as learning about ‘self’ (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011); and skills to deal with challenging situations (Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007).
To understand the links between the impacts of volunteer tourism and age, gender, project type and length of stay; as the research in these areas tends to be limited and somewhat contradictory (Alexander, 2012; Birdwell, 2011; Lepp, 2008). For example, Birdwell (2011) noted that younger volunteers were more likely than older volunteers to report personal development outcomes; whereas Bailey and Russell (2010) found that age did not influence the outcomes of their study. With regard to project type, Birdwell (2011), Harlow and Pomfret (2007) and Sherraden, Lough and McBride (2008) suggest that the type of volunteer project could influence the experience and therefore the impact. However, Lepp (2008) found that his community and wildlife volunteers benefitted from their experience in remarkably similar ways.

To identify whether the post-trip changes still hold one to two years later because there is some evidence that, as time elapses post-trip, some impacts could decline (see Bailey and Russell, 2010); thereby reducing the effectiveness of volunteer programmes in meeting some of their desired outcomes. Bailey and Russell found that, for the ‘wisdom’ trait, although there were significant increases between the pre-test and post-trip test scores, there was a 25% decline between the post-trip test and follow-up scores. This suggests that, for this trait, there were strong initial gains in measured outcomes when the participants returned home, but a decline thereafter. Ewert and Sibthorp (2009) comment that due to the emotional nature of such experiences, researchers often report strong initial gains in measured outcomes followed by a decline when the participants return home. Machin (2008) and Alexander (2012) identified this ‘fading factor’ as a gap in the literature and, therefore, an area for further research.

For this study, 15 traits will be measured: anxiety, depression, vulnerability, assertiveness, action, artistic interests, emotionality, adventurousness, intellect, liberalism, trust, altruism, self-efficacy, dutifulness, and cautiousness. This will be done using a standardised questionnaire (the IPIP-NEO personality inventory) for which participants must choose a statement that best applies to them; this will help address the problem, noted by Lough, Moore McBride and Sherraden (2009a), that some volunteers have difficulty articulating the specific impacts of the
experience when interviewed (Alexander, 2012). For example, one international volunteer commented:

I am who I am today because of that time. I have never looked at my life the same way I did before I volunteered. It changed my life in virtually every way. It’s difficult to explain the change, but it has had a lasting impact (Lough et al., 2009a:33).

In order to address this study’s objectives, sixty international volunteer tourists completed the IPIP-NEO personality inventory pre- and post-trip. An a priori power analysis showed that this was the number of subjects required for conducting Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks tests on the pre- (first test) and post-test (second test) scores, to establish the likelihood of change for each trait.

In addition, this study employed the interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) of 36 post-trip personal interviews. IPA attempts to explore/understand/make sense of the subjective meanings of events/experiences/states of the individual participants (Smith and Osborn, 2004); it involves the thematic analysis of the data to provide a better understanding of how change manifests itself in the participant’s everyday life at home and to understand the elements that influence change in the visitor. As will be seen from the following literature review, a noticeable weakness of the volunteer tourism impact studies is their lack of explanations of the experiential factors that facilitate changes in the volunteer (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lee and Woosnam, 2010). Generally, these studies emphasise authentic interaction with hosts and other volunteers, working towards common goals and doing meaningful work and establishing networks and friendships (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Gecko, Bradt Travel Guides and Lasso Communications, 2009; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011). So, there is an opportunity, in this study, to investigate these factors further.

The organisation of this thesis
This thesis is divided into nine chapters. Chapter one explores the academic literature on volunteer tourism. It examines the various definitions of volunteer tourism and highlights the rationale for providing conceptual clarification of the
term. Thereafter, it describes the general profile of volunteer tourists and reviews the current literature on the impact of tourism and volunteering on the visitor; identifies the factors that influence these impacts; and reviews the motives of volunteers in order to gain insight into the facets each brings to the experience.

Chapter two reviews volunteer tourism in South Africa, recognising the potential of volunteer tourism for that country. Chapter three explores the literature on the self as a tourist. It defines the tourist and explores the many different angles from which the tourist can be studied, including the angle adopted for this study. These angles range from ‘self’ as the driving force behind change, as with the experimentalist, experiential and positive psychology approaches, to ‘environment’ and contextual influences using a more social constructionist or post-modernism approach to studying the self.

Chapter four explores the methodological approaches of different research paradigms and explains in greater detail how the researcher went about designing and implementing the methodology for this study. In this study, it was necessary to draw from different discourses at different points in the research process. The multi-paradigm research strategy, using staged methods approach, is discussed in this chapter. The approach involves using grounded theory method for understanding what volunteer tourism is and generating a new explanation of volunteer tourism. Thereafter, personality tests focus on the quantitative measurement of change following a volunteer tourism experience; supplemented by the interpretive phenomenological analysis of interviews offering explanations for the change, and how change is manifested in people’s everyday lives at home. The sample itself is discussed as well as issues of selectivity, validity and reliability of the research; reflexivity in the research process; and associated ethical considerations and dilemmas.

Chapter five – the grounded theory findings - provides an explanation of volunteer tourism using grounded theory to clarify the conceptual components of volunteer tourism and to provide a more in-depth understanding of it before investigating its impact on the tourist in chapter six.
Chapter six – the personality inventory results – describes the context of the volunteer tourism experience for those Aviva volunteers participating in projects in South Africa. Thereafter, it describes this study’s participants and later determines the changes in these participants as a result of their volunteering experience; it additionally examines the influence of age, gender, project type, length of stay, and time elapsed post-trip on the experience.

Chapter seven discusses the personality inventory results, highlights the study’s similarities to other studies, and offers explanations for findings which differ from these studies. Some relevant theoretical concepts will be discussed to explain the personality results of the sample, these include: flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990); self-confidence (Maslow, 1993; Carver and Scheier, 2005); performance experience (Bandura, 1997); social integration (Chambre, 1987; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Wilson and Musick, 2000); and others. Some implications of these changes will also be highlighted and so will the limitations of this part of the study.

In order to broaden our understanding of the changes identified amongst this study’s volunteer tourists, chapter eight analyses the reported causes and consequences of those changes, from the volunteers’ perspective, using interpretative phenomenological analysis.

Chapter nine embeds the IPA findings within the notion of experiential engagement in an attempt to explain transformation in the volunteers, and points to the limitations of this part of the study. Finally, there is synthesis of all three stages of the research and their contribution to knowledge. The concluding section discusses the validity and reliability of the study and includes some thoughts and pointers for further research, followed by a list of references, appendices and publications.
Chapter one explores the literature on volunteer tourism. It examines the various definitions of volunteer tourism and highlights the rationale for providing conceptual clarification of the term. Thereafter, it describes the general profile of volunteer tourists and reviews the current literature on the impact of tourism and volunteering on the visitor; identifies the factors that influence these impacts; and reviews the motives of volunteers in order to gain insight into the facets each brings to the experience.

1.1. The notion of volunteer tourism

The tourism literature does not offer a universal definition of volunteer tourism. The volunteer tourism industry often uses the term ‘voluntourism’ and quotes David Clemmons (2009) of Los Niños and http://www.voluntourism.org as ‘the conscious, seamlessly integrated combination of voluntary service to a destination and the best, traditional elements of travel — arts, culture, geography, history and recreation — in that destination’. The term ‘voluntourism’ recently appeared in the Word English Dictionary (2009) as ‘tourism in which travellers do voluntary work to help communities or the environment in the places they are visiting’. Academics, on the other hand, use the term ‘volunteer tourism’ and most commonly use Stephen Wearing’s (2001:1) definition of volunteer tourists as those who ‘volunteer in an organized way to undertake holidays that may involve the aiding or alleviating of the material poverty of some groups of society, the restoration of certain environments, or research into aspects of society or environment.’

Generally, these definitions recognise the combination of two concepts: tourism¹ and volunteering² at the destination visited (Billington, Carter and Kayamba, 2008; Tourism: Both World Trade Organization (WTO) and United Nations Statistics Division, 1994, define the concept as ‘The activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes’ (Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert and Wanhill, 2005:13). Technical definitions also include a minimum stay of 24 hours (an overnight stay) and ‘outside usual environment’ is defined as the WTO recommended 160 kilometres or more. Tourism is said to be ‘international’ when ‘people visit destinations outside their own country’s boundaries’ (ibid., 2005:794).

Volunteering: The definition of volunteering used by Volunteering England (2008) is, any activity which involves spending time, unpaid, doing something which aims to benefit the environment or someone
Wearing, 2001). However, the tourism component is bedevilled by conceptual weakness and fuzziness (Cooper et al., 2005) owing to its very broad nature and the expanding spread of activities it covers, including volunteering (Gilbert, 1990). Similarly, there is no universal definition for volunteering (Volunteering England, 2008). The word is used by different people and different sectors to mean different things. For instance, government schemes whereby people have to work for charities in return for benefits are sometimes described as ‘voluntary’ but many people would argue that since people taking part have to do the work in return for benefits they are not ‘volunteers’. Equally many people work unpaid in order to gain experience in very competitive areas like television but most people would not describe them as ‘volunteers’ (Volunteering England, 2008).

Lee and Woosnam (2010) and Reed (2009) point out that the definitions of volunteer tourism are too limiting and tell the reader very little about the phenomenon; they do not elaborate the activities undertaken, purpose for travel, time frame involved, interaction with residents, and its potential impacts on the visitor (see Callanan and Thomas, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2008; Wearing, 2001). David Brooks of Wisconsin University offers further insight, ‘Volunteer tourism is something that changes the way we see the world and it changes the way the world sees us; it really does work both ways. So, again, there may not be one word beyond Volun-Tourism that describes it but there certainly are references to experience, firsthand personal experience, where tourism, travel, service and learning all fit together in a way that is seamless’ (in Miedema, 2010, p. 1). Academics are, therefore, still feeling their way in defining the term and the phenomenon (McGehee, in Sookhan, 2009); this is exacerbated by its broad nature and by the myriad of terms it is associated with, such as, ecotourism (Cousins, Evans and Sadler, 2009; Gray and Campbell, 2007; Tomazos and Butler, 2009; Wearing, 2001), sustainable tourism (Richards and Wilson, 2006; Wearing, 2001), participatory travel (Billington et al., 2008; Wearing, 2001), international volunteering (Benson, 2004; Simpson, 2007; Tourism Concern, 2009), charity tourism (Callanan and Thomas, 2005; Wearing, 2001), niche tourism (Philbrook, 2007; Xola Consulting, 2009), alternative tourism (Cousins et

1.1.1. Lack of clarity over the notion of volunteer tourism

A review of the literature on volunteer tourism reveals a form of tourism that encompasses sustainability, empowerment, local development, community participation, environment conservation and cross-cultural exchange to name just a few. There is a multiplicity of allied notions that contribute to the lack of clarity over our understanding of what volunteer tourism is. Analysis of the literature suggests that this lack of clarity is attributed to the fact that some themes are found in common between volunteer tourism and those allied notions; elaborated below.

Like volunteer tourism, ecotourism is a global, fast growing, special interest market (Porritt, 1995; Theobald, 1994) and a participatory rather than ‘gaze’ experience (Smith, 2006). Although ecotourism, itself, has been defined in many ambiguous ways (Croall, 1995; Holden, 2005; Wheeller, 1993), nevertheless, the term is generally used to describe tourism activities that are conducted in harmony with nature (Hawkins, 1994). This is emphasised by The Ecotourism Society’s (1992) definition of the concept as: ‘purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the cultural and natural history of the environment, taking care not to alter the integrity of the ecosystem, while producing economic opportunities that make conservation of natural activities financially beneficial to local citizens’. Wearing (2001) acknowledges that volunteer tourism may overlap significantly with ecotourism as a number of organisations, for example Track of the Tiger and its non-profit arm VWB in northern Thailand, use volunteer labour to develop a sustainable ecotourism industry. There is ample evidence pointing to the overlap of the two notions, for example, Gray and Campbell (2007), Clifton and Benson (2006), Tomazos and Butler (2009) and Cousins et al. (2009). These studies show that volunteer tourism is perceived to overlap with ecotourism when the tourist experiences are environmentally sustainable, contribute to the local community
and involve local people. While Butler (1992) and Whelan (1991) view ecotourism as a philosophy for its participants, Wearing (2001), on the other hand, sees volunteer tourism as a philosophy of appreciating natural areas and traditional cultures ‘treading lightly’ as he would describe it. Nevertheless, Tomazos and Butler (2009) consider ecotourism to have broadened its market and appeal, becoming more commercialised and, as a result, has lost its distinct philosophy that characterised its initial form. In contrast, Gray and Campbell (2007) describe volunteer tourism as an ‘ideal’ form of decommodified ecotourism because of its less commercialised nature. However, as volunteer tourism becomes increasingly diverse, Tomazos and Butler (2009) warn of the risk of volunteer tourism following the same path as ecotourism.

Volunteer tourism also offers a sustainable form of tourism when it is accompanied by thoughtful policy-making and planning (Billington et al., 2008; Wearing, 2001). As such, it is being used as a development tool for poverty reduction in a quest to meet the United Nations Millennium Development Goals in developing countries in Africa, Asia and Central and South America (Kennedy, 2009). Similarly, sustainable tourism involves management of all resources in such a way that can fulfil economic, social and aesthetic needs while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity and life support systems (Croall, 1995; Globe ‘90’, 1991; Holden, 2005; Sustainable Travel International, 2007). The Bruntland Report puts it simply as meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987). Tourism researchers and others believe that the focus moved from intangible, life-enriching experiences for the tourist, to trying to improve the quality of life of others to enhance sustainability, centring tourism around the host community rather than on the tourist (Uysal, 2010; Jafari, 2010). Unlike volunteer tourism, which is a special interest market, sustainable tourism is considered as a mainstream principle. Although volunteer tourism appears to be a sustainable form of tourism focussed on improving the quality of life of others through volunteer work, it differs from sustainable tourism in that volunteer tourists expect a participatory authentic experience which is unique and meaningful (Coghlan, 2006a; McGehee, 2005; Wickens, 2011). Furthermore, volunteer tourists travel to any area that has a charitable cause rather than to specific sustainable biological, geographic and
cultural areas; and it can impact a community negatively when project planning and development strategies are not thought out properly (Billington et al., 2008).

Volunteer tourism is linked to responsible tourism because of its potential to positively impact the physical environment and the inhabitants of the destination (Davidson, 1998) and because of the potential mutual benefits experienced by the traveller, who can gain much in terms of fulfilment, education, respect and discovery (Wearing, 2001). Although the definition of responsible tourism is the subject of much debate (Croall, 1995), a common basis for it was declared and signed by delegates at the Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations (2002); the declaration identified the concept of responsible tourism as having certain characteristics\(^3\). Many of these characteristics can be found in volunteer tourism and evidence of this appears in the commendations awarded to providers for delivering meaningful and responsible volunteer tourism experiences for travellers and communities alike. For example, Voluntours South Africa was awarded two commendations in 2008, one from the 2008 Virgin Holidays Responsible Tourism Awards and the other from the 2008 Imvelo Awards for Responsible Tourism in Johannesburg. However, it should be noted that not all volunteer tourism operators are responsible and there is concern over the commercial operators of volunteer tourism and their practices and the extent to which the project benefits the host community as well as the volunteer tourist (Benson, 2008). This has prompted research into other areas such as its impact on children (Richter and Norman, 2010), communities and their environments (refer to McGehee, 2005; McGehee and Santos, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Pezzullo, 2007; Wearing and Lee, 2008) as well as providers (refer to Cousins et al., 2009) and volunteer tourists (refer to Grabowski, Wearing and Lee, 2008; Taillon and Jamal, 2008; Wearing, 2001).

Volunteer tourism is considered a niche tourism segment and the eJournal of Niche Tourism Research (2005) describes niche tourism as one of the fastest

\(^3\) The characteristics of responsible tourism: minimising negative economic, environmental, and social impacts; generating greater economic benefits for local people and enhancing the wellbeing of host communities; improving working conditions and access to the industry; involving local people in decisions that affect their lives and life chances; making positive contributions to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage, to the maintenance of the world’s diversity; providing more enjoyable experiences for tourists through more meaningful connections with local people and a greater understanding of local cultural, social and environmental issues; providing access for physically challenged people and being culturally sensitive, engenders respect between tourists and locals and builds local pride and confidence.
growing sectors of the tourism industry. Volunteer tourism has been viewed as a type of niche tourism because it is a 'counter-point' to the more traditional and homogenous mass tourism products (Philbrook, 2007). It is special interest tourism that involves ‘the provision of customised leisure and recreational experiences driven by the specific expressed interests of individuals and groups’ (Derret, 2001:3). However, special interest tourism is not exclusively associated with volunteer tourism because niche tourism products extend beyond volunteer projects to other groups of products ‘that in themselves are a motivating lure for travelers and are defined by experience’ (Tourism Western Australia, 2008). Examples of these include nature-based products such as visiting, photographing and learning about orang-utans in Borneo as well as wine and food tourism such as tours of Italian cuisine.

Volunteer tourism is conceptualised as adventure tourism because it involves uncertain experiences; participants expect the unexpected and to step outside their comfort zone (Wearing, 2001). According to the Adventure Travel Trade Association (2008), volunteer tourism qualifies as adventure tourism because it involves two or three of the following concepts: a physical activity; a cultural exchange or interaction; and an engagement with nature. In this respect, Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) place volunteer tourism in the same cluster of activities as adventure tourism but within the broader definition of alternative tourism.

Volunteer tourism is conceptualised as a form of alternative tourism (Mustonen, 2006; Stoddart and Rogerson, 2004; Wearing, 2001; 2003) because of its move away from mass packaged forms of tourism towards less conventional and more participatory approaches to tourism development (Krippendorf, 1987; Mowforth and Munt, 2003; Wearing, 2005). Brohman (1996:63) argues that ‘the concept of alternative tourism has emerged as one of the most widely used (and abused) phrases in the tourism literature’. While there is no universal agreement on the definition of alternative tourism (Brown, 1998), the key distinguishing features of this new tourism are a shift to smaller or individual group travel, a move from packaged experiences to unpackaged or more flexible travel and a search for more real, natural and authentic forms of tourism or travel experiences (Mowforth

Authenticity is a concept debated by tourism researchers (see Boorstin, 1961; Cohen, 1988; Dann, 1981; MacCannell, 1989). Authenticity in volunteer tourism arises from the nature of the interactions between hosts and guests through their volunteer work (Wearing, 2001; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007).
and Munt, 2003). Cater (1993:85) adds that ‘alternative tourism activities are likely to be small scale, locally owned with consequentially low impact and leakages and a high proportion of profits retained locally’, and Wearing (2001) emphasises the social interaction and exchange, in volunteer tourism, between the participants and representatives of the community, group and natural environment which is not found in mass tourism. Wearing (2005) highlighted further differences from mass tourism such as its de-commoditisation and the placing of social objectives and human rights such as the right to work or to a decent standard of living over that of economic value. Therefore, its ideology is different from mass tourism in that it represents ‘travel to assist’ rather than ‘travel to take’. It has been positioned as the antithesis of mass tourism and all of the problems frequently associated with mass tourism (Guttentag, 2011). Wearing (2001; 2005) therefore suggests volunteer tourism as an alternative direction to mass tourism because it can move beyond the commoditised process and provide a sustainable form of tourism as long as the tourism infrastructure is sensitively developed; there is supply-led marketing versus demand-led; carrying capacities are established and monitored; and tourists and operators are environmentally sensitive. ‘As an alternative form of tourism, it therefore exists in fundamental opposition [to conventional mass tourism] by attempting to minimise the perceived negative environmental and socio-cultural impacts’ (Wearing, 2001:28). As a result, volunteer tourism is essentially small-scale, low density, dispersed in non-urban areas and caters to special interest groups of people with mainly above-average education and with good incomes (Wearing, 2001). Young (2008) noted further differences from mass tourism in that alternative tourists attempt to put as much distance between themselves and other tourists by trying to establish more contact with the local population, without reliance on a tourist infrastructure and utilising the same accommodation and transport facilities as the local people.

In this respect, the birth of volunteer tourism, in what O’Donnell (2003) describes as consumer-orientated post modernity, is more aligned to pre-modern tourism, such as traditional pilgrimage (Mustonen, 2006). But, whereas traditional pilgrims sought enlightenment, volunteer tourists search to fulfil altruistic motives. Both Wearing (2005) and Zahra and McIntosh (2007) agree that the young are actively seeking these alternative experiences and therefore have the potential to shape future tourist consumption reflecting the prevailing times; of products becoming
experiences which engage and change the consumer (Pine and Gilmore, 1999). However, Cousins et al. (2009) stress that volunteer tourism may not remain an alternative form of tourism indefinitely and that it may need to be tempered by future regulation. Already, a considerable segment ‘of organisations are clearly involved in such activities on a profit-making basis and view volunteer tourism as one more form of tourism to be commercially exploited’ (Tomazos and Butler, 2008:2). Nevertheless, volunteer tourism, in Africa for example, can have positive socio-economic benefits and ‘can add to the tourism development objectives of African countries by increasing length of stay, improving spatial distribution of the tourism economy and reducing seasonality of tourist flows’ (Govender and Rogerson, 2009:16). So, as an alternative form of tourism, ‘volunteer tourism has the potential to provide funding for development projects and to address issues such as skills shortages in certain sectors such as education’ (ibid., p.16).

Volunteer tourism is associated with charity\(^5\) because it can involve ‘the aiding or alleviating of the material poverty of some groups of society, the restoration of certain environments, or research into aspects of society or environment' (Wearing, 2001). Callanan and Thomas (2005) link volunteer tourism to *charity tourism* owing to tourists working on local charity projects with local groups. However, unlike volunteer tourism, charity tourism does not necessarily involve volunteer work or direct contact with the projects. For example, Malawi Tourism ([http://www.malawitourism.com/](http://www.malawitourism.com/)) considers its wilderness safaris as charity tourism, their proceeds go to charities such as ‘Children in the Wilderness’, helping children orphaned by HIV/Aids. In volunteer tourism, the tourists would participate in the projects themselves rather than contribute by means of payments for tourism activities. For example, Caribbean Charity Tourism ([www.onecaribbean.org](http://www.onecaribbean.org)) is more akin to volunteer tourism because the participants are in direct contact with the projects by ‘taking trips to assist host communities by providing services that help in everyday life or aid to disaster areas’.

---

5 Charity, as defined by the Charity Commission (2008), is ‘the prevention or relief of poverty; the advancement of education, religion, health or the saving of lives, citizenship or community development, the arts, culture, heritage or science, amateur sport, human rights, conflict resolution or reconciliation; the promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality and diversity; the advancement of environmental protection or improvement; the relief of those in need, by reason of youth, age, ill-health, disability, financial hardship or other disadvantages; the advancement of animal welfare; the promotion of the efficiency of the armed forces of the Crown or of the police, fire and rescue services or ambulance services; other purposes recognised as charitable under the existing law and any new purposes which are similar to another prescribed purpose’.
Volunteer tourism is associated with *philanthropic travel* when travellers develop ties with their favourite destinations and look for additional ways to give back to the communities they visit. Like philanthropic travel, volunteer tourism introduces travellers to local residents and helps them understand the challenges of the people in the places they visit. It involves supporting and empowering local communities by providing such things as clean water, medical and dental facilities, schools, training, jobs, homes, microfinance and entrepreneurial guidance (Philanthropic Travel Foundation, 2008). This support for local communities, according to the Centre on Philanthropy at Indiana University (Kranz, 2007), can take the form of voluntary association, voluntary giving and voluntary action. The notion of giving is used in different ways by different providers and can be in the form of money, time or both. Elevate Destinations (2008), for example, differentiates the term philanthropic travel by the amount of time a traveller has and how the contribution is made; traveller philanthropy involves donors who are travelling and are short on time but invest financial capital in the project whereas volunteer tourists, they say, have more time and may not invest as much financial aid in the project. Regardless of this differentiation, volunteer tourism can lead to philanthropy as demonstrated by McGehee’s (2002) surveys of Earthwatch expedition volunteers; she found volunteer tourists made financial donations to organisations after their trip. This hands-on experience is becoming more prevalent, according to Sustainable Travel International (2007), as we pass from the age of cheque book philanthropy into the age of participatory philanthropy as with volunteer tourism.

Although the term volunteer tourism became prevalent in the last decade following one of the most comprehensive volumes dedicated specifically to the study of international volunteer tourism, ‘Volunteer tourism: Experiences that make a difference’, by Wearing (2001), the concept appears earlier in the form of *international volunteering*, from the work of the Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO) established in 1958 and US Peace Corps in 1961. These non-profit organisations organised trips for volunteers to assist communities, generally in the less developed world, in construction, education and conservation projects (Tomazos and Butler, 2008). The idea of combining voluntary service with travel can be traced back for many thousands of years to missionaries, healers, sailors,
explorers and many others who have rendered service in conjunction with their travels.

From its recent iteration, of international volunteering with the VSO and US Peace Corps, it has developed into commercial tourism with a proportion of organisations offering projects and arranging participation for a fee (Benson, 2004; Tourism Research and Marketing, 2008; Wearing, 2003). This notion of ‘payment’ differentiates international volunteer tourism from international volunteering, although Tourism Concern (2009) say the lines are becoming increasingly blurred with the increase in diversity of providers, including government organisations, non-government organisations, charities and commercial operators. Some providers such as the VSO (2009) require volunteers to pay a registration fee, but then provide volunteers with a modest living allowance, covering expenses. Similarly, the American Peace Corps (2009) provides a living allowance that enables volunteers to live in a manner similar to the local people in their community; they also cover medical and dental expenses and travel as well as providing volunteers with $6000 post assignment towards their transition to living back home. However, the international charity Habitat for Humanity (2009) requires no fees from volunteers, nor pays volunteers. Conversely, commercial operators such as Aviva (2009) require volunteers to pay all their own expenses including travel, accommodation, a project contribution and general living.

Simpson (2007) comments on other differences between international volunteering and international volunteer tourism suggesting that, unlike traditional international volunteering, volunteer tourism allows us to go where and when we want and for a chosen period of time. However, these differences are fuzzy because international volunteering organisations, such as the VSO, offers over forty countries from which volunteers can choose, depending on their professional skills and experience. Similarly, the Peace Corps allows volunteers to state a geographical preference. The charity Habitat for Humanity allows volunteers to choose their destination before application, in common with commercial providers such as Aviva. In terms of ‘when’ volunteers wish to go, the VSO places volunteers approximately six months after application and the Peace Corps nine to twelve months post application, whereas both Habitat for Humanity and Aviva offer volunteers a choice of start dates. The ‘time’ element also varies between
providers. The VSO offers assignments between three months and two years; the Peace Corps have a compulsory twenty-seven month assignment; Habitat for Humanity offers assignments between one day and unlimited time periods; and Aviva, periods of two weeks to three months. In this respect, other than the notion of payment, time periods may distinguish international volunteering from volunteer tourism because, strictly speaking, assignments over one year are excluded from tourism definitions but not volunteering. The differences highlighted by Benson (2004) and Simpson (2007) are complex and sometimes contradictory, demonstrated by the examples above.

Volunteer tourism often involves cultural immersion (Brown, 2005). Similarly to cultural tourism, it emphasises an authentic experience; however, volunteering is only one interpretation of cultural tourism. The WTO (World Trade Organisation) defines cultural tourism as ‘a movement of persons for cultural motivation such as study tours, performing arts and cultural tours, travel to festivals and other cultural events, visits to sites and monuments, travel to study nature, folklore or art and pilgrimages’ (Mkhize, 1998:8). Similarly, both Brown’s (2005) and Coghlan’s (2006a) research cite cultural immersion as one of the major motivational themes of volunteer tourists and therefore volunteer tourism has become associated with cultural tourism. Additionally, Klicek (2005) argues that volunteer tourism is an embedded form of experience which requires active participation from both residents and visitors and which ultimately benefits them both. In this respect, McIntosh and Zahra’s (2007) study of 12 Australian volunteers undertaking organised volunteer activities in an indigenous Maori community in New Zealand found that volunteer tourists experience an alternative cultural product through their volunteer work; one rich in authentic cultural content, genuine and reflective of modern society and which is therefore a unique and a different type of cultural tourism because participants are engaged in a different narrative with their hosts. Similarly Klicek’s (2005) case study found that volunteers were less interested in sightseeing, than cultural tourists, and more interested in experiencing the living culture and everyday life of the destination. This search for cultural experiences is primarily argued to reflect people’s increasing recognition and reaction to the homogenous nature of traditional tourism products as well as their increasing desire for altruism, self-change and the ability to confirm their identities and provide coherence within an uncertain and fragmented post-modern life (Richards
and Wilson, 2006). Therefore, volunteer tourism provides a new ‘alternative’ cultural experience for the tourist, one based on a more engaging, meaningful and sincere interaction between visitor and host (Taylor, 2001). Consequently, communities are using volunteer tourism as a tourism strategy, to develop their destination in a sustainable way (Richards and Wilson, 2006; Wearing, 2001).

Volunteer tourism, like experiential tourism (Smith, 2006), encourages visitors to actively participate in the experience and promotes activities that draw people outdoors and into cultures and environments. Essentially, both types of tourists seek memorable experiences and are looking to experience and learn rather than merely stand back and gaze. This notion is supported by Brown’s (2005) volunteer tourists who reported that they wanted to have the opportunity to see real people, their lives and their everyday living environment, and they attached strong value to seeking and experiencing the authenticity of a place and its people.

An examination of the volunteer tourism literature, and specifically the similarities and differences between what is perceived as volunteer tourism and the associated forms of tourism, depicted in Table 1, suggest that volunteer tourism has the following package of characteristics: a) It is an emerging travel sector, a niche market and an alternative form of tourism; b) the providers/organisers generally charge more than a registration fee for their services and the tourists receive no remuneration for their work; c) the tourist expects to benefit from a unique, meaningful, participatory and authentic experience; d) it can benefit the tourist as well as the project or community, it can help promote sustainable methods of tourism and can be a responsible form of tourism taking into consideration concerns about the commercial operators and their practices; e) the activities involved may be formal, focus on volunteer work, support a charitable cause and where a proportion of the money received from the tourist goes to fund specific projects at the destination; and f) anyone can participate regardless of age, experience or profession.
Table 1. The similarities and contrasts of volunteer tourism to tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other terms associated with volunteer tourism</th>
<th>Assumptions underlying volunteer tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism</td>
<td>The tourist receives no remuneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable tourism</td>
<td>The tourist expects to benefit from a participatory authentic experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green tourism</td>
<td>The tourist expects to benefit from an experience which is unique and meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory travel</td>
<td>The activities focus on volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity tourism</td>
<td>The activities support a charitable cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche market tourism</td>
<td>Formal tourism activities are included in the trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative tourism</td>
<td>It is an emerging travel sector and is considered a niche market and an alternative form of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible tourism</td>
<td>It can help promote sustainable methods of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic travel</td>
<td>It benefits the personal needs of the tourist as well as the needs of the project, natural environment or community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>Anyone can participate regardless of age, experience or profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Tourism</td>
<td>The providers/organisers generally charge more than just a registration fee for their services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Tourism</td>
<td>A proportion of the money each tourist pays for their trip goes to fund specific projects at the destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other terms associated with volunteer tourism</td>
<td>It can be a responsible form of tourism but there are concerns about the commercial operators and their practices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ indicates similarity and blank represents a contrast, unclear or not applicable

Nevertheless, it is evident that although the above reading of the literature identified some main characteristics of volunteer tourism, the concept remains broad, ambiguous and difficult to define, not least because of its association with other very similar forms of tourism (Alexander and Bakir, 2011). The broad nature of volunteer tourism and the notion expressed by McGehee (in Sookhan, 2009) that academics are still feeling their way in defining the term and the phenomenon, has provided the researcher an opportunity to undertake an investigation to provide conceptual clarification of the term before its effect on the volunteer tourist is explored.

Furthermore, these allied notions, such as, alternative and charity tourism, philanthropic travel and international volunteering, can involve similar activities to those found in volunteer tourism, such as, teaching, helping children orphaned by HIV/Aids, assisting host communities by providing essential services, and conservation work. These similar activities contribute to our lack of understanding of what volunteer tourism is. In volunteer tourism, ‘there are a range of projects
available from humanitarian projects (trying to improve the conditions of life for people through health, education, repair, renovation, construction, sustainability) to conservation projects (the protection of animals, plants, land and buildings) and disaster mitigation’ (Alexander and Bakir 2011:17). Volunteer tourism additionally involves tourism activities, as one volunteer pointed out: ‘I want to see everything in Cape Town, do some extreme things like bungee jumping, sand-boarding, paragliding, safari’ (ibid., p.18). The variety of volunteer tourism projects covered in this study is discussed in chapter six. Birdwell (2011), Harlow and Pomfret (2007), Sin (2009) and Sherraden et al. (2008) all recognise the potential influence of these different projects on the volunteer tourism experience; hence, there is an opportunity in this study to explore this further, particularly as the research in this area is limited and contradictory (Birdwell, 2011; Lepp, 2008).

A review of the literature on volunteer tourism and its allied notions reveal a number of common encompassing themes, such as, ‘interaction’, ‘meaningful’, ‘beneficial’, ‘participatory’, ‘purposive’, ‘active’ and ‘involved’. By consolidating these themes into a theoretical framework known as Engagement Theory, discussed in the following section, they can be used to explore the volunteer tourism experience in this study.

1.2. Engagement Theory

In volunteer tourism, the idea underlying Engagement Theory is that volunteers optimise their volunteer tourism experience by being meaningfully engaged in activities through interaction with others and doing worthwhile tasks. Alexander and Bakir (2011, p. 16) use the concepts of ‘Relate-Dedicate-Donate’ to express this experience. These notions are first encountered in a paper on Learning by Kearsley and Shneiderman (1998; 1999). However, these authors do not provide empirical evidence to support these notions. Volunteer tourists ‘relate’ and collaborate by interacting and integrating with other volunteers and the communities themselves. They ‘dedicate’ themselves by participating in purposeful work and applying their knowledge and skills to existing worthwhile projects. Lastly, volunteer tourists ‘donate’ to an outside customer, the community where the project is located; thus making the project authentic.
Although ‘engagement’ conceptualises the volunteer tourism experience, it is nevertheless not peculiar to volunteer tourism. The concept of ‘engagement’ has emerged informally in many disciplines: in technology-based teaching and learning environments to optimise student learning (Kearsley and Shneiderman, 1998; 1999); in businesses, to increase job performance and job satisfaction (Maslach and Leiter, 2008); in marketing, to drive some meaningful action from the consumer (see Spillman, 2006); in conflict negotiation, to get disputants and stakeholders actively involved in a constructive non-violent process (see Coleman, Hacking, Stover, Fisher-Yoshida and Nowak, 2008); in tourism planning, to create and execute strategy (Cooper et al., 2005; Jamal, Taillon and Dredge, 2011); in wildlife tourism, to encourage visitors to adopt long-term environmentally sustainable practices (Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland, 2011); in psychology, to enhance well-being (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1997); and in service-learning, to describe ‘linkages/connections’ with communities in order to facilitate student learning (Butin, 2010).

However, Alexander and Bakir (2011) note that further research is required to understand the essence of engagement; so this presents an opportunity for this study to contribute to the small body of literature on the topic. The following section discusses who these volunteer tourists are.

1.3. The profile of volunteer tourists

The aim of this section is to provide some information about who these international volunteer tourists are. As a review of the literature will show in this chapter, international volunteer tourists tend to be below the age of 35 (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; McGehee, 2002; 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001; Zahra, 2006, 2011); mainly females (Jones, 2004; TRAM, 2008); highly educated (Birdwell, 2011); white (Birdwell, 2011); their motivation extends to travelling, adventure and cultural exchange (Jones, 2004; Laythorpe; 2009; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2009, 2011); and they tend to be more occasional than regular volunteers (Low, Butt, Ellis Paine and Davis Smiths, 2007). Evidence of this can be further found in this study’s volunteer profile, of the research sample, represented in Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Aviva population</th>
<th>Research sample</th>
<th>Control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td>341 (2009/2010).</td>
<td>60.</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>47 men (14%), 294 women (86%).</td>
<td>10 men (17%), 50 women (83%).</td>
<td>7 men (20%), 28 women (80%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>269 x 16-29yrs (79%), 72 x 30+yrs (21%).</td>
<td>44 x 16-29yrs (73%), 16 x 30+yrs (27%).</td>
<td>25 x 16-29yrs (72%), 10 x 30+yrs (28%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average spend</strong></td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>R51000 including airfares.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average length of stay</strong></td>
<td>8 weeks.</td>
<td>10 weeks.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of time on the project</strong></td>
<td>Approx 65%.</td>
<td>59%.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of participants by project type</strong></td>
<td>51% children &amp; community, 46% wildlife &amp; conservation, 3% both.</td>
<td>62% children and community, 35% wildlife and conservation, 3% both.</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation for participation</strong></td>
<td>Test drive future career with wildlife or children before committing to years of study, career break.</td>
<td>Ranges from ‘the desire to help others’ (altruism) to ‘getting away’ and ‘travelling’ (self-enhancement).</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td>Information not tracked.</td>
<td>The largest group were students, professionals and managers (60%), followed by administrative and secretarial roles (7%), caring/leisure (7%), unskilled (5%), gap year (3%) and others.</td>
<td>The largest group were students, professionals and managers (55%), followed by administrative and secretarial roles (23%), caring/leisure (3%), unskilled (3%) and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of origin (%)</strong></td>
<td>UK (39%), USA (18%), Europe (22%), Australia &amp; NZ (9%), Canada (8%), Southern Africa (&lt;1%), Asia and South America (3%).</td>
<td>UK (41%), USA (20%), Europe (17%), Australia and New Zealand (13%), Canada (7%) and Southern Africa (2%).</td>
<td>United Kingdom and Europe (69%), South Africa (31%).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These similar socio-demographic variables and motivational themes have prompted a handful of researchers to create a typology of volunteer tourists (see Coghlan, 2006a, 2006b; Daldeniz and Hampton, 2011; Lepp, 2008; McGehee, Clemmons and Lee, 2009) and of volunteer tourism organisations (Coghlan, 2007). Knowledge of these different ‘types’ of volunteer tourists can assist the design of various projects to meet the needs of diverse groups of people (Coghlan, 2006a; 2006b; McGehee et al., 2009).

Daldeniz and Hampton (2011) identified ‘VOLUNtourists’ and ‘volunTOURISTS’, and classified each according to their motivation to volunteer. ‘VOLUNtourists’ travel with purpose, they work with communities in less-developed countries and help them to improve their environment and/or community. This group perceives themselves as ‘local’ and want to be accepted as such. In contrast, ‘volunTOURISTS’ are motivated by their desire to travel and explore other parts of the world. They see themselves as a group of outsiders or travellers.

Coghlan (2006a; 2006b), on the other hand, identified a ‘mature market’ and ‘young market’ segment, based on their age, travel experiences and expectations. The ‘mature market’ is 50+ in age, they are experienced travellers, they expect to support the organisation and contribute something meaningful to the expedition by assisting the researcher with conservation work. In this regard, they are similar to ‘VOLUNtourists’. The ‘young market’ are between the ages of 18 and 24, they are less experienced travellers, expect novel experiences and to have some fun during the expedition. The ‘young market’ is more aligned to the ‘volunTOURISTS’.

McGehee et al. (2009) further divided volunteer tourists into three clusters based on destination choice, lengths of stay and travel companions. The first cluster, the ‘questers’, prefer to travel to less developed economies whereas the second and third clusters, the ‘vanguards’ and ‘pragmatists’, prefer developed destinations. Also, questers stay for longer at the destination than the other two clusters. These ‘questers’ are similar to the ‘VOLUNtourists’ and the ‘mature market’ types.

A review of the similarities and differences between these typologies, depicted in Table 3, illustrates common socio-demographic variables (age, gender, education, country of origin) and other common themes: motivation to volunteer; destination type; length of stay; travel experience; expectations; and project type. However, McGehee et al. (2009) differ in so far as their clusters also include an analysis of travel companions, that is, whom, if anyone, volunteers travel with. The ‘vanguards’ prefer to travel with friends and family rather than on their own.

The typologies illustrated in Table 3, all exclude factors such as ‘beneficial impacts’. In other words, is there a type of volunteer tourist that will benefit the most (or least) from volunteer tourism? Therefore, there is an opportunity in this study to broaden our knowledge of these typologies by identifying whether there is such a ‘type’; thus contributing to our knowledge of volunteer tourism and its impact on the tourist.

Table 3. The similarities and contrasts between volunteer tourist typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer tourist typologies</th>
<th>Daldeniz and Hampton</th>
<th>Coghlan</th>
<th>McGehee, Clemenons and Lee</th>
<th>Lepp</th>
<th>Assumptions underlying these typologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 VOLLunTourist</td>
<td>mature market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The main motivation for participation is based on altruistic motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 volunTOURIST</td>
<td>young market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The main motivation for participation is the tourism activity itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Generally students or educated to at least degree level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>vanguards, pragmatists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Originate from developed economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>questers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Travel to less developed economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>vanguards, pragmatists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Travel to developed economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>questers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Stay at a destination for long periods of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>vanguards, pragmatists</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stay at destination for short periods of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>vanguards, questers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Experienced travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>pragmatists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Generally younger volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>vanguards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Expect personal development outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>pragmatists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Expect to make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Mainly female participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally travel with friends and family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in wildlife and conservation projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in children and community projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ indicates similarity; blank represents a contrast, or not applicable; and ? represents ‘not specified’
The following section reviews the human capital, the stock of competences, abilities, knowledge, and skills etc, gained by the volunteer during their volunteer tourism experience.
1.4. The impact of volunteering on the tourist/volunteer

At the start of this chapter, volunteer tourism was said to be a combination of two concepts: tourism and volunteering at the destination visited. Therefore, prior to examining the literature on the impacts of volunteer tourism specifically, it is pertinent to examine the impacts of tourism, international and domestic volunteering; and, at the same time, to identify the shortfalls in the existing literature.

1.4.1. Impact of tourism on the visitor

Munro, Morrison-Saunders and Hughes (2008) review of some 21 day-trips is very relevant to this tourism research. Ecotourism and wildlife tourism studies tend to dominate this area of research. Munro et al. (2008) focussed on environmental interpretation of various wildlife parks, a natural areas management strategy aimed at promoting more sustainable visitor behaviour for the longer-term. Their review indicates an evaluative emphasis on quantifying knowledge gain and attitude change with few studies (two) extending to the measurement of behavioural change, and whether knowledge gain and attitude change is translated into action at home. Munro et al. (2008) argue that, without the latter, it is difficult to determine the effectiveness of environmental interpretation programmes. Interestingly, Hughes, Packer and Ballantyne’s (2009) study of day-visitors to Australian wildlife parks, revealed that although visitors felt their behaviour had increased towards environmental issues three months following their visit, t-tests revealed no significant differences in their conservation behaviour, apart from litter pick-up which was just one of 13 conservation practices. Ballantyne and Packer (2011) similarly showed statistically that a proportion of park visitors who intended to adopt environmentally responsible behaviours post-visit, did not translate these intentions into real actions. Alvarez and Roney (2010) remark on this problem; even if consumers worry about the environment, they may not necessarily behave in a pro-environmental way.

With the aim of enhancing the effectiveness of these free-choice learning programmes, Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland (2011) identified four factors that facilitate visitor change from a sample of 240 day-visitors to four marine based
tourism venues in Australia: experiences that involve seeing and hearing (experiential engagement); emotional affinity (feelings); an opportunity for reflection, to think deeply about what they have seen, heard and felt (reflective engagement); and an opportunity to make a personal response as to what they did about it (behavioural response). This type of experience is synonymous with experiential learning in that visitors learn from direct experience. Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland (2011) elaborated: in order to facilitate change, particularly behaviour change, visitors need more than a simple presentation of facts [about wildlife]; they need to learn through observation and interaction with the environment, as opposed to reading about facts from a book.

Whilst environmental interaction appears to facilitate change, Botha and De Crom (2010) additionally noted the importance of human interaction. Their study found that 15% more visitors learned something new from guided (interactive) routes rather than self-guided routes, in a nature reserve and botanical garden in South Africa. Similarly, Wearing and Neil (1999) discovered that interpersonal interpretation, involving interaction between staff and visitors, had more probability of influencing the visitor than non-personal interpretation such as brochures. Although, with regard to the latter, Ballantyne and Packer (2011) argue that action resources, including printed mailings, social media and web-based learning materials, function as post-visit reinforcement; facilitating the translation of intentions into real actions.

Whilst these tourism studies identify some factors that influence change in the visitor, such as direct experience, interaction with staff, and action resources; further research, in different contexts of tourism, may identify other factors (Schott, 2011; Sherraden et al., 2008; Uriely, Reichel and Ron, 2003).

Following various wildlife tourism encounters, Ballantyne, Packer and Falk (2011) captured outcomes in relation to alterations in knowledge and skills, attitudes, behaviour, interests, beliefs and emotions. They found wildlife experiences have the potential to positively impact tourists’ awareness, appreciation and actions in relation to the specific wildlife they encounter and the environment in general. Other tourism experiences were explored by Alexander, Bakir and Wickens (2010) who reported similar categories of impacts on the tourist with the addition of
changes (increases) in levels of confidence. In the study, vacation travel was shown to provide opportunities for personal development; one of their volunteers commented: ‘I saw the willingness of people to help and converse in the USA in contrast to London which has given me a better general outlook on life which is applied to work too’ (p. 48-49) and another reported: ‘I have a go at a lot more things’ (p. 91). Not only do both studies show the potential impacts of tourism experiences on the visitor but, also, how different tourism contexts can broaden our understanding of these impacts.

1.4.2. Impact of international volunteering on the volunteer

Earlier in the chapter, international volunteering was described as a form of tourism because it involves travelling to and staying in places outside one’s usual environment. There is a small but increasing body of research on the impacts of international volunteering on the volunteer, generated by the Institute for Volunteering Research, departments of social work and centres for social development, all of which gather evidence to support government initiatives to boost involvement in international volunteering, especially schemes to support young people and Diaspora communities to volunteer overseas (Machin, 2008).

Machin (2008) gathered data from academic and practitioner-led resources on the impacts of returned international volunteers, supplemented by literature, research, project evaluations and case studies provided by the VSO. With regard to the latter, many of these cases involved teaching projects overseas. Machin generally found that international volunteers were positively impacted by their experience and highlighted similar themes to those found from tourism experiences (see Ballantyne, Packer and Falk, 2011; Alexander et al., 2010). Additionally, she provided detail on the types of skills and knowledge that volunteers felt they had gained, such as, working with different cultures, communication, patience, problem solving and influencing and persuading; learning about diversity, tolerance, development issues, taking on responsibility, team working and leadership skills; and adaptability, evaluation and management skills, some of which assisted their professional development. Furthermore, she noted that volunteers increased their participation in volunteering after they returned home, becoming active citizens and working towards the betterment of their community through their volunteer work.
In addition to this rich subjective data, a quasi-experimental study was carried out by McBride et al. (2010). They studied 221 international volunteers participating in children and community based projects, and measured the impacts of international service on them. These volunteers were matched to a comparison group of 145 people who did not volunteer internationally during the same study period. They measured changes between two time periods: before leaving to volunteer abroad (baseline) and after volunteering abroad (post-trip test). Those who did not volunteer abroad during the study period (comparison group) were also surveyed at the same two time periods. McBride et al. used a bespoke instrument known as The International Volunteering Impacts Survey (IVIS) to measure changes in particular areas: international awareness (whether people think about problems of nations outside their own), intercultural relations (relationships with people of other cultures and ethnic or racial backgrounds), international social capital (the extent of respondents’ personal and organisational contacts who live in other countries) and international career intentions (respondents’ intentions to work in a career related to international or social and economic development issues). Whilst these areas of interest are not behavioural measures, they do gauge volunteers’ perceptions of, and interest in, international issues one week to one month post-trip; these trips range from two to 12 months. For the two time periods used in this study, McBride et al. (2010) found that there were no differences between non-participants and volunteers on the pre-test; however, the post-test revealed that volunteers reported significant increases in three of the four areas: international awareness, intercultural social capital and international career intentions; also, there was evidence of participants working towards social justice - the idea of creating a society or institution that is based on the principles of equality and solidarity, that understands and values human rights, and that recognizes the dignity of every human being. Although the IVIS identified some changes amongst these participants, it is a bespoke instrument in its infancy, limited by its specific interest categories and its administration to mainly American volunteers of two international voluntary organisations: WorldTeach and Cross Cultural Solutions. Nevertheless, the instrument offers the potential to build a comparative evidence base on some international voluntary service (IVS) outcomes, across IVS programmes and contexts. Although some impacts of international volunteering
are noted in these studies, the reasons for why participation had these beneficial impacts, is not explored.

1.4.3. Impact of domestic volunteering on the volunteer

In contrast to international volunteering, studies on domestic volunteering tend to focus on self well-being\(^6\) (refer to: Arnstein, Vidal, Wells-Federman, Morgan and Caudill, 2002; Howlett, 2004; Morrow-Howell, Hinterlong, Rozario and Tang, 2003; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Thoits and Hewitt, 2001; Wilson and Musick, 2000; Van Willigen, 2000), successful ageing (see Lee and Brudney, 2008) and self outcomes, such as, reduced rates of course failure, reduced rates of re-offending and a reduction in teenage pregnancy (see Moore and Allen, 1996; Paine, Ockenden and Machin, 2007).

Additionally, some personality traits have been identified as outcomes of domestic volunteering; such as, increases in trust, self-efficacy, intellect and dutifulness (Brown 1999; Hamilton and Fenzel, 1988; Wilson and Musick, 2000). Also, similarly to international volunteering, domestic studies investigate impacts on volunteers’ attitudes towards society, such as, citizenship, development issues and poverty related problems (see Eley, 2001; Moore and Allen, 1996; Rattanamuk, 2003; Wilson and Musick, 2000); with findings in-line with international volunteering outcomes.

The studies on well-being are drawn from government surveys such as the American Changing Lives Surveys, with samples of over 2000 people. For example, Van Willigen (2000) studied the long-term impact of volunteer work on the well-being of elderly persons (over 60 years) using a representative sample of volunteers and non-volunteers. She found that volunteers had significantly higher levels of life satisfaction and better health than their non-volunteer counterparts; whilst Wilson and Musick (2000) found volunteering had no effect on the levels of depression, a sub-set of well-being, among adults below that age. In this respect, there is a call to investigate the effects of age because the reason for this difference in impact is little understood (Howlett, 2004). Wilson and Musick (2000) suggest that it may be attributed to the types of volunteer activities/projects carried

\(^6\) Well-being is otherwise known as quality of life. The standard indicators of the quality of life include not only wealth and employment, but also the built environment, physical and mental health (including depression), education, recreation and leisure time, and social belonging.
out by the different age groups; or, the benefit of social integration for the older volunteers, the extent to which an individual is connected to other people (Chambre, 1987; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Wilson and Musick, 2000), as volunteering provides a broader and diverse network of interactions than other types of social activity (Lee and Brudney, 2008). Another possible explanation is occupying a role which may augment power, prestige and resources; it may heighten one’s sense of identity; provides challenging and meaningful work (Arnstein et al., 2002; Morrow-Howell et al., 2003). Other ideas put forward include feelings of usefulness and boosted self-esteem (Hunter and Linn, 1980); protection against role loss (Chambre, 1987) and social isolation (Moen, Dempster-McClain and Williams, 1992). However, not all studies concur on the beneficial impacts of volunteering for older people (Krause, Hertzog and Baker, 1992).

Some domestic volunteering impact studies have found personality trait changes amongst their volunteers. For example, Wilson and Musick (2000) noted increases in self-efficacy amongst their volunteers and questioned how long such benefits linger after the volunteer role is relinquished. Stevens-Ratchford (2005) also identified self-efficacy as an outcome of volunteering and attributed this to social connectedness and active engagement offered by volunteering activities. Some studies have recorded higher scores on trust measures for volunteers (Brown 1999; Musick and Wilson, 2008); whilst others have found no relationship between volunteering and trust (Kohut, 1997). Hamilton and Fenzel (1988) measured ‘dutifulness’ amongst community volunteers and found no significant increases in this trait. In other words, there was no increased sense of personal duty to help meet the needs of others. They did, however, provide evidence of ‘intellect’ changes amongst adolescents (aged between 11 and 17). In all of these cases, without the use of control groups, it is difficult to ascertain whether these traits were influenced by the social practice of volunteering or whether they were the cause of volunteering. If it is the latter, there is an opportunity to explore a personality type for volunteers – a bundle of traits that distinguishes volunteers from non-volunteers (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Also, if personality traits can be influenced by the social practice of volunteering, then they are not as stable as some personality researchers maintain (for example, McCrae and Costa, 2003).
Although these domestic volunteering studies provide insight into the potential of international volunteer tourism, some fundamental differences are also noted that could influence outcomes. For example, international volunteers tend to be below the age of 35 (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; McGehee, 2002; 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001; Zahra, 2006, 2011); mainly females (Jones, 2004; TRAM, 2008); their motivation extends to travelling, adventure and cultural exchange (Gecko et al., 2009; Jones, 2004; Laythorpe; 2009; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2009, 2011); and they tend to be more occasional than regular volunteers (Low et al., 2007).

1.4.4. Impact of international volunteer tourism on the visitor
A review of the literature on the impact of tourism and volunteering, on the participant, provides some evidence that volunteer tourism is well placed to offer experiences which have the potential to change the visitor. As a developing market segment, volunteer tourism studies contain a growing body of research into the impact on the visitor. Nevertheless, there is a call for more rigorous research to document impacts (European Commission, 2007; Hills and Mahmud, 2007; Lee and Woosnam, 2010; Machin, 2008).

Wearing (2001) posits that the most important development which may occur from the volunteer tourist experience is that of a personal nature, particularly a greater awareness of the self as a global citizen with responsibilities within various communities. His case study of volunteers in the Santa Elena Forest Reserve found that interactions with other volunteers and the community changed the volunteer participants by developing their confidence and increasing their awareness of other people and environments. Once back home, this awareness he says, ‘results in a variety of learning and behavioural changes, such as being less self-centred, more thoughtful and more open’ (p. 134). Zahra (2006) elaborated on these deep and complex experiences which, she claims, enabled volunteers to reflect on their lives and discover their spiritual side, resulting in subsequent changes in attitudes, values and behaviour which manifested in: ‘finding God’, ‘taking religion more seriously’ and ‘getting off drink and drugs’ (p. 182). McGehee and Santos (2005) offered examples of how 16 international community volunteers’ self-efficacy had increased, by becoming more socially active and avoiding restaurants that could exploit local citizens or boycotting
corporations based on their record of fair labour practices. Their findings, three to five years (plus) later, indicate that participation in volunteer tourism had a positive effect on both post-trip social movement activities (support of, or participation in, movements for change, or resistance to change, of some major aspect of society, see McGehee, 2002) and support for activism. Volunteers attributed this effect to resource mobilization - the rich social networks, particularly friendships developed during the trip itself; these social networks or ties share and/or support each other’s ideas and goals (McGehee and Santos, 2005). In contrast to these community-based impacts, Broad (2003) and Harlow and Pomfret (2007) observed the on-site impacts of environmental volunteering and found recurring themes amongst their volunteers; they additionally noted that volunteers developed skills to deal with challenging situations. However, it is unknown whether these changes transferred into the visitors’ everyday lives once they returned home, although Broad subsequently reported changes in career direction of three volunteers. Sin (2009) found, amongst her 11 student volunteer tourists from Singapore who visited South Africa for 26 days, that while there was a sense amongst respondents that it was a great experience, and they did allude to some changes in opinions after their experiences, it is inconclusive as to whether this led to substantial changes in their value-system, social consciousness or willingness to volunteer in other arenas after their volunteer tourism experience.

In order to improve our understanding of whether there are substantial changes following a volunteer tourism experience, there are other aspects to ‘self’ which can be investigated and measured. Ryckman (2008) posits that within self – the tourist for the purposes of this study - we not only find his or her habits, beliefs, values, skills, interests and so forth, but also a person’s traits. Traits cover a wide range of attitudes and behaviours and can be measured using personality tests (Albery, Chandler, Field, Jones, Messer, Moore and Sterling, 2004). For example, Bailey and Russell (2010) used a psychometric instrument known as the NEO-PI (see Costa and McCrae, 1985) to measure changes in one personality trait ‘openness to experience’ amongst volunteer tourists. As a personality trait, openness describes people who are willing to explore possibilities, entertain discordant opinions and investigate novel approaches to ongoing conundrums (Costa and McCrae, 1985). Individuals who exhibit openness also tend to be more trusting, tolerant of diversity, adventurous, have a good awareness of their own
feelings and easily become involved in artistic and natural events (ibid., 1985). As a result of their study, Bailey and Russell found significant differences between the pre-, post-trip test and follow-up scores in this trait, suggesting that growth in openness not only happened during the programme but continued to grow for the month following the programme; thus adding to the controversy over the malleability of personality traits (Albery et al., 2004).

Not only did Bailey and Russell find changes in openness, but also changes in civic attitudes and wisdom. Respondents reported that they could make more of a difference in the world; and have a responsibility to, and interest in, solving problems (civic attitude). With regard to the wisdom trait, this was measured using Ardelt’s 3-Dimensional Wisdom Scale (2003). Respondents reported an increased desire to understand life and its significance and deeper meaning, particularly regarding intra- and interpersonal matters; increased empathy and compassion towards others; and greater willingness to consider life from various perspectives. Importantly, Ardelt (2003) reported a positive association of wisdom to general well-being, purpose in life, subjective and physical health, positive family relations and fewer depressive symptoms in adulthood. Unlike the increases in openness to experience and civic attitude, Bailey and Russell found that, for the wisdom trait, there was a 25% decline between the post-trip test and follow-up scores. This suggests that, for this trait, there were strong initial gains in measured outcomes when the participants returned home, but a decline four weeks later.

Bailey and Russell’s study provides statistical evidence of change amongst volunteers and provides an indication that some impacts last longer than others; however, its validity could be improved by using a control group to eliminate some alternative explanations of the results, for example, day-to-day life. It appears that, to date, no other volunteer tourism study has used a control group. Furthermore, there is an opportunity, in this study, to measure many other personality traits, such as, anxiety, depression, vulnerability, assertiveness, amongst many others; and then to discover, from carrying out post-trip interviews with the volunteers, how changes translate into their everyday lives at home; thus providing a broader understanding of the impact on the tourist. Nevertheless, the results of Bailey and Russell’s study are encouraging in that they further validate earlier interpretative
enquiries identifying increased ‘openness to experience’ as an impact of the volunteer tourism experience (see Harlow and Pomfret, 2007).

In addition to exploring impacts of volunteer tourism, this study also aims to provide a better understanding of the elements that influence change in the visitor, and the process by which change occurs because this is an area which is under researched (Lee and Woosnam, 2010). Wearing (2001) attributed change to ‘interactionism’, which he describes as ‘the social interaction between participants on a particular project site with representatives of the community, group and natural environment resulting in an exchange of influence’ (p. 124). He emphasizes the direct personal and cultural communication and mutual understanding between tourists and residents. Zahra (2006) elaborated from her sample of Australian and New Zealand community volunteers, volunteering between four and 14 years ago in Asia: ‘when volunteers were confronted with suffering, poverty, cultures embedded with deep values devoid of materialism and consumerism, combined with the cheerfulness of the host communities amid the lack of basic needs, each volunteer was transformed’ (p. 176). This hands-on experience of another culture also transformed many of Harlow and Pomfret’s (2007) environmental volunteers. Zahra and McIntosh (2007) termed these experiences ‘cathartic’ because of their ability to positively transform volunteers, and for the long term. These common themes were also noted from interviews with 46 volunteers on community projects in Nepal (Wickens, 2011) and similarly by Laythorpe (2009) investigating the cultural experiences of 30 international volunteers who undertook long-term volunteering in Kenya; living and working in a culture that was significantly different from their own. Lepp (2008) found other experiences amongst his volunteers, such as, engaging in activities that are challenging (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), working towards common goals and participating in meaningful work. Others (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Sin, 2009; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007) found that ‘reflection’ was an important element for transforming volunteers. All of these factors contribute to an experience which is more likely to meet volunteers’ expectations (Andereck, McGehee, Clemmons and Lee, 2010).

In relation to this ‘alternative’ tourism experience, Howlett (2004) questions whether other experiences, or forms of social interaction, could deliver similar
results, thus supporting the argument for developing more evidence on the factors which influence change in the visitor. For instance, interaction with ‘others’ on general vacation was found to change the tourist (Alexander et al., 2010); as did interactive day-visits to wildlife parks (Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland, 2011); and guided routes of nature reserves (Botha and De Crom, 2010). Birdwell (2011), Harlow and Pomfret (2007) and Sherraden et al. (2008) all suggest that even the type of volunteer project itself could influence the experience and therefore the impact; although, Lepp (2008) found that community and wildlife volunteers benefit from their experiences in similar ways. Also, the duration of the volunteering experience could make a difference to the outcomes; Birdwell (2011) noted that long-term placements (of at least six months) appear more likely, than short-term placements, to result in positive outcomes in skills, career and educational aspirations.

Bailey and Russell examined the influence of other factors on the volunteer tourism experience, such as, gender, age, socio-economic variables, occupying leadership roles and time spent in personal reflection. Interestingly, only students who were involved in regular leadership roles beforehand, and students who spent more time in weekly reflection, reported stronger personal growth. Regardless of these other factors, Birdwell (2011) found younger volunteers were more likely to report measureable changes in personal development and social development; suggesting that age could indeed influence the outcome. So, the influence of these different variables remains unclear.

A review of the literature so far highlights the many impacts of volunteer tourism on participating tourists, emphasising authentic interaction between, and involvement with, hosts and other volunteers. In addition to these ‘interactions’, other influencing factors are also noted and summarised in Table 4: a) interaction (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; Lepp, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011); b) engaging in challenging activities, working towards common goals and doing meaningful work (Lepp, 2008); c) hands-on experience of another culture (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007); d) establishing networks and friendships (Laythorpe, 2009; McGehee and Santos, 2005); e) positive experiences that meet
expectations (Andereck, McGehee, Clemmons and Lee, 2010); f) seeing suffering and experiencing hardship, living with the local people (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Laythorpe, 2009; Lepp, 2008; Wickens, 2009, 2011; Zahra, 2006, 2011); g) opportunity for reflection (Bailey and Russell, 2010; McGhee, Clemmons and Lee, 2009; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Wickens, 2011; Zahra 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); h) meaningful relationships with hosts (McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Wickens, 2011); and i) occupying leadership roles pre-trip (Bailey and Russell, 2010). Additionally, McGhee et al., (2009) identified other transformative potentials: the geographic destination; level and type of interaction; intensity of experience; motivation for participation; expectation from providers; personal issues; and previous life experience. The number of inputs to this transformational experience makes it likely that the volunteering experience will vary greatly from individual to individual (Daldeniz and Hampton, 2011; Tomazos and Butler, 2008).

It is argued that some of these influencing factors imply a power relationship between hosts and guests because many volunteer tourists originate from ‘richer’ developed countries and travel to ‘poorer’ economies (see McGehee, 2011; Wearing, 2001; Wearing and Grabowski, 2011). From this view, volunteers have sufficient economic resources to pay for a volunteer tourism experience, and in this respect they have economic capital (Wearing, 2001). They also have the power to take time out of their schedules to travel, while their hosts are less mobile and therefore less able to make choices about leisure and cross-cultural education (Birdwell, 2011). Volunteers also bring with them cultural capital, such as, educational qualifications and knowledge of other languages (Birdwell, 2011). Additionally, they have social capital gained from their family upbringing, affiliations and networks amongst many other advantages (Wearing, 2001). Volunteers therefore have a large portfolio of capital versus their hosts (Crossley, 2008). In this respect there are potential consequences for those researching community impacts as well as volunteer impacts; with regard to the latter, the act of volunteering and fulfilling altruistic motives, gains further symbolic capital in the form of altruistic credentials (Wearing, 2001; Bailey and Russell, 2010; Lough et al., 2009b).
Table 4. A summary of the experiences and other influencing factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences and influencing factors</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with participants on a particular project site with representatives of the community, group and natural environment.</td>
<td>Wearing, 2001; McGehee and Santos, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Wickens, 2011; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Sin, 2009; Bailey and Russell, 2010; Laythorpe, 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging activities and everyone working towards common goals and participating in meaningful work.</td>
<td>Lepp, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on experience of another culture, its traditional values and customs (immersion).</td>
<td>McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; Wickens, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich social networks, particularly friendships developed during the trip itself.</td>
<td>Laythorpe, 2009; McGehee and Santos, 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive volunteer tourism experience that meets the volunteers’ expectations.</td>
<td>Andereck, McGehee, Clemmons and Lee, 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being confronted with suffering, poverty, cultures embedded with deep values devoid of materialism and consumerism, combined with the cheerfulness of the host communities amid the lack of basic needs/challenges of adapting to life in a rural environment.</td>
<td>Zahra 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Laythorpe, 2009; Wickens, 2009, 2011; Bailey and Russell, 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having meaningful relationships with hosts.</td>
<td>McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Wickens, 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all researchers, however, concur that volunteers gain from volunteer tourism: Gudykunst (1998), for example, labels ‘gap yearers’ as ‘fluent fools’ who have the language of understanding but possess little actual understanding. Likewise, Simpson (2004) argues that gap year providers’ claims for the educative benefits of overseas volunteering are based on flawed assumptions regarding the value of experience in changing attitudes. Additionally, there are a number of others who have found no evidence to suggest that changes in attitude and good intentions convert into real actions at home (Alvarez and Roney, 2010; Sin, 2009) and others have shown that some post-trip outcomes decline over time (Bailey and Russell,
However, the majority of evidence presented so far, summarised in Table 5, identifies self-reported changes, such as: a) increased self-efficacy (McGehee, 2002; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Zahra, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); b) personal development (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011); c) increased cross-cultural understanding (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001); d) some specific behavioural changes such as getting off drink and drugs (Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); e) attitude changes (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); f) value changes, often in relation to materialism and consumerism (Laythorpe, 2009; Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); g) empirical evidence of increased openness to experience and wisdom (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007); h) rich social networks, particularly friendships (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; McGehee and Santos, 2005); and i) changes in personal circumstances such as career direction (Broad, 2003).

A review of the literature in four different domains: tourism, international and domestic volunteering and volunteer tourism, reveal similar outcomes for participants, supporting the notion, presented by Howlett (2004), that other interactional experiences could indeed produce similar self-outcomes. Hence the need to gain more knowledge of these experiences and other factors, such as, age, gender, length of stay and activities (project type) which may influence the volunteer. The studies reviewed so far concur that tourism and volunteering experiences present similar opportunities to learn about the self, to increase participant’s awareness of other people and environments, to change one’s attitude, values and behaviours towards certain things, to become more open-minded, to improve well-being, to benefit from rich social networks, particularly friendships, and to change one’s personal circumstances.
Table 5. A summary of the impacts of volunteer tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal development –</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased confidence</td>
<td>Wearing, 2001; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning about self</td>
<td>and Russell, 2010; Wickens, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discovering new abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plot a more meaningful course in life/ find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• new goals/purpose in life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cultural understanding –</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased awareness of other people and</td>
<td>Wearing, 2001; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less self-centred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More thoughtful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have more favourable opinions of ‘others’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in their everyday lives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming conscious and worldly tourists or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More tolerant of diversity (liberalism).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-efficacy increased –</strong></td>
<td>McGehee and Santos, 2005; McGehee, 2002; Zahra, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioural changes –</strong></td>
<td>2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More vocal about social issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in the types of tourism products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Getting off drink and drugs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude changes –</strong></td>
<td>Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007; Broad, 2003; Harlow and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater appreciation of the environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater tolerance of ‘others’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being able to put things in perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved civic attitudes including feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• that one can make a difference in the world.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Materialism and consumerism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finding God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing skills to deal with challenging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to get on with other people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More trusting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More adventuresome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased awareness of own feelings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(emotionality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easily become involved in artistic and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• natural events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved physical and mental health,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• including depression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased ability and desire to understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• life and its significance and deeper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased empathy and compassion toward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased reflection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friendships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal circumstances -</strong></td>
<td>Birdwell, 2011; Broad, 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Career changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pertaining to the experiences attributed to these outcomes, there are many recurring themes across all four domains. One noticeable difference, however, is the focus of tourism studies, particularly day-trips to wildlife parks, on the experiential factors that facilitate visitor change. These factors are important in manufacturing experiences to produce certain conservation outcomes. For the same reason, volunteer tourism experiences could benefit from further exploration (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007).

1.5. Motivation to volunteer abroad

Schulman (2005) points out that in order to act one must have a motive. There is a plethora of contrasting research into why tourists volunteer abroad, summarised in Table 6. Wearing (2001) suggests that consumers are attracted to volunteer tourism because it satisfies their desire to ‘travel’ and to ‘help’; drawing on Iso-Ahola’s travel motivation model (1982) to explain these forces - the individual’s desire to escape from one’s everyday circumstances and search for intrinsic rewards in the form of personal meaning through volunteer tourism. Wearing identified the motives of international volunteers in an attempt to gain insights into the facets each volunteer brought to the experience. The consistent themes that emerged as motivators for these volunteers were: ‘altruism’, ‘travel/adventure’, ‘personal growth’, ‘cultural exchange/learning’ and ‘professional development’ (p. 66).

Using a post-trip focus group of international volunteers, Brown (2005) identified similar motivational push factors/needs that drive some leisure tourists to seek volunteer experiences: cultural immersion, giving back and seeking educational and bonding opportunities. The motivational theme of ‘camaraderie’, which did not emerge as a theme in Wearing’s study, emerged in Brown’s research. Both authors, however, concur that these themes are generally about relationships; interacting with the local people and with travel group members and the family. Most of Wearing’s and Brown’s themes recurred in Coghlan’s (2006a, 2006b) typological study of conservation volunteers; Coghlan, however, identified two further themes: ‘having fun’ and ‘doing something novel’. This need for ‘fun’ and ‘new and different experiences’ challenges notions that volunteer tourism is a serious form of leisure (see, for example, Lepp, 2009; and Bakir and Baxter, 2011, for touristic notions of ‘fun’). Importantly, and contrary to Harlow and Pomfret
(2007) and McGhee et al. (2009), she also established that there was no connection between the motives identified pre-trip and the participants’ on-site experience; she attributed this to the volunteer tourists’ inability to imagine the full extent of the experience ahead of time. A similar sentiment was expressed by one of Wearing’s (2001) volunteers who said that his aim changed when he got to the destination (p. 59). Taillon and Jamal (2008) added the concept of ‘religion’, to spread personal belief by word-of-mouth, as another important motivational factor. They quote from their volunteers: ‘It was my desire to serve God by going out to do some of this type of work’ and ‘I was motivated by all God-related churchy stuff’ (p. 2). While critiquing the different views on the motives to volunteer, Sin (2009), nevertheless, offered some key motivators, which, like Coghlan’s and others, centred on the volunteer’s ‘self’. She quotes some volunteers’ responses displaying this self-centred motive: ‘I want to…. travel’, ‘contribute’, ‘see if I can do this’. Sin points to a tension between the volunteering desired outcomes of altruism, aid and development in the host destination and the desire of the volunteer tourists for self-centred aspirations. The conclusion of her research shows that, with her group of respondents, ‘travelling’ and ‘getting to know the world’ took precedence over their objectives of volunteering or addressing social injustices through volunteer tourism. In contrast, a recent industry web-based survey of 2481 responses by Gecko et al. (2009) found that altruism is more important for the volunteers than their learning experience and personal growth.

These contrasting findings contribute to the argument raised by Batson, Ahmad and Lishner, (2005) and Brown (2005) about whether people volunteer to support their altruistic tendencies, or to travel and see the world (egoism). The motives identified in the volunteer tourism research are not very clear as to where, on a continuum from altruism to self enhancement, volunteer tourism falls. Daldeniz and Hampton (2011) offer the ‘VOLUNtourists - volunTOURISTS’ continuum, where volunteering for some volunteer tourists is clearly a holiday and for others it is a commitment with real costs. Lying between the poles of this continuum, however, there are others who see volunteering as an enjoyable experience with anticipated benefits in terms of career advancement.

Benson and Seibert (2009) applied push-and-pull motivational theory to gain further insight into the motives of 80 German volunteer tourists post their visit to
South Africa. This theory states that the motivation to travel to a particular tourism destination can be a result of ‘push’ and/or ‘pull’ factors (Dann, 1981). According to this theory, there are a range of socio-psychological motives that drive a person to take a holiday such as the need for a break from stress, referring to these as ‘push’ factors. ‘Pull’ motivations consist of the appealing attributes of a destination that an individual is seeking, such as the weather. Although Benson and Seibert’s push factors are consistent with this theory, the pull factors do suggest that the destination itself (in this case South Africa) is an important motivator for volunteers. The importance of the pull factors found in destinations was highlighted in Wickens (2011). Wickens’s volunteers were motivated to ‘experience the Nepali culture’ (p. 46) and interviews with her volunteers ‘shows they wanted to work and live authentically in a developing country that is a world away from their own’ (p.47). Keese (2011) adds that in a largely consumer-dependent segment of the industry, destination is primary and place matters. Incidentally, the ‘destination’ theme has not been sufficiently explored in the volunteer tourism research and may provide an area for further research (Mittelberg and Palgi, 2011).

This brief review of the literature on motives for participating in volunteer tourism thus shows varied, complex and contrasting views. This is not surprising given the different sample sizes, different providers of volunteer tourism, cultural differences of participants, previous experience of volunteer tourism, different lengths of stay, destinations visited, type of project and whether the data was collected pre-trip, on-site, immediately post-trip, or many years afterwards. As shown in the literature, Daldeniz and Hampton (2011), Sin (2009) and Tomazos and Butler (2008) all concur that tourists’ motivation to volunteer varies from person to person and what each volunteer tourist takes out of his or her experience often results from a complex interplay between his or her original motivations, the specific context of volunteer work and the composition of the volunteer team, amongst many other factors.

As for Wearing (2001) and Sin (2009), the motives of this study’s volunteers are identified for the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of who they are.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and title</th>
<th>Sample size and type of data</th>
<th>Characteristics of the sample</th>
<th>Themes on vacation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wearing, 2001 Volunteer Tourism, Experiences that make a Difference</td>
<td>12 versus 12 of one group on the SERR project.</td>
<td>Gender: 67% F, 8% M, balance not specified.</td>
<td>Altruism, Travel/adventure, Personal growth, Cultural exchange, Learning, Professional development, The YCI Programme, Right time/right place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of sample: opportunity.</td>
<td>Age: average 21-22 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of data: qualitative.</td>
<td>Average spends: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents were interviewed after an undisclosed period of time.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: three months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project type: conservation and community project in Costa Rica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation: students/gap year students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country of origin: Australia, Canada, Costa Rica.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of sample: opportunity.</td>
<td>Age: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of data: qualitative.</td>
<td>Average spends: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project type: community work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country of origin: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coghlan, 2006 Choosing your Conservation-based Volunteer Tourism Market Segment with Care</td>
<td>Size 76 versus all conservation volunteers on projects in Australia, Africa, Asia and Europe.</td>
<td>Gender: Majority F, smaller % M.</td>
<td>Personal development, Novel experience, Fun, Meeting new people, Helping the researcher, Developing skills and abilities, Supporting the organisation, Doing something meaningful, Learning, Experiencing a new culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of sample: opportunity.</td>
<td>Age: two main groups, the 18-24 and 50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of data: qualitative.</td>
<td>Average spends: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents surveyed pre-trip and on-site diary.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: mixture of long and short stays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project type: conservation projects in Australia, Africa, Asia and Europe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country of origin: Mainly Australia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taillon and Jamal, 2008 Understanding the Volunteer Tourist: A qualitative Inquiry</td>
<td>44 versus all US and Canadian people who volunteered within 3 years of graduating from a university or whilst enrolled.</td>
<td>Gender: 61% F, 39% M.</td>
<td>To spread personal beliefs; primarily religious, Word-of-mouth, Professional benefits, Cultural experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of sample: purposive.</td>
<td>Age: 19 to 70 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of data: qualitative.</td>
<td>Average spends. not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average length of stay: at least two weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project type: community and wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupation: students and graduates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin, 2009 Volunteer Tourism – “Involve me and I will Learn”?</td>
<td>11 versus 12 from one exploration trip to South Africa.</td>
<td>Respondents were surveyed post-trip, by telephone.</td>
<td>Gender: 36% F, 27% M, balance not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: 36% F, 27% M, balance not specified.</td>
<td>11 versus 12 from one exploration trip to South Africa.</td>
<td>Respondents were surveyed pre-trip and on-site.</td>
<td>Average average: US$2649 + personal expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gecko et al., 2009 Volunteer Travel Insights – Past Volunteering Experiences Abroad</td>
<td>2481 versus unknown number across Europe, N. America and Asia.</td>
<td>Most respondents were surveyed either pre-potential trip, on-site, or post-trip.</td>
<td>Gender: 66% F, 34% M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most respondents were surveyed either pre-potential trip, on-site, or post-trip.</td>
<td>2481 versus unknown number across Europe, N. America and Asia.</td>
<td>Most respondents were surveyed either pre-potential trip, on-site, or post-trip.</td>
<td>Average average: US$2649 + personal expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender: 66% F, 34% M.</td>
<td>Gender: 36% F, 27% M, balance not specified.</td>
<td>Gender: 36% F, 27% M, balance not specified.</td>
<td>Average average: US$2649 + personal expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daldeniz and Hampton, 2011 VOLUNtourists versus volunTOURISTS: a true dichotomy or merely a differing perception?</td>
<td>Size 16 versus 20 on a rural development project in Nicaragua.</td>
<td>Respondents interviewed on-site.</td>
<td>Gender: not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson and Seibert, 2009 The Motivations of German Volunteers:</td>
<td>80 versus 171 volunteers participating in the South African Volunteer Programme by German companies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender: 85% F, 15% M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The case of South Africa

Type of sample: purposive.

Type of data: quantitative.

Respondents were surveyed post-trip.

% of time on the project: not specified.

Project type: 71% community work, 14% conservation, 15% both; all in South Africa.

Occupation: 41% students or graduates, 47.5% just completed A-levels.

Country of origin: Germany.

Wickens, 2011 Journeys of the Self: Volunteer Tourists in Nepal

Type of sample: opportunity.

Type of data: qualitative.

Respondents interviewed on-site.

46 versus total on project.

Gender: not specified.

Age: not specified.

Average spends: not specified.

Average length of stay: not specified.

% of time on the project: not specified.

Project type: community project in Nepal.

Occupation: students/gap year students and professionals.

Country of origin: not specified.

Personal development

Interest in development work

To travel

To learn about Nepali culture

To help/do something useful

To make a difference

To live authentically in a developing country

To experience a culture very different to own.

1.6. Conclusion of this chapter

An analysis of the literature at the beginning of this chapter reveals that there is a multiplicity of buzzwords associated with volunteer tourism, as well as similar themes and activities that contribute to the lack of clarity over our understanding of what volunteer tourism is.

Although this chapter discusses emerging literature on the impacts of volunteer tourism on the tourist, it also points to the limited statistical evidence of these impacts; as well as the limited evidence of these impacts on volunteers’ everyday lives, coupled with an insufficient examination of the experience itself and the factors that facilitate change in participating volunteer tourists.

Finally, a brief review of the motives for participating in volunteer tourism suggests that the volunteer tourism experience may vary greatly from individual to individual. The following chapter reviews volunteer tourism in South Africa as it provides the context for this study.
Currently South Africa rates as number five on the volunteer tourism destination rankings behind Peru, Brazil, Australia and India (Gecko et al., 2009). If South Africa Tourism neglects to market volunteer tourism, South Africa may lose its market position. Currently, South Africa has the ability to increase its 8% market share (Gecko et al., 2009). Furthermore, South Africa has the potential to become a world leader in volunteer tourism because, of the top 10 volunteer tourism destinations, only Australia appears to actively market volunteer tourism via its official destination web-site. The South Africa Tourism web-site only mentions volunteer tourism as a subset of responsible tourism. Also, importantly, no country regulates volunteer tourism in any way. This fact coupled with the importance of the reputation of the tourism provider and popularity of using a provider to connect to a project (Delaware North Companies Parks and Resorts and PGAV Destinations, 2011; Olivier, 2009), together with the government’s recognition of the importance of responsible and sustainable forms of tourism as seen from the following review of tourism in South Africa, there is an opportunity for that country to benefit from marketing volunteer tourism.

2.1. Responsible tourism in South Africa

In 2002, 280 representatives from 20 countries made an agreed declaration at the Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations (2002). The declaration formed the basis for responsible tourism and included generating greater economic benefits for local people and enhancing the well-being of host communities, improving working conditions and access to the industry, involving local people in decisions that affect their lives and life chances, making positive contributions to the conservation of natural and cultural heritage embracing diversity and providing more enjoyable experiences for tourists through meaningful connections with local people and a greater understanding of local culture, social and environmental issues (Cape Town Declaration, 2002). In September 2011, an important milestone was reached with regard to responsible tourism. A National Minimum Standard for Responsible Tourism was launched (NMSRT), by the Department of Tourism, after a rigorous process through the South African Bureau
of Standard. The NMSRT consists of 41 criteria, covering the core aspects of sustainability and divided into four categories, namely: sustainable operations and management; economic; environmental; social and cultural sustainability. The NMSRT will be used by tourism organisations such as local tourism organisations or sector organisations to create awareness amongst their members about responsible tourism, and the document can be used as a benchmark for their members to work towards attaining responsible tourism goals. It can also be used by tourism businesses and organisations preparing for certification or simply evaluating the organisation’s progress in respect of sustainability (Department of Tourism, 2011). In this respect, volunteer tourism, has the potential to make a positive contribution to sustainable tourism goals (Responsible Tourism, 2009).

This notion is supported by Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) who studied the case of Habitat of Humanity South Africa (HFHSA) using the responses from 123 questionnaires obtained from international volunteer tourists visiting South Africa. In terms of its South African operations, HFHSA considers that it offers a method for empowering local communities to address their own housing needs. This method involves building houses for occupation by families earning low incomes. Families are selected for potential inclusion in the project based on criteria, such as, the willingness to carry out the required amount of ‘sweat equity’ and take part in a training programme. Additionally and importantly, they must have the capacity and willingness to repay the ‘mortgage’. Alongside the local communities, the volunteer tourists involve themselves in the development work by constructing shelters and community gardening. According to Stoddart and Rogerson, this enables the volunteer tourists to form links with the local people in a manner that enables them to have a tourism experience that incorporates social value. The development work undertaken by these volunteers are in locations which are often far removed from the scenic and exotic locales enjoyed by tourists generally. Hence volunteer tourism supports the tourism development goals of African countries by improving the spatial distribution of tourists so that more regions can benefit from tourism (Govender and Rogerson, 2009). Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) acknowledge that, although these tourists’ overall national contribution is minimal, their local contributions are significant and Tourism Concern (2009) points out that if volunteer tourism is managed correctly it can be a positive force for international development.
However, Cousins et al. (2009) argue that volunteer tourism may need to be tempered by regulation in order to ensure it is managed correctly. In this respect, Tourism Concern (2009), United Kingdom, developed a Code of Practice and audit system for companies sending volunteers abroad. However, registration is expensive and uptake is minimal amongst South African providers. Recently, in South Africa, a similar minded non-profit organisation, called FTTSA (Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa), was established to certify South African tourist organisations which benefit local communities and economies and which operate in ethically, socially and environmentally responsible ways. In 2010, they accredited their first two South African based volunteer tourism providers: Calabash Tours and Volunteer Africa. However, Deputy Minister Xasa (2010) voiced concerns, not only about the lack of a national minimum standard in South Africa but also the accreditation process for the tourism certification agencies themselves. With regard to the latter, ‘the inconsistent application of such elements as sustainability criteria by different schemes confuses consumers, potentially damaging destination reputation’ (p. 56). She stresses that the launch of The National Minimum Standard for Responsible Tourism (NMSRT), by the Department of Tourism, is a recent effort to address this issue by establishing a common understanding of responsible and sustainable tourism amongst tourism certification agencies. In this respect, it appears that much collaboration is required between FTTSA and the Department of Tourism.

2.2. Tourism in South Africa

In terms of tourism generally, the government in South Africa has prioritised tourism as one of the five economic growth sectors and it has been quoted as the ‘new gold’ of the South African economy because the total foreign direct spend of tourists has overtaken foreign exchange earnings (South Africa Tourism, 2010a; Standard Bank, 2004). Furthermore, tourism’s contribution to GDP has outperformed all other sectors in terms of both GDP and job creation (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Department of Trade and Industry and South Africa Tourism, 2004). There has been a period of strong growth since 1990. Prior to this, there was a small domestic market and less than one million annual foreign arrivals. By 2009, South Africa received 9.9 million foreign visitors (South Africa Tourism, 2010b). Most of the foreign arrivals (75%) come by land...
from neighbouring African states to visit family and friends as well as to holiday. A smaller percentage comes from overseas (25%) and although the latter constitutes a smaller volume, the per capita expenditure is more than African foreign tourists (South Africa Tourism, 2010a). Nevertheless, African foreign tourists spent R61.7 billion in 2009 versus R27.6 billion from Europe, Australasia and the USA combined (South Africa Tourism, 2010a). However, despite the financial differences, the South African government recognises that the new growth area is in the overseas market, not the foreign African market, because South Africa already has 69% to 99% of the foreign African market. Yet, South Africa only sits at position twenty-six in the global tourism destination rankings (South Africa Tourism, 2010a). In the past, South Africa Tourism (2008) depicted South Africa as a high-end, low impact destination, a niche, for a few wealthy foreigners; so the challenges include making it more affordable as well as opening it to young travellers who could return to South Africa at different stages in life. Another challenge is to address people’s perceptions of South Africa being unsafe and unstable. Furthermore, South Africa Tourism (2008) research revealed that overseas foreign tourists are exposed to less authentic cultural experiences than they desire. This represents a significant opportunity for South Africa in the light of key drivers of outbound markets: the desire to experience another culture.

Supporting this notion, Benson and Seibert (2009) interviewed 80 German tourists who visited South Africa in the previous five years and who participated in volunteering projects ranging from teaching, working in orphanages or homes for the handicapped, to nature conservation. Their results revealed the five most important motives were: to experience something different, something new; to meet African people; to learn about another country and other cultures; to live in another country; and to broaden one’s mind through cultural experiences. Benson and Seibert’s (2009) tourists were mainly below 36 years of age, with the majority (82%) between 18 and 29. Most participants (79%) had participated for between one and three months and were on their gap year between finishing school and starting work or higher education. Their volunteer travel patterns indicated that most participants (94%) have travelled within South Africa at least once during their time as a volunteer with 20% travelling six times or more. These findings indicate the potential of volunteer tourism to address some of the key challenges put forward by South Africa Tourism (2008), for example, ‘products’ offering
authentic cultural experiences that appeal to the young traveller in destinations outside the traditional tourism routes. Furthermore, the traditional European summer/holiday time coincides with South Africa’s lowest month for arrivals (June). However, to date there is no mention of volunteer tourism in the tourism strategy for South Africa despite the myriad of non-profit and for-profit providers, in South Africa and overseas, linking travellers to projects in South Africa, such as, the Aviva company used for this study.

Benson and Seibert (2009) and Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) attribute this to the fragmented nature of tourism studies undertaken in South Africa, spanning a range of alternative tourism topics such as Cultural Tourism (Jansen Van Veuren, 2001); Gay Tourism (Visser, 2002); Wine Tourism (Preston-Whyte, 2002); Ecotourism (Fennell, 2003); Backpacker Tourism (Niggel and Benson, 2007; Rogerson, 2007); and project planning for special development initiatives (Rogerson, 2001). At this stage, despite the potential of volunteer tourism, it is one of the most undeveloped themes in tourism (Wearing, 2001).

2.3. Conclusion of this chapter

In the light of this overview of tourism in South Africa, if that country wishes to integrate volunteer tourism into its tourism strategy and destination marketing, then understanding the [volunteer] tourist experience is an essential prerequisite (Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Kim and Brown (2010) additionally highlight the importance of understanding the type of specific benefits gained by visitors so that these benefits can be effectively marketed. The following chapter explores the many different angles from which the visitor can be studied.
Chapter three explores the literature on the self as a tourist. It defines the tourist and explores the many different angles from which the tourist can be studied, including the angle adopted for this study, ranging from ‘self’ as the driving force behind change, as with the experimentalist, experiential and positive psychology approaches, to ‘environment’ and contextual influences using a more social constructionist or post-modernism approach to studying the self.

3.1. The international tourist

The international tourist, for the purposes of this research, is a person who travels to and stays in places outside his or her usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes’ (Cooper et al., 2005:13). A person’s ‘usual environment’ is defined as being 160 kilometres or less (World Trade Organisation and United Nations Statistics Division, 1994) and tourism is said to be ‘international’ when ‘people visit destinations outside their own country’s boundaries’ (Cooper et al., 2005:794).

Additional to this definition, however, is the rare notion in tourism research that the tourist is an entity, a self with a separate existence (Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001). The tourist self presents an ontological challenge with regard to what constitutes self. The concept of self has eluded psychologists, philosophers, poets, artists and others for millennia because of its formidable ambiguities. Leary and Tangney (2005) state that sometimes the self is used to mean the whole of one’s being, including all mental and physical operations; sometimes it refers only to mental activity (conscious and unconscious) and excludes the body; sometimes self refers to an organising psyche which determines how one thinks, feels and behaves; and sometimes self is only a mental construct used to describe observable behavioural patterns. The nature of self has been studied from many different angles and in tourism the self has been studied as a product of interpersonal and cultural processes (see Lepp, 2008; McIntosh and Zahra, 2008; Wearing, 2001). These conceptions of the self are theoretically bound and articulated within particular perspectives such as the experimental self, the socially constructed self, the experiential self (Stevens, 1996) and, more recently, the post modern self. Each
perspective favours certain methods of data collection over others and produces different kinds of knowledge. What follows is an overview of some of the perspectives and the possible approaches for researching the volunteer tourist.

### 3.2. Theoretical and methodological approaches to studying the tourist

#### 3.2.1. Experimentalist perspective

The experimentalist perspective explores the self through the individual’s frame of consciousness, in other words, each person’s construct system (Kelly, 1955). This construct system is used by the individual to make sense of subject matter, a process known as cognition (Kelly, 1955; Ryckman, 2008; Stevens, 1996). It is manifested in our individual personalities; the more or less stable and enduring organisation of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique, which determines his or her unique adjustment to the environment (Eysenck, 1970).

Cognition is reported to be influenced by genetics up to around 81% (Whitfield and Brandon, 2005). Kelly (1955) explained personality being additionally influenced by education and values, all of which depend, at least in part, on the social contexts in which people live, highlighting the importance of the role of the environment on personality. Kelly’s view therefore suggests that personality is more flexible than proposed by Eysenck (1970): Kelly postulated that human beings are born in process so the capacity for change underlies his theory. In other words, we are all capable of changing or replacing our present interpretation of events (Fransella and Dalton, 1990). The subject of personality changeability is particularly relevant to this investigation because of the potential impact of volunteer tourism on its participants. However, the very idea that personal traits are flexible enough to be transformed by brief tourist experiences, yet persistent enough to be maintained thereafter is somewhat contradictory (Brookes, 2003).

Personality traits ‘tell what (a person) will do when placed in a given situation’, Cattell (1965:117-118); they are generally measured using standardised questionnaires (Albery et al., 2004). The challenge lies in deciding which traits to measure and, therefore, what questionnaire to use. For example, Allport (1961) identified common traits (traits shared with the rest of the population) and cardinal
traits which have the greatest influence on our behaviour and are unique to individuals; Cattell (1965) used sixteen traits to explain personality. More recently, Costa and McCrae (1982) identified five central traits known as the ‘Big Five’: extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience, each containing a further six sub-traits totalling thirty traits. The latter two differ from Allport in that they propose that people differ in their personalities due to different combinations of traits, rather than that some traits exist in some people and not in others.

Investigations underpinned by this perspective are generally undertaken using experiments and questionnaires (generally through the use of longitudinal designs) to obtain measurable data. The limitations to this perspective can be identified from exploring the link between the concept of trait and the self [tourist]. Ryckman (2008) posits that the self is the broader more encompassing term: ‘Within self we find, not only a person’s traits, but his or her habits, needs, interests, skills and so forth’ (p. 268). In other words, there are other aspects to the tourist than his or her traits that are neglected in this perspective. However, in terms of behaviour specifically, Allport (1961) comments that traits are central to its understanding.

Returning to the notion of personality changeability, studies contain conflicting results. On the one hand, there is little evidence that variance in traits might change with time (McCrae, 1993); they are predominantly stable but stability estimates are significantly lower prior to age 30 (Costa and McCrae, 1994; McCrae and Costa, 2003). Age 30 seems to be the bottom of the ramp of measured personality flexibility for most and the closer you are to 30 the less change there is. Those over 30 tend to have a correlation between personality inventories of about 90% from year to year, possibly because most people are supporting themselves and are on consistent career paths (Costa and McCrae, 1994; McCrae and Costa, 2003). However, teenagers are more in the range of 50% (Costa and McCrae, 1994; McCrae and Costa, 2003). Maiden, Peterson, Caya and Hayslip (2003) conducted a longitudinal study of 74 elderly women with a mean age of 80. They were assessed on the three personality traits out of the Big Five, that is, neuroticism, extroversion and openness, and were seen to be moderately stable on all three traits over time. The lack of change after the age of 30 may mean that the changes while younger were superficial, to fit into a more
diverse environment where one had less autonomy, or, it could reflect reduced mental flexibility (Maiden et al., 2003).

On the other hand, people's personalities are not set in stone by the age of 30; new research suggests that traits are not completely fixed and can be changed over time by events in a person's life (Albery et al., 2004). A US study by Srivastava, John, Gosling and Potter (2003) examined the 'Big Five' and found that not only do people change after 30, but in some ways they change more. Srivastava et al. (2003:1041) found a mixture of different patterns of how people change. They stated, 'In particular, people were more responsive and more caring [with age]'. The report also noted that in a large sample of adults aged between 21 and 60 (129,515 people) who completed the Big Five personality questionnaire over several time points, conscientiousness and agreeableness increased throughout early and middle adulthood at varying rates. Neuroticism declined among women but did not change among men. On the subject of gender, Harasty, Double, Halliday, Kril and McRitchie (1997) comment that most personality researchers agree that there are far greater differences between individuals regardless of gender than between men and women. Srivastava et al. (2003) concluded that the variety in patterns of change suggests that the Big Five traits are complex phenomena subject to a variety of developmental influences and therefore not completely independent of the influence of life changing events.

Ardelt (2000) reviewed the findings from 206 sets of results investigating the stability of Costa and McCrae's (1994) Big Five personality traits over time. He found that personality tends to be less stable if the time between the tests is large (six to seven years); if age at first measurement is below 30 or over 50; if a change in individual aspects of personality rather than overall personality is measured, in other words, the thirty sub-trait scores are strongly stable across short-term testing spans of a few weeks to a few months, with retest correlations typically between 50 - 70% (Watson, 2000; Watson and Walker, 1996). However, Watson and Walker's studies, using much longer retest intervals (six to seven years), have reported more moderate stabilities with correlations falling to 30%. Considering all available data, at present it seems likely that there
are continued changes after age 30, but they are small in magnitude (McCrae, Terracciano and Khoury, 2007).

Various lines of evidence suggest that major life events exert a significant influence only in the short term but that people move back to their pre-existing baseline (Myers and Diener, 1995; Suh, Diener and Fujita, 1996; Watson, 2000). This raises an important question as to whether changes in traits, amongst volunteer tourists, will be temporary or permanent changes. In England, there have been some studies which look at longer term impact on volunteers (Hill, Russell and Brewis, 2009). Such studies are important because they reveal whether the impacts of volunteering can change for participants over time; some effects are strongest in the period during and immediately after completing a volunteer scheme while others take longer to develop (Anderson, Laguarda and Williams, 2007). Moreover, impacts may vary over time for volunteers from different social, cultural or ethnic backgrounds.

3.2.2. Social constructionist perspective

In the psychological tradition, the previous approach explored the self from within, whereas the social constructionist perspective examines the context within which the self operates, following a more sociological tradition. It therefore explores individuals' environments and relationships with ‘others’ and their influence on the self. Hence a person’s sense of self is constructed from the environment and by other people in that we are influenced by how others seem to regard and respond to us (Stevens, 1996). That, in turn, will depend on how they categorise us, the role they place us in and also sometimes on our access to material and other resources. So, ‘knowing the particular kind of person we are or supposed to be, we know what is expected of us, how we should act and react, even how to think and feel' (Stevens, 1996:22). This approach also aligns itself to changes in self; these are continuous and fluid as we take on new roles, change status, travel and submerge ourselves in foreign cultures.

Wearing (2001) used this approach to examine volunteer tourists in the Santa Elena Reserve. He found a variety of learning and behavioural changes amongst his participants. Skinner (1974), however, stresses that this learning happens in conjunction with our unique genetic background which is neglected in this
approach and so too is the self as an agent of change, rather focussing on the ‘other’ as agent. This approach tends towards qualitative methods of data collection such as personal accounts, observation and case studies, for example, Broad (2003); Harlow and Pomfret, (2007); Lepp (2008); McIntosh and Zahra (2007); Wearing (2001); Wickens (2009, 2011); and Zahra (2006, 2011). These methods are able to explore the wider less tangible benefits of international volunteering, such as reflective approach to life, self fulfilment and a greater understanding of diversity (Sherraden et al., 2008). However, quantitative methods of data collection have also been applied, for example, McGehee et al. (2009); Grabowski et al. (2008); and Lough et al. (2009a, 2009b). For both methods, using this perspective, the context of the experience is important, providing a broader understanding of change in the tourist, such as changes in knowledge or skills, values and interests not necessarily identified in the experimentalist approach.

3.2.3. Experiential perspective

The experiential perspective, in some respects, is similar to the social constructionist approach in that the experience becomes the object of study; the engagement with the environment and ‘others’. However, the experiential approach follows psychological tradition with its emphasis on the experiencing individual rather than the environment and ‘others’; yet, unlike the experimental approach, it is not limited by individual construct systems. Rather, it examines the experience in terms of its effect on human potential; its ability to help people realise their creative potential and their highest and most important goals (Maslow, 1962; Rogers, 1961; Ryckman, 2008). This approach examines the way people relate to the world, their capacity to be aware and to reflect on their experiences; the individual being the agent of change. Maslow (1962) posits that people will benefit in different ways from their experiences, depending on their needs, resulting in different behaviours manifested at the various levels of the hierarchy. These needs range from the most basic needs for food, warmth, and shelter, to the highest level, the need for self-actualisation7 (refer Maslow, 1970). Maslow’s theory of self-actualisation was used by Alexander et al. (2010) to explain behavioural changes in vacationers. Some tourists returned from their trip wanting to help others, for example, by ‘paying monthly donations to Oxfam’, ‘giving money

---

7 Maslow (1970) defines self-actualisation as the need to realise one’s highest and most important goals (also known self-realisation or selfhood); the need to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming.
to charities’, and ‘taking a more positive approach to staff motivation and service delivery’. The explanation for this behaviour was attributed to those tourists fulfilling their higher needs; the need to benefit society and the environment rather than just themselves. This Maslowian thought was also used by Singh and Singh (2004) to describe the motivation for participation amongst their volunteers, in projects in the Himalayas; they were motivated by their higher intrinsic need for self-actualisation.

Self-actualisation was also explored by Frankl (2004:115): ‘being human always points, and is directed, to something, or someone other than oneself - be it a meaning to fulfil or another human being to encounter. The more one forgets himself - by giving himself to a cause to serve or another person to love - the more human he is and the more he actualises himself’. This idea of ‘giving to others’ and its role in helping people realise their own potential, is supported by Adler (1969) and May (1983). Both Adler and May describe self-actualisation as the actions we take that contribute to our growth but also to the betterment of others around us and the community. Therefore, cultures and individuals which place value on the process of engaging in learning, or other self-expansive activities such as volunteering, provide the ingredients that promote change and personal development (Pyszczynski, Greenberg and Goldenberg, 2005).

Other than ‘growth’ benefits, these expansive activities such as volunteering, have been shown to cure depression; Frankl (2004) published a study in 1933 which showed that unemployment neurosis disappeared in those patients who were persuaded to volunteer in youth organisations, adult education and public libraries, because they were engaged in a meaningful activity, filling their abundant free time. Frankl (2004:9) emphasised the importance of ‘finding meaning or purpose’ and ‘taking responsibility’ in order to grow and added, ‘no man can tell another what this purpose is. Each must find out for himself and must accept the responsibility that his answer prescribes’.

The experiential approach focuses on personal development and is therefore particularly relevant to this study, especially the explanations for this outcome. Frankl proposed ‘finding purpose’ and ‘taking responsibility’; however, Pyszczynski
et al. (2005:324) found that ‘intrinsic exhilaration’ from ‘integrative activity’ coupled with the ‘boost to self-esteem’ provided by ‘success’ in such endeavours facilitates personal development. Deci and Ryan (2000) added that ‘security’ and the ‘management of anxiety’ are prerequisites for this integration; and insecurity and anxiety prevent growth because people cling to the safety of what they already know. ‘It is believed that this conflict between the human potentials for creativity and fear lies at the heart of what many refer to as the human dilemma: immense capacity for growth and change that is often thwarted by our slavish dependence on the existing psychological structures that protect our fears’ (Pyszczynski et al., 2005:329). So, human growth is viewed, at least in part, ‘as motivated behaviour that has both intrinsic and extrinsic elements that encourage the individual to engage in activities that will lead to change’ (Pyszczynski et al., 2005). In this experiential approach, the methodology shifts from measurement and hypothesis testing in the experimental approach to qualitative considerations which capture the meaning of human experience. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000b) acknowledge the many significant contributions of humanistic psychologists but maintain that the humanistic psychology movement has never been accepted by academic psychologists because the research is not replicable, cumulative, objective and empirical. This is despite the plethora (more than one hundred) of research articles in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology (a high-quality clinical psychology journal) and with considerable research backing each (Bohart and Greening, 2001).

3.2.4. Positive psychology
The mainstream psychological approaches to studying the self are concerned with curing mental illness, improving normal lives and identifying and nurturing high talent (Boniwell, 2006). Mainstream research into the experiences that change people include such things as PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) following rape, sexual and physical abuse, car accidents, fire, experiences of war, receiving a serious medical diagnosis and being subjected to invasive painful treatment of

---

8 Integrative processing of information occurs when one engages in an activity that is just beyond one’s current understanding or capacities (Csikszentmihalyi, 1980).

9 Intrinsic motivation is the sense of positive effect or exhilaration that results from the integrative processing of information.

10 Extrinsic motivation is the sense of personal value (from others) one gets from success as well as the prerequisite feeling of security and safety (Leary and Tangney, 2005).
medical problems. These experiences have been found to change behaviour in many different ways such as increased depression, expectations that people are untrustworthy, unreliable, unhelpful and unpredictable and feelings of powerlessness leading to doubts about competence and self-efficacy. The latter contribute to dependency, submissiveness, passivity, reduced self-esteem and increased neuroticism (Krill, 2008; Lively, 2001; Lubit, 2008). Volunteer tourism represents a more proactive rather than reactive catalyst for altering our perspectives and subsequently our actions (Clemmons, 2010). In this regard, a more recent development is positive psychology which focuses on factors that allow individuals and communities to thrive (Boniwell, 2006). In short, it is concerned with how to transform people and enhance their potential. It is manifested in individuals’ levels of: altruism, dutifulness, liberalism, trust, assertiveness, self-efficacy, adventurousness and emotionality, as well as well-being, flow experiences and knowledge, amongst many others areas (Boniwell, 2006; Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000a).

Positive psychology is closely aligned with its predecessor, humanism and the experiential approach. However, positive psychology methodology lends itself to experimental approaches. It therefore favours quantitative methods which are replicable, cumulative, objective and empirical (Bohart and Greening, 2001). In this regard, it has been criticised for relying on too many correlational studies which establish that one thing is reliably associated with another, rather than studies that allow conclusions of one thing leading to another – so-called causality (Boniwell, 2006). Furthermore, there is a recent call from positive psychologists (refer to Ong and Van Dulmen, 2007) for applying a diversity of methods so as to triangulate findings.

### 3.2.5. Post-modern perspective

Post modernism, like positive psychology, is also a relatively recent approach to studying the self. It examines the multiple identities that individuals use to respond to a world of multiple demands. Often people find themselves working, playing, loving and learning in different social contexts within which it is possible for them to take on different identities (Gergen, 1991; Wetherell, 1996). Thus, in this approach, the context is crucial to understanding the self because of the plasticity, changeability and variability of identity to fit within the context and role (Ryan and
Deci, 2005). This approach therefore differs from the previous perspectives in that changes to self in one context may not necessarily transfer to another context, so it would be practical to investigate what elements of the volunteer experience are carried over into people’s day-to-day lives to determine how much plasticity, changeability and variability exists between contexts. Holden (2005:140) attributes these changes in identity to post modern life characterised by ‘the decline in the importance of defining identity and role by social classes’. In the context of tourism, the tourist is said to formulate his or her own identity from the different cultures through which he or she passes (Holden, 2005; Richards and Wilson, 2006). Post modernism is also characterised by an increasing desire for altruism and self-change (Mustonen, 2006), which arguably reflect people’s increasing recognition of, and reaction to, the homogenous nature of traditional tourism products and consumer society (Richards and Wilson, 2006). Such a society is characterised by very rapid change and disruption in the external world, where communities are fragmented, religious beliefs and other ideologies are undermined and distantly conceived multimedia communications have continuous and unavoidable influences on our realities (Thomas, 1996). The post modern self is further characterised, at least in the West, as experiencing boredom, confusion and disillusionment; an ‘existential vacuum’ (Frankl, 2004), where people experience an inner emptiness, a void within themselves which drives them to acquire and consume (Cushman, 1990). The results are often ‘saturated’ selves, overfilled with new and often technological manifestations of social life, such as, television, newspapers, junk mail and travel (Gergen, 1991). Increased consumption, however, is unable to fill the void; it drives people further, creating massive and deep social change within our society. This is resulting in a new consciousness, the emergence of individualism, fragmented personality and the increased emphasis on well-being, personal development, reflexivity (self-consciousness), self-actualisation, self expression, and outlets for the vital engagement of self in social activities (Baumeister, 1998; Carter and Gilovich, 2010; Gergen, 1991; Hollinshead, 1997; Ryan and Deci, 2005). McGehee and Andereck (2010) offer volunteer tourism as a potential mechanism for satisfying these post modern needs and therefore emancipating the self from over-work, sensory-overload and a lack of human interconnectedness. The methodology generally adopted to investigate the postmodern self is, therefore, more interpretative with open-ended investigations tracing the multiple connections
between people and their social worlds (Radley, 1996; Stevens and Wetherall, 1996). Post modernism, therefore, prioritises the context within which people operate and, within tourism, with the minutiae of experience; it is concerned with actions, events, and interpretations within the text (Ryan, 1997). So, the samples are small because researchers investigate meaning for their participants and, as a result, researchers are often participants themselves (Hall, 2004). In this respect, the findings are very specific to the context and are unlikely to be generalised to other contexts.

3.3. Conclusion of this chapter

The theoretical underpinnings of the self described in this chapter reflect the many lenses through which an individual, the volunteer tourist, can be studied; each lens producing different facets of knowledge about the tourist. Some lenses, such as the experimentalist self, measure the observable consequences of changes, whereas others such as the social constructionist, experiential and postmodern lenses, explore the subjective accounts of participants. While accepting that these perspectives look differently at the self, they could, nevertheless, be seen as complementary, revealing different facets of the individual. So, for this research, it would be fruitful to synthesise the approaches. For example, it could be argued that measuring change in individual traits of those who have participated in volunteer tourism, may not suffice on its own (experimental angle); we should take into account the context too and the meaning of the experience to the participants. Synthesis, the search for relationships and the complementary basis of the different perspectives, is one answer to diversity since all perspectives concur that multiple influences are involved in human conduct (Stevens and Wetherall, 1996). This view therefore lends itself to a pluralist approach to data collection, in order to address the shortcomings of the volunteer tourism literature identified in chapter one. The following chapter explains how this method will be achieved and the categories of knowledge that will be produced.
Chapter four explores the methodological approaches of different research paradigms and explains in greater detail how the researcher went about designing and implementing the methodology for this study. In this study, it was necessary to draw from different discourses at different points in the research process. The multi-paradigm research strategy, using a staged methods approach, is discussed in this chapter. The approach consists of three stages: the first, involves using grounded theory method for understanding what volunteer tourism is and generating a new explanation of volunteer tourism. The second stage uses a personality test and focuses on the quantitative measurement of change following a volunteer tourism experience; and the third stage is the interpretive phenomenological analysis of interviews offering explanations for the change, and how change is manifested in people’s everyday lives at home. The sample itself is discussed as well as issues of selectivity, validity and reliability of the research; reflexivity in the research process; and associated ethical considerations and dilemmas.

4.1. The research paradigms

Analysts have used a range of different approaches to investigate human nature. In the case of philosophy, any way of knowing is based on beliefs about what kinds of things exist (ontology), what we can know about these things (epistemology) and how we can find out about these things (methodology). These questions can be addressed in different ways by researchers; the answers reflect their philosophical underpinnings and therefore their world view, in other words, their set of experiences, beliefs and values which affect the way they perceive reality and respond to that perception. Although not always available, the transparency of a worldview, paradigm\(^{11}\) or discourse in the research process is necessary, and called for, to help the reader evaluate the research process and

\(^{11}\) Thomas Kuhn gave ‘paradigm’ its contemporary meaning when he adopted it to refer to the set of practices that define a scientific discipline. In the social sciences, Michel Foucault defines these specific ways of viewing reality as episteme or discourses. Both concepts can be found in social science research to refer to the philosophical and theoretical framework of a school or discipline within which knowledge is produced.
make judgement about its findings (Crotty, 1998; Zahra and Ryan, 2005). The answers to the questions around ontology, epistemology and methodology are different for each discourse. The first question is the ontological question and whether the researcher believes that reality is to be viewed as external to the individual, ‘out there’, or the product of individual consciousness, the product of one’s mind (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Denzin and Lincoln, 1998).

The second question, the epistemological question, seeks to identify what is the relationship between the knower (the inquirer) and the known (or knowable) (Guba, 1990). In other words, what are the origins and nature of knowing and the construction of knowledge, and the claims and assumptions that are made about what knowledge is (Dalmiya and Alcoff, 1993; Longino, 1990).

The third, the methodological question, tries to answer the question of how the inquirer should go about finding knowledge (Guba, 1990; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Phillimore and Goodson (2004:34) summarise these issues: ‘knowledge production relies upon the ontology of the researcher – their definition of reality. Their epistemology – what they count as knowledge – depends on what they want to know about, while the kind of knowledge they seek determines their methodology’.

Zahra and Ryan (2005) raise two further considerations when investigating human nature: the role of values in the research process and assumptions about human nature. In other words, do values feed into the research process, or is the research process value free? (Lincoln and Guba, 2000).

The other consideration is the definition of human nature and as such is closely linked to the ontological and epistemological questions but is, nevertheless, conceptually separate (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Some social scientists hold that human beings respond in a mechanistic or deterministic way when they confront the external world (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). These social scientists argue that the environment conditions human beings. The other view is that human beings have ‘free will’, that they have a choice and a more creative role in shaping the external world. How the researchers go about addressing the above questions, considerations and the methodology they adopt will incline them to a particular
methodology or way in which to gather data and produce or construct knowledge. The answers also provide an indication as to where researchers situate themselves within the discourses. What follows is an explanation of the two major schools, positivist and interpretative discourses, because of their relevance to the multi-paradigmatic approach of this research.

4.1.1. Positivist inquiry
Ontologically, positivists assume that an independent reality exists. This reality is outside the researcher, and the natural world is believed to be organised by universal truths and laws of causal relationships, without much regard to contextual influences (see Albery et al., 2004; Jennings, 2001; Zahra and Ryan, 2005; Hollinshead, 2004); the subject matter may be observed and measured similarly here, there and everywhere. The independence of the researcher and phenomena allows the researcher to observe and study the object without influencing or affecting it. Likewise, this independent attribute assumes that the object observed does not influence the researcher, who sustains an independent stance (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). Any interaction between the researcher and what is researched is deemed to threaten the validity of the research and therefore research strategies must be followed to reduce or eliminate these threats and hence they are usually technical in nature. The objective is to remove values and biases from influencing outcomes so that the research can be replicated as long as set procedures are closely followed. Consequently, data are examined as to their reliability and replicability (Albery et al., 2004; Hollinshead, 2004).

Positivists assume that human behaviour is determined by the situation or environment within which the person is located (Hollinshead, 2004). The research methodology for the positivist generally starts with a hypothesis deduced by theory, which is then empirically tested and verified; yielding clean, tidy, non complex classifications of lived reality (Albery et al., 2004; Guba and Lincoln, 1998; Hollinshead, 2004; Jennings, 2001; Zahra and Ryan, 2005). Observed measurements of key variables thus detail the world as it actually exists, reflecting what is typical rather than what may emerge (Hollinshead, 2004). In other words, positivistic research is generalised from the subjectivities of a select group of people (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). Underlying the positive paradigm is the view that objective enquiry is capable of providing true exploratory and predictive
knowledge of external reality (Albery et al., 2004; Burrell and Morgan, 1979). This assumes that social science theories can be assessed by reference to empirical evidence in the form of ‘results’ firmly concluded rather than ‘findings’ tentatively held.

4.1.2. Interpretative inquiry

The ontological basis for interpretivists is not objective reality ‘out there’ but multiple subjective mental constructions (Albery et al., 2004; Guba and Lincoln, 1998), where the construction of reality comes from the mind and can change over time. This relativism can lead to conflicting social realities not only between researchers and informant but also for individual researchers if their constructs change as they become more informed and experienced over time (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). Researchers in the interpretative discourse need to understand the social world as it is, at the level of subjective experience. They seek explanations within the framework of participants as opposed to observers of action. Researchers thus become part of the actors so that they can understand ‘better’ the subjective experience of the individuals involved. This creates a level of complexity because the researcher is investigating a range of views and perspectives, which often conflict with each other, reflecting the complex and problematic nature of human behaviour (Burrell and Morgan, 1979). Guba and Lincoln (1998) claim that for the interpretative discourse there is no clear distinction between the ontological basis and the epistemological basis. There is no distinction in how the world is perceived by the researcher and the relationship between the researcher and the subject matter being researched. Therefore, the values of the researcher are increasingly seen as an active force that determines the way knowledge is obtained (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). This approach requires a reflexive examination of the influence of the values of the researcher on the research process, and the assumptions that they make in producing what they regard as knowledge (Locke, 2001).

In terms of the methods employed to study a particular phenomenon, interpretivists do not attempt to use scientific methods to identify causal relationships, rather they prefer methods which allow them to get inside the phenomenon and understand it from within by using methods such as participant observation, case studies, personal accounts, focus groups and in-depth
interviewing. These researchers often undertake an inductive approach to their research by getting involved with the data or the participants in order to develop explanations, which are then used as the basis for ‘theory’ building (Locke, 2001).

4.2. Methodological justification

In this study, it was necessary to draw from both discourses at different points in the research process, and for different reasons. Prior to being able to investigate the effect of volunteer tourism on the tourist, it was first necessary to develop a robust understanding of the volunteer tourism phenomenon and to clarify the concepts within it and the nature of the relationships between these concepts. The method chosen for this first stage of the investigation was grounded theory because of its appropriateness for collecting data in a new area of research (Allan, 2003; Bakir and Bakir, 2006; Dick, 2005; Patton, 1990). It was able to generate theory (Locke, 2001). As the aim of this grounded theory study is to understand the term volunteer tourism, the researcher followed a more interpretative line of inquiry. She immersed herself in the data in order to develop explanations for the phenomenon and, in so doing, acknowledges that human values intrude on the coding process. Hence the values of the researcher are seen as an active force in determining the outcome.

Once the phenomenon of volunteer tourism was more fully understood, the researcher chose a standardised personality inventory to determine whether, and how, an international volunteer tourism experience could change the participating tourists. At this second stage of the research process, the researcher followed a positivist line of inquiry, taking an independent stance by remaining detached from the participants. The participants went on-line to complete the personality inventory, thereafter, the researcher collated and analysed the results remotely, thus studying the responses without influencing or affecting them. Therefore, the research can be replicated as long as set procedures are closely followed. Furthermore, this method produced clean, tidy, classifications, by means of traits, of changes to the volunteer tourists. However, a fundamental weakness with this type of inquiry is its inability to answer questions around meaning. For instance, what aspects of the tourism experience explained the changes in the participants, and what are those participants doing differently in their day-to-day lives as a result. Thus, in an attempt to understand more about the experience, in the third
stage, in-depth structured personal interviews were carried out with the participants based on the results of the personality inventory and were analysed using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). IPA is particularly suitable where one is concerned with understanding something about change (Higginson and Mansell, 2008; Smith and Osborn, 2004).

A staged methods approach has been shown to help create a more complete picture of reality (Feyerabend, 1975). It has additionally been used to appeal to broader audiences (Denzin, 1989; Fielding and Fielding, 1986; Flick, 1992; Hedge, Borman and Birkeland, 2001). The following section discusses this multi-paradigmatic, staged methods approach.

4.3. Multiple paradigm, staged methods approach

There are arguments for using a multiple paradigm, staged methods approach. Burrell and Morgan (1979) argue that inter-paradigmatic shifts are difficult and rare; in contrast, Lincoln and Guba (2000:164) state that ‘various paradigms are beginning to “interbreed” such that two theorists previously thought to be in irreconcilable conflict may now appear, under different theoretical rubric, to be informing one another’s arguments’. Feyerabend (1975) also argues for a multi-paradigmatic approach as ‘the world we want to explore is a largely unknown entity and no one methodology can provide all the answers’ (p.175). He advises researchers to maintain open options to create more opportunities for discovering not only a few isolated facts, but also perhaps more profound ‘truths’. Faulkner and Russell (1997) see that the adoption of paradigms according to their usefulness in specific situations as a pragmatic and potentially productive approach.

In support of staged methods, Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann and Hanson (2003) and Meetoo and Temple (2003) argue that it is possible to move from one paradigm to another if the stages are clear and transparent in the research process, but this movement does present challenges for the researcher in terms of how to use and link the various aspects of different paradigms in one research investigation (Zahra and Ryan, 2005). Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (1994) urge the researcher to be a bricoleur, to enter into a dialogue with multi-approaches, theories, practices and methods (see also Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001). This
bricoleur approach can be advantageous because of its ability to deal with dynamic situations and provide a broader understanding of the substantive area being studied (see, for example, the staged methods tourism research carried out by Briedenhann, 2010; Briedenhann and Wickens, 2003; Dantas, Ferreira, Oliveira and Aires, 2010). Nevertheless, Potter and Wetherall (1987) point out that each paradigm captures different kinds of information making it difficult, on the basis of their combination, to reach a coherent result, and this criticism is exacerbated in interdisciplinary research (see Olsen, 2004; Silverman, 1993) especially where different epistemologies are brought together (Meetoo and Temple, 2003; Patton, 1990).

In this study, staged methods are used to address different aspects of the research question; each method complements/adds to the next rather than validates it. This study’s approach follows Kelle’s (2001) suggestion of using each method for a specific purpose, drawing from each one’s strengths, with attention paid individually to validity and reliability. This allows the results to stand alone, or link sequentially to provide a more complete picture of reality.

4.4. The research design

The staged methods employed for this research are: grounded theory to explore the phenomenon of volunteer tourism; a personality inventory (a quantitative method) to identify the impacts of volunteer tourism on the tourists; and structured, web-based, personal interviews analysed using the interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) method (a qualitative method) for gaining insight into these impacts. Each will be discussed in turn. The staged design is visually presented in Figure 1.
Figure 1. A visual representation of the staged design.
4.5. The methods employed for this research: an overview

4.5.1. Stage one: grounded theory
The strength of grounded theory is its ability to provide a method for generating a new explanation of volunteer tourism through distinct and rigorous procedures. There is evidence of grounded theory use in volunteer tourism research (see Lepp, 2009; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Zahra, 2006). However, these studies do not appear to adopt the full grounded theory technique; they borrow some of its analytical aspects to help discover more about the experiences of volunteer tourists.

Grounded theory stresses the emergence of theory by data conceptualisation rather than descriptions of data generated (Glaser, 1992). It is viewed as a general method which can use any form of data because it is not unit bound; hence its ability to generate substantive theory and transcend the time, place and people of any unit sampled (Glaser, 2001). The resulting theory is evaluated in terms of its fit, relevance, workability and easy modifiability (Glaser, 2001). For this research, Glaser’s (1992) version of grounded theory is used. In this version, the data are reviewed, coded, compared and analysed, sentence by sentence, in an ongoing process whose aim is to allow relevant themes to emerge. The emerged themes are categorised, categories are related to each other and, along with their properties create the core category. Data are collected until such a time that any new data add nothing to what already has been discovered, whereupon a theoretical saturation is said to have been achieved. During data collection, any ideas, thoughts, connections, theory or questions that emerge, are recorded as memos by way of pocket cards (Glaser, 1998; Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The analysed data (the categories), along with the memos, are then sorted into a sequence such that a structure emerges which can then be described in words (refer to Glaser, 1993, for examples). This process produces a theory and, in this case, a new explanation of volunteer tourism. This rigorous procedure is essential for producing research that is credible and dependable.
Glaser’s approach was used over Strauss and Corbin’s (1990; 1998) for its more intuitive and less complex analysis and coding techniques. It was also easier to understand and visualise. Strauss and Corbin follow a more complex approach involving the systematic analysis of causes, context and consequences for every emerging theme (see Bakir and Bakir, 2006). This potentially produces a large quantity of unnecessary information irrelevant to the research problem. Additionally, the resulting descriptions are ‘forced’ rather than being allowed to emerge from the data (Glaser, 1992).

Grounded theory methodology was preferred over other methods because of its approach to ‘all is’ data. One can use any form of data because it is not unit bound; hence its ability to generate substantive theory. This study called upon data from a variety of sources, including: web-based questionnaires supplemented by testimonials from volunteer tourists, academic literature, articles, general correspondence, web sites, talk shows, blogs and media stories. Hence data were collected on people’s perceptions of volunteer tourism, from indirect experiences of family members and volunteer tourism providers, and the experiences of the volunteer tourists themselves. These data sources are potentially just as valuable for generating theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). A detailed account of the data collection process and a description of the data analysis process are presented later.

4.5.2. Stage two: personality inventories

Personality tests focus on the quantitative measurement of traits, or identifiable characteristics which define a person (Ong and Van Dulmen, 2007; Solomon, 1996). They are often used to measure traits (Albery et al., 2004) and as such they will be adopted for this research. These tests involve questions administered to individuals who are asked to rate their own actions or feelings in set situations. For example, an individual might be given the following statement: ‘Love to help others’ and be asked to choose a statement which best applies to them. The options might be: (a) Very Inaccurate, (b) Moderately Inaccurate, (c) Neither Inaccurate or Accurate, (d) Moderately Accurate, and (e) Very Accurate. This is an example of a self-report personality inventory. It provides a convenient way of getting a snapshot of a person’s position at a given moment in time (Albery et al., 2004).
All modern scientifically constructed personality tests are built on a trait measurement system with applications ranging from short listing and selecting candidates for jobs (Huczynski and Buchanan, 1991); predicting quality of life in patients undergoing cancer treatment (Allison, Giuchard and Gilian, 2000); predicting delinquency (Mak, Heaven and Rummery, 2003); predicting types of criminal behaviour (Nussbaum, Collins, Cutler, Zimmerman and Jaques, 2002); to predicting personal growth (Furnham and Drakeley, 2000; Rubin, 1981).

In the tourism literature, Bailey and Russell (2010) measured traits in their study of interpersonal growth amongst volunteer tourists, and the tourism industry, for example hotels, use trait measurement to recruit the ‘right’ people (e.g. Yildiz, Unguren and Polat, 2009).

The IPIP-NEO personality inventory represents the most commonly used personality framework in the current psychological literature (Brand and Egan, 1989; Egan, Deary and Austin, 2000; Wiggins and Trapnell, 1997). The inventory is based on an IPIP inventory developed by Goldberg (1999) and consists of 120 items that assess the domain constructs of the Five-Factor Model of personality as expressed in Costa and McCrae’s (1992) revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R), that is, openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. The IPIP-NEO personality inventory has been used in tourism and leisure research: to relate personality factors to placebo responsive participants in a 40km laboratory cycling performance test (Beedie, Foad and Coleman, 2008); to determine the role of personality in job stress and employee burnout (Kim, Shin and Umbreit, 2007); to establish whether consumer-generated media is created by certain travellers who share particular personality traits (Yoo and Gretzel, 2010) and to investigate the role that static caravans play within second home consumerism (Fowler, 2009). So, collectively, along with the advice sought from three prominent psychologists12, it was the natural choice for this research project. It covers all the major dimensions of personality comprehensively and it is very stable over long periods of time (Johnson, 2007).

Furthermore, unlike its commercial ‘parent’ (the NEO-PI-R) it has no restrictions or

12 Duncan Cartwright is the Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Applied Psychology at the University of KwaZulu Natal, South Africa. Charles Malcolm is the Head of Psychology at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. John Johnson is a Professor of Psychology at the Pennsylvania State University, USA.
conditions on its use and there are no costs for using it. It has also been translated and evaluated in many different languages and cultures and the test-retest reliability is good (Johnson, 2007; McCrae and Costa, 1983).

The IPIP-NEO personality inventory addresses the problem, highlighted in the aims of this research; of some volunteers being unable articulate the specific benefits of the volunteer tourism experience. Furthermore, it produces measurable and tangible results that can, thereafter, be validated by the respondents and enriched through other methods such as in-depth personal interviews. All these reasons, coupled with the fact that the researcher found the IPIP-NEO simple and easy to use, administer and score, made it the preferred tool. Using this standardised questionnaire, 15 traits were measured, namely, anxiety, depression, vulnerability, assertiveness, action, artistic interests, emotionality, adventurousness, intellect, liberalism, trust, altruism, self-efficacy, dutifulness, and cautiousness. These traits are defined in Appendix 1 and summarised in Table 7.
Table 7. The definitions of the 15 personality traits measured (summary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>The “fight-or-flight” system of the brain of anxious individuals is too easily and too often engaged. Therefore, people who are high in anxiety often feel as if something dangerous is about to happen. They may be afraid of specific situations or be just generally fearful. They feel tense, jittery, and nervous. Persons low in anxiety are generally calm and fearless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>A person with high trust assumes that most people are fair, honest, and have good intentions. Persons low in trust see others as selfish, devious, and potentially dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy describes confidence in one's ability to accomplish things. High scorers believe they have the common sense, drive and self-control necessary for achieving success. Low scorers do not feel effective, and may have a sense that they are not in control of their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>High scorers on this scale love beauty, both in art and in nature. They become easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. They are neither necessarily artistically trained nor talented, although many will be. The defining features of this scale are interest in, and appreciation of natural and artificial beauty. Low scorers lack aesthetic sensitivity and interest in the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>This scale measures the tendency to feel sad, dejected, and discouraged. High scorers lack energy and have difficult initiating activities. Low scorers tend to be free from these depressive feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>High scorers in assertiveness like to speak out, take charge and direct the activities of others. They tend to be leaders in groups. Low scorers tend not to talk much and let others control the activities of groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>Persons high on emotionality have good access to and awareness of their own feelings. Low scorers are less aware of their feelings and tend not to express their emotions openly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Altruistic people find helping other people genuinely rewarding. Consequently, they are generally willing to assist those who are in need. Altruistic people find that doing things for others is a form of self-fulfilment rather than self-sacrifice. Low scorers on this scale do not particularly like helping those in need. Requests for help feel like an imposition rather than an opportunity for self-fulfilment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>This scale reflects the strength of a person's sense of duty and obligation. Those who score high on this scale have a strong sense of moral obligation. Low scorers find contracts, rules and regulations overly confining. They are likely to be seen as unreliable or even irresponsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>Active individuals lead fast-paced, busy lives. They move about quickly, energetically and vigorously, and they are involved in many activities. People who score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
low on this scale follow a slower and more leisurely, relaxed pace.

**Adventurousness** – High scorers on adventurousness are eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands and experience different things. They find familiarity and routine boring, and will take a new route home just because it is different. Low scorers tend to feel uncomfortable with change and prefer familiar routines.

**Intellect** – Intellect and artistic interests are the two most important, central aspects of openness to experience. High scorers on Intellect love to play with ideas. They are open-minded to new and unusual ideas and like to debate intellectual issues. They enjoy riddles, puzzles, and brain teasers. Low scorers on Intellect prefer dealing with people or things rather than ideas. They regard intellectual exercises as a waste of time. Intellect should not be equated with intelligence. Intellect is an intellectual style, not an intellectual ability, although high scorers on Intellect score slightly higher than low-Intellect individuals on standardized intelligence tests.

**Vulnerability** – High scorers on vulnerability experience panic, confusion and helplessness when under pressure or stress. Low scorers feel more poised, confident and clear-thinking when stressed.

**Liberalism** – Psychological liberalism refers to a readiness to challenge authority, convention and traditional values. In its most extreme form, psychological liberalism can even represent outright hostility toward rules, sympathy for law-breakers and love of ambiguity, chaos and disorder. Psychological conservatives prefer the security and stability brought by conformity to tradition. Psychological liberalism and conservatism are not identical to political affiliation, but certainly incline individuals toward certain political parties.

**Cautiousness** – Cautiousness describes the disposition to think through possibilities before acting. High scorers on the cautiousness scale take their time when making decisions. Low scorers often say or do first thing that comes to mind without deliberating alternatives and the probable consequences.

Source: [http://ipip.ori.org](http://ipip.ori.org)

Although not as common as the IPIP-NEO, there are other personality questionnaires available, such as, the ‘50 Big-Five Facet Marker’. However, the traits they measure were not all relevant to the research. The decision around which traits were considered relevant, and which were not, is discussed below.

It is acknowledged that there are problems with personality inventories such as capturing only specific types of data; in this case, it only measures traits ignoring all those other areas subject to change such as a person’s skills, abilities,
capabilities, interests, values, needs and others. Furthermore, if people feel they are being judged, they may amend their answers accordingly to show themselves in a more positive light, a phenomenon known as social desirability (Albery et al., 2004). Another problem is mood on the day and environmental influences, affecting respondents’ answers (Albery et al., 2004). Also what people say and what they do may be different and therefore a measure derived from what people say they do may not be representative of their behaviour (Flanagan, 1995). Controversy also exists over the malleability of personality traits discussed earlier in the literature review.

With regard to the IPIP-NEO Personality Inventory, there is a 300-item version and a shorter 120-item version. The latter is designed to take 15 rather than 40 minutes to administer. The difference between the versions is in the number of questions per trait (ten versus four questions) but all traits are still accounted for in the shorter version.

The 120-item IPIP-NEO was chosen; however, it was further shortened to a 60-item version, measuring half of the traits contained in the 120-item version, to increase response rates. The pilot study feedback was such that even 15 minutes was too long to complete the personality inventory. The idea of shortening the IPIP-NEO is common practice and ‘researchers often make changes in the instruments to adapt them to their own situations’ (Solomon, 1996:233). For example, Bailey and Russell (2010) used an abbreviated 12-item version of the NEO-PI personality inventory and Wilson and Musick (2000) used an edited version of the Epidemiological Depression Scale. It must be noted, however, that these changes undermine the validity of the measures and reduce the comparability of the results across samples. This problem was discussed with Professor Johnson13, who created the scoring and narrative routines for the original IPIP-NEO and supplied the researcher with the survey questions for the 60-item version. He said ‘the idea of reducing the 120-item version to a 60-item version was workable as long as the researcher retained a minimum of four questions per trait’. The dilemma would be around which fifteen traits to include.

---

13 John Johnson (Professor of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, USA) was the publicised point of contact for questions relating to the NEO Personality Inventory. He was contacted on the 11.06.08 and he confirmed that the idea of reducing the 120-item to 60-items would be reliable as long as the researcher retained four questions per trait. He can be contacted on: j5j@psu.edu.
and which to exclude out of the original thirty presented in the 120-item version, Appendix 1. The 15 traits chosen were based on the findings of a study conducted by the researcher in 2007 investigating the impact of ordinary vacation travel on the tourist (see also Alexander et al., 2010). The relevance of these fifteen traits to change and personal development have also been noted by many academics (refer to Allport, 1961; Baumeister and Vohs, 2005; Frankl, 2004; Kegan, 1982; Keyes and Lopez, 2005; Locke, 2005; Maddux, 2005; Maslow, 1993; May, 1975; Rogers, 1975; Seligman, 2005). In this study a decision was made to use the trait ‘depression’ rather than the more frequently occurring ‘anger’ trait, identified in the study by Alexander et al., 2010, because ‘depression’ is used to measure the effectiveness of well-being interventions and government initiatives that send volunteers abroad (Fava, 1999; Machin, 2008).

A 60-item (15 traits multiplied by 4 questions) personality inventory was thus produced, Appendix 2, which took just seven minutes to complete through the bespoke web-site. This personality inventory could then be administered to volunteers before they left home and within four weeks of returning. The personality inventory was scored using a 5-point scale, ranging from Very Inaccurate (a) to Very Accurate (e).

In this particular piece of research a control group was also measured to improve the validity of the results as part of the scientific method by eliminating some alternate explanations of the results (Clegg, 1990; Johnson and Besselsen, 2002); in this study’s case, day-to-day life. The control group did not undertake volunteer tourism; instead, they lived their day-to-day lives including an annual vacation. The use of a non-volunteer comparison group is novel in volunteer tourism research.

The personality inventory served as a starting point for identifying changes to the tourist following a volunteer tourism experience. A detailed account of the sample, and the data collection and analysis process, are presented later.
4.5.3. Stage three: interpretative phenomenological analysis of interviews

The next stage in the research design involved understanding the meaning of those changes for the individuals concerned.

**The web-based interview**

As the sampling unit was dispersed around the world, a web-based option, in the form of structured email interviews, appeared to be the most practical method to capture data. Although personal interviews in volunteer tourism research are common place, a review of the literature revealed that a web-based interview, via email, is not. The web has mainly been used for questionnaire surveys (e.g. Bailey and Russell, 2010; McGehee et al., 2009; Benson and Seibert, 2009). In a web-based interview, as with a face to face interview, two people are talking together with a common purpose. There is a dialogue between the researcher and the participant. However, in email versus phone interviews or face to face, there is a greater time-lag between question/thought and answer/response, and this provided the recipient flexibility for responding, and time to think about the questions before answering. The scripts were written by the interviewee and therefore no transcribing was required, saving time. A further advantage is that email interviews may reduce social desirability bias: interviewees answering the questions in such a way as to show them in a positive light and interview reactivity, such as, interviewer intrusion on the interview process because the interview may be considered more impersonal. However, there is the difficulty of checking the demeanour of the interviewee for signs of distress. This is an important ethical consideration in some research projects.

For this research, the personal interviews took the form of a discussion around two open-ended questions (described later), their aim was to trigger an on-line discussion around the experiences the volunteers think may have led to the changes and what they are doing differently when they return home. The volunteer tourists were additionally asked six open-ended questions about the cost of their trip, length of stay, proportion of time spent on volunteer work, how they spent the rest of their time, and questions about their perception of international volunteering and whether they would participate in a similar project again. The answers
provided information about the context of the volunteer’s trip and volunteer tourism generally.

Analysis of the interviews

The interview scripts were analysed using interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA). This is a qualitative method developed specifically for psychology research and influenced by hermeneutics, phenomenology (Smith, 2008) and symbolic interactionism (Meek, 2007). IPA attempts to explore/understand/make sense of the subjective meanings of events/experiences/states of the individual participants (Smith and Osborn, 2004). It recognises that this cannot be done without interpretative work, in the form of thematic analysis of the data, to make sense of what the participant is thinking (Meek, 2007; Mitchie, Smith, Heaversedge and Read, 1999; Reid, Flowers and Larkin, 2005; Shaw, 2001; Smith and Osborn, 2004; Smith, 2008).

The aim of the IPA for this research was to understand what volunteers think about their volunteer tourism experiences (Smith and Osborn, 2004): what may have triggered their change, and the effects of those changes in their daily lives. IPA was the preferred method because of its suitability where one is concerned with understanding something about process and change (Higginson and Mansell, 2008; Smith and Osborn, 2004).

IPA has not been used before as a method of analysis in volunteer tourism research. The types of analyses that have been used include: content analysis (Cousins et al., 2009; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007); Richie and Spencer’s (1994) framework (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007); constant comparative analysis borrowed from grounded theory (Lepp, 2009; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Zahra, 2006); discourse analysis (McGehee and Santos, 2005) and thematic analysis (Wearing, 2001). In contrast to content analysis, for example, IPA is a ‘bottom-up’ approach rather than ‘top-down’. Content analysis systematically identifies frequencies in the data and compresses these into themes driven from theory and hypotheses (Stemler, 2001). However, IPA, although a similarly structured step-by-step process, involves identifying emerging themes from the data (Meek, 2007; Reid et al., 2005) and discovering connections between data to establish categories and eventually master categories. So, IPA is a bottom-up approach, grounded in the
actual experiences of the participants (Reid et al., 2005). In this respect, it is similar to grounded theory. However, the aim of grounded theory is to develop theory, whereas IPA is concerned with developing an understanding of individual experiences (Shaw, 2001). Therefore, in contrast to grounded theory which analyses the largest possible range of data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), IPA can be used to analyse an individual case (see Meek’s, 2007, case study of a Gypsy-Traveller).

In terms of judging IPA’s validity and reliability, its validity is anchored in the participants’ accounts and its reliability demonstrated by the transparency of the interpretation of those accounts within the findings (Smith and Osborn, 2004).

### 4.6. Sampling theory

For the grounded theory, one is unlikely to know how many subjects will be involved prior to an investigation. The sample size is determined by theoretical saturation of the data. Glaser and Strauss (1967) advise researchers to sample until theoretical saturation of each category is achieved, where no new relevant data emerge. So, sampling is controlled by the emerging theory (Glaser, 1992). In theoretical sampling the researcher selects, on analytical grounds, what data to collect next and where to collect them from, based on the formed concepts. In other words, the researcher learns which categories require attention and which ones can be dropped.

In quantitative methods of sampling, not only are researchers working with a fraction of the information theoretically available but also the researcher draws a sample from a defined population (Clegg, 1990). The skill with which a researcher selects a sample and its size, will determine just how accurately one can make generalised statements about the population from which it is drawn (Albery et al., 2004; Clegg, 1990; Flanagan, 1995).

In qualitative methods, inferences are not generally made about the population on which the sample is based, because the researcher is not looking to make generalisations, rather the researcher is trying to understand the social world as it
is, at the level of subjective experience, meanings and contexts. The following section discusses the samples used for this research.

4.6.1. The sample and issues of selectivity

The following two samples were used for all three stages of this study: the volunteer tourists and the control group; each of these samples is discussed in turn below. Additionally, for stage one (the grounded theory), the sample data were supplemented by testimonials from volunteer tourists, academic literature, articles, general correspondence, web sites, talk shows, blogs and media stories.

The volunteer tourists

All three stages of this study used the same volunteer sample (Albery et al., 2004), consisting of 60 participants, who put themselves forward. The sample was made up of 10 men (17%) and 50 women (83%). There were 44 (73%) 16-29 years of age and 16 (27%) 30+ years. The participants were from many countries including the United Kingdom, USA, Europe, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. They had booked their international volunteering trip through Aviva, a Cape Town provider. Aviva was recommended by Cape Town Tourism and was willing to support the research. The Aviva organisation is registered as a Gold Corporate member of the Volunteer Centre, which is affiliated to the International Association of Volunteer Effort (IAVE) and the United Nations Volunteers (UNV). A South African provider was chosen because South Africa rates as one of the top 10 countries where travellers want to volunteer (Gecko et al., 2009; Lasso Communications, 2009), and, the researcher is a dual national (British and South African) living primarily in Cape Town. So, it was an ideal destination to research.

Aviva provided the link between the volunteer tourists and the data collection website www.bucksresearch.org.uk via their on-line booking confirmation. Additional providers were ruled out because of the potential effect in confounding variables, where any changes to the volunteers could be attributed to the type of provider rather than the volunteering experience itself. As a non-random sample was used, the data collected and the findings are not representative of volunteer tourists generally.
The control group

As for the volunteer tourists, the same control group were used for all three stages of this study. Fifty people (30, age 30+ and 20, age 16-29 years; 18 males and 32 females) were selected as a control group through opportunity sampling, where people were willing to take part in the research when asked rather than volunteering to participate (Albery et al., 2004). This number was later reduced randomly (by deselecting every other +30 years of age) to 35 people (10, age 30+ and 25 age 16-29; seven men and 28 women) in order to better match the control group to the volunteer participants on age. The selection of the control group involved some snowballing (friends of colleagues and friends) which could have potentially introduced bias in the sample, particularly, if people were friends having certain things in common. The resulting sample eventually contained a mixture of colleagues, friends, friends of friends and family members and their friends who were dispersed around the world.

The control group consisted of people who did not undertake volunteer tourism but who normally went on an annual vacation. Although the ideal control group should all travel to South Africa to eliminate South Africa from being a confounding variable, such that any changes in the participants may be associated with the travel to South Africa rather than the international volunteer work, this was not practical. Most European tourists stay an average two weeks in South Africa (South Africa Tourism, 2010a); rather than the average ten weeks of this sample of volunteer tourists. Therefore, the length of stay would become a confounding variable rather than the travel to South Africa. Consequently, the control group was made up of a mixture of European and South African residents living their day-to-day lives at home. The staged approach enabled the researcher to supplement the personality inventory results with interviews in order to discover the reported causes of any subsequent changes in the volunteers, such as, the travel to South Africa.

The control group were matched to the volunteer tourists on age, gender and socio-economic variables, such as, occupation and education; reflecting some of the realities of doing research and highlighting limitations in this research. Ideally, control groups should be matched on every single relevant attribute, which may include, in addition, culture, intelligence, previous experiences, personality, family
background, etc. (Clegg, 1990). Otherwise, any differences between the volunteer tourists and control group may be attributed to any one or combination of unmatched variables.

In the following chapter, in order to address some of the questions about the adequacy of the control group, the researcher carried out statistical tests to determine how well the control group matched the volunteers on the 15 traits at the start. The statistical tests were limited by the type of data that were collected, that is, ordinal data\textsuperscript{14}. The personality inventory data was classified as ordinal because verbal labels were used to imply the type of order found, ranging from Very Inaccurate (a) to Very Accurate (e). In this regard, there is no sense of equal size between the grading to consider it interval data. The implications were such that the data could not be tested for normality and spread of scores; a requirement for parametric tests such as t-tests. For this reason non-parametric tests were used. The Mann-Whitney U-tests revealed no significant differences in 14 of the 15 traits measured; however, there was a significant difference in ‘vulnerability’; this outcome is discussed in chapter seven.

In addition to selecting the sample, its size is also important (Clegg, 1990). The difficulty for any researcher is deciding what constitutes a suitable sample size because there is no ‘standard’ in terms of the quantity of responses required to determine a level of confidence in the data. The research methods literature offers differing guidelines, although most authors argue strongly for securing a high rate of return as a means of minimising non-response bias and error. Babbie (1990) contended that a return of 50% is adequate and Bailey (1987) set the adequacy bar at 75%. The literature frequently cites 60-70% as an appropriate response rate, but published reports of self-completed postal surveys are often much lower (Punch, 2003). Response rates have traditionally been used as indicators of survey quality, but recent studies (Groves, Presser and Dipko, 2004) have challenged this practice, having found little relation between variation in response rates and changes in non-response error. These studies suggest that respondents

\textsuperscript{14} As part of a deeper reflexive process, it must be noted that the researcher originally classified the personality inventory results as interval data and carried out t-tests on the data. The lesson learnt was to invite earlier debate and different opinions into the research process to avoid unnecessary rework. However, the original error did provide her with confidence in the results as the non-parametric tests highlighted the same traits that were likely to change following a volunteer tourism experience.
and non-respondents often do not differ on commonly estimated statistics and point out that the standards for acceptable return rates are shaped as much by how many responses researchers can get as how many they should get (Groves et al., 2004). The challenge was, therefore, to establish how many responses would be required to determine a level of confidence in the data. Advice given by Babbie (1999), Munro et al. (2008), and Weiner, Schinka and Veliver (2003) suggest that an adequate sample size is met if one can show statistical validity. Therefore, an a priori power analysis was carried out to determine the minimum and maximum number of subjects required to make the study worthwhile, Appendix 3. A sample of between 35 and 57 people was found to be required for conducting Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks tests on the personality inventory results of the control group and the volunteer group (effect size = 0.5, error probability = 0.05, power = 0.80-0.95). Although there are no formal standards for power, most researchers assess the power of their tests using 0.80 as a minimum standard for adequacy (Cunningham and McCrum-Gardner, 2007). This sample size was similar to the advice given by the Psychology Department of the University of the Western Cape (UWC), South Africa. They suggested that 68 volunteer participants were sufficient – representing 20% of the population of Aviva, of 341 volunteers in 2009. Sixty volunteer tourists were used for this research.

For the control group’s size, the UWC advised the researcher to use roughly half the number of volunteer tourists (30) providing they have a similar socioeconomic range. Although control groups have not been used in volunteer tourism research, they have been used in volunteering and tourism domains. McBride et al. (2010) used a control group of 65% of the total sample, Hughes et al. (2009) 100% and Van Willigen (2000) 115%. The differences show a substantial variation in control group sizes, relative to the sample sizes, in the two domains. For this study, the minimum control group size, of 35 participants, was based on the results of an a priori power analysis (Appendix 3).

---

Charles Malcolm is the Head of Psychology at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa. His sample size suggestions were emailed to the researcher on the 7th July 2008 and 14th May 2008 respectively.
4.7. Data collection process

For the first grounded theory stage of this research, primary data were collected from 109 web-based questionnaires supplemented by secondary data from other sources: testimonials from volunteer tourists, academic and other literature, correspondence, web-sites, talk shows, blogs and media stories. For the second stage, primary quantitative data were collected from a first, second and follow-up personality inventory; and for the third stage, qualitative primary data were collected from structured web-based interviews, conducted by email. Each of these stages is discussed below.

4.7.1. Stage one: grounded theory

Data were collected from 109 web-based questionnaires supplemented by data from the other sources listed above.

*The web-based questionnaire design and pilot testing*

The web-based questionnaire, used as primary data for the grounded theory method, was set up in conjunction with the web-based personality inventory, the second method, as part of the staged methods approach. The personality inventory is discussed in detail further on. As was mentioned previously, the use of a web-based questionnaire was driven by the dispersed nature of the sample and its size. The web-site: [www.bucksresearch.org.uk](http://www.bucksresearch.org.uk) was specially developed for collecting data for this research. The web-site was designed to be simple but functional and compliant with the Data Protection Act (1998). The web-site was formally user-tested\(^\text{16}\) prior to it being launched in the public domain. Thereafter, a pilot study was conducted on the web-site using the first ten control group members to test out the data collection process and volume test the technical aspects of the web-site, prior to its launch in August 2008. The web-content consisted of a home page that described the research purpose (Appendix 4) followed by instructions on how to proceed (Appendix 5), followed by the questionnaire (Appendix 6) and lastly by the personality inventory with its instructions (Appendix 2).

\(^{16}\) The researcher is an experienced user-tester and has designed, user-tested and implemented IT solutions for a large UK retailer.
The 109 web-based questionnaires, for the grounded theory stage of this research, were completed by control group members and volunteer tourists between August 2008 and October 2009. Both groups linked to the web-site [www.bucksresearch.org.uk](http://www.bucksresearch.org.uk) to complete the demographic questions and personality inventory. The volunteer tourists linked through their on-line booking confirmation with Aviva (Appendix 7). The control group linked via an email sent to them directly (Appendix 8). The web-based questionnaire (Appendix 6) was short and contained two closed questions on age and gender, two open questions supplying demographic information on occupation and country of residence and five open questions:

1. When is your estimated return date from your trip?
2. What do you think you will do on the project?
3. What do you want to do with your spare time on your trip?
4. What is your understanding of international volunteering (also known as voluntourism or volunteer tourism)?
5. Why are you participating in this type of holiday?

The purpose of the demographic questions was to understand the nature of the sample as well as to match the control group to the volunteer tourists. The purpose of question one was to diarise the return date of the volunteer tourists for completing the post-trip personality inventory. The rest of the questions (two to five) helped to understand volunteer tourism. The participants in the control group were asked only to complete the demographic questions and question four, for which they were asked only to provide their understanding of international volunteering. Some control members had been volunteer tourists previously but others had not, some knew volunteer tourists and others did not. The questionnaire was carefully designed to encourage people to complete it in that the questions were as simple and unambiguous as possible and measured the objectives of the research. Furthermore, Dommeyer (1988) suggests that response rates increase when there is some kind of reward. There was an incentive for the participants to complete the questionnaire and personality inventory by way of an emailed document summarising some of their personality traits. The summary was promised within three working days of submitting the questionnaire and personality inventory.
The completed questionnaires and personality inventories were received automatically into the researcher’s email account (in the format shown in Appendix 9) and subsequently printed (as a back-up copy), coded, copied into an Excel spreadsheet for analysis and filed chronologically. The email was subsequently deleted.

*Other data*

The questionnaires were supplemented by secondary data: the testimonials of 34 volunteer tourists who booked their trip through Aviva. These were retrieved directly from the Aviva’s web-site, www.aviva-sa.com, with the permission of the Director. An example of one of these testimonials is shown in Appendix 10. These were printed and coded as per the questionnaires. There are issues with using testimonials because they often only reflect the good times and not the bad times, but they were important sources of information nevertheless. Further data were collected from other sources (academic and other literature, correspondence, web-sites, talk shows, blogs and media stories), listed in Appendix 11. The use of web-sites, testimonials and blogs are becoming popular data sources (demonstrated by Bede, Baillet and Berge, 2010). These are introspective stories which are the best way to access the subjective lived experience (Caru, 2007).

4.7.2. Stage two: Personality Inventory

Data were collected from the sample described earlier via a web-based personality inventory. The web-based personality inventory was designed to look and operate in the same way as the official 120-item IPIP-NEO web-site at: http://www.personalitytest.net/ipip/ipipneo120.htm. However, for users of the official web-site, the results are fed-back instantaneously and participants are told that their responses will be entered automatically into a database in order to improve norms by age and sex, whereas for this web-based personality inventory, this was not necessary. The web-based personality inventories were completed by control group members and volunteer tourists, over a three year period, between August 2008 and August 2011.

As a result of the pilot study feed-back, the original five page incentive summary of people’s personality traits, was reduced in length because it was ‘too detailed’. This feed-back led to a snappier one page document to improve response rates.
The summary was promised within three working days of submitting the first personality inventory on-line. Once the participants entered the web-site, they were informed about the research purpose and given instructions on what to do before completing the personality inventory. Responses were scored and the results summarised in a document (Appendix 12) which was then emailed to the participants, with a note thanking them and describing the next steps (Appendix 13).

The post-trip inventory was requested from the volunteers within four weeks of returning home so that they had time to settle back in, yet capture the experience whilst it was still fresh in the volunteer’s mind. Dex (1991) reminds us that the error of recall is likely to be greater the further back in history the respondent is required to remember. The post-trip data collection time period, used in this study, is consistent with some tourism and volunteering studies (for example, McBride et al., 2010), but not with others. For instance, Bailey and Russell (2010), Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland (2011), McIntosh and Zahra (2007) and Sin (2009) all collected data immediately after/at the end of the trip, whilst others, collected data three to nine months later (Eley, 2001; Lepp, 2008) or many years afterwards (as with Alexander et al., 2010; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Benson and Seibert, 2009; Wilson and Musick, 2000; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007; Zahra, 2006, 2011). These time periods vary according to study design; whether data were collected pre-trip, on-site, post-trip or much later, and whether data are being captured to determine change over time or not. With regard to the latter, the use of three or more repeated measurements is required (Ployhart and Vandenberg, 2009).

For the matched control group members, the second personality inventory was requested six months after the completion of the first personality inventory. This was a similar time period to the volunteers based on the average length of stay of a volunteer with Aviva, six weeks; plus the average length of time between booking and leaving, four months; plus two weeks, the length of time the volunteer tourist is given after returning home before they are asked to complete the second personality inventory.

For both volunteers and control group, the request to complete the second personality inventory was done through email (Appendix 14) and managed
through an on-line diary. The completed personality inventories were received automatically into the researcher’s email account. This was done in exactly the same manner as for the first personality inventory. The responses were then scored, summarised (Appendix 15), and emailed to participants within three working days. The summary document was accompanied by a thank you note (Appendix 16), and, if applicable, two questions about their changes. These two questions initiated the web-based structured interview.

The follow-up personality inventory was requested, of the volunteers, one to two years later because Ewert and Sibthorp (2009) comment that due to the emotional nature of such experiences, researchers often report strong initial gains in measured outcomes followed by a decline when the participants return home. A review of the volunteer tourism research shows both formal and informal follow-up times of between four weeks (Bailey and Russell, 2010) and two years (Sin, 2009). The request to complete the follow-up personality inventory was done through email (Appendix 17) and managed through an on-line diary. As for the other two personality inventories, the third personality inventory was also received automatically into the researcher’s email account. Similarly, the responses were scored and summarised for the participants (Appendix 18), then emailed to them within five working days.

### 4.7.3. Stage three: web-based structured interviews

In the web-based structured interview that followed the second personality inventory stage, participants were asked to describe the experiences which they thought may have led to the change/s and what, if anything, they were doing differently now as a result. Once these answers were discussed, the researcher also asked the volunteer tourists a few general questions about their trip, such as the cost of the trip, perceptions of volunteering, length of stay, proportion of time spent on volunteer work, about their tourism activities and views about further participation in volunteering (Appendix 19). The email interview/discussion had its weaknesses because the participants were not always sure what they thought which opens the responses to response bias. For example, volunteer 23 responded to the second request, to be interviewed, by saying:
Sorry no excuse for not replying except that I was not sure what to say. You have asked what I think led to these changes. I will try but I am not very articulate.

So, in this respect, if a participant did not respond to the initial questions they would receive, by email, a polite note to try and understand why. In terms of the ethical considerations, this gave the participants an opportunity to ‘pull out’ of the research, at which time the researcher took the opportunity to thank them for their contribution.

With regard to those who did want to discuss their results, the email discussion and the responses to the questions were printed and filed with the personality inventory results, for subsequent analysis.

In the following section, a description is given of the data analysis process for all three stages of this study: grounded theory, personality inventory and web-based structured interviews.

4.8. **Data analysis**

4.8.1. **Grounded theory: process and challenges**

The analysis of the data followed Glaser’s (1992) approach to grounded theory with its clearly defined steps (refer to Glaser, 1993, 1998, 2001). In an ongoing process, the data were reviewed, coded, compared and analysed, sentence by sentence, for emerging themes. For example, one volunteer tourist responded to the web-based questionnaire ‘what is your understanding of international volunteering (also known as volunteer tourism or volunteer tourism)?’

> It is about direct involvement and understanding what is happening there and how your presence is impacting on those people in that part of the world.

The researcher underlined the key point (code) in the sentence and wrote the theme/concept it relates to in the left margin of the document, Appendix 20. The researcher transferred these concepts to post-it notes so that each concept could
be placed on a wall, Appendix 21. The post-it notes facilitated the ongoing comparison and categorisation of concepts by providing a useful bird’s-eye view. Similar themes/concepts were categorised. The category that emerged with the highest frequency created the core category and linked with other connected categories and their respective properties. For example, in the extract described above, the concept of ‘involvement’ was identified and placed in the category ‘engagement’ which eventually became the core category for describing volunteer tourism. All the concepts and their respective categories are described and discussed in chapter five. Data were collected until a saturation point was reached, where any new data added nothing to what already had been discovered.

During data collection, any ideas, thoughts, connections, theory or questions that emerged, were recorded as memos on cards (Glaser, 1998). For example, one memo contained the following words:

Look into the difference between formal and informal volunteering.

The researcher used these cards to review the literature on the relevant theory and, once a saturation point was reached with the data, the post-it notes (the concepts and their respective categories), along with the memos, were then sorted into a sequence such that a structure emerged which could be described in words providing a robust understanding of volunteer tourism.

One of the benefits of using grounded theory is the amount of data collected for analysis. However, this can become overwhelming for the researcher; Denzin and Lincoln (1994:508) describe it as a “flood of concepts”. The researcher addressed this by constantly asking the question, of each collection of data, whether it resolves the main concern and whether it adds value to the task of understanding volunteer tourism. It was eliminated from the analysis if it did not. This was the researcher’s method for defining boundaries and restricting the volume of data. According to Rykman (2008), a good theory should be parsimonious, or economical. That is, the theory should contain only those constructs, relational statements and assumptions necessary for the explanation of the phenomenon within its domain. The inclusion of unnecessary constructs or assumptions can lead an investigator to waste a great amount of effort.
Another point worthy of consideration was 'incident tripping', which Glaser (1992) warns of with the large volume of data. Incident tripping is when the researcher focuses on particular perceptions and experiences, such as that from colleagues, and the constant comparative method is forgotten, so one never gets to the real story (Glaser, 1992). Glaser advises the researcher not to discuss the core category with anyone, including supervisors, until the end of the research and to treat all literature, academic or otherwise, as ego-equals. This can prove challenging for researchers with no formal experience in grounded theory. The researcher, therefore, relied on Glaser’s (1993, 1998 and 2001) step-by-step process and support from experienced tutors. To begin with the process was daunting because the researcher was unclear how to identify a code, a theme/concept and a category; but this uncertainty subsided as more data were collected and compared, and confidence grew in the process.

Once the theoretical explanation emerged to describe volunteer tourism, the researcher was more knowledgeable of the substantive area and therefore in a more informed position to determine its effect on the tourist. The following section describes the analysis of the completed personality inventories.

### 4.8.2. Personality Inventory: process and challenges

The analysis of the data involved scoring and comparing the first and second personality tests’ median scores. Then, one to two years later, the second test was compared with the follow-up test. All three personality inventories were scored in exactly the same way using a 5-point scale. The scores were converted into numbers, where a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4 and e=5. However, there were also questions for which the reverse numbering applied (questions 15, 26-27, 30, 34, 38-39, 41-42, 44-45, 47 and 49-60). For these questions, a=5, b=4, c=3, d=2 and e=1. An Excel spreadsheet was used for scoring purposes. The researcher highlighted the questions for which reverse scoring applied, in red, to reduce input error. The spreadsheet was designed to functionally add the scores together for each trait.

The first test score, for each trait, was then compared with the second test score and the differences noted to establish the ‘changes’, Appendix 22, so that the results could be fed-back to the participant. The purpose of the feedback was
twofold: firstly, it was to incentivise the volunteer tourists and control group members to participate in the research and, secondly, the feedback provided the opportunity to discuss the results/changes with the participants in order to understand the meaning of the changes to the participants.

Similarly, one to two years later, the second test scores were compared with the follow-up test scores to determine whether any of the initial changes still held.

**Statistical tests**

The types of statistical analyses carried out on data are determined by three restrictions: the type of measurement the scores represent; the distribution of scores, whether or not they come from a normal distribution; and the spread of the scores (Albery et al., 2004; Clegg, 1990). Parametric tests are more sophisticated and more powerful than nonparametric tests because they are better able to reject correctly the null hypothesis; however, they have more restrictions (Clegg, 1990). Firstly, the units measured must attain interval or ratio sophistication. Secondly, they can only be used on data derived from normal (nearly normal) distributions, although there is a certain amount of controversy among statisticians over how far you can break this ‘rule’ and get away with it (Albery et al., 2004; Clegg, 1990).

According to Brown (1997) violations of the assumption of normality are only problematic if the test is norm referenced and being used for norm-referencing. That is, comparing a person's score against the scores of a group of people who have already taken the same test. Furthermore, it can be problematic when the purpose of a parametric test is to make inferences from the sample statistic to the population parameter through sampling distributions (Chong-ho, 2010). Thirdly, homogeneity of variance is required. This means that the two sets of scores must have similar variances. So, the decisions around which tests to use were determined by these three restrictions. As was discussed earlier in this chapter, the data were classified as ordinal because verbal labels were used to imply the type of order found, ranging from Very Inaccurate (a) to Very Accurate (e). Therefore, non-parametric tests were used; the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test and Mann-Whitney U-test, depending on whether the samples were matched or not (Clegg, 1990; Sekaran, 2003).
These tests were used to determine: a) how well matched the volunteer group and control group were on their first test scores, using the Mann-Whitney U-test; b) the influence of day-to-day life on the personality traits, using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test; c) the influence of volunteer tourism on the personality traits, using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test; and d) the influence of age, gender, project type, length of stay and time elapsed post-trip, again using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks test. Excel was used to score the personality inventory results. The following web-sites were used to access the statistics programmes for carrying out the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks tests and Mann-Whitney U-tests respectively:


4.8.3. Analysis of interviews: process and challenges

Following the statistical analyses, the participants were asked describe the trip’s experiences which they thought might have led to the changes and what they were doing differently as a result. The email discussion and responses were then analysed using the IPA method. For the volunteer tourists, six additional questions were asked about their trip; these questions were highlighted earlier in this chapter.

The use of specific structured questions may be a limitation to this research in so far as the researcher could have missed opportunities to receive unexpected but useful information from a less structured inquiry.

Analysis of the data followed Smith and Osborn’s (2004) recommendations, beginning with the first script (the email discussion), searching for themes and respective categories before proceeding to the next script. Once all the scripts were coded, the search for patterns followed to establish master categories (super-ordinate themes) for the group as a whole. These categories were then tabulated, with references to the themes in the scripts. Having established the main categories, the master table was then translated into a narrative account. The categories were then described in detail supported by extracts taken from the interviews.
So, the IPA process involved taking each email discussion and underlining the key points (themes) in the sentences associated with what people are feeling and thinking about their experience, referencing them in the margin, Appendix 23, and writing the themes on a summary sheet along with a tentative category for the theme, Appendix 24. There was a summary sheet, per trait, for the experiences explaining the change/s and another for the impacts of volunteer tourism on volunteers’ day-to-day lives, Appendix 25 and Appendix 26 respectively. The summary sheets were useful in looking for patterns between the scripts to establish master categories for the group as a whole.

Having established the main categories, the researcher then translated the master table into a narrative account, introducing the topic and then each master category in turn. The categories are then described in detail and supported with verbatim extracts taken from the interviews. So, the purpose of the analysis was to develop an understanding of individuals’ experiences through coding and identifying emerging themes in the scripts. However, this coding required interpretation and is therefore a subjective account of the international volunteer tourism experience from a small group of volunteer tourists using Aviva.

A significant challenge was contending with the poor response rate to the interview. This is discussed in the section on ethics, later in this chapter. The following section discusses the concepts of validity and reliability as a means of evaluating research.

4.9. Validity and reliability

The concepts of validity and reliability are used to evaluate research projects especially those which follow a positivist paradigm.

Validity is the property of being true, correct, conforming of reality (Albery et al., 2004; Flanagan, 1995). This is the extent to which a study produces accurate results (internal validity) and produces results that are widely applicable (external validity), that it measures what it is supposed to measure and not something else.
Reliability is to do with results that are consistent or dependable; the degree to which a particular test or experiment gives the same result when used repeatedly under similar conditions (Albery et al., 2004; Clegg, 1990; Flanagan, 1995).

Interpretative research is not commonly associated with ‘tests’ and experiments and the approach has been regarded by positivists as exploratory and largely unscientific and so the use of validity and reliability are not possible for evaluating findings within this discourse (Decrop, 2004). Instead, Erlandson, Harris, Skipper and Allen (1993) suggest using trustworthiness for qualitative studies to make studies more rigorous. A trustworthy study, they state, is able to ‘demonstrate truth value, provide the basis for applying it, and allow for external judgement to be made about the consistency of its procedures and the neutrality of its finding and decisions’ (p. 29). Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) basic criteria of trustworthiness parallels positivists’ reliability and validity. Their typology is one of the most comprehensive efforts in establishing scientific canons for qualitative inquiry (Decrop, 2004). They have developed four criteria for qualitative inquiry. Credibility (which relates to the quantitative criterion of internal validity) refers to how truthful particular findings are. Transferability (associated with external validity) is concerned with the extent to which the research findings are applicable to another setting or group. Dependability (related to reliability) consists of looking at whether the results are consistent and reproducible. Confirm-ability (associated with objectivity) pertains to how neutral the findings are. In qualitative research, credibility can be questioned owing to the ‘subjective’ nature of the data collected, since there is no rigid separation between the researchers and their subjects, being an interactive and participative relationship. So, other techniques are used by qualitative researchers to address validity and reliability, and these will be described in the following section.

Additionally, there are data collection methods that draw on both types of evaluation such as grounded theory, where the findings/results/theory are evaluated by means of ‘fit’, ‘relevance’, ‘workability’ and ‘modifiability’ (Glaser, 2001). Here, the theory must closely fit the substantive area in which it will be used, must be readily understandable by laymen concerned with the area, it must be sufficiently general to be applicable to a multitude of diverse daily situations within the substantive area and it must allow the user partial control over the
structure and process of daily situations as they change through time (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

The following section discusses each of these mechanisms/concepts with reference to this research.

4.9.1. Internal validity/credibility

Campbell (1957) defines internal validity as the extent to which the relationship between two variables is causal in the specific situation/s. To claim that there really is a causal relationship between two variables, he posits, it is necessary to be convinced that those variables have been adequately defined. In this study, the variables are volunteer tourism (independent variable) and specific traits (dependent variables). Although both were discussed in chapter one, the explanation of volunteer tourism was limited. This prompted the grounded theory study in order to arrive at a new explanation of volunteer tourism. This new explanation would need to fit and be of relevance to the area it purports to explain. For grounded theory, this is achieved by rich samples to enable saturated and meaningful themes and theoretical explanation to be developed (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). It is the process of constant comparison which corrects any inaccuracies of data. In grounded theory, credibility is achieved through the process (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The aim is to develop a theory that is abstract of time, place and people; generalisable; fits; works; and is relevant and highly modifiable as categories are constantly compared to discover variations, which are then applied to develop new properties.

Once the theoretical explanation for volunteer tourism was developed, the researcher made use of the 60-item IPIP-NEO personality inventory to measure changes in specific traits following an international volunteer tourism experience. Albery et al. (2004) and Bryant, King and Smart (2007) identified three aspects to test validity of such instruments, they are: content validity, the degree to which an instrument covers all relevant aspects of the conceptual or behavioural domain it is intended to measure; criterion validity, the degree to which an instrument can be used to predict a relevant external outcome (measures what it claims to measure); construct validity, the degree of confidence one can have in labelling measurements in theory-relevant terms. This tripartite conception of validity is
consistent with the model adopted in current testing standards and guidelines in psychology and education (Bryant et al., 2007). Furthermore, it is consistent with the well-validated IPIP-NEO (Buchanan, Johnson and Goldberg, 2005), the personality inventory used for this research. However, the researcher made some changes to the original 120-item, 30 traits version. These were discussed earlier in the chapter and have the potential to affect the validity of the personality inventory; hence precautions were taken to reduce these effects, such as, using the original 120-item version IPIP-NEO survey questions for each of the 15 traits measured for this research.

Additionally, Ferguson and Bibby (2004) state that the aim of maintaining internal validity is to rule out any extraneous variables that may account for the findings and in this respect the researcher used a control group matched on age, gender and occupation. One problem with the control group was that they did not all travel to South Africa as part of their annual vacation, so the travel to South Africa per se could account for any changes in the volunteer, a potential weakness of this study. However, in an attempt to resolve this problem, the email interviews were analysed in chapter eight; the results suggested it was the volunteering experience rather than the travel to South Africa which accounted for the changes.

The email interviews were analysed using the IPA method, with recognition that the researcher plays a role in producing her own understanding of an interviewee’s account. IPA operates within the interpretative discourse and, therefore, requires different strategies for evaluation of validity. IPA’s validity is anchored in the data (in the participants’ accounts). So, in order to assess whether the findings are accurate/truthful/credible, different techniques are adopted by researchers. In this study the findings were checked with the research subjects themselves (respondent validation), by inviting informants to read the analysis provided by the researcher (Belsky, 2004; Decrop, 2004; Meek, 2007; Silverman, 1993). Additionally, there were many references to the data in order to support the analysis and interpretation, to enhance the credibility of the findings (Erlandson et al., 1993).
4.9.2. External validity/transferability

To demonstrate external validity, positivists aim for generalisation, to make claims about the world in general on the basis of their findings. Studies that lack external validity only tell the reader about behaviour in the specific situation. However, there is a trade-off between internal validity and external validity because the more one tries to control every unwanted factor in the research setting to improve internal validity; the more artificial the researcher makes the setting. So a study, especially a scientific investigation that takes the form of an experiment, may have excellent internal validity but limited applicability to the real world. Another threat to external validity comes from the people studied because a researcher cannot test everyone, only a sample of people. The sample must therefore be typical of the people the researcher wants to describe to claim the generalisability of the results.

For this research, the researcher does not claim generalisability of the results because non-random sampling techniques were used. Nevertheless, it was still important to demonstrate the similarities between the participants and other Aviva volunteers, in chapter one, to enhance the study’s usability.

The generalisation issue is a frequent criticism raised against qualitative research (in this case the IPA method) because the findings are based on small and non-representative samples. However, in addressing this criticism a distinction must be made between statistical generalisation and analytical generalisation. While the statistical generalisation of qualitative data is most often not possible or desirable, the analytic transfer of theoretical propositions to other objects, people, settings phenomena, etc, is conceivable, provided the researcher knows and gives details about the context of the study, integrates findings with existent literature, and describes how related objects are similar (Decrop, 2004). This ultimately depends on what kinds of generalisation one might wish to make. Mook (1983) argues that external validity is really a question, not a criterion. Decrop (2004) and Meek (2007) add that, by describing the data extensively and compiling them in an orderly way so as to give other researchers the opportunity to appraise the findings and the extent to which they could be transferred to other settings, helps readers estimate the plausibility and transferability of an interpretative study.

With regard to the grounded theory, transferability is easily and almost automatically achieved through the process of constant comparison.
Generalisation is facilitated through making decisions on the conceptual level of the emerging categories. The researcher should be guided by the criteria that the categories should not be so abstract as to lose their sensitising aspect, but yet be abstract enough to make the theory a general guide to multi-conditional, ever-changing daily situations. So, for grounded theory, transferability can be achieved by producing concepts that have broad practical use in the substantive area (Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

4.9.3. Reliability/dependability

Reliability is concerned with the degree to which a particular test or experiment gives the same result when used repeatedly under similar conditions. The easiest way to access reliability is to test the same group of people twice: a reliable questionnaire will produce similar scores at both points in time (test-retest reliability).

The term correlation is often used to determine if two scores are similar; it is a means of specifying precisely the extent to which two things are associated (Clegg, 1990; Ferguson and Bibby, 2004). If two measures are in perfect association, that is, the score for a variable on one test is always accompanied by a similar score on the same variable on the other test, they are said to be perfectly positively correlated. If, on the other hand, there is no association between the variables in the tests, then there is no correlation. In test reliability terms, if a high correlation is obtained between the two variables on both tests, then the test under scrutiny can be regarded as reliable (Clegg, 1990; Ferguson and Bibby, 2004). In reality, however, if the same group of people are tested twice, the subjects may remember their responses from the last time and give the same response for the second test, and this may undermine reliability. As a result, the American Psychological Association has insisted that the time period guidelines are set out in the psychological test users’ manuals, which should specify the most favourable time period between measurements to maintain high test-retest reliability (Ferguson and Bibby, 2004). With regard to the NEO PI-R personality inventory on which the IPIP-NEO personality inventory is based, the ideal time period between testing is between three months and six years apart, the test-retest reliability reported in the manual over six years was: N= .83, E= .82, O= .83, A= .63, C= .79. Costa and McCrae (1992) point out that this not only shows good reliability
of the domains, but also that they are stable over a long periods of time, as the scores over six years are only marginally different from the scores measured a few months apart.

For the IPIP-NEO 120-item, the coefficient alpha reliabilities by trait are: anxiety (0.78), depression (0.84), vulnerability (0.75), assertiveness (0.83), action (0.70), artistic interests (0.74), emotionality (0.67), adventurousness (0.70), intellect (0.73), liberalism (0.63), trust (0.85), altruism (0.74), self-efficacy (0.60), dutifulness (0.66) and cautiousness (0.86). These reliabilities can be directly applied to the 60-item version used for this research. Reliability was also verified, in chapter six, by using the control group to test for similar scores over two points in time, that is, six months apart.

As IPA operates within the interpretative discourse, it requires different strategies for evaluation of reliability. In interpretative research, reality is not single and immutable but multiple and contextual (Decrop, 2004, p.157). Therefore, knowledge generated is not absolute; but bound by time, context, culture and value, and so replicability has no place in interpretative research because of the ever-changing nature of the social world (Marshall and Rossman, 1995). Instead, Decrop (2004) suggests the use of the criterion of dependability to appraise the consistency between the data recorded and what actually occurred in the setting. Decrop (2004) and Meek (2007) suggest a number of ways in qualitative research to increase dependability: being transparent with one’s research plan and data interpretation, and documenting any changes, as was the case for this research.

With regard to grounded theory, reliability is even more problematic to assess because standardised research techniques are an antithesis to the unstructured and sometimes spontaneous strategies of the grounded theory. The methodology is entirely context driven. Furthermore, data analysis in quantitative research involves statistical tests, but grounded theory data are analysed by the constant comparison procedure; a process which cannot be standardised as it relies on the ability and theoretical sensitivity of the researcher. Hence Guba and Lincoln (1998) suggest the criterion of
dependability in evaluating grounded theory and like Decrop (2004) they recommend ‘auditability’ to be the criterion for rigour, such that one can clearly follow the decision trail used by the researchers in their decisions about the theoretical, methodological and analytical choices made in the study, and reach comparable conclusions using the investigator’s data and context. The systematic and rigorous procedures of the grounded theory allow the research process to be audited thus increasing the reliability of the research. Additionally, all categories and properties are constantly verified as part of the process for generating theory.

This section on validity and reliability discussed some of the ways both positivist and interpretative inquiry can validate research and enhance reliability. However, it is ultimately the reader who will judge the study content based on their own values and lines of inquiry. In this respect, it is the researcher’s responsibility to ensure that every step of the process is transparent and accompanied by an explanation regardless of which lines of inquiry are being used.

The active transparency of the whole research process, the decision trail used by the researcher in her decisions about the theoretical, methodological and analytical choices made in the study, especially with regard to the interpretative aspects of the research, is part of a reflexive process which is discussed in the following section.

4.10. Reflexivity and ethics: My role

Galani-Moutafi (2000) refers to reflexivity as the conscious use of the self as a resource for making sense of others. This requires researchers to acknowledge and question their culture and identity in order to provide some insight into their understanding of themselves in the context of their interactions with others. Reflexivity allows the research to be situated, as it depends on the point of view of the researcher, ‘which in turn reflects how she is positioned intellectually, politically and socially’ (Barnes and Sheppard, 2000:6).

For this research, epistemologically speaking, the psychology discipline provided the initial methodology, a personality inventory, to justify knowledge claims of
changes in traits; and the volunteer tourism provided the context. However, during
the process of the research, the strategy evolved to incorporate other methods to
bridge the gaps in this knowledge. The concept of volunteer tourism is not
universally agreed upon, and how the experience changes the volunteer tourist is
not extensively investigated. As a result, the strategy evolved from using a
psychological tool/method to include the use of grounded theory and interpretative
phenomenological analysis.

Also, of significance to this study is the fact that the researcher was not sponsored
by external sources and was in the privileged position of being able to self fund the
research; therefore there were no other vested interests. The implications were
twofold: firstly, this meant that the only motive behind the research was a genuine
desire to learn more about the catalysts for change and development of self, rather
than to satisfy a sponsor's interests. This provided the freedom to explore an area
that may not otherwise have been explored in this manner. Secondly, it meant
there were no interests to compromise, cloud judgements or raise ethical
dilemmas.

In his very open account of the role of the personal in the research process, Hall
(2004:149) states: ‘the personal is critical in determining the kind of research lines
we follow.’ So, if the researcher is to use reflexivity, we should start with ourselves,
and be honest about our life and why we are doing what we do. Making such
personal value statements is not easy and may not be easily accepted in a thesis,
but it is in agreement with Gibson and Jordan (2004) who point out that it gives the
audience an idea of how the interpretation process and the resulting findings are
influenced. It also makes the research transparent and easier to evaluate. In
addition to providing information on the researcher’s background, assumptions
and values, Humberstone (2004) discusses the use of providing a personal
account of the whole research experience so that, in addition, the social
construction of the research process can be explored. However, one must be
mindful of focussing too much on one-self such that the research becomes about
one-self rather than about the problem under study. Hollinshead, (2004:67) states,
reflexivity is still not common practice and ‘too few researchers in all fields are
prepared to indulge in what must admittedly be recognised as the longer reflective
and necessarily deeper reflexive effort that the logic of qualitative methodologies is
inclined to demand’. This effort involves self-introspection through the research process; methodological recognition of the way in which the researcher is connected to the world in which the research is taking place and the impact of this on the research; acknowledgement of the interrelationship between the research and research participants and the ways in which all parties shape the research; realistic writing up that encompasses both the ‘commonalities’ and the ‘contradictions’ found in the research (Dupuis, 1999).

In this research reflexivity is manifested in a number of ways: by making participants themselves reflective, by encouraging them, through interview, to think about the changes in their traits and then presenting their views and giving them voice in the discussion; transparency throughout the research process regarding ‘contradictions’ (for example, I use a personality inventory tool; personality being rooted in stability and predictability, to measure change and flexibility) and ‘commonalities’ (for example, the participants were asked to search for meaning in their experience; their reflections coincided with the concept of engagement which emerged as the key concept for describing volunteer tourism using grounded theory); noting the known and potential unknown impacts of the researcher on the participants and vice versa, for example, the effect of the web-link which was designed to attract participants to the research project by saying, ‘would you like to find out more about yourself, and how your volunteering experience could change and develop you as a person?’ (could this wording become a self-fulfilling prophecy?); highlighting the concerns and difficulties with and during the research process; the subtle influence of supervisors and academic community on the direction of the research, for example, their weighting of ‘key’ emerging concepts which I might not have noticed myself; noting what I would have done differently if I were to carry out the research again with new knowledge, such as, seeking greater debate before ‘jumping’ into data analysis.

In relation to ethics in research, Handelsman, Knapp and Gottlieb (2005) point out that generally the research guidelines focus too heavily on avoiding or punishing misconduct rather than promoting the highest ethical conduct. They tell the researcher what not to do rather than what they should aspire to (positive ethics). The American Psychological Association (APA) developed an ethics code in 1948 by soliciting examples of problematic situations (Handelsman et al., 2005). In
1992, the ethics code introduced aspirational ethical principles in addition to the enforceable standards of conduct. Similarly, The British Psychological Society (2006) has a detailed code that covers research which encompasses the following ethical principles: protection of participants from harm, right to privacy, deception, informed consent, debriefing and giving advice.

Although the volunteer tourism literature notes basic ethical standards, such as, obtaining consent, maintaining confidentiality, record keeping and compliance with the Data Protection Act, the right for participants to withdraw and sharing research data for verification, it could benefit from a discussion of ethical principles, for example, respect for others’ rights and dignities. However, in order to do this, researchers need to confront their own values and the virtues they want to develop. This may be difficult, especially in the face of competing forces such as the desire to collect data versus the right for participants to withdraw. There are a number of models of ethical reasoning that cover such dilemmas (see Haas and Malouf, 1989; Kitchener, 2000). These models broaden the context of ethical thinking beyond immediate circumstances and simplistic calculations. Unlike ethical standards which can be applied directly and visibly to individual research projects, ethical principles are more of a philosophy which can be applied to everyday life and may often go unseen.

**Ethical standards**

There were ethical standards required for this research, because some data were of a personal nature and were stored on computer and in hard copy and therefore required the appropriate handling as per the Data Protection Act (1998). Also there were ethical considerations and dilemmas; these were captured in a diary which was used throughout the research project. The diary contained the issues and the actions in chronological order, Appendix 27 (extract). For example, there were ethical considerations involved in the use of a web-site, such as, ensuring no data were stored on the web, it was rather transferred to a personal computer (diary entry 28.05.08); no name was attached to a record, just a combination of alphanumeric characters for the researcher to identify the record; there was an introductory note explaining the purpose of the research, what it would involve, how long it would take, and stating that all data would be treated in the strictest confidence and would not be disclosed to anyone; and there was a contact name
for any queries with regard to the web-site and its contents. There was also a question of whether I required ethics approval by the university board because of the country of residence of a large number of participants, many of whom were not from the United Kingdom (diary entry 06.05.08, 09.06.08 and 24.06.08). It was found not to be required. A further consideration was obtaining approval for the use of the IPIP-NEO personality inventory from the appropriate authority.\footnote{John Johnson is a Professor of Psychology at the Pennsylvania State University, USA.} I requested further ethical guidelines from the British Psychological Society (2006) - the research was conducted within those guidelines.

**Ethical considerations**

There were ethical dilemmas over the use of the official IPIP-NEO web-site to score this study’s results (diary entry 11.06.08). Its use would have compromised their own data because the norms by age and sex would be affected. I, therefore, designed a bespoke, shortened version of the IPIP-NEO personality inventory; to similarly score the results but independently. A further dilemma presented itself on a regular basis over how many times one should try to contact a participant if they did not respond to the request to complete the personality inventory or answer some questions (diary entry 28.10.08, 05.11.08a and 05.11.08b). I was mindful of harassing the participant and of their right to withdraw at any time, so any correspondence included the option of being able to renegotiate their consent as the study developed, and therefore withdraw or modify what they originally agreed to do. As there are no specific guidelines on this from the British Psychological Society, I did what I considered acceptable, that is, two to three requests. After that, I considered the participant to have withdrawn from that point in the research process. Two further ethical dilemmas appeared during the course of the research, the first was a language barrier highlighted by a Swiss lady who said her English was poor and that she could not understand the personality inventory questions, the researcher had to be sensitive to this when asking her to withdraw (diary entry 28.11.08). The second problem was around confidentiality when I was asked to comment on one participant’s personality traits. This would have been a breach of trust and confidentiality (diary entry 12.12.08).

There were other ethical challenges as some participants were less and less inclined to continue with the research as it progressed. At the interview stage
participants were being asked to reflect on their trip (or on what had happened during the last six months in the case of control group members) and this is often a time consuming and potentially difficult thing to do. So, people were asked only to complete this stage if they had time. If they didn't respond to the request for interview, I asked them to choose from a list of six multiple choice responses, Appendix 28, in order to understand why they didn't want to be interviewed. The interview was important for validating the results of the personality inventory so there were implications depending on the reason for not wanting to be interviewed. For all those volunteers who either completed the research, or withdrew from it, each received a debrief by way of a thank you and a summary of the findings.

4.11. Conclusion of this chapter

The multi-paradigm research strategy, using a staged methods research design was discussed in this chapter. Three stages were identified for this study: stage one, the grounded theory study; stage two, the personality inventory; and stage three, the web-based structured interviews. Each method addresses different aspects of the research question; each one adding to the other. Within this chapter, each method of data collection and analysis was discussed in turn. Additionally, issues of validity and reliability surrounding the results/findings were discussed, and consideration was given to the concept of reflexivity in the research process which was also manifested in the ethical considerations and dilemmas that were presented. The following chapter discusses stage one, the grounded theory study, used to provide an explanation of volunteer tourism.
5. CHAPTER FIVE - grounded theory: analysis and findings

Chapter five provides an explanation of volunteer tourism using grounded theory to clarify the conceptual components of volunteer tourism and to provide a more in-depth understanding of it before investigating its impact on the tourist.

5.1. Conceptual clarification of the term volunteer tourism

An examination of the volunteer tourism literature in chapter one and specifically the similarities and differences between what is perceived as volunteer tourism and the associated forms of tourism, revealed that the term could benefit from further exploration.

The phrase that emerged as an explanation of volunteer tourism is ‘engagement in volunteer work as a tourist’. As the phrase indicates it consists of three main elements: ‘engagement’, ‘tourist’ and ‘volunteer work’. The accumulated findings are shown diagrammatically in Figures 2-4. In these figures, the reader will see the three elements and their constituent concepts/themes. It was through the process of coding, conceptualising and categorising that the data led to the emergent theoretical explanation. ‘Engagement’ emerged as the core category which subsumed the other two categories of ‘volunteer work’ and ‘tourist’ and, combined, differentiated volunteer tourism from other forms of tourism and its allied notions. What follows is a detailed explanation of the engagement core category and the subsumed categories of volunteer work and tourist. Thereafter, Glaser’s (1998) criteria will be applied to the phrase to determine whether the term, ‘engagement in volunteer work as a tourist’ is trustworthy to be used as a definition for volunteer tourism.
Figure 2. The concepts relating to the category of engagement.

Figure 3. The concepts relating to the category of volunteer work.
Figure 4. The concepts relating to the category of tourist.
5.2. The concept of engagement

Engagement emerged as the essential, key component of volunteer tourism. It encompassed the concepts of: participation, action, integration, penetration, interaction, involvement and immersion, defined in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core category: engagement</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Sharing in an activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Doing something.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Mixing with other people or ethnic groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetration</td>
<td>To see clearly and deeply.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>To have an effect on each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>To become connected or associated with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>To engross yourself and get absorbed in.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A volunteer tourist responded: “You go and help wherever you may be needed with various … things, for example, I helped out with some teaching and then in surrounding villages I put up fences” (Karen, United Kingdom). What this respondent did while volunteering was that she ‘acted’ and ‘interacted’; ‘helped’, engaged in ‘teaching’ and ‘put up fences’. For her, volunteer tourism was a participatory travel experience (Billington et al., 2008; Coghlan, 2006a; McGehee, 2005) which went beyond Urry’s (2002) reference to tourists consuming spaces through the acts of looking and walking but never engaging, to being active participants wanting to, as another respondent relayed, “give time to others to improve their lives” (Pat, South Africa). Engagement in voluntary work as a tourist is a new emerging type of tourism, a niche tourism, which contrasts with the concept of ‘the gaze’, characteristic of the more traditional and homogenous mass tourism (Philbrook, 2007). The ‘need’ of the volunteer tourist to be involved, to engage, characterizes the modern tourist’s desire to experience a place and its culture rather than merely stand back and gaze: “It is about helping others whilst you enjoy the culture and climate of another country usually hotter than the UK but more disadvantaged” (Skinzzzy, United Kingdom); “a big piece of it is cultural
immersion” (Kimberley, Australia). It is this concept of cultural immersion which prompted some authors to draw parallels between volunteer tourism and cultural tourism (see, for example, Brown, 2005). To one volunteer tourist, “It [volunteer tourism] was about being able to physically and emotionally immerse oneself in the local culture and community” (Tammy, Canada); a kind of ‘integration’ and ‘penetration’ where the tourist seeks a natural and authentic experience (see MacCannell, 1989; Cohen, 1988; Wickens, 2011) rather than a contrived experience reported of tourism by Boorstin (1961). However, as Kontogeorgopoulos (2003) points out in his study of tourists in Thailand, authenticity means different things to different people; nevertheless, it is an individual’s desire for cultural authenticity that differentiates volunteer tourism from traditional mass tourism and confers on it the term ‘alternative form of tourism’ (see Wearing, 2001).

Engagement is a more comprehensive term than that of ‘interaction’ proposed by Wearing (2001). Many tourism activities involve interaction with the ‘other’ (Wearing, 2001) which may result in some impacts on the few individuals concerned, but it does not necessarily result in ‘connecting’ with one another. Engagement, on the other hand, usually involving a larger number of people, is about connecting with the ‘other’ in some kind of meaningful action. It is associated with Csikszentmihalyi’s (1975) ‘flow experience’ which has been used more recently by Ryan (1996) to describe the role of guides in white-water rafting. Flow experience, Csikszentmihalyi posits, is ‘complete involvement of the actor with his activity’ (p. 36).

Geoff Brown, a Community Partnership Coordinator at Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, uses the term ‘connection’ rather than ‘interaction’ in describing what volunteer tourists do: “perhaps I should set up some activities here in Florida to recruit the breed of folks [travellers] who want a ‘connection’. They may be interested to find projects like these [litter pick up/ invasive non-native pest-plant removal] during a visit or vacation to help them feel connected to the destination in a way that a ‘tourist’ would not”. The engagement themes of connection, commitment and immersion recurred in many respondents’ perception and description of volunteer tourism: “I will be assisting workers in the children’s home and tending to the children’s needs, I will be helping the project reach its
objectives" (Audrey, Ireland); “It is a type of tourism which involves engaging in activities to further a charitable cause” (Ali, United Kingdom).

These concepts, found within the core category of engagement, thus build on Alexander and Bakir’s (2011) empirically tested components of ‘Relate-Dedicate-Donate’ describing engagement in volunteer tourism:

‘Relate’ describes volunteer tourists interacting and getting involved (integrating) with other volunteers and the communities. Volunteer tourists ‘donate’ to an outside customer, the community where the project is located, by doing something (action) and getting absorbed in the tasks at hand (immersion), and volunteer tourists ‘dedicate’ themselves by participating in purposeful work.

5.3. The concept of volunteer work
A summarised account of the concept ‘volunteer work’, another category of volunteer tourism will be presented here. The components of this emerging category included the concepts of: choice, range of work, payment (to a provider), period of time and specific purpose, each is described in Table 9.

The concept of ‘choice’ was significant in its frequent appearance in respondents’ narratives. One volunteer tourist who sent notes about her ‘do-it-yourself’ volunteer trips stated:

Table 9. The category of volunteer work with its concepts and properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: volunteer work</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Volunteer tourists can choose a project, volunteer tourism provider (for profit and non-profit) and/or destination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>There are a range of projects available from humanitarian projects (trying to improve the conditions of life for people through health, education, repair, renovation, construction, sustainability) to conservation projects (the protection of animals, plants, land and buildings) and disaster mitigation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>There is some form of payment involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>The volunteer work is done for a set period of time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>The volunteer work serves a purpose for the project, provider and volunteer tourist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, there is more choice in volunteer tourism than there is in traditional volunteering. Volunteer tourists can choose where they want to go and how long they stay (O’Connor, 2008). Volunteer tourism can be tailored to the individual's interests and knowledge base (Selva, 2008). Volunteer tourists can head to far-flung parts of the world to build walls, dig fields and care for animals in wildlife sanctuaries, working by day and partying by night (Maxwell, 2006). ‘So numerous are the volunteer options’, said Michelle Peluso (2007), chief executive of Travelocity, ‘that many people are confused by the choice’. Although the concept of choice is central to the definition of traditional volunteering, it is more limited than for volunteer tourism where tourists can choose a destination, project, time period, and tourism activities. The Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO, 2007; 2008) indicated that volunteer tourists are increasingly approaching them and other similar organisations ‘as if it was a holiday’ and choosing safe destinations.

This choice is made possible because of the ‘range of projects’ available. In traditional volunteering, although there is a wide range of fields such as health and social care, sport and employer supported volunteering, projects are limited by their aim to benefit the environment or someone (individuals or groups) other than, or in addition to, close relatives (Volunteering England, 2008). However in volunteer tourism, especially where the provider is a commercial travel company
rather than a non-profit organisation or charity, the projects are travel products (Miller, 2007) and clients ‘pay’ for the services and in return are given access to an infrastructure and a placement to suit the traveller, taking into consideration ‘time’ restrictions and ‘specific purpose’ or requirements. The purpose of projects may therefore extend to satisfying the paying tourist and therefore volunteer tourism aims to benefit multiple parties (Clemmons, 2008b).

5.4. The concept of tourist

The concept of ‘tourist’, a category of volunteer tourism, was found to encompass the many diverse components of: expectations, assumptions, issues, motives and awareness of impacts; reflecting the very broad nature of volunteer tourism, as shown in Tables 10-13. Responding volunteer tourists expected to pay the provider; take a trip for a limited period of time; experience something unique and special; as well as do some tourism activities, in addition to the volunteer work (see Table 10).

“I think trips are usually between two and six weeks long. The volunteer tourists pay a lump sum which covers their travel expenses, food, accommodation, etc.” (Laura, South Africa); “You do some charitable work, for free, whilst on a holiday, either that you have paid for, or some charity group has financed, in return for your manual input of time” (Theresa, South Africa); another said: “I believe that the most exciting part of travel is exploring and discovering on your own and having a unique experience” (Whizzyboots, UK). Furthermore, volunteer tourists expected to be in the hands of responsible providers, “to be safe and to know the risks, including political and environmental hazards” (Spikiespike, United Kingdom), and to carry out meaningful volunteer work, “helping contribute to changing someone else’s life” (Tammy, Canada). Thoits (2008) comments: ‘people want purpose and meaning in their lives. One of the ways to find them is to give assistance to the community and feel that they’re doing something that matters’, demonstrated by one volunteer who said, “I want to use my last bit of free time doing something I’ve never done before and hopefully helping others” (Paperdragon, UK); yet, volunteer tourists also want to have some fun and do tourism activities on their volunteer vacation: “I want to see everything in Cape Town, do some extreme things like bungee jumping, sand boarding, paragliding, safari” (Toeman, Netherlands). With most projects, there is free time to relax, reflect, and explore the community and
destination. Volunteer tourism allows the volunteer tourist to combine good deeds with the best aspects of travel: recreational activities, cultural events, culinary adventures and even shopping and excursions (Globe Aware, 2007a).

Volunteer tourists have certain assumptions and issues about volunteer tourism as shown in Table 11. They assume that volunteer tourism is available to everyone because web-sites such as Globe Aware (2007b) state that ‘programmes are equally appropriate for the solo traveller to multigenerational family travel, corporate groups and more’; that the volunteer work itself is unpaid: one tourist summed this up by saying: “It is working in disadvantaged communities in order to improve their lot, and broaden one’s own outlook and understanding at the same time. Not earning a salary, possibly receiving accommodation/food/travel, in exchange for the donation of one’s time and experience” (Libra, South Africa); that it involves travel to a less developed country, “It is when people go do things like build houses for poor people in developing countries instead of lying on the beach all day at some resort” (Heather, South Africa); that the experience will have an impact on self, the volunteer tourist. A respondent stated: “It is about helping others and growing from the experience” (Duncan, South Africa).
Table 10. The category of tourist with its concept of ‘expectations’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Sub-concepts and properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Payment – volunteer tourists expect to pay the provider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time – volunteer tourists expect the trip to be for a limited period of time.

Experience – volunteer tourists expect the trip to be unique and special, a journey of discovery.

Additional activities – volunteer tourists expect to do fun activities additional to volunteer work such as excursions.

Responsible Providers – volunteer tourists expect the providers to be responsible by:
- shepherding
  - providing support
  - co-ordinating
  - providing management
  - providing security
- being ethical
- developing programmes of merit
  - satisfying project needs
- making payments to the project
- ensuring a sustainable development
  - creating a partnership
  - being committed
  - providing support.

Meaningful volunteer work – volunteer tourists expect the providers to create meaningful work which:
- uses their skills
- is of benefit
- provides contact with the locals
- provides an authentic experience
- provides recognition
- provides support
- provides respect.
Table 11. The category of tourist with its concepts of ‘assumptions’ and ‘issues’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: tourist Concepts</th>
<th>Sub-concepts and properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Available to all – volunteer tourists believe that anyone can participate including the young (16+), gap yearlings, students, post grads, retirees, professionals, families, corporate groups, middle aged people, mature people, regular volunteers, occasional volunteers, solo travellers, couples, groups. Volunteer work is unpaid charity. Movement of volunteers from rich west to poorer developing countries. There will be an impact on self – a long lasting change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues</strong></td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>little accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no official monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>different points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prioritisation of the whims of tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>industry is very fragmented with little collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the volunteer tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>choosing a trip is confusing - there is a myriad of pricing structures such as discounted projects, free projects but flights excluded, low cost etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lack of clarity over charitable contribution to the project and how it is distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unsure how to find a reputable project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unsure how to get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bureaucracy - such as reference checks and CRB checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experience not always reflective of website advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>variety of work - there can be too little or too much variety of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>menial tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenge of work - there may not be too much or too little of a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>free time – volunteer tourists are unsure of how much free time they will have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resentment between volunteers &amp; ‘western’ contractors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Volunteer tourists were also concerned with certain issues such as the confusion around finding a reputable project and what work will be required: “Weeding through the myriad of volunteer options can be daunting, it was for me” (Anna, Sweden). One volunteer tourist said of not knowing where to start or how to get involved:

I have thought about travelling for most of my life. When I happened to cross a volunteer tourism site as I was looking up regular travel options, I was floored! I never really knew there was anything like this out there. The problem I have is I don’t know how to go about getting involved. I’m not sure if I need degrees, or certain credentials. I do know that I want to travel. I also know that I want to have an in depth experience one could only get by actually working with the locals, or helping out environmentally (Anonymous, USA).

Volunteer tourists had numerous motives for participating in volunteer tourism as shown in Table 12. These range from ‘spreading personal beliefs’, ‘doing something different’, ‘networking’, ‘visiting a warmer climate’, ‘experiencing another culture’, to altruism and ‘the desire to give back’ and ‘help others’. One volunteer tourist who travelled to South Africa said, “God called me to do it” (Mark, Ireland) and another person said, “It is the desire to do something good while at the same time experiencing new places and challenges in locales one might otherwise not visit” (Ali, United Kingdom). Volunteer tourists rarely cited a single motivator for participating in volunteer tourism.

The experience brought about by ‘engagement’ left noticeable impacts on the volunteer tourists: “It hopefully benefits those receiving help and, for the person taking part, I would say it is a wonderful and rewarding experience” (Em, United Kingdom); “It is a unique travel experience that promotes self-growth while giving something back to wildlife, conservation and community projects in need” (Ed, South Africa); “it is more about changing the person that is going on the trip than it is about actually helping the world” (Starlagurl, Canada). The impact on self is supported by research into traditional volunteer work and well-being, showing that people who volunteered had greater well-being overall (Thoits and Hewitt, 2001). Research into volunteer tourism also shows that volunteer tourism profoundly
affects even the most day-to-day elements of the lives of its participants (McGehee, 2005). One respondent concurred:

Since my involvement in volunteer tourism and my international travel, I’m profoundly affected by the want and misuse of space that I see. It would be really easy just to focus on how bad everything is but I try not to do that. When I came back from Beijing, I sold my house and bought a much smaller house, and the kitchen is quite small, we call it our European kitchen. You definitely have to do the butt dance in the kitchen. And I think I am much more aware of the impact that we have with overspending and the overheating and over-everything. I recycle and reuse and think about things before I buy them....I could go on and on....(Maude, United States)

There was evidence that volunteer tourism positively impacts the projects and communities too as shown in Table 13. “Some [volunteer tourists] come away as passionate advocates and long-term donors of the communities they have interacted with, also with heightened awareness of how our actions have consequences on people even thousands of miles away” (Chris, United Kingdom):

While at times during my brief three-day sojourn at Mirror I felt inadequate, useless and under-prepared, there was one moment when my skills came to the fore, and finally I understood the value of my contribution. A group of about 20 volunteers, including myself and Paul, some Japanese students and a bunch of local Akha scholarship kids, headed into the Chiang Rai night market to hand out leaflets to western tourists, pointing out the dangers associated with giving money to child beggars (Julie, Australia).
### Table 12. The category of tourist with its concept of ‘motivations’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: tourist</th>
<th>Sub-concepts and properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>✤ to do something different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to do something special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to become actively involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to see another part of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to see another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ cultural immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ cultural exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ a challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ the thing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to visit a warmer climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to develop one’s career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to meet new people and develop friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to go on a family holiday and instil values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ to spread personal beliefs – primarily religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✤ altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ wanting to serve others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to improve other people’s lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to give back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to give time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to allow others to benefit from one’s skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ to positively impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13. The category of tourist with its concept of ‘impacts’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category: tourist</th>
<th>Sub-concepts and properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On project/community</td>
<td>economic benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultivate peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change image of foreigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict between communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resentment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repeated disruptions in attachment (between volunteers and children) on projects involving children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>local corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uneven development due to popularity of some projects more than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On volunteer tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• give donations to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• make the personal political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• visit ‘been-to’ cliques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• network ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• new friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• continued involvement in volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• bear witness and become advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• reverse culture shock - difficulty finding/resuming work or study, getting used to the pace of life, social difficulty, loneliness, depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• participation in social movements at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes, confidence and capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• self efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increased confidence and esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sense of accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater emotional and intellectual maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• self-actualisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• wider global perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• transformed attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater appreciation for the consequences of human action on the environment and communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• find own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• rethink life philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sense of control over life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inner peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• different levels of stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• feel good for doing more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• energised to do more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• disillusionment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• more motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater satisfaction with life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• greater well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• improvement in health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• detrimental to health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On country of residence</td>
<td>Resources diverted elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, there are instances of exploitation if projects are not carefully planned and managed (Archer and Cooper, 1994; Theobald, 1994):

It was disheartening to have travelled 5,000 miles away only to find that all I’m really here for now is money and assets. Everything we give to the children is snatched and more demanded. Should a child receive a new pencil, their friend will want one. There is aggression and so many kids will fight, lie and haggle to get what they want, be it fruit, chocolate or stationery (Tom, United Kingdom);

“I visited one school in Malawi where the head teacher said she took Western volunteers because they were cheaper than paying local staff” (Kate, United Kingdom).

Furthermore, Richter and Norman (2010) initiated a recent debate on children-based projects suggesting that caring for Aids orphans could be doing more harm than good because of the evidence collected from children in temporary or unstable foster care. These studies indicate that repeated disruptions in attachment are extremely disturbing for children, especially very young children (p. 217). However, although Richter and Norman have identified serious issues relating to interaction with children, Christopher Hill, Founder of Hands Up Holidays, responds: “Any interaction with the vulnerable, including children, disabled people and the elderly, needs to be tightly and carefully managed. We support a Voluntourism Code of Conduct to regulate the industry and help ensure that only ethical organisations that have the local people’s interests at heart will survive - and prosper. As with many things, there are risks involved and yet these should not mean that voluntourism needs to stop, if managed properly, it can be powerfully enriching for both the participants and the host communities” (Christopher Hill, UK).

So although volunteer tourism raises some contentious issues, it can offer an alternative to mainstream tourism in that it has the potential to help children, communities and the environment in a less commoditised form than mainstream tourism; with less emphasis on the bottom line and profit and greater emphasis on social objectives and human rights such as the right to work or to have a decent
standard of living over that of economic value (Wearing, 2001). As a result, the growth of volunteer tourism is seen as an opportunity to provide a new source of labour, ideas and funding to important projects, as well as a chance to develop a greater understanding of cultures and environments among participants (Ministry of Tourism, New Zealand, 2007) and hence its potential use for sustainable tourism development (PATA, 2006). Volunteer tourism, therefore, has the means to bring long-term benefits to residents and tourists alike, a symbiotic relationship which places a great deal of responsibility with providers (Clemmons, 2008a).

5.5. Trustworthiness of the findings and the limitations of this study

One objective of this study was to understand volunteer tourism using Glaser's grounded theory. The theoretical explanation that emerged from the data holds up to Glaser's (1998) criteria for judging the adequacy of the emerging explanation: fitness to the situation, workability and modifiability. The explanation and the concepts that gave rise to it were grounded in the experiences of volunteer tourists, volunteer tourism providers and other stakeholders, the perceptions of tourists, and research into the different aspects of volunteer tourism such as motives, experiences and impacts; it thus ‘fits’ the situation. It also ‘works’ because it helps people make sense of their experience and to manage the situation better. For example, one volunteer tourism provider reviewed its web-based project sheets to include the volunteer tourist’s financial contribution to the project. However, researchers will readily agree that their own theoretical formulation represents their own interpretations of the data, which could be interpreted differently by others.

5.6. Conclusion of this chapter

What has so far emerged to describe volunteer tourism is the key category of ‘engagement’, necessarily associated with two other emerging categories of ‘volunteer work’ and ‘tourist’.

These categories together provided the encompassing explanation of volunteer tourism as ‘engagement in volunteer work as a tourist’, pointing to a purposeful connection to particular peoples and places. The researcher played a major role in
arriving at this explanation as the concepts were her own and emerged as a result of her systematic searching for themes within primary and secondary data. She feels this subjectivity limitation was addressed by the extensive data collected and the visibility and audit ability of the detailed process in arriving at the emerged theoretical explanation. Many quotations were used in the chapter, giving readers the opportunity to interpret the data themselves, following the trail and hopefully arriving at a similar explanation and by doing so confirming the trustworthiness of the findings.

Glaser’s grounded theory offers a new explanation for volunteer tourism and, at the same time, allows its deconstruction into constituent elements, providing a greater understanding of volunteer tourism and offering a contribution to knowledge. Additionally, the deconstruction of the core category of engagement builds on Alexander and Bakir’s (2011) components of ‘Relate-Dedicate-Donate’ used to describe engagement in volunteer tourism. The following chapter examines the results of stage two, the personality inventory.
Chapter six describes the context of the volunteer tourism experience for those Aviva volunteers participating in wildlife and conservation projects as well as community projects in South Africa. Thereafter, it describes the participants and later determines the changes in those participants as a result of their volunteering experience; it additionally examines the influence of age, gender, project type, length of stay, and time elapsed post-trip on the experience.

6.1. The context

The sample used for the research involved three elements: the volunteer tourism provider, the volunteers and the control group. What follows is a description of each, providing the setting for this research, within the South African context discussed in chapter two.

6.1.1. The volunteer tourism provider and the projects

The volunteer tourism provider, Aviva, is a commercial business based in Cape Town, South Africa. It was established in 2002 and employs ten full-time staff. Aviva provides international volunteers access to 14 projects ranging from wildlife and conservation projects to children and community type projects, summarised in Tables 14 and 15 respectively. Aviva provides off-site accommodation for volunteers and transports them to and from their place of work. Aviva additionally offers volunteers optional tourist activities to occupy their spare time such as vineyard tours, tours of the Cape peninsula, cultural tours, scuba diving and many more. According to Callanan and Thomas (2005) framework of providers, they are ‘intermediate’ suppliers because they focus on promoting the project as well as travel opportunities for the volunteers. They promote both the financial success of the project along with the project’s contribution to the community.
Table 14. The wildlife and conservation projects offered by Aviva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of project</th>
<th>Tasks carried out by volunteers</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balule Conservation</td>
<td>Data capture on the regular morning and evening drives, and vegetation data capture on foot.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Wildlife</td>
<td>Track and locate endangered species using radio telemetry tracking equipment, radio collaring, relocation and re-introduction of game, update animal identikits, carry out game counts, assist with alien plant control and bird ringing.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkwenkwezi Conservation</td>
<td>Involved in the reserve's lion cub rearing program; they also carry out other tasks including species identification and interpretation, preparing a catalogue of the birds, fence patrols for snares and other threats to wildlife, game counts, mammal research and monitoring, and alien vegetation control.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penguin Conservation</td>
<td>Boat release programmes at Robben Island as well as participate in feeding and tube feeding birds.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamboti Conservation</td>
<td>Hands-on biodiversity and practical conservation work in the African bush.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vervet Monkey Sanctuary</td>
<td>Rehabilitating vervet monkeys, hand-rearing orphans (in baby season), building new enclosures, collecting, chopping and delivering food for monkeys, monitoring and report writing of monkeys around the sanctuary, cleaning monkey cages, washing feed bowls and plates and cleaning blankets, assisting with introductions and rehabilitation of new monkeys, assisting with basic medical practices and administering medications.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale &amp; Dolphin Research</td>
<td>A wide range of tasks depending on what is required at the time.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Coast Horses</td>
<td>Work alongside a team; volunteers are actively involved in the rehabilitation of abused horses. The centre runs on a well structured routine involving preparing feed, grooming, examining horses, helping with exercising and schooling of the horses, cleaning and replenishing water troughs and mucking out.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. The children and community projects offered by Aviva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of project</th>
<th>Tasks carried out by volunteers</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African School Feeding Scheme</td>
<td>Prepare a daily nutritious meal for approximately 100 children.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baphumelele Children's Home</td>
<td>Play an active role in the development of young children, assist with looking after the younger children (0-5 yrs), particularly with child development, laundry, washing, feeding, food collection and a variety of other support tasks.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of Hope interim place of safety for babies and young children abandoned, abused, neglected, raped or infected with HIV</td>
<td>Involved with the daily care giving to the children, helping with preparing breakfasts, lunch, snacks, dinners and formula feeds, cleaning and sterilising the bottles used during the day, feeding babies and toddlers, giving medication, recording and evaluating babies and toddlers according to their milestones, changing nappies, bathing and stimulating babies and toddlers according to a set programme.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masigcine Children's Home (place of safety for abandoned and orphaned children)</td>
<td>Take part in various activities assisting the caregivers with their daily tasks.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Coast Schools</td>
<td>Play a vital role in the introduction of computer literacy skills and a sports program to a number of rural schools.</td>
<td>Aviva House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeekoevlei outdoor based education programme</td>
<td>Assist as guides and educators in charge of small groups of youth for a 3 day/2 night periods.</td>
<td>On-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.2. The participants

The volunteers

The 60 volunteer tourists consisted of 10 men and 50 women. There were 44 of 16-29 years of age and 16 of 30+ years; the percentages are represented in Figures 5 and 6 respectively.

![Figure 5. The number of participants by gender.](image1)

![Figure 6. The number of participants by age group.](image2)

The participants spent an average of £4163 on their trip, including air fares, and stayed a mean average of ten weeks in South Africa, median 6.5 weeks. The most popular lengths of stays were four, six weeks and 12 weeks. Thus most visitors volunteered for longer than one month. This is in line with academic research and industry figures (tabulated on page 135). The visitors volunteered for 59% of their
holiday time; whilst weekends were spent relaxing and engaging in tourism activities such as shark-diving, clubbing, sightseeing and shopping. The majority of volunteers (62%) participated in children and community projects, a further 35% in wildlife and conservation projects, with the balance (3%) participating in both.

When volunteers were asked “why are you participating in this type of holiday?” the responses ranged from the desire to ‘help others’ (altruism) to wanting to ‘get away and travel’ (self enhancement). A summary of the key themes of motivation are listed in Table 16.

Table 16. A summary of the motives of the volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Key themes of motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do something I have never done before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do something different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do something rewarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do something challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Always wanted to do volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Want to give something back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>To learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To serve a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Get experience/career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Be independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Enjoy volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>To achieve something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>To make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Interest in SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>To see new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>To get something out of my travels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Cultural Immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>To get away/travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>To help me appreciate what I have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Love animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Love kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Want a non-commercial holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>To do something useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Roots in SA, family etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Safest place in Africa to volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reviews from past volunteers visiting to SA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These motivation themes are not unique to this research, they are consistent with those identified by Brown (2005), Coghlan (2006a; 2006b), Gecko et al. (2009), Lepp (2009), McGehee et al. (2009), Benson and Seibert (2009), Sin (2009), Wearing (2001) and Wickens (2011), as shown earlier in Table 6. Similarly to Brown (2005), different types of volunteer tourists emerged: the ‘volunteer-minded’
and the ‘vacation-minded’ tourist. Evidence of this is reflected in the statements of volunteers, one saw volunteer tourism as “the opportunity to travel...this is the most cost effective way to travel far and do a lot in a short time period, I will get to do more than most tourists who come to the foreign country” (Kbscharf, United States) whilst another saw it as “an opportunity to do something worthwhile........ knowing that I’m going to be helping the local wildlife, and make a difference, however small that difference may be” (Willbuttery, UK).

With regard to the occupation of the participants, the largest group were students followed by professionals, managers, administrative and secretarial roles, caring/leisure, unskilled, gap year and others illustrated in Figure 7, by percentage. The occupational groups were derived from those used by the Department of Trade and Industry, in the United Kingdom.

![Figure 7. The number of participants by occupation.](image-url)
Participants were visiting South Africa from all over the world as shown in Figure 8. The greatest percentages were from the United Kingdom, followed by USA, Europe, Australia and New Zealand, Canada and South Africa.

Importantly, to enhance the external validity of the results from this study, the sample was compared to the population from which it was drawn (see chapter one). Both the population and sample showed similar characteristics. Furthermore, the characteristics of the Aviva volunteers, particularly on age, gender and occupation, are similar to those found in other volunteer tourism research as well as industry figures (refer to Bailey and Russell, 2010; Gecko et al., 2009; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Lough et al., 2009a; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001; Zahra, 2006, 2011); these studies are summarised in Table 17.
## Table 17. The characteristics of samples of other volunteer tourism research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study and title</th>
<th>Sample size versus population, sample type and data type</th>
<th>Characteristics of the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey and Russell, 2010</td>
<td>192 versus 288 per spring break.</td>
<td>Gender: 66.6% F, 33.3% M. Age: young adults (18-26 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey and Russell, 2010</td>
<td>192 versus 288 per spring break.</td>
<td>Gender: 66.6% F, 33.3% M. Age: young adults (18-26 years).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living the Thai Life – A Case Study of Volunteer Tourism at the Gibbon Rehabilitation Project, Thailand</td>
<td>Type of sample: opportunity. Type of data: qualitative. Data collected on-site.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: three weeks to 26 weeks. % of time on the project: 86%. Project type: Wildlife, Thailand Occupation: Not specified. Country of origin: USA, UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gecko et al., 2009</td>
<td>2481 versus unknown number across Europe, N. America, and Asia.</td>
<td>Gender: 66% F, 34% M. Age: 70% (≤ 34 years), 30% (&gt;34 years). Average length of stay: 51% &gt;one month, 49% ≤ one month. % of time on the project: not specified. Project type: 79% community work, 21% conservation. Preference for S. America (45%) and Asia/Pacific (18%), South Africa (8%). Occupation: not specified. Country of origin: United Kingdom &amp; Europe (51%), America (28%), Asia/Pacific (13%), Africa (2%), Middle East (1%), and no answer (5%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepp, 2008</td>
<td>Seven (3 conservation, 4 community) versus seven available during the researcher's 2.5 weeks (programme facilitates</td>
<td>Gender: 71% F, 29% M. Age: specified only as young adults. Average length of stay: one to four months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Type of Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taita Discovery Centre Tourism Programme, Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGehee and Santos, 2005</td>
<td>16 versus 3 organisations: AJWS, WorldPULSE, MIUSA.</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh and Zahra, 2007</td>
<td>12 versus 15 volunteers, from one two-week project organised by an Australian NGO.</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin, 2009</td>
<td>11 versus 12 from one exploration trip to South Africa.</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Unexpected Road to Spirituality via Volunteer Tourism (2006)

- **Type of sample:** opportunity.
- **Type of data:** qualitative.
- **Data collected:** 4-18 yrs post-trip.

### Volunteer tourism as a life-changing experience (2011)

- **Type of sample:** opportunity.
- **Type of data:** qualitative.
- **Data collected:** 4-18 yrs post-trip.

### Volunteer Tourism: Evidence of Cathartic Tourist Experiences (2007)

- **Type of sample:** opportunity.
- **Type of data:** qualitative.
- **Data collected:** 4-14 yrs post-trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Average Spends</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay</th>
<th>% of Time</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zahra, 2006, 2011</td>
<td>6-10 versus unspecified total group size for project/s.</td>
<td>Gender: not specified.</td>
<td>Age: 16 to 26 years when they participated.</td>
<td>Average spends: not specified.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: three to four weeks.</td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified, only mentions downtime for beach trips and festival.</td>
<td>Project type: community project in Asia and Pacific.</td>
<td>Occupation: not specified, only that they come from affluent, urbanised, developed and secular societies.</td>
<td>Australia and New Zealand.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zahra and McIntosh, 2007</td>
<td>5 versus unspecified total group size for project.</td>
<td>Gender: 100% F.</td>
<td>Age: 17-26 years when they participated.</td>
<td>Average spends: not specified.</td>
<td>Average length of stay: two to four weeks.</td>
<td>% of time on the project: not specified.</td>
<td>Project type: community project in Asia and Pacific.</td>
<td>Occupation: not specified.</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand and Canada.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The control group**

The smaller control group comprised a further 35 people who roughly matched the volunteers on age, gender and socio-economic variables such as education and occupation.

Importantly, the control group matched the volunteers on the majority of trait scores at the start. Table 18 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U-tests carried out on both groups, the results revealed no significant differences in 14 of 15 traits. However, there was a significant difference in one trait - ‘vulnerability’. The control group had a lower median score on this trait than the volunteer group (8 versus 10.5), see Figure 9.

According to the trait definitions described earlier in chapter four, the control group were more poised, confident and clear-thinking when stressed than the volunteer group. This difference may explain why the volunteers chose to participate in volunteer tourism in the first place. A psychological theory – optimal arousal – suggests that the volunteer tourism could be perceived to provide the types of activities that would satisfy their needs (Iso-Ahola, 1982). In other words, increase their confidence levels and ability to deal with stressful situations. The implication...
of this trait difference is such that any changes in the volunteers, identified post-trip could be attributed to the differences in this trait at the start.

Table 18. Mann-Whitney U-test results for pre-test scores of volunteers & control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>P (two-tailed)</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1217.0</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1104.0</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>1199.5</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>1290.5</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>1290.0</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>1257.0</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>1266.0</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>1271.5</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1.709</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>1086.5</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>1301.5</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>1107.5</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>1131.0</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>1317.5</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>Marginally - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>1101.5</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>1059.0</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n₁ = 60 and n₂ = 35

Figure 9. The pre-scores of the volunteers and control group.
6.2. The IPIP-NEO 60-item version personality inventory

As the 60-item version of the IPIP-NEO personality inventory was used to collect data from the participants, an important consideration was to verify its reliability, by trait. The reliability figures of the standardised 120-item version, highlighted in the methodology chapter, were directly applied to the shorter version because it retained the same questions per trait. The only difference between the two versions was that the 120-item version measures 30 traits whereas the 60-item version measures 15. The reliability of the IPIP-NEO 60-item version was confirmed using the test-retest method (Albery et al., 2003). In order to do this, the matched control group (of 35) were used to test for similar scores over two points in time, within the recommended time periods discussed in chapter four of between three months and six years apart. Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests were carried out on the data.

The results of the tests, Table 19, show for all but one trait, ‘assertiveness’, there were no significant differences over a six month period between the controls first and second test median scores, illustrated in Figure 10. With regard to the assertiveness trait, it is important to note that any changes in the volunteers post-trip may not be sufficiently reliable to draw definitive conclusions (discussed in chapter eight). However, the researcher carried out the test-retest over a shorter period of time than for the IPIP-NEO 120 version (six months versus one year) and on a much smaller group of people (35 versus 21,588), which may account for the differences in the first versus second test scores for the control group. Nevertheless, for all the other traits, the results of the test-retest provided confidence in the IPIP-NEO 60-item version personality inventory, to use it as a tool to measure some of the effects of a volunteer tourism experience.
Table 19. Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test results for control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>170.0</td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>236.5</td>
<td>259.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>282.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>268.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>168.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>182.5</td>
<td>282.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td>176.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>217.0</td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. The pre- and post-scores of the control group.
6.3. Changes in personality traits

6.3.1. Statistical results

The IPIP-NEO 60-item version was then used to collect data from 60 volunteer tourists completed prior to the trip and again after the volunteer vacation.

Subsequent personality changes, determined by measuring fifteen core traits, were compared with a matched (control) group of 35. The process of drawing conclusions from the study involved a number of comparisons between the first and second test scores for each group (intra-group) as well as between the volunteer group and control (inter-group).

Table 20 shows the results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests carried out on the volunteers’ pre- and post-trip test scores. The results show significant differences between the volunteers’ first and second scores on nine personality traits out of 15, illustrated in Figure 11: anxiety (decreased), trust (increased), artistic interests (increased), depression (decreased), assertiveness (increased), emotionality (increased), activity levels (increased), adventurousness (increased) and vulnerability (decreased).

Table 20. The impact of volunteer tourism on 15 personality traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>1309.5</td>
<td>343.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>404.5</td>
<td>973.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>387.5</td>
<td>693.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>652.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>897.0</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>360.0</td>
<td>915.0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>333.5</td>
<td>701.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>569.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>480.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>923.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>392.0</td>
<td>986.0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>481.0</td>
<td>695.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>1137.0</td>
<td>403.0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>538.5</td>
<td>589.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>620.0</td>
<td>605.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11. The pre- and post-scores of the volunteers.

Table 19 showed just one of the personality traits, assertiveness, was significantly different (increased) amongst the control group over a similar period of six months. One would expect very little difference in the first and second test scores of the control group if nothing happened to them during that time. Interviews carried out with the control group offer some insight as to why this trait may have changed (chapter eight). The implications of this change amongst the control group were such that any changes, in this trait amongst the volunteers, may be attributed to day-to-day life rather than the volunteer experience.

Figure 12 displays the significant differences between the pre- and post-trip test scores of the volunteer group taking into account the above, the influence of day-to-day events (as with assertiveness); as well as the differences between the volunteers and control group measured at the start of this study (as with vulnerability). The remaining personality traits highly likely to be impacted by the volunteer tourism experience alone are: anxiety, trust, artistic interests, depression, emotionality, activity levels and adventurousness. Interviews carried out with the volunteers offer some insight as to why these seven traits may have changed (see chapter eight).
6.4. Age, gender, project type, length of stay and time elapsed post-trip

Statistical analyses were done on age differences and whether different age groups were affected differently by the trip; similarly for gender; project type - wildlife and conservation versus community projects; length of stay; and time elapsed post-trip.

6.4.1. The influence of age

The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests, carried out on the pre- and post-trip test scores, show that the different age groups are influenced differently by the volunteering experience as seen in Table 21 versus 22. The probability of the younger age group of 16-29 years being impacted is higher for all traits apart from ‘liberalism’ and ‘cautiousness’, illustrated in Figure 13; for which the 30+ group were more likely to be impacted, but not significantly.
Table 21. The differences between the pre- and post-test by trait – age 16-29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>754.5</td>
<td>148.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>580.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>348.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>364.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>534.5</td>
<td>131.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>216.5</td>
<td>603.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>306.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>372.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>177.0</td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>517.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>540.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>449.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>568.5</td>
<td>211.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>326.5</td>
<td>303.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>315.5</td>
<td>350.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. The differences between the pre- and post-test by trait – age 30+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>No - P&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.2. The influence of gender

The majority of volunteer tourists in this study were female (83% versus 17%); similar to many other volunteer tourism studies, as shown earlier in Table 17.

The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests, carried out on the pre- and post-trip test scores, show that the different gender groups are influenced differently by the volunteering experience, see Table 23 and 24. The probability of females being impacted is higher for anxiety (decreased), self-efficacy (increased), depression (decreased), assertiveness (increased), emotionality (increased), activity (increased), adventurousness (increased) and intellect (increased), illustrated in Figure 14; whereas the males were more likely to be impacted for trust (increased), artistic interest (increased), dutifulness (increased), vulnerability (decreased), liberalism (increased) and cautiousness (decreased).

These study results suggest that some personality traits are influenced differently depending on whether one is female or male. For this study’s female volunteers, there are high probabilities of changes (increases) in adventurousness (98.89%), assertiveness (98.83%) and activity (99.36%); change (decrease) in anxiety (99.91%). For the male volunteers, there are high probabilities of changes (increases) in trust (97.27%) and dutifulness (96.88%). Both groups were likely to
change (decreases) in depression and vulnerability; summarised later in Table 30. These results are discussed in the following chapter.

Table 23. The differences between the pre- and post-test by trait – females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>912.5</td>
<td>263.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>628.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>433.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>229.5</td>
<td>400.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>598.5</td>
<td>221.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>235.5</td>
<td>625.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>460.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td>391.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>293.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>670.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>713.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>368.5</td>
<td>577.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>745.5</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>432.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>368.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. The differences between the pre- and post-test by trait – males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.3. The influence of project type

The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests, carried out on the pre- and post-trip test scores, show that volunteers participating in the community or wildlife projects are influenced differently by the experience, as shown in Table 25 and 26. The probability of community volunteers being impacted is higher for anxiety (increased), self-efficacy (increased), depression (decreased), altruism (increased), dutifulness (increased), intellect (increased) and vulnerability (decreased), illustrated in Figure 15. With regard to the wildlife volunteers, they were more likely to be impacted for trust (increased), artistic interest (increased), assertiveness (increased), emotionality (increased), activity (increased) and liberalism (increased).

These results suggest that some personality traits are influenced differently, depending on whether one is a community volunteer or wildlife volunteer. For wildlife volunteers, there are high probabilities (96.97%, 98.90% and 96.58% respectively) of changes (increases) in trust, assertiveness and emotionality; for the community volunteers there is high probability (98.79%) of a change (decrease) in depression, summarised in Table 30. These results are discussed in the following chapter.
Table 25. The differences between the pre- and post-test scores - community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>478.5</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>335.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>275.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>244.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>173.5</td>
<td>322.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>311.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>197.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>207.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>338.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>362.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>166.5</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>419.5</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>198.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>185.5</td>
<td>249.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. The differences between the pre- and post-test scores – wildlife

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>135.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>129.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>133.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4.4. The influence of length of stay

The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests, carried out on the pre- and post-trip test scores, show that volunteers participating in volunteer tourism, for different lengths of time, are influenced differently by the experience, as shown in Tables 27, 28 and 29. The probability of volunteers staying 1 to 4 weeks being impacted is higher for trust (increased), self-efficacy (increased) and liberalism (increased), illustrated in Figure 16.

With regard to volunteers staying 5 to 12 weeks, they were more likely to be impacted for anxiety (decreased), artistic interest (increased), assertiveness (increased), emotionality (increased), altruism (increased), dutifulness (increased), activity (increased), adventurousness (increased), intellect (increased) and vulnerability (decreased).

With regard to volunteers staying 13 to 52 weeks, they were more likely than the other groups to be impacted for depression (decreased) and cautiousness (decreased).

These results suggest that some personality traits are influenced differently depending on how long people volunteer in South Africa. There are more potential benefits to those volunteers staying 5 to 12 weeks rather than shorter or longer...
periods of time; although, there is a high probability (97.66%) of a change (increase) in trust amongst those volunteers staying 1 to 4 weeks. With regard to the other traits, there are high probabilities (95.75%, 97.27%, 99.07% and 97.34% respectively) of changes (increases) in assertiveness, altruism, activity levels and adventurousness amongst volunteers staying 5 to 12 weeks; high probability (99.98%) of a change (decrease) in vulnerability amongst those same volunteers. For anxiety, both the 5 to 12 weeks and 13 to 52 week stays were highly likely to change (decrease); summarised in Table 30. These results are discussed in the following chapter.

The larger table, Table 30, summarises the areas analysed thus far, that is, the effect of volunteer tourism as well as the influence of age, gender, project type and length of stay on volunteer tourists engaging in volunteer work in South Africa; all of which are discussed in the following chapter.

Table 27. The differences between the pre- and post-test scores, 1 to 4 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28. The differences between the pre- and post-test scores, 5 to 12 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. The differences between the pre- and post-test scores, 13 to 52 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>Yes - P&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. The % of the time we would expect to obtain these results, stay length.
Table 3. Summary - the % of time we would expect to obtain these results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>All volunteers</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Age 16-29</th>
<th>Age 30+</th>
<th>Gender Female</th>
<th>Gender Male</th>
<th>Project Community</th>
<th>Project Wildlife</th>
<th>Stay (wks) 1 to 4</th>
<th>Stay (wks) 5 to 12</th>
<th>Stay (wks) 13 to 52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>99.99</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>99.91</td>
<td>94.53</td>
<td>99.24</td>
<td>98.83</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>99.88</td>
<td>96.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>99.03</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>99.18</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>93.79</td>
<td>97.27</td>
<td>81.57</td>
<td>96.96</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>80.13</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>75.61</td>
<td>77.83</td>
<td>69.92</td>
<td>78.22</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td>61.72</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>96.93</td>
<td>77.41</td>
<td>93.85</td>
<td>63.48</td>
<td>83.61</td>
<td>94.53</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>92.70</td>
<td>57.42</td>
<td>85.16</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>99.84</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>98.85</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>98.79</td>
<td>94.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>89.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>99.05</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>98.83</td>
<td>64.06</td>
<td>85.30</td>
<td>98.90</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>95.75</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>96.17</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>86.68</td>
<td>84.86</td>
<td>89.68</td>
<td>85.16</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>96.58</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>84.38</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>92.73</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>95.56</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>78.68</td>
<td>78.12</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>79.22</td>
<td>45.31</td>
<td>97.27</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>78.83</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>83.29</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>89.66</td>
<td>41.70</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>99.80</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>99.90</td>
<td>33.02</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>78.12</td>
<td>96.92</td>
<td>99.44</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>99.07</td>
<td>56.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>55.10</td>
<td>99.54</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>93.17</td>
<td>92.72</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>97.34</td>
<td>68.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>72.53</td>
<td>69.14</td>
<td>74.51</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>79.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>82.21</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td>92.15</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>99.79</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>98.70</td>
<td>92.61</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>99.61</td>
<td>98.67</td>
<td>97.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.98</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>53.03</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>57.98</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>50.49</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>82.74</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The areas highlighted are the areas where there is a significant probability of change.
6.4.5. The influence of time elapsed post-trip

Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests were also carried out on those participants that were contactable one to two years after their trip, and who were prepared to complete a third personality inventory; the results are shown in Table 31. The median post-trip and follow-up scores are illustrated in Figure 17. The response rates were very poor (27%) and, therefore, the results of these tests only provide an indication of what may happen over time.

These study’s results suggest that the changes identified post-trip still hold one to two years later. In other words, there were no significant differences between the post-trip scores and the follow-up scores on all 15 traits measured. These results are discussed in the following chapter.

Table 31. The differences between the post- and follow-up scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>W+</th>
<th>W-</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Samples significantly different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>No - P&gt;=0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5. Conclusion of this chapter

This chapter described the context of the volunteer tourism experience for those Aviva volunteers participating in different projects in South Africa. Additionally it described the participants and analysed the changes in those participants as a result of their volunteering experience. The personality inventory results demonstrated significant differences in volunteers’ pre- versus post-trip test scores for seven of the fifteen traits measured. These differences include: significant changes (increases) in trust, artistic interests, emotionality, activity and adventurousness; significant changes (decreases) in anxiety and depression. The results were different from the control group who were measured over a similar period of time.

Thereafter, the influence of age, gender, project type, length of stay and time elapsed post-trip were examined. For age, this volunteering experience is highly likely (greater than 95% probability) to change the 16-29 years in the seven traits identified earlier, but not the 30+ years. The results also suggest that some personality traits are influenced differently depending on whether one is female or male, a community volunteer or wildlife volunteer, and how long people volunteer in South Africa. It appears, from the results of this study, that those benefitting

Figure 17. The post- versus follow-up scores of volunteers one to two years later.
most from volunteer tourism tend to be female, aged between 16 and 29, engaged in wildlife projects of between 5 and 12 weeks in duration.

Lastly, the results show that for time elapsed post-trip, the changes identified post-trip were still evident one to two years later, as there were no significant differences between the post-trip scores and the follow-up scores on all 15 traits measured.

The following chapter discusses the results of this chapter as well as the likelihood of change in the participating volunteer tourists, highlights the study’s similarities to other studies, and offers explanations for findings which differ from these studies.
7. **CHAPTER SEVEN – discussion of the personality inventory results**

Chapter seven discusses the likelihood of change in the participating volunteer tourists, highlights the study’s similarities to other studies, and offers explanations for findings which differ from these studies. Some relevant theoretical concepts will be discussed to explain the personality results of the sample, these include: flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990); self-confidence (Maslow, 1993; Carver and Scheier, 2005); performance experience (Bandura, 1997); social integration (Chambre, 1987; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Wilson and Musick, 2000); motivated by egoism (Batson et al., 2005); cognitive stability (Eysenck, 1970); and others. Some implications of these changes will also be highlighted and the limitations of this part of the study.

### 7.1. **Discussion**

The primary aim of this study was to investigate whether international volunteer tourism changes participants undertaking community and wildlife projects, using the Aviva organisation in South Africa. This involved addressing a number of objectives which are summarised here:

1. To broaden our understanding of the impacts of volunteer tourism.
2. To understand the likelihood of change.
3. To eliminate some alternate explanations for the results, by using a matched control group.
4. To understand more about the influence of age, gender, project type and length of stay on the impacts of volunteer tourism.
5. To identify whether the post-trip changes still hold one to two years later.

In order to broaden our understanding of the impacts of volunteer tourism, sixty volunteer tourists completed the IPIP-NEO personality inventory pre- and post-trip. The participants were mainly female (83%), below the age of 30 (73%), the largest occupational group being students (32%), the majority originating from the United Kingdom (41%). As already mentioned in chapter six, the demographic profile, particularly the age, gender and occupational group of these volunteers, is similar
to the profile of other volunteer tourists. In this respect, other researchers can appraise the results and the extent to which they could be transferred to other settings. Also, their reasons for volunteering are consistent with those identified by Brown (2005), Coghlan (2006a; 2006b), Gecko et al. (2009), Lepp (2009), McGehee et al. (2009), Benson and Seibert (2009), Sin (2009) and Wearing (2001), as shown earlier in Table 6.

Addressing the first three objectives stated above, the results summarised in Table 30, column 1, show the likelihood of change, in percentage terms, amongst this study’s volunteers for the 15 traits measured (defined in Table 7); whilst Figure 11 displays the direction of the change. The highlighted areas in Table 30 identify those traits where change is highly likely and the probability is greater than or equal to 95%. This probability rating is used by statisticians to determine the level of significance of the results (Albery et al., 2004; Clegg, 1990). However, the reader may decide to use a lower percentage for judging the effectiveness of a volunteer programme. For example, the 90.49% chance of increased self-efficacy found in this study may be sufficient to convince the reader of its importance. In this study, post-trip volunteers showed significant changes (greater than 95% likely) in nine personality traits out of 15: anxiety (decreased), trust (increased), artistic interests (increased), depression (decreased), assertiveness (increased), emotionality (increased), activity levels (increased), adventurousness (increased) and vulnerability (decreased). However, the use of a control group of 35 people, measured over a similar period of time, meant that assertiveness was eliminated from the results because of the possible influence of day-to-day events on this trait, demonstrated by the changes in the control group. Vulnerability was also eliminated from the results because of the differences between the volunteers and control group at the start; thus leaving seven traits highly likely to be impacted by the volunteer tourism experience alone: anxiety, trust, artistic interests, depression, emotionality, activity levels and adventurousness.

This study identifies beneficial changes in some traits that were not specifically identified in the volunteer tourism literature: changes in ‘anxiety’, ‘depression’ and ‘activity’. Volunteers generally return from their trip more calm and less anxious; less likely to feel sad, dejected and discouraged, more likely to initiate activities; and more likely to lead busier lives moving about more quickly, energetically and
vigorously, and more likely to be involved in extra activities. The decreases in anxiety and depression, and increase in activity, contribute to improved well-being as noted in positive psychology research (Baumeister and Vohs, 2005; Williamson, 2005). These beneficial impacts, particularly decreases in depression and increases in activity, have also been recognised as outcomes of domestic volunteering (Arnstein et al., 2002; Howlett, 2004; Morrow-Howell et al., 2003; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Thoits and Hewitt, 2001; Wilson and Musick, 2000; Van Willigen, 2000). However, as was noted in the literature review, these beneficial impacts were concentrated on the 60 plus age group. In contrast, this study’s volunteer tourists, aged 16-29, received many more beneficial impacts than the 30+ age group. In support of this finding, not all domestic volunteering studies concur on the beneficial impacts of volunteering for ‘older’ people (Krause, Hertzog and Baker, 1992). Also, it was noted in chapter one that some fundamental differences exist between domestic volunteers and international volunteer tourists such as their motives. International volunteer tourists want to ‘travel’, have ‘fun’ and ‘adventure’, be ‘independent’ and ‘immerse themselves in another culture’. These different activities/experiences may account for the different findings (Wilson and Musick, 2000). Also, there were other differences: the volunteers in this study noted many occasions where they took ‘responsibility’ and how their lives changed as a result (Maddux, 2005); the volunteer tourists were also confronted head on with human problems, such as, poverty, educational inequalities, and substandard living conditions; so change might be expected (Bailey and Russell, 2010). Furthermore, in support of the results of this study, trait stability estimates are much lower (in the region of 50%) prior to age 30 (Costa and McCrae, 1994; McCrae and Costa, 2003); this would explain why there were more beneficial impacts for this age group.

Other changes concur with previous volunteer tourism studies (for e.g. Bailey and Russell, 2010; Laythorpe, 2009): changes (increases) in emotionality, trust, artistic interest and adventurousness. Volunteers return from their trip with better access to their own feelings; they assume people are fair, honest, and have good intentions; they have more interest in art and nature; and are eager to try new activities, to travel and experience different things. Bailey and Russell (2010) measured changes in these traits under the umbrella ‘openness to experience’. Individuals who exhibit openness also tend to be more trusting, tolerant of
diversity, exhibit artistic interest, adventuresome, and less dogmatic (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Costa and McCrae, 1985). However, Bailey and Russell (2010) did not use a control group in their study, so, other variables, rather than the volunteer tourism experience, may have accounted for the changes amongst their volunteers. Whereas, the use of a control group, in this study, enhanced the validity of the findings because none of the control group members showed any significant changes in these traits. Also, in support of increased interest in arts and nature, many of Laythorpe’s (2009) community volunteers ‘regretted the absence of opportunities to go to art galleries, museums and concerts; and one person was struck by the lack of history in the area’ (p. 10), indicating that this is what they sought.

Some of this study’s findings also differ from the findings of previous studies. Unlike Wearing’s (2001), Lough et al. (2009b), and Bailey and Russell’s (2010) work, this study showed no significant increases in altruism (the concern for other people generally and their feelings, and taking time for others). Wearing (2001) stated that volunteer tourism ‘results in a variety of learning and behavioural changes, such as being less self-centred’ (p.134). Similarly, Lough et al. (2009b) found that 90% of their volunteers reported that their experience particularly strengthened their commitment to volunteer service, although they later said ‘it may not significantly affect them’ (p. 10). Also, Bailey and Russell (2010) found positive growth in ‘civic attitude’: ‘the belief that an individual can make a difference in the world and has the responsibility in giving back to the community’ (p. 355). In contrast, and despite ‘altruism’ being a motive for many participating volunteers, this study group showed no significant increases in this trait (probability of 92.73%). Also, data from this study’s 36 interviews, in the following chapter, showed just two volunteers increasing their participation in volunteering or becoming more active citizens in their community after they returned home. One of these volunteers (no. 15) said: “I am grateful for what I have and now have a sense of duty to help whilst I can” whilst the other said: “I volunteer regularly at a local school listening to and helping 8 year olds read” (volunteer 33). This study further found that the probability of change increases to 95.56% for volunteers in the younger age group of between 16 and 29, shown in Table 30. In the above mentioned tourism studies, the volunteers were all below the age of 29, which might have accounted for these different findings, as personality trait flexibility is
significantly higher prior to age 30 (Maiden et al., 2003; Costa and McCrae, 1994; McCrae and Costa, 2003).

This study also shows that although self-efficacy (confidence in one's ability to accomplish things, and the belief in one's intelligence, drive and self-control necessary for achieving success) levels increased afterwards, it was not statistically significant (probability of 90.49%). This finding differs from McGehee and Santos (2005) who found evidence of social action and participation in social movements, which encourage social change, amongst their volunteers, such as avoiding restaurants that could exploit local citizens or boycotting corporations based on their record of fair labour practices. Also, Zahra (2011) provided examples of advocacy\textsuperscript{18} and commitment to social development amongst her volunteers. Self-efficacy was also noted by Zahra and McIntosh (2007) as an outcome of the cathartic nature of volunteer tourism experiences (p. 115). Whilst all their notions of self-efficacy may be slightly different to the one used in this study, they are close enough to gauge the extent to which people have confidence in their own power to achieve their goals. This study shows that although self-efficacy levels increased afterwards, it was not statistically significant. The short-stays of volunteers of around two to four weeks in Zahra's (2011) and Zahra and McIntosh's (2007) research might account for this contrasting finding, as the shorter lengths of stay in this study, of between one and four weeks, are more likely to facilitate change in this trait. In support of this explanation, Wearing (2001) indicated that the volunteer experience is initially new and unfamiliar, therefore volunteers attempt to control their environment when they first arrive at the destination; successful attempts at control increases self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Wilson and Musick, 2000). However, this explanation does not account for increased self-efficacy amongst McGehee and Santos's (2005) community volunteers as only six of 16 volunteers stayed less than a month.

These studies, on self-efficacy in volunteer tourism, prompted McGehee (2011) to question whether self-efficacy can be used as a measure of the likelihood to participate in a volunteer tourism experience. This notion suggests that there might be a volunteer tourist ‘personality type’ (Wilson and Musick, 2000). In this study, the volunteer group and control group showed no significant differences in this trait.

\textsuperscript{18} Advocacy includes social movement activity (Young and Everitt, 2004).
at the start, suggesting that self-efficacy is not a suitable measure; nor does it appear that there is a personality type – a bundle of traits – that predispose individuals to volunteer because there were no significant differences between the control group and volunteer group at the start, for 93% of the traits measured. In addition, McGehee pondered over how might volunteer tourism impact self-efficacy, and in turn, social movement participation? In this study, the participants of volunteer tourism did not show any significant differences between their pre-, post-trip test and follow-up scores, suggesting that self-efficacy is not a statistically significant end product of volunteer tourism; nor were there any examples of self-efficacy, such as social action and participation in social movements, identified from interviews with the volunteers.

Moreover, the increases reported in the liberalism trait (readiness to challenge authority, convention and traditional values as well as being more tolerant of diversity), in this study, were not statistically significant (probability of 20.86%), as shown in Table 30. Increases in this trait would have been positive and beneficial (Boniwell, 2006; Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000a). These findings differ from the findings of some qualitative studies which have reported changes in liberal behaviours and attitudes, for example, Wearing’s (2001) ‘gaining new perspectives’ and ‘being more thoughtful and open’ in his conservation and community projects, and Broad’s (2003) and Harlow and Pomfret’s (2007) ‘changes in the way the volunteers viewed their lives and the world’ and the ‘ability to get on with other people’ in their wildlife projects. The reason for this difference is little understood; however, as will be seen below, some traits are more likely than others to be impacted by wildlife versus community project experiences. The liberalism trait appears more likely to be impacted by wildlife rather than community project experiences; the probabilities are 58.29% and 8.16% respectively. This reason may account for the changes in Broad (2003) and Harlow and Pomfret’s (2007) wildlife volunteers but is more difficult to determine for Wearing’s (2001) volunteers who participated in both community and conservation tasks. It may be that the outcomes are different because of the different methods of analysis. This study analyses the statistical probabilities of changes amongst a group of 60 volunteers; whereas these other studies explore the subjective experiences of individual volunteers.
Lastly, with regard to the dutifulness trait (the strength of a person's sense of duty and obligation), Zahra and McIntosh (2007) reported an outcome of an increased 'sense of justice, rights and duties, and the responsibilities one has towards society' (p. 118); whereas, in this study, this trait was one of the least likely to be impacted by the volunteer tourism experience. Although their respondent commented on her responsibility to contribute to her community and country post-trip, she did not elaborate on the action taken; this may be a result of attitude and good intentions not converting into real actions at home (Alvarez and Roney, 2010; Sin, 2010). Also, domestic volunteering studies, of community volunteers, have found no significant increases in dutifulness, a volunteer's own sense of personal duty to help meet the needs of others (Hamilton and Fenzel, 1988).

With regard to these different findings, it must be noted that there is some chance of changes in altruism, self-efficacy, liberalism and dutifulness, following a volunteer tourism experience, but they are not statistically significant. Lastly, pertaining to the remaining traits, not specifically studied in the volunteer tourism literature, that is: 'intellect' and 'cautiousness', these traits are the least likely to be impacted by the volunteer tourism experience. A participant observer, in McIntosh and Zahra's (2007) community study, noted that certain intellectual issues came up in the conversation at the dinner table; why some people suffer and others don't; why some are lucky and others not. But, there was no evidence of these intellectual debates being carried over into people's daily lives at home. For intellect, there is some evidence of adolescents, aged between 11 and 17, growing intellectually in domestic volunteering studies (Hamilton and Fenzel, 1988), but without the use of a control group, it is unknown whether this is due to the volunteering experience or normal maturation (Musick and Wilson, 2008).

7.2. Some explanations of the statistical results

The significant changes in this study's volunteer tourists' traits, which have occurred as a result of their volunteer tourism experience, will now be explained using volunteer tourism and psychology literature and this study's empirical findings. The aim is to highlight their implications for the field of volunteer tourism and for positive psychology. At the same time, where possible, explanations will also be offered for those traits that are least likely to be impacted by the volunteer tourism experience.
7.2.1. Anxiety: the concept of flow

The decreased level of anxiety resulting from the volunteer tourism experience, as this study shows, suggests that the volunteer’s anxiety threshold level has increased. This experience offers an opportunity to develop one’s skills, through action programmes (challenges) which create ‘flow’ rather than ‘anxiety’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi, 2005). Flow is experienced when perceived challenges and skills are above the participant’s average levels (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). However, as challenges increasingly exceed capacities/skills, anxiety is experienced (Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi, 2005). According to Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi, in flow, one is engaged in just-manageable challenges/actions; one is completely absorbed in what one is doing. So, an explanation for decreased anxiety amongst this study’s volunteer tourists is that the experience provides an opportunity to develop one’s skills so that action opportunities (challenges) create ‘flow’ rather than ‘anxiety’. This is demonstrated by volunteer 10: “I did find the shifts really tough going. It was a physical job. We would fill the babies bottles in the morning and chop the veg for the day but the hard work was compensated by being with the children and getting to know them. We were always on the go throughout our shift”. In support of this explanation, Broad (2003) and Harlow and Pomfret (2007) found many of their volunteers developed skills to deal with challenging situations; and one of Sin’s (2009) volunteers expressed the need to be challenged as an important part of her experience, where feeling scared, exhausted and thoroughly tested is sometimes part of the deal (p. 493). These kinds of challenges have also been found to enhance well-being (Morrow-Howell et al., 2009); a potential implication for the field of positive psychology. The decreased anxiety post-trip, found from this study, also suggests that these skills might have been transferred to the volunteers’ everyday lives at home; another potential implication for the field of positive psychology. One volunteer (no. 13) articulates this impact well: “I learned a lot especially respect of other cultures and understanding other’s feelings and their individuality”.

7.2.2. Trust: increased self-confidence and giving up of control

The trust trait showed a significant increase amongst this study’s volunteers. According to Maslow (1993), trust in oneself and in the world involves self-
confidence, courage, and lack of fear of the world. Increased confidence post-trip and its impact on their day-to-day lives were evident in many participating volunteers. They attributed their increased confidence to ‘action’, ‘interaction’, ‘involvement’ and taking ‘responsibility’: “I am not quite as nervous now in new situations” (volunteer 21); “I feel a sense of achievement and will do more travelling as a woman solo traveller” (volunteer 3); and “I was constantly with people I didn’t know and therefore had to trust them and go with the flow, I got used to trusting people and hoping for the best” (volunteer 31). Maslow (1993:65) further adds: ‘trust involves the temporary giving up of straining and striving, of volition and control, of conscious coping and effort’. This consciously ‘giving up of control’ and trusting others, is experienced by some of this study’s volunteers: “I was thrown into a situation where I lived and worked with people I’ve never met before” (volunteer 17). Not only is trust a beneficial impact of volunteer tourism, but also optimism. People who are more trusting of others tend to be more optimistic, expecting good things to happen to them (Carver and Scheier, 2005); an important implication for positive psychology. In this respect, a volunteer tourism experience may help people to become more optimistic. Recent research on ‘optimism’ (see Carver and Scheier, 2005) suggests that pessimism can be changed despite it being deeply embedded in a person’s life either through inheritance or early childhood experience. However, there remain questions about how large a change can be reasonably expected and how permanent the change will be. There also remain questions about whether an induced optimistic view on life will act in the same way – have the same beneficial effects – as does naturally occurring optimistic view. So, volunteer tourism may provide the context for studying this phenomenon further and perhaps address these questions.

7.2.3. Self Efficacy: performance experience

The self-efficacy trait did not show a significant change amongst this study’s volunteers. ‘Performance experience’ may explain this result. Bandura (1997) postulated that our own attempts to control our environment are the most powerful sources of self-efficacy. Successful attempts at control will strengthen self-efficacy; whereas perceived failure at control usually diminishes self-efficacy (ibid.; Wilson and Musick, 2000). For the trust trait, a conscious ‘giving up of control’ explained increases in this trait; demonstrated by volunteer 31 who commented on how she was constantly with people she didn’t know and therefore had to trust them and go
with the flow. She got used to trusting people and hoping for the best; however, for self-efficacy, this explanation offers a reason as to why there were no significant changes amongst this study’s volunteers. Volunteer 26 noted how she had to rely on the host to transport her to places and therefore had to be back at a certain time; demonstrating the lack of control over her environment. These different effects of ‘giving up control’ on these traits is important for those manufacturing experiences to produce certain programme outcomes (see, for example, Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland, 2011).

7.2.4. Artistic Interests: engagement

The artistic interest trait showed a significant increase amongst this study’s volunteers. They were more likely to become involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events following a volunteer tourism experience. For example, volunteer 16 commented on how she appreciates art more “after her eyes were opened in South Africa”. There appears to be very little written about this trait, specifically, although it is a facet of ‘openness to experience’; open people tend to be appreciative of art, and sensitive to beauty (refer to IPIP-NEO web-site at http://www.personalitytest.net/ipip/ipipneo120.htm; Costa and McCrae, 1985, 1992; McCrae and Costa, 2003). Openness is often presented as healthier or mature by psychologists; however, open and closed styles of thinking are useful in different environments, for example, closed thinking is related to superior job performance in police work. Openness has also been identified in positive psychology studies as an antecedent to well-being (Bailey and Russell, 2010). Although the literature does not appear to offer a theoretical explanation for why this trait changed (Bailey and Russell, 2010), interviews with the volunteers in this study suggest the change was due to ‘engagement’ in volunteer tourism through ‘action’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘participation’. Volunteer 2 describes her ‘action’: “I visited art museums to learn about the history of South Africa”; and volunteer 28 described her ‘immersion’ and ‘interaction’: “we didn’t feel like tourists and that was a great feeling”, “we got to know people from all over the world and we had so much fun”. These individual components of engagement found in this study, that is, ‘action’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘participation’ display their transformative potential in many other volunteer tourism studies (see Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; Lepp, 2008; McGehee
7.2.5. Depression: social integration
The depression trait showed a significant decrease amongst this study’s volunteers. It must be noted that depression in this study is more to do with mood, as measured by the IPIP-NEO personality inventory, rather than malfunction. This personality inventory measures the tendency to feel sad, dejected and discouraged. High scorers lack energy and have difficulty initiating activities. A recurring explanation for why depression decreased amongst this study’s volunteers, and others, is to do with social integration; the extent to which an individual is connected to other people (Chambre, 1987; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Lee and Brudney, 2008; Stevens-Ratchford, 2005; Wearing, 2001; Wilson and Musick, 2000). These studies concur that activities such as volunteering provide a broad and diverse network of interactions; whereas people report much lower moods when alone, they feel less happy, less cheerful, less strong, more bored, and more passive (Albery et al., 2004; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997; Ryff and Singer, 2005). Interactions, such as those found in volunteering, are challenging as they require interpersonal skills; also people concentrate their attention on external demands, rather than worries (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Having good relationships with others is universally endorsed as being central to optimal living (Ryff and Singer, 2005). In this respect, volunteer tourism may offer an approach to promote well-being. Also, having a good life requires a certain level of activity (Albery et al., 2004; Boniwell, 2006); many of the volunteers in this study reported increases in their activity trait (see page 169). So, this may also explain why depression decreased amongst this study’s volunteers. An increase in activity correlates with a decrease in depression as a result of the social interaction and physical exertion of activity (Albery et al., 2004).

7.2.6. Assertiveness: conflict resolution and taking responsibility
Although the assertiveness trait changed (increased) amongst this study’s volunteers, the control group also changed suggesting that day-to-day life also influences the ability of people to stand up for themselves, speak out and take charge. Reviewing the experiences of both groups, a common theme was identified amongst those with increased assertiveness, that is, ‘conflict resolution’
and, therefore, ‘taking responsibility’ for changing what they did not like. Volunteer 32 explains: “there were a lot of volunteers who were on their own for the first time (and some older ones too) who weren’t doing their share around the house…..I was the one who would step up and talk to them about it”. Similarly, control member 6 explains: “I dealt with the pensioners’ medical aid recently and have had to steer the action against our old employer on behalf of ex-employees”. This concept of ‘taking responsibility’ and ‘changing what you do not like’ is a recurring theme in assertiveness training and many self-help books (see Cottrell, 2003). So, although volunteer tourism creates opportunities to increase one’s assertiveness, it can also be achieved in other contexts.

7.2.7. Emotionality: interactional temperament model
High emotionality means that one has good access to and an awareness of one’s feelings. This trait showed a significant increase amongst this study’s volunteers. When we understand more about ourselves, know our own triggers, and develop our emotional intelligence, we are more able to manage situations (Cottrell, 2003). The ‘interactional temperament model’ offers some insight into why this trait could have changed. Ryckman (2008) explains: the environment and temperament traits (emotionality being one of these), mutually influence each other. This is demonstrated by volunteer 13: “living in a different country, with different people and different language........I learned a lot especially respect of other cultures and understanding others’ feelings and their individuality”; demonstrating how the environment influenced this volunteer. In respect of these ‘others’ described by volunteer 13, it would have been fruitful to interview them in order to understand their emotional reactions to the volunteers and how they, in turn, were influenced by these volunteers, and the affect this then had on the volunteers (the interaction); thus helping us to better understand why emotionality changed amongst this study’s volunteers (see McIntosh and Zahra, 2007). The interactional temperament model is akin to Wearing’s (2001) concept of interactionism, in so far as the ‘self’ (the temperament traits in the case of the interactional temperament model) is impacted by the space and people that form the destination site.

7.2.8. Altruism and Dutifulness: motivated by egoism
The altruism trait and dutifulness trait did not show significant changes amongst this study’s volunteers. The volunteers may have been motivated by egoism rather
than altruism (see Sin, 2009); the focus of attention and contention for the past two decades (Batson et al., 2005). If the ultimate goal was to increase their own welfare, then the motivation is said to be egoistic (ibid., 2005). Proponents of universal egoism claim that everything we do, no matter how noble and beneficial to others, is really directed towards the ultimate goal of self-benefit. Although this knowledge may play havoc with our assumption about human nature, it could explain why altruism did not change significantly amongst this study’s volunteers. In support of this explanation, many of this study’s volunteers described their motives for participating in volunteer tourism: ‘to do something different’; ‘to learn’; ‘to get experience’; ‘to achieve something’; ‘to have an adventure’; ‘to see South Africa’; ‘to get away’; ‘to be independent’; and ‘to do something they have never done before’ (see chapter six). If these volunteers had been purely motivated by altruism – the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare – then one has to question why international voluntourism? Why not volunteer domestically instead? It may be that volunteers would rather travel further afield to help those that they perceive to have more need; however, why voluntourism? Why not international volunteering? The answers may lie in the tourism dimension of volunteer tourism; satisfying the self through the fun, travel and adventure offered by volunteer tourism (see Sin, 2009).

7.2.9. Activity level: fitness and other self-benefits

The activity level trait showed a significant increase amongst this study’s volunteers. Volunteers were more likely to return from their trip energetic and more likely to lead busier lives. Many volunteers improved their fitness as a result of the physical nature of their volunteering and tourism activities. Volunteer 10 “found the shifts really tough going. It was a physical job......we were always on the go throughout the shift”; volunteer 30 spoke of the contribution the work made to her losing three stone in weight; and volunteer 15 spoke of how much there was to do and see and how she “didn’t want to miss out”. Schulman (2005) points out that in order to act one must inquire about his or her motive. Volunteer 34 explains how her action of: “....trying to keep physically active at home” was motivated by her desire to improve her physical health. As having a good life requires a certain level of activity (Boniwell, 2006), this trait may be of significance to positive psychology.
7.2.10. **Adventurousness and Vulnerability: opportunities and confidence**

The adventurousness trait showed a significant increase amongst this study’s volunteers. Adventurousness is about trying new activities, travel and experiencing new things (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Volunteer ‘involvement’ and ‘participation’ in activities such as shark-diving, sky-diving, mountain climbing, hiking, caving, handling snakes, eating traditional foods and white-water rafting, seemed to have inspired some of the participating volunteers “not to hold back if there is something you want to do” (volunteer 32); “to try new experiences” (volunteer 21); and “to do more travelling” (volunteer 3). Some of this increased adventurousness seemed to be attributed to increased confidence as a result of trying new experiences (see Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Schott, 2011; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011): “I am not quite a nervous now to try new experiences” (volunteer 21) and “I feel a sense of achievement and will do more travelling as a woman solo traveller” (volunteer 3). The opportunity to try new activities abroad may explain why female volunteers showed significant increases in this trait post-trip whilst the men did not. Males may be more likely to try these activities at home. In support of this argument, males did show a higher median pre-trip score in adventurousness. Furthermore, Bailey and Russell (2010) found evidence of more personal growth amongst those participants who scored lower in these domains at the start; as was the case for this study’s female volunteers.

Unlike any of the other traits measured in this study, vulnerability trait scores were significantly different to the control group at the start. The volunteers scored higher on this trait than did the control group (10.5 versus 8); suggesting that other variables could have accounted for the changes in this trait, for example, personality type or state of mind, rather than the volunteer tourism experience (Musick and Wilson, 2008). Nevertheless, volunteers did return from their trip more poised, confident and clear thinking. Volunteer 4 commented on how she could deal with other situations now which take her outside her comfort zone. These volunteers reported how their ‘action’ and ‘interaction’ in new situations - such as “being in a different area and situation and meeting various people every day” (volunteer 21) – initially caused them anxiety, but they gained confidence as a result of coping with these new experiences (Wearing, 2001).
7.2.11. Intellect: cognitive stability

The intellect trait, along with artistic interest, is one of the most important central aspects to openness to experience (refer to IPIP-NEO web-site at http://www.personalitytest.net/ipip/ipipneo120.htm). In this study, although artistic interests changed amongst volunteers, intellectual style did not. High scorers in intellectual style are said to be open-minded to new and unusual ideas and like to debate intellectual issues whereas low scorers prefer to deal with people or things rather than ideas (see chapter four). The lack of change in this trait, even amongst the younger volunteers, tends to support the view of the stability of cognitive behaviour. Eysenck (1970), in his theory of personality, posits that intellect is a more or less stable aspect of personality along with a person’s character, temperament and physique. Based on the results of this study, volunteer tourism does not appear to offer an appropriate context for studying mature cognitive development. Furthermore, recent research suggests genetics influences cognition up to 81% (Whitfield and Brandon, 2005); adding further evidence to support the results of this study.

A discussion of the traits measured in this study provides a better understanding of why volunteer tourism may impact some of these traits and not others. This information could be useful to those manufacturing experiences to produce certain outcomes as well as to volunteers searching for desired self-outcomes (Alexander, 2012); this study provides statistical evidence of the likely impacts of volunteer tourism, supported by extracts from the interviews with the volunteers. It also demonstrates what can be realistically achieved through volunteer tourism, for the volunteer.

In respect of the changes identified in this study, there are a number of applications. For example, for volunteers who are motivated to participate in volunteer tourism by the opportunity to learn independence, increase confidence, improve well-being, or develop self etc, it would be useful to be aware of the likelihood of satisfying those motives. For instance, using Table 30 and Figure 11, amongst this study’s volunteers, there is a 90% chance of increasing one’s self-efficacy, a 99.99% chance of decreasing anxiety, and 99.84% chance of decreasing depressive feelings. Knowing these statistical probabilities may help
boost involvement in volunteering. Furthermore, marketers could use these figures to attract volunteers, and government initiatives could use these figures as statistical evidence to support the benefits of some international voluntary service. For example, this study’s volunteers are 99.80% likely to become more active individuals leading fast-paced, busy lives, and become involved in more activities, following their volunteer tourism experience. It must be noted that, for this study, ‘active’ does not translate into active citizenship where participants return home and work towards the betterment of their community; rather this study’s volunteers became active in the physical sense: “I am trying to keep physically active” (volunteer 34); and “I am more motivated to go out and do things instead of getting back into the same everyday routine” (volunteer 15).

7.3. The influence of age, gender, project type and length of stay

Addressing the fourth objective, of the influence of age, gender, project type and length of stay on the impacts of volunteer tourism, Table 3 highlights the traits that are significantly influenced by these variables.

7.3.1. The influence of age

For age, the volunteering experience is highly likely (greater than 95% probability) to change the 16-29 years in eight traits: anxiety, trust, depression, assertiveness, altruism, activity, adventurousness and vulnerability, but not the 30+ years. So this study shows that age influences the probability of change amongst these volunteer tourists. One reason for this age difference is the view that trait stability estimates are significantly lower prior to age 30 (Costa and McCrae, 1994; Maiden et al., 2003; McCrae and Costa, 2003). In support of this theory, Birdwell (2011) noted that younger volunteers were more likely than older volunteers to report changes in personal development and social development. However, Bailey and Russell (2010) found that age did not influence the impact of volunteer tourism on the ‘openness’ trait. Similarly, this study found that most of this category’s facets, that is, artistic interest, emotionality, intellect and liberalism, were not influenced significantly by age; only adventurousness was. With regard to another trait, depression, Wilson and Musick (2000) found that domestic volunteering had no effect on the levels of depression of 3617 volunteers below the age of 65. In
contrast, this study showed a high probability of change (99.84%) amongst the 16-29 age category volunteers; suggesting that older people have less tendency towards depression than younger people (Boniwell, 2006). As Wilson and Musick’s sample of volunteers were predominantly in the 30+ age group, aged between 25 and 65, this may account for the differences (Ardelt, 2000).

At the start of this study, the younger volunteers were also less trusting and less altruistic than their older counterparts (median pre-score of 13.5 versus 16; median pre-score of 17.5 versus 19 respectively). Some explanations for these differences include: one younger volunteer explains why altruism increased for him: “I encountered basic conditions and enjoyed them, it made me realise I can be happy with far less than I am used to, and that I can use the rest to help others. People here also have far more an altruistic attitude compared to home, so I might have copied their habits a bit” (volunteer 9). For the trust trait, ‘being thrown into situations’ – which many of these youngsters may not have experienced at home - may explain why these younger volunteers became more trusting as a result of the trip.

Also, the pre-trip scores, of the younger volunteers, were higher than their older counterparts for: anxiety (median score 12 versus 8), vulnerability (median score 11 versus 9.5) and depression (median score 10 versus 8). Some possible explanations described earlier include: not having the same level of experience-skills to deal with situations (anxiety and depression) and being less confident (vulnerability); so these younger volunteers were able to benefit more from their volunteer tourism experience because, as Wearing (2001) points out, it provides an opportunity for them to feel independence and handle any difficulties without the aid of others. Considering all this data, within the context of volunteer tourism, the evidence suggests that the traits are predominantly stable after the age of 30, thus supporting McCrae et al. (2007) notion of trait stability; so the younger volunteers are more likely to enjoy more beneficial impacts.

7.3.2. The influence of gender

For gender, this study’s findings suggest that some personality traits are influenced differently depending on whether one is female or male. In this study, for males, there are high probabilities of changes (increases) in trust (97.27%) and
dutifulness (96.88%). For females, there are high probabilities of changes (increases) in adventurousness (98.89%), assertiveness (98.83%) and activity (96.88%); and high probability of a change (decrease) in anxiety (99.91%). Bailey and Russell (2010) found that gender did not influence the impact of volunteer tourism on ‘openness’, including traits such as liberalism, adventurousness, emotionality, intellect and artistic interests; ‘civic attitudes’ and ‘wisdom’. Similarly, for this study, most of these facets of ‘openness’ were unlikely to change for both gender groups; however, in contrast, adventurousness was highly likely to change amongst the women (99.54% probability) but not amongst the men (discussed earlier in this chapter). Most personality researchers agree that there are far greater differences between individuals regardless of gender than between men and women (Harasty et al., 1997). However, in relation to the fifteen traits measured in this study, six traits showed significant gender differences. With regard to gender differences in other areas such as well-being, Ryff and Singer (2005) have uncovered important new findings. Specifically, women have shown more positive profiles for the interpersonal dimension of well-being compared to men, as well as on personal growth relative to men. So, it is possible that there are greater differences between the gender types than currently thought; an area that could benefit from further research especially in relation to improving the effectiveness of volunteer programmes for these different market segments.

Some of these gender differences can be explained by heredity and environment. The socialisation process may explain the different outcomes for ‘trust’, ‘dutifulness’ and ‘assertiveness’; whereas biological differences may explain the differences for ‘adventurousness’, ‘anxiety’ and ‘activity’. With regard to biological differences, there are physical differences between the two sexes including different levels of hormones. It is supposed that these hormones form the basis of differences between males and females (Albery et al., 2004). Collaer and Hines (1995) suggest that the effects of male sex hormones are more apparent in activities like physical play and aggression; possibly explaining the differences in the adventurousness and activity traits in this study. Another explanation for the gender differences is the environment and socialisation process: social learning, social reinforcement and observational learning (Albery et al., 2004; Bandura, 1977). According to this account, girls receive reinforcement for stereotypically female activities and boys for stereotypically male activities, and observe and
mimic the activities carried out by each sex. In this study it was interesting to note that the traits stereotypically associated with ‘boys’, such as adventurousness, activity, assertiveness and less anxiousness, changed significantly for the ‘girls’; whereas, the traits typically associated with the ‘girls’, such as dutifulness and trust, changed significantly for the ‘boys’. It could be that the differences were a result of greater personal growth amongst those participants who scored lower at the start (Bailey and Russell, 2010); the pre-trip scores for these traits, for both sexes, tend to support this theory.

7.3.3. The influence of project type

Birdwell (2011), Harlow and Pomfret (2007), Sherraden et al. (2008), Wilson and Musick (2000), and Uriely et al. (2008) posit that the type of volunteer project could influence the experience and therefore the impact. This study found that some personality traits are influenced differently dependant on whether one is a community volunteer or wildlife volunteer. For this study’s volunteers, there are high probabilities (96.96%, 98.90% and 96.58% respectively) of changes (increases) in trust, assertiveness and emotionality amongst wildlife volunteers but not community volunteers; high probability (98.79%) of a change (decrease) in depression amongst community volunteers but not wildlife volunteers. In contrast, Lepp (2008) commented that, despite the differences between both types of volunteers at the start, they both benefit from their experiences in remarkably similar ways; these benefits related to discovery of self and others, specifically volunteers discovered that their daily struggles were often trivial compared to the daily struggles of rural Kenyans, thus offering an explanation for why depression decreased amongst the community volunteers in this study. Lepp’s volunteers were of a similar demographic profile to this study’s volunteers and participated in volunteer tourism on the same continent and for similar lengths of time; so none of these variables account for the contrasting findings. However, Lepp focussed on very different outcomes such as goals and life-course impacts. Little research has been done on the influence of project type on the volunteer tourism experience; so this is another area that could benefit from further research (Lepp, 2008).

One possible explanation for the outcomes in trust, of the different project types, is the lower mean average length of stay of the wildlife volunteers (Lee and Woosnam, 2010), that is, six weeks. The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs
signed-rank tests, in chapter six, show that trust significantly changed for the shorter lengths of stay; the volunteers are more trusting at the beginning of their trip because everything is new and unsettled (see page 164). So, increases in trust amongst the wildlife volunteers, in this study, may be attributed to the shorter lengths of stay rather than project type.

For assertiveness, one possible explanation for the changes amongst the wildlife volunteers is their age, as 81% of wildlife volunteers were below the age of 30 compared to 70% of community volunteers in this study. The results of the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank tests, in chapter six, show that that assertiveness is highly likely to change for the younger age category but not for the 30+ age group; attributed to ‘taking responsibility’, as many of the younger volunteers were travelling alone for the first time (see page 167).

For emotionality, volunteer 33 (a wildlife volunteer) shed some light on the different outcomes: “watching the animals in solitude in the wide open spaces allowed one to relax more”; this solitary experience enabled this volunteer to become more aware of his self and his feelings. In support of this finding, Harlow and Pomfret (2007) commented on the effect of being in a natural environment, particularly in solitude; it provides an opportunity for deep contemplation and introspection.

7.3.4. The influence of length of stay
For length of stay, this study found that some personality traits are influenced differently depending on how long people volunteer in South Africa. A review of the literature on volunteer tourism (see Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; McGehee and Santos, 2005; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011; Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007) describes various outcomes amongst volunteers whose length of stay ranges from nine days to nine months. This study’s results suggest that there are more potential benefits to those volunteers staying 5 to 12 weeks rather than shorter or longer periods of time. Laythorpe (2009) posited that long-term volunteers (volunteering for longer than six months) tend to become more immersed in the local community than short-term volunteers, and Lee and Woosnam (2010) question whether length of stay explains variance in volunteer tourists’ personal transformation. Birdwell (2011) noted that long- and short-term placements have
similar positive outcomes for personal development and civic participation; however, long-term placements appear more likely to result in positive outcomes in skills, career and educational aspirations; thus suggesting, similarly to this study, that there are some differences in impact. In contrast, Lepp (2008) found both short- and long-term volunteers were impacted in similar ways. They were more able [than non-volunteers] to put things in perspective; plot a more meaningful course in life; find new goals; and have more favourable opinions of ‘others’ in their everyday lives. However, as these impacts show, Lepp focussed on very different outcomes. The findings of this study also contrast to an earlier study on the impact of general vacation travel, where shorter vacations between one and seven days had more impact than longer breaks of between 5 to 12 weeks (Alexander et al., 2010); these short-term impacts were attributed to ‘memory recall’ and the ‘primacy effect’. That is, experiences at the beginning of a holiday being recalled better because interference can cause people to forget their experience further into their holiday, especially if there are a number of similar experiences. However, this explanation does not explain the results of this study and why medium lengths of stay (of between one and three months) had the greatest impact on the volunteers. Given that project type could influence the volunteer tourism experience (see Birdwell, 2011; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Sherraden et al., 2008), it is possible that different types of tourism, in this case vacation travel versus volunteer tourism, are so very different as to account for the differences in impact. Wearing (2001:9) offers an alternative explanation: ‘as the volunteer learns and interacts more with the people and the culture of the place in which they are living, the surrounding environment becomes more familiar....... [and volunteers are therefore more] able to accept and deal with their environment’. Alexander et al. (2010) elaborate on familiarity, and why one is less likely to experience long-lasting change with long-stays, using one vacationer who commented on his three week tour of Mayan sites in Mexico and Peru, ‘the interest waned and we were calling temples ‘poors’ (piles of old rocks).....visits around ruins became shorter due to the similarity of places, after five weeks there was nothing special and it was boring compared to earlier on’ (p. 10).

Importantly, it appears from the results of this study, that those benefitting most from volunteer tourism tend to be female, aged between 16 and 29, engaged in wildlife projects of between 5 and 12 weeks in duration (Type 1: maximum impact).
Whereas those benefiting the least, tend to be male, 30+ years in age, and engaged in community projects for less than 5 weeks or greater than 12 weeks (Type 2: minimum impact). As no ‘impact type’ has been identified previously, this study offers a platform for further research on the types of volunteers that will benefit the most (or least) from volunteer tourism.

7.4. Time elapsed post-trip

Addressing the fifth objective, to identify whether the post-trip changes still hold one to two years later, this study’s results suggest, contrary to the argument presented by Ewert and Sibthorp (2009) that the emotional nature of volunteer experiences often results in strong initial gains in measured outcomes followed by a decline, the changes identified still held one to two years later. In other words, there were no significant differences between the post-trip scores and the follow-up scores on all 15 traits measured in this study. Although various lines of evidence suggest major life events exert a significant influence only in the short term and that people move back to their pre-existing baseline (Myers and Diener, 1995; Suh et al., 1996; Watson 2000), this was not the case for this study’s volunteers. Perhaps this finding would have been different for a larger sample of volunteers, not just for the 16 volunteers willing to complete a third personality inventory for this study.

According to post modernist approaches, people find themselves working, playing, loving and learning in different social contexts within which it is possible for them to take on different identities (Gergen, 1991; Wetherell, 1996). Therefore, the context is crucial to understanding the self because of the plasticity, changeability and variability of identity to fit within the context and role (Ryan and Deci, 2005). From this view, changes to self in one context may not necessarily transfer to another context (Brookes, 2003); however, the volunteers in this study provided evidence of seven personality trait changes being carried over into their day-to-day lives at home. Furthermore, there was evidence that these changes were for the long-term; suggesting that whilst volunteers may take on different identities whilst volunteering, the change itself applies to other contexts too, and provides further evidence of trait stability once a significant life event has exerted its influence (McCrae et al., 2007). In fact, the evidence presented in this study counters the idea that personal traits are inflexible and unlikely to be transformed by brief tourist
experiences (Brookes, 2003; Guttentag, 2011); moreover the changes are persistent enough to be maintained thereafter.

Other studies of long-term impacts in different tourism contexts, such as of day visitors to wildlife parks (see Ballantyne and Packer, 2011; Ballantyne, Packer and Sutherland, 2011) show that a heightened awareness of conservation issues, engendered on-site, quickly dissipates; hence the need to explore ways in which impacts of tourism experiences can be maintained over time. In contrast, for my study, volunteer tourism was highly likely to change people for at least one to two years post-trip. The differences in results may be attributed to the activities of day-trippers to wildlife parks, the duration of the visit, and the age of day-trippers who were predominantly aged 30+ (these variables were discussed earlier in this chapter). Also, in this study, social media such as Facebook, and regular post-visit updates/messages from the volunteer tourism provider, may have extended the impacts for the longer-term (Ballantyne and Packer, 2011).

Sin (2009) found that it was inconclusive whether volunteer tourism led to substantial long-term changes in her volunteers’ value-system, social consciousness or willingness to volunteer in other arenas. Informal discussions with her 11 volunteers two years post-trip revealed that only four had volunteered substantially post-trip, of which three had conducted their volunteering overseas in trips similar to the one in South Africa. Of these four respondents, one was already a regular volunteer in Singapore prior to joining Action Africa, and the other three were committed to their respective volunteer tourism trips even before the trip to South Africa. Sin (2009) acknowledged that participating in Action Africa did not significantly alter respondents post-trip volunteering activities. Instead, those who were inclined to volunteer would have done so anyway. Similarly, the volunteers in this study did not show an increase in volunteering activities during the years following their trip. However, Bailey and Russell (2010) found that, for the wisdom trait, there was a strong initial gain in measured outcomes when the participants returned home, but a decline four weeks later; suggesting that some traits are influenced differently by time. In contrast, the traits measured in this study were consistent over time.
The limitations of this study

The limitations of this study were discussed in the methodology chapter and are summarised here. Reflecting on the limitations of this stage of the research – the quantitative method - personality inventories, (e.g. IPIP-NEO), only capture specific types of data, in this case personality traits, ignoring other areas subject to change, such as, a person’s skills, abilities, capabilities, interests, values, needs and others. Whilst every effort was made to address this limitation by additionally using structured personal interviews to identify other changes in the volunteers, the study may have missed opportunities to receive unexpected but potentially useful information from a less structured inquiry. A further limitation of personality inventories is acquiescence or social desirability; the tendency of respondents to reply in a manner that will be viewed favourably by others (Albery et al., 2004). Furthermore, mood and environmental influence might influence psychometric performance. The use of a standardised test reduces these effects but nevertheless a psychometric test is only a reflection of a particular academic theory about the nature of personality (ibid., 2004).

As a shortened version of the original personality inventory was used in this study, the IPIP-NEO’s internal validity and reliability might have been affected. However, precautions were taken to reduce these effects such as carrying out test-retest reliability measurements on the IPIP-NEO 60-item version of the personality inventory using the control group (see Albery et al., 2003); ensuring a minimum of four questions per trait (Johnson, 2007); and using a matched control group in an attempt to rule out any extraneous variables that may account for the findings (Ferguson and Bibby, 2004). With regard to the latter, the selection of the control group did involve some snowballing which could have potentially introduced bias in the sample, particularly, if people were friends having certain things in common (Clegg, 1990). Furthermore, the control group could only be matched to the volunteer tourists on age, gender and socio-economic variables. By ignoring other variables, such as, culture, intelligence, previous experiences and family background, the differences between the volunteer tourists and the control group might have been attributed to any one or a combination of the unmatched variables (Albery et al., 2003; Clegg, 1990). However, the researcher used whoever was willing rather than ideal candidates, reflecting some of the realities of doing research. Also, the extraneous variables were not ruled out entirely because
the control group did not all travel to South Africa as part of their annual vacation and, therefore, it was possible that the trip to South Africa per se could have accounted for the changes post-trip, rather than the volunteer tourism experience itself. In an attempt to address this problem, the interviews were analysed for the causes of participants’ changes. Participants’ responses relayed very few references to South Africa, yet many references to the volunteering experience itself.

Although there were benefits to exploring facets of the Five-Factor Model of Personality; such as, being able to measure each trait without the counter-acting effects of the other, it did mean that it was more difficult to draw comparisons with studies measuring traits at The Big Five level. For example, Bailey and Russell (2010) studied one of the Big Five personality traits - openness to experience - amongst volunteer tourists; whereas this study explored its individual facets: artistic interest, emotionality, adventurousness, intellect and liberalism.

The sample used for this research was a volunteer sample and therefore it may not be typical of the Aviva volunteers. The people who volunteer for samples may need something such as advice or help with a personal difficulty they are experiencing, or it might alleviate their boredom or loneliness (Clegg, 1990). In this respect, the sample is biased and therefore the results of the study may not be representative of Aviva volunteers. With this in mind, the characteristics of Aviva volunteers and this study’s sample were compared (Table 2) so as to give other researchers the opportunity to appraise the similarities and differences.

A further limitation of this study, pertaining to the fifth objective of measuring change one to two years later, was the poor response rate (27%); so these follow-up results only provide an indication of what may happen to the traits over time. Nevertheless, the results may provide a stimulus and a platform for further research.

7.6. Conclusion of this chapter

This chapter discusses the key findings of the personality inventory results. In summary, post-trip volunteers showed significant changes in seven personality traits. The use of a control group, in this study, enhanced the validity of the
findings because none of the control group members showed any significant changes in these traits. Some of these traits have not been specifically identified in the volunteer tourism literature; such as, ‘anxiety’, ‘depression’ and ‘activity’. However, they have been recognised as outcomes of domestic volunteering. But, in contrast to these domestic studies, the beneficial outcomes of this study were confined to volunteer tourists aged between 16 and 29; supporting McCrae and Costa’s (2003) notion that trait stability estimates are much lower for people below the age of 30.

Whilst other changes concur with previous volunteer tourism studies, some of this study’s findings differ from previous studies in that these other studies showed changes in ‘altruism’, ‘self-efficacy’, ‘liberalism’ and ‘dutifulness’; whereas this study did not. Some explanations for these differences were discussed, and include: age differences, different project types and length of stays; also different methods of analysis were used.

A number of theoretical concepts were also discussed to explain the significant changes in the personality traits of the sample, and some implications of these changes; such as, the beneficial impact of decreased anxiety transferring to volunteers’ everyday lives at home and its positive effect on well-being.

The influence of age, gender, project type and length of stay were also discussed. The evidence suggests that younger volunteers, staying between 5 and 12 weeks at the destination, participating in wildlife and conservation projects, are more likely to enjoy more beneficial impacts. For gender, men and women receive different beneficial impacts, which may have implications for marketers and programme developers.

Importantly, and contrary to the evidence presented, there were no significant differences between the post-trip and follow-up scores on all 15 traits measured; suggesting that these beneficial impacts are for the long-term, and are carried over into their day-to-day lives at home.
Finally, the limitations of this part of the study were also discussed, such as, the use of a personality inventory to measure changes to 'self'; using a volunteer sample of volunteers; and the poor response to the follow-up personality inventory.

The following chapter analyses the causes and consequences of the significant results from the personality inventory. That is, the Aviva volunteers’ changes in trust, artistic interests, emotionality, activity, adventurousness, anxiety and depression.
8. CHAPTER EIGHT - interpretative phenomenological analysis of interviews

The previous chapter discussed the changes, amongst volunteer tourists post-trip, from a theoretical standpoint; whereas chapter eight analyses the explanations for the reported causes and consequences of those changes from the volunteers' perspective. Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) was employed to interpret data from interviewing willing volunteers. These were the same volunteers who completed the pre- and post-trip personality inventories. Not all 60 volunteers wanted to be interviewed. The reasons provided by six volunteers include: ‘didn’t have time’, ‘forgot’, ‘other reason – didn’t find the exercise useful’. So, the response rate for the email interviews was 60% (36 volunteers).

8.1. The analysis

Of those who were interviewed and therefore encouraged to reflect on their visit, the experience categories (reported ‘causes’), defined in Table 3, that emerged from the responses to the question, “describe the trip’s experience/s (if any) which you think may have led to each of the changes” were: ‘action’ (10 occurrences), ‘involvement’ (8 occurrences), ‘responsibility’ (16 occurrences), ‘participation’ (14 occurrences), ‘immersion’ (4 occurrences), ‘interaction’ (3 occurrences) and ‘expectations/satisfaction levels’ (2 occurrences).

The impacts categories (reported ‘consequences’), defined in Table 3, that arose from the responses to the question, “what are you doing differently now as a result (if anything)?” were changes around: people’s ‘personal circumstances’ (4 occurrences), ‘behaviour’ (9 occurrences), emotions (6 occurrences), ‘confidence’ (9 occurrences), ‘values’ (4 occurrences), ‘knowledge or skills’ (3 occurrences) and ‘attitudes’ (14 occurrences).
Table 3. Master experience categories identified from interviewing volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Looking after oneself, others or a task.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Observation whilst sharing in activities.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Doing something.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>To become connected or associated with.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>To engross oneself and get absorbed in.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>To have an effect on each other/exchange.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations/Satisfaction levels</td>
<td>What one hopes for/fulfilment of that hope.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Master impact categories identified from interviewing volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Our response tendency toward a person, object or situation.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Belief in one's personal worth and likelihood of succeeding.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>Acting in a particular way as a result of biological functions, perceptions, unconscious forces, attitudes, beliefs and feelings.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Feelings based on our appraisal of the situation and the possible actions we might take in relation to it.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Ideas about what people should do.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>Conditions that influence a person.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge or skills</td>
<td>Learning.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar questions were asked of the control group members who experienced significant changes in their traits. The experience category (reported ‘cause’) was: ‘responsibility’ (4 occurrences).

The impacts categories (reported ‘consequences’) that emerged were changes in: ‘behaviour’ (3 occurrences) and ‘attitudes’ (1 occurrence).

The large difference between the number of categories identified from the volunteers and those of the control group were the result of the larger number of significant changes amongst the volunteers. What follows is a synthesis of the statistical results described earlier and the interviews with the volunteers and control group. Both groups’ interviews are analysed, by trait, in the following section, thus offering explanations for the changes and how those changes manifest themselves in their everyday lives. A tabular representation of this analysis is presented in Table 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience CATEGORY</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>TRAIT</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>DAY-TO-DAY IMPACT</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>VOLUNTEER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I did find the shifts really tough going. It was a physical job. We would fill the babies bottles in the morning and chop the veg for the day but the hard work was compensated by being with the children and getting to know them. We were always on the go throughout our shift</td>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>I have a lot more get up and go and don't get bored at all. I fill my time a lot better. Rather than watching TV all night, I watch a programme I find interesting and then read a book rather than watching TV and not really enjoying it. I really want to fill my time up well. In saying that, if I feel I need a rest, I will take a rest too</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>At the children's home I was more active</td>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>It contributed to losing 3 stone in weight so it has certainly helped with my activity level</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I got a blood clot in my leg whilst volunteering</td>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>I am trying to keep [physically] active</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I did my sky dive, climbed mountains, hiked glaciers, did shark cage diving and much more and had a snake wrapped round my neck...while I was away I very much had the attitude of feel the fear and do it anyway.</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>I have always been really tight with my spending, but I've realized now that you only live once so don't hold back if there's something you want to do</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>While there I did a lot of crazy things that I never thought I would do -- skydiving, shark cage diving, crawling through caves, etc.</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>I now live without any hang ups and just let it all happen even to the point I did not follow the recent budget and have no idea of the changes as I feel I can do nothing about it</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Watching the animals, in solitude, in the wide open spaces allowed me to relax more</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I am doing more with my time outside the house as I hate being alone, I now volunteer regularly at a local school listening to and helping 8 year olds read.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Watching the animals, in solitude, in the wide open spaces allowed me to relax more</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>I am coping better with the loss of my wife</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I toured around East Africa for a few weeks, constantly in a different area and situation and meeting various people everyday</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>I am not quite as nervous now in new situations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I did my sky dive, climbed mountains, hiked glaciers, did shark cage diving and much more, and had a snake wrapped round my neck...while I was away I very much had the attitude of feel the fear and do it anyway.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>I really hope my confidence has changed in work situations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I visited art museums to learn about the history of SA</td>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>I now have an interest in learning about the history of other countries I visit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>I saw some terrible things whilst travelling around</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I have a lighter outlook on things</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations and Satisfaction levels</td>
<td>Prior to my trip to SA I felt assured that I was in good hands and that I would be looked after during my time there. As it transpired, the volunteer house was absolutely filthy, overcrowded and extremely untidy and there were issues of</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>If I return to SA it will be under very different circumstances, we older volunteers will secure our own arrangements and financial contributions to the projects; and research our own projects before</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
burglary within the house. I was offered accommodation via a member of the Aviva staff which I gratefully accepted. This solution however was not without its own issues. The accommodation was out of town, I had to rely on the host to transport me to places. The host insisted on waiting for me therefore I had to return at a specific time. Therefore my leisure time was restricted

Expectations and Satisfaction levels

Prior to my trip to SA I felt assured that I was in good hands and that I would be looked after during my time there. As it transpired, the volunteer house was absolutely filthy, overcrowded and extremely untidy and there were issues of burglary within the house. I was offered accommodation via a member of the Aviva staff which I gratefully accepted. This solution however was not without its own issues. The accommodation was out of town, I had to rely on the host to transport me to places. The host insisted on waiting for me therefore I had to return at a specific time. Therefore my leisure time was restricted

Anxiety

Emotions

All in all it was a tense time and I would never accept volunteer accommodation on ‘trust’ again. Actually I feel that this was a trade description issue as the accommodation was not as it was advertised; had I been asked if I would be happy to share a room with young men I would have said NO, had I been asked if I would live in poor and badly managed accommodation, I would have said NO. As it happens, the choices I made were based on the information provided which did not live up to its description

I was very ill and people were astonishingly kind

Trust

Attitudes

I realised that there are also genuine and trustworthy people in the world which has made me less suspicious and more willing to accept people

Adventurousness

No further information

No further information

Immersion

We didn’t feel like tourists and that was a great feeling

Artistic Interests

Behaviour

We are going back to SA!

Emotionality

Knowledge and skills

Learned a lot especially respect of other cultures and understanding other’s feelings and their individuality

Met new people

Anxiety

Confidence

I have greater confidence

Interaction

Artistic Interests

Knowledge and skills

I learned about SA history

Involvement

Activity Level

Behaviour

I am more motivated to go out and do things instead of getting back into the same everyday routine

Adventurousness

Confidence

I am not quite as nervous to try new experiences

Involvement

At the Inkwenkwei Conservation and Penguin Conservation Project I met wonderful people with whom I still keep in contact

Emotionality

No further information

No further information

Involvement

I met so many new lovely people who were in the same situation as me

Trust

Attitudes

I would now trust people with my life

Involvement

I was thrown into a situation where you live and work with people you’ve never met before

Trust

Attitudes

I trust people more now

Involvement

I was constantly with people I didn’t know and therefore had to

Trust

No further

No further information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Seeing poverty and seeing how little people have in Khayelitsha [at the children's home]</th>
<th>Activity level</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>It made me realise the value of money a lot more. Before, I don't think I really valued money at all and used to waste it on things I didn't really need. I have a lot more respect for money than I used to have.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Seeing poverty and seeing how little people have in Khayelitsha [at the children's home]</td>
<td>Activity level</td>
<td>Personal circumstances</td>
<td>The work at Baphumelele made me a lot more resilient and stronger physically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Took the opportunity to try new things such as white water rafting</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td>No further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>I have seen kids with not enough food, nothing to look forward to and no toys and they are still the happiest kids in the world! All they want is to be held.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>It changed my whole perspective, things that seemed important are no longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>I have seen kids with not enough food, nothing to look forward to and no toys and they are still the happiest kids in the world! All they want is to be held.</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>It changed my whole perspective, things that seemed important are no longer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Found goodness in people that I was beginning to think doesn't exist anymore</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>I think I have found a purpose in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Could not get over how happy the children were although they had nothing material</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>I have so much going on in my head at the present time; it was the most thought provoking experience of my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Could not get over how happy the children were although they had nothing material</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>It made me think of what I have and do I really need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>I opened my eyes to another country</td>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I appreciate art more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Saw people who had nothing which made me feel very humble</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>I look at the positive side of things now because I realise I have food, clothes and water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Being around the kids at the children's home was a definite help in getting over the issues I had (a huge personal trauma before I left), seeing them so happy really rubs off, and when you see how little they had.</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>It really put my life in perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>I saw the good people could do if they take time out for others</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>I am grateful for what I have and now have a sense of duty to help whilst I can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>The children I cared for suffered many disadvantages but they were generally very positive and dealt with things the best way they could</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Volunteering opened my eyes about other people's way of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Encountered people living with HIV and AIDS who were also warm, kind and happy</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>I realised that no matter how bad things are, you have got to make the most of life and live life to the full.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>I saw other volunteers being able to do jobs that I thought only I could do properly</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>It made me realise that 'others' are just as capable as me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Being placed in a different country for the first time on your own</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>I feel a sense of achievement and will do more travelling as a woman solo traveller.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Travelling on your own to a new country</td>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td>No further information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Making the trip on my own and meeting new people</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>I have greater confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>It gave me a new outlook on life. It made me realise that I shouldn't sweat the small stuff, I was always making sure that everything was perfect (with work, everyone's comfort, my house needed to be spotless etc). Now I realise that there is so much more to life than that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td>I was always busy (with God only knows what) &amp; now I take the time to breathe &amp; relax, and just hang out &amp; enjoy life a little more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>I feel I could deal with other situations now, which take me outside my comfort zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>After a few weeks I started to feel more comfortable and was able to walk to work by myself, walk to the mall, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>I saw how fast life can pass you by &amp; that there is too much time wasting worrying about the silly things that don't really matter in life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td>No further information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1.1. Anxiety

Anxiety levels significantly decreased post-trip ($W_+ = 1309.5$, $W_- = 343.5$, $N = 57$, $p <= 0.0001$); the volunteer tourists worry less about things, are calm and generally less fearful. Interestingly, Deci and Ryan (2000) found that the management of anxiety is a prerequisite for personal growth; otherwise, people cling to the safety of what they already know and do not change. Interviewed respondents threw some light on the decreased anxiety levels resulting from the trip: “I was always busy (with God only knows what) and now I take the time to breathe and relax and just hang out and enjoy life a little more” (volunteer 22). The ‘behavioural change’ in this volunteer’s life, she believes, was brought about by ‘taking responsibility’: “I worked with children who look up to you and rely on you each and every day, they always had unconditional love”. She also spoke of ‘attitude change’: “It gave me a new outlook on life. It made me realise that I shouldn’t sweat the small stuff, now I realise that there is so much more to life than that”. These changes were also a result of a ‘participatory experience’: “I found goodness in people that I was beginning to think doesn’t exist anymore”.

An ‘emotion change’ also emerged: “I have so much going on in my head at the present time; it was the most thought provoking experience of my life” (volunteer 23). This participant also experienced a ‘value change’: “It made me think of what I have and do I really need it”. Both these changes, for this volunteer, were brought about by a ‘participatory experience’: “not [being able to] get over how happy the children were although they had nothing material”.

Volunteer 24 expressed similar views: “I have seen kids with not enough food, nothing to look forward to and no toys and they are still the happiest kids in the world! All they want is to be held”; this affected her ‘attitude’: “It changed my whole perspective; things that seemed important are no longer”.

‘Confidence’ – decreased vulnerability - also emerged as a theme: “I feel I could deal with other situations now, which take me outside my comfort zone” (volunteer 4); “I am not quite as nervous now in new situations” (volunteer 21); “I have greater confidence” (volunteer 9); “after a few weeks I started to feel more comfortable and was able to walk to work by myself, walk to the mall, etc” (volunteer 32).
Confidence is demonstrated by some of these volunteers ‘taking responsibility’: “I met situations that took me outside my comfort zone” (volunteer 4); “I made the trip on my own and met new people. I arranged a lot of stuff myself during my trip and found solutions to problems” (volunteer 9); “when I first arrived I was really scared to walk anywhere even during the day and with others, I always felt like I was going to be mugged or something” (volunteer 32). Whilst for others (volunteer 21), the change was expressed in terms of her ‘doing something – acting’: “I toured around East Africa for a few weeks, constantly in a different area and situation and meeting various people every day”.

Another volunteer 33 described the ‘action’ of “watching the animals, in solitude, in the wide open spaces” and how this allowed him “to relax more”. Since returning home, he maintains a ‘behavioural change’: “I am doing more with my time outside the house”, for example, “I now volunteer regularly at a local school listening to and helping 8 year olds read”. The experience had an ‘emotional impact’: “I am coping better with the loss of my wife” and additionally brought about ‘attitude changes’: “I now live without any hang ups and just let it all happen even to the point I did not follow the recent budget and have no idea of the changes as I feel I can do nothing about it”.

One volunteer 34, a social worker in a child protection team, attributed her decreased anxiety to “having a break from social work [‘responsibility’]; without the pressure for 6 months was great”.

The emerging codes from the changes - impacts - described under the anxiety trait thus include: changes in behaviour, emotions, confidence, values and attitudes. The emerging themes from the experiences explaining the changes include: action, responsibility, participation and interaction.

8.1.2. Artistic Interests

Volunteers experienced a significant increased interest in the arts and nature post-trip ($W_+ = 293.5$, $W_- = 652.5$, $N = 43$, $p <= 0.031$); the volunteer tourists identify beauty, both in art and in nature and become more easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. This trait is a subset of openness to experience and
is often presented as healthier and more mature by psychologists (The IPIP Web site at http://ipip.ori.org).

Evidence of this increased interest can be found in the interview responses from volunteers. Volunteer 16 wrote about her ‘attitude’ change: “I appreciate art more”. This change she attributed to her ‘participation’ in volunteering: “It opened my eyes to another country”.

Volunteer 2 spoke of her increased ‘knowledge or skills’: “I now have an interest in learning about the history of other countries I visit” because “I visited art museums to learn about the history of SA” – denoting ‘action’.

Similarly, volunteer 28 commented: “I learned about SA history”. This prompted her to: “go back to SA!” – a ‘behaviour’ change. She added that “we didn’t feel like tourists and that was a great feeling” and “we got to know people from all over the world and we had so much fun”, reflecting her ‘immersion’ in the culture and ‘interaction’ with others.

The emerging codes from the changes - impacts - described under artistic interest trait thus include: changes in attitude, knowledge or skills and behaviour. The emerging themes from the experiences explaining the changes include: participation, immersion and interaction.

8.1.3. Depression

The levels of depression significantly decreased post-trip ($W^+ = 897.0$, $W^- = 279.0$, $N = 48$, $p <= 0.002$); the volunteer tourists feel happier and more positive and have fewer tendencies to feel sad, dejected, or discouraged. Van Willigen (2000) and Frankl (2004), similarly, found that depression decreases as a result of engagement in a meaningful activity such as volunteer work.

Volunteer 12 responded: “I am grateful for what I have and now have a sense of duty to help whilst I can” - a ‘behavioural change’ that was also accompanied by an ‘attitude change’: “I have a lighter outlook on things”.
Volunteer 30 similarly described an ‘attitude change’ - the experience “really put my life in perspective”. She attributed this to her ‘participation’: “being around the kids at the children's home”. She explained how this helped her: “in getting over the issues I had, a huge personal trauma before I left” because “seeing them [the kids] so happy really rubs off, when you see how little they have”.

Volunteer 15 expressed an ‘emotional change’: “volunteering opened my eyes about other people’s way of life .......I have a sense of accomplishment”. As for volunteer 30, she ascribed this change to her ‘participation’: “the children I cared for suffered many disadvantages but they were generally very positive and dealt with things the best way they could”.

Volunteer 3 experienced a ‘value change’: “I realised that no matter how bad things are you have got to make the most of life and live life to the full”. This, she felt, was brought about by her “encounter with people living with HIV and AIDS who were also warm, kind and happy” - a ‘participatory experience’.

‘Attitude change’ was also evident in volunteer 11: “I look at the positive side of things now because I realise I have food, clothes and water”. She attributed this change to her ‘participation’: “seeing people who had nothing which made me feel very humble”.

On returning home, one volunteer 31 attributed her decreased depression to her break from significant responsibility: “being away from home, not around my family or any other significant responsibilities”.

The emerging codes from the changes described under the depression trait were similar to those described under the anxiety trait and include changes in behaviour, emotions, values and attitudes. The emerging themes for the volunteer experience were participation and responsibility.

8.1.4. Assertiveness

The levels of assertiveness significantly increased post-trip ($W_+ = 360.0$, $W_- = 915.0$, $N = 50$, $p <= 0.007$); the volunteer tourists are likely to speak out more, take charge, and direct the activities of others, and have more of a tendency towards leading.
It was noted earlier, in chapter six, that this result may not be sufficiently reliable to draw definitive statistical conclusions on any potential changes. The reason for this was that the test-retest reliability scores for this trait could not be confirmed; additionally, the control group had significant differences between their first and second test scores suggesting day-to-day life could have increased assertiveness rather than the volunteering experience. Nevertheless, there is evidence of change in this trait amongst the voices of other volunteers (refer to Lepp, 2008; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Wearing, 2001) and in the interview responses from this study’s volunteers (below). Moreover, the transparency of the interpretation of these accounts allows the readers to judge the findings for them-selves.

Volunteer 21 relayed: “By the time I left the children I was quite happy to tell them off if they needed it and to help discipline them” – demonstrating her ‘involvement’ with children.

Other volunteers associated their experience of increased assertiveness with their experience of ‘taking responsibility’: “I try to find solutions to problems” (volunteer 9); “I proved to myself what I am capable of - going to another country by your-self to do something worthwhile” (volunteer 15); and “we had to take charge and responsibility for the children” (volunteer 28). Volunteer 32 comments on her experience at the volunteer house: “there were a lot of volunteers who were on their own for the first time (and some older ones too) who weren’t doing their share around the house.....I was the one who would step up and talk to them about it”, thus implying that she took ‘responsibility’ for the situation.

Volunteer 28 describes an ‘immersive experience’: “they called us mama from the second we walked in. They made us feel so welcome, they needed so much love and care”; also, ‘interaction’: “I felt I had to prove to the ladies who worked there that I didn’t feel like a better person and that I just wanted to help and after some time we became good friends ......, and they became as fond of us as we of them”. This impact was one of increased ‘confidence’: “I learned so much about taking chances and not to be afraid of doing new things".
The emerging code from the changes described under the assertiveness trait was confidence and the emerging themes, from the experiences, were involvement, taking responsibility, immersion and interaction.

As previously mentioned, assertiveness was also a trait that significantly changed (increased) amongst the control group over a similar period of time ($W_+ = 95.5, W_- = 282.5, N = 27, p <= 0.025$). Control members describe their last six months, of taking ‘responsibility’: “I've had an unstable 7 months because our house has been on the market with no imminent sale and my husband took voluntary redundancy, so I have had to be more assertive as a result” (control 2); “I have had to take charge of my elderly parents” (control 5); “I dealt with the pensioners medical aid recently and have had to steer the action against our old employer on behalf of ex-employees” (control 6); and “my work position has altered significantly and a new member of staff is working in the capacity of my manager” (control 22). These experiences were manifested in the control group members’ day-to-day ‘behaviour’ and ‘attitudes’. Control 2 relays how she is ‘behaving’: “over planning and going through a lot of ‘what if’ scenarios”. Control 5 says of his behavioural changes: “I am organising aspects of my parents’ life” and control 22 comments: “I have had to become more assertive and willing to speak out because otherwise I would have lost my grip on the job”. There was also an ‘attitude’ change for one control member who reflects: “I am now more likely to speak out in other situations too” (control 6).

Therefore, significant differences in assertiveness and the resulting behaviour and attitudes brought about by taking responsibility for oneself, others or a task, are not exclusive to the volunteer experience.

8.1.5. Emotionality

Emotionality significantly increased post-trip ($W_+ = 333.5, W_- = 701.5, N = 45, p <= 0.038$); the volunteer tourists have better access to, and awareness of, their own feelings. There is evidence of changes in this trait in other studies. Bailey and Russell (2010), for example, identified positive changes in ‘openness to experience’, one of the ‘Big Five’ personality traits of which ‘emotionality’ is a sub-set.
Volunteer 13 said: “I learned a lot especially respect of other cultures and understanding others’ feelings and their individuality” – ‘gaining knowledge or skills’. The same volunteer also felt that the experience was one of cultural ‘immersion’ and ‘taking responsibility’ for oneself: “living in a different country, with different people and a different language”.

The recurring themes from the experience were thus: gaining ‘knowledge or skills’, cultural ‘immersion’ and ‘taking responsibility’.

**8.1.6. Adventurousness**

Adventurousness significantly increased post-trip ($W_+ = 392.0$, $W_- = 986.0$, $N = 52$, $p <= 0.007$); the volunteer tourists are more eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands and experience different things, finding familiarity and routine boring. Again, there is evidence of changes in this trait in other studies. Bailey and Russell (2010), for example, identified positive changes in ‘openness to experience’, one of the ‘Big Five’ personality traits of which ‘adventurousness’ is also a sub-set.

This study’s volunteers experienced having increased ‘confidence’: “I am not quite as nervous to try new experiences” (volunteer 21); “I feel a sense of achievement and will do more travelling as a woman solo traveller” (volunteer 3). The increased confidence for volunteer 21 was a result of getting ‘involved’ in the experience: “not wanting to miss out on experiences you can’t do at home such as shark diving and sand boarding and experiencing different cultures”.

For volunteer 3, the change was a result of ‘taking responsibility’: “being placed in a different country for the first time on your own”. Volunteer 2 expressed the same sentiment: “travelling on your own to a new country”. She additionally described experiences involving ‘participation’ and ‘immersion’: “I took the opportunity to try new things such as white water rafting, and took the opportunity for cultural immersion”.

Volunteer 29 experienced ‘action’: “I did my sky dive, climbed mountains, hiked glaciers, did shark cage-diving and much more…..oh and had a snake wrapped round my neck…while I was away I very much had the attitude of feel the fear and do it anyway.” A similar response was expressed by volunteer 32: “I did a lot of
crazy things that I never thought I would do – skydiving, shark cage-diving, crawling through caves, etc.” She went on to describe a consequential ‘value’ change: “I have always been really tight with my spending, but I’ve realized now that you only live once so don’t hold back if there’s something you want to do”.

The recurring change themes were thus confidence and value changes. The experience themes were involvement, participation, responsibility, immersion and action.

8.1.7. Vulnerability
Vulnerability significantly decreased post-trip \( (W^+ = 1137.0, W^- = 403.0, N = 55, p <= 0.002) \); the volunteer tourists generally feel more poised, confident and think more clearly under stress. Increased confidence levels were found to be an impact of many volunteer tourism research studies (refer to Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Lepp, 2008; Wearing, 2001). However it was noted earlier (chapter seven) that, for this study, it is unwise to draw any conclusions on this trait-change, as a result of volunteering, because the volunteer group and control group were significantly different at the start.

Nevertheless, there is evidence of change in this trait in the interview responses from this study’s volunteers (below). Moreover, the transparency of the interpretation of these accounts allows the reader to judge the findings in a different way.

Volunteers noted changes in ‘personal circumstances’: “I have since changed jobs” (volunteer 6); changes in ‘confidence’: “my confidence has grown dramatically and I take up every single opportunity now” (volunteer 7); an ‘attitude’ change: “I am less caught up and worried about small things” (volunteer 10); and an ‘emotional’ change: “During my trip home, my first flight was late and I made it to my second flight just in time, but during the whole thing I told myself not to panic and just stay focussed and if I missed my flight I could always catch another and would deal with it if the time came” (volunteer 32).

Volunteer 32 pointed to the ‘responsibility’ for one-self: “This was my first time travelling by myself and going overseas so I was really scared.... making it through
the airports and flights by myself”. Similarly, volunteer 7 pointed to the ‘responsibility’ of “going to another continent without having much contact with home and being far away” and ‘participation’ in various projects: “I saw people and children who were much more vulnerable than me”; also, “I saw how resilient the children were, they never whined or complained, just got on with things, it made me realise that I am quite a complainer. I also saw the care workers who work so hard for so little money; it made me realise how cushy my life is” (Volunteer 10).

These themes were similar to those identified in other traits: changes in confidence, attitudes and emotional changes as a result of having responsibilities and participation. However, a new emerging code was also identified - change to personal circumstances.

8.1.8. Trust

Another trait that was found to be significant in this study was trust. Trust significantly increased post-trip ($W_+ = 404.5, W_- = 973.5, N = 52, p <= 0.010$); the volunteer tourists assume people are fair, honest and have good intentions. A number of volunteer tourism studies have identified positive changes in ‘openness to experience’, one of the ‘Big Five’ personality traits of which ‘trust’ is a sub-set (Bailey and Russell, 2010; Harlow and Pomfret; 2007).

Three volunteers described their ‘involvement’ in the volunteer experience: “I met so many new lovely people who were in the same situation as me” (volunteer 7); “I was thrown into a situation where you live and work with people you’ve never met before” (volunteer 17); “I was constantly with people I didn’t know and therefore had to trust them and go with the flow that I got used to trusting people and hoping for the best” (volunteer 31).

Another volunteer described his ‘participation’: I saw other volunteers being able to do jobs that I thought only I could do properly” (volunteer 12).

Volunteer 3 described how the experience went beyond her ‘expectation’: “I was very ill and people were astonishingly kind”.

The effects of their involvement, participation and expectation, resulted in attitude changes: “I realised that there are also genuine and trustworthy people in the
world which has made me less suspicious and more willing to accept people” (volunteer 3); “I would now trust people with my life” (volunteer 7); “It made me realise that 'others' are just as capable as me” (volunteer 12); “I trust people more now” (volunteer 17).

The recurring change theme was thus attitude changes. The experience themes were involvement, participation and expectation; the latter being a new emerging theme.

8.1.9. Activity

Activity levels significantly changed (increased) as a result of the international volunteering experience ($W_+ = 302.0$, $W_- = 923.0$, $N = 49$, $p <= 0.002$); the volunteer tourists lead a faster-paced, busier life, and move about more quickly, energetically and vigorously, and are more likely to become involved in many activities. Similarities can be drawn between 'activity level' and 'social movement activities', although the latter is most likely a sub-set. McGehee (2002, 2005), McGehee and Santos (2005) and Zahra (2011) found the volunteer tourism experience inspires people to become more socially and politically active and to participate in social movements at home. However, there is no evidence of social action or participation in social movements amongst this study’s volunteers.

Some other ‘actions’ were, nevertheless, identified. Volunteer 10 commented on how she has “a lot more get up and go and doesn’t get bored at all. I fill my time a lot better. Rather than watching TV all night, I watch a programme I find interesting and then read a book rather than watching TV and not really enjoying it. I really want to fill my time up well. In saying that, if I feel I need a rest, I will take a rest too”. She said this was a result of her ‘action’ at the children’s home: “I did find the shifts really tough going. It was a physical job. We would fill the babies bottles in the morning and chop the veg for the day but the hard work was compensated by being with the children and getting to know them. We were always on the go throughout our shift”. She additionally wrote of a change in ‘attitude’ and ‘personal circumstance’: “It made me realise the value of money a lot more. Before, I don't think I really valued money at all and used to waste it on things I didn't really need. I have a lot more respect for money than I used to have”; “the work at Baphumelele made me a lot more resilient and stronger physically”.
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Similarly, Volunteers 30 and 34 wrote of how their ‘personal circumstances’ changed: “it contributed to my losing 3 stone in weight so it has certainly helped with my activity level” as a result of “the action at the children’s home”; “I am trying to keep [physically] active”.

Volunteer 15 said: “I am more motivated to go out and do things instead of getting back into the same everyday routine” – a ‘behavioural’ change. She attributed this change to her ‘involvement’: “there was so much to do and see and I didn’t want to miss out. I also found myself more motivated doing the regular things I could do back home”.

The recurring change themes were thus behaviour, personal circumstance and attitude changes. The experience themes were action and involvement.

8.1.10. Individual deviances

Noting the limitations of investigating group scores in this study, it was useful to explore some individual deviances too. For example, volunteer 26, relayed how her ‘expectations’ had not been met during the trip, causing increased anxiety:

Prior to my trip to SA I felt assured that I was in good hands and that I would be looked after during my time there. As it transpired, the volunteer house was absolutely filthy, over-crowded and extremely untidy and there were issues of burglary within the house. I was offered accommodation via a member of the Aviva staff which I gratefully accepted. This solution however was not without its own issues. The accommodation was out of town, I had to rely on the host to transport me to places. The host insisted on waiting for me therefore I had to return at a specific time. Therefore my leisure time was restricted.

Her reaction afterwards, was an ‘emotional’ one:

All in all it was a tense time and I would never accept volunteer accommodation on ‘trust’ again. Actually I feel that this was a trade description issue as the accommodation was not as it was advertised; had I been asked if I would be happy to share a room with young men I
would have said NO, had I been asked if I would live in poor and badly managed accommodation, I would have said NO. As it happens, the choices I made were based on the information provided which did not live up to its description.

This resulted in her ‘attitude change’: “If I return to SA it will be under very different circumstances, we older volunteers will secure our own arrangements and financial contributions to the projects, and research our own projects before committing”.

This ‘attitude’ contrasts to the majority of responses from volunteers who said they would participate in a similar project either in SA or elsewhere.

A further deviance from the group emerged from the results of volunteer 33. For this volunteer, his assertiveness decreased rather than increased post-trip. He recalled his ‘interaction’ with two ladies: “I was with two ladies, one of whom was very assertive and I tended to go with the flow to make things easier for us all”, as a result he says, “I now allow things to happen and live life more ‘on a need to know’ basis rather than making decisions for myself all the time”, indicating an ‘attitude’ change. However, unlike volunteer 26, this volunteer “would do it all again”.

Volunteer 35, dissimilar to the group norm, showed an overall increase in depression following her trip. She attributed this to not being able to “get the kids to listen; so, [her] anxiety and feelings of being useless increased which exacerbated an underlying medical condition”. She went on to say how her depression worsened because “I felt like I wasn’t doing a good enough job”. Despite this, however, she did comment on how much she enjoyed the experience and explained to me that she “was in a vulnerable state trying to overcome an eating disorder and recognised that perhaps [she] should have volunteered a few years later”.
8.2. The influence of volunteering, travel, tourism, South Africa

Chapter four highlighted how the researcher would address issues around validity and reliability of the results. One of the issues was maintaining internal validity, by ruling out extraneous variables that may account for the results because the control group did not all travel to South Africa as part of their annual vacation. In an attempt to eliminate South Africa per se, the volunteers were asked, during their email interviews, about their trip and specifically about the experiences they believe changed them. The majority of responses indicated that it was a combination of the travel, volunteering and tourism activities rather than the trip to South Africa per se; only two (out of 36) responses attributed their changes to ‘being in South Africa’, see Table 35.

8.3. Conclusion of this chapter

Interviews with the volunteers provided explanations for the causes and consequences of volunteering with Aviva in South Africa. The interpretative phenomenological analysis of these interviews allowed themes to emerge: the experience categories (reported ‘causes’) included: ‘action’, ‘involvement’, ‘responsibility’, ‘participation’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘expectations/satisfaction levels’; the impacts categories (reported ‘consequences’) were changes around: people’s ‘personal circumstances’, ‘behaviour’, emotions’, ‘confidence’, ‘values’, ‘knowledge or skills’ and ‘attitudes’. The following chapter discusses this analysis within the notion of experiential engagement in an attempt to explain transformation in the volunteers, and points to the limitations of this part of the study.
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some older ones too) who weren’t doing their share around the house.....I was the one who would

step up and talk to them about it

Found goodness in people that I was beginning to think doesn’t exist anymore
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Saw people who had nothing which made me feel very humble
Encountered people living with HIV and AIDS who were also warm, kind and happy
Took the opportunity to try new things such as white water rafting
I saw people and children who were much more vulnerable than me
Seeing how resilient the children were, they never whined or complained, just got on with things, it made me realise that I am quite a complainer myself. I also saw the care workers who work so hard for so little money; it made me realise how cushy my life is.
Seeing poverty and seeing how little people have in Khayelitsha [at the children’s home]
The children I cared for suffered many disadvantages but they were generally very positive and dealt with things the best way they could
I have seen kids with not enough food, nothing to look forward to and no toys and they are still the happiest kids in the world! All they want is to be held
I opened my eyes to another country
I saw the good people could do if they take time out for others
I saw other volunteers being able to do jobs that I thought only I could do properly
Being around the kids at the children’s home was a definite help in getting over the issues I had (a huge personal trauma before I left), seeing them so happy really rubs off, and when you see how little they had.
Took the opportunity for cultural immersion, such as eating traditional foods, and visiting traditional villages
I lived in a different country, with different people and a different language
They called us mama from the second we walked in. They made us feel so welcome, they needed so much love and care
We didn’t feel like tourists and that was a great feeling
Met new people
I felt I had to prove to the ladies who worked there that I didn’t feel like a better person and that I just wanted to help and after some time we became good friends with them, and they became as fond of us as we of them
We got to know people from all over the world and we had so much fun
Prior to my trip to SA I felt assured that I was in good hands and that I would be looked after during my time there. As it transpired, the volunteer house was absolutely filthy, over-crowded and extremely untidy and there were issues of burglary within the house. I was offered accommodation via a member of the Aviva staff which I gratefully accepted. This solution however was not without its own issues. The accommodation was out of town, I had to rely on the host to transport me to places. The host insisted on waiting for me therefore I had to return at a specific time. Therefore my leisure time was restricted
I was very ill and people were astonishingly kind
I couldn’t get the kids to listen, so, my anxiety and feelings of being useless increased which exacerbated an underlying medical condition
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Chapter nine embeds the IPA findings within the notion of experiential engagement in an attempt to explain transformation in the volunteers, and points to the limitations of this part of the study. Finally, there is synthesis of all three stages of the research and their contribution to knowledge. The concluding section discusses the validity and reliability of the study and includes some thoughts and pointers for further research, followed by a list of references, appendices and publications.

9.1. Overview

Although some of this study’s objectives were achieved by collecting quantitative data to examine the likelihood of change amongst 15 personality traits, other objectives required a different approach and hence the use of staged methods. The final two objectives are summarised below:

1. Understanding the impact on people’s everyday lives at home.
2. Identifying explanations for the reported changes.

The interpretative phenomenological analysis of data from 36 interviews was used to understand the experiences of this study’s volunteers and the impacts on their daily lives. Using this technique, the study identified seven categories that described changes in the volunteer tourists, within two weeks of returning from their trip. These outcome categories: changes in ‘behaviour’, ‘personal circumstances’, ‘emotions’, ‘confidence’, ‘values’, ‘knowledge or skills’ and ‘attitudes’ all fit well with the volunteer tourism research discussed in the literature review (e.g. Bailey and Russell, 2010; Broad, 2003; Harlow and Pomfret, 2007; Laythorpe, 2009; McGehee and Santos, 2005; Mcintosh and Zahra, 2007; Wearing, 2001; Wickens, 2011; Zahra, 2006, 2011; Zahra and McIntosh, 2007).

Additionally, the study identified seven categories describing the experiences that the volunteers reported to have caused the changes: ‘action’, ‘involvement’, ‘responsibility’, ‘participation’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘expectations/satisfaction levels’. In practice, an understanding of these experiential elements could assist programme developers in creating projects that
not only address community needs but also improve the chances of volunteer satisfaction and other desired outcomes \cite{Ballantyne2011}. Birdwell \citeyear{Birdwell2011} suggests that the best and most effective programmes focus on ensuring both these aspects. The volunteers in this study provide many examples of how each of these experiential elements can be achieved.

Although some of these individual experiential categories are noted in the volunteer tourism literature, in chapter one, particularly interaction, this study consolidates these elements and uses the notion of ‘experiential engagement’ to describe a transformational volunteer tourism experience. This notion was used because many of these elements emerged from the grounded theory study (stage one) to describe the concept of engagement in volunteer tourism. Also, these elements were found in Alexander and Bakir’s \citeyear{Alexander2011} conceptualisation of the volunteer tourism experience through the concepts of ‘Relate-Dedicate-Donate’.

### 9.2. Experiential Engagement

Stage three of this study identified the elements that will most likely transform volunteers, and provided examples of how their day-to-day lives had changed. A transformational volunteer tourism experience is likely to entail a cocktail of experiences within experiential engagement \cite{Ballantyne2011, Daldeniz2011, Sin2009, Tomazos2008}. Evidence of these types of experiences is presented by this study’s volunteers in chapter eight:

- looking after oneself, others or a task (taking responsibility);
- observing whilst sharing in activities (participation);
- actually doing something (action);
- connecting or associating with others or a task (involvement);
- engrossing oneself and getting absorbed in the task (immersion);
- exchanging with other volunteers and the community (interaction);
- and getting what one hopes for (expectation/satisfaction).

One particular element of experiential engagement, ‘taking responsibility’, has been little studied but is receiving increased attention within the field of positive psychology \cite{Snyder2005}.
The notion of ‘taking responsibility’ for oneself and for others, as in volunteering, which can be found in the work of Frankl (2004); Csikszentmihalyi (1997); Maslow (1993) and others, is important in contributing to personal growth. Mustonen (2006) and Brown (2005) use Maslow’s (1970) classic hierarchy of needs to explain people’s search for self-actualisation and personal growth through volunteer tourism. Maslow (1993) writes about the impulse we all have towards growth, or towards the actualisation of human potentialities and how the fear of responsibility thwarts this process (p. 38). He elaborates using the Jonah complex theory, ‘So often we run away from the responsibilities dictated (or rather suggested) by nature, by fate, even sometimes by accident, just as Jonah tried – in vain – to run away from his fate’ (p. 34). Maslow notes that to self-actualise (the need to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming) is ‘to take responsibility’, for ‘each time one takes responsibility, this is an actualising of the self’ (p. 45). Similarly, Csikszentmihalyi (1997:132) acknowledges the importance of taking responsibility: ‘An active responsibility for the rest of humankind, and for the world of which we are a part, is a necessary ingredient of a good life’. He suggests that a simple way of improving the quality of life is to take ownership of one’s actions. Frankl (2004) endorsed a very similar perspective. In this respect, it is an important factor contributing to personal growth. The volunteers in this study noted many occasions where they took responsibility and how in doing their lives changed as indicated by their responses in Table 3, for example, “When I first arrived I was really scared to walk anywhere even during the day and with others........after a few weeks I was able to walk to work by myself” (increased confidence, volunteer 32).

This study shows ‘taking responsibility’ as an important element of experiential engagement and the process that facilitates changes (in self). Harlow and Pomfret (2007) commented on the effects of being given very little responsibility and indicated how their volunteers’ personal development could have been enhanced; whereas, Wearing’s (2001) volunteers recognised the importance of their responsibilities in their own personal development and learning (p. 127). Similarly, Ballantyne and Packer (2011) acknowledge the importance of responsibility in changing visitor behaviour towards the environment; they said that more attention needs to be given to individual actions (responsibilities). In this respect, Maddux (2005) suggests it [personal responsibility] also offers a replacement for the illness
ideology by helping people become more self-directed and self-organised. With regard to this component, and noting the impact that volunteer tourism has on the younger age group in this study, volunteer tourism may be thought of as a way of potentially reducing rates of re-offending and other self outcomes (see Moore and Allen, 1996; Paine et al., 2007). Further research is required in this area, particularly with regard to government policy initiatives relating to youth programmes (Mattero, 2008).

9.3. Limitations of this stage of the study

The limitations of this study were discussed in the methodology chapter and are summarised here. Although every effort was made to ensure the qualitative findings were accurate, truthful, and credible; inviting the informants to read and validate the analysis, and conducting the interview by email rather than face to face, interview reactivity can still cause bias in the interview responses, and so can the researcher’s interpretation/subjectivity in arriving at these findings.

In order to discover why some traits were impacted more than others, it would have been useful to interview volunteers on all of their trait changes rather than just the areas of most change. Given the feedback from the pilot study and the influence of time commitment on response rates, the researcher focussed only on the significant changes.

Although credibility in staged methods research is an issue because of the difficulty of linking methods together (Creswell et al., 2003) and of inter-paradigmatic shifts, it must, nevertheless, be ultimately derived from the logic of the study’s methodological design – the sample, appropriateness of the measurements used, and the adequacy of the control group. In this respect, as Mason (1996) suggests, the study spelt out the approach and decision trail about the theoretical, methodological and analytical choices made so that the reader can engage with the interpretation and look at how the findings were produced and how the processes affected what was produced.

Although this study identified seven categories of experience responsible for transforming volunteers, it does not examine these to any great depth; it only provides examples of these experiences from the interviews with the volunteers.
The study could therefore be improved by, for example, examining the types of interaction, involvement, participation, action, immersion, responsibilities and expectations found from the volunteer tourism experience. Also, identifying sub-categories, would have been useful, such as, culture shock and the adjustments volunteers make to their lives abroad noted within the category ‘immersion’ (discussed in Laythorpe, 2009; Wickens, 2011). This would provide a more in-depth understanding of the experience. Also, process variables, such as motivation, were not examined in this study; these may be useful in predicting the influence of these experiences. Similarly, for the seven categories of impacts identified in this study, a more in-depth understanding of these may be useful to stakeholders; such as, knowing the types of skills and knowledge gained from volunteer tourism and the types of behaviour outcomes expected including re-assimilation into their home communities (see Machin, 2008).

9.4. Interpretation and conclusion

A synthesis of the grounded theory findings, statistical results and interpretative phenomenological analysis of interviews is presented in Figure 18. This figure shows the elements of experiential engagement in volunteer tourism: ‘action’, ‘involvement/integration’, ‘responsibility’, ‘participation/penetration’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘expectations/satisfaction levels’; influenced by length of stay, age, gender, and project type. The personality inventory identified seven traits (anxiety, trust, artistic interest, depression, emotionality, activity level and adventurousness) that changed as a result of this engagement, and interviews with the volunteers revealed how these changes, presented in the form of categories (values, confidence, attitudes, personal circumstances, behaviour, emotions, knowledge and skills) manifested themselves in people’s everyday lives at home. Building on Alexander and Bakir’s (2011) notion of Engagement Theory, engagement in volunteer tourism emerges as a process that starts with experiential engagement and ends with specific changes in participants’ day-to-day lives.
Figure 18. A diagrammatic representation of Engagement Theory.
Notwithstanding the limitations of this staged methods study, its findings as identified earlier, nevertheless, make some significant contributions to knowledge and add to the volunteer tourism literature. Glaser’s grounded theory, the first method used in this study, offers a new explanation for volunteer tourism – the engagement in volunteer work as a tourist. At the same time, it allowed the deconstruction of constituent elements (engagement, volunteer work and tourist) and, combined, differentiates volunteer tourism from other forms of tourism and its allied notions such as cultural tourism, ecotourism, and other notions highlighted in chapter one. Engagement emerged as the core category within which subcategories emerged (interaction, involvement/integration, participation/penetration, action, immersion, responsibility and expectations/satisfaction), expanding on Alexander and Bakir’s (2011) Engagement Theory of ‘Relate-Dedicate-Donate,’ to explain transformation in volunteers’ daily lives at home:

‘Relate’ describes volunteer tourists interacting and getting involved (integrating) with other volunteers and the communities. Volunteer tourists ‘donate’ to an outside customer, the community where the project is located, by doing something (action) and getting absorbed in the tasks at hand (immersion), and volunteer tourists ‘dedicate’ themselves by participating in purposeful work where they expect to apply their knowledge and skills to existing worthwhile projects; additionally taking responsibility for oneself, others or a task.

Additionally, the second method (the personality inventory) provides a new dimension to the outcomes of volunteer tourism identified in the literature review; it focuses on personality traits and identifies the likelihood of these changing as a result of a volunteering trip; thus adding to our body of knowledge on volunteer tourism. It contributes to the call for developing more evidence to establish the effectiveness of volunteer programmes, particularly government programmes because there is a lack of rigorous, publicly available and easily accessible research on these service programmes, especially on youth projects outside of North America and Europe (Mattero, 2008). Birdwell (2011) and Harlow and Pomfret (2007) add that projects should be developed to achieve and measure personal development outcomes for volunteers. In South Africa, Benson and
Seibert (2009) and Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) note that the literature associated with volunteer tourism’s outcomes is limited, most provide rich subjective data of impacts with very few studies providing statistical evidence. In this study, some traits are highly likely (greater than 95%) to change, such as, anxiety (decreased), trust (increased), artistic interests (increased), depression (decreased), emotionality (increased), activity levels (increased) and adventurousness (increased); whilst other traits are not, such as, self-efficacy, altruism, dutifulness, intellect, liberalism and cautiousness. Also the use of a matched control group, living their day-to-day lives enhanced the validity of this study as part of the scientific method.

This study points to changes in some traits that are new to the volunteer tourism literature, they are, changes in ‘anxiety’, ‘depression’ and ‘activity’. Also whilst identifying some similarities to other studies, such as, changes (increases) in emotionality, trust, artistic interest and adventurousness (see Bailey and Russell, 2010, who studied these traits under the umbrella of ‘openness to experience’), the findings of this study also point to some significant contrasts. In contrast to Wearing (2001), Lough et al. (2009b) and Bailey and Russell (2010), this study showed no significant increases in altruism. Also, the findings differ from McGehee and Santos (2005), Zahra (2011) and Zahra and McIntosh (2007) as they reported increases in self-efficacy in their studies. Similarly, Broad (2003), Harlow and Pomfret (2007) and Wearing (2001) reported changes in liberalism; whereas this study did not. Lastly, Zahra and McIntosh (2007) reported an increased sense of duty amongst their volunteers; whereas this study did not. None of these studies determined the statistical probabilities of change in these areas and this may account for these different findings, as this study found that, although these traits may change, the statistical probabilities of them doing so are below the recognised percentage of 95%.

Furthermore, by investigating the influence of other variables on these traits, such as age, gender, project type, length of stay and time elapsed post-trip; some gaps in the volunteer tourism literature were filled as the research in these areas tends to be limited and somewhat contradictory (Machin, 2008). This study discovered that all of these variables have an effect on the 15 traits measured. The volunteering experience is more likely to change the 16-29 years of age than the
30+ years. Some traits are significantly more likely to change amongst the men (trust and dutifulness) and others amongst the women (adventurousness, assertiveness, activity and anxiety). Similarly, there are different outcomes depending on the type of volunteer project volunteers participate in; wildlife volunteers are significantly more likely to change for trust, assertiveness and emotionality, whereas the depression trait is more likely to change amongst community volunteers. Also, the length of stay influenced the likelihood of change; there are more potential benefits to those volunteers staying 5 to 12 weeks rather than the shorter or longer periods of time. Therefore, those benefitting most from volunteer tourism tend to be a certain type: female, aged between 16 and 29, engaged in wildlife projects of between 5 and 12 weeks in duration. The results of this study also counter the argument presented by Ewert and Sibthorp (2009) that there are often strong initial gains from such experiences but these decline over time; the measured outcomes of this study were still present one to two years later; with no significant differences between the post-trip and follow-up scores.

The staged methods design approach of this study proved useful as it allowed us to gain a broader understanding of the impact of volunteer tourism on the volunteer, and build on Alexander and Bakir’s (2011) notion of Engagement Theory in volunteer tourism. The engagement in volunteer tourism as a tourist emerges as a process that starts with experiential engagement through volunteers' ‘action’, ‘involvement’, ‘responsibility’, ‘participation’, ‘immersion’, ‘interaction’ and ‘expectations/satisfaction levels’; and ends with specific changes in participants' day-to-day lives, categorised as changes in people's ‘personal circumstances’, ‘behaviour’, emotions’, ‘confidence’, ‘values’, ‘knowledge or skills’ and ‘attitudes’. This knowledge provides a greater understanding of engagement as it identifies the elements that will most likely transform volunteers in the mentioned ways. One particular element, ‘taking responsibility’, emerged as a new and important transformational factor in experiential engagement.

Such a staged methods approach, used to gain a broader understanding of the substantive area, is novel in volunteer tourism research; its adoption in this study thus also provides a contribution to the field’s methodology.
The evidence presented in this study shows that volunteer tourism represents a proactive catalyst for altering our perspectives and subsequently our actions. In this respect, it offers a potential contribution to positive psychology. Additionally, it answers the call to use a diversity of methods (Ong and Van Dulmen, 2007), and offers a context in which to study these traits further.

**The validity and reliability of this study’s findings**

The validity and reliability of this study’s findings were discussed comprehensively in the methodology chapter. A number of techniques were used to enhance validity such as respondents validating the results of the personality inventory; presenting verbatim extracts of the participants’ accounts; carrying out an a priori power analysis on the sample size to determine statistical validity; carrying out the grounded theory part of this study to arrive at an explanation for volunteer tourism before determining its impact on the participant; using a standardised personality inventory; and using a control group to rule out some extraneous variables that may account for the findings in conjunction with interviews with the volunteers.

A number of techniques were also used to enhance this study’s reliability such as being transparent in the interpretation of the participants’ accounts within the findings; verifying the test-retest reliability of the shortened version of the IPIP-NEO personality inventory by testing for similar scores over two points in time; and using a staged methods approach for data collection.

Furthermore, as IPA operates within a different discourse to the personality inventory, it requires different strategies for evaluation. Every effort was made to ensure the findings were accurate, truthful, and credible; inviting the informants to read and validate the analysis, and conducting the interview by email rather than face to face. However, interview reactivity can still cause bias in the responses, and so can the researcher’s interpretation/subjectivity in arriving at the findings.

**Thoughts and pointers for further research**

During the course of this study, a number of areas were highlighted for further research; a more extensive understanding, of the impact of volunteer tourism, could be gained by measuring all thirty sub-traits that make up Costa and
McCrae’s (1992) Five-Factor Model of personality, not just the fifteen traits measured for this study.

It is possible that there are greater differences between the gender types than currently thought (Harasty et al., 1997); an area that could benefit from further research especially in relation to targeting specific markets for specific beneficial impacts. Also, little research has been done on the influence of project type on the volunteer tourism experience so this is another area that may benefit from further research, particularly if different projects could provide different beneficial impacts.

It appears from the results of this study, that those benefitting most from volunteer tourism tend to be female, aged between 16 and 29, engaged in wildlife projects of between 5 and 12 weeks in duration (Type 1: maximum impact). Whereas those benefiting the least, tend to be male, 30+ years in age, and engaged in community projects for less than 5 weeks or greater than 12 weeks (Type 2: minimum impact). This study offers a platform for further research on the types of volunteers that will benefit the most (or least) from volunteer tourism.

In this study there were other important variables that were not investigated, such as, destination country, respondents’ culture, the country of origin of the volunteers, motivation for participation, type of provider/volunteer organisation, travel and volunteer experience of the volunteers. All these moderating variables are important in understanding the potential causes and consequences of change amongst the volunteers (Lee and Woosnam, 2010; McGehee et al., 2009; Schott, 2011); they provide many opportunities for further research on the topic; particularly in predicting which traits will change. Furthermore, these variables may identify other transformative potentials that will build on engagement in volunteer tourism.

Lastly, it was noted that a more comprehensive longitudinal study, involving more volunteers completing the follow-up test one to two years later, is required to clarify whether the changes identified are temporary or more permanent in nature.

Considering the limitations of this study and noting the benefits of further research in particular areas, this study has shown that experiential engagement in volunteer
tourism is responsible for effecting change in some personality traits amongst participating volunteers.
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Appendix 1: The definitions of the thirty traits

For the IPIP-NEO personality inventory, John A. Johnson wrote descriptions of the five domains and thirty subdomains. These descriptions are based on an extensive reading of the scientific literature on personality measurement. Although Dr. Johnson would like to be acknowledged as the author of these materials if they are reproduced, he has placed them in the public domain.

**Extraversion**

Extraversion is marked by pronounced engagement with the external world. Extraverts enjoy being with people, are full of energy, and often experience positive emotions. They tend to be enthusiastic, action-oriented, individuals who are likely to say "Yes!" or "Let's go!" to opportunities for excitement. In groups they like to talk, assert themselves, and draw attention to themselves.

Introverts lack the exuberance, energy, and activity levels of extraverts. They tend to be quiet, low-key, deliberate, and disengaged from the social world. Their lack of social involvement should not be interpreted as shyness or depression; the introvert simply needs less stimulation than an extravert and prefers to be alone. The independence and reserve of the introvert is sometimes mistaken as unfriendliness or arrogance. In reality, an introvert who scores high on the agreeableness dimension will not seek others out but will be quite pleasant when approached.

**Extraversion Facets**

*Friendliness*. Friendly people genuinely like other people and openly demonstrate positive feelings toward others. They make friends quickly and it is easy for them to form close, intimate relationships. Low scorers on Friendliness are not necessarily cold and hostile, but they do not reach out to others and are perceived as distant and reserved.

*Gregariousness*. Gregarious people find the company of others pleasantly stimulating and rewarding. They enjoy the excitement of crowds. Low scorers tend to feel overwhelmed by, and therefore actively avoid, large crowds. They do not necessarily dislike being with people sometimes, but their need for privacy and time to themselves is much greater than for individuals who score high on this scale.

*Assertiveness*. High scorers Assertiveness like to speak out, take charge, and direct the activities of others. They tend to be leaders in groups. Low scorers tend not to talk much and let others control the activities of groups.

*Activity Level*. Active individuals lead fast-paced, busy lives. They move about quickly, energetically, and vigorously, and they are involved in many activities. People who score low on this scale follow a slower and more leisurely, relaxed pace.

*Excitement-Seeking*. High scorers on this scale are easily bored without high levels of stimulation. They love bright lights and hustle and bustle. They are likely to take risks and seek thrills. Low scorers are overwhelmed by noise and commotion and are adverse to thrill-seeking.
Cheerfulness. This scale measures positive mood and feelings, not negative emotions (which are a part of the Neuroticism domain). Persons who score high on this scale typically experience a range of positive feelings, including happiness, enthusiasm, optimism, and joy. Low scorers are not as prone to such energetic, high spirits.

Agreeableness

Agreeableness reflects individual differences in concern with cooperation and social harmony. Agreeable individual’s value getting along with others. They are therefore considerate, friendly, generous, helpful, and willing to compromise their interests with others’. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature. They believe people are basically honest, decent, and trustworthy.

Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and therefore are unlikely to extend themselves for other people. Sometimes their scepticism about others' motives causes them to be suspicious, unfriendly, and uncooperative.

Agreeableness is obviously advantageous for attaining and maintaining popularity. Agreeable people are better liked than disagreeable people. On the other hand, agreeableness is not useful in situations that require tough or absolute objective decisions. Disagreeable people can make excellent scientists, critics, or soldiers.

Agreeableness Facets

Trust. A person with high trust assumes that most people are fair, honest, and have good intentions. Persons low in trust see others as selfish, devious, and potentially dangerous.

Morality. High scorers on this scale see no need for pretence or manipulation when dealing with others and are therefore candid, frank, and sincere. Low scorers believe that a certain amount of deception in social relationships is necessary. People find it relatively easy to relate to the straightforward high-scorers on this scale. They generally find it more difficult to relate to the unstraightforward low-scorers on this scale. It should be made clear that low scorers are not unprincipled or immoral; they are simply more guarded and less willing to openly reveal the whole truth.

Altruism. Altruistic people find helping other people genuinely rewarding. Consequently, they are generally willing to assist those who are in need. Altruistic people find that doing things for others is a form of self-fulfilment rather than self-sacrifice. Low scorers on this scale do not particularly like helping those in need. Requests for help feel like an imposition rather than an opportunity for self-fulfilment.

Cooperation. Individuals who score high on this scale dislike confrontations. They are perfectly willing to compromise or to deny their own needs in order to get along with others. Those who score low on this scale are more likely to intimidate others to get their way.

Modesty. High scorers on this scale do not like to claim that they are better than other people. In some cases this attitude may derive from low self-confidence or self-esteem. Nonetheless, some people with high self-esteem find immodesty unseemly. Those who are willing to describe themselves as superior tend to be seen as disagreeably arrogant by other people.
Sympathy. People who score high on this scale are tender-hearted and compassionate. They feel the pain of others vicariously and are easily moved to pity. Low scorers are not affected strongly by human suffering. They pride themselves on making objective judgments based on reason. They are more concerned with truth and impartial justice than with mercy.

Conscientiousness

Conscientiousness concerns the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses. Impulses are not inherently bad; occasionally time constraints require a snap decision, and acting on our first impulse can be an effective response. Also, in times of play rather than work, acting spontaneously and impulsively can be fun. Impulsive individuals can be seen by others as colourful, fun-to-be-with, and zany.

Nonetheless, acting on impulse can lead to trouble in a number of ways. Some impulses are antisocial. Uncontrolled antisocial acts not only harm other members of society, but also can result in retribution toward the perpetrator of such impulsive acts. Another problem with impulsive acts is that they often produce immediate rewards but undesirable, long-term consequences. Examples include excessive socializing that leads to being fired from one's job, hurling an insult that causes the breakup of an important relationship, or using pleasure-inducing drugs that eventually destroy one's health.

Impulsive behaviour, even when not seriously destructive, diminishes a person's effectiveness in significant ways. Acting impulsively disallows contemplating alternative courses of action, some of which would have been wiser than the impulsive choice. Impulsivity also sidetracks people during projects that require organized sequences of steps or stages. Accomplishments of an impulsive person are therefore small, scattered, and inconsistent.

A hallmark of intelligence, what potentially separates human beings from earlier life forms, is the ability to think about future consequences before acting on an impulse. Intelligent activity involves contemplation of long-range goals, organizing and planning routes to these goals, and persisting toward one's goals in the face of short-lived impulses to the contrary. The idea that intelligence involves impulse control is nicely captured by the term prudence, an alternative label for the Conscientiousness domain. Prudent means both wise and cautious. Persons who score high on the Conscientiousness scale are, in fact, perceived by others as intelligent.

The benefits of high conscientiousness are obvious. Conscientious individuals avoid trouble and achieve high levels of success through purposeful planning and persistence. They are also positively regarded by others as intelligent and reliable. On the negative side, they can be compulsive perfectionists and workaholics. Furthermore, extremely conscientious individuals might be regarded as stuffy and boring. Unconscientious people may be criticized for their unreliability, lack of ambition, and failure to stay within the lines, but they will experience many short-lived pleasures and they will never be called stuffy.

Conscientiousness Facets

Self-Efficacy. Self-Efficacy describes confidence in one's ability to accomplish things. High scorers believe they have the intelligence (common sense), drive, and self-control
necessary for achieving success. Low scorers do not feel effective, and may have a sense that they are not in control of their lives.

*Orderliness.* Persons with high scores on orderliness are well-organized. They like to live according to routines and schedules. They keep lists and make plans. Low scorers tend to be disorganized and scattered.

*Dutifulness.* This scale reflects the strength of a person's sense of duty and obligation. Those who score high on this scale have a strong sense of moral obligation. Low scorers find contracts, rules, and regulations overly confining. They are likely to be seen as unreliable or even irresponsible.

*Achievement-Striving.* Individuals who score high on this scale strive hard to achieve excellence. Their drive to be recognized as successful keeps them on track toward their lofty goals. They often have a strong sense of direction in life, but extremely high scores may be too single-minded and obsessed with their work. Low scorers are content to get by with a minimal amount of work, and might be seen by others as lazy. Your level of achievement striving is high.

*Self-Discipline.* Self-discipline—what many people call will-power—refers to the ability to persist at difficult or unpleasant tasks until they are completed. People who possess high self-discipline are able to overcome reluctance to begin tasks and stay on track despite distractions. Those with low self-discipline procrastinate and show poor follow-through, often failing to complete tasks—even tasks they want very much to complete.

*Cautiousness.* Cautiousness describes the disposition to think through possibilities before acting. High scorers on the Cautiousness scale take their time when making decisions. Low scorers often say or do first thing that comes to mind without deliberating alternatives and the probable consequences of those alternatives.

**Neuroticism**

Freud originally used the term *neurosis* to describe a condition marked by mental distress, emotional suffering, and an inability to cope effectively with the normal demands of life. He suggested that everyone shows some signs of neurosis, but that we differ in our degree of suffering and our specific symptoms of distress. Today neuroticism refers to the tendency to experience negative feelings. Those who score high on Neuroticism may experience primarily one specific negative feeling such as anxiety, anger, or depression, but are likely to experience several of these emotions. People high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive. They respond emotionally to events that would not affect most people, and their reactions tend to be more intense than normal. They are more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and minor frustrations as hopelessly difficult. Their negative emotional reactions tend to persist for unusually long periods of time, which means they are often in a bad mood. These problems in emotional regulation can diminish a neurotic's ability to think clearly, make decisions, and cope effectively with stress.

At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low in neuroticism are less easily upset and are less emotionally reactive. They tend to be calm, emotionally stable, and free from persistent negative feelings. Freedom from negative feelings does not mean that low scorers experience a lot of positive feelings; frequency of positive emotions is a component of the Extraversion domain.
Neuroticism Facets

Anxiety. The "fight-or-flight" system of the brain of anxious individuals is too easily and too often engaged. Therefore, people who are high in anxiety often feel like something dangerous is about to happen. They may be afraid of specific situations or be just generally fearful. They feel tense, jittery, and nervous. Persons low in Anxiety are generally calm and fearless.

Anger. Persons who score high in Anger feel enraged when things do not go their way. They are sensitive about being treated fairly and feel resentful and bitter when they feel they are being cheated. This scale measures the tendency to feel angry; whether or not the person expresses annoyance and hostility depends on the individual's level on Agreeableness. Low scorers do not get angry often or easily.

Depression. This scale measures the tendency to feel sad, dejected, and discouraged. High scorers lack energy and have difficult initiating activities. Low scorers tend to be free from these depressive feelings.

Self-Consciousness. Self-conscious individuals are sensitive about what others think of them. Their concern about rejection and ridicule cause them to feel shy and uncomfortable around others. They are easily embarrassed and often feel ashamed. Their fears that others will criticize or make fun of them are exaggerated and unrealistic, but their awkwardness and discomfort may make these fears a self-fulfilling prophecy. Low scorers, in contrast, do not suffer from the mistaken impression that everyone is watching and judging them. They do not feel nervous in social situations.

Immoderation. Immoderate individuals feel strong cravings and urges that they have difficulty resisting. They tend to be oriented toward short-term pleasures and rewards rather than long-term consequences. Low scorers do not experience strong, irresistible cravings and consequently do not find themselves tempted to overindulge.

Vulnerability. High scorers on Vulnerability experience panic, confusion, and helplessness when under pressure or stress. Low scorers feel more poised, confident, and clear-thinking when stressed.

Openness to Experience

Openness to Experience describes a dimension of cognitive style that distinguishes imaginative, creative people from down-to-earth, conventional people. Open people are intellectually curious, appreciative of art, and sensitive to beauty. They tend to be, compared to closed people, more aware of their feelings. They tend to think and act in individualistic and nonconforming ways. Intellectuals typically score high on Openness to Experience; consequently, this factor has also been called Culture or Intellect. Nonetheless, Intellect is probably best regarded as one aspect of openness to experience. Scores on Openness to Experience are only modestly related to years of education and scores on standard intelligent tests.

Another characteristic of the open cognitive style is a facility for thinking in symbols and abstractions far removed from concrete experience. Depending on the individual's specific intellectual abilities, this symbolic cognition may take the form of mathematical, logical, or geometric thinking, artistic and metaphorical use of language, music composition or performance, or one of the many visual or performing arts. People with low scores on
openness to experience tend to have narrow, common interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward, and obvious over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle. They may regard the arts and sciences with suspicion, regarding these endeavours as abstruse or of no practical use. Closed people prefer familiarity over novelty; they are conservative and resistant to change.

Openness is often presented as healthier or more mature by psychologists, who are often themselves open to experience. However, open and closed styles of thinking are useful in different environments. The intellectual style of the open person may serve a professor well, but research has shown that closed thinking is related to superior job performance in police work, sales, and a number of service occupations.

**Openness Facets**

*Imagination.* To imaginative individuals, the real world is often too plain and ordinary. High scorers on this scale use fantasy as a way of creating a richer, more interesting world. Low scorers on this scale are more oriented to facts than fantasy.

*Artistic Interests.* High scorers on this scale love beauty, both in art and in nature. They become easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. They are neither necessarily artistically trained nor talented, although many will be. The defining features of this scale are interest in, and appreciation of natural and artificial beauty. Low scorers lack aesthetic sensitivity and interest in the arts.

*Emotionality.* Persons high on Emotionality have good access to and awareness of their own feelings. Low scorers are less aware of their feelings and tend not to express their emotions openly.

*Adventurousness.* High scorers on adventurousness are eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands, and experience different things. They find familiarity and routine boring, and will take a new route home just because it is different. Low scorers tend to feel uncomfortable with change and prefer familiar routines.

*Intellect.* Intellect and artistic interests are the two most important, central aspects of openness to experience. High scorers on Intellect love to play with ideas. They are open-minded to new and unusual ideas, and like to debate intellectual issues. They enjoy riddles, puzzles, and brain teasers. Low scorers on Intellect prefer dealing with people or things rather than ideas. They regard intellectual exercises as a waste of time. Intellect should not be equated with intelligence. Intellect is an intellectual style, not an intellectual ability, although high scorers on Intellect score slightly higher than low-Intellect individuals on standardized intelligence tests.

*Liberalism.* Psychological liberalism refers to a readiness to challenge authority, convention, and traditional values. In its most extreme form, psychological liberalism can even represent outright hostility toward rules, sympathy for law-breakers, and love of ambiguity, chaos, and disorder. Psychological conservatives prefer the security and stability brought by conformity to tradition. Psychological liberalism and conservatism are not identical to political affiliation, but certainly incline individuals toward certain political parties.

Appendix 2: The Personality Inventory: www.bucksresearch.org.uk

Know thyself Zoë Alexander is investigating the impact of international volunteering on “the self”

Please fill in the personality questionnaire before you go on the trip
Zoë will analyse the data and will send information about your personality traits.

Please use the rating scale next to each phrase to describe how accurately each statement describes you.
Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future.
Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. Please tick one box only

Back to main page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before the trip</th>
<th>After the trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Very inaccurate | Neither Accurate
| 2 | Moderately inaccurate | Moderately Accurate
| 3 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 4 | Not Inaccurate | Moderately Accurate
| 5 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 6 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 7 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 8 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 9 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 10 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 11 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 12 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 13 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 14 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 15 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 16 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 17 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 18 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 19 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 20 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 21 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 22 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 23 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 24 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 25 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 26 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 27 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 28 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 29 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 30 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 31 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 32 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 33 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 34 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 35 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 36 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 37 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 38 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 39 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 40 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate
| 41 | Not Inaccurate | Very Accurate

This questionnaire is completed.

- Worry about things
- Trust others.
- Complete tasks successfully.
- Believe in the importance of art
- Often feel blue.
- Take charge.
- Experience my emotions intensely
- Love to help others
- Keep my promises
- Am always busy
- Prefer variety to routine
- Love to read challenging material
- Panic easily
- Tend to vote for liberal political candidates
- Jump into things without thinking
- Fear the worst
- Believe that others have good intentions
- Excel in what I do
- See beauty in things that others might not notice
- Dislike myself
- Try to lead others
- Feel other's emotions
- Am concerned about others
- Tell the truth
- Am always on the go
- Prefer to stick with the things that I know
- Avoid philosophical discussions
- Become overwhelmed by events
- Believe that there is no absolute right or wrong.
- Make rash decisions
- Am afraid of many things
- Trust what people say
- Handle tasks smoothly
- Do not like poetry
- Am often down in the dumps
- Take control of things
- Am passionate about causes.
- Am indifferent to the feelings of others
- Break rules
- Do a lot in my spare time
- Dislike changes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas</th>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Moderately inaccurate</th>
<th>Neither Accurate</th>
<th>Moderately Accurate</th>
<th>Very Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel that I'm unable to deal with things</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tend to vote for conservative political candidates</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rush into things</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get stressed out easily</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distrust people</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Know how to get things done</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not enjoy going to art museums</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel comfortable with myself</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wait for others to lead the way</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't understand people who get emotional</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take no time for others</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break my promises</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am attached to conventional ways</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am not interested in theoretical discussions</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remain calm under pressure.</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believe that we should be tough on crime</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act without thinking</td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Moderately inaccurate</td>
<td>Neither Accurate</td>
<td>Moderately Accurate</td>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submit | Reset

For further information, please email: zaaalexander@yahoo.co.uk

Back to main page
Appendix 3: An a Priori Power Analysis

Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed ranks tests - ideal sample size required for power 0.80 and 0.95


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t tests -- Means: Wilcoxon signed–rank test (matched pairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> A priori: Compute required sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options:</strong> A.R.E. method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail(s) = Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent distribution = Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect size dz = 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α err prob = 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (1−β err prob) = 0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncentrality parameter δ = 2.8906114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical t = 2.0358928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df = 32.4225380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample size = 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual power = 0.8006915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t tests -- Means: Wilcoxon signed–rank test (matched pairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong> A priori: Compute required sample size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options:</strong> A.R.E. method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail(s) = Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent distribution = Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect size dz = 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α err prob = 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (1−β err prob) = 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncentrality parameter δ = 3.6888681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical t = 2.0053684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df = 53.4309905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample size = 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual power = 0.9517259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mann-Whitney U-tests - ideal sample size required for power 0.80

| Options: | A.R.E. method |
| Analysis: | A priori: Compute required sample size |
| Input: | Tail(s) = Two |
| Parent distribution | Normal |
| Effect size d | 0.5 [0.6]19 |
| \( \alpha \) err prob | 0.05 |
| Power (1-\( \beta \) err prob) | 0.8 |
| Allocation ratio N2/N1 | 1 |
| Output: | Noncentrality parameter \( \delta \) = 2.8279915 |
| Critical t | 1.9789766 |
| Df | 125.9606 |
| Sample size group 1 | 67 [60]20 |
| Sample size group 2 | 67 [35]21 |
| Total sample size | 134 |
| Actual power | 0.8013372 |

---

19 A smaller sample (see below) reduces the sensitivity of the test from effect 0.5 to 0.6.
20 The effect changes if you reduce the volunteer group size from 67 to 60.
21 The effect changes if you reduce the control group size from 67 to 35.
Appendix 4: The Home Page for www.bucksresearch.org.uk

---

Buckinghamshire New University Research

Zoë Alexander is investigating the impact of international volunteering on ‘the self’

Zoë, a PhD student, is inviting you to participate in this research project so that you can discover how the volunteering experience could change and develop you as a person.

You will decide how much time you want to spend. It could take from 5 minutes to complete a personality questionnaire up to an hour if you accept to be interviewed by Zoë.

By taking part you will be able to find amazing things about yourself.

Please click here to enter the web-page

---

For further information, please email: zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk

Know thyself Zoë Alexander is investigating the impact of international volunteering on ‘the self’

First we need some information about you. CLICK HERE to input the information.
Then, please CLICK HERE to input the personality questionnaire.
Zoë will analyse the data and will send a summary of your personality traits, CLICK HERE for an example.

Once you have returned from your trip, you will be asked to CLICK HERE to input another personality questionnaire.
Zoë will analyse the data and will send information about the changes in your personality traits.
All data will be treated in the strictest confidence and no information about you will be disclosed to anyone.

For further information, please email zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk
Appendix 6: The Questionnaire Page for www.bucksresearch.org.uk
--- On Tue, 29/7/08, Ed Scott <ed@aviva-sa.com> wrote:
From: Ed Scott <ed@aviva-sa.com>
Subject: RE: Two requests please: 1. To be a Control Group Member 2. To put the web-link on
To: zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk
Date: Tuesday, 29 July, 2008, 7:48 AM

Hi Zoe,

I will be very happy to add your survey link to our confirmation email. It might be best if we include an introduction by way of invitation (and to arouse their interest), something along the lines of...

Would you like to find out more about yourself, and how your volunteering experience could change and develop you as a person? If so, you may be interested to know that PhD student, Zoë Alexander, is investigating the impact of international volunteering on ‘the self’, and she would love to hear from you before and after your volunteering experience.

It has long been suspected that volunteering has a positive impact on a person’s self-development, and this has been borne out both by the changes we have seen in volunteers during their stay with us, and by the actions they have taken on their return home. Zoe’s study is the first of its kind to look at this specific area of volunteering scientifically, and as the majority of volunteers rarely think about how they will benefit when they book a project, this should prove to be an enlightening experience for everyone involved!

If you would like to take part in this ground breaking study, please visit Zoe’s website at www.bucksresearch.org.uk to submit a short confidential survey before and after your trip.

The web site includes clear instructions on completing your first survey, and as a thank you, Zoe can send you a summary of your personality traits within 3 working days. You will also find contact details for Zoe and she will be very happy to answer any questions you may have about her research.

Please let me know if you would like to change this, and once you’re happy, we will start to include this in our emails. I can also add an entry to our Facebook page for this.

All the best Ed Ed Scott Aviva Co-director
Re: Request to be a Control Group Member

Tuesday, 12 August, 2008 9:10 AM
From: "Alexander" <zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk>
To: 

Dear XXX,

Thank you for agreeing to participate, as a Control Group Member, in a research project investigating the impact of voluntourism (international volunteering) on "the self". The purpose of the Control Group is to determine whether the impact of international volunteer work on "the self" is due to the volunteer experience rather than life events generally.

Please would you take 10 minutes (max.) to link to www.bucksresearch.org.uk and answer/submit the short questionnaire about your-self and answer/submit the personality inventory (click 'before').

Because you are a Control Group Member, some questions about yourself will be irrelevant so please just place a 'NA' alongside them. They are:
- When is your estimated return date?
- What do you think you will do on the project?
- What do you want to do with your spare time....?
- Why are you participating in this type of hols?

Please do, however, give me your perception of what international volunteering is, in the relevant box, even if you haven't done any international volunteering.

Within 3 working days, you will receive some interesting information about your personality traits which I will, in six months time, compare to a second personality inventory and feed-back to you.

Many thanks for your support
Kind regards
Zoe
Appendix 9: An example of a submitted questionnaire and PI

Re: Submitted form contents from your website - Questionnaire

Thursday, 15 January, 2009 8:03 AM
From:
"root@bucksresearch.org.uk" <root@bucksresearch.org.uk>
Add sender to Contacts
To:
zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk
Input from submitted form:

Address = pittiramu@gmail.com
Gender = M
Age = 16-29
Occupation = Bush Regenerator
Country = Australia
Return_date = Early June 2009
Activities = Learn about animals, the bush, the environment, and gain skills.
Activities = Do some touristy things, meet the local people, immerse myself in the culture and feel of the place.
Volunteering = It is a good way to make money to fund projects as well as allowing people to experience different countries and cultures as well gaining something for themselves.
Reasons_for_participation = To further my career, to have an adventure, and to learn and see new things.
Submit = Submit

Additional (client) information:

Date = 2009-01-15 08:03
Browser = HTTP_USER_AGENT
IP Address = 60.240.53.63
Hostname = 60-240-53-63.tpgi.com.au
Re: Submitted form contents from your website – Personality Inventory

Monday, 19 January, 2009 9:17 AM
From:
"root@bucksresearch.org.uk" <root@bucksresearch.org.uk>
Add sender to Contacts
To:
zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk
Input from submitted form:

e-mail_address = XXXXXXXX
  1 = e
  2 = d
  3 = e
  4 = c
  5 = a
  6 = e
  7 = e
  8 = b
  9 = e
  10 = e
  11 = d
  12 = d
  13 = d
  14 = c
  15 = d
  16 = d
  17 = d
  18 = d
  19 = c
  20 = a
  21 = e
  22 = e
  23 = c
  24 = d
  25 = e
  26 = d
  27 = a
  28 = d
  29 = e
  30 = d
  31 = b
  32 = d
  33 = d
  34 = e
  35 = a
  36 = e
  37 = c
  38 = c
  39 = a
  40 = e
  41 = b
Additional (client) information:

Date = 2009-01-19 09:17
Browser = HTTP_USER_AGENT
IP Address = 86.141.189.87
Hostname = host86-141-189-87.range86-141.btcentralplus.com
Appendix 10: An example of a volunteer tourist testimonial

KELLY
Age 31
Nationality British
Resident London, England
Project Amapondo

Volunteering has become ‘the thing to do after years of routine in the same job’, to A: give yourself a break and B: do some good in the world that does not necessarily benefit you directly.

At Amapondo in Port St Johns the idea has become more of a philosophy – a practiced way of life. And the fulfillment you get when you “pondify” yourself is one of immense satisfaction.

Port St Johns is on the East coast of South Africa, a small town buzzing with energy and wildlife, a very real slab of Africa, (but with hot showers and very tasty food!) It is here that a group of people; a mix of black Xhosa natives, white Afrikaans natives, a couple of English, two Canadian and one Dutch representative, all got together and formed a family. As this community grew, so the idea to make some realistic, practical and wholesome changes came about. Africa does not need saving. It does not need the western way of doing things thrust upon it. This is not the only way. And you begin to learn and understand this only by living and breathing amongst it, by volunteering.

Amapondo’s vision is to ensure empowerment, ownership and sustainability of a land and people through a series of projects and programmes. Their philosophy is not to try and impose western strategies and infrastructure, but to embrace and retain African culture and tradition every step of the way. By doing this, African people are not changing WHO they are, they are changing the way they do certain things in order to enhance, progress and develop their existing lives. So far, Amapondo and the team are on their way to opening a school based on interactive, all inclusive Waldorf principles of teaching and a small shop that will sell crafts, jams and goods made by their growing community. All profits will go towards the cost of running the school. An ambitious project using permaculture as its basis, (using land to create food, water and shelter) is also in the making, at Mama Pats, 45 minutes along a very bumpy dirt track on the back of an open top 4x4 up to a small village with no electricity, little sanitation and very basic food production. The idea is to transform the area into an ecological paradise: two types of biodegradable toilet, a nursery, a compost heap, a mud brick maker, a water pool, plots for fruit, veg, plants, space to keep animals and buildings for workshops and classes. The plot will act as a model for other communities to see and learn how best to make use of their land. On a sunny day you can see down to the ocean from Mama Pats and it’s difficult to describe in words the beauty of the landscape and the sense of peace you feel when you’re up here.

As a volunteer you can work with the family at Mama Pats and the Pondo team to sow seeds, build chicken coops and plant gooseberry bushes. You can work with the teachers at the school, make crafts, garden, and learn Xhosa. You can create workshops for the boys at the local orphanage where there is talent and enthusiasm and laughter in abundance. A hearty breakfast, a satisfying lunch and a bloody tasty dinner are all included – a good mix of traditional and western style grub.

If you are looking to really experience Africa amongst the people who live, know and understand the land and its history, (and have an absolute blast doing it) then come to Amapondo. Day trips also included and they never work you too hard! It’s an incredibly relaxed and beautiful place to be. I will never, ever forget my time here.

Kelly Leach. UK. 25th October 2007
Appendix 11: Other sources of grounded theory data

Data were collected from web-sites offering information about volunteer tourism.

- http://www.aviva-sa.com/
- http://www.voluntourism.org/
- http://www.brijit.com/abstract/23276/voluntourism
- http://cabm.net/en/node/113303
- http://www.intheknowtraveler.com/1597
- http://www.voluntourmorocco.org/about.html
- http://whatthappensnow.com/articles_show.cfm?id=401&cat=7&sub=1
- http://gobudgettravel.com/volunteer-abroad/voluntourism-industry-unethical
- http://www.sustainabletravelinternational.org/documents/op_to_voluntourism.html
- http://www.worldhum.com/weblog/item/voluntourism_overpriced_guilt_trips_real_chance_to_save_the_world_20070731
- http://voluntourism.co.uk/
- http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0EIN/is_2007_Dec_17/ai_n21157399
- http://ivr.org.uk/
- http://www.globearaware.org/content/press/condenast.php
- http://www.ethicalvolunteering.org
Data were collected from blog-sites offering information about volunteer tourism.

- **Philanthropic Travel**

  *This is a piece regarding the pro/con argument for why voluntourism may make a better approach to travel than simply giving money.*
  http://www.thewholefamilytravels.com/2008/06/philanthropic-travel/

- **To Volunteer Or Not To Volunteer?**

  *Paul Glynn delivers his personal experience along with some pros and cons on the voluntourism travel genre.*
  http://optimistworld.com/Articles.aspx?id=1bad8a04-c232-4845-860c-25eafa1d219a&style=travel&page=1

- **Poorism, Visiting Slums As A Tourist Experience**

  *This entry on Travel Pod is an absolute MUST read for those who want to get some perspective. Here are lots of arguments from folks that have made comments regarding voluntourism as well.*
  http://www.travelpod.com/forums/index.php?s=acde5d052064ed2cc242f9d1ff2ae3e3&showtopic=7968&pid=52729&st=0&#entry52729

- **Does The Sun Shine In Uganda?**

  *Alyssa opens her voluntourism experience of Uganda to a world who may very well be interested in doing the same at some point. She has since travelled to Uganda and you can read additional posts; but this is a great start.*
  http://alyssasadventures.blogspot.com/2008/05/does-sun-shine-in-uganda.html

- **The Constructive Way to Get Through That Impending Existential/Quarter-Life/Mid-Life/Wrong-Side-of-25-and-Single Crisis**

  *Give Lisa Renaud some credit for the title of this blog post. Talk about taking a positive slant on things. She sees voluntourism as an option for those who need purpose beyond self.*
  http://upgradeitall.blogspot.com/2008/05/constructive-way-to-get-through-that.html

- **Voluntourism: The Right Fit**

  *Cecily O’Connor shares her take on voluntourism, citing the survey results that Bob Benson’s team at the University of California San Diego Extension offered as part of their new Center for Global Volunteer Service.*
  http://redwoodage.com/content/view/134604/49

Data were collected from media stories offering information about volunteer tourism.
• Voluntourism 2.0

The Wall Street Journal takes time from the financial markets to give their take on the emergence of VolunTourism.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB121460918786912073.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

• Guatemala Volunteer Vacations: Some Work, All Play

This article by Jennifer Block shares the notion that volunteer vacations may be heading towards a more balanced approach, at least in Guatemala.

http://www.plentymag.com/features/2008/05/eco_tourism_in_guatemala.php

• Voluntourism: Tourists Out To Change The World

Lynn Vincent gives an account of the varying viewpoints regarding VolunTourism.


• The Changing Face Of International Volunteering: Trends In Volunteer Opportunities Abroad

Volker Poelzl provides a review of some of the different options for travelling and volunteering, including VolunTourism.


• Volunteer Vacations provide fresh opportunities for service

Matt Thacker writes about volunteer vacations in BYU News.

http://www.newsnet.byu.edu/story.cfm/69013

• Small Community welcomes foreign volunteers

Amanda Zibners Naprawa writes an article on international volunteering in The Tico Times.


• Special Issue: Tours of a lifetime

Heather Wyatt writes about tours of a lifetime which include volunteering trips.


• Get in some volunteer work on vacation

A press release written by Laura Daily, special contributor to The Dallas Morning News


• Krasang Roleung, Cambodia

An article written by Gene Sloan for USA Today on Andrew Krupp’s experience of being a volunteer


• Voluntourism scams do-gooders
Data were collected from the general literature on volunteer tourism.

The Tourist Experience (Ryan, 1996; 1997)

Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that Make a Difference (Wearing, 2001)

VolunTourism: Harmonising Stewardship and Entrepreneurship (Clemmons, 2008a)

So You May Know – Gathering the Stakeholders (Clemmons, 2008b)

Wisdom & Insight – Living your sense of purpose through VolunTourism (Parker, 2008)

3-Q’s Small Destinations and VolunTourism (Clemmons and Sandstrom, 2008)

Supply Chain – Myanmar & Southeast Asian VolunTourism (Selva, 2008)

Study & Research – Initial Thoughts & Reflections: On the VolunTourist Survey (McGehee, 2008)

Voluntourism: A Brief History of Tourists as Witnesses and Advocates for Justice, (Phaedra and Pezzullo, 2007)

The Process of Re-entry (Weaver, 1987)

A Cultural Encounter through Volunteer Tourism: Towards the ideals of Sustainable Tourism? (McIntosh and Zahra, 2007)

Evolving Environmental Tourism Experiences in Zambia (Harlow and Pomfret, 2007)

The value of voluntourism (Jacobs, 2008)

Trips of a lifetime (Kavountzis, 2008)

Understanding the Motives and Benefits of Voluntourists: What makes them tick? (Brown, 2005)

Travelling with a Purpose: Understanding the Motives and Benefits of Volunteer Vacationers (Brown and Lehto, 2005)

Choosing Your Conservation-based Volunteer Tourism Market Segment with Care – Part 1: the motivators and the elements of the experience that were most important for the two primary markets (Coghlan, 2006a)

Choosing Your Conservation-based Volunteer Tourism Market Segment with Care – Part 2: ensuring volunteer tourist satisfaction (Coghlan, 2006b)
Data also included *general correspondence* which was either emailed to the researcher directly or found on the official American voluntourism web-site [www.voluntourism.org](http://www.voluntourism.org) and included:

Email Subject: Volunteer Tourism - Setting the context for a New ATLAS Special Interest Group, received from Angela Benson, Principal Lecturer Tourism at the University of Brighton on 27.06.08.

Letters to VolunTourism.org. (Clemmons, 2008c)

Data were collected from *Talk Shows* on ‘voluntourism’, ‘volunteer tourism’, and ‘international volunteering’.

The weekly live talk-cast [www.talkshoe.com/tc/43239](http://www.talkshoe.com/tc/43239) is hosted by David Clemmons, founder of voluntourism.org and publisher and editor of VolunTourist. He hosts guests from both the volunteer sector and the tourism industry. The following one hour broadcasts were coded analysed:

14.08.07 – What is voluntourism?

Guests: Elicia Sabotini, Director – Host Senior Sync; Christina Heinekke, Founder – Zolar Consulting

01.04.08 – Volunteer vacations and voluntourism.

Guests: Randy Punley, Director - United Way of America; Paul Jones, Manager - Global Vision International; and Theresa Higgs, Director - United Planet

12.02.08 – Traveller’s philanthropy and voluntourism.

Guests: Dominique Calmonopolis, Founder – Elevate Destinations; and Duncan Beardsley, Founder – Generosity in Action.

02.10.07 – A ‘taste’ of voluntourism.

Guests: Margaret Joborski (Freelance Travel Writer); Deena Wynburg, (Founder – Mindlight Global); and Chris Hill (Founder – Hands Up Holidays, UK).

CBS 2 interview at

[http://cbs2chicago.com/video/?id=46623@wbbm.dayport.com](http://cbs2chicago.com/video/?id=46623@wbbm.dayport.com)
13.07.08 - Voluntourism and Do-Good Vacations

Guests: Lisa Dietlin, charity contributor
Appendix 12: A summary of a participant’s personality traits (extract)

Re: Summary of Personality Traits for ‘pittiramu@XXXX’

Personality traits describe, relative to other people, the frequency or intensity of a person's feelings, thoughts, or behaviours. This report classifies you as low, average/balanced, or high in a trait; in a normal distribution of scores.

Please keep in mind that "low 4-6," "average 7-17," and "high 18-20" scores on a personality test are not good or bad. A particular level on any trait will probably be neutral or irrelevant for a great many activities, be helpful for accomplishing some things, and detrimental for accomplishing other things.

For Volunteers, your scores may be of interest to you before you go on your trip. These results will be later compared to your post-trip results and any changes fed back to you.

******************************************************************************
Anxiety – LOW (4) – You are generally calm and fearless.

Trust – AVERAGE (17) - You assume that some people are fair, honest, and have good intentions whilst others are selfish, devious, and potentially dangerous.

Self Efficacy – AVERAGE (13) – At times you believe you have the common sense, drive, and self-control necessary for achieving success, and at other times, you feel less effective and out of control.

Artistic Interests – AVERAGE (16) – At times you love beauty, both in art and in nature and become easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. Yet, at other times, you may lack this aesthetic sensitivity and interest.

Depression – LOW (5) - You rarely feel sad, dejected, and discouraged.

Assertiveness – AVERAGE (11) – At times you like to speak out, take charge, and direct the activities of others and, at other times, you tend not to talk much and let others control the activities of the group.

Emotionality – AVERAGE (11) – At times you have good access to and awareness of your own feelings but at other times, you may be unaware of these.

Altruism – AVERAGE (16) – At times you find helping other people genuinely rewarding and are willing to assist those who are in need. At other times, requests for help can feel like an imposition rather than an opportunity for self-fulfilment.

Dutifulness – AVERAGE (15) – At times, you have a strong sense of duty and moral obligation, and at other times, you find contracts, rules, and regulations overly confining and can be seen as unreliable or even irresponsible.

Activity Level – AVERAGE (8) – At times you lead a fast-paced, busy life and move about quickly, energetically, and vigorously, and get involved in many activities. At other times, you follow a slower and more leisurely, relaxed pace.

Adventurousness – HIGH (18) - You are eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands, and experience different things. You find familiarity and routine boring, and will take a new route home just because it is different.

******************************************************************************
Appendix 13: The note accompanying the personality inventory results

Re: Volunteer – Feed-back on Traits

Thanks so much for completing the Questionnaire and Personality Inventory, I hope you find the attached summary interesting and reflective. If you don't mind, I will send you an email a couple of weeks after you return from your trip (it will probably be around late October) to ask you please to do the PI again so that I can match your 1st and 2nd scores to determine if, and where, changes have occurred, and by how much. I will, of course, feed those back to you. In the meantime, have a wonderful trip and may it be a most memorable one in a truly beautiful part of the world. If you have any questions at all on this, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Kind Regards
Zoë

Re: CGM – Feed-back on Traits

Thanks so much for completing the Questionnaire and Personality Inventory, I hope you find the attached summary interesting and reflective. If you don't mind, I will send you an email in 6 months time to ask you please to do the PI again so that I can match your 1st and 2nd scores to determine if, and where, changes have occurred, and by how much. I will, of course, feed those back to you. If you have any questions at all on this, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Kind Regards
Zoë
Appendix 14: Request for completion of the second personality inventory

Re: How has your trip changed you? Please complete Stage 2.....

Hi there!
By this stage, you will have returned from your trip after a unique experience. To find out how it may have changed you, please would you copy and paste the following link into your web-browser and complete the Personality Inventory?

http://www.bucksresearch.org.uk/Questionnaire.htm
Please don't forget to enter your email address in the relevant field too.

The results will be fed back to you within 3 working days. Depending on these changes, and if you don't mind, I may ask you a few questions about your trip, via email. If you have any questions at all, please feel free to email me.
Many Thanks
Kind Regards
Zoë

Re: Request Stage 2 - Control Group Member

Hi there!
Yes, 6 months have gone by,
To find out how you may have changed over the last 6 months, please would you copy and paste the following link into your web-browser and complete the Personality Inventory?

http://www.bucksresearch.org.uk/Questionnaire.htm
Please don't forget to enter your email address in the relevant field too.

The results will be fed back to you within 3 working days. Depending on these changes, and if you don't mind, I may ask you a few questions, via email.
Many Thanks
Kind Regards
Zoë
Appendix 15: A summary of a person’s personality trait changes

Re: Summary of Personality Traits for ‘moosie182@XXXX’

For Volunteers, the scores on your second Personality Inventory were compared to your first scores. These traits (below) reflect the areas of most change since you returned from your trip. The four associated statements are listed under each trait to assist you in your reflections.

***************************************************************

**Artistic Interests – INCREASED** – You have become more interested in art and in nature and are more easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events.

- **Statement 1**  Believe in the importance of art
- **Statement 2**  See beauty in things
- **Statement 3**  Like poetry
- **Statement 4**  Enjoy going to art museums

**Adventurousness – INCREASED** – You are more eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands, and experience different things and find familiarity and routine boring.

- **Statement 1**  Prefer variety to routine
- **Statement 2**  Like to try new things
- **Statement 3**  Like changes
- **Statement 4**  Am not attached to conventional ways

***************************************************************
Appendix 16: Thank you note and questions relating to the changes

Re: Feedback, on changes in your traits, after your volunteer vacation

Hi XXXX,

Thanks so much for completing STAGE 2 and so quickly. You may find your results quite thought provoking and I personally find them very interesting. On that subject, you have changed in five areas (out of fifteen). That is, your levels of Anxiety, Depression and Intellect have all Decreased since you last did the PI (please see attached for explanations) and your levels of Trust and Altruism have Increased. There are, therefore, just a few questions I would like to ask if you have time.

When you have had time to think about them, please would you send me a short reply describing the trip’s experience/s (if any) which you think may have led to each of the change/s (attached) and what you are doing differently now as a result (if anything)? If your time is limited, please just comment on Trust and Depression because they were the areas of greatest change.

If you have any questions at all, please do not hesitate to contact me. These answers are only used for this research and are not fed back to Aviva.

Yours eternally grateful
Zoe
Appendix 17: Request for completion of a third personality inventory

Re: It is roughly one to two years since your volunteering trip with Aviva........have the changes you experienced still held or have they returned to their base-line?

Hi, it is Zoe again!

My research is taking me to new pastures and I am intrigued to know whether the changes people experienced, as a result of their international volunteering trip, still hold one to two years later. Recent research is now showing that lasting impacts are likely to evolve over time. It takes time for people to process new experiences.

If you can find the time to complete the personality inventory again, I would be very grateful. Please would you copy and paste the following link into your web-browser and complete the Personality Inventory?

http://www.bucksresearch.org.uk/Questionnaire.htm

Please don't forget to enter your email address in the relevant field too.

I will analyse your data and let you know the answer within five working days. There will be no further questions, I promise!

Many Thanks
Kind Regards
Zoe
Appendix 1: A summary report of the follow-up results

Re: Follow-up: approximately 1-2 years later

Hi Elena,
Thank you so much for completing yet another PI.

With regard to the analysis, I thought this would be a simple one-liner.....not so!
When you returned from SA, you showed a significant decrease in your anxiety levels and increases in assertiveness and adventurousness (a reminder of the definitions is below).

Now, over a year later, your anxiety levels and assertiveness remain at their post-trip scores. But, with regard to adventurousness, it has dropped slightly but not to the pre-trip score. However, a new trait is now significantly different - your activity levels have dropped below both scores; the new score is, however, still ‘average’ for your gender and age.

Interesting results but not sure what to make of them generally until I receive much more data through!
Thanks ever so much for taking the time and trouble to complete the inventory again.
Kind regards
Zoe

The definitions of the 15 personality traits measured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>The “fight-or-flight” system of the brain of anxious individuals is too easily and too often engaged. Therefore, people who are anxious often feel like something dangerous is about to happen. They may be afraid of specific situations or be just generally fearful. They feel tense, jittery, and nervous. Persons low in anxiety are generally calm and fearless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>A person with high trust assumes that most people are fair, honest, and have good intentions. Persons low in trust, see others as selfish, devious, and potentially dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy describes confidence in one’s ability to accomplish things. High scorers believe they have the common sense, drive, and self-control necessary for achieving success. Low scorers do not feel effective, and may have a sense that they are not in control of their lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>High scorers on this scale love beauty, both in art and in nature. They become easily involved and absorbed in artistic and natural events. They are neither necessarily artistically trained nor talented, although many will be. The defining features of this scale are interest in, and appreciation of natural and artificial beauty. Low scorers lack aesthetic sensitivity and interest in the arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>This scale measures the tendency to feel sad, dejected, and discouraged. High scorers lack energy and have difficult initiating activities. Low scorers tend to be free from these depressive feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>High scorers in assertiveness like to speak out, take charge, and direct the activities of others. They tend to be leaders in groups. Low scorers tend not to talk much and let others control the activities of groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>Persons high on emotionality have good access to and awareness of their own feelings. Low scorers are less aware of their feelings and tend not to express their emotions openly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Altruistic people find helping other people genuinely rewarding. Consequently, they are generally willing to assist those who are in need. Altruistic people find that doing things for others is a form of self-fulfilment rather than self-sacrifice. Low scorers on this scale do not particularly like helping those in need. Requests for help feel like an imposition rather than an opportunity for self-fulfilment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Dutifulness** – This scale reflects the strength of a person’s sense of duty and obligation. Those who score high on this scale have a strong sense of moral obligation. Low scorers find contracts, rules, and regulations overly confining. They are likely to be seen as unreliable or even irresponsible.

**Activity Level** – Active individuals lead fast-paced, busy lives. They move about quickly, energetically, and vigorously, and they are involved in many activities. People who score low on this scale follow a slower and more leisurely, relaxed pace.

**Adventurousness** – High scorers on adventurousness are eager to try new activities, travel to foreign lands, and experience different things. They find familiarity and routine boring, and will take a new route home just because it is different. Low scorers tend to feel uncomfortable with change and prefer familiar routines.

**Intellect** – Intellect and artistic interests are the two most important, central aspects of openness to experience. High scorers on Intellect love to play with ideas. They are open-minded to new and unusual ideas, and like to debate intellectual issues. They enjoy riddles, puzzles, and brain teasers. Low scorers on Intellect prefer dealing with people or things rather than ideas. They regard intellectual exercises as a waste of time. Intellect should not be equated with intelligence. Intellect is an intellectual style, not an intellectual ability, although high scorers on Intellect score slightly higher than low-intellect individuals on standardized intelligence tests.

**Vulnerability** – High scorers on vulnerability experience panic, confusion, and helplessness when under pressure or stress. Low scorers feel more poised, confident, and clear-thinking when stressed.

**Liberalism** – Psychological liberalism refers to a readiness to challenge authority, convention, and traditional values. In its most extreme form, psychological liberalism can even represent outright hostility toward rules, sympathy for law-breakers, and love of ambiguity, chaos, and disorder. Psychological conservatives prefer the security and stability brought by conformity to tradition. Psychological liberalism and conservatism are not identical to political affiliation, but certainly incline individuals toward certain political parties.

**Cautiousness** – Cautiousness describes the disposition to think through possibilities before acting. High scorers on the cautiousness scale take their time when making decisions. Low scorers often say or do first thing that comes to mind without deliberating alternatives and the probable consequences.
Appendix 19: A few general questions about the volunteer’s trip

Re: Thank you - Just a few more short questions about your trip

Hi Claire,

1. Thank you so much for putting the time and effort into thinking about your experience. Your answers make so much sense; they were very clear and concise and contained very useful information which will be very valuable to my thesis, thank you. It sounds like we should package volunteering as part of a serious weight loss program; well done, I am sure you feel so much better about yourself and are able to do so much more now.

2. I am 3/4 of the way through my research and I am presenting preliminary findings to a conference later in the year:
   'The international volunteer tourism experience in South Africa: An investigation into the impact on the tourist'
   A summary of the paper is attached if you are interested.

3. Would you mind answering a few other questions about your trip (a very brief answer is all I need on these)? That is,

1. What was the general cost of your whole trip, including all airfares, tourism activities etc?
2. Has your view of international volunteering changed as a result of your trip?
3. How long was your trip?
4. Approximately what proportion of your time did you spend on volunteer work?
5. How did you spend the rest of your time?
6. Would you participate in a similar project either in SA or elsewhere?

Thanks for everything,
Kind regards
Zoe
Appendix 20: The grounded theory coding and analysis process (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>Codes are underlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>“Direct involvement and a direct understanding of what is happening there and how your presence is impacting on those people in that part of the world”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 21: Post-it notes reflecting the concepts of volunteer tourism
Appendix 22: Comparison between the first and second inventory scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Pre Score</th>
<th>Post Score</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Interests</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutifulness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurousness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellect</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 23: The IPA coding and analysis process (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADV, EXP, 3e</td>
<td>“Adventurousness - I have definitely been bitten by the travel bug whilst on my trip. Prior to my departure a lot of people (including myself) thought I was mad to be leaving and travelling to a country I had never been to, on my own. I felt an immense sense of achievement that I had done what I did and fell in love with Africa. I would definitely return to south Africa and would love to visit other countries, such as Namibia, Botswana, Mozambique and travel as a sole female traveller, which is something I would never have thought I would do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV, CHG, 3f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where ADV = the trait, EXP or CHG (experience or change), 3 = participant number and e = theme number.

P.T.O for working example
From: gjertrud selems moe (gjeselmoe@hotmail.com)
To: zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk;
Date: Tue, 4 May, 2010 23:59:05
Cc:
Subject: RE: Feed back on your changes - AVIVA Volunteers - A few questions around those changes.....

hey:)

the volunteering experience I had in South- Africa is the best thing I have ever done. The children, the people who worked there and the people from aviva will always be in my heart.

my time in cape town was like two different lifes at the same time. at the childrens home we felt very needed and we had to take charge and responsibility for the children but i felt that I had to prove for the ladies who worked there that I did n‘t feel like a better person and that I just wanted to help and after some time we became very good friends with them. and they became as fond of us as we became in them. And of course the kids, miss them so much they called us mama from the second we walked in. they made us feel so welcome, because they needed so much love and care.

The days of when we lived in the Aviva house it was a totally different life. we got to know people from all over the world and we had so much fun, that was more like a holyday except that we felt like home after a while. we did n‘t feel like tourists. and that was a great feeling.

I think my changes is so big because I was happier in Cape Town then I have been for a long time. And all the people i got to know learned me so much about taking chances and not be afraid of doing new things, and it was so different to learn about there history when you are there, and you can unerstand what they are talking about. you can see it for your self.

it was a lot of tears when we left. And all we have talked about when we came back home is that we are going back.

I dont know if this could help you, but please ask if you want to know something more. I will more then gladly help you :)

Gjertrud :)

Date: Tue, 4 May 2010 19:41:08 +0000
From: zaalexander@yahoo.co.uk
Subject: Feed back on your changes - AVIVA Volunteers - A few questions around those changes.....
To: gjeselmoe@hotmail.com
Appendix 24: The summary sheet after IPA coding (extract)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V      | Travelling to a country I
       had never been to, on my own. | in different place On own |
| 3e     |                                                |                   |

Where V = volunteer or C = control group member, the arrow indicates an increase or decrease in the trait and 3e = the participant number and theme number respectively.
Appendix 25: The summary sheet for ‘impacts/changes’ (extract)
Appendix 26: The summary sheet for ‘experiences’ (extract)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Question/Issue</th>
<th>By whom</th>
<th>Action taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.05.08 – Do I need Ethics approval because I am studying participants from around the world, not just the UK, and the voluntourism provider is in South Africa?</td>
<td>Zoe Alexander</td>
<td>I asked Dr Ali Bakir and Dr Eugenia Wickens during a tutorial. They said it is not required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28.05.08 – What ethical considerations are involved in data collection via a web-site? | Zoe Alexander | I discussed the ethical considerations with the web-site designer (Dr Dorin Festeu). We made sure that the following aspects were incorporated into the web-site:  
1. Volunteers participated, by choice, via a link from their electronic booking confirmation.  
2. No data was stored on the web (it was automatically transferred to my personal email address and then manually onto an excel spreadsheet.  
3. No name was attached to a record, just a combination of alphanumeric characters to identify the record myself.  
4. There was an introductory note stating that all data will be treated in the strictest confidence and that no data will be disclosed to anyone.  
5. There was a contact name for any queries with regard to the web-site or its contents.  
6. Any ‘submission’ gave the respondent an option not to send the data after they were advised, via a pop-up, that I will be able to see their email address. I needed this in order to correspond with them later.  
7. Only questions that were relevant to the research were asked.  
8. The respondents were told the aim of the research via the introductory note.  
9. The web-site was a secure site. |
| 09.06.08 – I raised the question (of the 06.05.08) during a presentation of my research at a Research Colloquium. | Zoe Alexander | To check whether I perhaps do need Ethics approval. See below. |
| 11.06.08 – I was faced with the problem of reducing the personality inventory (PI) by half. Would this affect the integrity of the PI (an ethical consideration)? And furthermore, how would I score the PI, without the ethical issue around faking scores for questions not asked, on the IPIP NEO web-site? | Zoe Alexander | I contacted John Johnson (Professor of Psychology Pennsylvania State University, USA), a custodian of the NEO Personality Inventory. He confirmed that the idea of reducing the 120-item to 60-items would be reliable as long as the researcher retained four questions per trait. He also gave me access to a scoring mechanism which I could implement myself without using the IPI-NEO scoring web-site. |
| 24.06.08 – Double Check - Do I need Ethics Approval because I am studying participants from around the world, not just the UK, and the | Zoe Alexander | I asked Howard Bush (Bucks New University Research Unit) and he suggested I speak to Professor Barbara Humberstone (BH) who |
| voluntourism provider is in South Africa (SA)? | wrote the faculty’s research and ethics policy. Spoke to BH - she said that, because the proposal was accepted and no ethical issues were raised at the time, I can assume the research fulfills the university guidelines. She also suggested I review the British Psychological Society’s (BPS) Code of Ethics and Conduct as well as maintain this diary. The BPS Code of Ethics and Conduct was reviewed on 04.07.08 and I was thereafter happy that the research was being conducted within the boundaries of this. |
Appendix 28: The questions asked about non-completion

Re: 3rd Request – Feedback on your traits after your trip, along with some other options.

Hi there,
Forgive this email; you completed Stage 2 of the personality inventory but didn't provide any explanation for the significant changes in some of your traits (listed further below). I hope you don't mind me asking your honest reason for not being able to respond. Please could you choose the relevant number (below) and simply reply to this with that number in the subject box?
Thanks a million, Zoe

Was it:

1. Didn't have the time
2. Forgot
3. Didn't feel comfortable answering the questions
4. Didn't believe the results
5. Couldn't think of any reason why there was the change
6. Other reason
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