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Assessing the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean is a collaborative effort between the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) and the Association of Caribbean States (ACS). While this research sought to determine the current state of voluntourism within the English, Spanish and French speaking Caribbean islands; it also aimed to aid the development of a sound framework for voluntourism within the Caribbean. Guided by three research questions, the study adopted a mixed research design and methodology, which allowed for a balanced and holistic analysis of the findings. The results revealed that 67% of the English Speaking Countries (ESCs) and 40% of Spanish Speaking Countries (SSCs) surveyed are currently involved in voluntourism activities. However, the lone French Speaking Country that participated indicated that their respective country was not involved in voluntourism. Lack of awareness, limited benefits and challenges associated with voluntourism were among the top reasons for lack of involvement in the area by some countries. While the extent to which countries are involved in voluntourism was brought into question, the results revealed that for those countries not involved in voluntourism, there exists a level of interest for venturing into the field. In reviewing the research process and analysing the results a series of limitations were recognized. Recommendations were subsequently made in response to these limitations, supported by observations from the literature reviewed.

This research paper was presented in a systematic format, inclusive of five key chapters namely; Chapter 1: Introduction and Research Problem: Importance of Topic Selection, (2) Literature Review and References, (3) Research Design and Methodology for Collecting Data, (4) Data Collection, Findings and Analysis and (5) Conclusion and Recommendations. These chapters together facilitated the presentation and analysis of the results obtained. In closing, the results is significant to CTO, ACS, the NTOs (Ministries of Tourism and Tourist Boards), the Caribbean Tourism Industry and the wider Caribbean, as the Caribbean is seeking to diversify its tourism product to incorporate this new and innovative niche.
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Chapter 1: Introduction & Research Problem: Importance of Topic Selection

Introduction to Chapter 1:

This section seeks to provide a brief overview and general description of the area under review. It highlights the reasons why the topic is of interest to the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) as well as why it will be of interest to other business organisations and their management. The specific area within the field of voluntourism being researched is also identified; and the relevance of the research to the strategic, competitive situation of business organizations seeking to venture into voluntourism within the Caribbean is briefly discussed.

Assessing the nature of Voluntourism within the Caribbean

The Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) in collaboration with the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) has embarked upon a study which aims to investigate the nature of Voluntourism within the English, Spanish and French speaking Caribbean islands highlighting the perspectives of the National Tourism Organizations (NTOs) - (Phase 1) and the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) - (Phase 2); - two key stakeholder groups within the field. However, for the purpose of submitting this research paper within the specified deadline, only (Phase 1) has been completed, with (Phase 2) to be finalized at a later date. Moreover, the research seeks to not only provide insight into the existence and operations of voluntourism within the Caribbean at present; but also aid in the creation of a sound framework for this new and evolving concept within the region. As such, this research is guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent are Caribbean destinations within the English, Spanish and French Speaking Caribbean islands involved in voluntourism?
2. What are the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities/projects by potential host destinations within the Caribbean?
3. In what ways are Caribbean destinations currently benefitting from their involvement in voluntourism?
Moreover, though focus is given to this topic by CTO and ACS, the question is asked - what is voluntourism and why does it hold relevance to the Caribbean?

Voluntourism is a unique merger between two distinct fields namely; Tourism and Volunteerism/Volunteering. The former being one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world, contributing to 9 percent (%) of the world’s GDP; and generating 1,035 million in international tourism arrivals (ITA) for the year 2012 with a forecasted increase to 1.8 billion in ITA by the year 2030, (UNWTO Tourism Highlights 2013). This movement of people around the world is vast and has brought with it changes in the reason and purpose of travel by many. With this in mind, volunteerism/volunteering - the 2nd entity within this merger also has a significant impact worldwide. Volunteerism can be seen as any activity that involves spending time, unpaid; doing something that aims to benefit the environment or someone (individuals or groups) other than, or in addition to, close relatives, (Volunteering England 2014). It is generally assumed that a volunteer is a person, who contributes services to a cause without gaining financially, (Volunteer Tourism - International, Travel & Tourism Analyst 2008; Wearing 2001). According to the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) Statistical and Financial Information Report 2012, a total of 6,807 individual UN Volunteers with 5,523 coming from developing countries and 1,284 from other countries (High Income OECD, Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)), were deployed to assist on 6,912 UNV Assignments for the year 2012. This is testament to the significant role volunteerism/volunteering plays worldwide.

Taken together, voluntourism also known as volunteer tourism, voluntary work holidays, or volunteer vacations offers a more sustainable and rewarding sense of satisfaction to a traveller and particularly the modern traveller (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). This in turn affects present and future commitment by the modern traveller to engage in voluntourism tasks/activities and experiences. The modern traveller as it were is seeking a more meaningful holiday experience. As such, they are looking to incorporate into their vacation an opportunity to give something back, allowing for overall satisfaction with their holiday experience (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). According to Costa, Chalip, Green and Simes 2006, satisfaction with one’s job, task or experience plays an important role in determining retention, repetition (of task) and commitment
(to task and organization). Satisfaction is therefore, one key factor that has consistently affected employee retention (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Hayhurst, Saylor, & Stuenkel, 2005; Jamison, 2003; Perkins & Benoit, 2004). Therefore, satisfied employees/voluntourists are more likely to stay with their organization and participate in future voluntourism activities/tasks (Costa, Chalip, Green and Simes 2006). There is research evidence (Costa, Chalip, Green and Simes 2006) of 147 non-specialist volunteers from the Sunbelt IndyCarnival (an annual event that takes place on the Gold Coast of Queensland Australia), who completed questionnaires measuring their job satisfaction, evaluation of their training, organizational commitment, sense of community at the event and satisfaction with their opportunities to share opinions and experiences during training. The results revealed that volunteers’ sense of community has a positive effect on their commitment to the event organisation and their commitment to the organisation had a direct effect on their job satisfaction (Costa, Chalip, Green and Simes 2006).

Beyond this, voluntourism has the ability to contribute more meaningfully to the travel and tourism industry, thus tackling developmental challenges and supporting peace and development worldwide (UN Volunteers 2014). According to Bakker and Lamoureux (2008), tourists seeking to incorporate volunteer tourism activities into their holiday can select from a range of activities including environmental conservation, teaching, providing medical assistance, and health services, working with children, sea turtle monitoring and construction and disaster relief among others. For example, Habitat for Humanity International (HFHI) singlehandedly built more than 279,000 homes around the world as of 2007. Even further, New Orleans and surrounding areas saw an influx of hundreds of volunteers seeking to assist both the people and animals post the devastation by Hurricane Katrina in 2005.

It is obvious that this sustainable/alternative form of tourism is driven by many forces, with many tourists opting to forego the more traditional holiday for alternative experiences that provide opportunities to enhance their own lives or the lives of others (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). As such, voluntourism according to (VolunTourism.org 2014) is seen as ‘a seamlessly integrated combination of voluntary services to a destination and the best, traditional elements of travel - arts, culture, geography, and history - in that destination.’
Therefore, examining this niche within the Caribbean context will prove useful and timely, as the region seeks to go beyond the traditional, ‘sun, sand and sea’ notion of tourism within the region to explore more sustainable alternatives. Thus, while investigations into voluntourism by CTO did not originate as a ‘problem’, it was seen as an area of research and collaboration, for developing a partnership framework for joint sustainable tourism programming with ACS and some other organizations. Voluntourism was further seen as another avenue that Caribbean destinations could explore as a new “niche” and as a way to directly benefit from travellers’ philanthropy. Even further, post agreements to collaborate on the voluntourism project, it was seen as a research ‘problem’ required for the Caribbean, as there was a lack of research in the area as it pertains to the Caribbean. Thus for CTO, exploring this area became part of their efforts to build capacity in terms of tourism product diversification in the region.

As it relates to business researcher/organization (CTO and otherwise), voluntourism would be of interest and can be seen to be of relevance to the strategic, competitive position of the business as it can be linked to sustainability, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and triple bottom-line strategies and initiatives. CSR strategies are being increasingly pursued by organizations and are seen as critical to maintaining a positive public image of the organization while simultaneously giving back to communities and destinations. Thus CTO in association with ACS, are committed to pioneering this drive, geared towards the development of a voluntourism framework for the region which will guide member countries who may be interested in developing and exploring voluntourism initiatives as well as targeting voluntourists, as part of their tourism product offering.

**Summary of Chapter 1:**

It is clear from the above that, assessing voluntourism within the Caribbean can prove useful for developing the Caribbean’s voluntourism product. The results of the study will therefore provide direction as the Caribbean seeks to diversify into this niche. The next section in this work will seek to provide a more detailed review of voluntourism, highlighting key trends, landmark theoretical models and an overview of the Caribbean’s tourism and voluntourism industry all aimed at providing meaningful discussions central to answering the research questions.
Chapter 2: Literature Review & References

Introduction to Chapter 2:
This section seeks to provide an initial overview of voluntourism and the voluntourist. It continues with a brief history of voluntourism; exploring two theories, namely; the Transformative Potential Theory and the Social Exchange Theory model. It also highlights voluntourism trends at a global level and concludes with an overview of the Caribbean’s tourism and voluntourism industry.

An overview of voluntourism at a Global level and within the Caribbean

Driven by the desire to incorporate something more meaningful into their vacation, tourists are seeking more hands on travel experiences which afford them the opportunity to not only visit and experience various destinations, but also give back (Xola Adventure Industry Consultants 2007; Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). Hence, voluntourism which in itself is a combination of volunteerism and tourism provides such a platform whereby travellers can dedicate a portion of time to rendering voluntary services to a destination - its residents, environment, or infrastructure - in an effort to create a positive impact on the destination while simultaneously enjoying their holiday experience (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008; Callahan and Thomas 2005).

This shift in demand by tourists towards a more meaningful experience has brought with it a change in how they are defined and understood within the broader tourism context. Tourists have generally been classified into two basic streams which relate to the nature of their trip, namely: (1) domestic and international tourists and (2) ‘purpose of visit category’ whether for leisure and recreation, business and professional purposes, or other forms such as study and health tourism (Cooper et al 2008). However, there are many other ways by which tourists can be classified. These range from simple demographic and trip classifications through lifestyles and personalities, to their perception of risk and familiarity, and postmodern interpretations of consumers and commodities (Cooper et al 2008). Nevertheless, one approach with increasing relevance to contemporary tourism is to classify tourists according to their level and type of interaction with the destination (Cooper et al 2008; Cohen 1972; Plog 1974). Classifications of
tourists which adopt this approach usually place mass tourism at one extreme end and some form of alternative, ‘small-scale’ tourism at the other end, with a variety of classes in between (Cooper et al 2008). It is evident therefore based on the definition of voluntourism (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008; Callahan and Thomas 2005) and the motivations of the modern traveller (Xola Adventure Industry Consultants 2007; Bakker and Lamoureux 2008; Responsible Travel 2014) that voluntourism indeed has its place within this spectrum. According to (Wearing 2001), a volunteer tourist is a person whose motivation and altruistic wish over earning money, is to specifically travel to a destination to perform voluntary work (usually associated with poverty, the environment, and research of social) without remuneration. Moreover, this typology of tourists are travellers who volunteer in an organized way to undertake holidays that might involve aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups of the society, the restoration of certain environments, or research into aspects of society or environment (Wearing 2001:1). However, while it is important to understand this typology of tourist, it is equally important to understand the market characteristics of voluntourists, as this informs decisions of organizations and destinations seeking to attract this type of traveller. According to Alexia Nestora of Lasso Communications - a volunteer tourism strategic consulting firm cited in (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008);

“A key point for any organization would be to determine which market to go after…”

Voluntourists range from young to old and incorporates the Retiree Generation (aged 65+), Baby Boomers (aged 45-64), Generation X (aged 25-44) and Generation Y (aged 18-24). Families, traveller philanthropy, corporate travel or team building as well as scientific and academic volunteers, also constitute the market for this type of traveller (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). However, before exploring the current trends seen within this market at a global level and within the Caribbean, it is important to uncover the genesis of this movement.

History of Voluntourism

The notion of the voluntourist and the combination of travel and voluntary services is not a new phenomenon (Xola Adventure Industry Consultants 2007), having been explored together for thousands of years in various cultures and religious orders (VolunTourism.org 2014). While
travelling and volunteering each have a history reaching far back into the past, the phenomenon of volunteer tourism or voluntourism is a rather recent concept according to the field’s most influential authors (Brightsmith et al 2008; Holmes et al 2010; Campbell et al 2006). But, before going forward with what is now history (recent history), it is important that the origin of this concept be explored. As such, research shows that missionaries, healers and/or medical practitioners, sailors, explorers and countless others are among those groupings that have rendered service in conjunction with their travels throughout the years (VolunTourism.org 2014).

Even further, in an article by (The Christian Science Monitor 2010) entitled: “How Mother Teresa's work spurred growth of 'Voluntourism'”, author Benjamin Arnoldy, indicated that Mother Teresa's Nobel Prize winning mission in India has prompted many people to work short missions and 'voluntourism' into their lives (The Christian Science Monitor 2010; VolunTourism.org 2014). He stated further that:

“When Mother Teresa began her work with the poor of Calcutta in the 1930s she simultaneously opened her doors to drop-in backpackers who wanted to volunteer. One of those was Susan Drees Kadota, an American, who spent 2.5 months bathing, feeding, and simply talking with disabled residents.”

Today, Mother Teresa may be remembered most for her lifelong work with the poor. However, it is evident that she has been instrumental in the expansion of the modern notion of going on an overseas mission; encouraging ordinary people taking short breaks to volunteer on vacations (The Christian Science Monitor 2010). David Clemmons founder of VolunTourism.org in support of Arnoldy’s (2010) observation indicated that:

“Mother Teresa’s program was a precursor to ‘VolunTourism’. Clemmons stated further that there was no grand, long-term commitment. The program was crafted to allow for movement and flow of volunteers. As such, if individuals wished to volunteer for a day or two and then go sightseeing elsewhere in Calcutta, they were free to do so. In this way, Mother Teresa was ahead of her time (The Christian Science Monitor 2010).”
Beyond this, literature has continuously reported that the idea of voluntourism dates back to the U.S. Peace Corps of the early 1960s (Prosumer Report 2010; VolunTourism.org 2014). According to VolunTourism.org (2014), Voluntourism in its current iteration received a very big boost from the founding of Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO) in 1958 by Alec and Mora Dickson and that of the U.S. Peace Corps, established in 1961 during the John F. Kennedy administration (VolunTourism.org 2014). However, with good reason some would argue that the relationship between travel and volunteering in the Modern Era can be traced back to the work of Herb Feith in Indonesia in 1951. Feith’s contribution of the Volunteer Graduate Scheme (VGS) which is today known as Australian Volunteers International (AVI), might have very well paved the way for the connection between travel and volunteering that has evolved in the 60 years since (VolunTourism.org 2014).

**Voluntourisms’ Perceived ‘Transformative Potential’ and the Disadvantages of having Mass Voluntourism**

It is evident based on the above research that voluntourism has seen some significant interventions and contributions throughout the years by noteworthy individuals; who have not only shaped this attractive niche but also propelled its growth. Therefore, though travel combined with voluntary services have evolved through time; taking on new meaning and explored in various forms, what remains is the motivation behind the concept and its perceived transformative potential.

Much tourism literature describes international volunteer tourism as having ‘transformative potential’ (Lyons and Wearing, 2008b, 4) to (a) inspire reflexive self-development of tourists, (b) enable progressive trans-cultural understanding between tourists and host communities, and (c) contribute to environmental sustainability or social development in destinations where tourists render services. Clark, (1978; Chapman, 1982; Singh and Singh, 2001, 2004; Wearing 2001, 2002; Brown and Morrison, 2003; McIntosh and Zahra, 2007; Lyons and Wearing, 2008b) are among those authors who have also realized the transformative potential which voluntourism possesses. However, recent studies have begun to question this optimistic and confident assessment of voluntourisms’ ‘transformative potential’ (Mowforth and Munt, 1998; Butcher, 2003; Simpson 2004, 2005; Callahan and Thomas, 2005; Gray and Campbell, 2007; Raymond,
2008; Raymond and Hall, 2008; Goghlan, 2008; Guttentag, 2009; Coghlan and Gooch, 2011). In a review of this critical work, Guttentag (2009, 537; as well as McGehee and Andereck, 2008) identifies five possible inhibiting effects, including; ‘a neglect of locals’ desires, a hindering of work progress and completion of unsatisfactory work, a disruption of local economies, a reinforcement of conceptualizations of the ‘other’ and rationalizations of poverty, and an instigation of (unwelcomed) cultural changes”. Moreover, the lack of adequate collaboration between stakeholders and the commercialization of voluntourism - through the influx of large private sector agencies seeking to capitalize on the increased demand originating from this niche has brought the authenticity of voluntourism into question. Further still, the upsurge in private sector agencies have also proved to be unfavorable to host communities as many projects are poorly structured and have generated only minimal returns. Ellis (2003) indicated that voluntourism programmes are now packaged and marketed in a very similar way as mass tourism. Therefore, if sustainable tourism seeks to ensure that the resources needed for longevity in tourism are conserved (Sharpley, 2009); voluntourism cannot adopt a mass tourism model.

The Social Exchange Theory model and its relevance to voluntourism

Clearly a lot of research has gone into the perceived ‘transformative potential’ of voluntourism. Similarly, quite a deal has been said about the ‘social exchange theory’ model. A number of theoretical conceptions and models abound in voluntourism as a form of alternative tourism that takes into consideration residents and host communities culture and needs (McGehee and Andereck, 2009). The postmodernism theoretical model (Uriely, Reichel, and Ron, 2003), the social movement theory (McGehee, 2002), the development theory (Simpson, 2004), the grounded theory (Halpenny and Caissie, 2003) and the social exchange theory (McGehee and Andereck, 2009) are among those theoretical conceptions used in the field of voluntourism. However, this paper seeks to examine the ‘social exchange theory’ as it is regarded as the predominant theory for analysing residents’ attitudes toward tourism (Andereck, et al. 2005; Latkova, 2008). Moreover, this model was chosen as the study seeks to identify the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism by some destinations. Perhaps, lack of involvement is a consequence of lack of benefits being realized within host communities. Thus, from determining the reasons for lack of involvement, Caribbean destinations can tailor their voluntourism projects to ensure maximum benefits to host communities while simultaneously satisfying the needs of
the voluntourist. Additionally, since the study aims to determine whether the Caribbean can be a significant source market for voluntourism activities; using this model can reveal areas for improvement on the path of the Caribbean, in its effort to incorporate voluntourism into its tourism product offering.

The development of the social exchange theory model (see Illustration 1) was based on the three core premises of: the need for satisfaction, exchange relation, and consequences of exchange between residents and tourism (Ap, 1992). It therefore suggests that when exchange of resources (tangible and intangible - such as exposure to different cultures) between residents and tourism is high and balanced, or high for the host actor/community in an unbalanced relation, tourism impacts are viewed positively by residents. In other words, if the outputs, actions and outcomes of the interaction between host actor and tourism results in rewards, satisfaction and the fulfillment of needs on the path of the host residents, the exchange/interaction is viewed as favourable and worthwhile. However, when exchange of resources is low in either the balanced or unbalanced exchange relations, the impacts are viewed negatively; thus the exchange is viewed by host residents as unfavourable and worthless. Homans (1958) cited in (Na Manaʻo 2008) posits that every relationship comes with costs and rewards, and people only keep relationships if the rewards outweigh the costs.
Many studies (Perdue et al., 1990; Ap, 1992; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Andereck et al., 2005; Andriots and Vaughan, 2003; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2004; McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Sirakaya, Teye, and Sonmez, 2002; Kitnuntaviwat and Tang, 2008; Hug and Vogt, 2008; Latkova, 2008; Choi and Murray, 2010) have shown support for the use of the social exchange theory in examining the attitudes of residents and host communities towards tourism. However, in an effort to keep focused, further discussion into these studies will not be explored.

Moreover, though a lot of notable support is given to the social exchange theory, it is not without criticisms. Four major critiques will be discussed below. The first critique of the social exchange theory is that it is not testable. One important criterion of the theory is that it is testable and capable of being proven false. As Sabatelli and Shehan, (1993) state, it becomes impossible to make an operational distinction between what people value, what they perceive as rewarding, and how they behave. Rewards, values and actions appear to be defined in terms of each other (Turner, 1978). Thus it is impossible to find an instance when a person (whether voluntourist and host resident) does not act in ways so as to obtain rewards. The second problem area relates to
the conceptualization of human beings painted social exchange theory. In this theoretical framework, humans are depicted as being rational calculators, coming up with numerical equations to represent their relational life. Many people object to this understanding of humans, asking whether people really calculate the costs and rewards to be realized when engaging in a behavior or pursuing a relationship (in this case the relationship between the voluntourist and host residents). The Social Exchange theory, like many theories, assumes a great deal of cognitive awareness and activity, which several researchers have questioned (Berger & Roloff, 1980). Thirdly, under review is whether people are really as self-interested as the Social Exchange Theory assumes. This third critique is related to the second. Duck (1994) argues that applying a marketplace mentality to the understanding of relational life vastly misrepresents what goes on in relationships. He suggests that it is wrong to think about personal relationships in the same way that business transactions are thought about, like buying a house or a car. This suggestion relates to the ontological assumptions one brings to the theory. For some people, the analogy of the marketplace is appropriate, but for others it is not and may be highly offensive. How people evaluate the analogy depends on the ontological framework they bring to the theory. The final critique also focuses on ontological assumptions. This complaint suggests that Social Exchange Theory fails to explain the importance of group solidarity in its emphasis on individual need fulfillment (England, 1989 cited in West and Turner 2007). This critique combines some of the issues raised above and argues that "the exchange framework can be viewed as valuing the individual to the extent that rationality and self-interest are emphasized" (Sabatelli & Shehan, 1993, p. 397). By prioritizing this value, the connected self is overlooked and undervalued.

It is obvious from the above research on voluntourisms’ transformative potential and the social exchange theory model, that voluntourism holds significance to both voluntourists generating regions and voluntourists receiving regions. Thus, the selection of these two theories was felt to not only complement each other but allow for meaningful discussion in assessing the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean. Moreover, it is evident that, in order for voluntourism to work effectively; it must be mutually beneficial to both voluntourists generating regions and voluntourists receiving regions. It is now important to consider current voluntourism trends at a global level and later at a regional level with emphasis placed on the Caribbean.
**Voluntourism Trends**

Voluntourism continues to expand greatly, being explored by many organizations and destinations around the world; with the United Kingdom (UK), United States (US) and Australia being the three main source markets for voluntourism (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). In a 2009 GeckoGo’s survey of more than two thousand voluntourists worldwide, it was revealed that the UK was the third largest originating market (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). However, no reasons for this achievement by the UK were highlighted. Later, in an article by VolunTourism.org Founder, David Clemmons entitled: Voluntourism - From Whence They May Come, Clemmons sought to look to the Northeastern Atlantic and the United Kingdom to discover what contributing factors may play a role in the growth of voluntourists amongst these populations. At the outset, the Gap Year was identified as one element. However, Clemmons questioned what else is building a culture of voluntourism in the UK? As the article progressed, three additional factors emerged, namely; (1) Responsible Travel, (2) Social Impetus to Serve, and (3), Voluntourism Operators (Voluntourism.org 2014). Together, these four factors were identified as contributing to the UK’s potential for producing voluntourists. In support of this, Mahrouse (2011) in an article entitled ‘Feel-good tourism: An ethical option for socially conscious westerners’, posits that many socially-conscious people from the “first world” or global North have come to regard conventional tourism as a gratuitous and crass form of exploitation and are opting for more socially response alternatives, hence voluntourism.

In 2012, the United Nations Volunteers Inspiration in Action Group reported that a total of 6,807 individual UN Volunteers with 81% originating from developing countries and 19% from other countries; were deployed to assist on 6,912 UNV Assignments (United Nations Volunteers (UNV) Statistical and Financial Information Report 2012). These assignments were a mixture of International UNV Assignments (72%) and National UNV Assignments (28%) within the areas of: Environment and Sustainable Development, Democratic Governance, Crises Prevention and Recovery, and Poverty Eradication and Achievement of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These statistics are testament to those destinations which view voluntourism as a field of high interest and value, dedicating time and other resources to the advancement of the cause.
Further, a survey of 1,400 US Adults conducted in 2008 by the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), revealed that 17% deemed Africa as the most desired international destination for a volunteer trip; this was followed by East Asia with 12% and South America with 9% (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). The diverse environmental and social needs throughout the African continent attributed to making it the most popular destination for volunteer tourists (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008).

However, a shift has been seen in interest from a CANNU-centric (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States) marketplace to one that is beginning to include the G-BRICs (Germany, Brazil, Russia, India, and China); though other Asian markets (Malaysia and Singapore, in particular) continue to lead as a top destination of choice for voluntourists (VolunTourism.org 2014). In the same 2009 GeckoGo’s survey the results also revealed that 23% and 14% of voluntourists preferred Peru and Brazil respectively as destinations to which they wish to render voluntary services (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). Moreover, US respondents/voluntourists skewed towards shorter distances; with cheaper opportunities being potentially responsible for their choice (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). Whatever the motivation for travel to these destinations, it has become of concern to some organizations’ representatives that travellers will select a destination based on travel preference rather than possible needs of the voluntourists receiving region (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). Based on the above results it is evident that the popularity of voluntourism continues to expand with interest being realized in both voluntourists generating regions and voluntourists receiving regions. The media has been credited for the growth witnessed within the voluntourism industry (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). Moreover, Founder of Voluntourism.org, David Clemmons stated:

“The power of the Media is unquestionable. Much of what is known about VolunTourism is, in large part, due to the influence of the Media. Pick up a magazine, newspaper, or search through your favorite online version thereof, and you will discover that someone, somewhere, is writing about VolunTourism (Volutourism.org 2014).”
Further still, research conducted in 2004 showed that more than 800 organizations were recorded as providing overseas volunteer services in 200 countries (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). In 2006, voluntourism was estimated to be worth US$150 million (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). Later in 2008, a Tourism and Research Marketing survey of 300 organisations estimated the market size to be 1.6 million volunteer tourists per year with a value between £832 million and £1.3 billion per year (AUD) 1.3 billion - 2.1 billion (Tourism Research and Marketing 2008; Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). In 2008 it was further revealed that the market was estimated to have grown 5-10% in Western Europe over the course of five years (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014; (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008).

Yet still, no one study exists to measure the overall size of this global market. While there have been limited studies for market size in the UK and the US; for many other countries; statistics are sparse, incomplete and unavailable (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). However based on these results and other reported findings, voluntourism is seen as the fastest-growing trend in the tourism industry, this according to TIME Magazine, August 2007 (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008).

The Caribbean Tourism and Voluntourism Industry

The Caribbean like other regions and destinations is seeking to incorporate voluntourism into its tourism product offering package. Therefore, in its effort to move away from lone dependence upon the traditional mass tourism notion - offering ‘sun, sand and sea’; voluntourism has been identified as the new and innovative sustainable option for the Caribbean by the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO). However, this is not the first alternative form of tourism explored within the Caribbean region. Other sustainable alternatives such as Eco-Tourism in Dominica, Bonaire, Guyana, and Costa Rica (TCED 2014); Sports Tourism (Barbados), Culture and Events (Trinidad and Tobago), Agro-Tourism, Pro-poor Tourism and Health Tourism (Zappino 2005) among others have been practiced for decades throughout the Caribbean.

Moreover, in the Caribbean Tourism Review 2014, it was revealed that the Caribbean recorded modest growth in 2013 based on the latest information provided by CTO’s member countries. Though mixed performances among the destinations were seen, this resulted in an estimated 25.1
million tourists visiting the region, which was 1.8% more than the revised 24.6 million in 2012. Further still, the Caribbean’s major source markets continues to be the United States, Canada, Europe, The Caribbean, South America and Other - the list of countries included in “other” varies from country to country; imputed from data on international travel to member countries (Caribbean Tourism Review 2014). The United States remained the most important supplier of tourists to the region as its share of total arrivals averaged 50% over the last five years. There was no further expansion of market share in 2013 despite a 2.9% increase in arrivals from this market. About 12.3 million Americans visited the region with most arriving in the Bahamas, Jamaica, Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico (Caribbean Tourism Review 2014). However despite these statistics, the Caribbean region continued to be adversely affected by relatively weak economic conditions which persist in its key markets (Caribbean Tourism Review 2014). For instance, the ongoing challenges in Europe, though not as severe as in previous years, affected arrivals into the region as there was a further reduction of tourists from the European countries in 2013. By the end of the year an estimated 4.7 million Europeans visited the region, some 3.7% fewer than the previous year. However, double digit growth in the South American market was recorded, reflecting intense focus on attracting tourists from emerging markets. The momentum which was generated over the previous two years in tourist arrivals has been significantly reduced, as month-over-month changes in total stay-over arrivals were moderate (see Illustration 2).

Source: Caribbean Tourism Review 2014
Illustration 2: Monthly Tourist (Stop-Over) Arrivals 2009-2013
Thus for the Caribbean, voluntourism provides for an attractive alternative that if organized, planned and invested in adequately can be mutually beneficial to both voluntourist receiving regions (host communities), and voluntourist generating regions (voluntourists). In keeping with the theories explored above, a balance is necessary to ensure that host destinations as well as voluntourists feel satisfied with the exchange facilitated through interaction. Therefore, it is advisable during the planning stage of voluntourism projects, that these theories (transformative potential theory and the social exchange theory model) be included in order to circumvent future criticisms and challenges.

In 2013, secondary research conducted by Carrington (2013) revealed that some level of voluntourism activities already exist within the Caribbean region. Typical voluntourism activities included: beach cleanups; the provision of medical aid; construction of roads, schools, community centers and other buildings; teaching and training; the setting up of water treatment facilities; environmental programs such as reforestation; social welfare programs for example working with persons infected with AIDS; the restoration of Caribbean heritage landmarks; exchange programs; donations of money and relevant supplies; post-crisis recovery of communities and research. Moreover, The Landings - Pack for Purpose Program, in St. Lucia; The Westin St. John Resort and Villas - National Park Voluntourism Program, in the US Virgin Islands; The Ritz Carlton - Iguana Recovery Program (Giveback Getaway) in the Cayman Islands; and The Sandals Resorts - Reading Road Trip Program for guests present throughout the Caribbean were identified as key examples of voluntourism initiatives currently operating within the region. Many benefits can be realized from these and other programs in the Caribbean; with communities, community-based organizations (CBOs), NGOs, voluntourists and Volunteer Sending Organizations (VSOs) among others key stakeholders being identified as beneficiaries of voluntourism activities.

According to the Statistical and Financial Information Report 2012 from (UN Volunteers 2014), it was recorded that during 2012, there were 312 UN Volunteers from outside the Caribbean working within the Caribbean and 74 Caribbean UN Volunteers working on assignments in other regions. As it relates to UN Volunteers from the region serving within the region; it was recorded that for 2012, 28 Caribbean UN Volunteers were engaged on voluntourism projects/
assignments within the Caribbean. These numbers though low, shows some evidence of participation on the part of the Caribbean in voluntourism at a regional and international level.

**Summary of Chapter 2:**

The above research provides an overview of the global voluntourism industry, with a glimpse into the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean. It is evident from the statistics that if the Caribbean seeks to become a major source market for voluntourism activities, much more research needs to be undertaken. Moreover, for destinations such as the Caribbean seeking to develop a framework which can streamline and guide voluntourism activities, it is advisable to incorporate theories/models and existing frameworks; guides and success stories within the development process.
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology for Collecting Data

Introduction to Chapter 3:
This section seeks to present an overview of how the research was conducted as well as the challenges and limitations encountered during the data collection process. It also provides a brief overview of how well the research questions were elucidated by the literature review.

Research Topic:
“Assessing the nature of Voluntourism within the Caribbean”

Research Design and Methodology:
This study adopted a mixed methodology approach where elements of both quantitative and qualitative research were utilized. As such, a mixed study design was implemented, in that; a qualitative purpose which is synonymous with qualitative research was used. A qualitative purpose is one that is concerned about understanding social phenomena from the participants’ perspective, which in this case is the National Tourism Organizations (NTOs). However, a Survey Research Design which is consistent with Quantitative Research was utilized as the method of primary data collection. Thus, for the purpose of obtaining primary data, a survey questionnaire was fielded to participants via Survey Monkey - an online survey platform.

Since a survey research design was employed, a descriptive research sub-design was selected to examine the above research questions.

When survey research designs are used to address descriptive research questions, the sub-design is referred to as a descriptive research design. Such designs provide a summary or a simple description of an existing situation, issues, event, or phenomenon. Moreover, it focuses on the ‘nature’ of existing conditions or the extent to which something is evident. This approach was therefore adopted as it was deemed appropriate for the research topic under review.

Participants/Sampling:
According to (Tongco MDC. 2007) informant selection is highly relevant for research, as people are constantly looked upon for knowledge and information. Thus, this study adopted a non-probability purposive sampling technique. This type of sampling technique is most effective
when one needs to study a certain cultural domain with knowledgeable experts (Tongco MDC. 2007). Moreover, it is used by qualitative researchers to purely describe or explore a sub-group relevant to the area under study. However, purposive sampling can be used with both qualitative and quantitative research techniques. The inherent bias of this method contributes to its efficiency, and the method stays robust even when tested against random probability sampling. Choosing the purposive sample is fundamental to the quality of data gathered; thus, reliability and competence of the informant must be ensured (Tongco MDC. 2007).

Target Population/Sample

In light of this, the target population selected for this research was National Tourism Organizations (NTOs) which encompassed; Tourists Boards and Ministries of Tourism within the English, Spanish and French speaking Caribbean islands. It is important to note, given this project is a collaborative effort between CTO and ACS, the CTO Member Countries and the ACS Member Countries were specifically targeted. CTO was mandated with the responsibility of following up on participants within the English Speaking Caribbean countries; while ACS was responsible for the Spanish and French Speaking Caribbean islands.

A total of 20 English Speaking Caribbean islands were targeted to participate in the survey. These countries included: St. Eustatius, Dominica, Guyana, Grenada, The Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, British Virgin Islands, Suriname, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Maarten, Turks and Caicos, Saint Lucia, Montserrat, Cayman Islands, Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica, Barbados, Anguilla, and Bermuda. While a total of 13 Spanish Speaking Caribbean islands were the target of this research. These countries included: Panama, Belize, Puerto Rico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Bonaire, Cuba, Curacao, Mexico, Honduras, El Salvador, Republic of Columbia, and Venezuela. Finally, Four French Speaking Caribbean Islands were also selected for the study. These countries included: Haiti, St. Martin, Martinique, and Guadeloupe.

Research Instrument:

The Research Instrument utilized for this study was a survey questionnaire, fielded to participants online via Survey Monkey. The survey questionnaire was divided into two main
sections namely: (A) - Respondent Demographics and (B) - Nature of Voluntourism. Given the mixed nature of the research, the survey questionnaire encompassed a series of closed ended and open ended questions. As such, the instrument called for both quantitative and qualitative responses allowing for a more rounded analysis of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.

Data Collection Procedure and Ethical Considerations:

Data Collection Procedure

Data was collected in three cycles within a six month period via survey monkey. The survey was initially opened (first cycle) to the English Speaking Caribbean islands only (CTO Member Countries) on July 23rd 2013 and was given a submission deadline date of August 12th 2013. Following this, and the low response rate, the survey was reopened on September 16th 2013 (second cycle) with a submission deadline date of October 18th 2013 (beginning of third cycle). However, the survey was not limited to the English Speaking Caribbean only, but incorporated the French and Spanish Speaking Caribbean islands as well. Though the response rate was higher than the first cycle, the numbers were still insufficient to provide a proper representation on behalf of the NTOs within the Region. Thus, the survey remained open until November 1st 2013 (end of third cycle), which marked the end of the data collection period.

Three Cycle Survey Overview:

Cycle 1:

Target Population: English Speaking Caribbean Countries
- A total of four responses (Grenada, St. Eustatius, Guyana, Dominica) were obtained from the targeted group

Cycle 2:

Target Population: English, Spanish, and French Speaking Caribbean Countries
- A total of five responses (The Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, The British Virgin Islands, and Suriname) were obtained from the English Speaking Caribbean Islands. A further three responses (Panama, Belize, and Puerto Rico) were also received from the Spanish Speaking Caribbean
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Countries, with one response (Haiti) being provided from the French Speaking Caribbean Islands.

**Cycle 3:**

Target Population: English, Spanish, and French Speaking Caribbean Countries

- A further six responses (St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Maarten, Turks and Caicos, Saint Lucia, Montserrat, Cayman Islands) were obtained from the English Speaking Caribbean Islands. Two more responses (Costa Rica, Nicaragua) were also received from the Spanish Speaking Caribbean Islands; with no more responses being obtained from the French Speaking Caribbean Islands at the end of the data collection period.

**Ethical Considerations**

At the outset of this study, participants were made aware of the purpose of the research and the entities for which the information was requested. This was reiterated on the data collection instrument; translated into English, Spanish and French to ensure collective understanding among the targeted population. Moreover, though the survey was a totally voluntary participation exercise; participants were encouraged to participate as they were seen as key stakeholders within the field of voluntourism in the Caribbean. Further still, while the survey questionnaire requested participants’ name, job title, place of work, phone number (work) and email address (work); none of this information was either distributed or utilized in the Data Collection, Findings and Analysis Chapter of this paper. This information was only used to follow up with participants during the data collection period.

**Data Analysis Technique/s:**

For this study Quantitative Data Analysis techniques and more specifically the Frequency Distribution technique was used to analyse the findings of the data collection process. This method is a good way to present a univariate (one-variable) distribution (Sagepub 2014). Moreover, it displays the number percentage (the relative frequencies), or both corresponding to each of a variable’s values. A frequency distribution is usually labeled with a title, a stub (labels for the values), a caption, and perhaps the number of missing cases. If percentages are presented rather than frequencies (sometimes both are included), the total number of cases in the
distribution (the base number \( N \)) should be indicated (Sagepub 2014). Microsoft Excel was used in the calculation of the Frequency Distribution, and the presentation of the results. The Frequency Distribution method was chosen because it allowed for an accurate presentation of the results as well as it is seen as a better fit for the study design and methodology chosen.

**Strengths, Challenges and Limitations:**

**Strengths**

- The appropriate study design and methodology was selected, which was later complemented by the Non-Probability Purposive sampling technique adopted (Tongco MDC. 2007). Moreover, a mixed methodology was chosen as it strengthens the weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research; it provides for more evidence than studying a research problem using either quantitative or qualitative research alone; and it is practical as it allows the researcher to use all or various methods to address a research problem under review.

- Despite the inherent challenges and limitations the participation rate increased with time and encouragement.

- CTO and ACS adhered to ethical considerations pre, during and post the data collection period.

- The NTOs were a good starting point for collecting data, not only because they are a key stakeholder within the voluntourism industry in the Caribbean; but also because the Caribbean is seeking to expand beyond the traditional ‘sun, sand and sea tourism’ to incorporate sustainable alternatives such as voluntourism which merges tourism with volunteering.

**Challenges and Limitations**

- Some countries did not respond or participated and this resulted in a low response rate.

- Some countries responded two and three times in error, for example Dominica, which responded in the first and second cycle of the survey. Of these countries some responses were inconsistent with the first submission. Thus, follow up calls were made to verify, while in other cases decisions were made based on the flow of responses.
Some participants started the questionnaire but did not complete it. Therefore, data was unavailable for certain key questions which would provide a more holistic view of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.

Language barriers were also an issue; as not only the data collection instrument had to be translated, but also the emails which were sent out to inform participants within the Spanish and French Speaking Caribbean islands of the survey. Thus, the assistance of others had to be solicited which further delayed and resulted in the inevitable lack of participation by some.

Moreover, though follow up emails, reminders and calls were made, some countries did not see it as important enough to dedicate the approximated 15 minutes it would take to complete and submit the survey.

The research instrument did not originate with the author; but, was passed on to the author by CTO on behalf of the authors’ predecessor. As such, the author had to build the entire project based on a previously fielded survey instrument (first cycle). This posed a bit of a challenge as the author had to work backwards in some instances (development of research questions), instead of adopting the natural flow for conducting research.

Lastly, the research instrument lacked some key questions which upon reviewing other landmark studies; was felt could have provided an even better overview of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.

Summary of Chapter 3:
The study adopted a mixed methodology (quantitative and qualitative) approach allowing for a balanced, more holistic and better informed analysis of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean. The National Tourism Organizations (Ministries of Tourism and Tourist Boards) were the target of the first phase of the research as they play a key role in facilitating the process of diversifying the Caribbean’s tourism product, as well as are instrumental to the development of the voluntourism framework. Moreover, the survey was fielded in three cycles, and adhered to ethical considerations throughout the research process. A series of strengths, challenges and limitations were subsequently outlined based on the author’s reflections of the research process.
Chapter 4: Data Collection, Findings and Analysis

Introduction to Chapter 4:

This section seeks to provide insight into the current state of the Caribbean voluntourism industry from the perspectives of the National Tourism Organizations (NTOs) - Phase 1. It draws attention to those countries within the English, Spanish and French speaking Caribbean region which are currently involved in voluntourism activities. It also presents a snapshot of the extent, to which these countries are involved in voluntourism and the reasons for the lack of involvement by some. Lastly, it examines the ways in which countries within the region are currently benefiting from voluntourism.

Phase two of this research which focuses on Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) will be conducted outside the context of academia and will be presented to the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) at a later date.

Data Collection, Findings and Analysis

The survey questionnaire contained fifteen (15) questions which were divided into two sections namely; (1) Respondent Demographics and (2) Nature of Voluntourism. All surveys were undertaken in the national language for each participating country. However, it has been translated into English to cater to the English Examiners reviewing this paper. Moreover, these findings represent the perspectives of the National Tourism Organizations (Ministries of Tourism and Tourist Boards) within the respective countries.

Respondent Demographics

Question one and two of the survey questionnaire was tailored to obtain basic demographics from the target population. As such, these first two questions received one hundred percent participation on the path of all respondents. Of the 20 English, 13 Spanish and four French speaking countries which were targeted for this study, 15 (75%) English, five (38.5%) Spanish and one (25%) French respondent participated (see Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Participating Countries</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Speaking Countries</td>
<td>Cayman Islands, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Maarten, Saint Lucia, Turks and Caicos Islands, Suriname, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, The Bahamas, Grenada, St. Eustatius, Guyana</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Speaking Countries</td>
<td>Panama, Belize, Puerto Rico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Speaking Countries</td>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that based on these figures (response rate) the accuracy of this survey can be compromised. Research shows that a relationship exists between response rate and the level of confidence that can be placed into survey results (Van Bennekom 2014). Response rates are calculated by dividing the number of people who submitted a completed survey (where 80% or more questions have been answered) by the number of people originally invited to participate in the survey (Instructional Assessment Resources 2011). Whereas, confidence level is referred to as the probability value \( (1 - \alpha) \) associated with a confidence interval (see Glossary) (Easton and McColl 2014). Confidence Level is often expressed as a percentage. For example, say \( \alpha = 0.05 = 5\% \), then the confidence level is equal to \( (1 - 0.05) = 0.95 \), i.e. a 95% confidence level (Easton and McColl 2014). The higher the response rates for surveys, the greater the level of confidence (Van Bennekom 2014). Instructional Assessment Resources (2011) indicated that acceptable response rates vary according to how surveys are administered. If surveys are administered via mail, a response rate of 50% is seen as adequate, 60% as good, and 70% as very good. Even further, phone administered surveys are seen as good if they received a response rate of 80%; while emails with a 40% response rate are seen as average, 50% good and 60% as very good. Moreover, online surveys with a 30% response rate is seen as average; classroom paper surveys with a response rate of more than 50% is classified as good and face to face surveys/interviews with 80 to 85% response rate are deemed as good (Instructional Assessment Resources 2011). Given that the voluntourism survey was administered online via survey monkey; a response rate of 75% for the ESCs and 38.5% for the SSCs based on the above literature are very good and just
above average in that order. However, the 25% response rate by the FSCs proves inadequate. This was further evident, as post question five of the survey; no more responses were obtained from the FSCs. It is also possible that based on the country’s lack of involvement in voluntourism; participating in the survey past question five proved redundant. The survey therefore, became an assessment of the nature of voluntourism within the English and Spanish speaking Caribbean.

As mentioned above, one hundred percent of participants from the English, Spanish and French speaking countries provided responses pertaining to their names, job title, place of work, phone number (work), and email address (work) (see Table 2). This concluded Respondent Demographics section of the survey questionnaire.

Table 2: Employment Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Choices</th>
<th>English Speaking Countries</th>
<th>Spanish Speaking Countries</th>
<th>French Speaking Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Respondent</td>
<td>100% 15</td>
<td>100% 5</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>100% 15</td>
<td>100% 5</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Work</td>
<td>100% 15</td>
<td>100% 5</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number (Work)</td>
<td>100% 15</td>
<td>100% 5</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email (Work)</td>
<td>100% 15</td>
<td>100% 5</td>
<td>100% 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of Voluntourism

The findings and analysis presented within this section will be guided by the following three research questions:

1. To what extent are Caribbean destinations within the English, Spanish and French Speaking Caribbean islands involved in voluntourism?
2. What are the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities/projects by potential host destinations within the Caribbean?
3. In what ways are Caribbean destinations currently benefiting from their involvement in voluntourism?
Research Question 1

To what extent are Caribbean destinations within the English, Spanish and French Speaking Caribbean islands involved in voluntourism?

At the outset, a combination of questions and answers were analyzed together to produce an accurate response of the extent to which Caribbean destinations are currently involved in voluntourism.

Number of English, Spanish and French Speaking Countries already involved in voluntourism activities

When participants were asked whether their countries were already involved in voluntourism activities; of the 15 ESCs that responded, 10 (67%) indicated that they were; while only two (40%) of the SSCs answered in the affirmative (see Figure 1).

The lone FSC (Haiti) which participated indicated that they were not involved in any voluntourism activities (see Figure 1). It is possible that Haiti’s response was attributed to not being aware of the term “Voluntourism”. It can therefore be assumed that a number of factors could have contributed to the lack of awareness on the path of the French respondent such as; insufficient marketing and media coverage of the concept by external bodies (voluntourist generating regions/ international NGOs) to this destination. Research (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008; Volutourism.org 2014) has shown that media has the potential to drive the growth and
awareness of voluntourism. Even more, emerging communication technologies such as Web 2.0, social media and other information sources have also become prevalent among some voluntourism segments. Viral marketing, social networks, grass roots communication and consumer to consumer information sharing have been attributed to the continued expansion in the awareness of volunteer tourism opportunities (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008). The French respondent’s lack of awareness can also be attributed to the way in which voluntourism is packaged and marketed. Ellis (2003) and (Sharpley 2009) indicated that in some instances voluntourism is packaged and marketed in a similar way to mass tourism. Thus, this might make it difficult to distinguish it from mass tourism. It is also possible that at an individual level the respondent was not familiar with the term; as such, was unable to accurately respond on behalf of their respective country. Even further, it could have been a researcher’s error, as the concept may not have been adequately explained.

Extent to which country is involved in voluntourism

The extent of a country’s involvement in voluntourism can be analyzed from two points; (1) voluntourists generating region and, (2) voluntourists receiving region. An abundance or lack of resources and the presence or absence of needs can determine which category a country fits into. For example, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia are among the top voluntourists generating regions (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008), whereas, Africa, the Asian market and the G-BRICs are among the most desirable voluntourists receiving regions.

In light of this, analyzing the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean is conducted from the voluntourists receiving region stand point. As such, for those countries involved in voluntourism activities, their level of involvement was brought into question. Of the 10 ESCs already involved in voluntourism, seven (70%) stated that their respective countries were minimally involved in voluntourism. A further 10% expressed that they were moderately involved, and another 10% (Guyana) spoke of high levels of involvement in voluntourism. The remaining 10% were unaware of their country’s level of involvement within the area. In examining the level of involvement within the SSCs, it was revealed that of the two countries involved in voluntourism activities; one country was minimally involved while the other country (Belize) was heavily involved in voluntourism (see Figure 2).
Though one country within both the English and Spanish Speaking Countries recorded ‘high’ levels of involvement in voluntourism; the study failed to define and interpret these levels of involvement. Thus, it is possible that these countries based their level of involvement upon the types of voluntourists activities they are currently offering, the level of financial investment allocated to this niche, the number of tourists visiting the destination or perhaps the number of their voluntourists rendering services overseas. Other factors (external to this study) could have also been responsible for these destinations being heavily involved in voluntourism. For those destinations who recorded moderate and minimal involvement; it can be asked - what informed their response?

_Sectors that lead voluntourism initiatives in the country_

Fifty percent of the 10 ESCs indicated that Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) lead voluntourism initiatives in their respective countries. Thirty percent stated that it is led by the private sector, while 10% indicated that it is led by the public sector. The remaining 10% indicated that voluntourism initiatives within the country have been led by equal participation.
The two SSCs that responded, mentioned that voluntourism initiatives within their countries are solely led by NGOs (see Figure 3).

![Figure 3: Sectors that lead voluntourism initiatives in the country](image)

Research shows that most voluntourism activities are driven by and facilitated through NGOs around the world. In a 2004 survey, it was revealed that more than 800 organizations were recorded as providing overseas volunteer services in 200 countries (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). This is testament, to the number of NGOs and Private Sector businesses that have solely or in part committed themselves to facilitating voluntourism initiatives. In light of this, the 50% of ESCs, and the two SSCs which indicated that voluntourism initiatives are led by NGOs, is synonymous with the Global trends for organizations leading voluntourism initiatives around the world. From the results it is also clear that private sector organizations have been leading voluntourism initiatives within the Caribbean representing 30% of the ESCs responses. Research reveals that due to the increased demand for voluntourism activities around the world, a number of organizations (NGOs and Private Sector companies) have setup operations to meet this demand. However, this upsurge in the number of organizations, has resulted in the commercialization of voluntourism, as some organizations have seen it as a business venture (a way to make profit). These types of organizations are often criticized for poorly constructed projects and programs; and their inability to satisfy the needs of voluntourist receiving destinations. While it would be useful to gain insight into the NGOs that lead voluntourism
within the ESCs and SSCs countries, the survey did not allow for respondents to provide such information.

**Whether or not there is a budget for voluntourism in the organization**

The NTOs were asked whether a budget existed within their organization for voluntourism. Ninety percent of the ESCs indicated that a budget does not exist for voluntourism within their respective organizations, while only one participant, answered in the affirmative. The two respondents from the SSCs mentioned that there was also no budget for voluntourism within their organizations (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Whether or not there is a budget for voluntourism in the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the NTOs do not have a budget for voluntourism within their organization is perhaps due to them not leading voluntourism initiatives at a national level. In the previous question (see Figure 3 above), NTOs which are considered public sector entities, only accounted for 10% of the ESCs responses, with it not being identified as leading any voluntourism initiatives within the SSCs. In trying to determine a budget in US Dollars for voluntourism activities; neither the ESCs nor SSCs responded. Moreover, in examining the survey results at the country level, the two countries (Guyana and Belize) which indicated high levels of involvement in voluntourism, it was revealed that both countries voluntourism initiatives are led by the private sector and NGOs respectively. Hence, their budget for voluntourism activities can possibly be obtained from these two sectors.

**Existing voluntourism activities within the country**

This study also attempted to identify the types of voluntourism activities currently being offered within the ESCs, and SSCs to present and potential voluntourists. The results revealed that of
the 10 ESCs which responded, 88.9% identified cleanups as one of the top voluntourism activities existing within their countries. It is possible that this 88.9% ascribed to ‘cleanups’ and more specifically ‘beach cleanups’ maybe as a result of the negative human impact of mass tourism upon the Caribbean shores. Another 55.6% mentioned medical aid, followed by; construction, and teaching and training which accounted for 44.4% each. Environmental programs were selected by 77.8% of the respondents, with social welfare programs; restoration of heritage sites; and donations all being selected by 22.2% of the respondents. Thirty-three percent of respondents selected research, and exchange programs each. Only one respondent stated that post-crisis recovery was part of their country’s existing voluntourism activities (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: Existing voluntourism activities within the country

Of the two SSCs involved in voluntourism activities, only one respondent provided information on the types of voluntourism activities currently offered to present and potential voluntourists. These activities included; the provision of medical aid, construction, training and teaching, environmental programs, social welfare programs, and exchange programs (see Figure 4). The Spanish respondent also indicated that the regulation of the voluntourism sector was part of their
voluntourism activities offered. It can be assumed that some level of misunderstanding occurred in answering this question.

The types of voluntourism activities provided within the Caribbean are similar to the activities offered in the global voluntourism market. This similarity affords travellers a choice (in terms of destination) to which to render their voluntary services. A number of factors may affect voluntourists decision such as, financial gain, cost of travel, how exotic is the destination, and distance (transit route) between the voluntourist generating region and the voluntourist receiving region. For repeat voluntourists, satisfaction with previous experience; and/or the level of commitment to the organization/s (NGOs or Private Sector) which facilitated the transfer between destinations are among other factors that may influence voluntourists choice. According to the State of the Volunteer Travel Industry Report 2009, the average return rate for a traveller to volunteer abroad with the same company is 10%. This number varied widely with one company having a return rate of 70% while others had as low as 1%. The reasons given for higher return rates were; higher emphasis on engaging past travellers as well as a distinct correlation with volunteers that worked on hands-on projects like building or conservation (State of the Volunteer Travel Industry Report, 2009).

**Successful voluntourism projects identified and described within the ESCs and SSCs**

Participants were asked to select a successful voluntourism project within their respective countries and give a brief description of the project. Of the 10 ESCs involved in voluntourism, eight (Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, Turks and Caicos, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, British Virgin Islands, Dominica and Guyana) complied, providing an overview of one of their country’s most successful voluntourism projects. These projects ranged from environmental programs, and teaching and training programs; to infrastructural and cultural (mural paintings) projects (see Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Successful Voluntourism Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>Completed a Reef Ball Project which involved the building of artificial Reef Balls and Transplanting Coral Reefs from one area to another</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St. Kitts and Nevis  
Teaching, training and construction at local primary and secondary school

Turks and Caicos  
CommUnity In Action (CIA) is a great not for profit organization based in Grand Turk that has been doing many positive projects for the children, elderly and general population. On January 9, 2013, they hosted a huge benefit concert involving more than 100 cruise passengers that volunteered to help CIA rebuild a park that was destroyed by Hurricane Ike. Please see link for this project, [https://fbcdn-video-a.akamaihd.net/hvideo-ak-ash3/v/751002_423363691065346_20211_n.mp4?oh=e9f58941bafd74431b13373d8f169e4c&oe=527180D6&__gda__=1383170311_98d9c54bf72daebb338e8f14a83f10dc](https://fbcdn-video-a.akamaihd.net/hvideo-ak-ash3/v/751002_423363691065346_20211_n.mp4?oh=e9f58941bafd74431b13373d8f169e4c&oe=527180D6&__gda__=1383170311_98d9c54bf72daebb338e8f14a83f10dc)

St. Vincent and the Grenadines  
Richmond Vale Academy Programme

Trinidad & Tobago  
Nature Seekers – Trinidad’s Leatherback Sea Turtles Project with Earthwatch Volunteers help Earthwatch scientist’s record information on hatching survival and adult turtle health, and to tag adult turtles to keep an accurate population count. This data has two critical purposes - it reveals long-term population trends and it supports quality public outreach. Nature Seekers hosts more than 15,000 turtle-watchers annually at Matura Beach. Educating these visitors, who come from the local community as well as abroad, has nearly stopped the killing of turtles at Matura. They also help scientists understand climate change impacts by tracking the slope and width of the beaches, the moisture in the sand, and the nests washed out to sea—all information that can give insight into how rising temperatures and rising seas could affect turtles and their habitats. More information can be read at - [http://earthwatch.org/expeditions/trinidads-leatherback-sea-turtles](http://earthwatch.org/expeditions/trinidads-leatherback-sea-turtles)

British Virgin Islands  
Mural Paintings, artists from USA came to assist with this project.

Dominica  
Missionary Workers: Constructing homes for the less fortunate

Guyana  
The present voluntourism in Guyana country is the CPLt20 2013. This competition will showcase the culture of Caribbean to the rest of the world and give a lot of young West Indian players a chance to showcase their talent.

One Spanish respondent (Belize) provided an example of a successful voluntourism project currently operating within the country (see Table 5). It is also evident that misunderstanding
occurred in answering this question, as the participant responded on what their organization is doing in terms of tourism and voluntourism.

**Table 5: Successful voluntourism projects identified and described within the - SSC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Successful Voluntourism Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>We are an Organization that regulates and sets standards for Tourist Accommodations, Tour Guides and Tour Operators. We also engage in product and destination development, as well as quality and capacity building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were subsequently asked to rate how the projects identified above met a 15 point criterion developed by CTO. However, this will be discussed in answering Research Question 3, which seeks to determine in what ways voluntourism is currently benefiting the countries involved in voluntourism activities across the Caribbean.

**Number of voluntourists that visit the country**

Of the 10 ESCs involved in voluntourism, 56% indicated that between 0 - 500 voluntourists visit their country annually. Twenty-two percent does not have this information recorded, while one respondent stated that between 500 - 1,000 voluntourists arrive to their shores annually. The last ESC participant indicated that over 1,500 voluntourists visit their country to engage in voluntourism activities on an annual basis. Only one respondent from the SSC responded. This lone respondent (Belize) stated that over 1,500 voluntourists visit their country to pursue voluntourism activities annually (see Figure 5).
Figure 5: Number of voluntourists that visit the country annually

The number of voluntourists visiting a destination is a key indicator of whether the voluntourism product/package offered by the voluntourist receiving destination is impactful and attractive. It is also an indicator of whether the programs/projects were marketed effectively, or whether it is seen as an authentic need which requires the services of a voluntourist. For those destinations that reported a (0 - 500) arrival figure for voluntourists, it may be a good indication of satisfaction. Research (Costa, Chalip, Green and Simes 2006) shows that satisfaction with one’s task, job or voluntourism experience influences retention, repetition and commitment. Satisfaction can be influenced by how voluntourists are received, and whether voluntourists are able to partnership with host communities; allowing for a favourable balanced exchange (social exchange theory model) between host and the voluntourist. Moreover, satisfaction levels can also be determined by whether tourists obtained training prior to providing voluntary services, or whether they are allowed to share their opinions thus enhancing the ‘transformative potential’ of their experience. The State of the Volunteer Travel Industry Report 2009 provides other factors that influence voluntourists rate of return.

A 2009 GeckoGo’s survey of more than two thousand voluntourists worldwide revealed that the UK was the third largest originating market for voluntourists (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). In an article by David Clemmons - Founder of VolunTourism.org, it was further revealed that the gap year, the desire for responsible travel, one’s social impetus to serve and voluntourism operators were the key factors that contributed to the growth of voluntourists within the UK. It is evident that the number of voluntourists visiting a destination is influenced by a series of push
and pulls factors. According to Dann (1981), there are seven elements within the overall approach to motivation. One key element is the destination pull in response to motivational push. This element distinguishes between the motivation of the individual voluntourist in terms of the level of desire (push) and the pull of the destination or attraction. Moreover, three basic components make up the total demand for tourism. These components include; effective or actual demand, suppressed demand and no demand. As it relates to suppressed demand in particular, demand is further broken down into potential demand and deferred demand. Deferred demand is referred to as demand that is postponed because of a problem in the supply environment, such as a natural disaster (2004 Boxing Day Tsunami). While problems in the supply environment may deter the average tourist, for voluntourists, an event of this nature is a pull factor, as voluntourists are generally motivated by the desire to meet a need.

Moreover, while there are thousands of voluntourism projects packaged and offered around the world (United Nations Volunteers Statistical and Financial Information Report 2012), research shows that Africa, the G-BRICs (Germany, Brazil, Russia, India, and China), Peru and other Asian markets (Malaysia and Singapore, in particular) are among the top destinations for voluntourism and voluntourists. It will prove useful to determine; what are the pull factors within these destinations. Furthermore, from the responses provided above on the level of voluntourists received annually within the Caribbean, it is important to determine who is responsible for collecting voluntourists arrival figures at a national level and whether there is a central register. Moreover, while the results may be ‘low’ and not allow for conclusive arguments, it is important to remember that these are only the responses of the regions’ NTOs (Ministries of Tourism and Tourists Boards). Determining what can be done to increase these numbers; and identifying what isn’t the Caribbean doing are among some key questions for the Caribbean to answer. Moreover, since the Caribbean is seeking to structurally explore voluntourism as a niche, it will be valuable to determine what the major voluntourists receiving destinations are doing, that the Caribbean can adopt. Answering these questions will assist the Caribbean in determining whether to venture into emerging markets (international) as a target for voluntourists, or whether to look internally within the Caribbean - for regional voluntourists.
Research Question 2

What are the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities/projects by potential host destinations within the Caribbean?

Reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities (selected) within the ESCs and SSCs

It was previously mentioned that of the 15 ESCs and six SSCs that participated in the study 10 ESCs and two SSCs were presently involved in voluntourism activities. This meant that the remaining five ESCs and four SSCs were not. The results also showed that the lone FSC (Haiti) was not involved in any voluntourism activities. It is therefore important to determine the reasons for lack of involvement on the path of these countries.

Sixty percent of the ESCs not involved in voluntourism activities mentioned that it was due to a lack of awareness of the term. Twenty percent indicated further that the benefits were limited. The remaining 20% (2 respondents) selected the other (please specify) option (see Figure 6).

![Figure 6: Reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities](image-url)
Of the two respondents that selected the ‘other please specify’ option, it was revealed that for Dominica there are limited human and financial resources available to develop voluntourism as a niche at present. Therefore, has focused on activities that generate an increase in visitor arrivals, which in turn impacts upon expenditure. The second respondent (Grenada) mentioned that although voluntourism is now a common place globally, it is not immediately apparent why destination ‘Grenada’ cannot embrace such a positive and sustainable initiative. It was further mentioned that the human capacity to fully establish a voluntourism program already existed with personal development training being provided by the US Department of State where one person is exposed to a three week program on volunteerism in the US: Civic Leadership in Action program.

Of the four SSCs one indicated that their country’s lack of involvement was due to a lack of awareness of the term. Another respondent stated that the benefits are limited; while another mentioned that the challenges associated with voluntourism are too great. It is unclear what these challenges are, however it is possible; that the destination may not have the appropriate infrastructure and voluntourism activities in place to accommodate voluntourists. Moreover, it can be assumed that the perceived transformative potential is low, or that the country does not stand to benefit from the social exchange facilitated through interactions with voluntourists. Moreover, perhaps voluntourists are inexperienced, or their attitude towards the host community is unfavourable.

The last participant mentioned that they had no interest in the area. Two of the four respondents also selected the other (please specify) option. One explained that the Costa Rican Tourism Institute has not been directly involved in voluntourism. However, if collaterally given the support to small tourism businesses, especially within the area of rural tourism, it would be an area of consideration. Even further, the Costa Rican respondent stated that as a country - Costa Rica has multiple organizations and several destinations for collaboration on the part of volunteers in rural tourism. The other respondent mentioned that voluntourism is a product in which their country Panama have not yet made inroads, but, though not a priority is regarded as important.
The lone French respondent mentioned ‘a lack of awareness of the term’ as their reason for not being involved in voluntourism (see Figure 6 above). This was also discussed above in answering Research Question 1.

The lack of involvement in voluntourism activities by some voluntourist receiving destinations within the Caribbean can also be influenced by ‘perceived’ satisfaction by potential voluntourists and ‘experienced’ satisfaction from repeat voluntourists; as well as distance between regions. These factors, independently and collectively influence demand. If perceived and experienced satisfaction is negative, demand is negatively affected; the reverse is also true. Additionally, distance between regions also affects demand. Perhaps if Caribbean destinations are targeting the US voluntourist market then they (Caribbean destinations) may have to compete with other destinations. In the 2009 GeckoGo’s survey it was also revealed that some US respondents skewed towards shorter distances with shorter transit routes (as long haul destinations are becoming unattractive); and cheaper opportunities (Volunteer Tourism Views 2014). Caribbean destinations may also have to consider alternative or emerging markets. Research shows that some travellers are now selecting a destination based on travel preference rather than possible needs of the voluntourists receiving region (Bakker and Lamoureux 2008).

**Level of interest in pursuing voluntourism**

For those countries not involved in voluntourism at present, the question was asked - on a scale of one to five where one represents ‘no interest’ and five represents ‘high levels of interest’ how interested might your country be in pursuing voluntourism? At the outset, 80% (four out of five) of the ESC responded. Of that 80 % one respondent, indicated that their country have no interest in pursuing voluntourism, another mentioned that they were interested in pursuing voluntourism, while the last two ESC respondents showed average interest in pursuing voluntourism as a country (see Figure 7).
A total of four respondents from the SSCs indicated some level of interest in pursuing voluntourism. Of the four, 50% mentioned that their respective countries had average interest in pursuing voluntourism; while 25% showed general interest and the remaining 25% indicated high levels of interest in pursuing voluntourism (see Figure 7 above). The one FSC that responded also indicated that they have high levels of interest in pursuing voluntourism (see Figure 7 above). It is possible that the FSCs response was influenced by their lack of understanding of the term.

**Figure 7:** Level of interest in pursuing voluntourism
Research Question 3
In what ways is voluntourism currently benefitting those countries involved in voluntourism activities across the Caribbean Region?

Whether or not voluntourism is beneficial to the country and areas in which voluntourism is currently benefitting the country

Voluntourism is deemed beneficial to the 10 ESCs involved in voluntourism. The two SSCs currently involved in voluntourism, also mentioned that voluntourism is beneficial to their respective countries (see Figure 8). It is important to note that the 60% and 33% ‘no response’ for the SSCs and ESCs respectively represents those countries which are not currently involved in voluntourism. The 40% and 67% ‘yes’ represents all countries within the SSCs and ESCs currently involved in voluntourism.

Figure 8: Whether or not voluntourism is beneficial to the country

Therefore, of the 10 ESCs that saw voluntourism as beneficial to their country; 7% stated that voluntourism has been beneficial as it has increased tourism receipts; another 7% stated that voluntourism has allowed for an increase in medical aid. Thirteen percent indicated that voluntourism is currently benefitting their country through improved infrastructure. A further 19% said that voluntourism has resulted in increased educational aid, while another 19% mentioned that it has allowed for skills transfer to locals. A better understanding of culture by tourists was highlighted by 32% of the ESCs (see Figure 9)
Before going forward, it is important to remember that the results provided above represents a summary of country results and not individual country responses. Moreover, it is unclear whether research went into completing this survey, as some of the results presented are questionable. One (3%) ESC respondent selected the other (please specify) option and indicated that voluntourism is currently benefiting their country through the provision of service.

The two SSCs currently involved in voluntourism, mentioned that it has proven beneficial to their respective countries through an increase in tourism receipts which accounted for 11% of total beneficial areas. Improved infrastructure; and a better understanding of culture by tourists also captured 11% and 11 % respectively. Moreover, increased medical aid and educational aid, which accounted for 22% and 22% respectively, were among the benefits mentioned by the SSCs. Skills transferred to locals captured the remaining 23% of areas in which voluntourism benefits the SSCs (see Figure 9 above). The lone FSC could not provide information for this question, as they are not currently involved in any voluntourism activities.
The above provides a detailed list of benefits of voluntourism within the Caribbean. However, these benefits can be summarized by using the ‘Transformative Potential’ theory (Lyons and Wearing, 2008b, 4), which posits that voluntourism can (a) inspire reflexive self-development of tourists, (b) enable progressive trans-cultural understanding between tourists and host communities, and (c) contribute to environmental sustainability or social development in destinations where tourists render services. Outside of this, voluntourist receiving destinations can also gain indirectly, through ‘voluntourist spend’. It is expected that voluntourists would visit local restaurants and bars, as well as utilize local accommodations thereby, financially contributing to the economy of the voluntourist receiving region.

Extent to which successful project identified by NTOs within the ESCs and SSCs, meets a 15 point criteria list for voluntourism

Participants were asked to identify a successful voluntourism project within their respective countries and to state how the selected project meets a 15 point criterion. Using the Likert Scale method, each criterion was given a weight from one to five, where one equaled strongly agree, two equaled agree, three equaled neutral, four equaled disagree and five equaled strongly disagree.

From observing the responses of the ESCs, it was revealed that the scale tilted in favour of ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’; as most respondents indicated that the successful project they identified either strongly satisfied or satisfied the 15 point criterion (See Figure 10). In examining the 15 point criterion list, four key areas were given a ‘strongly agree’ rating. These included; (1) provides opportunities for volunteer to get a deeper understanding of Caribbean culture and challenges, (2) uses local materials and supplies, (3) community involvement is clear and (4) projects are owned by the local community. Moreover, three areas were given an ‘agree’ rating, these included (1) provides skill that may be in short supply, (2) community benefits are clear and (3) focuses on identified needs and challenges (see Figure 10). Taken together, criterion two through four of the ‘strongly agree’ category and criterion two and three of the ‘agree’ category above, places great focus on the community. Thus, using the ‘social exchange theory model’ which is based on the three core premises of: the need for satisfaction, exchange relation, and consequences of exchange between residents and tourism; the local community may...
view their interactions with voluntourists and experiences as high and balanced, with resulting positive impacts.

There were instances where respondents selected a more neutral response when examining whether their ‘successful project’ met the criterion. This was most evident in the following criterion: (1) provides financial gains to local communities, (2) locals are able to maintain the outcomes of voluntourism projects, (3) does not create an attitude of dependence among locals and (4) risk assessments and emergency procedures are taken into account (see Figure 10). Criterion four from the above list was selected by four persons, which also proved to be the highest rating within the neutral category. This criterion also received a ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’ vote by two participants. It can therefore be assumed that, there is inadequate planning for risks and emergencies associated to voluntourism projects or perhaps these projects are deemed ‘low risk’; as such, not much attention is directed to this area. But, it can also be asked; what is ‘low risk’ and how is it measured? If ‘low risk’ is subjective, then for voluntourism project developers, it may be seen as ‘low risk’, but for voluntourists this can be viewed differently.
Provides opportunities for volunteer to get a deeper understanding of ...

Uses local materials and supplies

Community involvement is clear

Projects are owned by the local community

Fosters continuity and maximizes impacts for country

Risk assessments and emergency procedures are taken into account

Focuses on identified needs and challenges

Works within a framework, policies, guidelines, code of conduct and ...

Community benefits are clear

Does not create an attitude of dependence among locals

Periodic monitoring and evaluation of projects is in place

Locals are able to maintain the outcomes of voluntourism projects

Allows for transfer of skill from tourists to locals

Provides skills that may be in short supply

Provides financial gains to local communities

**Figure 10:** Extent to which successful project identified above, meets fifteen (15) criteria of the voluntourism concept - ESC
Belize was the only SSC that provided an example of a successful voluntourism project. From examining the responses provided, it was revealed that the respondent disagreed with the projects ability to meet nine of the 15 criterion. Moreover, the project received a ‘neutral’ rating and an ‘agree’ rating on seven of the 15 criterion (see Figure 11). What is a noteworthy observation is that, the identified project works within a framework, and is guided by policies, guidelines, codes of conduct and standards. This will prove useful for CTO to examine these guidelines, as well as other guidelines and frameworks such as the; Developing the Voluntourism Program - Engaging the Voluntourist, 2008; the International Voluntourism Guidelines - for Commercial Tour Operators; 2014) (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012); Comhlámh (Irish Development Organization), the Year Out Group and Tourism Concern - Gap Year and International Volunteering Standard (GIVS) (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012).
Provides opportunities for volunteer to get a deeper understanding of...
Uses local materials and supplies
Community involvement is clear
Projects are owned by the local community
Fosters continuity and maximizes impacts for country
Risk assessments and emergency procedures are taken into account
Focuses on identified needs and challenges
Works within a framework, policies, guidelines, code of conduct and standards
Community benefits are clear
Does not create an attitude of dependence among locals
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Locals are able to maintain the outcomes of voluntourism projects
Allows for transfer of skill from tourists to locals
Provides skills that may be in short supply
Provides financial gains to local communities

Figure 11: Extent to which successful project identified above, meets fifteen (15) criteria of the voluntourism concept - SSC
Summary of Chapter 4:
This section sought to assess the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean through the presentation and analysis of three research questions. Combinations of questions from the research instrument in collaboration with the literature review were used to provide meaningful discussions and answers to the research questions and research purpose under review. The results revealed that of the 15 ESCs and five SSCs surveyed, that 10 ESCs and two SSCs were to some extent currently involved in voluntourism activities. For those not involved in voluntourism activities, which also included the lone French respondent three key reasons for the lack involvement, were given. These included the lack of awareness, limited benefits and challenges associated with voluntourism. Following this, the results showed that those countries currently involved in voluntourism activities were benefitting from, an increase in tourism receipts, increase in medical aid and educational aid, skills transfer, and a better understanding of the culture of the voluntourist receiving region by the voluntourist. Lastly, participants were asked to identify a successful voluntourism project within their country and to rate them against a 15 point criteria. The results revealed that voluntourism provides opportunities for volunteers to get a deeper understanding of Caribbean culture and challenges, provides skills that may be in short supply, uses local materials and supplies, community involvement is clear, community benefits are clear, projects are owned by the local community and it focuses on identified needs and challenges. Moreover, the lone SSC participant that gave an example of a successful voluntourism project indicated that risk assessments and emergency procedures are taken into account and that voluntourism works within a framework, policies, guidelines, code of conduct and standards within their country.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction to Chapter 5:
This section seeks to bring closure to the topic under review. It presents a summary of how the findings provide insight into the research purpose through the research questions. It also offers a review of the limitations of the research and how these limitations have affected the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Even further, it demonstrates to some degree the researcher’s place within the research, in terms of the internship experience, the shaping of and approach to the research problem, the researcher’s value and what could have been done better/differently in terms of practical and research approaches.

Conclusion:
This study sought to assess the nature of voluntourism within the English, Spanish and French speaking Caribbean islands, by analysing the responses of the National Tourism Organizations - Ministries of Tourism and Tourist Boards. Of the 15 ESCs, five SSCs and one FSC which participated in this survey, 10 ESCs, and two SSCs were currently involved in voluntourism activities. While these participants identified a range of voluntourism activities, and listed the benefits gained from their involvement; the extent of their involvement was brought into question. Eighty percent of the ESC participants indicated minimal and moderate involvement in voluntourism activities. One SSC participant also indicated minimal involvement in voluntourism. This was further supported by the fact that 90% of the ESC participants and the lone SSC participant indicated that no budget existed for voluntourism activities within their organization. While it can be argued that the absence of a budget for voluntourism within the NTOs is related to the sector that leads voluntourism activities. It can be counter argued that as the NTO, the national tourism budget should incorporate an allocation for ‘alternative forms’ of tourism; even if not specific to voluntourism. Moreover, the number of voluntourists visiting the respective voluntourist receiving destinations also plays a part in determining the extent to which Caribbean destinations are involved in voluntourism. Arrival figures can be an indication of what the destination is or is not doing, competition, and changing consumer needs and demands among others. The results revealed that 56% of ESCs received between 0-500 voluntourists annually, while other destinations within the ESC and SSC recorded higher annual voluntourist arrival figures. Though voluntourists are influenced by a series of pull and push factors, it is the
responsibility of the voluntourist receiving destination to engage in activities to ensure that their destination is a ‘destination of choice’ for voluntourists.

Beyond this, the study sought to determine the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism activities by some destinations. While the lack of awareness of the term, limited benefits and challenges associated with voluntourism were among the top three selected; participants were subsequently asked how interested would they be in pursuing voluntourism. The results revealed that some destinations had no interest, while others displayed average levels to high levels of interest in pursuing voluntourism. Therefore in light of this, and the fact that some destinations are already involved in voluntourism activities, the Caribbean Tourism Organization in collaboration with the Association of Caribbean States, are better informed of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean. Moreover, the above results will guide these two organizations as they seek to develop a sound framework for voluntourism within the Caribbean. As previously mentioned, a number of key guidelines and frameworks exist such as the; Developing the Voluntourism Program - Engaging the Voluntourist, 2008; the International Volontourism Guidelines - for Commercial Tour Operators; 2014); Comhlámh (Irish Development Organization) (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012), the Year Out Group and Tourism Concern - Gap Year and International Volunteering Standard (GIVS) which can be used to facilitate the development of the voluntourism framework process for the Caribbean (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012).

Limitations:

However this study is not without limitations. In conducting the research and analysing the results a number of limitations were recognized. Some of these limitations were listed above in Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology for Collecting Data. Other limitations can be seen below:

- Within the research instrument some questions used a Likert Scale approach such as, no interest to high levels of interest, and minimally involved to heavily involved. However, no further explanation of these levels within the scale was given to allow for an accurate analysis of the results. For instance, what does heavily involved or high levels of interest
mean? What combining factors indicate heavy involvement in voluntourism? It is obvious that responses to these questions was completely subjective; as neither researcher nor participant were informed of what the levels meant.

- Some questions within the research instrument led to more questions, and assumptions; thus compromising the accuracy of the information provided and analyzed.

- The study failed to allow for additional questions which would have led to more conclusive arguments. For instance, some respondents indicated that NGOs and private sector companies lead voluntourism initiatives. However, no other question allowed for participants to provide examples of NGOs and private sector organizations. Also, participants provided information on the annual voluntourist arrival figures. But, no follow up question allowed for them to state the source markets for voluntourists or identify which voluntourist generating regions they usually target.

- The study also failed to identify at what point students are considered volunteers/voluntourists or low wage seasonal employees. For instance, some destinations within the Caribbean have for years been on the receiving end of international and regional students, who may have flocked to the islands to pursue an internship (paid/non-paid) over the different seasons categorized as tourists. But, at what point are these students considered volunteers/voluntourists or low wage seasonal employees?

- Moreover, the nature of the research was focused on the Caribbean as a voluntourist receiving region as opposed to a voluntourists generating region. Thus eliminating the role of the Caribbean as a source market for voluntourists. It is possible that this elimination curtailed the assessment of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.

These and other limitations, as well as research within the literature review informed the following Recommendations.

*Recommendations:*

In light of the above literature review, results, discussions, conclusion and limitations; the following recommendations are made.
At the outset, it is recommended that before Phase 2 of the above research (which targets NGOs) is conducted that the research instrument be revised to obtain the relevant information that will allow for a more accurate assessment of the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.

The Caribbean Tourism Organization in collaboration with the Association of Caribbean States is advised to examine the above mentioned frameworks and guidelines in developing the sound framework for voluntourism within the Caribbean. Developing guidelines and codes of practice for organisations that run volunteer tourism projects could increase the quality of the products on offer and benefits to local communities and weed out the 'bad' projects (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012). It would also give organisations a framework for best practice in developing volunteering programmes. Moreover, it would give consumers (voluntourists) more confidence that the project they are volunteering with has been assessed and is legitimate (Voluntourism setting standards thorny issue, 2012).

In an effort to treat with the reasons for the lack of involvement in voluntourism by some Caribbean destinations, the CTO, the ACS and the NTOs can carefully examine the Social Exchange Theory Model and the Transformative Potential Theory Model among others to ensure that voluntourism activities allow for mutual benefits between host communities and voluntourists.

Moreover, marketing plays a huge role in the growth of voluntourism around the world. As such, it is advised that the NTOs and NGOs (Phase 2) invest in marketing to ensure that not only voluntourists are aware of voluntourism activities but also, voluntourist receiving destinations are aware and well informed of the voluntourism activities they offer.

Additionally, given that voluntourists demands are influenced by a series of pull and push factors, it is important for destinations to be fully aware of what are the factors that influence the markets they target for voluntourists. This will in turn directly influence voluntourists arrival figures.

It is also advisable to discover whether the types of voluntourism activities currently offered in the Caribbean influences (positively or negatively) the number of voluntourists received annually.
Moreover, since the Caribbean is seeking to structurally explore voluntourism as a niche, it will be valuable to determine what the major voluntourists receiving destinations are doing, that the Caribbean can adopt. Answering these questions will assist the Caribbean in determining whether to venture into emerging markets (international) as a target for voluntourists, or whether to look internally within the Caribbean - for regional voluntourists.

Perceived satisfaction and experienced satisfaction were identified as potentially being responsible for the lack of involvement in voluntourism. It was therefore recommended that in order for the Caribbean to remain competitive it may be wise for destinations to invest in their voluntourism product; as ‘perceived’ and ‘experienced’ satisfaction as well as distance between regions, influences demand; which in turn determines the level of involvement in voluntourism or lack thereof.

Lastly, the research sought to assess the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean from a voluntourist receiving region’s perspective. It is therefore advisable that research be conducted to determine how the Caribbean could become a significant source market for voluntourists. The UK was identified as the third originating market for voluntourists, thus examining the four factors which have contributed to the UK’s rise to third place, can be adopted.

Summary of Chapter 5:
This chapter sought to bring together the purpose and aim of the research. It is evident from this and previous chapters that there exists some degree of voluntourism within the Caribbean. The reasons for lack of involvement in voluntourism were also explored with the purpose of changing those reasons for lack of involvement into reasons for involvement. A series of limitations were identified; and recommendations were subsequently made based on these limitations, in addition to the results, discussions and literature reviewed. Moreover, recommendations were made of various frameworks and guidelines which can be used, as CTO in collaboration with ACS seeks to move forward in developing a sound framework for voluntourism within the Caribbean. Even further, the results and recommendation of this study gives these organizations direction as they continue to assess the nature of voluntourism within the Caribbean.
Beyond this, the author’s internship experience which facilitated this research was found to be an educational one. As mentioned previously, the ‘research problem’ did not originate with the author. However, this process was to be repeated, the author would take into consideration the limitations and recommendations suggested above.
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Appendix

Survey Questionnaire

**VOLUNTOURISM IN THE CARIBBEAN SURVEY**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey for the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO) and the Association of Caribbean States (ACS). It should take about fifteen (15) minutes of your time.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate the nature of **voluntourism** in the Caribbean. This information is important in aiding the creation of a sound framework for voluntourism in the Caribbean.

Voluntourism can be defined as **“the practice of taking a holiday that combines leisure and sightseeing with the opportunity to work for a charity or other worthwhile cause.”**

**RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS:**

1. The information provided will be pertaining to which country?

_____________________________________________________________________________________

2. Please provide the following information (Required):

Name of respondent: ________________________________________________________________

Job Title: ________________________________________________________________

Place of Work: ________________________________________________________________

Phone Number (Work): __________________________________________________________

Email (Work): ________________________________________________________________
NATURE OF VOLUNTOURISM:

3. Is your country already involved in voluntourism activities? Yes ( ) No ( )

4. If you answered 'No' above, please state why your country is not involved in voluntourism. (You may select more than one response.)
   - Have not heard of the term “voluntourism” ( )
   - The challenges associated with voluntourism are too great ( )
   - No interest in the area ( )
   - The benefits are limited ( )

Other (please specify):
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________
____________________________________________

5. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 = no interest and 5 = high levels of interest; how interested might your country be in pursuing voluntourism?
   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( )

6. If “Yes” was selected for Question 3 above, on a scale from 1 to 3 where 1 = minimally involved, 2 = moderately involved, and 3 = heavily involved; how involved is the country in voluntourism?
   1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) I do not know ( )

7. Is voluntourism beneficial to your country? (E.g. economically, socially, etc.)? Yes ( ) No ( ) I do not know ( )

8. How is voluntourism currently benefitting the country? (You may select more than one response.)
   - Increased tourism receipts ( )
   - Skills transfer to locals ( )
   - Improved infrastructure ( )
   - Increased medical aid ( )
   - Increased educational aid ( )
   - A better understanding of culture by tourists ( )
   - I do not know ( )

Other (please specify):
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
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9. How many voluntourists are received annually?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not have this information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Which sector(s) lead voluntourism initiatives in your country?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Governmental organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Is there a budget for voluntourism in your organization? Yes (  ) No (  )

12. What is the budget in US Dollars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - $10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):

13. What voluntourism activities exist in your country? (You may select more than one response.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of heritage sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-crisis recovery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
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14. Select a successful voluntourism project in your country, and please provide the name and a brief description of the project.

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
15. Based on the project described above, please share how it meets the following fifteen (15) criteria. (1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree)

Name of Project: ____________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides financial gains to local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides skills that may be in short supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for transfer of skill from tourists to locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals are able to maintain the outcomes of voluntourism projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic monitoring and evaluation of projects is in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not create an attitude of dependence among locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefits are clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works within a framework, policies, guidelines, code of conduct and standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on identified needs and challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk assessments and emergency procedures are taken into account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters continuity and maximizes impacts for country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects are owned by the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement is clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses local materials and supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for volunteer to get a deeper understanding of Caribbean culture and challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Glossary</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agro-Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Refers to any activity, business or enterprise that links agriculture with products, services and experiences in tourism. It can involve staying on or visiting a farm, where the visitor can watch or help people grow, harvest and process fruits and vegetables; take care of animals; or even participate in agricultural fairs, fruit festivals, and food and craft markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Has a wide variety of meanings and was put forward as a response to the excesses associated with mass tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-based Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Key volunteer tourism market player and an integral part of Governments service delivery systems. Moreover, Community-based Organizations are civil society non-profits that operate within a single local community. They are essentially a subset of the wider group of nonprofits. Like other nonprofits they are often run on a voluntary basis and are self funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence Interval</strong></td>
<td>A confidence interval gives an estimated range of values which is likely to include an unknown population parameter, the estimated range being calculated from a given set of sample data. If independent samples are taken repeatedly from the same population, and a confidence interval calculated for each sample, then a certain percentage (confidence level) of the intervals will include the unknown population parameter. Confidence intervals are usually calculated so that this percentage is 95%, but we can produce 90%, 99%, 99.9% (or whatever) confidence intervals for the unknown parameter. The width of the confidence interval gives us some idea about how uncertain we are about the unknown parameter (see precision). A very wide interval may indicate that more data should be collected before anything very definite can be said about the parameter. Confidence intervals are more informative than the simple results of hypothesis tests (where we decide &quot;reject H0&quot; or &quot;don't reject H0&quot;) since they provide a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
range of plausible values for the unknown parameter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Corporate Social Responsibility</strong></th>
<th>The corporate belief that a company needs to be responsible for its actions – socially, ethically, and environmentally.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eco-Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Nature-based tourism that attempts to minimize its environmental impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Tourism</strong></td>
<td>The practice of traveling to a tourist destination with the main purpose of receiving some therapeutic treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass Tourism</strong></td>
<td>A form of tourism involving tens of thousands of people going to the same venue or resort at the same time of the year. It is often the cheapest way to holiday as it is offered as a package deal where most, if not all of the tourist needs are catered for by one company, thus making it the most popular form of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Tourism Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Combination of the Ministries of Tourism, Tourists Boards, and Tourism Departments at a national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Governmental Organizations</strong></td>
<td>Legally constituted corporations created by natural or legal people that operate independently from any form of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector</strong></td>
<td>The area of the nation's economy under private rather than governmental control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-poor Tourism</strong></td>
<td>Tourism strategies designed to alleviate poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Sector</strong></td>
<td>The public sector consists of governments and all publicly controlled or publicly funded agencies, enterprises, and other entities that deliver public programs, goods, or services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Fulfillment of one's wishes, expectations, or needs, or the pleasure derived from this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Exchange Theory</strong></td>
<td>The development of the social exchange theory model was based on the three core premises of: the need for satisfaction, exchange relation, and consequences of exchange (Ap, 1992). It therefore suggests that when exchange of resources (tangible and intangible - such as exposure to different cultures) between residents and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tourism is high and balanced, or high for the host actor/community in an unbalanced relation, tourism impacts are viewed positively by residents. However, when exchange of resources is low in either the balanced or unbalanced exchange relations, the impact are viewed negatively.

**Sports Tourism**

Refers to international trips specifically taken to watch sporting events. Common examples include international events such as world cups (soccer, rugby, Cricket, etc), the Olympics and Formula 1 Grand Prix, regional events (such as the soccer European Champions League), and individual (non-team) participant sports such as tennis, golf and horse racing.

**Transformative Potential**

Refers to the ability to (a) inspire reflexive self-development of tourists, (b) enable progressive trans-cultural understanding between tourists and host communities, and (c) contribute to environmental sustainability or social development in destinations where tourists render services.

**Volunteer Sending Organizations**

Key volunteer tourism market player. These organizations coordinate international volunteer roles and projects and will often also arrange such logistics as housing, in-country transportation, and meals.

**Volunteerism**

Is an important component of any strategy aimed at poverty reduction, sustainable development and social integration.

**Voluntourism**

A seamlessly integrated combination of voluntary services to a destination and the best, traditional elements of travel - arts, culture, geography, and history - in that destination.

**Voluntourists Generating Regions**

Represents the generating market for voluntourists and, in a sense, provides the push to stimulate and motivate travel.

**Voluntourists Receiving Regions**

Represents the sharp end of voluntourism. At the host destination, the full impact of voluntourism is felt and experienced.

**Voluntourists/ Volunteer Tourist**

A person whose motivation and altruistic wish over earning money, is to specifically travel to a destination
to perform voluntary work without remuneration for whatever cause that is normally associated with poverty, the environment, research or social reasons and at the same time seeks to experience the conventional elements of travel is referred to as a volunteer tourist.