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ABSTRACT

Tourism is the largest setting for intercultural contact. Volunteer tourism is growing in popularity all over the world. The purpose of this research is to understand volunteer sojourners communication efforts in a culturally different environment and to add to the accumulation of data on sociocultural adaptation.

Research indicates that short-term volunteer tourism is growing in popularity. Using a qualitative research plan, the researcher traveled to Peru and conducted a two-week case study. Both participant observation and interviews were employed. Research focused on communication among volunteers, staff, and locals. Nine interviews were conducted with native-English speaking volunteers.

The results of the research offer a small glimpse into the expansive world of volunteer tourism. Understanding how volunteers interact and communicate with locals while abroad can further better communication with culturally dissimilar individuals and aid all sojourners with adaptation.
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INTRODUCTION

Long before the term "globalization" became popular, people have wandered the world. Early explorers were intrigued with the possibility that something different lay waiting, while others sought to expand their empires and pillage distant lands. Because of modern-technological advances, the current brevity to travel and communication on a global scale is astounding. Instead of traditional classroom learning from a textbook, many schools offer the chance to study abroad; while businesses operate international companies and millions of visitors explore exotic locations. Whether in the past on arduous-ship journeys or in modern times on leisurely plane rides, migration has taken place since the beginning of time.

Tourism is the most common setting for intercultural contact (Berno & Ward, 2005). There has been a recent trend and increased interest to volunteer overseas (Ooi & Laing, 2010). An abundance of companies and organized programs combine volunteer projects with touristic exploration. Compared to regular tourism, volunteer tourism aims to spur cultural interaction and develop deeper connections between hosts and foreigners (H. Sin, 2010). Additionally, volunteer tourism directly aids the host country while providing an experience that benefits the volunteer (Raymond & Hall, 2008).

With the broad and non-constricting definition of volunteer tourism, there are many instances to display similarities to the phenomenon and of the vast differences and types of volunteer tourism. Businesses have engaged in volunteering for a long time, but recently began to transition volunteer efforts overseas. For instance, Microsoft has a corporate volunteer program and they encourage and compensate employees for overseas volunteer projects (Salvesen, 2012). Foreign assistance of prominent U.S. organizations such as the Peace Corps
also closely align with ideals of volunteer tourism. Outside of the business world, religious missions can in some instances also be considered a form of volunteer tourism. Backpacker tourism, sustainable tourism, and eco-tourism may all be associated with volunteer tourism should the itineraries include service work (McGehee, 2012).

For the purposes of this study and for research interests, however, the focus of volunteer tourism is independent travelers who elect volunteer projects outside their home country. Due to expense of year long study-abroad programs, many people (especially students – high school to college) are popularizing short-term volunteer projects (Callanan & Thomas, 2005; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Urraca, Ledoux, & Harris, 2009). The term "sojourner" is descriptive of individuals of these short-term volunteers and of other types of short-term, culturally exposed travelers. Sojourners travel for many reasons such as backpacking, work, or volunteering. Often in research, this term is attributed to study-abroad programs or international students who travel abroad but eventually return to their home country (Sussman, 2002). According to John Oetzel (2009), there is no strict classification system to identifying a sojourner; though usually, it is framed between six months to five years abroad.

The idea of volunteerism usually conjures positive connotations, and we know that helping both people and communities are good and commendable acts. However, there are instances when lending a helping hand can cause detrimental repercussions; for example, welfare subsistence in the United States. Debated since its inception, there are many pros and cons of "Welfare" as a social and government-aid program. While the heart of the program aims to do good and help needy families, we understand that some people abuse the system and use it as a crutch instead of a stepping stone. In the long run, is it helping or hindering people? Welfare is a
very complex system and an equally complex set of circumstances to navigate. The same type of
critical thinking can be applied when considering volunteer efforts. The dilemma is further
compounded as people leave their own national borders to provide assistance throughout the
world.

Regardless of possible consequences and with people looking for alternative experiences,
volunteer tourism has exploded onto the market. Findings suggest that tourism is no different
from other cross-cultural travel (Hottola, 2004). Ward (2008) acknowledges that tourism is a
gold mine for intercultural-relation studies and for scholars. Understanding how people
communicate, especially those that are culturally different, is vital. With globalization of our
world, the need for intercultural communication and cultural understanding increases (Sorrells,
2013). To connect the dots between intercultural communication and tourism studies proves a
pertinent research avenue.

LITERATURE REVIEW

When cultures intertwine, many terms emerge such as culture shock, adaptation,
acculturation, and assimilation. Though all different in their own accord, each attempts to define
specific parts of the process. Exploration of this phenomenon requires examining two root terms:
communication and culture. Simply stated, communication is the exchange of both verbal and
non-verbal messages. Through a process of encoding and decoding, the message relayed will,
hopefully, be interpreted correctly. What is culture? The anthropological definition of culture is a
system of shared meaning; the cultural studies definition places culture as a contested site of
meaning; while the globalization definition views culture as a resource (Sorrels, 2013). Brislin
(1993) emphasizes that ideals, values, and assumptions about life guide culture; thus in broadest terms, it refers to differences among people.

The idea of culture is man-made and not an innate or naturally occurring phenomenon (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). Traditions passed down by generations influence the culture of an individual's life and are learned. Cushner and Brislin (1996) further explain that culture is so natural and ingrained into our lives that it is often difficult to evaluate one's own culture, or to understand how culture guides everyday life. The primary way we learn and transmit culture is through communication (i.e., language, world-views, values, etc.) (Wang, 2002). For example, citizens of a specific country may share a common culture due to their nationality; however, there may exist a great many differing cultures within that nation. The concept of culture can be quite unrestricted in what constitutes a culture; thus culture analysis becomes a great challenge.

Brislin (1993) explains similarities among all human-beings are referred to as culture-common concepts (i.e., care of elderly, raise children to be productive members of society, etc.). Cultural-specific concepts refer to the differences (i.e., disciplining children, choices for romantic partners, etc.). In addition, some aspects of culture are highly visible (i.e., food, activities, etc.) while others are invisible (i.e., non-verbal communication, attitudes, etc.). Cultural research focuses on the combination of culture-common and culture-specific concepts to fully understand culture (Brislin, 1993).

Cultures are in constant flux, which adds even more dimension to the dynamism of culture as a hurdle. It would be easier if cultures were bounded by borders, but nothing is further from the truth. A formal working definition is offered by Oetzel (2009):
Culture is a learned system of meanings that fosters a particular sense of shared identity- and community- among its group members. It is a complex frame of reference that consists of a pattern of traditions, beliefs, values, norms, symbols, and meanings that are shared to varying degrees by interacting members of an identity group. (p. 4)

Definitions are central in scholarly work and in general; however, it is important to acknowledge the complexities of culture instead of the entanglements that surround its definement (Durant & Shepard, 2009).

When culturally dissimilar people interact the probability is that misunderstanding will occur. Usually misunderstandings rise over those aspects of culture that are invisible or intangible (i.e., cultural-specific) (Cushner & Brislin, 1996). With the inevitable disparities, actions or expectations between two parties often differ. People try to adjust to new cultures, but the experience can become challenging and frustrating. Scholars have long studied both communication and culture in an effort to harmoniously bridge the gap.

**Popular Theories: Acculturation and Adaptation**

Several theories have emerged in this realm of study. Arguably, the most well-known theorist on this topic is psychologist John Berry. According to Berry (2005), acculturation is the dual process of cultural and psychological changes that take place when cultural groups or individuals come into contact. Each culture can be seen as either the dominant culture or the subordinate culture. The individual or group can choose the degree of acculturation. Rudmin (2003) describes the four generic types of acculturation commonly referred to as the fourfold theory as follows: either the dominant culture is favored, the minority culture is favored, the two
cultures coexist, or both are rejected. Berry's work with the fourfold theory has garnered him notoriety as one of the founders of the theory. His terms for each quadrant is now commonly accepted though other scholars sometimes change the names (Rudmin, 2003). The most common method of assessment involves scales, creating new scales, or classifying scores into the four quadrants (Berry & Sabatier, 2011).

Within the discipline of intercultural communications, William Gudykunst and Young Yun Kim are leading scholars. Though Gudykunst has many theories of his own rite (i.e., anxiety/uncertainty theory), it is Kim's integrative communication theory of cross-cultural adaptation that has more recently been spotlighted. This theory follows the popular public relations perspective of systems theory (Kim & Mckay-Semmler, 2012). Kim (2001) describes the theory as, "the dynamic process by which individuals, upon relocating to a new, unfamiliar, or changed sociocultural environment, establish (or re-establish) and maintain a relatively stable, reciprocal, and functional relationship with the environment" (p. 31). Two key elements in the theory involve deculturation (unlearning) and acculturation (learning). Oetzel (2009) comments that the theory is a process of compromising for people in finding a fit between themselves and their environment.

Colleen Ward, a former student of Berry's and prominent intercultural scholar, proposes three guiding theories that are commonly termed the "ABC’s" of acculturation: Affective; stress and adaptation theory, Behavioral; cultural learning theory, and Cognitive; social identity theory (Berno & Ward, 2005). Cultural learning theory is concerned with skills needed to function in the host country such as verbal and non-verbal communication styles, as well as conventions and norms. It highlights behaviors that people use when they meet a new society. Ward (2004) noted
that meetings between culturally diverse people are no different from normal social encounters and suggests that the less cultural distance between the host country and sojourner, the less difficult the adaptation. Language is also encouraged as it significantly affects both the quality and quantity of intercultural interactions. The stress and adaptation theory recognizes that experiencing a new culture can be stressful. Stress in relocating outside one's origin country has long been documented and researched by scholars (Berry, 2005; Kim & Mckay-Semmler, 2012; Rudmin, 2009). The third approach, social identification, is a tricky subject because everyone identifies differently; furthermore, identities can shift. The two main theories examined under this approach are the social identity theory (SIT) and integrated threat theory (ITT). Ward (2004) noted that sojourners retain a stronger identity with their home country and are generally resistant to changing their attitudes/values. Social identity theory addresses the need for individuals to maintain self-esteem while in a social group.

Another common theory associated with intercultural communication is Gordon Allport's contact theory (1954). The theory states that to reduce misconceptions and promote tolerance and understanding between diverse groups, the following four conditions are necessary: 1) equal status, 2) common goals, 3) intergroup cooperation, and 4) the support of authorities, law or custom (Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). The more optimal conditions create the more positive contacts.

Conducting a study to assess acculturation, adaptation, adjustment, etc., can become "messy" (Yu, 2012). Most studies address the issues through the examination of intercultural competence. Although intercultural competence has found little consensus on definition, it can in
essence, be defined as the ability to interact effectively through one’s intercultural knowledge, skills and attitudes (Deardorff, 2006; Wilson, Ward, & Fischer, 2013).

To discern between the aspects of this phenomena, Ward and Kennedy (1999) separated adaptation into two domains: psychological and sociocultural. The psychological factors refer to an individual's well being. The term acculturation encompasses many psychological components (Berry, 2005). The term sociocultural adaptation refers to behavior; more specifically to how people interact, use skills, and communicate. Within the whole realm of social science it is not unusual to see terms used interchangeably or to incorporate other considerations outside a specific discipline, as the study of humans is an elaborate process.

Current Research: Moving Away from Theories and Toward Qualitative Research

As popular and widespread as these theories are in the academic world, they are not without critics. Most studies pertaining to these theories involve quantitative measures that use either pre-existing scales, construct new scales, or issue a survey (which usually consists of either a pre-test, post-test, or both). Berry and Allport's theories have been tested numerous times over the years. In comparison, there is less research on Kim and Ward's theories, especially by anyone other than themselves. Ward (2008), an obvious supporter of Berry, found it relevant to urge researchers to "think outside the Berry boxes." Ward and Kagitcibasi (2010) remarked that a great deal of research tends to be "narrowly focused and oriented to hypothesis testing with the goal of explaining phenomena" (p.188).

*The International Journal of Intercultural Relations* released a much-needed special edition in 2009 to evaluate the progress on intercultural acculturation-type research. Keeping
with the empirical tradition in modern science, researchers either describe existing phenomenon or conduct studies to confirm existing theoretical models. Within the journal article, Chrikov (2009) differentiated between the explanatory mode and understanding mode within science and determined the understanding mode more appropriate for this type of research. He contested the dedication to the naturalistic model of science in discovering universal regularities and instead emphasized an interpretive approach and qualitative research methods, which look into the fabric of real lives.

Both Chirkov (2009) and Kramer (2000) remark that positivistic approaches cannot interpret acculturation. This is not to say regularities or generalizations cannot be extracted from this type of research; instead, it should be a secondary goal that follows a thorough accumulation of research. Chirkov (2009) eloquently states that scholars are:

Prematurely striving to be an advanced and mature science by rushing to develop models and theories, which often sound pretty superficial, and then design studies to verify these models. It seems like acculturation researchers are trying to convince themselves that they are developing a 'real,' 'hardcore' science, thus creating for themselves and for future generations of acculturation researchers an illusion that the field of research is mature enough to implement the confirmatory mode of research using hypothetical-deductive approach accompanied by rigorous statistical analysis. (p. 100)

Even leading scholar Berry (2005) admitted that researchers often impose their own ideologies or views rather than research culturally-relevant differences. Kramer (2011) satirically mourned the loss of data by observing virtual research taking hold and lamented that one can be an expert
on human behavior without physically interacting with a human. Earlier, Kramer (2008) observed the same trend in data collection and noted:

It seems that because of laziness and, ironically, an increasing demand for research productivity, rigor is waning and control over data-gathering processes are being loosened with the consequence seeing more data gathered by students from students, researchers purchasing data generated for irrelevant purposes, and surveys being done virtually on-line with little care about who is really filling them out or how serious they are about filling them out. (p. xxxv)

These observations are indications that more qualitative work is needed to paint a broader picture in this field of study. Understandably, researchers cannot be present all the time, but according to Waldram (2009) the best data is derived from interactions with individuals and not from scaled instruments. Kramer (2008) supported the physical gathering of data by researchers to assure rigor and validity. Chirkov (2009) noticed the reliance on statistics and multivariate techniques in order to establish irrefutable evidence and further noted that the dominant scale studies, "eliminate all the unique and specific cultural and ethnic aspects of each group of immigrants (and each host nation) in order to discover the general laws of acculturation and predict, based on these laws, the success of acculturation" (p. 100). Rudmin (2009) who urged researchers to make sure of existing scales also acknowledged the issue with scales. However, he surmised that this type of research would continue replacing scales because each pairing of cultures needs unique, specific questions.

The types of people and groups that are studied are often repetitive. Many studies focus on people outside the dominant culture. Waldram (2009) recognized the overabundance of
research on immigrants and refugees, which he equated with being easily observable and
different. Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocnik (2010) noticed immigrants, refugees,
asylum seekers, and sojourners (e.g., international students and seasonal farm workers) as
primary specimens.

Qualitative Research and Studies

Unlike quantitative research that may have an overall guiding theory, qualitative inquiry
usually operates with a worldview or paradigm that guides and bases the research on the
following five assumptions: ontological, epistemological, axiological, rhetorical, and
methodological (Creswell, 1998). How is knowledge gained? What is reality? What values are
held? In addition to the worldviews held in qualitative research, there are different perspectives
for any given view. The most common perspectives in qualitative studies are postmodern,
critical, and feministic (Creswell, 1998).

A couple qualitative studies have emerged that examine sojourner adaptation and
adjustment. In 2009, Kristjansdottir conducted a phenomenological study of sojourners' cross-
cultural adaptation. As a reason for her inquiry choice, she noted the trend in social science to
predict phenomenon instead of to understand it. Supported by the National Science Foundation
(NSF), the author traveled to France with undergraduate students who worked with French
chemists for the summer. Within a nine-month period, she interviewed eight students before,
during, and after their summer experience. Her interviews produced two-hundred and fifty pages,
which she then analyzed. The article provides only brief accounts from the participants regarding
their experiences, as qualitative work tends to be shortened either by or for publication
companies (L'etang, 2012). Reflecting on the results of her study, Kristjansdottir concluded that she was able to gain a better understanding of the experiences and of biases faced by many of her participants for being American. This study is not generalizable, however, if done correctly it should reveal an essential structure that is relatable to other experiences (Kristjansdottir, 2009).

L. Brown (2009) also explored qualitative inquiry. Her ethnographic study focused on international students' adjustment at an English university. Brown interviewed thirteen students from thirteen different nations over a period of one year and conducted participant observation of the students throughout the year. Her observations proved useful in corroborating data and gaining perspective and later, added to the ease of coding interviews and generating categories. Similar to the previous study, brief excerpts from participants are laced throughout the article when they correspond to the main themes that emerged. The most prominent factor found was the division between Eastern and Western students. L. Brown noted that diversity was insufficient in stimulating cross-cultural adaptation and interaction. Students tended to stay within their monolithic groups. L. Brown echos the lack of generalizability in her study but drew the same conclusion as Kristjansdottir (2009) with qualitative methods' abilities to find patterns over time.

Tourism Research and Studies

A complete shift from the social sciences and into the world of business reveals a wealth of information compiled specifically on the research of volunteer tourism sojourners. Many of the tourism studies explored took a qualitative approach and used both interviews and participant
Matthews (2008) examined the interest backpackers/ independent travelers have in volunteering. He traveled to multiple destinations during his research both within the United States and internationally. In his interviews with more than thirty people (majority face-to-face, some via e-mail) who had been abroad for a minimum of three months, all had decided to volunteer in an attempt to engage with the "other" and grow personally. In addition, Conran (2011) conducted nine months of ethnographic fieldwork in Northern Thailand and found the frequent motivating factor was to encounter and interact with local people. Volunteers in her study also cited that the interaction with the host community was the most memorable part of their experience. Chen and Chen (2011) conducted fieldwork in China and found volunteers' motivations centered around interaction with locals. Though these studies show support for interaction with locals as the prime motivator, it should be noted that individuals usually have multiple motivating factors. For example, Stoddart and Rogerson (2004) examined Habitat for Humanity volunteers in South Africa and found that helping the poor was the primary motivation of participants.

Similar to the above studies, Broad (2003) conducted a ten-month ethnographic study in Thailand. Through interviews and participant observations, her research paints a picture of the volunteering experience. In her study, she noted that the company overseeing the program gave volunteers a handbook. Of particular significance was a recommendation for the primary place to eat and socialize. Volunteers met other locals and some even developed romantic relationships with villagers. It was not uncommon for volunteers to be taken on trips by locals. All volunteers
spoke basic Thai and their efforts were well received by the community. Interestingly, one of the key themes that emerged from her research was volunteers' relationships with co-volunteers. Similarly, a study by S. Brown (2008) found that seeking co-volunteers camaraderie was another major motivational theme.

Barbieri, Santos, and Katsube (2012) also conducted a study on volunteers but wanted to change the conversation from motivations to understanding experiences. Joining a ten-day trip to Rwanda, the researcher used an auto-ethnographic approach. Through observations and conversations, Barbieri et al. found that strong bonds between volunteers and locals started from the first day. Locals spoke little English but were still able to work alongside volunteers. The researchers note that the community, as a whole, was welcoming toward volunteers and did not perceive them as tourists.

Matthews (2008) comments, "without the presence of 'real' locals, one could be anywhere... negating the very reason for travel in the first place" (p. 107). With so much emphasis on communication especially with dissimilar cultures, it is apparent why Ward (2008) urged more research for intercultural studies within tourism. Operating within one's own field is quite common in academia, but the possibilities that arise when true interdisciplinary collaboration takes place could well be the missing cohesive bond yet needed within intercultural understanding.

**Volunteer Organizations**

Most volunteer projects are structured by companies, which range from tourism entities to non-government organizations. In conducting research, Laura Ann Hammersley (2013) found
minimal information on volunteer companies' roles within host communities and with volunteers. Studies are beginning to emerge to address this lack of information. H. Sin’s (2010) study focused on host countries and found that companies are neglecting both their preparations and the planning of programs. Though both volunteers and locals reported a seemingly positive attitude toward each other, one major dynamic was an unequal distribution of power. The volunteers, knowingly or unknowingly, are in a privileged position. After all, volunteers choose to travel abroad to a desired location and take entitled roles such as teacher, expert, or guest (Raymond & Hall, 2008; Hammersley, 2013). The relationship, therefore, is unequal from the start. If left unaddressed, H. Sin (2010) concluded that despite the good intentions by volunteers, unequal power hierarchies might be perpetuated.

In interviews, locals expressed concern regarding politics, misplaced generosity, and dependency on outside help (H. Sin, 2010). A delicate balance needs to be maintained in which volunteer projects should not undermine the value of or create tension among locals (Raymond & Hall, 2008). To facilitate the process, companies need to have a communicative dialogue with host countries and have meaningful projects (H. Sin, 2010). Companies should also provide opportunities for interaction and exchange between volunteers and the host community (Raymond & Hall, 2008). Importance should be placed on building relationships of understanding, and not just the physical completion of an actual project (Hammersley, 2013).

Barbieri et al. (2012) concluded their study by calling for a more proactive role by companies, as facilitators, in order to improve experiences and avoid miscommunications. Matthews (2008) questioned misleading advertising materials by companies regarding the amount of interaction with locals that potential volunteers could have on projects. Callanan and
Thomas (2005) were also critical of marketing campaigns by companies and believed it correlated to volunteers shortening their project durations.

Currently, there are no mandatory structure requirements or certifications needed to operate a volunteer tourism company. However, several organizations exist to help both tourists and countries. Though not specifically concentrated on volunteer efforts, the International Institute for Peace through Tourism (IIPT) is a non-profit organization dedicated to international cooperation and peaceful coexistence. The International Volunteer Program Association (IVPA) is a non-governmental association that works with companies located within the United States. IVPA provides a set of principles and practices that American volunteer tourism companies should use in the construction of their programs and in businesses. The IVPA helps not only the volunteer companies but also potential volunteers in the selection of appropriate programs. In an effort to keep programs ethical and beneficial, IVPA offers a membership if companies satisfy the following requirements: meet all IVPA’s principles and best practices guidelines, have been incorporated for at least two years, and have an office in the United States. Once fees are paid and companies are granted membership, an IVPA seal of approval can be used on websites and materials to inform potential clients of companies' good practices and efforts to provide quality programs for both volunteers and host countries. Astonishingly, out of the hundreds of companies in operation in the United States, only nine are members of the IVPA.

Though this number is alarming, it is hard to generalize the structure of volunteer tourism companies and volunteer programs. Prior knowledge and brief research reveals that most, if not all, require an application process. In addition, volunteer tourists do not receive monetary compensation for their efforts and, instead, pay to volunteer (Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Ooi &
Laing, 2010). Some programs may offer an orientation session or training program for participants; however, every company and program operates differently. With low numbers joining programs such as the IVPA, one can only hope that companies are operating with ethical consideration. Unfortunately, it would be naive to assume that volunteers are not flying, haphazardly, into situations that have no real infrastructure, support system, or training.

One of the most important issues raised is the need for companies to be selective in potential volunteers (Tomazos & Butler, 2009). Volunteer tourism is a business, and like any business, must generate revenue. Nevertheless, profits should neither influence a company’s decision-making process nor cause them to admit all applicants. Ethics need to outweigh the growing business mindset among volunteer tourism companies. If companies truly care about their participants, host countries, and volunteer projects; then appropriate and adequate action and accountability needs to take place. That is not to say that all the responsibility should fall onto the companies. However, adequate planning and management by the sending companies can profoundly influence the success and quality of cross-cultural understanding (Raymond & Hall, 2008; Hammersley, 2013).

Many of the aforementioned issues should be addressed by the companies and by the participants. To counteract power issues, volunteers need basic knowledge about matters affecting their host country as well as specifics of the volunteer projects (Hammersley, 2013). Tomazos and Butler (2009) concluded in their study on volunteer tourism that organizations should offer some level of training before letting volunteers enter the field. Furthermore, volunteers need to process their experiences. Hammersley (2013) argued that a more educational
approach should be taken by volunteers to ensure they are not reinforcing cultural stereotypes or power hierarchies.

In Hammersley’s (2013) study, she noted the company in her research offered a one-day, optional training workshop. In follow-up, she interviewed those participants who did not attend the workshop and found that they questioned their purpose and contributions while abroad. If they had participated in the workshop, fewer volunteers would have had unrealistic expectations - such as training locals with their expertise. Hammersley (2013) commented:

Part of this understanding is the development of appropriate attitudes, which enable international volunteers to work with host communities without jeopardizing the building of relationships by inappropriately assuming the role of providers of change, knowledge and skills. The findings indicate that volunteers need to be aware of their greater role, motivations and expectations; and in response, develop an attitude based on "here to learn" rather than "here to make a difference." (p.16)

Attendance of the training by other volunteers allowed them to reflect on their motivations and expectations, which prevented disappointment and encouraged a learning attitude. It is crucial for volunteers to understand that they are there to learn, and not to be a hero. Having realistic expectations as well as an appropriate attitude will facilitate a better experience and outcome for everyone (Raymond & Hall, 2008).

In a recent Tedx talk Daniela Papi, founder of Pepy (a Cambodian youth leadership organization), noted the irony that volunteers might face in realizing they should be learning from their visited country. Again stemming from unequal power issues, Papi (2012) urged a movement away from sympathy tourism to empathy learning, which requires that volunteers
learn through training and reflection. In additional interviews with other volunteers, Hammersley (2013) discovered that volunteers began to view their roles as facilitators and motivators and acknowledged the shift from building or fixing something to building relationships.

**RESEARCH QUESTION**

Though the field has popular theories relating to intercultural communication, many scholars urge a return to the drawing board. Past research has added to the accumulation of knowledge, but more is needed in order to propose theorems. Both social science studies explored in this paper (L. Brown, 2009; Kristjansdottir, 2009) are of sojourners who were students in an educational setting. Close examination of the contact and specifically the communication happening in volunteer tourism could provide rich data, which is often overlooked by tourism studies and negated by social scientists, and could diversify commonly researched groups.

Callanan and Thomas (2005) examined a popular volunteer website, GoAbroad.com. The majority of projects involved community welfare or teaching. In addition, the common duration offered was less than six months. Upon closer examination, the researchers found that within the six-month category, there were actually more project durations of four weeks or less.

Numerous studies within tourism identify volunteers' contact with locals as a major motivation and highlight of their sojourn. H. Sin (2010) found that most volunteers had a desire to care for the "other," and to experience authentic interactions with locals. Echoing similar sentiments, another study on sojourners found an important predictor of satisfaction was support from locals (Podsiadlowski, Vaulair, Spiess, & Stroppa, 2012). In H. Sin's (2009) study,
commonly cited reasons for volunteering abroad were to travel, to contribute, for convenience, and to put oneself to "the test." Motivations behind each person’s decision to volunteer can vary, especially by degree of sincerity.

The role of the volunteer company may seem a bit odd to include in intercultural communication studies, however, it is actually quiet pertinent. Though independent travelers do join volunteer projects, many people travel entirely through companies. The role of the company greatly influences a volunteer's expectations, which in turn has the power to influence the overall experience. Some companies offer intercultural training. While intercultural training is its own realm of study, it can significantly influence the willingness of volunteers to step outside their comfort zones and interact with locals. As stated above, there is a strong advocacy by scholars to not only include training in their programs, but to structure their projects with an educational approach to combat power issues and stereotypes. A study by Tomazos and Butler (2009) was unable to conclude whether people were driving the rise of volunteer tourism or if companies were selling the idea of good deeds with a vacation.

As there are no strict guidelines for what constitutes a sojourner or timeline for acculturation, adaptation, assimilation, etc., and with the rise of short-term experiences, it seems a highly pertinent and relevant area for discovery. As Barbieri et al. (2012) noted, relationships between volunteers and locals started from the first day. Intercultural communication is definitely taking place in these types of scenarios. But how? Is understanding taking place? Are real relationships forming between volunteers and host-country individuals? Are volunteers interacting more with co-volunteers throughout the project? With these thoughts and with the
prior stated research, the following problem statement is proposed: How does interpersonal contact within visited countries affect volunteers' communicative adaptations abroad?

METHOD

To examine the question, this study took a qualitative approach. Working with a volunteer tourism company, the researcher worked at a volunteer project in Peru for two weeks during July, 2015. Nine native-English speaking volunteers, ranging in age from 18-40, were interviewed. The numbers of volunteers observed while conducting research on this project ranged from 28, at one point, then dwindled to only seven by the close of the research period (due to individuals’ various travel itineraries). This emic approach allowed for an in-depth collection of data by way of participant observation and interviews.

While this research is too brief to be considered an ethnography, it can be viewed as a case study which analyzes a situation and is constricted by time and place (Creswell, 1998). The purpose of this case study is to understand interpersonal contact and communication practices among short-term volunteers with host-country nationals. It should be reiterated that this is a study on only one model of volunteer tourism (the type of project, interaction levels, motivations, etc. vary among companies and volunteer tourists). This study specifically examined independent native-English speaking sojourners who engaged in a short-term volunteer project abroad. As previously mentioned, there is a wide array of terms to describe this process. The term sociocultural adaptation (Ward and Kennedy, 1999) will be used to describe the concept of how people interact, use skills, and communicate.
This research received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the appropriate protocol was followed. All volunteers were made aware of the researcher's position and intentions at the volunteer site upon arrival. All identifiable information was stripped from the data. Purposeful sampling was used as interviewees in the research needed to be native-English speaking, volunteer sojourners.

Throughout the volunteer project, participant observation was conducted during times of intercultural contact between volunteers and locals (i.e., while conducting volunteer work and in other social activities). Though there were many volunteers, field notes focused on interviewees' sociocultural adaptation. Field notes were recorded at the end of every work day. From the preliminary analysis of field notes, deductive progression led to additional interview questions in which the participants could elaborate on their specific, observed experiences.

Interview questions were carefully crafted with consideration to the previous research (L. Brown, 2009; Kristjansdottir, 2009; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Demes & Geeraert, 2014; Pedersen, Neighbors, Lee, & Larimer, 2012). Though this study will not make use of previously mentioned scales, the items were examined and contributed to the formation of the interview questions (see Appendix B). Interviews ranged between ten to twenty-five minutes with volunteers from the following native-English speaking countries: Australia, Canada, England, the United States of America, and Wales. Interviews were conducted within the twelve remaining hours before each volunteer's departure from the project (note: the last three interviews were conducted within the last twelve hours of the researcher's departure as these volunteers were continuing to volunteer the following week(s)). All native-English volunteers who were over the
age of eighteen agreed to be interviewed. In total, nine interviews were conducted, recorded, and transcribed.

Position of Researcher

As the researcher, I do approach this project from a unique position. I was a trip leader for an American-based tour company geared toward young adults for two consecutive summer seasons. I led backpacking-style, community-service trips, which ranged from two-weeks to a month in duration and in size from 13-18 participants. As the trip leader, I also volunteered throughout the trips. Watching my participants interact and seeing my own relationships with locals, inspired my research into this niche market and, no doubt, will influence my interpretations.

During this research, I also participated as a volunteer. This allowed me to establish a rapport with the staff and with volunteers. Living and working with the volunteers provided opportunities to observe interactions readily. It also allowed me to notice the day to day expectations and lifestyles of the volunteers on this project.

There was a two-week minimum stay required for volunteers on this project. There was no limit on the total amount of time a volunteer could remain at the placement. Due to scheduling conflicts, I was only able to remain on the project for two-weeks.

This project was selected with assistance from the company. The company provided a list of the top five countries that native-English speakers often travel to as volunteers. From that list, Peru was selected because of proximity to the researcher and yielded the greatest probability for data collection. Out of all the projects offered in Peru and through discussions with the company,
this specific project was selected because it offered the greatest opportunity to observe volunteers working with locals. The housing situation was also conducive to a group environment which would help the researcher establish a rapport with volunteers/staff and allow for better observation. Archaeology was the focus of the project and the classification used by the company for this type of volunteer work.

Research Guide

This research was guided by a social constructivist paradigm, which focuses on interaction among individuals and on specific contexts in which people live and work (Creswell, 2008). Philosophically speaking, each person's experiences are subjective in the world. Simply put, people see things differently and there is no one-way of seeing the world. This reinforces humanistic thought on individuality. This research closely aligns with both the interactionist and interpretive perspectives. The interactionist perspective views knowledge as much more situational and where theories cannot be generalized across situations. This describes meanings and actions within particular social groups and cultures (Littlejohn, 2005). The interpretive perspective also celebrates subjectivity and aims to understand how people perceive their own experiences, but with less interest in discovering universal laws. Social constructivists do not rely on theory, but instead on generated patterns of meaning.

As Creswell (2008) explained, this paradigm influences research in a number of ways. First, data collection relied on the participants' viewpoints. Broad, open-ended questions were used in order for participants to construct their own meanings of situations. In this instance, researchers must listen carefully and observe the setting. Furthermore, researchers must
recognize how their own backgrounds influence their interpretations and position themselves within the research accordingly.

**Research Site**

The volunteer site was in a remote area of Peru in the Andes Mountains. Volunteers lived on a large piece of property that is situated among farmlands. In addition to an abundance of fruit trees, the volunteer property also had a small coffee and a corn farm. Both volunteers and staff lived on the premises.

Volunteer work was usually on archaeological sites around the area. However, volunteers also performed other tasks and did work on the volunteer property. Work was usually very physical. Depending on the archaeological site, volunteers generally hiked between 1-3 hours a day. Some volunteers noted that during prior weeks, hiking took up to five hours a day. Most daily project work consisted of using machetes to cut overgrown foliage on archaeological sites. Volunteers also drew and mapped sites. Unfortunately, excavations were not authorized by the government during the summer months. Examples of other work around the property included clearing wood from the forest, cleaning out drainage systems, and harvesting coffee beans.

One day a week, referred to as "community days," volunteers worked in local elementary and pre-schools. On Friday's, volunteers cleaned the volunteering housing unit in the mornings and were free to leave afterwards to start the weekend early. During my time at the project, volunteers always left for weekends of sightseeing and returned on Sunday afternoons.

Because the project was almost at capacity, work fluctuated. During the first week, volunteers were split into three groups with varying assignments. During the second week, the
project supervisor was on vacation. Volunteer work during this second week included a field trip and a day of classifying artifacts. It should be noted that several volunteers commented that during my two-week stay, the schedule was atypical.

There were a number of staff that worked on the project. The project supervisor, Paul, was a former volunteer several years ago before making the transition to staff. Paul is originally from the United Kingdom and the only non-native staff member. The additional seven staff members are local. Maria is the head of the kitchen and works with Camila to prepare all meals. Diego is the archaeologist. Emilio joined the project during the second week and is pursuing his Ph.D. dissertation work on artifacts from the archaeological sites. Tomas, Felipe, and Miguel assist with grounds maintenance, driving, and various other assignments. Felipe and Maria are married.

Volunteers

During the two-week project, volunteer sojourns on the project ranged from two to eight weeks and the ages of volunteers ranged from sixteen to late forties. During the first week, there was a special high school group consisting of thirteen volunteers ranging in age from sixteen to nineteen. Generally, all volunteers on the project tended to be younger; ranging in age from late teen's to early twenties. The other volunteers during the two-week period were from the following countries: Peru, Italy, Holland, Germany, Japan, Belgium, and Canada (the other Canadian volunteer spoke very little English and was fluent in French. It was determined to not include this volunteer in the interview process). Though these volunteers were not included in the interviews, their presence was noted in field notes and were also mentioned by interviewees.
During the first week, there were twenty-seven volunteers on the project site. Volunteers arrive and depart at various times depending on their own pre-determined schedules. I arrived along with two new volunteers from Peru and Italy. The high school group departed at the end of the first week. The second week, no new volunteers arrived. However, many volunteers departed the second week and numbers steadily decreased daily. At the conclusion of the research, there were only seven volunteers.

Analysis of Data

Data was transcribed and typed within a month of leaving the volunteer project site. It should be noted that the qualitative data analysis did not follow a strict technical process; generally, researchers organize information differently and must apply inductive reasoning throughout the analysis (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). This allows for a creative and dynamic process. The aforementioned paradigms and perspectives influenced the interpretation of data.

The data was meticulously examined with focused attention on the nine interviewees' sociocultural adaptation. The pre-interview information in Table 1 displays the background of each volunteer and perceived level of experience. The ten main interview questions were then reviewed during content analysis for greater understanding and to glean themes and a general consensus on topics. A simple codebook was constructed to compare and present this data (see Appendix C for codebook). Specifications for each question and thematic code are provided, along with examples. For example: the first code Appendix C, Q1 accounts for volunteer motivations in pursing this volunteer project. The coder could identify the material as either (1) country-specific, (2) subject-specific, (3) culture/learn/volunteer, (4) something to do,
etc. Upon completion of the codebook, the nine interviews were individually coded and the results displayed, accordingly, in Table 2. Respondents sometimes provided several answers, which are reflected in Table 2 with multiple coded numbers. Table 3 was constructed to more easily identify those staff members and additional volunteers who were mentioned several times by the interviewees. Field notes and interviews were further explored for emergent themes and patterns directly related to volunteers sociocultural adaptation.

RESULTS

The eight general questions (Table 1) were arranged to more easily present and compare pre-interview data. A majority of the interviewees were in their late teens and were a representation of the earlier discussed volunteer age range. The ratio of male to female interviewees was almost even. On the volunteer project as a whole, there were double the amount of female volunteers compared to male volunteers (females: 18, males: 9). Aside from the high school group, all volunteers had some form of higher education and were either enrolled in college or held at least an undergraduate degree.

The interviewees' pre-interview data further painted a picture of volunteer demographics. Of the interviewees, two volunteers were on a gap travel year and one volunteer was enrolled in a graduate program. None of the interviewees had been to Peru before this trip. Two volunteers were roommates and travelled together; however, all the remaining interviewees came to the project alone. All but two of the volunteers had traveled abroad before; however, only two volunteers had lived abroad prior to volunteering. Some of the volunteers spoke other languages, but only two reported to have some level of proficiency in Spanish.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Peru Prior</th>
<th>Solo Travel</th>
<th>Traveled Abroad Prior</th>
<th>Lived Abroad Prior</th>
<th>Other Languages</th>
<th>Project Weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>U.S.A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gap Year</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Welsh</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gap Year</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8 (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Female (F) and Male (M), Yes (Y) and No (N). Both Subject D and Subject G on Gap Year have been accepted into college and start next Fall. Subject A and Subject B spent two weeks on this project, and two weeks on another project site within Peru. Subject G was interviewed three weeks into her eight week duration at the current site. She was splitting time between volunteer sites which totaled 12 weeks.

This information is consistent with observations concerning the six volunteers outside the high school group during this period as well. These volunteers, aside from the local Peruvian, had traveled to Peru independently, it was their first time to the country, and only two reported a proficiency level in Spanish. It is also worth noting that besides Subject H and Subject I, there were three additional volunteers that ranged in age from early thirties to late forties. There was a wide range of ages and length of time at the project site amongst all volunteers. Most volunteers stayed two to four weeks at the volunteer site. Some volunteers were volunteering at multiple sites within the country.
Examining Question: Q1 - Motivations

As previously discussed, volunteers travel for many reasons and their motivations vary (Q1). Many interviewees stated they specifically wanted to travel to Peru as a pre-determining factor for selecting the project. Furthermore, five interviewees stated they were specifically interested in archaeology and had studied it in the past or were considering archaeology as a potential major in college. Subject G noted the project was different from other volunteer work she had found:

Instead of working with children or working with medical, hospital work, it's all about getting out into the jungle with machetes, archaeology. It's a bit more exotic. It's different and it's in a beautiful, remote place you won't see very often.

Table 2. Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q1.1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3*</th>
<th>Q4*</th>
<th>Q5*</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7*</th>
<th>Q7.1*</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q8.1</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: See Codebook in Appendix C. *indicates that question will be expanded upon in theme section.
Subject H, Subject G, and Subject D were also on gap years or yearlong travels and had incorporated volunteering into their itinerary. For Subject D, this was a test to see if she could travel independently and live in another country. Interestingly, the idea of volunteering abroad was found in a book by Subject I. All the male interviewee's except for Subject A stated that they wanted to do something and have an experience. Subject B explains:

I wanted to do something with my summer... I didn't want to do more medicine since I'm going to do that my whole life, so I wanted to do something else. Traveling is one thing I love doing, because I do it almost every year. Usually when I travel I like to have something linked to it, not just tourism the whole time. I wanted to volunteer, so I chose one of the volunteering projects.

Also, mentioned by Subject B is the desire to travel differently. A couple other volunteers also mentioned this as a reason for their decision to volunteer abroad. Subject I noted that it allowed one to "see the real side of their life in the culture, as opposed to the tourist aspect you see when you are a tourist."

Examining Question: Q1.1 - Monetary Considerations

There is usually a cost involved in volunteering apart from the plane ticket and other miscellaneous travel expenses (Q1.1). Five interviewees stated that they had help paying for the project. Subject A and Subject B both had scholarships for traveling abroad. Subject C received the trip as a present while Subject D and Subject F received a monetary gift from a relative. All interviewees except the three from the high school group (Subject A, Subject B, and Subject C) stated they used personal money as well. Not specific to volunteering, Subject G explained how
long she had been budgeting for her anticipated gap year of traveling: "I've been saving up since I started working, when I was about 14. I wanted to do a big trip. I thought, 'I'm just going to save up heaps of money.' I've kind of been preparing for this." Subject H was also on a yearlong travel itinerary and specifically budged for costs of volunteering. She stated that it was a priority and that her other travel plans had to adapt. For Subject I it was less a monetary consideration than a timing factor for her decision to finally volunteer.

[I] was in contact with them for the past two years before I finally pulled the trigger and sent in my application. But it wasn't so much the money, I was waiting for the time. I was working full time. For me to take a month off, I was like, "I don't know. That's kind of not enough." I knew I was planning on going to school. There were just so many things up in the air, that I guess it was just meant to be this time.

Subject H also echoed these thoughts about finding time to accomplish her dream of volunteering abroad. Interestingly, the older volunteers seemed to state timing was more of a consideration than money.

Examining Question: Q2 - Pre-departure Preparations

When preparing for the trip (Q2), a majority of the interviewees did little to nothing as preparation before arriving. Subject A did note he took Spanish and intercultural training class prior to coming to Peru, but that it was purely coincidental. Subject C and Subject D both stated they did research prior to coming. However, the types of research greatly differed between the two. Subject C mainly looked at sightseeing options while Subject D explains that her research consisted of the following:
I looked on lots and lots of different websites about the culture differences and the things you should wear and shouldn't wear that fits in with culture and things like that. The way things, like what hand signals are considered rude here but not in Britain... I did do some research just to ensure that I wouldn't offend anyone or say something bad...

Only Subject G and Subject I enrolled in Spanish classes in preparation for this trip. Most volunteers were excited about the trip, any nervousness or fear was greatly outweighed by their excitement.

Examining Question: Q3 - Engagement with Locals

When asked about engagement and development of meaningful conversations with locals (Q3), most interviewees agreed they were able to achieve this and felt positively about their experience. Many interviewees spoke of the volunteer staff's and mentioned the staff's ability to understand English. Subject I explains: "The majority of them [the staff] understand English, I think, to a fair degree. You can make it known what you're saying, even I can't speak Spanish. I can't say I've had ... Not a conversation." Subject F also reiterated the inability to have a full conversation, but believed he engaged with locals, especially the kitchen staff because he was often ill:

I could get by, not a conversation but I could ask for what I wanted and most of the time get it without any help, so that was okay. I spoke to Maria quite a lot because, obviously, I had to get her to make that tea all the time.

Subject C also admitted to engaging more with the volunteer staff rather than other locals in Peru. She recounts the following as the best opportunities to talk to the local staff: "I think it was
probably more like the nights when we would have bonfires and dinners and when we were all just hanging around after the day, and that was when I conversed mostly with them."

Interviewees also mentioned working with children as an opportunity for interaction as well as participating in local games such as soccer. Subject H and Subject I admitted to staying in touristy areas, which usually provided a basic English platform for communicating with locals.

Table 3. Staff and Additional Volunteer Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Project Supervisor</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Archaeologist</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felipe</td>
<td>Assistant Supervisor</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>Logistics and Groundskeeper</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomas</td>
<td>Groundskeeper</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>Assistant Cook</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilio</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablo</td>
<td>Chaperon (High School Group)</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Old Project Supervisor</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Daughter of Camila</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Shopkeeper</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volunteers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzi</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umi</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luz</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Peruvian</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Volunteer (High School Group)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Names have been changed to protect the anonymity of all parties. Other names mentioned in interviews or field notes (but not in this paper) include Ashley, Ben, Kim and Stacie.
Subject D noted that she made friends with the girl at the internet cafe, a shopkeeper, and a local woman on a bus. Subject H was the only interviewee to respond negatively and disagree with her ability to have meaningful conversations with locals: "I haven't, no. But then I tend to be more introverted and shy. Talking to someone, unless we are stuck in a situation where we have to, I haven't had more than a basic conversation." Even with her basic conversations, it does highlight what the other interviewees may have considered to be their degree of "meaningful" interactions with locals.

Examining Question: Q4 - Understanding

Though there may have been a lack of common language or issues with communication between the volunteers and locals, all interviewees except for Subject H believed they were able to make themselves understood (Q4). Subject H exclaimed, "Oh God, not even close," in response to the question but admitted to being able to make herself "basically" understood. Interviewees admitted to using a lot of non-verbal communication in their interactions and to relying on translators.

Examining Question: Q5 - Friendships with Locals

All interviewees believed they were able to establish friendships with locals (Q5). The group was split as to whether they would remain in contact with their new friends. For example, Subject A was optimistic that he would stay in contact but noted the difficulty:

Yeah. Actually ... I really hope so because I was just asking Felipe about their mailing address and his email and stuff so I can just talk to Miguel and Tomas... Honestly, if they
did we’d have to message over Spanish. It’s too much work. I’ll just talk to Felipe, honestly.

Subject E had the same predicament: "I don't think I'll be able to. I can't imagine that I'd be communicating with them or be able to speak to them. I don't really have a way of speaking to them anyway." Most interviewees "want[ed] to say yes" like Subject C, but responded like Subject B who thought "probably, realistically not."

Examining Question: Q6 - Discrimination

The general consensus by the interviewees about acceptance in the country and program was overwhelming positive (Q6). Many mentioned how warm and welcoming the locals were and the instant connection they had with fellow volunteers. Subject I did note some discrimination after thinking about the question:

In the project... I didn't feel discriminated, I felt accepted. It was weird, when I first met everybody at the host family, like I'm sure you heard before everybody saying, "It was like we already knew each other." We were instant friends, there was that instant connection... I guess though I have noticed if I speak to them in English, you may get a different answer as if you go up to them with Spanish...we'd get a different price... You could tell they were marking up the prices for tourists. But you see that everywhere you go. I guess in that sense I feel discriminated against. In Canada, it's one price for anybody... I kind of understand, because it's not exactly a rich country. But at the same time, you kind of do feel a little discriminated against in that sense.
Subject C and Subject H reported feeling like an outsider at times. Much like Subject I though, they generally felt accepted by the country and at the volunteer site. Subject C stated:

Sometimes I felt like an outsider when people ... There's one girl in our group who is fluent in Spanish and she can speak it really well, so she would talk to all the staff... I didn't feel anyone was trying to make me feel left out, but it was just, "I wish I could understand it"... Everyone was really accepting of the fact that I didn't speak Spanish and they would try to help ... and they're all super nice.

Subject H also had a brief moment of feeling like an outsider and attributed it to her personality:

"I felt like I always do. I walk in, I always feel like an outsider, but that's me personally being the introvert... But the volunteers already here were very friendly and welcoming. The staff have been great."

Examining Question: Q7 - Interaction with Volunteers

All interviewees believed they interacted and had more meaningful interactions with fellow volunteers in comparison to locals (Q7). Some interviewees explained further and several noted that time spent with locals was much lower than time spent with volunteers. Subject C who was in the special high school group remarked, "...We weren't here for the longest time so we moved around a lot. We weren't with the same locals a lot, so it was harder to make a connection, but when we were in a group, we were in the same group for the entire time." Subject A and Subject G also thought it was because they spent more time with fellow volunteers. Subject H thought that it "comes down to language. Not just that, it's just that we do have such separate roles. They are working." Subject G also thought the language was a reason for the disparity and
stated that volunteers "... spend a lot of time together and speak the same language." Subject D noted that it was "easier and less stressful" interacting with fellow volunteers. Subject B though he could identify better with volunteers because they were closer to his own age than the staff members.

Three of the interviewees thought they had interacted more with native-English speaking volunteers compared to other volunteers. Subject F noted his interactions with native-English speaking volunteers were more prevalent but not solely without disregard for the other volunteers: "Probably more with the English speaking countries because at the moment here it's just Suzi and Umi and everyone else is... pretty much apart from Bella but then she really wants to learn English, so she's constantly talking to us." Several interviewees noted that all volunteers had some type of fluency in the English language like Subject H who stated: "all the volunteers that seem to have come here were all English speaking."

Examining Question: Q8 - Home Communication

The volunteer housing site was in rural Peru with no internet connection or wifi capabilities (Q8). A ten minute bus ride into town, offered daily, allowed volunteers to visit internet cafes. Some volunteers did report having a phone signal at volunteer housing through an international plan or local phone card. With these limitations, a majority of interviewees reported communicating with their home (i.e., parents, friends, etc.) on a weekly basis. Subject D attributes her daily communication as a requirement by her mother to stay in contact. Subject H noted her lack of personal attachment back home as the reason for her sparse communication:
I haven't got a home. I don't have a boyfriend. I don't have a child at home. All my friends and my brothers are married with kids. There's nothing immediate to miss. Me, personally, I'm looking to live in another country anyway.

Social media and email were, overwhelmingly, the medium used to communicate. Subject F was the only interviewee who made an actual phone call and that was because he was very ill. Most volunteers carried their smart phones with them on the weekends to connect to wifi in the more touristy towns. Subject A did not miss the convenience of internet and stated "It was just a good catalyst to talk to new people and not look at your phone all the time." Subject D also noted she liked "getting away from the internet and all that kind of stuff" and disconnecting.

Examining Question: Q8.1 - Homesickness

In addition, most interviewees reported no homesickness (Q8.1). Subject G stated she was upset the day fellow volunteers departed, but that it was very brief. Subject F and D were both ill on several occasions and counted that as a reason for feeling brief homesickness as well. Interestingly, several interviewees noted anxiety during airline travel to Peru. Subject C mentioned that it was her first time traveling alone whereas previous international travel was in a group. Subject D admitted to having thoughts such as "What am I doing? Why am I doing this? Why did I think this was a good idea?" Subject F referred to his episode as a "panic attack" but that it disappeared once he met fellow volunteers in Peru.
Examining Question: Q9 - Adjustments

When asked about the major adjustments or adaptations while in Peru (Q9), the majority stated issues with the environment. Insect and bug stories were prevalent. Both Subject A and Subject B noted that the bug situation detracted from their overall experience. In addition, the mountainous region of Peru is considered high altitude and that can cause one to feel quite ill. Subject C noted the difference between city life and rural living to be an adjustment. The other emergent difficulty was to the overall cleanliness and hygiene practices in the country. Many noted the lack of soap in the bathrooms and kitchens. Subject H and Subject I both had trouble with one practice in particular; Subject I explains:

Toilet paper... Putting it in the bin. And the no soap in half the bathrooms. The no towels to wipe. The basic bathroom hygiene situation is the biggest thing I've had to adapt to. I could get away with a lot of it, but putting the toilet paper in the bin is the biggest thing...

Subject I also thought "hot showers" or the availability of warm water would have improved her experience as well. Though modern convinces would have helped the comfort level, Subject H was quick to interject:

It is what it is. I can ask for better hygiene, lockable doors on the bathroom, but that's not what this place is... I didn't come here for a five star resort... I knew it was going to be basic, rustic, and exactly as it is. Obviously I didn't picture this, but this is what I was expecting. Basic. I wouldn't change it, because then it wouldn't be what it is. If they did spend more money and time doing something to the kitchen or the bathrooms, or whatever, then ... that money is wasted, on what could be done to help the community, or
doing more research for their archaeology, and that's what we're here for, so I wouldn't change anything.

Subject D was the only interviewee that noted food problems as local cuisine tended to be "starchy food." Language issues were only mentioned by two interviewees. Subject D and E both brought up volunteer life adaptations that included physical exercise and a change in routine. Subject H noted she had very little adjustments and attributed it to, "...being a little bit older, and having traveled a bit, and loving travel, to me there was nothing to adjust to."

**Examining Question: Q10 - Overall Experience**

When asked about their overall experience (Q10), all interviewees recounted positive feedback. Subject G stated she would "stay here, forever, because it's really nice." Subject H noted it was very different from sitting in front of a computer all day and she was "loving it." Some even were considering their next volunteer project and stated they would gladly do this type of work again. Interestingly, interviewees from North America all rated their experience on a 1-10 scale with 9/10 and 10/10 as the chosen fraction.

**Communicative Practices Between Volunteers and Staff**

Interaction with staff was noted multiple times in the interview process. Arguably, volunteers had more meaningful interactions with the local staff members than with other locals in the country. Volunteers did spend more time with staff because of time at the volunteer project. Subject C also thought she interacted more with local people "around the camp." Also, several interviewees noted that the staff spoke English to some degree. Subject D remarks:
And with the language, I really didn't have to adjust much because everybody pretty much speaks English around here so it's kind of easy. But I'd say if I were by myself without any other English speakers then that would be more of a problem.

These factors may have contributed to their ability to form better relationships with the local staff members compared to locals in the community. Subject E supposed: "Yes. I was probably speaking more with the staff here than other people around."

However, during observation little interaction was noted between volunteers and staff during work. This could be attributed to the fact that the volunteer work did not warrant much interaction. Much of the volunteer work was done independently; Subject C further elaborates on the situation working with staff:

I talked to Felipe a bit, but Diego also speaks really good English, so Diego was really easy. We talked with him the whole time. Also the work we do with Diego was not as physically demanding so it was much easier to talk while we worked, but with Felipe we were macheting through the bush so it wasn't exactly a talking opportunity.

During work time on the volunteer project, Diego did most of the speaking. When volunteers would work with other staff members such as Felipe on the archaeological site, no instruction would be provided. Volunteers would teach the new volunteers how to use the machete or how to clear a site. In regards to working with Diego, Subject D said the following: "Well the weeding, he showed us how to do it and then left us to it basically. But with the mapping, he was right there helping us." It was observed numerous times that staff would leave during volunteer work. Work at the volunteer housing was also very independent; for example, carrying debris from the
forest. The local staff would help in these instances, but the work offered little availability for interaction.

Earlier, Subject C explained that she interacted more with the staff at night or during bonfires. There were opportunities noted when volunteers and staff were together outside of typical volunteer work. For example, several volunteers (Subject G, Subject I, and Luz) were assisting the kitchen staff in pizza preparations. However, Luz was translating and volunteers were not communicating as much as placing toppings on pizzas. During the first week, Tomas was present at a bonfire but remained seated away from the group and no interactions occurred. The second week, Emilio and Miguel were both present at the bonfire. Miguel left early and no interactions occurred. Emilio was present when a game began around the fire. Luz translated for Emilio the duration of the game.

In orientation, Paul encouraged involvement with the staff and locals. He stated that sports were a great outlet to accomplish this. While at the volunteer project, only one soccer game was initiated by the staff the first week. Subject A, Subject B, Subject G, Daniel, and another male from the high school group played against three of the local staff which included Miguel, Tomas, and Felipe. Subject C also mentioned the previous week that she had joined a volleyball and a soccer game:

We went and played volleyball with some of them [the locals] and I played soccer with them. We go into town. Maria plays volleyball. I can't remember if it's every Thursday or every day, so we did that. We ended up cleaning because they had coffee beans drying so we had to bring all the coffee beans off the court for them. We played some locals too. It was easier with something like that because then we had something to talk about even
though we couldn't really speak the same language. Same with soccer and stuff and things like that.

No volleyball games were attended during the two-week study. It was raining when the above soccer game was initiated which may have contributed to the low number of participants.

Interviewees noted Diego as the staff member with the most English speaking skill. Observations also found this to be true. The other staff members, aside from Paul, did not speak English freely; Subject F elaborates on the staff member she most interacted with: "...I got on with Diego quite well, I reckon. Paul, but obviously he's Irish anyway."

During the second week with the absence of Paul, Diego was charged with organizing volunteers and duties. When asked if Subject D thought she communicated more with Diego than the other staff, she replied: "I wouldn't say communicated the most. Probably more Paul. Just because he was here for longer. But no, I love Diego. He's really funny." Out of all the staff members, Diego did use humor in a lot of his interactions with volunteers. He would stare at volunteers until they either laughed or started a conversation with him. For instance, he had inside jokes with Umi about hiking for long hours.

There was also little interaction noted between volunteers and local staff during meal times at the volunteer project. Lunch on the archaeological sites remained very quiet. Meals at volunteer housing usually had conversations that remained among fellow volunteers. During the first week, Subject A actively attempted to sit by the staff during meal times at both locations. Subject A would start conversations and ask questions. This usually prompted other volunteers to contribute when eating off-site. As Subject H mentioned earlier, language may have been a barrier, but the volunteers and staff members' separate roles most likely played a part:
Maria and Camila, they're in the kitchen all day when we're out in the fields. It's sort of hard to sit down and have a conversation with them, when by the time they sit down and have dinner, we're almost finished. There's that sort of staff separation that makes it a little harder to form a friendship when you're not an outgoing person.

Subject H commented that her personality tended to be more introverted as a reason for her lack of interaction with locals. In observation, she was much more reserved than say Subject A, who was "outgoing." Emilio was introduced to the volunteers at breakfast. He sat with the volunteers after his introduction, and no one tried to engage him in conversation or offered to pass food toward him. Volunteers returned to their conversations; Luz and Bella, at the end of the meal, started a conversation with him.

Interestingly, many members of the staff seemed to understand English. It was noted several times in observations that staff would comply with volunteer requests without speaking. For example, often volunteers would want milk for their coffee in the mornings. Volunteers would not ask, but the staff would overhear conversations and milk would appear. This was a common trend among volunteers - having questions or uncertainty but declining to ask staff members. Volunteers would often have questions about archaeological site workdays (e.g., how many hiking hours), but said they could never get a straight answer from Diego as the reason they no longer inquired. Subject I recounts a story:

I've spoken a few sentences with, say, Tomas. He understands, I think, English, but he doesn't really speak it. Or he's asking me something in Spanish. I was kind of like, "What?" He's repeated himself. I get what he's saying, even though I don't know exactly
what he's asking me. I get ... "So you know?" You know what I mean? I can answer yes or no kinds of things.

As mentioned in Q3, many of the interviewees thought the staff's English contributed to their ability to communicate. Subject D explained: "I've been able to talk, obviously, with the staff there because they all pretty much speak English apart from Camila."

It was noted during the interviews that conversations with the staff or, locals for that matter, were usually short. As Subject A stated, no "complex questions" were asked instead he would usually converse about the following: "I joke around with them and stuff, but I also just ask them what daily life was like. What they like doing and stuff and it’s just interesting to listen." Subject B also spoke "very short phrases rather than longer sentences" and also mentioned his use of humor. Interviewees such as Subject F admitted to not having conversations as much as communicating a need or basic ideas to the staff. During the second week, Subject E did speak with Emilio for longer periods of time on separate occasions. Emilio did not speak English very well, but Subject E had some degree of proficiency in Spanish.

Subject A and Subject G noted the desire to improve their Spanish skills. Through observations, it was apparent that Subject A actively tried to use his Spanish and attempted to interact with locals:

I knew that coming here would be the best opportunity to improve my Spanish, so I put myself in a position to talk to Miguel and the other natives here... It's really cool to meet people from Europe or Australia or other developed countries, but I think coming here ... I can just meet those people in [America], like a lot of people come from different places.
But you don’t get the opportunity to talk to people like Felipe and Diego and stuff as much, so I wanted to take advantage of that here.

Subject G, who had taken Spanish classes before arriving, was not observed pursuing conversations with the staff. However, she hoped to develop a deeper connection with the staff in her remaining five weeks. Subject I had also taken Spanish classes before arriving and was not observed using her new language skills. In the interview, Subject I stated: "I don't think I could even get through a sentence. If I had to say a sentence, I would have to sit down, think about it, write it down, translate it, and try to figure out if it was even right." Subject I noted in interviews two separate occasions where she used a translator and was observed, numerous times, using this medium for communication. Subject E had some Spanish fluency was observed speaking with Emilio, specifically, during the second week. Subject G and Subject E both had quieter personas much like Subject H where as Subject A was very outgoing and stated: "It's easy for me to meet people and stuff." As an example, Subject A was the only volunteer to come up to me and the two other new volunteers to welcome us and to introduce himself.

In observations, it appeared that the staff actively tried to engage with volunteers at times. As mentioned, the soccer game was initiated by the staff. Also, Subject C participated in one volleyball game because of Maria's involvement. Diego also tried to initiate conversations through his "stare" tactic and interaction by way of humor. During a meal, it was observed that Miguel tried to engage Suzi in a conversation in Spanish by offering her food. Diego interacted with the volunteers often, especially at archaeological sites. Though he would use English, he would also demonstrate while talking. During mapping exercises, he used pen and paper to draw the requirements.
The staff did, quite often, use a fellow volunteer who was fluent in Spanish for translation purposes. Maria asked Luz to make an announcement to all volunteers about the wasting of rice. After volunteers completed a coffee harvesting assignment, Tomas asked Luz to translate the next instructions. During ceramics, Luz was tasked with translating all instructions for Emilio. This request was from Diego, who is capable of translating, himself. Diego would also look to Luz, when speaking, for confirmation that he was saying something correctly. At times, he would ask her for help with certain words. He often conversed with Luz in Spanish and frequented her group during the mapping exercises. The first week, Daniel was tasked with leading the volunteers to the school event, as Paul was on vacation and no other staff members accompanied the group.

**Other Interactions with Locals and Peruvian Culture**

Interviewees also relayed stories about their interactions with locals outside of the volunteer project. Often on weekends, volunteers would travel together and sightsee. In addition, the community workdays offered the ability to expand the volunteers' social circles.

Subject I noted that she tended to stay in the touristy areas on the weekends and that English was understood:

I haven't had an issue because it's touristy everywhere I've gone. You go in a restaurant, they understand basic English... Like if you're ordering something off the menu, they know what you're talking about, because you're pointing it out and saying it in Spanish. When it comes to a lot of the markets, the people that are selling, they understand English numbers. When you say, "How much?" "Yes or no." Even the numbers, when you're like,
"Fifty," they're like, "yes, no." They seem to understand that, because they deal with that in lots of things with tourists.

Subject H also felt similar to Subject I and stated:

You're in a group of English speakers, you're doing these touristy things. It's not like where I'm staying with a host family and I need to communicate on a daily basis or anything like that. I haven't felt the need for, or I don't feel like I've been stuck in a situation where it's hopeless.

However, Subject E felt the opposite and stated that though he did not use Spanish much at volunteer housing, he did in other places such as Cusco: "No one really speaks English there and other places around there, so yes I did need to use it." Interestingly, Subject G stated her reliance on Spanish speakers like Subject G when outside of the volunteer project: "Well, I think last time we went out, we had Subject E, who's really good at Spanish... he did lots of the talking. I was just listening to him like, 'Oh, that's what that means.'"

Aside from the staff at the volunteer project, there were several locals in town whom volunteers interacted with often, if not daily. While traveling to Machu Picchu, Subject D recounted a story of meeting a woman on the bus as well as interacting with town locals:

I was sat in the tour bus and I was speaking to a woman, this woman just started speaking to me... it's kind of half English, half Spanish but I understood the Spanish bits as well, which is quite lucky. It was the easy Spanish, it sounds the same but with an "o" on the end kind of idea. But she was just asking "Who are you? Where are you from? Where are you going? What have you been doing here?" And just normal conversations at home
which was quite nice... And then the shop people as well, the shopkeeper like Javier... I've got a quite good friendship with the little girl at the internet cafe.

Volunteers could go to town, daily before dinner, for a couple hours. Though volunteers visited establishments in town, observations revealed that interactions were limited. Volunteers would not engage the internet cafe girl or owners other than stand up at the end of their session and ask for the price. Subject D asked on one occasion whether I spoke English on our way to the internet cafe. The internet was down that day, and she had trouble following the owner's reasoning in Spanish.

Volunteers always met and shopped at Javier's shop. However, Javier was not always present. On one occasion, Javier was sitting outside his shop drinking:

The owner then started to go around to my group that had just arrived and offered us a glass of beer. The owner was smiling and would say things in Spanish while offering the glass. He approached Subject G first. She replied "bien" (translation: good). He said a long sentence in Spanish and Subject G replied, "Oh, we should go buy something in your store." Luz translated that he was saying thanks for being my friend and buying things at his store. Subject I answered, "de nada" (translation: you're welcome). He continued to go around and offer beer to the volunteers and each replied "gracias" to the owner. Miguel showed up and the owner offered him a glass of beer. Several of the girls said, "no, he's driving." The owner seemed to understand and made a sign with his hand to indicate a little bit. Everyone laughed.

Usually volunteers entered, selected their items, and paid the female cashier. The cashier would simply say the total in Spanish and volunteers seemed to understand. It also seemed that
volunteers were known around the town. A group of volunteers went to a local bank to exchange money with Luz. She spoke in Spanish to the cashier, but Subject I remarked that they were "used to us" and knew what we wanted.

Subject G had an interesting situation occur while eating a guinea pig on the side of the road during a festivity. An older woman approached Subject G while she was trying to eat the Peruvian delicacy. The older lady tried to speak to Subject G and used the word "gringo" (translation: foreigner) repeatedly. Luz translated that she was telling everyone how to eat it and wanted everyone to try it. The older lady then grabbed the pig and snapped it in half. Subject G continued smiling through the process. The older lady then started to eat part of the pig. Subject F was appalled and stated "I'm not eating that now" and got up. In the interview Subject G expanded on the situation:

I did give a bunch of locals my guinea pig and they were very happy about that... Yeah, I took it because I couldn't put it in the bin. It was like, this is special, like, meal, here. I can't put it in the bin. I thought, I have to give it to someone or just hold on to it.... She was just saying, "Eat, Eat..." she showed me how to eat it.

She had found the old lady near Javier's shop and given the pig to the locals. She was culturally sensitive not to dispose of the pig in the trash and was conscious of Peruvian culture. Subject D was hesitant to photograph a church during a festival; she also did research on cultural norms to ensure she did not offend anyone.

Subject E also had an interesting situation with a clown during a school holiday festivity. It should be noted that on this day no staff accompanied the volunteers to the school. Volunteers awkwardly stood a majority of the time. A woman, perhaps a principal or high official at the
school, approached the group. She gave everyone a hug and a kiss and shook hands with the males in the group. Once the children started to arrive, two young girls ran up and hugged Subject D. After some rearranging, the clown took the stage. Three of the male volunteers were called upon to participate. Subject E reluctantly followed Daniel and Subject F. The clown went through several skits with the participants. Subject E’s arms remained crossed the entire time. The clown only spoke Spanish, but the microphone made it hard to decipher anything. As the other participants attempted to dance and mimic the clown, Subject E's energy level was low. The clown repeatedly asked Subject E to re-do movements illustrating he wanted more action. All participants were released back to their seats except Subject E. The clown continued to use him in the skits. When asked about this moment in the interviews, Subject E was brief: "Yeah, sometimes [I could understand the clown]. It's harder with the funny voice to understand. Mostly he was just doing hand gestures and things like that." Subject F noted "It was fun. Subject E didn't like it but then he's quite shy. Daniel and I thought it was quite funny."

Another interesting arena for interaction was brought up in the interview with Subject H. She had been traveling for several months and had formed romantic relationships with locals in different countries. Though she did not plan on staying in contact with these romantic interests, she stated she established a number of friendships with local guides on her journeys.

Another major point of interaction and meaningful interaction noted by the interviewee's was with local children. Subject B recounted joining a soccer game at the school. Subject G thought she interacted more with the children:

I feel like definitely more with the kids, because I can't talk much Spanish. I can just say, 'Hola, good day'... Playing with the kids, has definitely been a bigger part of it, like
playing soccer, playing games... I didn't really talk to the teacher[s] much. I don't know. I just went straight to the kids.... I do love being with the kids because they're lovely and they're so much fun.

Subject F remarked that he thought interactions with the children were "easier" and continued to explain:

The kids don't understand any English at all so it's quite hard to communicate with them but they don't really care. I was drawing for them, they kept handing me things, like making me copy these drawings from these books. Yeah, I made a few friends there... my mum's a junior teacher as well, she teaches five and six year olds who are about the same age as the ones that we're playing with so yeah, it's not a lot different because they're not great at English either.

Subject also explained her interactions with the children and thought it was easy:

They were three to four [years old], so they knew their Spanish words. They were all good speakers. But I think they must do this a lot with the volunteers. They know we can't speak a lot. But again, we were just doing the basics. We were doing colors and numbers. Because I, again, know the basics, most of them. We're doing those sort of things. You know, "donde," where is, what is, and those sort of things. Because of the games we're playing, "casa," and the animals, and those sort of things. The basics I know.

With kids, it's easy. One word question answers usually works well.

Subject I noted that she was nervous about community days on the project but that it quickly vanished after working with the children. She found that the mothers were interested in talking and explained:
I found a lot of the mothers were really interested in speaking English. One woman, like there's the little blocks, and they're like fruits. I was talking to the little kid, and I'm looking at it, and it's got English and Spanish. I'm looking at the Spanish and I'm trying to pronounce the Spanish, and the mother's saying it in English and looking at me like, "Is that how you say it?" I'm like, "Yes, yes, yes, so like this." I kind of went through the fruits with her, vegetables with her, or no, it was just fruits, on how to say it in English. Then she started asking me more complex questions that she couldn't say in English. She was able to ask me where I'm from and what my name is and "How do you say this?" but she wasn't able to ask me ... or have a conversation with me, because she didn't know enough English, so I had to call Bella over to have the conversation for me.

Subject C had the opposite experience with the children and their mothers. During one community day, seventy children came to the volunteer site, Subject C explains:

We had a big group so, we got all of the groups to come here, so 70 kids running around. We just played with them. If they asked certain words of English we would say to them, but we weren't specifically teaching them English... some of the parents were there, and they would talk to us, but a lot of them were ... I think it was their break. They were hanging out in the shade and having some juice and talking with each other while we were running around with their kids.

Subject C also noted that children in Peru did not appear to be shy, which was different:

I noticed lots of the kids are not shy. When we had the group of kids come over last Thursday, they'll just come up to you and they'll hold your hand and they'll walk around
with you. Their parents are totally okay with it and the kids run around, so it's really different from in Canada, where everyone's, "No, stay by my side."

Subject D also noted that children would come up and sit on her lap. Subject G received hugs regularly from children around town.

In many of these instances, the locals approached or started conversations with the volunteers. Subject C notes that "Even if they didn't speak English they would try to talk with me even though we didn't speak the same language, so it was really good." Subject C and Subject I both had parents attempt to engage them in conversations. Javier was very friendly and outgoing. Also, interviewees noted how welcomed they felt in the country. Subject D explains:

They're all so friendly and welcoming. Everyone I've spoken to pretty much, you always say "hi" to anybody you see on the street. Because back in England or Wales you don't, you just walk and you just mind your own business. But here you just say "hi" to everybody.

Culturally, Peruvians do say good morning, good afternoon, or good evening depending on the time of day. Subject H also felt "very welcome[d] in Peru" and stated she loved the country. Subject G stated that she felt it was "quite easy to get along with Peruvians. They're very good natured."

Communication Tools Used by Volunteers

As briefly mentioned in the above interaction accounts, interviewees and volunteers used a number of ways to bridge the communicative gap. Many of the interviewees cited using non-verbal communication and help from other people in their communication with both locals and
staff. However, many also felt that the staff knew English to a degree which helped the process; such as Subject D who found that it was "quite easy because everyone kind of knew what we were saying so you didn't really have to try that hard to let them know what you want[ed]."

Subject D and Subject G both had translation books that they cited helped in their communicative processes. Subject A and Subject B both noted using humor in their interactions.

Subject A stated that at times he did not understand, but could "get a good idea of what they're saying" when speaking. Subject F also felt he was able to communicate and relied on the following in his interactions with locals. He often spoke to Maria in the kitchen because he was ill quite often while on the project and needed special tea:

Simple Spanish. I'd get her attention with Spanish and then thank her in Spanish and say a couple of things, if she said, do I want more, I'd say that in Spanish but otherwise she speaks pretty good English. If I didn't know the Spanish, which is most of it, I could just say simple English and she'd get it. Yeah. I got the point across, they never got the wrong thing I suppose from what I was saying.

Subject G thought she had a basic understanding and could glean meaning, but could not reply. She stated, "I could understand what they say, but then I'm just like, I can't reply. I don't know the words but I know what you're saying."

When words did not work, Subject G also stated she would draw pictures or "or write something... or I get my phone out and type it in Spanish. Often my accent's really strange. If I write it down in Spanish, they can read it. They go, 'Oh I know what you're talking about.' Some place[s] you use hands." Subject H also recounted a story of going to the pharmacy while ill and
using hand gestures. Subject A was very vocal about his use of non-verbal communication and stated:

I just feel like non-verbal communication is really important. When verbal doesn’t work you just can’t ... You don’t know the word or you don’t know the grammar for it just facial expressions or hand motions and stuff can really, really help and that’s crazy to think different languages can have completely different words for the same thing, but, universally, everything is the same which is really cool, I think.

Subject A also differentiated between conversations with staff and other locals. He found that he joked and asked more questions with the staff, but on weekend excursions or with other locals, the conversation were limited to the following: "for the most part I’m just going to ask, 'Can I use the bathroom? Where’s the trash can?' or something."

Subject C explained that in addition to non-verbal communication, she would sometimes employ the help of a friend:

Sometimes I was, certain words that I'd be trying to explain, and I'd just have to ask somebody just so they could get the general point I was trying to get across, but a lot of it was a lot hand movements, hoping that they understood what I was saying.

Subject H also mentioned how easy it was to communicate through a translator:

The volunteering we always had an English speaking tour guide. There'd always be one or two people like Luz, who had the language, so we just got really lazy. We didn't talk in Spanish. Or we just did the basics: Gracias. You didn't need much more than that. Either you used hand signals, or hopefully the people you were talking to had some English as
well, and you worked it out between you. I certainly haven't picked it up as I was wanting to.

Subject D felt it was easier to use Luz as well and stated: "It's easier to just go to Luz and say, 'Can you ask her this please?' And then she'll be able to do perfect Spanish pretty quickly."

In observations, it was noted that Luz and Bella were used often by volunteers. As stated previously, Subject I "call[ed] Bella over to have the conversation" for her, and asked for Bella's help when talking to children's parents. During ceramics, Subject I repeatedly asked Luz to translate and ask questions of Emilio. It is interesting to note, however, that Luz wanted volunteers to communicate on their own. For instance, Subject I asked Luz at a festival for the price of cotton candy. Luz responded: "No, you have to figure it out yourself." Subject I did approach the vendor herself and obtained the price.

Subject G noted that she had not had many obstacles communicating with locals because she did not travel alone. For the upcoming weekend trip, Subject G, Subject H, and Subject I were traveling together. Subject G noted it would be the "test" and stated: "the three of us, who all speak English, so we're going to be learning lots of Spanish. Definitely, it's good learning experience on the weekend, to pick up your Spanish, which is what I want to do. I really want to get good at it, which would be nice."

Volunteers used a combination of these things to help with communication. Volunteers, such as Subject A, who actively pursued communication with locals stated the following:

I feel there’s a lot of rapport between me and the staff here and I think there’s a stronger connection between me and them than some of the other volunteers that chose to stick
just with the people they knew. There’s nothing wrong with that. I just think that relationship is a consequence of me actively trying to do that.

Subject A stated that he used a combination of Spanish and English as well as non-verbal communication such as signaling of his hands. Though most interviewees were positive about having meaningful conversations and establishing friendships with staff or locals, observations did not reveal an active pursuit by many of the volunteers. Translation was used heavily by both volunteers and staff at the volunteer site.

Volunteer to Volunteer Interaction

Interviewees stated that they interacted more with fellow volunteers. Observations also corroborate this data. However, Subject A noted the disadvantage of establishing such quick friendships: "Typically, they're superficial relationships because you don't have time to really understand, but they're good superficial relations. Everyone's friendly with each other..." Many interviewees stated having an instant bond with fellow volunteers as well.

English was widely spoken amongst volunteers. Interestingly, many topics of conversations revolved around American culture and tv shows. Volunteers would play one specific game after dinner some nights which required spelling words in English. Some of the other volunteers from non-native English speaking countries had a difficult time. Suzi, for instance, often got frustrated and stopped playing. Bella would confuse the spelling of words, but was eager to play. Communication between fellow native-English speaking volunteers also had its mishaps. From the different native-English speaking countries represented at the project, there was a difference in pronunciation of words and cultural items specific to one's own country.
For the purposes of the game, it was often laughable and proved an enjoyable time. However, a proficiency in an English vocabulary and spelling were necessary to play.

Many of the interviewees noted that there was little distinction between interacting with native and non-native English speaking volunteers. Subject I noted that it had to do more with a person's "mentality level" than country they were from. Subject B also said he felt he interacted with the ones who were "willing or wanted to interact more." Observations also corroborated this data, as volunteers readily mixed. However, volunteers were closer with fellow volunteers that had entered the program on the same day. Subject H explained her situation:

But as five of us came together, it was like you, and Luz, and Bella, you sort of have your little knit group you've traveled in together. We had that sort of backup when we walked in. But the volunteers already here were very friendly and welcoming. The staff have been great.

Subject G also mentioned she arrived with other volunteers which helped them get to know each other fairly well before actually arriving at the volunteer site. Umi, Suzi, and Sara were quiet and hesitant to start interactions with fellow volunteers. Bella and Luz interacted with everyone and were not shy. However, the native-English speakers, aside from the high school group, tended to interact more with each other. This may be a consequence of a majority of the native-English speakers arriving together as stated by Subject H and Subject G.

During the first week, Subject H yelled at Sam, one of the high school volunteers from France, for sitting down on the job. Subject H yelled: "Why aren't you working? Why come here then?" Subject A immediately came to Sam's defense and apologized stating he instructed Sam to take a break. Subject H responded, "I'm not talking to you." Subject A responded, "You don't
need to yell at him, he's only 15, he's ill, his hands are blistered..." Subject H interrupted grasping her wrists, "My wrists are swollen and I'm still working." After the exchange, Sam got up and started to do light work. No one else entered into the conversation. Felipe, who was managing the group, was nowhere to be found. Later Subject H offered Sam some medicine and attempted to make small talk. When recounting the story later, she stated her dislike for Sam.

Another event worth mentioning involves volunteers exiting ritual. As volunteers prepare to leave the project, they are given paint to decorate the walls. Most volunteers choose to put up a saying or draw a picture. Some of the past paintings and sayings are very crude. There are no rules as to what can be painted. After the high school group was given paint, a fresh writing appeared that read, "Texas is better than your bitch ass country." It was signed by Subject B. During Subject A's interview, he stated that this was an inside joke with his fellow volunteers. Subject H found it very distasteful and was not amused that it was an inside joke. There were no other paintings or writings similar to Subject B's text.

Though country of origin played little significance as to who volunteers interacted with, there was a clear division between the high school group and the other volunteers. From the first day, observations clearly showed a disdain for the younger group. Subject H stated that she had "no patience" for the group. Subject E stated very bluntly:

They are arseholes, basically. No-one liked them. They were just annoying, they just got in the way and they were being really rude and playing really loud music at the same time as we're sitting quietly playing guitar and stuff.

Subject I also expressed frustration at the high schoolers in her group and called them "lazy" when they stopped working the last hour of cleaning. Umi and Suzi also were counting down the
days until the group left and things became quiet again. Subject F was surprised that they actually were not that much younger, but lacked maturity:

They weren't that much younger I guess. I was kind of expecting more like eighteen into thirty rather than fifteen, sixteen. They're a bit immature, they didn't clean up after themselves, they didn't respect other people as much. Yeah, that was kind of annoying but other than that, they're only here for a week anyway.

Subject I also felt the same way about the age of the high school group and stated:

Some of the teenagers that were here... just turned you off. Just the way they act, and stuff like that. Whereas other ones seemed to be pretty more mature. You know what I mean? Subject D, she's only eighteen, nineteen now. She's native English speaking.

Subject A admitted about being torn as to what group to join as he was nineteen:

Yeah, so that was a qualm I had at the beginning. I was like, 'Oh, I’m 19. Be hanging out with a bunch of 16 year olds,' but for the most part they’re pretty mature. Honestly I am not that mature in the first ... On these trips I’ll be immature, but when it’s time to me mature I will. On these trips I’m not that ... Honestly, not that mature, so being with them I didn’t feel much older, much more serious than them. That wasn’t really an issue.

Interestingly, the high school group did not have a chaperone with them the entire time. All three of the high school group interviewees mentioned a "Pablo," but he was not observed the first week. Paul also did not spend time with the high school group or monitor their actions. Subject A noted that many of his fellow high school volunteers like to drink beer though they were under the legal age in both Peru and their home countries.
Volunteer Safety and the Organization

A few interviewees contracted some sort of illness while on the project. Subject F, Subject D, and Subject H missed days of work because of this. Subject F reported he was sick "the whole time basically" and even had to call his doctor in England. Subject D reported falling ill at least once a week and unfortunately missed out on many of the archaeological days. Subject H counts this as the worst month in her extended travels, but has tried to keep going: "I don't think I've missed out on too much. I certainly haven't been out for days like Subject D and Subject F were. I think I've been fairly lucky." During one instance, Bella fainted twice at the volunteer project. Paul was present, but no medical attention was deemed necessary. Paul cited that the nearest "good" doctor was hours away.

The work of the volunteers is very strenuous. They must hike with machetes to archaeological sites. The hike is often steep, damp, and unruly. Machetes are optional and at volunteers' discretion. Many volunteers also had multiple blisters and injuries associated with the work. Insect bites were prevalent among the volunteers.

During the interviews, volunteers noted that they had little expectation coming to the project as it was everyone's first time volunteering abroad. Subject H explains:

I mostly didn't know what to expect. I knew there'd be archaeology work... But I didn't think about it, Incas lived in the mountains. I suppose because it was such a big journey for me, and I planned it all very quickly, I didn't do a lot of research, so I really didn't know what to expect and didn't have any expectations. I wanted in a way to be surprised...

Subject I also did not fully know what to expect:
I didn't really know exactly what to expect in a certain aspect. It tells you you're going to be hiking, it tells you basically the things ... you're going to be clearing ruins and stuff like that, so I knew that I was going to be hiking, I knew I was going to be machete-ing. Some of the hikes I didn't realize were going to be so long, or I guess I was hoping I would be better fit for them. I didn't really expect too much, so I wasn't really surprised by any of it, I guess you could say.

None of the volunteers appeared to complain or be disheartened by the work. Several mentioned their disappointment that no excavations were taking place like Subject F: "I was kind of disappointed that we didn't get to do excavation but then that's not their fault, it's the ministry."

During observations, volunteers did talk about the out-of-country coordinator being uninformed and unable to adequately answer questions.

A mid-trip check-in was also performed on the third day after arrival. Paul called volunteers out to meet, one-on-one. He had a single organizational form and read down a list of questions while making no eye contact. As volunteers stood, he offered no opportunity to elaborate on any of the questions as he phrased them as yes or no answers. The meeting lasted less than a minute.

While Paul was on vacation the second week, Adam, a past supervisor on the project from Holland, visited the group for a day. Subject H mentioned she had met him before and he still worked with the company from time to time. During his brief time at the volunteer house, he initiated an after dinner presentation/discussion. He explained to volunteers the Incan counting system. He demonstrated on a board that was made by the company to help during community days when volunteers go into local schools. He gave a brief history and made all volunteers try
the system. Volunteers seemed to enjoy the lesson and continued to play with the board after the presentation. These boards were not used in schools during the two weeks on the project.

**Volunteer Thoughts on Volunteer Travel**

Interviewees also commented on volunteer tourism. As previously noted, several interviewees were drawn to this specific project because it was different. In observations, Bella and Luz both stated this as a reason for their selection of the archaeology project. Subject F who had studied archaeology in school was not surprised that volunteers had no background:

Lots of people do this kind of thing because they want to try it out. Like Subject D, Subject E, they wanted to do that. Some people are just interested in history and stuff and want to learn more. Some people go on hikes and do some archaeology because they've never done it.

Subject H who also had a background in archaeology was not surprised and expected a range of different backgrounds on the project.

Subject F freely spoke about some of the issues with volunteer tourism. He shared a story with his friends in Namibia and Bolivia who were part of a Christian group:

They go off and they go up and do various things. Build houses and stuff and they do water. Then I've heard lots of the local people, they'd take down the stuff that the volunteers had done during the day and then rebuild it better because they'd done it wrong.

Subject F felt confident in the current company and the work done at the archaeological site in Peru. He continued his thoughts:
It's just like, with this kind of thing, I know it's being done right because we're being told by professionals, this is what you do, I've done it so I know what I'm doing. Then it's quite easy. It's not like I'm going in and interfering with the local people. It's like I'm interacting with the local people not interfering. Whereas lots of volunteering abroad, I think it's like, we're privileged white people, let's go and help them out because we're so privileged and they need help. When often they do but it's better when they help themselves rather than just getting a bunch of white teenagers in to do it.

Subject G concluded her interview stating that volunteering was a great way to "find confidence in yourself;" It allowed one to be on their own, meet new people, and see new places. Subject I suggested that more people should do it. She felt that people were unaware of volunteer tourism as an option for traveling:

I've been telling people... I'm like, "Where do you want to ..." Because a lot of people do not know about it, they just know about touring. I bring it up and they're like, "Well, what's that?" I explain it to them and they're like, "Oh, that's kind of cool." You talk to a lot of people that have traveled and they say the best way to experience another culture is to work there. What better way than voluntouring.

Other Notable Information from the Data

Use of electronic devices was not prevalent at the volunteer project. Phones were carried to take pictures. Luz used an application on her phone to star gaze on multiple evenings. Volunteers did not appear to listen to music with headphones. Subject D sometimes used her iPad to play games at the kitchen table. Subject H read books on her electronic device. Most
volunteers spent leisure time doing laundry, reading, or writing in their journals. Group games or bonfires were initiated, sometimes, in the evenings.

No interviewees stated that transportation was an issue, but rather just something "different." Though it was not listed as an adaptation, many expanded on the transportation circumstances in Peru. Subject I explained:

[It's] not really hard to adjust to. It's just different than back home. I mean we have public transportation. They don't have that here, but they kind of have some sort of transportation thing, right... That's pretty cheap, to get between places. It's like public transport back home, except back home you're going around the city and not to different towns. The language barrier can be difficult, definitely. Part of that I guess is my own fault for not starting Spanish and taking it earlier, knowing I was coming here, right.

Subject A also noted the driving was "a lot more sketch and people cut in front of you." He further explained how he deals with situations like the difference in transportation:

I say it's really different for me because I'm used to seat belt in, front seat airbags on the side, driving down the highway in Texas and it's different to see one driver drive twenty kids with some sitting on the roof, but I know that Felipe's responsible and this is something he does everyday, so I shouldn't judge and say that it's weird only because I've never seen it, but rather because ... I should have faith in him because he does it everyday, so just one of those things. I don't worry too much about that.

Subject F also recounted his transportation experience in Peru:

In here they fill every seat but then they put a cow in and then six other people and you go, this isn't safe. I mean, obviously that's an exaggeration but they did have about
sixteen people in a ten person carrier with us all squashed together. It wasn't safe and no-one ever has seat belts, ever. I've seen one person use a seat belt who's actually native since I've been here and that was the taxi driver on the first day.

Transportation on the volunteer site was different as well. The company used an old bus to transport volunteers up and down the mountain. It was also used to shuttle volunteers into town. However, a smaller van was used during the six-hour journey from Cusco to the volunteer site.

Another common admittance in the interviews concerned the length of time volunteers were on the project. Several interviewees mentioned that they wished they could stay longer. Subject C related the following desire to make her experience better:

I think honestly, for me just staying longer, if I was here for a whole month or a whole summer, I think I could get a better chance to immerse myself in the culture and get to know the locals better. I'd get to see more of Peru, because on the weekends we get off, so I think just for me would just be to stay longer and get into the routine of living here would be interesting. I think the other projects would be really cool, but I think I would want to stay with one project for a longer amount of time to really get to know the staff and the locals in that area. As much as the other one seems really cool, I'd love to do it, but if I was going to do that, again I'd want that one to be for a longer period of time.

Subject G also commented that she could stay forever because it's a "nice country" and "really nice people." Subject I stated that two weeks anywhere is never long enough as the reason she chose a month to volunteer and concluded: "Was 3 weeks long enough? No. I think I would have loved to stay a lot longer. I'd love to stay until I got sick of it, but I don't know if I could get sick of it." Subject F thought his amount of time of three weeks was sufficient. Subject H also thought
her length of time on the project was perfect and stated:

I think four weeks for this sort of project is good. Shorter, you don't always get the full experience. Especially the way you guys have come in. We haven't had normal weeks. Everything is all over the place. You haven't got to experience fully the norm. Not that there's anything wrong with the way we've experienced it. It's all been great. We've done different things and learned a lot, and all the rest of it. But I think going that little bit longer, you've got more of a chance of seeing a bit of everything, rather than just getting a taster. But I don't think I could have done more than four weeks on this project. Not with the hills.

Subject D admitted she was sad about her departure as she did not feel she was able to meet everyone properly and stated:

If I was here for 4 weeks, I think I'd be a lot happier because I'd feel like I've completely gotten everything I can out of the trip. But I don't quite feel as if I have yet because I want to do the ceramics but that's tomorrow. Plus being ill, I haven't been able to do as much hiking as I want or mapping as I wanted to. But that just means I get to come back next year.

Many concluding remarks with the interviewees unearthed their desire to volunteer again in the future. Subject I was very excited and was thinking of her next project and funding. She stated the determining factor would not be a project necessarily but "it's what country do I want to see."
DISCUSSION

Most interviewees did not report major adaptation issues with their sojourn. In observation, none of the volunteers appeared to be distraught or to have major issues living and working in Peru. This may stem from many factors. All of the interviewees had prior experience in traveling abroad. As Subject H mentioned, she had only small adjustments that she attributed to the fact that she is older and well traveled. This could account for the low number of reported homesickness episodes on the project. In addition, a majority of the volunteers were on the project for a month or less.

As mentioned by Cushner and Brislin (1996), misunderstandings usually arise out of culture-specific concepts. Given the short duration of the research and some of the volunteers brevity on the project, issues may not have fully developed or been acknowledged by some volunteers. Self-reporting of their experiences may have painted a broad picture and negated instances where the adaptation to the new environment and a new culture were challenging or frustrating.

As most interviewees mentioned, a deeper connection and friendship evolved with fellow volunteers. This information echos similar findings by Broad (2013) and S. Brown (2008) that also found relationships with co-volunteers as an emergent theme. Volunteers spent more time with each other than with staff or locals while on the project. The prevalence of spoken English language on the project by volunteers and staff, likely aided the native-English speakers’ sociocultural adaptation. During each week, volunteers did not appear to have significant contact with the staff while performing project work. Furthermore, unless volunteers were motivated to interact with staff members, interaction was minimal. This may account for the low number of
volunteers who participated in sports, but which Paul credited as a major outlet for interaction with locals.

The local staff seemed to understand English, even though they only spoke a few words. Within the group of volunteers, there were a certain number of individuals with a high proficiency in Spanish. Other volunteers, as well as the staff, used these individuals to translate messages. Arguably, most interviewees and volunteers appeared to know some basic Spanish. In North America, it is a more readily available language for study than in a country such as Australia (as Subject G mentioned). Spanish is spoken in numerous countries. The comfort level with Spanish by volunteers may have been higher than the less prevalent languages.

Both the American interviewees stated they used humor in their interactions with the local staff. Observations reveal that other volunteers rarely used this skill in their communication with the staff. Humor may be more of a personality choice; however, it may also be more appropriate in American culture than other cultures represented on this project.

Volunteers and staff also used translation, heavily, as a means to communicate. It would have been interesting to note how well the staff communicated if Luz were not present. Perhaps, Diego would have translated more or selected another volunteer to relay messages. Volunteers also relied heavily on Luz for translation. As Subject H mentioned, she became "lazy." Subject D also stated how easy it was to run to Luz. However, if Luz were not there, it seems practical to assume that someone in the volunteer group would have had a higher proficiency in Spanish and found they were in a similar circumstance. This brings up an interesting topic of communicative practices at volunteer sites in general.
Participating as a volunteer in the project’s environment most likely furthered the volunteers’ ability to adapt. Friendships with fellow volunteers were instant, as noted by several interviewees. In addition, volunteers traveled in groups on the weekends, which not only solidified bonds but also provided added comfort in an unfamiliar country. Interviewees did not seem to have a problem communicating with other locals outside of the project. As Subject I stated, most volunteers traveled together on the weekends and tended to remain in touristy areas. Subject G mentioned she traveled with Subject E, who had a high degree of fluency in Spanish.

The consensus among interviewees was they were able to make themselves understood. However, observation reveals that translators were often utilized. In addition, volunteers were hesitant to engage in conversation with the staff. Again, Subject H was the only interviewee to respond negatively to this question, which again highlights how critical she may have been in answering the question.

One possible reason for the low interaction, especially by volunteers, could be attributed to lack of motivation. Unlike previously mentioned research (Matthews, 2008; Conran, 2011, and Chen & Chen, 2011), none of the volunteers cited interacting with the local people as a motivating factor in their decision to volunteer abroad. Instead, volunteers were interested in traveling to Peru and working on the type of project offered, archaeology. Subject I stated she would determine her next volunteer project according to the next country she wants to visit. It seems that volunteers were motivated by and interested in visiting a specific country. After determining the country, volunteers then selected a project within that country.

Many of the interviewees enjoyed their interactions with the children. Some of the interviewees stated that it was easier and less stressful because communication with children is
simple. Though volunteers enjoyed playing with the children, it does beg the question whether it was meaningful interaction. Interaction with children may not provide the best type of interchange for friendships or meaningful conversations. As Subject F implied, playing with children is universal and a language is not necessarily required. Subject H was the only interviewee to answer negatively on whether or not she had meaningful conversations or interactions with locals. Her answer, again, may have been more thought through than responses from the other interviewees.

The project seemed to draw educated, financially stable individuals. This could be related to the cost involved in volunteering abroad. A majority of volunteers tended to be young. Though no one reported a requirement in performing volunteer work abroad, there may be a trend in the younger generation to spend summers "doing something" that could add experience to their college application or resume.

It may be a trend in travel to join volunteer projects in order to meet and travel with other people. Every weekend volunteers traveled with other volunteers to sightsee. There were no observations of volunteers traveling independently around the country. Though many of the interviewees returned home after their participation on the project, it was not uncommon for volunteers to continue traveling together (e.g., Luz and Bella). Volunteering abroad may be a vehicle in which a home base and a social network are available for independent travelers.

Furthermore, it may be another common trend for those on extended travel to add volunteer work to their itineraries. As mentioned in the research, Subject G, Subject D, and Subject H were on extended travels. Subject D was actually using this experience to "test" her ability to travel alone.
Observation also highlights the type of people that may be drawn to this kind of work or sojourn. Most volunteers seemed positive and happy. Though the work may have been strenuous, there was little complaint. To maintain a positive attitude in the situation while working through issues is a skill set the volunteers commonly utilized.

If interactions were so low, then why did interviewees believe they had established friendships with the locals? The mere presence of local staff members may have provided enough of an authentic feel for volunteers to think them connected. In addition, repeated interaction (though minimal), likely made volunteers feel they knew the staff. The staff sufficiently cared for the volunteers’ needs.

As mentioned by Subject F, he interacted almost entirely with staff while he was ill. The simple act of preparing tea for a volunteer who is not feeling well also highlights power inequalities. Volunteers may have viewed staff in a subservient manner. As Subject H noted, there was a clear division in the roles of the "working" staff and volunteers. Staff took care of volunteer needs and meals. Additionally, both the current and previous supervisors on the project were not Peruvian. Though the supervisors had some level of proficiency in Spanish, it is difficult to surmise whether local staffs were in a position to offer opinions or suggestions for the program. If such unequal power hierarchies continue unaddressed, the inequality of subservient staff may be perpetuated, as observed and warned by Sin (2010) in his study.

**The Volunteer Organization's Role and Suggestions**

The company offered an intranet site with information about the country, project, etc. It also had a Facebook page that all Peruvian volunteers could access. Subject I was aware of the
community days, but other interviewees stated they did not know that was part of the project work. Subject I and the other volunteers also mentioned their discontentment with the off-site coordinator who provided little insight about the project.

Reported preparation for the trip was minimal. Subject A and Subject C had roughly six months to a year to prepare for the trip, but did not take the initiative to do much. Subject C stated that she did research, but the depth of research is questionable. Volunteers, who sign up ahead of time, should be encouraged to take language courses and provided adequate information about the project.

Tomazos and Butler (2009) encourages that companies have a selective process for admittance of volunteers to projects. This particular company should also review and revise its pre-departure information to offer more in terms of intercultural training. This may help curb situations like the unfortunate writing on the wall by Subject B. In addition, intercultural training and education could aid volunteers to process their experiences and contribute in an effort to alleviate the power imbalance. Though the volunteer organization should neither be responsible nor held accountable for all volunteer actions while abroad, the company can profoundly influence the success of its program and of its volunteers.

Several volunteers mentioned experiencing anxiety while en-route to Peru. This data could be beneficial for companies with volunteers traveling alone and could provide support during their journeys. Subject F was also confused about his travel out of the country that he booked through the company. Subject F left the second week while Paul was absent. Ensuring that there is a contact person when essential staff is away could eliminate miscommunication.
Another observation was that the high school group that was there for the first week caused division among volunteers. As noted earlier, the volunteers outside of the high school group did not care for the additional persons on the project. As noted, the high school group's chaperon was absent. Paul, the volunteer supervisor, did little to alleviate tensions or facilitate group cohesion. In fact, Paul did not have much of a presence outside of volunteer work. This freedom may have allowed the high school group to act out, misbehave, and drink though underage. The number of volunteers was drastically increased by the presence of the high school group. As a result, volunteers were assigned to varying groups and had less archaeological site time.

When the high school group departed, the dynamic on the project changed. Several volunteers stated they were not aware that there would be a high school group joining the project. If attempts are not made to meld the groups in the future, then the company should reconsider how to handle this situation. Perhaps it would be best to keep age groups separated or at least inform older volunteers of a high school group's participation, so they are not caught off guard. It would also be advisable to have a chaperone with the high school group at all times. This person could assist in building cohesiveness among the age groups. Again, company communication with volunteers could help alleviate tension and resolve simple issues.

As noted in the study by S. Brown (2008), the presence of diversity was not enough to stimulate cross-cultural adaptation or interaction because participants tended to stay within their own groups. A few interviewees conceded that they interacted more with fellow native-English volunteers than volunteers from other countries. In addition, interviewees felt a barrier existed between volunteers and staff.
Two other outlets that provided for volunteer and staff bonding were bonfires and sports. However, there was very little initiative by the staff to facilitate any meaningful interaction. Neither did the volunteers avail themselves of opportunities to interact. The volunteer organization could schedule more activities in an effort to bring about overall group cohesion, which might also alleviate divides between high school groups and other volunteers, as well as with staff members.

Volunteers seemed to enjoy the counting activity with Adam. That was the only interaction outside of volunteer work to bring the group together. There were many festivals and holidays during the two-week study. Volunteers were allowed to participate in these events, but were merely dropped off in town.

Planned activities outside of volunteer work could help engage the local staff with volunteers. Quality interaction does not simply happen. As mentioned earlier, volunteers are in a privileged position and the nature of their relationship with staff and with locals should be addressed. Companies/volunteer organizations should put forth the effort to create an environment conducive to intercultural exchange by the volunteers, the staff, and the locals. Hammersley (2013) urges the importance of building relationships through volunteering, rather than the completion of project tasks.

Several volunteers became ill during their stay. There were no instructions for how to properly utilize the project tools while working. When Bella fainted, no medical attention was provided. These instances highlight safety concerns that the company should address. While it is common for people to become ill when they travel, preventive measures by the company could reduce the numbers of frequent occurrences and ensure volunteer safety.
The mid-trip check-in procedure should also be re-evaluated by the company. There was no opportunity for engagement by the volunteers. Open-ended questions with the opportunity to elaborate should be emphasized. Volunteers should be made comfortable and to feel they can discuss issues. Paul may have treated it like a standardized operation, but it is a great opportunity for staff to learn about their volunteers and take an interest in their wellbeing. Though this group did not seem to have discontentment or issues with the staff or work, if done correctly, engaging the volunteers more could prevent conflicts in the future and ensure that volunteers have a rewarding experience.

Within the community, the company seemed to have good standing. Subject F noted issues within volunteer tourism and felt confident in his decision to work with this company. The project work did not directly interact with community except on days when the volunteers went into schools. There is a need for more data from individuals directly affected by volunteers’ presence in school and/or around town. It is important to note, the internet cafe and local shops likely see an increase in revenue from volunteer spending. If the company wishes to have a stronger bond with the community, perhaps they could consider having volunteers work with teachers and not only with the younger children. A change of structure with community engagement could help facilitate better opportunities for both volunteers and the locals in the community.

Additional Recommendations

Volunteer companies should consider incorporating the service learning approach into their volunteer projects. As mentioned earlier by Papi (2012), a benefit to this approach is that
volunteers learn through training and reflection and "empathy learning." Empathy sets volunteers in a learning position; one where they can better understand cultural aspects and differences within a host country. This approach also helps to off-set the unequal power structure that is sometimes present in volunteer tourism. Instead of volunteers teaching locals the "right" way to do things or merely completing the projects, the volunteers are there to learn from the locals and expand their own understanding of the world.

Volunteer tourism attempts to aid complex developmental issues. A continuous flow of groups entering communities without a proper plan can sometimes leave those communities reliant upon the tourism industry, rather than establishing their own sustainable development and infrastructure. Though the relationship may seem short-term as a volunteer, the presence of the company in the area is long lasting. A philosophical change in volunteer tourism can help not only volunteers, but ultimately aid in progress within the host countries.

When this approach is taken, volunteers will begin to build relationships with locals (Hammersley, 2013). In this study, relationship building with the local community was a missing component. The development of relationships among volunteers and local communities should be paramount. A change in mindset of the volunteers would have been advantageous in this study, because volunteers could have worked more closely with local staff. As an example, volunteers could have potentially worked with the kitchen staff and engaged in such daily duties as food preparation. If these two groups had worked together in the kitchen, it would have not only added to the volunteers' cultural experience, but established better overall relationships between volunteers and staff. Additionally, this addresses any power inequalities or subservient feelings by either party.
Another recommendation deserving further examination is pre-departure training. Many of the volunteers in this study noted a lack of pre-departure training. Companies should re-evaluate their programs. If lacking in volunteers' pre-travel preparations, they should incorporate more resources and provide the needed training ahead of projects' start dates. For example, better language skills would have greatly diminished the over reliance on English, which I observed during this study. Volunteers could have felt more confident and been more comfortable when engaging staff and locals in conversation. In turn, this would have built stronger and better relationships. And as Tomazos and Butler (2009) have mentioned, companies should be selective in the volunteers admitted to the programs. No interviewees in this study expressed much of a desire to interact with locals. This could have been related to a volunteer project that focused on archaeology. However, motivational factors for volunteering should be evaluated by companies, and they should ensure volunteers are cognizant and prepared for the specifics of any volunteer project. The organization of pre-departure training may be expensive; however, companies could provide an intranet for its volunteers that is rich in resources, language training, etc.

In addition to training its volunteers, companies should engage with the communities to ensure open communication and to encourage dialog about the progress of projects. With the rapid growth in short-term volunteer tourism, it is likely that most volunteers remain in a community less than a month. However, the companies' roles within communities and the frequency of their volunteer groups throughout the duration of the projects will be constant. Sustainable development should be a goal of the communities and volunteer companies, as well. Once a level of success is attained, it should be determined by the community whether the resources provided by volunteer projects are still needed there. The communities may know that
volunteer projects could better serve elsewhere, and this is another reason communication is vital between the companies and the communities. An enhanced mutual understanding will decrease an over reliance upon volunteerism and the miscommunication between communities and volunteers.

Cultural Differences

Interviewees noted cultural differences during their stay in Peru. There was the scenario with the older woman and the guinea pig and of Javier sharing beer with volunteers outside his shop. While it may seem odd to pick up another person’s food or offer the same glass to everyone for a drink, the personal boundary space varies in other countries. Subject C mentioned how frequently children sat on her and were not shy. She was also surprised at how readily parents allow their children to play and engage with strangers. Children of communities where volunteer projects take place may be more adapted to foreigners. This could contribute to the children's "un-shy" or “out-going” nature more than a difference in culture.

During the two-weeks on the project, many festivals took place. It seemed most every week there was a holiday or occasion for celebration. Peruvians love ceremonies and observe an abundance of regional and national holidays (Ferreira & Dargent-Chamot, 2003). During these events, there was evidence the volunteers were respectful of local customs. Subject G made sure not to discard the guinea pig in the trash, and Subject D was careful not to take photos without asking. This highlights that volunteers were cognizant of social norms while in the country.

All interviewees commented about how warm and welcoming the people of Peru seemed. Staff at the volunteer project were also noted as warm and welcoming. These findings are
consistent with Barbieri, Santos, and Katusbe's (2012) research in Rwanda; though there may have been a language barrier, the volunteers, the staff, and the locals were able to work together.

The good-naturedness and hospitality felt by the volunteers are qualities of the Peruvians (Ferreira & Dargent-Chamot, 2003). The friendliness of the people no doubt aided volunteers in their sociocultural adaptation in this foreign land. It was not unusual to walk down the street and hear people greet you with "buenos dias" (translation: good day). This custom is quite different from the native-English speaking countries from which the interviewees originated. There were several occasions where it appeared the locals attempted to engage the volunteers.

The Peruvian people have a long history, and their history has defined their identity and culture. Peru has separate regions within the country with differing customs and characteristics for each region. Interestingly, the Peruvian term "metizaje" is similar to the idea of "melting pot" for the United States (Ferreira & Dargent-Chamot, 2003). Peruvians are accepting of people of varying ethnic backgrounds and differences.

Interviewing the locals and staff would help identify communicative and adaptation issues that may present amongst volunteers, the staff, and the company. It was difficult to discern whether the staff were naturally reserved, were simply quieter around the volunteers, or whether there was a cultural reservation. This may also illuminate why staff appeared to rely heavily on Luz for translation purposes. Perhaps they did not feel comfortable speaking to the volunteers in English. This action, however, could be the barrier that interviewees spoke about between local staff and themselves. It may also highlight a communication inadequacy where local staff did not feel they could approach volunteers with problems (such as the rice incident). Though volunteers may not be cognizant of these types of factors or of the effect of their ability or inability to
communicate or adapt in this environment, the local staff may themselves have issues that are not readily observable.

Other Interesting Insights

Subject B wrote a very short but lewd statement on the wall. Though it was an inside joke among current volunteers from that high school group, the message is easily misconstrued. Future volunteers will have no inkling of the joke, and offense can easily be taken from the wording. With the hundreds of scribbles and drawings, no one else took aim at other countries. Unfortunately, this joke is no laughing matter. It is a poor representation of the United States and is outright disrespectful. Subject A admitted taking intercultural training courses the previous summer. Though he did not write the message, it is unfortunate that he did not feel the need to change it. Future volunteers from the U.S. will no doubt have to answer for the statement or face equally lewd statements about the U.S. on the walls of the volunteer house. It was a decision that will no doubt have repercussions in the minds of future volunteers. Adequate training, especially in preparation of the trip, could eliminate this type of behavior.

Volunteers from non-native English countries also expressed a desire to improve their English while on the project. The prevalence of English on this volunteer project may indicate a larger trend in volunteer tourism. People may be using volunteer tourism as a means to improve their English speaking skill and not necessarily the host national’s language.
Future Research and Considerations

The actual volunteer work at this project did not ultimately offer the best scenario for interactions between volunteers and staff. During the two weeks, only one local staff member was normally paired with each work group. The work was usually independent. In addition, staff disappeared quite often and left volunteers to themselves. Excavations, when allowed by the Ministry, may offer greater opportunities for volunteers and staff to work together. However, gaining access to volunteer sites with more community based work may help enlighten communication studies, specifically.

During the two-weeks on the project, the work was atypical. Future research should consider a longer stay to more fully understand the inter-workings of a volunteer site. More time on the project could also increase the number of interviews. Obtaining data from the staff and locals would also help illuminate the situation and give a voice to the often-neglected host nationals in current research. It may also be interesting to include non-native English speaking volunteers in the data to gain a deeper understanding of a volunteer's adaptation in general.

This research highlights issues with qualitative work. For example, the wording of interview questions made it difficult to gauge what each interviewee interpreted as "meaningful conversations" or "friendship." Though most interviewees relayed they would most likely not stay in contact with locals, some mentioned they are Facebook friends with Diego. Does a Facebook friendship equate to bona fide friendship? This question is also applicable to friendships formed among fellow volunteers. Subject F and Subject H both admitted to failing to remain in contact with people regardless of whether volunteers or locals. Does proximity to local people and a basic conversation equate to meaningful exchange? In responding to these
questions, volunteers interpreted their own experiences and rated their own level of social interaction. Observation helped ensure the information was accurate; however, a researcher cannot be everywhere at once. It did not appear that volunteers were interacting heavily with the local staff, but it was difficult to note all interactions, especially those outside of the project.

Future researchers should consider revising the interview questions to ensure interviewees' understanding and a common base line of interpretation of the questions posed. Including a definition of "meaningful" or "friendship" may help return data that are more precise. Interestingly, interviewees from North America tended to "rate" their experience on a 1-10 point scale. Rewording this question also may help refine the data.

Limitations to the data and its analysis should be noted. This was a case study for a specific project over a two-week period. Only native-English speakers were included as interviewees and their responses analyzed for this research. No other coders were participants in this study, nor were the interviewees contacted for respondent validation. Future research, with longer observation period and established rapport with volunteers, should consider incorporating this type of rigor. In addition, at least two researchers (or more) at the site could establish investigator triangulation and corroborate findings. A researcher who is an outside coder and has little or no time in the field, could prove problematic for reliability in coding.

CONCLUSION

Volunteer tourism is flourishing. As evidenced by this research, volunteers are committing to short-term projects. Many of the interviewees in this project did not take the
initiative to prepare for their trip or to learn the language. This highlights the communicative issues that arise when volunteers sojourn in another country (often in rural areas) to work.

This study found that volunteers had little issue with sociocultural adaptation. Many of the interviewees and volunteers did not cite any major issues or hurdles while in Peru. Most of the volunteers were well traveled and educated. Actual homesickness episodes were neither reported by interviewees nor observed among volunteers. Overall, interviewees and volunteers felt welcomed in the country. Interviewees cited the environment and cleanliness in the country to be major adjustments.

In terms of communication, techniques used by volunteers included non-verbal communication and translation. However, many of the experiences and interactions of volunteers could be deemed superficial. English was widely spoken by volunteers and at the project site. As discussed earlier, the project did not initiate a deep connection with the local staff or community. Interviewees noted that they tended to interact more with fellow volunteers. Interestingly, none of the volunteers on this specific project mentioned a desire to connect with host nationals, which has been a common motivational factor in prior volunteer tourism research. Many of the volunteers selected this project because it was different or because they had an interest in archaeology. This may be a contributing factor as to why volunteers did not seem motivated to interact with locals.

Volunteer tourism can provide wonderful intercultural interactions, which can correct misconceptions and raise awareness of global issues such as inequalities (Ooi & Laing, 2010). The company should re-examine its procedures and work itineraries to both inspire and facilitate relationships between volunteers and locals. A delicate balance needs to be reached in which
volunteer project participants should not undermine the value of or create tension among locals (Raymond & Hall, 2008). To facilitate this process, companies need to have a communicative dialogue with host countries and have meaningful projects (H. Sin, 2010). Importance should be placed on building relationships of understanding, and not just the physical completion of an actual project (Hammersley, 2013).

Volunteer companies play a vital role. Building understanding and relationships are arguably the most important factors in volunteer tourism (Hammeresley, 2013). Companies should also provide opportunities for interaction and exchange between volunteers and the host community (Raymond & Hall, 2008). This specific company could facilitate better projects and activities to connect the volunteers with the local community. In addition, better facilitation at the project could bring about volunteer and staff engagement and interaction.

Tomazos and Butler (2009) concluded in their study on volunteer tourism that organizations should offer some level of training before allowing volunteers to enter the field. Volunteer companies should operate responsible programs, as cross-cultural understanding is not automatic and does not simply happen (Raymond & Hall, 2008). As discussed earlier, the company could better educate its volunteers prior to their arrival in the country. This educational approach would ensure that volunteers are not reinforcing cultural stereotypes or power hierarchies (Hammersley, 2013). Educating volunteers within the country should also occur. This project had leisure time that the company could fill with cultural classes or activities. Additionally, better community outreach could promote cultural understanding. Companies should also follow up with volunteers after their departure from the project.
Can qualitative inquiry add to the body of knowledge on sociocultural adaptation? Definitely. Each form of inquiry has its advantages and disadvantages. Ethnographers are finding that tourism is an important aspect in the lives of people they study and a contributing factor in transforming cultures (Burns, 2004). As stated before, over time qualitative work can reveal patterns and produce theory.

Though this study is not generalizable, it should help inform future research. Including host nationals in future interviews would help expand the data on volunteer tourism. It would also unearth many invisible cultural-specific concepts to help volunteers in understanding a country’s culture.

Examining the phenomena of sociocultural adaptation in volunteer tourism is a challenging endeavor. Perhaps collecting qualitative data will result in a general theory in time. Though much can be done to facilitate great intercultural communication and relationships, the experiences are the individuals’, especially in the case of volunteers. Building an understanding of how people communicate interculturally will forge a bridge between our differences. H. Sin (2010) was repeatedly asked during her study whether volunteer tourism was good, to which she replied:

It really depends. On one hand, it does provide some aid and I suppose that is better than nothing at all. Also, something intrinsic in my heart tells me not to stamp down hard on many volunteer tourists’ goodwill and genuine desire to do something about the unfair world they see. It is perhaps important not to tip over to the other critical extreme of assuming that nothing works and heading the temptation to strike off any value in innovative ideas such as volunteer tourism. (p.990)
Whatever each person's motivations for doing volunteer tourism, their actions are commendable. Volunteer tourism shows no signs of slowing down. Regardless of whether it is right or wrong, understanding communicative aspects in this type of tourism can ensure that everyone puts their best foot forward in trying to bridge the cultural gaps of this world.
Appendix A
Interview Questions

General Questions

1. Gender: ______________________________________________________________

2. Age: _________________________________________________________________

3. Career/Education level:________________________________________________

4. Have you visited this place before? How many times?_____________________

5. Are you traveling alone?______________________________________________

6. What is your primary language?________________________________________

7. Do you speak any other languages?_____________________________________

8. Have you traveled abroad or lived abroad before? Where and length of stays?

Interview Questions

1. Why did you decide to volunteer abroad? (General prompt - motivation, continuing travel? Was monetary limitations a consideration?)

2. How did you feel going abroad? (i.e., emotions: nervous, excited, etc.) Did you undergo intercultural training, language courses, or research of the country visited before departing? (General Pre-departure preparation prompt)

3. Did you engage in meaningful conversations with local people and/or develop, social interactions? How often did you interact? (i.e., shopping, eating, leisure activities, etc.)

4. Do you feel you were able to make yourself understood? How? (i.e., did you speak their language or use English, could you work effectively, was reading or writing a factor, etc.)
5. Do you feel you were able to establish friendships or relationships with the locals? (i.e., understand humor, do you think you will maintain friendships?)

6. Did you feel accepted or as an outsider/discriminated against during your stay? (i.e., did you witness any attitudes toward foreigners, safety issues, etc.)

7. Did you socialize with the other volunteers or native-English speakers? Do you feel those interactions were more meaningful than those made with locals?

8. How often did you communicate with someone from home? What was the method of communication? (i.e., any homesickness)

9. Looking back, what are the main things that you adjusted/adapted to while in the new country? (i.e., climate/environment, community, transportation, food, customs, religion, language, rules, clothes, styles, attitudes, social norms)

10. Overall, how would you rate your experience abroad? Is there anything that could have improved your experience?

11. Would you like to share other comments or additional information?
### Theme Analysis Codebook for Interview Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Examples from Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. Motivation to volunteer</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (1) Country-specific&lt;br&gt; - (2) Subject-specific (Archaeology)&lt;br&gt; - (3) Culture/Learn/Volunteer&lt;br&gt; - (4) Something to do&lt;br&gt; - (5) Test yourself&lt;br&gt; - (6) Travel&lt;br&gt; - (7) Travel Differently</td>
<td>1: &quot;I wanted to go to Machu Picchu&quot; (C)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;...I was interested in Archaeology&quot; (E)&lt;br&gt; 3: &quot;...Understanding...cultures important&quot; (A)&lt;br&gt; 4: &quot;...do something with my summer&quot; (B)&lt;br&gt; 5: &quot;...see if I could do it...&quot; (D)&lt;br&gt; 6: &quot;I haven't been abroad... in a while&quot; (F)&lt;br&gt; 7: &quot;...another way of traveling...&quot; (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.1 Monetary considerations</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (1) Scholarship&lt;br&gt; - (2) Present&lt;br&gt; - (3) Personal Money</td>
<td>1: &quot;I had a scholarship...&quot; (A)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;...from my nan...trust fund&quot; (D)&lt;br&gt; 3: &quot;...saving since...14...&quot; (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2. Pre-departure prep</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (0) None&lt;br&gt; - (1) Spanish/Language training&lt;br&gt; - (2) Independent research</td>
<td>0: &quot;I didn't really do anything to prepare...&quot; (E)&lt;br&gt; 1: &quot;14 weeks of Spanish courses&quot; (D)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;I did a bit of research&quot; (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3. Tried to engage with locals</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (1) Agreed/Actively tried&lt;br&gt; - (2) Somewhat agreed&lt;br&gt; - (3) Disagreed</td>
<td>1: &quot;I put myself in position to talk...&quot; (A)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;I think sometimes, yeah...&quot; (C)&lt;br&gt; 3: &quot;I haven't, no...&quot; (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4. Able to make oneself understood</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (1) Agreed&lt;br&gt; - (2) Somewhat Agreed</td>
<td>1: &quot;... It was fine...&quot; (E)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;I think I could...&quot; (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5. Establish friendships with locals</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (1) Agreed and will attempt to stay in contact&lt;br&gt; - (2) Agreed and will not stay in contact</td>
<td>1: &quot;I'll probably Facebook... send something&quot; (G)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;... I don't think so...&quot; (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6. Experienced discrimination/outsider</strong>&lt;br&gt; - (0) None&lt;br&gt; - (1) Outsider&lt;br&gt; - (2) Discrimination</td>
<td>1: &quot;No, weirdly...&quot; (D)&lt;br&gt; 2: &quot;I always feel like an outsider...&quot; (H)&lt;br&gt; 3: &quot;...two different prices...&quot; (I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q7. Interaction with fellow volunteers | 1: "Language...nothing to do.. who I talk to..." (I)  
- (2) More native-English volunteers  
2: "...more... the English speaking countries" (F) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7.1 Fellow volunteers vs. Local interaction</td>
<td>1: &quot;...yeah very much so.&quot; (H)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q8. Communication home | 1: "I'd say five times a week..." (D)  
- (2) Weekly  
2: "Once on the weekend..." (G)  
- (3) Social media  
3: "I've been on Facebook..." (I)  
- (4) Email  
4: "I emailed my mom..." (C)  
- (5) Phone call  
5: "I had to call my mum..." (F)  
- (6) Texting  
6: "iMessage my mom..." (A) |
| Q8.1 Homesickness | 0: "No." (B)  
1: "...only when I was ill..." (D) |
| Q9. Major adjustments | 1: "...the biting insects..." (E)  
- (2) Hygiene/cleanliness  
2: "...the basic...hygiene situation" (I)  
- (3) Language  
3: "I guess language is the biggest one..." (G)  
- (4) Food  
4: "...the starchy food..." (D)  
- (5) Volunteering  
5: "...more the exercise..." (D) |
| Q10. Overall experience | 1: "...it was good, really good..." (E)  
- (2) Self rated on a 1-10 scale  
2: "...ten out of ten, for sure..." (A) |
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