

ABSTRACT

HOFFMAN, ASHLEY J. Examining Predictors of Short-Term Humanitarian Aid Volunteer Effectiveness. (Under the direction of Dr. Lori Foster Thompson).

“Voluntourism” refers to volunteer opportunities individuals pursue for the purposes of both serving the greater good and experiencing a different culture. Voluntourists are often selected and trained based on the personal experiences of a trip leader rather than through rigorous, evidence-based methodologies respected in the organizational sciences. This leaves voluntourist programs and the communities they serve open to potential harm from unfit voluntourists who may engage in irresponsible or even destructive behaviors during a trip. To better understand the motivational and dispositional nature of the voluntourist, the current study sought to provide insights into voluntourists’ individual differences and motives, and how those differences related to a voluntourist’s self-ratings of his or her task performance and volunteer-related organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs).

133 voluntourists who had engaged in a voluntourist trip outside of their home setting or culture within the last 12 months answered questions about their personal traits (adaptability, social responsibility, altruism, stress tolerance, and cultural competence), motives for volunteering (values, career, social, understanding, enhancement, and protective; Clary, et al., 1998), and their own performance on assignment.

Results showed volunteers with less self-centered motives (volunteering because of one’s own values or in an attempt to understand other cultures) and more networking-based motives exhibited more helping behaviors (OCBs) during their experience as compared to peers with more self-centered motives (career, enhancement, and protective). An ability to understand and experience new cultures, or cultural competence, was related to OCBs, in addition to positively predicting task performance. Significant relationships were also found

between self-reported task performance and social responsibility, as well as all 6 motives for volunteering. Finally, positive correlations were identified between self-reported OCBs and altruism, and values, social, understanding, enhancement, and protective motives.

This study suggests that voluntourist organizations who wish to engage volunteers who exhibit better task performance and OCBs should consider additional focus on the cultural competency of participants, both through selection and training of volunteers. If a prominent concern of the organization is task performance, participants who are socially responsible should be given consideration. However, if a voluntourism program wishes to engage volunteers who engage in more OCBs, they should identify volunteers with values, understanding, or social motives for volunteering, as well as those volunteers who are more altruistic.

© Copyright 2017 by Ashley Hoffman

All Rights Reserved

Examining Predictors of Short-Term Humanitarian Aid Volunteer Effectiveness

by
Ashley J. Hoffman

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Raleigh, North Carolina
2017

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Lori Foster Thompson
Committee Chair

Dr. Adam Meade

Dr. Samuel B. Pond, III

Dr. S. Bartholomew Craig

DEDICATION

For Grandma Nebergall—because you never fail to ask me if “that thing is done yet.” Now it is, Grandma!

BIOGRAPHY

Ashley Hoffman is a student in the Industrial/Organizational Psychology program, which she entered in the fall of 2007. Ashley completed her undergraduate degree at Heidelberg University, a small liberal arts college nestled in the farmland of Northwest Ohio. Upon graduation, Ashley moved to North Carolina, where she happily resided for 9 years. She spent her time outside of school investing in her community through work with Crosspointe Church in Cary, where she lead worship and volunteered with children's and student ministries. She is a member of the Global Organisation for Humanitarian Work Psychology, and was the Executive Board chairperson from 2014-2016. Ashley is currently employed by Amtrak, where she is a Talent Management Process Manager, and works to improve Talent Assessment processes and procedures. Ashley has a passion for volunteering, particularly with homeless populations, and loves testing new hobbies, such as growing houseplants, being crafty, and cooking superior meals.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to Lori Foster for her continued encouragement and excitement about this research, and to my committee members (Adam Meade, Bob Pond, and Bart Craig) for their consistent backing through my graduate career. Further thanks to my colleagues (Sean Gasperson, Alex Gloss, Emery Clayton, and Inusah Abdul-Nasiru) for slogging through piles of articles to support this research, and the spectacular membership of the Global Organisation for Humanitarian Work Psychology for your boundless optimism and inspiration. I'm proud to represent you! And, of course, thanks Mom, Dad, and GTV!

The additional list of people to which I owe a debt of gratitude is long—3 decades worth of individuals investing in my life has returned a larger prize than I deserve. This is in honor of all of you; may I never take it for granted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
Introduction.....	1
Method	16
Results	22
Discussion.....	24
Limitations and Future Research.....	28
Practical Implications	31
Conclusion	32
References	34
Appendices.....	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1, Sample mean differences	43
Table 2, Study variables descriptive statistics	44
Table 3, Correlations among study variables.....	45
Table 4, Summary of relationships between predictors and self-assessed task performance and OCBs.....	47
Table 5, Regression of volunteer motives on self-assessed task performance	48
Table 6, Regression of volunteer motives on self-assessed citizenship behavior effectiveness	49

Introduction

Short-term volunteers remain an essential piece of the distribution of humanitarian aid. Often, short-term volunteers are university students engaging in alternative break programs, church members who participate in sponsored mission trips, or simply socially conscious individuals wishing to provide volunteer service. Humanitarian aid organizations have relied heavily on the free labor provided by such volunteers to complete their programs. Yet, many have encountered the negative aspects of using short-term volunteers. In particular, short-term volunteers may not provide the highest caliber of effectiveness, and may, in fact, undermine the goals of the organization that sponsors such volunteers, the goals of the community being served, and go against the best practices associated with humanitarian aid delivery.

Because many of the issues related to short-term volunteer effectiveness are linked to volunteer behaviors, applied research paradigms from the organizational sciences are ideally suited to address the problem at hand. The application of such paradigms is consistent with a growing movement in the psychological sciences, Humanitarian Work Psychology (HWP; Berry, Reichman, Klobas, MacLachlan, Hui, & Carr, 2011; Lefkowitz, 2014; O'Neill Berry, Maynard, & McWha-Hermann, 2016). HWP entails research and the application of Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology principles to humanitarian aid work; for example: training evaluation, leadership development, and assessment and selection programs. Consistent with this movement, the current study seeks to identify individual characteristics that contribute to short-term volunteer effectiveness in order to improve the quality of short-term volunteer aid.

In comparison to many humanitarian aid topics, the general volunteerism literature tends to have a more robust body of publications. Previous literature has focused on volunteer recruitment (e.g., Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Peterson, 2004), medical aid workers (e.g., DeCamp, 2011; Green, Green, Scandlyn, & Kestler, 2009), cross-cultural considerations (e.g., Sherraden, Lough, & McBride, 2008), corporate social responsibility (e.g., Berens, van Riel, & van Rekom, 2007), and volunteer tourism, or “voluntourism” (e.g., Atkins, 2011; Barbieri, Santos & Katsube, 2011). As short-term volunteers are the core of the current study, the topic of voluntourism is of particular interest. Voluntourists are short-term volunteers who are participating in opportunities for the purpose of both helping others, as well as the travel and tourism benefits (Wearing, 2001). However, despite these economic and developmental benefits, there is a body of literature that posits voluntourism may do harm to the very communities humanitarian aid projects are created to assist (e.g., Guttentag, 2009). For example, Ivan Illich (1968) pointed out the lack of training and preparation for cross-cultural volunteers more than 45 years ago. More recently, Guttentag (2009) summarized the voluntourism literature and concluded that while there has been a steady increase in the occurrence of voluntourism trips, the quality of work provided by such voluntourists has not improved.

As voluntourism will likely continue, it is imperative to avoid mobilizing people who may have difficulty handling the pressure of crisis situations and may put themselves and others at risk. Prior research in this vein has focused on the attitudes and perceptions held by disaster relief volunteers (Hui, Zhou, Chan, Zhang, & Fan, 2013). Hui and colleagues (2013) studied individuals who responded to an earthquake to provide recovery and relief services in

an attempt to identify predictors of personal pride in one's contributions, satisfaction, burnout, and emotional exhaustion. Hui et al. (2013) found positive correlations among resilience, satisfaction and personal accomplishment, a positive correlation between adaptability and personal accomplishment, as well as a negative correlation between resilience and emotional exhaustion.

The current study similarly tested a variety of predictors, but expanded the outcome of interest to include a different set of perceptions. Rather than looking at feelings of personal accomplishment generally, this study focuses on volunteers' perceptions of their own work effectiveness, both task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs). This addition builds on the work of Hui and colleagues (2013) and will serve to increase our understanding of how voluntourists perceive their service experiences. Additionally, the current study focused more broadly on any voluntourist who traveled outside of his or her home culture, rather than a sample of disaster relief workers, and studied a United States based sample, rather than the Asian sample and context Hui et al. considered. This expansion tests a valuable set of contributors, as well as additional outcome measures, to aid in our understanding of voluntourist performance, which may be useful across many types of short-term volunteer contexts.

As noted, the current study identified voluntourists who served outside of their home culture. In cross-cultural research, there has been an assumption that operating outside of one's country of origin can be used as a proxy for cultural differences (e.g., Adler & Gundersen, 2008). Yet, recent research suggests culture is often equally or more varied within a country than between countries (Taras, Steel, & Kirkman, 2016). Thus, while short-

term voluntourists may operate within their home countries or abroad, those venturing outside of their own cultural norms arguably face unique challenges compared to those volunteering in their local region. These challenges, such as different time zones, new cuisines, language barriers, or unfamiliar cultural norms, could lead to negative reactions, depending on the psychological makeup of the volunteer. This places a high priority on understanding the distinct factors that contribute to or inhibit the effectiveness of volunteers working outside of their home culture so the potential negative impact of volunteers can be mitigated.

Voluntourist performance

As voluntourist effectiveness is the primary focus of the current study, it is important to consider how to conceptualize such behavior. Within the social sciences, effectiveness is often assessed using self-reported perceptions, in areas such as leadership development (e.g., Cardno & Youngs, 2013), stress management (e.g., Clunies-Ross, Little, & Kienhuis, 2008), experiences of racism (e.g., Paradies, 2006), and overall psychological well-being (e.g., Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008). In the humanitarian aid domain, effectiveness can be operationalized in many ways. This study looks at two aspects of effectiveness: task performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs).

A paramount concern for humanitarian work psychologists is effective accomplishment of the defined tasks of short-term volunteers, as well as the volunteers' contributions to the overall success of the trip, and aid to the community. In its purest form, task performance refers to actions that an individual executes in either the creation or maintenance of a product (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). In short-term trips, it is common to

see tasks related to community outreach, construction projects, or child engagement and education programs. While the exact tasks being conducted vary greatly depending on the trip initiatives, a general measure of performance is possible. That is, items regarding the extent to which workers believe they engage in the tasks required, as well as how effectively they perform these tasks, and behaviors such as timeliness, attention-to-detail, and adherence to project guidelines can be used to assess success (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are also important in the assessment of volunteer effectiveness. Typically, OCBs are defined as actions that provide a benefit to an organization psychologically or socially, unrelated to explicit job tasks (Motowidlo, 2003). While the measurement of task performance refers to whether tasks were completed properly or not, the measurement of OCBs requires volunteers to assess the way they conduct themselves in matters unrelated to the tasks required for their assignment, and the related perceptions of oneself as a good teammate. For example, OCBs could involve someone assisting a teammate without being asked to do so, or going beyond requirements to ensure the team runs smoothly. General indices of OCBs in the context of short-term voluntourism include things like working extra hours on something not required, lending a hand to teammates needing assistance, and consideration for rules and property.

Stable volunteer characteristics

With the performance domain established, it is next important to pinpoint which volunteer knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) distinguish effective voluntourists from their lower-performing counterparts. Such characteristics can be divided into two categories: those that are stable traits within the individual, and those that are more

malleable or changeable over time. Stable volunteer characteristics are those that are not easily changed or developed through an intervention such as training, such as aspects of one's personality.

Adaptability. Adaptability refers to people's ability to be flexible in their approach to work and allow for changes to occur without being too rigid in their response to such change (Morrison & Hall, 2002; Ployhart & Bliese, 2006; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Distinct behaviors related to adaptability include: creative problem solving, dealing with unpredictable situations, learning tasks and technologies, and demonstrating interpersonal and physical flexibility (Pulakos et al., 2000). While previous work has posited that adaptability *should* be related to voluntourist performance in developing settings (e.g., MacLachlan & Carr, 1999; Ng, Chan, & Hui, 2012) there has been little research testing this proposition. Hui and colleagues (2013) studied volunteers who responded to the disaster relief need during the Sichuan earthquake in 2008. They found that adaptability was positively related to desirable self-perceptions, notably volunteers' feelings of personal accomplishment. The current study will expand upon those findings to examine the relationship between adaptability and organizational citizenship behaviors.

It would stand to reason that adaptability might be contextually relevant because of the ever-changing nature of assignments in developing settings, which is where most voluntourism takes place. Previous research supports the link between adaptability and the task-related behaviors of employees during times of change or trauma (Parent & Leavitt, 2009). However, adaptability in the context of a volunteer trip would likely be manifested in the tasks that fall outside of the assignment requirements – that is, citizenship behaviors –

due to the unpredictable nature of the environmental and interpersonal challenges in these settings. As such, it is often the situation that fluctuates during short-term volunteer work, while the required tasks remain well defined and concrete, with far less demand for adaptive behavior. This contention is supported by a systematic review of traits relevant to voluntourist effectiveness (Hoffman, Gloss, Clayton, Abdul-Nasiru, & Gasperson, 2013). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant positive relationship between adaptability and self-assessed OCBs.

Social responsibility. Previous research has indicated the importance of focusing on the social and environmental welfare of people in relation to the effectiveness of volunteers (e.g., Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Horn, 2012; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Twenge, Campbell & Freeman, 2012). In particular, people who exhibit socially responsible behaviors care about the well-being of others and work hard to exhibit integrity in every situation. Studies have found that socially responsible traits are related to service participation in a humanitarian aid organization (Horn, 2012), and are positively related to volunteer satisfaction and commitment to the cause (Craig-Lees, et al., 2008). As with the aforementioned predictors, social responsibility has not been studied in the context of voluntourist performance, as identified by a systematic review conducted to identify gaps in the literature (Hoffman, et al., 2013). However, due to the nature of social responsibility, it is likely that volunteers who are more committed to the cause will be more motivated to complete assigned tasks successfully. Therefore, the following hypothesis will be investigated:

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant positive relationship between social responsibility and self-assessed task performance.

Altruism. A variety of research studies hint at the importance of characteristics such as compassion and concern for others during volunteerism and service (e.g., Craig-Lees, Harris & Lau, 2008; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005; Penner, 2002). Research has found that altruistic traits contribute to individual differences in concern for others (Twenge, et al., 2012), particularly in employees working in service professions. As altruism inherently describes compassion and understanding directed toward other people even at the cost of effort or potential risk on the part of the volunteer, it seems that this trait should be related to actions performed outside of one's prescribed role, especially if the action provides an opportunity to assist someone in need. Therefore:

Hypothesis 3: There will be a significant positive relationship between altruism and self-assessed OCBs.

Stress tolerance. Stress tolerance (resilience) has been defined as the characteristic that allows people to either be resilient in the face of stressful situations, or to have high self-efficacy regarding their ability to deal with stress that they may encounter (Izutsu, Tsutsumi, Asukai, Kurita, & Kawamura, 2004). Previous research related to stress tolerance has centered on the health and human service fields in an attempt to define effective coping mechanisms (e.g., Potter, Vujanovic, Marshall-Berenz, Bernstein, & Bonn-Miller, 2011). However, stress tolerance as a predictor of success in a humanitarian aid setting has been investigated far less. Hui and colleagues (2013) studied people with high resilience levels, and noted their subsequent resistance to psychological harm in highly distressful, or

negatively stressful, situations. The study found that resilience was positively related to feelings of personal accomplishment, as well as volunteer satisfaction. Additionally, resilience was negatively related to self-reported emotional exhaustion. The current study will extend this investigation to performance outcomes.

From a variety of studies, it is clear the negative impacts of a highly stressful environment can be dangerous to people, particularly when the stress is due to perceptions of difficult interpersonal relationships, an excess of requirements, or lack of resources (e.g., Garel & Asquin, 2010; Kua, Tian, Lai, & Ko, 1989; Watkins, Pittman, & Walsh, 2013). These perceived stressors have been found to greatly impede the effectiveness of an employee in completing his or her tasks. However, while individual differences such as anxiety and hostility have shown negative relationships with effectiveness in a stressful environment (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986), there has been no work conducted to study the relationship between general stress tolerance and task performance in volunteer settings (Hoffman, et al., 2013). The current study proposes that people who have a higher tolerance for the inherent stress of working in an unfamiliar environment with a variety of unique stressors will be more successful at engaging in tasks related to their assignment as a short-term volunteer. This is expected because those volunteers who exhibit a great deal of stress tolerance should be able to adjust more easily to their new surroundings, allowing them to focus on completing specified tasks during the limited duration of the trip without becoming overwhelmed or experiencing psychological distress.

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant positive relationship between stress tolerance and self-assessed task performance.

In addition, it would seem that people who are more capable of tolerating highly stressful situations will also have greater capacity to identify opportunities and engage in helpful activities not related to their assigned tasks, as well as the bandwidth to perform these actions.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be a significant positive relationship between stress tolerance and self-assessed OCBs.

Motives for volunteering. Each volunteer may experience measurably different underlying attitudes that induce the action of volunteering. For example, volunteers' motives could be related to gaining experience relevant to their occupation, or to the fact that the opportunity enables them to act out their personal values. While volunteer motives may not neatly fit into the paradigm of a trait-based characteristic, there is some consensus that motives are a reflection of innate attitudes (e.g., Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). Researchers in the domain of volunteering have used the functional approach to motives, whereby different people engage in the same behaviors for a variety of reasons, and based on differing attitudes and values (Snyder, 1993). This approach aligns with work seeking to understand the motives of university students engaging in volunteer opportunities (Grönlund, et al., 2011). Grönlund and colleagues (2011) found that a sample of university students from multiple countries showed significant altruistic and value-driven motives to volunteer regardless of country of origin. In addition, students from the United States showed significantly higher levels of self-interested and ego based motives compared to students from the other countries studied, specifically Korea, Japan, and Finland. In an exploration of the motives of university students in thirteen countries, researchers determined that students

who resided in a more egalitarian setting tended to score higher on altruistic motives for volunteerism, while students from more individualistic cultures scored higher on utilitarian motives, such as the benefit of résumé building that could result from the volunteer experience. What remains unknown is whether one's motive or reason for volunteering has any bearing on the effectiveness of the voluntourist; for example, do volunteers who serve for "selfish" purposes exhibit significantly higher or lower levels of task-related and citizenship behaviors than those volunteering because of more altruistic reasons?

Clary and colleagues (1998) have examined how to quantify the motives of volunteers. Specifically, they developed a measure of volunteer motives called the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI). The VFI was developed to assess certain factors related to volunteer motives, including: personal values; career goals; social motives; understanding of a new perspective; enhancement of one's self-worth; and protection from one's personal problems. Each motive is characterized by a unique way of thinking. Volunteers motivated by *personal values* tend to express altruistic intentions and a great deal of concern for others. *Career goal motives* are expressed by volunteers who engage in opportunities to enhance skills or perform tasks related to the volunteer's career. A volunteer who is motivated by *social motives* is concerned with the chance to make connections with other people, typically in a setting that is viewed favorably by society at large. *Understanding of a new perspective* motivates volunteers who want to gain new knowledge, or practice the skills they already possess. This includes learning more about a cause through hands-on experiences, or obtaining a new perspective about a cause or group of people. When a volunteer requires positive growth and development of the ego, generally related to one's self-worth, the

volunteer is likely motivated by *enhancement of one's self-worth*. Finally, the *protection from one's personal problems* can be a motivator by allowing a way for the volunteer to avoid negative aspects of his or her personal life while providing a more positive focus for the volunteer.

After a thorough development of the VFI, Clary et al. (1998) measured the motivation of a group of volunteers in order to predict volunteer satisfaction; they also conducted an additional study using motivation to predict commitment of volunteers. Results indicated that volunteers who worked in positions with benefits functionally related to their motivational type (e.g., volunteers motivated by enhancement of self-worth who work in jobs where self-worth was affirmed) were more satisfied. Additionally, volunteers who worked in positions that were highly relevant to their motives were more likely to continue to volunteer with the organization, both short- and long-term. However, previous research has neglected to study the relationship between these volunteer motives and the perceived effectiveness of voluntourists. One study conducted by Rogelberg and colleagues (2010) investigated the relationship between volunteer motives and outcomes such as volunteer commitment. Yet, the inclusion of performance appears infrequent in volunteer motives research. It is reasonable to expect that people who possess more of any given motive will have a stronger desire to be on assignment and will direct greater intensity of effort and persistence toward volunteer opportunities compared to those less motivated, thereby outperforming their less-motivated counterparts. Therefore, volunteer motives will be assessed in the current study using the VFI in order to investigate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 5: There will be a significant positive relationship between personal values motive and (H5a) self-assessed task performance and (H5b) self-assessed OCBs.

Hypothesis 6: There will be a significant positive relationship between career motive and (H6a) self-assessed task performance and (H6b) self-assessed OCBs.

Hypothesis 7: There will be a significant positive relationship between social motive and (H7a) self-assessed task performance and (H7b) self-assessed OCBs.

Hypothesis 8: There will be a significant positive relationship between understanding motive and (H8a) self-assessed task performance and (H8b) self-assessed OCBs.

Hypothesis 9: There will be a significant positive relationship between enhancement motive and (H9a) self-assessed task performance and (H9b) self-assessed OCBs.

Hypothesis 10: There will be a significant positive relationship between protective motive and (H10a) self-assessed task performance and (H10b) self-assessed OCBs.

While one previous study found that motives are related to the performance of volunteers (Newnam, Newton, & McGregor-Lowndes, 2009), there is still a dearth of research regarding the unique contributions that each motive provides in the energy and effort of voluntourists. Therefore, the current study seeks to understand the specific influence

that each motive has on both task performance and OCBs, not only in isolation, but also in combination.

Research question 1: Do the 6 volunteer motives uniquely contribute to (RQ1a) self-assessed task performance and (RQ1b) self-reported OCBs when considered alongside the other motives?

Malleable volunteer characteristic

In addition to more stable traits and innate attitude outlined above, it is worth considering more malleable characteristics that can impact the performance of voluntourists, particularly those who are working in cultures outside of their home environment. Cultural competence in particular warrants investigation, as it is a likely contributor to perceived volunteer effectiveness, and a skill that can be developed through training.

Cultural competence. Cultural competence refers to the ability of a volunteer to understand and respond appropriately to differences in culture. These cultural differences may exist because of volunteer work that takes place in a different country, but there is also evidence to support the variation of culture within countries (Taras, Steel, & Kirkman, 2016), leading to cross-cultural experiences for any volunteer venturing outside his or her home culture. For example, a middle-class or affluent volunteer from the Midwestern United States working in an impoverished community in the Appalachian region of the Eastern United States is arguably working cross-culturally, spanning both socio-economic and geographical boundaries and their associated norms, history, and traditions. Cultural competence is therefore important to many volunteers, and includes respect for traditions, language barriers, and other cultural differences (Culhane, Reid, Crepeau, & McDonald, 2012), as well as

adaptation to cultures different from one's home culture (Bowman & Roysircar, 2011). Cultural competence is often studied in military settings (e.g., Gabrenya, Moukarzel, Pomerance, Griffith, & Deaton, 2011), as soldiers are typically required to interact with cultures very different from their home cultures. A study by Ang and colleagues (2007) found that the ability of international managers to apply cultural intelligence was a significant predictor of success during a peer-assessed task simulation. However, while cultural competence has been related to factors such as ease of adjustment in development workers (McFarlane, 2004), the relationship between cultural competence and volunteers' perceptions of task performance and OCBs in a short-term volunteer setting has yet to be tested. In all likelihood, individuals who are adept in navigating general cultural differences will be more successful in all aspects of volunteering conducted across cultural contexts, including both task-related and citizenship behaviors. This type of competence would seem to translate into volunteers who spend less time and energy negotiating cultural intricacies, and devote far more time to task-related and citizenship behaviors, despite new or different circumstances. This behavior is especially desirable in the case of short-term voluntourist efforts, as the work being done is often subject to restrictive time constraints. As such, organizations would benefit from voluntourists who could overcome situations overwhelmingly different from their normal circumstances in order to complete tasks within the time allotted.

In addition to the proposed desirability of culturally competent voluntourists involved in short-term trips, it is also reasonable to believe that the behaviors reflective of cultural competence are trainable- that is, learning about, understanding, and acting

appropriately in relation to a culture different from one's own is something a voluntourist could be taught to do, rather than simply being born with the innate trait. The learned behaviors, then, should lead to distinct differences in the effectiveness of said voluntourists. This study's final set of hypotheses may therefore provide insight into possible training avenues for improving voluntourist effectiveness:

Hypothesis 11a: There will be a significant positive relationship between cultural competence and self-assessed task performance.

Hypothesis 11b: There will be a significant positive relationship between cultural competence and self-assessed OCBs.

Method

Sample

As outlined in the research proposal that preceded this study (Appendix A), participants ($N=133$) were drawn from the internet site Mechanical Turk ($N=10$) as well as two universities in the southeastern United States ($N=123$) that provided opportunities for students to participate in short-term breaks during university closures such as fall and spring breaks. Table 1 shows the results of a t-test of independent samples, indicating the two samples did not exhibit significantly different mean levels of the predictor and criterion variables included in this study.

Each participant had recent experience on a short-term volunteer trip, having engaged in a trip that lasted less than 1 year within the 12 months preceding this study. The type of project varied, including but not limited to disaster and crisis relief, construction projects, educational and childcare initiatives, healthcare, water relief, or other community and

international development projects. Participants ranged from 18 to 38 years of age. They all participated in volunteer opportunities outside of their home culture, regardless of whether the trip was domestic (59%) or abroad (41%). The sample was 52% female, with 56% of participants indicating Caucasian as their race. Half of participants had completed at least a portion of a 4-year degree, while 51% reported Christianity as their religious affiliation.

Table 2 shows additional descriptive statistics pertaining to the sample.

Design

The study included the assessment of 11 predictors and 2 outcomes related to voluntourist effectiveness. The predictors were adaptability, social responsibility, altruism, stress tolerance, volunteer motives (personal values; career goals; social motives; understanding of a new perspective; enhancement of one's self-worth; and protection from one's personal problems), and cultural competence. The two outcomes studied were self-reported task performance and self-reported OCBs.

Procedure

A letter explaining the current study was sent to organizations and universities that coordinate short-term voluntourist trips, as well as posted on the website Mechanical Turk (MTurk). Participants' email addresses were requested from the aforementioned organizations and universities, and were gathered from the primary investigator's personal network. Potential participants received an email detailing the project, and a link to the internet-based survey, hosted on the online survey platform, Qualtrics. Those who chose to participate in the study by clicking on the link were directed to an informed consent page, followed by a page of instructions for completing the survey after giving consent.

Participants were then screened to ensure they had participated in a voluntourist experience within the last year, and were specifically screened to ensure those who simply volunteered locally were not included in the study. Those who indicated no participation in a voluntourist trip, including those whose recent experience was limited to local volunteering, were directed to a page explaining the reason they were removed from the study and thanking them for their time. Additionally, participants who accessed the study via MTurk were screened through the MTurk website for previous successful task completion ratings over 95%, as well as fluency in English, and a US-based location.

Those who met all screening criteria were then directed to the survey, which began by asking the type of voluntourist experience respondents had and the name of the organization with which they volunteered. The survey then moved into the predictor and outcome questions. Participants were presented with seven pages, averaging twenty items per page, asking about each of the predictors, followed by two pages of an average of ten items each related to their task performance and OCBs. Finally, participants were asked ten demographic questions, and upon completion, were directed to a generic webpage thanking them for their time and responses. The average time spent by participants to complete the entire survey was approximately one hour.

Measures

Each of the following measures was completed by the voluntourist, using a 5-point Likert-type scale with response options ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) unless otherwise indicated.

Adaptability (8 items; $\alpha = .62$). Adaptability was assessed using items from Goldberg's (1999) International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). An example item is, "I adapt easily to new situations."

Social responsibility (7 items; $\alpha = .61$). Social responsibility was measured using a subscale from the Prosocial Personality Battery (Penner, 2002). An example item is "No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them."

Altruism (5 items; $\alpha = .70$). Altruism was measured using a subscale from the Prosocial Personality Battery (Penner, 2002). An example item is "I have helped carry a stranger's belongings." It is important to note that with both the social responsibility scale, and the altruism scale, the response options were altered from a frequency response to a Likert-type agree-disagree scale. This alteration was made to enable consistency in response scales across constructs, in order to ease the cognitive burden on respondents who were being asked to complete a relatively long survey. However, this change may have contributed to lower-than-desired alpha levels for the social responsibility scale, which fell at or below the commonly accepted minimum of .7 (George & Mallery, 2003).

Stress tolerance (15 items; $\alpha = .90$). Stress tolerance was assessed using the Distress Tolerance Scale (Simon & Gaher, 2005). This scale includes items such as "Feeling distressed or upset is unbearable to me."

Motives (30 items). Motives were assessed using the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, et al., 1998). The VFI includes 6 factors (values, 5 items, $\alpha = .85$, "*I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself*;" career, 5 items, $\alpha = .86$, "*I can make new contacts that might help my business or career*;" social, 5 items, $\alpha = .85$, "*My friends volunteer*;"

understanding, 5 items, $\alpha = .85$, “*I can learn more about the cause for which I am working;*” enhancement, 5 items, $\alpha = .83$, “*Volunteering makes me feel important;*” and protective, 5 items, $\alpha = .84$, “*No matter how I’ve been feeling, volunteering helps me forget about it;*”) used to determine the functional motives of volunteers – that is, the reason for which respondents engage in volunteer projects. Participants used 1 (*not at all important/inaccurate*) to 5 (*extremely important/accurate*) Likert-type scale to respond to these items. They received a score on each of these 6 scales independently, rather than receiving a single overall motive score.

Cultural competence (20 items; $\alpha = .92$). The Cultural Intelligence Scale was used to assess cultural competence (CQS; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009). The CQS consists of 4 subscales, including metacognitive cultural intelligence, cognitive cultural intelligence, motivational cultural intelligence, and behavioral intelligence. Researchers have found that these 4 subscales can be equally weighted and averaged into a single assessment that covers a full range of the content domain of cultural competence; as such, the items were combined to provide a single score of cultural competence. Items include specific references to understanding both thoughts and motives related to cultural interaction, such as “I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.”

Demographic questions (8 items). In addition, demographic questions were asked, including age, gender, race, education level, and the option of disclosing religious affiliation, volunteer experience prior to the most recent trip, and details of the trip, such as length, organizational affiliation, and location.

Task performance (7 items; $\alpha = .95$). Task performance was rated using a short inventory based on Williams and Anderson's (1991) work in the performance domain. This inventory was adapted to reflect a self-assessment of task performance for volunteers, asking volunteers to assess their own behaviors as they think their leader would have rated it on the trip. A score was calculated to provide an overall task performance score for the voluntourist. This scale included items such as "My leader would say I fulfilled responsibilities as specified by my team leader."

OCBs (12 items; $\alpha = .98$). OCBs were assessed with items also based on William and Anderson's (1991) work, again revised to reflect the context of volunteer effectiveness and the perception of the volunteer. This measure included items such as "My leader would say I went out of the way to help teammates."

It should be noted that while self-assessments do not provide a full picture of performance, for the purposes of voluntourist performance, they do contribute to our understanding of the behaviors of individuals engaging on voluntourism trips. Previous research has indicated that self-assessments can provide insight into individual performance, and self-assessments of performance have been compared to other-reported performance, with meta-analytic results indicating outcomes that are similar or in the same direction for each group (e.g., Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008). In addition, the framing of the performance items in the current study functioned as a prompt for reflection of how one's leader would assess the individual's performance, rather than simply asking the individual to rate his or her own actions. This distinction arguably made the self-assessment more congruent with performance ratings, as the items required more than a simple reaction or

perception, and instead encouraged the voluntourist to engage in perspective taking and consider a more objective assessment of his or her own behaviors. Finally, self-reporting OCBs is considered a fairly acceptable practice, as it is often difficult for others to accurately assess the quantity and quality of OCBs someone else has completed because these behaviors are often done in private or without formal recognition (Illies, Fulmer, Spiztmuller, & Johnson, 2009). For the purposes of this study, it could be argued the same observational limitations are present related to both the task performance and OCBs of the voluntourists, given that often teams are geographically distributed during their voluntourist experiences, and, as such, team leaders lack opportunities to observe the task performance of voluntourists, thus limiting accuracy in appraisal ratings. Therefore, the current study posits that the use of self-reported performance assessments, while not without limitations, is both valid and theoretically appropriate in the context of voluntourism.

Results

To study the hypotheses and research questions, both correlations and linear regression analyses were calculated. Specifically, 19 correlational analyses and 2 regression analyses were run. Correlations were conducted to study the bivariate relationships between task performance and social responsibility (H2), stress tolerance (H4a), and cultural competence (H11a). Additionally, correlations were calculated for the relationship between OCBs and adaptability (H1), altruism (H3), stress tolerance (H4b), and cultural competence (H11b). Finally, correlations were run to test the relationships between task performance and motive types (H5a-10a), as well as OCBs and motive type (H5b-10b). Finally, regression

coefficients were calculated to determine whether each of the motives uniquely contributed to task performance (RQ1a) and OCBs (RQ1b) when considered alongside the other motives.

Descriptive statistics for all study variables appear in Table 1. Skewness and kurtosis were examined, and all study measures fell within the appropriate range (± 2 ; George & Mallery, 2010). Both correlation and regression analyses were run twice – first without a control variable, and second controlling for sample source (university sample vs. MTurk). As the pattern of results was the same with and without the control variable, the correlations (Table 3) and regression analyses (Tables 5 and 6) are presented without the control variable for the sake of simplicity and readability. A summary of significant correlations is provided in Table 4.

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, there was no support for the hypothesis that adaptability and OCBs were related (Hypothesis 1: Not Supported). Social responsibility was positively related to task performance (Hypothesis 2: Supported), and altruism was positively related to OCBs (Hypothesis 3: Supported). Stress tolerance was related to neither self-assessed task performance (Hypothesis 4a: Not Supported) nor OCBs (Hypothesis 4b: Not Supported), while cultural competence had a significant positive relationship with both task (Hypothesis 11a: Supported) and OCBs (Hypothesis 11b: Supported). In addition, there were positive correlations between task performance and all 6 motive types (Hypotheses 5a-10a: Supported), as well as positive relationships between OCBs and 5 of the 6 motive types, with everything except for career motives (Hypothesis 7b: Not supported) showing a significant bivariate relationship with self-rated OCBs (Hypotheses 5b-6b and 8b-10b: Supported). As shown in Table 5, a regression analysis was conducted to examine Research Question 1a.

Self-rated task performance was regressed onto the six motive types, resulting in a significant model ($R^2=0.15$, $p=.004$). However, none of the motive types in the model reached statistical significance. A similar analysis was conducted to examine Research Question 1b (Table 6), again resulting in a significant model whereby the six motive types together accounted for 55% of the variance in self-rated OCBs ($R^2=0.55$, $p<.001$). An examination of the individual regression coefficients indicated that values motives contributed uniquely to OCBs ($p=.02$), as did social ($p=.02$) and understanding ($p=.04$) motives.

Discussion

Voluntourist effectiveness is an understudied, yet critical component of the disbursement of humanitarian aid and hence development. As such, defining the relationship between individual characteristics and effectiveness is valuable to both voluntourists and sending organizations. The current study sought to provide further insight into the individual differences that may be important in the performance outcomes of short-term volunteers during trips outside of their home context. Given the dearth of voluntourist research examining performance as an outcome, this study's methods were carefully devised to capture self-assessments of both in-role (task) and extra-role (OCB) aspects of effectiveness, thereby bringing an important distinction commonly made in the scientific literature on paid work to the emerging literature on voluntourism.

As hypothesized, variation in social responsibility and altruism predicted differences in task performance and OCBs respectively, indicating that voluntourists who were more socially responsible believed their leader would say they exhibited more effective task-related behaviors, while those who were more altruistic perceived themselves as engaging in

more citizenship behaviors. This pattern makes conceptual sense in that social responsibility has an integrity component that should be related to fulfilling prescribed task-related duties while on a volunteer assignment. Meanwhile, altruism is other-oriented by definition, which conceptually relates to the motivation to step in and help others in the form of OCB. Not only is this pattern of results theoretically interesting, it also lends confidence to the meaningfulness of the criterion measures employed in this research.

Results showed that voluntourists who had higher levels of cultural competence tended to rate themselves as engaging in higher levels of both task-related and citizenship behaviors. Presumably, people with lower levels of cultural competence must expend a greater amount of effort, energy, and attention navigating and negotiating the unfamiliar culture, and rectifying any blunders they may be responsible for. Such time and energy could otherwise be spent performing one's duties or helping teammates, which those higher in cultural competence may have greater bandwidth to do.

The analyses of volunteer motives provided a rich narrative about the way that motives factor into volunteer effectiveness, offering a new and unique contribution to both the OCB and volunteer motive literatures, which have not been adequately integrated previously. Nearly every motive, when considered on its own, predicted self-assessments of task performance and citizenship behaviors. When considered in tandem, values motives uniquely predicted OCBs, as did social and understanding motives, while the other three motives (career, enhancement, and protective) did not reach statistical significance.

Practically, this means that people who take a volunteer trip because of their personal values and beliefs are more likely to perceive themselves as engaging in citizenship on the trip. The

same is true for those who volunteered because of social factors, and in an attempt to gain “understanding” in the parlance of the VFI, which includes the desire to learn how to deal with a variety of people, learn more about the cause the volunteer trip centers on, and gain a new perspective. This pattern of significant results is especially notable when considered within the context of OCBs. In the current study, OCBs were conceptualized as tasks whereby a volunteer would help others around them without being asked, take a personal interest in teammates, or maintain order through following informal rules and considering and protecting organizational property. As such, it makes theoretical sense that those motives tied to other-oriented behaviors, social experiences, and learning would also be statistically linked to OCBs. This outcome is also particularly meaningful because relative to the motives that did not reach significance in the regression analysis, the three significant motives tend to be less self-centered or more other-oriented in nature. The motives that did not show significant relationships with OCBs tend to be motives that are more ego-driven: protecting one’s ego from life’s difficulties (protective motives); improving one’s own career prospects (career motives), and developing one’s ego (enhancement motive). Past research (Stukas, Worth, Clary & Snyder, 2009) has suggested that outcomes are maximized when a work assignment allows volunteers to fulfill motives that are important to them. Opportunities for OCB during a volunteer trip align better with some volunteers’ motives than others, resulting in performance differences on this important outcome variable. Conventional wisdom holds that it is better to recruit and select volunteers who are “in it for others” rather than “in it for themselves.” The results of this study simultaneously challenge and support that contention. When all volunteer motives were analyzed together, there were no significant differences

between the more and less ego-driven volunteers' self-reports of core duty performance. However, this study suggests that it is perhaps better to engage less ego-driven volunteers for volunteer projects that require high levels of OCB to succeed.

The current study provides a unique contribution specifically to the OCB literature, as this is the first-ever study to link volunteer motives specifically to OCB in the context of a volunteer trip. Previous research related to citizenship behaviors largely focuses on actions related to prosocial behaviors in paid work roles; that is, tasks that are beneficial to colleagues and the organization, but that are not concretely specified in the job description (Motowidlo, 2003). In the paid work context in which OCB research is typically conducted, a distinction is sometimes made between OCBs that are directed toward individuals (OCB-I), or the organization (OCB-O; Finkelstein, 2006). Such a distinction perhaps implies different motivations on the part of the worker. The current study examines motives directly, shedding new light on the underpinnings of OCB in a volunteer setting.

Previous research found a significant relationship between resilience and the outcome of feelings of personal accomplishment (Hui, et al., 2013). Yet, the current study found no significant relationship between the similar construct of stress tolerance and either task-related or citizenship behaviors. In addition, Hui and colleagues (2013) found a significant relationship between adaptability and personal accomplishment, while the current study found no significant relationship between adaptability and OCBs. These findings are particularly interesting to note in light of the specific outcomes voluntourist programs may be concerned with during or after a trip. That is, if a voluntourist organization is concerned more with the personal feelings of pride and accomplishment of voluntourists after a trip, perhaps

these organizations would be best served by recruiting and selecting individuals higher in adaptability and resilience. If the organization is interested in the effectiveness of voluntourists during the trip, these characteristics may not be as important to assess, while other characteristics such as cultural competence could be more useful. This contention presumes, of course, that this study's non-significant findings pertaining to stress tolerance and adaptability reflect reality and not a Type II error.

Limitations and Future Research

While the results of the study indicated some interesting and meaningful relationships, there also were limitations that should be addressed. The sample was a combination sample of university students from two universities who had embarked on a school-sponsored short-term volunteer trip and a small Mechanical Turk (MTurk) sample. While previous research has indicated the viability of an MTurk sample (e.g., Behrend, Sharek, Meade, & Wiebe, 2011), there is always a general concern about the viability of such data. The survey was also quite extensive, requiring participants to commit around one hour of time to completing the instrument, which may have led to fatigue, less robust responses, and careless responding (e.g., Berry, et al., 1992).

Another limitation is the use of a performance measure that was a generic self-report of performance. While post-trip self-reports can be useful for research, (e.g., Gilboa et al., 2008), applied researchers working in a setting where performance feedback needs to be delivered to volunteers may benefit from a customized effectiveness assessment that measures outcomes specific to the unique trips in which the volunteers are engaged. Additionally, there are questions about the accuracy of self-assessments of performance,

which are necessarily subjective in nature. Meta-analytic research has indicated that self-reports of performance are similar in strength and direction to other-rated performance (Gilboa, et al., 2008), yet there continues to be speculation surrounding the limitations of self-reported performance measures. Perhaps the limitations in this study are somewhat mitigated by the fact that the voluntourists were asked to rate their own performance from their leaders' perspective, rather than comparing themselves to a fellow teammate. Nevertheless, future research should consider the ramifications of self-reported performance measures in a voluntourist setting and seek to replicate the results of this study using performance assessments from other sources such as teammates, team leaders, or trip leaders.

From an applied research standpoint, using self-assessments of effectiveness is a more accessible, faster, and cheaper way to collect outcome data. This can be especially helpful for organizations that (a) aspire to be data-driven, engaging in applied research and evidenced-based decision making, yet (b) lack the time and funds typically required for a more comprehensive, multi-source performance assessment. This is important to point out because many volunteer sending organizations are not-for-profit and resource constrained. The findings of this study indicate that an individual's stable and malleable characteristics are indeed related to self-reports of his or her own task-related and citizenship behavior effectiveness. In other words, conceptually sound patterns of results were discovered, thus lending some credence to the continued use of self-assessments of performance in future research under the right circumstances.

Additionally, by requiring volunteers to reflect on their own behavior as they believe a leader would have rated them on the trip, the voluntourist was encouraged to consider his

or her own contributions to both task-related and non-task aspects of the trip, which may have encouraged self-reflection on the part of the voluntourist. This, in turn, has the potential to change the voluntourist's behavior should he or she engage in another trip in the future. This type of reflection aligns with the "re-entry" process of many volunteer organizations, where voluntourists are required to reflect and grow from their experiences by considering their own contributions to the trip, both from a task-related and citizenship perspective. By adapting a performance measure to assess voluntourists' perceptions of their own behavior, the tool can be used as a practical measure to guide debriefing efforts of organizations and individuals after the experience has ended in a way that other-rated effectiveness measures might not be able to do as productively. Future research should test the effects of post-trip self-assessments of performance on personal growth and development both as a stand-alone event, and as part of a guided debriefing exercise.

Due to the correlational design of the current study, an additional limitation is the inability to assume causality. As such, directionality of the relationships identified in this study cannot be inferred. While it is unlikely that self-assessed performance would shape the individual differences outlined in this study, it is possible that a third variable could be influencing the relationships. Future research should include external ratings of performance in order to mitigate this limitation.

There were two scales (adaptability and social responsibility) that exhibited reliability estimates below the acceptable threshold of .7 (George & Mallery, 2003). As such, the results including the constructs of adaptability and social responsibility should be cautiously

interpreted, as measurement error may have limited these scales' ability to detect significant relationships.

Finally, the VFI (Clary, et al., 1998) has been analyzed using different approaches in a variety of studies (e.g., Okun, & Schultz, 2003; Penner, et al., 2005; Stukas, Snyder, & Clary, 1999). The current study treated each motive as independent within each person, and each person could display multiple motives in equal measure simultaneously. While treating each motive as independent is consistent with past research and provided valuable information about the impact that each motive has on performance, future research could also study motive profiles. With a sufficient sample size, motives could be analyzed to determine whether meaningful clusters or profiles of motives occur amongst a sample of volunteers. Such profiles could then be used to match voluntourists to volunteer opportunities in order to understand if the voluntourists' work performance, personal growth, and satisfaction can be maximized by placing volunteers into assignments that best match their personal motive profile.

Practical Implications

The current study has provided the basis for further research into the relationship between individual characteristics and voluntourist effectiveness. In addition, there are practical implications for voluntourist programs that have stemmed from findings of the current study. For example, the significant relationship between cultural competence and both self-assessed task performance and OCBs can be an important consideration for voluntourist training programs. As cultural competence is the sole malleable characteristic that warranted inclusion in this study, programs that use volunteers to complete projects

could capitalize on the relationship between cultural competence and effectiveness through training intended to improve the overall disbursement of aid. Such training programs could include instruction related to the nuances and traditions of the culture with which the voluntourist will engage, practice in communicating and interacting with people of other cultures, and any language skills needed to interact with the host community. It is likely, based on the findings of the current study, that voluntourists provided with these opportunities will be more effective at displaying both task-related and citizenship behaviors, particularly if the voluntourists feel as though the organization is investing in their success prior to the trip through proper preparation and training.

Conclusion

Voluntourism has become more prominent in recent years. As such, it is imperative that we continue to study and improve the quality of volunteer work to ensure the aid is meaningful and effective. At present, research on the impact that popular short-term volunteer trips have on both the volunteer and the community with which they liaise is scant. Many organizations are making decisions about trip participants based upon limited experience-based measures, anecdotal reports, and informal interviews. These trips, while potentially meaningful to volunteers, could cause long-term detriment in the communities to which voluntourists travel, and also may provide an even more transformative experience should the selection and training processes of voluntourists be informed by research and rigor. The Humanitarian Work Psychology (HWP) community has a great deal of work ahead to both study volunteers and convince voluntourist organizations to adopt evidence-based practices. The outcome of such pursuits could lead to an overall improvement in aid

and development procedures, and a long-term reduction in poverty globally by stimulating the more effective deployment and utilization of volunteer labor.

References

- Adler, N. J., & Gundersen, A. (2008). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. Mason, Ohio: Thomson/South-Western.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision-making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, *3*, 331–357.
- Atkins, S. G. (2011). Smartening-up voluntourism: SmartAid's expansion of the Personality-focused Performance Requirements Form (PPRF). *International Journal of Tourism Research*. *14*(4), 369-390.
- Barbieri, C., Santos, C.A., & Katsube, Y. (2011). Volunteer tourism: On-the-ground observations from Rwanda. *Tourism Management*, *33*, 509-516.
- Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W. & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, *43*, 1–14.
- Berens, G., van Riel, C.B.M., & van Rekom, J. (2007). The CSR-quality trade-off: When can corporate social responsibility and corporate ability compensate each other? *Journal of Business Ethics*. *74*, 233–252.
- Berry, M., Reichman, W., MacLachlan, M., Klobas, J., Hui, H. C., & Carr, S. C. (2011). Humanitarian Work Psychology: The Contributions of Organizational Psychology to Poverty Reduction. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *32*, 240-7.
- Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers' organizational commitment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 159-172.

- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowman, S., & Roysircar, G. (2011). Training and practice in trauma, catastrophes, and disaster counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 39(8), 1160-1181.
- Cardno, C., & Youngs, H. (2013). Leadership development for experienced New Zealand principals: Perceptions of effectiveness. *Educational Management Administration Leadership*, 41(3), 256-271.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74 (6), 1516 – 1530.
- Clunies-Ross, P., Little, E., & Kienhuis, M. (2008). Self-reported and actual use of proactive and reactive classroom management strategies and their relationship with teacher stress and student behavior. *Educational Psychology*, (28)6, 693-710.
- Craig-Lees, M., Harris, J., & Lau, W. (2008). The role of dispositional, organizational, and situational variables in volunteering. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 19, 1-24.
- Crandall, R. (1976). Validation of self-report measures using ratings by others. *Sociological Methods Research*, (4)3, 380-400.
- Culhane, E., Reid, P., Crepeau, L.J., & McDonald, D. (2012). Beyond frontiers: The role of cross-cultural competence in the military. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*. 50(1), 30-37.

- DeCamp, M. (2011). Ethical review of global short-term medical volunteerism. *HEC Forum*, 23, 91–103.
- Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Employment sector and volunteering. *Sociological Quarterly*, 47(1), 21-40.
- Finkelstein, M.A. (2006). Dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior: Motives, motive fulfillment, and role identify. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(6), 603-616.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr., Moukarzel, R. G., Pomerance, M.H., Griffith, H., & Deaton, J. (2011). A validation study of the Defense Language Office Framework for Cross-cultural Competence. Technical report, Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- Garel, G., & Asquin, A. (2010). When project-based management causes distress at work. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(2), 166-172.
doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.08.006
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). Using SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology*, 61, 227–271.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe*, Vol. 7 (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., & Gough, H. C. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of public-domain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84-96.
- Green, T., Green, H., Scandlyn, J., & Kestler, A. (2009). Perceptions of short-term medical volunteer work: a qualitative study in Guatemala. *Globalization and Health*, 5:4.
- Grönlund, H., Holmes, K., Kang, C., Cnaan, R., Handy, F., Brudney, J., et al. (2011). Cultural values and volunteering: A cross-cultural comparison of students' motivation to volunteer in 13 countries. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(2), 87–106.
- Guttentag, D. A. (2009). The possible negative impacts of volunteer tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11, 537–551. doi: 10.1002/jtr.727
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(4), 285-303.
- Hoffman, A.J., Gloss, A., Clayton, A., Abdul-Nasiru, I., & Gasperson, S. (2013). *Systematic review of predictors related to nonprofit worker and volunteer performance*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Horn, A.C. (2012). The cultivation of a prosocial value orientation through community service: an examination of organizational context, social facilitation, and duration. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 41(7), 948-968.
- Hui, C. H., Zhou, X., Chan, M. P. S., Zhang, X., & Fan, J. (2013). Assessing and placing disaster relief volunteers. In J. B. Olson-Buchanan, L. K. Bryan, & L. F. Thompson (Eds.), *Using I-O psychology for the greater good: Helping those who help others*. New York, NY: Routledge Academic.

- Ilies, R., Fulmer, I.S., Spiztmuller, M., & Johnson, M.D. (2009). Personality and citizenship behavior: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 945-959.
- Illich, I. (April 20, 1968). To hell with good intentions. Address at the Conference on InterAmerican Student Projects (CIASP) in Cuernavaca, Mexico.
- Izutsu, T., Tsutsumi, A., Asukai, N., Kurita, H., & Kawamura, N. (2004). Relationship between a traumatic life event and an alteration in stress response. *Stress and Health, 20*(2), 65-73.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163–204.
- Kua, E. H., Tian, C. S., Lai, L., & Ko, S. M. (1989). Work stress and mental distress. *Singapore Medical Journal, 30*(4), 343.
- Lefkowitz, J. (2014), Educating Industrial–Organizational Psychologists for Science, Practice, and Social Responsibility. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 7*: 38–44. doi: 10.1111/iops.12102
- MacLachlan, M., & Carr, S.C. (1999). The selection of international assignees for development work. *The Irish Journal of Psychology, 20*, 39-57.
- McFarlane, C. (2004). Risks associated with the psychological adjustment of humanitarian aid workers. *Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies, 2004*(1).
- Morrison, R., & Hall, D. (2002). Career adaptability. In *Multicultural Aspects of Counseling Series: Careers in and out of organizations*. (pp. 205-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781452231174.n7

- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(4), 618-629. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.618
- Motowidlo, S.J. (2003). Job Performance. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, R.J. Kilmoski, & I.B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology, Vol. 12: Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 39-53). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Newnam, S., Newton, C., & McGregor-Lowndes, M. (2009). Predicting the safety performance of volunteers: Does motivation for volunteering influence driving behavior? *Safety Science, 47*(8), 1090-1096.
- Ng, E., Chan, M.P.S., & Hui, C.H. (2012). Personnel psychology for disaster response and recovery. In S.C. Carr, M. McLachlan, & A. Furnham (Eds.) *Humanitarian Work Psychology*, (pp. 225-246). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Okun, M. A., & Schultz, A. (2003). Age and motives for volunteering: testing hypotheses derived from socioemotional selectivity theory. *Psychology and aging, 18*(2), 231.
- Omoto, A.M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J.D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality, 78*(6), 1703-1734.
- O'Neill Berry, M., Maynard, D. C., & McWha-Hermann, I. (2016). *Humanitarian Work Psychology and the Global Development Agenda : Case Studies and Interventions*. London: Routledge.
- Paradies, Y. (2006). A systematic review of empirical research on self-reported racism and health. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 35*(4), 888-901.

- Parent, J.D., & Levitt, K. (2009). Manager vs. employee perceptions of adaptability and work performance. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(4), 23.
- Penner, L. A. (2002). The causes of sustained volunteerism: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 447-468.
- Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., & Schroeder, D.A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56:365-392.
- Peterson, D.K. (2004). Recruitment strategies for encouraging participation in corporate volunteer programs. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 49:371–386.
- Ployhart, R.E., & Bliese, P.D. (2006), Individual Adaptability (I-ADAPT) Theory: Conceptualizing the antecedents, consequences, and measurement of individual differences in adaptability. In C.S. Burke, L.G. Pierce, E. Salas, (Eds.) adaptability: A prerequisite for effective performance within complex environments. Vol. 6 (pp.3-39). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Potter, C. M., Vujanovic, A. A., Marshall-Berenz, E. C., Bernstein, A., & Bonn-Miller, M.O. (2011). Posttraumatic stress and marijuana use coping motives: The mediating role of distress tolerance. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 25, 437-443.
- Pulakos, E.D., Arad, S., Donovan, M.A., & Plamondon, K.E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 612-624.
- Rogelberg, S. G., Allen, J. A., Conway, J. M., Goh, A., Currie, L., & McFarland, B. (2010). Employee experiences with volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 20:423–444.

- Sherraden, M.S., Lough, B., & McBride, A.M. (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *Voluntas*, *19*:395–421.
- Simon, J.S., & Gaher, R.M. (2005). The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motivation and Emotion*, *29*(2), 83-102.
- Smith, M., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and personality*. New York: Wiley.
- Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a “functional” personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 251–264.
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*(1): 138–161.
- Stukas, A. A., Snyder, M., & Clary, E. G. (1999). The effects of “mandatory volunteerism” on intentions to volunteer. *Psychological Science*, *10*(1), 59-64.
- Stukas, A.A., Worth, K.A., Clary, E.G., & Snyder, M. (2009). The matching of motivations to affordances in the volunteer environment: An index for assessing the impact of multiple matches on volunteer outcomes. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *38*(1), 5-28.
- Taras, V., Steel, P., & Kirkman, B.L. (2016). Does country equate with culture? Beyond geography in the search for cultural boundaries. *Management International Review*, *56*(4), 455-487.
- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, W.K., & Freeman, E.C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults’ life goals, concern for others and civic orientation, 1966-2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(5), 1045-1062.

- Van Dyne, L. Ang, S., & Koh, C.K.S. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development. In M.A. Moodian (Ed.) *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Watkins, D. C., Pittman, C. T., & Walsh, M. J. (2013). The effects of psychological distress, work, and family stressors on child behavior problems. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 44(1), 1.
- Wearing S. (2001). *Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that make a difference*. CABI Publishing: New York.
- Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*. 17(3): 601-617.

TABLES

Table 1
Sample mean differences

	University Student Sample			MTurk			<i>t-test sig*</i>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	<i>N</i>	Mean	SD	
1. Adaptability	123	3.07	0.53	10	2.94	0.30	0.20
2. Social responsibility	123	2.86	0.60	10	2.81	0.42	0.31
3. Altruism	123	3.75	0.67	10	3.68	0.56	0.44
4. Stress tolerance	123	2.68	0.73	10	2.68	0.65	0.81
5. Cultural competence	123	4.95	0.83	10	4.96	1.22	0.10
6. VFI: Values motive	123	4.12	0.54	10	4.52	0.49	0.89
7. VFI: Career motive	123	4.24	0.67	10	3.75	0.72	0.72
8. VFI: Social motive	123	3.69	0.69	10	3.84	0.70	0.97
9. VFI: Understanding motive	123	4.14	0.55	10	4.68	0.39	0.23
10. VFI: Enhancement motive	123	3.90	0.62	10	4.34	0.68	0.55
11. VFI: Protective motive	123	3.50	0.77	10	3.96	0.81	0.85
12. Task performance	123	4.23	0.26	10	4.10	0.36	0.22
13. Contextual performance	123	4.42	0.32	10	4.48	0.26	0.56

* $p < .05$ (significance indicates a mean difference in sample)

Table 2
Study variables descriptive statistics

	Mean	SD	Skewness	
			Statistic	S.E.
1. Adaptability	3.06	0.52	1.20	0.21
2. Social responsibility	2.86	0.58	0.24	0.21
3. Altruism	3.74	0.67	0.14	0.21
4. Stress tolerance	2.79	0.29	0.62	0.21
5. Cultural competence	2.48	0.43	0.00	0.21
6. VFI: Values motive	4.15	0.55	-0.13	0.21
7. VFI: Career motive	3.78	0.72	-0.72	0.21
8. VFI: Social motive	3.70	0.69	-0.20	0.21
9. VFI: Understanding motive	4.18	0.56	-0.48	0.21
10. VFI: Enhancement motive	3.90	0.63	-0.35	0.21
11. VFI: Protective motive	3.51	0.78	-0.37	0.21
12. Task performance	4.06	0.71	-1.27	0.21
13. Contextual performance	4.25	0.72	-1.16	0.21

N=13

Table 3
Correlations Among Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Adaptability	-							
2. Social responsibility	0.50**	-						
3. Altruism	-0.02	-0.20*	-					
4. Stress tolerance	0.32**	0.25*	0.01	-				
5. Cultural competence	-0.04	0.00	0.41**	-0.03	-			
6. VFI: Values motive	-0.16	-0.15	0.37**	-0.05	0.35**	-		
7. VFI: Career motive	0.16	0.16	-0.01	0.26**	0.13	0.15	-	
8. VFI: Social motive	0.01	0.06	0.23**	0.18*	0.32**	0.37**	0.39**	-
9. VFI: Understanding motive	-0.09	-0.06	0.35**	-0.03	0.32**	0.63**	0.26**	0.50**
10. VFI: Enhancement motive	0.02	0.16	0.23**	0.19*	0.24**	0.42**	0.38**	0.49**
11. VFI: Protective motive	0.04	0.14	0.35**	0.34**	0.24**	0.43**	0.23**	0.50**
12. Task performance	0.17*	0.21*	0.12	0.13	0.38**	0.27**	0.23**	0.27**
13. OCBs	-0.02	-0.08	0.37**	-0.13	0.43**	0.45**	0.09	0.39**

Table 3, continued

	9	10	11	12	13
9. VFI: Understanding motive	-				
10. VFI: Enhancement motive	0.53**	-			
11. VFI: Protective motive	0.31**	0.60**	-		
12. Task performance	0.25**	0.19*	0.17*	-	
13. OCBs	0.44**	0.24**	0.29**	0.63**	-

Note: $N=133$; * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

Table 4
Summary of relationships between predictors and self-assessed task performance and OCBs

	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Task performance</i>		<i>OCBs</i>	
		<i>Significant Relationship with Task Performance*</i>	<i>Hyp?</i>	<i>Significant Relationship with OCBs*</i>	<i>Hyp?</i>
1. Adaptability	Flexible, creative		N		Y:H#1
2. Social responsibility	High integrity	✓	Y: H#2		N
3. Altruism	Other-oriented, helpful		N	✓	Y:H#3
4. Stress tolerance	Resilience		Y: H#4a		Y:H#4b
5. VFI:Values motive	Personal belief/compassion	✓	Y: H#5a	✓	Y: H#5b
6. VFI:Career motive	Skill enhancement	✓	Y: H#6a		Y: H#6b
7. VFI:Social motive	Networking	✓	Y: H#7a	✓	Y: H#7b
8. VFI:Understanding motive	Gain new knowledge	✓	Y: H#8a	✓	Y: H#8b
9. VFI:Enhancement motive	Improve self-esteem	✓	Y: H#9a	✓	Y: H#9b
10. VFI:Protective motive	Avoid negative life events	✓	Y: H#10a	✓	Y: H#10b
11. Cultural competence	Understand other cultures	✓	Y: H#11a	✓	Y: H#11b

* $p < .05$

Table 5
 Regression of volunteer motives on self-assessed task performance ($N=133$)

	B	SE (B)	β	t	<i>Sig. (p)</i>
1. Value motive	0.10	0.06	0.19	1.63	0.11
2. Career motive	0.06	0.04	0.16	1.65	0.10
3. Social motive	0.05	0.04	0.12	1.16	0.25
4. Understanding motive	0.03	0.07	0.05	0.40	0.69
5. Enhancement motive	-0.03	0.06	-0.06	-0.46	0.65
6. Protective motive	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.73

Note: $R^2=0.15, p=.004$

Table 6
 Regression of volunteer motives on self-assessed citizenship behavior effectiveness (N=133)

	B	SE (B)	β	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig. (p)</i>
1. Value motive	0.14	0.06	0.25	2.34	0.02
2. Career motive	-0.03	0.04	-0.07	-0.82	0.41
3. Social motive	0.11	0.04	0.23	2.47	0.02
4. Understanding motive	0.13	0.06	0.24	2.10	0.04
5. Enhancement motive	-0.09	0.06	-0.18	-1.59	0.12
6. Protective motive	0.06	0.04	0.16	1.63	0.11

Note: R²=0.55, p<.00

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Examining predictors of short-term humanitarian aid volunteer effectiveness abroad

by
Ashley Hoffman

A dissertation proposal submitted to the
Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Raleigh, North Carolina

2014

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Lori Foster Thompson
Chair of Advisory Committee

Dr. Adam W. Meade
Committee Member

Dr. Samuel B. Pond, III
Committee member

Dr. S. Bartholomew Craig
Committee Member

Short-term volunteers have been an essential piece of the distribution of humanitarian aid. Often, short-term volunteers are university students engaging in alternative break programs, church members who participate in sponsored mission trips, or simply socially conscious individuals wishing to provide volunteer service. Humanitarian aid organizations have relied heavily on the free labor provided by such volunteers to complete their programs. Yet, many have encountered the negative aspects of using short-term volunteers. In particular, short-term volunteers may not provide the highest caliber of performance, and may, in fact, undermine the goals of the organization that sponsors such volunteers, the goals of the community being served, and go against the best practices associated with humanitarian aid delivery.

Because many of the issues related to short-term volunteer effectiveness are linked to volunteer performance, applied research paradigms from the organizational sciences are ideally suited to address the problem at hand. The application of such paradigms is consistent with a growing movement in the psychological sciences, Humanitarian Work Psychology (HWP; Berry, Reichman, Klobas, MacLachlan, Hui, & Carr, 2011; Lefkowitz, 2014). HWP entails the research and application of principles related to Industrial/Organizational (I/O) Psychology to humanitarian aid work; for example: performance measurement, training evaluation, leadership development, and assessment and selection programs. Consistent with this movement, the current study seeks to identify individual characteristics that contribute to short-term volunteer effectiveness in order to improve the quality of short-term volunteer performance.

In comparison to many humanitarian aid topics, the general volunteerism literature tends to have a more robust body of publications. Recent literature has focused on volunteer recruitment (e.g., Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Peterson, 2004), medical aid workers (e.g., DeCamp, 2011; Green, Green, Scandlyn, & Kestler, 2009), cross-cultural considerations (e.g., Sherraden, Lough, & McBride, 2008), corporate social responsibility (e.g., Berens, van Riel, & van Rekom, 2007), and volunteer tourism, or “voluntourism” (e.g., Atkins, 2011; Barbieri, Santos & Katsube, 2011). As short-term volunteers are the core of the current study, the topic of voluntourism is of particular interest. Voluntourism refers to short-term volunteers who are participating in opportunities for the purpose of both helping others, as well as the travel and tourism benefits (Wearing, 2001). However, despite these economic and developmental benefits, there is a body of literature that posits voluntourism may do harm to the very communities humanitarian aid projects are created to assist (e.g., Guttentag, 2009). For example, Ivan Illich (1968) pointed out the lack of training and preparation for Peace Corps members nearly 45 years ago. More recently, Guttentag (2009) summarized the voluntourism literature and concluded that while there has been a steady increase in the occurrence of voluntourism trips, the quality of work provided by such voluntourists has not improved.

As voluntourism will likely continue, it is imperative to avoid mobilizing people who may have difficulty handling the pressure of crisis situations and may put themselves and others at risk. Prior research in this vein has focused on the selection of disaster relief volunteers (Hui, Zhou, Chan, Zhang, & Fan, 2013). Hui and colleagues (2013) studied

individuals who responded to an earthquake to provide recovery and relief services in an attempt to identify predictors of personal pride in one's contributions, satisfaction, burnout, and emotional exhaustion. Hui et al. (2013) found positive correlations among resilience, satisfaction and personal accomplishment, a positive correlation between adaptability and personal accomplishment, as well as a negative correlation between resilience and emotional exhaustion. However, the study did not attempt to predict volunteer performance, and focused solely on disaster response volunteers. The current study will similarly test a variety of predictors, but will define short-term volunteer effectiveness in terms of task and contextual performance, rather than the less performance-focused criteria Hui and colleagues investigated. Additionally, it will focus on volunteers engaged in work that is not directly related to disasters. This will provide a valuable set of contributors to performance useful across many types of short-term volunteer contexts that will be appropriate for selection, training, and performance review purposes. Furthermore, while short-term voluntourists may operate within their home countries or abroad, those venturing outside of their own cultural norms arguably face more unique challenges. These challenges, such as different time zones, new cuisines, or unfamiliar cultural norms, could lead to additional negative consequences for performance. This places a high priority on understanding the distinct factors that contribute to or inhibit the effectiveness of volunteers working abroad so the potential negative impact to performance can be mitigated. As such, the focus of the current study will be those voluntourists who have engaged in a trip outside of their home culture. The

information garnered will serve to improve our understanding of successful short-term voluntourist performance cross-culturally.

Voluntourist performance

As voluntourist performance is the primary focus of the current study, it is important to consider how to conceptualize such performance. In the humanitarian aid domain, performance can be operationalized in many ways. A paramount concern for humanitarian work psychologists is effective accomplishment of the defined tasks of short-term volunteers. In its purest form, task performance refers to the behavior that an individual executes in either the creation or maintenance of a product (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). In short-term trips, it is common to see tasks related to community outreach, construction projects, and child engagement and education programs. While the exact tasks being conducted vary greatly depending on the trip initiatives, a general measure of performance is possible. That is, items regarding the extent to which workers engage in the tasks required, as well as how effectively they perform these tasks, and behaviors such as timeliness, attention-to-detail, and adherence to project guidelines can be used to assess success (Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Contextual performance is also important in the assessment of volunteer effectiveness. Typically, contextual performance is defined as behaviors that provide a benefit to an organization psychologically or socially, unrelated to explicit job tasks (Motowidlo, 2003). While the measurement of task performance indicates whether tasks are completed properly or not, contextual performance refers to the way people conduct themselves in matters unrelated to the tasks required for their job. For example, contextual

performance could involve someone assisting a teammate without being asked to do so.

General indices of contextual performance in the context of short-term voluntourism include things like engagement in activities unrelated to the task, assistance lent to teammates, and consideration for rules and property. By studying both task and contextual performance, psychologists can provide a more comprehensive analysis of the holistic performance of the volunteer, and provide relevant performance information that benefits the organizations and communities using short-term volunteers.

Stable volunteer characteristics

With the performance domain established, it is next important to pinpoint which volunteer knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) lead to effective task and contextual performance. Such characteristics can be divided into two categories: those that are stable traits within the individual, and those that are more malleable or changeable over time. Stable volunteer characteristics are those that are not easily changed or developed through an intervention such as training. They include aspects of the individual's personality, and perhaps also his or her motives for volunteering.

16PF. To date, a variety of personality characteristics deemed important to voluntourist performance have been posited. Atkins (2011) identified the Catell's (1994) 16PF personality variables as potentially relevant. As described in Table 1, these personality variables include warmth, emotional stability, reasoning, dominance, liveliness, rule consciousness, social boldness, sensitivity, skeptical vigilance, abstractedness, diplomatic privateness, apprehension, openness to change, self-reliance, perfectionism, and tension.

While there is not strong empirical evidence to support the relationship between the 16PF and task performance in paid work contexts, scholars have proposed that the 16PF personality factors should be an indicator of volunteer performance (Atkins, 2011). As such, the current study will test the factors of the 16PF to determine if there is indeed a relationship between the factors and the task performance of short-term volunteers.

Atkins (2011) established the 16PF as potentially important to voluntourist task performance by asking subject matter experts to briefly rate the importance of these characteristics for people completing volunteer assignments. From these ratings, Atkins has proposed that a 60-item subset of 16PF items would provide adequate coverage of the larger 16PF item pool, and that these 60 items should be predictive of voluntourist performance. However, these characteristics have not yet been tested in a field setting – that is, no prior research has assessed volunteers with respect to these traits to determine which if any of the traits differentiate higher performers from their less effective counterparts. The current study addresses this research need, testing whether the relationships between personality and task performance proposed by Atkins are empirically supported:

Hypotheses 1-9: There will be a significant positive relationship between task performance and warmth (H1); dominance (H2); liveliness (H3); rule consciousness (H4); openness to change (H5); social boldness (H6); sensitivity (H7); perfectionism (H8); and reasoning (H9)

Hypotheses 10-16: There will be a significant negative relationship between task performance and emotional stability (H10); skeptical vigilance (H11);

abstractedness (H12); diplomatic privateness (H13); apprehension (H14); self-reliance (H15); tension (H16)

Adaptability. In addition to the 16 PF traits, adaptability also has the potential to influence voluntourist performance. Adaptability refers to the ability of people to be flexible in their approach to work and allow for changes to occur without being too rigid in their response to such change (Morrison & Hall, 2002; Ployhart & Bliese, 2006; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Distinct behaviors related to adaptability include: creative problem solving, dealing with unpredictable situations, learning tasks and technologies, and demonstrating interpersonal and physical flexibility (Pulakos et al., 2000). While previous work has posited that adaptability *should* be related to effectiveness in developing settings (e.g., MacLachlan & Carr, 1999; Ng, Chan, & Hui, 2012) there has been little research testing this proposition. Hui and colleagues (2013) studied volunteers who responded to the disaster relief need during the Sichuan earthquake in 2008. They found that adaptability was positively related to desirable self-perceptions, notably feelings of personal achievement in the volunteers providing assistance.

It would stand to reason that adaptability might be contextually relevant because of the ever-changing nature of jobs in developing settings, which is where most voluntourism abroad takes place. Previous research supports the link between adaptability and the work performance of employees during times of change or trauma (Parent & Leavitt, 2009). However, adaptability in the context of a volunteer trip would likely be manifested in the work that falls outside of the job requirements – that is, contextual performance – due to the

unpredictable nature of the environmental and interpersonal challenges in these settings. As such, it is often the situation that fluctuates during short-term volunteer work, while the required tasks remain well defined and concrete, with far less demand for adaptive behavior. This contention is supported by a systematic review of traits relevant to voluntourist performance (Hoffman, Gloss, Clayton, Abdul-Nasiru, & Gasperson, 2013). Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 17: There will be a significant positive relationship between adaptability and contextual performance.

Prosocial orientation. A variety of research studies hint at the importance of characteristics such as empathy, compassion, concern for others, and promoting the social and environmental welfare of people when studying the effectiveness of volunteers (e.g., Finkelstein, Penner, & Brannick, 2005; Horn, 2012; Omoto, Snyder, & Hackett, 2010; Twenge, Campbell & Freeman, 2012). Yet, considerable differences remain in the name given to these stable trait groups, despite the similarity in characteristics that compose them. For the purposes of this study, the construct of prosocial personality will be considered, and will attend to individual differences such as care and understanding towards other people, with an underlying basis in altruistic action and non-obligatory behavior (Craig-Lees, Harris & Lau, 2008; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005; Penner, 2002). Studies have found that such prosocial orientation traits are related to service participation in a humanitarian aid organization (Horn, 2012), positively related to volunteer satisfaction and commitment to the cause (Craig-Lees, et al., 2008), and individual differences in concern for

others (Twenge, et al., 2012). As with the aforementioned predictors, prosocial orientation has not been studied in the context of volunteer performance outcomes, as identified by a systematic review (Hoffman, et al., 2013). However, due to the nature of prosocial orientation, it is likely that volunteers who are more committed to the cause will be more motivated to complete assigned tasks successfully. Therefore, the following hypothesis will be investigated:

Hypothesis 18a: There will be a significant positive relationship between prosocial orientation and task performance.

In addition, as prosocial orientation inherently describes compassion and understanding directed toward other people, it seems that this trait should be related to actions performed outside of one's prescribed role, especially if the action provides an opportunity to assist someone in need. Therefore:

Hypothesis 18b: There will be a significant positive relationship between prosocial orientation and contextual performance.

Stress tolerance. Stress tolerance has been defined as the characteristic that allows people to either be resilient in the face of stressful situations, or to have high self-efficacy regarding their ability to deal with stress that they may encounter (Izutsu, Tsutsumi, Asukai, Kurita, & Kawamura, 2004). Previous research related to stress tolerance has centered on the health and human service fields in an attempt to define effective coping mechanisms (e.g., Potter, Vujanovic, Marshall-Berenz, Bernstein, & Bonn-Miller, 2011). However, stress tolerance as a predictor of success in a humanitarian aid setting has been investigated far less.

Hui and colleagues (2013) studied people with high stress tolerance (resilience) levels, and noted their subsequent resistance to psychological harm in highly distressful, or negatively stressful, situations. The study found that stress tolerance was positively related to feelings of personal achievement, as well as volunteer satisfaction. Additionally, stress tolerance was negatively related to emotional exhaustion. The current study will extend this investigation to performance-related outcomes.

From a variety of studies, it is clear the negative impacts of a highly stressful environment can be very dangerous to people, particularly when the stress is due to interpersonal factors, an excess of requirements, or lack of resources (e.g., Garel & Asquin, 2010; Kua, Tian, Lai, & Ko, 1989; Watkins, Pittman, & Walsh, 2013). These stressors have been found to greatly impede the effectiveness of an employee in completing his or her tasks. However, while individual differences such as anxiety and hostility have shown negative relationships with performance in a stressful environment (Motowidlo, Packard, & Manning, 1986), there has been no work conducted to study the relationship between general stress tolerance and task performance in volunteer settings (Hoffman, et al., 2013). The current study proposes that people who have a higher tolerance for the inherent stress of working in an unfamiliar environment with a variety of unique stressors will be more successful at performing tasks related to their assignment as a short-term volunteer. This is expected because those volunteers who exhibit a great deal of stress tolerance should be able to adjust more easily to their new surroundings, allowing them to focus on performing specified tasks

that need to be completed in the limited duration of the trip without becoming overwhelmed or experiencing psychological distress.

Hypothesis 19a: There will be a significant positive relationship between stress tolerance and task performance.

In addition, it would seem that people who are more capable of tolerating highly stressful situations will also have greater capacity to identify opportunities and engage in helpful activities not related to their assigned tasks, as well as the bandwidth to perform these actions.

Hypothesis 19b: There will be a significant positive relationship between stress tolerance and contextual performance.

Motives for volunteering. Each volunteer may experience measurably different underlying attitudes that induce the action of volunteering. For example, volunteers' motives could be related to gaining experience relevant to their occupation, or to the fact that the opportunity aligns with their personal values. While volunteer motives may not neatly fit into the paradigm of a trait-based characteristic, there is some consensus that motives are a reflection of innate attitudes (e.g., Herek, 1987; Katz, 1960; Smith, Bruner, & White, 1956). Researchers in the domain of volunteering have used the functional approach to motives, whereby different people engage in the same behaviors for a variety of different reasons, and based on differing attitudes and values (Snyder, 1993). This approach aligns with work seeking to understand the motives of university students engaging in volunteer opportunities (Grönlund et al., 2011; Hustinx, 2010). Hustinx and colleagues (2010) found that a sample of

university students from six countries showed significant altruistic and value-driven motives to volunteer regardless of country of origin. In addition, students from the United States showed significantly higher levels of self-interested and ego based motives compared to students from the other five countries studied. In an exploration of the motives of university students in thirteen countries, Grönlund et al. (2011) determined that students who resided in a more egalitarian setting tended to score higher on altruistic motives for volunteerism, while students from more individualistic cultures scored higher on utilitarian motives, or the benefit of résumé building that could result from the volunteer experience. What remains unknown is whether one's motive or reason for volunteering has any bearing on the performance of the volunteer; that is, do volunteers who serve for "selfish" purposes exhibit significantly higher or lower levels of performance than those volunteering because of more altruistic reasons?

Clary and colleagues (1998) have examined how best to quantify the motives of volunteers. Specifically, they developed a measure of volunteer motives called the Volunteer Functions Inventory (VFI.) The VFI was developed to assess certain factors related to volunteer motives, including: personal values; career goals; social returns; understanding of a new perspective; enhancement of one's self-worth; and protection from one's personal problems. Each motive is characterized by a unique way of thinking. Volunteers motivated by *personal values* tend to express altruistic intentions and a great deal of concern for others. *Career goal motives* are expressed by volunteers who engage in opportunities to enhance skills or perform tasks related to the volunteer's career. A volunteer who is motivated by

social returns is concerned with the chance to make connections with other people, typically in a setting that is viewed favorably by society at large. *Understanding of a new perspective* motivates volunteers who want to gain new knowledge, or practice the skills they already possess. When a volunteer requires positive growth and development of the ego, generally related to one's self-worth, the volunteer is likely motivated by *enhancement of one's self-worth*. Finally, the *protection from one's personal problems* can be a motivator by allowing a way for the volunteer to avoid negative aspects of his or her personal life while providing a more positive focus for the volunteer.

After a thorough development of the VFI, Clary et al. (1998) measured the motivation of a group of volunteers in order to predict volunteer satisfaction, as well as an additional study using motivation to predict commitment of volunteers. Results indicated that volunteers who worked in positions with benefits functionally related to their motivational type (e.g., volunteers motivated by enhancement of self-worth who work in jobs where self-worth was affirmed) were more satisfied. Additionally, volunteers who worked in positions that were highly relevant to their motives were more likely to continue to volunteer with the organization, both short- and long-term. However, previous research has neglected to study the relationship between these volunteer motives and performance outcomes. One study conducted by Rogelberg and colleagues (2010) investigated the relationship between volunteer motives and outcomes such as volunteer commitment. Yet, the inclusion of performance appears to be a gap in volunteer motives research. Therefore, volunteer motives

will be assessed in the current study using the VFI in order to investigate the following research questions:

Research question 1: Is there a significant positive relationship between personal values motivation and (RQ1a) task performance and (RQ1b) contextual performance?

Research question 2: Is there a significant positive relationship between career motivation and (RQ2a) task performance and (RQ2b) contextual performance?

Research question 3: Is there a significant positive relationship between social motivation and (RQ3a) task performance and (RQ3b) contextual performance?

Research question 4: Is there a significant positive relationship between understanding motivation and (RQ4a) task performance and (RQ4b) contextual performance?

Research question 5: Is there a significant positive relationship between enhancement motivation and (RQ5a) task performance and (RQ5b) contextual performance?

Research question 6: Is there a significant positive relationship between protective motivation and (RQ6a) task performance and (RQ6b) contextual performance?

Malleable volunteer characteristic

In addition to stable traits, it is worth considering more malleable characteristics that can impact the performance outcomes of voluntourists, particularly those who are working abroad. Cultural competence in particular warrants investigation, as it is a likely contributor to volunteer effectiveness, and a skill that can be developed through training.

Cultural competence. Cultural competence refers to the ability of a volunteer to understand and respond appropriately to differences in culture. It includes respect for traditions, language barriers, and other cultural differences (Culhane, Reid, Crepeau, & McDonald, 2012), as well as adaptation to cultures different from one's home culture (Bowman & Roysircar, 2011). Cultural competence is often studied in military settings (e.g., Gabrenya, Moukarzel, Pomerance, Griffith, & Deaton, 2011), as soldiers are typically required to interact with cultures very different from their home cultures. A study by Ang and colleagues (2007) found that the ability of international managers to apply cultural intelligence was a significant predictor of performance during a peer-assessed task simulation. However, while cultural competence has been related to factors such as ease of adjustment in development workers (McFarlane, 2004), the relationship between cultural competence and performance in a short-term volunteer setting has yet to be tested. In all likelihood, individuals who are adept in navigating general cultural differences will be more successful in all aspects of work conducted across cultural contexts, including both task and contextual performance. This type of competence would seem to translate into volunteers who spend less time and energy negotiating cultural intricacies, and devote far more time to task and contextual performance, despite new or different circumstances. This behavior is

especially desirable in the case of short-term voluntourist efforts, as the work being done is often subject to restrictive time constraints. As such, organizations would benefit from voluntourists who could overcome situations overwhelmingly different from their normal circumstances in order to complete tasks within the time allotted.

In addition to the proposed desirability of culturally competent voluntourists involved in short-term trips, it is also reasonable to believe that the behaviors reflective of cultural competence are trainable- that is, learning about, understanding and acting appropriately in relation to a culture different from one's own is something a voluntourist could be taught to do, rather than simply being born with the innate trait. The learned behaviors, then, should lead to distinct differences in the performance of said voluntourists. This study's final set of hypotheses may therefore provide insight into possible training avenues for improving voluntourist performance:

Hypothesis 20a: There will be a significant positive relationship between cultural competence and task performance.

Hypothesis 20b: There will be a significant positive relationship between cultural competence and contextual performance.

Method

Sample

Participants will be drawn from a variety of sources. A main source of participants will be through a network of churches, primarily located in the southeastern portion of the United States. These organizations typically provide opportunities for members of their

congregations to engage in short-term volunteer trips with partners in a variety of international locations. Additionally, there are a number of organizations throughout the United States that focus solely on short-term volunteer trips. A proposal will be given to organizations that provide international trip opportunities to volunteers in order to gain access to their trip participants. Finally, numerous universities provide the opportunity for their students to participate in alternative fall, winter, and spring break trips. Universities throughout the southeastern United States will be approached to request participation in the study. Participants must have volunteered in an international context, but the type of project may vary, including, but not limited to disaster and crisis relief, construction projects, educational and childcare initiatives, healthcare, water relief, or other community and international development projects. In addition, a participant must be over 18 years of age, and have been on a trip that lasted less than 1 year within the last 6 months, in order to qualify for participation.

In order to adhere to HWP's belief in the need to provide assistance through equipping organizations and volunteers to distribute the best quality aid possible (Carr, et al., 2012), the current study will share generalizable predictors that can be used for both organizational selection and training purposes. As such, recruited organizations will be provided with information regarding the specific benefit of a selection system, training program, or performance appraisal system, as well as the incentive of assistance with implementation and feedback regarding the use of these programs within their respective organizations.

Design

The study includes the assessment of 26 predictors and 2 outcomes related to voluntourist performance. The predictors studied will be 16 personality factors (warmth; emotional stability; reasoning; dominance; liveliness; rule consciousness; social boldness; sensitivity; skeptical vigilance; abstractedness; diplomatic privateness; apprehension; openness to change; self-reliance; perfectionism; and tension), adaptability, prosocial orientation, stress tolerance, volunteer motives (personal values; career goals; social returns; understanding of a new perspective; enhancement of one's self-worth; and protection from one's personal problems), and cultural competence. The two outcomes studied will be volunteer task performance, and volunteer contextual performance.

Procedure

A letter explaining the current study will be sent to organizations and universities that coordinate short-term international voluntourist trips (Appendix A). Participants' email addresses will be requested from these organizations and universities, and will also be gathered from the primary investigator's personal network. Potential participants will receive an email (Appendix B) detailing the project, and a link to the internet-based survey, hosted on the online survey platform, Qualtrics.

Before accessing the survey, participants will receive an informed consent letter (Appendix C). This letter will provide information about the study, and it will inform the participant of the confidential nature of the current study. After the participant confirms

receipt of the informed consent letter via a check-box at the bottom of the letter, he or she will be directed to the first page of the survey, requiring the participant to provide his or her name. This will be required so the data can be matched to the data collected from the raters in the second part of the study, who will be asked to provide a performance review. Then participants will be directed to the main part of the survey, consisting of 171 items. Items will be presented in a list format, with response options indicated by radio button choices. Every page of the survey will include instructions on how to complete the individual measures, including Likert-type scale options for each unique measure. These scale-specific options are detailed in the measures section below.

After completing the items related to individual characteristics of the voluntourist, the participant will be directed to a webpage unlinked to the survey results, again asking for his or her name, and an email address associated with a team member who acted in a leadership role that also participated in the trip. This email address will be used to contact the team member to request information about the performance of the participant. The email (Appendix D) will contain information about the study, as well as the name of the participant the rater will be assessing, and will conclude with a link to the performance assessment, also hosted on the online survey platform Qualtrics.

Upon clicking on the link to the performance assessment, raters will be provided with an informed consent letter. This letter will indicate the scope and nature of the project, as well as assure the anonymity of the responses of the rater (Appendix E). Upon confirmation of receipt of the informed consent letter via a check-box at the bottom of the letter, each rater

will be asked to indicate the role he or she played on the team, as well as the amount of time he or she spent with the participant, and his or her confidence in the ability to properly rate the performance of the participant. After these checks, the rater will be directed to the performance assessment. This assessment will contain 19 items, and the rater will be instructed to provide answers to the items in accordance with the behaviors he or she observed in the participant while on the short-term trip, as well as the name of the participant he or she is rating for data matching purposes. After completion of these 19 items, the rater will be thanked for his or her participation and directed out of the survey site.

Voluntourist measures

Each of the following measures will be completed by the voluntourist, using a 5 point Likert-type scale response scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*) unless otherwise indicated.

16PF (16 scales; 163 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Personality will be assessed using the International Personality Item Pool's (Goldberg, 1990; items presented in Appendix F) version of the 16PF scale. The inventory consists of 16 scales, These scales are warmth (10 items), reasoning (13 items), dominance (10 items), liveliness (10 items), rule consciousness (10 items), social boldness (10 items), sensitivity (10 items), skeptical vigilance (10 items), abstractedness (10 items), diplomatic privateness (10 items), apprehension (10 items), openness to change (10 items), self-reliance (10 items), perfectionism (10 items), and tension (10 items). An example of an item from the 16PF reasoning scale is "I learn quickly."

Adaptability (8 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Adaptability will be assessed using items from Goldberg's (1999) International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; items presented in Appendix G). An example item is, "I adapt easily to new situations."

Prosocial orientation (30 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Prosocial orientation will be measured the Prosocial Personality Battery (Penner, 2002; items presented in Appendix H). This battery includes four subscales, social responsibility, empathy, moral reasoning and altruism that are statistically combined to indicate prosocial orientation. An example item is "No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them."

Stress tolerance (15 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Stress tolerance will be assessed using the Distress Tolerance Scale (Simon & Gaher, 2005; items presented in Appendix I). This scale includes items such as "Feeling distressed or upset is unbearable to me."

Motives (30 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Motives will be assessed using the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary, et al., 1998; items presented in Appendix J). The VFI includes 6 factors (protective, 5 items; values, 5 items; career, 5 items; social, 5 items; understanding, 5 items; enhancement, 5 items) used to determine the functional motives of volunteers, in terms of the reason for which volunteers engage in volunteer projects. Respondents will use 1 (*not at all important/inaccurate*) to 5 (*extremely important/accurate*) Likert-type scale to respond to these items. Participants will receive a score on each of these 6 scales independently, rather than receiving a single overall motive score.

Cultural competence (20 items; $\alpha=.xx$). The Cultural Intelligence Scale will be used to assess cultural competence (CQS; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009; items presented in

Appendix K). The CQS consists of 4 subscales, including metacognitive cultural intelligence, cognitive cultural intelligence, motivational cultural intelligence, and behavioral intelligence. Researchers have found that these 4 subscales can be equally weighted and combined into a single assessment that covers a full range of the content domain of cultural competence; as such, the items will be combined to provide a single score of cultural competence. Items include specific references to understanding both thoughts and motives related to cultural interaction, such as “I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.”

Demographic questions (8 items; $\alpha=.xx$) In addition, demographic questions will be asked, including age, gender, race, education level, and the option of disclosing religious affiliation, as well as whether volunteers had been on a short-term volunteer trip previously, and details of the trip, such as length and location (items presented in Appendix L).

Rater measures

The rater, whose name and contact information will be provided by the voluntourist, will complete the following performance measures. Each scale will be completed using a 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) Likert-type scale. There will also be a “Not applicable/Don’t know” option.

Task performance (7 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Task performance will be rated using a short performance inventory based on Williams and Anderson’s (1991) work, shown in Appendix M. This score will be calculated to provide an overall performance score for the voluntourist. There will also be an option for the rater to indicate he or she does not know or could not

assess the item. If more than half of the items are responded to with this option, the data for the participant will not be included in the study. The measure has been revised to reflect the context of volunteer performance, and includes items such as “Fulfilled responsibilities specified by team leader.”

Contextual performance (12 items; $\alpha=.xx$). Contextual performance will be assessed with items also based William and Anderson’s (1991; items presented in Appendix M) work, revised to reflect the context of volunteer performance. There will also be an option for the rater to indicate he or she does not have the appropriate information to respond to the item. If more than half of the items are responded to with this option, the data for the participant will not be included in the study. This measure includes items such as “Went out of the way to help teammates.”

Analysis

To study the hypotheses and research questions, both bivariate correlations and linear regression analyses will be employed. Specifically, 7 correlational analyses and 3 regression analyses will be run. Correlations will be conducted to study the unique relationships between task performance and prosocial orientation (H18a), stress tolerance (H19a) and cultural competence (H20a). Additionally, correlations will be calculated for the relationship between contextual performance and adaptability (H17), prosocial orientation (H18b), stress tolerance (H19b), and cultural competence (H20b). Calculation of regression coefficients will be conducted to determine the incremental validity of each of the 16PF factors on task performance (H1-H16), as well the unique variance of motive type on both task and

contextual performance (RQ1-RQ6). A power analysis using the G*power test (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) determined that a sample size of 153 was necessary to achieve adequate power to detect a medium-sized effect or larger with an alpha set at .05. Additional sources indicate the sample size should be calculated using the equation $N > 104 + m$, where m = the number of independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As such, the current study will attempt to gather 153 participants, in alignment with both calculated estimates.

References

- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.-Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 331–357.
- Atkins, S. G. (2011). Smartening-up voluntourism: SmartAid's expansion of the Personality-focused Performance Requirements Form (PPRF). *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 14(4), 369-390.
- Barbieri, C., Santos, C.A., & Katsube, Y. (2011). Volunteer tourism: Oh-the-ground observations from Rwanda. *Tourism Management*, 33, 509-516.
- Berens, G., van Riel, C.B.M., & van Rekom, J. (2007). The CSR-quality trade-off: When can corporate social responsibility and corporate ability compensate each other? *Journal of Business Ethics*. 74, 233–252.
- Berry, M., Reichman, W., MacLachlan, M., Klobas, J., Hui, H. C., & Carr, S. C. (2011). Humanitarian Work Psychology: The Contributions of Organizational Psychology to Poverty Reduction. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 32, 240-7.
- Boezeman, E. J., & Ellemers, N. (2008). Pride and respect in volunteers' organizational commitment. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38, 159-172.
- Borman, W.C., & Motowidlo, S.J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W.C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Bowman, S., & Roysircar, G. (2011). Training and practice in trauma, catastrophes, and disaster counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(8), 1160-1181.
- Carr, S.C., De Guzman, J.M., Eltyeb, S.M., Furnham, A., MacLachlan, M., Marai, L., & McAuliffe, E. (2012). An introduction to Humanitarian Work Psychology. In Carr, S.C., MacLachlan, M., & Furnham, A. (Eds.) *Humanitarian Work Psychology*, (pp. 3-33). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cattell, RB. (1994). A cross-validation of primary personality structure in the 16 P.F. by tow parceled factor analysis. *Multivariate Experimental Clinical Research* *10*(3): 181–190.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74* (6), 1516 – 1530.
- Craig-Lees, M., Harris, J., & Lau, W. (2008). The role of dispositional, organizational, and situational variables in volunteering. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, *19*, 1-24.
- Culhane, E., Reid, P., Crepeau, L.J., & McDonald, D. (2012). Beyond frontiers: The role of cross-cultural competence in the military. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, *50*(1), 30-37.
- DeCamp, M. (2011). Ethical review of global short-term medical volunteerism. *HEC Forum*, *23*, 91–103.

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191.
- Finkelstein, M. A., Penner, L. A., & Brannick, M. T. (2005). Employment sector and volunteering. *Sociological Quarterly, 47*(1), 21-40.
- Gabrenya, W. K., Jr., Moukarzel, R. G., Pomerance, M.H., Griffith, H., & Deaton, J. (2011). A validation study of the Defense Language Office Framework for Cross-cultural Competence. Technical report, Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.
- Garel, G., & Asquin, A. (2010). When project-based management causes distress at work. *International Journal of Project Management, 28*(2), 166-172.
doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.08.006
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative 'description of personality': The big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(6), 1216-1229.
doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216
- Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. Deary, F. De Fruyt, & F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe, Vol. 7* (pp. 7-28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.
- Green, T., Green, H., Scandlyn, J., & Kestler, A. (2009). Perceptions of short-term medical volunteer work: a qualitative study in Guatemala. *Globalization and Health, 5*:4.

- Grönlund, H., Holmes, K., Kang, C., Cnaan, R., Handy, F., Brudney, J., et al. (2011). Cultural values and volunteering: A cross-cultural comparison of students motivation to volunteer in 13 countries. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(2), 87–106.
- Guttentag, D. A. (2009). The possible negative impacts of volunteer tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11, 537–551. doi: 10.1002/jtr.727
- Herek, G. M. 1987. Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50(4), 285-303.
- Hoffman, A.J., Gloss, A., Clayton, A., Abdul-Nasiru, I., & Gasperson, S. (2013). *Systematic review of predictors related to nonprofit worker and volunteer performance*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Horn, A.C. (2012). The cultivation of a prosocial value orientation through community service: an examination of organizational context, social facilitation, and duration. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 41(7), 948-968.
- Hui, C. H., Zhou, X., Chan, M. P. S., Zhang, X., & Fan, J. (2013). Assessing and placing disaster relief volunteers. In J. B. Olson-Buchanan, L. K. Bryan, & L. F. Thompson (Eds.), *Using I-O psychology for the greater good: Helping those who help others*. New York, NY: Routledge Academic.
- Hustinx, L. (2010). Weakening organizational ties? A classification of styles of volunteering in the Flemish Red Cross. *Social Service Review*, 79(4), 624-652.
- Illich, I. (April 20, 1968). To hell with good intentions. Address at the Conference on InterAmerican Student Projects (CIASP) in Cuernavaca, Mexico.

- Izutsu, T., Tsutsumi, A., Asukai, N., Kurita, H., & Kawamura, N. (2004). Relationship between a traumatic life event and an alteration in stress response. *Stress and Health, 20*(2), 65-73.
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163–204.
- Kua, E. H., Tian, C. S., Lai, L., & Ko, S. M. (1989). Work stress and mental distress. *Singapore Medical Journal, 30*(4), 343.
- Lefkowitz, J. (2014). Educating Industrial–Organizational Psychologists for Science, Practice, and Social Responsibility. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 7*: 38–44. doi: 10.1111/iops.12102
- MacLachlan, M., & Carr, S.C. (1999). The selection of international assignees for development work. *The Irish Journal of Psychology, 20*, 39-57.
- McFarlane, C. (2004). Risks associated with the psychological adjustment of humanitarian aid workers. *Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies, 2004*(1).
- Morrison, R., & Hall, D. (2002). Career adaptability. In *Multicultural Aspects of Counseling Series: Careers in and out of organizations*. (pp. 205-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781452231174.n7
- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences for job performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*(4), 618-629. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.71.4.618

- Motowidlo, S.J. (2003). Job Performance. In W.C. Borman, D.R. Ilgen, R.J. Kilmoski, & I.B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of Psychology*, Vol. 12: *Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 39-53). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Ng, E., Chan, M.P.S., & Hui, C.H. (2012). Personnel psychology for disaster response and recovery. In S.C. Carr, M. McLachlan, & A. Furnham (Eds.) *Humanitarian Work Psychology*, (pp. 225-246). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Omoto, A.M., Snyder, M., & Hackett, J.D. (2010). Personality and motivational antecedents of activism and civic engagement. *Journal of Personality*, 78(6), 1703-1734.
- Parent, J.D., & Levitt, K. (2009). Manager vs. employee perceptions of adaptability and work performance. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(4), 23.
- Penner, L. A. (2002). The causes of sustained volunteerism: An interactionist perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 447-468.
- Penner, L.A., Dovidio, J.F., Piliavin, J.A., & Schroeder, D.A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56:365-392.
- Peterson, D.K. (2004). Recruitment strategies for encouraging participation in corporate volunteer programs. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 49:371–386.
- Ployhart, R.E., & Bliese, P.D. (2006), Individual Adaptability (I-ADAPT) Theory: Conceptualizing the antecedents, consequences, and measurement of individual differences in adaptability. In C.S. Burke, L.G. Pierce, E. Salas, (Eds.) *adaptability: A prerequisite for effective performance within complex environments*. Vol. 6 (pp.3-39). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

- Potter, C. M., Vujanovic, A. A., Marshall-Berenz, E. C., Bernstein, A., & Bonn-Miller, M.O. (2011). Posttraumatic stress and marijuana use coping motives: The mediating role of distress tolerance. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 25*, 437-443.
- Pulakos, E.D., Arad, S., Donovan, M.A., & Plamondon, K.E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(4), 612-624.
- Rogelberg, S. G., Allen, J. A., Conway, J. M., Goh, A., Currie, L., & McFarland, B. (2010). Employee experiences with volunteers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 20*:423–444.
- Sherraden, M.S., Lough, B., & McBride, A.M. (2008). Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and institutional predictors. *Voluntas, 19*:395–421.
- Simon, J.S., & Gaher, R.M. (2005). The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motivation and Emotion, 29*(2), 83-102.
- Smith, M., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and personality*. New York: Wiley.
- Snyder, M. (1993). Basic research and practical problems: The promise of a “functional” personality and social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 251–264.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

- Twenge, J.M., Campbell, W.K., & Freeman, E.C. (2012). Generational differences in young adults' life goals, concern for others and civic orientation, 1966-2009. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *102*(5), 1045-1062.
- Van Dyne, L. Ang, S., & Koh, C.K.S. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development. In M.A. Moodian (Ed.) *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Watkins, D. C., Pittman, C. T., & Walsh, M. J. (2013). The effects of psychological distress, work, and family stressors on child behavior problems. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, *44*(1), 1.
- Wearing S. (2001). *Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that make a difference*. CABI Publishing: New York.
- Williams, L.J., & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*. *17*(3): 601-617.

Table 1: Titles and definitions of 16PF factors (Cattell, 1994)

<p>Warmth: (L)*- distant, reserved; (H)** outgoing, attentive</p> <p>Dominance: (L)- humble, obedient; (H)- forceful, stubborn</p> <p>Liveliness: (L)- prudent, restrained; (H)- animated, spontaneous</p> <p>Rule Consciousness: (L)- non-conforming, expedient; (H)- dutiful, moralistic</p> <p>Openness to Change: (L)- conservative, traditional; (H)- experimental, free-thinking</p> <p>Social Boldness: (L)- timid, hesitant; (H)- venturesome, uninhibited</p> <p>Sensitivity: (L)- no-nonsense, utilitarian; (H)- sentimental, intuitive</p> <p>Perfectionism: (L)- impulsive, undisciplined; (H)- organized, compulsive</p>	<p>Reasoning: (L)- less intelligent, concrete thinking; (H)- abstract-thinking, bright</p> <p>Emotional Stability: (L)- easily upset, changeable; (H)- mature, calm</p> <p>Skeptical Vigilance: (L)- accepting, trusting; (H)- suspicious, oppositional</p> <p>Abstractedness: (L)- grounded, practical; (H)- imaginative, impractical</p> <p>Diplomatic Privatness: (L)- naïve, genuine; (H)- discreet, shrewd</p> <p>Apprehension: (L)- complacent, self-satisfied; (H)- worried, insecure</p> <p>Self-reliance: (L)- joiner, follower; (H) solitary, resourceful</p> <p>Tension: (L)- patient, tranquil; (H)- high energy, impatient</p>
---	---

* *L* indicates characteristics associated with low levels of trait

***H* indicates characteristics associated with high levels of trait

Appendix A- Organizational recruitment letter

Good morning/afternoon—

My name is Ashley Hoffman and I am a doctoral candidate at North Carolina State University. I am currently conducting research in order to complete my dissertation in the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. My specific research focuses on the characteristics of people who are most likely to be successful in humanitarian aid pursuits. This information can be particularly useful in the selection and training of volunteers and expatriates.

I am contacting you to request access in order to survey people associated with your organization who have recently engaged in a short-term humanitarian aid volunteer trip. These participants must have worked in an international context, and may have helped on any of a variety of tasks, including, but not limited to, disaster and crisis relief, construction projects, educational and childcare initiatives, healthcare, water relief, or other community and international development projects. In addition, a participant should have been on a trip that lasted less than 1 year, and the trip should have occurred within the last 6 months.

The purpose of the study is to begin to develop a system in which the best candidates for volunteer participation can be identified in order to strengthen the quality and caliber of the team, as well as to identify areas of focus when training volunteers. To do so, a list of volunteer email addresses is required. These volunteers will be asked a series of questions related to individual characteristics such as personality and motives. Additionally, volunteers will be asked to provide an email address for a team leader with which he or she travelled. This leader will be asked to respond to a survey regarding the performance of the volunteer during the trip. In return for providing email addresses of volunteers affiliated with your organization, I will provide the results of my research, access to all survey materials that are useful in predicting volunteer success, and assistance in using these survey materials in the future. If you are willing to participate, kindly send a list of the volunteer emails by xx/xx/xx.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. I will look forward to hearing from you shortly in order to establish access to your volunteer populations.

Thank you for your consideration!

Best,
Ashley Hoffman, M.S.

Appendix B- Participant request email

Good morning/evening,

My name is Ashley Hoffman and I am a doctoral candidate at North Carolina State University. I am currently conducting research in order to complete my dissertation in the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. My specific research focuses on the characteristics of people who have engaged in humanitarian aid pursuits.

Based on information provided by (organization name), it seems you have participated in a short-term volunteer trip abroad within the six months. If you are willing to participate in my study, you will be asked a series of questions related to the way you feel and react in a number of situations.

Additionally, you will be asked to provide an email address for 3 teammates with which you travelled. These team members will be asked to respond to a survey regarding your performance during the trip. When choosing a teammate as a rater, please provide the name of a teammate that had the opportunity to observe you and your actions during the trip, and would be able to respond knowledgably about your volunteer experience.

If you are willing to participate, kindly click on the following link and complete the survey provided.

<http://www....>

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions, or if you would like to receive a copy of the results upon completion of the study.

Thank you for your time!

Ashley Hoffman

Appendix C- Participant informed consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Principal Investigator: Ashley Hoffman

Telephone Number: 419.680.1282

INTRODUCTION

You have been asked to participate in a study being directed by Ashley Hoffman. The faculty member who is supervising the research is Lori Foster Thompson, PhD. This study is part of a program of research that has been designed to learn more about short-term volunteers.

INFORMATION

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete survey items asking questions about characteristics you possess. This study should take approximately 50 minutes to complete.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

None foreseeable.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

If you choose to review the results of this research study, it will hopefully benefit you by informing you about areas of industrial-organizational psychology and giving you insight into the methods and procedures used to conduct research in the field of psychology.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your participation in this study is confidential; your ratings will not be identified to your supervisor as coming from you. Only Ashley Hoffman, Dr. Lori Foster Thompson, and approved research assistants will have access to the individual data you generate. All results will be reported in an aggregated format (e.g., as averages). Under no circumstance will any individual participant be identified in a publication or presentation describing this study.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study. You may request a copy of the study results as per the instructions in the survey. Participants may withdraw from the study at any point in time without negative consequences.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about this study or the procedures, you may contact Ashley Hoffman at 419.680.1282 or ahoffma@ncsu.edu. If you feel that you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of the project, you may contact Ms. Deb Paxton, IRB Administrator, 919.515.4514 or Dr. Samuel Snyder, IRB Chair, 919.513.4328.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information.

“I agree to participate in this research with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time. ✓

Appendix D- Rater request email

Good morning/evening,

My name is Ashley Hoffman and I am a doctoral candidate at North Carolina State University. I am currently conducting research in order to complete my dissertation in the field of Industrial/Organizational Psychology. My specific research focuses on the characteristics of people who have engaged in humanitarian aid pursuits.

Based on information provided by (volunteer name), it seems you have participated in a short-term volunteer trip abroad within the last year. If you are willing to participate in my study, you will be asked a series of questions related to the performance of (volunteer name) during the trip.

If you are willing to participate, kindly click on the following link and complete the survey provided. Rest assured your responses will remain confidential, and will not be shared with the teammate you are rating.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions, or if you would like to receive a copy of the results upon completion of the study.

Thank you for your time!

Ashley Hoffman

Appendix E- Rater informed consent

INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Principal Investigator: Ashley Hoffman

Telephone Number: 419.680.1282

INTRODUCTION

You have been asked to participate in a study being directed by Ashley Hoffman. The faculty member who is supervising the research is Lori Foster Thompson, Ph.D. This study is part of a program of research that has been designed to learn more about short-term volunteers.

INFORMATION

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete survey items asking questions about the performance of a teammate on a short-term volunteer trip you have taken recently. This study should take about 10 minutes to complete.

RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

None foreseeable.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

If you choose to review the results of this research study, it will hopefully benefit you by informing you about areas of industrial-organizational psychology and giving you insight into the methods and procedures used to conduct research in the field of psychology.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your participation in this study is confidential; your ratings will not be identified to your supervisor as coming from you. Only Ashley Hoffman and Dr. Lori Foster Thompson will have access to the individual data you generate. All results will be reported in an aggregated format (e.g., as averages). Under no circumstance will any individual participant be identified in a publication or presentation describing this study.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study. You may request a copy of the study results as per the instructions in the survey. Participants may withdraw from the study at any point in time without negative consequences.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about this study or the procedures, you may contact Ashley Hoffman at 419.680.1282 or ahoffma@ncsu.edu. If you feel that you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of the project, you may contact Ms. Deb Paxton, IRB Administrator, 919.515.4514 or Dr. Samuel Snyder, IRB Chair, 919.513.4328

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you choose to withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information.

“I agree to participate in this research with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time. ✓

Appendix F – 16PF

Read each statement and select the response that best describes you as you actually are currently, NOT as how you would like to be in the future. Please respond using the scale (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

Warmth

+ keyed

Know how to comfort others.
 Enjoy bringing people together.
 Feel others' emotions.
 Take an interest in other people's lives.
 Cheer people up.
 Make people feel at ease.
 Take time out for others.

– keyed

Don't like to get involved in other people's problems.
 Am not really interested in others.
 Try not to think about the needy.

Reasoning

+ keyed

Make insightful remarks.
 Know the answers to many questions.
 Tend to analyze things.
 Use my brain.
 Learn quickly.
 Counter others' arguments.
 Reflect on things before acting.
 Weigh the pros against the cons.

– keyed

Consider myself an average person.
 Get confused easily.
 Know that I am not a special person.
 Have a poor vocabulary.
 Skip difficult words while reading.

Dominance

+ keyed

Take charge.
 Want to be in charge.
 Say what I think.
 Am not afraid of providing criticism.
 Take control of things.
 Can take strong measures.

– keyed

Wait for others to lead the way.
 Never challenge things.
 Let others make the decisions.
 Let myself be pushed around.

Emotional Stability

+ keyed

Seldom feel blue.
 Feel comfortable with myself.
 Readily overcome setbacks.
 Am relaxed most of the time.
 Am not easily frustrated.

– keyed

Have frequent mood swings.
 Often feel blue.
 Dislike myself.
 Feel desperate.
 Am easily discouraged.

Liveliness

+ keyed

Am the life of the party.
 Love large parties.
 Joke around a lot.
 Enjoy being part of a loud crowd.
 Amuse my friends.
 Act wild and crazy.

– keyed

Seldom joke around.
 Don't like crowded events.
 Am the last to laugh at a joke.

Dislike loud music.

Rule-consciousness

+ keyed

Believe laws should be strictly enforced.
 Try to follow the rules.
 Believe in one true religion.
 Respect authority.
 Like to stand during the national anthem.

– keyed

Resist authority.
 Break rules.
 Use swear words.
 Oppose authority.
 Know how to get around the rules.

Social boldness

+ keyed

Feel comfortable around people.
 Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
 Don't mind being the center of attention.
 Make friends easily.
 Start conversations.

– keyed

Find it difficult to approach others.
 Often feel uncomfortable around others.
 Have little to say.
 Am quiet around strangers.
 Keep in the background.

Sensitivity

+ keyed

Like to read.
 Enjoy discussing movies and books with others.
 Read a lot.
 Don't like action movies.
 Cry during movies.

Love flowers.

– keyed

Do not enjoy watching dance performances.
Do not like poetry.
Dislike works of fiction.
Rarely notice my emotional reactions.

Vigilance

+ keyed

Find it hard to forgive others.
Suspect hidden motives in others.
Am wary of others.
Distrust people.
Believe that people seldom tell you the whole truth.
Believe that people are essentially evil.

– keyed

Trust what people say.
Trust others.
Believe that others have good intentions.
Believe that people are basically moral.

Abstractedness

+ keyed

Do things that others find strange.
Like to get lost in thought.
Enjoy wild flights of fantasy.
Love to daydream.
Swim against the current.
Take deviant positions.
Do unexpected things.

– keyed

Do things by the book.
Seldom daydream.
Seldom get lost in thought.

Privateness

+ keyed

Reveal little about myself.
 Am hard to get to know.
 Don't talk a lot.
 Bottle up my feelings.
 Keep my thoughts to myself.

– keyed

Am open about myself to others.
 Am open about my feelings.
 Disclose my intimate thoughts.
 Show my feelings.
 Am willing to talk about myself.

Apprehension

+ keyed

Am afraid that I will do the wrong thing.
 Feel threatened easily.
 Am easily hurt.
 Worry about things.
 Spend time thinking about past mistakes.
 Feel guilty when I say "no."
 Feel crushed by setbacks.

– keyed

Don't worry about things that have already happened.
 Am not easily bothered by things.
 Don't let others discourage me.

Openness to change

+ keyed

Believe in the importance of art.
 Love to think up new ways of doing things.
 Enjoy hearing new ideas.
 Carry the conversation to a higher level.
 Prefer variety to routine.

– keyed

Avoid philosophical discussions.
 Rarely look for a deeper meaning in things.
 Am not interested in theoretical discussions.
 Am not interested in abstract ideas.
 Try to avoid complex people.

Self-reliance

+ keyed

Want to be left alone.
 Prefer to do things by myself.
 Enjoy spending time by myself.
 Seek quiet.
 Don't mind eating alone.
 Enjoy silence.
 Enjoy my privacy.

– keyed

Enjoy being part of a group.
 Enjoy teamwork.
 Can't do without the company of others.

Perfectionism

+ keyed

Want everything to be "just right."
 Get chores done right away.
 Like order.
 Continue until everything is perfect.
 Am exacting in my work.

– keyed

Am not bothered by messy people.
 Am not bothered by disorder.
 Leave a mess in my room.
 Leave my belongings around.
 Put off unpleasant tasks.

Tension

+ keyed

Get irritated easily.

Get angry easily.
Am quick to judge others.
Am annoyed by others' mistakes.
Am easily put out.
Can't stand being contradicted.
Judge people by their appearance.

– keyed

Am not easily annoyed.
Try to forgive and forget.
Have a good word for everyone.

Appendix G- Adaptability

Read each statement and select the response that best describes you as you actually are currently, NOT as how you would like to be in the future. Please respond using the scale (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

1. Am good at taking advice.
2. Adapt easily to new situations.
3. Can stand criticism.

4. Am a bad loser. -
5. Want to have the last word. -
6. Can't stand being contradicted. -
7. Put down others' proposals. -
8. Don't tolerate critics. -

Appendix H- Prosocial orientation

Read each statement and select the response that best describes you as you actually are currently, NOT as how you would like to be in the future. Please respond using the scale (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

Social Responsibility

1. When people are nasty to me, I feel very little responsibility to treat them well. (R)
2. I would feel less bothered about leaving litter in a dirty park than in a clean one. (R)
3. No matter what a person has done to us, there is no excuse for taking advantage of them.
4. With the pressure for grades and the widespread cheating in school nowadays, the individual who cheats occasionally is not really as much at fault. (R)
5. It doesn't make much sense to be very concerned about how we act when we are sick and feeling miserable. (R)
6. If I broke a machine through mishandling, I would feel less guilty if it was already damaged before I used it. (R)
7. When you have a job to do, it is impossible to look out for everybody's best interest. (R)

Empathy

8. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view. (R)
9. When I see someone being taken advantage of, I feel kind of protective towards them.
10. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.
11. Other people's misfortunes do not usually disturb me a great deal. (R)
12. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments. (R)
13. When I see someone being treated unfairly, I sometimes don't feel very much pity for them. (R)
14. I am usually pretty effective in dealing with emergencies. (R)
15. I am often quite touched by things that I see happen.
16. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.
17. I tend to lose control during emergencies.
18. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.
19. When I see someone who badly needs help in an emergency, I go to pieces.

Moral reasoning

20. My decisions are usually based on my concern for other people.
21. My decisions are usually based on what is the most fair and just way to act.
22. I choose alternatives that are intended to meet everybody's needs.
23. I choose a course of action that maximizes the help other people receive.
24. I choose a course of action that considers the rights of all people involved.

25. My decisions are usually based on concern for the welfare of others.

Self-reported altruism

26. I have helped carry a stranger's belongings (e.g., books, parcels, etc.).

27. I have allowed someone to go ahead of me in a line (e.g., supermarket, copying machine, etc.)

28. I have let a neighbor whom I didn't know too well borrow an item of some value (e.g., tools, a dish, etc.).

29. I have, before being asked, voluntarily looked after a neighbor's pets or children without being paid for it.

30. I have offered to help a handicapped or elderly stranger across a street.

Appendix I- Stress Tolerance Scale

Read each statement and select the response that best describes you as you actually are currently, NOT as how you would like to be in the future. Please respond using the scale (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

1. Feeling distressed or upset is unbearable to me.
2. When I feel distressed or upset, all I can think about is how bad I feel.
3. I can't handle feeling distressed or upset.
4. My feelings of distress are so intense that they completely take over.
5. There's nothing worse than feeling distressed or upset.
6. My feelings of distress or being upset are just an acceptable part of life.
7. I can tolerate being distressed or upset as well as most people. -
8. My feelings of distress or being upset are not acceptable.
9. I'll do anything to avoid feeling distressed or upset.
10. Other people seem to be able to tolerate feeling distressed or upset better than I can.
11. Being distressed or upset is always a major ordeal for me.
12. I am ashamed of myself when I feel distressed or upset.
13. My feelings of distress or being upset scare me.
14. I'll do anything to stop feeling distressed or upset.
15. When I feel distressed or upset, I must do something about it immediately.
16. When I feel distressed or upset, I cannot help but concentrate on how bad the distress actually feels.

Appendix J- Volunteer motives

Read each statement and select the response that best describes you as you actually are currently, NOT as how you would like to be in the future. Please respond using the scale (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

Protective

1. No matter how bad I've been feeling, volunteering helps me to forget about it.
2. By volunteering I feel less lonely.
3. Doing volunteer work relieves me of some of the guilt over being more fortunate than others.
4. Volunteering helps me work through my own personal problems.
5. Volunteering is a good escape from my own troubles.

Values

6. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself.
7. I am genuinely concerned about the particular group I am serving.
8. I feel compassion toward people in need.
9. I feel it is important to help others.
10. I can do something for a cause that is important to me.

Career

11. Volunteering can help me to get my foot in the door at a place where I would like to work.
12. I can make new contacts that might help my business or career.
13. Volunteering allows me to explore different career options.
14. Volunteering will help me to succeed in my chosen profession.
15. Volunteering experience will look good on my resume.

Social

16. My friends volunteer.
17. People I'm close to want me to volunteer.
18. People I know share an interest in community service.
19. Others with whom I am close place a high value on community service.
20. Volunteering is an important activity to the people I know best.

Understanding

21. I can learn more about the cause for which I am working.
22. Volunteering allows me to gain a new perspective on things.
23. Volunteering lets me learn things through direct, hands on experience.
24. I can learn how to deal with a variety of people.

25. I can explore my own strengths.

Enhancement

- 26. Volunteering makes me feel important.
- 27. Volunteering increases my self-esteem.
- 28. Volunteering makes me feel needed.
- 29. Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.
- 30. Volunteering is a way to make new friends.

Appendix K- Cultural Competence

Read each statement and select the response that best describes your capabilities. Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree)

1. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds
2. I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me
3. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions
4. I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures
5. I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures
6. I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages
7. I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures
8. I know the marriage systems of other cultures
9. I know the arts and crafts of other cultures
10. I know the rules for expressing nonverbal behaviors in other cultures
11. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures
12. I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me
13. I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me
14. I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me
15. I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture
16. I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it
17. I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural interaction requires it
18. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it
19. I change my nonverbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it
20. I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it

Appendix L- Demographic questions

Voluntourist questions

1. What is your age? [18-100 dropdown menu]
2. What is your gender? [male, female]
3. What is your race? [Of African descent (not Hispanic); Asian; Caucasian/White (not Hispanic); Hispanic/Latino; Native American/Pacific Islander; Other (define)]
4. What is your nationality?
5. What is your education level? [Some high school (or less); GED; HS Diploma; 2 year college degree/Associates degree; 4 year college degree/Bachelor's degree; Master's degree; PhD/MD/JD or other professional school degree]
6. What is your religious affiliation? (optional) [Christian; Muslim; Hindu; Buddhist; Jewish; Other (define); Not religious; Decline to answer]
7. Have you volunteered on a short-term trip prior to your most recent trip? [Yes/No]
8. What was the length of your most recent short-term volunteer trip? [< 1 week; 1-2 weeks; 2-3 weeks; 1 month; 2-3 months; 4-5 months; 6-7 months; 7-8 months; 9-10 months; 11-12 months]
9. In what country was your most recent short-term volunteer trip?

Rater questions

1. What is your age? [18-100 dropdown menu]
2. What is your gender? [male, female]
3. What is your race? [Of African descent (not Hispanic); Asian; Caucasian/White (not Hispanic); Hispanic/Latino; Native American/Pacific Islander; Other (define)]
4. What is your nationality?
5. What is your education level? [Some high school (or less); GED; HS Diploma; 2 year college degree/Associates degree; 4 year college degree/Bachelor's degree; Master's degree; PhD/MD/JD or other professional school degree]
6. What is your religious affiliation? (optional) [Christian; Muslim; Hindu; Buddhist; Jewish; Other (define); Not religious; Decline to answer]
7. Have you volunteered on a short-term trip prior to your most recent trip? [Yes/No]
8. How much time during your trip did you spend with the volunteer you are rating? [5-10%; 15-25%; 30-50%; 75-100%]
9. How confident are you that the ratings you've provided are an accurate representation of the volunteer's performance on the trip [1: not very confident; 2: somewhat not confident; 3: moderately confident; 4: somewhat confident; 5: extremely confident]

Appendix M – Performance

When responding to the following questions, please consider the performance of your assigned team member **only during** the short-term volunteer trip. Consider all aspects of the performance you encountered, and respond to each item to the best of your knowledge of the performance of the team member. This information will not be shared with the volunteer you are rating, so please be as accurate as possible in your answers. Please respond on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). There will also be a “Not applicable/Don’t know option.”

Checks

1. Were you in a leadership or supervisory role during your trip [yes; no]
2. Do you feel you had enough interaction with the participant to provide an accurate rating of his or her performance during the trip? [yes; no]

Task performance

The volunteer I am rating:

1. Adequately completed assigned duties
2. Fulfilled responsibilities specified by team leader
3. Performed tasks that were expected of him/her
4. Met formal performance requirements of the project
5. Engaged in activities that directly affected the team’s overall performance
6. Neglected aspects of the job
7. Failed to perform essential duties

Contextual performance

The volunteer I am rating:

8. Helped others who were absent or missed instruction
9. Helped others who had heavy work loads
10. Assisted team leader with his/her work (when not asked)
11. Took time to listen to teammates' problems and worries
12. Went out of the way to help teammates
13. Took a personal interest in teammates
14. Passed along information to teammates
15. Did not take undeserved breaks from tasks
16. Spent a minimal amount of time with personal matters
17. Did not complain about insignificant things during tasks
18. Conserved and protected organizational property
19. Adhered to informal rules devised to maintain order