



Altruism in tourism: Social Exchange Theory vs Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon in host volunteering



Pavlos Paraskevaidis ^{a,*}, Konstantinos Andriotis ^b

^a Ministry of Education, Research & Religious Affairs, Directorate of Secondary Education of Imathia, Dim. Moumoglou 1, 59132 Veria, Greece

^b Middlesex University London, Business School, Department of Marketing, Branding and Tourism, Williams Building, The Burroughs, London NW4 4BT, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 30 November 2015

Revised 22 September 2016

Accepted 20 November 2016

Keywords:

Altruism

Social Exchange Theory

Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon

Motivation

Host volunteering

Voluntary tourism associations

ABSTRACT

Taking into consideration the scarcity of research on volunteering and altruistic behavior of host communities, this exploratory study examines altruism in tourism from the viewpoint of members of voluntary tourism associations. A literature review reveals two general types of altruism, i.e. reciprocal and true, as well as two theoretical constructs, namely Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon (ASP). By taking a sample of 21 members from two voluntary tourism associations located in the municipality of Veria, Northern Greece, this study confirms that reciprocal altruism is one of several motives for participating in voluntary tourism associations. Additionally, it is shown that ASP is more adequate than SET to interpret the study groups' social behavior.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Altruism is the basis for some socially acceptable activities such as volunteering, charity, philanthropy, and blood donation (Piliavin & Charng, 1990). However altruistic behavior, such as helping strangers, may expose individuals to risky social environments and attract criminals. For instance, Homant (2010, p. 1199) suggests that being helpful to strangers “may leave one vulnerable to a crime committed by the person being helped, such as a scam or a theft of some sort”. Nevertheless, altruistic behavior is generally described as a selfless behavior that benefits third parties' welfare and by doing so it provides an understanding “of social solidarity in modern societies” (Wuthnow, 1993, p. 344). Due to its significance in understanding social behavior, altruism has been studied in social sciences, in contrast to selfishness and the dominant self-interested behavior of modern man, who focuses prominently on personal achievements and goals.

A remarkable fact related to altruistic behavior is “that the word ‘altruism’ did not exist until 1851” (Wilson, 2015, p. 4), when the French philosopher Auguste Comte (1851, cited in Wilson, 2015) introduced this term by juxtaposing it to egoism, and by considering it compatible with a higher and purer moral system of living. However, the origins of the concept of altruism can be identified in the ancient Greek philosophy and drama in the form of self-sacrifice, as in the case of Euripides' Alceste. The concept of altruism is also found in the early Christian philosophy, where the Greek term ‘agape’ referred to selfless and “divine love for humanity” (Wuthnow, 1993, p. 346). In social sciences, Emile Durkheim – one of the founding figures of sociology – noted the importance of altruism by opposing it to egoism (Wuthnow, 1993), although altruism as a

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: pparaskeva@sch.gr (P. Paraskevaidis), k.andriotis@mdx.ac.uk (K. Andriotis).

concept gained increased scientific interest in sociobiology only during the 70's (Fennell, 2006; Wilson, 1975). Nowadays, a key issue that needs to be further explored concerns the way modern societies understand how altruistic behavior benefits group-level symbiosis of individuals (Wilson, 2015).

Through a literature review, 44 studies were found published between 1997 and 2016 exploring the concept of altruism in tourism. The majority of them, 29 in total, were focused on the motives and behaviors of volunteer tourists (for instance Coghlan & Fennell, 2009; Sin, 2009; Tomazos & Butler, 2012; Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Weaver, 2015); and none of them has examined altruism in tourism from the viewpoint of members of voluntary tourism associations. Instead, altruism has been examined in host communities and host-tourist encounters (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997; Fennell, 2006; Uriely, Schwartz, Cohen, & Reichel, 2002).

The literature review reveals that altruism comprises a constant variable in understanding volunteer tourism and more specifically the motive commonly ascribed to volunteer tourists, which diversifies their typical pattern of leisure seeking. However, Holmes and Smith (2009) and Smith and Holmes (2009, 2012), suggest an obvious distinction between volunteer tourists and host volunteers in the tourism sector. While volunteer tourists visit a destination to offer volunteering services, host volunteering mainly “involves residents as volunteers within their own community, and takes place in visitor attractions, at events and in destination service organisations” (Smith & Holmes, 2012, p. 563). Hence, host volunteering seems to have more common elements with host community studies than with volunteer tourism which is often perceived as ‘volunteer vacations’ (Smith & Holmes, 2009). Despite the fact that host volunteers are often lacking professional skills and tourism training (Alonso & Liu, 2013; Smith & Holmes, 2012) they contribute to the social capital of their community motivated by place attachment, civic pride and the emotional ties with their community.

As far it concerns altruism in host volunteering, Lockstone-Binney, Holmes, Smith, and Baum (2010) suggest that local volunteers at events, museums and heritage sites seem to be more self-oriented compared to volunteer tourists, for the reason that the first often consider volunteering as work experience, while the latter as an activity that fulfils their altruistic as well as their self-interest needs. Whereas the altruism vs egoism debate is dominant in volunteer tourism (Coghlan & Fennell, 2009; Wearing & McGehee, 2013), only a few studies examined altruism as a motivational factor influencing host volunteers in tourism (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005; Holmes & Smith, 2009; Lockstone-Binney et al., 2010). Whichever the case, the concept of altruism in tourism studies remains “largely subjective, with no clear, precise criteria” and, therefore, it lacks “clarity and precision” (Wright, 2013, p. 246).

Considering the scarcity of research on this topic, this exploratory study aims at examining altruistic motivations and behaviors of a community segment that plays a voluntary and ancillary role in the development of tourism, namely voluntary tourism associations. In doing so, the authors investigate whether altruistic behavior of host volunteers (members of voluntary tourism associations) is driven by self-interest benefits or by an attempt to improve the welfare of their communities. Due to the controversies of the concept, explained above, this study explores altruism from two different perspectives: true altruism (i.e. a lack of motivation for return favors) vs reciprocal altruism (i.e. the anticipation of intended direct or indirect benefits). Two theoretical constructs are tested, that is, Social Exchange Theory (SET) as opposed to Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon (ASP).

Altruism: reciprocal vs true

Altruism comprises a multifarious and multidimensional concept. Therefore, it is misleading, to talk about a single altruistic motive. Wilson (2015), while conceptualizing altruism, states that when we refer to altruism “we [may] mean a broad family of motives that cause people” (p. 141) to help others. Altruistic behavior in the context of tourism literature pertains mainly to the increase of ‘anonymous’ third party welfare in host societies (Fennell, 2006; Zahra & McGehee, 2013). From a different perspective, Kim, Lee, and Bonn (2016), refer to direct altruism by claiming that altruism occurs also between individuals “who feel [a] common-bond attachment” (p. 98). Altruistic acts between two individuals comprise second party advantages, thus bringing to the forefront the discussion on the concept of reciprocal exchanges.

Reciprocity as a concept has been frequently examined in relation to SET and the structure of social exchanges. According to Molm, Collett, and Schaefer (2007) social exchanges can be either direct or indirect. Direct forms of social exchanges are: a) reciprocal exchanges, when “actors’ contributions are separately performed, non-negotiated and initiated by performing beneficial acts for another” (Coulson, MacLaren, McKenzie, & O’Gorman, 2014, p. 135) and b) negotiated exchanges, when they “focus on the terms two actors negotiate to reach a mutually beneficial agreement” (Andriotis & Agiomirgianakis, 2014, p. 579). Direct exchanges usually refer to the resource exchanges between two actors (the giver and the recipient) in contrast to indirect (or generalized) exchanges, where the recipient does not reciprocate the giver directly but the latter receives “from a different actor” (Molm et al., 2007, p. 208), that is, a third party in the social environment.

In adapting the concept of reciprocal altruism to the forms of reciprocity, altruistic acts can be either direct between two actors or indirect, thus benefiting third-party welfare in the context of the community. However, altruism as a major component of volunteering refers predominantly to “multiparty interactions” (Fennell, 2006, p. 111). Consequently, volunteering is characterized mainly by indirect reciprocity (Mofulu, Pan, & Li, 2016). From a different perspective, Ballinger and Rockmann (2010) refer to altruism as a non-reciprocal form of relationships, whereby the person undertakes an act to the advantage of another person “without regard for his or her own outcomes” (p. 379). This state of “non-reciprocal

exchange relationship" (Ballinger & Rockmann, 2010, p. 385) is identical to true altruism. These differences between reciprocal and non-reciprocal exchanges are manifested by different motives and behaviors, which result in activities with certain core elements, as in the case of the two general types of altruism identified in the literature, namely, reciprocal and true altruism. A theoretical analysis of these two types is provided below.

Reciprocal altruism

Reciprocal altruism refers to a beneficial behavior involving two actors in the context of symbiosis, yet "with the expectation of a return favor" (Fennell, 2006, p. 109). Trivers (1971) stated that altruistic human social behavior exists between non-kin individuals with the expectation of reciprocal interactions that provide longevity among the members of a social group. As far as cooperation among relatives is concerned (kin altruism), Hamilton (1964) introduced the theory of 'inclusive fitness' to explicate cooperative traits among individuals, who are biologically related. Wischniewski, Windmann, Juckel, and Brüne (2009, p. 307) noted for their part that: "sustaining mutual cooperation at a high level may have promoted new levels of societal organization with increasing specialization and diversity both biologically and culturally". In fact, Trivers (1971) developed the concept of reciprocal altruism in an attempt to explain altruistic behavior that leads to cooperative relationships fostered between non-relatives. However, reciprocal altruism depends on a set of prerequisites, such as future encounters between individuals that may result in a beneficial return over time (Osinski, 2009). It is also important to take into account that in reciprocal altruism "the benefits enjoyed by each should be larger than the costs, so that over a period of time both enjoy a net gain" (Plummer & Fennell, 2007, p. 950).

In tourism studies, reciprocal altruism can be used to understand the motivations of altruistic behavior between tourists and hosts, so as to study cases of short-term symbiosis of non-relatives (Fennell, 2006). Therefore, the concept of reciprocal altruism provides a basis upon which to explore intrinsic motivation of hosts' perceptions on tourists and tourism development. Fennell's (2006) conceptual study examined reciprocal altruism in the context of formulating cooperative relationships between tourists and host service-providers. He found that, in order to provide an efficient cooperative environment at a given destination, altruistic behavior of both parties, the giver and the recipient, should be recognized and rewarded by local authorities. Fennell (2006) claimed that reciprocal altruism has a great disadvantage, namely that, while interactions between tourists and hosts are limited in time and frequency, both parties may choose to cheat each other (without returning the received favor). At developing destinations host-tourist encounters are infrequent. Thus, reciprocal altruism should be considered from the viewpoint of the social behavior of residents who voluntarily attempt to formulate adequate conditions for tourism development with the expectation of anticipated rewards. In this case reciprocal altruistic behavior can be observed on host-to-host cooperative traits aiming at gaining future benefits.

True altruism

Two and a half decades ago, Piliavin and Charng (1990) noted difficulties in defining the term 'true altruism', and remarked that "for a long time it was intellectually unacceptable to raise the question of whether 'true' altruism could exist". The reason behind this difficulty lay in that: "anything that appears to be motivated by a concern for someone else's needs will, under closer scrutiny, prove to have ulterior selfish motives" (p. 28). For this reason, the term 'true' altruism does not refer to any widely acknowledged definition of altruism, which could be perceived as true as opposed to 'false' or 'pseudo' altruism. Due to the complexity of the concept, this study defines true (or pure) altruism as a selfless behavior, which benefits the welfare of others without expected favors in return, and coincides with a "more pure [and] higher existence to which we can only aspire" (Wuthnow, 1993, p. 356). These assumptions are compatible with an ethical state of living that derives mainly from ancient Greek and early Christian philosophical and spiritual traditions. While several modern assumptions doubt true altruism on the basis of concealed selfish motivation, some scholars assert that altruistic behavior is also based on pure motives (Warneken & Tomasello, 2009; Wischniewski et al., 2009; Wuthnow, 1993). From a practical standpoint, true altruistic behavior derives from a set of moral principles and refers to selfless acts that benefit others without seeking any reward. Had there be any, they should be unintended. The pureness of altruistic behavior may also derive from religious ideals, values, and beliefs of helping others (Einolf, 2011).

In reality, there is a controversy with regard to true altruism as suspicions may arise about the intrinsic, unacknowledged personal benefits behind altruistic behavior. Based on this, Wakefield (1993) supports that true altruism is highly disputed and questions whether it "is part of human nature or just one more learned or socially constructed form of motivation" (p. 417). Wildman and Hollingsworth (2009) in their study of blood donors in Victoria, Australia, did not find any "empirical evidence of pure altruism" and concluded that "donation appears more [as] a consequence of social norms and societal embeddedness" (p. 502). However, even if we were to accept that true altruism is predominantly a socially constructed theory/concept, it still increases third parties welfare. Should actors in the tourism industry refuse to admit intent for rewards, the ambiguity as to their motivation will only grow bigger. In the same vein, it is important to note that human behavior can also be subconsciously motivated. Consequently, altruistic acts may derive as automatic and unintended responses to certain situations (Stajkovic, Locke, & Blair, 2006).

From a tourism perspective, true altruism has mainly been conceptualized as a purely motivated behavior of volunteer tourists (Mustonen, 2007; Wearing & McGehee, 2013) and the quest for true altruism in host volunteering seems to be

absent from tourism research (Anderson & Cairncross, 2005; Holmes & Slater, 2012; Smith & Holmes, 2009, 2012). Hence, there is lack of research at the community level, which is to be addressed by this study. Exception includes the study of Lockstone-Binney et al. (2010) which found that host volunteers are often more interested in advancing their own goals instead of the goals of the communities involved.

Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon (ASP)

The concepts of reciprocal and true altruism are theoretical constructs useful in understanding individuals' altruistic behavior. Two constructs (SET and ASP) were used to explain further these concepts in social behavior. Both of them are analyzed below.

Social Exchange Theory (SET)

Social Exchange Theory has been extensively examined in host community studies (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Coulson et al., 2014; Erotokritakis & Andriotis, 2006; Monterrubio & Andriotis, 2014; Sharpley, 2014). According to SET a host community tends to support tourism development when economic, environmental, and sociocultural impacts are perceived as positive; it is worth noting that these impacts comprise extrinsic outcomes for the hosts. However, SET also takes into account intrinsic rewards. As Ritzer (2010) notes in his analysis of Blau's (1964) study: "rewards that are exchanged can be either intrinsic (for instance, love, affection, respect) or extrinsic (for instance, money, physical labor)" (p. 427). Blau (1964) also states that "organized philanthropy provides another example of indirect social exchange" (p. 260), thus implying that altruism is an additional factor, which affects social interactions.

Whereas it seems that SET is opposed to true altruistic motives of behavior (Honeycutt, 1981), exchanges in social interactions can be based on other kinds of rewards that go beyond financial gains, such as "altruism, competition, reciprocity, and status consistency" (Meeker, 1971 cited in Emerson, 1976, p. 353). As far as the use of SET in tourism studies is concerned, it focuses mainly on the extrinsic rewards residents receive, predominantly tangible economic benefits (e.g. personal income, employment). This accounts for the lack of research on intrinsic and intangible rewards in the case of the social exchanges (e.g. recognition, affiliation). Whichever its shortcomings, SET is based on rewards, which explains why, when combined with altruism, it could be used in the context of reciprocal altruism. In the latter, hosts may support tourism development in order to gain intrinsic and intangible rewards. Another aspect regarding SET is that it emphasizes the importance of individuals' exchanges and benefits rather than the benefits drawn by a given community. It is important to keep in mind that, "processes at the societal level are fundamentally different from those at the individual level" (Blau, 1964 cited in Ritzer, 2010, p. 431).

Altruistic Surplus Phenomenon (ASP)

From a different standpoint, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) and Clifton and Benson (2006) identified in SET a major disadvantage, namely that this theory underlines individual benefits over community benefits. This is mainly the reason these authors proposed the ASP concept, worthy of exploration at a deeper level of analysis. In the words of Faulkner and Tideswell:

Like earlier notions of community perceptions of tourism based on SET, Altruistic Surplus sees residents' responses being governed by a trade-off between the costs and benefits derived from this activity. Unlike SET, however, this concept envisages the trade-off being externalized in such a way that costs to the individual might be tolerated in the interest of broader community benefits (1997, p. 24).

ASP has been used predominantly in urban planning studies to explore urban residents' reactions to collective community benefits (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997). However, it seems that tourism also provides an adequate field of application. To this end, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) used the ASP to explain residents' attitudes towards tourism development in the Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia, and noticed that individuals may tolerate personal costs of tourism development for the broader collective benefits of the host community. This element seems to differentiate further ASP from SET, as the latter does not justify that residents continue to support tourism development when they believe that tourism can result in adverse effects to their own personal goals (Kayat, Sharif, & Karnchanan, 2013).

Besides, this phenomenon seems to be related to the mature stage of a destination's tourism development as it reveals responsibility and accountability of residents' attitudes and behavior (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997; Hall & Page, 2014). Lundberg (2015), when exploring the applicability of ASP, found that, although residents of some non-mature coastal tourist settings near Gothenburg (Sweden) understood the fallout of tourism development, they continued to support it. This suggests that ASP may not be entirely influenced by the development stage, but rather by the community's social attitudes. ASP was also confirmed in the study of Waitt (2003), where the empowerment of "community and national spirit" (p. 209) was considered a significant motivation for local volunteers during the Sydney Olympics.

Methods of study

Smith and Holmes (2012) note that: “quantitative studies often fail to capture the specific motivations” (p. 563) of host volunteers, therefore a qualitative methodology was considered as more appropriate to reveal the motivation of local volunteers under study. This exploratory study aims at addressing past research shortcomings by using two theoretical constructs, SET or ASP, in an attempt to explore whether host motivations and behaviors are based on true or reciprocal altruism. More specifically, this study explores altruistic behavior by using a sample unit of two voluntary tourism associations based in Veria, a municipality of Northern Greece (Fig. 1). Voluntary associations were used because they embody social actors playing a supportive role at a community level by providing civic engagement in local administration and development. This was highlighted by Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2012) when they noted that tourism policy makers: “should promote civic engagement in the society by encouraging citizens’ participation in voluntary associations and encouraging social networks among community members” (p. 1014).

The first voluntary association under study is the Tourism Board of Veria (hereafter TBV). TBV was created in 1957 and its activities included an annual parade of floats and majorettes in the streets of the city as well as music festivals and folklore dances. In 1963, TBV suspended its activities due to organizational difficulties. It resumed its work in 2014, when some of its older members, with the help of some newcomers elected a new Management Board. The newly appointed Board’s vision was to reclaim Veria’s culture through tourism and to work jointly with local authorities to support planning and development of tourism in the wider area. The second voluntary association is the Tourism Board of Seli (hereafter TBS). TBS was founded in 1973 in the village of Kato Vermio (formerly known as Seli). Its initiatives include local development through a variety of activities such as beautifying and cleaning of local parks and water fountains, planting trees and organizing cultural (folklore) events. Kato Vermio became well-known after 1934, when the first organized ski resort in the region of Central Macedonia, Northern Greece, located at about 1.5 kilometers from the village of Kato Vermio, became operational.

Twenty one members of the above-mentioned associations (12 men and nine women) were interviewed between April and October 2015. These volunteers were selected based on the following criteria: first, their involvement in the associations is strictly voluntary; and second, their actions are not financially depended on tourism for their living. Eleven of the respondents were members of the TBS and ten were members of the TBV. Their age ranged from 33 and 76 years. As far as their educational background is concerned, two of them held a Master’s degree, 12 held a Bachelor Degree and seven had completed Secondary Education. The interviews lasted between 30 minutes and one hour and were recorded in notebooks. The sample size of 21 interviewees was considered adequate since the data collected from the last informants did not generate any new insightful information on the themes and subthemes of this study. Therefore, it was assumed that data saturation was achieved and that all research questions were sufficiently answered (O’ Reilly & Parker, 2012).

To better understand host perceptions and to answer the question why specific segments of residents adopt altruistic or selfish behaviors towards tourism, in-depth interviews were conducted. A semi-structured format made of open-ended questions was considered suitable for understanding individuals’ perceptions on altruism because, as reported by Marshall and Rossman (2011), it allows interviewees to freely express their opinion on broader topics. The fact that one of the authors resides in the area was helpful to achieve competent understanding of local host perceptions and to ensure first-hand knowledge and understanding of local social norms and cultural habits (Paraskevaidis & Andriotis, 2015). Nevertheless, findings could be misinterpreted as being subjective representations of the first author who resides in the study area and collected primary data (Jackson, 2008), thus sharing similar social norms and cultural tradition with interviewees. To avoid erroneous interpretations, all transcribed primary data findings were extensively analyzed, coded and cross-checked by the second author who is a non-resident of the study area.



Fig. 1. The Municipality of Veria

The interview schedule was designed following the main themes emerging in the literature, mainly the studies conducted by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997), Fennell (2006), Holmes and Smith (2009), Lockstone-Binney et al. (2010), Uriely et al. (2002), Wilson (2015), and Wuthnow (1993). The focus of the research was on how informants perceived local tourism development, what they expected from joining a voluntary association and if they perceived their behavior as being altruistic. Issues of indirect professional involvement with local tourism development were also raised, so as to understand whether participants expect vocational benefits from their voluntary actions. Respondents were also asked about any individual and collective benefits tourism development could provide.

Crude data were subsequently transcribed and thoroughly read and reread several times. They were then coded into the various themes and subthemes which emerged from the literature review as well as during the coding process. Following coding of themes and subthemes, patterns and typologies were applied to the data so as to give meaning to every theme and subtheme while providing meaningful interpretations of the phenomenon under study. To avoid falsified interpretations of primary data, and to ensure its validity and credibility (Cho & Trent, 2006; Decrop, 1999), this study implemented data triangulation by comparing primary findings with secondary ones, namely those collected from research articles and social media. It should also be noted that member checking affirms the concept of data saturation, since interviewees were asked to confirm the study findings and provide further insights (Hutchison, Johnston, & Breckon, 2011). Member checking was applied in this study by asking two informants to indicate whether they agreed with the study findings, which they did.

Study findings

For a better understanding of the motivations and behaviors of members of voluntary tourism associations and for identifying whether their altruistic behavior is related to true or reciprocal altruism as well as to SET or ASP, findings have been classified as follows.

Tourism's development potential

Tourism's development potential refers to community members who earn their living through tourism and tourism impacts greatly on the development of their community (Andriotis, 2000). With that in mind, members of voluntary tourism associations, need to believe that the tourism sector has the potential to contribute to the development of their community. Therefore, respondents were asked whether they believe that their communities have the potential to develop their tourism industry. The potential of tourism for the development of the study area was evident in the responses provided by all members of the TBV, who indicated that local tourism development is a vital factor for job generation, economic rejuvenation and possibly international cultural recognition. Just to cite one example, a 76-year old male noted:

We can show impressive sightseeing spots to Greeks and foreigners. Our city has impressive historical and cultural monuments worth visiting, such as Byzantine churches, and the shrine of Apostle Paul, the place where the Apostle preached.

Unexploited monuments of Veria were also mentioned by a 55-year old female member of the Management Board who stated: "I would like to see tourists visiting our city and its monuments". Another 43-year old female member of the Management Board said: "the city will gain greatly if tourism flow increases. We need to promote our area as well as our local products. I can't bear watch our city dying bit by bit". Apart from the responses, the interest of TBV for tourism is evident in their Facebook page, which includes many pictures of local sights, such as monuments and landmarks (Tourism Board of Veria, 2015). There is, for example, a picture of an old building (uploaded on Facebook 18-07-2015) accompanied by the comment: "Veria: Palimpsest of civilizations".

Obviously respondents' eagerness for developing tourism in their area is the result of negative effects of the Greek financial crisis (Paraskevaidis & Andriotis, 2015). According to Lapavitsas (2013), after 2010 austerity measures resulted in severe economic recession. The latter produced a sharp decrease of Greece's GDP as well as a significant reduction of per capita income. In the view of all TBV members, tourism can be used as a source of income to a recession-hit area, such as Veria. Despite the fact that tourism in Greece is mainly developed in insular and coastal areas, during the last years many urban locations started to promote tourism in order to reinforce local economic development (Papadimitriou, Apostolopoulou, & Kaplanidou, 2015). According to the President of TBV: "factories are not going to open in this area and agriculture is not able to provide sufficient income. The only sector which is able to increase economic benefits is tourism". This quote is in line with findings by Styliadis and Terzidou (2014), who reported that residents' of Kavala, Northern Greece, support for tourism development increased as a result of the on-going economic crisis. To use their own words, "the current economic turmoil in Greece is pushing residents of Kavala to adopt a more positive overall attitude towards tourism" (p. 222).

The Tourism Board of Seli (2015) has a different perspective as far as the development of local tourism is considered. In fact, its members do not consider tourism as viable and attractive option to economic crisis. The main reason for this is that while all interviewees have roots in Kato Vermio, their main residence is in the city of Veria. Kato Vermio is their secondary residence, used as cottage during the summer time, for the weekends or during statutory holidays, such as Christmas and Easter (Paraskevaidis, 2007). This is mainly the reason why the respondents in question would rather prefer their village

to remain 'intact', that is, with limited if any tourism development, the latter being viewed from a negative standpoint (congestion, environmental and cultural decline, etc.).

Consequently, all members of TBS noted that their main interest lies in improving living standards of their community instead of increasing economic output through tourism-induced development. To this end, all members of TBS stated that their interest focuses on the village itself rather than on tourism. As the Secretary of TBS explained "this is not about tourists in the strict sense; it is more about visitors, mainly relatives and friends of the residents who visit the village occasionally". As far as the nearby ski resort is concerned, respondents admitted that tourists visiting the ski resort usually do not visit the village. This reveals the lack of synergies between local businesses and the ski resort facilities. This is succinctly put by the TBS Treasurer:

Seli ski resort is a government-run business. In the past, there were some discussions for efforts of mutual cooperation with the managers of the resort. However, there is no cooperation between Ski resort operators and local businessmen. As far as we are concerned, our main interest is the village itself and the well-being and quality of life of its residents.

Apparently, this trend can be understood by the explanation offered by the Secretary of the Management Board, a 33-year old male who claims that "if the snowfall was heavier, residents would recognize the potential or the opportunity for tourism development. Currently, the skiing period is particularly short due to insufficient snowfall, which means that tourism development cannot progress in Kato Vermio". In a similar vein, a 57-year old male explains "local tourism development could only be achieved through our ski resort. But since the ski resort activities have declined due to reduced snowfall, there actually are no tourism opportunities to go after". In fact, global warming and the associated reduced snowfall have impacted negatively tourist flows in Kato Vermio, as has been reported from many winter resorts worldwide (Gilaberte-Búrdalo, López-Martín, Pino-Otín, & López-Moreno, 2014).

The fact that TBS members do not believe in Kato Vermio's tourism development does not mean that they are not interested in people visiting the area. As the Vice-president declares "Our interest lies in improving our quality of life, as well as our visitors' stay". Although Kato Vermio is considered an underdeveloped mountainous destination, the village attracts hundreds of visitors every year at the eve of Virgin's Mary celebration on August 15 (Paraskevaidis, 2008). In comparing the responses given by interviewees from both associations, it is evident that their perceptions differ significantly. On the one hand, TBV members focus primarily on the development of tourism in the city of Veria and the broader region and believe that tourism may be their last chance to improve financial well-being while reversing the negative effects of the economic crisis. On the other hand, TBS members are mainly interested in the development of the village while relying minimally on tourism. This variation on attitudes can be explained by the fact that TBV members are permanent residents of the city of Veria, as opposed to TBS members, who are cottage owners in Kato Vermio and consider the village as vacation destination.

Another difference in attitudes is related to the perceptions of economic crisis per se. On the one hand, TBV members are concerned with and engaged in voluntary activities in their attempt to help their city overcome the negative effects of the crisis. On the other hand, TBS members are not engaged in their association as a reaction to the economic crisis, although they express their dissatisfaction with how recession has affected negatively the potential of their association to organize cultural events. As the Treasurer of TBS admitted: "Before the recession, our organization was subsidized by municipal authorities; nowadays funding dried out. As a result, we do not have the financial resources necessary to achieve our goals".

Voluntary associations members' motivations

Although altruistic motivation, that is the motivation of 'helping others' and specifically 'helping the local community', was predominant in members' responses for their engagement in local associations, self-oriented motivations, mainly self-development, were also apparent.

Place attachment

The findings revealed that place attachment is a significant factor in encouraging respondents to join TBV. In seven out of ten cases, the main reason for joining the association is the special bond respondents have with their hometown. This is how they express their motivation: "I joined out of love for my hometown". In a similar vein, all TBS members admitted that their voluntary activities stem from the special bond with their hometown and their cultural roots. As a 55-year old male says: "I've got involved in the TBS because I love my village and I want to contribute to the revival of local customs, which are at the core of the Association's mandate". Despite the fact that TBS members are not primarily concerned with tourism development, an additional motivation was to improve living conditions in their community, which suggests their attachment to the place.

Clearly, all respondents stated the bonds they developed with their hometowns as their main motive to get involved in volunteering. According to Needham and Little (2013) the most common components of place attachment are: "belongingness, rootedness [and] bonding" (p. 71), a viewpoint that was confirmed by the majority of the interviewees. Likewise, Smith and Holmes (2012) in their study on local volunteers involved in visitor centres in Australia, noted that the: "passion and enthusiasm for the local area" (p. 566) were important motives for host volunteering.

Reciprocal altruism

Helping others with intended future community rewards is undoubtedly a prime altruistic motive. This motive can be combined with the expectation that tourism development can improve living conditions and result in positive future outcomes. Apparently, such altruistic motives and behaviors cannot be considered as true altruism, but rather as reciprocal. This was evident in the case of the President of TBV who is also an elected town councillor, when he stated: “I am also interested in politics. Social exposure is achieved through participating in local authorities and associations, such as the TBV. I believe that most people who are active members of associations are interested in gaining recognition”. Although this motive was addressed in [Boz and Palaz’s survey \(2007\)](#), in which they examined the motives of community volunteers in Turkey, none of other TBV members anticipated any comparable benefit from their participation in the association.

Responses of TBS members confirm that the motivation of helping others is accompanied with intended future benefits. As a 55-year old male mentioned: “I believe that TBS promotes development in Kato Vermio. Thanks to the efforts of its members, footpaths were constructed and folklore events were organized”. However, even though TBS members did not express any direct interest in supporting tourism development in Kato Vermio, their interest in beautification activities, such as creating footpaths and organizing cultural events, reveals an indirect interest in visitors and tourists. For example, a 39-year old male admitted: “I would like to see our activities to be more related to tourism”. Therefore, their activities primarily address local residents and concern visitors only indirectly. In a similar vein, the Secretary of TBS explained: “our efforts aim at developing our village”. These responses reveal that the altruistic behavior of the TBS members is linked to reciprocal altruism; hence members are motivated by a common vision to provide community benefits even if deep down, they expect some kind of personal benefits. According to the Vice-president:

Many residents reach out to us when they are faced with a problem, for example, water supply. In such instances, we inform them that we will contact the municipal authorities, even if our main focus is on other initiatives, such as tree care and park conservation. The municipality of Veria provides us with the necessary equipment and we provide manual labor. We love our village. This is the reason why we help and support our co-villagers.

In this context, the role of TBS is perceived by the residents of Kato Vermio as a local ‘authority’ body that contributes voluntarily to the solution of the village’s daily problems. Despite the fact that TBS is not an official local government body, it cooperates closely with local authorities. This finding confirms the study of [Schofer and Fourcade-Gourinchas \(2001\)](#), which analyzed the corporate administrative culture of Sweden and found that “the carriers of corporate interests play substantive social roles, often being closely integrated with policymaking institutions and assuming broad administrative responsibilities” (p. 814). Whichever the important social role of TBS, it is not based on the encouragement of the public sector, but it is the result of volunteering.

Although reciprocal altruism explains the altruistic behavior of both associations’ members, as they expect communal future benefits from local development, it also contributes to the empowerment of social interactions among members and their respective communities. This was also confirmed in the studies of [Holmes and Smith \(2009\)](#) and [Holmes and Slater \(2012\)](#), who highlighted the significant role of social interactions in host volunteering. In the case of TBV, it is quite early to realize the total effects of reciprocal altruism. Although TBV is an old association it was reactivated in 2014. Therefore, trustful and long-term relationships need to be achieved between the association and the residents of Veria. However, TBS seems to have already established fruitful and advantageous cooperation among its members and the local community.

Self-development motives

Beyond altruistic motives, all members mention self-oriented motives for getting involved in TBV, such as self-development and self-improvement. This was summarized in the words of a 55-year old female who said: “volunteering helps me to become a better person”. This finding also refers to the fact that half of TBV members are also members of other voluntary associations aiming at promoting cultural and folklore interests. Consequently, such behaviors are related to personality traits. As [Bekkers \(2005, p. 448\)](#) explains: “openness to experience was typical of citizens participating in non-political associations”. This was also confirmed by a 76-year old male: “thanks to my involvement in the Association, I was given the opportunity to educate myself on matters related to our culture”.

Similarly seven out of 11 TBS members admitted that their participation was also motivated by the need for self-development and self-improvement. A 55-year old female states to that effect: “I think that through my participation in the Association I benefit from interacting with other members and from listening to diverse opinions”. However, the presence of self-interest motives is linked to the broader philosophy of volunteering. The same respondent added: “if volunteering didn’t exist, nothing could be done. I want to support my place through volunteering”. Moreover, a 39-year old male admitted self-improvement through closer relationships with members as motive for participating in volunteering activities: “I think team-building helps me become a better person”.

In the context of the present study, volunteering seems to be a way of life related to personality traits. This has also been confirmed by [Uriely’s et al. \(2002\)](#) study on local volunteers in Israel. In our case, respondents from both associations declared that providing help to their respective communities was their primary goal as opposed to self-development and self-improvement, both of which were stated as secondary motives. An explanation to this behavior may be based on the

fact that helping the community comprises a high-valued motive in contrast to self-development and self-improvement, which were perceived as low-valued motives.

Collective benefits

As far as collective benefits are concerned, all TBV members stressed the importance of volunteering for local tourism development. To this end, a 56-year old female member of the TBV Management Board stated: “In our Association we support voluntary activities that reflect a collective attitude towards the city’s problems”. Likewise, a 43-year old female member of TBV said: “I hope more citizens would follow our lead and become actively involved in our Association. We need to become a collective body”. The development of collective consciousness is perhaps a major factor in voluntary associations, although the latter’s social role depends on the political environment that encourages or hinders such a development (Schofer & Fourcade-Gourinchas, 2001). Whatever the case, the overall attitudes and behaviors of TBV members indicate their firm belief in voluntary activities while confirming ASP.

In the case of TBS members, ASP is also confirmed by the absence of expecting individual tangible, financial, and vocational future gains. The case of TBS’ Vice-president is an exception, since he implied unintended tangible and intangible gains: “I am a local small business owner. My involvement in the Association helps me professionally, because I meet a lot of people. However, I never joined the Association so as to have a personal gain”. All other members of TBS emphasized that their activities are primarily focused on their community’s best interest, as well as on the preservation of local culture, thus revealing their vision of collective benefits.

A typical example of this was an event organized by TBV and promoted through its Facebook page. On the 22nd of March 2015, TBV organized street cleaning in two districts of the city of Veria. The Association’s call was met with great enthusiasm since many members as well as non-members actively participated in it (Tourism Board of Veria, 22-03-2015). A similar event was organized on the 3rd of August 2015 by the TBS (Facebook, 04-08-2015) where residents were invited to voluntarily clean a park in the village. These events confirm ASP for participants may have offered their services voluntarily but they also benefited not only themselves but also their co-citizens from the use of a clean park.

In brief, ASP is considered more adequate in explaining the findings of this study simply because altruistic behavior of TBV and TBS members was adopted for the purpose of achieving collective benefits. Additionally, both regions, namely Veria and Kato Vermio, are underdeveloped (Paraskevaidis, 2007) thus making the application of ASP irrelevant to their current development stage. That being said, ASP is appropriately applicable to members’ social attitudes and behaviors.

Conclusion

Upon identifying a lack of research on altruistic motivations of host volunteers, this study adopted an interdisciplinary approach by combining theoretical and empirical evidence drawn from evolutionary biology, and social sciences to theoretically substantiate altruistic behavior in tourism. To explore altruism in tourism from the perspective of host communities and more specifically from the viewpoint of voluntary tourism associations twenty one interviews were conducted.

To provide a deeper understanding of altruistic motivation and behavior two opposing concepts, i.e. true altruism and reciprocal altruism, were explored. Adopting altruistic behavior without expecting return favors and positive individual outcomes is characterized as true altruism in contrast to reciprocal altruism where actors tolerate personal costs in helping others, but in doing so they expect future rewards. In this study, the concept of reciprocal altruism accounts for motivational factors that influenced the members of both associations to offer voluntarily their time and labor in an attempt to improve their respective communities’ standards of living. Drawn in both studied associations, it can be concluded that TBV was more focused on promoting tourism development as a way of overcoming unfavorable impacts of the current economic recession in Greece, whereas TBS was trying to reinforce local development based primarily on cultural regeneration.

To explore further social behaviors two theoretical concepts were used: SET and ASP. In this study ASP, as opposed to SET, was considered more appropriate to interpret the behavior of the members of the two associations for two reasons. First, one of the prerequisites of SET is that residents support tourism development when their individual gains are greater than their personal costs. According to Ritzer (2010) rewards of social exchanges can be extrinsic (such as money) or intrinsic (such as respect). In the case of TBV and TBS, members tolerated personal costs, such as offering voluntary services without receiving any extrinsic gains. Even if self-development and self-exploration are considered as intrinsic rewards, these were of secondary importance for respondents’ prime motivation. The respondents’ incentives for participating in voluntary tourism associations were selfless since the ultimate goal was to help the community. Second, all interviewees from both associations disregarded individual negative consequences for collective prosperity, thus confirming ASP which: “has its roots in emphasizing collective over individual benefits” (Clifton & Benson, 2006, p. 248), as opposed to SET. Therefore, ASP is more adequate in understanding community perceptions in cases where hosts endure greater individual losses than benefits and continue to support tourism. This phenomenon cannot be explained through SET.

Another element to be taken into account in interpreting altruistic behavior is that interviewees undertook significant risks while expecting future development. This is due to the fact that their associations’ role is unofficial. Additionally, long-term plans for local development might never be achieved. Thus one of the main practical implications of this study suggests that tourism authorities and policy makers should involve voluntary tourism associations in tourism planning.

By doing so, local communities will benefit greatly from their initiatives, and voluntary tourism associations will be further motivated to support tourism development of their respective communities.

Both communities under study are developing destinations and therefore hosts-tourists' interactions have been rarely observed. Henceforth, altruistic behavior cannot be retrieved in host-tourists' encounters. In fact, ASP is not as innocent as one should expect. Some respondents may tolerate personal costs stemming from voluntary work in order to create a solid basis for the community's future development. But, in the long run, local development may contribute to higher standards of living in financial and environmental terms, which will induce, on average, collective community benefits. Therefore, residents who support voluntarily tourism development by assisting voluntary tourism associations might expect intended multiple positive outcomes for their community. In the future, this will translate into local development, which will come back to them, in the form of personal and collective gain. For this reason, it becomes obvious that ASP cannot be associated with true altruism but with reciprocal.

Moreover, both developing destinations under study, i.e. Veria a small city and Kato Vermio a village, have insignificant tourism impacts. Consequently, members' personal costs are not associated with tourism; rather they pertain to members' individual costs of offering their services voluntarily. Contrary to the findings of Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) that correlated ASP with mature destinations where negative impacts occur, in this study, ASP was related to social attitudes observed in TBV and TBS members and not to the development stage of the regions studied herein. Similarly to Lundberg (2015), who confirmed ASP in non-mature settings, this study revealed that this phenomenon is not only related to the destinations' development stage, but also to residents' attitudes and behaviors.

Although it has been proven that the collection of data from different sources (interviews, social networks, and published studies) has resulted in a solid methodological approach, useful in exploring altruism at a community level, there are several limitations that have to be considered. One limitation this study attempted to overcome was the 'value-action gap' in residents' perceptions defined by Sharpley (2014) as: "what people say they would do is not reflected in what they actually do" (p. 46). To overcome this gap, the current study asked interviewees to indicate the altruistic activities they have been engaged in; their responses were then triangulated and confirmed through secondary data collection.

Due to the explorative nature of this study, primary research was limited to members of two Greek voluntary associations located in a single municipality. One might expect that the fact that both associations aim at promoting a specific destination would likely influence the results. Therefore, findings need to be enriched by other surveys with larger samples that will include voluntary tourism associations based on several locations as well as associations whose purpose is not focused exclusively upon tourism (e.g. learned societies and environmental groups) in order to justify, modify or extend the outcomes of the current study and clarify whether non-tourism voluntary associations have different attitudes and behaviors towards tourism.

Additionally, differences on respondents' socio-demographic characteristics were not used to explain attitudes and behaviors, as the aim of this exploratory study was to provide a better understanding of residents' altruistic behavior. In order to enrich tourism knowledge on community altruistic behavior, further research is required to explore whether socio-demographic variables influence such behavior.

To conclude, the findings of this study provide the potential of a theoretical framework in tourism studies. In particular, in underdeveloped tourism destinations host community members are more likely to participate in volunteering and to develop altruistic behavior, first, to achieve collective benefits for the community and, second, to benefit their individual self-interests (e.g. self-development, affiliation etc.). Basic prerequisites for hosts to get involved in volunteering seem to be place attachment and personality traits (e.g. openness to new experiences, compassion concern etc.). Such altruistic behavior is strongly linked to reciprocal altruism as it comprises a desirable indirect reciprocal exchange. Host volunteers are willingly offering services and perhaps money to help their community achieve tourism development. In return, they expect positive outcomes such as economic, social and environmental rejuvenation for the benefit not only of their community but of themselves. Moreover, host volunteers are also interested in self-oriented benefits in addition to their primary concern for community gains. These self-interested benefits might consciously be concealed and are possibly the main reason for participating in volunteering. However, such motivational intentions may never be confessed (e.g. gain social recognition) as this would have the exact opposite outcome; individuals who would admit that their primary intention for offering voluntary services is to gain social recognition would be accused of moral hypocrisy by the community. This issue needs further future research.

References

- Alonso, A. D., & Liu, Y. (2013). Local community, volunteering and tourism development: The case of the Blackwood River Valley, Western Australia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16(1), 47–62.
- Anderson, E., & Cairncross, G. (2005). Understanding and managing volunteer motivation: Two regional tourism cases. *Australian Journal on Volunteering*, 10(2), 7–17.
- Andriotis, K. (2000). *Local community perceptions of tourism as a development tool: The island of Crete (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*. United Kingdom: Bournemouth University.
- Andriotis, K., & Agiomirgianakis, G. (2014). Market escape through exchange: Home swap as a form of non-commercial hospitality. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(7), 576–591.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172–185.
- Ballinger, G. A., & Rockmann, K. W. (2010). Chutes versus ladders: Anchoring events and a punctuated-equilibrium perspective on social exchange relationships. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(3), 373–391.

- Bekkers, R. (2005). Participation in voluntary associations: Relations with resources, personality, and political values. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 439–454.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
- Boz, I., & Palaz, S. (2007). Factors influencing the motivation of Turkey's community volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(4), 643–661.
- Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative Research*, 6(3), 319–340.
- Clifton, J., & Benson, A. (2006). Planning for sustainable ecotourism: The case for research ecotourism in developing country destinations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(3), 238–254.
- Coghlan, A., & Fennell, D. (2009). Myth or substance: An examination of altruism as the basis of volunteer tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3–4), 377–402.
- Comte, A. (1851). *Système de politique positive*. Paris: Mathias.
- Coulson, A. B., MacLaren, A. C., McKenzie, S., & O' Gorman, K. D. (2014). Hospitality codes and social exchange theory: The Pashtunwali and tourism in Afghanistan. *Tourism Management*, 45, 134–141.
- Decrop, A. (1999). Triangulation in qualitative tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 20(1), 157–161.
- Einolf, C. (2011). The link between religion and helping others: The role of values, ideas and language. *Sociology of Religion*, 72(4), 435–455.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335–362.
- Erotokritakis, K. & Andriotis, K. (2006). Residents' perceptions towards tourism in a rural Cretan community. Paper presented at the International Conference of Trends, Impacts and Policies on Tourism Development, 15–18 June 2006, Heraklion, Greece.
- Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 3–28.
- Fennell, D. (2006). Evolution in tourism: The theory of reciprocal altruism and tourist-host interactions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 9(2), 105–124.
- Gilaberte-Bürdalo, M., López-Martín, F., Pino-Otín, M. R., & López-Moreno, J. I. (2014). Impacts of climate change on ski industry. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 44, 51–61.
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2014). *The geography of tourism and recreation. Environment, place and space* (4th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hamilton, W. D. (1964). The genetical evolution of social behaviour (I & II). *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 7(1), 1–52.
- Holmes, K., & Slater, A. (2012). Patterns of voluntary participation in membership associations: A study of UK heritage supporter groups. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(5), 850–869.
- Holmes, K., & Smith, K. A. (2009). *Managing volunteers in tourism: Attractions, destinations and events*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Homant, R. J. (2010). Risky altruism as a predictor of criminal victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(11), 1195–1216.
- Honeycutt, J. M. (1981). Altruism and social exchange theory: The vicarious rewards of the altruist. *Mid-American Review of Sociology*, 6(1), 93–99.
- Hutchinson, A. J., Johnston, L., & Breckon, J. (2011). Grounded theory-based research within exercise psychology: A critical review. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 8(3), 247–272.
- Jackson, A. Y. (2008). Power and pleasure in ethnographic home-work: Producing a recognizable ethics. *Qualitative Research*, 8(1), 37–51.
- Kayat, K., Sharif, N. M., & Karnchanan, P. (2013). Individual and collective impacts and residents' perceptions of tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 15(4), 640–653.
- Kim, M. J., Lee, C.-K., & Bonn, M. (2016). The effect of social capital and altruism on seniors' revisit intention to social network sites for tourism-related purposes. *Tourism Management*, 53, 96–107.
- Lapavitsas, C. (2013). *Profiting without producing. How finance exploits us all*. London: Verso.
- Lockstone-Binney, L., Holmes, K., Smith, K., & Baum, T. (2010). Volunteers and volunteering in leisure: Social science perspectives. *Leisure Studies*, 29(4), 435–455.
- Lundberg, E. (2015). The level of tourism development and resident attitudes: A comparative case study of coastal destinations. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 15(3), 266–294.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meeker, B. (1971). Decisions and exchange. *American Sociological Review*, 36, 485–495.
- Mofulu, G., Pan, A., & Li, P. (2016). Indirect reciprocity: Its antecedents and consequences in social entrepreneurship. *Rationality and Society*, 28(1), 105–138.
- Molm, L. D., Collett, J. L., & Schaefer, D. R. (2007). Building solidarity through generalized exchange: A theory of reciprocity. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 205–242.
- Monterrubio, C. J., & Andriotis, K. (2014). Social representations and community attitudes towards spring breakers. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(2), 288–302.
- Mustonen, P. (2007). Volunteer tourism – altruism or mere tourism? *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 18(1), 97–115.
- Needham, M. D., & Little, C. M. (2013). Voluntary environmental programs at an alpine ski area: Visitor perceptions, attachment, value orientations and specialization. *Tourism Management*, 35, 70–81.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997–1023.
- O' Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2012). 'Unsatisfactory saturation': A critical exploration of the notion of saturated sample sizes in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 13(2), 190–197.
- Osinski, J. (2009). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism and social discounting. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 374–378.
- Papadimitriou, D., Apostolopoulou, A., & Kaplanidou, K. (2015). Destination personality, affective image, and behavioral intentions in domestic urban tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(3), 302–315.
- Paraskevidis, P. (2007). *Host perceptions on the impacts of tourism development: The case of Kato Vermio (Unpublished master's thesis)*. Greece: Hellenic Open University (in Greek).
- Paraskevidis, P. (2008). Mountain tourism. In K. Andriotis (Ed.), *Sustainability and alternative forms of tourism* (pp. 167–190). Athens: Stamoulis (in Greek).
- Paraskevidis, P., & Andriotis, K. (2015). Values of souvenirs as commodities. *Tourism Management*, 48, 1–10.
- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H.-W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27–65.
- Plummer, R., & Fennell, D. (2007). Exploring co-management theory: Prospects for sociobiology and reciprocal altruism. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 85, 944–955.
- Ritzer, G. (2010). *Sociological Theory* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schofer, E., & Fourcade-Gourinchas, M. (2001). The structural contexts of civic engagement: Voluntary association membership in comparative perspective. *American Sociological Review*, 66(6), 806–828.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49.
- Sin, H. L. (2009). Volunteer tourism – “Involve me and I will learn”? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 480–501.
- Smith, K. A., & Holmes, K. (2009). Researching volunteers in tourism: Going beyond. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 12(3–4), 403–420.
- Smith, K. A., & Holmes, K. (2012). Visitor centre staffing: Involving volunteers. *Tourism Management*, 33(3), 562–568.
- Stajkovic, A., Locke, E., & Blair, E. (2006). A first examination of the relationships between primed subconscious goals, assigned conscious goals, and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1172–1180.
- Stylidis, D., & Terzidou, M. (2014). Tourism and the economic crisis in Kavala, Greece. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, 210–226.
- Tomazos, K., & Butler, R. (2012). Volunteer tourists in the field: A question of balance? *Tourism Management*, 33, 177–187.
- Tourism Board of Seli (2015). In Facebook [community page]. Retrieved August 7, 2015 from <https://www.facebook.com/t.o.seliou?fref=ts>.
- Tourism Board of Veria (2015). In Facebook [community page]. Retrieved August 18, 2015 from <https://www.facebook.com/veriatourismclub?fref=ts>.
- Trivers, R. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 46(1), 35–57.
- Uriely, N., Schwartz, Z., Cohen, E., & Reichel, A. (2002). Rescuing hikers in Israel's deserts: Community altruism or an extension of adventure tourism? *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(1), 25–36.
- Waite, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194–215.
- Wakefield, J. C. (1993). Is altruism part of human nature? Toward a theoretical foundation for the helping professions. *Social Service Review*, 67(3), 406–458.

- Warneken, F., & Tomasello, M. (2009). The roots of human altruism. *British Journal of Psychology*, 100, 455–471.
- Wearing, S., & McGehee, N. G. (2013). Volunteer tourism: A review. *Tourism Management*, 38, 120–130.
- Weaver, D. (2015). Volunteer tourism and beyond: Motivations and barriers to participation in protected area enhancement. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(5), 683–705.
- Wildman, J., & Hollingsworth, B. (2009). Blood donation and the nature of altruism. *Journal of Health Economics*, 28, 492–503.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, D. S. (2015). *Does altruism exist? Culture, genes and the welfare of others*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wischniewski, J., Windmann, S., Juckel, G., & Brüne, M. (2009). Rules of social exchange: Game theory, individual differences and psychopathology. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 33, 305–313.
- Wright, H. (2013). Volunteer tourism and its (mis)perceptions: A comparative analysis of tourist/host perceptions. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 13(4), 239–250.
- Wuthnow, R. (1993). Altruism and sociological theory. *Social Service Review*, 67(3), 344–357.
- Zahra, A., & McGehee, N. G. (2013). Volunteer tourism: A host community capital perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 22–45.

Pavlos Paraskevaidis is an educator at the Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs, Greece, pparaskeva@sch.gr and his research interests are in tourism development and sociology of tourism.

Konstantinos Andriotis is Professor in Tourism at Middlesex University London, Business School, Department of Marketing, Branding and Tourism k.andriotis@mdx.ac.uk. His research interests are in tourism development and planning, community attitudes and tourism experience.