

Aileen Schütz

**Unequal Relationships in
Voluntourism and their
Impacts on Receiving
Organizations in Tanzania**

ARBEITSPAPIERE DES
INSTITUTS FÜR
ETHNOLOGIE
UND AFRIKASTUDIEN

WORKING PAPERS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF
ANTHROPOLOGY AND
AFRICAN STUDIES



Herausgegeben von / The Working Papers are edited by:

Institut für Ethnologie und Afrikastudien, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität,

Forum 6, D-55099 Mainz, Germany.

Tel. +49-6131-3923720; Email: ifeas@uni-mainz.de; <http://www.ifeas.uni-mainz.de>

<http://www.ifeas.uni-mainz.de/92.php>

Geschäftsführende Herausgeberin / Managing Editor: Konstanze N'Guessan (nguessan@uni-mainz.de)

Copyright remains with the author.

Zitierhinweis / Please cite as:

Schütz, Aileen (2018): Unequal relationships in voluntourism and their impacts on receiving organizations in Tanzania. Arbeitspapiere des Instituts für Ethnologie und Afrikastudien der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (Working Papers of the Department of Anthropology and African Studies of the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz) 178.

Schütz, Aileen: Unequal Relationships in Voluntourism and Their Impacts on Receiving Organizations in Tanzania.

Abstract

The popularity of “voluntourism”, a form of travel which combines vacationing and volunteer work mainly in the so-called global South, has risen considerably during the last years. The resulting encounters between many “Northern” voluntourists and the local “Southern” communities are often characterized by hierarchical relationships of care. These relationships rely on already well-established geographical assumptions of a binary contrast between an active and helping North and a passive and grateful South, which can be related to a colonial legacy not only in tourism but also in humanitarianism. By analyzing four semi-structured interviews with representatives of receiving organizations in Tanzania the impacts of these unequal relationships were investigated. The results show the representatives engaged in a balancing act between presenting agency and activity on the one hand and need and dependency on the other hand. Consequently, this behavior does not confirm the medially widespread assumption of the passivity of actors in and from the global South but underlines their active engagement in global hierarchical networks as a strategy to support their projects.

Zusammenfassung

„Voluntourismus“, eine Form des Reisens, welche Urlaub und Freiwilligenarbeit vereint und meist im sogenannten globalen Süden stattfindet, hat in den letzten Jahren an beachtlicher Beliebtheit gewonnen. Die in diesem Kontext entstehenden Begegnungen zwischen VoluntouristInnen (größtenteils aus dem „globalen Norden“) und der lokalen Bevölkerung im „globalen Süden“ sind oftmals durch hierarchische Beziehungen der Fürsorge geprägt. Diese Beziehungen beruhen auf tradierten geographischen Annahmen eines Gegensatzes zwischen einem aktiven und helfenden Norden und einem passiven und dankbaren Süden, welche auf das koloniale Erbe nicht nur im Tourismus, sondern auch in humanitären Kontexten zurückgeführt werden können. Anhand einer Analyse von vier teilstrukturierten Interviews mit RepräsentantInnen aufnehmender Organisationen in Tansania wurden die Auswirkungen jener ungleichen Beziehungen untersucht. Die Ergebnisse verweisen auf einen Balanceakt der RepräsentantInnen zwischen der Darstellung von Autorität und Handlungsmacht einerseits, und Hilfsbedürftigkeit und Abhängigkeit andererseits. Dieses Verhalten bestätigt somit nicht die medial verbreitete Annahme der Passivität von Akteuren in und aus dem globalen Süden, sondern betont vielmehr deren aktive, strategische Verortung in globalen hierarchischen Netzwerken zur Förderung ihrer Projekte.

Die Autorin

Aileen Schütz, B.A. und B.Ed. studierte von April 2014 bis Oktober 2018 Ethnologie an der Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz. Dort studiert sie seit April 2013 Englisch und Spanisch für das gymnasiale Lehramt und seit Oktober 2017 Deutsch als Fremdsprache / Deutsch als Zweitsprache (M.A.).

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Voluntourism Encounter	2
2.1	Participants' Expectations of Voluntourism.....	4
2.2	Prevalent Effects of Voluntourism on Participants	6
3	The Emergence of Unequal Relationships in Voluntourism	8
3.1	Colonialism and Paternalism	8
3.2	Humanitarian Practice and Relationships of Care	9
3.3	Moral Economies in Tourism	11
3.4	Caring Relationships in Tanzanian Voluntourism.....	12
4	The Paradox of Caring Relationships.....	13
5	Methodology.....	16
6	Analysis	17
6.1	Presenting Authority	18
6.2	Presenting Need	20
7	Discussion	23
8	Conclusion	25
9	References	27

1 Introduction¹

“Then we give these information to the people responsible for those areas and they have some time to decide if this person fits to them. If they say ‘no’, I can’t pressure them. Like, we are not starving for volunteers,” declared the young and self-confident woman on the other side of the school desk and continued to explain how an international volunteer experience should benefit everyone involved. After having finished with my last questions, my interviewee, a spokeswoman of an NGO which offers shelter for street children in one of the major cities in Northern Tanzania, invited me to show me around the organization’s premises. We inspected the classrooms, the dormitories and the dining hall, passed some of the offices, left the enormous building and walked toward the entrance gate where I should deregister in the visitors’ book at the watchman’s guard house. Besides my impressions from the tour and the interviewee’s explanations, it was the whole manner of how my visit was conducted which had convinced me that this NGO was indeed not “starving” for international volunteers. Nevertheless, before the spokeswoman bid me farewell, an already well-known situation occurred. Even though my interviewee did not directly ask me for some kind of cooperation, she wished to know in how far my interview would benefit the Tanzanian people.

This question and other, more explicit requests for a mutual favor frequently left me dumbfounded, and it struck me how uncomfortable I felt after most of these encounters. Despite my official request for a visit and an interview, and even though I expected to meet my respondents on an equal footing, I often felt myself transferred into a superior position. Other interviewees suggested that I could “help”, “spread the word” and become their “ambassador” or stay and volunteer. Not being able to grant this favor caused me discomfort, a feeling, which Tegeler (2016: 73) points out to be “the primary emotion” felt by international volunteers or the so-called “voluntourists” during their encounters with the host community. This discomfort is therefore not only a phenomenon that is linked to the “potentially unequal power relations between researcher and researched” (Staddon 2014: 255), especially during fieldwork in the Global South, but also to power hierarchies and asymmetric relationships in voluntourism. The different expectations with which voluntourists and local communities often enter the encounter appear to be “symptomatic of broader systemic inequalities and opportunities” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 109). Consequently, some of the overall topics into which voluntourism, as an encounter between “Southern”² hosts and their “Northern” guests, is embedded, need to be taken into account.

¹ The paper presented here is a revision of my cultural anthropology bachelor thesis submitted to the faculty of history and cultural science at Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz in May 2018. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all who have contributed to its development: my supervisor who always provided me with valuable advice and support throughout the different stages of the paper, my interviewees for their help, hospitality and candor and my family and friends for their ceaseless support.

² Most voluntourism programs take place in countries that are popularly labelled as “developing” or “third world” countries. As these terms often imply romanticized or degrading

Voluntourism is a complex phenomenon that is supposed to combine “travel or ‘seeing’ with volunteering or ‘saving’ people” (Mostafanezhad 2013: 319). It can thus be related to touristic motivations and a humanitarian ethos. Even though “seemingly positive and compassionate” (Sin 2010: 984), the relationships established in this encounter often show an inherent asymmetry, as the act of ascribing certain roles to the participants might reinforce differences instead of reducing them. Voluntourists are frequently placed in a position of power from which they engage as providers of care while host community members are assumed to be passive and grateful receivers of aid. This power constellation is reflected in the abundant literature on the voluntourists’ experiences and the growing appeal for a deeper engagement with the local populations’ perspectives (Raymond and Hall 2008: 541; Sin 2009: 497; Sin 2010: 991; Wright 2013: 242; Benson 2015b: 213). Consequently, this thesis aims to contribute to a broader understanding of the hosts’ experiences of the encounter and is led by the overall question: Which implications do caring relationships and power hierarchies in voluntourism have on receiving organizations? It is argued that organizations which receive international voluntourists, in this case in Northern Tanzania, may be aware of the power differences inherent in their relationship to the voluntourists. As a result, they are engaged in a constant balancing act between expressing pride of and authority over their projects while at the same time asking actively for support and presenting themselves as being in “need” and therefore suitable for voluntourism projects.

After a short overview on voluntourism in general and the participants’ motivations in and outcomes of the encounter, the following chapters shall examine the nature of the relationship between voluntourists and host communities. By tracing back the source of the asymmetry in these relationships through different times and themes, I provide a theoretical background for the analysis of four semi-structured interviews with respondents from Tanzanian receiving organizations. The analysis is followed by a discussion and a conclusion, which presents the overall results and gives a short outlook.

2 The Voluntourism Encounter

As „[v]olunteering is a powerful concept, one that is capable of mobilizing individuals and groups and of marking out the possibilities of acting in the service of a greater good by addressing social inequalities or perceived deprivation” (Prince and Brown 2016: 4), the combination of tourism and volunteering can be described as an even more powerful phenomenon. Wearing (2001: 1) was among the first to define voluntourism as a way of travelling for

those tourists who, for various reasons, volunteer in an organized way to undertake holidays that might involve aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups in society,

connotations, the still dichotomic but more neutral terms of the Global South and the Global North will be used in the following.

the restoration of certain environments or research into aspects of society or environment.

Being “mutually beneficial” (Wearing 2001: 1), voluntourism is presented by Wearing as an alternative to mass tourism as it is generally supposed to show positive side effects for everyone involved (Wearing 2001: 1) and has nowadays established itself as an integral part of the tourism industry (Wright 2013: 240). Besides the term “voluntourism”, shortened from “volunteer tourism” (Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 3), there are also other labels for this new emerging practice, such as ‘Peace Corps Light’, ‘meaningful travel’, ‘volunteer vacationing’ (Swan 2012: 240) and “international volunteering” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 130). Even though there are various ways to name the phenomenon, all those terms denote the more or less same idea: An individual travels and volunteers, thus combines leisure and work while immersing into tourism and international development (Swan 2012: 253).

Despite its comparably recent emergence (Wearing 2001: 4-7), voluntourism has shown a significant growth in numbers (Mostafanezhad 2013: 319) and popularity (Sin 2009: 480). As the presence of programs and information around voluntourism in the media and the World Wide Web has risen intensely (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 120), voluntourism now appeals to a more and more diverse set of people (Wright 2013: 239). This trend initiated the appearance of commercial and charitable NGOs (Simpson 2004: 682), which increasingly offer a broad set of programs and destinations for their customers (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 120). Yet, despite the growing number of volunteers and tourists emerging in the Global South (Sin 2010: 984; Prince and Brown 2016: 1-12), the majority of voluntourists are still individuals from the mainly Western parts of the world that wish to “give back” and “do something” (Mostafanezhad 2013: 319; Mostafanezhad 2014: 78).

Wearing’s (2001) definition of voluntourism presents a first approach for many other scholars who deal with the topic (Raymond and Hall 2008: 530; Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 3; Mostafanezhad 2013: 319; Wright 2013: 239), and Benson (2015a: 101) even describes Wearing’s as “the most cited definition of volunteer tourism”. Nevertheless, Wearing has soon withdrawn from his and other earlier definitions as they “are relatively narrow in their focus” (Lyons and Wearing 2008a: 3). Today, various articles include attempts to categorize voluntourism and find its position within tourism and humanitarian practice (Lyons and Wearing 2008; Raymond and Hall 2008; Sin 2009; Sin 2010; Wright 2013; Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015). Nonetheless, the attempt to find an adequate definition becomes even more complicated as the individuals involved in such experiences frequently do not resort to Wearing’s or others’ definitions, may it be the voluntourists themselves (Sin 2009: 493; Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 14; Swan 2012: 244; Mostafanezhad 2014: 129) or the host community members. Swan (2012: 248-249), for example, points out that most of her respondents in Ghana usually only considered the difference between volunteers and tourists after having recognized what kind of differences separated themselves from the young white Westerners. Sullivan (2016: 150), recalling Ezra, also mentions that in Tanzania, there is no specific Swahili term for voluntourists, but “the term that people

used was generally '*wafadhili*' – sponsors" (Ezra 2013 in Sullivan 2016: 150, emphasis in original) with which volunteers from overseas have long been associated (Sullivan 2016: 150).

It is argued that precisely because of this diversification of customers, projects and expectations, a final definition of voluntourism can hardly be achieved (Swan 2012: 253; Wright 2013; Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 120). For the purpose of this thesis, voluntourism is understood as voluntary work that concentrates on people rather than their environment and is not related to well-established organizations such as Peace Corps or Volunteer Service Overseas, which have already been existing since the 1950s and originally demanded certain "professional experience, training and time commitment" (Swan 2012: 240). This is a necessarily broad definition as the focus is on the receiving organizations, which have hosted and are still hosting a large variety of international volunteers that might not be affiliated with those long-established organizations and often pay for their stay.

Payment, indeed, is one of the persistent characteristics of most voluntourism programs (Wearing 2001: 2; Swan 2012: 239-240; Phelan 2015: 129; Prince and Brown 2016: 22). Because of this financial aspect, the phenomenon is closely related to tourism and contains not only altruistic but also touristic motives on the part of the voluntourists. As the motivations and expectations with which the individuals enter the encounter differ, discomfort and complaints are frequently voiced by participants (Wright 2013: 246; Mostafanezhad 2014: 110; Benson 2015a: 102; Sullivan 2016: 155-156; Tegeler 2016: 65). In order to understand the nature of these relationships between guests and hosts and their outcomes, the motivations and expectations with which its participants enter the voluntourist experience have to be considered.

2.1 Participants' Expectations of Voluntourism

Voluntourism is based on a complex "network of relationships between different places" (Sin 2010: 988), fields and partakers. These networks may comprise international volunteer agencies, the media, external sponsors, coordinators of voluntourism programs and the voluntourists on the one hand, and nation states, receiving organizations, host communities and the beneficiaries or target group of voluntourism projects on the other hand (Mostafanezhad 2014: 8-9; Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 119). The intimate relationship between the voluntourists and the host communities and/or receiving organizations usually lies at the core of these entanglements. Even though the increasing diversification of the voluntourism experience and activities leads to different experiences (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 120), there are certain recurring motivations that can be related to the participants of voluntourism. On the part of the voluntourists, those motivations can be divided into more altruistic motivations and more non-altruistic push factors (Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 2-5).

Altruistic factors often show the same ethos as advertisements of voluntourism agencies (Wright 2013: 241-242). These advertisements largely promote voluntourism

as being a strong “vehicle to promote knowledge and peace amongst people” (Gius 2012: 2), even more because it creates a connection and interaction between the participants that is closer than in tourism. Furthermore, often-mentioned arguments in favor of voluntourism frequently include its assumed potency to reduce conflicts (Raymond and Hall 2008: 532) and stereotypes (McGehee and Andereck 2008: 19–20; Gius 2012: 2) and challenge the “status quo” (Gius 2012: 3) while at the same time creating a cosmopolitan ethos (Raymond and Hall 2008: 532; Mostafanezhad 2014: 73) and fostering cross-cultural understanding³ (Raymond and Hall 2008: 532; Mostafanezhad 2014: 111). Voluntourists’ motivations, therefore, often include the desire to improve the world (Wearing 2001: 66) or a specific region (Tegeler 2016: 46–47). By reducing poverty and “giving back” to hosting communities (Wearing 2001: 66; Sin 2009: 489; Wright 2013: 247), they pursue to “do something useful” (Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 2) and “travel with a purpose” (Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 5). Moreover, voluntourists often seek social interaction (Wearing 2001: 66; Raymond 2008: 52; Sin 2009: 489; Tegeler 2016: 51) and wish to perform caring and compassionate acts of help toward other people (Wearing 2001: 66; Swan 2012: 244).

Additionally, less altruistic factors might derive from a destination and placement marketing that is closely related to tourism strategies (Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 5). Next to the factor of experiencing an economically affordable adventure (Wearing 2001: 66; Sin 2009: 490), voluntourists often desire to achieve a deeper understanding of the unknown host community’s way of life and thus live a seemingly more authentic touristic experience (Raymond 2008: 52–53; Sin 2009: 489; Swan 2012: 244; Wright 2013: 245). This touristic experience might also include the desire to seek leisure and vacationing (Sin 2009: 487) and touristic notions of difference, authenticity and an Other to which one can construct the own self⁴ (Sin 2009: 488; Gius 2012: 4; Tegeler 2016: 42). As a result of the encounter, voluntourists often attempt not only to transform the lives of their hosts but also hope for a personal transformation. Therefore, the enhancement of the self (Wearing 2001: 67; Raymond 2008: 52; Swan 2012: 244; Tegeler 2016: 51) is, next to the enhancement of their CV or professional career profile, a strong push factor (Wearing 2001: 68; Lyons and Wearing 2008b: 148; Sin 2009: 489; Daldinez and Hampton 2010: 10).

Despite the abundant research on the voluntourists’ motivations, far less literature concerning host community members’ motives for participating in voluntourism has been published. Nevertheless, communities often mention certain arguments for hosting voluntourists such as economic profit and the incorporation into global economies (Mostafanezhad 2014: 112; Sullivan 2016: 150–151; Tegeler 2016: 67–68). Furthermore, hospitality (Sullivan 2016: 150), learning from the voluntourists and

³ The term culture is abundantly used in development discourse and voluntourism advertisements and mainly depicts different static traits and characteristics of one or more group(s) of people. The following references to culture shall be understood as concepts that are popularly accepted in this quotidian and non-academic sense (Beer 2003: 60–61).

⁴ In the following, the term Other will likewise be used to denote mentally and socially constructed ideas of difference and otherness that one group of people draws about another group and which often implicate assumptions about superiority and inferiority.

engaging in a cross-cultural experience and social interaction might constitute an essential motivation (Raymond 2008: 53; Mostafanezhad 2014: 111; Tegeler 2016: 68). Finally, the creation of awareness is another factor that plays an important role for host communities. First of all, the encounter enables them to “expand their own ways of organizing the community” (Tegeler 2016: 68) while at the same time leading to an awareness of global inequalities. This consciousness is often transferred onto the voluntourists by encouraging them to foster outside awareness for the host community’s concerns. Voluntourism can consequently serve as an arena in “which to gain political and economic support for local issues” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 138-139) and initiate social movements (Mostafanezhad 2014: 143). Sullivan (2016: 161-162) illustrates how these processes of awareness creation are achieved on a small scale. She points out that many of her respondents wished to establish broader networks and enable a personal or professional progress by interacting with voluntourists during and after their stay. Making them agents for the local institutions back home in the Global North, voluntourists are expected to support their hosts via fundraising and are thus “often appreciated for the personal influence they [have] on their organization” (Raymond 2008: 53).

Even though there are some shared motivations such as the hope for an engagement in a cross-cultural experience and social interaction in general (Mostafanezhad 2014: 111), the overall results show that voluntourists and host communities have often contrasting expectations when engaging in the voluntourism experience (Wright 2013: 245-248; Mostafanezhad 2014: 109-112; Tegeler 2016: 65-66). While voluntourists seek to combine travel with enactions of care and responsibility, hosts see their benefits primarily in the economic progress and the creation of awareness for local and personal issues. Misunderstandings and discontent between the participants of this encounter are often presented as being the outcome of these different perceptions and interests (Sin 2009: 494-495; Mostafanezhad 2014: 42).

2.2 Prevalent Effects of Voluntourism on Participants

Tensions between hosts and guests on the one hand and between expectation and reality on the other hand are particularly mentioned with reference to short-time programs (Raymond and Hall 2008: 531; Sullivan 2016: 145) as participants often lack a critical reflection on the experience (Simpson 2004: 685-688; Sin 2009: 496; Gius 2012: 11). Besides different negative impacts that voluntourism can have on the local economy (see Raymond and Hall 2008: 538-539; Daldeniz and Hampton 2010: 13-16; Prince and Brown 2016: 18; Sullivan 2016: 145), the factor of sustainability is often criticized. As such, programs that are established without the consent and cooperation of locals lack sustainability in infrastructural projects (Mostafanezhad 2014: 119-120; Simpson 2004: 685) and consistency in teaching programs (Swan 2012: 252; Mostafanezhad 2014: 119-121).

As voluntourists might be untrained, inexperienced or even sexually abusive (Wilson 2015: 202-203), projects that are centered on vulnerable children might be as

problematic as teaching programs that ascribe untrained voluntourists the role of an expert (Simpson 2004: 685; Raymond and Hall 2008: 531; Wright 2013: 245; Sullivan 2016: 141-145). Moreover, many voluntourists show a significant lack of knowledge of the local contexts (Tegeler 2016: 64), which often leads to social tensions between voluntourists and the local community members. Hosts might be irritated because of the volunteers' touristic and inappropriate behavior (Daldeniz and Hampton 2008: 2010: 13; McGehee and Andereck 2008: 18) or the visibility of inequality and power differences between hosts and guests (Wright 2013: 245).

Cultural and economic differences as well as social and structural inequalities and hierarchies are some of the negative effects that are prevalent throughout the literature on voluntourism and its impacts on host communities. In the encounter, such inequalities easily become visible for both sides (McGehee and Andereck 2008: 18; Prince and Brown 2016: 11; Sullivan 2016: 145) and are frequently not reduced by the voluntourist experience but perpetuated and even reinforced (Sin 2009: 497; Gius 2012: 6-10; Swan 2012: 245; Mostafanezhad 2014: 111-114; Prince and Brown 2016: 23). This paradox may occur because of a lack of critical engagement with the local contexts on part of the voluntourists (Sullivan 2016: 145). As they tend to essentialize and depoliticize the situation of their hosts, poverty and social inequalities are naturalized and romanticized (Simpson 2004: 689; Sin 2009: 496; Sin 2010: 984; Gius 2012: 11).

These processes often originate from "images of the Third World as sites of 'otherness' and need" (Prince and Brown 2016: 22) in popular discourses, which voluntourists adopt and use as an Other against which to construct their own self. This distancing repeatedly leads to the reproduction of racial assumptions of superiority and inferiority (Sin 2009: 497), and without sufficient interaction and closeness, similar processes might occur on both sides. For example, host communities might relate white skin to superiority, power, freedom and mobility whereas they see themselves in a light of disadvantages and social inequalities (Swan 2012: 252; Mostafanezhad 2014: 111). Finally, power hierarchies that resemble colonial ones, seem to be inherent in the encounter and are sometimes even perceived as such by elderly locals (Swan 2012: 252).

It is often mentioned that the voluntourists themselves feel uncomfortable and insecure in their roles when comprehending the hierarchical nature of the relationship to their hosts. Being prevented from making the positive impact they wished for and having to renegotiate their identity as either volunteer or tourist, the voluntourists easily perceive the discrepancy between their previous expectations and those of their hosts on-site (Swan 2012: 242; Wright 2013: 245-246; Tegeler 2016: 55-66). It seems that the lack of preparation and the nature of the relationship between hosts and guests are frequently the reasons for uncertainty, tensions and the perpetuation of stereotypes and inequalities. This nature can be best understood when taking a closer look at the power inequalities and hierarchies in which the encounters are embedded and how certain mechanisms can be traced back through different times and related fields.

3 The Emergence of Unequal Relationships in Voluntourism

Voluntourism is situated at the crossroads between tourism and leisure on the one hand and altruistic commitment and humanitarian ethos on the other hand (Swan 2012: 253). Thus, the beginnings of this spectacularly growing practice can be described in terms of a hybrid emergence out of different fields. The media depicts voluntourism as a more conscious and compassionate form of modern alternative tourism (Wearing 2001: 1-2; Mostafanezhad 2014: 10) since it leads to humanitarian action being achievable and desirable for a broad range of individuals (Mostafanezhad 2014: 145). The processes that were necessary for this fusion can be summarized under the terms of globalization, economic neoliberalization, development privatization and at the same time the growing popularity of humanitarian appeals and moral economies. In order to analyze the relationships in voluntourism, similar approaches as to the fields of humanitarianism and tourism can be used. Theoretical frameworks such as neo-colonialism, paternalism and “geographies of care and responsibility” (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 119) can thus lead to a deeper insight into the encounter.

3.1 Colonialism and Paternalism

In order to examine the often hierarchical relationships between Northern guests and Southern hosts in voluntourism, it is possible to resort to the power relationships and distinctions between “them” and “us” that have existed since colonialism. These colonial discourses heavily relied on a process of “othering”, “which refers to the systematized and hierarchical construction of difference between groups of people on the basis of such factors as ‘race’, ethnicity or culture” (McEwan 2009: 122). These discourses rendered “peoples of colonized countries [...] as subordinate, inferior and without agency or voice” (McEwan 2009: 122). Therefore, racial assumptions and the mission to “civilize” served as justifications to subdue colonized peoples and legitimate the colonial and imperial aims of the colonizers (McEwan 2009: 126; Wright 2013: 241). Especially, “to civilize Others, to strengthen the weak and to give experience to ‘childlike’ colonial peoples who require supervision and guidance” (McEwan 2009: 220) was seen as a means to expand Western notions of civilization to the world and shows a paternalistic world view. Paternalism might be described as the assumption of knowing better than others and includes acts that are “intended to improve the welfare of those who might not be in a position to help themselves” (Barnett 2011: 12) and interfering in their lives without their consent (Barnett 2011: 12).

Especially the African continent has been a place of missionaries and humanitarian intervention for hundreds of years (Prince and Brown 2016: 19) since the portrayal of Africans as incompetent and “indolent children” (McEwan 2009: 136) “legitimate[d] colonialism and imperialism under the guise of paternalism” (McEwan 2009: 136). Nevertheless, even today, the colonial mission to civilize others still silently underlies modern development ideas (McEwan 2009: 220), and “[t]he connection

between Africans and childhood still operates in contemporary aid discourses" (McEwan 2009: 136). In these development discourses, Africans are often seen as undemocratic, corrupt and unorganized on the one hand (McEwan 2009: 148) and "passive, childlike and obedient" (McEwan 2009: 137) on the other hand. Additionally, international aid agencies tend to perpetuate the notion of a Western or Northern giver and savior (McEwan 2009: 138), and "Africa as the receiver works to construct the continent, not as a political actor, but as an aid recipient that needs the West" (Mostafanezhad 2013: 328-329).

3.2 Humanitarian Practice and Relationships of Care

Humanitarianism, as "the desire to relieve the suffering of distant strangers" (Barnett: 2011: 233) comprises caring relationships and is therefore connected to power hierarchies, paternalism and to the humanitarian ethos in voluntourism. Alchemical humanitarianism as the endeavor to prevent suffering by not only interfering in times of crisis and emergency but also as a preventative means is closely connected to development discourses (Barnett 2011: 41). Thus, humanitarianism is often based on neo-colonial "assumptions about where agency and passivity reside" (McEwan 2009: 211) and similar differences between "them" and "us" are drawn when Northern humanitarianists are ascribed to a position of power while "the incapable victim in the South" (McEwan 2009: 211) remains passive and voiceless (McEwan 2009: 211).

Similar mechanisms can be found in caring relationships as these relationships naturally put the person who provides care in a superior position. Here, it is assumed that the latter has the privilege and potential to display acts of compassion and responsibility toward a less privileged, disempowered other individual (Sin 2010: 985; Barnett 2011: 34, 221-223). These assumptions about agency and passivity combined with the humanitarian aim to relieve the suffering of others lead to unequal relationships and power distributions. As Barnett (2011: 34) points out, "[w]hile there exist various ways to dissect the power imbalance between the giver and the recipient, the concept of paternalism encapsulates many of the central ambiguities of humanitarianism". Whereas paternalism was seen as necessary to civilize in colonial and imperial times, it later turned into an argument for improving the lives of "othered" peoples and engaging in caring relationships (Mostafanezhad 2014: 32). Today, this endeavor has a more negative connotation (Barnett 2011: 233) because the "rescuer tend to believe that they can speak on behalf of the victims, that they know their needs better than [...] the victims" (Barnett 2011: 14). Barnett (2011, 13-14; 214), for example, criticizes this neglectance of the opinion of those who are supposed to receive aid and consequently often end up being infantilized.

Most of the paradoxes that surround relationships in humanitarian practices derive from rationality within the field. Resorting to a specific geography, "a construction of the world where there are simplistic boundaries between two places i.e. that of the north and south" (Simpson 2004: 682) is characteristic of development discourses and humanitarian advertisements. In development discourse, this

dichotomy can often be seen in the representation of a Global North as an entity that is active, powerful, developed, affluent, generous and responsible whereas the South is represented as a passive, disempowered, underdeveloped or developing, grateful Other that needs guidance from the North (McEwan 2009: 210-212; Sin 2010: 984-988).

In humanitarian practice, similar mechanisms are present when distinctions between “those being helped (often thought of as the “victims”) as well as the humanitarians themselves (those who “save”)” (Ticktin 2014: 279) are drawn. It becomes clear that “[p]ower is always present in humanitarian action” (Tegeler 2016: 33), visible by the fact that “one group is always doing the giving, while another does the receiving” (Tegeler 2016: 39). It remains paradoxical that humanitarianists “strive toward a flattening of power hierarchies by aiding those in need” (Tegeler 2016: 39) and that they “claim to be in solidarity with the objects of their compassion – yet the relationship between deliverer and recipient contains its own inequalities” (Barnett 2011: 34). Nevertheless, having to decide whom to assist, humanitarian agents are consciously or unconsciously urged to resort to a constant categorization that creates “an inequality of lives and hierarchies of humanity” (Fassin 2010: 239), “valuing some lives over others” (Ticktin 2014: 280). These inequalities and power relations are inherent in humanitarianism as it “is necessarily built on difference” (Ticktin 2011: 261). Humanitarian actors, often white males, are portrayed as having the power and the knowledge to address the suffering of other people. Those others are typically individuals from the Global South who are depicted as being in need of protection and support in order to alleviate their suffering (Ticktin 2011: 256-261). Illustrated as a passive opposition to the North (McEwan 2009: 219), the South’s vulnerability and precarious situation is often presented in an “essentialising and generalising cultural discourse” (McEwan 2009: 134).

Especially in Western Christian humanitarian discourse (Malkki 2010: 59), children often incorporate many of the characteristics of “archetypical ‘innocent victims’” (Malkki 2010: 62) as they are associated with peace (Malkki 2010: 70), “childhood, innocence, and goodness” (Malkki 2010: 62). Particularly when depicted without the embeddedness in kin structures, they seem to be unaware of and therefore separated from history and politics (McEwan 2009: 132; Malkki 2010: 65), making them ahistorical and thus universally recognizable and acceptable victims (Ticktin 2011: 254). Women might evoke similar affective reactions (Malkki 1996: 388) when they possess certain characteristics such as being absent of power, being “suffering victims of oppressive patriarchal cultures, often equated with innocence, passivity and apolitical, corporeal existence” (Ticktin 2011: 260). Refugees constitute another beneficiary group of humanitarian assistance and are as such subjects of categorizations, too. In order to receive support (Kobelinsky 2015), they frequently have to present a specific appearance and behavior (Malkki 1996: 384). Especially a “fresh off the boat”-look is related to the image of authentic refugees (Kobelinsky 2015: 84), while “a rich refugee [is] a contradiction in terms” (Malkki 1996: 382). Frequently deprived of the trustworthiness of their stories, refugees become caught up in processes of dehistoricization and depoliticization and, in the end, dehumanization (Malkki 1996: 385-390). Development and “[h]umanitarian intervention is thus

politically shaped in a paternalistic fashion” (Reiffen and Winters 2018) and the “‘passive/active’ dichotomy continue[s] to play a particular vital role in the formation of identities” (McEwan 2009: 219).

3.3 Moral Economies in Tourism

It is within this colonial legacy that many humanitarian and voluntourist agencies have been established (Redfield and Bornstein 2010: 5; Mostafanezhad 2014: 74). Their emergence has been facilitated by neoliberalization on the one hand and moral economies on the other hand. Together with the processes of neoliberalization and the privatization of the aid and development sector (Mostafanezhad 2013: 319-321; Prince and Brown 2016: 18), many states have withdrawn “from twentieth-century promises of work, care and social redistribution” (Prince and Brown 2016: 2). Consequently, development has increasingly been carried out by external actors, such as volunteers or humanitarian actors. This depoliticization of development can lead to dependencies as nowadays many communities all over the world rely on themselves or on external aid (Simpson 2004: 685; Sin 2010: 990; Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 122; Prince and Brown 2016: 8). Besides “the role of unregulated market exchange and privatized social services” (Mostafanezhad 2013: 320) and its economic outcomes (Wright 2013: 240), neoliberalism has enabled the rapid growth of NGOs and volunteer agencies everywhere (Prince and Brown 2016: 2-8). Those organizations have now “taken on state-like functions such as providing public goods and serving as de facto government ministries” (Barnett 2011: 222). Voluntourism, consequently, “is increasingly appropriated as a form of popular humanitarianism by NGOs and local governments alike” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 144).

According to Mostafanezhad (2013: 332), there is a transfer of the already present geographies in development and humanitarian discourse to a broader audience, turning them into “geographies of compassion”. This categorization reflects the notion of a naturally divided world but emphasizes the responsibility of the North toward the South (Sin 2010: 985). Today, there is a sense of “[c]osmopolitan empathy” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 70), which Mostafanezhad (2014: 70) defines as “an emotional response to the plight of the poor in the Global South”. Because of the growing awareness of development and humanitarian discourses that deal with the colonial legacies and disadvantages of the former colonies and the still ongoing inequalities and mechanisms of economic exploitation of mostly Southern countries, many individuals in the North seek to compensate this situation by voluntarily offering their time and labor (Sin 2010: 984-985). By avoiding the often very complex and transnational interconnection between producers and consumers, this wish can now be comfortably fulfilled through the “consumer choice” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 70), by buying, for example, fair trade products (Mostafanezhad 2013: 322-323).

It is within these “emerging moral economies in the West” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 70) that the humanitarian ethos and the desire to enact relationships of care cannot only be found in consumerism, but the feeling of responsibility has also reached

the tourism sector (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 123-124). Trying to minimize the negative effects of modern mass tourism, alternative tourism, and voluntourism in particular, are thought of as presenting more sustainable and beneficial forms of tourism as they are embedded in a humanitarian ethos (Wearing 2001: 1-7; Mostafanezhad 2013: 320). In this way, advertisements render voluntourism “the new fashion for the internationally mobile elite” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 78). Without political participation but by consumerism (Mostafanezhad 2013: 321-322), the consumer is “hailed by overt images of humanitarian gestures” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 7). Especially “those with sufficient cultural and economic capital” (Mostafanezhad 2014: 7), who desire to step into the shoes of celebrity humanitarians and perform the role of the “sentimental Western savior” (Mostafanezhad 2016: 8) might wish to experience a new form of travel. By means of directly connecting the consumer or giver and the producer or receiver (Mostafanezhad 2013: 322), voluntourism has emerged as “a unique ‘product’ within the new moral economies” (Mostafanezhad 2013: 322).

3.4 Caring Relationships in Tanzanian Voluntourism

As the idea of giving to distant strangers through voluntary labour is one of the most alluring characteristics of voluntourism (Sin 2009: 495; Sin 2010: 986; Gius 2012: 3; Tegeler 2016: 45), “tourism spaces, especially in volunteer or responsible tourism, can possibly also be examined as sites of care, where ‘caring relationship’ can be formed” (Sin 2010: 985). Like other fields in which caring relationships can be found, such as humanitarian and international development practices, voluntourism also resorts to a helping and developing discourse (Sin 2010: 984; Mostafanezhad 2014: 145). Mostafanezhad (2013: 332) argues that these discourses are embedded in a “geography of compassion”, too as they encourage a simplistic idea of development by dividing the world into an active, developed and caring North and a helpless and grateful South (Mostafanezhad 2013: 328-329). As such, advertisements and sometimes the participants themselves portray voluntourists as wealthy, privileged individuals that deliver “acts of kindness, care, or responsibilities” (Sin 2010: 988) toward “the poor and less privileged” (Sin 2010: 991). This form of geography reflects colonial assumptions of power and agency and the caring relationships rooted in the encounters often reveal paternalistic notions. The nature of the relationship between the voluntourists and their hosts is, indeed, built on differences, for “the very premises of care posits the voluntourist as privileged when compared to his or her hosts, meaning that the relationships formed are unequal to begin with” (Sin 2010: 991). As such, giving and actions of care might be embedded in asymmetrical relationships and power hierarchies between giver and recipient (Sin 2010: 984; Gius 2012: 3; Prince and Brown 2016: 13). Thus, the idea of “a ‘third world’, where there is ‘need’, and where European young people have the ability, and right, to meet this need” (Simpson 2004: 682) might even reinforce the inequalities and hierarchies instead of reducing them. Finally, it has to be remembered that “‘helping’ is not a universally fixed category” (Swan 2012: 253)

and not everybody holds the same opinions on “issues of poverty, development and well-being” (McEwan 2009: 132).

Voluntary engagement throughout the history of Tanzania has already been examined by many scholars (Prince and Brown 2016: 13). Whereas missionaries and religious charities played a major role in humanitarian action in the colonial and post-colonial period in the country (Prince and Brown 2016: 14-17; Jennings 2016: 123; Hunter 2015: 46), the late colonial years focused on national voluntary labor (Hunter 2015: 45) and the early years of independence were characterized by “discourses of self help and nation-building” (Prince and Brown 2016: 14). After Tanganyika’s independence in 1961 and the union with Zanzibar in 1964, the newly renamed country of Tanzania was led by Julius Nyerere, who implemented the *ujamaa* program. This program was rooted in socialist ideals and emphasized the voluntary action of Tanzanian citizens in order to strengthen the community and the newly independent nation (Prince and Brown 2016: 15). This focus on self-reliance of and solidarity within the country by means of voluntary labor eased the creation of a sense of citizenship and nationhood in the communities and implied economic savings for the state (Prince and Brown 2016: 16; Hunter 2015: 44).

While *ujamaa* was originally directed at national volunteers, its vision also appealed to many international volunteers (Prince and Brown 2016: 20). Drawn by the “ideals of equality, cooperative endeavour and social justice” (Jennings 2016: 121) and a sense of solidarity and responsibility, particularly European, North American and Australian volunteers entered the country wishing to support the creation of a fairer world. However, the emergence of a considerable number of international volunteers resulted in a politization of the international voluntary labor (Jennings 2016: 119-123). The volunteers were turned into “a development *resource* in themselves, to be used, misused, manipulated and fought over as much as capital or physical resources” (Jennings 2016: 122, emphasis in original) and the Tanzanian government tried to exert control over their activities (Jennings 2016: 125). Even though *ujamaa* was replaced by a free market economy after president Nyerere’s abdication in 1985 (Fouéré 2014: 2), Nyerere and the ethos of *ujamaa* and national volunteer labor are still remembered positively by most Tanzanians in recent time (Fouéré 2014: 17-18). Since the 1990s the country has witnessed another intake of international NGOs (Hunter 2015: 45) and the number of international volunteers rises constantly.

4 The Paradox of Caring Relationships

The paradox “that ‘responsibilities based on sameness’ are established upon relationships that separate and distinguish who is privileged and who is not” (Sin 2010: 991) is the origin of much disapproval of voluntourism. Even though the previous sections have focused on the assumption that caring relationships are inherently unequal and that the voluntourists naturally incorporate the role of the giver, it is a fallacy to assume that caring behaviors are solely reserved for the voluntourists (Sin 2010: 987). According to the privatization of development, it is often assumed that

“‘active’ participation is perceived as predominantly limited to the external, visiting volunteer, rather than being a local prerogative” (Simpson 2004: 685). Nevertheless, ascribing power, responsibility and caring behavior only to the North leads to a perpetuated marginalization of the South by neglecting its agency and responsibility (Sin 2010: 984-988). However, host communities or receiving organizations do play a vital role in this encounter.

Foucault, for example, argues that power relations are always constituted by free and therefore active participants as long as these power relations are not rendered into a form of “physical determination” (Foucault 1982: 790). In fact, some scholars argue that the notions of passivity are only and foremost required in order to make humanitarian appeals attractive for a broad audience that can be triggered by compassionate gestures (McEwan 2009: 138; Ticktin 2011: 259). As the overall aim of humanitarianism and development discourse is perceived as being the alleviation of suffering and the support of communities on their way to a better life, it is important to consider the impacts for all participants (Sin 2010: 988; Barnett 2011: 14). Therefore, the perspectives of host community members and receiving organizations should by no means be left out of the discussion. Lyons and Wearing (2008a: 9), furthermore, argue that the neocolonial concept in which “communities are exploited and seen as ‘other’ [...] underestimates local communities and the influential role they can play in maintaining the alternative frame of volunteer tourism”.

These and the following arguments and findings show that the discourses that render the South and its people as passive victims compared to the active and heroic Northerners have to be critically challenged. First, the Global South, in development discourse often depicted as passive and “incapable” (Sin 2010: 985), does have agency. This can be demonstrated for example by the emergence of “the New Economic Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD)” (McEwan 2009: 221), the water privatization in Ghana or the fact that emigrants from the Global South sent remittances back to their countries of origin and thus show agency and involvement in global affairs (McEwan 2009: 213-229). Especially among studies concerned with refugees, the notion of passivity and victimness is often challenged. As such, refugees may play an active role as they might prepare stories and perform certain behaviors in order to be recognized as a refugee by the legal system and to act out political strategies and assert influence over the politics in their homelands (Malkki 1996: 377; Coutin 1998: 901-913; Jeffery and Candea 2006: 288-290).

Similarly, Lyons and Wearing (2008a: 10) allude to the dichotomy in tourism, which presents the tourists and tourism operators as powerful and dominant whereas the destination countries are perceived as oppressed entities. In this field, the interaction between tourist and “touristed” is usually based on a clear distinction between “‘our world’ and ‘their world’” (Gius 2012: 2) and “socially constructed and culturally determined perceptions of ‘difference’” (Wearing 2001: 41) and “otherness”, for tourists often engage in a search for cultural authenticity in seemingly pre-modern or pre-capitalist environments and peoples (Mostafanezhad 2014: 40, 111-112; Tegeler 2016: 44). Nevertheless, Edensor (2001: 71) argues that local communities might not always be the oppressed Other but actively play their part in the encounter in order to

deliver the idealized touristic experience, which may be expected. He states that a “disciplinary gaze” (Edensor 2000: 327) in tourism influences the behavior of the participating individuals as hosts might “try to please the tourists and regulate the “‘appropriate’ behaviour and performative procedures” (Edensor 2001: 69).

Finally, if these aspects apply to humanitarianism and tourism, why not also to voluntourism? This question has been addressed in some studies of voluntourism. In fact, I would like to stress that examining the host community members’ motivations already asserts their active part in the caring relationships that are enacted in the encounter. Tegeler (2016: 66-79), for example, has found out that the Yaxunha from Yucatán have adapted to voluntourism and see it mainly as an additional source of income. Hosting volunteers and ascribing them to certain projects has become a part of their daily lives, and they have the authority over the projects and decide on what constitutes an “authentic” Mayan culture. Voluntourists thus may find themselves in an “encounter, [...] that is a calculated interaction and ultimately a form of income for the host community” (Tegeler 2016: 77).

In the same way, Mostafanezhad (2014: 129) argues that members of hosting communities in Thailand “increasingly engage in debates about what amounts to an ‘authentic’ experience in their country. She refers to Urry’s concept of the “tourist gaze”, which illustrates the construction of difference in tourism (Urry 1990: 1-2). Mostafanezhad (2014: 7) states that voluntourists engage in similar essentializations and romantizations of the distant Other and adapt their expectations of the voluntourist experience to the images evoked by the voluntourism industry or other agencies of mass or cultural tourism. Voluntourism agencies aim for satisfying the prospective voluntourists desire to encounter themselves by “the comparison with the ‘other’” (Sin 2009: 488) and thus perpetuate “touristic and neo-colonialism imageries” (Gius 2012: 11) which deeply influence the voluntourists’ perceptions and expectations of their experiences (Gius 2012: 11).

Sin (2010) takes up Edensor’s approach on performances in tourism and proposes that host communities and receiving organizations play an essential role in the perpetuation of the power hierarchies in the encounter. She argues that some community members might wish to appear “suitable for the caring relationship demanded in volunteer tourism” (Sin 2010: 987) and thus perform certain roles. Their behavior is then not only directed toward prospective voluntourists or voluntourism agencies but also toward other community members, as they probably seek to establish “authority over volunteer projects or otherwise” (Sin 2010: 987). Consequently, hosting community members might show themselves as being “a very poor, pitiful, and suffering community [...] [o]r perhaps [...] be entirely receptive to what gifts, aid, and knowledge volunteer tourists bring with them” (Sin 2010: 988). She thus guesses that when confronted with the danger of becoming too rich in the eyes of receiving voluntourists, experienced host communities might “learn to perform such dependencies and desparations so as to fulfill what volunteer tourists have come to expect” (Sin 2010: 990). These performances might occur due to the fact that most host communities and receiving organizations are depending on external support and therefore need to appear suitable for voluntourism and have to meet the prospective

volunteers' expectations (Sin 2010: 989-990). Voluntourism can thus be described as "a platform where locals and tourists both have the power to actively negotiate their identities and relations with each other" (Sin 2010: 983).

Mostafanezhad argues that the voluntourists themselves might also be aware of the importance of images and performances in voluntourism as they often implement the strategy to "'help' with caution" (Mostafanezhad 2014: 112) because they feel that "'developing too much' would adulterate the 'authenticity' of the experience" (Mostafanezhad 2014: 112). Indeed, a hosting community which is perceived as being too rich and westernized could possibly make the destination become unattractive for voluntourists (Sin 2010: 991). This clash of interests leads to a situation in "which host communities are at once 'helped' develop by voluntourists, but also prompted to continue acting out their 'traditional' ways of living in order to continue to appeal to foreign travelers" (Tegeler 2016: 45).

5 Methodology

Aiming for an in-depth understanding of the situation on the ground, I applied qualitative research methods during my stay in Tanzania from September to October in 2017. Having worked and lived as a voluntourist in Tanzania for three months in 2012, I was already familiar with some parts of the country and certain kinds of volunteer work in the Kilimanjaro region. Nevertheless, I did not know any of my interviewees before, but located those organizations in the northern part of the country, whose e-mail addresses were available on the internet. Due to my own experience as a voluntourist in this sector, I preferred child-related humanitarian projects. The first contact was established via e-mails, in which I described my own involvement in the topic as a former volunteer and a current student undertaking a research project concerning international volunteering in Tanzania. I sought to obtain my respondents' informed consent and expressed my wish to learn more about the experiences of the receiving organizations in Tanzania. My request for an interview and a visit was accompanied by the assurance that their information would be dealt with confidentially and anonymously. Consequently, I will merely provide the most necessary information on the organizations in the next chapter.

As semi-structured interviews can be used to reveal the self-concepts, subjective perspectives and assumptions of the interviewees (Hopf 2012: 350), I adopted this method during four interviews with representatives of organizations in the Kilimanjaro region of Tanzania. All one-on-one interviews were conducted on-site in the respondents' homes or offices and were usually followed by a short tour around the premises. Despite the informal nature of the interviews, a recording of the conversations was largely refused, probably due to the sensitivity of the issue and the initial unfamiliarity between my interviewees and me. As a consequence, I took notes and later resorted to my own memory in order to complete my annotations and overall impressions. Although the following citations can merely be seen as records of my own remembrance, this procedure was necessary in order to establish an unconstrained and

informal atmosphere. Due to my respondents' reticence and the overall aim to focus on their subjective opinions and impressions, a more objective and quantitative approach, such as the usage of surveys, was not applied (Breidenstein et al. 2013: 82-86). The interviews were largely explorative, with questions concerning the respondents' descriptions of the NGO, their impressions of the voluntourists and their work and further questions concerning the interviewees' role within the network of voluntourists, sending organizations and the community.

A short time after the interviews, I completed the annotations and wrote down the field notes in more detail. Later on, I analyzed the interviews and compared them systematically by themes such as motivations, authority and pleas/demonstrations of need. In a second step, I complemented field notes and interviews to achieve multiperspectivity (Lüders 2012: 44). As a matter of fact, one has to remember that my interviewees' answers and behaviors are naturally adapted to my presence and thus also indicate a way in which they see themselves and wish to be seen by others (Breidenstein et al. 2013: 83). I find it interesting that my initial research question about the motivations and experiences of the receiving organizations of voluntourists led to a broader question of reciprocity. My own discomfort in certain situations made me perceive the inequalities between me, as a researcher from the Global North, and my respondents from the Global South (Staddon 2014: 255) and could be compared to similar feelings and relationships in voluntourism.

6 Analysis

Overall, one must keep in mind that the following citations and impressions show only a small insight into the perspectives of certain participants in voluntourism, who will be characterized in the following. Besides my own familiarity with child-related projects and thus "humanitarian-orientated international volunteer tourism" (Mostafanezhad 2013: 319), the broad availability of such projects for voluntourists eased finding a range of organizations that concentrate on the support of children and teenagers. This accessibility is probably due to the widespread interest in and existence of child-related humanitarian projects in general (Mostafanezhad 2013: 323-330), of which the northern region of Tanzania is no exception. Even though all the organizations offered child-related, humanitarian projects for international volunteers, the institutions are very heterogeneous. The singularity of each organization becomes visible when comparing their self-definitions, by which they will be distinguished in the following analysis. They will be either referred to as an education center, an NGO for street children, an orphanage or a foundation for orphaned and misfortunate community members. All of the institutions were already well established, with the foundation year ranging from 2001 (NGO) to 2002 (Foundation), 2004 (Education Center) and 2008 (Orphanage).

I interviewed the founder and owner of the Education Center and her husband in their office on the premises of the organization in the outskirts of a major city in Northern Tanzania. The Education Center comprises a nursery school, a secondary

school, a dormitory and provides daily meals for the children. It aims particularly at the education of girls, who would not be able to receive school-based education otherwise for the founder herself had experienced this situation when she was a child. Similarly, the owner of the orphanage, a 40-50-year-old primary school teacher, had drawn consequences from her and her husband's own experiences. Both had lost their parents at an early age and had soon started to support other orphans, too. The orphanage is situated in the center of a major city in Northern Tanzania and provides accommodation, food, financial support and vocational training, such as sewing, cooking or language courses, for orphans and young adults with limited to no financial income. The foundation is led by a likewise holistic concept. The interview was granted by the co-founder and owner of the foundation, a 50-60-year-old lady who mainly spoke Swahili and a 20-30-year-old local volunteer who translated, mediated and answered, too, as he is involved in the foundation as a project manager. The foundation is located in a small village in Northern Tanzania and includes an orphanage and a nursery and primary school. The organization also supports other community members such as children, widows and people suffering from HIV/AIDS. The NGO is situated in the outskirts of a major city in Northern Tanzania and offers street children housing, meals, primary and secondary school education and support in reuniting them with their families. Furthermore, the children and teenagers receive vocational training and medical care. My interviewee was a 20-30-year-old spokeswoman of the NGO, who is responsible for visitors and volunteers and has worked for the organization for some years.

The results of the interviews and field notes will be introduced by two prototypical situations that occurred during one and the same interview with the founder and owner of the Education Center. By means of these incidences, similar situations from other conversations will be examined and the role of my respondents in these encounters and in voluntourism in general will be discussed. The next two chapters will therefore deal with the ways the interviewees present their organizations, be it in very confident way or in a manner that strives to evoke sympathy.

6.1 Presenting Authority

Yes. I want to say that there are some big organizations. They are very famous, so they receive many requests from volunteers and they say "come come come!" and they place them at schools, even if that doesn't benefit the school. But they do their business. Me, I can say that I don't want someone teaching for three weeks but they tell everyone to come. [...] These are schools that are new to the thing of volunteering. A *mzungu*⁵ brings reputation you see? And they are happy to receive *wazungu* so they won't complain (Field notes, interview Education Center, September 20, 2017).

⁵ *Mzungu* (sg.) or *wazungu* (pl.) is a Swahili term meaning "European" (Höftmann & Herms 2005: 248) which is more generally applied to foreigners with light skin, too.

When asked about another important aspect that she would like to tell me and that we had not discussed yet, the founder and owner of the Education Center, a firm woman in her 50s or 60s, revealed to me an important aspect that made me understand many of the contradictions that I felt during my visits. The topics mentioned in this explanation, such as the role of sending organizations, the question of the type of activities voluntourists are supposed to engage in, the status of foreigners in Tanzania and the role of smaller receiving organizations or institutions seem to be overlain by a sense of pride and superiority. According to my interviewee, she perceives the organization and herself as more experienced and powerful than “[t]hese [...] schools” (Field notes, interview Education Center, September 20, 2017) because she can decide on the suitability of certain voluntourist projects at her Education Center.

Although the organizations seemed to be very heterogeneous, I perceived this feeling of pride and authority in one way or another during all of my conversations with representatives of child-related humanitarian organizations in Northern Tanzania. The appearance of the organizations that I visited varied from small and huddled buildings in the middle of the community, to comparably distant properties with representative houses, to impressive buildings on large premises with very well organized procedures of welcoming visitors. Nevertheless, all my interviewees showed a strong consciousness of their active role within the organization. While my interviewee from the NGO was a spokeswoman of her organization, the others had founded their institutions and were in charge of them. Moreover, most of the organizations cooperated with other international sending organizations but were not completely reliant on external agencies. All of them were available via their own websites and some also mentioned establishing contact to possible voluntourists via Facebook.

Apart from the voluntourists, national volunteers and trainees supported all of the organizations, and two of my respondents mentioned paid employees. The number of staff ranged from six to thirty non-international individuals and indicates that voluntourist often represent a minority within the organization, making them – as in one case – “just an extra” (Field notes, interview NGO, September 25, 2017). Indeed, I perceived that all respondents draw a clear line between national and international volunteers, many times following my question about the number of volunteers they receive. The division is most visible when mentioning the kind of work the voluntourists are allowed to do. The NGO, for example, does not allow voluntourists to search for street children in the city due to possible dangers and the attention *wazungu* would draw to themselves because of their appearance as “[t]he kids will only focus on this” (Field notes, interview NGO, September 25, 2017). Furthermore, the statement of the national volunteer of the Foundation implies the creation of differences on an interpersonal level, when explaining that international volunteers are perceived as making the children at the orphanage “feel more loved [...] more special” (Field notes, interview Foundation, October 2, 2017).

Most of my respondents mentioned the duration and type of stay as important factors for a successful program. The founder and a national volunteer from the

Foundation explained to me that at their organization, stays from two to four days were not appreciated and might not be seen as volunteer work but as “a visit” (Field notes, interview Foundation, October 2, 2017), and in these cases, a donation would be preferred. In general, most interviewees stated that voluntourists who wish to stay for a short time receive less responsible jobs such as construction work or fundraising and interacting with the children. It can be seen that most of my respondents present a high knowledge of the negative impacts of short-term projects, as they are aware of the need “that volunteers are appropriately qualified and prepared so that they are perceived positively by their hosts and can make a genuine contribution, rather than simply absorb time and resources” (Raymond and Hall 2008: 538).

While two respondents mentioned talking to and sometimes even dismissing volunteers who did not behave to their agreement, the NGO’s spokeswoman described a complex application process by means of which they tried to guarantee a mutually beneficial experience. She stated that because of all the strong precautions, such as age requirements, background checks, references and a description of professional skills and former experiences, their institution was “more developed than others” (Field notes, interview NGO, September 25, 2017). Furthermore, the allocation of a voluntourist to a certain position or activity is done in agreement with local volunteers and employees. I wonder whether the fact that the NGO is connected to many international foundations and therefore seems to receive considerable support is interlinked with the spokeswoman’s statement that the NGO is “not starving for volunteers” (Field notes, interview NGO, September 25, 2017).

In contrast to the well-established NGO, the Foundation in a remote village relied heavily on local volunteers, as there were few international volunteers and limited external donations. Nevertheless, it seemed to me that the solidarity within the whole community is very strong, even outside of the foundation, and that the sense of duty and cooperativeness within the community compensates the missing external support (Field notes, Foundation). The network within the community also appears to be an important factor for the founder of the Education Center as she mentions that the voluntourists “[o]ften [...] arrive in big groups and if we have already filled our capacities here at the centers, I split the group and send them to work somewhere else” (Field notes, interview Education Center, September 20, 2017). By cooperating with other community members, the founder shows her authority and power in two ways. First, she is in a position to decide who can volunteer at her place and under which conditions. Secondly, she has the power and authority to decide who else in the community will benefit from additional hands and help, thus demonstrating her power within the community (Sin 2010: 987). As a conclusion, I would like to stress that to me all my interviewees seemed to be very proud of their organizations’ achievements and highlighted their active part within the organizations by their description of the choice of voluntourists and their tasks.

6.2 Presenting Need

At the end of the interview with the founder and owner of the Education Center, my interviewee started to search for pictures that she wished to show me. After she had finished searching on her computer and I had finished completing my annotations, she asked me to come over to her side of the desk:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Founder | You see? This is a governmental school. You see the clothes of the students? The teachers here look nice but the students [pauses shortly] you can see their status when looking at the clothes. |
| Me | There's still lots of work to do. |
| Founder | Yes. We need help here
[shows some other pictures of the students. Afterwards I return to my chair, her husband has entered the room] |
| Founder | So, tell me, what can you do for us? |
| Me | [pauses] Well, me personally, I can only do advertisement. |
| Founder | [nods] That's good. We need to fill the volunteer house. |
| Husband | You will be our ambassador. |
| Founder | Yes, our ambassador! And if you wish to stay here again and if you meet some volunteers that need an accommodation, you tell them my place. And now, will you walk around and take a look at the school and the volunteer house? |

(Field notes, conversation Education Center, September 20, 2017)

This dialogue contains at least two aspects which I encountered during all of my interviews and visits: On the one side, the importance of images as a vehicle for affective reactions and on the other side the direct request for a reciprocal favor. Similar to the strong effect of pictures in development discourse and humanitarian appeals, seeing and observing seems to be of great importance in voluntourism, too. The NGO in particular seems to be used to showing their progress and achievements visually. There was a large picture collage on the wall in the entrance hall, which documented the construction of different buildings and presented pictures of children and teenagers at the NGO. Moreover, the spokeswoman of the NGO explicitly encouraged me to take pictures while having a look around the premises. This behavior might be traced back to her position within the NGO and the fact that the organization has an own visitor program. Consequently, she was probably accustomed to welcome people who are interested in supporting the NGO. Similar to the tour guided by the NGO's representative, all of the other interviewees had taken me on a tour or encouraged me to do so. In fact, most of these walk-arounds became a look-around:

[The founder and owner of the foundation] explained to me that this was the boys' dormitory and we counted 16 bunk beds. All in all the room looked a little bit untidy and mattresses were missing on some of the beds. The founder and owner of the foundation pointed it out to me and explained that right now there was not enough money for sufficient mattresses

and that sometimes two or three of the boys shared one bed. [...] She told me that there were blankets missing and that it was very expensive to offer three meals a day. When we left the building, she mentioned that she also supported around 20 girls by buying things for them like sanitary pads. She said that God supported her work but that it was hard and that the volunteers were also a great support (Field notes, Foundation, October 2, 2017).

This conversation took place during a tour around the premises of the Foundation and illustrates how the founder achieves a smooth transition from an implicit presentation of the needed items to a more explicit expression of dependence from external actors. First, she presents the dormitory, counts the bunk beds and then indicates the missing mattresses. Then, she explains the witnessed situation by a lack of money and elaborates on other expenses, her challenges and how God and volunteers – probably local and international volunteers – were needed in order to help her and the people out of their precarious situation. It appears that witnessing the situation and hardship on-site is an important aspect or even strategy in order to achieve support. During the interview, the founder and the volunteer from the Foundation told me about a friend who had supported them in that she “was in contact with them [a Tanzanian charity]. She came here and there were some five children staying with us and she saw it and contacted the charity” (Field notes, interview Foundation, October 2, 2017). The founder and owner of the Education Center mentioned a similar situation:

The organizations look for me. They come and visit my place and say “ok”. Also we look for each other. I also go and visit them. And when they come to the center, I tell them “this is what we need, look at this and that” and they send the volunteers (Field notes, interview Education Center, September 20, 2017).

Financial support seems to be one of the central concerns of these organizations and the lack of it has been mentioned to me several times, sometimes explicitly, such as “we need volunteers very much [...] because there is no payment” (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017) or in form of explanations about the expenses of providing vocational training for young single mothers (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017). Sullivan states that hospitals in Tanzania also need to ask for certain items and know exactly what they need them for (Sullivan 2016: 158) since improvements might not be achieved otherwise due to “a lack of investment in either ideas or needs of the very health professionals who are charged with providing (and bolstering) care within fragile health systems” (Sullivan 2016: 142). These hopes for financial support are always present and are often transferred onto the volunteers (Sullivan 2016: 158). This act has indirectly been exemplified in some of the interviews. The founder and volunteer of the Foundation, for example, underlined the importance of international volunteers in that “they contact their families and the families often donate – even if it’s a very little contribution” (Field notes, interview Foundation, October 2, 2017). Moreover, the founder of the Orphanage

mentioned the support of the first volunteer who had “helped to buy things for the new building. He stayed for six weeks but after seeing everything, he helped us with beds and mattresses” (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017).

It is possible that most of my interviewees were not informed about my visit as they asked me to tell them why I was there or to explain the reason for my visit to others. Uncertain about my role, they might have related me to other voluntourists or to agents who visit the organizations, talk to the representatives and decide on whether they should support the organization or not. Both of these roles seemed to situate me in a superior position compared to my respondents and I felt uncomfortable when confronted with the question “So, tell me: what can you do for us?” (Field notes, conversation Education Center, September 20, 2017), which occurred in various different notions like “what do you want to achieve with this interview? [...] is there a benefit? What kind of impact does it have on the African people, let’s say?” (Field notes, conversation NGO, September 25, 2017) While two of my interviewees directly approached me with the question of reciprocity, the other two already prevented me from answering this question by proposing how I could support them. The volunteer of the foundation, for example, asked me to help them with an article in German for their website in order to contact more international volunteers, and the founder of the Education Center encouraged me to become their “ambassador” and asked me to come again and recommend her place to other volunteers (Field notes, conversation Education Center, September 20, 2017).

Networking and creating awareness for the organizations’ issues seem to essential motivations for hosting volunteers in Tanzania, for they can bolster the locals’ personal and the institutions’ professional progress (Sullivan 2016: 167). This is in line with my observations during the interviews: The founders of the Orphanage and the Education Center mentioned creating awareness by talking to the volunteers about the situation and the need for more support. The act of fundraising was brought up by nearly everyone, sometimes as part of their program or as an aspect of how far the voluntourists would benefit the organization. The founder and owner of the Orphanage, for example, explained that hosting volunteers “is networking” (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017). In that they would do fundraising and contact others, they would “spread the organization to the world” (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017). Similarly, the founder and volunteer of the Foundation mentioned keeping in contact with the voluntourists and their possible continued support as they might raise awareness and raise funds. While the founder of the Foundation referred to the essentiality of the help of national and international volunteers, the founder of the Orphanage pointed toward the international volunteers’ importance since they had helped to build the orphanage and thus “[e]verything started with them” (Field notes, interview Orphanage, September 30, 2017).

7 Discussion

The fact that voluntourism is “a place-based phenomenon in which the contingencies and contexts of locality matter greatly” (Sin, Oakes and Mostafanezhad 2015: 125) is also visible in my results. “Africa – as a prominent site of global humanitarian efforts and development interventions” (Prince and Brown 2016: 2) has been a volunteer destination for many decades (Prince and Brown 2016: 2). Especially in Tanzania and more precisely the touristic northern region, the number of international volunteers has risen significantly so that “seeing *wazungu* [...] throughout orphanages, schools, churches, and NGO offices, is routine” (Sullivan 2016: 141). Nevertheless, the results show that there are considerable differences between the individual organizations. My analysis of the interviews reveals that the organization in the smaller and less touristic village heavily relies on local volunteers whereas the organizations in the larger towns usually host many volunteers and in one case even distribute excessive voluntourists to other projects in the community. Additionally, there seems to be a difference between organizations that are already accustomed to hosting and working with voluntourists and those that are not yet very familiar with the practice. The latter were described as being aware of the rising reputation of their institutions when hosting voluntourists but did not consider the possible negative impacts of ascribing voluntourists to certain tasks (Field notes, interview Education Center, September 20, 2017). My interviewees’ strong awareness of their agency and activity might be due to the convenience sample. As only those organizations that were available via the World Wide Web were contacted, the results naturally only represent organizations that were already actively presenting themselves to the public.

During the interviews and tours, it seemed to me that all of my interviewees showed considerable pride in their projects and were clearly in charge of them. Whereas most respondents mentioned talking to the voluntourists in order to solve problems and find an adequate task for them, the NGO had established a detailed application procedure and used background checks to ensure the quality of the projects. Even though all of the interviewees presented themselves as very confident and powerful, in some way or another, all of them appeared to expect reciprocity in form of a service in return. Missing items, the lack of money and needed improvements were often mentioned to me. Especially, when directly asked to do them a favor, I felt discomfort, for I had not expected this behavior as my endeavor had officially been to visit and interview my respondents. These situations underlined my hosts’ uncertainty concerning our encounter and added up to my own role ambiguity, which also occurs to many voluntourists as they recognize the distinct motivations and power hierarchies that shape the relationships with their hosts (Swan 2012: 242; Tegeler 2016: 63-66).

In this situation of presenting authority on the one hand and need on the other hand, some of the possible outcomes of the mechanisms of the voluntourism encounter become visible. Sin (2010: 989) states that many of the organizations first seem to be in authority over their own projects but as the final decision of support is made by the voluntourists and the voluntourist agencies, hosting communities and receiving organizations depend on them. She argues that host communities are forced to answer

to the prospective volunteers' perception of their project and their expectations of caring relationships. The possibility that hosts might need to appear as a "poor, pitiful, and suffering community" (Sin 2010: 988) and "be entirely receptive to what gifts, aid, and knowledge volunteer tourists bring with them" (Sin 2010: 988) was partly addressed in my interviews. Especially the pictures and walkabouts, the mentioning of need for support and a lack of money goes hand in hand. This makes me wonder if receiving organizations might have incorporated the categorizations used in humanitarian practice and resort to the characteristics of archetypical victims such as vulnerability and neediness in order to meet these expectations. It seemed to me that my interviewees were aware that "becoming 'too rich' for volunteer tourism is indeed the ironical situation caring relationships and unequal relationships brings" (Sin 2010: 991) but they did not present themselves as extremely pitiful or suffering. This struggle can be explained by Benson's (2015b: 209) statement that "volunteer tourism is still predominantly a business transaction based on supply/demand mechanisms, in that organisations set up projects that they believe will 'sell' to volunteers". It could therefore very well be the case that hosts are often aware of the dangers of not appealing to voluntourist and voluntourism agencies (Sin 2010: 990) and, therefore, resort to ambiguous behaviors. These behaviors could be described as a constant balancing act between having authority over and pride in their projects while at the same time asking actively for help and presenting themselves as needy.

In this manner, "constructing a socially just world through action" (Simpson 2004: 689) and trying to empower people through caring relationships might lead to the contrary effect as hosts might feel urged to present themselves suitable for caring relationships, thus presenting need and poverty. Mostafanazehad (2014: 147) argues that "structural change in the form of debt forgiveness, the expansion of social services, and a more general redistribution of global wealth through trade policies and agreements" would be a better approach. As voluntourism is based on certain "political, economic and social inequalities" (Mostafanezhad 2014: 147), "the answers we need are not sentimental – they are political" (Mostafanezhad 2013: 333). Moving away from the economies of compassion and engaging in a more business-like interaction (Benson 2015b: 209) could be a more convenient way than perpetuating unequal caring relationships. Here, the contacted NGO might show a means on how to engage in more equal relationships. To me, the organization appeared willing to gain support of external actors by presenting itself as a very structured and responsible organization, thus focusing on its reliability rather than its hardship.

8 Conclusion

It has been shown that many of the perceived negative impacts of voluntourism such as the perpetuation of inequalities and stereotypes can be correlated to certain mechanisms that are similarly present in the fields of tourism, humanitarianism and international development. Images and notions of differences between individuals of the Global North and the Global South can often be found in voluntourism

advertisements or the media and may form part of the expectations and motivations with which voluntourists and hosting communities enter the encounter. While voluntourists commonly perceive these encounters as altruistic motivated caring relationships, such intentions are generally not identified by the receiving organizations, which see their main benefit in the possibility of creating a broader awareness for their projects and further fundraising. Besides these diverging interests, the existence of unequal power relations between the participants of voluntourism can lead to tensions and discomfort on both sides. These hierarchies can be explained by binary assumptions about an active and responsible North and a passive and grateful South that are not only present in modern tourism and humanitarianism but represent a legacy of colonial times.

My results, however, challenge this presupposed and popularly accepted role distribution: Instead of being passive, helpless and unconditionally grateful receivers of aid, all interviewed representatives of child-related organizations in North Tanzania have shown a strong awareness of and pride in being in charge of their voluntourism programs. Furthermore, they presented a consciousness of their position within the voluntourism industry as they apply voluntourism as a means for advancing their own projects. By actively asking the voluntourists and me for support, they possibly intend to initiate further fundraising and an awareness creation in the respective home countries. The extent to which pictures and the application of stereotypical notions of victimness, similar to categorization processes in humanitarian practice, are applied to satisfy the voluntourists expectations and to engage in the voluntouristic “business transaction” (Benson 2015b: 209) still has to be examined.

It can be concluded that receiving organizations of voluntourists are engaged in a balancing act between presenting agency and activity on the one hand and need and dependency on the other hand. This behavior initially seems ambiguous but can be related to the fact that receiving organizations usually rely on external support due to the externalization and privatization of development and aid and have thus actively adapted to these circumstances. Therefore, I would like to resort to McEwan’s (2009: 245) appeal that asserting the South’s agency is no “argument that allows the North to abrogate its moral responsibilities to distant others”. Indeed, in order to challenge neocolonial assumptions of power and activity, it is necessary to create more awareness of the encounter on both sides (Sin 2010: 991; Tegeler 2016: 75). On the one hand, voluntourists and voluntourism agencies should engage in a more critical reflection of the encounter and the broader contexts of global inequality on which it is based (Simpson 2004: 689-690). On the other hand, the opinions of hosts have to be examined even further while at the same time taking into account the other participants of the encounter such as voluntourism agencies, national states and the supposed beneficiaries of voluntourism. Only by respecting and considering the different expectations, motivations and contexts, the encounter as such can fully be understood and might in the end reduce discomfort and end up being “mutually beneficial” (Wearing 2001: 1).

9 References

- Barnett, Michael, 2011: *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Beer, Bettina, 2003: „Ethnos, Ethnie, Kultur“. In: Fischer, Hans and Bettina Beer (eds.): *Ethnologie: Einführung und Überblick*. Berlin: Reimer, 53-72.
- Benson, Angela M., 2015a: “Introduction: Why and How Should the Volunteer Tourism Experience Be Improved?” *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes* 7 (2), 100-106.
- Benson, Angela M., 2015b: “Conclusion: Why and How Should the International Volunteer Tourism Experience Be Improved?” *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes* 7 (2), 208-214.
- Breidenstein, Georg et al., 2013: *Ethnographie. Die Praxis der Feldforschung*. Konstanz/ München: UVK, 71-107.
- Coutin, Susan Bibler, 1998: “From Refugees to Immigrants: The Legalization Strategies of Salvadoran Immigrants and Activists”. *International Migration Review* 32 (4), 901-925.
- Daldeniz, Bilge and Mark P. Hampton, 2010: “Charity-based Voluntourism Versus ‘Lifestyle’ Voluntourism: Evidence from Nicaragua and Malaysia”. *University of Kent/Kent Business School Working Paper* 211, 1-18.
- Edensor, Tim, 2000: “Staging Tourism: Tourists as Performers”. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27 (2), 322-344.
- Edensor, Tim, 2001: “Performing Tourism, Staging Tourism: (Re)producing Tourist Space and Practice”. *Tourist Studies* 1 (1), 59-81.

- Fassin, Didier, 2010: "Inequality of Lives, Hierarchies of Humanity: Moral Commitments and Ethical Dilemmas of Humanitarianism". In: Feldman, Illana and Miriam Iris Ticktin (eds.): *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 238-255.
- Foucault, Michel, 1982: "The Subject and Power". *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4), 777-795.
- Fouéré, Marie-Aude, 2014: "Julius Nyerere, Ujamaa, and Political Morality in Contemporary Tanzania". *African Studies Review* 8 (1), 1-24.
- Gius, Chiara, 2012: "Ecountering the Other, or Encountering the Self? The Constuction of Otherness into Voluntourism Experiences". In: McGarry, Orla and Agnieszka Stasiewicz-Bienkowska (eds.): *Landscapes of (Un)Belonging: Reflections on Strangeness and Self*, 1-12.
- Hopf, Christel, 2017: „Qualitative Interviews - ein Überblick“. In: Flick, Uwe (ed.): *Qualitative Forschung: Ein Handbuch*. 8th edition. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 349-360.
- Höftmann, Hildegard and Irmtraud Herms, 2005: *Wörterbuch Swahili-Deutsch*. Köln: Köppe.
- Hunter, Emma, 2015: "Voluntarism, Virtuous Citizenship, and Nation.Building in Late Colonial and Early Postcolonial Tanzania". *African Studies Review* 58 (2), 43-61.
- Jeffery, Laura and Matei Candea, 2006: "Introduction: The Politics of Victimhood". *History and Anthropology* 17 (4), 287-296.
- Jennings, Michael, 2016: "Doing Good While They Can: International Volunteers, Development & Politics in Early Independence Tanzania". In: Prince, Ruth and Hannah Brown (eds.): *Volunteer Economies: The Politics and Ethics in Voluntary Labour in Africa*. Woodbridge: James Currey, 119-139.
- Kobelinsky, Carolina, 2015: "In Search of Truth. How Asylum Applications are Ajudicated". In: Fassin, Didier et al. (eds.): *At the Heart of the State. The Moral World of Institutions*. London: Pluto, 67-87.
- Lüders, Christian, 2017: „Beobachten im Feld und Ethnographie“. In: Flick, Uwe (ed.): *Qualitative Forschung: Ein Handbuch*. 8th edition. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, 384-402.
- Lyons, K.D. and Stephen Wearing, 2008a: "Volunteer Tourism as Alternative Tourism:

- Journeys Beyond Otherness". In: Lyons, K.D. and Stephen Wearing (eds.): *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism: International Case Study Perspectives*. Wallingford: CABI, 3-11.
- Lyons, K.D. and Stephen Wearing, 2008b: "All for a Good Cause? The Blurred Boundaries of Volunteering and Tourism". In: Lyons, K.D. and Stephen Wearing (eds.): *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism: International Case Study Perspectives*. Wallingford: CABI, 147-154.
- Malkki, Liisa, 1996: "Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism, and Dehistoricization". *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (3), 377-404.
- Malkki, Liisa, 2010: "Children, Humanity, and the Infantilization of Peace". In: Feldman, Illana and Miriam Iris Ticktin (eds.): *In the Name of Humanity: The Government of Threat and Care*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 58-85.
- McEwan, Cheryl, 2009: *Postcolonialism and Development*. London: Routledge.
- McGehee, N.G. and K. Andereck, 2008: "'Pettin' the Critters': Exploring the Complex Relationship between Volunteers and the Voluntoured in McDowell County, West Virginia, USA and Tijuana, Mexico". In: Lyons, K.D. and Stephen Wearing (eds.): *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism: International Case Study Perspectives*. Wallingford: CABI, 12-24.
- Mostafanezhad, Mary, 2013: "The Geography of Compassion in Volunteer Tourism". *Tourism Geographies* 15 (2), 318-337.
- Mostafanezhad, Mary, 2014: *Volunteer Tourism: Popular Humanitarianism in Neoliberal Times*. New York: Routledge.
- Phelan, Kelly Virginia, 2015: "Elephants, Orphans and HIV/AIDS: Examining the Voluntourist Experience in Botswana". *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes* 7 (2), 127-140.
- Prince, Ruth and Hannah Brown, 2016: "Introduction: The Politics and Ethics of Voluntary Labour in Africa". In: Prince, Ruth and Hannah Brown (eds.): *Volunteer Economies: The Politics and Ethics in Voluntary Labour in Africa*. Woodbridge: James Currey, 1-27.
- Raymond, Eliza Marguerite and Michael C. Hall, 2008: "The Development of Cross-Cultural (Mis)Understanding Through Volunteer Tourism". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16 (5), 530-543.

- Raymond, E., 2008: "'Make a Difference!': The Role of Sending Organizations in Volunteer Tourism". In: K.D. Lyons and Stephen Wearing (eds.): *Journeys of Discovery in Volunteer Tourism: International Case Study Perspectives*. Wallingford: CABI, 48-60.
- Redfield, Peter and Erica Bornstein, 2010: "An Introduction to the Anthropology of Humanitarianism". In: Redfield, Peter and Erica Bornstein (eds.): *Forces of Compassion. Humanitarianism between Ethics and Politics*. Santa Fe: SAR, 3-30.
- Reiffen, Franziska and Nanneke Winters, 2018: "*Care in Crisis: Ethnographic Perspectives on Humanitarianism*" – Conference Report. <www.medizinethnologie.net/care-in-crisis-ethnographic-perspectives-on-humanitarianism-conference-report/>. Mainz: Institut für Ethnologie und Afrikastudien, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz. (Arbeitsgruppe Medical Anthropology in der DGV e.V). Cited: May 15, 2018.
- Simpson, Kate, 2004: "'Doing Development': The Gap Year, Volunteer-Tourists and a Popular Practice of Development". *Journal of International Development* 16, 681-692.
- Sin, Harng Luh, 2009: "Volunteer Tourism – 'Involve Me and I Will Learn'?" *Annals of Tourism Research* 36 (3), 480-501.
- Sin, Harng Luh, 2010: "Who Are We Responsible to? Locals' Tales of Volunteer Tourism". *Geoforum* 41, 983-992.
- Sin, Harng Luh; Oakes, Tim and Mary Mostafanezhad, 2015: "Traveling for a Cause: Critical Examinations of Volunteer Tourism and Social Justice". *Tourist Studies* 15 (2), 119-131.
- Staddon, Samantha, 2014: "'So what Kind of Student Are You?' The Ethics of 'Giving Back' to Research Participants". In: Lunn, Jenny (ed.): *Fieldwork in the Global South: Ethnical Challenges and Dilemmas*. London and New York: Routledge, 249-261.
- Sullivan, Noelle, 2016: "Hosting Gazes: Clinical Volunteer Tourism and Hospital Hospitality in Tanzania". In: Prince, Ruth and Hannah Brown (eds.): *Volunteer Economies: The Politics and Ethics in Voluntary Labour in Africa*. Woodbridge: James Currey, 140-163.
- Swan, Eileadh, 2012: "'I'm not a Tourist. I'm a Volunteer': Tourism, Development and International Volunteerism in Ghana". In: Beek, Walter van and Annette Schmidt (eds.): *African Hosts and Their Guests*. Oxford: James Currey, 239-255.

- Tegeler, Caroline, 2016: *The Voluntourism Encounter: Affect, Discomfort, and Transformation in Yaxunah*. Colby College: Honors Theses Paper 821.
- Ticktin, Miriam, 2011: "The Gendered Human of Humanitarianism: Medicalising and Politicising Sexual Violence". *Gender and History* 23 (2), 250-265.
- Ticktin, Miriam, 2014: "Transnational Humanitarianism". *Annual Review of Anthropologie* 43, 273-289.
- Urry, John, 1990: *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Wearing, Stephen, 2001: *Volunteer Tourism. Experiences That Make a Difference*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Wilson, Liz, 2015: "Finding the Win-Win: Providing Supportive and Enriching Volunteer Tourism Experiences while Promoting Sustainable Social Change". *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes* 7 (2), 201-207.
- Wright, Hayley, 2013: "Volunteer Tourism and Its (Mis)interpretations: A Comparative Analysis of Tourist/Host Perceptions". *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 13 (4), 239-250.