HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	The role of student volunteers in tourism and building up a sustainable operating system : the "Providing Information and Knowledge Model" and the "Common Pleasure Model"
Author(s)	Okamoto, T.
Description	Sustainable Tourism 2008, 3-5 September 2008, Malta
Relation	Sustainable Tourism III
Citation	WIT Transactions on Ecology and the Environment, 115, 121-129 https://doi.org/10.2495/ST080131
Issue Date	2008-08-15
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/35573
Rights	© 2008 WIT Press
Type	conference paper
File Information	okamoto-1.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

The role of student volunteers in tourism and building up a sustainable operating system "Providing Information and Knowledge Model" and "Common Pleasure Model"

T. Okamoto
Graduate School of International Media, Communication, and Tourism Studies, Hokkaido University, Japan

Abstract

There are two objectives in this thesis: one is to clarify the role of university students (US) in a tour held at a university. Another is to prove what the "spontaneous motivation" is that enables US to have a sustainable interest in tourism. This research adopts the following method. 1: Analysis of two preceding tours. 2: Building up Providing Information and Knowledge Model (PIKM) and Common Pleasure Model (CPM). 3: Proof of CPM. As a result, CPM can provide intimate communication between US and tourists. CPM can provide pleasure for both US and tourists and special reward for students.

Keywords: student volunteers, Providing Information and Knowledge Model, Common Pleasure Model, motivation

1 Introduction

1.1 Objectives and background

There are two objectives in this thesis: one is to clarify the role of university students (US) in a tour held at a university and to build up two models upon it. Another is to prove what the "spontaneous motivation" is that enables US to have a sustainable interest in tourism. These objectives are set up under the following background.

At present, Japan faces the problem of declining birthrate and aging population. As the result, the number of students who enter universities is decreasing and some universities have not met their intake quota. Universities need to get hold of more students in order to sustain their businesses. The aging population has brought about increasing the number of elderly people who have retired, are both healthy and wealthy, and seek enjoyment for their pastime.

Recently, in order to both get more students and accommodate to provide lifelong education, Japanese universities have a big task for opening up the university campus to the public [3]and making effective use of resources universities possess from both aspects of public relations and education.

Under these circumstances, some university visits, or tours, have begun to be held. However, the tour has problem. US cannot find any satisfaction in these activities, which makes the number of US decrease and makes the tours difficult to carry on [6].

When universities are considered to be tourist spots, then what kind of role do US take? What kind of system is needed for sustainable concern of university students with tourism?

1.2 Literature review

Preceding studies on tourism emphasized the relationship between tourists and local residents as an important field for understanding this phenomenon in tourism [2, 10]. Nevertheless, preceding studies up to the present mainly deal with tourists themselves [5, 8, 9], and even if they deal with local residents, the major concern is about the change of local residents' attitude toward the impact of tourism [1, 4, 7].

1.3 Methodology

This research adopts the following method in order to accomplish the above mentioned objectives.

1.3.1 Analysis of preceding cases

Analysis of two tours: Hokudai(Hokkaido University) Campus Visit(HCV) and Mana-tabi Sapo-to Shugaku Ryokou(MSSR), in both of

which US were concerned, followed by a discussion of the role of US and conditions concerning their sustainable participation in tours (chapter 2).

1.3.2 Building up a model

Based on organized conditions in chapter 2, two models are built from the point of relationship between US and tourists in the tours held at the university: 'Providing Information and Knowledge Model (PIKM)' and 'Common Pleasure Model (CPM)' (chapter 3)

1.3.3 Proof of a model

CPM is a model which excludes factors preventing US' motivation from sustaining. A tour adopting CPM was held and the efficiency of the model was clarified. Some problems are also mentioned (chapter 4).

2 Analysis of preceding cases

2.1 Outline of Case1: Hokudai Campus Visit (HCV)

The Hokudai Campus Visit (HCV) is held by the US' organization. In HCV, US hold a campus tour for visitors to Hokkaido University. The tour goes as follows. US lead visitors, walking around in the campus and guiding them with a text of information. It takes one or two hours.

HCV, when it was established, consisted of 31 student volunteers, 3 staff members, and 3 professors, and held guided tours to high school students (HS) and local residents. But as the years passed, the number of the members decreased. In October 2006, only 4 student volunteers remained and were essentially in charge, although there were some members who registered but did not take part in the tours. Therefore, they cannot manage to hold guided tours for HS on a school trip, who are major visitors for the tours.

Table1: The number of HCV members

Year	Students	Office worker	Professor	Total
2002	31	3	3	37
2003	26	3	3	32
2004	28	3	2	33
2005	11	2	1	14
2006	11	2	1	14

2.2 Outline of Case2: Mana-tabi Sapo-to Shugaku Ryokou (MSSR)

'Mana-tabi sapo-to Shugaku Ryokou (MSSR)' is a commodity for educational tours developed by both a major enterprise in an education field and a major travel agency. In the tour, one student guide leads 5~20 HS, walking around the campus and providing some information about his campus life. A tour takes from half an hour to one hour. There are many students who stop this job after a single tour.

2.3 Result in the survey of two tours

Result of analyzing two tours are displayed in the following table.

Table2: Comparing CASE1 with CASE2

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2"></th><th colspan="2">CASE1 :HCV</th><th>CASE2 :MSSR[1]</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Organizer</td><td colspan="2">Students organization (University)[2]</td><td>Enterprise</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Tour style</td><td>Target</td><td colspan="2">High school students and local residents</td><td>High school students</td></tr>
<tr><td>Number of people[3]</td><td colspan="2">10~20/1~2</td><td>5~20/1~2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Length of tour[4]</td><td colspan="2">1~2</td><td>0.5~1</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Guide member</td><td colspan="2">Fixed</td><td>Flexible</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Payment for tour guide</td><td colspan="2">Nothing</td><td>1000yen/h</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Charge</td><td colspan="2">Free</td><td>Charged</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="4">Role of US</td><td colspan="2">Guiding</td><td rowspan="4">Guiding</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Preparation for tour</td><td>Making guidebook</td></tr>
<tr><td>Routing</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Operating tour</td></tr>
</table>

Note 1: Two tours held in two universities in May 2007 are analyzed here.
Note 2: This project receives fund from the university and professor concern to its management.
Note 3: number of tourists / number of guides
Note 4: hours

Rewards US receive by participating in a tour are classified into 7 aspects, and the factors which can prevent US from concerning to the tour continuously can be classified into 3 aspects (Table3).

Table 1: Rewards and Hindrance

Reword	Explanation	Hindrance	Explanation
R-1 Sense of accomplishment	To produce a tour by themselves and have a feeling of achievement	H-1 Much time and work is necessary for this activity	Although the benefits are great, if the work is too time consuming for them, the possibility is higher that students will stop their participation. The same situation happens when this activity requires more than other activities do in order to get a similar kind of benefits.
R-2 Praise	To be thanked with words of praise by tourists.		
R-3 Information	Information brought by tourists, such as the idea of different generation, local information in the residential area of tourists and so on.		
R-4 Exchange	Harmonious communication with tourists.	H-2 No rewards obtained in the activity	When university students receive no rewards by guiding tours or can not find any possibility to receive rewards, possibility for students to stop their guiding increase.
R-5 Deep understanding of their own university	Guides to others make them know about their university more deeply and take pride in their university.		
R-6 Tourists' pleasure	Tourists express their pleasure for student guides.	H-3 Unpleasantness felt in the activity	University students do not feel like carrying on this activity because of given complaints by tourists and troubles on the relationship with members of the organization.
R-7 Material rewards	Money, goods and so on		

3 "Providing Information and Knowledge Model (PIKM)" and "Common Pleasure Model (CPM)"

Combining conditions given by the analysis above mentioned two models on relationship between US and tourists are built up two models.

3.1 Providing Information and Knowledge Model (PIKM)

Providing Information and Knowledge Model (PIKM) is a guiding model in which US provide some knowledge and information one-way to tourists. Although tourists make appropriate responses and ask some questions, it does not include communication.

In both Case1 and Case2, US guide a tour according to this model. But in actual situation, the guide is not always one-way. It sometimes happens that US have a talk with tourists individually during moving from one spot to another. R2, R3, R4 and R6 are obtained in such a situation.

3.2 Common Pleasure Model (CPM)

Common Pleasure Model (CPM) is a guiding model in which both US and tourists feel pleasant in exchanging their knowledge and information. Here, both US and tourists communicate with each other positively, exchange knowledge, which includes or does not include knowledge about tourist spots, and emotional expression such as praising and smiling.

Considering the results of analysis, US could receive more and strong psychological rewards in the tours of CPM style than of PIKM.

4 Proof of a model

The efficiency and problems of CPM are clarified by observing tours which are made as a commodity applying CPM. Data are obtained by the following methods. 1. Survey of written materials about how both US and tourists communicate with each other and evaluate tours. 2. Participatory observation. 3. Interview and questionnaire to US.

4.1 Outline of 'Hokudai Senior College Tour'

Hokudai Senior College Tour (HSST) is a tour project, planned and operated jointly by Hokkaido University Center for Advanced Tourism Studies (CATS) and East Japan Railway Company. This tour is a trip with learning of 4 nights and 5 days planned for elderly people. The tour was actually held from August 30th to September 3rd, 2007. There were 28 participants (57~83 of age) who stayed in sleeping accommodations near University, walked around University campus, took lectures and practical training and so on.

4.2 The method of applying CPM to a tour

In walking around University campus, one professor in charge guided 28 participants. He provided some information using a megaphone at several spots in Hokkaido University Campus. 7US attended in the walking tour and communicated with participants.

4.3 Result of Proof

4.3.1 Tourists' evaluation

Before the tour, tourists were asked to answer a questionnaire (free description style) about their motivation to participate in 'Hokudai Senior College Tour.' Answers of 23 participants are given and classified in 5 aspects.

Table 2: Tourists' expectation

Expectation	Number of respondent	Example
Ex-1 Getting knowledge and experience	18/23	I can attend a lecture. I can experience practical trainings. I could learn various things.
Ex-2 Visiting and walking around Hokkaido University Campus.	9/23	I can walk around University Campus. I can take a walk along a row of poplars, a special feature of University.
Ex-3 Good weather and environment	3/23	Cool weather, clean air, and full green.[1]
Ex-4 Meeting with people	3/23	I want to talk with a university professor. I want to look at how students are at University.
Ex-5 The contents of the tour	2/23	I am interested in the theme of the tour.
Ex-6 Others	3/23	As a reference of trip to Hokkaido

Note 1: These have no special connection with University itself.

After the tour, tourists were asked to answer a questionnaire about the degree of satisfaction over the whole tour.(selection among 5 categories: 1 fully satisfied 2 moderately satisfied 3 satisfied 4 a little unsatisfied 5 unsatisfied) Answers of 22 participants are given.

Table 3: Tourists' Satisfaction

	Fully satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Satisfied	A little unsatisfied	Unsatisfied
A number of respondent	13	6	2	1	0

As the result of questionnaire (free description style), asking about 'a general impression of the tour' answered after the tour, 16 participants out of 24 wrote about good evaluation and words of their gratitude to student volunteers. There are no negative comments or complaints to them. Even those who selected 'a little unsatisfied' in the questionnaire

on the evaluation of the tour showed good evaluation to student volunteers. After the tour, tourists set up their alumni association and expressed their will to keep in touch with the student volunteers

4.3.2 Evaluation made by student volunteers

After the tour, student volunteers were asked to answer a questionnaire about impression of the tour (free description style). The given answers were classified in 7 aspects.

Table 4: Tourists' Evaluation

Questionnaire			Interview[2]
Evaluation	NOR[1]	Example	
Ev1 Review of the tour	6/7	I did not have enough knowledge because of lack of my study	I would have never thought that the tourists would give me such gratitude.
Ev2 Tourists' pleasure	6/7	I was glad to see the tourists look happy. I was glad to know that the tourists enjoy communication with us.	Tourists enjoyed it more than I thought.
Ev3 Getting Information	5/7	I obtained some knowledge and experience.	Tourists listened enthusiastically to my talk. I thought tourists might have been uninterested in what I had to say
Ev4 Pleasure	5/7	I enjoyed the tour. I felt interested in the tour.	
Ev5 Suggestion to the next tour	3/7	I want to guide again after getting more knowledge.	I learned a lot from the participants
Ev6 Being helpful to tourist	3/7	I was helpful to tourists.	It was good to become aware of what I have ignored so far
Ev7 Words of gratitude to the tourist	2/7	I express my gratitude to the tourists for giving some advice on my life.	The view of my university has changed

Note 1: Number of respondent

Note 2: 5 students out of 7 expressed their will to participate again and 2 students also agreed if a tour schedule fits theirs

5 Conclusion

Considering the result of an experimental tour, the efficiency of a model and tasks for the future are demonstrated.

5.1 Function of CPM

Most of the tourists participated in the tour, expecting to get more knowledge and experiences rather than to communicate with people.

But, the survey after the tour shows that the tourists highly evaluated US. This is because US walked around and communicated with the tourists rather than only providing knowledge and information to them. From this

fact, it is understandable that no tourists referred to the lack of knowledge of US, although US felt sorry for it.

Actually, in the participatory observation, these scenes were observed. US could not answer a question, “What is the name of the building?” asked by a tourist. Having their roles reversed, tourists answer a question about names of flowers, asked by US.

In one-way providing of knowledge and information, roles of ‘the provider’ and ‘the provided’ are fixed. Under this situation, US felt that tourists looked unconcerned with their guide and tourists complained about quality and quantity of provided knowledge and information. But in this experimental tour, such negative situations were not observed. US expressed their gratitude to the tourists. As US’ guide did not become one-way, not only US but also tourists were satisfied with each other through exchanging knowledge and information.

5.2 Reward to US

US participated in this tour received all rewards except R1 and R7.They did not get R1 because this tour was planned not by them but by the enterprise and University. R7 was not received because the students agreed to participate in this tour as volunteer guides without payment and no students complained about it.

Rewards to students which were not observed in preceding cases are: “It was good to become aware of what I have ignored so far” and “The view of my university has changed.” These comments show that students got a different view toward what are considered as natural things. This reward is observed not in PIKM but in CPM, which could mean that this reward is brought about through intimate communication.

6 Task for the future

Here, it is proved that CPM has two efficiencies: to provide satisfaction both to students and tourists and to have a possibility to bring about students’ cognitive change as a reward through intimate communication with tourists.

But a major problem is how far communication should go into in order to get a good relationship. Although this point was not measured in this survey, both students and tourists could be tired and lose interest if they had too much communication in a tour.

The idea of how deeply the reward as a cognitive change influenced the sustainable participation of students should be analyzed in the future. It should be assured how important cognitive change as a reward is for guides who have been concerned with tourism for long time.

By analyzing more cases and proceeding analytical study on the relation between students' rewards and their sustainable participation in tourism, conditions in which students find some values in concerning with tourism and continue their activities could be demonstrated.

References

[1] Ap, J., Residents' perception on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(3), pp665-690, 1992

[2] Cohen, E., The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, pp373-392, 1984

[3] Ikeda, F. & Makoto, S., A Campus Tour Project in Hokkaido University: An Activity Conducted Mainly by Students. *J. Higher Education and Lifelong Learning*, 12, pp.31-39, 2004.

[4] Kathleen L. Andereck., Karin M. Valentine., Richard C. Knopf. & Christine A. Vogt., Residents' perception of tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), pp.1056-1076, 2005.

[5] Maeda, I., Psychology of tourism and service, Gakubunsya Press, 1995

[6] Okamoto, T., Yamamura, T., Otani, A. &Ono, C., A study on Sustainable Campus-Tourism Development Part1. *Proceedings of JITR Annual Conference*, 22, pp.17-20, 2007.

[7] Paul, B. &Paul, C., HOST PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), pp.493-515, 1999.

[8] Sasaki, T., Psychology of tourist behaviour, Kansai University Press, 2000.

[9] Sasaki, T., A research note on the impact of tourism and residents' attitudes toward tourism: Approach to a low-interest field in the psychology of tourism, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Sociology*, 37(3), pp.197-269, 2006.

[10] Smith, V. L., Hosts and Guests, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.