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Abstract

Volunteer tourism (VT) is defined ‘as a form of tourism, which aims to provide sustainable alternative travel that can assist in community development, scientific research or ecological restoration’ Wearing (2002, p. 240). VT is frequently described as making a difference or doing something worthwhile and its sustainability performance is based on transparency and accountability between its stakeholders manifested by joint planning and community engagement with host projects that lead to their empowerment and equality. Currently, the VT industry has been criticised for the commodification of volunteer experiences by exploiting host communities that fail to making a difference. More research is needed about how the engagement between the main VT stakeholders influence sustainability performance and how to evaluate sustainability performance.

This research develops an evaluative framework to better understand how stakeholders’ relations influence sustainability performance in VT, crucially investigates how and why certain sustainability outcomes occur. The principle contribution of developing an evaluative framework is the innovative methodology that brings together collaboration theory and realistic evaluation. While collaboration theory provides an essential theoretical basis for exploring the main stakeholders’ relations in VT, realistic evaluation determines the root causes of how and why sustainability performance is achieved. By doing so, the evaluative framework takes an all-encompassing and holistic approach and determines the nature of the collaborative relations between all the main stakeholders.

Two main advantages of the evaluative framework are pertinent, i.) its in-depth analytical ability in evaluating sustainability performance and ii.) the transferability of its findings. The findings address the current body of knowledge in terms of what VT’s mantra of doing something worthwhile or making a difference actually means at an operational and community level. Based on the theory developed through realistic evaluation, this study offers a definition of sustainability performance in VT:

The theory outlines that the (sending and receiving) organisations under certain circumstances enable sustainability. Their practices must include the integration of stakeholders, screening and matching of volunteers to host projects in such a way as to support effective skills and expertise transfer to host project staff. The on-going facilitation of stakeholder relations should lead to positive experiences and safety for all involved. In addition, long-term planning and needs
assessment support empowerment, equality and transparency for host projects and which can encourage social mobility over time.

The development of the evaluative framework addresses an emerging research agenda for evaluating sustainability performance by offering a new understanding of social mobility and other long-term outcomes for the recipients at host projects and how VT is making a difference through transformative change. Further afield, the evaluative framework offers a sound foundation for future investigations in assessing the effectiveness and outcomes of other social interventions.
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# Glossary of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Context, mechanism, outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Collaboration Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPSIR</td>
<td>Driver-Pressure-State-Impact-Response Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation of Mature and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Realistic Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Responsible Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVCM</td>
<td>Sustainable Value Chain Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGS</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STI</td>
<td>Sustainability Tourism Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMM</td>
<td>Tourism Optimisation Management Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBL</td>
<td>Triple Bottom Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations International Children’s Emergency Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWTO</td>
<td>United Nations World Tourism Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCA</td>
<td>Value Chain Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Volunteer Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

‘Volunteering is an amazing thing, but volunteer the right way.’

J.K. Rowling

1.1 Introduction

This research aims to evaluate how the relations between the main stakeholders in volunteer tourism influence sustainability performance. The first chapter outlines the current issues, rationale and purpose of this study, and broadly outlines the importance of evaluating sustainability performance in volunteer tourism. The chapter is organised in three sections. The initial section introduces sustainability and begins to formulate what sustainability performance in volunteer tourism means by reflecting on the background and current settings of the volunteer tourism industry. In highlighting the challenges inherent in the volunteer tourism industry and providing an overview of the various responses from industry players, the rationale for the thesis becomes apparent. The second section explains how the thesis is positioned in the current body of knowledge and provides a brief synopsis of its intentions, outlining its significance, aims and objectives. The methodological approach of realistic evaluation applied in this study is briefly introduced along with how it relates to the subsequent literature. The final section outlines the thesis’s structure and explains the purpose of each chapter.

Within the volunteer tourism industry and academia, there are a number of variations and meanings of the term ‘volunteer tourism’. Frequently, the term is truncated to ‘voluntourism’\(^1\). According to Callanan & Thomas (2005), there is no significant difference in meaning or distinction between the two terms, but some industry practitioners differentiate ‘volunteer tourism’ as a sustainable version to the unsustainable version ‘voluntourism’. The current body of knowledge predominately uses the full term (e.g. Burrai et al., 2016; Grabowski et al., 2016; Phelan, 2015), with some exceptions (e.g. Alexander and Bakir, 2011). In this thesis, the more formal and full term of ‘volunteer tourism’ is used, and is abbreviated to ‘VT’. To seek clarity, the next section explores definitions of VT and the meaning that constructs an understanding of the issues concerning sustainability performance in VT.

\(^1\) Accessed 08/07/2015 http://www.voluntourism.org/
1.1.1 Sustainability Performance in Volunteer Tourism

Before exploring what sustainability performance in VT means, this section begins with a brief background of sustainable development and sustainability in tourism. The roots of the definition of sustainability are found in the 1980s and have since evolved to reflect contemporary global challenges. One explanation of the meaning of sustainable development is ‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 41). Time is the main focus in defining sustainability as simply that actions today should not affect tomorrow. Since then, the Sustainable Development Goals have outlined sophisticated targets to guide the implementation of actions addressing a range of concerns such as poverty reduction, education and climate change. A significant element in these sustainable development goals is the emphasis on delivering global goals at a local level. To apply similar principles to tourism, the United Nations World Tourism Organisation explains that a balance needs to be established between the three economic, social and environmental dimensions, highlighting poverty alleviation and the fair distribution of socio-economic benefits for all, including host communities. The organisation outlines the need for respect, cultural understanding and support for the authenticity of host communities and their values. The UNWTO also highlights participation and consensus amongst stakeholders, and continuous monitoring to guide improvements and prevention. Further, elements include visitor satisfaction, meaningful experiences and the raising of awareness of sustainability issues. This offers some useful caveats of what sustainable tourism is based on, and how it parallels with sustainability in VT.

VT is firmly rooted in the context of sustainability. For instance, it is defined as a form of sustainable tourism; for example it is labelled as ‘alternative’ (Lyons & Wearing, 2008, p. 6), ‘ethical’ (Mostafanezhad, 2013, p. 485) or consists of ‘moral consumption’ in contrast to mainstream tourism (Smith, 2014, p. 31). A more detailed definition by Wearing articulates sustainability and community development as part of VT: “a form of tourism that makes use of holiday-makers who volunteer to find and work on conservation projects around the world and which aims to provide sustainable alternative travel that can assist in community development, scientific research or ecological

---

3 Accessed 28/10/2018 http://sdt.unwto.org/content/about-us-5
Several different terms are used in the VT industry and the media, such as: ‘international volunteering’⁴, ‘responsible volunteer tourism’⁵ and ‘ethical volunteer tourism’⁶. While VT’s sustainability includes concepts such as morality, ethics and responsibility, and comprises volunteers travelling to work in support of community development, it is viewed as a win-win situation for those involved (Mostafanezhad, 2014b; Wilson, 2015).

Subsequently, a recent description of sustainability performance in VT suggests: ‘We see the future for VT as a partnership between volunteers and destination communities which seeks to provide opportunities for rich intercultural exchanges and intercultural understanding’. The authors continue: ‘VT should be about volunteers and local communities coming together... to interact in mutually beneficial cultural exchanges’ (Wearing et al., 2017, p. 518). Significantly, the authors’ visionary explanation emphasises cultural exchanges and mutuality for the volunteers and destination host communities. Significant is how the authors also describe stakeholders’ relations as a partnership, highlighting the importance of positive relations. Sustainability performance in VT is also simply described as making a difference in that it is about doing something worthwhile (e.g. Coghlan, 2008; Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Wearing, 2001), emphasising how sustainability outcomes of VT are focused on influencing positive change without articulating how and for whom. Further attributes of sustainability performance are found in the current body of knowledge.

Further explanations of sustainability performance and best practice in VT are based on operational practices, stakeholders’ relations and specific outcomes. For instance, some of the operational aspects include the transparency and accountability over volunteers’ contributions and the provision of critical information to host projects, the appropriate preparation of volunteers, safety for projects that involve vulnerable people such as orphans; and long-term commitments to host projects by the (sending and receiving) organisations (Barbieri, Santos, & Katsube, 2011; Czarnecki et al., 2015; Ong, Pearlman, & Lockstone-Binney, 2011; Phelan, 2015; Wilson, 2015). In addition, the effectiveness and quality of volunteer experiences should allow volunteers to be fully integrated and engaged into the host project and are able to fulfil their assigned roles (e.g. Coghlan & Weiler, 2015; Gius, 2015; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2014). The (sending and receiving) organisations must focus on host project engagement to address socio-economic inequality and empowerment and encourage communications and cultural exchanges between host projects and volunteers (Coghlan & Noakes,

⁴ Accessed 08/07/2015 www.fairtravelers.org
⁵ Accessed 08/07/2015 http://travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk/About.aspx?category=25#.VZ1GWP5oC
⁶ Accessed 08/07/2015 www.ethicalvolunteering.org
Sustainability outcomes of VT must demonstrate social and economic benefits for host projects (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012).

Nevertheless, outcomes and sustainability performance are questioned as the rhetoric surrounding VT has turned from advocative to cautionary (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b, p.122), and its claims of making a difference or doing something worthwhile are increasingly questioned (e.g. Butcher & Smith, 2015; Gius, 2015; Hammersley, 2014; Palacios, 2010; Wearing et al., 2017). Further, Wearing and colleagues (2017) suggest evaluations are needed to determine whether it actually does make a difference. They query VT’s impacts and performance because sustainability in VT is contentious and confusing issue which is illustrated by the differentiation of commodified and decommodified forms of VT (Gray & Campbell, 2007; Wearing et al., 2005). The reasons for querying sustainability performance in VT become apparent by outlining a brief background of VT and its impacts.

### 1.1.2 Background of the Volunteer Tourism Industry

In reflecting on the background of the development of VT, some valuable insights illustrate the growing issues surrounding its sustainability. Here, the gaps between the reality and definition of VT’s sustainability begins to become apparent. The root cause for the change in VT is its extensive growth and popularity in the global North since the turn of this century. A 2008 study reveals that each year, 1.6 million volunteers travel overseas. According to this report, this figure is speculated to be much higher, at approximately 10 million, and to be worth between £832 million and £1.3 billion (TRAM, 2008 cited in McGehee, 2014, p.848). Estimates from 2014 suggest that the global VT industry is worth AU$ 2.6 billion (approximately £1.5 billion) (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2014). Another study in 2014 suggests that up to 500,000 UK students volunteer abroad each year (Neeves and Brignall 2010, cited in Smith, 2014). There do not appear to be more current estimates of the VT industry’s growth, however. Nonetheless, these estimates indicate that the VT industry has grown extensively, particularly over the last two decades (e.g. Guttentag, 2009). Thus, what was once considered as sustainable and ethical travel (Wearing, 2004) is now also described as a ‘mass niche market’ (Callanan and Thomas, 2005, p. 183) and is thus increasingly comparable with mainstream conventional mass tourism (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). Hence, one of the issues over VT’s claims to making a difference is its very popularity.

The increase in VT’s popularity over the last decades may be partially attributed to a growing trend towards ethical consumerism. It is influenced by an “ever increasing guilt conscious society” and the “consequences of a restless society, jaded from the homogeneous nature of traditional tourism products and seeking alternative tourism experiences” (Callanan and Thomas, 2005, p. 183). In an
effort to moralise individuals’ choices and actions, and to make a difference to global economic and social inequality, ethical consumerism is playing a growing role in decision making processes (Butcher, 2003; Vrasti, 2013). Butcher (2003) concludes that a new moral tourism attempts to make a difference through consumer choices, such as VT (Wearing & Lyons 2008a; Wearing 2001). Contributing to the ethical and moral trend, including the dramatic growth in VT, is the increase in ‘pop philanthropy’ by celebrities fronting global social and environmental causes (Mostafanezhad, 2014c, p. 111). VT has become integrated into modern celebrity culture in several ways, ranging from the widely publicised participation of the British Royal Princes in volunteer projects during their gap years (Butcher, 2003), to images of Madonna or ‘Brangelina’ adopting orphans in less developed countries. Images of celebrities hugging infants are re-enacted by young volunteers and reinforced through the self-depictions through selfies on social media, which drive the demand for VT (Mostafanezhad, 2014c). This growth has changed the operational practices in VT, and has provoked a great deal of criticism.

The popularisation of humanitarianism drives the demand for volunteer projects with vulnerable people in underprivileged communities in developing countries; a demand that is reflected in the significant increase in social, care and development projects, and in commercial gap year companies (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Sin et al., 2015). Consequently, VT organisations are criticised for prioritising profits over negative impacts to destinations arising from the commodification of the interactions with destination host communities (Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; McGehee, 2014; Simpson, 2004; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). For example, according to reports by UNICEF and Friends International, the demand for VT has contributed to a 60% increase in orphanages in Cambodia between 2005 and 2015, of which half are near major tourist attractions. Considering that an estimated 80% of the 16,500 children in 460 care institutions in Cambodia have at least one living parent, this raises serious concerns about the consequences of VT (Friends International, 2017; Knaus, 2017; UNICEF Cambodia and Division of Data, 2017). This is one example that illustrates the unprecedented exploitation and commodification of vulnerable people arising from the demands of volunteers.

1.1.3 Impacts of the Volunteer Tourism Industry

The substantial growth and popularity of the VT industry have led to several negative impacts such as the commodification of destination communities and dissatisfied volunteers (Guttentag, 2012; McGehee, 2012; Phelan, 2015; Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). The current body of knowledge suggests that VT leads to social injustice, exploitation and power imbalances over host communities (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; McGehee, 2014; Palacios, 2010; Tomazos et al., 2012; Wearing et al. 2005). VT is scrutinised as the benefits to the host
community are not obvious and VT’s ability to address global concerns such as poverty are unrealistic (Sin, 2010). Sin also observes how the lack of experience, skills and knowledge of volunteers distinguishes them from experienced and trained international development aid workers, and proposes that VT is harmful, manifesting the perpetuation of ‘existing power and social hierarchies between the rich and privileged and poor and less-privileged’ (Sin, 2010, p. 984). VT’s geopolitical relationships between volunteers from the rich global North and the underprivileged host communities in the global South, facilitate neo-colonialism and paternalism and lead to dependency, inequality and the exploitation of host communities (Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; McGhee, 2014; Palacios, 2010; Simpson, 2004; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012; Wearing & McGhee, 2013b). Volunteers themselves, meanwhile, have concerns over their experiences in engaging with their hosts.

Further questions are raised over the quality and effectiveness of volunteer experiences as returning volunteers voice their concerns based on their disillusionment and frustrations arising from a feeling that their experience did not meet their expectation of making a difference (Coghlan, 2015; Coghlan & Weiler, 2015; Gius, 2015; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2014; Palacios, 2010; Phelan, 2015). Furthermore, volunteers feel they are a ‘burden’ to their hosts, and question their role and the impacts of their involvement (Hammersley, 2014, p. 856). Poor volunteers’ experiences include lack of work, or integration for volunteers with the host project staff, and poorly managed projects (e.g. Cleary, 2016). The experience of volunteers, and the exploitative nature of VT, illustrates some stark differences between reality and the understanding of VT in academic circles. Based on the above explanation of VT, VT should be based on mutually balanced relationships between volunteers and the host community, where the outcomes benefit both and the purpose clearly demonstrates doing something worthwhile and making a difference (Wearing et al., 2017). The commodification of the host communities therefore directly conflicts with the sustainability performance of VT (Smith, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Mostafanezhad, 2014a; Tomazos et al., 2012; Guttentag et al., 2012; Simpson, 2004). The impacts of VT’s contradictions through its unregulated practices trigger several responses by different industry actors who are affected by a diminishing reputation.

The implications of VT’s waning sustainability performance provokes different responses from different industry participants, such as past volunteers, third sector organisations and the media. One of the strongest responses has been from the Australian government, which has limited the sale of VT projects with vulnerable people such as at orphanages under its Modern Slavery Act (Knaus, 2018). Several not-for-profit and sustainable tourism campaign organisations provide an array of self-assessment and monitoring tools, including guidelines and codes of practice targeting volunteer
organisations and volunteers (Table 1.1). Some industry participants are campaigning for operational practices to improve, including more host community engagement (e.g. Comhlámh, 2011). With no statutory power, however, third sector organisations have a limited capacity to bring about a change to more sustainable practices. Nevertheless, these initiatives raise awareness amongst consumers and increase the pressure on the VT industry to change their practices so as to minimise the negative impacts. Frequently, media reports take a critical view of VT, cautioning potential volunteers about its pitfalls, and providing some practical advice on how to select sustainable projects (e.g. Purvis, 2016). Dissatisfied and disillusioned volunteers returning from their placements, meanwhile, take to social media to share their disappointing volunteering experiences.

Table 1.1: List of Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>ABTA</td>
<td>Volunteer Tourism Guidelines (not available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.abta.com">www.abta.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Bread for the World-Protestant, Working Group tourism &amp; development</td>
<td>Policy Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECPAT Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de">www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.akte.ch">www.akte.ch</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecpat.de">www.ecpat.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Tourism Concern</td>
<td>International Volunteer Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk">www.tourismconcern.org.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>The International Ecotourism Society</td>
<td>The International Voluntourism Guidelines for Commercial Tour Operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecotourism.org/">http://www.ecotourism.org/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Comhlamh</td>
<td>Code of Good Practice for Volunteer Sending Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.comhlamh.org">www.comhlamh.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.fairtrade.travel/">http://www.fairtrade.travel/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

Overall, in recent years, the reputation of the VT industry has been tarnished, and the growing pressure and dissatisfaction from a wide range of industry participants illustrate the urgent need for the VT industry to change its practices. In addition, the contradictions between the current definitions and understanding of VT and the reality of VT’s lack of sustainability demands investigation. While there is a great deal of rhetoric questioning how and if VT is making a difference, or what ‘doing something worthwhile’ means, this offers little tangible and specific detail in outlining what
sustainability performance actually is. For instance, little is known about for whom and how VT should make a difference and what doing something worthwhile actually is. Nevertheless, several themes have emerged that appear to influence sustainability performance and outcomes, such as operational practices, the volunteer experience and how they interact with their community project at the destination. Furthermore, based on current explanations, VT is about the opportunity for volunteers and host communities to have cultural exchanges and understanding that has mutual benefits and outcomes (Wearing et al., 2017). Consequently, the relations between the stakeholders, particularly between the volunteer and host community, and how this is arranged through VT organisations, plays an influential role in determining the outcomes. Thus, further investigation is required to understand and evaluate how and what leads to sustainability performance.

1.2 Positioning the Thesis in the Literature

This thesis sets out to evaluate VT’s sustainability performance based on the relations between the stakeholders. The rationale of the thesis is based on several considerations: Firstly, the relations between the different stakeholders who are directly involved in VT, for instance volunteers, host projects and sending organisations, play an important role in influencing sustainability performance. And yet a gap in knowledge has been identified in terms of understanding the diversities and complexity between the different stakeholders (Wearing et al., 2017). Secondly, clarity is needed for understanding the overall sustainability outcome and the impacts of VT. The question of whether sustainability in VT means making a difference and is doing something worthwhile needs to be addressed, and understanding how this manifests itself in VT needs to be fully explored. Research into evaluating probable outcomes is recommended (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b; Wearing et al., 2017). Thirdly, little is understood of VT’s operational practices, including best practices, and this deserves further investigation (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). In this section, the rationale and the positioning of the thesis are further explored within the current body of knowledge.

One narrative in the body of knowledge characterises VT, and its impacts, through the lens of international development (e.g. Gilfillan, 2015; Griffin, 2013; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2014; Simpson, 2004; Vrasti, 2013). The apparent similarity between VT and international development emphasises the geographically dependent variations in socioeconomic circumstances between volunteers from the global North and host communities in the global South, (e.g. Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; Palacios, 2010). In addition, it has been suggested that VT has the capacity to address global problems such as alleviating poverty (Wearing & Grabowski, 2011). The discourse on international development is characterised by examining the binary relations between volunteers
and host communities. Such emphasis on the expert/beneficiary in the global North or privileged donor/ needy recipient in the global South, however, limits the understanding of the deeper subtleties within host-guest relations that can, and should, include mutuality and cultural exchange (Everingham, 2014; Lough & Carter-Black, 2015; Wearing et al., 2017). Thus, this approach narrows and limits the in-depth understanding of the different relations amongst the stakeholders in VT, since there are multiple stakeholders who are directly engaged in the process of operating VT (e.g. volunteers, sending organisations, receiving organisations and the host project at the destination). Orientating the investigation of sustainability performance within the international development discourse is therefore not feasible, and other approaches to exploring the stakeholder relations need to be considered.

Currently, the different relations between the VT stakeholders are not fully understood. Although the literature on VT continues to expand, it is largely concerned with examining individual stakeholder groups one at a time, with volunteers, in particular, receiving much attention (e.g. Brown, 2005; Coghlan & Fennell, 2009; Leonard & Justice, 2009; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2002). Several empirical studies have examined some of the relations between VT stakeholders, particularly engagements with host communities (e.g. Burrai et al., 2014; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Wright, 2014). While community engagement is recognised as a significant attribute of best operational practices, further investigation is needed to provide detailed insights in respect to how they relate to overall outcomes and sustainability performance (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). In addition, there is an acknowledgement of the significance of collaborative relations between the different stakeholders as part of sustainable management practices (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). Little is known, however, about stakeholders’ collaborative relations and interactions and how these affect communities at the micro level (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Similarly, a detailed understanding is required of best practices and the role of the organisations in VT.

There is also currently limited research in VT that explores good practices and to evaluate if and how organisations play a role in influencing outcomes (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Sending organisations play a significant role as operational practices have changed and are considered as gatekeepers amongst cross-sectoral stakeholders including host communities and are responsible for sustainable practice (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2009). Thus, VT organisations need to ensure more community level engagement and transparency (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012; Wearing et al., 2005; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). A gap in knowledge regarding the collaborations between stakeholders is apparent and a call for a ‘deeper analysis of the diversity of interactions and dialogue between volunteer tourists, members of the destination communities and
volunteering organisations is needed’ (Wearing et al., 2017, p. 517). Furthermore, it is unknown how
and why collaborative relations possibly influence VT’s outcomes and sustainability performance.
Thus, further in-depth investigation is required to evaluate the collaborative relations of the
stakeholders, including the engagements at a community level. Likewise, the current literature offers
little understanding of what leads to certain VT’s outcomes and impacts.

There is also a lack of understanding of what influences outcomes in VT. While VT is scrutinised over
its outcome of sustainable performance, the detail of its outcomes and benefits remain largely
unknown and a more in-depth understanding is needed (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015;
Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012). Moreover, recent observations at community level provide empirical
evidence of negative impacts affecting host community members (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Phelan,
2015) and further exploratory research is needed to understand the root causes of this (McGehee,
2014). Future research should focus on evaluations to provide an understanding of the outcomes and
the role of volunteer organisations (Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). To frame sustainability in VT, areas
for future research are identified to include developing mechanisms that explore decision making
processes by host communities at the destination, and the socio-cultural impacts and outcomes of VT
(Benson & Wearing, 2017). Sustainability performance also needs to be evaluated with a focus on
identifying outcomes and their influences, and it is important to investigate operational practices at
the micro level in order to understand the interactions between volunteers, the organisation and
community project fully, as well as the outcomes at the destination.

1.2.1 The Need to evaluate Sustainability Performance

Several methodological approaches are used in tourism research to determine sustainability
performance. To be able to evaluate sustainability and determine the sustainability performance of a
destination, a product or service is a valuable tool and offers credibility to the practices in tourism
(Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002). Thus, monitoring and evaluation is instrumental to sustainability
(Butler, 1999). At a micro level, however, there is a lack of useful and transferable evaluations of
sustainability performance in tourism. This is due to the intangibility and complexity of tourism
systems at destinations and of the social values of host communities (Park & Yoon, 2011). Past efforts
to evaluate sustainability include the development of sustainability indicators which are systematic
and able to distil the complexity of tourism to indicator frameworks. These remain subjective and
oversimplified (Tanguay, Rajaonson & Therrien, 2013; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013) and advances
have stagnated (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009; Tanguay et al., 2013). In addition, indicator development
is location and scale specific (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Miller, 2001; Tsaurs, Lin, & Lin, 2006; Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002) and there is a lack of consensus about the underlying methodologies (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009). Although the importance of evaluating sustainability performance is acknowledged, the methodologies for evaluating sustainability based on indicator development have limitations. Thus, a particular limitation is that the same indicators are not applicable to different geographical and social settings, which poses challenges in respect to the transferability of different case studies.

Furthermore, since sustainability performance indicators evaluate outcomes through a quantitative approach, they rarely explain root causes and lack analytical ability. Consequently, more progressive research is needed to advance practical applications in tourism settings (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009; Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). The complexity and diversity of the socio-geographical settings of the projects within the VT industry limit the generalisability of empirical case studies. Thus, a potential contribution to the current body of knowledge is the ability to overcome the challenges of generalisability by applying a different methodology for evaluating VT’s sustainability performance. Additionally, a different methodology to indicator development is needed to determine the root causes of why and how sustainability performance is achieved.

The literature indicates that by evaluating the relations between VT stakeholders, valuable insights such as the sustainability performance can be determined. This would contribute to the in-depth understanding of the operational practices and help to determine what influences sustainability outcomes. The current literature acknowledges that collaborative relationships are evaluable, and can determine sustainability performance (Lupoli & Morse, 2014). Furthermore, recent analytical studies in VT contribute to evaluating sustainability performance based on evaluating VT stakeholders’ interactions. The authors address the systematic evaluation and monitoring of performance and quality in VT, including evaluating relationships to determine sustainability performance (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014, 2015; Taplin et al., 2014). Lupoli’s exploratory study, for example, reveals the preferences in respect to indicators among a host community, acknowledging that an all-encompassing approach to stakeholders’ collaborative relations is crucial to improving sustainability performance. Their study, however, requires further development in terms of assessing local impacts (Lupoli et al., 2014). Taplin, meanwhile, when evaluating VT organisations and their management practices, highlights the necessity to take account of the various contexts when developing a methodological approach (Taplin et al., 2014). This thesis will examine the collaborative relations of VT stakeholders, as it will contribute to the current body of knowledge by providing an in-depth understanding of the operational practices and the nature of the different relations. In examining all stakeholder relations, it will take a holistic and all-encompassing approach.
An evaluative framework based on collaboration theory provides a theoretical approach for evaluating collaborative relationships and their outcomes (Brown, 1991; Gajda, 2004; Munanura & Backman, 2012), including communities (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). Collaboration is “a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem domain about the future of that domain” (Gray, 1989, p. 11). Further, the emphasis in collaboration is on evaluating the strengths and the outcomes of collaborative relations in terms of their local impacts (Brown, 1991; Gajda, 2004; Munanura & Backman, 2012). While collaboration theory provides the essential theoretical basis for examining the stakeholders’ relationships within VT, the approach also needs to allow for the inclusion of unknown and unintentional outcomes (Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011). The outcomes of VT projects are evaluable in terms of the aims and objectives of the projects, which relate to the wider external settings of national or regional social, environmental and economic circumstances (Gajda, 2004). An evaluative framework evaluating the collaborative relations between VT’s stakeholders, therefore, determines how these factors influence VT’s sustainability performance and impacts, contributing to the current gaps in knowledge. Such a framework links the stakeholder relations to sustainability performance in VT, and provides valuable insights into the operational practices that influence sustainability performance to academia and industry. The diverse nature of VT is challenging, however, and the usefulness of the evaluative framework is subject to its transferability across the industry.

An approach to evaluating sustainability performance is therefore required that allows transferability to a wide range of different settings. While collaboration is an instrumental part in evaluating the nature of the stakeholder relations, in this thesis, transferability is based on the methodology of realistic evaluation, and this methodological approach represents a significant contribution to the process of developing an evaluative framework. By testing the framework on a case study, the outcomes from its evaluation are transferable to other examples in the industry (Pawson, 2013). Pertinent to the transferability is that realistic evaluation enables the evaluative framework to identify certain settings of the collaborative relations amongst the stakeholders that enable sustainability. An important element of the evaluative framework is that realistic evaluation assesses why and how certain outcomes such as sustainability performance are achieved by stakeholders’ collaborative relations (de Souza, 2013; Gajda, 2004; Pawson & Tilley, 2004). Thus, two critical components contribute to the methodology: i.) realistic evaluation detects different settings that influence collaborate relations to achieve sustainability performance (why), and ii.) collaboration theory determines the nature of the stakeholder relations that lead and identify sustainability performance (how). Based on this methodology of applying realistic evaluation and collaboration theory in developing the evaluative framework, the thesis makes a significant contribution to the current body of knowledge within the field of sustainability tourism and to the VT industry.
1.2.2 Significance, Scope and Aims

This research evaluates how stakeholders’ relations influence sustainability performance in VT and crucially investigates how and why certain sustainability outcomes occur. A significant contribution is based on the innovative methodology in applying realistic evaluation and collaboration theory, which has several advantages: First, the outcomes of the evaluation provide an insight into why and how sustainability performance is achieved in VT at a micro level. This addresses the current knowledge gap in respect to understanding fully how collaborations between stakeholders influence sustainability performance. The approach is innovative because it is all-encompassing and holistic in evaluating all the relations between the main stakeholders. Second, the evaluative framework contributes to the understanding of what sustainability performance is in VT and illustrates best practice that offers the industry and academia valuable insights. In doing so, the thesis contributes to defining sustainability in VT in detail. Third, applying realistic evaluation allows for the transferability of the evaluative framework, which provides a starting point for future attempts to evaluate sustainability in VT and other fields in tourism.

The aim of this thesis is to develop an evaluative framework that critically understands the processes of collaborative relations between the main stakeholders in VT, and how this influences the outcomes of VT.

The objectives of the research are therefore:

Objective 1 - To evaluate the collaborations of the main stakeholders in VT.

Objective 2 - To assess how and why the collaboration between the main stakeholders influences sustainability performance in VT.

Objective 3 - To develop an evaluative framework that assesses how and why collaborations between the main stakeholders influence sustainability performance in VT.

1.3 Structure of the Thesis

The aim and objectives of this empirical study are focused on developing an evaluative framework to evaluate stakeholders’ collaborative relations and how these influence sustainability performance in VT. The thesis contains eight chapters, the first three focus on why and how to develop the evaluative framework (Table 1.2). In providing the background for this study, Chapter 1 highlights how the research is situated within the context of the tourism industry and some of the contemporary
concerns of VT’s sustainability performance. The chapter continues to explain how the research is positioned within the current body of knowledge. By identifying the gaps in knowledge, Chapter 1 presents the study’s scope, significance and aims. The following two chapters (Chapter 2 and Chapter 3) present the literature review, which explores several different bodies of knowledge, namely VT stakeholder relations, evaluating collaborations, methodological approaches to evaluating sustainability and how to apply realistic evaluation.

Specifically, Chapter 2 turns the focus to understanding VT stakeholder relations, initially identifying the main stakeholders, examining their characteristics and contextual settings, and exploring the current body of knowledge on evaluations stakeholders’ relations and outcomes in VT. The chapter then turns to explain how collaboration theory provides a basis for evaluating VT stakeholders’ relations (Objective 1). The thesis continues in Chapter 3 to explore current methodologies for evaluating sustainability, providing useful insights to inform the construction of the evaluative framework and how to evaluate sustainability performance in VT. It begins by examining the current body of knowledge on how the development of indicators and supply chains have been applied to evaluating sustainability performance in tourism. The chapter then turns the focus to explaining how realistic evaluation provides an invaluable methodological basis for evaluating how stakeholder relations influence VT’s sustainability performance (Objective 2). Through this understanding of the main components and insights, the thesis continues to develop the evaluative framework.

A significant component of the thesis is Chapter 4 since this provides the methodological grounding for constructing the evaluative framework and elaborates in detail how it will evaluate sustainability performance in VT (Objective 3). The chapter explains how the construction of the framework is based on the supply chain of VT stakeholders, and applies collaboration theory to examine in-depth the collaborative relations between stakeholders, and how realistic evaluation explores why the stakeholder relations influence sustainability performance in VT. Chapter 5 outlines the methods used to apply the evaluative framework, introduces the case study chosen for testing the framework, in the UK and South Africa, and describes some of the geographical and social settings. It continues with the audit trail of the research instrument, sampling strategy and the data handling, and the thematic data analysis. The chapter also includes the ethical considerations pertinent to conducting the data collection, which then leads to the presentation of the data in the following chapter.

Chapter 6 presents the findings arrived at by applying the evaluative framework to the case study, and details how and why the contextual settings and stakeholder relations influence the sustainability performance. The chapter presents each of the identified collaborative relations and the themes that
emerged from the analysis. The chapter presents findings that illustrate why the different components of contextual settings and relations evaluated influence sustainable performance, as well as how they do this, thereby highlighting some themes and patterns that are further explored and discussed in the following chapter. Chapter 7 synthesises the findings and the associated current body of knowledge to develop several middle range theories that articulate how sustainability performance is influenced within the case study’s supply chain. The structure of the discussion is based on the three objectives, enabling the construction of the middle range theories, which leads to the conclusions. Chapter 8 reflects on the aims and objectives and summarises the thesis’s contributions to knowledge, presents its main conclusions, and provides further recommendations to industry and academia.

Table 1.2: The Structure of the Thesis

| Chapter 1 Introduction | Industry Settings  
|                        | Sustainability in Volunteer Tourism  
|                        | Significance, Scope and Aim  
| Chapter 2 Literature Review | Evaluating Stakeholders in Volunteer Tourism  
|                        | Evaluating and Evaluating Outcomes and Impacts  
|                        | Evaluating and Evaluating Collaborative Relations  
| Chapter 3 Literature Review | Evaluating Sustainability and Performance Indicators  
|                        | Sustainable Value Chain Management  
|                        | Applying Realistic Evaluation to Volunteer Tourism  
| Chapter 4 Methodology | Rationale of the Evaluative Framework  
|                        | Theoretical and Methodological Considerations  
|                        | Constructing and Conceptualising the Evaluative Framework  
| Chapter 5 Methods | Research Instrument Design  
|                        | Sampling Strategy and Data Collection  
|                        | Data Handling, Analysis and Interpretation  
| Chapter 6 Results | Collaborative Engagements and their Settings  
|                        | CMO Configurations  
|                        | Evaluating Sustainability Performance  
| Chapter 7 Discussion | Collaboration of Stakeholders  
|                        | Collaborations Influencing Outcomes  
|                        | Application of The Evaluative Framework  
| Chapter 8 Conclusion | Conclusions of The Study  
|                        | Contributions to Knowledge  
|                        | Recommendations to Industry and Academia  

Author, 2018
2 Evaluating Stakeholders’ Collaborative Relations

My life was so enriched by being in townships and I just wanted to share that with other people, because there I learnt very valuable lessons about what it means to be a human being and how we should engage with one another as human beings.

Paul Miedema, Calabash Tours

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter briefly outlined the background to VT and its associated impacts and outcomes. It also introduced some of the stakeholders involved in the VT industry, highlighting how stakeholder engagements play an important role in the sustainability performance of VT. This chapter examines the current body of knowledge that is concerned with evaluating the collaborative relations between the main VT stakeholders’ (Objective 1), and how these relations may influence VT’s outcomes and sustainability performance (Objective 2). This chapter is structured into two main themes: i.) evaluating stakeholder relations in VT (Section 2.2) and, ii.) using collaboration theory to evaluate relations and its outcomes (Section 2.3 -2.4). Based on the current body of knowledge, the chapter begins by outlining the main VT stakeholders and investigating their roles and responsibilities. Currently, little is known about the relations between stakeholders and how they may influence VT’s outcomes and sustainability performance. The chapter, therefore, explains why it is necessary to understand how they engage with one another. The current body of knowledge on evaluative approaches to stakeholder relations provides valuable insights into the development of the evaluative framework (Objective 3). Thus, the later sections introduce and explain the usefulness of collaboration theory in evaluating the stakeholders’ relations, and explores how to incorporate it into the evaluative framework. The following chapter (Chapter 3) examines methodological approaches for evaluating sustainability performance in tourism and supply chains, highlighting their advantages and challenges. It explores how realistic evaluation underpins the methodology of the evaluative framework in terms of how to link these relationships with outcomes.

2.2 Stakeholders’ Relations

The previous chapter reveals that a more in-depth understanding is needed of the relations between stakeholders in VT. This section outlines the main stakeholders, followed by an examination of their different relations and impacts, and continues with how to evaluate them. The current body of
knowledge is dominated by portrayals of volunteers and volunteer organisations (e.g. Benson & Henderson, 2011; Callanan & Thomas, 2005; Coghlan & Fennell, 2009; Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Conran, 2011; Ong et al., 2011). Although in recent years there has been an increase in empirical studies on the impacts of VT on host communities and their relations to other stakeholders (Burrai et al., 2014; McGehee, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Sin et al., 2015; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b), the understanding of how stakeholders interact with one another remains limited. In particular, the exchange and interaction between volunteers and the recipients in the host community project are significant. An evaluation of stakeholders’ relations may reveal the nature of these relations, to what degree they collaborate, and how that may influence outcomes. This research, therefore, explores the stakeholders’ collaborative relations (Objective 1) and how they influence outcomes (Objective 2). This section defines and illustrates VT’s main stakeholders and examines the current body of knowledge on their roles, responsibilities and relations.

2.2.1 The Main Stakeholders in Volunteer Tourism

The existing body of knowledge on each stakeholder reveals a lack of consensus about some of their characteristics, roles and responsibilities, each of which is explored individually below. The current body of knowledge also addresses each stakeholder disproportionately. For instance, the majority of studies on VT focus on just one stakeholder, and volunteers, in particular, receive a great deal of attention (e.g. Leonard & Justice, 2009; Ooi & Laing, 2010; Otoo, 2014). Only a small number of studies have examined more than one stakeholder and their interactions, values, opinions and perceptions (e.g. Burrai et al., 2014; Gray & Campbell, 2007; Hammersley, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2015). Based on the current body of knowledge, four main stakeholders are directly involved in VT: volunteers, sending organisations, receiving organisations and the hosting local project within the destination community (Morgan, 2009). The distinction between ‘sending’ and ‘receiving’ organisation is a recent development in the current body of knowledge (e.g. Hammersley, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Taplin, 2014) and still needs more clarity (Frilund, 2015). Within the diverse VT industry, however, there are variations of the stakeholder map, and other players include charities, donor agencies for those organisations who seek additional financial support, or large travel companies that offer VT products as part of a holiday package. Few empirical studies, however, make the host project within the destination community their focus or consider host projects as an equal active agent (e.g. Bargeman et al., 2016; Frilund, 2015). Each main stakeholder is outlined below.

Much research explores the motivation of volunteers, revealing that their motivations are questionable. A large body of knowledge in VT is concerned with the volunteers’ motivations,
perceptions and activities (e.g. Benson, Management & Seibert, 2009; Leonard & Justice, 2009; Ooi & Laing, 2010; Rattan, 2016; Unger, 1991). Volunteers’ motivation is often portrayed as being based on ‘selflessness’ and altruism, but this is debatable since other motivations are also identified (Coghlan & Fennell, 2009). Furthermore, they are described as amateur aid workers, fulfilling the role of an expert but lacking the appropriate knowledge, skills and qualifications for their given volunteering role (Mostafanezhad & Hannam, 2014; Punaks & Feit, 2014; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Additionally, the differentiation of the varying demographics of volunteers reveals several consumer groups such as ‘gappers’ (gap year students) and retired professionals, who consequently possess different motivations (Alexander, 2012; Everingham, 2014). A typical attribute of volunteers is that they predominately originate from the global North and tend to travel to the global South, placing volunteers within a socioeconomic geopolitical setting (Palacios, 2010; Taplin et al., 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012).

The current literature on the characteristics, roles and responsibilities of sending organisations, meanwhile, draws an incomplete and unclear portrayal as it tends to examine quite different aspects such as their governance, type of organisation or their aims (Hammersley, 2014; Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). For example, some authors speculate that organisational governance influences operational practices and decision making, and particularly focus on whether organisations are not-for-profit organisations or not (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli et al., 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Some researchers explain that not-for-profit organisations face contradictory ambitions in respect to having both commercial interests and a need to achieve the goals of their philanthropic mission (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Another characteristic of sending organisations is their financial sustainability within the VT industry. For instance, several studies suggest that VT sending organisations face challenges in a competitive market and need to focus more on profits (Coren & Gray, 2012; Wearing et al. 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). According to Benson and Henderson (2011), sending organisations are vulnerable since they work in politically and economically unstable countries, and to address this financial vulnerability, organisations are motivated to offer more, and a more diverse range, of projects. It is apparent, however, that sending organisations vary greatly in terms of their governance, and that their external factors influence their sustainability performance. It is also apparent that a more in-depth understanding is needed.

Further characteristics of the sending organisations, roles and responsibility include that they are based in the global North and may have multiple partnerships with organisations in the global South.
They deal with the planning and delivery of the volunteer programme such as volunteer recruitment, pre-departure, and arranging logistics for volunteers at the destination (Ong et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Taplin, 2014). Several studies stipulate that sending organisations play a significant facilitative role and are responsible for minimising negative impacts and maximising positive benefits (Barbieri et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008), as is explored in more detail below. There is a gap in knowledge, however, in respect to with whom and how sending organisations form partnerships in the global South. In addition, the detailed nature and arrangements of such partnerships are unknown. Clarity is also needed about sending organisations roles and responsibilities and whether the governance and organisational structure and type do indeed influence sustainability.

Turning to receiving organisations and host or community projects, the body of knowledge is limited and consists mainly of reports by industry actors (Czarnacki et al., 2015; Morgan, 2009; Punaks & Feit, 2014; Sinervo, 2014). The receiving organisation tends to be a local organisation at the destination, usually in the global South, which directly or indirectly works with the hosting local project in the destination community, and may partner with multiple host projects (Raymond et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008). Thus, there is a difference between the receiving organisation and the host project. The receiving organisation may be a community initiative or not-for-profit organisation such as an international aid organisation, but not one actually hosting volunteers (e.g. Ong et al., 2011; Phelan, 2015; Sin, 2010). They may also fulfil the role of an agent or ground handler in dealing directly with logistical and travel-related issues, such as accommodation, provisions and local transport (Czarnacki et al., 2015). The limited number of studies acknowledging the role of the receiving organisation, and the confusion between the sending and receiving organisations and host project, demonstrates the lack of in-depth insights into the different processes and relations involved in operating volunteer programmes. It is significant that there is no clear consensus in the current body of knowledge, and further investigation is required to gain insights into the roles and responsibilities of the receiving organisation (Frilund, 2015). Similarly, clarity is also needed on the hosting project in the community.

In this respect, the body of knowledge in understanding the host project is also limited, with host projects usually only addressed in association with other stakeholders (e.g. Bargeman et al., 2016; Frilund, 2015; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Zahra & McGehee, 2013). While host projects in the destination communities are the hosts for volunteers and where the volunteer experience takes place, more clarity is needed to understand fully what and who the host projects actually are. In the current body of knowledge, care and social orientated volunteer programmes commonly take place
in orphanages or schools (Bargeman et al., 2016; Frilund, 2015; Klaver, 2015; Sinervo, 2014). More studies are needed that explore host projects in terms of cross-cultural understanding, communications with and relations with volunteers, as well as their views and perspectives (Hammersley, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008). Further, the complexity of their relations and the operational aspects in implementing a volunteer programme need further investigation (Raymond et al., 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008). While the body of knowledge describes volunteer experiences, detailed insights are needed to explore who volunteers directly engage with at host projects. The differentiation between the service providers, such as teachers or care workers, and the service recipients, such as schoolchildren or orphans, is limited. Further investigation is needed into the relations between the host project and other stakeholders, such as the sending and receiving organisation.

Although the body of knowledge lacks consensus, some useful information has been gathered above in respect to each of the main four stakeholders, such as their characteristics, roles and responsibilities. The diversity of the stakeholders is challenging, particularly in respect to the sending and receiving organisation, as well as the host projects. Nevertheless, more insights are required to understand each in sufficient detail as to be able to identify the influence of their relations with one another. The following section presents the body of knowledge on the relations between the main stakeholders, and how this may influence sustainability.

2.2.2 Stakeholders’ Relations

This section explores the current body of knowledge on the different relations between some of the main stakeholders and their impacts and outcomes. Chapter 1 (Section 1.1.3.) outlines some of the criticism and impacts of the VT industry that are associated with the commodification of the VT industry. Specifically, therefore, this section explores how the different relations influence outcomes such as the commodified volunteer experience and negative impacts on stakeholders, and how to influence more sustainable outcomes, such as positive experiences. Predominately, the body of knowledge addresses the relations between volunteers and host projects and the involvement of the sending and receiving organisations. Through this thesis, where the literature does not make a clear differentiation between organisations, they are referred to using the form (sending and receiving) organisations. The position of the host project and other stakeholders, particularly the volunteers, is frequently associated with imbalance and social and economic inequality. Furthermore, the economic and social benefits for host projects and the communities at the destination are often questionable, querying the sustainability performance in VT (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Mostafanezhad, 2014c; Simpson, 2004; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012). Thus, the relations between volunteers and
host projects play a significant role in achieving sustainability performance in VT as it affects the outcomes for the stakeholders involved.

Furthermore, several case studies highlight in detail at the micro level the issues associated with sustainability performance. Empirical evidence suggests that volunteers can be more of a hindrance than a help and that their contribution has no or little positive impact on communities (Bargeman et al., 2016; Gius, 2015). Empirical evidence from a case study demonstrates how volunteers questioned whether their own efforts were making a difference and ‘their usefulness to the community’, and expressed that they were ‘highly concerned about the kind of impact’ they had on the community’ (Phelan, 2015, p. 137). Additionally, a recent case study at an orphanage provides further empirical evidence that community members were only passive recipients. Their preferences in respect to how volunteers should be involved played no part and serious questions were raised over the psychological effects on children who form temporary bonds with volunteers, and what the benefits are (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014). Power imbalances are also apparent in other ways, since, although volunteers and local workers supposedly share a common interest of wanting the best for the recipients, volunteers may choose not to engage in some routine tasks (Wearing & Grabowski, 2011). Such evidence demonstrates that VT can have significant negative impacts on the host project and their service recipients, validating the existence of the social imbalances and demonstrate that such VT projects do not make a difference. Altogether this illustrates the commodification of VT by sending organisations.

Sending organisations have therefore been condemned for exploiting host communities and serious questions have been raised over the social and economic benefits to host communities (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012). It has been recognised that sending organisations have a pivotal role as intermediaries and facilitators, since they are responsible for considering the needs of host communities (McGehee & Andereck, 2009). Studies suggest, therefore, that improvements in the operation and management of (sending and receiving) organisations are necessary in order to address the power imbalances and their effects on host communities (Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Everingham, 2015; Lupoli et al., 2014; McGehee, 2012; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014). Furthermore, organisations have been criticised for their detachment from host projects in local communities (Wearing et al., 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006) and it has been argued that more engagement with, and incorporation of, community feedback is needed. The operation and management of the volunteer experience by (sending and receiving) organisations is a significant element in the sustainability performance of VT, particularly with respect to the relations between the volunteer and host project.
In the body of knowledge, host project engagement plays a significant role in addressing socio-economic inequality. Frilund (2015) observes that host projects are perceived as inactive participants in VT and a realignment of all participants is necessary for future investigation. Wearing and McGehee (2013) conclude that this inequality can be addressed through communication and cultural exchange between volunteers and host projects. They further emphasise the importance of community involvement and note that the unique social situation of host communities needs to be the focus of any kind of tourism development, and particularly VT, given that it operates at a community level. Thus, community engagement such as assessing communities’ needs is a significant attribute of sustainable practices (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). Furthermore, the responsibility for achieving sustainability outcomes in terms of engaging with host projects lies evidently with the sending organisation.

In addition to the engagement with host projects, other aspects of operational and management practices that influence sustainability performance are highlighted in the current body of knowledge. Further aspects of influencing sustainability performance and considered best practice in VT are identified. These include: transparency over volunteers’ contributions; the provision of critical information to host projects; appropriate preparation of volunteers; safety for projects that involve vulnerable people such as orphans; and long-term commitments to host projects by the (sending and receiving) organisations (Barbieri et al., 2011; Czarnecki et al., 2015; Ong et al., 2011; Phelan, 2015; Wilson, 2015). Phelan (2015) argues that transparency is required regarding how volunteers’ contributions are spent in the host destination and how VT projects support the community. While best practice guidelines include social and economic benefits for host communities, the encouragement of transparency between stakeholders is limited (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). Consequently, more research is needed to assess fully organisational interactions, responsibilities and management requirements, and how these influence the impacts claimed for VT (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Due to their intermediary role between the volunteers and host communities, responsibility and accountability rest with the (sending and receiving) organisations.

In summary, to achieve sustainability performance, equality and positive outcomes for host projects within the volunteer programme is significant. The management and operational practices of (sending and receiving) organisations play a critical role in delivering a volunteer programme that demonstrates sustainability performance, but who does what, why and how remains unclear. Furthermore,
engagement with host projects, which includes decision making and feedback mechanisms, maximises positive outcomes. These may include more long-lasting impacts for the host project and community, as well as a better-quality experience for volunteers. The current body of knowledge in respect to operational and management practices at a micro level is limited, however, and the detail of how the different relations and processes influence outcomes is not fully understood. The next section examines the body of knowledge concerned with evaluating stakeholders in VT, thereby providing some useful insights for developing an evaluative framework.

2.2.3 Evaluating Stakeholders’ Relations

This section examines the approaches and methods applied to evaluate the main VT stakeholders. The body of knowledge addresses particularly the sending organisations and some specific aspects of managing a volunteer programme that influences sustainability performance. Clarity is needed as to what sustainability performance is, as well as how to evaluate it. This section examines the approaches used to evaluate sustainability performance and explores their findings, strengths and limitations. The current body of knowledge proposes several approaches that might contribute to an understanding of how to evaluate sustainability performance in VT, focusing on organisational practices, community engagement and inequality (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Gilfillan, 2015; Taplin et al., 2014). By systematically examining one or two of the main VT stakeholders, the studies provide valuable insights into some of the internal operations and practices within VT and, by extension, evaluative approaches for sustainability performance. Common features of all the evaluative approaches are their reflectiveness and their direct and indirect focus on the impacts on host communities. Exploring each approach offers understandings that are useful for informing the development of the evaluative framework (Objective 3).

The process of evaluating sending organisations’ values and mission is able to offer valuable insights into how these may influence the organisations’ decision making and operational practices and, subsequently, their sustainability performance. Coghlan and Noakes (2012) examine how internal and external drivers affecting sending organisations influence their practices, and suggest a philanthropic and commercial scale on which to place organisations’ performance. The researchers propose five organisational performance evaluations. These are: i) the complexity of the project’s aim, ii) the number of stakeholders and their heterogeneity, iii) financial resources and constraints, iv) the market and consumer trends and v) the proximity to mainstream tourism. Furthermore, Coghlan and Noakes (2012) suggest that collaborative relations are important to evaluate performance in terms of producing social value and outcomes for the community, implying that community engagement is essential to evaluating impacts. Such evaluations are challenging, however, due to the complexity and
diversity of the social values and cultures of host communities. They argue that currently too little is done to address gaps in knowledge with respect to the key drivers and constraints that shape organisations operating in highly complex local circumstances while also working in a competitive market. Coghlan and Noakes’ research contributes valuable perspectives regarding how organisational strategies and aims can influence VT’s sustainability performance, especially in terms of how sending organisations engage with host communities.

Another study explores VT organisations’ monitoring and evaluation activities, focusing on systematically evaluating their contextual arrangements (Taplin et al., 2014). The authors argue that a qualitative critical assessment that promotes engagement amongst stakeholders is important for improving sustainability performance. Their framework identifies five contextual components: i) the project’s aims, ii) the nature of the project’s intervention, iii) the external environmental settings, e.g. market and involved stakeholders, iv) the scope of the evaluation, e.g. parameters, and v) the context of the evaluation, e.g. who and how. By focusing on these five contextual components, the researchers argue that it is possible to scrutinise organisations’ monitoring and evaluation activities. The framework attempts to determine if and how VT organisations pursue monitoring and evaluation based on the different dimensions (stakeholders, organisations, markets, programmes) and contexts within VT. The research’s outcomes raise questions over who and why evaluations are carried out, and it concludes that more investigation is needed to determine how accountability and transparency allow VT to achieve sustainability. Furthermore, the research determines that, because contextual settings are highly variable within VT, any methodological approaches to evaluation and monitoring should prioritise consideration of the contextual settings.

Another study also focuses on achieving sustainability in sending organisations and suggests a conceptual framework which considers the contextual settings of VT by determining pertinent criteria at the local community level (Gilfillan, 2015). By incorporating the international development discourse within the current body of knowledge on VT, Gilfillan’s conceptual evaluative framework assesses VT’s contribution to international development by proposing four assessment criteria based on the Millennium Development Goals. These are: i) volunteers provide skills not available locally, ii) projects are part of a broader development framework, iii) benefit to the host community is prioritised, iv) projects are initiated and driven by the community (Gilfillan, 2015). By prioritising the host community in the framework’s criteria, Gilfillan addresses the main criticisms of VT’s outcomes in terms of inequality and power imbalances. It is significant that Gilfillan’s conceptual framework assesses the operational practices at a community level since this contributes to a more in-depth
understanding of VT practices and outcomes when delivering a project, as well as allowing for comparisons between projects.

2.2.4 Section Summary

This section has described the main stakeholders and the issues surrounding their geopolitical relations that results in power imbalances and inequality in respect to the host communities. The current body of knowledge highlights the domineering nature of organisations’ and the volunteers’ relations with the recipients in host communities. Since organisations play a pivotal role between volunteers and host communities, however, it is vital that they adopt good practices. But, the current body of knowledge is limited in terms of understanding how and why interactions and engagements occur between the main stakeholders, and how these may influence VT’s outcomes with respect to sustainability performance. Thus, further investigation is needed to evaluate how relations between the main stakeholders influence VT’s sustainability performance. Recent developments in respect to frameworks to evaluate VT are useful in understanding some of the logical approaches used to determined VT stakeholders’ relations, operations and outcomes. A key element here is the inclusion of host communities; since VT operates at a community-level, assessing sustainability performance requires the inclusion of communities’ needs and opinions so as to determine social values and outcomes. There is also a need to take account of the context-specific settings of projects, since these are highly varied, and a conceptual framework that is based on community-focused indicators will also allow for the comparison VT outcomes from different projects. A methodological approach that addresses the challenges posted by the diversity of contextual settings of host projects and the other stakeholders is therefore very important, as becomes more apparent in Chapter 3.

2.3 Collaboration Theory

2.3.1 Section Overview

The previous section focused on how evaluative frameworks aim to evaluate sustainability performance within VT, and highlighted how relations and contextual settings play a significant role. The lack of engagement between host communities and other stakeholders underpins the need for further investigation in VT. Furthermore, VT’s effectiveness is questionable and specific outcomes are currently unknown. Consequently, in this study, the evaluative framework needs to assess the nature of the collaborative relations (Objective 1) and to determine how they influence project outcomes (Objective 2). Evaluating collaborative relations contributes to a deeper understanding of the nature of the different relations between VT stakeholders; as well as how they influence outcomes and impacts. Collaboration theory offers an approach to understanding the nature of relations between
organisations and individuals. This section explores definitions, deconstructions and applications of collaboration theory before continuing to identify some of the main issues in collaborations. The following section (Section 2.4) builds on this introduction to collaboration theory by examining how the performance of collaborations is evaluated, broadly based on analytical frameworks and methodological approaches. The section, and chapter concludes by identifying how collaboration theory is applicable to evaluating VT stakeholders’ relations.

2.3.2 Definitions of Collaboration

Collaborative relations occur in a large variety of different guises. They are sometimes referred to as “problem solving interventions” (McCann, 1983), ”stakeholder collaboration” (Roberts & Bradley, 1991), “social partnerships” (Waddock, 1989), “inter organisational collaboration” (Gray & Hay, 1986; Gray, 1985) or “collaborative alliance” (Gray & Wood, 1991a). Collaborations are described as social partnerships or “bridging organisations” (Brown, 1991) which can take the shape of associations, networks, social partnerships, political coalitions, social movements or structures (Dempsey, 2009; Fleisher, 1991; Golich, 1991; Roberts & Bradley, 1991; Selsky, 1991). The diversity of collaborative relationships varies according to the number of organisations involved, as well as their scale, size, complexity and shared vision. The aim, mission or vision is a defining factor of the formation and existence of a collaboration, while their lifetime is determined by when their aims and objectives are met. There are numerous examples of collaborations across different disciplines, ranging from health, education, economy, politics and development. Collaborative relationships can take a variety of forms such as round tables, associations, task forces, conglomerates, groups, councils, joint ventures, consolidations, partnerships, collaborations, strategic alliances or mediations (Gajda, 2004; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). Given this diversity, a fuller understanding of collaborations will be useful.

The most widely accepted description of collaboration originates from inter-organisational behaviour studies. Collaboration between organisations is described as an alternative approach to decision making (Gray, 1985). Collaboration is “a process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible”. Gray continues to explain that collaboration is “a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem domain about the future of that domain” (Gray 1989, p. 5 and p. 11). These descriptions focus on problem solving and decision making processes as part of collaborative relations between stakeholders. In more detail, the collaborative inter-organisational behaviours are deconstructed into three elemental components: i) the exchange of knowledge, expertise or resources, ii) the presence of at least two organisations, and iii) jointly
addressing a problem that cannot be resolved by one individual organisation (Gray, 1985, Gray & Hay, 1986; Gray & Wood, 1991).

Since stakeholders in VT liaise with one another to deliver VT programmes, concurrently solving the challenges associated with this, collaboration theory offers a pertinent approach to disseminating relations between VT stakeholders. In addition, the fact that processes such as decision making are currently unknown and power relations are questionable in the context of VT stakeholders offers a further reason to explore their relations more fully in a structured manner using collaboration theory.

2.3.3 Application of Collaboration Theory

The occurrence of collaboration is predominately based on external forces that motivate organisations to engage in collaborative relationships. For example, in rapidly changing societies uncertainty, turbulence and competition for resources can trigger more collaborations (Emery & Trist, 1965; Trist, 1977, 1983). Societal problems such as drug addiction, violence, overstretched health services, marginalised people, high youth unemployment or poverty can also trigger more organisational collaborations, since these problems tend to be complex and large scale such that they are unlikely to be resolved by a single organisation. Other causes for the collaboration formation include mediation (Brown, 1991), the occurrence of a crisis (Selin & Chavez, 1995) and consensus building to address social or political fragmentation (Innes & Booher, 1999). Such collaborations allow access to more appropriate resources and expertise to address complex problems. In order for organisations to engage collaboratively, they must share the same goals, values and common interests or purpose (Aldrich, 1976, Cummings 1984, Gray 1985, McCann 1983, Triest 1987; Triest, 1983). The external contextual settings of collaborations are applicable to VT stakeholders who collaborate to address complex societal problems such as poverty or poor education. In sharing a mutual interest, goals and values, they collaborate in delivering a purpose specific VT project, each bringing a different set of skills, expertise and resources. Within VT, host projects are the recipients of the collaboration’s efforts and the focus of VT programmes. Consequently, the engagement of host projects is significant in terms of sharing value, purpose and common interests.

A further reason for collaboration is innovation, since collaboration allows organisations from different sectors to share different sets of knowledge and expertise. This encourages creativity in producing new services or products that would otherwise be difficult to develop in isolation (Roberts & Bradley, 1991). Increased competition within in an industry sector may cause organisations to collaborate to strengthen their position against a particular group of competitors. Such collaborations may later develop into joint ventures. Organisations recognise that they are able to function more
effectively and productively when they are part of a collaboration by sharing different resources such as financial resources, expertise and skills (Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). Similarly, in VT, where sending and receiving organisations collaborate to deliver VT projects, each organisation may contribute a different set of skills and expertise. The external factors to form a collaboration may be market or industry driven to strengthen both their economic status within the global VT market and the social and economic settings of the host project at the destination.

Depending on the aims, collaborations may consist of cross-sectoral organisations, including public, private or third sectors. For example, government agencies working with non-government organisations, local to national organisations or local community groups form vertical collaborative connections (Brown, 1991). Horizontal connections may consist of networks of organisations from the same or similar sectors. Collaborations should also be considered in terms of their geography, spatial distribution, size and scale. Thus, for example, international organisations collaborate with national or local organisations to address global issues such as poverty alleviation. An advantage of collaborations is their ability to operate across geopolitical divides (Jamal et al., 2007). Stakeholder and community engagements are considered to be a form of collaboration (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). Collaborations can, therefore, play an integral part in resource management and sustainable development.

Overall, taking into account the flow of volunteers, the geographical positioning of organisations, their shared purpose in addressing sustainability and global societal problems, it can be seen that VT stakeholders operate collaboratively. VT stakeholders consist of both horizontal and vertical relations as they include different community settings or groups as well as individual volunteers and organisations. Spatially, VT projects usually operate at a small-scale community level but can be distributed globally. Viewing VT stakeholders’ interactions as a collaboration may contribute to a deeper understanding of the nature of their relations.

2.3.4 Deconstructing Collaborations

Collaboration can be broadly deconstructed into three main components; i) the problem or issue defined by its aim, ii) the connectivity between organisations, and iii) the formation and development of the collaboration. The latter is addressed by Tuckman’s widely accepted model of collaboration development, which consists of four or five development phases (Tuckman & Jensen 1977, Gajda, 2004). The first phase is assembly and formation, in which organisations initiate a collaboration and define its aim. During the second phase, storm and order, organisations formulate a strategic plan, organisational structures and individual contributions. The third phase, norm and perform, focus on
implementation and the effectiveness of the collaboration. Lastly, the *transform and adjourn* phase addresses the evaluation of the collaboration’s performance and makes modifications to the collaboration if necessary (Gajda, 2004). This model, however, does not take into account practical challenges and changes over time (Rickards & Moger, 2000; Roberts & Bradley, 1991). Gajda (2004) adapts Tuckman’s collaboration development model to define key characteristics from collaboration formation to termination. Her approach describes how collaborations commence and evolve, particularly taking into consideration the interactions of each organisation and how their engagement changes over time. The deconstruction of collaborations provides an evaluative approach in evaluating the collaboration’s performance (Gajda, 2004). Her approach determines the level of integrations and the nature of the collaborative relations between VT stakeholders. Additionally, it allows for a deeper understanding of the engagement types and interactions, including decision making, and the interpersonal communications between each stakeholder.

Collaborations play a significant role in addressing sustainability. This is particularly the case where issues are caused by multiple and complex problems requiring multi-faceted approaches from a local to a global scale. For example, collaboration at an international scale is essential to address global issues such as climate change effectively (Jamal et al., 2007). Since collaboration also entails stakeholder engagement, it is recognised to be crucial in achieving sustainable governance and management of resources. Governments and organisations such as UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) and international aid agencies promote and encourage collaborations in order to support global sustainable development (Munanura & Backman, 2012). Furthermore, the issues raised by collaboration theory, such as equality and engagement and addressing global social problems, align with contemporary criticisms of VT’s power imbalances. This is another reason why the collaborations between VT stakeholders need to be fully explored to understand and assess the nature of their relations in terms of equality, and the impact on their sustainability performance.

Collaborations are not homogenous, and the relations amongst stakeholders vary, which in turn influences their outcomes. Collaborative organisations may not always fully agree with their shared goals, values and strategy, which compromises the collaborative relations. Further, there is a risk of collaborative organisations becoming inter-dependent when they may need their autonomy. Collaborative stakeholders have different levels of power, which may not equalise during the formation process. For instance, the power imbalance in collaborations involving community groups is challenging and limits the aim of the collaboration, suggesting a need to reduce power imbalances and encourage consensus (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). This is particularly pertinent for this research since, in VT, stakeholders are not homogenous and the levels of power and inequality amongst them.
are unknown; aspects of their environment that can be explored productively using collaboration theory.

Assessing the nature of the collaborative relations between stakeholders can reveal how effective the collaboration is in achieving its goals, as well as the distribution of power in the relationships. Such assessments are therefore important in terms of evaluating and monitoring the progress and effectiveness of collaborations (Innes & Booher, 1999; Willumsen et al., 2012). Gajda’s (2004) case study exemplifies this kind of evaluation, focusing on a heterogeneous collaboration of public and not-for-profit organisations that are addressing social change within the health and education sectors. She utilises collaboration theory and argues that her framework allows practitioners to assess the effectiveness of collaborative relations, emphasising that a collaboration is about the journey as well as its destination. Collaborations, however, may start with inherent power imbalances between stakeholders, and the assessment of collaborations plays a vital role in reducing those power imbalances and supporting collective learning and consensus building. This can result in more inclusive relations over the lifetime of the collaboration (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Munanura & Backman, 2012). This illustrates that assessing collaborative relations and their outcomes and effectiveness proves useful in evaluative frameworks. In the context of VT, therefore, the evaluative framework needs to relate the internal collaborative relations to their outcomes and effectiveness, which involves exploring the nature of those collaborative relations and establishing how they influence outcomes.

2.3.5 Section Summary

The section has presented how collaboration theory is applied in different case studies. It highlights how collaborations can be deconstructed and establish similarities to VT. Mutual interests, values and goals are typical motivators to form collaborations. Similar to VT, some collaborations address complex social problems and are spread over a wide geographical range. In VT, collaborative relations are heterogeneous, consisting of vertical or horizontal cross-sectoral relations including host communities and projects at a local level. Collaboration theory articulates the nuances of power relations and imbalances between different stakeholders which offers an approach to evaluating and ultimately addressing these.

2.4 Evaluating Collaboration Performance

2.4.1 Section Overview

The last section of this chapter explores the different frameworks and evaluative approaches that are used to determine the internal processes and nature of the relationships within collaborations that
might influence the performance of those collaborations. It is found that the nature of collaborative relations and engagements define their strengths and effectiveness. The section demonstrates the rationale for how collaboration theory underpins the evaluative framework to evaluate the relations between collaborative stakeholders in VT.

2.4.2 Empirical Studies applying Collaboration Theory

The existing literature on collaboration explores a wide range of conceptual ideas (Gray & Hay, 1986), develop models and frameworks (Milward, 1982), designs new guidelines (McCann, 1983) and suggests new propositions (Gray, 1985; Gray & Wood, 1991). Empirical studies are based on descriptive and qualitative case studies applied in different disciplines, such as education, health, politics and development in both the public and private sectors (Austin, 2000; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Selin et al. 1995). Several studies apply collaboration theory to evaluate the actual outcomes and results of alliances and evaluate their limitations and successes (Brown, 1991; Gajda, 2004; Munanura & Backman, 2012). While other studies examine the formation and development of collaborative relations and evaluate their external conditions and organisational structures, characteristics and motivations (Waddock, 1989; Waddock & Post, 1995). The diverse applications of the collaboration theory of inter-organisational relations include analyses of their formulation, development and implementation of policies (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Brown, 1991). Others deal with capacity building (Jamal et al., 2007), consensus building (Innes & Booher, 1999), power balance and shared decision making (Selsky, 1991).

Some empirical studies focus on evaluating the performance of collaborations, mostly based on single case studies (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Roberts & Bradley, 1991) or on two collaborating organisations (Waddock & Post, 1995). One quantitative study provides a deeper understanding and meaning of collaboration theory (Thomson et al., 2009), while two other studies use a mix of quantitative and qualitative case study approaches (Gajda, 2004; Selsky, 1991). Both these studies explore the development and performance of collaborative interactions by applying periodic surveys and in-depth analysis over a set timeframe. One of them (Selsky, 1991) examines the collaboration’s response to external factors, while the other (Gajda, 2004) produces an assessment tool that evaluates performance and how the collaboration meets its objectives. Other longitudinal studies involve qualitative analysis (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Rickards & Moger, 2000; Waddock & Post, 1995). These longitudinal studies provide valuable insights into the development and effectiveness of collaborations over a considerable time period, because progress occurs only over a long timeframe. This approach allows for monitoring and evaluation at each stage of the collaboration and evaluates
outcomes by considering its full life cycle. Indeed, exactly when a collaboration’s performance is evaluated is critical, since collaborations require time to meet their goals.

2.4.3 Methodologies for evaluating Collaboration

The data collection methods used to evaluate the performance of collaborations varies. Some studies are based on secondary research (Brown, 1991; Selin et al., 1995; Waddock & Post, 1995; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991) while others are empirical (Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Jamal et al., 2007; Rickards & Moger, 2000) or a combination of both (Gray & Hay, 1986; Roberts & Bradley, 1991). Secondary data include analysing minutes of meetings and archives of organisations’ reports (Roberts & Bradley, 1991). In many cases, combinations of multiple sources of primary and secondary data are used (Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Gajda, 2004; Gray & Hay, 1986; Jamal et al., 2007). This allows for in-depth analysis and exploration of all relevant aspects of the various case studies, including the heterogeneity of collaborations. Empirical data collection methods include note taking, observations, workshops, stakeholder meetings, dialogues and interpretation of surveys (Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Gray & Hay, 1986; Jamal et al., 2007; Roberts & Bradley, 1991). In particular, Gajda (2004) highlights the successful application of diverse data-gathering techniques. This includes focus groups to encourage reflective analysis by participants, and baseline quantitative and qualitative data gathering as part of a series of workshops (Gajda, 2004). Similar methods are appropriate in this study.

Data collection frequently involves direct interactions and involvement with participants in collaborations. In some cases, researchers are actively incorporated into the development process based on participatory action research (Jamal et al., 2007). In stakeholder mapping and engagement techniques, meanwhile, stakeholders are integrated into the research (Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Jamal et al., 2007). In many qualitative and quantitative case studies, data collection consists of in-depth questionnaires or interviews with decision makers and staff. Questionnaires include observed variables, demographic and descriptive information (Selsky, 1991). For qualitative studies, semi-structured and non-directive interviews are also used (Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Roberts & Bradley, 1991). Austin (2000) applies two different interviews, detailed and structured, with different sets of key staff from not-for-profit and commercial organisations. The methods used to investigate collaborations are therefore highly varied, based on the circumstances of the samples and aims of the study. The variability in data collection shows that collaboration theory is applicable in different settings, and the flexibility in the methods used enables collaboration theory to address the heterogeneity of the organisations within collaborations.
2.4.4 Evaluating Collaborations

A number of studies of collaboration address sustainability and sustainable development by applying various approaches that directly or indirectly relate to collaboration theory, including stakeholder theory (Gajda, 2004; Jamal & Stronza, 2009) and bridging organisations (Brown, 1991; Jamal et al., 2007; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). In general, collaboration is one of the guiding principles in international conventions and agreements for tackling global concerns such as biodiversity or climate change (Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). For instance, Selsky (1991) draws on the community development literature and applies adaptation and systems processes. Several studies explore the effectiveness and how policies are influenced by bridging organisations, along with the nature of their relations (Jamal & Stronza, 2009, Brown, 1991; Trist, 1983; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). Brown (1991) examines organisations in developing countries and evaluates their collaborative nature and outcomes. Another study examines the effectiveness of different stakeholders involved in managing the natural resources of a national park, highlighting how collaboration theory can be used as an analytical tool (Jamal et al., 2007). Westley and Vredenburg (1991) examine the internal drivers by distinguishing organisations’ egoistic or altruistic motives based on the concept of bridging organisations. Overall, collaboration is appropriate for addressing sustainability and social change in a wide range of different circumstances.

In the body of knowledge in collaboration theory, analytical studies have developed frameworks that are applied to different research aims in various collaborative settings across both the private and public sectors, such as education, health and tourism (Austin, 2000; Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Brown, 1991; Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Roberts & Bradley, 1991; Thomson et al., 2009; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). Some approaches involve deconstructing collaboration or exploring particular attributes, such as internal organisational drivers and interactions. For instance, Gray and Hay (1986) examine different aspects of power sharing and power distribution within the collaboration, while Waddock and Post (1995) apply the principles of catalytic collaboration focusing on social change. Roberts and Bradley (1991) deconstruct collaboration theory based on five different collaborative social elements. They conclude that trans-mutational purpose and reflexive self-criticism are among the key characteristics that are beneficial for a collaboration’s outcomes. Bramwell and Sharman (1999), meanwhile, apply a framework assessing whether collaborative arrangements are inclusionary and involve collective learning and consensus building. This study bases its evaluations on three different aspects of the collaboration processes and policy making, including the scope and intensity of collaboration and the degree of consensus emerging from it, thereby examining the effectiveness
and outcomes of the collaboration. Their framework successfully determines the full nature of the collaboration, its power imbalances and level of consensus.

Austin (2000) derives four components for a cross-sector collaboration framework including a continuum, and the collaboration’s organisational values, drivers and enablers. In systematically categorising the nature of the relationships within the collaboration, the study concludes that cross-sector collaborations are very different from the same sector or peer collaborations. The author, therefore, concludes that future research needs to consider organisations’ internal cultures, decision making processes, styles and competencies when applying performance indicators and determinants. Austin also concludes that future studies need to focus on specific outcomes and sectors, although his own study includes a variety of organisations, businesses and not-for-profit organisations, and his framework is applicable to collaborations dealing with socially orientated purposes. The level of engagement within collaborations depends on the formal integration of organisations, which is based on the number, type and nature of those organisations. In addition, according to Gajda (2004), several levels of integration exist along a continuum, since she adopts Bailey and Koney’s model of differentiating levels of engagement, ranging from low to high, in the spheres of networking, cooperation, coordination, collaboration and coadunation (Bailey & Koney, 1996). These levels of engagement are distinguishable by the process of decision making, level of co-existence and integration, and level of independence of individual participants. The level of engagement varies according to the mutuality, commonality and collectiveness of their support, goals and organisational cultures. The framework differentiates levels of integration in terms of purpose, strategies and tasks, leadership and decision making and interpersonal communications, all of which may usefully be applied to VT stakeholders’ relations.

2.4.5 Applying Collaboration Theory to Volunteer Tourism

There are several considerations with respect to how collaboration theory is pertinent to the evaluation of performance and outcomes in VT by evaluating stakeholders’ collaborative relations. Collaboration can be evaluated in terms of its scope, intensity or degree of consensus (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999). The scope can be determined by several indicators, for instance, whether the collaboration includes a range of representatives from all stakeholders or a facilitator, and whether there is an agreement or consent from each stakeholder. Additionally, the nature of the dialogue within the collaboration, acceptance of outcomes and the frequency of interaction among stakeholders defines the collaboration’s intensity. The degree of consensus, policies and purpose can be determined based on how issues are reviewed and accepted by stakeholders and how inequalities emerge and are addressed. For this, Bramwell and Sharman use indicators such as acknowledgement.
of different opinions and respect and understanding of each stakeholders’ position. Gajda (2004), meanwhile, evaluates integration and consensus by examining the collaboration’s structure, purpose and intensity. Similar evaluable attributes are applicable to VT’s stakeholders through a process of deconstructing processes and relations in order to explore how VT stakeholder collaborations possess a structure, communicate, reach consensus and share power. This leads to an evaluation of each relationship between the stakeholders and, as illustrated above (Section 2.2.2), how this relationship influences outcomes and sustainability performance.

According to Austin (2000), a collaboration can be characterised by different types of relations and stages defined by the level of engagement and interactions, its importance to a mission, its scope of activities and strategic values. The value of collaborations at each of those stages, as well as its enablers and drivers, are useful indicators and descriptors. Within VT, organisational drivers are determined in terms of alignment of their missions, aims, shared vision, continual learning and personal relationships. These influence the decision making about why they engage with other stakeholders, and this, in turn, influences VT’s outcomes such as sustainability performance. Processes, effective management and communication amongst collaborative stakeholders are enablers which explain how stakeholders collaborate. In applying Austin’s approach, there is a need to determine the processes and outcomes in collaborations between VT stakeholders which identify and evaluate their drivers and enablers. Thus, VT stakeholders’ activities, values, and how their goals are met, are described in order to evaluate their collaborative relations. To adopt this approach to evaluating VT stakeholders’ collaborative relations and outcomes, similar indicators and descriptors can be developed for the evaluative framework, as is explained in detail in the methodology chapter.

2.4.6 Section Summary

This section has explored how collaboration theory has been applied in various evaluative frameworks to investigate different aspects of collaborative relations that can ultimately be used to evaluate the outcomes of a collaboration. Exploring the mutuality, commonality and collectiveness of stakeholders by examining how decision making, leadership and interpersonal communication takes place, defines their level of integration. VT stakeholders possess shared goals, values and a purpose to achieve particular outcomes and social change, and their relationship is therefore fundamentally collaborative. The section, therefore, demonstrates how collaboration theory is applicable to VT in providing a theoretical basis for evaluating VT stakeholders’ collaborative relations. The collaboration models outlined above offer methodological robustness to examine their relations by providing a logical approach in deconstructing collaborations and its outcomes. Thus, collaboration theory offers a range of parameters that are suitable to evaluate VT’s stakeholders’ collaboration, as well as the
subsequent overall outcomes of VT. Further details on how collaboration is applied to VT are carefully explained in the methodology (Chapter 4).

### 2.4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has explored how VT stakeholder relations play an important role in influencing the overall sustainability performance in VT and outlines how collaboration theory is suitable to apply to VT. The chapter began by explaining the contemporary issues with respect to VT’s misrepresentation of host projects and communities, and how poor practices affect its stakeholders. VT’s claims of making a difference in terms of having positive impacts are questioned, and the demand for positive change and the adoption of sustainable practices by VT organisations is evident. The body of knowledge recognises that management and operational practices, such as stakeholder engagement, influence VT sustainability performance, but there is a gap in knowledge in respect to understanding the details of the impacts and outcomes on stakeholders, such as the host project. In addition, the nature of the relations between sending and receiving organisations and host communities are currently unclear. Thus, insights into the relations between stakeholders, and how they influence outcomes are addressed here. By applying collaboration theory it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of the relations and processes of VT stakeholders, as well as of the overall outcomes of their collaboration. This is significant since collaboration theory provides the methodological basis of relating the nature of collaboration in VT to its overall outcomes (Objectives 1 and 2). Chapter 4 outlines how collaboration is applied in the development of the evaluative framework (Objective 3). In Chapter 3, the literature review continues to explore how sustainability in tourism is evaluated and how VT stakeholders’ relations and performance are assessed.
3 Methodologies for evaluating Sustainability Performance

Change will not come if we wait for some other person or some other time. We are the ones we’ve been waiting for. We are the change that we seek.

Barack Obama

3.1 Introduction

The aim of the research is to develop an evaluative framework that determines the processes of collaborative relations between the main stakeholders in VT and how they influence VT’s outcomes of sustainability performance (Objective 3). The current body of knowledge in evaluating sustainability performance and management provides useful insights for developing the framework. Thus, this chapter has two functions, i) to assess the different methodologies applied in evaluating sustainability performance in tourism, which includes indicators and evaluating value chain sustainability performance, and ii) to demonstrate how realistic evaluation (RE) provides a robust theoretical basis for the evaluative framework. In conjunction with Chapter 2, this chapter provides the current body of knowledge that shapes the methods and methodologies relevant to the development of the evaluative framework (Chapter 4). This chapter consists of three main sections, with each contributing a particular perspective for formulating the evaluative framework. The first section provides insight into the approaches, challenges and benefits of evaluating sustainability performance using indicators (Section 3.2). These apply directly to VT and the development of the evaluative framework, including the methodological approach. The second section, on evaluating value chain sustainability performance, contributes a conceptual framework and approach to deconstructing VT stakeholders and highlights the different relationships and interactions between them (Section 3.3). The last section demonstrates how RE provides a theoretical lens to evaluate the collaboration of VT stakeholders and how this influences the outcomes of VT (Section 3.4). Together, these sections address how the outcomes of VT are influenced through stakeholders’ processes and relations and offer an understanding of some of the potential challenges and benefits.

3.2 Sustainability Indicators

3.2.1 Section Overview

This section provides a valuable overview of how to evaluate sustainability performance and the methodological approaches used in tourism. It gives a contextual background that complements the previous chapter’s overview of the current body of knowledge on the methods applied to evaluate
sustainability performance in VT (Section 2.2.3). This first section provides valuable insights into the current body of knowledge on the development of indicators of sustainability, highlighting their role and benefits, but also the challenges in evaluating sustainability performance. Currently, several different methodological approaches are used to evaluate different aspects of sustainability and transformative change. Since the framework developed in Chapter 4 intends to evaluate the outcomes of social change it is important to consider previously related methodologies that might inform its development.

3.2.2 Definitions and Terminology

In the current tourism literature, the definition of and terminology used in respect to sustainability performance and management are generally widely accepted. Assessments and evaluations are commonly understood to be essential tools to enhance, improve and support better management practices. The assessments and evaluations of impacts are an integral part of an adaptive or efficient management and planning culture which underpins reflectivity (Blackstock et al., 2008; Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). ‘Monitoring is the process of undertaking regular evaluations of one or more phenomena in order to assess their change over time’, making a distinction from assessments and evaluations by including a temporal dimension (Twining-Ward & Butler 2002, p. 365). While assessments and evaluations provide a snapshot in time, monitoring through continued assessments and evaluations provide an overview of change and trends over a certain time-span. As with assessments and evaluations, monitoring supports decision makers to understand certain conditions or resources relevant to them (Tsaur et al., 2006). In the same way that other performances are demonstrated through evaluations, e.g. profitability, sustainability also needs to be demonstrated. Thus, evaluating sustainability performance is important in order to be able to provide evidence to demonstrate its accomplishments.

The existing body of knowledge in respect to sustainability in tourism demonstrates that definitions of assessments and monitoring mostly occur in parallel with attempts to define indicators. A simple definition of indicators explains that: ‘An indicator is something that helps you to understand where you are, which way you are going and how far you are from where you want to be’ (Gallopin, 1997 cited in Roberts & Tribe, 2008, p. 577), emphasising that knowing the actual performance is important. Indicators are perceived to be useful tools to assess, evaluate, monitor, diagnose and identify certain issues such as sustainability (Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Indicators are ‘desirable instruments and/or measuring rods to assess and monitor progress’ (Selman, 1999, cited in Tsaur et al., 2006, p. 641). These definitions suggest that indicators are fundamental components in evaluating, assessing and monitoring, and thus highlight their significant
contribution to establishing performance. In summary, indicators are used to assess and evaluate performances, such as sustainability, against certain targets to monitor progress and prove achievements. Additionally, indicators are a cautionary tool in relation to meeting or failing to meet set objectives (Bell and Morse, 2003, cited in Blackstock et al., 2008).

Indicators tend to be logically organised into sets or systems that focus on one or several domains. As the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) states: ‘Indicators are information sets which are formally selected to be used on a regular basis to evaluate changes that are of importance for tourism development and management’ (UNWTO, 2004, p. 8). Also, a holistic and comprehensive assessment of specific issues can be made based on the assembly of multiple indicators (Economic & Labour Market Review, 2011). ‘A set of indicators are a compilation of simple indicators organised to meet certain research goals and offer a new perspective on a particular phenomenon’ (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen 2013, p. 35). Further, indices are constructed through the accumulation and aggregation of indicators sets which are formulated for a certain perspective such as sustainability (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Indicator frameworks allow indices and indicator sets to be organised in a particular fashion in order to provide structure and cohesion. This may include frameworks that define sustainability in the dimensions of the Triple Bottom Line (TBL): environment, social and economic. Indicators can also be more wide ranging in an effort to address governance, politics, culture and technology. In tourism, Sustainable Tourism Indicators (STI) are frequently used and frameworks tend to include STIs and indicator systems adapted from environmental, resource management or sustainable development contexts. Similarly, the evaluative framework assesses the sustainability performance in VT.

3.2.3 Sustainability Indicator Systems and Frameworks

Various indicator frameworks have been implemented that adapt to the individual settings of different case studies. Each framework’s approach reflects individual and unique circumstances and is therefore adjusted for the specific purpose, subject and scale (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Miller, 2001; Tsaur et al., 2006; Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002). For example, the Tourism Optimisation Management Model (TOMM) is based on the Limits of Acceptable Change Model and provides an integrative management and multi-disciplinary approach which includes stakeholder participation (Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002). The Barometer of Sustainability focuses on the sustainability of ecosystems in conjunction with the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) (Ko, 2005; Moiseev & Guijt, 2001; Tsaur et al., 2006). The Barometer of Sustainability is used to develop a relationship framework between resources, residents and tourists of a small indigenous site, where each relationship is evaluated across economic, social and environmental domains (Tsaur et al., 2006). Ko
Meanwhile, proposes that the human and ecological domains are assessed equally as one system, allowing the integration of different domains in one hypothetical sustainability scale. The European Environmental Agency (EEA) applies a Driver-Pressure-State-Impact-Response Framework (DPSIR) which predicts the future by evaluating impacts and responses to change (Economic & Labour Market Review, 2011). Another study on evaluating visitor behaviour applies the Cape Town Declaration of Responsible Tourism as a theoretical framework, focusing on impacts, improving host-guest relations and empowering hosts (Blackstock et al., 2008).

These different methodological approaches allow indicators to be categorised by themes or domains and mostly consist of similar dimensions, such as the TBL, although they may also include governance, financial, political, technical and cultural elements (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Miller, 2001). The empirical case studies share a common approach in adapting pre-existing models in order to incorporate the purpose and subject and thus to examine a particular aspect of sustainability. Some studies also use existing sustainability definitions and concepts. In this study, a similar approach to the current body of knowledge about indicator development is needed to be able to develop a conceptual framework that is tailored to VT (Objectives 1 & 2). Applying a consistent and systematic approach in indicator development ensures the reliability and consistency that also needs to be applied for the evaluative framework.

Although the purposes of each empirical study vary, they share some commonalities in terms of data gathering, as well as in evaluating and monitoring destination management and sustainability. For example, as a planning tool, indicators may assess a cultural destination (Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012), to support rural tourism development (Park & Yoon, 2011), to evaluate responsibility in a national park (Blackstock et al., 2008) and to evaluate and manage community tourism (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006). Further examples include analysing the relationship between resources, sustainable and community tourism (Tsaur et al., 2006) and evaluating and monitoring sustainability, resources and the relationships between the economic, ecological, social and political dimensions in tourism development (Twining-Ward & Butler, 2002). For the purpose of evaluating and benchmarking the sustainability of an indigenous site by assessing resources and local communities, a multi-disciplinary advisory panel and various committees representing different social or environmental aspects and stakeholder groups can be established (Tsaur et al., 2006). When developing sustainable indicators in a rural setting, the economic, social and environmental benefits are maximised for residents (Park &

Yoon, 2011). The studies illustrate that different characteristics of stakeholder groups and sustainability are evaluable in a wide range of tourism settings and scale. They also enable the analysis of the different components that support management and policy-making.

3.2.4 Benefits of evaluating Sustainability Performance

The body of knowledge on tourism outlines multiple arguments for the usefulness of applying STIs as a method to evaluate impacts and sustainability performance in tourism. Butler highlights the importance of sustainability performance and explains that evaluation is at the forefront of sustainability. He argues that sustainability is meaningless unless there is evidence and believes indicator frameworks are valuable tools (Butler, 1999). The UNWTO states that ‘indicators are measures of the existence or severity of current issues, signals of upcoming situations or problems, measures of risk and potential need for action, and means to identify and measure the results of our actions’ (WTO, 2004, p. 8). Frameworks can be applied as an integral and practical planning and management tool at local and regional level by supporting short-term strategies, guiding policy makers and action plans as well as benchmarking (Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Indicators also provide an overarching framework supporting comprehensive assessments that offer insight into progress during transitional changes (Economic & Labour Market Review, 2011). Indicator systems are therefore practical evaluating and monitoring tools for policy implementation which support evaluability and analysis leading to informed decision making (Park & Yoon, 2011). In addition, STIs possess other advantages (Table 3.1), as identified by the UNWTO (UNWTO, 2004). Although the UNWTO’s Guidebook is aimed predominately at indicator development at the destination level, the benefits also apply to the local micro and project level.

Table 3.1: Advantages of Sustainability Indicators

| • Informed decision making - supports reducing risks or costs; |
| • Identification of emerging issues - allows prevention; |
| • Identification of impacts - supports corrective action when required; |
| • Performance evaluation of implementation– evaluates progress; |
| • Reduced risk of planning mistakes - identifies limits and opportunities; |
| • Gaining more accountability - credible information for the public and other stakeholders of tourism fosters accountability for its wise use in decision making; |
| • Constant monitoring can lead to continuous improvement - building solutions into management. |

Adapted from UNWTO, 2004
Indicators can reduce large and complex quantities of data into a simpler and more manageable form (Roberts & Tribe, 2008), and thus provide some meaning to what would otherwise be only raw data or statistical information (Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005). Indicators also encourage knowledge transfer (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013), and learning of the outcomes and awareness of changes (Reed et al. 2006, cited in Park & Yoon 2011). Consequently, change and indicator functions are a part of a monitoring regime. Most significantly, STIs are valuable in evaluating sustainability (Blackstock et al., 2008; Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013) and in providing some meaning to sustainability (Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005). Further, STIs help to address the challenges of evaluating sustainability and are invaluable in finding solutions; indeed, Miller stipulates that without STIs there can be no sustainability, suggesting that, without proof, sustainability is meaningless (Miller, 2001). The application of indicators is, therefore, an integral part of sustainable development in tourism, and also a fundamental part in destination management and planning to evaluate performance and impacts (Manning, 1999; Tanguay et al., 2013). The UNWTO Guide, for example, explains that, in the past, destination planning and management was often undertaken without sufficient information on the impacts of tourism, with consequent long-term negative effects on the destinations’ assets.

3.2.5 The Limitations and Challenges of Evaluating Sustainability

Despite their usefulness in evaluating sustainability, indicator frameworks have limitations and challenges (Table 3.2). Other researchers, however, highlight some of the limitations and challenges, noting that evaluating and achieving sustainability are highly complex (e.g. Goodwin, 2011a). Others critique sustainability frameworks on the basis that the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) remains a concept and is less of a practical tool (Fauz and Dwyer, 2009). Although the concept and value of TBL are widely accepted, its implementation is argued to be flawed because of political misuse (Buckley, 2003). As the three dimensions of sustainability (TBL) are seen as contradictory (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009), they are referred to as mere ‘prescriptions’ (Telfer, 2009, p. 150). Thus, the ambiguity of defining sustainable tourism is a challenge in terms of developing indicators (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013), as past research has highlighted (Tanguay et al., 2013). Apart from the ambiguity of applying the concept of sustainability, the main challenges of indicator systems are their practical and real world application (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Thus, the body of knowledge highlights that indicator systems face several challenges, and this knowledge provides valuable insights for developing the evaluative framework.
Table 3.2: Limitations of using Indicators

- Ambiguity in applying concepts of sustainability in developing indicators;
- Challenges in bridging concept and implementation to real case studies;
- Lack of clear guidelines for implementing indicator systems;
- Difficulties in balancing scientific value parameters and practicalities of application;
- Indicator systems are not transferable and need to be case specific;
- Outcomes of indicator systems are not used as intended by decision makers.

Author, 2018

The simplification of data is part of the process of developing indicators, and systematically organising indicators into a coherent structure is a considerable and challenging task that carries with it the inherent risk of overlooking important issues (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Furthermore, there is no consensus regarding the different approaches used for simplification. Additionally, selection, simplification and weighting of indices risk introducing subjectivity on the part of the researcher. Thus, subjectivity is a further limitation that is possible with respect to the evaluable issues (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Miller and Twining-Ward (2005) argue that more qualitative indicators need to be developed that can be compared with quantitative indicators. The authors highlight that indicator development needs to encompass a less linear approach through appropriate methodological advances that could be sourced from other disciplines. In this study, the theoretical contextualisation of RE provides an innovative methodological advance in evaluating sustainability performance in tourism.

Indicator frameworks are applied for evaluating sustainability performance, but what and how the results are used is a different and broader matter of purpose and use. Indicator systems have been criticised for not providing practical guidance on how to apply them in situ and how they support decision making (Lozano-Oyola et al., 2012). Blackstock et al. (2008), however, argue that applying indicators is a way to operationalise sustainability in tourism and is therefore of significance to how tourism resources are managed. When evaluating sustainability through indicator systems it can be challenging to find a middle ground between applicability and scientific value, and that of decision makers and academics (Tanguay et al., 2013). Achieving a balance in these respects is a crucial consideration in the design of indicator frameworks. The process defines the value, purpose and long-term vision of the indicator system, which addresses the balance between practicality, scientific value and the use of the framework’s results for decision making.
The wider political backdrop of global initiatives and organisations influences the evaluation of sustainability performance down to the micro level. Further challenges arise in the application of STI frameworks at different levels of working within a nexus of a global to local scale, where a global STI framework is applied at local or micro level (Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). This challenge can be recognised and addressed during the indicator development process, however, which adapts the needs and objectives of the framework as well as locality, scope and scale (UNWTO, 2004). The current literature acknowledges that evaluating sustainability through an STI framework is still in its early stages, although considerable advances have been evident over the last two decades. Current leading models of development have not advanced to the stage of implementing real changes (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009) since we are in what is described as a ‘trial and error phase’ of developing and applying indictors (Tanguay et al. 2013, p. 863). Nonetheless, a positive outcome in applying STIs is the engagement with stakeholder groups that they entail, since this may encourage stakeholders to gain a better understanding and become more involved in sustainability (Blackstock et al., 2008). Furthermore, all frameworks are based on some assumptions and no one system is perfect, meaning that some limitations need to be accepted (Economic & Labour Market Review, 2011).

### 3.2.6 Considerations for selecting Indicators

Currently, there is no consensus on the methodologies used to evaluate sustainable tourism performance and impacts (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Evaluations of economic performance based on statistical analysis at international and national level are not new; and statistical data such as visitor arrival, length of stay, occupancy rates, revenue, and expenditures are commonly applied. It is challenging, however, to capture an in-depth analysis that deals with tourism’s impacts on the local environment, people and the wider economy. While the economic leakage in destinations is acknowledged and understood, it is difficult to quantify (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). Further tools, such as Limits of Acceptable Change, Multiplier Effect and Visitor Impact Management, provide support for destination planning and management, but these still have difficulty in accurately capturing the real situation due to evaluability issues and the complexity of the data (Mbaiwa & Stronza, 2008; Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005). When evaluating sustainable development at destinations, the impacts reach beyond tourism activities and a multi-dimensional approach is necessary (Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005). Thus, consideration of implications that reach deeply into all aspects of a destination must be included in indicator development; these include the environment, society, culture and economy (UNWTO, 2004). Other dimensions of sustainability and other domains such as governance also need serious attention.
Consideration also needs to be given to differentiation in the scale and scope of STIs. The scale of indicators systems and how they are derived is significant for how they are used and at what level; whether it is national, regional or local (Economic & Labour Market Review, 2011). Since tourism is managed at different levels, indicator systems need to be applied at the same scale in order to provide the appropriate support. Typically, tourism is managed at national, regional or local levels, and at lower levels may include specific assets, key tourist sites, natural features and geographical perspectives. Specific considerations such as the sites’ environmental or cultural sensitivity, certain risks or performances, as for example national parks, a mountain or coastal area are important. Additionally, companies of different sizes, such as hotel chains or individual organisations, may develop or apply existing indicator systems to evaluate their performance (UNWTO, 2004). Thus, scale and level specific considerations are crucial in developing evaluating frameworks.

Indicators are organised based on different approaches and frameworks, for example, distinctions are made between simple or complex indicators. Indicators are simple statistical information with little or no data manipulation, while complex indicators are the result of multi-dimensional evaluations of more than one simple indicator that are based on a weighting system. Additionally, indicators need to be defined based on their scale and scope in geographical terms, and whether their range is at national, regional or local level (Tsaur et al., 2006). Indicators can be distinguished by what type they are: quantitative, qualitative and normative. Quantitative indicators can include ratios, percentages or raw data. These may be easily quantifiable in terms of monetary or numerical values (Manning, 1999), and are often considered to be ‘objective, rigorous and reliable’ (Miller, 2001; Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005). Qualitative indicators, meanwhile, tend to address issues of a more tangible nature, and are considered to be subjective and less reliable or robust (Miller & Twining-Ward 2005 p. 115; Tsaur et al. 2006). These include normative or nominal indicators, category indices or opinion-based indicators (UNWTO, 2004). The selection criteria are relevant considerations for developing indicators (Table 3.3). The criteria provide systematic rationality and robustness, as well as useful practical considerations to achieve their specific goal in evaluating sustainability performance. These are useful in the following chapter when considering the methods and methodologies for developing the evaluative framework.
Table 3.3: Selection Criteria for Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Relevant to the research programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific precision</td>
<td>Scientifically well founded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluability</td>
<td>Containing the necessary and reliable data to proceed to its calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Clear as regards its methodology and the selection of parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable</td>
<td>Adaptable to specific characteristics of the territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparability</td>
<td>Producing comparable results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updating</td>
<td>Using updated data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost efficiency well balanced</td>
<td>Efforts expended in data collection well balanced with information ultimately obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial representation</td>
<td>Possibility of mapping using geo-referenced data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal representation</td>
<td>Showing trends over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
<td>Sensitive to spatial and temporal changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Results easily communicated and understandable to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Meeting the needs and interests of target audience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from (Bell & Morse, 2003; Blackstock et al., 2008; Rebollo & Baidal, 2003)

3.2.7 Indicator Development in Volunteer Tourism

Lupoli et al. make significant contributions by exploring their methodology and approaches in developing indicators to evaluate impacts on host communities (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014, 2015). Their research uses a compass of sustainability framework to understand volunteer organisations’ and host communities’ preferences with respect to identifying viable indicators. The compass of sustainability framework has been used effectively in recent empirical research as a conceptual framework for developing indicators (Lupoli & Morse, 2014a; Lupoli et al., 2015; Lupoli et al., 2014). It consists of four areas of N, S, E and W, which represent nature, society, economy and well-being. Society constitutes social structures and institutions, and wellbeing focuses on the health and happiness of individuals. Lupoli and colleagues justify their choice of a framework based on a bottom-up approach for indicator development that includes participatory community engagement in identifying community wellbeing and sustainability. As a holistic approach, it is an organisational system that allows the inclusion of a diverse range of stakeholders (Lupoli et al., 2015). The authors accept, however, that the ‘compass of sustainability’ is not the only or the most effective framework, and highlight that there are other suitable frameworks.
During the indicator development process, VT sending organisations and host communities select indicators that are designed to evaluate the impacts of VT on host communities. The researchers argue that collaboration between the host community and VT organisations needs to be an integral part of indicator development since this empowers communities to express their priorities in terms of assessing the impacts of VT (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014). The researchers argue that although a standardised impact assessment is beneficial for VT organisations, particularly those with multiple projects in developing countries, their research shows that the indicators developed in five case studies were not applicable elsewhere, therefore limiting comparability across different social and cultural settings (Lupoli and Morse, 2014). The researchers conclude that the heterogeneous political, social, economic, cultural and societal context of host communities results in a lot of variability in preferred indicators (Lupoli et al., 2015). The authors’ results, however, show that while some indicators were placed in different categories by different stakeholder groups during the indicator development process, no indicators were excluded and that, overall, the systems approach of the compass of sustainability framework succeeded (Lupoli et al., 2015).

While Lupoli et al. developed baseline indicators to evaluate impacts, they do not themselves prioritise these indicators in view of practicalities, evaluability and access (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014). Instead, they propose a second round of questionnaires to VT organisations and communities to prioritise indicators in terms of their importance and to develop these further, reflecting on performance issues (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014). Their research uses multiple case study and mixed methods approach, based on an online survey for international VT organisations, predominately in the English-speaking global North. Here, Likert-scale questions are used to determine the preferences and usefulness of social and economic indicators, followed up by in-depth telephone interviews. Additionally, methods focusing on community participation were applied through one-day workshops in at least five different host communities in South America (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014). Comparing the indicator development methodologies for both VT organisations and host communities, the researchers suggest that the methodologies are truly collaborative amongst stakeholders. They emphasise that collaboration between stakeholders and an all-encompassing approach is critical to achieving more sustainable practices in identifying and maximising community benefits (Lupoli et al., 2014).

In reflecting on the findings, community-specific needs and circumstances are important (Lupoli et al., 2015). Community preferences for cultural exchanges and education differ from the primary aims of sending organisations. In addition, some existing indicators do not correspond to the preferences of the community (Lupoli & Morse, 2014). The researchers recommend that the preferences expressed
by host communities should be fully addressed by VT organisations. Similarly, Taplin et al. (2014) argue that a critical and qualitative approach to evaluation and monitoring of VT promotes constructive dialogue between stakeholders, which can encourage improvements in operations and the delivery of VT projects. Lupoli’s research uses a mixed method and multiple case study approach and places significant importance on community engagement and involvement. He also stressed that collaboration between host communities and VT organisations is crucial in determining how to evaluate the impacts and outcomes of VT projects. Thus, recent empirical research in VT has developed context-focused assessment and analytical frameworks to determine impacts in VT (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014, 2015; Taplin et al., 2014). The context within VT organisations and host projects operate is, therefore, a significant focus.

3.2.8 Section Summary

Overall, the advantages of applying indicator systems or frameworks to evaluate sustainability appear to outweigh the limitations. The current literature offers a valuable overview of evaluating sustainability performance in tourism, and a sound foundation for developing an evaluative framework. The ability to evaluate sustainability performance is particularly important in order to substantiate VT’s claims of sustainability performance and how sustainability can be operationalised in a tourism setting at a local level. Evaluating sustainability through indicators underpins reflectivity in understanding performance and supporting transformative change. The section reveals how the process of indicator development supports a robust and systematic methodological approach and contributes to this study in the identification of outcomes and in the understanding of sustainability performance and its causes. Additionally, it has highlighted how issues such as simplifying the complexity of circumstances and settings, the subjectivity of indicator selection and case specific frameworks have limited transferability. The body of knowledge reveals that there is no consensus in regard to the use of one methodological approach for developing and implementing indicator frameworks. A knowledge gap is therefore recognised in respect to advancing indicator development and its implementation to overcome the limitations of indicators.

The evaluative framework proposed in this thesis may provide evidence-based information that allows for shared learning and informed decision making in VT, as is further explored in Chapter 4. The next section deals with how to construct the relations between VT stakeholders in a logical way. Although indicator development is advantageous in systematically including multiple stakeholders, its limitations in terms of transferability and generalisability are apparent. Furthermore, indicator systems cannot determine why and how certain outcomes occur and therefore do not fulfil Objective
2. Section 3.4, therefore, explains how realistic evaluation provides the theoretical basis for addressing contextual complexity, and its ability in determine root causes as well as evaluate outcomes.

3.3 Evaluating Value Chain Sustainability Performance

3.3.1 Section Overview

This section explores how to examine VT stakeholders’ relations and evaluate their sustainability performance by assembling them as a value chain. The previous section examined the methodology of developing indicators to evaluate the impacts and sustainability performance of VT in a robust and systematic manner that is adaptable to the evaluative framework. Constructing VT’s stakeholders as a value chain clearly positions each stakeholder systematically and highlights their relations and processes, thereby enabling the evaluation of stakeholders’ relations, processes and sustainability performance (Objectives 2 & 3). The section initially explores how evaluating value chain performances can be applied to VT. Furthermore, the section highlights how other issues and concerns within a value chain are important to the performance of organisations, such as sustainability, and examines the concepts of sustainable supply chain performance. By applying collaboration theory, the section explains how the early stages of indicator development are applicable in evaluating the relations and processes of stakeholders within the value chain. Lastly, the section examines how value chain frameworks are operable at both local and micro levels within a tourism setting.

The current body of knowledge consists predominately of literature reviews (Ahi & Searcy, 2015; Gold et al., 2010; Kache & Seuring, 2014; Varsei et al., 2014), propositions of conceptual models (Beske & Seuring, 2014; Schaltegger & Burritt, 2014), and several empirical studies (Dos Santos et al., 2014; Erol et al., 2011; Fu et al., 2012; Harms et al., 2013; Svensson et al., 2015). Within this current body of knowledge, however, a conceptual model of evaluation in supply chain sustainable performance is emerging that reveals how businesses aim to evaluate social issues (Beske & Seuring, 2014). Since the evaluative framework developed in Chapter 4 needs to assess the collaborative nature of VT stakeholders at an organisational level, this section examines how sustainable value chain analysis provides an approach to evaluating sustainability performance, in particular in terms of how to develop evaluations to indicate the collaborative nature of the VT stakeholders within the value chain. Thus, the literature provides invaluable insights into the implementation and application of frameworks for the development of the evaluative framework.
3.3.2 Definition of Value Chain

Evaluating value chains does not just entail looking at one organisation, but at its relations to its consumers and suppliers when producing a product or service. A value chain is defined ‘as a full range of activities, which are required to bring a product or service from conception, through the different phases of production (involving a combination of physical transformation and the input of various producer services), delivery to final consumer, and final disposal after use’ (Kaplinsky and Morris, 2001, cited in, Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 3). This definition highlights how the production or service is affected by each stakeholder adding value and the economic flow in the value chain. This description is applicable to VT in that several stakeholders influence a volunteer experience (or product). Another definition explains the value chain as ‘...a set of primarily collaborative activities and relationships that link companies in the value creation process to provide the final customer with the appropriate value mix of products and or services’ (Braziotis et al., 2013 cited in Schaltegger and Burritt, 2014, p. 232). The latter definition emphasises the inter-relationships between one organisation and multiple others, with the customer as the focal point and purpose of that relationship. A value chain, however, is not simply a linear chain or a causal relationship but is often complex and changeable (Tejada & Liñán, 2009), and this is significant in terms of examining how a supply chain may reflect the realities of how the stakeholders relate to one another.

A value chain can, therefore, help to deconstruct and logically organise VT stakeholder groups. This study’s aim is to determine how the nature of the collaboration between VT organisations (sending and receiving) influences the final VT experience or product. An additional factor in the supply chain for VT, however, is the host community, since they are an integral part of the volunteer product, with the volunteer being the customer. Deconstructing VT stakeholders by their value chain, therefore, emphasises the position, role and relations of each stakeholder (Figure 3.1) and helps to formulate the basic structure of the evaluative framework.

Figure 3.1: Value Chain of Volunteer Tourism Stakeholders
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3.3.3 Purpose of Value Chain Sustainability Performance

Evaluating the performance of individual companies is not new but, recently, a shift towards evaluating the performance of an organisation’s supply chain is gaining more attention (Ahi & Searcy, 2015). For a value chain, the typical criteria for evaluating performance are the reduction of risks and the maximisation of opportunities. In addition, the expansion in value chain sustainability performance is driven by organisations recognising the external pressures of the market and consumer demands, such as competitiveness, effectiveness and efficiency (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2014). The body of knowledge on the value chain within business and organisational studies is growing and includes evaluating sustainability in terms of risks and opportunities (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2014). Recent advances include evaluating environmental and social sustainability, alongside economic considerations in value chains, although these are at a very early stage (Ahi & Searcy, 2015). There are several different motivations and purposes for companies to evaluate sustainability. One common motivation is that organisations’ value chains often include developing countries which may have less effective regulations on working conditions and environmental standards, potentially exposing companies to reputational damage in consumer markets with higher environmental and social awareness (Schaltegger & Burritt, 2014). Such consumers increasingly expect organisations to adopt advanced sustainability practices and to act more responsibly. A further reason for assessing the value chain sustainability performance is the ability to verify an organisation’s sustainability credentials.

These issues in value chain management are increasingly echoed in the criticism of the VT industry, as set out in Chapter 1. There are many parallels to evaluating sustainability in supply chains within the VT market: Firstly, value chains are based on the collaborative relations that organisations form with their suppliers to develop their product, in the same way that VT sending organisations based in the global North form relations with receiving organisations at destinations. Particularly in VT, the product of a volunteer experience is predominately based on the receiving organisation and host project in the destination community. Thus, evaluating the value chain sustainability performance is a valuable and rational approach to disseminating the relations of VT stakeholders. Secondly, VT organisations source their suppliers at destinations, which are often in the global South. Thirdly, to maintain their reputation, many organisations in VT and tourism assess their sustainability performance in order to substantiate their sustainability credentials (often using indicators, as explained in the previous section). Subsequently, the value chain builds the links between the VT stakeholders, which then provides the foundation of the evaluative framework (Figure 3.1). Furthermore, evaluating these relationships are underpinned by collaboration theory (Section 2.5) and the evaluability of the collaborative relations.
3.3.4 Frameworks of Value Chain Sustainability Performance

Performance evaluation and management requires a set of goals and definitions against which performance is evaluated. Indicator-based frameworks are employed by various case studies (Dos Santos et al., 2014; Varsei et al., 2014) including Key Performance Indicators (Bai & Sarkis, 2014) and multi-criteria frameworks (Erol et al., 2011). TBL is often used to deconstruct and evaluate sustainability in a value chain (Dos Santos et al., 2014; Satolo & Simon, 2015). Other studies suggest evaluations of collaborations within value chains (Beske & Seuring, 2014; Gold et al., 2010; Kache & Seuring, 2014). This ‘collaboration paradigm’ is based on organisations within value chains being required to integrate fully in order to be more competitive (Gold et al., 2010). Beske & Seuring (2014) suggest disseminating sustainability into five categories of context (orientation, continuity, collaboration, risk management and proactivity) that provide a set of indicator dimensions for the evaluative framework (Figure 3.2). These are arranged into three hierarchical levels, where collaboration is placed at the highest level and the subsequent categories below this. These categorisations begin to formulate the basis for evaluable indicator development. The evaluative framework (Objective 3) will be developed and adopted in the following Chapter (Chapter 4).

Figure 3.2: Value Chain Sustainability Performance

Author, 2018 (adapted from Beske & Seuring, 2014)

3.3.5 Value Chain Approach in Tourism

Investigating the current body of knowledge with respect to the value chain approach in tourism provides some useful and practical insights for this study. For instance, a qualitative study of Value Chain Analysis (VCA) has several benefits in evaluating how tourism can have economic impacts on
local economic development in developing countries (Mitchell, 2012). Mitchell develops a conceptual framework that is constructed by the main stakeholders in a supply chain, and several pathways within this framework illustrate how the economic benefits are transferred from the tourism sector to neighbouring communities. The author emphasises that VCA is suitable as a tool to assess the economic viability of developing tourism products since it encompasses both demand and supply and has the ability to identify critical issues within particular target groups. In addition, he describes the approach as ‘conceptually robust’ and concludes that the framework proved useful in evaluating impacts and guiding the analysis (Mitchell, 2012, p. 457). While VCA is limited to only evaluating economic aspects, it provides some insights of its usefulness in its approach in analysing qualitative data that determines reasons and causes, not just outcomes. Thus, the value chain approach is particularly pertinent to addressing Objective 2 of this study.

Furthermore, the successful application of VCA as a tool at a micro and enterprise level, such as one hotel, is valuable for this study (Mitchell et al., 2014). Mitchell’s study demonstrates that VCA is a tool that is adaptable for application in different geographical settings and scale. In this study, the evaluative framework explores collaborative relations at micro and enterprise level, and the research by Mitchell et al. indicates that VCA is replicable for this level. In addition, its innovative approach in an in-depth analysis of an individual business, obtaining access to actual data proved successful when compared to working with estimates at a regional level. The authors accentuate the structured approach in dealing with a complex product which allows for a detailed analysis, including community members (Mitchell et al., 2014). This study can adopt a similar structured method in dealing with complex data for evaluating stakeholders’ collaborative relations and their outcomes (Objectives 1 and 2). The authors state that accessibility to data and information is crucial and, in their study, this includes ‘open book’ access through the internal positioning of the researchers (Mitchell et al., 2014, p. 6). Similarly, in this study, access to each stakeholder group is important to be able to collect relevant data that describes the nature of the different relations amongst them.

Similar to the empirical studies on economic impacts in a tourism organisation (Mitchell et al., 2014; Svensson et al., 2015) employ an inductive methodological approach using multiple sources of qualitative data, including company records and websites, on-site observations and face-to-face interviews with key personnel who are responsible for the implementation of sustainability. Further methods include a quantitative survey entailing closed and partly open-ended interviews for a large number of companies (Harms et al., 2013). Sourcing qualitative data such as content analysis of the
annual reports and other public documentations of a large retail chain allows an assessment of the evaluation of sustainability performance and the implementation of sustainable practices (Dos Santos et al., 2014). In considering VT stakeholders, and applying similar methodologies, access to secondary data originating from the organisations, such as their websites, communications and documentation is a valuable support to data collection by interviews. This data helps to understand the internal processes of managing the product of the volunteer experience by the organisations. Additionally, any other relationships associated with developing the product can provide useful data, such as the host community and volunteers themselves, since these are also integral parts of the value chain.

3.3.6 Section Summary

By exploring how to evaluate sustainable performance with value chain approaches this section makes a valuable contribution to gaining knowledge on how and what influences outcomes within a supply chain (Objective 2). Evaluating value chain sustainability performance provides an analytical and practical tool that is applicable to VT stakeholders and provides a valuable structure for the evaluative framework (Objective 3). It explores the nature of relations between stakeholders in order to evaluate organisational performances, such as their effectiveness and competitiveness in relation to environmental and socio-economic concerns. It also shows that the challenges in evaluating complex issues such as social concerns within a supply chain such as VT can be overcome. Furthermore, value chains are applicable to the wide geographical distribution of VT stakeholders and can evaluate integrity at the local and micro level. While this section explored conceptual approaches which are concerned only with the outcome, such as sustainability performance, and are unable to establish causes, the next section explains how RE does not only deal with outcomes but also determines what are the causes leading to certain outcomes.

3.4 Realistic Evaluation

3.4.1 Section Overview

This section demonstrates how realistic evaluation (RE) can provide theoretical and contextual robustness to the methodology, thereby complementing the previous sections on other approaches to evaluating sustainability performance and impacts in tourism. The framework evaluates what outcomes VT stakeholder relations influence and how (Objectives 1 & 2). The section begins by providing a brief overview of theory-based evaluations (Section 3.4.2), in order to contextualise RE, and continues with how RE is applied in social sciences, exploring its main limitations and benefits. The section describes how RE relates to stakeholder relations, and how and why these relations cause certain outcomes; it continues to explain how RE is integrated into the evaluative framework
(Objectives 3). This section concludes by showing how RE provides a methodological foundation, which is developed fully in the following chapter (Chapter 4), and how it allows for the evaluation of sustainability performance based on the framework’s amalgamation of collaboration theory, value chain and indicator development.

3.4.2 Overview of Evaluations

This section begins by outlining the definitions and different understandings of evaluation. A definition of evaluation is: ‘Evaluation is the systematic assessment of the operation and/or the outcomes of a programme or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the policy or programme’ (Weiss, 1998 cited in Powell, 2006, p. 106). It is also simply and clearly defined as ‘evaluation is primarily concerned with determining the merit, worth or value of an established policy or planned intervention’ (Clarke, 1999, p.3). These definitions highlight a systematic assessment of an intervention such as a programme that is comparing actual with planned outcomes. The emphasis of an evaluation is on the process as well as the outcome, however, and the need for a systematic assessment of an intervention. Evaluation is closely related to applied research, with more emphasis on practical implications and less on developing existing theories (Hall & Hall, 2004). They state that ‘evaluation produces research results which are intended to be used, which makes it distinct from other kinds of research...’ (Hall & Hall, 2004, p. 28). Thus, evaluations are diverse and take many different forms.

Inevitably, evaluation has a multitude of different meanings and purposes (Tilley, 2000). The applications of evaluation are diverse and there are many different forms, for example: impact-, outcome, formative-, participatory-, process-, illuminative-, responsive-, empowerment, transformative evaluation (Hall & Hall, 2004). Each has a different stance, approach and perspective depending on the nature of the form of evaluation. Different forms of evaluation are found throughout the public sector, such as health care services (Hewitt et al., 2012), law (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010b), anti-social behaviour (Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011), education (Clegg, 2005) and military operations (Williams & Morris, 2014) and an array of other disciplines. Thus, evaluations are a growing trend requiring organisations to demonstrate success and justify project costs (Hummel & van der Duim, 2012). Evaluations are therefore increasingly a necessity in many aspects of society, politics and policy-making, and an integral part of project management alongside planning and implementation. For example at the World Bank, as part of its development and research activities (Almeida et al., 2012), at the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) as an integral management tool (Valters, 2014), at the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), where evaluations aim for more efficiency and transparency (UNEG Strategy 2014–2019, 2014). Although evaluations are applied differently,
fundamentally their purpose is similar in supporting decision making, influencing policy and strategy, and enhancing effectiveness, transparency and accountability.

To understand how different facets of evaluation are methodologically applied is important. Patton makes the distinction between RE and developmental evaluation by emphasising that RE takes changes into account (Patton, 2008 cited in Coryn et al., 2010). Rogers et al. (2000), meanwhile, determine that theory-driven evaluations should analyse the programme or interventions and empirically test how programmes cause their outcomes. Coryn et al. (2010) suggest three fundamental characteristics of evaluation: i) the analysis of an intervention, including the input process, ii) the evaluation of the findings and outcomes, and iii) the analysis of the degree to which these relationships occur. While RE is considered to be a form of theory-driven evaluation, finding its roots in the natural sciences, and differentiating itself from other forms of evaluation through its emphasis on realism (Pawson, 2013; Tilley, 2000). Further, in its most simplistic form, evaluation consists of the basic elements of input, output, a transformation process and feedback (Hall & Hall, 2004). The transformation process is occasionally explained as the ‘black box’ (e.g. Astbury & Leeuw, 2010). The black box describes the intervention (Byng et al., 2005; Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011) or change (Dillman, 2013; Jackson & Kolla, 2012) which takes place based on a programme (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010a; Sridharan & Nakaima, 2012). The black box emphasises that a transformation process attempts to change a particular situation, further outlined below (Section 3.4.4).

This evidence-based evaluation is applicable to tourism. In the same manner as evidence-based evaluations explore transformations and social interventions, certain forms of tourism are perceived as a development intervention in addressing poverty alleviation (Butcher, 2011; Goodwin, 2009, 2011b; Mbaiwa & Stronza, 2010; Scheyvens, 2007, 2011; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012; Zhao & Ritchie, 2007). Similarly, VT is an intervention or a transformational process attempting to change a particular situation. VT is considered to be a type of ‘operation’, ‘programme’ or ‘intervention’ that aims to cause change or a particular outcome (Brown & Korten, 1989; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Taplin et al., 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2012). This aligns with the definitions of VT (Chapter 1), which stipulate that VT attempts to make a difference. In addition, performance, effectiveness and efficiencies are primary reasons for evaluation, driven by today’s societal and political demands for more evidence-based policy-making and associated reporting, accountability and transparency (Hall & Hall, 2004). Similarly, an evaluation of VT practices to understand more about its impacts and outcomes would provide valuable insights (Alexander, 2012; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Guttentag, 2009; Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Mostafanezhad, 2014c; Palacios, 2010; Tomazos, 2012). Thus, evidence-based evaluation is suitable for the development of an evaluative framework (Objective 3).
### 3.4.3 Why Realistic Evaluation?

There is some confusion in the literature in respect to the terms RE and Theory of Change (ToC). RE shares many similarities with, but also has some distinct differences from, ToC. According to Blamey & Mackenzie (2007, p. 444), there is a ‘fundamental lack of consistency on how different theories are described’ and they suggest that both theories are individually different but of the same family because they are taking different approaches in defining their theories and produce different sets of knowledge. They suggest that RE is more purposeful since it examines the smaller elements and components of a programme, in particular addressing the causal triggers, compared to ToC, which takes a broader approach. A distinct advantage of RE is its focus on constantly revising and cumulatively learning through regular revision of evidence, while ToC is less focused on cumulative learning and makes more implicit assumptions during the evaluation process (Blamey & Mackenzie, 2007). In their case study on sentencing guidelines in the UK, Hunt & Sridharan (2010) explain that there is a gap between the potential of what can be learned and what is actually learned. This is significant for the aims of this thesis since they highlight through this that RE is more appropriate as a theoretical framework than ToC.

While both theories demand a close and integrated relationship between the key stakeholders within a programme and the evaluator, RE may potentially take less time as it is not focusing on obtaining stakeholder ownership and engagement as part of the process. Patton advocates inductive and deductive, or stakeholder focused, approaches in developing and applying evaluative theory (Patton, 2008 cited in Coryn et al., 2010). Further, Chen prefers RE’s approach in which stakeholders are involved and the evaluator assumes the role of a facilitator (Chen, 2005). In comparison, although ToC does in principle aspire to include stakeholder ownership during evaluation, it is perceived as unrealistic in practice (Blamey & Mackenzie, 2007). Both theories, however, have been criticised on the basis that evaluators can be too close to their subjects, ultimately calling into question their objectivity (Blamey and Mackenzie, 2007). In response to this, Chelimsky (2013) argues that all evaluation is subject to individual bias by stakeholders or those involved, including policy and decision makers, special interest groups and participants. Miller (2010) concludes that, through further research, evaluation theories will contribute evidence to assist the development of a theoretically rooted evaluation practice and practice-based theory. Timmins & Miller (2007), meanwhile, argue that RE takes into account that people are a major contributing factor to the outcome and success of a programme.
Questionable in RE are the inadequacies in addressing complex interventions, which is ‘exacerbated’ by programmes dealing with persistent and ‘intractable’ problems (Blamey and Mackenzie, 2007, p. 442). The authors, however, conclude that the evaluation theories are equipped to deal with different scales of complexity. RE has proven to be useful and effective in addressing heterogeneity when dealing with a diverse range of different circumstances and conditions (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010a). When examining the application of RE in their case study, the authors emphasise that RE can contribute to policy and programme intervention, and can deal with the ‘active’ ingredients in policies. They explain that in many sectors, such as law, education and health, it is common for evaluators to possess clarity about the different pathways that lead to different outcomes. They emphasise that evaluators are only able to determine causal explanations if the specific social intervention or mechanisms are fully understood and applied. Hunt and Sridharan (2010b) suggest that RE’s strengths lie in specifying the contextual setting, and determining if the intervention may or may not work. Thus, RE provides appropriate robustness for this study in determining in what context (internal and external) VT outcomes such as sustainability performance are achieved. The next section continues to explain the basic components in RE.

3.4.4 The Basis of Realistic Evaluation

The remainder of this chapter explains what RE is in detail, and how it applies to evaluate sustainability performance in VT. The chapter continues to explain the basis of how the evaluative framework is developed, a process that is continued in-depth in the following chapter (Chapter 4). According to Pawson & Tilley (2013), RE offers a realist approach to examining a particular social phenomenon. They argue that it provides a robust approach, suitable for research that attempts to evaluate a certain occurrence or intervention of a social system causing a particular outcome, such as VT.

RE sets out to determine what works for whom under what circumstances (De Souza, 2016; Pawson & Tilley, 2004). Furthermore, emphasising a causal explanation: ‘the key problem for evaluation research is to find out how and under what conditions a given measure will produce its impacts (Tilley, 200). Astbury (2013) describes this as ‘unpacking pragmatic boxes’, while Pawson and Tilley referred to it as the mechanism (Astbury & Leeuw, 2010, p. 363; Pawson & Tilley, 2004). RE is based on the CMO configuration (Context, Mechanism, Outcome) of C + M → O (Astbury, 2013; Dalkin et al., 2015; Pawson & Manzano-Santaella, 2012). RE tests and investigates how a particular outcome (O) occurs, by exploring what particular circumstances (C) trigger certain actions (M). This generates certain patterns of CMO configurations. Figure 3.3 illustrates how RE determines a causal explanation within a social intervention of a certain mechanism that leads to outcomes within a particular context or condition. Thus, RE attempts to explain the interactions between the context (C) and the mechanism
which influence certain outcomes (O), which is commonly referred to as the CMO configuration (e.g. de Souza, 2013; Jagosh et al., 2014; Wong et al., 2016). In applying RE to VT’s intervention, the ‘black box’ consists of the collaborative relations between stakeholders, for example, the interactions outlined previously (Section 2.2.2) which lead to certain outcomes such as sustainability performance. In defining outcomes further, RE can also be applied to transformative change.

Figure 3.3: Simple Representation of Realistic Evaluation

Author, 2018 (adapted from Pawson & Tilley, 1997)

Where outcomes are defined as change or transformation, Pawson and Tilley (1997) explain that RE determines a causal explanation of if-then. The authors stipulate that if the right contextual setting influences the social situation then change occurs. The causal relationship of the CMO configuration focuses on an ‘if-then’ situation, whereby the emphasis is on a certain context with an underlining mechanism that is based on a causal and conditional situation that results in the outcome. Thus, in simple terms, the CMO configuration changes accordingly over time (T_1 and T_2) from C_1M_1O_1 to C_2M_2O_2. Figure 3.4 illustrates a social intervention consisting of different contextual settings (Cs) and mechanisms (Ms) causing different outcomes (Os). In a similar manner, RE is applicable to determining the outcomes in VT, such as sustainability performance; and whether VT is indeed making a difference. The scenario illustrated below is significant in demonstrating that outcomes are defined by change over time because it addresses VT’s current situation, as previously outlined. The final section in this chapter outlines in more detail how the CMO configurations are developed for the VT settings (Section 3.4.6). Before that, the next section explores some empirical applications of RE that provide some useful understanding to inform the use of RE for the evaluative framework.
3.4.5 Empirical Applications of Realistic Evaluation

Several empirical examples demonstrate how RE has been successfully applied in developing a context, mechanism and outcome (CMO) configuration for evaluating the performance of an intervention. For example, RE has been used to evaluate complex health and social welfare programmes, and demonstrates the ability to gain deeper understandings of various expected and unexpected outcomes, as well as how and why they occur (Byng et al., 2005; Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011; Wand, White & Patching, 2010). Wand et al. develop a detailed CMO configuration, which is based on an interview process with stakeholders. The study incorporates a feedback stage after the initial design to fine tune the applicability of the configuration (Wand et al., 2010). The application of RE demonstrates its usefulness for practitioners and policy makers, in particular by going beyond the programme’s outcomes to understand more about its mechanisms. A similar study applies RE as part of analytical induction procedures involving a multi-stage process in developing the CMO configuration based on case studies and interviews with stakeholders, in this case, health workers (Byng et al., 2005). A more dynamic approach involves the creation of a CMO system after each stakeholder interview, which subsequently is given to the next interviewee for evaluation (Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011).

The development of how the CMO configuration has been applied in empirical studies also provides useful insights. The CMO configuration develops through several processes consisting of interviews with key stakeholders, and follow-up meetings for reflection and feedback with the same stakeholders. Byng et al. (2005) highlight the challenges of overcoming multiple Cs and Ms to accommodate the different circumstances and heterogeneity of the intervention. The feedback
mechanisms involved in developing the CMO configurations are a critical part of the successful application of RE. The researchers conclude that RE proves invaluable as a theoretical tool for determining the Cs and Ms, and that the process of determining the CMO configuration is critical (Byng et al., 2005). Furthermore, Wand et al. (2010) state that the process of developing the CMO framework supports their deeper understanding of the intervention, and of gaining knowledge about not just what, but also how. Furthermore, in order to understand the full nature of the intervention and its outcomes, it is crucial to incorporate unknown outcomes into the CMO configuration because the mechanism can unexpectedly change (Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011). Overall, these studies provide some useful insights into the development of CMO configurations.

An additional step to establish the CMO configurations are the data collection methods that are applied. These may include interviews with a variety of stakeholder groups, including the recipients of interventions, such as patients (Wand et al., 2010). Similarly, in the VT context, the recipients are members of host projects. In this regard, Nanninga and Glebbeek’s (2011) study on youth anti-social behaviour also uses comprehensive desk research focused on policy documentation from public sources in advance of the stakeholders’ interviews. Their study is of interest since it encompasses a wider range of stakeholder groups, including stakeholders who are indirectly involved in the intervention. Throughout the process of developing CMO configurations, Nanninga & Glebbeek (2011) emphasise that semi-structured interviews are useful to allow for clarification and elaboration. Another study on a health service demonstrates the scalability and generalisability of RE by applying it to health services more broadly and using large-scale qualitative interviews (Byng et al., 2005). These empirical studies demonstrate how RE is applied to evaluate the success of interventions in a variety of different social circumstances. They also demonstrate that it is possible to include the recipients of an intervention, which is an important observation in relation to this study.

The applications of RE demonstrate the diversity of interventions and the complexity of the different social settings in which it is used. The different types of interventions, which vary in scale, size and intended outcomes, suggest that similar approaches are successful in developing the evaluative framework and the associated process of establishing CMO configurations. Some of the empirical studies tend to be larger in scale and more time consuming than is required to develop the framework. The lessons learnt are useful in developing the framework when engaging different stakeholder groups as part of the process of constructing the CMO configurations. The process of developing CMO configurations based on the involvement of different stakeholder groups echoes Gajda’s (2004) and Lupoli & Morse’s (2014) indicator development and the use of collaboration theory. Thus, the proposed methodology integrates RE and indicator development and collaboration theory in
constructing the CMO configuration of stakeholders’ collaborations in VT. Furthermore, the fact that it is possible to generalise from RE indicates how the evaluative framework may be usefully applied on a larger scale and across a wider scope within the VT industry (Pawson & Tilley, 2004).

3.4.6 Realistic Evaluation in the Evaluative Framework

The last section of the literature review begins to explain how the evaluative framework is constructed using collaboration theory, sustainable value chain performance and RE. Thus, RE’s causal explanations are applicable to evaluating the relations between VT stakeholders and how these influence outcomes in certain contextual settings. Specifically, the mechanism in RE is significant in terms of examining the inside of the black box by applying collaboration theory to evaluate the collaborative relations. Thus, the construction is, firstly, based on evaluating collaboration performance (Section 2.4) through which the stakeholders’ relations are explored. Secondly, all the stakeholders’ relations are constructed using value chain analysis (Section 3.3). Thirdly, RE explores how and why the relations cause certain outcomes relating to sustainability performance (Section 2.2.2), which relates to Objective 1 & 2. The evaluative framework is based on RE’s CMO configuration, consisting of the stakeholders’ contextual circumstances (C), the collaborative relations (M) and outcomes of sustainability performance (O). In applying RE, the evaluative framework assesses VT’s outcomes, such as sustainability performance, and determines how the stakeholder relations influence those outcomes (Objective 3). This structural and methodological approach enhances the robustness of the framework. The lessons learnt from the evaluation will contribute to the gap in knowledge with respect to gaining insights about how relations influence sustainability in VT, and why.

Based on integrating the sustainable value chain performance, the CMO configurations of the evaluative framework are outlined as follows. In certain contextual circumstances (C) the manner in which stakeholders collaborate with each other (M) influences the outcomes (O). Table 3.4 outlines a basic construction. When applying RE (left column), the CMO configuration is constructed. Based on the sustainable value chain performance (Figure 3.2), the indicator dimensions (middle column) and performance categories (right column) are integrated and contextualised to a basic structure (Beske & Seuring, 2014). Specifically, the different contextual settings of the stakeholders (C) consist of their strategic values. The mechanism (M) is based on the collaborative relations, including processes and their structural arrangements, i.e. governance. The outcomes (O) are based on VT’s supply chain sustainability performances of transformative social change over time.
In addition, the integration of collaborative theory entails a further step in the development of the evaluative framework. Based on sustainable value chain management, the evaluative framework contextualises the individual indicator dimensions of strategic values, structure and processes within VT, and defines the evaluable indicator categories. According to Beske and Seuring, collaboration is one of the indicator dimensions (Figure 3.2) of the conceptual sustainability supply chain framework (Beske & Seuring, 2014). In disseminating their framework to a CMO configuration and integrating collaboration theory, collaborative relations and sustainability performance in the VT supply chain become. The evaluability of collaborations (Section 2.4) is based on their intensity, level of integration, degree of consensus, level of engagement and scope (Austin, 2000; Bramwell & Sharman, 1987; Gajda, 2004). Thus, the integration of the different models (sustainability supply chain management and indicator development) and theories (realistic evaluation and collaboration theory) formulates the basis of the evaluative framework. Figure 3.5 illustrates the basic evaluative framework. The systematic approach of RE provides validity and rigour to the evaluative framework for VT. The framework evaluates the collaborative relations that exist within the different stakeholder groups and how these influence the outcomes of VT. The CMO configuration is evaluated through performance indicators and the dimensions identified. These evaluations are developed further as indicators to determine the contextual setting of how and why stakeholders collaborate (Chapter 4).

---

**Table 3.4: Basic Construction of the Evaluative Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realistic Evaluation</th>
<th>Indicator dimensions</th>
<th>Categories of sustainable performance in supply chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>strategic values of stakeholders</td>
<td>orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>processes, relations and structure</td>
<td>collaboration, continuity, risk management, proactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>sustainability performance</td>
<td>transformative change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018 (adopted from Beske & Seuring, 2014)
The study uniquely integrates RE to sustainable supply chain management in order to determine the collaboration (M) and thereafter the outcomes (O) based on the different contexts (C) of the stakeholders. The amalgamation of RE with sustainable supply chain management, collaboration theory and the value chain provides the conceptual basis of the evaluative framework. This section demonstrates the basis of RE’s suitability as a theoretical lens for evaluating VT stakeholders’ sustainability performance. With the exception of one case study (Gregory-Smith et al., 2017), RE is a relatively new theoretically-based evaluation which has not been applied previously in tourism or for evaluating sustainability. Nonetheless, the literature reveals how RE effectively addresses heterogeneity and complexity in a large variety of different social circumstances and contexts. To bring change to a particular social situation through interventions is complex, and it is challenging to determine its effectiveness and success. RE has been successfully applied in empirical studies determining the CMO configurations through the involvement of the main stakeholder groups. Since VT also consists of heterogeneous stakeholders and complex issues, the practical applications of RE provide useful lessons for this study. The deconstruction of the VT setting based on a value chain, and through the application of collaboration theory to the stakeholders’ relations, provides the framework for developing performance indicators for each CMO component. This methodology and concept are further developed in the following chapter, which articulates the final details of the evaluative framework.
3.4.8 Chapter Summary

The literature review in this chapter has presented the theoretical and practical basis of the evaluative framework. The framework is fully developed in the following chapter, detailing the methodology. To conceptualise the evaluative framework, this chapter reviewed a diverse body of knowledge that included the development and application of sustainability indicators, supply chain management and realistic evaluation; each making a theoretical or practical contribution to the proposed framework. The processes and application of indicator development demonstrate how sustainability is evaluable, and they also provide useful insights into how indicators might evaluate sustainability in different tourism contexts. Sustainability value chain performance provides a useful concept for understanding how to position VT stakeholders and how to evaluate the relationships between them. Chapter 4 will develop the indicators further to customise evaluable attributes fully to the VT stakeholder supply chain. Both indicators and supply chain management provide the framework for how to evaluate the complex nature of VT and its current issues. RE, meanwhile, provides a theoretical lens whereby the collaboration can be evaluated within the contexts of VT stakeholders, including how they influence outcomes and impacts. Figure 3.5 formulates the basis of the evaluative framework that is rooted in sustainable value chain management and the collaborative nature of the relationship between the stakeholders. The challenge for the methods and methodology is to further integrate the three aspects of this chapter to develop the evaluative framework so it can provide more in-depth evaluation.
4 Methodology

‘I was taught that the way of progress is neither swift nor easy.’

Marie Skłodowska Curie

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology and the theoretical and philosophical basis of the evaluative framework. It also presents the development and conceptualisation of the framework. The framework is the result of the amalgamation of the VT supply chain, collaboration theory (CT), realistic evaluation (RE), each drawn from different areas of the current body of knowledge. The purpose of the framework is to evaluate the processes of the collaborative relations between the main stakeholders within the VT supply chain, by determining how and why the contextual settings and mechanisms of collaboration between stakeholders influence VT’s outcomes. The aim of this chapter is threefold: i) to explain the theoretical and philosophical foundation of the framework, ii) to describe the formation of the evaluative framework, and iii) to test the methodology of applying the framework. Adapted from Astbury (2013), Figure 4.1 shows the main steps involved in developing and applying the evaluative framework, each of which are detailed and discussed in the following chapters. This chapter explains in full Steps 1-4, while Chapters 5 and 6 address Steps 5 and 6 in outlining the methods and then the results of testing the framework. Chapters 7 and 8, meanwhile, deal with Steps 7 and 8, discussing the findings and exploring the refinement of the framework and how it can be applied in the VT industry.
This chapter is organised in four sections, the first section provides a general rationale for the framework by means of a brief consideration of the epistemological and ontological orientation of the theory-driven approach in RE. The chapter continues by explaining the collaborative relations between the main stakeholders and the formation of the evaluative framework. It continues with how the CMO configuration is applied to VT and how each will be evaluated within the framework. This includes an explanation of the CMO configurations, developed by elaborating and populating each C, M and O. Lastly, the methodological considerations for testing the framework are presented, before a brief summary of the chapter.

4.2 Theoretical Considerations of Realistic Evaluation

4.2.1 Overview

The existing body of knowledge on RE is relatively new and fast growing, although predominantly focused in health services, and also in education and law (Greenhalgh et al., 2015; Marchal et al., 2016). To date, one RE study has been conducted in the field of cultural tourism, applying an environmental social marketing intervention (Gregory-Smith et al., 2017). The literature also highlights the wide range of application of RE, and how its philosophical principles are interpreted.
differently. This section briefly examines the philosophical origins of RE and considers the ontology and epistemology of realist social sciences and evaluation research. The aim is to present how the main principles of RE are developed, with emphasis on how it provides the methodological basis for the evaluative framework. This leads to the following sections, which detail the formation of the evaluation framework in populating the CMO configurations.

4.2.2 The Theoretical Basis of Realistic Evaluation

Evaluation research relies on existing social science methods and methodology, finding its roots in a combination of philosophical paradigms rather than one specific paradigm. Clarke suggests that evaluation is accepted either as formative, to encourage better practice, or as summative, to determine effectiveness (Shriven, 1996 in Clarke, 1999). Evaluation is therefore differentiated more by its objective and practical purpose to improve policy making and practices in social settings, than by its line of enquiry to establish the truth. Clarke (1999) concludes that many theorists accept that evaluation research is becoming its own discipline, finding its own place within social sciences in which both quantitative and qualitative methods are accepted (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012). Emphasis is on understanding and finding explanations for a particular social intervention. Nevertheless, developing the methodology of the evaluative framework requires a further understanding of the philosophical basis of realistic evaluation.

Constructivism is based on the social construction of a pluralistic social intervention, such as VT, taking place in its natural settings, which are defined by multiple contexts. Thus, constructivism may have multiple truths, as they are explored through the construction of individual minds (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, cited in Hall & Hall, 2004). Pawson and Tilley reject these pluralistic views and consider them as unworkable and unrealistic. They disagree with such open-ended evaluation and explain that reality must also exist beyond the constructive truths of participants (Marchal et al., 2016). Given that Pawson and Tilley reject constructivism, they apply reflective critique and advocacy in developing their philosophical justification of RE. They explain that RE searches for the causal explanation of certain outcomes based on realism (Astbury, 2013; Hall & Hall, 2004). Emphasising the explanatory nature of their approach, Pawson and Tilley (1997) suggest that realism is not attempting to ‘position itself as a model of scientific explanation which avoids the traditional epistemological poles of positivism and relativism’ (Pawson & Tilley, 1997 p. 55). They suggest, instead, that they are pushing the ‘scientific realistic explanation to realist social explanation’ by being able to take realist evaluations in social settings (Pawson & Tilley, 1997 p. 56). To achieve this they rely on realism’s standard set of concepts, given that RE is based on realism where theory drives the evaluation (Manzano-Santaella, 2011;
Manzano, 2016; Pawson & Tilley, 1997). The concept of realism within RE contends that social phenomena are based on several realities and pluralism (Hall & Hall, 2004).

The emphasis of realism is to find the root causes of a social phenomenon. Pawson and Tilley eliminate any scientific debate on methods since they emphasise that RE is focused mostly on the causal explanation of ‘how?’. Realism recognises that a social intervention can be considered as a social system, consisting of different social fabrics, such as processes, organisations, social structures and individuals. Pawson and Tilley apply concepts of realism to substantiate causal explanations based on such social systems in order to find the root causes of social change. They suggest that individuals and organisations interact in a stratified social reality, and argue that causal mechanisms are formed through the social processes of individuals’ interactions and contexts (Marchal et al., 2016). Manzano (2016) states that while the ontology of the real world applications of realistic evaluations is not always clear, its philosophical roots are found in realism. Bryman (2016) observes that realism provides a narrow scope and deep research approach. Further, realism offers tourism research an approach through which to combine the natural and social elements within a tourism phenomenon, which can include creative imagination with scientific explanations that permit deeper analysis (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012).

Furthermore, the focus of empirically testing RE should be on the development and contribution to knowledge, and not on methodological perfection (Pawson & Manzano-Santaella, 2012). For them, RE is a theory-driven evaluation, which determines the methodological choices. Hence, the focus should be on the methodological approach and the application of the realistic framework. The approach of the realistic framework explains the conditions and circumstances that give rise to certain outcomes and investigates causal relationships. In essence, RE determines ‘what works for whom in what circumstance’. To explain certain outcomes and social changes, Pawson and Tilley suggest a theory-driven approach, developing a ‘generative model of causation’. The inter-relationship between theory and observation is the realist interpretation of a multi-dimensional logic and results in testing a theory (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). An outcome is explained through the different contextual conditions and mechanisms by examining theory and observation in testing a social construction, and bridging theory and practice (Astbury, 2013; Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Manzano-Santaella, 2011; Manzano, 2016). Subsequently, middle range theories are defined as operational programme theories in evaluations (Marchal et al., 2016). The RE framework is designed to test middle range theories or hypotheses based on the CMO propositions, and to develop and refine those middle range theories (Manzano, 2016; Marchal et al., 2016; Pawson & Manzano-Santaella, 2012). These middle range theories are
based on existing theories derived from academic or grey literature (Manzano, 2016; Marchal et al., 2016).

The evaluative framework assesses sustainability performances in VT and formulates the basis for its middle range theories. Pawson and Manzano (2012) conclude that the significance of the application of RE lies in how C, M and O are constructed to lead to causal explanations, and how each play their role in the evaluative framework. Impacts and outcomes (O), such as sustainability, are caused by certain contextual conditions (C) triggering mechanisms such as procedures, processes and personal relations (M). In this study, the evaluative framework tests the sustainability performance, which depends on the contextual circumstances of the supply chain, which in turn consists of VT stakeholders’ external environmental and internal settings and the subsequent nature of the collaborative interactions between them (M). Hence, the middle range theories are the evaluation of why VT stakeholders’ contextual conditions and how their relations influence particular outcomes of sustainability performance. In applying the evaluative framework, the middle range theories are tested and refined, as explained in the conclusion (Chapter 8).

The realistic framework will explore how stakeholders’ contextual conditions, such as their motivation and expectations, influence their collaborative relations with each other and consequently VT’s sustainability performance. There are several significant advantages to applying a theory-driven evaluation for this research study. The systematic deconstruction of a complex social intervention into specific CMO components links causal explanations to particular outcomes (Objective 3). This allows for more transferability and relevance for practitioners, and a fuller contribution to knowledge, by enabling the direct application of theory-driven evaluation (Marchal et al., 2016). According to the literature, RE has the ability to deal with heterogeneity and allows for the systematic exploration of complex social circumstances and root causes (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Astbury, 2013; Manzano-Santaella, 2011). The framework is here applied to evaluate a case study in order to test its usefulness in a VT context.

4.2.3 Section Summary

This section examined how RE’s focus on how within social interventions is based on realism, and how this supports causal explanations within social systems and processes to define their mechanisms and their contextual settings. In the evaluative framework, RE links the mechanisms of interactions of VT stakeholders and their contextual circumstances to the specific outcomes of sustainability performance. In addition, the section explains how middle range theories will formulate sustainability
performance. The following section explains the formulation of the framework that is based on an amalgam of different theoretical components.

4.3 Formation of the Evaluative Framework

4.3.1 Overview

The function of the evaluative framework is twofold: i) to evaluate the sustainability performance of VT, and ii) to establish a causal explanation of VT’s outcomes. This section explains how the evaluative framework is developed to achieve this, based on current knowledge in RE, collaboration theory (CT) and sustainable value chain performance. Specifically for VT, the principles of RE, collaboration theory and supply chain value management are applied in the construction of the evaluative framework. In formulating the evaluative framework for VT, the section initially explains how the framework evaluates sustainability performance and how collaboration theory is applied to the VT sustainable value chain. This is followed by a detailed explanation of the framework.

4.3.2 Volunteer Tourism Value Chain Sustainable Performance

Systematically deconstructing VT through Value chain analysis (VCA) allows the sustainability performance of its main stakeholders to be evaluated at organisational, community or micro level (Dos Santos et al., 2014; Erol et al., 2011; Fu et al., 2012; Harms et al., 2013; Satolo & Simon, 2015). VCA examines the processes and activities involved in developing and delivering a product or service, and thus the inter-relationships between suppliers; and is, therefore, applicable to VT (Braziotis et al., 2013, cited in Schaltegger & Burritt, 2014). By integrating the VCA, the framework encompasses both demand and supply, whereby the volunteers are the consumers and the host projects are part of the supply of the product or service. Within the VT supply chain, the VT product is the interaction and engagement of volunteers and host communities. The framework evaluates the interrelationships and collaborations between demand and suppliers, such as individual people within host communities and small organisations (Mitchell et al., 2014; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). In assessing the interrelationships between suppliers, i.e. different VT stakeholders, the focus is on the distinction between each supplier and the relationships they maintain (Beske & Seuring, 2014; Gold et al., 2010; Kache & Seuring, 2014). The product of VT, i.e. the engagement with the host community, is different from mainstream tourism products. Since VT is attempting to ‘make a difference’ (Mostafanezhad, 2014 p. 116), the interactions of volunteers with individuals of host communities are more purposeful in the sense of seeking to initiate some type of change.
Moreover, VT is described as a social intervention that attempts to achieve change through a transformational process based on the transfer of volunteers’ skills, knowledge or resources at community level (Brown & Korten, 1989; Bussell & Forbes, 2002; Taplin et al., 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2009). Additionally, volunteer organisations act as agents or facilitators, bringing volunteers to the host project for social, environmental or economic interventions. In the same manner, each participating stakeholder/supplier plays a specific part in contributing to the social intervention/VT product. VCA, therefore, enables the evaluative framework to explore each of the stakeholders’ contextual settings and assess how the social intervention is constructed. Significantly, VCA adds consistency and systematic structure to the process of investigating a complex social intervention, it describes a logical flow within the supply chain (Astbury, 2013). Integrating RE, the evaluative framework assesses the stakeholders collaborate relations (M), which consist of visible and observable processes, activities and communications. The contextual settings of each stakeholder (C), consist of motivations, expectations and experiences (C) (Astbury, 2013; Dalkin et al., 2015; de Souza, 2013; Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Manzano-Santaella, 2011; Schmitt & Beach, 2015; Wolpe, 2016), which influence certain outcomes and transformative change (O). Figure 4.2 illustrates the integration of the CMO and the VT value chain as a social intervention. The figure highlights the different relations between the different stakeholders (M1, M2, M3 and M4) which are shown as one directional.

Figure 4.2: Volunteer Tourism Value Chain Sustainable Performance
In addition, when considering collaboration theory, the sustainable VT value chain is two directional since the stakeholder collaborative relations (Figure 4.3) are dynamic and interactive in both directions (Gray & Wood, 1991b). For example, a two-way exchange of knowledge, expertise and resources exists between the stakeholders in their processes, activities and communications (Graci, 2013). These exchanges are significant in determining sustainability performance in that they help to identify the level of power sharing, shared decision making and value creation, as well as inter-organisational learning and joint product development amongst stakeholders. The qualitative levels of engagement and collaboration in delivering the VT product determine the sustainability performances of equality and transparency amongst stakeholders (Austin, 2000; Gray, 1989). These attributes are fully explored and explained below.

Figure 4.3: Volunteer Tourism Value Chain Sustainable Performance — reverse flow

Linear supply chains are insufficient to evaluate all the collaborative relations in VT, however, because the collaborative relations (M4) between volunteers and the host community is not included. This is significant since it is the exchange of knowledge, skills and resources in this collaboration that defines the VT product. To enclose all collaborative relations (M1-M4) within the supply chain, the evaluative framework needs to adopt a more dynamic design and move away from a conventional linear supply chain model. Figure 4.4 illustrates a circular value chain design, incorporating the collaborative relations (M4) by connecting both ends of the value chain. A circular design is a more holistic representation of the VT value chain and is appropriate for evaluating sustainability in VT since it
includes the crucial exchange and interaction between volunteers and the host community (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2009). The proposed design achieves an all-inclusive framework, which incorporates all possible collaborations equally amongst the VT stakeholders, reflecting the fact that the nature of each collaboration between the stakeholders is different. In addition, the Figure shows $M_5$ and $M_6$, which represent additional links between the stakeholders that do not follow the typical sequential flow of the supply chain. These are important since direct collaborations also exist between the volunteers and the receiving organisation ($M_5$). The sending organisation also directly collaborates with host community members, as well as with the receiving organisation ($M_6$). The framework evaluates each mechanism and associated CMO configuration in order to determine the outcomes of the VT’s intervention by determining each individual CMO pathway.

Figure 4.4: Circular Value Chain Framework
4.3.3 Causal Pathways between CMO Configurations

To understand what influences VT outcomes (O), the framework determines why and how (C) stakeholders interact with each other (M). Thus, each stakeholder’s contextual circumstance in engaging in the VT supply chain influences how and why the stakeholders interact with each other, and how and why this subsequently results in specific VT outcomes (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Dalkin et al., 2015; Schmitt & Beach, 2015; Wolpe, 2016; Astbury, 2013; Manzano-Santaella, 2011; de Souza, 2013). The linkages between Cs and Ms are specific causal pathways that influence each stage of the supply chain and its final outcome (Blamey & Mackenzie, 2007). Constructing each pathway is a crucial phase in developing the evaluative framework since it needs to be designed specifically for the particular social intervention. When constructing the six two-directional pathways, however, it can be challenging to distinguish different determinants within the CMO configuration and relate them to the specific intervention (Timmins & Miller, 2007). Existing knowledge, and the evaluator’s familiarity with the interventions are therefore critical to developing and applying the evaluative framework (Hunt & Sridharan, 2010).

Next, the pathways of the framework are further developed based on the VT supply chain. These pathways determine, firstly, how stakeholders influence their collaborative relations, and, secondly, how the collaborations influence outcomes (Greenhalgh et al., 2015; Pawson & Manzano-Santaella, 2012; Wong et al., 2016). The resulting pathways between C, M and O provide a robust structure since there are six possibilities in configuring VT’s bi-directional causal pathways, incorporating multiple Cs, Ms and Os. The six bi-directional mechanisms are based on collaborative processes and their associated relations between any of the four main stakeholders. Thus, the framework determines outcomes (O), and particular CMO configurations, based on the causal pathways (Jackson & Kolla, 2012). The pathways provide a consistent arrangement that allows for deeper exploration in evaluating the complex social intervention of the VT supply chain. Furthermore, the pathways enable the framework for each stakeholder to be evaluated in the same manner. Since there are multiple stakeholders who each influence the VT product in different ways, however, there are many possible CMO configurations and each pathway is unique. To address the complexity and diversity of the VT social intervention, therefore, the CMO configuration and its pathways need to be further developed and adapted. More intricacy, therefore, needs to be added to the pathways to enable the relationships to be explored at a deeper level.

Thus, to develop the evaluative framework for the specific social intervention of the VT supply chain, and to enable an associated in-depth evaluation, a more in-depth distinction of each component
within the CMO configuration needs to take place. Each CMO configuration is accordingly further developed into distinct components that encompass additional considerations and intricate attributes, described in detail in the following section. Specifically, the contextual settings of stakeholders can be divided into internal and external contextual conditions. External conditions describe the economic, social, environmental and political settings (C), while internal conditions relate to each stakeholder’s values, motivations and expectations (c). The mechanisms of collaborative relations are likewise divided between processes and relations (M), and describing the relations (m). Furthermore, the outcomes are divided into the short-term and immediate outcomes (T1) of the collaborative relations (o), and the long-term (T2) outcomes (O), which are an accumulation of the short-term outcomes. Adopting this intricate approach to the six pathways enables the evaluative framework to evaluate the VT value chain more accurately and in greater depth (Table 4.1 and Figure 4.5). The next section explains how each of the components is populated and evaluated.

Table 4.1: Causal Pathways linking CMO Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>MECHANISM</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>external</td>
<td>internal</td>
<td>processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c1</td>
<td>+ c2</td>
<td>+ M1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c2</td>
<td>+ c3</td>
<td>+ M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c3</td>
<td>+ c4</td>
<td>+ M3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c4</td>
<td>+ c1</td>
<td>+ M4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c5</td>
<td>+ c3</td>
<td>+ M5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C + c6</td>
<td>+ c4</td>
<td>+ M6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018
**Figure 4.5: The Evaluative Framework**

Legend
- **C**: External contexts
- **M**: Collaborative processes
- **O**: Long-term outcome
- **T_2**: Long-term
- **T_1**: Short-term
- **c**: Internal contexts
- **m**: Collaborative descriptors
- **o**: Short-term outcome

**4.3.4 Section Summary**

This section constructs the conceptual evaluative framework illustrating how the VT stakeholders holistically relate to one another in the CMO configuration and its associated components (c,m,o). It provides an overview of how the configurations link together: firstly, the stakeholders’ internal and external contextual conditions (c, C), secondly the interactions of observable collaborative processes.
(M) and collaborative descriptors (m) and thirdly, the short (T₁) and long (T₂) term outcomes (o, O).
The circular structure of the stakeholder groups and the differentiations between CMO and cmo are each important features of the proposed conceptual framework. Based on the relevant literature, the following section explains how the individual components of the CMO and cmo configurations are defined and evaluated.

4.4 Development of the CMO Configuration

4.4.1 Overview

Through a realistic evaluation lens, the previous section introduced the conceptual framework, which illustrates how each of the stakeholder groups in the VT supply chain relate to one another. This section identifies in detail each component of the conceptual framework’s CMO configurations. It defines evaluable attributes and determinants of each C, M and O (and c,m,o) and how they contribute to the evaluative framework. The section begins with an outline of the different causal pathways and continues to explain the contextual circumstances (c & C), the collaborative processes and collaborative descriptors (m & M), and, lastly, the short and long-term outcomes (o & O) over time (T₁ & T₂). The existing body of knowledge relating to evaluating performance based on collaboration theory and sustainable value chain performance and VT provides a foundation from which to populate the different components of the CMO configuration.

4.4.2 Determining and evaluating Contextual Conditions

The deconstruction of the VT’s value chain is centred on the evaluative framework encompassing the four main stakeholder groups operating at a local community level (volunteers, sending and receiving organisations and the host project). The contextual setting of each stakeholder is predominately based on an understanding of how the value chain analysis can evaluate sustainability performance. The contextual settings are distinguishable by internal (c) and external (C) settings. The internal contextual conditions (c) (Astbury, 2013; de Souza, 2013; Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Manzano-Santaella, 2011) consist of the stakeholders’ motivations, societal values and commitments, expectations and willingness to engage with others within the supply chain (Austin, 2000; Beske & Seuring, 2014; Gajda, 2004). Since each stakeholder group plays a different role in influencing the supply chain, their internal contextual conditions are different from one another; these are individually labelled as c₁ to c₄. The stakeholders’ values and sustainability orientations (c₁–c₄) influence their interactions with one another, leading to the supply chain’s sustainability. Additionally, evaluating sustainability performance requires an understanding of individuals’ or organisational sustainability orientations, strategic values, a willingness to engage, commitment, and dedication to sustainable practices (c)
Furthermore, the broader external contextual (C) settings, such as economic, political, social or environmental considerations, also influence how the stakeholders interact. Although the stakeholders engage on a micro level, external influences play a role and may originate at regional, national or international levels. It is important to include external considerations as part of the contextual settings, although care must be taken not to overload or overcomplicate the evaluative framework (Pawson & Manzano-Santaella, 2012).

The literature on VT offers an insight into the contextual settings of VT organisations, such as the lack of transparency and accountability. Organisations have been criticised for poor practices, and although their facilitative role and responsibility in respect to VT outcomes have been repeatedly emphasised, the literature provides little in the way of insight into the motivations, values and policies that define their operational and sustainable practices. Various studies have explored VT organisations’ attempts to monitor their activities and processes, but acknowledge that more research is required (e.g. Taplin et al., 2014; Lupoli et al., 2015; Lupoli & Morse, 2014b). Furthermore, the literature offers little on host project staff motivations, expectations and societal values and commitments with respect to their involvement in VT. Recent media reports of dissatisfied volunteers and exploitation of vulnerable people, such as volunteering in orphanages, incite more research in VT, but the root causes within the VT supply chain that lead to volunteers’ dissatisfaction and host projects’ exploitation are not fully understood. The details of how the framework will address these issues are outlined below.

The contextual orientation of each stakeholder group needs to be evaluated and described, because of these influence the dynamics of their relations. The contextual conditions are defined by the stakeholders’ motivations, expectations, societal values and commitment to sustainability (c) and describe the contextual orientation and settings that drive how stakeholders engage on a micro level with one another (Austin, 2000; de Souza, 2013; Westley & Vredenburg, 1991). Although stakeholder groups may consist of individuals or organisations, the descriptions of the contextual conditions are generally consistent. A summary of the descriptions (Table 4.2) illustrates the internal and external contextual settings of each stakeholder group. The stakeholders’ contextual settings influence the supply chain’s stakeholders’ collaborative relations and processes that are part of the VT intervention leading to their outcomes (Austin, 2000; de Souza, 2013). These drivers and enablers trigger the evaluable causal mechanisms that are explained in the next section.
### Table 4.2: Description of Stakeholders’ Contextual Conditions (C & c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS  C</th>
<th>INTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS  c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>economic, social, political, environmental</td>
<td>economic, social, political, environmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>Sending organisation</th>
<th>Receiving organisation</th>
<th>Host project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-motivation, expectations</td>
<td>-organisational motivation, expectations</td>
<td>-organisational motivation, expectations</td>
<td>-motivation, expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-societal values and commitment</td>
<td>-societal values and commitment (vision and purpose)</td>
<td>-societal values and commitment (vision and purpose)</td>
<td>-societal values and commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-willingness to engage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-willingness to engage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

#### 4.4.3 Determining and evaluating Mechanisms

The mechanism within the CMO configuration is described as the connection between the input and output of the ‘black box’. The mechanism explains the causal linkages, or certain behaviours by stakeholders, that lead to the particular outcomes of a social intervention (Astbury & Leeuw, 2010; Dalkin et al., 2015; de Souza, 2013; Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Schmitt & Beach, 2015). Observable processes and non-observable relations differentiate the mechanisms. The processes and interrelationships between C and O are described as the ‘observed relationship’ (Dalkin et al., 2015, p.2), which suggests that mechanisms are determined and evaluable (Dalkin et al., 2015; Schmitt & Beach, 2015). In bridging theory to practice, the middle range theories are a description or explanation of these interrelations which operationalise the mechanism (Dalkin et al., 2015; de Souza, 2013; Koenig, 2009; Marchal et al., 2016; Schmitt & Beach, 2015; Wolpe, 2016). Significantly, Dalkin et al. (2015) highlight that the mechanisms behave not as a simple binary on/off switch, emphasising instead their gradations and complexity. Mechanisms are a gradual continuum of actions or relationships that respond to certain contextual conditions to generate certain outcomes. Hunt & Sridharan (2010) describe how policies do not have causal power independent of human reasoning and similarly, processes do not have the power to change unless it is within certain contextual conditions. The causal mechanism of the evaluative framework is divided between processes, procedures and relations (M) which are defined by collaborative indicators (m).

The conceptual framework consists of six supply chain linkages (Table 4.3) that are based on the CMO configurations and their six collaborative processes, labelled as $M_1-M_6$. The framework investigates the nature of the collaborative processes within VT’s value chain, which are clearly definable. The initial collaborative process between the volunteer and sending organisation consists of volunteer...
recruitment (M\textsubscript{1}). An exchange of information takes place to match both volunteers and host projects by identifying the suitability of skills, location, skills needs, etc. A partnership (M\textsubscript{2}) exists between the sending and receiving organisations that involves procedures to operate the volunteer placements, as well as strategic planning and decision making. In addition, the receiving organisation liaises with the host project (M\textsubscript{3}), which involves various processes. The volunteer placement (M\textsubscript{4}) consists of the exchange of knowledge, experience and expertise between the volunteer and the staff of the host project. During the volunteer placement, the receiving organisation liaises with the volunteer directly (M\textsubscript{5}) in dealing with logistics such as transportation. Finally, direct engagement (M\textsubscript{6}) occurs between the sending organisation and the local host project when staff members visit the host project. In differentiating each causal mechanism, within the framework, the procedures between the stakeholders are individually evaluated based on collaboration theory.

Table 4.3: Summary of Mechanisms in Volunteer Tourism (M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Partnership Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>Host Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{4}</td>
<td>Volunteer Placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{5}</td>
<td>Volunteer Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M\textsubscript{6}</td>
<td>Host Project Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

In addition to these processes and procedures, De Souza (2013) describes how mechanisms can operate at different strata or directions. Amalgamated within the collaborative relationships between the stakeholders (M), the evaluative framework considers both the personal collaborative relationships and the overall processes and procedures. Long-term decision making practices, structures and processes, including self-assessment, reflectiveness and continued learning, both develop, maintain and improve the VT product and thus understanding them through the evaluative framework can make significant contributions to the evaluation of the supply chain’s performance. The trust and support of other stakeholders, as well as building long-term relationships, are also crucial elements that build on mutual sharing of risks and benefits, joint product development and planning and building capacity for other stakeholders (Beske & Seuring, 2014). A further attribute is sharing the risks and benefits of each of the stakeholders since this contributes to the continuation and performance of the whole supply chain. In the case of a weakened collaborative relationship, the whole supply chain may be affected, possibly jeopardising the final product or service (Getz & Jamal, 1995). Thus, the supply chain’s overall performance is determined based on the mechanisms between
stakeholders. The collaborative descriptors (m) of the interpersonal relations are incorporated into the mechanisms of the evaluative framework’s CMO configuration (Table 4.4). Based on the CT literature, the collaborative descriptors (m) of the collaborative relations between stakeholders are evaluated.

The effectiveness of collaboration, including community engagement and communications, are evaluable qualities that define the nature of the stakeholders’ relations (Austin, 2000; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Brown, 1991; Gajda, 2004; Munanura & Backman, 2012). Evaluating collaborative relations is a multifaceted task based on various attributes, such as the processes of integration, the level of interdependency, and the strengths of decision and policy making. Additionally, the co-existence, degree and scope of consensus amongst each stakeholder, shared aims and visions, as well as responses to external factors and influences, are all important (Roberts & Bradley, 1991; Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Gray, 1989; Selsky, 1991). Furthermore, the level of exchanges in knowledge, expertise and resources, and the formation of personal relationships and cultural exchanges are significant during the volunteer placement. These exchanges constitute the VT product/service, particularly between volunteers and host beneficiaries (Wearing & Grabowski, 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). This applies to both individuals, organisations and their staff within the VT supply chain (Waddock, 1989; Waddock & Post, 1995). In drawing together these attributes (Table 4.4), the evaluative framework explores the collaborative descriptors (m) of each of the processes and interrelations between stakeholders. Although there is a risk of over-complicating the framework, the collaborative indicators are able to define and explain the complex and highly varied processes, procedures and relations. Thus, the qualitative nature of the indicators defines the nature and intensity of each of the mechanisms between each of the stakeholders. The indicators detail the pathways through which contextual conditions trigger certain mechanisms in producing particular outcomes.

Table 4.4: Summary of Collaborative Descriptors (m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE DESCRIPTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>willingness to engage (m_wes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level of integration and engagement (m_ine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing aims and values (m_sav)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint planning and product development (m_jpp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint decision making and power sharing (m_jdm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- joint problem solving (m_jps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- level of exchange of skills and expertise (m_exk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- building capacity for other stakeholders (m_cas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sharing risks and benefits (m_srb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- joint reflectivity and monitoring (m_jrm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cultural exchange (m_cul)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018
4.4.4 Determining and evaluating Outcomes

This final section on the CMO components explains and describes the outcomes. The importance of evaluating the sustainability performances of social values and impacts on host communities is acknowledged (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli & Morse, 2014), but there is currently little empirical evidence to suggest how transformative change achieves sustainability at a community level (Forrest & Wiek, 2014, 2015). It is recognised that the inclusion of the collaborative relations between all stakeholders in the VT supply chain results in sustainability, hence the emphasis is on evaluating the outcomes of those collaborative relations, including impacts at a local level (Brown, 1991; Gajda, 2004; Munanura & Backman, 2012). The evaluative approach also needs to allow for the inclusion of unknown and unintentional outcomes (Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011). Lupoli’s exploratory study includes the local community and reveals their preferences in respect to indicators, but that study requires further development to assess local impacts (Lupoli et al., 2014). Considering VT organisations, and evaluating VT’s performances, and its management practices, Taplin highlights the need to take account of the context when developing a methodological approach, including an understanding of the implications of different contexts (Taplin et al., 2014). Similarly with collaborative relationships, the outcomes are evaluable based on the aims and objectives of the volunteer project (Gajda, 2004).

Table 4.5: Summary of Outcomes (O)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES T₁</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host-Guest Interaction, Equality, Transparency, Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE</th>
<th>LONG-TERM OUTCOMES T₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational, Social and Economic mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

The outcomes (o & O) are differentiated between short-term outcomes (o) and long-term outcomes (O). Short-term outcomes (o) occur immediately at the point of each volunteer placement (T₁), while long-term outcomes (O) are the accumulation of many volunteer placements over a long period of time (T₂), demonstrating transformational changes to all stakeholders. Specific to the VT supply chain, the sustainability performance is evaluated by practices, for instance, that indicate transparency, accountability, and the effectiveness and nature of the collaboration (o). Thus, according to the current literature power balance, equality and independence amongst stakeholders are critical in achieving sustainable VT. Accumulative short-term outcomes may result in long-term transformational impacts. (Table 4.5). Thus, positive transformational change demonstrates sustainability performance, such as social mobility for example (O). Transformative change and
benefits to the host project and its staff define one of the desirable outcomes in VT (Coghlan & Gooch, 2011; Kontogeorgopoulos, 2014). This transformative change relates to the contextual settings and causal mechanisms. The evaluative framework aims to explore if and how the VT supply chain operates to foster transformative change and to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving sustainability performance.

**4.4.5 Section Summary**

Based on the current literature, this section has explained the evaluative framework, detailing each of the CMO configurations and their associated attributes and characteristics (Figure 4.6). It has elaborated how the framework has been theoretically constructed and adapted to VT. By testing the evaluative framework, the CMO configurations demonstrating which contextual settings and mechanisms influence VT’s sustainability performances will be determined. The findings of this testing of the CMO configurations are shown in the results chapter (Chapter 6).
Figure 4.6: Summary of the CMO Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>economic, social, political, environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>Sending organisation</th>
<th>Receiving organisation</th>
<th>Host project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C_2)</td>
<td>(C_3)</td>
<td>(C_4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-motivation, expectations -societal values and commitment -willingness to engage</td>
<td>-organisational motivation, expectations -societal values and commitment (vision and purpose) -willingness to engage</td>
<td>-organisational motivation, expectations -societal values and commitment (vision and purpose) -willingness to engage</td>
<td>-motivation, expectations -societal values and commitment -willingness to engage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES**

- \(M_1\) Volunteer Recruitment
- \(M_2\) Partnership Management
- \(M_3\) Host project management
- \(M_4\) Volunteer Placement
- \(M_5\) Volunteer management
- \(M_6\) Host Project Assessment

**COLLABORATIVE DESCRIPTORS**

- willingness to engage (\(m_{wes}\))
- level of integration and engagement (\(m_{ine}\))
- sharing aims and values (\(m_{sav}\))
- joint planning and product development (\(m_{jpp}\))
- joint decision making and power sharing (\(m_{jdm}\))
- joint problem solving (\(m_{jps}\))
- level of exchange of skills and expertise (\(m_{exk}\))
- building capacity for other stakeholders (\(m_{cas}\))
- sharing risks and benefits (\(m_{srb}\))
- joint reflectivity and monitoring (\(m_{jrm}\))
- cultural exchange (\(m_{cul}\))

**COLLABORATIVE OUTCOMES**  **SHORT-TERM**  **\(T_1\)**

- Equality, Transparency, Empowerment, Cultural Exchange

**TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE**  **LONG-TERM**  **\(T_2\)**

- Social mobility, Educational, Social and Economic

Author, 2018
4.5 The Methodological Considerations in Testing the Framework

4.5.1 Overview

Based on recent empirical studies in VT and RE, this section deals with the methodology used to apply the evaluative framework in a case study. This includes the methodological design of the research instrument used to test the evaluative framework. Initially, the section discusses the rationale for using a qualitative approach to test the framework, followed by the generalisability and ‘cumulation’ in applying the framework. The section continues to discuss the positionality and objectivity of the evaluator, before a detailed consideration of the inclusion of communities as stakeholders. Based on these methodological considerations, the methods are constructed in the following chapter (Chapter 5).

4.5.2 A Critical Qualitative Approach

Although the body of knowledge on evaluating sustainability performance in VT has evolved, the methodological approaches applied have been limited and inconsistent. Some empirical studies in VT have applied quantitative or mixed methods (Alexander, 2012; Jackson & Kolla, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Knollenberg et al., 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014; Wong, Newton & Newton, 2014). The majority, however, have applied a qualitative and single case study approach, with some of these studies providing evidence of the impacts of VT (Coren & Gray, 2012; Phelan, 2015; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014). In this thesis, the limitations of investigating sustainability performance in VT are acknowledged and integrated into the methodology. To determine the framework’s usefulness in an industry setting requires an exploratory qualitative approach that allows for in-depth interpretative analysis of each of the collaborative relationships between the stakeholders within VT’s value chain. This necessitates that the evaluative framework takes a critical qualitative approach to evaluating the sustainability performance of the VT intervention by assessing the outcomes and the collaborative relationships between all stakeholders holistically. A systematic methodology of evaluating the stakeholders’ collaborative relationships and the impacts of these is crucial (Lupoli & Morse, 2014). Underpinned by CT, the participatory multi-stakeholder approach adopted here includes the host community.

To ensure usefulness and applicability within an industry setting, this approach attempts to consider the practicalities, such as the accessibility of data and efficiency of evaluating performance through collaboration and its outcomes (Lupoli & Morse, 2014; Lupoli et al., 2014, 2015; Taplin et al., 2014). It is an important element of the framework’s approach that it is not applying a specific set of sustainability evaluations, indicators or guidelines. The framework is instead based on evaluating positive transformational change that can indicate sustainability. Through the theoretical
construction, the framework possesses several attributes, which can address limitations of past
empirical work; namely the heterogeneity of stakeholders and the complexity of different social
circumstances. According to Lupoli et al. (2015), the data obtained through their indicator
development approach is unsuitable for generalisability beyond the applied case study. Consequently,
if it is to be applied as a self-assessment tool by practitioners, the evaluative framework needs to be
adaptable to different social and cultural situations. Its approach is therefore based on the
interpretation and application of specifically designed theoretical concepts (Gajda, 2004; Selsky,
1991). Likewise, the framework bases its approach on several concepts, integrating RE in its
assessment of the collaborative relationships of the stakeholders within VT’s value chain. The
approach incorporates heterogeneity and complex social settings to evaluate values of collaboration
without evaluating specific social, economic or geographic attributes (Astbury, 2013; Hunt &
Sridharan, 2010; Manzano-Santaella, 2011), thereby evaluating the contextual conditions, the causal
actions undertaken by stakeholders and the overall outcome of sustainability performance.

The pluralistic nature of RE makes it neither qualitative nor quantitative (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). Other
realistic evaluators point towards a combination of methods that are possibly most suitable to capture
data relating to C, M and O (Manzano-Santaella, 2011). The nature of data on the outcomes (O) is
possibly different from the data relating to context (C) and mechanism (M), however. Furthermore, a
data-driven strategy based on the researcher’s theory is the subject of the data collection, and
participants accept, reject or adjust the theory (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, p. 155). Put another way, the
middle range theories derived from existing academic and grey literature, are tested, developed and
refined during the evaluation (Manzano, 2016). Testing the framework requires a qualitative and case
study approach both to explore empirically how the CMO configurations are applied in a real situation,
and to determine how and what information can be derived from how each C, M and O relate to one
another, and what has the most influence on the outcomes (O). The emphasis on how, what and why
suggests a qualitative nature of inquiry (Silverman, 2014). In this study, the research questions have a
narrow scope and require a deep analysis which relate to volunteer placements and the involved
stakeholders (Bryman, 2016). Manzano-Santaella suggests that evaluations are always case studies
because they are limited in space and time so as to be able to perform a full investigation and allow
for organisational complexity and multi-agency initiatives, such as dealing with different stakeholders.
Although the outcomes may be specific to the case study and its locality, she suggests in respect to
her study that the same outcomes are applicable elsewhere (Manzano-Santaella, 2011). Furthermore,
Koenig (2009) concludes that a critical case study approach is useful and can lead to positive
contributions in testing the CMO configurations.
4.5.3 Generalisability and ‘Cumulation’

Evaluative research focuses on generalisations from data (Clarke, 1999). Pawson and Tilley suggest that evaluations need to take into account different circumstances and settings, which leads to the ‘cumulation’ of evidence. They define cumulation as a deeper understanding of how CMO are connected in detecting, formalising, defining and specifying patterns. They emphasise ‘traversing between general theory (abstract configuration) and empirical case study (focused configuration)’. A series of evaluations, or a set of existing evaluation studies (meta-evaluation), can lead to cumulation, but this is not always possible. In individually performed evaluations, cumulation is achieved by incorporating the results of other empirical studies. Additionally, improvements, in theory, can be achieved through reliability and replicability (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, p. 116). Based on the constructivist paradigm, social intervention cannot be generalised, since interventions and their outcomes are never the same. Through RE, on the other hand, Pawson and Tilley incorporate an experimentalist approach of validating causal explanations by applying both internal and external checks. Internal validity is a process of eliminating other plausible explanations that may influence outcomes. External validity is based on the replication of the social intervention in similar settings, although this is challenging to achieve in practice.

Pawson and Tilley summarise ‘realists know that science does not arrive at laws inductively and, therefore, search for cumulation beyond the thicket of specification’, and further suggest that generalisation is a form of abstraction, opposed to typicality (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, p. 119). They emphasise that, in RE, generalisability is not achieved by the traditional means of representation of a population sample, but through the process of transferring ‘sets of ideas’, and ‘not sets of data’. This suggests that commonalities and thematic traits can also provide generalisability (Chelimsky, 2013). By developing a theory that constructs an ‘organising framework’ RE can extract patterns and commonalities that can be applied effectively in other case studies. The evaluative framework, constructed by CT, and applying RE, therefore allows for the generalisability and transferability of the common themes. The relationship between theoretical and empirical application contributes to the body of knowledge, and this allows the results of the evaluative framework to be applied elsewhere. This is underpinned by the understanding that applying the CMO configuration is a process of simplification and not an attempt to typify interventions, suggesting that CMO is a process of abstraction. In this case, the refinement of the middle range theory associated with the testing of the evaluative framework opens the way for the theory to be applicable in other case studies within VT and tourism.
4.5.4 Integrating Community Members into Qualitative Studies

Most VT studies focus predominately on one stakeholder. Only a minority of studies examine several stakeholders and deal with the intricacies of the interrelationships in the VT value chain, and the complexity of interactions and understandings of stakeholders’ values, opinions and perceptions (Burrai et al., 2014; Gray & Campbell, 2007; Lupoli et al., 2015). Some empirical studies emphasise the necessity for a multi-stakeholder approach and community participation in gathering data (Lupoli et al., 2015), and this is relevant to VT studies in order to incorporate outcomes and establish effective mechanisms (Byng et al., 2005; Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011; Timmins & Miller, 2007). Engaging with beneficiaries such as community members in VT research has produced a variety of results. Lupoli et al. (2015), for example, suggest that involving community members in providing their input in a bottom-up approach results in community-orientated benefits, and the researchers claim that community members involved in the research process are empowered as a result. A community’s contribution to research does not instantaneously lead to empowerment, however.

To reflect more on VT’s performances, Lupoli et al. (2015) concluded that their research would benefit from additional questionnaires with community members and VT organisations (Lupoli & Morse, 2014). It is important to note that the framework can potentially be applied as a self-reflective and learning tool and that it allows for the integration of all stakeholders. In responsible tourism studies, the benefits of reflectiveness and feedback mechanisms based on a multi-stage process are evident, and a similar approach can be taken in testing the framework (Byng et al., 2005; Hewitt et al., 2012). Burrai et al. (2014) examine the perceptions of volunteers and destination stakeholders and successfully deal with the complexity and heterogeneity of human interactions between a selection of stakeholder groups. Additionally, Gray and Campbell (2007) interview all four main stakeholder groups (volunteers, receiving and sending organisations, and host community) producing evaluative results. Both studies use in-depth interviews for each of the stakeholder groups. In contrast, Lupoli’s indicator development involves participatory workshops for community members and quantitative questionnaires for VT organisations. Although the researchers accentuate the blended techniques that are essential for capturing data from different stakeholders, their approach yields only some of the systematic qualities that are required in applying the framework (Lupoli et al., 2015).

Within realistic evaluation and collaboration theory literature, qualitative studies demonstrate that semi-structured in-depth interviews are a successfully proven instrument for capturing data from stakeholder groups (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Graci, 2013; Ladkin & Bertramini, 2002; Selsky, 1991) and enabling social interventions (Byng et al., 2005; Jackson & Kolla, 2012; Koenig, 2009; Nanninga &
In VT, semi-structured and in-depth interviews have been designed for each main target group (Burrai et al., 2014; Lupoli et al., 2015; Palacios, 2010; Phelan, 2015). Overall, a qualitative approach allows the framework to be tested in a case study setting at a micro level; further justification of the research instrument and design based on realistic evaluation is provided in Section 5.3.

4.5.5 The Role of the Realistic Evaluator - Positionality and Objectivity

Taplin et al.’s study reveals claims of VT organisations participating in the evaluation and monitoring of VT projects to be untrue and flawed due to power imbalances and inequalities. They also raise the important question of who the evaluator is since impartiality is compromised if a VT organisation also acts as the evaluator of their monitoring activities (Taplin et al., 2014). In other studies, similar issues of the researchers’ position and perspective in relation to research participants are evident (Lupoli et al., 2015). RE, however, theoretically underpinned by CT, provides a systematic and well-formulated methodology to determine and relate specific contexts or mechanisms to certain outcomes within the framework (Timmins & Miller, 2007). This provides an all-encompassing approach to examine the interrelations between the VT stakeholders in an impartial and robust manner. Taking an all-inclusive approach, some qualitative studies are successful as self-critical self-assessment or analytical tools to assess collaborative alliances (Gajda, 2004). Clarke (1999) states that a qualitative researcher needs to get close to the subjects and to understand their point of view and gain their knowledge; this rejects scientific objectivity in favour of phenomenological subjectivity.

A qualitative method is inductive with the aim to achieve wider generalisations from the collected data. In taking a qualitative approach, the evaluator focuses on gathering participants’ views or opinions. This requires an in-depth approach, suggesting interviewing participants without predetermined goals or expectations. This means that the instrument needs to be open-ended and flexible for participants to have the freedom to share information, such as opinions, feelings and thoughts, with the researcher. Qualitative researchers should be reflective of their own biased interpretation based on their own socio-economic background and status such as gender, ethnicity and culture, as well as being aware of their cultural and social role as a researcher when interacting with participants (Creswell, 2014). Interviewing participants is an unequal interaction, in that the researcher has more control in conducting the interview, which is based on the research’s agenda. Thus, the nature of the relationship between the researcher as an interviewer and the interviewee is challenging (Creswell, 2013). Participants may respond to this imbalance, by, for example, being unwilling to share sensitive information, particularly on issues of a power imbalance or relating to
their cultural identity and history. This could limit the depth of the obtainable data. Developing rapport with the participants is discussed in the following chapter (Section 5.3.4).

Realistic researchers are frequently considered to be evaluators (Byng et al., 2005; Hewitt et al., 2012; Holma & Kontinen, 2011; Hunt & Sridharan, 2010; Jackson & Kolla, 2012; Nanninga & Glebbeek, 2011; Timmins & Miller, 2007). Depending on the aims and nature of the evaluation, there are multiple positionalities of the researcher, who may adopt a role as facilitator, collaborator, external expert, internal colleague or advocate (Clarke, 1999). If possible, a realist evaluator should be prepared and have existing knowledge of the settings and the intervention from existing academic and grey literature (Manzano, 2016). In this research, the evaluator is externally positioned with no direct stake in the case study’s supply chain. This is a more objective position for each of the involved stakeholders. Based on interpretations of the framework, an RE approach considers different perspectives. A realistic evaluator gains a deeper appreciation and understanding, they share their intuitions on how and why a social intervention might work and ask for comments; specifically asking participants what has the most influence on the outcomes (Timmins & Miller, 2007; Wand et al., 2010). Engaging with all stakeholders captures different perspectives of the case study’s outcome.

### 4.5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter explained how and why VT’s outcomes and impacts can be determined by an innovative approach to constructing an evaluative framework that evaluates sustainability performance. The concept of the framework is based on the current VT literature and sustainable indicators and sustainable supply chain analysis. The framework addresses current knowledge in incorporating all VT’s stakeholders, including community members, and examines the different processes and interactions within the VT supply chain. The evaluative framework provides an innovative approach in terms of examining all VT stakeholders to assess the power balances between different stakeholders, and how these influence the final VT outcomes. The framework finds its theoretical roots in evaluating the social intervention constructed by RE and CT and evaluating transformational change, allowing it to deal with different social, economic, political and environmental circumstances. The assembly of pathways linking the stakeholders, their collaborative relationships with one another, and the outcomes (CMO), are significant in determining triangular interactions. The framework aims to offer robustness and consistency while also being adaptable and transferable to different settings in an effort to identify the pathways that most influence VT’s outcomes and that are the most significant drivers of VT’s sustainability performances.
The chapter addresses the fundamental attributes of generalisability, reliability, viability and objectivity in the corresponding sections. Based on Pawson and Tilley’s (1997) argument for how RE is rooted in realism, their theory-driven approach substantiates the chosen method. In adopting their interpretation of generalisability through ‘cumulation’ of the transferability of sets of ideas the framework is able to attain the necessary quality, as previously discussed. Qualitatively testing the framework in a case study will demonstrate its validity and usefulness. Semi-structured interviews with all stakeholders are a valid research instrument allowing each of the interviews to be adopted to suit the heterogeneity of the stakeholders while maintaining consistency. Based on these methodological considerations, the precise method used to test the framework is presented in the following Chapter (Chapter 5).
5 Methods

5.1 Introduction

The previous chapter explained the methodological considerations in testing the framework. It concluded how the framework attempted to address the heterogeneity and complexity of different social settings when explaining the CMO configuration and its evaluable attributes. The evaluative framework attempts to address some of the limitations and challenges of evaluating sustainability by constructing a systematic approach based on realistic evaluation and collaboration theory, with a qualitative approach being used to test the framework. The aim of this chapter is to elaborate on the appropriate methods and build an audit trail that explains the research instrument, sample strategy, data handling and analysis. The last sections explain the ethical considerations and issues, including the risks to participants and the researcher, informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity. This chapter leads to Chapter 6, which presents the results of applying the evaluative framework.

5.2 The Research Instrument – Semi-structured Interviews

This section deals with the rationale for the research instrument used to test the evaluative framework empirically (Objective 3). Based on the previous chapter (Section 4.6), the section critically evaluates the choice of research design and instrument to ensure a reliable and valid research strategy. Clarity is needed on what method works best in terms of gathering data realistically, practically and effectively to obtain the right information. The interview scripts were adapted for each study group (Appendix I), indicating which sets of questions relate to each C, M, O component. Questions relate to the values, processes, level of interactions, relations and outcomes. The semi-structured interview allows for any clarification that respondents may have, as it enables investigation of certain aspects and additional in-depth questions, and encourages respondents to provide as many of their own ideas, opinions and viewpoints as possible. The interview needs to support an exchange of ideas and learning, allowing respondents to play an active role in the RE process. Thus, the interview is designed to allow respondents to explain their choices and rationale, experiences, expectations and opinions that relate to C, M and O (Pawson & Tilley, 1997; Wong et al., 2016). As Clarke concludes, a researcher’s task is not only to establish the truths but to ensure all truths are accurately collected (Clarke, 1999, p. 39).

A combination of structured and unstructured questions are ‘sensible’ and ‘advantageous’, as this provides the necessary flexibility to gather appropriate and diverse data (Pawson & Tilley, 1997, p. 154). Since structured questions are suitable for evaluating outputs, and unstructured questions for
reasoning and understanding, a mixture of both will explore C, M and O (Pawson & Tilley, 2004; Wong et al., 2016). Questions are directly related to the attributes of C, M and O so as to investigate their connectivity (Byng et al., 2005; Jackson & Kolla, 2012). Accordingly, the interview questions are based on the CMO configuration, which allows for an in-depth investigation of their attributes and characteristics and explores their connectivity (c,m,o). Each stakeholders’ values, skills and experiences (c) are explored, as well as their wider external settings (environmental, socio-economic, political) (C). In addition, their collaborative interrelationships (m) are fully investigated while determining how they influence different (intended and unintended) outcomes (o,O) (Wong et al., 2016). Comparing the different CMOs between each of the stakeholders based on the nature of the collaborative relations amongst them allows an exploration of why and how influences the outcomes of sustainability performances (O). In addition to the semi-structured interviews, other secondary sources such as reports, internal forms, audits and websites were used. Secondary data was sourced from other industry organisations, the case study organisations, and specific websites, and was used to complement the primary data (Manzano, 2016).

5.3 Sampling Strategy

5.3.1 Section Overview

The theoretical considerations for choosing the appropriate sampling strategy are based on the research strategy outlined above, which in turn directly links to the aim of this study. The section, therefore, begins by identifying and describing the population of VT organisations, since this directly defines the different samples of VT stakeholders. The aim is to identify a representative sample or case study from among the wider population of VT organisations so as to enable a non-biased selection process and thus improve the generalisability. The section continues to outline sampling for each stakeholder group within the theoretical context, detailing the reliability of the sampling before continuing to the data collection section.

5.3.2 Purposive Sampling

The sample is defined by the middle range theories (Section 4.2) of determining sustainability performance by applying the evaluative framework. The middle range theories in this study are the evaluation of why VT stakeholders’ contextual conditions and how their relations influence particular outcomes of sustainability performance. Consequently, the case study’s supply chain consisting of four stakeholder groups define the sample. The evaluative framework aims to determine the why and how leading to sustainable performance, and thus choosing a supply chain with known sustainability performance allows the framework to be fully tested in terms of how it determines the pathways of
what contextual conditions trigger certain mechanisms of collaborative relations amongst stakeholders. Since the sampling strategy is predetermined by the aim of testing the framework and its middle range theories, a non-probability purposive sampling or generic purposive sampling approach is suggested (Bryman, 2016). This is a narrow range of the sample, but it is essential for the specific research purpose of Objectives 2 and 3 (Creswell, 2013). Thus, sampling consists of several levels of specific sampling selections, and four hierarchical levels of sampling are identified: i) the sending organisation, ii) the receiving organisation and iii) the local host projects, and, iv) the volunteers, host project staff and organisations’ staff. Based on the research’s objectives, the study groups comprise of the stakeholder groups previously identified, and the participants of each study group are pre-determined.

The approach is a fixed non-sequential purposive sampling strategy for all levels, which is not subject to change while the research is in progress (Bryman, 2016). Purposive sampling is frequently applied at a local level for community members or to evaluate sustainability performance (Blackstock et al., 2008; Mshenga & Richardson, 2012; Park & Yoon, 2011), and also in using RE (Byng et al., 2005). For the priori purposive sample, the criterion for each level of selection is defined differently and focuses on the inclusion of participants from each stakeholder group (Table 5.1). This kind of purposive sampling is also used in other VT and tourism studies with similar characteristics of evaluation since it allows for case-specific advantages during data collection and ensures in-depth and rich data (e.g. Kirillova et al., 2015; Mostafanezhad, 2014b; Zahra & McGehee, 2013). This sampling strategy is also known as criteria sampling (Bryman, 2016; Creswell, 2013) and it provides an optimal setting for achieving Objective 3, as well as meeting practical and logistical considerations (Silverman, 2014).

The selection of the case study, and subsequently each related stakeholder group, is detailed below (Table 5.1) and thus populates the conceptual framework as described in Section 4.4. The criteria at each hierarchical level differ in order to accommodate the specific circumstances. The case study selection in Level I focuses particularly on the specific purpose of testing the framework’s ability to evaluate sustainability performance in VT (see above). In addition, the chosen sending organisation is based in the UK because this is practical and logistically convenient. Further significant considerations in selecting a case study are gaining access to potential participants within the organisations, language and time zone. Access to all stakeholders is crucial in gathering in-depth data about CMOs because the evaluative framework needs to be all-encompassing and holistic.
Table 5.1: Sampling Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Sending organisation</td>
<td>-representative of sending organisations’ population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-suitability of VT value chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-demonstrate sustainability performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-existing relations with receiving organisations for subsequent selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-supportive of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Receiving organisation</td>
<td>-existing relations with sending organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-existing relations with projects for subsequent selection levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-provision of field work support such as transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-reasonable access to project locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Host project projects</td>
<td>-reasonable access to location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-reasonable number of potential participants, such as volunteers and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Organisation staff</td>
<td>-reasonable number of potential participants, such as volunteers and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>-volunteered at selected host projects in recent years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Host project staff</td>
<td>-regularly interacted with volunteers in recent years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-English language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

Consequently, the researcher selected sending and receiving organisations that demonstrate sustainability performance and, to support the selection process, the annual World Responsible Tourism Awards were used to identify organisations with sustainability achievements. The awards are based on an industry peer-review process of publicly selected nominations. By applying the awards’ results as part of the selection process, organisations with recognised accomplishments were highlighted from a large population. In reviewing the results, the most notable achievements were by peopleandplaces. Compared with other organisations, it demonstrated frequent, consistent and relevant achievements. Peopleandplaces received the annual award three times, in 2007 as a highly recommended volunteer organisation, in 2009 as the winner of the best volunteer organisation, and in 2013 as the best campaigning organisation. Peopleandplaces works with numerous receiving organisations in the stakeholder map.

---

8 www.travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk
Extensive discussions took place with the operational director of *peopleandplaces* to support the process of selecting the appropriate receiving organisation for Level II. Additional considerations included: i) an organisation that had a long relationship with *peopleandplaces*, ii) one with a sufficient number of volunteers and project staff who were willing to participate in this study. The receiving organisation chosen was *Calabash Tours*, based in South Africa. Recognised by the same awards as the sending organisation, the annual World Responsible Tourism Awards, *Calabash Tours* also won the same award in 2004 as the best organisation for poverty alleviation. This was based on their township tours, allowing township residents to access tourism markets, and highlights Calabash Tours’ sustainability credentials. In placing volunteers, *Calabash Tours* works continuously with at least ten elementary schools and one community health centre. This provided an adequate range of projects from which to select participants who work directly with volunteers. The project staff are predominately English speakers and are accessible with relative ease in the districts of Port Elizabeth Bay. *Calabash* is also able to provide onsite assistance with transportation and other logistics, which is a relevant safety concern for addressing lone working (Section 5.6).

For Level III, the selection criteria for host projects are: i) projects that have frequently placed volunteers from *peopleandplaces* in the recent past, and, ii) ones with a pool of staff who have worked with volunteers. The selection for the project was supported and extensively discussed with the operations director of *Calabash Tours*. The selection of projects is critical for the following level. It was important to select projects who have hosted volunteers frequently in the past twelve months, and a further consideration was the location of the project to ensure reasonable travel and logistical access.

There were three sample groups at Level IV: the volunteers, project staff who work directly with volunteers, and the sending and receiving volunteer organisation’s staff. The selected volunteers were hosted at the selected local projects in the 12-18 months preceding the data collection. Similarly, the project staff were selected on the basis that they had worked with volunteers. Indeed, some participants of the sample groups had worked together. This allowed both volunteers and staff to recall their experiences confidently and ensured depth and richness of data. The receiving organisation’s staff consisted of one operational director, who regularly had contact with the volunteers, and the host project staff.

---
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5.3.3 Rapport and Access

Access and rapport influence the sampling approach since it facilitates data collection (Bryman, 2016). The researcher benefits from an existing long-term rapport that is based on the researcher conducting some short-term project work for **peopleandplaces** in the past. This rapport enabled facilitation and access to **peopleandplaces**, as well as general support for this research study. The researcher also relied on her in-depth professional knowledge of the VT market and organisations, gained from longstanding industry experiences. During the development of this research, **peopleandplaces** and **Calabash Tours** acted as gatekeepers (Creswell, 2014). They granted permission for the researcher to access potential participants by agreeing to take part in the study. The existing rapport with **peopleandplaces** facilitated the development of a working relationship with **Calabash Tours**. The rapport with both organisations proved crucial in encouraging potential participants of the different sample groups to agree to take part in the study. For example, the researcher was introduced to participants in a formal but friendly manner through introductions from **Calabash Tours’** Director to the schools’ headmasters and the Health and Advice Centre’s Manager (gatekeepers). These introductions resulted in participants being open, welcoming and willing in take part in the research. The researcher built a rapport with each participant through prior familiarisation and informal conversations and invited participants to ask any questions relating to the study, a process that may have lasted for up to fifteen minutes.

5.3.4 Sample Saturation and Size

Bryman (2016) suggests that there is no set rule for qualitative sample sizes that lead to convincing results, and it is always a challenge to determine the appropriate balance of number of interviews and sample saturation. Sample size depends on varying factors, such as the scope of the research foci and the nature of the sample groups. This research has a narrow and deep scope that relies on intensive analysis. Since the objectives of this research are very specific, a relatively small sample size is suggested. This is typical for phenomenological studies in which participants share their experience of the phenomena (Creswell, 2013, p. 155). To reach sample saturation for testing the framework involves a number of different sample groups and deep analysis in exploring their interrelationships. This also suggests that relatively small sample sizes are necessary (Bryman, 2016). While there are four sample groups (Table 5.2), who are stakeholders within the supply chain, each is homogeneous since participants share several common criteria. According to Creswell, phenomenological studies should include 3-10 participants (Creswell, 2014, p. 189). With this in mind, in this study, the researcher acknowledged saturation while conducting the interviews with several sample groups by observing recurring themes. When this occurred, the researcher explored new themes, as well as
verifying the recurring themes with subsequent participants. This allowed a full exploration of the specific details of information (Creswell, 2013).

Table 5.2: Overview of Sample Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample groups</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>UK &amp; South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending organisations</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving organisations</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host project staff (direct)</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

5.4 Data Collection

5.4.1 Section Overview

This section outlines the details of the data collection and elaborates on some of the logistical and practical aspects of collecting data in the UK and South Africa. One stage of the data collection took place at host project locations in Port Elizabeth Bay’s townships. This involved interviewing project staff who directly worked with volunteers, the director and staff of the receiving organisation. Interviews with sending organisations’ staff and volunteers based in the UK took place over the phone or using VoIP technology (Skype). The interview scripts were piloted extensively with one volunteer to reflect on how the questions were asked, and the suitability and timing of the interview (Creswell, 2013). It was not possible to carry out an extensive pilot for all sample groups since the narrowly focused sample made it difficult to source participants with similar socio-economic circumstances and experiences or positions. Mindful of this, the researcher reflected back after each interview to review any possible adjustments that might be made. In practice, however, few amendments were necessary.

5.4.2 Brief Description of the Host Projects

In total, the researcher visited three different projects in Port Elizabeth Bay: two primary township schools, *Emafini* and *W.B. Tshume*, located in the KwaDesi and KwaZakele 2 districts, and one community health centre, the *Emmanuel Advice Care Centre* (EACC), located on the outskirts of Port Elisabeth Bay in KwaNoxolo district (Appendix IV). It is important to recognise that each of these host projects operate continuously and the volunteer placements are merely an additional element to their usual operational practices and community services, which should be considered as distinct entities within their community.
The two primary schools, *Emafini* and *W.B. Tshume*, are part of a selection of ten schools that receive external funding through donations and sponsorships. A headmaster established the informal programme, with the support of the Calabash Trust, with the aim of improving education in township schools. Primarily, the volunteer placements are to support English or Maths teachers in the classroom, providing their knowledge and expertise to enhance their teaching skills and to act as assistant teachers due to the large numbers of children in each class. Volunteers are predominately retired teachers, and volunteers without teaching qualifications provide support with the administration or constructing and maintaining classroom facilities such as a library and computer room. The two schools visited were very different in location, size, number of students and classroom facilities. Emafini primary school has approximately 1300 students compared with W.B. Tshume, with approximately 500 students. Class sizes average 35-45 students for both primary schools, and most students are from impoverished neighbourhoods.

The primary aim of EACC is to provide community care and health services for people and their families with HIV/AIDS. The centre was established by a Scottish expatriate in 2001, but the founder has since returned to the UK. In 2005, EACC\(^\text{10}\) was formally registered as a not-for-profit organisation in South Africa and was affiliated to the district health facilities. At the time of the data collection, EACC had an operational five-year work plan and a formal governance structure consisting of technical advisers, a board, trustees and a committee. The care provided involves house visits, a crèche for vulnerable children affected by HIV/AIDS, a support group for residents, education on prevention, youth activities and weekly meals for residents. In the past, the centre has received donations such as office furniture, kitchen equipment, a new toilet block. Utilities such as water and electricity are also available. Several shipping containers provide basic and functional office and storage space for the centre. Recent developments include a vegetable garden.

None of the centre’s staff are formally trained for the roles they fulfil, including the centre manager, operations manager, cook, crèche teacher and community care workers. Some of the care workers and board members are past clients and infected by HIV/AIDS. The centre staff are all female but most of the board members are male. All staff have been working in an unpaid voluntary capacity since the government discontinued financial support for the centre due to economic austerity in 2014/2015. The centre has a monthly budget of approximately 300 ZAR (=14.65 GBP\(^\text{11}\)) to pay for the utilities and

\(^{10}\) For further information: [http://eaccoffice.wixsite.com/eaccpe](http://eaccoffice.wixsite.com/eaccpe)

\(^{11}\) Currency exchange on 20/04/2016
some essential food to prepare meals. Depending on their skills and experience, volunteers work directly with health workers and clients conducting house visits, working in the nursery or kitchen, or training care workers in basic health care, administration and management. Additionally, volunteers support the construction and maintenance of the buildings and vegetable garden. While the centre has a five-year plan, long-term planning and day-to-day running are constrained by inconsistent funding streams. Subsequently some of the community services are infrequent, for example, providing regular meals is not affordable.

5.4.3 The Context of Data Collection

The context of data collection is crucial since participants’ behaviour differs depending on the location and timing (Bryman, 2016). The headmasters introduced the participants to the researcher and, to eliminate any persuasion or coercion by third parties, the researcher ensured that the interviews took place in the privacy of a meeting room or office. The researcher explained the consent and the rights to withdrawal to the participants. The appropriate documentation (Appendix II & III) was useful in explaining details. In the case of the sample group of local host project staff, the location and timing were set in their work place and time, and thus interviews were relatively easy to arrange and conduct. Since this was also the location where volunteers’ placements take place, it was the setting in which participants could associate most with the interview questions. Interviews for the sending organisations’ staff were conducted in neutral locations and not their office to ensure privacy. For the UK-based participants (volunteers and sending organisations’ staff), email communications took place to arrange the interviews, including obtaining signed consent forms and arranging interview times and dates. Before interviews commenced, participants were asked if they had any questions. Using Skype allowed participants to take part in the comfort of their own home while still having direct face-to-face contact with the researcher.

Interviews took place over a period of approximately 2-3 weeks during February and March 2016 in Port Elizabeth, and April and May 2016 in the UK. In Port Elizabeth, the researcher travelled daily to the three project locations in order to arrange suitable times at which to visit and conduct the interviews. The duration of the interviews varied between 40-70 minutes. Arrangements were made in advance, being mindful not to disrupt participants’ work. Meeting rooms or office space was made available for the interviews, and all project staff were exceptionally friendly and supportive. Each project was visited two to three times to allow familiarisation with other staff and the project’s facilities. Calabash transported the researcher daily to the relevant projects with other volunteers.
5.4.4 Recording and Storage of Data

The interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder (Olympus model DM0-670), because of its high-quality audio recordings. The recorder has a large internal memory (8 gigabytes), a long-lasting battery capacity and a very robust metal casing. Its reliability and small size make it ideal for conducting interviews since the voice recorder appears unimposing to participants, and it is able to deal with complex sound environments and reliably record human voices to a high standard, making it suitable for use in different noisy settings. Although all interviews were conducted in English, some participants spoke English as their second language because their native language was either Xhosa or Afrikaans. The high quality of the recordings and its clarity made different accents easy to understand and transcribe. It was also able to record interviews using Skype. The digital voice recorder has a convenient USB connectivity to a personal computer for easy data transfer and is supported by audio file management software (Olympus Sonority).

While conducting fieldwork in South Africa, the audio files on the digital voice recorder were downloaded after each day of data collection onto a laptop and copied to Dropbox.\textsuperscript{12} At this point, the files from the digital voice recorder were deleted, since they could not be password protected while stored on the recorder. Interviews conducted in the UK were collected initially with the digital voice recorder and then transferred in the same manner as the dataset collected in South Africa. After the data collection all audio files were stored electronically in three locations: a personal laptop, Dropbox and an external hard drive (stored in a home office); all of which were password protected). Only the researcher has access to these three locations. To observe the UK and South Africa data protection laws, details on how their data was stored were given in writing to each participant in the Participants Information Sheet (Appendix III).

Each interview was stored in one file, allowing for easy management of individual interviews and recording of the date and duration. Audio files of each interview were transcribed by a transcription service into document files, enabling consistency, easy access and file management, while taking care to comply with UK data protection and confidentiality standards.

\textsuperscript{12} \url{http://www.dropbox.com}
5.4.5 Additional Data

Several different sources were used in addition to the semi-structured interviews in an effort to access deeper and wider information in relation to the specific host projects and volunteer organisations. In tourism research, documentation is increasingly used as a component within a multi-method approach, including qualitative research (Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012). The selection of additional information such as photos, documents and reports contributes another dimension to the data collection (Bryman, 2016). In this study, these sources included annual reports and policy documents, such as the code of conduct for volunteers from the Calabash Trust and Calabash Tours. Additionally, it included several recent audits from Fair Trade Tourism South Africa\(^{13}\) as part of their volunteer organisation certification programme. Written material from *peopleandplaces* included their child policy, volunteer and responsible tourism policy, and policy reviews. Additionally, their blog and websites, including video recordings of past volunteers, provided useful insights. Field notes made during the site visits and after each interview, to reflect on the general settings and observations, also proved valuable.

5.4.6 Section Summary

The logistical and practical information in relation to the data collection provides the detail of how and where the interviews were conducted. A brief description of the three project sites gives some background context to the research. Additionally, an account of how the data was collected is important to support the researcher’s work. The following section details the data processing and analysis.

5.5 Processes of Data Handling and Analysis

5.5.1 Section Overview

The purpose of this section is to detail the different processes of data handling and analysis. The section contributes to the validity of the research by capturing all the details of the research process, as it forms a continuation of the audit trail. Data handling and analysis is a crucial component of the research as it is the process of extracting the meaning of the data through interpretation by the researcher. The data consists of primary data collected, along with field notes and secondary data

\[^{13}\text{http://www.fairtrade.travel/South-Africa}, \text{accessed 20/04/2016}\]
such as reports and policy documentation. This section explains how the primary data was handled and processed based on thematic framework analysis, coding and triangulation.

### 5.5.2 Thematic Framework Analysis

A framework analysis is a pragmatic approach for real world investigation. It consists of distinct components that could be either a thematic or case-based approach. Framework analysis finds its roots in realism, although it is not a research paradigm (Ward et al., 2013, p. 2425). Thematic framework analysis is used to overcome the potential for bias if just one researcher interprets the data. It provides a more rigorous approach than using a less formal emerging themes approach, which leads to clear and transparent results. In contrast, a framework analysis offers flexibility and a systematic process that can deal with complex and large volumes of data while addressing concerns about subjectivity. The evaluative framework’s CMOs provide the basis for the main overarching themes, while the thematic analysis allows for further in-depth analysis of these. The themes explored formulate the emerging pathway previously discussed (Chapter 4). A qualitative data analysis software package (NVivo) was used since this allows for the categorisations of each C, M and O. Since data were collected from almost 30 interviews, as well as from other sources, each CMO was consolidated appropriately.

Framework Analysis is a method of systematically sifting, sorting and charting selected volumes of complex data (Hyde, et al., 2012; Srivastava & Thomson, 2009). It involves identifying and capturing themes and/or patterns within the data. According to Ritchie and Spencer (1994), the procedure consists of multiple stages: 1. familiarisation, 2. identifying a thematic framework, 3. indexing, 4. charting, and, lastly, 5. mapping and interpretation. Each will be briefly explained followed by a description (audit trail) of how it was applied in this study (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994; Ward et al., 2013).

**Stage 1. Familiarisation and immersion in the data.** This initial stage involved familiarisation and gaining a sense of each interview. Field notes taken by the researcher immediately after each interview facilitated this phase since a comparison could be made of the similarities and differences between each of the interviews within the sample group. These included the duration and location and any other notable occurrences during, before and after the interview. The main issues and any significant remarks were noted down, including a brief description and some general observations of context, such as the atmosphere (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994). This reflectiveness is a useful process in engaging with the research questions and involves some preliminary examination of the evaluative framework before immersion in the detail of each interview. All interview recordings were transcribed verbatim to Microsoft Word documents, which ensured consistency and efficiency. Each interview
document and field notes were processed by observing any initial overarching themes, which were highlighted and colour coded. The researcher thereby gained a rich and deep understanding of the intricacy of the data, as well as of its depth and diversity (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994).

Stage 2. Identifying a thematic framework. When reviewing the materials gathered from stage 1, the researcher examined the information and summarised each sample group, highlighting recurring themes and issues raised by the respondents. This allowed for the sifting and extraction of vital data as well as identification and referencing (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994). When the transcripts were loaded into NVivo, all the themes were given descriptive labels and categories. This stage developed the full systematic integration of the CMOs and the themes from the interviews for each sample group. The emerging themes and patterns from the interviews were charted within the CMO configurations and pathways, which helped to develop themes within the framework. The CMOs were redrafted several times through refinement and reflection, based on their previously identified categories and characteristics. According to Spencer and Ritchie (1994), this usually requires logical thinking by the researcher, rather than an automatic or mechanical process. Once all the data was processed and all themes categorised within the CMO configurations, the analysis continued to indexing the themes.

Stage 3. Indexing. Based on the CMO categories, pathways and the sample group, all the themes were indexed and annotated. The themes previously highlighted through colour coding were translated into a more detailed coding system consisting of letters and numbers indicating the CMO categories, themes, pathways and sample group. This ensured a methodological and consistent approach to interpreting the data in the next stage. Comparisons were made between each of the sample groups to identify differences and similarities between them. This analysis helped the researcher to immerse herself further in the data, so reflection and adjustments could be made (Ward et al., 2013). Patterns signified by similarities, differences, causation and frequency were detected for interpretation (Saldana, 2016). Narrative coding and analysis are most appropriate for detecting intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences that explore personal values and attitudes. They allow for deep and reflective analysis by the researcher to find meaning (Saldana, 2016).

Stage 4. Charting of the framework. This is the process of ‘lifting’ the data from the transcripts and fitting it into the framework (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994, p. 182). The indexed themes were superimposed into the framework according to the CMO categories. This produced charts with the headings and subheadings according to the CMO categories and pathways, providing an effective summary of the evaluative framework.
Stage 5. **Mapping and interpretation.** The ‘serious and systematic process’ of detection occurs at this stage (Ritchie & Spencer, 1994, p. 186). Each of the charts was compared by triangulation of C, M and O in order to identify and develop the individual pathways reflecting the conceptual framework (Figure 4.5). Triangulation of different data sets such as different sample groups contributes to the study’s validity (Creswell, 2014; Silverman, 2014). The development of the pathways (Table 4.1) was significant and finalised the mapping process. The findings are interpreted and presented in the following Chapter (Chapter 6).

5.6 **Ethical Considerations**

In accordance with the University of Surrey’s Research Ethics Policy, it is a requirement to obtain ethical approval prior to any fieldwork involving human participation. Application for ethical approval was obtained in January 2016 with some recommendations for minor amendments. The process proved useful in preparation for the fieldwork and the conducting of the interviews. The main ethical considerations were risks to participants and researcher, confidentiality, anonymity and the informed consent of the participants of the three different study groups.

5.6.1 **Risks to Participants and Researcher**

No direct risks that may affect participants’ health and safety arising from taking part in the interviews were identified. There was also no deliberate deception or covert activities as part of this study. There were some benefits to the participants in having the opportunity to voice concerns, critiques and opinions during the interview process. Some participants commented that they enjoyed the interviews since they were an opportunity to reflect on and share past positive experiences. Although there were no direct threats to the researcher arising from conducting interviews with individuals of the target groups, there were some associated risks and health and safety considerations arising from lone working, particularly in South Africa’s townships. A risk assessment and plan was prepared as part of the University’s ethical approval process and addressed some associated concerns.

5.6.2 **Informed Consent**

A Participants’ Information Sheet was given to all participants prior to each interview (Appendix III). This outlined the right to withdraw and explained the nature and purpose of the study. Contact details were provided should any of the participants have wished to speak to the researcher after the
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interview. The Participants’ Information Sheet proved useful to explain the details of the study to participants and to emphasise the main ethical considerations to ensure that the participants felt comfortable and confident when taking part in the research. This was done for both the face-to-face interviews in South Africa, as well as for the Skype interviews in the UK.

Each participant signed a consent form (Appendix II). For the interviews conducted face-to-face in South Africa, the consent was completed prior to the interview. For interviews conducted using Skype, the consent forms were emailed to each of the participants and signed copies returned to the researcher prior to the interview. The process of establishing informed consent to participate was useful both to ensure consistency and to verify that participants did want to take part, particularly since volunteers and host project staff were selected through third parties, such as the directors and also sometimes their line manager or superior, as was the case for the teachers. Since interviews were always conducted in private in separate meeting rooms or offices, participants had the opportunity to speak in a private setting, which made sure potential participants were able to refuse if they wished to do so.

5.6.3 Confidentiality and Anonymity

The Participant Information Sheet (Appendix III) also explained how confidentiality and anonymity were handled. It was important to assure participants from the outset that their anonymity would be maintained. No specific personal data was collected from any of the participants. The nature of the data collected was about participants’ experiences, opinions of processes, communication and engagement with each of the other relevant stakeholder groups. Names and identity (volunteers and host project staff) were anonymised by changing and coding in each script to ensure full anonymity and confidentiality. Anonymised names were used in any subsequent publications of the thesis, reports or peer reviewed publication. Synonyms were used for each participant, so for example, for volunteers, synonyms start with V, and so on. Although volunteer organisations’ staff members’ names, job titles and the name of their organisation were recorded and stored, this data was not shared. For future data sharing, whether anonymised names should be used will be formally agreed with the organisations. Anonymised personal names were used and the organisations’ names were identified only for publication of the thesis, reports or peer reviewed publication. Directors of each organisation will be given the right to review any drafts of publications (peer reviewed or industry reports) that include their organisation’s names. Written information of this arrangement was given to the directors prior to data collection.
5.6.4  Chapter Summary

This chapter outlines in detail the appropriate methods and audit trail for this study. The qualitative method selected is semi-structured interviews because these allow for in-depth and rich data containing opinions and attitudes from each stakeholder group. The sampling strategy is concise and specific for the purpose, but its approach is typical for a qualitative inquiry and is extensively detailed. The purposive sampling approach provides a robust sample based on comprehensive structured sample criteria at each level, as well as sample saturation and the contextual factors during data collection. This chapter contributes to the validity of the research, as it is a continuation of the audit trail detailing the process of data sampling and collection. The systematic and rigorous approach in the thematic analysis is also appropriate for handling the data. The findings of the thesis are set out in the next Chapter.
6 Results

‘Do your little bit of good where you are; it’s those little bits of good put together that overwhelm the world.’

Desmond Tutu

6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the empirical findings of the data collection and data analysis in order to fulfil the aim and objectives of this thesis. This chapter highlights evidence gathered based on semi-structured interviews with the main four volunteer stakeholder groups, based on the methodology and methods presented in the previous chapters (Chapter 4 and 5). In developing the evaluative framework (Objective 3) the collaborations of the stakeholders are evaluated (Objective 1) along with the way they influence outcomes (Objective 2). The framework determines how the different pathways of the context and mechanisms within the VT supply chain lead to specific outcomes. Empirical evidence based on thematic framework analysis and its systematic coding processes (Chapter 5) is shown throughout the chapter and how it relates to C, M or O. Thus, by applying the evaluative framework in the case study (Figure 4.5) the analysis demonstrates how each of the components of C, M and O establishes a CMO configuration and its associated pathways. Chapter 7 discusses the outcomes in a wider and deeper analytical context, highlighting the significance of the findings.

The empirical findings for each component of C, M, O are shown following the logical flow of the supply chain. The empirical findings consist of the information gained in the interviews with participants. This chapter is organised in eight sections, of which six are focused on one mechanism each. The first section provides a detailed overview of the processes and procedures of the VT supply chain based on the conceptual framework, elaborating the characteristics and particular features that are of significance. The overview is based on the schematic evaluative framework (Figure 4.5) and explains the dynamics and organisational arrangements within the supply chain. A crucial element of this overview is the explanation of the difference between C, M and O (upper case) and c, m and o (lower case) in Figure 4.6 and how they are applied to the industry setting. The following six sections present the findings of each of the Ms and the specific collaborative relationships between the stakeholders, focusing on the details of the CMO configurations. Each section illustrates in detail how the CMO configurations are constructed based on the interviews with participants, and additional
sources, and highlights the most influential pathways. The chapter concludes with a summary of the results.

6.1.1 Layering the Evaluative Framework

In applying the evaluative framework to the industry setting of a case study, two distinct layers or of the value chain become apparent. On the surface, the stakeholders’ functional processes and procedures are visible, which consist of communications and management tools such as forms, reports or meetings. These manage a complex and dynamic supply chain that is interconnected from one stakeholder to another by means of procedures. Thus, the ‘surface layer’ represents the operational aspect of the supply chain, where procedures and processes fulfil a particular function that is applied in a certain manner. Exploring these mechanisms and analysing the associated empirical data helps to reveal how they influence particular outcomes. The second layer, meanwhile, is significant in terms of how the procedures and processes are applied, and thus for understanding the contextual settings which enable specific outcomes.

Based on the findings of the industry case study, the evaluative framework illustrates a much more refined and detailed analysis, bridging theory with practice. By exploring stakeholders’ interactions and collaborative relations, the framework facilitates a deeper examination of the supply chain to determine how each process and procedure is applied. This leads to a deeper understanding of how different aspects of the mechanisms under certain contextual conditions trigger certain outcomes. The evaluative framework is constructed as previously described (Sections 4.5.3-4.5.5), demonstrating how each of the C, M and O configurations possess particular purposes. Based on the application to a case study, the evaluative framework determines the pathways of the interrelationships between C, M and O, and their ‘observed relationships’, thus developing the middle range theories. Throughout this chapter, the empirical findings determine the specific pathways of the CMO configurations. A summary of the CMO configurations illustrates the different C, M and O found in the case study and their broad interconnectivity (Figure 6.1). This summary of the CMO configurations provides a useful overview of the diversity of each C, M and O, and demonstrates how each C and c, M and m and O and o are distinguished. The usefulness and significance of the differentiation become apparent in each configuration, as explained below. The details and significant in how the CMO are related become apparent in this chapter and also in the discussion chapter (Chapter 7).

Within the evaluative framework (Figure 6.1), the contextual circumstances are shown to be differentiated by the wider environmental settings that influence the stakeholders within the supply chain, such as the socioeconomic, political settings or markets (C). The framework also includes the
level of resources available, including staffing level, funding and financial stability. In addition, the values and motivations contextualise how stakeholders respond and react within their collaborative relations (c) in ways that fundamentally influence outcomes. Meanwhile, in the supply chain, the six collaborative interactions consist of a series of individual procedures (M), each with a specific purpose. The evaluation of the collaborations characterises the type and nature of the different interactions (m), thereby revealing the depth and range of each collaboration and contributing to a deeper understanding of why and how they affect certain outcomes. Immediate outcomes are directly attributed to each of the collaborations (o) between stakeholders, whereas long-term outcomes (O) are defined by transformative lasting change, which can be attributed by the accumulation of short-term outcomes. A simple numbering system for each stakeholder labels their contextual settings and outcomes. To illustrate, volunteers are represented by the number 1, and their contexts are thus C₁ or c₁ and outcomes as O₁ or o₁, followed by a theme, for example c₁•MOTIVATION. Lasting change is characterised by stakeholders traversing across socioeconomic or political boundaries. Both outcomes can be compared against the aims and purpose of the value chain, as well as against principles of sustainability.
Figure 6.1: Summary of Evaluative Framework

### EXTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS
- C environmental economical social political settings
- C₁TIME & MONEY, C₁FAMILY, C₂&3-MARKET, C₂&3-INDUSTRY, C₄-POST-APARtheid, C₄-NEED, C₄-CORRUPTION, C₄-POVERTY

### INTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>Sending organisation</th>
<th>Receiving organisation</th>
<th>Host project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₁-MOTIVATION C₁-EXPERTISE</td>
<td>C₂-GOVERNANCE C₂-VALUES C₂-COMMITMENT</td>
<td>C₃-GOVERNANCE C₃-VALUES C₃-APPROACH C₃-EXPERTISE</td>
<td>C₄-MOTIVATION C₄-EXPERTISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-EXPECTATION C₁-GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C₄-HIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-VALUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C₄-EXPERIMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-COMMITMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C₄-VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C₄-VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-APPROACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C₄-VALUES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLABORATIVE ENGAGEMENTS IN SUPPLY CHAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M₁ Volunteer Recruitment</th>
<th>M₂ Partnership Management</th>
<th>M₃ Host project Management</th>
<th>M₄ Volunteer Placement</th>
<th>M₅ Volunteer Management</th>
<th>M₆ Host Project Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M₁-SELECTION</td>
<td>M₂-SELECTION</td>
<td>M₃-SELECTION</td>
<td>M₄-SELECTION</td>
<td>M₅-SELECTION</td>
<td>M₆-SELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁-Screening</td>
<td>M₂-Agreement</td>
<td>M₃-Agreement</td>
<td>M₄-Skills</td>
<td>M₅-Orientation</td>
<td>M₆-Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁-Life Story</td>
<td>M₂-Policy</td>
<td>M₃-Committee</td>
<td>M₄-Relations</td>
<td>M₅-Meetings</td>
<td>M₆-Consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁-Match</td>
<td>M₂-Relations</td>
<td>M₃-Relations</td>
<td>M₄-Contracts</td>
<td>M₅-Relations</td>
<td>M₆-Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁-Volunteer Preparation</td>
<td>M₂-Volunteer</td>
<td>M₃-Risk</td>
<td>M₄-Volunteer</td>
<td>M₅-Volunteer</td>
<td>M₆-Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁-V. Report</td>
<td>M₂-Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLABORATION DESCRIPTORS

- willingness to engage (m₁\text{ws})
- level of integration and engagement (m₁\text{line})
- sharing aims and values (m₁\text{sv})
- joint planning and product development (m₁\text{pp})
- joint decision making and power sharing (m₁\text{dm})
- joint problem solving (m₁\text{ps})
- level of exchange of skills and expertise (m₁\text{sex})
- building capacity for other stakeholders (m₁\text{c})
- sharing risks and benefits (m₁\text{r})
- joint reflectivity and monitoring (m₁\text{r})
- cultural exchange (m₁\text{c})

### COLLABORATIVE SHORT-TERM & INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES T₁

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O₄-Respect</th>
<th>O₂&amp;₃-Trust</th>
<th>O₂&amp;₃-Endurance</th>
<th>O₂&amp;₃-Transparency</th>
<th>O₂-Respect</th>
<th>O₂-Transparency</th>
<th>O₂-Endurance</th>
<th>O₂-Transparency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
<td>O₄-Dependence</td>
<td>O₄-Participation</td>
<td>O₄-Equality</td>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
<td>O₄-Dependence</td>
<td>O₄-Participation</td>
<td>O₄-Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₄-Safety</td>
<td>O₄-Dependence</td>
<td>O₄-Participation</td>
<td>O₄-Equality</td>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
<td>O₄-Transparency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE LONG-TERM OUTCOMES T₂

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O₁&amp;₄-Mobility</th>
<th>O₁&amp;₄-Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Author, 2018

112
6.2 Volunteer Recruitment (M1)

This section presents the main CMO configurations arising from the initial collaborative interactions (M1) between the first two stakeholders of the supply chain; the volunteer and sending organisation. The interactions consist of dynamic processes as well as communications and information sharing. The collaborative engagement (M1) consists of seven separate procedures and processes: i) selection of an organisation (M1:SELECTION), ii) volunteer screening (M1:SCREEN), iii) the volunteer’s life story (M1:STORY), iv) volunteer skill and project matching (M1:MATCH), v) volunteer pre-trip preparation (M1:PREP), vi) volunteer’s payment (M1:V.PAYMENT), and vii) post-project feedback report (M1:V.REPORT). Each M1 mechanism plays a different role and therefore its significance to the outcomes of the social intervention and its supply chain will also differ. The dynamic collaborative communications between the two stakeholders support other aspects and mechanisms of the supply chain. For this reason, this section is subdivided into two parts. The first part (Section 6.2.1) explains the functions of each M1 mechanism and its significance to the supply chain. The significant M1 processes are explored in terms of how each is influenced by particular contextual arrangements (C or c) which lead to certain sustainable outcomes (O) to determine the CMO configuration. The second part (Section 6.2.) investigates how the M1 processes are interlinked with other processes, for example, partnership management M2, and their associated CMO configurations. The M1 processes and procedures discussed below, are as far as possible, organised in a logical and chronological order, although some occur simultaneously.

6.2.1 The M1 Mechanisms

The first mechanism consists of a potential volunteer selecting a sending volunteer organisation (M1:SELECTION), based on gathering information from the sending organisation’s website. The website presents all the available placement options and the organisation’s ethos 15 and enables a potential volunteer to make direct contact with the sending organisation. The selection process continues through phone and email dialogue and through a basic willingness (m1:wes) to engage with one another develops. During this selection stage (M1:SELECTION), a potential volunteer considers opting for this particular sending organisation and its associated supply chain, such as a host project. Simultaneously,

---

15 See http://www.travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk/
the screening process (M1-SCREEN) begins, which initially consists of determining whether a potential volunteer is willing to pursue the collaboration further, based on the sending organisation’s requirements. Volunteers are also asked to apply for a Disclosure and Barring Service Check (formerly known as a CRB check)\textsuperscript{16} to provide evidence of any previous criminal convictions. A considerable level of integration and engagement (m1-ine) is required in the form of volunteers’ willingness, first, to participate in a placement for at least one month, and, second, to engage with the subsequent M1 processes, which take a lot of time and involve some administrative tasks.

The collaborative relationship develops further if a potential volunteer acknowledges those requirements and wishes to pursue the collaboration. The following M1 process consists of the volunteer’s life story (M1-STORY), which is recorded in a detailed form that asks about the volunteer’s background, motivations, personal preferences and dislikes, as well as the non-vocational and professional skills and expertise. The life story is a communication tool within the supply chain and fulfils the important function of allowing the sending organisation, and a potential project, to make informed decisions (m1-jdm). It also encourages full integration (m1-ine) (Section 6.2.3). The form includes a character reference from a friend or family member. The volunteer’s life story is referred to by the sending organisation as a ‘3D picture of a person’ [Interviews-9, sending organisation], highlighting that a conventional Curriculum Vitae is not sufficient in providing the necessary personal information about who the volunteer is. This approach enables the sending organisation to understand more about the volunteer and thus to find an appropriate project that not only focuses on the volunteers’ skills and experience but also considers the volunteers’ personality and character. The comment above illustrates the significance of the life story (M1-STORY) to the supply chain and is further examined in relation to other mechanisms in Section 6.2.3.

The next mechanism articulates the phase in which the volunteer’s skills are matched (M1-MATCH). This is a vital phase, managed by the sending organisation, in which the volunteer’s preferences and skills are matched with a project’s needs (M6-P.SELECTION) to determine the best available options (Section 6.7). It consists of joint decision making (m1-jdm) between the volunteer and the host project but is facilitated by the sending and receiving organisation (M3), (Section 6.4). The next phase is the volunteer’s payment for the placement (M1-V.PAYMENT), which is done in instalments, since volunteers pay a separate fee to the sending and receiving organisation, as well as paying for accommodation and making a contribution to the host project. Finally, shortly after their placement, volunteers are asked to

\textsuperscript{16} See https://crbdirect.org.uk/
complete a post-project feedback report ($M_{1\text{-V.REPORT}}$) detailing their feedback on the experience. The report contributes to the development and improvement of the placements ($m_{1\text{-imp}}$) that are integrated into different ways within the supply chain (Section 6.7). $M_1$ processes also include the volunteer pre-project preparation ($M_{1\text{-PREP}}$), where detailed information is provided to the volunteer about the project, including the most recent volunteer post-project reports ($M_{1\text{-V.REPORT}}$), and the project support plan ($M_{6\text{-PLAN}}$), which serves to integrate the volunteer further into the supply chain ($m_{1\text{-int}}$) and which enhances the placement experience in several ways (Section 6.5).

In summary, the collaborative relationship between the volunteer and sending organisation is dynamic and is distinguishable by seven different mechanisms, each with a different purpose. The initial $M_1$ processes formulate the foundations for the ensuing mechanisms, highlighting the complexity of the interconnectivity of the mechanisms within the supply chain. As a consequence, each $M_1$ process is different, including the directional flow of information. The ($M_{1\text{-SELECTION}}$), ($M_{1\text{-SCREEN}}$) and ($M_{1\text{-MATCH}}$) consist of an exchange of information. In ($M_{1\text{-STORY}}$), and ($M_{1\text{-V.REPORT}}$) the information flows downstream, whereas the flow is the opposite direction in ($M_{1\text{-PREP}}$). The volunteer’s payment ($M_{1\text{-V.PAYMENT}}$) consists only of financial transactions and also flows downstream of the supply chain.

### 6.2.2 The CM$_1$O Configurations

The $M_1$ procedures demonstrate how the initial collaborative relationship between the volunteer and sending organisation evolves. The contextual conditions surrounding the stakeholders explain why the mechanisms occur and determine specific outcomes. Specific drivers such as the motivational and societal commitment of the volunteers and sending organisation define the contextual conditions. Volunteers’ comments indicate motivations ($c_1$-motivation) with strong ethical and sustainable themes; for example, they want to: ‘learn from local people’, and did ‘not want to be a voyeur’ or ‘not be like tourists’, while seeking ‘genuine and real’ experiences [Interviews-1-8, volunteers]. In addition, most volunteers demonstrate considerable societal commitments and engagements ($c_1$-commitment) by having extensively supported charities or local communities prior to their volunteer placement. All volunteers have experience in working with people, either because they are in the teaching profession or are social workers. Significantly, other volunteers’ comments explain how they value ($c_1$-value) the sending organisation’s commitment to sustainability and its ethical integrity and credentials ($c_2$-value), and this contributes to their selection of the sending organisation. This is substantiated by the sending organisation, as Sallie explains: ‘the very nature of the way we position ourselves in the market place, which is we are a bit worthy... people know that their skills are going to be matched to a need, it’s not just bums on seats...’ [Interview-10, sending organisation].
Furthermore, the contextual settings of the sending organisations, such as their values and commitments to sustainability (c2-VALUES), are a causal driver influencing why and how each M1 is operated. Their policy states: 17 ‘Our core values are mutual respect, service, partnership, transparency and sustainability’ (c2-VALUES). To illustrate, in the volunteers’ skills and project matching (M1-MATCH), the process is driven by the sending organisation’s value of mutual respect and transparency for all stakeholders (c2-VALUES). As Kate explains: ‘...through discussion it has to be a win-win situation for the volunteer and for the project. If that is not the case, then I have failed in my job’ (Interview 9, sending organisation). Her statement emphasises that joint decision making is important (m1-jdm) and enables transparency (o2-TRANSPARENCY) and mutual respect (o2-RESPECT), which results in equality (o4-EQUALITY). Similarly, the manner of the (M1-V.PAYMENT) demonstrates how the sending organisation puts its values (c2-VALUES) successfully into practice. The payment process (M1-V.PAYMENT) consists of different instalments for the sending and receiving organisation and a contribution to the host project. Although this is less convenient, volunteers comment on how this payment arrangement is transparent (o1-TRANSPARENCY) as they are aware of what each stakeholder receives.

6.2.3 CMIO Configurations and M4 & M6 Mechanisms

As stated previously, some M1 mechanisms do not operate in isolation within the two stakeholders only, but are more complex, since they are interlinked with other mechanisms within the supply chain. The importance of these links is presented here, including their contextual settings and possible outcomes. As explained above, the volunteer’s life story (M1-STORY) is a communication tool that allows for further integration of the volunteer into the supply chain (m1-ine). Its purpose is not only to support the volunteer matching (M1-MATCH) process, but also to provide information about potential volunteers to allow the host project to be able to give informed consent (M6-CONSENT) and to make informed decisions about the details of the placement and the exchange of skills (M4-SKILLS). It is apparent that these four processes are closely intertwined, one supporting and facilitating the other and together encouraging a deeper integration of the volunteer into the supply chain (m1-ine) and enabling an effective skills exchange (m4-exi). Thus, the life story (M1-STORY) is the cornerstone to facilitate (M1-MATCH), (M6-CONSENT) and (M4-SKILLS), where informed consent (M6-CONSENT) is a requirement to complete (M1-MATCH). Consequently, the (M1-MATCH) process is lengthy, since obtaining consent (M6-CONSENT) from the project takes some time on account of the need to ensure joint decision making (m1-jdm), and this prolongs the volunteer screening (M1-SCREEN).

17https://travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk/About.aspx?category=24#WNjXGaLdm00
Informed consent (M\textsubscript{6-CONSENT}) is a critical part of the skills matching process (M\textsubscript{1-MATCH}), which is driven by the commitment and values of the sending organisation (C\textsubscript{2-VALUES} and C\textsubscript{2-COMMITMENT}) who determine their processes and procedures. As Sallie explains: ‘No volunteer would be placed without the informed consent of the project and it would be a skills share programme [Interview-10, sending organisation]. Thus, informed consent ensures that the host project has decision making powers over each volunteer placement, demonstrating how empowerment is operationalised within the supply chain (o\textsubscript{4-EMPOWERMENT}). The volunteer life story (M\textsubscript{1-STORY}) makes the informed consent possible since adequate information is given to the host project, ensuring transparent volunteer recruitment (o\textsubscript{4-TRANSPARENCY}). Furthermore, the matching process (M\textsubscript{1-MATCH}) through the life story (M\textsubscript{1-STORY}) leads to a more effective skills exchange (o\textsubscript{4-SKILLS}), resulting in positive experiences for both the volunteer and the host project staff (o\textsubscript{1&4-EXPERIENCE}). In summary, the most significant contextual drivers are the core values and the sending organisation’s commitment to sustainable practices (C\textsubscript{2-values}). In putting their values into practice, manifested by the life story (M\textsubscript{1-STORY}) and informed consent (M\textsubscript{6-CONSENT}), the recruitment process enables positive and sustainable outcomes (Figure 6.2 and Figure 6.3). It also demonstrates that a simple CMO configuration needs to be adopted to reflect the supply chain’s nature fully and to accommodate multiple Ms.

Figure 6.2: The CM\textsubscript{1}O Configuration based on Consent and Skills
6.3 **Partnership Management (M\textsubscript{2})**

This section examines the management of the partnership between the sending and receiving organisations (M\textsubscript{2}). In contrast to the volunteer placement (M\textsubscript{1}), the partnership is predominately based on the collaborative relationships between stakeholders. As the time scale and duration of M\textsubscript{2} is established on the basis of a long term relations of over a decade, the nature of the collaborative relationship is more complex and intricate. Aspects of the partnership are differentiated by their purpose and personal relationships, comprising the initial selection process (M\textsubscript{2-SELECTION}), a formal agreement (M\textsubscript{2-AGREEMENT}), product development and the operation of the volunteer placement (M\textsubscript{2-VOLUNTEER}) and policy development (M\textsubscript{2-POLICY}). Partnership relations are formed by the founding directors of each organisation (M\textsubscript{2-RELATION}). These different components are fully explored below, using CMO configurations to analyse their intricacy and scope. The first section presents each M\textsubscript{2} and their associated collaborative characteristics (m), before continuing with how the contextual settings (c and C) drive the partnership and generate specific outcomes (o and O). As in the previous section, the M\textsubscript{2} collaborations that operate as individual components within the supply chain are explored first, followed by the M\textsubscript{2} collaborations that are linked with other mechanisms, such as host project management (M\textsubscript{3}).
6.3.1 The M2 Mechanisms

The initial mechanism of selecting a suitable partner (M2-SELECTION) is significant since it underlines the foundations of the partnership. It is based on a set of criteria that is driven by the partners’ shared aims and values (m2-sav) and which defines the depths and complexity of its future. Their contextual settings and outcomes are shown below. Partnership management logically continues with a formal agreement (M2-AGREEMENT). Agreeing on a contractual arrangement involves a dialogue about intricate details such as the specific roles and responsibilities of the volunteer programme, and thus indicates shared aims and a degree of engagement (m2-sav, m2-ine). Paul states that during the early stages of their partnership they ‘bounced ideas back and forth’ when developing the volunteer programme (M2-VOLUNTEER), revealing an exchange of expertise (m2-evk). He adds that People and Places are a ‘good partner and willing to test new models’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation], indicative of sharing risks and benefits in developing new products (m2-ub, m2-jpp). The willingness to exchange ideas and share risks indicates the great depth of their collaboration, illustrated by the characteristics.

Both organisations strongly emphasise the importance of the partnership (M2) by articulating their roles and responsibilities in delivering the volunteer programme (M2-VOLUNTEER). In explaining the sending organisation’s responsibility with respect to volunteer recruitment (M1), Paul states that it is ‘whole lot of work…what Kate does, it’s that constant engagement with the volunteers’. He proclaims that he would not want to deal with recruitment (M1) and that he would not be suitable. Paul concludes that handling recruitment from South Africa is ‘very difficult’ and that he has ‘…great faith in People and Places’ system…’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation], indicating a high level of integration (m2-ine) since one organisation fully assumes one specific function within the supply chain. According to the sending organisation, the responsibility of the receiving organisation includes looking after volunteers, in a similar way to looking after tourists. The comments indicate a high integration of collaboration (m2-ine). Sallie describes the receiving organisations’ role in the following way: ‘…their role is to be a cultural bridge, a bridge between the volunteer and People and Places in the northern hemisphere, between our culture and their culture and to be that bridge…’ [Interview-10, sending organisation]. She also emphasises the importance of the sending organisation’s facilitative role (m2-ine), highlighting how both have a clear understanding and expectations of their roles and responsibilities (Section 6.3).

In addition, when developing new policies and guidelines, such as the child protection (M2-POLICY), Paul explains: ‘It was just a dialogue and exchanging of documents and editing …so one of the issues that they [People and Places] did not look at is discrimination against children that are HIV Positive,…so we made sure that the HIV issue was included in our child protection policy.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. The
statement indicates how an exchange of expertise and capacity building (m2-cas, m2-exk) contributes to developing a comprehensive policy for volunteers and demonstrates both parties’ commitment to delivering a responsible volunteer product. Another aspect of the partnership is a personal relationship that evolved between both organisations (M2:RELATION). Paul explains that he has known Sallie for a long time and describes it as ‘real friendship’, and jokingly adds ‘incestuous’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation], a perspective echoed by both directors in the sending organisation (m2-per) [Interview-9 & 10, sending organisation]. In summary, partnership management, M2, consists of several different dimensions, which together demonstrate considerable depth and scope, as well as many links between the mechanisms. The willingness to develop the volunteer programme and associated policies together is highly significant for the progression and improvement of the supply chain and for the market. This is supported by close collaborative relations.

6.3.2 The CM2O Configurations

The M2 partnership consists of different aspects that define each of their functions, as well as the organisational values or commitments that drive the partnership. The driving forces influence the different components of the partnership and cause particular outcomes within the supply chain. Initially, the sending organisation’s viewpoint (c2) on the formation of a partnership is explained, followed by the receiving organisation’s perspective (c3). These contextual settings influence the partnership in two ways: firstly their selection and relations, and secondly the value chain. In describing the partnership with Calabash, Sallie explains that it is based on ‘Paul’s credentials,…his ‘coal-face’ community work, it was based on his RT [responsible tourism] credentials ….’ [Interview-10, sending organisation] (c2-value & c3-value), illustrating shared values (m2-sav). Further evidence of the receiving organisation’s values is provided below by Paul. It becomes apparent that the values describing different contextual settings are associated with different mechanisms of the partnership, along with how they relate to one another.

Shared values of sustainability play a significant role in the selection process and in operationalising the volunteer programme, and mutual respect and trust also clearly play a role in their relations. An example is the partners’ opinion of the volunteer tourism market. Paul dismisses the market (C3: MARKET): ‘…when the gap year market was booming … it was all about what is sellable, it wasn’t about what is the need.’ He continues: ‘…where I am seeing a lot of abuse of volunteers and community because the needs are poorly identified,…to come and hug a child, like really, we can hug our own children, we don’t need foreigners to come and hug our children, but this is what is being sold.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. He clearly rejects orphanage volunteer tourism and its associated profitable market. Paul describes Calabash’s vision (c3-values) anecdotally: ‘…Our view is that you have to have programmes
that are in existence or clearly identified community needs. That’s the most important thing...’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. As shown in the next section, the sending organisation also rejects the volunteer tourism market. The receiving organisation illustrates how decisions and choices focused on prioritising ethics over profitability leads to sustainable practice.

The partnership (M2-RELATION) needs to be based on ‘trust’, ‘open’, ‘honesty’ and ‘not to have secrets about the volunteer programme’ according to the directors [Interview 9 & 10, sending organisation]. This echoes Paul’s description of ‘honesty’, ‘respect’, ‘high level of trust, in terms of integrity’ and the need to be ‘transparent’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation], and holding true to their core values (c2-VALUES) in achieving trust (o2&3-TRUST). It signifies that both stakeholders perceive the partnership in the same way and that the relations (M2-RELATION) are of considerable significance, which in turn suggests a familiarity and trustworthiness (o2&3-TRUST). Further, Kate explains: ‘these relationships are soundly based: they have an absolutely rock-solid base....The relationship will continue regardless....’ [Interview-9, sending organisation], emphasising the endurance and robustness of the partnerships (o2&3-ENDURANCE). Further, Kate elaborates: ‘...it has its ups and downs, but it is not a personal relationship, it is not a business relationship, I can't put a title to it because they are fluid.’ [Interview-9, sending organisation]. Her comment suggests that the boundaries between personal and professional relationships (M2-RELATION) are blurred (m2-per). The robustness and trustworthiness of the collaboration are significant as they support other aspects of the partnership.

Sallie explains how Paul deserves a great deal of credit for: ‘...mentoring me and helping me to understand how to run a responsible programme and the reality of running a responsible programme.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. The comment indicates a role of capacity building and exchange of expertise (m2-jdm, m2-exk) between the partnerships that help to develop their product and policy (m2-jpp) of the volunteer programme (M2-VOLUNTEER). It highlights how one aspect of the partnership (M2-RELATION) supports another to develop the volunteer programme (M2-VOLUNTEER). Thus, shared values and aims (c2-value & c3-value) influence the selection of partners (M2-SELECTION) and progress to good relations (M2-RELATION) which in turn enables the development of a policy (M2-POLICY) and the operation of a volunteer programme (M2-VOLUNTEER). This is illustrated by how the partnership has endured for ten years (o2&3-ENDURANCE), as well as its trustworthiness (o2-TRUST). The nature of the partnership is crucial since it supports and drives other aspects of the supply chain. This becomes more apparent with each mechanism described below.
6.3.3 The CM$_2$O Configuration and other M$_1$ & M$_3$ Mechanisms

A more complex connectivity between mechanisms exists since the partnership is also influenced by other mechanisms and their contextual settings elsewhere in the supply chain. The importance of two particular linkages, and how they lead to outcomes, are explored here. Firstly, the partnership is linked by the role of the sending organisation (M$_2$-VOLUNTEER). Paul anecdotally explains how he values the importance of the sending organisation’s recruitment process: ‘...it help[s] to take off the rose-tinted glasses and that this [volunteer experience] is going to be like a Princess Diana trip where you’re going to be giving chocolates to the children and everyone is going to love you and it’s all going to be wonderful. We like it when people [volunteers] read about the challenges that volunteers have had, the difficulties because ...we know this person is for real, they understand that this is not going to be a walk in the park. There is a good way that they can contribute but it’s not just going to be a nice wonderful fairy tale [Interview-14, receiving organisation].’ He emphasises how he values (C$_3$-VALUE) the volunteers’ preparedness and expectations because the thoroughness of the recruitment process (M$_1$-PRETRIP and M$_1$-SCREEN) enables the placement to have positive outcomes (O$_{1,4}$-EXPERIENCE).

Secondly, when selecting partners (M$_2$-SELECTION), different contextual conditions are evident, as Sallie clarifies, ‘We don’t look at the map and say we would like to go to this country. We will look at where we can find a good local partner’ [Interview-10, sending organisation]. This comment emphasises that ‘good’ local partners are more important than what the volunteer tourism market demands (C$_2$-market). Sallie continues: ‘we find local partners who are already doing amazing work in their communities, who already have community links with the project [Interview-10, sending organisation],’ accentuating how the local partnership, i.e. the receiving organisation and their community (M$_3$), is very important. She provides two critical reasons for this. Firstly, how the receiving organisation supports the schools through a trust, and how it facilitates empowerment by placing responsibility onto the schools to manage themselves. Secondly, she highlights the receiving organisation’s governance and ability to provide financial reports, as well as its: ‘care for the volunteers, having due diligence for the proper registration, risk analyses, risk management, all of those things which are hugely important.’ Her comments highlight the importance of the local partnership (M$_3$-SELECTION & M$_3$-RELATION) in their selection of partnerships (M$_2$-SELECTION). The outcome of this configuration illustrates how the partnership management leads to host project empowerment (O$_{4}$-EMPOWERMENT) and equality (O$_{4}$-EQUALITY) within the supply chain.
6.4 Host Project Management (M₃)

The host project management (M₃) entails the collaboration between the receiving organisation and the host projects. Here, the collaborations are also long-term, but they are more diverse and varied because each local host project is different. As revealed in the previous chapter, three host projects are included in this study: two schools and one community health care centre. Little difference was found in the CMO configurations of the two schools, but the community project operates within a different contextual setting and reveals different CMO configurations. Similarly, the host project partnerships have different CMO configurations and outcomes. The host project management consists of different mechanisms, with each playing a different role and function in delivering the volunteer programme, such as the initial selection of suitable host projects (M₃-SELECTION), a formal agreement (M₃-AGREEMENT), risk assessment (M₃-RISK), and a host project committee (M₃-COMMITTEE). Since the partnership consists of individual staff members, the collaborations also include personal relationships (M₃-RELATION). Lastly, a post-project feedback form is completed by the host project (M₃-FEEDBACK). Similar to the previous collaborations, the M₃ host project management is initially explained based on each of the different mechanisms, and their contextual settings (C and c) and particular outcomes (o). The second part of this section examines how host project management is interlinked with other mechanisms, particularly the volunteer placement (M₄).
6.4.1 The M₃ Mechanisms

The first mechanism deals with the selection of the host project (M₃-SELECTION). Paul explains that there must be an ‘attitude of willingness’ on the part of the school and the teachers who will be working with volunteers, and ‘firm decisions from the leadership that they want to participate in the programme...’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. His comment indicates that willingness to work with volunteers is a crucial criterion for approving the schools’ involvement (m₃-wes). A receiving organisation’s employee, meanwhile, comments: ‘the relationships are 100% because the community people are involved’ [Interview-13, receiving organisation], therefore also emphasising the importance of the active involvement of the host project (m₃-inv). The formal agreement (M₃-AGREEMENT) between the receiving organisation and the host project consists of a Memorandum of Understanding for each of the host projects, which serves to confirm the willingness to engage, and formalises the aims and purpose of the partnership (m₃-wes, m₃-ine, m₃-sav). The formal agreement is not emphasised as an important aspect of the partnership in the same way as other mechanisms. In addition, the host projects establish a committee specifically for delivering the volunteer programme (M₃-COMMITTEE), which consists of the principal or centre manager, and the teachers or community workers who are directly involved in it. In allocating resources and time, the schools and health centre demonstrate their commitment to the programme. Additionally, risk assessments (M₆-RISK) for each project are separate processes and are interlinked with the development of volunteer placements (M₂-VOLUNTEER).

6.4.2 The CM₃O Configurations of the Schools

A committee provides a communication platform (M₃-COMMITTEE) between the stakeholders and supports other mechanisms. Prior to a placement, the committee supports the processes of assessing the volunteers’ life story and informed consent (M₁-STORY, M₆-CONSENT). During the placement, the receiving organisation meets weekly with the host project and the volunteer (M₅-MEETINGS), see Section 6.5. The committee ensures joint decision making (m₃-jdm) and joint planning (m₃-jpp) in relation to the placements. Several teachers and community workers expressed how they appreciated receiving information about the volunteer prior to the placement (M₁-STORY), allowing preparations to be made. Some of the teachers explained that communications are ‘open’, ‘honest’ and ‘direct’ and that any issues arising are solved [Interview-15 & 17, host project]. The comments demonstrate that communications between stakeholders appear to be working well and that they ensure a high level of engagement and integration (m₃-ine). The facilitation by the committee (M₈-COMMITTEE) plays a significant role in ensuring an effective means of implementing the volunteer placement and incorporating the host project, as becomes more apparent below.
Another aspect of the local partnership is the relations (M3-RELATION) between the receiving organisation and the host projects. These predominately consist of Paul, the teachers and principals at the schools or the care workers at the EACC. One teacher describes the partnership: ‘Calabash is doing a wonderful duty for us’ and ‘...our source of inspiration...pillar of strength...our life blood’ [Interview-15, host project]. ‘Our parent, because looks after us. Come to the rescue’, thereby defining a parental relations with the receiving organisation [Interview-17, host project]. Another teacher describes the relations as ‘commitment, love, growth, experience...’ and ‘learning from each other’ [Interview-22, host project]. A teacher proclaims to ‘nurture the relationship’ and a principal describes the partnership as being built on ‘trust’ and says ‘we know each other very well’ [Interview-16, host project]. The comments reflect a mixture of positive and empathetic perceptions, integration (m3-ine) as well as a degree of familiarity (m3-per). The perception that the receiving organisation plays a form of parental or life supporting role, and that it has a higher status than the host project is clearly significant, and indicates an element of imbalance and dependency (o4-DEPENDENCY), although some staff express a more balanced and progressive relationship consisting of trust and commitment.

Some of the comments from the community workers are similar to those from the school projects, while others reveal a different stance on their personal relations (M3-RELATION). Comments from the community workers proclaim: ‘Calabash can rely on us’ and volunteers are going to ‘feel at home’ [Interview-26, host project], highlighting their contribution to the programme and to the relations with the receiving organisation, and expressing their trustworthiness and reliability. As a community worker explains: ‘...the relationship with Calabash is quite good because there’s always feedback and then Calabash is a link between the volunteers and Emmanuel.’ [Interview-25, host project]. The statement expresses the value placed on the facilitative role played by the receiving organisation. Another carer describes that their collaboration with Calabash is ‘very important’ and ‘a blessing and that they learn a lot from the volunteers’ and acknowledged that they would not have volunteers if it were not for Calabash and they would ‘suffer’ [Interview-27, host project] without the volunteers. The last comments suggest the significance of their partnership but also a degree of dependency on the local partner (o4-DEPENDENCY). It also emphasises the value of the volunteers to their project which suggests a different perspective on their partnership than that of the schools.

In summary, a significant aspect of the partnerships is regular communications based on the committee, since this provides a platform for decision making that directly involves those teachers, principals or care workers who will host and work directly with the volunteer. This links with the previous mechanisms of the life story and informed consent, coordinated by the receiving organisation. The benefit of these local partnership mechanisms is that they allow for direct face-to-
face communications such as meetings, allowing for long-term collaborations to develop. The differences between the schools and the community project become more apparent below, where different mechanisms reveal their CMO configurations.

6.4.3 The CM2O Configuration of the School Projects

Here the contextual settings of the two stakeholders are closely explored, highlighting how they influence the partnerships and their outcomes. The host projects are each very different since their contextual environments are diverse and complex. Significantly, the influence of the projects’ needs (C4-NEED) and their values (C4-VALUE) defines the local partnerships. This becomes apparent when examining the receiving organisations’ response when selecting host projects. Paul explains that ‘development is not a cash cow’, and he makes decisions based on the ‘integrity of our work’, which are sometimes ‘anti-commercial’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. He describes how it would be very profitable to place volunteers with a local orphanage, but acknowledges that the ‘negative impacts would be too strong for the children.’ An awareness that they are working in poor communities and of the need to understand the positive impacts and mitigate any negative impacts (C3-VALUES) underpins his reasoning when selecting host projects (M3-SELECTION), which is therefore guided by sustainable and responsible alignments that enhance positive outcomes (O and O). Significantly, the rationale for selecting partnering schools is articulated as one involving consideration of their local and regional settings (C4-NEED).

Exploring the socioeconomic context of the schools, one of the principals refers to the school system as ‘a mess’ [Interview-24, host project], thus providing a broader perspective of the township schools’ financial resources and circumstances. The teacher explains that when the school opened in 1989 no funding was available for any furniture and many of the school children sat on the floor [Interview-21, host project]. The principal suggests that schools in white areas are better resourced and funded, then those in the township areas and explains that many of them are ‘bankrupt’ [Interview-19, host project]. He also explains that many schools in white areas charge a school fee since families in those areas can afford it, and this creates valuable funding. He explains that in the townships many families cannot afford to pay a fee (C4-NEED). The principal explains that many school children in the township area possess very little English language skills and therefore have limited futures and options, emphasising that good English language skills are significant to a pupil’s success [Interview-19, host project]. The volunteer programme

---

addresses both needs through the volunteers’ skills and contribution (M₄-SKILLS and M₄-V.CONTRIBUTION), and this reaches the ‘poorest of the poor’ according to a principal [Interview-19, host project].

One principal suggests that performance and standards in some other schools have suffered from corruption and poor management [Interview-24, host project], indicating some variation in the contextual settings of the schools, including exploitation (C₃-CORRUPTION). The receiving organisation highlights that (M₃-SELECTION) ‘strong leadership and effective principal and staff are very important’ (C₃-EXPECTATIONS) when selecting suitable schools. Paul explains his rationale: ‘because you can’t try and bring about change when there is no capacity among leadership to see the need for change or want to participate in change’. He clearly defines a crucial criterion (C₄-LEADERSHIP) in selecting schools, namely that they should have the same values (C₃-VALUES) and motivation (M₃-VALUE) to pursue social change as the outcome of the partnership (O₃-CHANGE). The comment emphasises how important the host project’s internal contextual setting is for ensuring better outcomes, as well as how the receiving organisation responds to this setting. One Calabash employee elaborates: ‘we must make sure that these projects are run mostly by the township people…it is a question of facilitating the project but the community people must be hands on...’ [Interview-13, receiving organisation]. This comment indicates the significance of the host projects’ active participation in this collaboration (O₄-PARTICIPATION) and defines the receiving organisation’s responsibility to play a facilitative role in this (Figure 6.5).

Figure 6.5: The CM₃O Configuration for the Schools
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6.4.4 The CM$_3$O Configuration of the Emmanuel Advice Community Centre

In contrast to the state-run schools, as a community project, the EACC project is operating in a very different setting. The EACC project is under immense financial pressures since it does not receive any regular funding, such as state funding. Thus, the project’s need for resources is desperate (C$_3$-NEED). Consequently, the relations (M$_3$-RELATION) between the EACC and the receiving organisation are more complex. As a volunteer describes the differences: ‘The relationship is more equal, schools would still run w/o Calabash, not sure if Emmanuel would, volunteers are supporting the project...’ [Interview-6, volunteer]. The doubt expressed by the volunteer indicates the dependency and inequality of the relationship between the EACC project and the receiving organisation (O$_4$-INEQUALITY and O$_4$-DEPENDENCY) compared to the schools. Her comment relates to the greater need of EACC compared to the need of the schools. Nevertheless, the comment contradicts the criterion stated by both the sending and receiving organisations that the selecting project must not be reliant on the volunteer programme (Section 6.3). The volunteer adds: ‘If Paul felt the volunteers were not benefiting Emmanuel he would pull out...’ [Interview-6, volunteer], which highlights several aspects of the partnership: i) that it is monitored and managed by the receiving organisation, and ii) that the volunteers do bring benefits to the project (Section 6.5).

Furthermore, volunteers share their views of the host project relations, and these reveal the complexity and challenges of the partnership. One volunteer explains: ‘He [Paul] liaises to endeavour to facilitate community empowerment and growth. About redistribution economic potential’, but adds: ‘Tricky relationship, such learned helplessness’ [Interview-6, volunteer]. Another volunteer comments: ‘He is still the white man and they were the black women’, and ‘a little subservient’ and ‘although he did not want that’. She continues: ‘In South Africa, there is a lack of sense of entitlement to actually make decisions on the part of blacks. There is still this hangover, Paul is the white man coming to bring us sources of help in terms of how we can access funding and bring in other white people who bring money. There is a legacy. Apartheid legacy, it is very difficult, even though Paul’s motivations and help are well intended’ [Interview-4, volunteer]. The comments contextualise the project’s post-apartheid socio-political and economic setting (C$_{3&4}$-POST-APARTHEID) and the reaction and interactions of the stakeholders, illustrating associated challenges of social and gender inequalities (C$_4$-INEQUALITIES & C$_4$-GENDER). The comments also emphasise the receiving organisation’s values (C$_3$-VALUES) and efforts to manage the power balance of the local partnership M$_3$. Nevertheless, the outcomes suggest a degree of dependency and inequality (O$_4$-DEPENDENCY and O$_4$-INEQUALITY).
Figure 6.6: The CM\textsubscript{3}O Configuration for the EACC

6.5 Volunteer Placement (M\textsubscript{4})

The collaborative engagement between the volunteer and the host project during the volunteer placement is a significant component of the supply chain, as it is here that the social intervention takes place. This section explores the volunteer placements at schools and at the EACC, which also consist of different aspects, each interacting with one another. The initial aspect is the selection of the staff members, teachers or care workers who will be directly working with the volunteer (M\textsubscript{4-SELECTION}). Secondly, the main part of the volunteer placement is the exchange of skills and expertise between the volunteer and the individual staff member (M\textsubscript{4-SKILLS}). This is related to personal and professional relations, which develop during the time the volunteer and staff member spend together (M\textsubscript{4-RELATION}). Since the placement is the social intervention, and the actual product of the supply chain, the outcomes for the volunteer and host project are significant. This section follows a similar format to previous sections in initially explaining each aspect of the volunteer placement, followed by the CMO configuration and their connectivity, including long-term outcomes. Some aspects of the placement are closely interrelated with the volunteer management (M\textsubscript{5}), such as the volunteer’s contribution (M\textsubscript{4-V CONTRIBUTION}), and will thus be explained in Section 6.6. The schools and the EACC are examined separately.
6.5.1 The M₄ Mechanisms at the Schools

Section 6.2.1 summarises how the volunteer recruitment process explains how volunteers are selected. Here, the selection of the individuals working directly with the volunteers is examined (M₄: SELECTION). The schools are examined first. One teacher explains how volunteers are matched predominately with teachers of English, but if a volunteer has different subject skills, a teacher of the same subject would be selected [Interview-22, host project]. Another teacher describes how teachers are chosen based on their skills who: ‘...will be able to best guide the volunteers’ and ‘have good mentoring skills’. She also adds that some teachers are unsuitable because they only speak Xhosa and would be unable to communicate well in English with the volunteer. She explains that teachers are chosen who: ‘...will carry out the school’s aim...also we cannot just have any teacher you know who might not do good to the school’s name.’ [Interview-20, host project]. The comments, therefore, identify selection criteria such as the subject they teach, English language skills, ability to work with volunteers and being a good representative of the school. Several of the teachers’ accounts indicate that the selection of teachers also depends on their workload and the frequency of volunteers, ensuring that teachers are not overburdened and that they are willing to work with volunteers (m₄-wes).

The next aspect of the placement is the actual exchange of skills and expertise that takes places from volunteer to teachers (M₄:SKILLS). Many teachers are able to give examples of how they worked with volunteers and what they have learnt from the experience, which entails different teaching methods, lesson planning and class activities, etc. All teachers and volunteers give an account of shadow teaching and role-playing. One teacher explains how a volunteer advised her to make the most of classroom time through class engagement and not dealing with administrative tasks [Interview-17, host project]. The teacher also elaborates on the advice from the volunteer: ‘She said to me, when the child is finished with his or her activity, he or she must have something else to do because that causes a noise of its own’. She concludes: ‘...the advantage of doing that is that the classroom is focused, they [pupils] know that after they’ve finished writing they must go there...they go to the book corner...it’s smooth.’ [Interview-17, host project]. The account demonstrates how a volunteer’s expertise is transferred to a teacher (m₄-exk) and highlights a close one to one collaboration addressing effectiveness in the classroom. The teacher’s recognition of the benefits of the volunteer’s approach to class management is significant.

Personal and professional relations develop between volunteers and teachers (M₄:RELATION) through the course of the placement. The vast majority of teachers respond positively to the prospect of volunteers working at the school, with comments including ‘happy’, ‘excited’, ‘interested’, ‘having some new’, ‘refreshing’ and have a ‘positive attitude’ [Interview-15, 17, 18, 21 host projects]. Their comments
suggest some eagerness to work with volunteers (m4-vol). Volunteers reciprocate this by describing their relationships with teachers as ‘very good’, ‘extremely positive’, ‘comfortable and easy’, ‘wonderful time in the classroom’ (Interview 1, 2 & 7, volunteers). Many of the teachers consider the volunteers as their friends, and contact remains between them after the placement (m4-per). The final aspect of the collaboration deals with the volunteers’ financial contribution towards the host project (M4 CONTRIBUTION). This is usually spent during or at the end of the placement. The contribution is spent on teaching equipment, facilities or sometimes salaries for trainees or unpaid staff. The volunteer decides how the contribution is spent, in close consultation with the receiving organisation, and this is linked to Ms, and explored further below.

6.5.2 The CM4O Configuration at the Schools

Host project staff and volunteers have a diverse range of contextual backgrounds that influence the way in which the volunteer placement (M4) takes place, and, subsequently, certain outcomes (o). The contextual settings of the volunteers and the host project staff (c1 and c4) influence the nature of the collaboration, specifically the exchange of skills and expertise (M4-SKILLS) and personal relations (M4 RELATION). The host project’s contextual conditions are distinguishable by the aims, needs and values of the schools and the wider socioeconomic setting (C4-NEED), (Section 6.4) as well as by the individual carers’ and teachers’ contextual level skills, expertise, motivations and commitments (C4-SKILLS). The approach the volunteers take when interacting with host project staff, meanwhile, is defined by their skills and expertise, as well as their motivation and expectations (e.g. c1-SKILLS). The contextual settings of local teachers are initially explored, followed by those of the volunteers, and how their interactions are influenced. In addition, distinctions between short and long-term outcomes are highlighted, and who is affected by these, and how. This plays a significant role in reflecting on the success of the supply chain in delivering sustainability.

Many local teachers express motivation, passion (C4-MOTIVATION) and commitment (C4-COMMITMENT) for teaching and working with children, and a sense of pride and self-belief (C4-VALUES) in their accomplishments as teachers (Interview 21, host project). Additionally, one teacher highlights how, as a teacher, she contributes to society. The similarities between the local teachers and the volunteers are striking (see section 6.2.) since both groups are passionate and highly motivated. Their commonalities of shared values (m4-sav) and commitments provide sound foundations upon which positive relations (M4 RELATIONS) and exchange (M4-SKILLS) can develop. Further, many of the teachers and volunteers share similar ages, gender and years of teaching experience, and collegiality (m4-sav) provides some common ground between the stakeholder groups which maximises the opportunity for positive relations to develop. These particular interpersonal conditions of how individuals interact influence the positive
exchanges, and thus (M4-RELATIONS) influences (M4-SKILLS). The evidence of the perceptions and opinions of each other shown below indicates how they approach their engagement, and how their relations (M4-RELATIONS) and skills exchange (M4-SKILLS) are closely intertwined. The conditions for the engagement of the two stakeholder groups are created and influenced by other mechanisms within the supply chain. Particularly, the management of the two stakeholders’ expectations about how and why the engagement should take place (C1-EXPECTATIONS and C4-EXPECTATIONS) plays an important role.

Several teachers’ perceptions of volunteers demonstrate positive reactions (M4-RELATIONS): ‘...you have ideas from other countries and watch and see’, and ‘...we were looking forward to learning new methods’ [Interview-20 & 21, host project], indicating an eagerness to learn and willingness to work with volunteers (m4-wes). Two teachers express some reservations and explain what led them to change their opinions: ‘In the beginning...we are thinking these people [volunteers] had just come here to relax and do nothing’ and continues: ‘...there is something very important... they sacrifice their time ... they are here to assist us and our learners.’ [Interview-18, host project], and: ‘...because we were working with people who are elderly and they accommodated us...what was important is that they understand ... and they know that not everybody knows everything...so as the time goes on trust becomes better and better.’ [Interview-17, host project]. What is pertinent here is how the volunteers’ consideration and empathy overcome the teachers’ anxieties and builds trust in the relationship (o4-TRUST). The teachers’ appreciation for the volunteers is based on them having given up their time to help them and indicates how full integration (m4-inte) of the two stakeholder groups is important. In addition, the volunteers’ age, approach and consideration (C1-EXPERTISE) plays a significant role in the exchange (M4-SKILLS).

The volunteers’ approach reveals an in-depth insight into how the skills exchange takes place (M4-SKILLS). Several of the volunteers explain their approach in working with teachers: ‘we were demonstrating, we were not telling them [teachers] you have to do this way, never did I say “do it this way”’. They would adopt similar methods...’ and continues: ‘we demonstrated little techniques, not because there were better necessarily, but they were worth trying and that was the way it was presented.’ [Interview-2, volunteer]. A volunteer concludes: ‘direct outcome of demonstrating teaching methods are working as children show they understand and teacher sees effectiveness’ [Interview-3, volunteer]. Another volunteer explains: ‘...I would not ever ever say to the teacher “you are doing it wrong”. All I could do was try to teach by example. The teacher saw there is another way of doing this.’ [Interview-2, volunteer]. Lastly, ‘the teacher brought teaching aids/prompts and embraced it totally and for me that was great. She took initiative my heart soared...’ [Interview-2, volunteer]. Their account illustrates that an integrative ‘lead by example’ approach highlighting their expertise as teachers (C1-EXPERTISE and C1-SKILLS), a desire to share their skills (C4-MOTIVATION), and exchange (M4-SKILLS) of different teaching methods (o4-
SKILLS appears to be effective. The comments also demonstrate that the teachers respond positively to the volunteers’ approach, indicating a considerable level of integration and engagement (m4-ine) which is significant for a positive outcome.

Further comments by two volunteers reveal how the exchange affects the local teachers’ motivation and enthusiasm (o4-MOTIVATION): ‘the teacher said she has lost her creativity, and she re-found and enjoyed it, she was enjoying the work with the children. She had so many good ideas’ [Interview-7, volunteer]. Another volunteer explains: ‘you could have knocked me over with a feather. When the teacher prepared everything the following week. My teacher was very creative and came up with loads of ideas.’ [Interview-2, volunteer], indicating improving motivation (o4-MOTIVATION) and positive (m4-cul) experiences (o1&m4-EXPERIENCE). The teachers resonate the volunteers’ comments: ‘I’ve learnt skills, how to manage a classroom and I’ve learnt ideas...’, ‘it was good for me’, and lastly: ‘...I’m going to gain things and my kids [pupils] will benefit from the volunteer’ [Interview-20 & 22, host projects]. This confirms that teachers gain skills (o4-SKILLS), motivation (o4-MOTIVATION) and confidence (o4-CONFIDENCE), and provide examples of different methods when teaching and managing classroom activities.

Other outcomes of the placement relate to the pupils, parents and the school’s reputation. Many teachers and principals comment on how pupils’ language skills improve and how they become more confident in speaking English (o4-LANGUAGE & o4-CONFIDENCE) as a direct result of interacting with volunteers. One of the principals explains how pupils adopt the volunteer’s English accent and improve their pronunciation and fluency during a volunteer placement. He clarifies that Xhosa is the local teachers’ native language and English is their second language [Interview-24, host projects]. Some teachers and one principal emphasise that good English skills are critical to enable pupils to engage with the wider world outside townships since English creates more opportunities to secure employment [Interview-19 & 20, host project]. Their comments suggest that language skills enable empowerment. These immediate outcomes can be attributed directly to volunteers interacting with teachers and pupils. Based on the continuation of the volunteer programme, accumulative and long-term outcomes are also revealed. This is illustrated by some teachers’ comments on how pupils are progressing into secondary schools in ‘white areas’ and private schools deemed of higher educational standards to those in townships [Interview-22&24, host project].

Two teachers’ highlight that one pupil recently qualified as a medical doctor, which the pupil attributes to the volunteer programme [Interview-20 & 24, host project]. Generally, comments suggest that the language skills enable pupils to gain social mobility through progressing their education in a different social setting (O4-MOBILITY) that crosses the boundaries of the post-apartheid social and economic settings.
Long-term implications of the volunteer programme influence wider social surroundings. For instance, pupils’ parents express more hope for their children’s future since they believe the schools’ standards are similar to schools in white areas [Interview-17, host project]. According to the principals, the schools gain in popularity and enrolment dramatically increases as a direct result of the volunteer programme [Interview-19 & 24, host project]. Paul explains how he was unsure about the raised status of the schools, but that children are no longer scared of white people. He concludes that the volunteer programme raises morale and gives the schools’ ‘kudos’ and it’s ‘powerful symbolism’ and that the pupils ‘feel part of a global world.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. The statements reveal that long-term change is occurring (O4-CHANGE), but that this is not easily evaluable.

A further outcome of the volunteer programme is how it bridges historical racial differences during the post-apartheid era. Several teachers comment on how the volunteer programme allows pupils to become accustomed to engaging with white people, which they otherwise have very limited opportunities to do [Interview-16 & 17, host project]. Some teachers also highlight how the presence of white people in township schools and interacting with staff is exceptional, and that this distinguished European volunteers from white South Africans. These are unintended outcomes that are outside the supply chain, and not part of the volunteer programme’s aims, nevertheless, the implications are significant and indicate the potential for long-term social change (O4-CHANGE).

6.5.3 The M₄ Mechanisms for the Emmanuel Advice and Care Centre

For the EACC projects, the M₄ mechanisms focused on the selection of a staff member (M₄-SELECTION), the exchange of skills and expertise (M₄-SKILLS), personal relations (M₄-RELATION) and the volunteer contribution (M₄-V.CONTRIBUTION), which are the same as for the schools. A brief description of the individual M₄ mechanisms is followed by a full explanation of the CMO configurations. Some similarities and differences are evident when exploring each collaboration, however. Similarly to the school projects, the selection of the appropriate EACC staff member to work with a volunteer depends on the volunteer’s skills and how these relate to the staff member’s role and skills level (M₄-SELECTION), indicating a close integration and engagement during the placement (m₄-rel). The exchange of expertise and skills (M₄-SKILLS) is wide ranging, consisting of bookkeeping, accountancy and first aid training (m₄-exk), and are further examined below as part of their CMO configurations. Personal relations (M₄-RELATION) develop over time (m₄-per), and several care workers describe the volunteers as their ‘friends’, ‘open’ and that they had a sense of ‘belonging’ and being ‘part of the family’ [Interview-25-28, host project]. As highlighted above, the volunteer contribution (M₄-V.CONTRIBUTION) is influenced by another M₅ mechanism, which is fully explored below in the last section (Section 6.5.5).
6.5.4 The CM4O Configuration for the Emmanuel Advise and Care Centre

There are some significant differences between the school projects and the EACC (see Section 6.5.2). The EACC’s governance is less formal and not overseen by a government department as the schools are. The funding sources for the community project are precarious and the need for resources is great (C4-NEED). This contextual setting underpins how the volunteer placement is operated, and the resulting CMO configurations. All the care workers are unpaid since government funding has ceased (C4-NOSKILL); they have minimal relevant skills (C4-NOSKILL) and little training as health care workers (C4-NOTRAINING). Some of the staff are HIV positive (C4-HIV), and one carer explains how the health care centre supported her while sick. Once recovered, she felt ‘to help people and the community … make people aware about HIV and AIDS’. She adds that there are ‘no jobs’ [Interview-28, host project] (C4-MOTIVATION). Another states: ‘It’s about helping…to give ourselves …and help the community and we want to see sometimes a change’ [Interview-29, host project]. The statements explain their motivations (C4-MOTIVATION) and commitment (C4-COMMITMENT) to the community, as well as their rationale and values (C4-VALUES). Thus, for some care workers the motivations to work at the EACC are personal and deep-rooted in their personal lives, and their roles have more significance for them than just fulfilling a job.

Exploring the CMO configurations, it is evident that the exchange of skills and expertise is significant (M4-SKILLS), alongside personal relations (M4-RELATION). A noticeable difference is how the two mechanisms are more closely intertwined than with the school projects. Some of the carers explain how working at the centre is emotionally very challenging, and how they motivate each other, demonstrating a commitment to the centre (C4-COMMITMENT) [Interview-25&26, host project]. To illustrate their strategy for dealing with extreme poverty and desolation, another care worker describes how they (C4-POVERTY): ‘…hug each other in the morning, ‘talk before work’ or ‘sing together’ [Interview-25, host project]. A care worker describes how volunteers are willing to hear about their problems (M4-RELATION) because the volunteers do the ‘same work at home’ (C4-EXPERTISE) and explains how volunteers get attached to the staff (M4-per), proclaiming that volunteers are part of their team [Interview-26, host project]. Her comments demonstrate that there is a willingness to integrate volunteers closely into the project (M4-wel & M4-ine). The care worker continues to explain that talking together makes them ‘feel better’ (O4-MOTIVATION). This resonates with a comment by a volunteer, who explains how her presence made a difference: ‘...there were no volunteers for some time, I knew I had to inject some encouragement.’ [Interview-6, volunteer], illustrating that motivation is one positive outcome (O4-MOTIVATION).

A carer describes the exchange of skills and expertise (M4-SKILLS) and explains that volunteers do a ‘hard job’ and are ‘very special for us’ and ‘they always keep us busy’ [Interview-27, host project], showing that the
volunteers’ contribution is acknowledged. Two volunteers, meanwhile, explain: ‘...tried to build up trust and [a] honest dialogue, I was working very hard’ [Interview-4, volunteer] and ‘I was going in with some openness on how best to support them but needing to learn first what they wanted ...’ [Interview-6, volunteer]. Their comments describe that the volunteers’ approach (C1-APPROACH) in developing relations through open-mindedness and in developing trust are closely related (M4-RELATION) with the exchange of skills and expertise (M4-SKILLS). One volunteer, however, explains how the experience has had a negative effect on her (O1-EXHAUSTION): ‘...felt very drained and exhausted. The whole experience. Worn out. I did a shed load of work’ [Interview-4, volunteer]. Hoping for more volunteers because they provide skills and knowledge, one carer explains that volunteers are ‘leaving a legacy’ and ‘feeling good’ about learning. Another carer rationalises: ‘...because why they [volunteers] choose us, we are special. There is something that we make them [volunteers] that to believe in us.’ Feeling proud to do a good job...She [volunteer] gave me that trust that I can do my job’ [Interview-25, host project], illustrates several outcomes including motivation (O4-MOTIVATION), confidence (O4-CONFIDENCE), and skills exchange (O4-SKILLS).

According to several project staff, the volunteer programme makes a big difference to the EACC and has a ‘huge impact’, and they explain that the project could not exist without the volunteer programme. Project staff provide many examples of skills and expertise (O4-SKILLS) acquired from volunteers and explain that volunteers have supported the care workers and many clients by providing counselling and mentoring [Interview-25-29, host project]. While these statements suggest long-term change (O4-CHANGE), concerns are also raised regarding dependency on volunteers, as two project staff explain that clients with HIV are vulnerable and easily become dependent on carers. Both project staff explain that expectations need managing and that ‘barriers and limitations’ are necessary [Interview-28 & 29, host project]. Dianne also expresses some concern over emotional dependency [Interview-11, sending organisations] in particular of long-serving volunteers working with clients (O4-DEPENDENCY). Additionally, one volunteer describes how project staff have asked her for money or for use of her mobile phone, and she explains how Paul advises volunteers that boundaries (M5-ORIENTATION) need to be established between carers and clients [Interview-6, volunteer]. The statements illustrate how the EACC project, due to its needs and circumstances (C4-NEED), requires more management and sensitivity to achieve balance.

**6.5.5 The CM4O Configurations and M6 Mechanisms for the Schools and EACC**

At the end of the volunteer placement, a volunteer contribution (M4-V CONTRIBUTION) is given to the project, which is intended to support the volunteers’ exchange of skills and expertise. These contributions from volunteers include funding school equipment or teaching aids. If the contribution is not needed for the volunteers’ activities, then its purpose is decided through consultation (M4-V CONTRIBUTION), as detailed in the following section. Many teachers comment on how they appreciate the
training aids and training equipment the school receives [Interview-17, 22, 23, local host]. Other contributions include financing other facilities such as the library, and one volunteer explains how three volunteers decided that their contribution should be used to contribute to a hitherto unsalaried support teacher [Interview-2, volunteer]. An EACC staff member, on the other hand, explains that they are sometimes dependent on the volunteers’ financial contribution to pay for basic needs (C4-NEED) such as utility costs [Interview-29, host project]. The statements highlight that if the need for a project is great then dependency is more likely (O4-DEPENDENCY) and more management is required to maintain an appropriate power balance. As illustrated, however, the greater the need the more of a positive impact is achievable. Thus, sustainability is more questionable at the EACC than it is for the schools because of the contextual settings (c) but not the mechanisms (M) of how the volunteer programme is operated.

Figure 6.7: The CM₄O Configuration

6.6 Volunteer Management (M₅)

As outlined above, the management of volunteers is the main role and responsibility of the receiving organisation as part the partnership management (Section 6.4). According to the evaluative framework (Figure 4.6), the collaboration of these two stakeholders is not part of the sequential flow of the supply chain, nevertheless, it is just as valuable in its contribution to the outcomes of the value
chain. The direct involvement between the volunteer and the receiving organisation takes place through several procedures and personal relations. Some of the different aspects of volunteer management occur simultaneously and are carried out by several staff members of the receiving organisation. These include an orientation meeting (M$_5$-ORIENTATION), the transportation of volunteers to and from their accommodation to the host project location (M$_5$-TRANSPORTATION), weekly meetings (M$_5$-MEETING), and payment to the receiving partner (M$_5$-P.PAYMENT). Other personal relations also exist between the staff of the sending organisation and volunteers (M$_5$-RELATIONS). As highlighted in the previous section, two M$_4$ procedures are closely linked with M$_5$ procedures. For instance, the weekly meeting (M$_5$-MEETING) takes place between three stakeholders since it also includes staff members of the host project. Lastly, the volunteer contribution (M$_4$-V.CONTRIBUTION) only takes place after guidance from the receiving organisation during the orientation (M$_5$-ORIENTATION) and discussions during the weekly meetings (M$_5$-MEETING).

### 6.6.1 The M$_5$ Mechanisms

Paul provides an induction or ‘orientation’ for volunteers prior to their placement. This ensures that volunteers are well prepared (M$_5$-ORIENTATION) and that they understand the current situation of their host project. In addition to volunteer reports and the project’s support plan, Paul provides more details. The orientation also includes a brief on the volunteer contribution (M$_4$-V.CONTRIBUTION), indicative of full engagement and integration (m$_5$-pe). Through interactions such as the orientation and weekly meetings, relations develop between volunteers and Paul (M$_5$-RELATIONS). Volunteers predominately speak highly of Paul, describing him as ‘exuberant’, ‘brilliant’ and ‘very professional in how he operates’ and ‘dedicated’. Others explain how ‘impressed’ they are with Paul and ‘would like to feel we became friends’ [Interviews 1-8, volunteer], indicating the development of some kind of personal relationship (m$_5$-pe).

One volunteer, however, describes how she was disappointed that all the project information on the EACC project she received was wrong and that she felt disappointed. She explains how he dealt with it effectively but that he was ‘mortified’ and he ‘could not believe it’ [Interviews 6, volunteer]. Her account highlights how the orientation meeting can provide an opportunity for direct dialogue and how emerging problems can be dealt with directly (m$_5$-jps).

Two regular drivers, who are also trained tour guides, usually carry out the daily transportation of volunteers (M$_5$-TRANSPORTATION). Through daily interactions and conversations, personal relations (M$_5$-RELATIONS) develop between staff and volunteers (m$_5$-pe). One staff member feels inspired by volunteers because of their culture of ‘doing something that is right without getting paid’ [Interview 12, receiving organisation]. While the other staff member expresses appreciation of volunteers’ senior age and their abilities to travel and volunteer. He values the cultural exchange (m$_5$-cul) and learning new things and
meeting people from different backgrounds [Interview-13, receiving organisation]. Both their comments indicate positive cultural exchanges with volunteers that are based on respect. Volunteers, meanwhile, frequently offer an account of their experiences at the host project, and through their daily interactions, they have the opportunity to ask staff their opinions, comments or advice [Interview-12, receiving organisation]. Thus, the daily transportation facilitates volunteers to develop informal relations (m5-per) and staff act as informal advisers and ‘cultural guides’. It also ensures continuous and ongoing interactions between the volunteer and the receiving organisation throughout their placement (m5-ine). Furthermore, the daily transportation (M5-TRANSPORTATION) of volunteers ensures their safety (o1-SAFETY).

Meetings take place at the end of each week for the duration of the volunteer placement held at the host project (M5-MEETING). These include the involved teacher, the volunteer, Paul from the receiving organisations and at least one other staff member from the school, such as the principal or deputy, demonstrating an opportunity for joint problem solving (m5-jps) and decision making (m5-jdm). The objective of the meeting is to reflect on and discuss the week’s placement and address any arising concerns. Issues tend to relate to the placements, such as lack of materials, miscommunications or cultural differences. Paul, however, admits that sometimes volunteers would not speak up for fear of creating an ‘uncomfortable situation’, and he, therefore, arranges a separate meeting away from the host project [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. He emphasises that his involvement in this process is part of his responsibilities and rationalises that this type of engagement is necessary and the reason why volunteers pay a management fee. Lastly, volunteers are asked to pay each organisation separately (M5-P.PAYMENT). The contextual settings of why and how some of the processes are conducted and how they achieve certain outcomes are shown below.

### 6.6.2 The CM5O Configuration

As outlined in Section 6.4, the contextual drivers and settings of how the volunteer management is carried out relate to the receiving organisation’s roles and responsibilities within the value chain. The aim is to ensure a successful, positive and safe placement that is defined by risk assessment, due diligence and acting as a cultural bridge and facilitator between the volunteer and host project [Interview-10, sending organisation]. Paul explains anecdotally why the volunteer management processes are important and give some indication of the driving forces that influence how they are carried out. He states: ‘I have a grim view of the volunteer tourism sector, I think it’s a pretty explosive sector how it’s currently running. ... I see more abuse of volunteers and communities than what I see good practice.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. His opinion and critique of the volunteer tourism industry (C2-V.INDUSTRY) as exploiting volunteers and communities accentuates the importance of good practice, and he explains that his organisation is attempting to achieve best practice (C2-VALUES). Paul explains that part of the orientation
(M5-ORIENTATION) is ‘to communicate that one of the guiding reasons why we do this is this the notion of embodying common humanity ... we are all interconnected whether we want to accept it or not’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. Sharing his values of mutuality and equality (m5-sav) with volunteers at the beginning of their placement underpins how the volunteer management is carried out (O4-EQUALITY).

In explaining his involvement in the management of volunteers he proclaims: ‘I don’t understand how you can have a volunteer programme running without that kind of engagement. You can’t just parachute people in and leave them there’ [Interview-14 receiving organisation]. His rationale for ongoing support throughout the placement, such as the weekly meetings (M5-MEETING), clearly emphasises its necessity and illustrates his values (C2-V.INDUSTRY). The comment alludes to other volunteer organisations not involving themselves during the placement (C2-V.INDUSTRY). The meetings are seen as successful, since a staff member explains how they overcome difficulties such as cultural differences, indicating joint problem solving (m5-jps). Paul continues to explain how he encourages volunteers to be honest and speak up about any concerns they may have and emphasises that the meetings are ‘open’ communications [Interview-14 receiving organisation]. One volunteer explains how Paul is ‘very good in those meetings ... the way he manages the situation, he was respectful... and he had distance and involvement’. He is also described as ‘friendly, supportive and genuine’ [Interview-1-8 volunteer], which one teacher confirms [Interview-16, host project]. The comments suggest a high level of engagement amongst the three stakeholders, which is facilitated by the receiving organisation and which encourages openness and transparency during the meetings (O1&4-TRANSPARENCY) leading to more positive experiences (O1&4-EXPERIENCE).

6.6.3 The CM5O Configuration and M5 Mechanism

Communication during the orientation (M5-ORIENTATION) and weekly meetings (M5-MEETINGS) influences how the volunteer contribution (M4-V CONTRIBUTION) is spent on the host project, based on joint decision making (m5-jdm). The primary purpose of the contribution is to support the volunteer’s tasks during the placement or other aspects of the project. The contextual drivers which influence the decision making originate from the receiving organisation. Paul explains that during the orientation he acknowledges that the volunteer contribution is theirs but that, as a visitor, volunteers may not be the best person to identify the needs of the project [Interview-14 receiving organisation]. Thus, through discussions during the weekly meetings, a process of orientation takes place in respect to how the contribution should be spent on the project. Paul emphasises that consensus must be reached between the host project and volunteer. He adds:’...it’s been difficult at times...a bit of little give and take... but most of the time we find consensus and we try and ensure that our projects are the drivers’ [Interview-14 receiving organisation]. His statement emphasises the context in which the decision making takes places (C4-VALUES) as one of joint
decision making (m<sub>5-jdm</sub>) that leads to transparency (o<sub>1&4-TRANSPARENCY</sub>) and a balance of power (o<sub>4-EQUALITY</sub>) inclusive of the host project.

Since the EACC’s needs are great and the project lacks funding for operational costs (C<sub>4-NEED</sub>), Paul explains that he guides volunteers more [Interview-14 receiving organisation], which also results in transparency (o<sub>1&4-TRANSPARENCY</sub>). But his statement highlights how he understands (C<sub>3-EXPERTISE</sub>) the different needs of the project and takes a different approach (C<sub>2-APPROACH</sub>) in managing the volunteer and their contribution. In summary, the contextual driver predominately originates from the receiving organisation in how it operationalises their sustainability values by ensuring that the host projects are an integral part of the decision making in respect to the volunteer contribution. By maintaining ongoing support for the volunteer during their placement, it is apparent how the facilitative role and cultural bridge between the volunteer and the host project are achieved. This is accomplished through the ways in which processes are carried out. Figure 6.8 highlights the intricacies of how the volunteer management is interlinked with the placement, and how this is driven by the approach and values of the receiving organisation.

Figure 6.8: The CM<sub>3</sub>O Configuration
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6.7 Host Project Assessment (M₆)

This final section highlights how the sending organisation plays a role in achieving sustainable practices in its collaboration with the host project. The section fully examines the contextual drivers as part of the process of determining the CMO configurations that relate predominately to the sending organisation. The collaborative processes consist of project selection (M₆–P.SELECTION), informed consent (M₆–CONSENT), the support plan (M₆–PLAN), and the project feedback report (M₆–H.REPORT). As shown above in Section 6.2, informed consent and the support plan (M₆–PLAN) serve to support the project matching process (M₁–MATCH). Similarly, project selection (M₆–P.SELECTION) is linked to the matching process since the circumstances of individual projects are also incorporated. The project selection, informed consent and the project’s feedback consist of frequent short processes for each volunteer placement, whereas the support plan is a long-term management plan that is carried out every two years and thus has a significantly longer time span, and is a more elaborate collaborative process. This section, therefore, explores each process separately and continues to explain their relevance and how they are interlinked with other processes. The pathways of CMO collaborations are highlighted in the latter part of this section.

6.7.1 The M₆ Mechanisms

The project selection (M₆–P.SELECTION) considers several contextual factors associated with each project, such as the recent number and frequency of volunteers and the number of project staff. The selection of projects is an integral part of the matching process (M₁–MATCH) since the sending organisation needs to establish a balance between the volunteers’ preferences and a project’s settings and needs. Giving explicit consideration to the project selection demonstrates how the host project is fully integrated (m₆–ine) into the value chain’s initial processes (M₃). This is followed by the host project’s informed consent (M₆–CONSENT), which finalises the matching process (M₁–MATCH) and ensures that the process is transparent and power balance is achieved (Section 6.2), as well as demonstrating integration and engagement (m₆–ine). Thus, the informed consent (M₆–CONSENT) is a critical component since it gives an opportunity to each host project to make an informed decision about the suitability and timing of each volunteer placement. This allows the host project to reject or accept a volunteer, as well as to plan and arrange prior to the placement (m₆–ine). Hence, it ensures that the host project is willing to engage in the supply chain with each volunteer placement (m₆–wes).

The purpose of the support plan (M₆–PLAN) is to provide a long-term plan outlining the host project’s needs and aims and their requirements in terms of volunteers’ skills. The support plan is developed and updated by the sending organisation in close collaboration with the host project. The plan guides
the sending organisation in selecting suitable placements and in identifying needs and required skills. The plan is also given to volunteers prior to their placement in order to provide them with relevant information about the project and the placement’s overall aim. The receiving organisation plays a facilitative role in the production and updating of the support plan, resulting in a three-way joint planning and product development process (M6-JPP), as well as joint decision making (M6-JDM). The collaboration involved in producing the support plan reflects the joint processes of monitoring the volunteer placements (M6-JRM) and in reviewing the projects’ and volunteers’ feedback reports (M6-H.REPORT, M1-V.REPORT). In the post-project feedback report (M6-H.REPORT) the host project evaluates each volunteer, which is described as ‘working well’ [Interview-20, host project]. Developing the support plan involves a visit to each project by a member of staff from the sending organisation only every two years, and therefore personal relations are not as well developed in comparison to other collaborations within the supply chain (M6-RELATIONS) and are not a significant contribution to the M6 procedures.

6.7.2 The CM6O Configuration

In establishing the CMO configurations, and the pathways through which the M6 collaborations fulfil their functions and purpose, the sending organisations and host project’s contextual settings are fully explored. A significant inclusion into the matching process (M1-MATCH) is the consideration of the contextual settings of each project (M6-P.SELECTION). Considerations such as the frequency and number of volunteers play an important role in ensuring that projects are given an appropriate number of volunteers, sufficient to fulfil their needs without overburdening them (C4-VOLUNTEERS). Kate offers an anecdote: ‘...to fill a bucket one needs to keep the flow constant, even if it is just a drip at a time to fill that bucket, to fulfil a project’s needs we need to keep adding input...’ [Interview-9, sending organisation]. She continues to explain that as an ethical organisation they have a relatively small number of volunteers, she needs to decide carefully which projects to select for each volunteer (C2-VALUES). The sending organisation ensures that the host project’s needs are given priority within this process. She also explains how it would be unethical to take on more projects when they cannot provide a sufficient number of volunteers (C2-VALUES). As a result, the sending organisation ensures equality is achieved in fully integrating the host project (O4-EQUALITY).

By explaining why and how informed consent (M6-CONSENT) is obtained from the host project, the sending organisation explains the process as follows: ‘...the bottom line and the project accepts them [volunteer] with consultation with the local partner. It is the project’s choice first then it’s the volunteer’s choice...’. In clearly defining an order of priority, the comment indicates that the host project drives the collaborations (C1-VALUES). Sallie explains their difficulties, however: ‘...one of the things we were really struggling with was the capacity of the host project to understand what their
needs were and therefore to give the correct consent to which volunteer they should accept [Interview-10, sending organisation]. This statement indicates that achieving a balance of power can initially be challenging in facilitating equality (O4-EQUALITY). Nonetheless, informed consent is a critical component of the value chain in ensuring transparency (O4-TRANSPARENCY) through its implementation providing direct consultative support. It is evident that the driving force for how the process is managed in this collaboration is the sending organisation’s values (C2-VALUE).

Sallie clarifies how the support plan (M6-PLAN) is implemented: ‘...[the volunteer programme] mustn’t be volunteer led, it mustn’t be us going in and telling them what they need, it must be what they [host project] actually need’ [Interview-10, sending organisation]. The emphasis on how the plan fosters the host project’s participation demonstrates the sending organisation’s values of equality (C4-VALUES) through joint planning and development (m6-jpp). Sallie explains that before the support plan the identification of the project’s needs was driven by the sending and receiving organisation and, in their experience, these were not the right ones. This highlights how the project’s needs may be wrongly identified if the project is not actively involved in identifying their own needs. Thus, a critical component of the support plan is the correct identification of the project’s needs by the project staff themselves, indicative of capacity building (m6-cab). As Dianne concludes: ‘...our review of our support plans shows pretty clearly that some things are being taken on board and where they’re asking us to teach them a skill, they’re certainly making use of that skill.’ [Interview-11, sending organisation], explaining the lasting outcomes (O4-SKILLS). This demonstrates that the support plan achieves equality (O4-EQUALITY) by fully incorporating the host project.

Dianne describes how the support plan (M6-PLAN) assists in how volunteers’ skills are utilised during the placement (M4-SKILLS) and focus on long-term achievements. She explains how the support plan outlines a plan for the schools that details how volunteers work directly with the teachers, such as showing different approaches in classroom teaching. Dianne describes that there is an obvious temptation for teachers to just ask a volunteer to work with the weaker students outside the classroom, which has only limited short-term outcomes. The emphasis, therefore, is on working with adults and project staff rather than directly with the pupils since the skills exchange is, therefore, more effective. Dianne explains that the same is the case at the EACC project where the emphasis is on sharing skills with the staff rather than with the project’s clients [Interview-11, sending organisation]. Her approach illustrates how the support plan enables a dialogue with the host projects (C2-APPROACH). It also creates optimum settings for lasting impacts arising from the volunteer placements (O4-SKILLS). A comment by a volunteer explains why she thinks the volunteer placement is successful: ‘...the communications and research, Dianne goes and sets things up, there are always people to check up on that.’ [Interview-5, volunteer], thus reinforcing
the support plan’s effectiveness. The implementation of the support plan and the informed consent illustrates the sending organisation’s facilitative role and the receiving organisation’s consultative role. Meanwhile, the management of the informed consent and support plan shows a highly integrated three-way collaboration ($m_{6_{-in}}$). It also highlights the close-knit collaboration that consists of shared aims between the sending and receiving organisation.

Figure 6.9: The CM$O$ Configuration
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6.7.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the empirical evidence for the collaborative relationships between the main stakeholders in VT and how they influence its outcomes. The main body of the chapter examined six collaborative relationships between the main four stakeholders (Objective 1) and determined how these collaborations influence the outcomes of VT (Objective 2). The findings are based on an evaluative framework which applies realistic evaluation and incorporates collaboration theory, as conceptualised in Chapter 4 (Objective 3), and tests this through a case study within an industry setting (Objective 4). In applying realistic evaluation, the evaluative framework determined CMO configurations revealing how each collaboration entails different mechanisms (M) which are evaluable by their characteristics and nature (m). The intermediate (o) and long-term (O) outcomes are influenced by different sets of contextual conditions that either originate from the wider socio-
economic environment (C) or from personal qualities (c). Thus, the evaluative framework reveals why the contextual settings result in sustainable outcomes and how the collaborations support this. Sustainable outcomes are defined by balanced, equal and transparent collaborations.

The conceptual framework provides a close and detailed analysis of each of the different C, M and O components in the supply chain, and how they interact with one another. It demonstrates that the interactions are dynamic and complex, tending towards a three-way communication process that illustrates facilitation processes by the sending and receiving organisations and allows for more transparency and balanced decision making within the collaborations. Throughout all the different interactions there is strong evidence for highly engaged and integrated processes at each stage of the supply chain. Each of these processes fulfil a particular role and purpose which indicate that they have been implemented with a great deal of thought and understanding of the supply chain’s dynamic collaborations. The importance of the sending and receiving organisations’ shared aims and purpose is very evident, along with how they influence other aspects of the supply chain. Furthermore, the differences in the contextual settings of each of the projects demonstrate how they influence the outcomes and how they are managed through established elaborate mechanisms. This highlights how stakeholders respond and make choices based on the resources, constraints and opportunities available to them.

The next chapter (Chapter 7) provides a detailed contextualisation and discussion of the empirical evidence of each of the C, M and O configurations. This will allow for a full understanding of which contextual settings and mechanisms of the collaborations influence particular outcomes. In comparing each of the CMO configurations, the following chapter explores and discusses which of them are the most influential. This leads to the conclusion of the study in Chapter 8.
7 Discussion

‘There are known knowns, things we know that we know; and there are known unknowns, things that we know we don’t know. But there are also unknown unknowns, things we do not know we don’t know.

Donald Rumsfeld

7.1 Introduction

Chapter 6 demonstrated how each set of collaborative relations within the supply chain serves different purposes. The findings reveal dynamic and interrelated collaborations amongst the stakeholder groups, which are based on the CMO configurations and result in particular outcomes. Overall, the shared values of the sending and receiving organisations play a significant role in driving the different processes amongst the stakeholders that influence sustainability performances. This chapter explores the results of the CMO configurations, which includes the contextual settings of each collaborative relation and how they influence sustainable outcomes. The chapter further discusses the implications of these findings for the VT industry and how they contribute to the current body of knowledge and future investigations. With the study’s aim in mind, the chapter’s purpose is twofold: i) to explore the findings resulting from the application of the evaluative framework to the case study and, ii) to reflect on the application of the framework itself. The final chapter summarises the understandings and explanations of their implications for industry and academia (Chapter 8).

The first section (Section 7.2) explores the collaborative relations between the stakeholders (Objective 1). It explains the findings’ relevance to the current literature about the main stakeholders and their external and internal contextual settings (C, c) and the collaborative relations and descriptors (M, m). The study’s contributions to the current understanding of stakeholders and their interactions are highlighted, and their potential implications and limitations are discussed. This is followed by Section 7.3 which identifies how and why the stakeholders’ collaborations influence sustainable outcomes (Objective 2). It examines the most significant pathways of the CMO configurations in how they influence sustainable outcomes in VT (O, o). The section highlights the significance of how the stakeholders’ contextual settings and their interactions (C+M) influence sustainable outcomes and explains how some pathways are interrelated and influence each other.

Section 7.4 deals with the final objective (Objective 3), which explores the development and application of the evaluative framework. Important points of discussion here are the development of
the middle range theories and the derivation of explanatory variations of the collaborations (how) and their contextual conditionality (why). The CMO configurations are further refined to the middle range theories to determine what influences sustainability performance. This section emphasises how the new understanding of evaluating sustainability performance relates to the current body of knowledge of other conceptual approaches and frameworks. It explores the generalisability and transferability of the study’s findings. This chapter also reveals how this exploratory study develops a new understanding of the interrelations between VT stakeholders and what it is among these that influences sustainability performance. The chapter concludes with summative remarks on the evaluative framework and its middle range theories.

7.2 Evaluating stakeholders’ collaborations within their contextual setting

7.2.1 Section Overview

Here, the main components of the first objective are examined: firstly, the stakeholders’ contextual settings, and; secondly, the evaluation of their collaborative relations. Initially, the attributes and characteristics of each stakeholder group (volunteers, sending organisation, receiving organisation, and local host project staff) are explored and how these findings contribute to new insights. This section examines the main contextual settings (c, C) that the stakeholders operate in and discusses the constraints and drivers of each stakeholder group that influence their collaborative relations within the supply chain. A significant issue that is identified through this is the qualities of the collaborations between stakeholders since this addresses gaps in the literature (Section 7.2). In addition, different aspects of the collaboration are examined: firstly, the processes and procedures (M) amongst the stakeholders, and; secondly, the collaborative descriptions (m). This leads to the following section (Section 7.3), which explores the main pathways of the CMO configurations, scrutinising the outcomes of the sustainability performance (o, O). Finally within this section, some of the limitations of this qualitative research are identified.

7.2.2 The Main Stakeholder in the Supply Chain

The supply chain of the main four stakeholders is representative of the VT industry. The arrangement of the main stakeholder groups (volunteers, sending organisation, receiving organisation and local project) are an important component of the evaluative framework. The four main stakeholders identified are consistent with the current body of knowledge (Czarnecki et al., 2015; Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; Morgan, 2009; Palacios, 2010; Punaks & Feit, 2014). Although the literature suggests that this is a relatively common arrangement within the industry, other supply chain models with different stakeholder exist. Nonetheless, the proportions of different
supply chain models in the industry and their collaborative relations are unknown (Taplin et al., 2014). A quantitative assessment of the different supply chain arrangements within the industry, and using realistic evaluation to assess their collaborative relations would contribute to this gap of knowledge. Importantly, the stakeholder supply chain identified in this case study is representative and is transferable in determining the sustainability performance of other organisations with similar supply chain models.

Additionally, the global distribution of the case study’s stakeholder groups is typical within the VT industry and this further supports the representativeness of this study. The findings show that the volunteers originate from the Global North and tend to travel to the host project in a developing country in the Global South. Likewise, sending organisations tend to be based in the Global North while receiving organisations are in the Global South. In addition, it should be noted that the host country, South Africa, is a developing country, the host projects are in the Global South (United Nations, 2018). Thus, the geographical distribution of the stakeholder groups is representative for the VT industry (Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; Palacios, 2010; Taplin et al., 2014). This suggests that the case study is also representative of the industry in terms of the geopolitical relations between the stakeholder groups and indicates transferability in evaluating sustainability performance in future studies. Within the VT industry, as illustrated below the geographical distribution of the main stakeholder groups plays an influential role in characterising unsustainable and poor practices.

7.2.3 Stakeholders’ External Contextual Conditions (C)

The available resources and circumstances of each stakeholder group define the external conditions, how stakeholders interact with one another and the responses and outcomes of those collaborative relations and therefore play a significant role in influencing the overall outcomes. The external contextual settings include the socioeconomic and also political circumstances of the stakeholder groups, particularly the host projects. In addition, the VT industry is the external setting within which the organisations operate and through which they respond to market forces. Table 7.1 illustrates the main resources and settings of the stakeholder groups. The external contextual settings in the case study were identified by the stakeholders in their accounts of how they react to certain settings. The literature is limited to exploring how external influences affect stakeholders (e.g. Coghan & Noakes, 2012; Coren & Gray, 2012; Sinervo, 2014). This section explores how the case study contributes to the existing body of knowledge, and in doing so establishes some of the main contextual variables and the transferability of the case study.
In exploring the external contextual conditions (Table 7.1) it is apparent that the identified external conditions challenge the various stakeholder groups disproportionately. The findings suggest that some stakeholder groups are more influenced by their external factors than others and that this affects their position in the supply chain. Only a few volunteers mentioned the VT market in relation to opting for an ethical and sustainability orientated sending organisation. Others mentioned that they were constrained by time and money or family commitments, which limits their ambitions to volunteer more (C₁-TIME & MONEY, C₁-FAMILY). As paying consumers, volunteers chose a sending organisation and its associated supply chain, and thus do not have any direct external constraints that influence their engagement with the supply chain. Two other external contextual settings (C₂&₃-V. INDUSTRY, C₂&₃-MARKET) relate to the sending and receiving organisations and the remaining four to the host projects (C₄-POST-APARTHEID, C₄-NEED, C₄-CORRUPTION, C₄-POVERTY). These external influences relate to the current body of understanding in relation to the contexts of volunteer placements and contribute to further knowledge in evaluating how they influence their collaborative relations (Taplin et al., 2014). The findings indicate that the host projects face the most pressing challenges, which are specific to their local, regional and national settings, as becomes more apparent below (Section 7.3.4 and 7.3.5).

Table 7.1 Summary External Contextual Conditions (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C environmental economic social political settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁-TIME &amp; MONEY, C₁-FAMILY, C₂&amp;₃-MARKET, C₂&amp;₃-V.INDUSTRY, C₄-POST-APARTHEID, C₄-NEED, C₄-CORRUPTION, C₄-POVERTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

The competitive VT market (C₃-MARKET) does not influence this sending organisation. As Sallie explained: ‘the very nature of the way we position ourselves in the market place, which is we are a bit worthy... people know that their skills are going to be matched to a need, it’s not just bums on seats...’ [Interview-10, sending organisation]. The statement illustrates how the sending organisation distinguishes itself from the current industry and its unsustainable practices (Guttentag, 2012; McGehee, 2012; Tomazos, 2012; Tomazos & Butler, 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Furthermore, the sending organisation does not appear to be challenged by a competitive market (Coren & Gray, 2012; Wearing et al. 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). The statement indicates how the sending organisation positions itself within the VT market, opting to focus on the quality of the placement rather than on the number of volunteers. The statement highlights the sending organisation’s sustainability credentials and how it distances itself from the industry’s competitiveness. The significant point here is how the organisation is not affected directly by the market but by how it is positioned within the industry.

C₂-MARKET
The external contextual circumstances of the receiving organisation illustrate its position in the VT market and reveal a similar market position to that of the sending organisation. The director, Paul criticised the VT market (C₃-MARKET): ‘...when the gap year market was booming ... it was all about what is sellable, it wasn’t about what is the need.’ He further explained ‘I have a grim view of the volunteer tourism sector, I think it’s a pretty explosive sector how it’s currently running. ... I see more abuse of volunteers and communities than what I see good practice.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. His profound critique of the volunteer tourism industry (C₃-V.INDUSTRY) demonstrates his condemnation of current unsustainable practices (Guttentag, 2012; McGehee, 2012; Tomazos, 2012; Tomazos & Butler, 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). The findings give an insight into the receiving organisation’s position in the market and contribute to the currently limited understanding of the receiving organisations’ roles and responsibilities (Czarnecki et al., 2015; Punaks & Feit, 2014). Similar to the sending organisation, the findings confirm the receiving organisation’s known sustainability credentials. In rejecting current industry practices and focusing on sustainable practices these organisations are not directly influenced by the market and industry. Their internal contexts reveal how their shared values play an important role, as illustrated later in this chapter. The different external circumstances of the host project highlight the significance of their contextual influences.

C₃-MARKET + C₃-V.INDUSTRY

In considering the external (and internal) factors of the host projects, two valuable insights emerge. Firstly, the external circumstances characterise the challenges and opportunities facing the host projects that may directly or indirectly affect the outcomes of the volunteer programme. Secondly, the external settings begin to define the needs of the host project that are addressed by the volunteer programme. For instance, the school projects are influenced by predominately national and regional economic and social constraints. As a principal explained, schools in townships have less government funding (C₄-NEED) and school fees are less affordable for the parents (C₄-POVERTY) than schools in white areas. The school faces many challenges such as overburdened resources which impede on the quality of education, with the principal describing them as ‘bankrupt’, and some schools suffer from corruption and poor management (C₄-CORRUPTION) [Interview-24, local project]. Previous studies have identified the recipients’ position of disempowerment and inequality in relation to other stakeholders (e.g. Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Phelan, 2015). However, there is currently little understanding of the social and economic circumstances of local projects which relate to why and how they may engage in hosting
volunteers, nor of how these articulate the host projects’ position within the supply chain and influence the outcomes of the relationship (Section 7.3.4 and 7.3.5).

Schools: $C_{4\text{-NEED}} + C_{4\text{-CORRUPTION}}$

Similarly, the economic and social settings reveal useful insights with respect to the EACC (Emmanuel Advice Community Centre). Specifically, the EACC is under considerable financial pressure because it’s regular funding being withdrawn ($C_{4\text{-NEED}}$) while their recipients are extremely poor ($C_{4\text{-POVERTY}}$) and suffer from HIV/AIDS ($C_{4\text{-HIV}}$). A significant issue here is reflected in the observation of one volunteer about the legacy arising from apartheid of low socio and economic status in township areas, and how the project is part of this ($\text{Interview-4, volunteer}$) ($C_{4\text{-POST-APARTHEID}}$). The findings illustrate that the contextual circumstances that have the most direct impact on the host project, indeed challenging the project’s continuation of its services to its community, are its financial viability. In contrast, while the current literature describes power imbalance and inequality between volunteers and host projects, studies rarely define in detail the settings and circumstances of the projects themselves (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012).

EACC: $C_{4\text{-NEED}} + C_{4\text{-POVERTY}} + C_{4\text{-POST-APARTHEID}} + C_{4\text{-HIV}}$

Overall, the external factors of each stakeholder group provide invaluable insight into understanding some of the constraints and challenges within which they operate. It becomes apparent that the sending and receiving organisations are not influenced by the VT industry and its market as perhaps expected. Further, the external settings of the host projects highlight the pressures and challenges they face in operating their respective educational and community care services.

7.2.4 Stakeholders’ Internal Contextual Conditions (c)

The internal contextual considerations of the stakeholders allow an in-depth understanding of each stakeholders’ characteristics and attributes. The internal contextual settings (Table 7.2) are important to understanding how they influence the processes and procedures influencing certain outcomes (which will be explored further in CMO pathways, Section 7.3). These insights into each stakeholder group provide a useful profile that articulates the formation of the supply chain and characterises each host project. Underpinned by their CMO pathways, each supply chain is unique and this understanding enables a deeper appreciation of each of the stakeholders’ sustainability performances. In addition, since the internal contextual settings of the schools and the EACC are significantly different, these
Differences reveal invaluable insights into the influence of internal contextual settings on outcomes. The CMO pathways (Section 7.3) show how the different internal contexts have practical implications on the volunteer placements, and how those contexts are addressed to manage desirable outcomes and minimise negative impacts.

Table 7.2: Summary Internal Contextual Conditions (c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Contextual Conditions</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
<th>Sending organisation</th>
<th>Receiving organisation</th>
<th>Host project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1-MOTIVATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-MOTIVATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-EXPECTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-EXPECTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-VALUES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-COMMITMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-COMMITMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-SKILLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-APPROACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-APPROACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4-GENDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-EXPERTISE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERNAL CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS**

|                      |                      |                      |                        |              |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|                        |              |
| **Volunteer**        | **Sending organisation** | **Receiving organisation** | **Host project** |              |
| C2-GOVERNANCE        | C3-GOVERNANCE        |                      |                        | C4-MOTIVATION |
| C2-VALUES            | C3-VALUES            |                      |                        | C4-EXPECTATION |
| C2-COMMITMENT        | C3-APPROACH          |                      |                        | C4-VALUES    |
|                      | C3-EXPERTISE         |                      |                        | C4-COMMITMENT |
|                      |                      |                      |                        | C4-SKILLS    |
|                      |                      |                      |                        | C4-APPROACH  |
|                      |                      |                      |                        | C4-GENDER    |
|                      |                      |                      |                        |              |

Author, 2018

Since most of the volunteers are retired or in late stages of their professional career, they characterise one segment of volunteers within the VT market. Further, volunteers demonstrate a considerable level of altruism and selflessness based on an ethical rationale including: ‘learn from local people’, and did ‘not want to be a voyeur’ or ‘not be like tourists’, but instead sought ‘genuine and real’ experiences ([Interviews 1-8, volunteers]). The comments indicate that the participating volunteers are...genuine and appear selfless (Alexander, 2012; Coghlan & Fennell, 2009; Everingham, 2015). It is significant that most of the volunteers indicated considerable societal commitments and engagements (C1-COMMITMENT) in their home prior to volunteering, as they typically supported UK-based charities or their local community by making use of their skills and expertise, such as by counselling vulnerable people. This is a key finding that reinforces the altruism of volunteers before their volunteer experience and demonstrating their societal commitment and selflessness. The findings suggest that selflessness is an indication of altruism, but societal commitment could also be a valuable indicator, demanding further research that could reveal a deeper understanding of volunteers’ altruistic characteristics.

Furthermore, the volunteers offer a very high level of skills and expertise, based on their extensive careers, and this makes a considerable contribution to the supply chain. The findings show that all the volunteers possessed relevant skills and expertise for their volunteer placement, as many of them had
worked in the education or care sector as teachers, support staff, counsellors and social workers. These findings demonstrate that their past or existing job roles are similar to their placement, enabling to apply their experience, skills and expertise. The findings contradict a previous study which generalises volunteers by describing them as ‘amateur aid workers’ fulfilling the role of an expert but lacking the appropriate knowledge, skills and qualifications for their volunteering role (Sin, 2010). In general, there is quite a polarised debate about volunteers’ skill levels within the international development discourse in VT (Mostafanezhad & Hannam, 2014; Punaks & Feit, 2014; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The findings here, however, do not correlate with the typical critique of volunteers’ skills, demonstrating instead that the skills exchange is more complex and dynamic than previously suggested. The relevance of the volunteers’ skills and expertise is also a manifestation of how the supply chain is managed and more details on how this is achieved become apparent later in this chapter. In addition, the supply chain’s sending and receiving organisations play an important part in this.

This study illustrates how the contextual settings of the sending organisation’s governance and aims influences their behaviour, which corresponds to the existing body of knowledge. The sending organisation, peopleandplaces, is a social enterprise,\(^\text{19}\) which means that any profit is reinvested into the organisation or society through a registered charity. It also means there are no shareholders who influence the governance. The current body of knowledge suggests that sending organisations’ sustainable practices are influenced by their governance and type, and propose further investigation for clarification of their roles and responsibilities (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli et al., 2014). The findings of this research offer an in-depth insight into a sending organisation that is a social enterprise and confirms the current thinking that organisational governance relates to sustainable practices and outcomes. Thus, the internal contextual settings define an organisations’ governance and operational practices, which can also be linked to their values.

\(^{19}\) https://travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk/About.aspx?category=5#.WmnjYjdpGCg
The sending organisation’s aims explain their values of sustainability that underpin their operations and practices. As the sending organisation’s aim is outlined20: ‘Our core values are mutual respect, service, partnership, transparency and sustainability’ which is reinforced by their statements [Interviews-10, sending organisation]. In addition, their policy outlines what the organisation’s values are and explains their interpretation of sustainability (C-VALUES). Their mission explains balancing profit vs sustainability and acknowledges that maximising profit is not the main objective, since the overriding drivers are their values especially with respect to sustainability. The findings contests previous reports about the challenges organisations face in meeting both their commercial and philanthropic ambitions (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012), and the blurred boundaries between enterprises and commercial companies do not always apply (Coren & Gray, 2012; Wearing et al. 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). The findings confirm the sending organisation’s credentials and illustrate that, as a social enterprise, their values are centred on sustainability. In conjunction with its position in the market place, the sending organisation faces only limited challenges in balancing competitiveness, commercial and philanthropic ambitions. It is significant that both the internal and external contextual settings of the sending organisation articulate its driving forces, which define its position and operational practices. A similar position is found with the receiving organisation.

C2-VALUES

The receiving organisation is focused on equality and rejects current industry practices. As Paul explained, ‘development is not a cash cow’, and he makes decisions based on the ‘integrity of our work’, and that they are sometimes ‘anti-commercial’. He described how it would be profitable to place volunteers with a local orphanage but acknowledged that there the ‘negative impacts would be too strong for the children.’ [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. The statements illustrate how the receiving organisation finds a balance between commercial and philanthropic aims (C3-VALUES), rejecting the current understanding of the pressures on organisations (Coren & Gray, 2012; Wearing et al. 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). In addition, the contextual setting provides some invaluable insights into the values of receiving organisations, and also their expertise and approach to addressing the host

20https://travel-peopleandplaces.co.uk/About.aspx?category=24#WNjXCaI.dm00
projects’ needs (Lupoli & Morse, 2014). The internal settings explain how the sending organisation contributes to the supply chain and underpins the formation of its relations with other stakeholders, which becomes more apparent below (Section 7.4). The internal settings of the host projects also reveal some useful insights.

| C3-VALUES |

The internal contextual settings of the schools and EACC demonstrate different circumstances that require different considerations in operating a volunteer programme. For instance, at the schools, the teachers are paid and trained \((c_{4\text{-paid}} + c_{4\text{-skills}})\) but the care workers at the EACC are untrained and unpaid \((c_{4\text{-nopay}} + c_{4\text{-noskills}})\). The staff at both projects, however, share similar values and commitment in their work \((c_{4\text{-values}} + c_{4\text{-commitment}})\). Furthermore, all staff possess good English language skills, are approachable, and are predominately female, although management positions, such as the principals and committee members, are male. This is an indication of the host country’s past and present social setting that contributes to understanding the projects’ background. Past case studies also observed issues of differences in gender with respect to stakeholders and the training of host project staff (Bargeman et al., 2016). Further characteristics of host projects are not offered in the literature. This study, however, shows that the host projects’ characteristics and attributes help to define their needs and are significant considerations in maximising benefits and minimising negative impacts. The differences in the projects’ contexts become apparent as their requirements for managing each project by the receiving organisation are highlighted below (Section 7.3).

| Schools: | \(c_{4\text{-values}} + c_{4\text{-commitment}} + c_{4\text{-paid}} + c_{4\text{-skills}}\) |
| EACC: | \(c_{4\text{-values}} + c_{4\text{-commitment}} + c_{4\text{-nopay}} + c_{4\text{-noskills}}\) |

Combining the external and internal settings for each stakeholder provides valuable insights into their position within the supply chain. The volunteers do not possess known external forces that affect their position, but their internal contextual settings such as motivations and skills add value to the supply chain. The dominant contextual settings for both the sending and receiving organisations are their values, which drive their decision making processes. Furthermore, the type and governance of both organisations play a significant role in allowing them to be driven by their clearly defined values. This allows both organisations not to be affected by the external pressures of the market that would otherwise make profitability their primary aim. In exploring deeper, the host projects are predominately driven by external pressures, which puts them in a more vulnerable situation and signifies their inequality, compared to volunteers. Furthermore, the different contextual settings of the host projects highlight their apparent diverse circumstances that are likely to change over time.
Thus, based on the external settings, the position of the volunteers and host projects are significantly different, but a different picture emerges in comparing the internal settings of the host projects.

The external contexts reveal a qualitative indication of the pressures, constraints and challenges that stakeholders are under and the power balances between them. Volunteers have considerably fewer pressures than hosts and are less likely to be influenced by their external pressures (family, time and money), as they have the decision making powers to opt when and where to join a volunteer programme. In comparison, the host projects external constraints (poverty, post-apartheid, social and economic need, corruption) are long-lasting and determine their decision making and power sharing.

Based on these findings, the geographical distribution of the stakeholder groups and their position of power become apparent as external pressures of the host projects in the global South is greater than the volunteers’ pressures in the global North (Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; Palacios, 2010; Taplin et al., 2014). Thus, the findings contribute to the body of knowledge as they articulate in detail the power relations of the different stakeholders.

The different internal settings of volunteers and host projects are revealed to be more diverse than suggested in the current body of knowledge. In this study, all the volunteers possessed relevant experience and were skilled professionals. In comparison, the project staff at the schools and the EACC had different levels of skills that ranged from qualified teachers to untrained care workers. The findings indicate therefore that the simplified descriptions of expert vs beneficiary, and the tendency to refer to volunteers as ‘amateurs’ are both incorrect (Mostafanezhad & Hannam, 2014, p. 61; Punaks & Feit, 2014; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Furthermore, the findings suggest that the binary representation of the two stakeholder groups as expert vs needy is overly simplified (Everingham, 2015; Lough & Carter-Black, 2015), and limits the in-depth evaluation of the dynamic collaborative relations between volunteers and host project staff. Here, the findings contribute to the body of knowledge as the relations between stakeholders are dynamic than the binary relations described in the literature.

7.2.5 Evaluating Processes and Procedures- (M)

Examining the internal and external contextual settings of the main four stakeholders determined their most influential constraints and opportunities affecting their collaborative relations. This section closely examines the collaborative relations between the stakeholders and explores how the findings relate to current understanding and how they address existing gaps in knowledge. Two main components of the evaluative framework are explored, an overview of the processes and procedures (M) and the level of engagement amongst stakeholders (m). The sections reflect on the significance
of how these contribute to the evaluative framework. In examining the collaborations between the sending and receiving organisation, the study reveals that each organisation’s roles and responsibilities within the supply chain are clearly defined. In addition, the sections show the operational arrangements and internal structures within the supply chain, as well as how these relate to sustainability performance (Section 7.4).

The evaluative framework reveals complex cross-sectorial collaborations, each with a specific purpose that incorporates all stakeholders. The results (Chapter 6) demonstrate that each mechanism of collaborative engagement forms a complex web of interactions. The results show that organisations face challenges in managing complex and cross-sectorial stakeholder relationships such as incorporating volunteers and different host projects like schools and community centres (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). The results confirm that each collaboration involves two-way or three-way communications amongst at least two stakeholders, indicating that they are dynamic and interactive in both directions (Gray & Wood, 1991b). Thus, the stakeholders collaborate closely in delivering the volunteer programme, and each stakeholder and each collaboration clearly defines a specific role and purpose within the supply chain. One of the main contributions of the work in this area is the deeper understanding it offers of the purpose of each collaboration and how that collaboration consists of different processes and procedures. The driving forces and roles and responsibilities become apparent when examining the CMO pathways (Section 7.3).

Table 7.3: Summary of Collaborative Engagements (M)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATIVE ENGAGEMENTS IN SUPPLY CHAIN</th>
<th>M1 Volunteer Recruitment</th>
<th>M2 Partnership Management</th>
<th>M3 Host Project Management</th>
<th>M4 Volunteer Placement</th>
<th>M5 Volunteer Management</th>
<th>M6 Host Project Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1 Voluntary Recruitment</td>
<td>M2SELECTION</td>
<td>M3SELECTION</td>
<td>M4SELECTION</td>
<td>M5SELECTION</td>
<td>M6SELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-Screening</td>
<td>M2-AGREEMENT</td>
<td>M3-AGREEMENT</td>
<td>M4-SKILLS</td>
<td>M5-INVOLVENT</td>
<td>M6-P.SELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-Life Story</td>
<td>M2-POLICY</td>
<td>M3-COMMITTEE</td>
<td>M4-RELATIONS</td>
<td>M5-P-RELATIONS</td>
<td>M6-CONSENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-MATCH</td>
<td>M2-RELATIONS</td>
<td>M3-RELATIONS</td>
<td>M4-RELATIONS</td>
<td>M5-PAYMENT</td>
<td>M6-RELATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-Pre-TRIPPREP</td>
<td>M2-VOLUNTEER</td>
<td>M3-RISK</td>
<td>M4-V CONTRIBUTION</td>
<td>M5-TRANSPORT</td>
<td>M6-REPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-V-Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1-V-REPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Author, 2018

In examining all the collaborative relations it becomes evident that the processes and procedures are interlinked in delivering the volunteer programme and this gives an in-depth insight into the operational practices and arrangements. The evaluative framework shows that each collaborative engagement consists of several procedures and processes with a specific purpose (Table 7.3) and this
demonstrates the presence of a comprehensive system for managing volunteer placements through the supply chain and involving all four stakeholders. Processes and procedures are frequently interlinked to deliver a specific purpose in communicating or delivering one aspect of managing volunteer placements. Processes involve communications tools and meetings for the exchange of valuable information, short- and long-term monitoring and planning, the transfer of fees and donations and the development of personal relationships. The evaluation of processes and procedures offered here addresses existing gaps in knowledge with respect to the detailed understanding of operational practices and arrangements (Taplin et al., 2014). The findings make a considerable contribution to understanding what the operational arrangements are and how they deliver a specific purpose; in particular how many of the processes and procedures are interlinked (which is explored specifically below in Section 7.3) and thereby demonstrate how to operationalise sustainability in VT, such as by fully involving host projects.

Throughout the supply chain, the processes and procedures include the host project, for example during the recruitment process (M1), in preparation of the volunteer placement (M3) during the volunteer placement (M4), and in the planning process as part of the host project assessment (M6). As a result, the host project engages with the sending and receiving organisation at different stages in the process of hosting volunteers. This is in accordance with Wearing and McGehee (2013a), who stipulate that VT should operate at the community level and that stakeholder engagement is a significant role of organisations. The different collaborations with the host project demonstrate how the operational arrangements involve close engagement on the part of the sending and receiving organisations, and how these organisations are transparent and take responsibility for engaging with the host community (Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). It is particularly important, therefore, how the host project is an integral part of several processes that entail their direct involvement since this indicates that the operational arrangements can lead to sustainability, and addresses some of the criticisms of the VT industry.

| M1-STORY + M6-CONSENT + M1-MATCH |
| M3-COMMITTEE |
| M4-SKILLS |

The monitoring and evaluation processes and procedures include both host projects and volunteers. Following the volunteer placement, volunteers (M1-V.REPORT) and host projects complete a report (M6-H.REPORT), coordinated by the sending organisation, to feedback on their experience. This finding addresses gaps in knowledge about organisations’ efforts in monitoring and evaluation, and it should
be noted that this is deemed as an important aspect of sustainability in VT (Taplin et al., 2014). In addition, this finding confirms that the sending organisation should include feedback by volunteers and host recipients in order to monitor and improve their interactions and address issues of inequality (Barbieri et al., 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). Furthermore, the fact that the sending organisation conducts a long-term plan that incorporates the reports as well as determining each project’s needs is an important element in the process and an important finding of this research. There are also several opportunities both before and during the placement for volunteers and the host project staff to raise any concerns that they may have, thereby allowing such concerns to be addressed as they arise.

In summary, the main findings in respect to processes and procedures are: (1) that many are interlinked and fulfil a particular purpose amongst all stakeholders; (2) many of these processes also enable two-way or three-way communications between stakeholders; (3) that those processes and procedures demonstrate the operational arrangement throughout the supply chain; (4) that the host projects are fully integrated into these processes and procedures, including in planning and product development.

7.2.6 Evaluating the Level of Collaboration (m)

The previous section examined the processes and procedures (M) among all stakeholders and demonstrated how some of the processes are interlinked to achieve a specific purpose. In this section, in line with collaboration theory, the collaborative descriptors are used to explore the qualitative nature and attributes of the collaborative relations between all stakeholders. The findings illustrate how the application of collaboration theory as part of the evaluative framework enables a detailed understanding of the collaborative relations. The descriptors provide an in-depth understanding of each of the collaborative relations and further define the level of willingness, integration and engagement of each stakeholder. Through this, the differences between organisational (sending and receiving organisation) and individual (volunteers and host project staff) stakeholders becomes apparent. Furthermore, we are able to show how some of the collaborative processes and procedures allow for decision making and power sharing between stakeholders, and how this determines the quality of the exchange of skills and expertise (Table 7.4).
As part of communications, activities and processes, there is a two-way exchange of knowledge, expertise and resources between the stakeholders (Graci, 2013). These exchanges are important for determining sustainability performance since they help to identify the level of power sharing, shared decision making, value creation as well as inter-organisational learning and joint product development amongst stakeholders. The qualitative level of engagement and collaboration in delivering the VT product determines the sustainability performances such as equality and transparency amongst stakeholders (Austin, 2000; Gray, 1989).

Table 7.4: Summary of Collaboration Descriptors (m)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLABORATION DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-willingness to engage (m_wes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-level of integration and engagement (m_ine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sharing aims and values (m_sav)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-joint planning and product development (m_jpp)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-joint decision making and power sharing (m_jdm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-joined problem solving (m_jps)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-level of exchange of skills and expertise (m_exk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-building capacity for other stakeholders (m_bcs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sharing risks and benefits (m_srb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-joint reflectivity and monitoring (m_jrm)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-cultural exchange (m_cul)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the supply chain, stakeholders demonstrate a willingness to engage (m_wes) and a level of integration (m_ine) which is underpinned by their shared aims and values (m_sav). At each point at which a stakeholder enters the supply chain, a mechanism establishes their willingness to engage during the volunteer recruitment, partnership, host project management and volunteer placement processes. The findings confirm that the evaluative framework enables the evaluation of integration and degree of consensus (Bramwell & Sharman, 1999; Gajda, 2004). The selection processes allow each respective stakeholder to confirm their willingness to engage (m_wes), and supports their integration and engagement (m_ine). Significantly, the selection processes of each stakeholder joining the supply chain ensure consensus by stakeholders, which are underpinned by their shared aims and values (m_sav).

| M1-SELECTION | (m1-wes) + (m1-ine) + (m1-sav) |
| M2-SELECTION | (m2-wes) + (m2-ine) + (m2-sav) |
| M3-SELECTION | (m3-wes) + (m3-ine) + (m3-sav) |
| M4-SELECTION | (m4-wes) + (m4-ine) + (m4-sav) |

The partnership between the sending and receiving organisation consists of a rich fabric of collaborative relations that underpins their operational arrangements and processes. It consists of several processes that deliver the volunteer programme as well as long-term personal relationships between the directors (m2-per) that have been in existence for approximately ten years. The organisational and personal relations are underpinned by their shared values and aims (m2-sav) and the
exchanges of their expertise ($m_{2-exk}$) in the development of a volunteer programme ($m_{2-jpp}$). Jointly operating the volunteer programme involves inherent shared risks and benefits ($m_{2-srb}$). Additionally, the organisations are exchanging expertise and are building capacity ($m_{2-cas}$), which is evident by jointly developing a policy on child protection. The collaborative relations, therefore indicate value creation, as well as inter-organisational learning and joint product development amongst the organisations (Austin, 2000; Gray, 1989). In revealing the detailed nature of this long-term partnership, the findings are a significant contribution to knowledge beyond just understanding the narrow operational arrangements that enable their success in delivering a volunteer programme (Taplin et al., 2014). This long-term partnership also influences other aspects of the supply chain and its outcomes, and ultimately the sustainability performance, as is shown later in Section 7.3.3.

Multiple collaborative relations with the host projects indicate power sharing and joint decision-making. For instance, as part of volunteer recruitment, specifically the matching process ($M_{1-MATCH}$), host projects are involved in deciding each volunteer’s placement. The exchange of information based on the volunteer’s life story ($M_{1-STORY}$) that enables informed consent ($M_{6-CONSENT}$) gives host projects decision making power ($m_{6-jdm}$) in respect to hosting each volunteer. Similarly, through committee meetings ($M_{3-COMMITTEE}$), host projects are able to make decisions ($m_{3-jdm}$) on arranging volunteer placements. These processes also enable transparency since the exchange of important information is shared ($m_{3-ine}$). The communication exchanges are significant for determining sustainability performance by identifying the level of power sharing and shared decision making on matters relating to the volunteer placement ($m_{3-jpp}$). The collaborative descriptors highlight how the procedures enable host project engagement (Tomazos & Cooper, 2012; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). In addition, the level of engagement can determine the sustainability performances with respect to equality and transparency amongst stakeholders (Austin, 2000; Gray, 1989). Thus, the descriptors verify the processes and procedures and make a valuable contribution to qualifying sustainability performance. Similarly, the descriptors demonstrate joint planning and development and capacity building in the monitoring and evaluation processes.
The collaborative descriptors also highlight joint planning and product development with the host project as part of the monitoring and evaluating processes during and after the volunteer placement. The weekly placement meetings (M5:MEETING), which are facilitated by the receiving organisation but which include both the host project staff and the volunteer, enables joint problem solving (m5:jrm) of any issues arising during the placement. Meanwhile, the post-placement report (M6:H.REPORT) after each volunteer placement allows the host project to reflect and comment on the experiences of each placement. The host report is reviewed and is taken into account in the long-term planning processes (M6:PLAN). In addition, the planning process and needs assessment involve face-to-face meetings between the host project and the sending organisation, in which joint decision making (m6:jpp) and joint product development (m6:cas) also take place. The findings highlight a high level of engagement that indicates the sustainability of equality and transparency amongst stakeholders (Austin, 2000; Gray, 1989). Furthermore, the findings are evidence of host project engagement to address issues of inequality (Barbieri et al., 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). This is a valuable contribution to the understanding of how to operationalise monitoring and evaluation in an equitable manner.

\[ M_{1-V.REPORT} + M_{6-H.REPORT} \Rightarrow M_{6-PLAN} + (m_{6-jpp}) + (m_{6-cas}) \]
\[ M_{5-MEETING} + (m_{5-jrm}) \]

In summary, the collaboration descriptors provide valuable insights by highlighting qualitative attributes of the collaborative relations within the supply chain. They demonstrate a diverse and dynamic range of collaborations, which are characterised by a high and consistent level of engagement, integration and consensus amongst stakeholders. The descriptors highlight equality and transparency in how the different collaborative relations are implemented, such as through joint decision making and planning and development. Overall, the level of engagement in delivering the volunteer programme indicates sustainability performance.

### 7.2.7 Section Summary

The beginning of this section demonstrated how the case study's supply chain consists of stakeholders that are representative and share the same geographical distribution of the North-South social and economic divide that is common within the industry. Several contributions to the body of knowledge have emerged which together provide more detail about the operational practices of the stakeholders and their evaluable attributes. In addition, each stakeholder group is influenced differently by a set of internal and external contextual conditions that highlighted some of their challenges, constraints and advantages. Furthermore, purpose-orientated processes and procedures that involve two-way or
three-way communications engage all stakeholders. The collaborative descriptors reveal a rich fabric of diverse collaborations that together suggest equality and transparency amongst all stakeholders. This section has made several contributions by evaluating the contextual settings and the collaborative relations individually. The following section presents each component of the CMO pathways and discusses how they are linked.

7.3 CMO Configurations

7.3.1 Section Overview

This section explains the CMO configurations in depth (Objective 2) based on the findings in the previous chapter (Chapter 6) and how they relate to the existing body of knowledge on VT (Chapter 2). The previous section revealed how C,c and M,m are constructed, leading to causal explanations of specific outcomes O,o (Pawson and Manzano, 2012). An important element here is how certain contextual circumstances (C,c) influence the different processes that lead to particular outcomes (O,o) of sustainability performances. By aligning the current body of knowledge with the CMO configurations (shown in brackets), it is possible to build up a detailed appreciation of how this research contributes to understanding how sustainability performance is influenced by the ways in which stakeholders engage with one another. Section 7.4 illustrates the middle range theories, which emerge from each collaborative engagement, while the concluding chapter summarises how sustainability performance is influenced. Each process within the supply chain demonstrates its purpose and how it is operated in a manner that maximises positive outcomes and benefits. This section is presented in the same order as the previous chapter (Chapter 6) relating to the collaborative relations; volunteer recruitment, partnership management, local project management, volunteer placement, volunteer management and host project management. Following the detailed account of the CMO configurations based on the existing body of knowledge, these are refined in the following section (7.4) to derive the middle range theories.

7.3.2 Volunteer Recruitment (M1)

The current body of knowledge offers a limited understanding of how the outcomes of VT are influenced by volunteer recruitment procedures. The current literature focuses on the influence of the sending organisation, focusing predominately on their roles and responsibilities towards host projects and volunteers. In order to assess this research’s contributions to understanding recruitment processes, it is necessary to highlight two important aspects within the existing body of knowledge: i.) recommendations on how to address inequality between the sending organisation and host project, and; ii.) a recent industry assessment of sending organisations. The findings at community level reveal
how volunteer recruitment ensures sustainable outcomes and highlights the importance of the role of the sending organisation as suggested by the current body of knowledge. Furthermore, the recruitment process demonstrates how the sending organisation is managing facilitative processes that result in transparency and equality.

Unlike many other sending organisations in the industry (Czarnecki et al., 2015), the findings illustrate how the sending organisation’s uses the Disclosure and Barring Service (formerly known as CRB) for each volunteer. By screening volunteers’ suitability, including a DBS, the sending organisation demonstrates its commitment to the safety of host project staff. Nonetheless, a recent industry report indicates that less than half of sending organisations request a police clearance certificate, indicating that most organisations do not consider the hosts’ safety, meaning that the sending organisation in this study is in the minority (Czarnecki et al., 2015). The findings also show that the requirement of a criminal record check posed no concerns to volunteers. Since many volunteer projects involve vulnerable people, making a DBS check standard is reasonable to eliminate any risks. Stipulating a DBS check, therefore, illustrates the sending organisation’s commitment and their pivotal role in achieving sustainability (McGehee & Andereck, 2009).

The importance of the sending organisation’s pivotal role is demonstrated by how they share personal volunteer information with host projects, which results in transparency. The volunteer’s life story is described as a ‘3D picture of a person’ (interview-9, sending organisation), which captures the volunteer’s expertise and skills, and describes their personality. Based on the facilitative process undertaken by the sending organisation, the life story allows the host project to make an informed decision (M6-CONSENT) about each volunteer (Section 7.4.7). The majority of sending organisations, however, do not obtain information on volunteers’ expertise and skills and are therefore unable to share useful information with the host project (Czarnecki et al., 2015). Furthermore, the life story illustrates that organisations play a pivotal role in managing relations between volunteers and the host community’s needs (McGehee and Andereck, 2009). The findings show that the volunteer’s life story enables the transparent and effective integration of the volunteer into the collaborative relations within the supply chain.
Based on joint decision making, the matching process results in equality for host projects and demonstrates the significance of the sending organisation’s values. The sending organisation is not interested in ‘bums on seats’ [Interview-10, sending organisation] but is more focused on a ‘win-win’ outcome for volunteers and host projects [Interview-9, sending organisation]. The findings confirm that outcomes are influenced by the sending organisation’s decisions on how to operate their volunteer programme (McGehee & Andereck, 2009). Furthermore, they emphasise how the sending organisation operates in a respectful manner by prioritising positive outcomes for host projects and volunteers over maximising their profits. This is contrary to the criticisms of exploitative sending organisations (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2011). The organisation’s values drive this strategy of taking responsibility for their engagement with host projects (Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli et al., 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014). The results demonstrate how sending organisations can operate in a manner that allows joint decision making and that thereby achieves beneficial and balanced outcomes, and this further highlights the importance of their responsibility to play a pivotal and facilitative role within the supply chain.

\[ c_2 \text{-VALUES} + M_1 \text{-MATCH} + (m_1;jdm) \Rightarrow o_{1&4} \text{-TRANSPARENCY} + o_4 \text{-RESPECT} + o_4 \text{-EQUALITY} + o_{1&4} \text{-EXPERIENCE} \]

In summary, volunteer recruitment processes demonstrate how the collaborations between the volunteer and sending organisation influence sustainable performance such as equality, transparency and safety for the host project. The facilitative nature of the sending organisation is contrary to the current body of knowledge which portrays sending organisations as exploitative (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2011). The sending organisation facilitates the volunteer and host project’s initial exchange of information, and this serves to determine a willingness by both to engage with one another. The importance of the roles and responsibilities of the sending organisation is highlighted by their implementation and management of these processes and how they achieve equality and transparency. It is important to note that the processes are driven by the sending organisation’s values and commitments and that this influences why they achieve sustainable performance through careful integration and joint decision making between stakeholders (Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli et al., 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014). The processes demonstrate how each contributes to the sustainability performance of the supply chain. Overall, the findings contribute to the current understanding in several ways. Firstly, taking advantage of external resources such as the DBS (CRB check) exemplifies how the sending organisation takes responsibility for the safety of host projects and any vulnerable stakeholder groups. Secondly, requesting a volunteer’s life story supports informed decision making by the host project enabling equality and
transparency. Thirdly, not being driven solely by profit, and considering the quality of the volunteer exchange, is beneficial for all stakeholder groups. The next section examines how the sending and receiving organisation’s partnership influences sustainability.

### 7.3.3 Partnership Management (M2)

The nature of the organisational partnership is very different from the other collaborative arrangements within the supply chain since the organisational relations do not consist of processes and procedures. The current body of knowledge offers few insights into how outcomes are influenced by the receiving organisation’s responsibility and roles in respect to other stakeholders (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The findings illustrate the roles and responsibilities of the sending and receiving organisation, including in relation to other stakeholders. The nature of the partnership plays an important part in forming robust relations, and this influences other complex and dynamic relations within the supply chain. Furthermore, the importance of a robust and integrated partnership between the sending and receiving organisation is highlighted. Particularly important for the partnership are the collaborative relations through which the local project management aims to empower host projects (Section 7.3.7).

The receiving organisation’s existing relationship with local host projects is an essential criterion for the sending organisation when initially forming partnerships. Illustrating the significance of the receiving organisations’ community engagement we were told that, ‘we find local partners who are already doing amazing work in their communities, who already have community links with the project’ and facilitate empowerment of host project [Interview-10, sending organisation]. The results therefore, show the importance of community engagement and indicate the shared values throughout the supply chain. The results also confirm that it is an organisation’s (sending or receiving) responsibility to engage with host communities (Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Additionally, they illustrate that community engagement is not only important in its own terms but ultimately it is important because the empowerment of the host project is the outcome desired by both organisations (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The details about how host project engagement is influenced are presented below (Section 7.3.4) but for now we can say that the receiving organisation’s community engagement supports the empowerment of the host project.
The partnership consists of each organisation fulfilling specific roles and responsibilities in their respective countries which illustrates their efficiency of delivering positive outcomes. As Sallie explained, ‘Paul’s ‘coal face’ community work and RT credentials’ are important responsibilities for the receiving organisation [Interview 10, sending organisation]. Similarly, Paul praised the recruitment process and the preparedness of volunteers when explaining how volunteers do not see their volunteering efforts through ‘rose tinted glasses’ and that it is ‘not a Princess Diana trip’ [Interview 14, receiving organisation]. The results demonstrate how the partnership arrangements address complex and cross-sectorial stakeholder relationships with volunteers and members of the host community (Coghlan and Noakes, 2012). Furthermore, the results contribute to a gap in knowledge in terms of assessing organisational interactions and responsibility and management requirements, and how this influences the organisations’ impacts (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The findings additionally demonstrate how the driving forces of shared values and commitment to building trustworthy partnerships result in positive experiences for volunteers and host projects.

\[ c_{2 \& 3} \text{-VALUES} + c_{3 \text{-VALUES}} + M_{2 \text{-VOLUNTEER}} + (m_{2 \text{-exk}} + m_{2 \text{-ipd}}) \Rightarrow o_{2 \& 3 \text{-TRUST}} + o_{1 \& 4 \text{-EXPERIENCE}} \]

The foundation of the organisational partnership is based on values of trust and transparency that are shared by both the sending and receiving organisations. The sending organisations describe their relations as ‘rock solid, the relation will continue regardless….the relations are fluid’ [Interview 9, sending organisation] and ‘mentoring me, to understand how to run a responsible programme and the realities of running a responsible programme’ [Interview 14, receiving organisation]. The findings demonstrate the nature of the relations comprising of trust; namely that they are based on sharing the same values and on exchanging skills and expertise in operating the volunteer programme. In addition, the staff have formed personal relations. The findings acknowledge that more research is needed to assess fully how organisational interactions and responsibilities influence the outcomes of volunteer programmes (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Nonetheless, the findings address a gap in knowledge by revealing how the nature of the collaborative relations influences and supports other positive outcomes in other stages of the supply chain. Furthermore, the overall outcome is lasting relations which in turn enable capacity building with respect to developing new policies and products.

\[ c_{2 \& 3 \text{-VALUES}} + M_{2 \text{-RELATION}} + (m_{2 \text{-exk}} + m_{2 \text{-pers}} + m_{2 \text{-sav}}) \Rightarrow o_{2 \& 3 \text{-TRUST}} + o_{2 \& 3 \text{-RESPECT}} + o_{2 \& 3 \text{-ENDURANCE}} \]
For example, the nature of the organisational relations results in the development of a child protection policy. The policy exemplifies how the partnership’s exchange of knowledge and capacity building enables the safety of host project staff. It demonstrates that their shared values and the trust that they have in their relationship lead to an increase in their ethical standards to ensure host project safety. The policy is an illustration of how organisational interactions and their shared sense of responsibility lead to management requirements that influence impacts (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The contribution to the current understanding of organisational interactions not only emphasises how but also why shared values between organisations are critical. In addition, the findings also demonstrate that shared values build strong partnership results in developing a best practice example.

\[ C_2 \text{-VALUES} + C_3 \text{-VALUES} + M_2 \text{-POLICY} + ( m_{2 \text{-cas}} + m_{2 \text{-exk}} ) \Rightarrow O_4 \text{-SAFETY} \]

The analysis of the partnership addresses gaps in the literature on operational and managerial relations between organisations (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). It is apparent how each organisation has its roles and responsibilities within their respective country, and how they acknowledge each other’s positive value to the supply chain. In addition, the partnership illustrates why and how the organisational relations influence outcomes in other stages of the supply chain. The relations consist of an exchange of expertise and capacity, and of sharing risks and benefits, which strengthens the supply chain since it enables new products and policies, as with the child protection policy for example. Further findings are revealed: First, the shared values of the sending and receiving organisations drive their robust and trustworthy collaborative partnership. Second, that how the organisations aim for positive outcomes for the other stakeholders in the supply chain, such as positive experiences for volunteers and the empowerment and safety of the host projects (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). The empowerment of the host project is achieved through the receiving organisation’s engagement, as is now illustrated below.

### 7.3.4 Host Project Management (M3)

Previously, the importance of the receiving organisation’s ability to engage with the local community projects was highlighted. This section now illustrates how empowerment and social change is achieved through that host project engagement. The details of the community engagement are discussed and the process of comparing the different host projects of the schools and EACC illustrates significantly different outcomes. This serves to highlight the importance of the roles and responsibilities of the receiving organisation in managing the host project to mitigate negative
outcomes and maximise positive outcomes. Furthermore, the findings show how local contextual settings influence whether a host project is suitable for the volunteer programme. In doing so, a detailed illustration of receiving organisations’ engagement with host projects can be developed and this contributes to the limited literature on organisational relations and management practices.

As part of the collaborative engagement, the host project’s suitability is defined by their willingness to achieve change through participating in the volunteer programme. Host projects need to show an ‘attitude of willingness’ [Interview-14, Receiving organisation], articulating that the host project needs to want to be part of the volunteer programme. The statement also indicates that the host projects’ wishes are considered, and enables equality, as stipulated in the current literature (Barbieri et al., 2011; Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). Furthermore, the host projects need to share the same values in wanting change through the volunteer programme. This demonstrates that being part of the programme is not enough: host projects need to want to achieve the same outcomes as the other stakeholders. Therefore, host projects’ suitability is defined by sharing the same values, and their willingness to change underpins their participation. This significantly contributes to the current literature in defining the host project’s position amongst stakeholders and their participation.

A further criterion for suitable host projects is their leadership qualities and governance. The contextual settings of the schools play a significant role because some of the schools are managed ineffectively and are subject to corruption [Interview-24, host project]. In addition, their ability to collaborate to achieve certain outcomes is also crucial. These contextual settings demonstrate that host projects’ leadership and governance are important when selecting suitable host projects as they support maximising positive outcomes. The results demonstrate that, firstly, local contexts play an important role in the suitability of local projects, and secondly, that the receiving organisation’s knowledge and experience of those contexts are very important. In addition, the findings illustrate how the receiving organisation plays a significant facilitative role in setting their expectations and encourage local participation. Thus, the findings contribute to the limited literature on host projects’, since they illustrate how governance and local contexts play a significant role in influencing a positive outcome.

C4-VALUES + M3-SELECTION + (m3-ine +m3-wes +m3-sav) => o4-PARTICIPATION

C3-EXPECTATION + c4-LEADERSHIP + M3-SELECTION + (m3-ine +m3-wes +m3-sav) => o4-PARTICIPATION
In terms of how host project engagement managed, the findings show that it is based on regular meetings that embed active participation in planning and operating the volunteer placements. The committee is a platform to discuss each volunteer placement in detail and in such a way as to take into consideration the project’s circumstantial situation or needs and how a volunteer’s skills should be applied. According to one staff member, ‘the relationships are 100% because the community people are involved’ [Interview 13, receiving organisation]; a sentiment that is echoed by host project staff, thereby verifying how the participation of the host project is vital (Barbieri et al., 2011; Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). Regular committee meetings ensure equality since host projects are making decisions jointly with the receiving organisation and are part of planning and confirming placements (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014). In contrast, a similar study concluded that lack of preplanning can lead to misunderstandings, frustrations and lower productivity during the placement (Bargeman et al., 2016). The expression of a more mutual relationship, high integration and familiarity between the host project and receiving organisation, acknowledges the facilitating role of the receiving organisation. Thus, the findings contribute to the understanding of the practical and operational processes at the local level.

The receiving organisation aims for equality in managing the relations with host projects. Based on understanding the social and economic contextual settings. The ‘EACC’s relationship with Calabash is quite good because there is always feedback and then Calabash is a link between the volunteers and Emmanuel [Interview 25, host project]. This resonates with the criticism of inequality (McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Raymond & Hall, 2008) and illustrates that host projects appreciate the receiving organisation’s role (Barbieri et al., 2011; McGehee & Andereck, 2009). Staff, however, also describe paternal relations with the receiving organisation [Interview 17, host project]. The findings illustrate an intricate relationship which relies on local expertise and addresses some of the social contextual divides between volunteers and host projects (Frilund, 2015). Consideration of local context is critical in achieving sustainability since it influences outcomes. An example of how the receiving organisation and sending organisation deals with these contextual differences is illustrated below (Section 7.3.6 & Section 7.3.7).
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Overall, the findings offer a new insight into the host project engagement and their relations with the receiving organisation. The findings demonstrate that the facilitative role and the expertise of the receiving organisation are vital in maintaining local engagement and in aiming for equality. Another significant finding is how the selection of a suitable host project is based on their ability and willingness to participate in the volunteer programme. Selecting host projects that share the same values in respect to wanting change results in an alignment of values across all the stakeholders. Also, implementing regular committee meetings enables consistent joint decision making and planning, which illustrates local level communications with host projects that ultimately result in sustainable outcomes. The next section explores volunteer placements and the interactions between host project staff and volunteers.

7.3.5 Volunteer Placement (M₄)

The volunteer placement, i.e. the collaborative relationship between the volunteer and the host project, is the actual product of the supply chain. At this stage, the social intervention and the skills and knowledge exchange take place, which leads to the outcomes of lasting transformative change. It is apparent that the previous three collaborative relations (M₁-M₃), and the remaining relations (M₅ & M₆), support the volunteer placement. The discussion focuses on what influences the positive outcomes of skills and knowledge exchange, and how. Comparing some of the outcomes of previous case studies illustrates how positive outcomes are maximised based on the processes and contextual settings. A significant contribution is the differentiation of short and long-term outcomes. Further, the importance of organisations’ values in how some contextual pressures by host projects are being addressed is shown here. The section begins with the school projects, followed by the EACC, and continues to discuss the similarities and differences between their outcomes.

At the schools, as part of planning and preparation and in order to maximise positive experiences and effective skills exchange, suitable teachers are selected based on their willingness, existing skills and needs. Teachers are matched based on the skills and experience of the volunteer. Further, English is essential for communication [Interview 22-host project], and teachers must ‘have mentoring skills’ and ‘carry out the school’s aim’ [Interview 20-host project]. The findings contrast with previous studies which conclude that language barriers and teachers’ absence and tendency to work less during volunteer placements lead to frustrations, annoyance and confrontations (Barbieri et al., 2011; Bargeman et al., 2016). The finding of this research, in contrast, reveals that stipulating that teachers possess English language and mentoring skills enables effective communications between the volunteer and staff. Furthermore, teachers need to have a sound professional attitude and be willing to work with a volunteer, since selecting suitable teachers to partner with a volunteer minimises some of the negative outcomes
observed in a past case study (Bargeman et al., 2016). The careful selection of host project staff is an important criterion in enhancing positive outcomes, and illustrates the importance of planning and selecting staff. It demonstrates how the committee supports an effective skills exchange and positive experience.

SCHOOL: \( c_4 \text{-SKILLS} + M_4 \text{-SELECTION} + \{ m_{4-\text{wes}} + m_{4-\text{ine}} \} \Rightarrow o_{1&4} \text{-EXPERIENCE} + o_4 \text{-SKILLS} \)

This careful planning and staff selection process also leads, during the volunteer placement, to effective professional and personal relations and trusting collaborative relations between volunteers and project staff. One teacher shared her thoughts: ‘initial thought that volunteers come here to relax and do nothing,…but they sacrifice their time and they assist us and our learnerS [Interview-18, host project].’ Another teacher explained: ‘what was important was that they understand …and they know that not everybody knows everything... and trust becomes better and better’ [Interview-17, host project]. This illustration of the teachers’ appreciation of volunteers contrasts with a previous case study where teachers’ believed volunteers were just “on holiday” and that experiencing a new culture was more important to them than volunteering (Bargeman et al, 2016). The findings highlight that in this case study the relationship between volunteers and staff were aligned, and that this led to integrated working and trusting relationships. The findings offer a new insight into the importance of the volunteers’ professional experience in working with their counterparts and how this develops into trusting and effective relations. The willingness to integrate and work together plays an important role in the skills exchange and overall experience.

SCHOOL: \( c_1 \text{-APPROACH} + M_4 \text{-RELATION} + (m_{4-\text{wes}} m_{4-\text{ine}}) \Rightarrow o_{1&4} \text{-EXPERIENCE} + o_4 \text{-TRUST} \)

An effective skills exchange is achieved based on close integration between the volunteer and host project staff. A volunteer explains how she engaged with a teacher: ‘we were demonstrating, we were not telling: you have to do it this way’ and continues ‘you would never ever say ‘you are doing it wrong’’ [Interview-2, volunteer]. While a teacher explained: ‘I’ve learned the skills and ideas it was good for me and my kids will benefit from the volunteer’ [Interview-20 and 22, host project]. The description is in contrast to past case studies where working together was unsuccessful and misunderstandings or lack of productivity occurred. The authors of those studies observed that volunteers and teachers did not engage in each other’s’ work methods and that inexperienced volunteers had their own approach to teaching which resulted in decreased productivity and continuation for pupils (Bargeman et al., 2016; Wearing & Grabowski, 2011). The findings in this study, however, suggest that volunteers and host
project staff are integrated, thereby allowing the effective exchange of skills. This close integration is based on several factors, such as experienced volunteers who are better equipped at liaising with their host counterpart and in transferring skills in a positive manner, as well as the ability to form productive relations during the placement.

In addition, the presence of volunteers influences language skills and confidence in pupils. In interacting with volunteers, pupils imitate and adopt their more English accent thus enhancing their fluency and pronunciation. This outcome for the pupils is significant in an environment where Xhosa is the dominant language. The presence of volunteers was also noted in a similar case study in Ghana to have a positive influence on pupils such as the improvement of attendance and positive cultural exchanges (Bargeman et al., 2016). The distinction between the different beneficiaries at the host project, teachers and pupils, is crucial in managing and influencing the positive outcomes of the skills exchange. As in all the case studies, the host project consists of staff members, such as teachers and pupils at the schools and, at the EACC, care workers and beneficiaries such as pupils or sick community workers and their families. The differentiation in the outcomes between the two is further discussed below as part of project management and makes a useful contribution to the current body of knowledge about influencing positive outcomes.

Nevertheless, when comparing the EACC project to the schools, the outcomes of the skills exchange and relations are sometimes different, and this highlights the importance of how the contextual settings, particularly the host project’s needs, influence outcomes. The relations between the volunteers and the EACC host project staff are similar to the parallel relations in the schools in terms of their overall approach to building rapport. As two volunteers explain: *I was going in with some openness on how best to support them but needing to learn first what they wanted …’* [Interview-6, volunteer] and ‘*…tried to build up trust and [a] honest dialogue,’* [Interview-4, volunteer]. In response, staff felt volunteers were an integral part of the ‘team’ and ‘family’ [Interview-25-28, host project]. It is significant how volunteers and staff form personal relations and listen to one another based on the similarities of the care work they do [Interview-26, host project]. The findings illustrate how positive relations are based on host project staff, although less skilled and trained, relating to volunteers due to their similar work experience as care workers. The often very different circumstances of young and untrained volunteers working with
experienced staff has negative consequences (Bargeman et al., 2016; McGehee, 2014). In confirming the current body of knowledge, the findings highlight the importance of volunteers having an appropriate skill level if they are to develop a constructive rapport with their counterparts.

Although learning new skills and building confidence is the outcome from the skills transfer between the volunteers and host project staff, some volunteers found the experience challenging. In the same way, some of the staff explain the positive outcomes in learning new skills in office administration, first aid and counselling. Further, staff explained that they gained confidence and motivation: *Feeling proud to do a good job...She [volunteer] gave me that trust that I can do my job’* [Interview-25, local project]. The outcomes highlight how volunteers focus on the skills that the staff need that demonstrates close integration and an exchange of expertise and skills. On the other hand, a volunteer explained how the experience was hard work and made them feel ‘very drained and exhausted’ [Interview-4, volunteer], resonating with the host project staff who explained that they find the work emotionally challenging, revealing their coping strategy of ‘...hug each other in the morning, talk before work or sing together’ [Interview-25&26, local project]. The findings in respect to the need for this coping strategy and the sense of emotionally exhaustion felt by both parties are indicative of their societal commitment and the challenging circumstances. These findings, therefore, provide very useful insights into the collaborative relations at the micro level.

Further insights show undesirable behaviour by host project staff, which compromises the positive relations with the volunteers. The findings illustrate how the contextual settings of their needs can lead to negative relations. A volunteer described how project staff asked her for money and use of her mobile phone. The volunteer explained that Paul advises (M5_ORIENTATION) volunteers to establish boundaries with the staff and clients [Interview-6, volunteer]. Her account illustrates that the EACC’s circumstances and unpaid staff possibly drive this negative behaviour and weakens the relations between volunteers and staff, affecting integration and engagement. The findings of compromised relations reflect similar findings in previous case studies (Bargeman et al., 2016). The findings
contribute to knowledge in suggesting that the quality of the relations between staff and volunteers is connected to the contextual settings of the host project.

In general, this dependency is an unsustainable outcome of relations between volunteers and the clients of the EACC. Concerns over beneficiaries’ ‘emotional dependency’ on volunteers were voiced by Dianne and project staff [Interview 11, sending organisation, Interview 28 & 29, host project]. Similarly, concerns have in the past been raised about the psychological effects on orphans who form temporary bonds with volunteers (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014). In this circumstance, the findings of this study make a particularly important contribution by revealing how negative outcomes, such as emotional dependency, are addressed by both the sending and receiving organisations. Both organisations stipulate that volunteers’ direct engagement with project beneficiaries, i.e. pupils or community members, should be minimal and that they should instead focus on project staff [Interview 11, sending organisation]. The findings provide an example of how the negative impact of dependency is mitigated through the volunteer and host project management processes (M5 and M6). The example illustrates the necessity of careful management of volunteer placement if sustainability is to be achieved.

The volunteers’ financial contributions are positive but influenced by the contextual setting of the project. The contribution can lead to some dependency, as illustrated when comparing the EACC and schools. In the schools, teachers appreciate how the contribution financed additional teaching aids, equipment or part fund a support teacher’s salary. The contribution appeared of use but was not considered as of great importance in the schools, as compared with the EACC. At the time at which this case study was conducted, the EACC’s usual funding stream had been withdrawn and the need for funding was accordingly much greater. Here, the volunteers’ contribution mostly covered the EACC’s operational costs. While the contextual setting creates some dependency at the EACC, the volunteers’ contribution provided a valuable financial support during a vulnerable time. Nevertheless, the contributions are not considered by host staff at either project as the most important outcome of a volunteer placement as described in a previous study (Bargeman et al., 2016). The findings suggest that other contributions such as gaining new skills are more valued than the volunteers’ financial contribution. What is significant, however, is how the contribution is managed to create positive outcomes, and this will be discussed in more detail below (Section 7.3.6).
The presence of white volunteers also has a positive influence in both the schools and the EACC, as pupils are not accustomed to white people. Host project staff commented on the benefits of white volunteers engaging with the pupils, as pupils have ‘no fear’ of white people [Interview-14, host project] and this gives hope to their parents [Interview-17, host project]. Furthermore, volunteers give schools local ‘kudos’, ‘powerful symbolism’ and ‘feel part of a global world’ [Interview 14, receiving organisation]. At the EACC, hope and self-belief was also an important aspect of the presence of volunteers: ...because why they [volunteers] choose us, we are special ... they believe in us’ [Interview-25, host project]. Similarly, in a previous case study set at a school in Ghana, teachers also commented how white volunteers have a positive effect on pupils as it improved their attendance and teachers gained a cultural appreciation for white people (Bargeman et al., 2016). The authors’ conclusions in this earlier work support the findings of this study on the presence of direct outcomes to host project staff and pupils. Furthermore, the findings reveal more profound outcomes such as hope and being part of something outside their immediate social and economic settings. They indicate that pupils’ engagement with white people from outside the township becomes normalised and bridges a social economic gap that is prevalent in the post-apartheid era. This is an unintended positive outcome that, accumulatively, may influence lasting long-term outcomes, as shown below.

Evidence suggests that short-term outcomes (T₁) of the skills and experience exchange accumulatively lead to long-term transformative change (T₂), such as social mobility for the schools’ pupils. Social mobility is attributed to robust English language skills and the fact that the standards of the host project schools are on par with schools in white areas, an outcome which is predominately attributed to the volunteer programme [Interview-17, host project]. Similarly, at the EACC volunteers are said to be ‘leaving a legacy’ [Interview-25, host project]. These findings address criticisms over questionable economic and social benefits for host communities (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012). Furthermore, the findings are significant in illustrating short and long-term outcomes and

---

21 There is no collaboration descriptor for financial transaction
transformative change, which are not explicit in the current literature. Articulating outcomes by transformative change makes a valuable contribution to understanding and defining outcomes in VT.

While each volunteer can have a positive impact on the host project, such as transferring skills or building confidence, accumulatively, the programme also gives hope and global influences that over time lead to long-term transformative change. The articulation of short- and long-term outcomes is an important attribute in defining sustainability in VT.

In examining the findings on the volunteer placement in relation to the existing body of knowledge, several contributions to knowledge are evident. Comparing the findings with other case studies illustrate the importance of contexts and processes in delivering the placement. Firstly, the willingness of volunteers and host staff is important in establishing integrated work relations and effective skills transfer. Additionally, the professional conduct of host staff, and the experience of volunteers influences how the trusting relations develop and succeed. Secondly, unintended outcomes include white volunteers giving a sense of hope to host projects and affiliated community members in a post-apartheid setting. Thirdly, outcomes are distinguishable between short and long-term outcomes. Each volunteer provides short-term outcomes such as new skills and motivations to individuals, but these short-term outcomes also have associated long-term outcomes since they accumulatively lead to transformative change. The transition to short and long-term outcomes demands further investigation.

The volunteer placement is the final stage of the supply chain and the interrelationships between the collaborations within the framework are evident. The volunteer placement focuses on the collaborative interactions between volunteers and host projects, and several processes (M1-M3 and M5-M6) influence the volunteer placement’s outcomes, which are further explored below. While the previous collaborative relations focus (M1-M3) on the preparations and planning of the placement, the last collaborative relations take place during or after the placement (M5-M6) and influence the placement outcomes.

7.3.6 Volunteer Management (M6)

As detailed above (Section 7.3.4), little is known about the roles and responsibilities of the receiving organisation. In particular, more research is required to understand what factors influence cultural understanding during a volunteer placement (Raymond & Hall, 2008). The practices and operations
revealed by the results of this study, therefore, particularly how the roles and responsibilities of the receiving organisation influence outcomes, offer a significant insight into a current understanding of best practices. This section contributes further to the current body of knowledge by revealing how the management of the volunteer placement by the receiving organisation includes liaising with the volunteer and host project and contextualising the local setting of the project to the volunteer, and how this creates a cultural bridge and facilitation within the supply chain. Such enhanced preparedness and expectations influence the sustainability performance. Another significant contribution to knowledge is the demonstration of how the receiving organisation plays a crucial role in achieving transparency and equality. Thus, an organisation that is based in the Global South is an important attribute in understanding the local and community setting. Their values that address safety, by dealing with risk assessment and due diligence are important in the organisations’ stewardship of the host projects.

As part of the process of managing the volunteer placement, an orientation for volunteers is the final preparation prior to the placement. During this orientation, articulating the contextual circumstances to the volunteers is a vital element in reinforcing some of the organisational values that influence a positive experience. Also during the orientation, the receiving organisation offers guidance and shares some of the values of the organisations, such as mutuality, respect and equality [Interview-14, receiving organisation]. The orientation emphasises how the receiving organisation’s role ensures sustainable outcomes compared to current industry practices. For instance, to avoid undesirable outcomes of dependency the receiving organisation advises volunteers who are working at the EACC to set boundaries when engaging with staff and beneficiaries [Interview-6, volunteer]. The findings are an illustration of how the receiving organisation’s role and responsibility in preparing and guiding volunteers influence equality between volunteers and host staff. Although Wearing and McGehee (2013) also conclude that the unequal balance between hosts and guests is addressed through communication and cultural exchange, here the findings reveal the importance of the facilitative role played by the receiving organisation in influencing the host-guest relations that influence sustainability performance. The findings highlight that the relations between volunteers and host project staff benefit from facilitation and guidance by the receiving organisation.

\[ C_{\text{industry}} + C_{\text{value}} + M_{\text{orientation}} + (m_{5-12v}) \Rightarrow o_{4-\text{equality}} + o_{1&4-\text{experience}} \]

Once the placement has started, weekly meetings ensure ongoing monitoring and provide three-way communications amongst stakeholders, a process that results in equality and transparency. Both volunteers and project staff consider these meetings to be useful and open and believe that they demonstrate respect. Furthermore, the receiving organisation is described as ‘honest’ [Interview-1-8, volunteers]
Wearing and McGehee (2013) also conclude that community members need to be involved in the planning and implementation of tourism development to address the lack of balance between them. The findings of this study, therefore, support Wearing and McGehee’s work, since the regular meetings allow all stakeholders to communicate and to make decisions jointly about aspects of the volunteer placement. The regular meetings demonstrate how equality and transparency are achieved by facilitating communications between volunteers and the host project. This is another example of the receiving organisation’s role in influencing sustainable performance.

The decision on how the volunteers’ contribution is spent is critical since it needs careful integration into the host project to achieve a sustainable outcome. The decision is made by consensus across all three stakeholder groups (volunteer, receiving organisation and host project staff) in the meetings. In addition, the receiving organisation provides guidance during the orientation, since volunteers do not appreciate the host projects’ immediate needs [Interview 14, receiving organisation]. In accordance with Phelan (2015), the management of the volunteers’ contribution achieves transparency and equality, and this on joint decision making between the host project, volunteer and receiving organisation reinforces sustainable performance. This contrasts with a similar case study in which volunteers decided to reduce their contributions or give them to other local projects because their contributions were handled improperly by host project staff (Bargeman et al., 2016). The outcomes of that case study indicate that volunteers alone decided how their contribution was spent and that staff misused their contributions. The contrast between the outcomes of that case study and this one illustrate how facilitation by the receiving organisation is crucial in influencing sustainability performance and ensuring transparency and equality. Furthermore, the findings underpin the usefulness of the receiving organisation’s local expertise in managing the volunteer contribution as well as the placement more broadly.

Transporting volunteers daily to and from their projects is an essential logistical exercise to ensure their safety, but also provides informal cultural exchanges and reinforces local contexts for volunteers in developing informal relations with the staff of the receiving organisation. Although volunteers’
safety is important, the current literature does not address issues of volunteer safety. Daily interactions support regular informal monitoring of volunteers’ wellbeing and their placement and, in addition, forms part of the volunteers’ experiences and cultural interactions, which enriches their overall experience. Overall, therefore, these findings address Raymond & Hall’s (2008) suggestion that more detailed knowledge of the factors that influence cultural understanding is needed, as well as a better understanding of the facilitative role of (sending) organisations. The findings provide an insight into how cultural interactions are facilitated on an informal basis by the receiving organisation as the staff act as cultural intermediaries supporting integration and continued communication and openness.

In summary, during the volunteer placement, the facilitative role of the receiving organisation is critical in ensuring transparency, equality and safety for volunteers. This is a significant contribution to knowledge in understanding the relations between volunteers, host projects and the receiving organisations, and how together these relations influence sustainability performance. Firstly, throughout the volunteer placement, the receiving organisation plays an active role in managing relations between volunteers and the host projects and provides daily transportation to ensure volunteers’ safety. The relations and cultural exchanges are informal but support cultural understanding for volunteers. Secondly, the fact that the receiving organisation plays an active part in deciding how the volunteers’ contribution is spent ensures transparency and effective expenditure. Thirdly, when comparing the different projects and their social and economic settings, the importance of the receiving organisation’s role in influencing the sustainable outcomes is apparent. As the economic setting of the EACC is more challenging, more management and guidance is required for the volunteer placement. Overall, the receiving organisation bridges the economic and social differences between the Global North and Global South in understanding and responding to contextualising local settings. Thus, their role ensures sustainability, especially through achieving more transparency and equality.

7.3.7 Host Project Management (M₆)

The last collaborative relationship of the host project management highlights the importance of the sending organisations’ long-term commitment and their values of achieving equality and transparency. The section highlights a new understanding of how the host project management
influences the volunteer placement in facilitating the relations between the volunteer and the host project. In addition to obtaining consent for each placement, the host project management predominately involves evaluation, needs assessment and long-term planning. A significant contribution to knowledge here relates to how sustainable outcomes are influenced by how needs are identified and addressed. In addition, the consideration of the host project’s carrying capacity reveals valuable insights into sustainability performance.

During the matching process and project selection, the sending organisation considers the contextual settings of each project and demonstrates their commitment to meeting each project’s individual needs over the long-term. The findings show that a challenging element of project selection is weighing out the needs of all projects (Interview-9, sending organisation). The comments suggest that equality between the host projects is achieved by focusing on the needs of the host projects when matching volunteers’ skills and expertise. Furthermore, the findings show how the number and frequency of recent volunteers, the size of the project, and staff availability are all considered when selecting a suitable project (Interview-9, sending organisation). These findings address criticisms of the exploitative organisations, and how operational practices can influence outcomes (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012). In addition, the findings show how these criteria define each project’s carrying capacity in terms of hosting volunteers. The findings introduce the notion of the host project’s carrying capacity and provide an invaluable insight into best practice in influencing sustainable performance. The current body of knowledge in VT, however, does not include carrying capacity, and thus the findings of this study open the way to further investigation of how a host project’s carrying capacity is assessed and how it can influence sustainability performance.

As part of the matching process, the host project’s informed consent provides an important element of equality since it provides the host project with the opportunity to decide on whether to accept a volunteer or not. According to the sending organisation, the priority of who drives the matching process is: ‘project first, volunteer second’ (Interview 10, sending organisation). The findings illustrate how the informed consent supports empowerment by the host project through direct engagement and confirms the significance of the pivotal role played by the receiving organisation (Barbieri et al., 2011; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). These findings contribute to the current body of knowledge by demonstrating how informed consent is empowering host projects by making them central to the decision making on each placement. Furthermore, the findings illustrate how the
sending organisations facilitate the process of achieving transparency and equity of sustainable
performance, both goals that are driven by their values, thereby confirming that organisations’
responsibilities influence outcomes (Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lupoli et al., 2014;
Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014). The findings offer a valuable insight into how the organisation’s commitment
achieves equality through the implementation of an informed consent process.

\[ \text{C2-COMMITMENT + C2-VALUES + M6-CONSENT + (m6-jdm)} \rightarrow \text{O4-EQUALITY + O4-EMPOWERMENT + O4-TRANSPARENCY} \]

Based on a post-project report, ongoing evaluation leads to equality and empowerment as host
projects voice their views and experiences. The post-project report is described to be ‘working well’
[Interview 20, host project]. The findings confirm current thinking that organisations’ careful management
should include feedback from the host project in order to improve constructive engagements amongst
stakeholders (Barbieri et al., 2011, Taplin, 2014). The findings illustrate the details of how some of the
monitoring and planning processes are linked together. The host project report is applied in the same
manner to the volunteer report (M1.V.REPORT) and incorporates joint planning and development (M6.
PLAN), achieving equality between the volunteer and host project. Thus, the findings demonstrate how
the reports are managed by the sending organisation and highlight their facilitative role through the
equal integration of all stakeholders, particularly the host project (McGehee & Andereck, 2009). The
findings demonstrate the importance of careful management by the sending organisation in
influencing sustainability performance, and this becomes further apparent when examining the
support plan.

\[ \text{C2-VALUES + M6-H.REPORT + (m6-jpp)} \rightarrow \text{O4-EQUALITY} \]

The support plan ensures equality and long-term planning since the host projects’ needs are
determined based on capacity building and joint decision making. The sending organisation
emphasised the importance of the support plan in assessing the appropriate needs for the project and
explained that the programme is host project led [Interview 10, sending organisation]. These findings demonstrate
how the sending organisation is not exploitative (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014;
Tomazos, 2012) and how the support plan provides an opportunity for the host project to specify their
needs and demonstrate best practice (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Wearing
& McGehee, 2013b). Furthermore, the support plan is effective since the host projects make use of
the skills they requested [Interview 11, sending organisation], which encourages the host project to decide and
prioritise its needs. Significantly, therefore, the findings demonstrate effective host project
engagement and needs assessment, which leads to equality and illustrates the importance of long-term planning. The findings further illustrate how the sending organisation’s commitment and values are vital in implementing an effective needs assessment (McGehee & Andereck, 2009).

\[ C_2 - \text{Commitment} + C_2 - \text{Values} + M_6 - \text{Plan} + (m_6 - \text{jpp} + m_6 - \text{cas}) \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{Equality} + O_4 - \text{Skills} \]

To maximise transformative change, the aims of the placements focus on skills transfer for the staff. As Dianne explains, volunteers’ skills are more effective when transferring skills to host project staff, rather than as acting as an additional staff member such as a supply teacher, where the benefits only last for the duration of the placement [Interview-11, sending organisation]. The vulnerability of the host project’s beneficiaries, such as pupils, is also an important consideration. This is in contrast to previous observations of volunteers acting as supply teachers, where host staff were absent or volunteers did not engage in the tasks (Bargeman et al., 2016; Wearing & Grabowski, 2011). Importantly, in one case study it was concluded that class room productivity and curriculum progression decreased when volunteers were present (Bargeman et al., 2016). In contrast, the findings in this research reveal that the careful strategic thinking enables lasting change to take place in host projects. Thus, the findings demonstrate how long-term planning, and focusing on project staff, are critical to achieving transformative change. In addition, they show how the sending organisations’ values and commitment to the host project, as well as the volunteers’ skill set, influence the outcomes and how these are facilitated by the sending organisation (McGehee & Andereck, 2009).

\[ C_1 - \text{Skills} + C_2 - \text{Commitment} + C_2 - \text{Values} + M_6 - \text{Plan} + (m_6 - \text{jpp} + m_6 - \text{cas}) \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{Equality} + O_4 - \text{Skills} \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{Change} \]

In summary, the last collaborative relations between the sending organisation and the host project demonstrates how the consistent facilitative role and responsibilities of the sending organisation influence sustainable outcomes. The organisation’s commitment and values drive why and how the processes are conducted. The findings are significant in identifying what influences sustainability performance such as equality, transparency and transformative change, with joint decision making, a willingness to engage and joint planning all being part of the collaborative relations. Furthermore, the findings highlight the significance of each process. Firstly, the carrying capacity takes into consideration the host project’s needs, size of project, frequency and number of volunteers, which influences equality. Secondly, obtaining the host project’s informed consent is crucial as part of the recruitment process since this operationalises joint decision making with the host project. Thirdly, the host project’s feedback is taken into consideration and is incorporated into the support plan. Fourth, the support plan plays an important role in allowing host projects to drive their needs assessment and
focus on volunteers transferring skills to host project staff. This strategy maximises skills transfer to staff, which has a more lasting impact and minimises interactions with vulnerable people.

7.3.8 Section Summary

In response to Objective 2, this section has systematically deconstructed the social intervention of the volunteer programme and determined the contextual settings and how these influence sustainability through certain mechanisms. In discussing the CMO configurations, a detailed illustration is constructed that provides an in-depth evaluation. This section has also highlighted some of the implications for the VT industry and academia. It is apparent that the processes and procedures are the result of the sending and receiving organisations’ strategies in operating the volunteer placements, demonstrating how they influence and manage the supply chain (Section 7.3). Many of the processes and procedures ensure a high level of integration and engagement amongst stakeholders. They enable joint decision making and power sharing, which results in safety, transparency and equality for host projects. The partnership between the sending and receiving organisations plays an important role, as demonstrated by how the receiving organisation manages relations between the volunteer and host project staff. In addition, the discussion revealed how the different contextual settings of the host projects can have a negative influence on the sustainability performance and how this is managed and mitigated by the receiving organisation.

Each CMO configuration explained how the intervention of the volunteer programme led to certain outcomes, based on the empirical investigation. The summary of the CMO configurations illustrates a diverse and rich fabric of pathways that reflect the comprehensive all-encompassing approach of the evaluative framework (Table 7.5). The summary table shows how certain different mechanisms lead to certain outcomes for the volunteer programme and highlight the contextual settings. Each collaboration is characterised by the collaboration descriptors and reveals more about the intent and purpose of each mechanism. The following section begins by fully exploring the commonalities of the CMO configurations by determining plausible patterns and causal explanations. This refinement and development of the CMO configurations lead to the middle range theories that explain the variations of the interactions between the contextual settings and collaborative relations that ultimately result in certain sustainability performances. Lastly, the next section will discuss how the evaluative framework contributes to the current body of knowledge.
Table 7.5: Summary CMO Configurations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>MECHANISM</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-external</td>
<td>c-internal</td>
<td>M-processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-processes</td>
<td>m-descriptors</td>
<td>m1-ine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: SCREENING</td>
<td>m1-ine</td>
<td>04-TRANSPARENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2-VALUES</td>
<td>M1-STORY</td>
<td>m1-ine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3-VALUES</td>
<td>M1-MATCH</td>
<td>m1-jdm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: SELECTION</td>
<td>m2-sav</td>
<td>04-EXPERIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: VOLUNTEER</td>
<td>m2-exk</td>
<td>04-INTERNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: RELATION</td>
<td>m2-exk</td>
<td>04-EXTERNAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: POLICY</td>
<td>m2-sav</td>
<td>04-EXHAUSTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: SELECTION</td>
<td>m3-ine</td>
<td>04-MOBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: COMMITTEE</td>
<td>m3-jdm</td>
<td>04-CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-VALUES</td>
<td>M3-RELATION</td>
<td>m3-sav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: SELECTION</td>
<td>m4-sav</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: RELATION</td>
<td>m4-exk +m4-exk</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: SKILLS</td>
<td>m4-jdm</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: SKILLS</td>
<td>m4-sav</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: RELATIONS</td>
<td>m4-exk</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: RELATIONS</td>
<td>m4-exk</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: RELATIONS</td>
<td>m4-exk</td>
<td>04-BLACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-NEED</td>
<td>C4-NOPAY</td>
<td>M4-RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-NEED</td>
<td>C4-HIV</td>
<td>M4-RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOLS & EACC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C4-POST-APARTHEID</th>
<th>M4-RELATIONS</th>
<th>m4-ine</th>
<th>O4-KUDOS</th>
<th>O4-HOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O4-LANGUAGE</td>
<td>O4-MOBILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O4-CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>O4-MOBILITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOLS & EACC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C3-INDUSTRY</th>
<th>C3 VALUE</th>
<th>M5-ORIENTATION</th>
<th>m5-sav</th>
<th>O4-EQUALITY</th>
<th>O1&amp;4-EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C3-INDUSTRY</td>
<td>C3 VALUE</td>
<td>M5-MEETING</td>
<td>m5-jps</td>
<td>O4-EQUALITY</td>
<td>O1&amp;4-EXPERIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-NEED</td>
<td>C4-V.C.F.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>O4-DEPENDENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4-NEED</td>
<td>C3-APPROACH</td>
<td>C3-EXPERTISE</td>
<td>M4-V.C.F.</td>
<td>m5-jdm</td>
<td>m5-ine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3-VALUES</td>
<td>M5-RELATIONS</td>
<td>m5-per</td>
<td>m5-cud</td>
<td>m5-ine</td>
<td>m5-per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3-VALUES</td>
<td>M5-TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>m5-ine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOLS & EACC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2-COMMITMENT</th>
<th>C2 VALUES</th>
<th>M6-P.SELECTION</th>
<th>m6-jdm</th>
<th>O4-EQUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2-COMMITMENT</td>
<td>C2 VALUES</td>
<td>M6-CONSENT</td>
<td>m6-jdm</td>
<td>O4-EQUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2-VALUES</td>
<td>M6-H.REPORT</td>
<td>m6-jpp</td>
<td></td>
<td>O4-EQUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2-COMMITMENT</td>
<td>C2 VALUES</td>
<td>M6-PLAN</td>
<td>m6-jpp</td>
<td>O4-EQUALITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1-SKILLS</td>
<td>C2-COMMITMENT</td>
<td>M6-PLAN</td>
<td>m6-jpp</td>
<td>O4-EQUALITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no collaboration descriptor for financial transaction
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7.4 Evaluating Sustainability Performance through the Evaluative Framework

7.4.1 Section Overview

The previous section discussed each detected CMO configuration, illustrating the interactions between each component (C,c,M,m,O,o) as summarised above (Table 7.5). It explained in detail at a micro level the different aspects of why and how the volunteer programme leads to specific outcomes. This section addresses Objective 3 by exploring the development of the evaluative framework and draws on the current body of knowledge on the methodological basis of RE (Section 4.6) and existing approaches in evaluating sustainability in VT (Section 2.3). Thus, this section consists of two parts: First, the section fully explores the refinement of how the CMO configurations develop to the middle range theories. An account of how the CMO pathways lead to the middle range theories elaborates on the implications of how their transferability of collaborations and why their contextual conditionality influences sustainability performance. Second, the section highlights some of the advantages of the evaluative framework for exploring existing frameworks of sustainability in VT. It also begins to explore how the empirical findings contribute to the existing understanding of sustainability performance in VT; contributions that are further summarised in the concluding chapter.

7.4.2 Themes and Patterns of the CMO Pathways

The CMO pathways (Section 7.3) identified the contextual conditionality of why the different collaborative relations influence sustainability performances, which is an explanatory variation of the interactions of its components. Several plausible themes and associated patterns emerge that explain why and how the volunteer programme leads to sustainability. The RE’s mantra of ‘what works for whom in what circumstance’ underpins both the theory-driven approach and the explanatory synthesis of how the evaluative framework provides an in-depth evaluation of VT’s sustainability performance (Marchal et al., 2016; Pawson & Tilley, 2004; Westhorp, 2014). Based on the analysis in the refinement of the CMO pathways (Section 4.6), several patterns of causal explanations of ‘observed outcomes’ emerge that lead to the middle range theories (Byng et al., 2005; Marchal et al., 2016; Pawson & Tilley, 1997). These causal explanations lead to different outcomes. First, the skills exchange has direct outcomes with respect to host project staff gaining new skills, motivation and confidence in fulfilling their challenging roles. This is the intended outcome of the volunteer programme. Second, evidence of safety, transparency, equality and empowerment for host projects are also evident, which result from different sets of processes and procedures. The main themes, based on patterns and trends of individual CMO components which navigate across all CMO configuration.
The combination of the various settings of the sending and receiving organisations have a significant influence on sustainability. For instance, their values are important in opting for sustainability over profitability as these values underpin how they manage processes and procedures. Furthermore, the organisations’ internal governance appears to free them from accountability to shareholders or other external pressures, which enables them to minimise external settings such as market pressures and allows them to make sustainable choices over ‘anti-economic choices’. Their rejection of the main VT market trend, such as unsustainable projects in orphanages, demonstrates their values and commitment to sustainability. The middle range theory articulates the importance of the internal settings such as the organisations’ shared values and governance. It is important to recognise that it is the combination of these different settings that provide the right set of circumstances to enable the organisations to enhance their sustainability. In addition, the shared values between the organisations reinforce the collaborative partnership and its positive outcomes. The current body of knowledge recognises the importance of the organisations’ accountability in influencing sustainability, and these pathways demonstrate how this combination of settings play an important role in this (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Taplin et al., 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Further investigations on other VT organisations would probably identify other combinations with similar outcomes. Likewise, there are probable settings that result in unsustainable outcomes.

The contextual settings of stakeholders are particularly important aspects in the process of selecting stakeholders as they provide the criteria for assessing stakeholders’ willingness and suitability for engaging with the supply chain. For instance, host projects are expected to share the same values as the sending and receiving organisations in terms of wanting transformative change and being willing to host volunteers. Willingness to engage and shared values encourage active participation within the supply chain. Thus, careful selection into the supply chain is based on the individual stakeholders’ willingness, guided by the values of the sending and receiving organisations, and this careful selection enhances empowerment for stakeholders such as the host project. Here, the CMO configurations are fundamental in contributing to the in-depth understanding of the settings which influence equality and empowerment for host projects (Barbieri et al., 2011; Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Ong et al., 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). The importance of the contextual settings is twofold: first, in determining the values of the organisations that drive the selection processes and second, in providing
the basis of the selection criteria for other stakeholders. Similarly, in selecting a receiving organisation, their values in community empowerment are of great importance. Thus, the middle range theory emphasises the contextual settings of stakeholders that underpin shared values and high integration in enhancing sustainability performance. In a similar manner, the recruiting and matching processes enable the integration of suitable volunteers within the supply chain.

\[
\begin{align*}
c_2 \text{-VALUES} + c_3 \text{-VALUES} + & \quad M_2 \text{-SELECTION} + (m_2 \text{-ine} + m_2 \text{-sav}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-EMPOWERMENT} \\
c_4 \text{-VALUES} + & \quad M_3 \text{-SELECTION} + (m_3 \text{-ine} + m_3 \text{-wes} + m_3 \text{-sav}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-PARTICIPATION} \\
c_3 \text{-EXPECTATION} + c_4 \text{-LEADERSHIP} + & \quad M_3 \text{-SELECTION} + (m_3 \text{-ine} + m_3 \text{-wes} + m_3 \text{-sav}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-PARTICIPATION} \\
c_4 \text{-SKILLS} + & \quad M_4 \text{-SELECTION} + (m_4 \text{-ine} + m_4 \text{-wes}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-EXPERIENCE} + o_4 \text{-SKILLS}
\end{align*}
\]

The initial processes (life story and project matching) that serve to gather volunteers’ information and share it with the host projects encourages equality and transparency for host projects. The processes ensure informed decision making for each volunteer placement (consent) and enable transparency and empowerment for the host project. The current body of knowledge supports the importance of such processes on the basis that they operationalise stakeholder engagement and manage relations that leads to sustainability performance (McGehee & Andereck, 2009). The emphasis is also on the values of the organisations since they are the driving force in the stakeholder engagement, highlighting the importance of the contextual settings of organisations. These CMO configurations demonstrate how joint decision making and integration of stakeholders are important collaborative qualities in supporting effective stakeholder engagement. Here, the middle range theory determines how operationalising stakeholder engagement is a critical component in enhancing sustainability performance. It illustrates that management and operational practices are significant and that the skills exchange is not the only crucial aspect in achieving sustainability performance. These processes are critical in maximising positive outcomes of the skills exchange.

\[
\begin{align*}
c_2 \text{-VALUES} + & \quad M_1 \text{-STORY} + (m_1 \text{-ine}) \quad \Rightarrow o_1 \text{-TRANSPARENCY} + o_4 \text{-EQUALITY} \\
c_2 \text{-VALUES} + & \quad M_1 \text{-MATCH} + (m_1 \text{jdm}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-RESPECT} + o_4 \text{-EQUALITY} \\
c_2 \text{-COMMITMENT} + c_2 \text{-VALUES} + & \quad M_6 \text{-CONSENT} + (m_6 \text{jdm}) \quad \Rightarrow o_4 \text{-EQUALITY} + o_4 \text{-EMPOWERMENT} + o_1 \& o_4 \text{-TRANSPARENCY}
\end{align*}
\]

The effectiveness of the skills exchange by volunteers is based on the full integration with their counterparts, which is determined by the skills, expertise and approach of the volunteers’ and host project staff. In addition, the willingness and suitability of host project staff to collaborate with volunteers is important in supporting good working relations. The positive outcomes of the collaborative relations between the volunteers and host project staff are maximised by ensuring an
appropriate work environment. Thus, the middle range theory defines how the skills exchange is the result of the pre- and post-processes, which align the appropriate matching of contextual settings of the volunteers and host project staff. A crucial element here is how the skills and expertise of volunteers, and the needs of the host project staff, are aligned. It is also important how management and operational considerations are put in place to support the skills exchange and it is this highly organised environment that enhances positive outcomes. In addition to the direct outcomes of the skills exchange, further outcomes of the volunteer programme influence sustainability performance, such as stakeholders’ safety, transparency and equality for host projects.

\[
\begin{align*}
&c_1 \cdot \text{EXPERTISE} + c_1 \cdot \text{SKILLS} + M_4 \cdot \text{SKILLS} + (m_{4-\text{exk}} + m_{4-\text{ine}}) \Rightarrow o_4 \cdot \text{SKILLS} + o_4 \cdot \text{MOTIVATION} + o_4 \cdot \text{CONFIDENCE} \\
&c_4 \cdot \text{POST-APARTHEID} \quad + M_4 \cdot \text{SKILLS} + (m_{4-\text{ine}}) \Rightarrow o_4 \cdot \text{LANGUAGE} + o_4 \cdot \text{CONFIDENCE}
\end{align*}
\]

The safety for host project staff, project beneficiaries and volunteers is based on organisational policy and processes that are determined by their shared values and commitment; for example, a policy that addresses the safety of vulnerable host beneficiaries and screening of volunteers, and volunteer transportation to and from project sites. These evaluates are the results of the exchange of expertise and capacity building between the sending and receiving organisations. Therefore, the stakeholders’ safety is driven by the shared values of the sending and receiving organisations. These findings help to address the gap in knowledge in regards to the extent to which safety is addressed by sending and receiving organisations (Czarnecki et al., 2015). Consequently, the middle range theory determines that safety of stakeholders is an important aspect of sustainability, driven predominately by the sending and receiving organisations’ values and commitments to sustainability.

\[
\begin{align*}
&c_2 \cdot \text{INDUSTRY} + c_2 \cdot \text{COMMITMENT} + c_2 \cdot \text{VALUES} \quad + M_1 \cdot \text{SCREENING} + (m_{1-\text{ine}}) \Rightarrow o_4 \cdot \text{SAFETY} \\
&c_2 \cdot \text{VALUES} + c_3 \cdot \text{VALUES} \quad + M_2 \cdot \text{POLICY} + (m_{2-\text{exk}} + m_{2-\text{ex}}) \Rightarrow o_4 \cdot \text{SAFETY} \\
&c_3 \cdot \text{VALUES} \quad + M_5 \cdot \text{TRANSPORTATION} + (m_{5-\text{ine}}) \Rightarrow o_1 \cdot \text{SAFETY}
\end{align*}
\]

The ongoing facilitation and engagement with the host projects by the receiving organisation addresses local contextual settings and minimises negative outcomes and inequalities between volunteers and host project staff. The receiving organisation’s role and expertise are pivotal in achieving equality due to their consideration of the local internal and external contextual settings of each host project. For instance, ongoing facilitation, such as committee and orientation meetings, addresses the different social and economic settings between volunteers and host projects, and this, in turn, influences equality and participation. This was apparent in the outcomes of volunteer placements at the EACC, despite this project’s disempowering circumstances of unsalaried staff and
financial constraints. The findings offer detailed insights into the significance of the role of receiving organisations and this represents an important contribution to the current body of knowledge (Frilund, 2015). The middle range theory stipulates how the values and expertise of the receiving organisations drive the process of balancing the host projects and volunteers’ settings in order to achieve equality between host projects. Thus, the facilitation processes highlight the inter-connectivity of the contextual settings of the three stakeholders.

The findings offer detailed insights into the significance of the role of receiving organisations and this represents an important contribution to the current body of knowledge (Frilund, 2015). The middle range theory stipulates how the values and expertise of the receiving organisations drive the process of balancing the host projects and volunteers’ settings in order to achieve equality between host projects. Thus, the facilitation processes highlight the inter-connectivity of the contextual settings of the three stakeholders.

The scale and the nature of host projects’ contextual settings influence the outcomes and facilitation requirements. When comparing the different contextual settings of the schools and the EACC, it is evident that the EACC’s needs and vulnerability are greater. The differences in the host projects’ settings emphasise the significance of the facilitation efforts undertaken by the receiving organisation with respect to influencing the outcomes and, especially in attempting to minimise negative outcomes such as dependency. Furthermore, the different CMO configurations suggest that more facilitation and engagement is required to overcome negative outcomes at the EACC. Such individual considerations are driven by the values and expertise of the receiving organisation in recognising and effectively addressing negative issues because more management and operations are required. To put it another way, where the contextual settings are great such as projects’ needs than more facilitation and management are needed, there is also a greater potential for more positive outcomes. Consequently, the middle range theory tentatively suggests that, given the appropriate facilitation, if a host project’s need is great there is an opportunity for the positive transformation also to be great. The relations between the contextual settings between needs and outcomes requires further in-depth exploratory evaluation.

Joint long-term planning and monitoring is critical in supporting transformative change. The support plan enables host projects to participate in planning and assessing their needs and this supports the
effectiveness of the programme in reaching the appropriate short-term outcomes, while over time also facilitating transformative change. Furthermore, the host projects’ participation in long-term planning ensures equality since their needs are given priority and there is a focus on what the volunteer programme will deliver. The implementation of long-term planning is driven by the sending organisation’s values and commitments to the host projects. The CMO configurations are emphasised by the current body of knowledge in detailing how effective host project engagement such as planning influences sustainability performance (Barbieri et al., 2011, Taplin, 2014). Thus, the middle range theory stipulates that sending organisations’ commitment and values drive joint long-term planning, including needs assessments, which is crucial in influencing sustainability and, in particular, in supporting transformative change. The middle range theory emphasises the importance of long-term commitments to host projects but also highlights how short-term outcomes accumulate to transformative change.

\[
\begin{align*}
&M_5 - \text{MEETING} + M_1 - \text{V.REPORT} + M_6 - \text{H.REPORT} \\
&c_2 - \text{VALUES} \quad \quad \quad \quad + M_6 - \text{H.REPORT} + (m_{6-jpp}) \quad \quad \Rightarrow M_6 - \text{PLAN} \\
&c_2 - \text{COMMITMENT} + c_2 - \text{VALUES} \quad \quad + M_6 - \text{PLAN} + (m_{6-jpp} + m_{6-cas}) \quad \quad \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{EQUALITY} + O_4 - \text{SKILLS} \\
&c_1 - \text{SKILLS} + c_2 - \text{COMMITMENT} + c_2 - \text{VALUES} \quad + M_6 - \text{PLAN} + (m_{6-jpp} + m_{6-cas}) \quad \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{EQUALITY} + O_4 - \text{SKILLS} \Rightarrow O_4 - \text{CHANGE}
\end{align*}
\]

In summary, the significance of the outcomes of the evaluative framework in evaluating sustainability performance is based on the account of the interactions between the CMO configurations, and it is these interactions that explain the social intervention of the volunteer programme in the case study. The middle range theories are the substantive truths that formulate the transferability of the empirical findings (Table 7.6). This section began with the refinement of the CMO configurations and was followed by an account of the middle range theories based on the case study’s sustainability performance. Their implications and contributions to the current body of knowledge, and the VT industry was discussed throughout. The significant implications and contributions of their transferability are presented in the final chapter. The following section continues to address Objective 3 by detailing the implications and contributions of the evaluative framework to the current body of knowledge of conceptual and tested frameworks. The section highlights some of the evaluative framework’s advantages in evaluating sustainability performance.
Table 7.6: Overview of Middle Range Theories

- Shared values of organisations influence the supply chain and its processes and procedures.
- Several sets of processes and procedures lead to safety, empowerment, transparency and equality.
- Careful integration through selection processes encourages a willingness to engage and verifies shared values among all stakeholders.
- The effectiveness of the skills transfer in building an appropriate environment is based on the sets of internal settings of both the volunteers and host project staff.
- Ongoing facilitation by the receiving organisation minimises negative effects and enhances positive outcomes.
- The different contextual internal and external circumstances of host projects lead to different challenges in maintaining equality and achieving empowerment.
- Host projects with more needs require more supportive facilitation management and volunteer inputs, which can possibly lead to more positive outcomes.
- Long-term planning and needs assessment support projects’ progression and transformative change, highlighted in how long-term outcomes are based on accumulative short-term outcomes.

Author, 2018

7.4.3 The Evaluative Framework

The aim of this thesis is to develop an evaluative framework that is able to deal with the complexity and heterogeneity of sustainability in VT. By applying RE, the framework was able to develop an in-depth understanding of what leads to sustainability performance in the case study. The framework offers a detailed and systematic insight of 31 CMO configurations that determined the interactions of various different contextual settings, explaining why the intervention produced certain outcomes. The CMO configurations act as an imaging tool in abstracting from the empirical analysis, which leads then to the middle range theories (Marchal et al., 2016). Illustrated in the explanatory map of the case study’s intervention (Figure 8.1), the framework’s strength lies with the appropriate abstraction of the empirical CMO configuration and the eight emerging middle range theories (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). The appropriate level of abstraction is defined by the cumulation of the middle range theories, based on the existing body of knowledge in other empirical case studies and existing frameworks evaluating sustainability in VT. Through the process of cumulation, the methodological approach gains its internal (existing body of knowledge) and external (evaluative frameworks) validity. Further cumulation and refinement of the middle range theories require future evaluations in other case studies to populate additional sets of CMO configurations; a process that is fully explored in the final chapter.

Underpinned by RE, the framework’s strength lies in the transferability of the middle range theories. Since the framework is grounded methodologically in realism, the middle range theories and certain
aspects of the intervention of the case study are transferable. Realism stipulates that, based on their different social and cultural settings and experiences, different people in different contexts will respond differently to the same social intervention (Greenhalgh et al., 2015). This means that the advantage of the evaluative framework lies is the transferability of the general aspects and patterns that emerged. Thus, the generalisability of specific sets of data, for example indicators, is less relevant due to the application of RE (Pawson & Tilley, 1997). Furthermore, the framework’s unique application to a case study of known high sustainability performance is atypical of the population of VT sending or receiving organisations. The case study’s lack of representation of the population of the VT organisations, therefore, undermines the generalisability of the specific data arising from it. This implies that it is the middle range theories, as constructed through RE into a comprehensive evaluative framework that are potentially transferable. As discussed in the paragraph above, however, more refinement of the middle range theories and verification of the transferability of the framework demands further evaluations to populate CMO configurations. Consequently, the contribution of this novel exploratory approach forms the basis for an exciting new line of enquiry in evaluating sustainability performance in VT and other fields in tourism. The evaluative framework significantly advances the existing understanding of how sustainability performance can be evaluated.

Several contributions are highlighted in identifying the framework’s advantages, comparing the evaluative framework with the existing body of knowledge about evaluating sustainability in VT. Firstly, the evaluation is based on RE and has the advantage over indicator development in terms of how elements or themes can be transferred to the VT industry and contribute to the existing body of knowledge. Based on the abstraction of empirically evaluating sustainability performance, certain commonalities and conditionalities are transferable to other volunteer programmes in the VT industry, helping in understanding the constraints and drivers of their sustainability performance. Previous applications of indicator development in case studies, on the other hand, are not necessarily applicable elsewhere, limiting comparability to other settings (Lupoli and Morse, 2014). Furthermore, the heterogeneity of local contextual settings tends to result in a high variability of sustainability indicator preferences, which limits their generalisability (Lupoli et al., 2015). When applying RE, however, the locality and case study approach are not limiting factors in evaluations (Koenig, 2009; Manzano-Santanella, 2011). A significant advantage of the evaluation is how it included contextual settings (internal and external), making it able to address the heterogeneity of volunteer programmes. The importance of the inclusion of the contextual settings (internal and external), and how they influence sustainability performance, is highlighted throughout this chapter.
The framework successfully detected the internal and external contextual settings that explain stakeholders’ drivers and constraints. As a result, the evaluation was able to provide an in-depth analysis of the internal settings at a micro level in organisational management practices and strategies. Similarly, Coghlan and Noakes (2012) recognise the importance of contextual settings and suggested possible organisational evaluations, including the complexity of the project’s aim, the number of stakeholders and their heterogeneity, financial resources and constraints, the market and consumer trends and the proximity to mainstream tourism. The evaluative framework detected comparable and related contextual settings in addressing organisations’ strategies and operational practices. The findings illustrate the importance of evaluating the drivers and constraints of organisations and show how this contributes to the understanding of what influences sustainability performance in volunteer programmes, and how. This is crucial to gaining a deep understanding of how organisations navigate between meeting financial demands, market forces and sustainability (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012).

Currently, little is understood about the diverse fabric of the VT industry and the different players involved. Applying the evaluative framework quantitatively to assess more contextual settings of VT organisations would provide a more coherent picture of the industry’s landscape, determining the scale and extent of sustainability performance.

Some critical findings of the evaluative framework correspond with elements of Gilfillan’s conceptual framework, highlighting thereby some pertinent patterns in achieving sustainability performance. Since his framework is based on applying several Millennium Development Goals at a micro level, some similarities are apparent with this case study and what he deemed to be essential in achieving sustainability (Gilfillan, 2015). First, the needs assessment conducted by host projects would ensure that volunteers offer skills and expertise to project staff that are required and, presumably, would not be locally available. Second, although the volunteer programme is not part of a broader development framework, it is based on a long-term plan for assuring continuous development and progression of the host projects. Third, the programme aims to maximise the benefit to the host community, an aim driven by the values of the organisations. Fourth, the host projects are closely integrated and make joint decisions on several aspects of the programme. Furthermore, the volunteer programme is driven by the organisations and their needs and values, not the volunteers. Host projects are an integral part of the needs assessment. These similarities reinforce some valuable elements of the middle range theories that demonstrate what leads to sustainability and how it can be achieved, and this relates to the more bottom-up approach stipulated in the literature (Wearing et al., 2017). In addition, the similarities highlight how the different CMO components play an important part within the evaluative framework.
The successful development of the evaluative framework is the actualisation of a novel approach, and the transferability of the emerging middle range theories offers a new evaluative lens for evaluating sustainability. The strengths and attributes of the evaluative framework are the basis for a ‘reusable conceptual platform’ for further exploration and application in evaluating sustainability in VT and other fields in tourism (Pawson, 2013, p. 92). Since the framework offers deep insights and analysis of the case study, it indicates necessary components that contribute to sustainability performance. For instance, the contextual settings of the volunteer and host project staff need to be complementary if effective skills exchange is to be achieved. In addition, the combination of certain contextual settings of the sending and receiving organisations offers the right basis to operate and manage a sustainable volunteer programme. Such necessary components need further exploration: both to strengthen the evaluative framework further, and to reflect the diverse VT landscape of different organisations and supply chain models. Consequently, the natural progression from this thesis is the further refinement of the propositions put forward by the middle range theories by exploring additional contextual settings in other cases studies. Future investigation in other case studies would offer a fully understanding of other contextual settings and mechanisms that lead to sustainability. The implications of the evaluative framework on both the current body of knowledge and industry are highlighted in the final chapter.

### 7.4.4 Section Summary

By presenting the middle range theories this section addressed Objective 3. Specifically, 31 CMO configurations were refined to eight middle range theories. This process included the careful consideration of existing empirical evidence for the outcomes of the social intervention of volunteer programmes, as well as of other frameworks assessing sustainability performance. The section provided valuable insights into the evaluative framework’s transferability, which are summarised in the final chapter. It draws on the findings of the middle range theories and the existing body of knowledge that enabled the abstractions of patterns and themes that influence sustainability performance. This cumulation is important in improving the validity of the middle range theories derived from the evaluative framework. An important point to note here is how the refinement of the CMO configurations leads to middle range theories as a process of distilment or simplification, and not as an attempt to typify the social interventions of the case study. The transferability of the middle range theories, therefore, plays a significant role in articulating sustainability performance within the VT industry.
7.4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has revealed how this explorative study developed a new understanding of the inter-relations of VT stakeholders and how sustainability performance is evaluable. It provides an opportunity for a new line of enquiry to determine what factors influence sustainability and how to evaluate sustainability performance. Based on the empirical findings (Chapter 6), the most pertinent findings from this research were highlighted in this chapter. Collectively, the findings support a new evaluative framework for assessing sustainability performance in VT. The study reveals, firstly, the geopolitical standing of the stakeholders’ contextual settings and their collaborative relations. Secondly, the relations between the 31 CMO components highlight in great depth and detail how and why collaborations influence sustainability performance. Thirdly, the eight middle range theories generate transferable patterns or themes contributing to future evaluations. Considering the findings in their entirety, the evaluative framework assessed and determined key elements at a micro level that influence sustainability performance in VT, which are summarised in the final chapter.

The thesis is based on a qualitative case study, which provides a narrow narrative to develop and test the framework. The advantages of the evaluative framework its basis on RE and its ability to abstract the main ideas and patterns of the volunteer programme through the inclusion of different sets of contextual settings of each stakeholder. The framework is comprehensive in considering all possible collaborations between all stakeholders and determines their qualities in-depth. Furthermore, the framework incorporates all main stakeholders within the supply chain and is all-encompassing and holistic in including all stakeholders equally. Consequently, the framework determines not only how sustainability is influenced but also identifies the key drivers for this. In the process, constraints and challenges were highlighted and these provide invaluable insights into the importance of stakeholders and their contextual settings. In doing so, unintended outcomes and the importance of time were highlighted as significant findings. The evaluative framework therefore systematically deconstructed a complex intervention and determined the key factors that influence sustainability.
8 Conclusions

‘After climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb.’

Nelson Mandela

8.1 Introduction

The previous chapter identified several key factors that influence sustainability performance in VT. In particular, the significance of the external and internal settings of the four main stakeholders have become apparent with respect to how they influence outcomes. Through an array of collaborative relations, including processes and procedures, which incorporate and address particular stakeholders’ settings, outcomes for host projects such as transparency, safety and equality are realised. This chapter outlines the conclusions and contributions of this thesis and the implications of the evaluative framework it has developed. The chapter begins by restating the thesis’ aims and objectives, followed by the contributions to knowledge, which are centred on the three objectives. The contributions of the evaluative framework are highlighted by explaining how that framework may shape the research agenda as well as the VT industry. The chapter concludes by outlining recommendations for industry practitioners when evaluating sustainability and proposes some suggestions for future research.

8.2 Aims, Objectives and Contributions

The aim of this thesis was to address the gaps in knowledge surrounding how the collaborative relations and interactions between the main stakeholders influence sustainability performance in VT, particularly engagement with host projects at the micro level. The thesis took a holistic approach to encompassing all main stakeholders and developed an evaluative framework that assessed how and why their collaborations influence the outcomes in terms of sustainability performance. Based on these aims, the objectives of the thesis were i.) to evaluate the collaborations of the main stakeholders (Objective 1), ii.) to assess how and why collaboration between main stakeholders influences sustainability performance in VT (Objective 2), and iii.) to develop an evaluative framework that assesses how and why collaborations between main stakeholders influence sustainability performance in VT (Objective 3).

Using a novel qualitative approach to assess sustainability performance across a supply chain in VT, the thesis develops several implications for VT and the travel industry more broadly. This evaluation provided invaluable insights that allow a deeper understanding of how sustainability in VT is achieved and that facilitate evaluations in other sectors of the travel industry. The thesis makes several new
contributions to the current body of knowledge by applying realistic evaluation and collaboration theory to the theoretical framework. This approach combines conceptual and empirical research to develop a systematic, structured and transnational evaluative framework that allows an all-encompassing holistic approach to evaluating stakeholders within a supply chain so as ultimately to be able to offer invaluable insights into best practices and community development through VT. This research contributes some new ideas to the limited knowledge about good practice in operationalising sustainability and offers clarity on how the role of organisations influences sustainability (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Furthermore, the findings offer the basis to develop criteria and credentials for good practice and explore what VT can achieve, such as social mobility (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b).

8.3 Contribution to Knowledge

The evaluative framework illustrated the successful implementation of a volunteer programme with lasting outcomes and the ability to address the challenges posed by geo socio-economic differences. The evaluative framework operated at two levels of analysis: i.) processes which are observable and which can be replicated by other organisations, and ii.) collaboration descriptors which indicate the nature and quality of collaborative relations. The contributions to knowledge have apparent implications for the VT industry and stakeholder engagement since they offer in-depth insights into how sustainability is achieved, based on what drives and enables the processes. Furthermore, the evaluation demonstrated that sustainability performance is defined by outcomes such as effective skills exchange, transparency, equality and safety that can lead to social mobility.

8.3.1 Contributions to evaluating Stakeholder Collaborations

In response to Objective 1, the evaluation examined two components: i.) the stakeholders’ external and internal settings and, ii.) the stakeholders’ collaborative relations. In addition, the collaborations were evaluated at two levels, the processes and procedures which are visible at one level, and their attributes and nature at a deeper level that describes them. Furthermore, some similarities and differences were determined when comparing the current body of knowledge with the findings of the evaluation.

By evaluating the external and internal settings in this case study, the evaluation determined that the skills and expertise levels of volunteers and hosts are over simplified in the current body of knowledge. The volunteers demonstrated that the skills and expertise level (internal settings) consisted of trained professionals such as teachers or health care workers. The skills level of project staff was more varied, comprising of trained teachers or untrained health care workers. Subsequently, based on the
evaluation, the simplified binary descriptions in the current body of knowledge of expert vs beneficiary or privileged donor vs needy, and the tendency to refer to volunteers as ‘amateurs’ are too general and inaccurate (Burrai et al., 2016; Everingham, 2014; Lough & Carter-Black, 2015; Punaks & Feit, 2014; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The evaluation reveals that the internal settings of the relations between volunteers and host projects are dynamic, diverse and less polarised, and thus contributes to the current body of knowledge a more in-depth understanding of the characteristics of stakeholders such as the volunteers and host project staff. Additional detailed analysis of the contextual settings of the main stakeholders explores further differences.

The contextual environment is a significant new dimension that was shown to influence each stakeholder’s position in the supply chain and their decision making and engagement with other stakeholders. The inclusion of external influences in the evaluation enables each stakeholder group to be characterised in more detail according to their responses to pressures, opportunities and challenges. Furthermore, defining influences such as external challenges and pressures, particularly in the case of host projects, enables a vivid and more specific illustration of how other stakeholders address them. These findings are a contribution to knowledge since they provide more detailed insights into how external environments influence each stakeholder (e.g. Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Coren & Gray, 2012; Sinervo, 2014). In addition, the findings have implications for industry practices in VT and for community-based tourism with regards to how external influences are evaluated and in the understanding of their significance. The findings confirm the circumstances of stakeholders, such as the important role played by inequality and power balances.

The significance of the inclusion of contextual settings in the evaluation becomes apparent when examining the sending and receiving organisations. In this regard, the evaluation illustrated the significance of organisations’ governance and values and places the responsibility for sustainability performance onto the organisations, which has implications for both academia and industry practices. The sending organisation demonstrated a clear desire and choice to be different in not being constrained by the competitive VT market; contrasting with the existing body of knowledge which suggests that organisations are profit focused due to the challenges of operating in a competitive market (Coren & Gray, 2012; Wearing et al. 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). Similarly, the receiving organisation’s disapproval of current unsustainable, but more profit-focused, industry practices illustrates that the portrayal in the literature of receiving organisations as following unsustainable practices is inaccurate, or at least incomplete (e.g. Guttentag, 2012; McGehee, 2012; Tomazos, 2012; Tomazos & Butler, 2011; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). The evaluation revealed how the sending and
receiving organisations’ internal values outweighed external market pressures and industry forces, and how their internal settings are their prominent attributes.

The disproportionate external constraints and challenges affecting each stakeholder group coincide with the nature of the geographical distribution between volunteers and host projects and articulate their inherent power imbalances and inequality. The study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by validating and articulating the geo-socio-economic differences between volunteers and host projects, and their inequality and power imbalances (e.g. Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Phelan, 2015). The study revealed that volunteers from the global North have considerably fewer pressures (family, time and money) compared to the constraints affecting host projects in the global South (poverty, post-apartheid, social and economic need, corruption). Thus, the evaluative framework illustrates the inequality and power imbalances at a micro level and uses this micro level analysis to show how these external influences affect each stakeholder group. This also represents a contribution to knowledge (e.g. Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Coren & Gray, 2012; Sinervo, 2014). The evaluation illustrated the decision making power imbalances between the stakeholders and addressed the gap in knowledge with respect stakeholder relations. Through the case study, it showed that, if sustainability is to be achieved, inequality needs to be actively addressed by the sending and receiving organisations through engaging with host projects.

The evaluative framework highlights the significant differences in the external and internal settings within stakeholder groups, particularly the host projects. An in-depth understanding of the host projects’ circumstances enables more tailored community engagements at the micro level. The evaluation determined that the circumstances of the schools and EACC projects were considerably different to each other and that these differences result in unique needs that have to be taken into account if volunteers are to be placed successfully. The thesis addresses a gap in the current literature in offering a detailed understanding of host projects’ socio-economic circumstances, and how these interrelate with volunteer placements (Bargeman et al., 2016). The evaluative framework, therefore, provides an invaluable foundation for the industry to adopt because it includes an understanding of the individual host project’s circumstances. Furthermore, external settings such as the socio-economic conditions change over time, which implies that evaluations need to be carried out accordingly at appropriate time intervals for effective community engagement at the micro level. Consequently, the findings conclude that external settings are a new dimension to community engagement which demands further long-term investigations. These findings in respect to evaluating the collaborations and the stakeholders’ internal and external settings build the foundation for the following sections on the CMO configurations (Section 8.3.2) and the emerging middle range theories (Section 8.3.3).
8.3.2 Contributions to evaluating Sustainability Performance

The study addressed Objective 2 by providing a detailed systematic analysis at the community level of the causal explanations of how and why sustainability performance is achieved within the case study. This section deals with the question of what influences sustainability performance and why, and attempts to answer the question of whether VT does make a difference (Wearing et al., 2017). This thesis offers an in-depth analysis of how the collaborative relations amongst stakeholders influence the impacts on host projects, which has not been explored in the current body of knowledge (Barbieri et al., 2011; Hammersley, 2014; Sin, 2010; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). In identifying 31 CMO configurations, the evaluation illustrated a detailed and rich fabric of connections explaining how contextual circumstances influence certain collaborative relations within the value chain. Unlike indicator development, the evaluation makes a significant contribution to knowledge by showing how (stakeholders’ collaborative relations) and why (contextual settings) sustainability performance is achieved at a community level within the value chain. Thus, the evaluation addressed the limitations that have been recognised by the current body of knowledge in the indicator development approach (Tanguay et al., 2013; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013). Based on the realistic evaluation of ‘what works for whom and when’ (Pawson & Tilley, 2004, p. 11), the CMO configurations highlighted the significance of the contextual settings of the stakeholders to articulate why sustainability is achieved. The evaluation’s analytical ability contributes to its practical application in respect to evaluating sustainability performance, which is an observed limitation in the current body of knowledge (Fernandez & Rivero, 2009; Miller & Twining-Ward, 2005; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2013).

The contextual settings of the sending and receiving organisations’ commitments and values are significant drivers in the implementation and management of the different processes and procedures that structure a rigorous and responsive volunteer programme. In addition, governance also plays an important role in articulating their organisational status, autonomy and financial commitments, such as number of employees. Furthermore, the organisations’ stance with respect to market forces is significant in illustrating the importance of external pressures. The findings illustrate the complexity and diversity of the contextual settings as well as their implications on the outcomes, thereby making a contribution to knowledge (Taplin et al., 2014) and in addition offering an understanding on how the contexts influence the outcomes. An important realisation developed through this thesis, therefore, is the understanding that the main drivers influencing sustainability are not only the organisations’ values but also their other circumstances. Nonetheless, it should be recognised that the evaluation offers only one combination of contextual settings within one case study and that other variations of contextual settings of sending and receiving organisations are likely, including other supply chain...
models. Understanding the diversity and complexity of constraints and opportunities of organisations requires further investigation if the full landscape of VT organisations and their impacts is to be revealed.

The matching of volunteers and host project staff based on their contextual settings is fundamental in providing an effective skills exchange. The process of matching volunteers’ skills and those of host project staff, underpinned by a needs assessment of each host project. The understanding of the host project’s needs is vital and the importance of matching skills in delivering an effective and sustainable volunteer programme is apparent. Furthermore, by illustrating VT organisations’ juxtaposition in how they negotiate profitability and sustainability, the evaluation offers a detailed understanding of how the organisations prioritise host projects’ needs over volunteers (Guttentag, 2012; Mostafanezhad, 2014a; Smith, 2014; Tomazos & Butler, 2009; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). Although the case study provides atypical examples of highly skilled volunteers taking careful approaches in working directly with skilled and experienced staff as mentors, it does illustrate the importance of establishing an appropriate role and position for volunteers within host projects. Consequently, in considering that the majority of the volunteers within the VT industry are less skilled and experienced, such as gappers (Jaeni & Timonen, 2014; Sin et al., 2015), they might be more suited to roles and positions in which they support host project staff, as opposed to fulfilling their roles. For example, in a school, the appropriate role and position of less skilled volunteers might be as a support or assistant teachers.

The varying levels of external and internal pressures on host projects are significant in influencing sustainability performance since the different contextual settings illustrate the vulnerability of some host projects. For instance, within some host projects (e.g. EACC), financial and emotional dependency and undesirable behaviour by staff and the project’s recipients were detected. The response of the organisations to addressing these negative settings is significant, in that it highlights how the implementation of the processes and procedures are able to address individual project’s concerns. Thus, it is paramount that the contextual settings of host projects need to be considered by organisations if they want to achieve sustainability. The evaluation demonstrates how the individual contextual settings are managed to enable a constructive work environment for the exchange between the volunteer and host project staff. Thus, the thesis addresses current thinking that VT’s future needs to adopt decommodified and sustainable practices and create work environments which enable intercultural exchanges (Wearing et al., 2017).

Based on the case study, the evaluation illustrates best practice to reveals how sustainability is operationalised at a micro level throughout the volunteer programme. Within the six different
collaborative relations amongst the four main stakeholders (volunteers, sending organisation, receiving organisation and host community) there exists an array of five different collaborative relations i.e. processes and procedures. The systematic evaluation illustrates a comprehensive and detailed volunteer programme approach where processes and procedures fulfil different purposes such as information gathering and sharing, stakeholder engagement through facilitation and long-term planning. The evaluation provides a detailed understanding of best practices by highlighting what roles and responsibilities organisations have, and how they maximise benefits and minimise negative impacts. The thesis offers a clear illustration of the organisations’ roles and responsibilities in community engagement and addresses criticisms described in the current literature in respect to organisations not fulfilling their obligations towards host communities (Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Sinervo, 2014; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Furthermore, the in-depth evaluation provides evaluable descriptors illustrating the nature of each collaborative relations. They reveal rich and dynamic exchanges that articulate power sharing and decision making at a micro level, and thus make a valuable contribution to the current body of knowledge in qualitatively evaluating best practices. In addition, the evaluation concludes that essential attributes in VT are based on host projects’ willingness to engage with the volunteer programme and this further illustrates their control of when and how it is implemented, as stipulated by the current body of knowledge (Wearing et al., 2017).

The evaluation illustrates a detailed understanding of the case study’s sustainability performance, and how it is achieved on different levels. First, at the core of VT is the effective skills exchange that leads to host project staff learning new skills and gaining confidence, and to positive experiences for both volunteers and host project staff. Second, stakeholder engagements with host projects result in trust, respect, empowerment and equality. The thesis addresses the call for more research that shows trust and respect at a micro level between volunteers and host projects (Wearing et al., 2017). Third, various processes and procedures enable transparency and safety for all stakeholder groups, addressing gaps in knowledge about VT’s outcomes and benefits to members of host communities such as host project staff and recipients (Guttentag, 2012; Kirillova et al., 2015; Sinervo, 2014; Tomazos, 2012; Wearing & Lyons, 2008; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Fourth, transformative change, such as social mobility, is supported by long-term commitments, planning and needs assessments, offering new insights into how social mobility plays an important role in sustainability in VT. Thus the evaluation addresses an emerging research agenda by offering a new understanding of social mobility and how it is supported in this context (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b).
This study offers several constructive facets that underpin a definition of sustainability in VT. The evaluative framework demonstrates that sustainability in VT is much more than ‘volunteers and local communities coming together... to interact in mutually beneficial cultural exchanges’ (Wearing et al., 2017, p.518). The effectiveness of skills transfer between the volunteer and host project staff is paramount and is based on a regime of collaborative relations and processes and procedures. In addition, sustainability is defined by transparency between all stakeholders, equality for host projects and consideration of the safety of all stakeholders. These principles move beyond the international development discourse in VT (e.g. Mostafanezhad, 2014b; Vrasti, 2013) to focus on volunteers’ motivation (e.g. Benson & Seibert, 2009; Ooi & Laing, 2010; Wearing, 2002), by articulating more specifically the attributes of sustainability at a community level. Furthermore, the evaluation articulates sustainability in VT as being based on how the accumulative short-term outcomes during effective skills/expertise transfers lead to long-term outcomes through transformative change. Hence, the evaluation begins to address the current body of knowledge in terms of what VT’s mantra of doing something worthwhile or making a difference actually means at a micro level in illustrating the relations between stakeholders has specific outcomes (Knollenberg et al., 2014; Wearing & Lyons, 2008; Wearing & McGehee, 2013a; Wearing et al., 2017).

8.3.3 Contributions to developing an Evaluative Framework

In addressing Objective 3, namely the development of an evaluation framework, two key advantages are apparent, i,) its analytical ability in evaluating sustainability performance, ii,) the transferability of the theory which defines sustainability in VT. The analysis between the main stakeholders such as volunteers, host community members and volunteer organisations contributes to the current body of knowledge in providing an example of the process of operationalising and managing best practice (e.g. Barbieri et al., 2011; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Sinervo, 2014). The evaluative framework makes a significant contribution to knowledge by evaluating the relations between all four main stakeholders in the same manner, and not treating host project staff as ‘passive’ actors (Wearing et al., 2017, p. 517), as well being able to deal with heterogeneous stakeholders and stakeholder groups (Wearing et al., 2017). Furthermore, the evaluation provided a sustainable VT framework at a micro level, and, by assessing the relations between stakeholders, including host project staff, the evaluative framework contributes to the future research agenda suggested in the current literature (Wearing et al., 2017). Based on the middle range theories and the theory validation, the evaluative framework proposes a sustainable VT framework that is transferable to other supply chains in VT and the broader tourism industry. Following Pawson (2013), by merging and simplifying the middle range theories below, and in considering the current body of knowledge in VT, this thesis develops a foundation for
understanding the essential attributes of sustainability in VT. This leads to a new definition of the theory of sustainability performance in VT:

The theory outlines that the (sending and receiving) organisations under certain circumstances enable sustainability. Their practices must include the integration of stakeholders, screening and matching of volunteers to host projects in such a way as to support effective skills and expertise transfer to host project staff. The on-going facilitation of stakeholder relations should lead to positive experiences and safety for all involved. In addition, long-term planning and needs assessment support empowerment, equality and transparency for host projects and which can encourage social mobility over time.

The development of the evaluative framework opens a new line of enquiry for evaluating sustainability performance in VT. Throughout the discussion chapter (Chapter 7), the framework demonstrates how it explores at a level that is deep enough to evaluate the CMO configurations successfully, and this allows the middle range theories and the subsequent theory to be articulated (see above). Through a process of identifying the main attributes and abstraction of the developed theory, a new platform develops that is simple and logical in explaining sustainability performance in VT. Consequently, a working platform develops, that is a ‘reusable conceptual platforms’ (Pawson, 2013, p.92). The platform forms the basis of a generic model (Figure 8.1) that will enable future evaluations of other VT programmes and supply chains (Pawson, 2013). The final conceptual platform provides a valuable contribution by providing the groundwork for a new line of enquiry in evaluating sustainability performance in VT. Further evaluations are necessary to develop the theory of sustainability performance in VT since the reusable platform is the first conceptual framework for explaining sustainability performance in VT. When testing the reusable conceptual platform, future investigations will be able to ascertain additional influences of sustainability in other supply chains. Additionally, aspects of VT can be further investigated, such as social mobility and other long-term outcomes (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b).
Limitations of this Study

The study’s limitations primarily relate to, firstly, the methods of data gathering and selection of sample populations; and, secondly, the methodology of the scope and identification of each of the CMO components. Other limitations with regards to the study’s validity, reliability and generalisability are outlined. Some of the data gathered may have been subject to bias as the different ethnicity of the researcher to most of the host project staff may limit the development of a constructive rapport (Phillmore & Goodson, 2004). Furthermore, the perception of the researcher as an associate of the receiving organisation due to their facilitation of this research by the host project staff might have influenced their responses so that they may have been less candid about expressing their true opinion about the volunteer programme.
Considering the issue of validity, the evaluative framework consisted of the main four stakeholder groups (volunteers, sending organisations, receiving organisations and host projects) but did not consider other stakeholders that may also influence the supply chain or the main stakeholders. Thus, the supply chain could have additional stakeholders or, depending on the circumstances, additional external contextual settings: for instance, volunteers from other organisations at the same host project. In addition, Calabash operates a separate charitable foundation to channel funds from fundraising initiatives to various local projects, some of which are host projects. From the perspective of the host projects, different funding streams that reach the project may blur the boundaries between the volunteer programme and other initiatives. In addition, the wider community, for example, residents who live adjacent to the host projects’ locations, or pupils’ parents, may also influence the outcomes. Although comments were made about other stakeholders in this study, other community members should be considered in future evaluations in order to enhance the validity of the evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluation detected the outcomes of the programme for both staff and the recipients of the services at host projects. At the schools, the recipients were pupils, while at the EACC, they were HIV sufferers and their families. Recipients were not included in this study due to their vulnerability on account of age or their mental state and wellbeing. To enhance validity, future investigation may consider the inclusion of recipients while taking appropriate ethical precautions.

Since the purpose of the study was to evaluate the how and why of sustainability performance, a case study of recognised sustainability performance was chosen. When applying realistic evaluation, however, the study’s transferability becomes more significant than its generalisability (section 7.4.2). Realistic evaluation enabled a full exploration of the case study’s main determinants that influence their sustainability. It is apparent that the aim of the study limited the choice of suitable case studies considerably, and that these exemplary organisations are not representative of the mainstream VT industry. Furthermore, as a qualitative study, there are several limitations in relation to the sample populations because time and resources constrained the scope of the study. These limitations include: First, the study only examined one supply chain model of how VT organisations operate. Thus understanding more about the different supply chain models in the VT industry is a gap that remains to be addressed. Second, the study only explored one receiving organisation. An additional receiving organisation in a different country and their partnerships with the same sending organisation, as well as their relations with host projects may have revealed some different perspectives. Third, the inclusion of additional host projects may determine other contextual settings, enhancing the transferability of the evaluative framework.
The findings and analysis of this study are limited by the range and identification of the CMO components which compromises the reliability of the methodology. Currently, the body of knowledge widely acknowledges that identifying and analysing CMO components is challenging (Marchal et al., 2016). Several limitations in relation to the methodology were identified: First, the external contextual settings were identified by the respondents and were not actively explored by the researcher; for example by interviewing other stakeholders affiliated with the case study. Some bias may be created, or some settings may have been omitted by this method; for example financial considerations by the organisations were not declared. Second, some of the mechanisms could possibly have been pursued more deeply during the interview, such as the carrying capacity of host projects. Third, the findings in respect to the long-term outcomes of transformative change, namely the indication of social mobility of pupils, were probably known to only a few respondents who needed to have been part of the programme for a long time to be able to have this knowledge. Since the programme is just over ten years old, the opportunity to capture this information is limited and suggests that further investigation would be useful.

8.5 Recommendations for Future Research

The conclusions of this study lead to several recommendations for future research in VT, as several new aspects are revealed in terms of how and why sustainability performance is achieved. First, the relationship between short- and long-term outcomes requires further investigation; since fully understanding how short-term outcomes influence long-term outcomes would be beneficial in enhancing the effectiveness of volunteer programmes. Second, there is a gap in knowledge with respect to how the frequency, skills sets and duration of volunteers influence short-term outcomes. Thus, defining the parameters of projects’ carrying capacity demands further investigation since this very likely influences sustainability performance. Third, the long-term outcomes of transformative change need to be explored to gain further knowledge in the contextual settings that influence transformative change such as social mobility by recipients (e.g. pupils) in host projects (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). Such an investigation would require a sample population of past receivers who had been exposed to a volunteer programme for a considerable time. Fourth, future research on other value chain models should apply the evaluative framework in order to determine their sustainability performance; this would contribute to knowledge by allowing a deeper understanding of VT organisations.
Moving away from VT, the evaluative framework offers a robust and suitable foundation for future investigations in other fields. In tourism, the evaluative framework and CMO configurations could be adapted to evaluate the effectiveness of interventions such as programmes, policies or campaigns. Within the international development field, an evaluative framework would be highly suitable to assess the specific outcomes and effectiveness of social interventions such as community-based programmes and policies.

8.6 Recommendations to Industry

The conclusions of this study lead to several recommendations for how the VT industry might address sustainability performance. The study was based on a case study of a sending and receiving organisation because of their reputation in achieving sustainability performance, allowing the evaluative framework to be fully tested and to determine how sustainability is operationalised. The substantial growth of the industry, and how it has been criticised for perpetuating inequality amongst stakeholders, for its commodification of poverty and its questionable benefits, (e.g. Everingham, 2016; Guttentag, 2012; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2009; McGehee, 2014; Palacios, 2010; Sin, 2010) makes the conclusions of this study highly pertinent. The VT industry needs to consider standardising practices and developing criteria for sustainable credentials (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). To achieve transparency, equality, empowerment, safety and positive experiences for all stakeholders, the following considerations should be taken into account by organisations in the VT industry:

- An organisational partnership that is based on shared values and aims and includes a receiving organisation in the host destination.
- Careful integration allowing all stakeholders, particularly host projects, to share the same values and thus to encourage active participation.
- On-going facilitation with host projects that address social and economic inequalities between volunteers and host project staff.
- Host project engagement that includes joint long-term planning and needs assessment and that defines carrying capacity.
- Effective skills exchange that is based on the appropriate matching of skills levels between the volunteers and host project staff.
- Implementation of procedures such as screening of volunteers (e.g. DBS checks), recording of volunteers’ skills and expertise, motivational statements by volunteers, volunteers’ skills and project matching, and host projects consenting to each volunteer placement.
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### 10 Appendices

**Appendix I - Interview Script - Example of Organisation Director**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Motivation</th>
<th>Starting from the beginning, what are your <strong>own personal main reasons</strong> to set up/ get involved peopleandplaces/ Calabash? When did you set this up? When did you become involved? What are your <strong>personal motivations</strong> to do so?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td><strong>Is your experience meeting your expectations?</strong> Are you <strong>finding fulfilment</strong> in your ambitions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational strategic values</td>
<td>**What are your organisation’s s main <strong>aims, purpose and values</strong>? <strong>Why</strong>? In your own words, how would you describe what peopleandplaces/ Calabash actually does? How would you describe <strong>how sustainability</strong> fit into your organisation’s values? <strong>Why</strong>? Where does peopleandplaces/Calabash find its bearings in terms of sustainability and responsibility? How does peopleandplaces/Calabash demonstrate commitment <strong>to sustainability in day to day operations</strong>? How does peopleandplaces/Calabash balance sustainability and profitability? How does peopleandplaces/Calabash <strong>ensures transparency/accountability/responsibility in its practices</strong>? and how is this communicated to everyone? What <strong>standards</strong> does your organisation observe specifically for volunteers? Are there any? <strong>How</strong>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>From your organisations perspective .... In relation to the volunteer programme, how would describe the <strong>organisational relationships with local organisations</strong>? In relation to the volunteer programme, how would describe the organisational relationships with international organisations? What are <strong>the main motivations</strong> to form partnerships with international/local organisations? What are key selection criteria in forming partnerships? How would you describe the specific role of peopleandplaces/Calabash’s amongst these relationships? <strong>(Why and how is there a Trust and a company?)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree, scope, level of collaboration (project level): Shared aims and objectives, vision, value and purpose Process of policy making Mutual gain</td>
<td>From a broader perspective considering all parties... How important are the relations between peopleandplaces, Calabash and local projects in delivering the volunteer programme? (between 1-10, where 1 =not at all important and 10=very important) Does peopleandplaces/Calabash <strong>share the same values and vision</strong> with those organisations? How is balance maintained with all organisations and individuals and ensure all parties benefit?, volunteer to project beneficiaries? How are decisions made at an inter-organisational strategic level in relation to the volunteer programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of integration and engagement with other stakeholders</td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the most important factors that contribute to successfully deliver the volunteer programmes? How is each stakeholder (individuals) integrated into the process of placing volunteers? How do you <strong>ensure good level of communication</strong> in the process of volunteer recruitment and placement, before, during and after their experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(individual level) M2, M1, M3</td>
<td>Exchange of knowledge, expertise, and resources M2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you ensure good exchange of knowledge, expertise and resources (financial resources) between volunteers, local project staff and beneficiaries? How do you match volunteers’ skills to projects?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power sharing and decision making M2, M1, M3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are decisions made in relation to the volunteer placement on a day to day practical level? Who are the main points of contact for volunteers? As an organisation how do you response to external factors and pressures? Give an example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of overall capabilities of others M2, M1, M3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has there been occasions in the past, where any of the stakeholders received support from one of the other stakeholders? Any examples?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in planning, product development/design M2, M1, M3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you give the opportunity to volunteers, project staff, and beneficiaries to provide feedback? If so how? How are stakeholders involved in any planning and product development?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro Activity C2, C3 Inter-organisational learning M2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you interested in the continual learning about the volunteering and its impacts? Evidence? Between 1-10 how important is it for peopleandplaces/ Calabash to be self-critical and reflective? (1=not at all important and 10=very important) Can you explain more…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jointly addressing a problem M2 M1, M3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If there were any problems in the past, even minor ones, how are they dealt with? Did you ever any safety concerns for anyone involved in the volunteer programmes, including volunteers-beneficiaries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes O1 and O2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O3 =R+ or R- Are the volunteer programmes viable for the organisations involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O1= R+ or R-** Do you think the project has lasting impact (social, economic or environmental)? Are the contributions making a difference to the volunteer project? How do you think it may have changed? Can you see any long-term change, good or bad? Do you think the project is helping local people, children/patients, and their families and overall community? How so?**

**O2 =R+ or R-** Finally, do you think the volunteer experience changes volunteers?
Appendix II-Informed Consent Form for Participants

Informed Consent Form

Study Title

The development of an evaluative framework that evaluates processes and impacts of volunteer tourism

Voluntary Consent

I have read and understood the information on the form and I consent to volunteer in this research study. I agree to the interview being recorded and its contents being used for research purposes. I have read and understood the procedures and the risks involved in this study.

I understand that without any consequences I have the right to fully or partially withdraw within one week after the date of the interview. I agree to the interview being recorded and its contents being used for research purposes. I have read and understood the procedures and the risks involved in this study.

Name (please print):

Signature:

Date:

Location:

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in the study. I have answered any questions that have been raised, and witness the above signature.

Researcher signature:

Date: 29/04/2016
Appendix III - Participant Information Sheet for Volunteers

Study Title
The development of an evaluative framework that evaluates processes and impacts of volunteer tourism
I would like to invite you to take part in my doctorate research study at Leeds Beckett University (UK). Before you decide you need to understand why the research is being done and what it would involve for you. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask questions if anything you read is not clear or would like more information.

What is the purpose of the study?
The purpose of the study is to learn how successful volunteer tourism projects are in serving the needs of the different parties involved. The participation of volunteers like you is essential to understand all different perspectives about the benefits of volunteering.

Why have I been invited?
As you have volunteered with peopleandplaces and Calabash in South Africa, I would like to learn more about your experiences, before after and during your volunteering time. As part of this study I will interview beneficiaries, volunteers and organisations’ directors and staff.

Do I have to take part?
It is up to you to decide. I need to ask you to sign a consent form to show you agreed to take part. You are free to fully or partially withdraw within one week after the date of the interview, without consequences or providing a reason.

What will happen if I take part?
I will ask you questions as part of an interview, and I will record our interview and take notes.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?
There is no disadvantage or risks involved in taking part.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
I cannot promise the study will help you, but the information I get from the study will help to increase the understanding of how to evaluate the impacts of volunteer tourism and will contribute to improving the industry.

What about confidentiality and anonymity?
Your name will be kept strictly confidential and anonymised by giving you a different name to make sure your responses are secure.

What will happen to the results of the research study and protecting data?
The data will be kept securely on a laptop and external backup hard drive, both kept in my home office. I also use Dropbox for virtual storage space, which is password protected.

Further information and contact details:
If you have any further questions or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me using the details below: Claudia Eckardt, Leeds Beckett University, Headingley Campus. LS6 2QS, UK Mobile: +44 (0) 7914694640, Skype: claudia.eckardt or email: Claudia.eckardt@gmail.com
In case you would like to contact my supervisors:
Dr Xavier Font x.font@leedsbeckett.ac.uk or Dr Simon Woodward s.woodward@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
In advance I thank you for your valuable time and cooperation.
Kindest regards, Claudia
Appendix IV: Map of Port Elizabeth Bay