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Abstract

The literature on volunteer tourism to date has tended to focus on the perspectives of the volunteer tourists, exploring their motivations and experiences. Despite volunteer tourism pivoting on its claim to 'make a difference' to host communities, less attention has been paid to understanding how, and indeed if, volunteer tourism organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes. In addressing this gap in knowledge and understanding, the overall aim of this thesis is threefold: 1) To critically examine the current project monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations; 2) to assess the extent to which host communities participate in these processes; and 3) to identify opportunities and barriers to improved practices.

Taking a post-disciplinary approach, in addition to the volunteer tourism literature, this research draws on literature, theoretical perspectives and analytical concepts from a number of different fields including: evaluation studies, liquid organisations (sociology) and principal-agent theory (economics, political science and sociology). Set within a broader critical studies context, Critical Management Studies is used as an overarching framework. Within this critical framework, qualitatively driven mixed methods were employed to examine the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism programmes from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations. Three stages of data collection took place: 1) a qualitative desk study of secondary data; 2) a quantitative online survey; and 3) qualitative in-depth interviews.

The findings identify that many of the volunteer tourism organisations are characteristic of the liquid organisations metaphor and that approaches to monitoring and evaluation are largely informal and 'liquid' in nature. This research also reveals that relationships between volunteer tourism organisations and host partner organisations and host communities can be modelled as principal-agent relationships. The impact of liquid organisational practices and principal-agent relationships on monitoring and evaluation is examined. In doing so, this research contributes a unique perspective on, and understanding of, the programme monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer travel organisations.
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1 VOLUNTEER TOURISM: AN INTRODUCTION

1.1 From Promise to Problem: Emerging Issues in Volunteer Tourism

Volunteer tourism is a popular form of alternative tourism (Wearing & McGehee, 2013a, 2013b), and is a highly profitable tourism market (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Boffey, 2011; Butcher & Smith, 2010). However, concerns about the rapid expansion and commercialisation of the sector have led to increasing scrutiny of the practices of volunteer tourism organisations and volunteer tourists (e.g. Brown & Hall, 2008; Butcher, 2006, 2011; Butcher & Smith, 2010; Guttentag, 2009, 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Sin, 2010; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012; Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). Wearing (2001) originally proposed that volunteer tourism has the potential to offer a more empowering form of tourism to host communities than, for example, mass tourism and may actually offer a suitable form of sustainable development to host communities. However, Lyons and Wearing (2008b) have more recently highlighted the increasing commoditisation of volunteer tourism, contending that this shift could undermine the sustainability of the communities and environments that these projects are seeking to help instead of benefitting them. At present there is very little research regarding the impacts of volunteer tourism on the host communities which it claims to support. There are growing concerns about the increasing commercialisation of volunteer tourism and it's development into a profitable sector of the tourism industry, particularly with regard to the scope for negative impacts on host communities if volunteer tourism projects are not carefully planned and monitored. Such concerns are evident in academic discourses (e.g. Butcher, 2006, 2011; Butcher & Smith, 2010; Griffin, 2004; Guttentag, 2009, 2011; Hall & Brown, 2006; McGehee, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2008; Palacios, 2010; Simpson, 2004, 2005; Tomazos & Butler, 2009a), the media (Birrell, 2010; Boffey, 2011; Brodie, 2006; Frean, 2006; Griffiths, 2007), and in public debate¹.

¹ See growth of public debate on the impacts of volunteer tourism in blogs and online social media, for example:
http://www.ethicaltraveler.org/2011/01/do-voluntourists-help-or-harm/
1.2 The Push for Greater Accountability

In recent years there has been an increasing push for greater accountability and regulation of both volunteer tourism organisations' and volunteer tourists' practices in order to promote the sustainable well-being of host communities. Volunteer tourism organisations "promote, sell and organise programmes for volunteer tourists" and "now offer a large variety of options depending on volunteer tourists' preferred activity, location and duration" (Raymond & Hall, 2008, p.531). A small but growing number of voluntary tools have been created in an effort to promote best practice. For example, Simpson (n.d.), who has published research on the UK gap year, has produced the 'The Ethical Volunteering Guide' to encourage volunteer tourists to ask volunteer tourism organisations key questions before deciding which organisation to travel with. From a tour operator perspective, PEPY Tours (n.d.) has created the 'Voluntourism 101 Operator Self Check Guide' which outlines indicators for evidence of responsible and ethical practice. In academia, the potential use of initiatives such as 'Fair Trade' certification and a 'good for development label' for volunteer tourism projects and organisations have been discussed (Fee & Mdee, 2010; Mdee & Emmott, 2008). Others suggest that a set of regularly reviewed, industry-wide guidelines that are overseen by independent bodies could help to promote positive rather than negative outcomes (Ong, Pearlman, Lockstone-Binney, & King, 2013). Lupoli, Morse, Bailey, and Schelhas (2014) have explored the development of indicators for assessing the impacts of volunteer tourism in host communities and concluded that different volunteer activities require different indicators which measure social, economic and environmental impacts.

Indeed, a study by McGehee and Andereck (2008) which focused on Tijuana in Mexico, a highly 'voluntoured' destination, with an estimated one million volunteer tourists per annum, found an interest in greater regulation of volunteer tourism as a recurring theme amongst volunteer tourism administrators. Key elements of the regulation suggested include: (1) tracking patterns of volunteer tourism to the community; (2) controlling who volunteers, volunteer tourist numbers and the type of activities in which they engage; and (3) matching the

http://www.socialedge.org/discussions/responsibility/the-voluntourism-debate
skills and interests of volunteer tourists with the needs of the community (McGehee & Andereck, 2008, pp.22-23).

Recent years have seen the greatest effort to increase responsible and ethical practice in volunteer tourism. For example, Tourism Concern, a UK based ethical tourism campaigning non-government organisation (NGO), has created the GIVS Volunteering Standards Group\(^2\) which aims to promote best practice in the industry. The International Ecotourism Society (TIES)\(^3\) has produced global voluntary guidelines for volunteer tourism organisations, and a UK based FairTrade Volunteering\(^4\) initiative has also been set up. Furthermore, the not-for-profit organisation Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa (FTTSA)\(^5\) has developed fair trade standards and certification in volunteer tourism specific to South Africa in order to promote its positive impacts and reduce negative impacts.

In the context of this growing push towards greater regulation and monitoring of standards, this study seeks to develop more nuanced understandings of the current monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations, and the organisational contexts within which these practices take place. The outcomes will be of value in informing the development of responsible and ethical practice in volunteer tourism.

1.3 Defining Monitoring and Evaluation

For the purposes of this research monitoring is defined as 'The purposeful checking of, and gathering information on, how a volunteer tourism programme's activities are progressing' (adapted from Bartle, 2007). Evaluation is defined as 'The process of determining the merit or worth (value) of a volunteer tourism programme, and the extent to which a programme has achieved its goals or objectives' (adapted from Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Further discussion and examination of different approaches to monitoring and evaluation takes place in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

---

\(^2\) See [http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk/GIVS.html](http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk/GIVS.html) for further information.


1.4 This Study: Significance, Research Aim and Objectives

Despite increasing concerns surrounding the impacts of volunteer tourism on host communities (e.g. Guttentag, 2009), and the current lack of regulation and monitoring of volunteer tourism activities (McGehee & Andereck, 2008; www.ecotourism.org/voluntourism-guidelines), there is very little research to date exploring such impacts, or approaches to the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes. In order to mitigate negative impacts and optimise positive effects on host communities, there is a strong impetus for developing evaluation and monitoring of volunteer tourism projects that incorporate host community participation. Preliminary research by Tourism Concern in 2007 found that many UK based volunteer tourism organisations do not obtain feedback from project hosts and that there are currently few mechanisms in place to monitor and evaluate projects (Power, 2007).

This research is based on the premise that better understandings of the current monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations are needed, particularly with regards to host community participation. Understanding current practices will assist in developing monitoring and evaluation guidance which could support organisations in their future monitoring and evaluation efforts.

The volunteer tourism literature has also indicated that volunteer tourism organisations commonly engage in numerous partnerships in order to provide volunteer tourism experiences (Eddins, 2013; Raymond, 2008). The complexity of these arrangements can be both a source of opportunity and problems. Partnerships can offer opportunities for leveraging resources and skills (Eddins, 2013; Raymond, 2008), but can pose problems for determining which parties are responsible for monitoring and evaluating a volunteer tourism programme. The complexity of these partnerships and organisational contexts has not been explored in any detail, nor has consideration been given to the effect that these partnerships and organisational arrangements have on the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects. This is the challenge this study addresses.

To address this important gap in knowledge and understanding of the monitoring and evaluation practices and organisational contexts of volunteer tourism
organisations, the overall aim of this research project is threefold: To critically examine the current project monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations, to assess the extent to which host communities participate in these processes, and to identify opportunities and barriers to improved practices.

In order to address this aim, the specific research objectives that focus this research are:

1. To examine current knowledge of monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. *(Addressed in Chapter 2, Volunteer Tourism: Historical Development and Current Challenges)*

2. To critically examine the organisational contexts within which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects take place. *(Addressed in Chapter 4, The Organisational Contexts of Volunteer Tourism)*

3. To identify and critically examine the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their projects. *(Addressed in Chapter 5, Volunteer Tourism Organisations' Engagement with Monitoring and Evaluation)*

4. To identify, from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations, the barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes. *(Addressed in Chapter 6, Host Community Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation)*

5. To identify strategic, action oriented recommendations with respect to how monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects may be enhanced. *(Addressed in Chapter 7, Conclusions and Recommendations)*

1.5 Research Approach

This research takes a post-disciplinary approach (Bramwell & Lane, 2005; Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2005, 2006, 2009; Laing, Lee, Moore, Wenger & Weiler, 2009; Stone, 2011) to examining the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. Coles, Hall, and Duval (2006) argue that a post-disciplinary approach to studying tourism is appropriate because the complex
nature of tourism, and the issues arising from its various forms, often transcend disciplinary boundaries. Therefore, a flexible approach to knowledge creation is necessary. Careful selection of the relevant literature, theoretical perspectives and analytical insights from a plurality of disciplines is required. In doing so, "Post-disciplinary perspectives allow ideas and connections to be pursued to their logical conclusion not to some contrived end point determined by artificial disciplinary boundaries" (Coles et al., 2006, p.303). In taking a post-disciplinary approach, in addition to the volunteer tourism literature this research draws on literature, theoretical perspectives and analytical concepts from a number of different fields including: evaluation studies, liquid organisations (sociology) and principal-agent theory (economics, political science and sociology) (see Figure 1.1). The insights gained from these perspectives are synthesised with the research findings in the data analysis/findings chapters (Chapters 4, 5 & 6) in a process of crystallisation (Ellingson, 2009). Set within a broader critical studies context, Critical Management Studies (CMS) is used as an overarching framework to guide this research. Figure 1.1 demonstrates the various strands of literature, theoretical perspectives and analytical concepts that were used in this study. Within this critical framework, qualitatively driven mixed methods were employed to examine the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism programmes from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations. Three stages of research took place: 1) a qualitative desk study of secondary data; 2) a quantitative online survey; 3) qualitative in-depth interviews. The survey was completed by 80 participants representing 80 different organisations, capturing 42% of the total sample population. Interviews took place with 31 participants representing 30 different organisations.
1.6 Situating this Thesis within Existing Literature

Wearing and McGehee (2013b) reflect that since Wearing's (2001) seminal text, *Volunteer Tourism. Experiences That Make a Difference*, much of the existing literature on volunteer tourism has focused on the volunteers, examining their motivations and experiences. In their review of the volunteer tourism literature to date, Wearing and McGehee (2013b) utilise Jafari's (2001) four platforms of tourism research (advocacy, cautionary, adaptancy and scientific) to contextualise the development of the field. After an initial 'advocacy' phase which positioned volunteer tourism as a wholly positive and altruistic activity, the literature took on a cautionary stance raising concerns about the potential for negative impacts on local communities (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b, p.122). They observe that there is now a growing literature that takes an adaptancy platform. The adaptancy platform explores and suggests ways for organisations to better manage volunteer tourism and its associated activities in order to promote positive over negative
outcomes (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). In addition, the volunteer tourism literature is also beginning to enter a fourth phase, the scientific platform. The scientific platform seeks to "examine volunteer tourism in a more systematic and logical way... providing a more comprehensive picture of the depth and breadth of the volunteer tourism phenomenon globally" so that volunteer tourism can be better understood and managed (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b, p.122). To do so, Wearing and McGehee (2013b) propose a research agenda that draws from a range of methodological approaches and theoretical foundations to examine volunteer tourism.

This study, with its focus on the potential for monitoring and evaluation to promote positive over negative outcomes of volunteer tourism, is situated within the adaptancy platform. This research also retains elements of the scientific platform. Through the exploration of the programme monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations, this research contributes to providing a more nuanced understanding of volunteer tourism from an organisational perspective. To date, this is an area of volunteer tourism practice that has received minimal attention. Literature associated with each of the platforms that is relevant to this research will be discussed in Chapter 2. Each chapter will further draw on literature relevant to the specific issues arising.

1.7 Thesis Outline

In order to address the aim and objectives of this research, this thesis is structured in the following manner: Following this introductory chapter, in Chapter 2, Volunteer Tourism: Historical Development and Current Challenges, Objective 1 is addressed, the relevant volunteer tourism literature to date is discussed, and current issues and key debates within the field that are related to this research are outlined. Key gaps in the literature pertinent to this study are highlighted. Next, Chapter 3, Research Approach and Methods outlines the critical paradigm within which this research is situated; it outlines the methods of data collection and how the quantitative and qualitative methods are analysed within a qualitatively driven framework. Details of the sample and the ethical issues that were addressed in this research are also discussed. In Chapter 4, The Organisational Contexts of Volunteer Tourism, Objective 2 is addressed and literature related to the key analytical concept 'liquid organisations' is synthesised with both the survey and
interview data. In Chapter 5, *Volunteer Tourism Organisations' Engagement with Monitoring and Evaluation*, Objective 3 is addressed and relevant literature from the field of evaluation studies is synthesised with both the survey and interview data. In Chapter 6, *Host Community Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation*, Objective 4 is addressed and relevant literature related to agency theory is synthesised with both the survey and interview data. Finally, in Chapter 7, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, Objective 5 is addressed. The key findings and contributions of this research are outlined and a framework for volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation is presented. Finally, recommendations for further research are made.
Page left blank intentionally
2 VOLUNTEER TOURISM: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT CHALLENGES

2.1 Introduction
This chapter examines current knowledge of the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations (Objective 1). First, an overview of volunteer tourism is provided and key factors driving its growth and development are discussed. Current debates and issues in volunteer tourism related to monitoring and evaluation are then outlined. The importance of monitoring and evaluating volunteer tourism programmes is established and the current gap in knowledge with regard to understanding how and indeed, if, organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes is highlighted.

2.1.1 Overview and Definition of Volunteer Tourism
The most commonly cited definition of volunteer tourism is that by Stephen Wearing, the first academic author to draw significant academic attention to the phenomenon. Wearing's definition (2001, p.1) states that volunteer tourism encompasses "those tourists who, for various reasons, volunteer in an organised way to undertake holidays that might involve aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups in society, the restoration of certain environments or research into aspects of society or environment". However, as knowledge and understanding of volunteer tourism expands, the phenomenon continues to demonstrate its complex, often "blurred" and "ambiguous" nature (Lyons & Wearing, 2008a, 2012). Consequently, new definitions continue to surface and an overarching definition has failed to emerge (Benson, 2011). For example, Keese (2011, p.58) describes volunteer tourism as "a combination of development work, education and tourism" owing to it usually consisting of community or conservation-based development work, yet generally still retaining elements more traditionally associated with holidaying such as sightseeing and taking part in adventure or other tourist activities. Others use the term 'voluntourism' defined as "the conscious, seamlessly integrated combination of voluntary service to a destination and the best, traditional elements of travel-arts, culture, geography,
history and recreation-in that destination" (voluntourism.org). For the purposes of this research, the definition outlined by Wearing (2001) is used. This definition is used because it acknowledges that volunteer tourism is driven by varying motivations and can involve a range of activities, as is highlighted throughout this chapter. However, this study also acknowledges that Wearing's (2001) definition is set within Jafari's (2001) advocacy platform (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b) and so is limited. Therefore, for the purposes of this research, which embraces the adaptancy platform and some elements of the scientific platform, this study uses Wearing's (2001) definition cautiously. For example, this study acknowledges that attempts at "aiding or alleviating the material poverty of some groups in society" (Wearing, 2001, p.1) may be nothing more than shallow rhetoric.

At present, volunteer tourism most commonly involves volunteer tourists travelling from developed countries to developing countries to take part in some form of a volunteer tourism project. Thus, the focus of this research is on volunteer tourists travelling from developed to developing countries. It is nonetheless acknowledged that the number of volunteer tourists from developing countries is also increasing (Mwaruta, 2008, 2012) and that volunteer tourism also occurs within developed countries, for example The Conservation Volunteers in the UK (www.tcv.org.uk). A multiplicity of non-government organisations (NGOs), academic groups (such as universities), commercial tour operators and religious groups operate around the world as 'volunteer tourism organisations', offering a plethora of volunteer tourism experiences (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). Examples of volunteer tourism experiences include teaching English in schools, working in orphanages, building schools or homes, taking part in community development projects, assisting with data collection for conservation projects and animal care (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). The volunteer tourists themselves vary in age and background, often require minimal skills or experience, and can generally choose the location and duration of their volunteer tourism trip according to their own preferences (Callanan & Thomas, 2005).

In 2008, the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education published the report 'Volunteer Tourism: A Global Analysis'. This was the first 'global overview' of volunteer tourism, and it estimated a global market of 1.6 million volunteer tourists a year generating a value of between £832 million and £1.3 billion (AUD
More recently, in 2011, it was estimated that the gap year industry alone (gap year students are the largest target market of volunteer tourism), is worth £6 billion (AUD $8.9 billion) to companies in western developed countries (Boffey, 2011), demonstrating significant growth of the industry during recent years and indicating that it is a highly profitable industry. Tomazos and Butler (2009a) have also highlighted the scale and breadth of volunteer tourism, finding that for the year 2007, the database 'Volunteer Abroad' held information on 3,441 projects spread across 150 countries.

Traditionally, volunteer tourism has mostly been the domain of NGOs, with many NGOs being supported by governments such as through AusAid, the government agency for international development in Australia. However, the number of commercial tour operators involved in volunteer tourism has significantly increased and this specific form of travel is a major growth area of alternative and niche tourism (Callanan & Thomas, 2005; Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Novelli & Benson, 2005; Wearing, 2001).

2.1.2 Origins and Links with Development

In the 1960s and early 1970s, mass tourism was heralded as a tool for economic development in lesser developed countries (Davis, 1968; Naylon, 1967; Telfer, 2002). Since then, however, it has been strongly criticised by some researchers for imposing destructive social and environmental impacts on its hosts, and for the most part, benefiting a few powerful elite (e.g. Cohen, 1978; de Kadt, 1979a, 1979b; Krippendorf, 1982, 1987; Mowforth & Munt, 2009; Richter, 2007; Sharpley & Telfer, 2002). Alternative forms of tourism, often perceived to be more ethical, have now emerged. Volunteer tourism is one example. Also known as 'voluntourism' it has become an increasingly popular tourist activity and the subject of mounting academic and media attention (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Tomazos & Butler, 2009a; voluntourism.org).

A 'gap year' is most commonly associated with young adults taking a year off to travel between completing school or tertiary studies and starting university or formal employment. Although this study refers to the gap year in this context it must be acknowledged that it is also becoming increasingly popular for older adults to take career breaks or even for retired adults to take a 'gap year' from their usual routine and responsibilities to travel (Lyons, Hanley, Wearing, & Neil, 2012; Simpson, 2004).
Despite the increased interest in volunteer tourism over the last decade (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b), Raymond and Hall (2008) argue that volunteer tourism is certainly not a new concept. Early examples include religious missionary movements, which can be traced back to ancient times (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Smillie, 1995; Tomazos & Butler, 2009a; Wearing & McGehee, 2013b) and the Colonial era (Smillie, 1995). More recent examples are the development charities which arose as a result of the devastation caused by the First and Second World Wars, attracting volunteers with altruistic motivations to travel across international borders to help those in need of assistance (Smillie, 1995). The period following World War II is also identified as a key point in history for international volunteering in the development context which has been linked to both altruism and also the politics at the time (Butcher & Smith, 2010).

In 1949 the United States government pledged to relieve the suffering of the 'third world' through 'development' (Escobar, 1984-5). The growing exposure of the development discourse resulted in international volunteering becoming increasingly institutionalised (e.g. the creation of the U.S. Peace Corps) as industrialised countries in the global north established international volunteering as the first institutionalised form of development work (Moyes, 1966), sending young people from developed countries "overseas to work with 'the poor'" in developing countries (Ehrichs, 2000, p.1).

By the 1980s it was clear that the mainstream development programme operated by western governments was not successful in fulfilling its promises, and a loss of public trust in the programme emerged (Clark, 1991). Since the 1990s NGOs have gained increasing public support, often being regarded as the appropriate vehicles to drive development programmes (Clark, 1991; Ehrichs, 2000). The number of NGOs offering development assistance to developing countries has continued to grow rapidly with many using long-term volunteers and, more recently, short-term

---

7 The terms 'developed/developing country', 'global north/south' and 'first/third world' are used variously throughout the volunteer tourism literature. For consistency this thesis uses 'developed country' to broadly represent countries "that are technologically and economically advanced, enjoy a relatively high standard of living and have modern social and political structures and institutions" and 'developing country' to broadly represent "all nation states that are not necessarily recognised as being developed" (Telfer & Sharpley, 2008, pp.4-5). It is acknowledged that such terms are controversial because of their socially constructed connotations which imply the inferiority of developing/south/third world countries to those considered developed/ north/ first world (Escobar, 1988; Lewis, 2006). However, these debates are not the focus of this research.
volunteer tourists to provide resources and funding for their programmes. As Keese (2011, pp.259-260) points out:

NGOs are tapping into the demand for alternative travel experiences and, at the same time, exploiting a new niche within the aid industry. Volunteer tourism and NGOs are linked by the common pursuit of alternative approaches to travel and to development.

The rise in the number of people wanting to participate in short-term, organised volunteer tourism programmes has seen an influx of both commercial and NGO sending organisations (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008, Raymond & Hall, 2008). As discussed, international volunteering is certainly not a new phenomenon; however the key difference now is that it has received wider interest and recognition from the tourism industry and engaged the involvement of tour operators (Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010).

Volunteer tourism is distinguished from other forms of international volunteering by its touristic and shorter term character, which are in contrast to the longer term, more formal and professionalised commitment required from skilled participants who take part in programmes with development charities and organisations such as Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO), United Nations Volunteers (UNV) and the American Peace Corps (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Butcher & Smith, 2010; Isaac & Platenkamp, 2010; Thomas, 2001). The focus of this study is short-term development oriented volunteer tourism, not international volunteering. As is discussed further in section 3.5 of Chapter 3, this study focuses on organisations which offer volunteer tourism programmes in developing countries with a community development focus. Organisations that only offer programmes where the primary focus is on conservation or scientific research assistance are not the focus of this study.

Growth and Development of Volunteer Tourism: Market Drivers

Following the growing discontent and concern with mass tourism (e.g. de Kadt, 1979b; Krippendorf, 1982, 1987), the 1990s saw a push for 'new tourism' markets (Butcher, 2003, 2005; Poon, 1994). Since the mid 1990s in particular, tourism markets have diversified significantly from mass tourism domination, and numerous 'niche tourism' markets, offering new vehicles for profit in a competitive and congested market place, have emerged (Robinson & Novelli,
Volunteer tourism is one such example of niche tourism\(^8\) (Marson, 2011). 'Micro-niches' within volunteer tourism are also evident, such as surf voluntourism (Aabo & Ponting, 2011), and archaeological volunteer tourism (Kaminski, Arnold, & Benson, 2011). As a concept, niche tourism is generally outlined as an alternative to 'mass tourism' in that it offers tourists greater variety of tourism experiences through more specialised forms of tourism consumption (Marson, 2011). In addition, niche tourism tends to focus on a smaller and more targeted market, although this is not always the case. Because of these factors some regard niche tourism as a more sustainable approach to development than mass tourism (Marson, 2011). The notion that niche tourism can offer a more desirable and sustainable form of development has been promoted in tourism policy in some countries, for example South Africa (www.fairtradetourismsa.org.za), and has driven the increase in niche tourism markets such as volunteer tourism\(^9\) (Robinson & Novelli, 2005).

Indeed, the ideological push for sustainable development from international organisations such as the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) as well as in the policies of developing countries eager to grow foreign exchange opportunities has had a significant bearing on the opportunities identified by the tourism industry. At the United Nations Rio 'Earth Summit' in 1992, the Agenda 21 initiative cited tourism as having the potential to offer sustainable development to 'certain communities, particularly in fragile environments' (Stancliffe, 1995; UNCED, 1992). Since then, it has been suggested that volunteer tourism may offer a suitable form of sustainable development to host communities because "…the principles of volunteer tourism incorporate the facilitation of community ownership and control..." (Wearing, 2001, p.147). This suggestion does, however, remain highly debated as researchers express concerns about the unknown

\(^8\) Volunteer tourism is also considered a form of alternative tourism (Wearing & McGehee, 2013a). See Wearing and McGehee (2013a, pp.18-38) for an extensive discussion of the debates and issues surrounding defining volunteer tourism as a form of alternative tourism.

\(^9\) The increasing commercialisation of volunteer tourism and its rise in popularity has led some scholars to regard volunteer tourism to be a 'mass niche' (Callanan & Thomas, 2007).

Development thinking and practice has changed over time with numerous and often blurry paradigm shifts. Various theories and approaches to development illustrate different leading ideologies and values at particular times (Peet & Hartwick, 2009; Pieterse, 2010). Such shifts in development ideology and practice are further issues affecting the growth and development of volunteer tourism (Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). Influenced by neo-liberal public management ideologies and the push for globalisation, the balance of power in driving tourism as a tool for economic development has shifted from public to private interests. Traditional top-down, state-led modes of development such as government aid and investment have been reduced and increasing importance has been placed on private capital as a means of economic and social development. Put simply, the business of development has become increasingly privatised and outsourced (Edwards & Fowler, 2002; Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). Business, NGOs and local communities are now often promoted as the most appropriate actors to drive development. Bottom-up approaches to development, whereby local communities have greater involvement, are now favoured because they are perceived to be more cost effective and in touch with stakeholder needs (Clark, 1991; Edwards & Fowler, 2002; Peet & Hartwick, 2009; Pieterse, 2010; Smillie, 1995; Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). Such changes in development ideology and practice have opened the door for volunteer tourism organisations to engage with development as NGOs increasingly use tourism as a tool for poverty reduction (Kennedy & Dornan, 2009). While NGOs are often perceived as providing alternative and decommodified approaches to tourism and development (Kennedy & Dornan, 2009; Wearing, 2004; Wearing, McDonald, & Ponting, 2005), it is not just NGOs that offer volunteer tourism experiences. Commercial tour operators now also offer volunteer travel experiences and will often partner with an NGO (Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). Thus, Vodopivec and Jaffe (2011) contend that volunteer tourism "reflects and contributes to a new logic of development. This form of travel can be understood as a particular neo-liberal form of development practice, in which development is not only privatised but can be packaged as a marketable commodity" (Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011, pp.111-112). They argue that although
such changes in contemporary development discourse and practice may seem positive, they should not be accepted uncritically (Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011).

In line with the argument that volunteer tourism has become a marketable commodity, Ingram (2010, p.211) argues that "development' has become fashionable", and that engaging with development through volunteer tourism has become a part of this trend. Similarly, Butcher and Smith (2010, p.27) observe that "the last two decades have witnessed a growing literature on 'ethical' tourism that links the behaviour and purchasing habits of consumers to development outcomes". Ethical consumption is argued to have a strong affinity with Gidden's (1991, 1994) 'life politics' and volunteer tourism is considered one such example of life politics taking place through 'ethical tourism'; individual tourists feel that they can 'make a difference' through the consumption of short-term volunteer work with a volunteer tourism organisation in a developing country (Brown & Hall, 2008; Butcher & Smith, 2010). A shift in motivational factors for tourists therefore is another key issue driving the growth and development of volunteer tourism. There has been an increasing move away from 'go and see' to 'go and do' approaches to holidaying (Cetron, 2008), and a lean towards participating in meaningful travel experiences as opposed to hedonistic and frivolous ones commonly associated with mass tourism (Butcher, 2003; Butcher & Smith, 2010; Levine, 2010). Butcher and Smith (2010) also link volunteer tourism to the shift from 'solid' to 'liquid' modernity (Bauman, 2000), as it is demonstrative of individuals seeking to take the issue of development, which in solid modernity was considered the responsibility of governments and nation-states, into their own hands (Butcher & Smith, 2010). Butcher and Smith (2010, p.31) focus on this solid to liquid shift from the perspective of the individual volunteers, arguing that volunteer tourism becomes "a part of a self-conscious shaping of their own identity".

Another significant driver affecting the growth and development of the volunteer tourism industry is the 'gap year' industry, which is largest in the UK. The gap year is currently the biggest target market for the volunteer tourism industry and it is this market in particular that has contributed to the rapid growth of the commercial sector in volunteer tourism (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Lyons et al., 2012; Simpson, 2005). Simpson states that contrary to the popular assumption that
the gap year has a strong relationship with the not-for-profit and the NGO sectors, the majority of the members of The Year Out Group, (an association of independent organisations that organise gap year activities), are in fact predominantly commercial companies in the private sector (Simpson, 2005, p.42). However, it is not a simple case of not-for-profit organisations and NGOs competing with commercial organisations for the volunteer tourist dollar. Not-for-profit organisations and NGOs are increasingly partnering with the private sector, as a means for generating revenue and securing markets for their projects, blurring the boundaries between the not-for-profit and commercial sectors (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Turner, Miller, & Gilbert, 2001).

Looking at volunteering more generally, there has been an increasing global trend towards short-term, episodic volunteering (Holmes & Smith, 2009; Macduff, 1991, 2005) which may also explain why volunteer tourism has increased in popularity. A report by the United Nations on the future of volunteering, supports this view and highlights the growing trend for short-term 'voluntourism' (United Nations Volunteers, 2011).

The range of market influences driving the growth and development of volunteer tourism have led to a highly diverse volunteer tourism market. Based on a thematic analysis of the literature Table 2.1 outlines five key dimensions of the volunteer tourism market to illustrate this diversity.
Table 2.1 Current Volunteer Tourism Markets. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLOW OF VOLUNTEERS</strong> <em>North -’developed countries’, South -’developing countries’</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-South</td>
<td>(Mwaruta, 2008, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUNTEER AGE GROUP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary/high school</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Gap Year' (18-24)</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Young' (18-30)</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Middle-aged' (31-54)</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired (55+)</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAVEL PARTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling alone</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or university travelling as a group</td>
<td>(Palacios, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family volunteering</td>
<td>(Clemmons, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeymooners/couples</td>
<td>(de Castella, 2011; Nash, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious group volunteering</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUNTEER MOTIVATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egotistic</td>
<td>(e.g. personal/self-development (Lo &amp; Lee, 2011; Sin, 2009; Wearing, 2001, 2002) and/or to increase social capital (Simpson, 2004; Sin, 2009; Snöderman &amp; Sneed, 2008)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic</td>
<td>(e.g. desire to ‘give something back’ (Brown, 2005; Lo &amp; Lee, 2011) and/or to conserve wildlife or the environment (Broad, 2003; Lyons, 2003; Wearing, 2002; Wearing &amp; Neil, 2001)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Pluralistic motivations' (both altruistic and egotistic)</td>
<td>(McGehee &amp; Andereck, 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow Intermediate Deep continuum</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUNTEER SKILL SET REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No relevant/limited skills</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited to moderate skills</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills, experience and/or qualifications related specifically to work being undertaken</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005) (See also Raymond (2007) on ‘the match-up process’).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Volunteer Tourism 'Making a Difference'?

In 2001 Wearing published the seminal text *Volunteer Tourism: Experiences that make a difference* (Wearing, 2001). This text focuses on the volunteer tourism experience from the perspective of the volunteer tourists, and argues that volunteer tourism can foster more meaningful encounters between guests and their hosts and host environment than mass tourism. Volunteer tourism is argued to provide a space for the sharing and exchange of social values between the volunteer tourist and local community members, which can serve to evoke a
change in the values of the participants and contribute to the learning and the development of the 'self' through travel (Wearing, 2001). Similarly, other case studies also add strength to the suggestion that volunteer tourism can foster more meaningful encounters between hosts and guests (Clifton & Benson, 2006; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2003; McGehee & Santos, 2005; McIntosh & Zahra, 2007).

For example, Higgins-Desbiolles (2003) found that volunteer tourism can offer reconciliation; it acts as a force for peace between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians. McIntosh and Zahra (2007) reported meaningful cross-cultural interactions taking place between both indigenous and non-indigenous volunteer tourism participants in New Zealand. A study by McGehee and Santos (2005) found that volunteer tourists' participation in volunteer tourism can result in participants' heightened awareness of social inequalities and injustices, evoking consciousness raising which can lead to increased engagement with social movements. With regards to the host perspective, an early study of residents' attitudes towards research-based volunteer tourism by Clifton and Benson (2006) found that residents of South-West Sulawesi in Indonesia were enthusiastic and accepting of the volunteers and relayed mostly positive accounts of visitor-host relations.

The early volunteer tourism literature positions volunteer tourism in a particularly optimistic light and it is offered as a positive alternative to mass tourism (Scheyvens, 2002; Stoddart & Rogerson, 2004; Wearing, 2001, 2002, 2004; Wearing et al., 2005). Wearing (2001) contends that volunteer tourism, as opposed to mass tourism, is ideally suited for the development of sustainable forms of community-based tourism. He argues that unlike mass tourism, which is viewed as highly commodified and fuelled by the aim of maximising commercial profit, volunteer tourism is by its very definition underpinned by the aim of maintaining the well-being of local host communities and environments. Wearing (2004) further suggests that volunteer tourism is a beacon for 'best practice' in the tourism industry, because the focus of the tourism experience is shifted from what the tourist and tourism organisation can gain from the host community and environment to being concerned with what the tourist and the volunteer tourism organisation can do for the host community and environment (Wearing, 2004).
However, it is important to acknowledge that Wearing's (2001) seminal text is not grounded in host community perspectives; rather it is based on the volunteer tourists' accounts of the volunteer tourism experience. Furthermore, Wearing's argument does not question the aims and values of the volunteer tourism organisations or volunteer tourists who are in a position to define the 'well-being' of local host communities and environments. It must also be noted that it is volunteer tourism programmes run by NGOs that are specifically cited as examples of best practice in Wearing's work. Aside from the perception of NGOs being 'more inclined' to consider the well-being of host communities and environments beyond their own economic benefit, NGOs were also the main providers of volunteer tourism at the time these papers were published (Wearing, 2001, 2004; Wearing et al., 2005). The organisational landscape of volunteer tourism has changed considerably since the time of these seminal publications and Wearing's findings may not be applicable under contemporary organisational arrangements which involve different types of organisations and partnerships. Chapter 4 of this thesis examines the organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations and Chapter 5 discusses their influence on the ways and extent to which monitoring and evaluation takes place.

2.2.1 Comparing Values between Different Organisations

Wearing and colleagues make an ideological distinction between the philosophies and practices of NGOs and commercial tour operators as tourism providers, asserting that NGOs are decommodified in that they are more inclined to be driven by the values of preserving natural environments and maintaining the well-being of local communities, in contrast to traditional commodified approaches of commercial operators which focus on profit making (Wearing, 2004; Wearing et al., 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). However, in practice such a clear-cut dichotomy may not always be the case, even if in ideological terms the philosophies of NGOs represent a challenge to commodified forms of tourism (Lyons & Wearing, 2008a). As Goodwin (2011, p.185) observes, "the status of the organisation is not a guarantee of responsible practice". Similarly, Gugerty (2010, p.17) comments "As any other category of collective actors, there are 'good' and 'bad' non profits". For example, attention has been drawn to ethical issues that have been raised surrounding the level of accountability and transparency of
volunteer tourism organisations such as NGOs (Brown & Hall, 2008; Edwards & Fowler, 2002). All types of organisations including NGOs, governments and private sector organisations can have both positive and negative implications for community based tourism initiatives (Simpson, 2008). Additionally, as recognised by Lyons (2003), and further highlighted by Lyons and Wearing (2008a) and Coghlan and Noakes (2012), there are increasingly blurred boundaries and overlapping relationships between NGOs and commercial tour operators emerging in volunteer tourism, the extent of which has not been fully explored in the literature to date but is explored in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

The union of volunteering and tourism is viewed by many organisations such as governments, NGOs and private operators as a 'seamless' solution to a host of social, economic and environmental problems, particularly in developing countries (Lyons & Wearing, 2008b). However, "in reality this relationship is fraught with potential inequalities and challenges" (Lyons & Wearing, 2008b, p.6). Indeed, the reality of whether or not alternative tourism activities, such as volunteer tourism, can resist market forces and can become or remain decommodified tourism products has been questioned (Butcher, 2006; Lyons & Wearing, 2008a, 2008b; Wearing et al., 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006). More recently, Coghlan and Noakes (2012) purport that due to the increase in commercial operators, not-for-profit volunteer tourism organisations may adopt a commercialised business model in order to compete with other organisations and generate income to support their mission. Moreover, the argument that volunteer tourism has packaged development into a marketable commodity presents further tensions with Wearing's 'decommodified' argument (Vodopivec & Jaffè, 2011).

Based on a thematic analysis of the literature, Table 2.2 highlights four key dimensions and a large number of sub-dimensions to consider in the current volunteer tourism organisational landscape. As further elaborated in chapters 4, 5 and 6 these dimensions may influence an organisation's approach to monitoring and evaluation.
Table 2.2 Volunteer Tourism Organisations and their Characteristics. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPES OF ORGANISATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit (including charities and some NGOs)</td>
<td>(Brown &amp; Hall, 2008; Coghlan &amp; Noakes, 2012; Raymond &amp; Hall, 2008; Tomazos &amp; Butler, 2009a, 2009b; Tomazos &amp; Cooper, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Profit</td>
<td>(Brown &amp; Hall, 2008; Coghlan &amp; Noakes, 2012; Raymond &amp; Hall, 2008; Tomazos &amp; Butler, 2009a, 2009b; Tomazos &amp; Cooper, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprises</td>
<td>(Benson &amp; Henderson, 2011; Mdee &amp; Emmott, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic organisations</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Palacios, 2010; Sin, 2009, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious groups</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

| Sending organisation | (Raymond, 2008, 2011). |
| Host partner organisation | (Raymond, 2008, 2011). |
| Organisation both 'sends' and 'hosts' volunteers | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |

MAIN FOCUS OF ORGANISATION

| Volunteer travel | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| Niche travel | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| Community development/service | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| Conservation of wildlife and/or environment | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| Religious activities | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |

ORGANISATION MOTIVES

| Altruistic | (Ong, Pearlman, & Lockstone-Binney, 2011; Raymond & Hall, 2008; Scheyvens, 2002; Stoddart & Rogerson, 2004; Tomazos & Butler, 2009a, 2009b). |
| Commercial | (e.g. to make financial profit) |
| Religious convictions | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| Political objectives | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). |
| 'Philanthropic-commercial continuum' and 'Spectrum between commercialisation and service' | (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). |

2.2.2 The Critical Turn

The increasing prevalence of commercial tour operators engaging in volunteer tourism and its rapid growth into a highly profitable niche market has led to a more critical gaze on volunteer tourism from within academia (e.g. Brown & Hall,
2008; Butcher, 2006, 2011; Butcher & Smith, 2010; McGehee, 2012; Raymond, 2008, 2011; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012). The media has also contributed to greater critical awareness of volunteer tourism, targeting much of its criticism at the usually unskilled young gap year volunteers, branding them as the new 'neo-colonialists' (See Birrell, 2010; Boffey, 2011; Brodie, 2006; Hanafin, 2011 as examples from the UK). Critics are concerned that the volunteers seldom have sufficient knowledge or experience of the tasks they are doing, which according to Brown and Hall (2008, p.845) "calls into question their (the volunteer tourists') effectiveness and raises the spectre of neo-colonialism in the tacit assumption that even ignorant Westerners can improve the lot of people in the South".

This critical turn highlights a number of potential negative impacts of volunteer tourism on the host communities which it claims to support. Guttentag (2009) argues that just as other forms of tourism are subject to critique and scrutiny, so too should volunteer tourism be. Based on a review and analysis of literature, Guttentag (2009) argues that potential negative impacts on host communities could include a neglect of locals' desires; a hindering of work progress and completion of unsatisfactory work; a disruption of local economies; a decreased labour demand and reinforcement of dependency; a reinforcement of conceptualisations of the 'Other'; rationalisations of the 'Other' and rationalisations of poverty and the instigation of cultural changes. Similar concerns are reported by responsible tourism advocate Goodwin (2011, p.537) who states:

…the situation with voluntourism is far from ideal. I have come across many instances of volunteers replacing local employees, of volunteers demanding transport and other resources, as well as reports of buildings being knocked down to be built again by the next group of volunteers or remaining unfinished, the promises to volunteers and communities left unfulfilled.

Despite such criticisms surrounding potential negative impacts and undesirable practices, it is also recognised that these could likely be avoided if volunteer tourism programmes were properly planned and managed (Guttentag, 2009). However, the key problem at present with regard to attempting to mitigate negative impacts is the current dearth of research on what the impacts actually are, and a lack of understanding of how volunteer tourism organisations manage volunteer tourism projects and evaluate the success of their programmes. This study contributes to addressing this gap.
Some critics have taken issue at the suggestion that volunteer tourism may offer a suitable form of sustainable development for communities (Brown & Hall, 2008; Butcher, 2006; Butcher & Smith, 2010). For example, Brown and Hall (2008, p.845) incite that, at its worst, volunteer tourism "reduces development to individual acts of charity which seek to work around rather than transform the relationship of poor, rural societies to the natural world". Similarly, Simpson (2004, p.683) in her study of the UK gap year industry argues that the industry "offers a highly simplistic understanding of development". Further, Simpson's (2004) study found that the volunteer tourism experience acted to promote the othering of host communities and the 'third world' by the volunteer tourists. This is contrary to Wearing's suggestion that volunteer tourism can evoke cross-cultural understanding and a more meaningful exchange between hosts and guests (Wearing, 2001; Wearing & Grabowski, 2010). Others have argued that cross-cultural understanding cannot be assumed to be an automatic outcome of the volunteer tourism experience, but rather should be viewed as an important goal of volunteer tourism (Hammersley, 2013; Raymond & Hall, 2008). Raymond and Hall (2008) and Hammersley (2013) argue that volunteer tourism programmes need to be carefully managed if they are to avoid reinforcing stereotypes and cross-cultural misunderstanding; they contend that volunteer tourism sending organisations have an important role to play in encouraging volunteer tourists to critically reflect on their experiences. Likewise, Conran (2011) acknowledges that in order to move beyond the charge of 'neo-colonialism' volunteer tourism programmes must be designed and managed in a way that facilitates consideration and greater awareness of the complexities and politics of development beyond economic gain.

In this context it is important to acknowledge that volunteer tourism programmes come in many different shapes and forms (Lyons & Wearing, 2012). Based on a thematic analysis of the literature Table 2.3 provides a current overview of the various types of volunteer tourism programmes offered and the nature of their involvement in volunteer tourism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>REFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOCUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>DIMENSION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development (can include but not limited to: construction and refurbishment of buildings, social work, orphanage work, education activities)</td>
<td>Ingram, 2010; Palacios, 2010; Sin, 2010; Stoddart &amp; Rogerson, 2004; Vodopivec &amp; Jaffe, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>(animal and environmental preservation) (e.g. Broad, 2003; Campbell &amp; Smith, 2006; Coghlan, 2007a, 2007b; Cousins, 2007; Gray &amp; Campbell, 2007; Wearing, 2001) and/or research (Clifton &amp; Benson, 2006; Ellis, 2003, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>(Lyons, 2003; Lyons &amp; Wearing, 2008a, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Exchange</td>
<td>(Lyons &amp; Wearing, 2008a, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>(Martiniuk &amp; Negin, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising adventures</td>
<td>(Lyons &amp; Wearing, 2008a, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF PROGRAMME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One off single 'project'</td>
<td>Raymond, 2007, 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contributes to a wider programme which the volunteer tourism organisation has a longer term commitment to</td>
<td>(PEPY Tours n.d.; Fair Trade Volunteering n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual placement with an organisation</td>
<td>(Raymond, 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-project</td>
<td>(Volunteers spend 1 or 2 days on a variety of projects, Raymond, 2007, p.5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DURATION OF VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro/day trip</td>
<td>(e.g. 2 hour 'Reading Road Trip' with Sandals Resorts International (2011) and 'Crystal Voluntourism Adventures' with Crystal Cruises (n.d.)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term – up to 3 months</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-term – typically less than 6 months</td>
<td>(Callanan &amp; Thomas, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term – up to 12 months or longer</td>
<td>(ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT VOLUNTEERING VERSUS LEISURE/HOLIDAYING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost all the time (Volunteering is the main focus of the programme and may include a day or two leisure experience)</td>
<td>(Lamoureux, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time (volunteering takes up a minimal amount of the overall programme)</td>
<td>(Lamoureux, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, many variations in between these two ends of the spectrum ‘depending on the desire of the volunteer and the needs of the receiving organisation”</td>
<td>(Lamoureux, 2011, p.10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPTH/INTEGRITY OF PROGRAMME</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FURTHER NICHES IN VOLUNTEER TOURISM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dive Voluntourism</td>
<td>(<a href="http://www.divevoluntourism.com">www.divevoluntourism.com</a>; Walsh &amp; Hampton, 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Voluntourism</td>
<td>(Kaminski et al., 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honeyteering</td>
<td>(de Castella, 2011; Nash, 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Stakeholder Perspectives: Unbalanced Insights

Thus far, the literature on volunteer tourism has tended to focus on the perspectives of the volunteer tourists, exploring their motivations and experiences (Broad, 2003; Brown, 2005; Lo & Lee, 2011; Wearing, 2001). Based on a review of the literature, Table 2.4 identifies key stakeholders in volunteer tourism, and outlines the importance of their participation in monitoring and evaluation. Despite volunteer tourism pivoting on its claim to 'make a difference' to host communities, less attention has been paid to the perspectives of members of local communities that host volunteer tourism. The small number of studies that have highlighted the complexity of the relationships between host communities and volunteer tourists and volunteer tourism organisations, will now be discussed (Gray & Campbell, 2007; McGehee & Andereck, 2008, 2009; Sin, 2010; Zahra & McGehee, 2013).

Table 2.4 Stakeholders and their Importance in Monitoring and Evaluation. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Stakeholder</th>
<th>Why are they important?</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Volunteer tourism organisations (see Table 2.2 for further information about the different types of volunteer tourism organisations) | • Recruit and/or receive volunteers  
• Organise programmes  
• Organise and/or host volunteers  
• Oversee volunteer activities  
• Intermediary between volunteer and host community  
• May fund programmes  
| Host communities | • Host volunteers  
• May or may not be satisfied with programmes/ and or volunteers | (Benson, 2011; Gray & Campbell, 2007; Guttentag, 2009, 2011; Higgins-Desbiolles, 2003; McGehee & Andereck, 2009; Sin, 2010; Wearing & Darcy, 2011). |
| Volunteer tourists (see Table 2.1 for further information about the different types of volunteer tourism markets) | • Pay and/or volunteer to participate in programme | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Benson, 2011; Wearing, 2001). |
| Governments and government agencies | • May fund programmes  
• May impose regulations on volunteer tourism activities | (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Benson, 2011; Garland, 2012). |
2.3.1 Contrasting Perspectives between Hosts and Guests

Demonstrating that hosts and guests can construct different meanings of the volunteer tourism experience, Gray and Campbell's (2007) research into volunteer ecotourism in Gandoca, Costa Rica found that both the volunteer tourists and members of the local communities supported volunteer ecotourism, but that different and conflicting values underpinned their support. The host communities were supportive primarily because they valued the economic benefit it could bring to the community, whereas the volunteer tourists placed greater value on maintaining the well-being of the environment and the turtles, with some expressing criticism at the way local people prioritised economic outcomes. Gray and Campbell (2007) further argue that this finding undermines Wearing's (2001, 2004) earlier argument that volunteer ecotourism privileges local voices and values through meaningful exchange. They argue that local communities may wish for tourism development to become more commodified than do the volunteer tourists, making the long-term sustainability of volunteer tourism in the area uncertain (Gray & Campbell, 2007).

Similarly, McGehee and Andereck's (2008, 2009) survey of resident attitudes towards volunteer tourism in Tijuana, Mexico, found that, overall, most respondents indicated positive attitudes towards volunteer tourism activities. However, unlike Gray and Campbell (2007), McGehee and Andereck's (2008, 2009) study did not explore the values underlying residents' perceptions of volunteer tourism. The research did reveal though that volunteer tourists were not always seen by local residents as different to other types of tourists and the researchers did report some resistance from residents towards faith-based organisations that were keen to proselytize.

2.3.2 Perspectives within Host Communities

The intended beneficiaries or 'communities' hosting volunteer tourism activities are not homogenous. 'Host' or 'local' communities often comprise individuals and groups with both shared and conflicting social, cultural and economic values and interests. Volunteer tourism organisations therefore need to take this into account and consider appropriate monitoring and evaluation methods to gather information relevant to stakeholders and the intended beneficiaries of a volunteer programme (Mascarenhas, Coelho, Subti, & Ramos, 2010). More recently, Zahra
and McGehee (2013) used a community capitals framework to examine the impact of volunteer tourism on host communities in the Philippines. They report that host communities perceived the presence of volunteer tourists to contribute positively, neutrally and negatively to several types of community capital. For example, in terms of bridging social capital, a positive impact was that many local people felt the presence of the volunteers had resulted in the community becoming more civic minded. However, this positive perspective was not shared by all community members. Some did not trust the volunteers and felt that the volunteer tourists looked down on them and told them what to do, leading to feelings of being disrespected. Zahra and McGehee's (2013) findings exemplify that host communities are not homogenous and that different community members will hold different perspectives towards the presence of volunteer tourists. Similar findings have also been identified in other tourism research (Blackstock, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013), highlighting the need to monitor and evaluate volunteer tourism programmes from a variety of host community member perspectives.

### 2.3.3 Complex Relationships: Power and Dependencies

Highlighting the complexity of the relationships between host communities and volunteer tourism organisations, Sin (2010) undertook research in Cambodia with members of local communities that hosted volunteer tourists and also local NGO and missionary workers. Her research revealed that many of the respondents were keen to tell of various insights that might improve the volunteer tourism experience, although most of the respondents reported having generally positive experiences with volunteer tourists. They were, however, reluctant to put their names to the quotes and were wary of offending funding organisations. Sin (2010, p.986) quotes one respondent as saying:

> It is only natural that we don't want to bite the hand that feeds us. What happens if other people hear what we say...What will they think? And it's not all bad. It's just some things can be better. But they might not see it this way.

This perspective emphasises the unequal power relationships and dependencies between host communities and volunteer tourism organisations and demonstrates that the local communities did not feel empowered to be able to offer suggestions that could potentially improve the volunteer tourism experience. Similar concerns over biased evaluations of projects are raised by Guttentag (2011), who also
identifies that locals may be wary of criticising projects for fear that projects and their funding will be withdrawn (Guttentag, 2011). Sin (2010) further identifies unequal relationships associated with the decision making processes in volunteer tourism as respondents told of a lack of control and authority over the volunteer tourism projects. Differences between projects that host communities would prefer to be implemented and projects that the actual volunteer tourists favour were also expressed by local NGO workers. These workers commented that it was more likely that a project would get approved by the funding volunteer tourism organisation if it suited the desires of the volunteer tourists, for example to build a school as opposed to proposals for longer term projects such as establishing microfinance for villagers. Some of Sin's respondents also reported feeling that host communities needed to appear 'needy' in order to attract volunteer tourists and that, in some cases, communities were not considered 'poor enough'. Sin (2010, p.9) comments that, ironically, host communities "may have to appear as the poorest or most pitiful destination and there is a very real threat of becoming or appearing 'too rich' for volunteer tourism".

Sin's research is one case study, and unfortunately, minimal research into host community perspectives on volunteer tourism makes it impossible to extrapolate these findings to other cases and contexts. However, the findings demonstrate that without trust and a strong relationship between the host community and volunteer tourism organisations, and appropriate feedback mechanisms in place, there is potential that host communities will remain silent and not volunteer their suggestions for improvement for fear of missing out on assistance. A report by Tourism Concern (Power, 2007) investigated the practices of UK gap year companies that organise volunteer tourism experiences and found that at the time of investigation, the majority of these organisations did not seek feedback from host communities on the projects. Therefore there is a strong possibility that Sin's research findings are not an uncommon situation. The findings of these studies reinforce that further attention on the processes of monitoring and evaluating volunteer tourism is warranted.

2.4 The Gap: Monitoring and Evaluation

Other research has also recognised the value of monitoring and evaluation processes in volunteer tourism (e.g. Barbieri, Santos, & Katsube, 2012; Nelson,
Barbieri et al. (2012) undertook research in Rwanda, suggesting that in order to improve the volunteer tourism experience for all involved, volunteer tourism organisations should consider implementing a system in which volunteer tourists can evaluate their volunteer experiences so that the information gained can be used in the ongoing improvement of services offered to volunteers. Likewise, they suggest that local community members should also be given the opportunity to evaluate their project experiences and to identify where and how volunteer tourists dedicate their time and efforts. It was found that both the volunteers and members of the local community supported the potential implementation of such practices.

In arguably the most enlightening empirical research to date on volunteer tourism from a host community perspective, Nelson (2010) challenges the often assumed and claimed notion that local communities are the key benefactors of volunteer tourism activities. Instead, Nelson contends that volunteer tourism made minimal impact on the material development and overall capacity building of the local communities in South Africa. Her research found that a lack of shared meaning between the NGOs, volunteer tourists and local communities led to frustrations, disheartening and misunderstandings between them, highlighting the importance of NGOs and project facilitators listening to community needs. Consequently, Nelson argues that seeking community perspectives on the impacts of volunteer tourism is essential for evaluating the success of programmes and asserts that the long-term outcomes of volunteer tourism could be significantly improved if evaluation measures that enabled 'honest conversations' between the community, the volunteers and the volunteer tourism organisation were in place (Nelson, 2010).

As this chapter has outlined, there are many potential issues and negative and positive impacts that can result from the interaction between volunteer tourists and host communities and also between volunteer tourism organisations and host communities. The ongoing monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects is therefore seen as an essential part of a volunteer tourism organisation's duty of care to both the volunteer tourists and the host community (Raymond, 2011). Engaging in evaluation practices creates the opportunity for both volunteer tourists and host communities to voice concerns over any issues they are not
satisfied with, to suggest ways to improve or to confirm aspects that are working well (Barbieri et al., 2012; Nelson, 2010; Raymond, 2011). Without volunteer tourism organisations engaging in practices that encourage host community input into the ongoing improvement of volunteer tourism projects, volunteer tourism organisations risk perpetuating inappropriate practices and host communities can remain silent (Nelson, 2010; Sin, 2010). This in turn undermines the notion that volunteer tourism is underpinned with the aim and value of maintaining the well-being of local host communities and environments (Wearing, 2001).

The need for all types of tourism organisations to engage with the monitoring and evaluation of their activities and services, particularly those which aim to deliver benefits to communities and are engaged in cross sector partnerships, is recognised as essential to determining whether or not communities really are benefiting from such initiatives (Simpson, 2008). However, as identified by Sin (2010) and Guttentag (2011), the evaluation of projects involving local host community members becomes all the more complex if host communities are fearful of criticising a project and take the stance that benefiting from a project in some way is better than not benefitting at all. This reminds us that relationships between volunteer tourism organisations, volunteer tourists and host communities are situated within broader unequal social structures and processes which reflect power asymmetries.

2.5 Positive Outcomes: The Role of Volunteer Tourism Organisations

Volunteer tourism organisations appear to be the key agencies of power in volunteer tourism and the significant role that they play in volunteer tourism cannot be underestimated (Hammersley, 2013; McGehee, 2012; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond, 2008). Volunteer tourism organisations are often the gatekeepers or intermediaries between the volunteer tourists and host communities (McGehee & Andereck, 2008; Ong et al., 2011). They have control over the marketing of volunteer tourism projects (Caton & Santos, 2009; Keese, 2011; Simpson, 2004; Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011); decide on the location of volunteer tourism projects

---

10 As noted by Raymond (2008), it is possible to take part in volunteer tourism without using a volunteer tourism organisation. However, the majority of volunteer tourism takes place utilising volunteer tourism organisations and it is this context that is the focus of this study.
Keese, 2011; Tomazos & Butler, 2009a; Vodopivec & Jaffé, 2011); the type of project (Sin, 2010); the recruitment, preparation and debriefing of volunteers (Hammersley, 2013; Raymond, 2008; Raymond & Hall, 2008) the delivery of programmes (Ong et al., 2011) and who, if anyone, is responsible for monitoring and evaluating their programmes (Raymond, 2011). Good practice in volunteer tourism organisations is thus considered central to maintaining a sustainable and responsible volunteer tourism industry (Wearing & McGehee, 2013a, 2013b).

Volunteer tourism organisations are considered responsible for meeting the needs of a variety of stakeholders including volunteer tourists and host communities (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Ong et al., 2011; Raymond, 2008). However, perceptions by volunteer tourism organisations of their responsibility have not yet been explored in the literature. Chapters 5 and 6 thus examine this important issue. Ong et al.'s (2011) study of the websites of not-for-profit sending organisations suggests that these organisations are guided by the ideals of meeting the needs of host communities and volunteer tourists. In practice however, research by Palacios (2010) argues that volunteer tourism organisations risk perpetuating neo-colonialism and frustrating hosts and volunteers if they are not realistic about the ways in which volunteers can 'help'. Further, McGehee (2012) proposes that whilst organisations have the potential to maintain unequal power relations and perpetuate neo-colonial attitudes they can also be agents for positive social change. McGehee (2012) argues that for organisations who actively pursue positive social change, their actions have the potential to overcome power inequalities between volunteer tourists and host communities. However, the pressure for organisations to compete for volunteers within an increasingly commercialised and for-profit volunteer tourism industry may distract organisations from their original well-meaning missions (Coghlan & Noakes, 2012). Moreover, the interests of for-profit organisations remain largely unexplored within the literature.

Despite the pivotal role that volunteer tourism organisations play in promoting and upholding good practices, significant examination of these organisations remains missing from the literature. This research addresses this key gap and responds to the call for further understandings of the practices of volunteer tourism organisations (Coghlan, 2007b; McGehee, 2012; Ong et al., 2011;
Raymond, 2008) by investigating how volunteer tourism organisations engage with monitoring and evaluating their volunteer tourism programmes. To date, concerns about the negative impacts of volunteer tourism have mostly been centred on volunteer tourism programmes that take place in developing countries (e.g. Guttentag, 2009; Sin, 2010). At present the most common flow is for volunteers from developed countries to travel to volunteer in developing countries (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008). Accordingly, this thesis focuses on the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations based in developed countries which send volunteer tourists to developing countries. The author recognises, nonetheless, that it is becoming increasingly popular for volunteers from developed countries to travel within their own or to other developed countries, and for volunteers from developed countries to volunteer within both developed countries and developing countries (Mwaruta, 2008, 2012).

2.5.1 Operational Arrangements, Power and Monitoring and Evaluation

As outlined previously in Table 2.2, volunteer tourism organisations can have varying operational arrangements. Depending on the partnerships which take place between ‘sending organisations’ and host partner organisations, it may influence which party is deemed responsible for monitoring and evaluating various aspects (if any) of a programme. Further, geographic distance may complicate communication and collaboration efforts (Benson & Blackman, 2011). Partnerships between organisations may also affect whose goals, values and interests are represented in monitoring and evaluation processes. In partnerships which exhibit funder–fundee relationships where one party is financially dependent on the other, evaluation might be used primarily as a control mechanism to ensure that the programme is ‘on track’ to meet the goals agreed to between the funder and fundee (Meyer, 2012), and therefore what is monitored and evaluated is largely dictated by the interests of the funder. Indeed, Lister (2000) questions whether or not partnerships can be classified as partnerships when there are asymmetrical power relationships such as those involved in volunteer tourism between host communities and volunteers.

---

11 Volunteer tourism organisations are also known in the literature as ‘sending organisations’ (e.g. Raymond, 2008).
2.6 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to examine current knowledge of monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations (Objective 1). Within growing concerns about the increasing commercialisation of the volunteer tourism industry and the potential for negative impacts to host communities, the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes are identified as essential for responsible tourism management. In reviewing the volunteer tourism literature, four broad and intersecting dimensions of volunteer tourism that may influence monitoring and evaluation were apparent:

(1) Markets (As outlined in Table 2.1, there are several different markets with varying characteristics that drive the demand for volunteer tourism.)

(2) Organisations (As outlined in Table 2.2, various types of volunteer tourism organisations with different organisational contexts engage with volunteer tourism.)

(3) Programmes (As outlined in Table 2.3, different types of programmes are offered and the nature of their engagement with volunteer tourism varies.)

(4) Stakeholders (As outlined in Table 2.4, there are several key stakeholders with varying objectives and motivations for engaging with volunteer tourism.)

Together, these four intersecting dimensions (and their sub-dimensions) reveal the highly contextual nature of volunteer tourism and the complexity and diversity of interests and settings which can shape the how, when, where and why monitoring and evaluation is undertaken.

However, this chapter has also highlighted the lack of significant examination of volunteer tourism organisations to date, particularly with regard to the current gap in knowledge and understanding of how, and indeed if, organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes. This research contributes directly to addressing this important gap and does so taking a post-disciplinary approach (Bramwell & Lane, 2005; Coles, Hall, & Duval, 2005, 2006, 2009; Laing, Lee, Moore, Wenger & Weiler, 2009; Stone, 2011).
Various disciplines have informed the volunteer tourism literature to date including, tourism, recreation and leisure, anthropology, sociology, development studies and geography (Wearing & McGehee, 2013b). In order to create new knowledge and in alignment with the post-disciplinary approach of this thesis which requires critical consideration of the relevant literature from a plurality of disciplinary bases (Coles et al. 2009) and Wearing and McGehee's (2013b) call for additional theoretical contributions to expand current understandings of volunteer tourism, this study responds to this gap in knowledge by drawing upon relevant literature from evaluation studies, the concept of liquid organisations (sociology) and principal-agent theory (economics, political science and sociology). These areas of literature are introduced and discussed in the corresponding findings chapters (See Chapter 1, Figure 1.1). The research approach and methods used in this study are outlined in the next chapter.
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3 RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

3.1 Introduction

The previous chapter highlighted that many issues and negative and positive impacts can potentially result from volunteer tourism (e.g. Guttentag, 2009). It was discussed that engagement with the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes is essential to determine whether or not communities really benefit from such initiatives (Raymond, 2011; Simpson, 2008). It was also acknowledged that monitoring and evaluation are not neutral processes but can work to both empower or disempower key stakeholders such as host communities (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Further, the various political, social and contextual factors played out in volunteer tourism, such as the potential for unequal power relationships and dependencies between host communities and volunteer tourism organisations, can promote biased evaluations of projects (e.g. Guttentag, 2009, 2011; Sin, 2010). These issues influenced the decision to examine the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations from a critical perspective. The previous chapter also highlighted the dearth of research that has focused on the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. In response to these observations, an exploratory approach was adopted for this research. A summary of the approach and methods used in this study is outlined in Figure 3.1.

![Figure 3.1 Summary of Approach and Methods. Adapted from Crotty (1998) in Creswell and Plano Clark (2011, p.38).]
3.2 Overarching Research Paradigm: A Critical Orientation

Influenced by the issues highlighted in the volunteer tourism literature, this research is situated in what Guba and Lincoln (2005) describe as the "critical theory and related positions" paradigm (hereafter referred to as the "critical paradigm"). Critical theory is the underpinning foundation of the critical paradigm. Critical theory has its roots in the Frankfurt School, whose anti-positivist scholars, such as Theodor Adorno, Max Horkeheimer and Jurgen Habermas, developed the theories and work of Karl Marx (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Kelemen & Rumens, 2008; Scherer, 2009). Critical theory is generally considered to be an umbrella term which encompasses a broad range of interdisciplinary perspectives and approaches including, for example, some feminist theories and postcolonial approaches, neo-Marxism, the work of Michel Foucault, and critical postructuralism (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009; Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Rather than a specific theory per se, critical theory "is a socio-philosophical school of thought" (Scherer, 2009, p.30). Kincheloe and McLaren (2005, p.303) describe the dynamic nature of critical theory:

(a) there are many critical theories, not just one; (b) the critical tradition is always changing and evolving; and (c) critical theory attempts to avoid too much specificity, as there is room for disagreement among critical theorists. To lay out a set of fixed characteristics of the position is contrary to the desire of such theorists to avoid the production of blueprints of sociopolitical and epistemological beliefs.

Despite an aversion to specificity within the critical paradigm (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005), a uniting feature of the various critical approaches that fall within the critical paradigm, and indeed this research, is that they seek to question established landscapes of power and to examine taken for granted assumptions that tend to reproduce the status quo. In doing so, critical research seeks to uncover practices and ideas that have led to the marginalisation or silencing of certain groups (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009; Alvesson & Deetz, 2000; Guba & Lincoln, 2005). A further distinctive feature of the critical paradigm is that it holds an emancipatory interest which is concerned not just with discovering such practices or ideas but also in reflecting on how these can or should change (Scherer, 2009). In this regard, the critical paradigm is critical of both positivism and interpretivism, whose acceptance of such conditions and lack of emancipatory
interests reproduce "conservative, status-quo-preserving effects" (Scherer, 2009, p.38). Similarly, in tourism research, a key aim of the critical paradigm is to use research to improve the tourism experience for minority and/or oppressed groups (Jennings, 2010). In the same vein, this research seeks to understand and shed light on how volunteer tourism organisations engage with evaluation processes and for what purposes. For example, as outlined in the aim and objectives, this research also aims to explore if and how local host communities are involved in monitoring and evaluation processes and to understand what the barriers to and opportunities for their inclusion may be in order to make recommendations on how monitoring and evaluation may be enhanced. Thus the critical paradigm, with its focus on "seeking understanding as a guide to effective action" is deemed appropriate for this research (Gray, 2009, p.25).

3.2.1 A Critical Ontology and Epistemology

In social research, the underlying philosophical assumptions and beliefs of a paradigm, namely those related to ontology, epistemology and methodology, serve to guide an inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Kelemen & Rumens, 2008). The critical paradigm rejects the rigid framework of positivism which views the world as a measurable, 'value free' and objective 'out there reality' which can be predicted and controlled through the use of quantitative research methods. Rather, "reality" is shaped and constructed by various social, cultural, political, economic, ethnic and gender values and ideologies which have "crystallized over time" (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p.125). The critical paradigm also rejects the epistemological stance of positivism which sees the relationship between the researcher and the researched as independent of one another, with the role of the researcher being that of neutral observer. In contrast, the critical paradigm believes that research findings are "value-mediated" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011) and that "What can be known is inextricably dependent on the relationship between the knower and the object under study" (Kelemen & Rumens, 2008, p.28).

3.2.2 Critical Management Studies (CMS)

This research is focused on the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. Therefore, critical management (organisation) studies (CMS), which draws from the philosophical foundations of critical theory and the
critical paradigm, but is distinct in its specific focus on the management and practices of organisations is deemed an appropriate theoretical lens for this research (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009; Scherer, 2009).

As a mode of study, CMS aims to unmask unquestioned and under-challenged relations of control and domination within and between organisations and in organisations' relations with wider society (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009; Alvesson & Deetz, 2005; Buchanan & Bryman, 2009; Deetz, 2009). CMS applies critical research approaches to management and organisations in an effort to interrogate issues including social justice, inequality and ethics (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009). Grounded in the emancipatory values of the critical paradigm, CMS is also driven by an interest in promoting and removing barriers to democratic forms of organising (Mumby, 2008).

CMS is unique from other forms of critical research in that it is careful not to 'demonise' all who are in positions of power unnecessarily. Rather, CMS is generally appreciative of the conditions and constraints that arise from organisational contexts and is responsive to the practical and ethical dilemmas that organisations face (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009). For example, in a volunteer tourism context, a lack of resources may mean that organisations must decide between using available funding to fund more projects at the expense of monitoring and evaluating existing ones. This 'non-demonising' aspect of CMS is represented in this research through the survey questions and interview guide in the inclusion of questions that seek to understand any difficulties that organisations may face with regard to monitoring and evaluation.

3.2.3 CMS as a Guiding Map

Social theory can be utilised in different ways in research. It can range from deductive hypothesis testing, as is often found in positivist quantitative research, to inductive theory building as is done in grounded theory approaches. Theory may also be used to inform what is studied and how a topic is to be studied (Creswell, 2014). This research adopts the view of Kincheloe and McLaren (2005, p. 306) who "understand social theory as a map or a guide to the social sphere" and Alvesson and Deetz (2000, p. 37) who state:
In our view, theory is a way of seeing and thinking about the world rather than an abstract representation of it. As such it is better seen as the 'lens' one uses in observation than a 'mirror' of nature.

In adopting the view that theory does not represent the social world, and instead offers a 'map' or 'lens' to guide inquiry, this research utilises CMS to guide the research questions and methods which were used to study the programme monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. In this context, theory is not used as an explanation of, or representation of the world, as is characteristic of the positivist paradigm. Rather, theory offers a lens to assist in highlighting issues of importance that require examination (Creswell, 2014). For example, utilising a critical lens, the author of this research takes the position that monitoring and evaluation should be used as tools for empowering key stakeholders, in particular host communities. Although the importance of other key stakeholders is recognised, such as the volunteers, existing research has demonstrated the potential for negative impacts on host communities including unequal power relationships and dependencies between host communities and volunteer tourism organisations (Guttentag, 2009; Sin, 2010). Therefore, using CMS as a guiding 'map' to highlight issues of importance, how organisations engage with host communities with respect to monitoring and evaluating their volunteer travel programmes is considered a key issue in this research. As a result, questions driven by the author's ethical interest in the involvement of host communities in volunteer tourism programme monitoring evaluation formed a significant part of the survey and interview guide.

Further, as outlined in Chapter 1, in taking a post-disciplinary approach, theoretical perspectives and analytical concepts from a number of different fields including: evaluation studies, liquid organisations (sociology) and principal-agent theory (economics, political science and sociology) are also used within this broader CMS framework and synthesised with the research findings in the data analysis/findings chapters (Chapters 4, 5 & 6) (see Chapter 1, Figure 1.1). Post-disciplinary approaches are "purposefully grounded in broader (post)disciplinary frameworks that attempt to explore and explain the phenomenon in a coherent and systematic manner, rather than creating tourism knowledge for creating tourism knowledge’s sake" (Stone, 2011, p.20). Due to the potential for new knowledge
and understandings that drawing from a plurality of disciplines can provide, support for taking a post-disciplinary approach to studying tourism is growing among tourism academics (e.g. Bramwell & Lane, 2005; Coles et al. 2005, 2006, 2009; Dredge, Whitford & Jenkins, 2011; Laing, Lee, Moore, Wegner & Weiler, 2009; Tribe, 2006; Stone, 2011), reflecting support for post-disciplinary approaches within the broader social sciences (e.g. Sayer, 1999 and Smith, 1998).

3.3 Methodological Approach
Qualitatively driven mixed methods incorporating three stages of data collection were employed within an exploratory, cross sectional framework. The following provides a discussion of debates surrounding the use of mixed methods and outlines the rationale for using mixed methods within this study.

3.3.1 Mixed Methods: An Overview
For much of the 20th century, quantitative research methods grounded in a positivist philosophy dominated social science research. Since the 1960s, however, qualitative research has become a legitimate and substantial field of inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, 2011). These two methodological approaches have, for the most part, been divided into two dichotomous camps with each stating their claims to superiority over the other (Howe, 1988, 1992; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). However, an increasing number of scholars argue that dichotomising qualitative and quantitative research approaches is not always appropriate or useful. Rather, it is argued that a mixed methods approach, using both quantitative and qualitative methods, can be the most appropriate means to answer a research question (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Creswell and Plano Clark (2011, p.5) describe the following core characteristics of mixed methods:

In mixed methods, the researcher

- collects and analyses persuasively and rigorously both qualitative and quantitative data (based on research questions);
- mixes (or integrates or links) the two forms of data concurrently by combining them (or merging them), sequentially by having one build on the other, or embedding one within the other;
• gives priority to one or both forms of data (in terms of what the research emphasises);

• uses these procedures in a single study or in multiple phases of a programme of study;

• frames these procedures within philosophical worldviews and theoretical lenses; and

• combines the procedures into specific research designs that direct the plan for conducting the study.

Mixed method approaches are now supported from within a variety of disciplines, including those related to this research such as tourism (Jennings, 2010), evaluation studies (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Mertens, 2010) and organisation studies (Bryman, 1988, 2009; Kelemen & Rumens, 2008). However, mixed methods research is not without its critics (Howe, 1988; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). The 'incompatibility thesis' argues that methods and paradigms are inextricably linked, asserting that the mixing of quantitative and qualitative methods is incompatible and contradictory (Howe, 1988; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Others counter-argue that methods and epistemology and ontology are not wholly dependent on one another and therefore such an argument is invalid (Bryman, 2009; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). As explained by Bryman (2009, p.518) "This view can be disputed on the grounds that methods are not necessarily associated with particular epistemologies; it is the use that is made of them that is crucial" (italics in original). This stance is also demonstrated by Patton (1990, p.90 cited in Teddlie & Tashakkorrie, 2003, p.18) who states:

In short, in real world practice, methods can be separated from the epistemology out of which they emerged. One can use statistics without doing a literature review of logical-positivism. One can make an interpretation without studying hermeneutics. And one can conduct open-ended interviews or make observations without reading treatises on phenomenology. (italics in original)

The author of this research supports the argument that methods and epistemology are not inextricably linked. It is agreed that whilst paradigms and their related epistemologies and ontologies will bear some influence on the methods used, methods need not be dichotomised, prescribed and pre-selected according to the underpinning paradigm utilised in research.
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3.3.2 Mixed Methods and CMS

Although much CMS research utilises qualitative methodologies and methods, Alvesson and Ashcraft (2009) maintain that mixed methods and the employment of some quantitative approaches, in conjunction with qualitative approaches, are not antithetical to critical research approaches. Similarly, Keleman and Rumens (2008, p.123) state that "critical theories and critical theorists are neither directly opposed to nor naturally adverse to quantitative forms of research". Instead of dichotomising research based on quantitative or qualitative methods, Kelemen and Rumens (2008, pp.23-24) argue that "Such a dichotomy is more reflective of the entrenched quantitative/ qualitative divide within the social sciences rather than the actual behaviours and mindsets of a large number of critical theorists". This is also the position taken in this research. Within this study, the mixing of qualitative and quantitative methods is achieved under the frameworks of CMS and the critical paradigm. In addition, a qualitatively driven approach to mixed methods is employed (Hesse-Biber, 2010).

3.3.3 Qualitatively Driven Mixed Methods

Creswell and Plano-Clark (2011) note that the importance and level of priority given to each of the qualitative and quantitative methods, or 'strands', varies between studies. Equal priority may be given to both the qualitative and quantitative components, or the study may place greater priority on either the qualitative or quantitative method/s. Quantitative and qualitative approaches can be viewed on a continuum, where "a study tends to be more qualitative than quantitative or vice versa" (Creswell, 2014, p.3). This study prioritises the qualitative component, that is, the in-depth interviews, above the quantitative component – the online survey. In prioritising the qualitative component, this research has sought to understand not only how volunteer tourism organisations monitor and evaluate their volunteer travel programmes but why things are done or not done in a certain way.

3.3.4 Rationale for Using Mixed Methods

Mixed method approaches can be utilised at different stages of the research process, including during data collection, analysis and interpretation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Hesse-Biber, 2010). In this study, mixed methods were utilised
across each of these stages in an explanatory sequential mixed methods design as outlined in Figure 3.2. That is, each method built upon the previous method across three distinct phases. Three key reasons underpinned the decision to do so.

1) Using mixed methods to facilitate purposive sampling (data collection stage).

The first reason for using mixed methods was a pragmatic one. The qualitative desk study identified the sample population. A quantitative survey was sent to every volunteer tourism organisation that met the sample criteria (n=192). At the end of the survey, all participants were invited to participate in an in-depth interview to further discuss the issues outlined in the survey. Thus, a sub-sample (n= 31) from the wider population was identified via the survey for participation in the main qualitative component, the interviews. The sample population will be further discussed in section 3.5.2.

2) Using mixed methods to develop research questions (data collection stage).

The desk study helped refine the survey questions in both the questions that were asked and the terminology that was used. The survey then asked participants a variety of closed and open ended questions in order to obtain descriptive data on the organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations and their current monitoring and evaluation practices. The closed questions provided a broad overview of trends relating to type of organisations offering volunteer travel programmes and their monitoring and evaluation practices. The open ended questions in particular, allowed space to open up lines of enquiry for further exploration in the in-depth interviews. The survey findings therefore informed and refined the interview guide used in the main qualitative component, the interviews. The interview guide included questions on topics which required "more in-depth exploration" than could be obtained from the survey alone (McMahon, 2007, p.363 in Hesse-Biber, 2010).

3) Utilising mixed methods to facilitate crystallisation of results (data analysis and interpretation stage).

Mixed methods were also utilised in data analysis and interpretation. Combining the analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative methods facilitated the crystallisation of findings (Ellingson, 2009).
A simplified overview of this approach is outlined in Figure 3.2:

![Figure 3.2 Mixed Methods Design Used in this Study]


### 3.3.5 An Exploratory, Cross-Sectional Framework

The mixed methods design was also situated within a wider exploratory, cross-sectional framework. Exploratory studies are deemed "particularly useful when not enough information is known about the phenomenon", as in the case of this research where very limited information was available on both the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations and the organisational contexts within which they take place (Gray, 2009, p.35). Being an exploratory study was deemed appropriate in that it would assist the research in being "open to discovering new issues" and "chance factors that have larger implications" (Neuman, 2003, p.30). In addition, cross-sectional studies aim to find out about a particular situation by obtaining information about it from a 'cross-section' of the relevant population within a relatively short time period (as opposed to longitudinal studies) (Patton, 2002). Therefore, a cross-sectional study design was considered most appropriate due to the fact that a variety of different types of organisations, including NGOs, not-for-profit and for-profit organisations offer volunteer tourism programmes and therefore required representation within the study (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Patton, 2002).

### 3.4 Data Collection

To increase the understanding of volunteer tourism organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices in relation to the aim and objectives of this research, three stages of data collection were employed (see Figure 3.2).
3.4.1 Stage 1: Desk Study of Secondary Data

A desk study of secondary data explored the websites, formal policy statements and annual reports of the selected volunteer tourism organisations. There were four key purposes to this stage: (1) To develop an understanding of the setting under study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999); (2) to identify the sample population; (3) to assist in deciding upon appropriate methods for primary data collection (Corti & Thompson, 2004; Jennings, 2010); (4) to stimulate paths of inquiry to be followed up during primary data collection (Patton, 2002). Data collected from the desk study was particularly useful for guiding and refining questions used in both Stage 2, the survey, and Stage 3, the interviews.

3.4.2 Stage 2: Online Survey

Following the "behind the scenes" insights of Stage 1 (Patton, 2002, p.294), it was decided that inviting the sample population to take part in an online survey was an appropriate way to: (1) Introduce the research to potential participants; and (2) obtain descriptive survey data from the sample population on the organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations and their current monitoring and evaluation practices. Using the online survey platform Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, 2012 version), a variety of closed and open ended questions were asked. Due to the wide geographical distribution of the target sample, online surveying provided a practical and cost effective way to gather descriptive data. It also facilitated an efficient response speed from participants in comparison to postal surveys (Deutskens, Ruyter, & Wetzels, 2006; Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009; Sue & Ritter, 2007). In addition, "data quality is the same or better" than that derived from postal surveys (Sue & Ritter, 2007, p.7). Being part of a mixed method design, participants who took part in the survey were then invited to participate in stage 3, the in-depth interviews. The data collected from the online survey was also used to further inform and refine the interview guide in stage 3.

Creating the Survey

Initially, notional survey questions were created in a word document after creating a matrix which linked potential survey questions to conceptual and theoretical underpinnings that were drawn from existing literature. Stage 1, the desk study, also helped to determine the relevant information and appropriate terminology to form questions and answers. For example, in the desk study it became apparent
that different organisations referred to volunteer tourism in various ways, and so in order to encompass all variations, which ranged from volunteer tourism, volunteer abroad and voluntourism, the term 'volunteer travel' was utilised to encompass all these variations. A template of the survey is provided in Appendix 1.

As shown in Appendix 1, five-point Likert scales were used. Five-point Likert scales were deemed the most appropriate in the context of this study because they balanced practicality with gain. For example, to use seven or ten-point scales would have been too long and tedious for participants for the purpose of gathering descriptive statistics and may have resulted in fewer completed surveys. While using two or three-point scales may not have given participants enough options to best portray their organisation's practices and could have been too limiting (Krosnick & Fabrigar, 1997).

Following the creation of a draft survey using Qualtrics 2012, cognitive interviews were carried out with four participants, each colleagues. Cognitive interviewing is a qualitative tool used for promoting the validity of questionnaires and surveys (Dillman et al., 2009; Drennan, 2003; Willis, 2005). Cognitive interviews pre-test the questions planned for use in the survey or questionnaire via participants 'thinking aloud' and saying what they think the question is asking them, describing their interpretation of the question (Dillman et al., 2009; Drennan, 2003; Willis, 2005). The purpose of doing this was to establish whether or not the question was perceived by participants in the way the researcher intended. It was also an opportunity to ascertain if the layout and ordering of the questions was comfortable and appropriate (Drennan, 2003; Willis, 2005).

After some minor revisions, a pilot survey was sent to three academics from the same university as the researcher who regularly use online surveys as a research method. They completed the survey via email link to simulate being a 'real' survey participant. These participants were not asked to 'think aloud' as in the cognitive interviews, instead they were asked to provide feedback on the flow, structure, integrity and useability of the survey (Dillman et al., 2009). It was also important to pilot the survey in the online environment to ensure that there were no technical glitches (Dillman et al., 2009). After addressing the feedback from the pilot
participants the survey was then ready to 'go live' and for members of the sample population to be invited to participate.

**Administering the survey**

Following the survey pilot, an invitation and survey link were sent via email to representatives of organisations who met the sample criteria (see section 3.5.2). As far as possible, emails were personalised to individual representatives. Personalisation of the invitation is considered an important aspect of both internet and postal survey research in that it helps to establish a connection between the researcher which can encourage social exchange (Dillman et al., 2009). In the majority of cases, names, job positions and personal email addresses where available on organisations' websites. However, in some cases very limited information was available and it was necessary to address respondents in this first invitation email using a generic 'Dear Sir/Madam' in order to ask who would be the correct person to contact. Individual and personalised (where possible) emails were sent to eliminate the risk of accidentally sharing the details of one participant with another. Information security and privacy can be a concern related to administering online surveys (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006). Taking this issue seriously, the author took the time to send each email separately. Although this was time consuming it was deemed the most appropriate and ethical approach to take. Ethical considerations are further discussed in section 3.7. Potential respondents appeared to respond favourably to the personalised communication. Initially, 192 organisations were identified as meeting the sample criteria and so an average of 30 individual emails per day were sent over the course of seven days so that it did not become unmanageable to answer replies in a timely manner. The survey was 'live' from October – December 2012 inclusive, with the majority of responses recorded during October 2012 and November 2012. Two reminder emails were sent at two week intervals after the survey had been sent to participants.

Overall, the use of the online survey was considered successful due to the high response rate, which is discussed in section 3.5.5. However, some minor issues did arise. Despite it being mentioned above that online surveys facilitate an efficient response speed from participants (Sue & Ritter, 2007), one of the 'cons' of survey research is the need for potential participants to have access to the
internet, otherwise 'offline' participants can be excluded (Hung & Law, 2011). At the outset of this research this was not considered a potential problem given that all of the organisations in the target sample had websites and contact email addresses. However, the nature of volunteer tourism, which often takes place in remote and rural locations and can mean that staff are away from reliable internet for prolonged periods of time, may have had an effect on the response rate. Although this did not appear to be a significant issue, three respondents did reply that they were interested in taking part in the research but were currently relying on solar powered computers and slow internet speeds that could not support the downloading of the survey or an interview via Skype.

3.4.3 Stage 3: In-depth, Semi-structured Interviews

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were undertaken with key informants from volunteer tourism organisations in order to collect primary data which built upon the findings of Stages 1 and 2. Interviews were carried out between November 2012 and April 2013. The research interview is a longstanding and popular methodological tool within organisational and social science research (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009; Cassell, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Stake (2010, p.95) asserts that for qualitative researchers a key purpose of interviewing includes "finding out about 'a thing' that the researchers were unable to observe themselves". It is exactly for this purpose that in-depth, semi-structured interviews were chosen to collect data about the practices of volunteer tourism organisations from key informants who work within the organisation. The interviews offered rich insights into the practices of multiple organisations whose operations and programmes are spread across the globe. A key practical strength of interviews is that they enable access to large amounts of data in a relatively short period of time and permit the researcher to clarify the interviewee's responses immediately (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Interviews also allow for the further probing of questions about a topic as information is brought to the surface (Stake, 2010). In addition, semi-structured interviews can reveal multiple realities and viewpoints (Jennings, 2010). Each of the aforementioned potential qualities of in-depth interviews supported the decision to utilise the method in this research.

The qualitative interview is often likened to a conversation (Kvale, 1996; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Rubin & Rubin, 1995). In their discussion of in-depth
interviewing, Marshall & Rossman (1999, p.108) quote Kahn and Cannell (1957) who describe interviewing as "a conversation with a purpose". In line with Kahn and Cannell's description, the researcher engaged in conversations with the staff of volunteer tourism organisations with the purpose of exploring how (and if) and why the volunteer tourism organisations engage with monitoring and evaluation practices, exploring the perceived realities of implementing such practices in a variety of organisational contexts. In line with discussions of semi-structured interviews, the researcher introduced the topic and purpose of the interview to the interviewee and then flexibly guided the interview by asking pre-planned questions (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) (Appendix 2). In keeping with the exploratory and predominantly qualitative nature of this research, semi-structured interviews, with their open-ended questions and flexibility, facilitated a space for the interviewee to raise and expose 'new issues' for exploration which were not anticipated by the researcher or reflected in the interview guide (Neuman, 2003).

With the informed consent of each participant, interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and then later transcribed and analysed as outlined in section 3.6.4. Draft scripts of transcribed interviews were returned efficiently to participants for 'member checking', which is not only considered essential for upholding rigor in research (Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson, & Spiers, 2002), but is also a key component of the ethical treatment of research participants (Stake, 2010). Ethical considerations are discussed in more detail in section 3.7.

3.4.4 Interviewing within a CMS Framework

Alvesson and Ashcraft (2012, p.245) observe that much organisation-focused research, particularly that of the dominant neo-positivism stance, view interviews "as transparent windows through which to observe organizational behaviour". Such a position is concerned with minimising bias and the influence of the researcher in order to retrieve factual accounts of reality (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2012). CMS scholars on the other hand accept that there are limitations to interviews in that "There are always sources of influence in an interview context that cannot be minimized or controlled" (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000, p.71). In organisational research for example, issues to do with impression management can occur. For instance, interviewees may not want to risk promoting a poor image of the organisation or being perceived as an ineffective manager, preferring
instead to relay 'favourable truths'. Such concerns can lead to a positive bias in many organisational interviews (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2012; Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). Consequently, CMS is wary of accepting participants' responses as 'facts' or 'mirrors' of reality. Rather, CMS calls for reflexivity and the use of 'critical listening', which requires the probing of participants' responses rather than taking them at face value (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009). Thus, interview material is viewed as a product of the communication between the interviewer and interviewee (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). Therefore, subsequent analysis of interviews took this into account. Impression management was certainly a potential risk within this research where interviewees were asked about the potentially sensitive topic of their organisation's programme monitoring and evaluation practices.

To assist with overcoming the limitations of the interview's ability to mimic that of a transparent window, the CMS literature advocates taking steps such as reassuring anonymity to interviewees and highlighting researcher independence to encourage participants to feel safe and comfortable with talking freely and 'truthfully' (Alvesson & Deetz, 2000). Both of these actions were taken in this research at several stages including in the introductory email, invitation email, information statement, survey introduction page, at the start of and during the interview.

3.4.5 Positionality and the CMS Researcher

A further issue that was of central consideration to the researcher throughout the interview process was the moral position of the researcher. Alvesson and Ashcraft (2009) state that a tension exists in critical research with regards to striking the right balance between being a critical researcher with an emancipatory interest and 'wielding a moral hammer' when participants relay their views or advocate practices that the researcher perceives as potentially damaging or harmful to members of society (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009, p.73). As advised by Alvesson and Ashcraft (2009) the researcher did refrain from 'wielding a moral hammer' and focused on framing the critical probing and challenging of responses in ways that asked the participant to imagine alternative options, as opposed to personally criticising or 'pointing the finger' at participants and their respective organisations.
3.4.6 Skype as a Medium to Facilitate Interviews

Developments in computer technology and greater access to the internet have led to an increase in using such technologies to facilitate interviews within organisational research (Cassell, 2009). Due to the widespread geographical distribution of volunteer tourism organisations interviews were conducted primarily via Skype, a free voice over Internet Protocol (IP) software application which enables live voice and video calling between users. In addition, two interviews were conducted via telephone and two interviews were conducted face-to-face. The main advantages of utilising Skype were the low cost and that it overcame the practical barriers that face-to-face interviews with people based all over the world would present (Hanna, 2012). As discussed in section 3.5, organisations were based in Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada and UK. During the research, the researcher was based in Australia and the option of a face-to-face interview was offered in addition to the options of Skype or telephone interviews to participants based in the same or neighbouring state. The researcher also spent a month in the UK during the data collection time frame and so also offered the option of a face-to-face interview to UK based participants. All other potential participants were given the choice of either Skype or telephone. The option of telephone was offered to avoid alienating those people who may not be familiar with or comfortable using Skype. However, the majority of participants stated that they would prefer to take part in the interview via Skype.

One criticism levelled at research that relies on utilising the internet and telephone to conduct interviews is that not everybody has access to internet and telephone. However, Buhalis and Law (2008) observe that the use of information technology is now prevalent in the tourism industry, with many companies using the internet as a platform to promote and sell their products and services. This was also found to be the case with volunteer tourism organisations. During Stage 1 of the research – the desk study – it became apparent that the vast majority of volunteer tourism organisations used Skype and the telephone to communicate with prospective volunteers, with most listing phone numbers and Skype contact details on the website. In the context of this research the researcher was therefore confident in relying predominantly on Skype and telephone as a medium for conducting interviews and did not think that it affected participation or the results.
In addition to the benefits of low cost and overcoming the practical barriers of distance, the video calling mode of Skype facilitated a form of face-to-face interviewing which allowed for the exchange of visual and non-verbal communication (Hanna, 2012). Skype also allowed both the researcher and the interviewee's flexibility in when and where to participate in the interview (Hanna, 2012; Holt, 2010).

As is the risk with all technology, some unpredictable technological 'glitches' occurred. The video would occasionally 'freeze' or slow down so that it was out of sync with the voice. However, these issues only occurred in a small number of cases and did not cause any significant disruption. Interviewees appeared to be familiar with the nature of Skype and were unfazed by such matters, however it must be acknowledged as a limitation of using Skype in the interview situation.

### 3.4.7 Telephone and Face-to-Face Interviews

Face-to-face interviewing is traditionally positioned as the best way to carry out qualitative interviews, whilst telephone interviewing is often unquestioningly assumed an inferior approach because of the loss of visual cues which make it difficult to create a rapport with interviewees (Holt, 2010; Novick, 2008; Trier-Bieniek, 2012). However, there is growing support in the methods literature from those that have used telephone interviewing, considering it to be a valid method for conducting semi-structured interviews (Holt, 2010; Novick, 2008; Stephens, 2007; Trier-Bieniek, 2012). Talking on the telephone is a familiar mode of social interaction for many people which allows them to stay in familiar settings, whilst retaining some anonymity (Trier-Bieniek, 2012). Trier-Bieniek (2012) argues that for these reasons, telephone interviews can potentially facilitate more honest conversations than face-to-face interviews, whilst Novick (2008) argues that there is currently little evidence to support the many claims that face-to-face interviews yield superior data to telephone interviews. In comparing the three interview mediums, there were no noticeable differences in the quality of transcripts and the researcher did not perceive any noticeable differences in the quality of conversations during the actual interviews themselves.
3.5 Sampling

3.5.1 Purposive Sampling

The literature identified that not only do a variety of different types of organisations provide volunteer tourism projects, such as commercial tour operators and NGOs (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008), but that there are also increasingly blurred boundaries between the commercial sector and the non-profit sector as organisations partner together in order to provide volunteer tourism experiences (Keese, 2011; Lyons & Wearing, 2008a, 2008b). Therefore, it was important that the full variety of organisations was represented in this research. Purposive sampling, viewed as a form of 'strategic' sampling which attempts to link the correct respondents with the research questions (Bryman, 2008), was employed in order to identify organisations that represent this variety. Specifically, the sample included NGOs, not-for-profit organisations, for-profit-organisations and commercial tour operators. From within this sample, 'key informants' from each organisation were identified and invited to participate in both the survey and the in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Key informants are those considered to be "influential, prominent or well informed people in an organisation" who can usually provide the interviewer with an informative picture of the organisation's activities and also its relationships with other organisations (Marshall & Rossman, 1999 p.113).

3.5.2 Selecting Organisations

This research focused on organisations which met the following criteria for inclusion:

Table 3.1 Inclusion Criteria for Selecting Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The primary focus of the organisation is on offering short-term volunteer tourism projects (less than three months).</td>
<td>• Over three months is generally considered 'international volunteering', which is often a more permanent and professionalised form of volunteering (ATLAS/TRAM, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The organisation is not a government or quasi-government organisation.</td>
<td>• These organisations and the more formalised and professionalised form of long-term international volunteering that they offer are not the focus of this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisations were first identified using an existing list of organisations provided in the report by ATLAS/TRAM (2008). To supplement this data and to account for the growth in volunteer tourism organisations since 2008, an internet search was conducted between April and June 2012 to identify further organisations which met the above criteria. The contact details of organisations meeting the sample criteria were recorded using a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Internet searches were carried out on Google.com.au, Google.co.nz, Google.com, Google.ca, Google.co.uk using the search terms 'volunteer abroad', 'volunteer programmes', 'volunteer projects', 'gap year volunteer programmes/projects', 'volunteer travel', 'volunteer tourism', 'voluntourism'. Organisations were also identified via searching the following databases: volunteerglobal.com, transitionsabroad.com, gonomad.com, goabroad.com, volunteerinternational.org.

A total of 192 organisations were identified as meeting the above inclusion criteria.

Koerber and McMichael (2008) assert the need to be aware that, with purposive sampling, sampling techniques are not misused. Purposive sampling makes it easy for researchers to manipulate participant selection. For example, it is possible that a researcher could select only organisations that are only known to the researcher to have exceptionally good or exceptionally poor practices (Koerber & McMichael, 2008). It is important therefore to state upfront that the researcher did not have any prior affiliations with or knowledge of the monitoring and evaluation practices of any volunteer tourism organisations in the sample population. Thus,
all of the organisations that met the sample criteria were invited to take part in the research.

3.5.3 Selecting and Gaining Access to Key Informants

A purposive sample is also defined as having "the characteristics…necessary to answer questions about a certain matter or product" (MacNealy 1997, cited in Koerber & McMichael 2008), and thus key informants who could shed the most light on their organisations monitoring and evaluation practices and processes needed to be identified from within the selected organisations. At the outset of the research, from the author's 'outsider' perspective it was unclear as to who within an organisation was the most appropriate to answer the survey and take part in an interview. In other words, it was difficult to determine who were the 'key informants'/ 'elites'. The process of making contact with key informants required patience and some interaction between staff members in order to determine who was to be invited to take part. This practice is not uncommon in organisational research (Feldman, Bell, & Berger, 2003).

Gaining access to elites such as managers can be difficult, particularly as these people are likely to be very busy (Feldman et al., 2003). Further, as noted by Bryman (1992, p.2) organisational research "often entails substantial negotiation to obtain access to firms and their members". Organisations can be suspicious of the researcher's agenda and more senior level staff can be concerned that participating in the research will take up a lot of their or their employee's time. In order to minimise issues of gaining access, once the author had obtained appropriate contact details, an initial 'pre-notice' email with an attached information statement was sent. The information statement outlined the aims and purpose of the research, what participation would involve, and explained why it was valuable to the research that their views were included. It also identified that the research was part of an independent study and that they had the right to withdraw at anytime without repercussion. Importantly, potential participants were assured that neither they nor their organisation would be identified or identifiable. A pre-notice was considered important to introduce the research to potential participants and Dilman et al. (2009) note that a pre-notice improves survey response rates. Once participants had responded to the pre-notice, and
indicated their interest in taking part in the research, they were sent an email with the link to the survey.

A limitation of making contact with potential participants via email is the risk that the invitation to participate could be identified as 'Spam', or junk email (Dilman et al., 2009; Evans & Mathur, 2005). It is difficult to determine the extent to which this was an issue in this research. It certainly did happen in a number of cases despite emails being sent individually and not as 'group emails'. The researcher was notified of this when some respondents emailed some time after the initial email was sent and apologised for the delay but they had found the email in their Spam folder. The researcher also attempted to telephone organisations when there was no response to check if they had received the invitation email, and in four cases the email was found in the Spam folder.

At the end of the online survey, participants were invited to take part in an interview and were asked to leave their contact details if interested. Once people had left their contact details and stated their interest in taking part in an interview they were contacted via email to confirm their interest and determine which medium, i.e. Skype, telephone or face-to-face would be preferable for them. With the purpose of encouraging participants to participate in an interview, interviews were arranged and conducted at a suitable time and date for the participants (Miller-Adams & Myers, 2003).

3.5.4 Survey Response

Out of the 192 organisations selected and contacted, as outlined in section 3.5.2, representatives from 16 organisations responded to say that they were too busy to participate and there was no response from 64 organisations. Representatives from 112 organisations replied indicating their interest in the research and the survey was sent to those individuals. In total, 80 participants representing 80 different organisations completed the survey, capturing 42% of the total sample population and 63% of the total responsive population.

3.5.5 Interview Response

Both the survey and interview sample size were dictated primarily by the number of volunteer tourism organisations that agreed to participate in this research (Koerber & McMichael, 2008; Miller-Adams & Myers, 2003; Saunders, 2012).
Existing research cites that qualitative interviews with between 5 and 25 participants from a purposive sample is appropriate (Kvale & Brinkmann 2009 in Saunders, 2012). However, in situations where there is a heterogeneous population, such as in this research where a variety of different types of organisations were involved, qualitative interviews with between 12 and 30 participants is deemed appropriate in order to look for any variations between different types of organisations and volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation practices (Kuzel, 1992 & Creswell, 2007 in Saunders, 2012). Others purport that reaching theoretical saturation, or the point at which no new insights emerge from the data, should dictate the sample size (Morse, 1995). Fortunately, the large number of participants in this research facilitated reaching theoretical saturation.

At the end of the survey, 34 participants expressed their interest in taking part in an interview. Of these 34 people, 29 people took part in interviews. During two of the interviews, the participants suggested that the researcher also talk to their colleagues who were also involved in their organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices and so a further two interviews were carried out with people who had not answered the survey.

3.6 Data Analysis

3.6.1 Crystallising the Findings: Transcending the Boundaries between Quantitative and Qualitative Data

As discussed in section 3.3.3, a qualitative approach to mixed methods was taken and a greater priority was placed on the qualitative component of primary data collection and analysis, the interviews. Nevertheless, each stage built upon the previous stage and all three stages of data collection contributed to the overall process of crystallisation during the analysis phase (Ellingson, 2009). Crystallisation is a "creative analytic approach" which allows researchers to combine different types of data and analysis in order to extract meaning and create a rich interpretation of the phenomenon being studied\textsuperscript{12} (Ellingson, 2009,

\textsuperscript{12} Crystallisation is not to be confused with triangulation. While both often draw from more than one source or form of data, Ellingson (2009) notes that they differ in their goals. Triangulation has a positivist connotation and uses different forms and sources of data in a quest to uncover the
p.10). According to Ellingson (2009, p.11) "Crystallization depends upon including, interweaving, blending or otherwise drawing upon more than one way of expressing data and/or the world" (italics in original).

To analyse the primary data, first, a preliminary analysis of the survey took place. This phase of analysis assisted in identifying areas of interest for follow up in the interviews. This process is outlined in section 3.6.2. Once the interviews had commenced, analysis took on an iterative nature which involved a constant shifting back and forth between the literature, the survey results and the interview findings in order to interpret and draw meaning from both the quantitative survey data and the qualitative interview data (Ellingson, 2009). The interviews were analysed using thematic analysis, as discussed in section 3.6.4. When writing the findings chapters of this thesis, the data from both the survey and the interviews were combined to contribute to creating the overall story, transcending the dichotomous boundaries of qualitative and quantitative data and contributing to the overall process of crystallisation (Ellingson, 2009; Richardson & St Pierre, 2005). The next sections describe the individual processes of analysis which occurred before a combined analysis of the data took place when writing up the findings chapters.

3.6.2 Survey Data Analysis

Before commencing survey data analysis it is important to check for errors within the data set to mitigate the risk of the data being distorted. This is also known as 'screening and cleaning' the data (Pallant, 2013). After closing the survey to respondents the survey data was exported electronically into the programme IBM SPSS Statistics Version 22. Although the Qualtrics software does provide an output of survey results and the option to create graphs from the data it does not allow the data to be 'cleaned' in a flexible manner. The data was 'screened and cleaned' in SPSS by first checking for errors and correcting them (Pallant, 2013). A codebook was created and a diary of 'cleaning actions' was kept to maintain an audit trail.

Once the data had been screened and cleaned, it was then necessary to deal with any missing data. In order to determine the extent of missing data a missing

truth'. Crystallisation rejects positivism and seeks to interpret multiple truths (Ellingson, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 2005).
values analysis was carried out and Little's MCAR test was run in SPSS. The results outlined that the data is missing completely at random (MCAR) because the data was not significantly (sig.=.444) dependent on or associated with another variable (Table 3.2). It is not significantly related because .444 is greater than .05.

As a 'rule of thumb' missing data can generally be ignored when it is missing completely at random and is less than 10 percent (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). If the missing data were not non-random (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) then it would have been an indication that perhaps the questions asked were particularly sensitive, didn't make sense, or required answers that were too difficult or lengthy, or perhaps the survey was too long. The missing data would also have to be dealt with via means considered appropriate to the data and the result of the missing values analysis. Because the data was missing completely at random and at less than 10%, in addition to the data being used primarily for descriptive purposes it was not necessary to take any further action by 'imputing' missing data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 3.2 Little's MCAR Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>911.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the above data preparation procedures, a preliminary analysis took place. This involved producing descriptive statistics, such as frequency, mean and distribution for the purpose of summarising and providing a broad understanding of the organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations and their programme monitoring and evaluation practices. As previously discussed, the findings were used to inform stage 3 of data collection – the interviews. As part of the crystallisation process, the survey findings then underwent a combined analysis along with the interview findings (Ellingson, 2009).
3.6.3 Interview Data Analysis

There is no specific 'recipe' to follow when it comes to qualitative data analysis, rather it is down to the judgement of the researcher to apply suggested guidelines to their research as is deemed appropriate and in consultation with research supervisors (Patton, 2002, p.432). The purpose of the research guides how data is analysed (Green et al., 2007; Patton, 2002; Richter, 2007). The purpose of this research has been to use the data gathered from key informants within volunteer tourism organisations to gain a deeper understanding of their organisation's volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation practices. This is an exploratory study that has sought new insights into the phenomenon. Thus, in order to create 'meaning' from the interview data, it was deemed appropriate that a thematic analysis be undertaken prior to undertaking a combined analysis of the survey and interview data (Bazeley, 2009; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Green et al., 2007).

3.6.4 Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a process of data analysis that is widely used within qualitative research, across a range of disciplines (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006; Green et al., 2007). Thematic analysis involves identifying and analysing patterns within a data set in order to develop 'themes' that capture something important about the data. Those themes are then used to support and tell the 'story' of the data (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006). Despite the wide use of thematic analysis, there is a lack of guidance on its application (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Recognising this gap, Braun and Clarke (2006, p.87) created a flexible outline guide which demonstrates the six main, iterative phases involved:

1. **Familiarizing yourself with your data**: Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas;

2. **Generating initial codes**: Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code;

3. **Searching for themes**: Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all relevant data to each potential theme;
4. **Reviewing themes**: Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic 'map' of the analysis;

5. **Defining and naming themes**: Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme;

6. **Producing the report**: the final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.

This research followed a similar process to that outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). However, as stated by Ryan and Bernard (2003) it is important to make explicit the techniques used for discovering themes in qualitative data, so that readers can evaluate the findings accordingly. Therefore, the steps used specifically in this research will now be discussed in order to provide a nuanced account of how thematic analysis was used in the context of this research. It must be noted that whilst the process is presented below in a linear fashion, in reality the process of thematically analysing the interview data was an iterative, "sense-making' endeavour" (DeCuir-Gunby, Marshall, & McCulloch, 2011, p.137; Srivastava & Hopwood, 2009) which contributed to the overall process of crystallisation.

1. **Organising and becoming familiar with the data**
First, interview recordings were transcribed verbatim by the researcher, using the audio player software Express Scribe. Interviews were transcribed verbatim because an in-depth understanding of the data was sought. It would not have been appropriate nor adequate therefore to shorten or summarise the interview text prior to analysis (McLellan, MacQueen, & Neidig, 2003). Transcriptions were then sent back to the interviewee for checking to confirm that they agreed with and felt comfortable with the transcript to be analysed (Morse et al., 2002). The researcher chose to transcribe the interviews herself in order to assist with the process of becoming familiar with the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). During and after each transcription, initial reflections were noted down in an 'interview
reflections research diary'. These brief notes made initial links to existing literature, theoretical concepts, and as the interviews progressed, any similarities or differences between the interview accounts. Once the transcripts had been returned by interviewees, they were entered into the computer software package QSR NVivo10 (NVivo). Coding was done manually within the programme. NVivo was predominantly used to electronically store and manage the transcripts. The majority of transcripts were extremely long (in some cases 20 pages), and so NVivo facilitated with the organisation and swift retrieval of the data. It was also a flexible tool for developing and revising codes and recording notes and memos through the data analysis process (Bazeley, 2007). Once in NVivo, each transcript was then closely re-read and initial notes and ideas were recorded using the 'memo' function within NVivo to further familiarise and immerse the researcher in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

2. Generating initial codes

After engaging in a period of familiarisation, the process of generating initial codes began. Creating codes, or 'coding' is a central aspect of analysing interview data (DeCuir-Gunby et al., 2011). Codes are short phrases or single words that capture the essence of, or summarise portions of the data that share the same or similar features (Bazeley, 2013; Saldaña, 2013). Bazeley (2013) observes that how coding is applied will vary according to what the emphasis, focus and approach of a particular inquiry is. First, in order to manage the large volume of data, broad, structural codes related to the objectives of the research and the interview guide questions were created to organise the data. These codes were of a descriptive nature. For example, all the data relating to partnerships was assigned under the code 'partnerships' and likewise for monitoring and evaluation. In addition, the text was also coded for initial codes of interest that related to the theoretical perspectives underpinning this research, including CMS. For example an overarching code labelled 'host community involvement' was created to collate all the data pertaining to host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation. Creating structural, apriori codes that are related to the research questions and interview guide is typical in the early stages of coding (Bazeley, 2009, 2013; Ryan & Bernard, 2003).
Whilst reading transcripts for the purpose of applying structural codes to help organise and manage the data, initial inductive data-driven codes were also created to reflect issues of interest that emerged from the data (Bazeley, 2009, 2013). Although these codes were data driven, it should be acknowledged that the theoretical lens guiding this research, CMS, influenced what parts of the text were deemed important to code and how the data was interpreted (Bazeley, 2013; Saldaña, 2013). After establishing descriptive codes, the codes were then refined and coding became more focused and analytical. This involved merging some similar codes together and removing others (Bazeley, 2013; Ryan & Bernard, 2003; Saldaña, 2013).

3. Searching for themes

Codes were then analysed for relationships between and connexions with one another and grouped together in various analytical categories to create themes (Bazeley, 2013; Braun & Clarke, 2006). In addition to searching for patterns, contrasting accounts and outliers were also identified as the researcher remained attentive to the 'small stories' that emerged in the way that participants experienced monitoring and evaluation practices within their organisations (Deschambault, 2011). These small stories provided highly contextualised insights into the way different participants and organisations deal with programme monitoring and evaluation.

4. Reviewing themes

Initial themes were reviewed against the transcript extracts and the dataset as a whole (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Noting the prevalence of the themes, how they were talked about and by whom were of particular interest during this stage. This prompted further questioning and analysis of the data to build not only an overall interpretation of the data but also to contextualise the small stories of interest with the data (Bazeley, 2013; Deschambault, 2011).

5. Defining and naming themes

The names and definitions of the themes were then further refined and their role in telling the story of the data considered (Braun & Clarke, 2006).
6. Producing the report

Finally, the themes were considered in the context of their role in the final presentation of the findings. Examples of significant themes, including example quotes and 'small stories' were selected and included in the final write-up (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Deschambault, 2011).

3.7 Adherence to Ethical Standards

Research has, at times, had a tainted history and caused harm to participants both intentionally and unintentionally (Smith, 1999; Stake, 2010). It is essential, therefore, that the researcher maintains ethical awareness at all times and upholds a respectful and responsible concern for the well-being of their participants by adhering to formal ethical guidelines and also through drawing on their own "empathy, intuition, intelligence, and experience" to mitigate any negative impacts on participants (Stake, 2010, p.206). The researcher's respect of research participants must be central to the research process (Australian Government National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research, 2007). Fieldwork was not undertaken until the proposed research had received ethical clearance from the Southern Cross University Lismore Human Research Ethics Committee, and only then was the research carried out as outlined in the conditions of approval. The ethics approval number is ECN-12-207, received 9 August 2012.

3.7.1 The Importance of Confidentiality and Ethical Awareness

Confidentiality is a central ethical concern in all areas of research and is also a particularly poignant issue in the context of organisational research (Cassell, 2009). In organisational research it is important that both the participant and the organisation they represent are de-identified (Cassell, 2009). All names of participants and organisations were removed during transcription prior to analysis. In addition, there were some cases where interview participants talked about the practices of other organisations, and the names of those organisations were also removed from transcripts in order to prevent any potential negative repercussions for the organisation. Such information could also be hearsay so caution was applied to these insights. Confidentiality was also an area of concern in using email to contact and communicate with potential survey respondents and interview participants. As outlined in section 3.5.3, rather than sending an initial
bulk email to first invite and contact participants, emails were sent individually to minimise the risk of personal details being shared between potential participants (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006). Further, during the actual process of carrying out the interviews the researcher remained ethically aware by continually drawing on their own "empathy, intuition, intelligence, and experience" to ensure that participants felt comfortable with sharing information. Below is an extract from a transcript, where the researcher reminds the participant of the confidential nature of the research and their right to remove sensitive information from the transcript following the interview.

*Ok, have you got any examples of a serious issue?*

Yeah (pause) this is where, obviously this starts getting a bit more confidential. You're not going to be mentioning (name of organisation)'s name anywhere?

*No, not at all, and I will give you the transcript before I do anything with it, and then once you're happy with the transcript you can even remove things if you decide you prefer not to talk about it, so I won't do anything with the transcripts until you're happy with them.*

That's nice thank you. Yeah it's just a bit sensitive as much for our partner as for us, all of our volunteers know what happened and we've addressed it and things, but I know that the partner that I'll talk about is going to try and continue their volunteer programme so I don't want necessarily to jeopardise that.

*That's ok, if you prefer not to talk about it, that's absolutely fine. I don't want you to feel uncomfortable.*

No, it's good to talk about, I mean it's a good example in a way. What I'll do is I won't say the country and that will de-identify it anyway.

[Interview 2]

In addition to addressing the aforementioned ethical issues that were specific to this research, the following steps were also taken:

- Participants were informed in full of the purpose and nature of this research via a project information sheet (Appendix 4). Informed consent received via email was obtained before participants could take part in an interview. If someone did not wish to take part their decision was
respected and they did not face any repercussions as a result of their decision.

- Participants were made aware of their right to withdraw from the research at any point, without repercussion.

- All data was de-identified and neither the participant nor the organisation to which they belong were identified nor identifiable (revealing the identities of specific organisations served no purpose in this research, instead a 'top-line' profile of organisations is provided in Appendix 5) and de-identified records were kept in a locked filing cabinet and on the researcher's personal computer.

- Participants were given draft transcripts of their interviews for checking and the right to make changes and withdraw from the study. Participants were also provided with a copy of the research report contained in Appendix 3.

- Private and personal information (other than for descriptive purposes e.g. role within organisation) that was not closely related to the research questions was not sought from the participants.

- Confidentiality was upheld and the researcher did not share details obtained from one participant with another participant.

3.8 Conclusion

This chapter has justified and explained the critical perspective that influences this research. Thus far existing literature advocating a critical approach to studying volunteer tourism has been conceptual (e.g. McGehee, 2012). In using CMS as a framework, this research offers a unique perspective on volunteer tourism and the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. This study also contributes to the small but growing literature on qualitatively driven mixed methods studies (Hesse-Biber, 2010). An exploratory, qualitatively-driven mixed methods approach was adopted and justified as being the most robust approach to researching the monitoring and evaluation practices of a geographically widespread population of volunteer tourism organisations, balancing pragmatism and theoretical grounding. Further, the inclusion of a cross-section of types of
volunteer tourism organisations will contribute to more nuanced understandings of the practices of a range of volunteer tourism organisations, including both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations.
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4 THE ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXTS OF VOLUNTEER TOURISM

4.1 Introduction
The aim of this chapter is to critically examine the organisational contexts within which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects takes place (Objective 2). In keeping with the commitment to use theory as a lens to explore the research findings, the metaphor 'liquid organisation' (Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014), a derivative of Zygmunt Bauman's (2000) metaphors of solid and liquid modernity, is introduced and used to interpret the organisational contexts of many of the organisations within the data set. The particular characteristics, including the structures, identities and interests, of the volunteer tourism organisations, followed by their inter-organisational contexts, namely partnerships, are discussed.

4.2 Liquid Modernity and Liquid Organisations
Chapter 2 highlighted that volunteer tourism takes place within a variety of organisational contexts including different organisational types, profit statuses, operational arrangements and motivations for engaging with volunteer tourism. The findings of this research revealed a further dimension of organisational context not yet explored within the volunteer tourism literature, in that many of the organisations display characteristics symbolic of the 'liquid organisations' metaphor (Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014). Such characteristics included hybrid organisational types, ambiguous identities, flexible and dynamic structures, fluid missions and objectives, uncertain futures and loose partnership bonds and commitments within ever growing and changing networks of organisations, projects and individuals. Thus, the concept of liquid organisations (Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014) is used to interpret and explain the organisational contexts within which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism takes place. While the below quote reflects on the consequences of the liquid organisation for its employees, it also encapsulates
the liquefied environment in which many volunteer tourism programmes take place.

Where organizational life is increasingly subject to liquid differentiation, people move rapidly from project to project, assuming and making new identities as they shift. The opportunities for coherence are both more difficult, as projects present discontinuity of places, people and problems, and more challenging for those who seek to escape upwards from the demands of peripatetic project life (Clegg & Baumeler, 2010, p.1723).

Bauman's liquid modernity thesis forms the foundation for theorising about liquid organisations. Bauman (2000) contends that the 'modern' era of society was a 'heavy' and 'solid' state in which the focus of society was the modernist project of production and the end point of becoming modern. Using the metaphors of 'solid' and 'liquid' to compare and contrast modern times with the current era, modern society, described by Bauman (2000) as 'solid modernity', consisted of stable structures in which institutions such as governments and religion exerted power through control and limiting possibilities. Identities were determined by social stratification. Bauman (2000) argues that this era of solidification has shifted into a liquefied state, 'liquid modernity'. Like liquids, liquid modernity is fluid, flexible and does not hold its shape for long. In liquid modernity the focus has shifted from production to consumption. Individuals are free to create their own identities through consumption; identity making is ever changing and an ongoing process. Liquid times are uncertain, unregulated and privatised. Amongst other things, identities and relationships change at incessant speed (Bauman, 2000). Unlike solid modernity which strove for certainty, liquid modern life is 'rhizomatic', it is 'a constant state of becoming, a middle without a beginning and an end' (Blackshaw, 2005, p.93). Both solid and liquid modernity share an inherent focus and interest in profit maximisation, effectiveness and efficiency. However, they take contrasting 'solid' and 'liquefied' approaches for achieving these goals (Bauman, 2000).

As society changed from a solid to liquid state, organisations and institutions also changed and liquefied, reflecting these changes (Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014). Despite the volumes of attention that have been
paid to Bauman's liquid modernity thesis, much of this has focused on the individual and has neglected to explicitly examine the consequences of liquid modernity for organisations. Liquid modernity from an organisational perspective has received scant direct attention (recent examples include Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014). In comparing the liquid organisation with the classical organisations of solid modernity, Clegg and Baumeler (2010, p.1717) state, "If the classical organization gave us the character of a bureaucrat secure in routines, imbued in the spirit of living an ethos of vocation, the liquidly modern organization is embedded not in such a stable character but in one rapidly mutating". In addition, Bauman's (2005) notion of liquid relations, i.e. relations that are loose and fleeting, also traverses into liquid organisations and thus according to Clegg and Baumeler (2010, p.1718) "liquid organizations in Bauman's sense will be those in which investments in people are very largely liquid, are easily liquidated and carry no long-term investment implications". Derived from the literature, a comparison of classical or 'solid' and liquid organisations is outlined in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Comparison of Solid and Liquid Organisations. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solid Organisations</th>
<th>Liquid Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Hierarchical bureaucracy</td>
<td>• Post-bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heavily regulated</td>
<td>• Unregulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fixed identity</td>
<td>• Shifting identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close partnerships &amp; stable relationships</td>
<td>• Loose partnerships &amp; unstable relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term goals &amp; commitments</td>
<td>• Short-term goals &amp; commitments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Bauman (e.g. 2000) often poses solid and liquid modernity as contrasting opposites, he also states that the boundaries between solid and liquid modernity are to some degree porous, and solid and liquid modernity are not completely separate from one another. Rather, there is "a degree of overlap between the two, a seeping of the 'solid' into the 'liquid' other" (Blackshaw, 2005, p.48). Thus, solid and liquid characteristics are more likely to exist on a
continuum. Likewise, Clegg and Baumeler (2010) argue that the same is true of organisations, and there are still examples of the classical 'solid' organisation found in liquid modernity.

Although Bauman's liquid modernity thesis is considerably better known than the more recent derivative notion of liquid organisations, Franklin (2003, p.206) observes the missed opportunity from within the tourism literature to make use of Bauman's liquid modernity thesis, stating "It is surely ironic that Bauman's liquid modernity, which gives rise to the sorts of mobilities, flexibilities and freedoms that fuel the dramatic growth of tourism, if not the touristification of everyday life, has not been drawn on or made much use of by recent writers in tourist studies". Recent exceptions include Vogel and Oschmann's (2013) work on cruise tourism. However, to date and as far as the author is aware, there has been no focus on liquid organisations from a tourism or volunteering perspective. Thus, by using liquid organisations to frame the following discussion, this research makes a unique and original contribution to the volunteer tourism and wider tourism and volunteering literature.

In the next sections of this chapter, the findings of this research are discussed in terms of the organisational contexts in which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects takes place. This discussion is organised to reflect six key areas of organisational context that highlight the liquid organisational characteristics present in the data: 1) 'Type' of volunteer tourism organisation; 2) Diverse interests and activities; 3) Shifting missions and markets; 4) Ambiguous identities; 5) Contrasting values between for-profit organisations, and 6) Organisational Partnerships. Key themes that emerged from a systematic review of the quantitative survey results and the qualitative interviews which helped to expand and explain the quantitative observations are identified and discussed.

4.3 'Types' of Volunteer Tourism Organisations

It was discussed in Chapter 2 that a variety of organisations now offer an assortment of projects under the banner of volunteer tourism. Different 'types' of organisations, with varying interests and missions, took part in this research. Participants were asked how their organisations were best identified according to type of organisation. Table 4.2 provides a breakdown of the types of organisations that took part in the survey and interviews. It shows that a relatively even
representation of different types of organisation took part in both the survey and the interviews. The findings are not heavily skewed towards a particular type of organisation. In both sets of data, 'NGOs' and 'Travel Organisations', followed closely by registered charities had the highest representation, whilst 'Philanthropic organisations' and 'Other' were the least represented.

Table 4.2 Breakdown of Organisations Represented in Survey and Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Survey (# of organisations)</th>
<th>% n=80</th>
<th>Interviews (# of organisations)</th>
<th>% n=29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8 (9 participants)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel organisation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7 (8 participants)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered charity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprise</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These preliminary categorisations indicate that volunteer tourism programmes, and therefore the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes, take place in contrasting organisational sectors ranging from registered charities to commercial travel organisations. However, as the rest of this chapter will demonstrate, such categorisations only provide a limited representation of what constitutes a volunteer tourism organisation. They do not account for the multi-dimensional nature of many of the volunteer tourism organisations which operate within the dynamic and fluid spaces of the volunteer tourism industry. Rather, the findings of this study support the interpretation that some volunteer tourism organisations embody characteristics of liquid organisations, making it difficult to accurately classify volunteer tourism organisations according to 'type'.

### 4.4 Diverse Interests and Activities

During the desk study of websites it became apparent that although all of the organisations which met the sample criteria offered volunteer travel programmes, volunteer travel was not the main focus of some of the organisations. Other activities such as community development or religious activities were their primary focus with volunteer travel contributing in some way to their overall organisational interests. It was therefore of interest to determine the main focus of
the organisations represented in the survey and interview data in order to learn if and how the main focus of an organisation influences the ways and extent to which an organisation monitors and evaluates its volunteer travel programmes. The main focus of organisations is outlined in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 Main Focus of Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main focus</th>
<th>Survey (# of organisations)</th>
<th>% n=80</th>
<th>Interviews (# of organisations)</th>
<th>% n=29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/niche travel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap year activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host communities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Educational travel</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Disease prevention</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Youth development</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td>(3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of survey respondents (65%) indicated that 'Volunteer travel' was the main focus of their organisation. 'Volunteer travel' was followed equally by 'Alternative/niche travel' (7.5%), 'Service learning' (7.5%) and 'Host communities' (7.5%). Although Sustainable development was not listed as an option in the survey, it was a common answer described in 'Other (please describe)' and so is represented in the findings (6.2%). Despite organisations that appeared to have religious activities as their main focus being invited to take part, they did not participate in the research. A similar representation was found in the interview sample, with volunteer travel being the main focus for the majority (66%) of organisations.

The interviews facilitated a closer look at differences in the main focus of organisations, and discussions highlighted that organisations had different objectives and reasons for engaging with volunteer tourism. Organisations were driven by different values and interests. Interviewee 31 and Interviewee 26 represent two organisations with contrasting interests in terms of how they approach volunteer tourism and the role it plays within their organisation.
Commercial interests are demonstrated by Interviewee 31 who represents a travel organisation focused primarily on volunteer travel:

…100% of the product that we have available is in the field of volunteering trips, so organised and supported volunteering trips around the developing world…for a customer looking to volunteer overseas they can choose from our range of products offered and they get it all pre-organised for them. [Interview 31, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Interviewee 31 clearly states that the organisation's main focus and raison d'être is to market and sell the 'product' of volunteer trips to 'customers' who can choose from a 'range of products' as though they were choosing any other product such as a package holiday, suggesting that this organisation is committed to meeting the needs of the consumer. Such sentiments are in line with Vodopivec and Jaffe (2011) who note that through volunteer tourism, community development can be packaged as a marketable commodity to tourists. In contrast, for Interviewee 26 representing an NGO, the main focus of organisation emerged as a point of difference that they were eager to clarify in order to differentiate between their organisation and more commercialised organisations such as that represented by Interviewee 31.

So I guess the first thing to say is we're actually a development organisation, and the way that works is we're actually a UK charity partnered with an independent NGO (based in destination country) and so that's our primary focus, the development side of things in (destination) combined with conservation and environmental sustainability as well. To support these charitable aims we also have a volunteering arm… [Interview 26, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

They go on to comment:

Obviously we always have our focus and our priority on the NGO and its operation in (destination) and the priorities of the community. [Interview 26, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

In the example of Interviewee 26's organisation the volunteers feed in to supporting their charitable aims but the organisation does not exist for the sole purpose of providing volunteer travel experiences to customers. As with Interviewee 26, for those interviewees representing organisations classified as 'Other', the main focus of the organisation was also a point of difference that participants were keen to clarify. For example, for Interviewee 12 the main focus
of their organisation was on disease prevention, with the organisation running 'voluntours' twice a year to the destination where their disease prevention programme takes place. The voluntours help to provide funding and promote awareness of the organisation's work. In fact, Interviewee 12 did not feel that their 'voluntour' programme fell within the realms of tourism and was more aligned with volunteering, stating:

We're not tourism, we take them outside but it's always involved in the programme. We take them outside of (name of city), we take them across Lake (name of lake) to an orphanage and a traditional fishing village over there but it's for our programme, so it's not what I would consider a tourism kind of thing… I would say it's primarily prevention of disease, that's our primary function… [Interview 12, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

It seemed important to Interviewee 12 to clarify that they were primarily driven by their mission of disease prevention and secondarily education, and not by running tourism activities for volunteers. For Interviewee 11 on the other hand, they were not only keen to distance themselves from the 'voluntourism' discourse but they also distance themselves from development and the NGO sector. Rather, Interviewee 11 places the organisation's activities within the 'educational travel' sector, with their main focus on the education of young people:

We don't use the word voluntourism, mostly because I don't like it, so what we're involved in is an educational travel company or series of programmes that work specifically with schools, gap year students and universities, all under the banner of education, all achieved through, not all achieved through volunteering, but a lot of what we do has an involvement with local communities in developing countries so that young people will be working with local communities in some capacity and achieving a range of outcomes.

*Can I ask why you don't like the word voluntourism?*

I always think it smacks of voyeurism, I think it places the wrong emphasis on what we do – we don't pretend for one minute that we are a) an NGO or b) saving the world, we're not. So it would be wrong to present us as somehow on the same footing as World Vision or Médecins Sans Frontières13. We don't do stuff like that, what we do is give young people a taste

---

13 World Vision and Médecins Sans Frontières are large international NGOs that generally accept professional and non-professional volunteers for longer term placements. They are not volunteer tourism organisations.
of life in a developing country, our access is via their willingness to put up their hand and say we'd like to make a contribution, so via those means they gain access to the people, the culture, to the way of life etc. etc. whereby they learn. The flip side of that is whilst they're learning about another people and another culture they're also putting in a water tank or they're refurbishing a classroom or they're doing some sort of good work. Some might regard that as voluntourism, I don't. [Interview 11, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

These quotes demonstrate the different ways in which participants perceive and locate their organisation's activities within the volunteer tourism industry. Each of the programmes has the following in common: they involve some volunteering, an educational aspect, and some tourism related activities (even though Interviewee 12 did not consider it tourism, they still partake in what most would generally consider a tourist activity, such as an excursion or visiting another town). However, despite these factors in common, the outlined examples show that behind the main focus of organisations a spectrum of organisational interests was present and that volunteer tourism takes place within diverse settings. At one end of the spectrum, interests range from a commercial focus of packaging and selling volunteer travel programmes as 'products', to community development and disease prevention at the other, with educational travel sitting somewhere in between. The characteristics of the sample support Callanan and Thomas' (2005, p.195) assertion that the industry has become "increasingly ambiguous in definition and context" and Lyons and Wearing's (2008a, 2012) reflections that volunteer tourism activities are increasingly "blurry" and "ambiguous". However, as is outlined in the remainder of this chapter, this research extends Callanan and Thomas (2005) and Lyons and Wearing's (2012) observations: It is identified that the interests and approaches of volunteer tourism organisations not only differ between organisations but also change to varying degrees within organisations, over time and in different spaces, as is synonymous with liquid organisations.

4.5 Shifting Missions and Markets

Unlike the 'solid' organisations of modernity which are characterised by fixed structures and identities, a key characteristic of the liquid organisation is their dynamic, fluid and shape-shifting nature (Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014). The liquid organisation is a mobile concept; it is constantly changing and becoming, as opposed to being a permanent static entity (Kelemen & Rumens, 2008;
Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2014). Similar to the dynamic nature of the liquid organisation, a number of participants discussed how their organisation has changed over time in terms of mission and market interests. Consequently, as their organisation's approach to volunteer tourism shifts, their volunteer tourism programmes change shape and mission too. This key finding is encapsulated in the theme 'dynamic and changing nature'. Several organisations were, at the time of interview, in the midst of changing focus:

...our programmes are also adapting, they're growing, it's a dynamic or organic situation where we started focusing on just teaching English and just teaching environmental conservation, well that's gone out to broaden out now to a bit of hospitality, small business development, which I think is very much related, those skills that you learn in the English classes or in the conservation classes can be applied further on. So I think we're building on what we're doing on the basis of some of those basic education classes that we first offered, and diversifying too, to putting in concrete floors, helping families get roofs over their homes, so it has adapted a bit, but it's looking like now more than ever we're starting up new. [Interview 14, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Motivations for change varied between organisations. Interviewee 14's volunteer tourism programmes and focus were diversifying as they discovered new ways in which volunteer tourism could provide development assistance. In contrast, two organisations in particular had taken the decision to move away from the notion of volunteer tourism and volunteer tourists 'helping' with community development. Through their own long-term experiences of offering volunteer tourism programmes, they no longer felt comfortable with taking such an approach, and were critical of doing so.

... we think it is a very chauvinist attitude and a bit of a joke in a way because honestly what on earth can a westerner do going out for a matter of a few weeks? I mean the whole idea is wrong. I don't mean to say that people haven't done useful things, of course they have, but you should never go out with the assumption that they will. [Interview 18, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]
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Instead, these organisations now lean towards making the focus of their volunteer programmes about the learning experience of the volunteer. Interviewee 18's organisation was particularly flexible in their approach.

Initially we used to run a very traditional volunteering scheme where we recruited people for specific work and they were expected to do that when they were out there, but what we found over the years was that this doesn't really work...so we began to modify our scheme and the emphasis has been more on providing a unique learning opportunity for people...so there are always opportunities for volunteers to help in any way they can but the way they may help is kept open. We may get people who help in the primary school with a variety of things there, we may get people who help in the college or the new computer centre or anything else, but that is left more open...we're actually preparing new material. We're thinking to extend the scheme a little bit so that when people are there in this rural development project they have an opportunity to learn the local language. We're also introducing more yoga and we're looking into introducing vegetarian cooking lessons. So we're working on that at the moment. [Interview 18, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

We concentrate very hard on, you know, training them (the volunteers) up as much as we can and that they're not going to save the world... Despite all of this we still feel like we are doing volunteer tourism, we still feel like a lot of it is people going over there and taking pictures of the poor and that's not correct. We're thinking about completely re-structuring again...so a learning type of tour...that's the type of thing we're pondering at the moment because we need to avoid volunteer tourism because there are lots of people that do volunteer tourism and often it does more harm than good. So these are questions we are thinking about at the moment. [Interview 3, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Whilst the above organisations were clear in their reasons for changing their focus and approach to volunteer tourism, Interviewee 1 was certain of change but they were unsure what direction their organisation may take in the future. They appeared willing to let the organisation's future path be directed by either the communities or the volunteers, and as is typical of the liquid organisation as discussed in the literature review of this chapter (Bauman, 2000; Blackshaw, 2005), they are comfortable with uncertainty.
I don't know how the organisation will evolve in the future. I think that we will respond to demands. Whether the demands come from the slums or the demands come from the volunteers, we will adjust it. [Interview 1, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

The dynamic and changing nature of these organisations and their different and fluid interpretations of volunteer tourism reinforce Lyons and Wearing's (2008a, 2012) argument that volunteer tourism is an ambiguous phenomenon. These findings also further empirically substantiate Callanan and Thomas's (2005, p.195) observation that volunteer tourism has become "increasingly ambiguous in definition and context". Volunteer tourism programmes and their monitoring and evaluation therefore are not only situated in different organisational sectors such as the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors, but the programme contexts also shift and change as the missions and markets of organisations change, making it difficult to classify and define many of the organisations.

4.6 Ambiguous Identities

For-profit or not-for-profit?

The data revealed that profit status is not a fixed or transparent area of organisational context. Just over half of the survey respondents (55%) represented not-for-profit organisations and 35% of respondents identified their organisations as for-profit (see Appendix 3). 'Other' was selected by 10% of respondents and their descriptions demonstrated that it was ambiguous as to whether or not these organisations could be categorised as 'for-profit' or 'not-for-profit'. Respondents who selected 'other' described how their organisations did not fit into either the 'for-profit' or 'not-for-profit' categories, examples of comments include:

"Non-profit, for-profit hybrid", "company that supports our own charity", "company for a good cause", "we are a regular company, but we operate on a non-profit principal for programme fees. i.e. 100% of programme fees go to the local community".

These descriptions indicate that there is some ambiguity surrounding the profit status of organisations which offer volunteer travel, indicating that in some
contexts it is not a simple matter of a not-for-profit/for-profit dichotomy. Rather, the above comments from the survey provide some insight into the varied ways in which volunteer travel organisations operate and are structured which can include both for-profit and not-for-profit volunteer tourism activities within one organisation. That 10% of survey respondents selected 'other' when asked if the organisation they represent is not-for-profit, or for-profit was an area of interest that was further explored in the interviews.

In the interview data set, in terms of 'official' status, i.e. whether or not an organisation is registered as not-for-profit or as a for-profit company, 13 (45%) organisations were 'not-for-profit' and 16 organisations (55%) 'for-profit'. This means that there was a slightly higher representation of 'for-profit' organisations in the interview data than the survey data. One participant was particularly candid about their 'for-profit' status, commenting:

We essentially are a travel company, a travel business. We're a profit making travel business and we make no efforts to hide that at all. It feels there's no reason to because the product that we offer is providing value to the traveller themselves because it's all organised, the safety and security side of things...the security and safety benefit we offer is of big value."

[Interview 31, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

In contrast however, for most (13 cases) of the participants that stated their organisation is for-profit, there were blurred boundaries between being for-profit and not-for-profit. Blurred boundaries were apparent in two main contexts: 1) the structure of the organisation and 2) the values underpinning the business model for the organisation.

In terms of the structure of the organisation, half of the organisations also have their own charity or foundation (as found in the cases of Interviewees 4, 8, 9, 10, 17, 21), or donate a portion of their profit back into the projects that they support (Interviewees 5, 19, 24). Additionally, despite not being formally registered as a not-for-profit organisation, some participants did not perceive their organisations as for-profit organisations, and many appeared to feel the need to justify and explain why their organisation was a company and not registered as a not-for-
profit. Such justifications could be due to participants' awareness of criticisms about the increasing commercialisation of the industry that have been published in the media in recent years (e.g. Birrell, 2010). Ambiguity surrounding not-for-profit/ for-profit status, or 'structure ambiguity' was an overarching theme identified in the interview returned sample and the following subthemes also emerged: operational constraints, for-profit and not-for-profit travel activities, community benefit.

**Ambiguous, liquid structures**

Emerging from the data, this research revealed the key theme 'structure ambiguity' which refers to participants who did not feel that the status 'for-profit' was a true reflection of their organisation's operations. Some participants claimed that although they were set up with a business structure, in a practical sense their organisation made no or very little profit. For example, Interviewee 7 and Interviewee 10 commented:

> At the moment it's a private limited company, which in the UK, theoretically it's for-profit. In practice it doesn't make a profit.  
> *[Interview 7, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]*

> The way we're set up, we have a registered charity but we're also, (name of organisation) is a registered company in the UK, so effectively we're for-profit but we don't make any profit from what we do. Everything at the moment goes directly back into the projects and the costs of having volunteers on the ground and we don't even pay any salaries to directors or any staff. But we are registered, so we're a social enterprise, we're registered as a company so we could effectively be for-profit but we're not really.  
> *[Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]*

Similarly, Interviewee 29 considered their organisation's activities, for the most, in alignment with a not-for-profit organisation, yet in terms of business structure these organisations remain companies with the potential to profit from their volunteer travel activities, even if at present they do not or do not consider it to be substantial.

> We pretty much run it on a non-profit basis, anyway anyone that works for us gets a pretty meagre salary – it pays the bills but it's not much more than that. We spend a lot on marketing and advertising the programmes to get more people over there. There's not really a lot left over at the end of that unfortunately.  
> *[Interview 29, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]*
Participants were probed as to why they did not seek official not-for-profit status if they felt they were operating in ways that aligned closer to not-for-profit principles than for-profit. The theme of 'operational constraints' was displayed by five participants (10, 11, 19, 20, 29). These participants believed that operating as a registered not-for-profit would impose a variety of operational constraints that would be detrimental to their activities:

Registering as a charitable company, which is not a particularly straightforward process in itself, would simply create unnecessary additional administration costs without any significant advantages at present for either us or the projects that we support...This structure will constantly be under review but for now it suits our purposes best. [Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

We're a regular company but we model ourselves on a non-profit. (Name of organisation) was set up as a non-profit organisation in (name of country) and I ended up moving back here a few years ago. When we moved back we realised that in (name of country) the rules are a little bit different and we would have trouble paying any salaries to anyone if we were non-profit unless we went the full charity route and had an independent board of directors and we just decided that we weren't really big enough at that stage to justify it, we didn't want to lose control of what we were doing, so it's something that we're still considering. Maybe in the future we might do it, but it's just a big call to get a whole bunch of strangers on a board of directors and have them telling you what to do. [Interview 29, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Thus, higher administration costs and loss of control over the organisations activities were viewed as deterrents to becoming a not-for-profit. Similarly, Interviewee 7 described how although they would like to become a not-for-profit organisation later down the track, at the moment they are transitioning instead to become a 'Community Interest Company' (a business structure specific to the UK) because it imposes less constraints:

I'm in the process of trying to change it to, there's something in the UK called a CIC, which is a 'Community Interest Company' which is more philanthropic, it's set up for social benefit but it's not a full blown charity. The reason I've made that choice is I want the credibility of being not-for-profit because I want to get
more involved in the fundraising side as well, but because I'm running it on my own at the moment, to take the step to make it a full blown charity involves a much bigger administration overhead and you have to be run by a committee and so on and so forth. [Interview 7, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

For these participants, the perceived impracticality of becoming a not-for-profit was the reason used to justify the official profit status of these organisations. For other organisations, the ambiguity in profit status was down to the fact that the organisations offered both for-profit and not-for-profit travel activities. The sub-theme "for-profit and not-for-profit activities" was identified in both the survey and interview data and relates to those organisations which also run profit making tourism activities and therefore it is not appropriate for them to operate within a not-for-profit structure.

It is important for us that it is not only for volunteering. Volunteering is the crux of what we do but at the same time things like learning Spanish in Peru or learning Indian cooking in India, that kind of stuff that brings that cultural immersion aspect still forms part of what we do, so we're set up in a way that enables us to do more than just the charity side of things. [Interview 19, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

We like the adventure side, we want to be trekking and swimming with dolphins. It's a benefit for us to have the tourism side to it and also the tourists that come through, it's their funding, as long as their funding is used and directed by our teachers, builders and managers and that local input and direction, that's what achieves great things, that structure. [Interview 20, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

The above examples represent autonomous companies that operate both for-profit and not-for-profit activities within one organisation. In contrast, the following example represents a company with its own charity:

...we are a limited company and that's why we have the charity completely separate so that people know that their charitable donations are completely separate and that's what's going to the project. Whereas the (name of company) side is basically all of their costs and operating costs and that side of things, and also because we offer some just expeditions sometimes, that's why
The interviewees conveyed a sense of value for the freedom of not being bound by the rules of being a registered charity or not-for-profit. This autonomy allows the organisations to remain flexible. Flexibility is favourable because it enables the organisations to diversify and meet market demands in order to attract volunteers and their funding. Participants are aware that their organisations are situated within broader liquid modern environments of neo-liberalism and financial insecurity, and recognise the value of being able to adapt in order to meet the demands of volunteers who fund their operations. The aversion to the perceived boundaries and bureaucracy that being a registered not-for-profit or charity might entail can be interpreted as supporting the notion that such volunteer tourism organisations represent liquid organisations operating in accordance with their broader liquid environments and is further exemplified by Interviewee 19:

It (being a registered charity) makes it more difficult for you to be able to help them arrange trips or to arrange stuff like language learning. If it doesn't cover exactly what you as a charity cover then you're not allowed to touch it. I mean the other thing obviously is that in the current climate, any charity that is reliant on grant funding and all that kind of stuff is just dying at the moment. It's very difficult out there, all that money doesn't exist like it used to. It's not a good time to be setting up a structure that isn't volunteer funded. [Interview 19, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

4.7 Contrasting Values between For-Profit Organisations
Some participants asserted that they were not concerned by the company structure of their organisation and focused on the importance of the values which underpin their business models. The values of an organisation, also known as 'organisational values', 'embody those general values that guide organizational members in their selection or evaluation of behaviour' (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013, p.497). These participants expressed how it was important to them that the activities of the organisation benefit the local community where the volunteer tourism programme/s take place. The sub-theme 'community benefit' encapsulates these values. Interviewee 4 and Interviewee 20, both the founders and current
directors of two separate for-profit companies were particularly vocal about the value and interests that drive their organisations.

…I know that I'm running a business and I know that I've still got to make a profit and I'm not afraid of that as long as that profit, if you like, the spoils of tourism, are shared and that it's an equitable relationship. I can't say anymore than that. It's just logical…if the company is not willing to share part of their gross profit margin to enable that community to develop themselves out of material poverty then all you're doing is you're keeping people in that poverty in order to maintain your market. [Interview 4, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

We donate so much to the communities, it's all about that for me, the charity/company it doesn't matter, it's about your morals, ethics and what you're discussing today, how are the projects assessed, how are they benefitting the community and how do they ensure it's a benefit because at the end of the day charities can spend money in so many different ways. [Interview 20, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Both of these participants' interests in volunteer travel go beyond 'making a profit'. They place value on contributing positively to the communities where their programmes take place and portray an ethical commitment to the host communities and people they work with. They did not see being a company as a barrier to having a positive impact in a community. Rather, they expressed similar values to NGOs as described by Wearing et al. (2005) in that they are driven by the values of contributing to the well-being of local communities. These organisations potentially destabilise Bauman's concerns that the liquid modern organisation values market interests above all else (e.g. Bauman 2000, 2014; Bauman & Donskis, 2013). On the other hand, the earlier quote by Interviewee 31 exemplified a for-profit organisation whose interests and main focus are very clearly market-based, reinforcing Bauman's concerns. Therefore, a key finding of this research is that defining organisations by profit status is not necessarily an accurate depiction of their interests and activities or what is of interest for organisations to monitor and evaluate. The way in which an organisation's values transpire in their monitoring and evaluation activities is discussed in the next chapter.
4.8 Organisational Partnerships

Both the survey and interview data revealed that partnerships were common within the data sets. The term 'partnership' was defined in the survey and interviews as follows: "Partnering means that two or more organisations work together for the purpose of being able to offer volunteer travel programmes." The survey data revealed that the majority (78%) of organisations partner with other organisations in order to provide volunteer travel programmes. All of the organisations represented in the interviews stated that their organisation engages in partnerships. The following key themes arising from the data will be discussed: Diverse and dynamic partnership structures (including 'Multi-layered partnerships' and 'Direct partnerships'), and breadth and depth of partnerships.

Diverse and dynamic partnership structures

Drawing from existing volunteer tourism literature (e.g. ATLAS/TRAM, 2008; Eddins, 2013; Lamoureux, 2009; Raymond, 2007, 2008) the survey asked participants about three different types of partnerships: with 1) in-country host partner organisations, 2) tour operators and 3) donor/funding agencies. The findings demonstrate that it was common for organisations to partner with 'In-country host partners', with 66% of respondents indicating that their organisation 'Always' partners with 'In-country host partner' organisations. Partnering with 'Tour operators' and 'Donor/funding agencies' was least common, with 34% of respondents selecting that they 'Never' partner with 'Tour Operators' and 41% selecting that they 'Never' partner with 'Donor/funding agencies'. Respondents also revealed a diversity of partners which included universities, schools, churches, insurance companies and industry groups. In the interview sample, two broadly defined partnership structures which influenced the ways and extent to which monitoring and evaluation took place were apparent. These were 1) 'Multi-layered Partnerships' and 2) 'Direct Partnerships'.

The first type of partnership, 'Multi-layered Partnerships', between sending organisations and in-country host partners involves a sending organisation recruiting and sending volunteers to one or more in-country host partners. Host partner organisations may then work with further partners such as schools, health clinics and community centres, for example. The volunteer is placed within the network of host partner organisations and responsibility for the volunteer during
the programme is predominantly transferred from the sending organisation to the host partner organisation. Fourteen organisations from the interview data set engaged in this type of partnership (Interviews 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23, 28, 29, 31). This type of partnership is further explained below by Interviewee 2 and Figure 4.1:

So the way we work is we have partners in each country that we work in, and they are locally run organisations, so independently registered in their own country with their own names, everything like that, and we are partners which means we essentially recruit volunteers and prepare them and get them ready for their experience and then once they arrive in country, the partner organisation then takes over and picks them up from the airport and does all the in-country stuff. Obviously we'll still email volunteers and things once they are in country but essentially, yeah once they are there it's the partner's responsibility and then when they come home we obviously start feedback process and touch base with them again. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

![Figure 4.1 Multi-layered Partnerships](source: Author)

The second main type of partnership, 'Direct Partnerships', is between sending organisations who partner directly with other locally based organisations or individuals without an intermediary host partner organisation. A key difference between Direct Partnerships and Multi-layered Partnerships is that, in a Direct Partnership, the sending organisation does not delegate responsibility for the
volunteer or the programme to another organisation during the project. Rather, the organisation both sends to and hosts programme/s (i.e. has an active presence during the programme). The organisation still engages in partnerships with local organisations such as NGOs, community based organisations (e.g. schools, hospitals and churches) and government agencies, however, responsibility for the volunteer at the programme on the ground is not delegated to these partners. Fifteen organisations from the interview sample engaged in this type of partnership (Interviews 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30). This type of partnership is further explained below by Interviewee 20 and Figure 4.2:

I guess we are the partner if you know what I mean?...I'd say what most organisations do would be to partner a school or a local charity, to then recruit volunteers here to then send the volunteers there and then sometimes for that organisation to send them some money, sometimes not. Sometimes it's just an administration fee and that's it and their obligation really ends there, but I guess that's what the difference is, when the volunteers arrive in (name of country) our obligation really starts. That's when everything really begins because you're met at the airport by (name of organisation) leaders, you're then taken to an island that we've booked to do your briefing, the (name of country) government will then come over to that island and they'll brief you about the aims. We then guide you into a community that we've had to risk assess, that us and the government have been planning to go to for the last three years. By the time you arrive into the community as a group you're guided by two of our expedition leaders, our building manager, our team, everybody then lives in the village with different families and then the project begins. [Interview 20, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

![Figure 4.2 Direct Partnerships](source: Author)
These two partnership structures can only be defined here in 'broad' terms as within each of these categories partnership structures can further vary. Partnerships vary not only from organisation to organisation, but also partnership to partnership depending on the project/programme. Interview participants 2, 19 and 29, all sending organisations, describe how their partnerships differ according to the particular project and location.

All of our partner organisations are quite different, so some of them are non-profit organisations, some of them are social enterprises and there's different organisations, some are individual projects, so for example in (name of developing country) our partner is a children's home for street children, a temporary children's home and that's our partner, whereas somewhere like (name of different developing country) our partner works with probably 30 or 40 different projects so they're more of an umbrella for more organisations. So there's quite different local partnerships. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

So the way that we work, it can actually be different in every single country that we work in to be honest, and there's a slightly different situation in every instance...either directly into a project, into a coordinating local entity or into something with our staff, so sort of three different layers. [Interview 19, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

We work in 28 different countries, in most countries we just have one partner that we work with. Those partners vary in their structure and how they look, so in some cases it can just be an individual that's keen to make a difference in their local community and in other cases it can be a small community group all the way up to pretty large NGOs with 20 or 30 staff. [Interview 29, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

These quotes demonstrate how, particularly in the context of Multi-layered Partnerships, organisational context doesn't just change from volunteer tourism organisation to volunteer tourism organisation, it actually changes from programme to programme and geographical location. This means that monitoring and evaluation activities don't just take place within the one organisational context, they can be situated in multiple inter and intra organisational contexts within the one organisation. As is characteristic of the liquid organisation, these organisations' partnerships do not maintain any shape in particular, rather they are organised in ways that they alter and adapt as new partnerships arise in multiple
and diverse contexts and networks of other organisations and individuals (Elliot, 2007). Thus, "Organisations are no longer seen as collections of stable and static entities (people, material resources, ideologies and so on) but as shifting networks in a permanent state of flux and transformation" (Kelemen & Rumens 2008, p.55).

**Breadth and depth of partnerships**

In liquid modernity, the forming of partnerships and connections between organisations are supported by "the software universe of light speed travel" (Bauman, 2000, p.117) whereby technology facilitates communications across geographical distances, allowing partnerships to be made regardless of the organisations' spatial locations. Interviewee 19 highlighted the everyday ease of making contact with a potential new partner:

> If somebody reaches out to us and says "we really need volunteers" then I can call my guy in (name of country) for example and say there's somebody down the road who really needs help, could you go and have a meeting with them...

[Interview 19, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Breadth and depth in partnerships are two continuums found to exist in volunteer tourism partnerships. The term 'breadth' refers to the number of partnerships that a volunteer travel organisation is engaged in, which can be clustered in one geographical area or spread worldwide. The survey identified that the number of organisations partnered with ranged from 1 organisation to 300 organisations. Whilst most organisations represented in the survey partner with 1 to 5 organisations (29%), followed by 6 to 10 organisations (27%), some organisations were partnered with 51 to 100 organisations (7%) and 101 to 300 organisations (9%). The breadth of partnerships for sending organisations also varied greatly from organisations working with few organisations, to organisations partnered with one 'umbrella organisation' which then feeds into multiple other organisations, as described by Interviewees 7 and 19 below. Thus the monitoring and evaluation of programmes takes place on vastly different scales between organisations.

> So theoretically we could be working with a number of NGOs but in practice, at the moment, we work specifically with one particular NGO, they're based in (name of country), but they run projects in (name of countries), and recently they have expanded...
out into quite a lot of countries across (name of continent). So they identify volunteer placements. [Interview 7, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

We work in 24 different countries at the moment, so in terms of the projects themselves it sits at over 200 at this point, but we have our one coordinator in Peru who is liaising with 10 different projects that we work with there, for example, or we might work with one organisation in Africa that actually covers three countries, so we have the relationship with the coordinators who are then coordinating within those countries. [Interview 19, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

However, the ease of forming multiple connections ('breadth') does not necessarily translate into shared responsibility, closeness or trust ('depth') within a partnership. The term 'depth' refers to the closeness of a partnership between organisations, determined by the degree to which responsibility of the volunteer travel programme is shared between the organisations who work closely together to implement a volunteer travel programme. The following quotes represent examples of organisations displaying a strong depth of partnership.

...the partnership we have is with one project... I know the project very well because I was one of the people who founded it, with my husband who is from that village.... [Interview 18]

...we're actually a charity partnered with an independent NGO (based in destination country) and so that's our primary focus... [Interview 26]

The partnerships between these organisations and their partner/s are very deep in that their sole reason for existence is to support that particular partner and they maintain direct and regular contact, contributing to more 'solid' relationships between partners. In contrast, for other organisations, such as that represented by Interviewee 19 above, partnerships are often moderated by a third party such as an in-country coordinator who acts as the 'middle man' between the sending organisation and the in-country host partners. These partnerships are more 'liquid' in nature. Partnerships are easily made and loosely structured meaning that bonds and allegiances are less secure than those within 'solid' and 'deep' partnerships. In addition, responsibility and accountability to each other is ambiguous in these liquid contexts (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2014). Chapters 5 and 6 further
explore and discuss the impact of these partnerships on the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes.

4.9 Conclusion
The aim of this chapter was to critically examine the organisational contexts within which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects takes place (Objective 2). The findings reveal three key observations:

This research has highlighted firstly that it is difficult to classify volunteer tourism organisations according to traditional typologies such as 'not-for-profit/ for-profit', 'travel organisation' or 'NGO', for example. Rather, it was identified that organisations' markets and interests can shift and change and organisational structures are fluid and ambiguous, making organisational identities hard to define. As is typical in liquid modernity, for those organisations whose activities appear to be dominated by market interests, "Identity, like everything else, becomes fragmented and placed within a vague present, losing its significance as a reassuring signpost demarcating a lifelong path of activity. What is available instead is a façade...its purpose first and foremost as a marketing tool, a brand" (Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014, p.4).

Second, this research has extended current understandings and conceptualisations of volunteer tourism organisations in a unique and original way by revealing that the 'liquid organisations' metaphor is an appropriate classification for many of the volunteer tourism organisations. The organisations within the data set were liquefied to varying degrees. Some organisations, particularly those that expressed a stronger affinity with development rather than tourism still retain some aspects of traditional, 'solid' organisations such as clear organisational structures and identities, long-term commitments and goals, and standardised processes and structures. Nevertheless, these organisations recognise that they are situated within an increasingly globalised and liquefied world in which they are predominantly reliant on the volunteer tourist to fund and support their existence. Consequently, organisations are acutely aware of the need to be able to adapt to meet the consumer demands of the volunteer tourist and a growing trend towards increasingly liquid organisational characteristics was apparent. This finding also reinforces the diverse nature of volunteer tourism organisations, programmes and markets that was highlighted in Chapter 2.
Finally, the finding that many organisations are characteristic of liquid organisations requires further consideration of the moral and ethical implications of this for the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations and the well-being of the host communities that volunteer tourism organisations claim to serve. For Bauman (e.g. 2000; Bauman & Donskis, 2013) a key moral and ethical concern in both liquid and solid times is adiaphorization, the moral distancing of people from their decisions and actions. Adiaphorization in the context of liquid organisations has only recently begun to receive attention (e.g. Bauman, 2014; Clegg & Baumeler, 2010; Jensen, 2014; Kociatekiewicz & Kostera, 2014). A central concern is that liquid organisations, given their fluidity and liquid approaches to responsibility, may be prone to distancing themselves from their moral obligations in order to increase efficiency and promote their own interests. In a brief commentary on liquid organisations, Bauman (2014, p.xvi) states:

They serve the process of adiaphorization – of excising large swathes of human behaviour and human habitat from the realm of moral evaluation and ethical obligations and thereby rendering them less sensitive to moral impulses. To put it simply: they serve the process of cutting down moral responsibility to a manageable size; and of recycling it into a form that is amenable to management. Reduction and simplification of moral obligations and ethically inspired emotions in general are viewed as indispensable conditions for a focused, determined, efficient and therefore rational conduct. (italics in original)

Thus, the potential ethical and moral implications of liquid organisations, namely adiaphorization, provides an analytical undercurrent for the remaining chapters of this thesis in exploring the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations monitor and evaluate their volunteer tourism programmes (Chapter 5, Objective 3) and opportunities and barriers for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation (Chapter 6, Objective 4).
5 VOLUNTEER TOURISM ORGANISATIONS' ENGAGEMENT WITH MONITORING AND EVALUATION

5.1 Introduction
This chapter aims to identify and critically examine the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their projects (Objective 3). The previous chapter concluded that the organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations are characteristic of liquid organisations; they are fluid, flexible and often ambiguous. This chapter highlights the impact of these liquefied organisational contexts on the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their projects. The chapter begins with a review of the evaluation studies literature and outlines the potential purposes of, and different approaches to, monitoring and evaluation. The different ways and extent to which organisations monitor and evaluate their volunteer tourism programmes are then examined.

5.2 Purpose of Monitoring and Evaluation
The processes of monitoring and evaluation play important roles in the wider project planning and implementation cycle of an organisation. In this thesis, monitoring is considered to be the purposeful checking of how a programme’s activities are progressing and the gathering of information on the various activities taking place within a programme (Bartle, 2007). Monitoring activities often feed into evaluation. Evaluation is the process of determining the merit and worth (value) of a programme, serving as a basis for determining if and how a programme needs to be improved or even terminated (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Monitoring and evaluation can serve as valuable learning tools for organisations (Preskill & Torres, 1999). To ensure that their services or programmes are meeting the needs of their clients, organisations need to "continually obtain pertinent evaluative feedback" on their programmes and services (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007, p.29), an issue recognised in both the volunteer tourism (e.g. Raymond, 2011) and the wider evaluation literature (e.g. Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Mertens, 2012).
In addition, evaluation can serve different functions within society. Meyer and Stockman (in Meyer, 2012) propose that evaluation uses can be classified into four overlapping functions: insight, control, development and legitimation. For the purposes of volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation, evaluation could be conducted for the purpose of producing new insight by producing new knowledge about the programme which can then be used to learn from experience and aid the development of the programme. This is proposed as the priority approach to mitigate against negative impacts on host communities and dissatisfaction of volunteers. The evaluation functions of control and legitimation are also important. For organisations engaged in funder-fundee relationships, evaluation functions as a control mechanism to verify that a programme is meeting agreed goals (Meyer, 2012). Evaluation that functions to legitimise organisations’ activities allows organisations to prove their worth to current and potential supporters (Meyer, 2012). Supporters may be customers and/ or donors, both of which are essential to the sustainability of volunteer tourism.

5.3 A Review of Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation

Traditionally, the field of evaluation has been dominated by the assumptions of the positivist paradigm which seeks to measure the social world, promoting objective and value-neutral inquiry (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). In this context, the historical, social and political contexts surrounding a programme are viewed as variables to be controlled (e.g. Campbell, 1969). Evaluators aligned with this school of thought have proposed the use of quantitative methods such as quasi-experimental methods which adapt scientific methods for use within the social world (Campbell, 1969; Mertens & Wilson, 2012). However, a broad spectrum of approaches to monitoring and evaluation now exist. These approaches can be positioned along a continuum. At one end of the continuum are methods which are influenced by rational scientific approaches and the positivist paradigm, and which seek to collect quantifiable data (Campbell, 1969; Mertens & Wilson, 2012). At the other end of the continuum are qualitative, critical approaches which recognise the inherently ethical, political, social and contextual factors involved in evaluation processes and recognise that the ways in which people make sense of their situations are heavily influenced by their values (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Thus from this perspective, engagement with peoples' values, particularly the values of key stakeholders, is seen as a fundamental part of evaluation (Greene,
Sitting between these two ends of the spectrum are mixed method approaches to evaluation, which utilise both qualitative and quantitative methods (Bamberger, 2013; Greene, 2002; Mertens, 2010).

It is now recognised within evaluation studies that there is no single best method or model for carrying out evaluations. A multitude of evaluation approaches, underlying concepts and models exist (Meyer, 2012). Choice of methods will differ according to the context of the particular programme being evaluated (Bamberger, 2013; Rog, 2012). As discussed in Chapter 2, the nature of volunteer tourism programmes varies greatly and so it is unlikely that a 'one size fits all' approach to programme monitoring and evaluation is appropriate. Evaluations can be conducted internally or externally (Mertens, 2012), formally or informally (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007) and on a large or small scale (Robson, 2000).

Recognising that there are various political, social and contextual factors playing out in volunteer tourism, such as the potential for unequal power relationships and dependencies as outlined in Chapter 2, this thesis focuses on qualitative, critical approaches to evaluation. However, it is acknowledged that quantitative approaches can still be of value within the volunteer tourism context, particularly when quantifiable data is required. Further, mixed method approaches to evaluation will be appropriate in many contexts where there is a need for both quantitative and qualitative evaluative data (Bamberger, 2013).

Drawn from a review of the literature, a summary of qualitative approaches to evaluation is outlined in Table 5.1. Approaches include Empowerment Evaluation (Fetteman 1994, 1996 in Jackson & Kassam, 1998), Participatory Evaluation (Cousins & Whitmore, 1998; Cullen & Coryn, 2011; Jackson & Kassam, 1998), Values Engaged Evaluation (Greene, 2005, 2012; Greene, DeStefano, Burgon, & Hall, 2006), Responsive Evaluation (Stake 1975 cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1989) and Evaluation for Social Justice (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). A key theme running throughout each of these approaches is the notion that evaluation is an essential tool for improving situations and services/programmes for the people that those services/programmes are meant to serve.
Table 5.1. Qualitative Approaches to Evaluation. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Approach</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Evaluation (PE)</td>
<td>Involves evaluators collaborating with stakeholders of the entity being evaluated, streams within PE include practical PE and transformative PE.</td>
<td>Cousins &amp; Whitmore (1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE is often used by development organisations, and in such a context the focus of PE is on sharing knowledge through the evaluation process.</td>
<td>Jackson &amp; Kassam (1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocates that together citizens and professionals can generate analysis and new knowledge that will increase the capacity of interventions to produce improved and lasting results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, no universal agreement as to what constitutes PE, a continuum of participation, exists.</td>
<td>Cullen &amp; Coryn (2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At its best, evaluation can improve services and programmes, promote the accountability of organisations and empower stakeholders (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Mayhew, 2011; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). At its worst, however, evaluation processes can disempower and marginalise stakeholders, such as when they are not consulted appropriately (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Whether or not evaluation works to empower or disempower is dependent on the way in which evaluations are (or are not) carried out, how the findings are disseminated and whether or not findings are acted upon responsibly by key agents such as policy makers, regulatory bodies and service providers (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Therefore, understanding processes of evaluation is essential to improving evaluation findings (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), and requires further theoretical and practical attention within volunteer tourism.
In the next sections of this chapter, the findings of this research are discussed in terms of the volunteer tourism organisations' engagement with monitoring and evaluation. The discussion is built around five broad, organising themes that emerged from a systematic review of the quantitative survey results and the qualitative interview data which helped to expand and explain the quantitative observations: 1) Attitudes towards monitoring and evaluation; 2) Approaches to monitoring and evaluation; 3) The uneven emphasis given to feedback provided by different stakeholders; 4) The logistics shaping monitoring and evaluation practices; 5) The monitoring and evaluation of programme outcomes. Key themes that emerged within these organising themes are identified and discussed.

5.4 Organisations' Overall Engagement with Monitoring and Evaluation

In the current context of volunteer tourism, the lack of a clear regulatory framework or overarching governing body means that the majority of volunteer tourism organisations are not required to undertake any form of monitoring and evaluation nor are they accountable to a governing body. It was therefore somewhat surprising when 97% of the volunteer travel organisations represented in the survey stated that they monitor their volunteer travel programmes and 95% of organisations indicated that they evaluate their programmes, suggesting a high level of voluntary commitment to the monitoring and evaluation of programmes. Similar to the survey results, all of the organisations in the interview sample stated that they engage in monitoring and evaluation to some extent. The interviews therefore focused primarily on learning about the monitoring and evaluation processes that take place as opposed to trying to understand why organisations do not conduct monitoring and evaluation.

5.5 Attitudes Towards Monitoring and Evaluation

Interview participants were asked how important the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer travel programmes is to their organisation. Participants were first asked about the importance of monitoring and evaluation as overall processes, rather than focusing on individual aspects of monitoring and evaluation as was done in the survey. This was to allow for the emergence of new themes and insights. There was an overarching agreement amongst participants that monitoring and evaluation are important to their organisation. However, the affirmation that monitoring and evaluation are important to an organisation did not automatically
translate into an interviewee's confidence in the organisation's current monitoring and evaluation practices. Neither did it always translate into thorough monitoring and evaluation processes. Two major themes were present in the interview data, *monitoring and evaluation is important* and *monitoring and evaluation is important, but...* The theme *monitoring and evaluation is important* reflects those participants who place a strong value on monitoring and evaluation, regarding them as worthwhile organisational processes that are integral to the management of their volunteer travel programmes. This theme was present in cases consisting of both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. For example, when asked how important monitoring and evaluation was to their organisations, Interviewees 10 and 24 replied:

Very important. Without monitoring and evaluation we don't really know what we're doing, where we're going and what the purpose of what we're doing is. Our main objective is really to actually achieve something on the ground with the projects, we're very much needs driven than demand driven...We're not interested in marketing or recruiting volunteers for something just because it's nice and it's a great experience and people want to do it. So without monitoring and evaluation we can't really ascertain if we're doing what we think we're doing. *[Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]*

It is very important, I think it is extremely important, because if I say it's very important it doesn't really bring the severity of evaluation...because everything related to volunteer travel or tourism in general, we have to work out and make sure that whatever is being done a) is beneficial to the locals b) the locals have really had a good input and c) the volunteers who have come have benefitted in some way... *[Interview 24, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]*

For these two participants, monitoring and evaluation processes are important because they help the organisation obtain information on the worth and value of the programme. Thus, monitoring and evaluation have strong links to these organisation's interests and values and the data indicates that the positive attitude towards monitoring and evaluation was reflected in the organisations' actual monitoring and evaluation practices. These participants reported monitoring and evaluation practices which take place on an ongoing basis, gathering information from a range of stakeholders. In contrast, the theme *monitoring and evaluation is important, but...* emerged from two participants representing not-for-profit
organisations. These participants suggested that monitoring and evaluation are important activities, however this was not necessarily reflected in their organisation's current monitoring and evaluation processes. Both participants felt that their organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices could be strengthened. However, they perceived a lack of time and resources as organisational impediments to doing so.

So I think it is important to them, (name of organisation) was founded with the goal of genuinely helping the communities that they work with and that's very important to the founder and to the CEO and to all the staff that work here...and I think it is important, if you ask them do you think it's important I think everyone would say yes, but the reality also is that we all have a lot of work to do and day to day stuff can quite easily consume...There are definitely some processes in place but I'm sure that if we had more time, more could be done as well. But I think as a general answer, yes, I do think we think it is important and it is something that we hope we do. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

It is important but I suppose it depends whether we're talking about how important we think it is or sort of where it fits into everything in some ways, because I think the challenge we find that is probably similar to most volunteering organisations is that you're always aware you should be doing more. You want to do more, you've got plans of what you could be doing, but the reality, especially in developing countries, is that it's very, very difficult really, and certainly without having lots of staff and quite sort of thorough processes...So I think we are very conscious that it's much weaker than what it should be and what we would like to be really. If I compare how we work compared to government funded agencies where I've worked before we just don't have the capacity, so we don't have the staff, we don't have the resources to have very thorough learning processes to identify objectives and outcomes and then to do monitoring and measuring towards the end of placements and projects and that kind of thing. [Interview 16, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

A lack of confidence in current monitoring and evaluation processes is conveyed by these participants and their enthusiasm for monitoring and evaluation is dampened by the belief that their organisations could be doing more. For Interviewee 16 in particular, there is a gap between professed importance of monitoring and evaluation and their perspective of the organisation's actual actions. Unlike the participants represented by the theme monitoring and
evaluation is important, whose values and interests were reflected in their enthusiasm for monitoring and evaluation and are carried through to their actual monitoring and evaluation practices, monitoring and evaluation activities in these cases represented by the theme monitoring and evaluation is important, but... were notably affected by what was perceived as feasible on a practical level. Organisational impediments such as lack of resources and time are readily accepted by these participants as barriers to more thorough processes, who assume this to be the norm for not-for-profit voluntary organisations.

5.6 Liquefied Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation

The interviews revealed that for the most part, the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer travel programmes was done at the discretion of the organisation. Apart from a small number of not-for-profit NGOs (represented by Interviewees 21, 26 & 30) who are required to obtain some specific information to meet funding requirements, the majority of organisations are currently in a position where they are able to decide if and how they monitor and evaluate their volunteer travel programmes. In the survey, the introduction and definition of evaluation acknowledged that evaluation can be carried out formally and informally and that there are different ways to carrying out evaluations, and so the way in which monitoring and evaluation is carried out (i.e. formally/informally) was not asked about at that stage of data collection. In the interviews however, the informal nature of monitoring and evaluation emerged as a recurring theme in a third of cases. These participants made the point that their monitoring and evaluation processes were not 'formalised'. The participants referred to not having specific 'forms' to be completed or 'standardised' formats for gathering information. The more informal approach described by participants does not necessarily mean that they are not engaging with monitoring and evaluation, rather monitoring and evaluation for these organisations is an ongoing process of communication through talking to people as opposed to being formalised in the sense of filling in forms and reports or following a standardised format. These organisations take an organic approach and their informal, fluid and flexible monitoring and evaluation processes are interpreted as liquefied monitoring and evaluation processes.

14 Respondents were reminded of the definitions of monitoring and evaluation contained in the survey during the subsequent interviews.
Being as we are small, these systems aren't formal, which means basically, when the volunteers come back we would meet with them on their return, we'll keep in touch with email, we always meet with returned volunteers. We have a conversation with him or her and anything we learn is used to amend our procedures. [Interview 1, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

I don't have a standardised form, maybe I should do, but it's more a telephone conversation or an email or a text, just every now and again, you know, how's Johnny getting on? Any problem? Has he done this or has he done that? Just trying to keep in touch and that's what I probably need to do more of I think. [Interview 23, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Interpretations and understandings of monitoring and evaluation, and consequently the actual practices of monitoring and evaluation, differed greatly between the organisations. The informal nature of monitoring and evaluation also sits on a continuum, between those organisations at one end actively seeking feedback and information but in a non-standardised way as described above, and those at the other end who take a 'no news is good news' approach, where at times there is an unclear line between engaging with monitoring and evaluation or not. Interviewee 10 provides an example of active informal monitoring and the reasoning why more formal monitoring and evaluation processes are not in place:

In terms of the information that we collect from the local community we don't have a sort of formal structure to the way we actually monitor. We don't have a specific template that we have to monitor in a certain way and then we evaluate it in a set way. It's not really possible to do it because our projects are so diverse and we're working in such a large number of areas and country to country the projects are very different...Even within our medical project we've got so many different groups or areas that we're involved in, the monitoring and evaluation process is different for each one...You couldn't really set a hard and fast structure to how you're going to collect that information, how you're going to monitor it and how you're going to evaluate it at the end of the day. But all of them have quite clear, even though they may not be entirely formal, there's quite clear processes that we can collect the information we need to ensure the projects are going in a direction where they are actually achieving something. [Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Thus, how they monitor and evaluate remains flexible in accordance with the various programme contexts. Interviewee 10 goes on to describe the different
areas they regularly collect information on, which involves both quantitative and qualitative data at a number of different levels including the volunteers, community groups and local government agencies. In line with Rog (2012) who argues for a 'context-sensitive' approach to evaluation, taking a non-standardised approach is likely the most appropriate course in this kind of situation given the varied nature of the projects and their contexts. The informal character of evaluation in this sense therefore, should not necessarily be viewed as an inferior form of monitoring and evaluation to more formalised ones. In contrast, at the other end of the continuum, the informal character of monitoring and evaluation entails organisations taking a less active role. This end of the continuum was best demonstrated by Interviewee 6, who represents a volunteer travel organisation that, at the time of interview, was in the process of ceasing operations.

It was done very much on a friendly basis. I realised that if I was to ask a native person in a country that doesn't have English as a common language to write a report they could only say probably bloody awful or very good, and that wouldn't tell us anything, but by the way that they reacted and asked us for more people like that one or whatever, gave me a clue of what it was all about. When the volunteers came back I always asked them to give us a report, 99% of them were students and they had far too much to do when they got back...I was not prepared to make a song and dance about it. [Interview 6, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

For this participant, whose organisation displayed predominantly liquid organisation characteristics, monitoring and evaluation was so informal in character that at times it did not happen. Overall, the organisation took a passive role whereby monitoring and evaluation was done on an ad-hoc basis at a minimal level, and sometimes not at all, making the level of their engagement with monitoring and evaluation questionable.

For organisations that did take a more pro-active approach to monitoring and evaluation, different methods included informal conversations, workshops and meetings with host community members, stakeholder mapping exercises, interviews and surveys. These methods also existed along a second continuum; at one end of the continuum the methods are employed in a highly structured, standardised way, at the other end they are unstructured. One organisation uses a
'mystery shopper' to determine local perspectives on projects. The 'mystery shopper' is an example of a very extensive and unique approach to host community focused monitoring and evaluation which is adapted and used in both informal and formal as well as unstructured and structured ways. The mystery shopper is explained below by the director and founder of a small for-profit niche travel company (which donates 10% of profits to projects). The director is originally from one of the countries that they offer voluntours to and has a deep understanding of local customs and dynamics.

*How do you go about getting feedback from the community on the programmes?*

One is random testing and one is specific testing. Random testing, I'll give you an example, so I will send someone who is not from the area and they will go and say 'oh you guys have a clinic here, oh my god it looks so good, so how many people use it, when did you build that clinic, how did you come about it' and these kind of questions...we call it mystery shopping.

*ok, yeah*

Yeah, it's like the mystery shopper, so they will come and will just ask locals randomly, for me that has worked. But, then we've got the specific. Specific means that people will come, they know what you are asking about and why you are asking it, and the reason why you are asking it is because you want to make sure of the validity or the actual importance and usage of that project. So you will ask a) people who are involved and b) people who are not involved but they are affected by it. For example when we work with a women's group we will get someone who isn't involved in the project to ask, because whoever is involved they are so excited by the opportunity of whatever's been done that it can sometimes blur their judgement to call it and say to be honest we should have done better here. So you try sometimes to engage someone who is affected by it but not involved.

*How regularly do you do that?*

...we do it as a matter of project by project and also randomly. If we've done something a year later we want to find out whether it's still going on and if something has gone wrong, so the team leader will go and see. So for example a school trip, we took a school from here and built a toilet at a school, and you know I showed up on the door step of the school and the lady had never seen myself, she had always liaised with my team so I was the one driving and my team manager was sitting in the back, so when I showed up I said I have just come to see how the toilet is
going, so I went to use the toilet to see how it is but she could not stop telling me, you know, thanking me and stuff so I said to her, you know, look, for me I'm just happy that the kids in this school have extra facilities which they can use, because before they didn't have the toilet and they didn't have the money to be able to build another one...So after six months of it being completed and going there, it allows me to see that actually these things a) are beneficial b) they are appreciated and c) they are sustaining them. [Interview 24, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

In contrast to the organisations that exhibit various liquid approaches to monitoring and evaluation, one organisation was in the process of updating their monitoring and evaluation processes and moving towards a more formalised and pro-active approach. This for-profit travel organisation had started life as an expedition company and now has its own charity. In recent years it had become more focused on the community development aspect of its operations and this is reflected in its shift in approach to monitoring and evaluation. In doing so the organisation sought to legitimise its activities in order to prove their worth to current and potential supporters and to verify their impact on the host communities within which they work (e.g. Meyer, 2012). This shift can be interpreted as reflecting the organisation's increased commitment to the community development aspect of their volunteer travel programmes.

I'd say it's (monitoring and evaluation) really important. I think in a formal sense it's only over the past couple of years that we've started to really put it into effect. We've always done feedback surveys with our volunteers, so we make sure that they complete those and with our project partners we get project partner reports every year and speak to them. Then the head of the charity speaks to community members while they're there, but in the past it's been much more informal. In terms of speaking to the community in particular, it's been much more a case of doing it informally and doing it through the project partners. It's been over this past year that we've really thought, actually we want to be a bit more strict with this and we want to make sure that it is a more formal part of our programme so that we can actually prove to other people and to external people that we are taking it seriously, and we do want to make sure that our impact is actually positive and it is long lasting, you know, as far as we can do that with our resources. So this last year we've had somebody working here in the UK trying to develop a system and then we started trialling it this summer. [Interview 17, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]
The broad variety of approaches to monitoring and evaluation uncovered during this research and described above are represented visually by Figure 5.1 below. In this diagram the horizontal arrow-line represents the continuum of informal-formal approaches to monitoring and evaluation. The vertical arrow-line represents the continuum of unstructured-structured ways in which monitoring and evaluation processes can take place. For organisations with more liquefied approaches, their monitoring and evaluation practices typically move around, varying from programme to programme and are not fixed within a particular space on the diagram.

**Figure 5.1 Approaches to Monitoring and Evaluation: Two Continua.** Source: Author

### 5.7 Stakeholder Feedback: Uneven Emphasis on Different Perspectives

This research revealed that three core overarching areas of stakeholder feedback in monitoring and evaluation were present in both the survey and interview findings: 1) volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation, 2) host partner organisation focused monitoring and evaluation and 3) host community focused monitoring and evaluation.

Both the survey and the interviews revealed that the monitoring and evaluation of the volunteers' experience was a major area of focus for all of the organisations
and this was the most consistent area of monitoring and evaluation across all of the organisations. The monitoring of Volunteer Satisfaction was considered 'Extremely important' to organisations by 94% of survey respondents, placing it just above Host Community Satisfaction (90% said Extremely important) and Host Partner Satisfaction (81% said Extremely important). Volunteer Satisfaction was also the most frequently monitored, with 86% of survey respondents selecting that their organisation 'Always' monitored Volunteer Satisfaction. In addition, the monitoring of volunteers was the most frequently monitored aspect of a volunteer travel programme, with all of the organisations engaging in the monitoring of volunteer travel programmes to some extent. Similarly, the evaluation of Volunteer Satisfaction was considered 'Extremely important' to organisations by 94% of survey respondents and 88% of survey respondents said that their organisation 'Always' sought Volunteer Feedback. The majority of organisations represented in the interviews also engaged in Volunteer Focused Evaluation.

The survey data revealed that despite that the monitoring of Host Partner Organisation/s Satisfaction was considered 'Extremely important' to organisations by 81% of survey respondents, in terms of frequency that this aspect is monitored, there was a decrease to 63% of survey respondents selecting that they 'Always' monitored host partner satisfaction. There was also a decrease in the importance placed on the evaluation of Host Partner Organisation/s satisfaction with 75% of survey respondents indicating that it was 'Extremely important'. In addition, only 58% of respondents said that they 'Always' sought host partner organisation feedback when evaluating programmes. Compared to volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation, engagement with host partner organisation focused monitoring and evaluation was less frequent. The fact that not all organisations are engaged in partnerships with host partner organisations (Multi-layered Partnerships) accounts for some of this difference. Overall, the results revealed that the nature of host partner focused monitoring and evaluation was, in most cases, of an ad-hoc, informal character.

Similar to host partner organisations, there was a gap between the importance placed on monitoring and evaluating host community satisfaction and the extent to which participants indicated that it actually takes place. The monitoring of Host Community Satisfaction was considered 'Extremely important' to organisations by
90% of survey respondents, however in terms of frequency that this aspect is monitored, the percentage of respondents that indicated that their organisation 'Always' monitors Host Community Satisfaction was significantly less. Just 54% of survey respondents selecting that they 'Always' monitored Host Community Satisfaction. There was a slight decrease in the importance placed on the evaluation of Host Community Satisfaction with 81% of survey respondents indicating that it was 'Extremely important'. However, just 34% of respondents said that they 'Always' sought Host Community Feedback when evaluating programmes. Compared to both volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation and host partner organisation focused monitoring and evaluation, host community focused monitoring and evaluation was reported as the least frequent. These findings from the survey data are presented below in Figures 5.2 and 5.3.

![Figure 5.2 Importance and Frequency of Monitoring Stakeholder Satisfaction: Percentage of Survey Respondents Selecting 'Extremely Important' and 'Always'

Interpretation of the data in Figures 5.2 and 5.3 provides indicative patterns but does not constitute 'reliable' data.
Building on the quantitative survey data outlined above, the qualitative interview data revealed many reasons why varying emphasis was placed on different sets of stakeholder perspectives. The dominant focus on volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation is discussed in the next section, followed by discussion of how partnerships influence the logistics of monitoring and evaluation, and consequently organisations' engagement with different stakeholder perspectives.

**The value of volunteer feedback**

Volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation was the dominant focus in the data set thus this section explores the value of volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation to the organisations. Volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation was deemed important to the organisations for different reasons. For commercially oriented organisations, the volunteers were perceived as customers that fund the organisation and thus are important stakeholders to gather feedback from in order to keep up to date with market perspectives on their programmes. For charitable organisations volunteers are perceived as important because they are donors to the organisations' activities, helping to fund or provide labour to their projects. In some cases, for organisations with a more ambiguous orientation that is blurred between commercial and charitable interests, the volunteers are perceived as both customers and donors. The following key themes emerged from the data: 1) **volunteers as customers**, 2) **volunteers as donors**, and 3) **volunteers as customers and donors**. These themes will now be discussed.
Volunteers as customers was a recurring theme in seven of the transcripts belonging to representatives of for-profit organisations, some of which are considered more ambiguous in their profit status, as discussed in the previous chapter. For these participants the purpose of volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation is to gain useful feedback linked to their commercial interests. The organisations recognise that the volunteers are not just volunteers but also consumers of a 'product' and that the organisation's existence is dependent on the continued consumption of their products. For Interviewee 31, for example, the feedback from volunteers is used to help decide which projects they will continue to partner with, meaning that their support for a particular project is dependent on its popularity with volunteers and not necessarily based on community need.

A lot of that comes from the customer, from the volunteer themselves, so when somebody's completed a programme with (name of organisation) they have a post trip questionnaire and feedback form which we encourage them to complete, and we consider all feedback very carefully, everyone's feedback is taken at face value, we look for patterns in feedback...From the volunteer angle we've developed our feedback processes and that has changed quite a bit over the years to make it beneficial. To be honest, we make decisions on future partnerships or continuation of partnerships based on the feedback ratings from volunteers. We have a grading system, 1-10, ten being perfect and one being not so perfect, a grading system, it works pretty well for us, we can start to take average feedback ratings and we can see patterns and changes from month to month and year to year so that we can then manage that accordingly. [Interview 31, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Volunteers as donors is a theme present in seven transcripts representing not-for-profit organisations. In this theme volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation is important because the volunteers provide some or all of the funding for the programmes and the organisations' activities. For these organisations, they rely heavily on volunteers for funding.

So basically for about 95% of our income we rely on volunteers, so we're a not-for-profit NGO so our whole projects are volunteer-focused so we have volunteers that pay to go on expeditions with us, they basically fund the company pretty much. [Interview 22, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

In contrast to volunteers as customers as exemplified by Interviewee 31's comments, Interviewees 26 and 30 (representing the same non-profit, community
development-focused NGO) took a very different view on evaluating the feedback from volunteer tourists. Unlike Interviewee 31 where the organisation is market driven, utilising market trends to determine the organisations volunteer tourism activities, Interviewee's 26 and 30 represent an organisation that is driven by the needs of the community. They still recognise the importance of the volunteers in that they are donors and supporters of the organisation. However, the difference is that their main focus is first and foremost as a development organisation and the needs of the host community are placed above meeting market demands. Their support for projects is not contingent on popularity with volunteer tourists, demonstrating very different values and interests to Interviewee 31.

Obviously we always have our focus and our priority on the NGO and its operations in (destination) and the priorities of the community. Everything we work on has been requested locally, so what we have to make sure is that where the volunteers are coming in and getting involved, we have to be sure that they'll naturally be getting involved in locally requested projects. So we're not asking people to paint a school for the fifth time in a month and things like that, there's actually a locally requested job that needs to be done, so they're actually working just by the very nature of how we're structured on authentic, I suppose you could call it in a way, projects. But we do have to make sure, you know, obviously people fundraise a lot of money, they put a lot of time into preparing to come out to (name of country), we also have to make sure that it's a good experience for people who come out. [Interview 26, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

As I said, our volunteer programmes are not really centred around the volunteer, they're centred around the local needs and we very much tell people that from the start. If someone says ooh well I expected better food – which would actually be unlikely because our food's pretty good – but then I would say well no, that's not what it's about but if they say I was concerned that this project that we're doing is not actually necessary then that would raise serious alarm bells. [Interview 30, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Volunteers as donors and customers was a theme that emerged from six organisations which displayed more ambiguous profit statuses, as discussed in the previous chapter, such as for-profit organisations which have their own charity or for-profit organisations that do not actually make a profit and perceive themselves to be more akin to a not-for-profit organisation in terms of values and interests. Interviewee 9, representing one such organisation, highlights the importance of
monitoring and evaluating the delicate balance between meeting the needs of both the local communities and the volunteer tourists.

I think it (monitoring and evaluation) is really important, definitely, because there are two sides with this business, there is the fact that the aim is to improve these people's livelihoods, like child welfare and sustainable community development, it is about making the lives of these people better and so we need to make sure that who we're partnering with, and the volunteers that we're giving them, that that is getting better, but because it's a business structure we have to make sure that our volunteers are happy and that they're going to build our name by having an amazing time and coming back! So monitoring and evaluation are definitely important. [Interview 9, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

As highlighted by Interviewee 9, and discussed in the literature by Coghlan and Noakes (2012), volunteer tourism organisations have to manage multiple stakeholder relationships. Organisations must navigate a fine line between ensuring that they are meeting the needs of, and attracting, the volunteer tourists who fund their operations without becoming so commercialised that the needs of the host communities and beneficiaries become secondary to the volunteers, or even overlooked altogether. Interviewees 9, 26 and 30 acknowledge both the communities and the volunteers as important stakeholders to include in monitoring and evaluation. In contrast, Interviewee 31 represents an organisation in which its commercialised organisational context drives not only what is deemed important to monitor and evaluate, but also how the information is used.

5.8 Partnerships and the Logistics of Monitoring and Evaluation

The interview data revealed that the ways and extent to which organisations engaged with all areas of monitoring and evaluation is substantially influenced by the organisation's operational arrangements. It was discussed in Chapter 4 that organisations can operate in different ways, with most operating within partnerships with one or multiple in-country host partners (Multi-layered Partnerships) or as a sending and hosting organisation where they have a higher level of direct engagement with the project at the ground level (Direct Partnerships). Partnerships influenced the logistics of how monitoring and evaluation took place at a practical level. These operational arrangements also influenced organisations' level of engagement with monitoring and evaluation;
organisations held different perspectives on what they considered to be their responsibility to monitor and evaluate within a partnership. This section will now discuss how partnerships can impact the ways and extent to which 1) volunteer focused 2) host partner organisation focused and 3) host community focused monitoring and evaluation takes place.

**Volunteer monitoring and evaluation within partnerships**

Whether or not an organisation is in Multi-layered Partnerships or Direct Partnerships has implications for the level of engagement that the organisation has with a programme at the ground level, i.e. the actual volunteer travel programme taking place in a destination. For organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships which send their volunteers to in-country host partner organisations, this distance impacts upon how volunteers are monitored. In this situation, it is common for monitoring to be done from afar, predominantly using email or Skype to check in with how the volunteers are getting on. Some organisations use social media, such as Facebook, Instagram and online journaling platforms to monitor the volunteers. Overall, the responsibility for monitoring volunteers in this context was deemed by most interviewees to sit with the in-country host partner organisations. However, some monitoring is done from a distance by the sending organisation. Volunteer focused monitoring is carried out in this nature for eight organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships, regardless of profit status or organisational type. For example:

In terms of monitoring, the monitoring of people on the programme is generally done by the partner organisations. There's not a huge amount of monitoring that we do. They're directed for all that stuff for their individual programmes to go straight to the partner organisation who's with them in that country. The one thing that we do have which helps us with the monitoring is the blogging website...if people are unhappy then on our Facebook or Twitter feed tends to be one of the first places that we'll hear about it, they use that quite a lot. We have people in each of the country offices that are responsible for managing the Facebook and Twitter feeds at certain times during a 24 hour period. [Interview 15, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

So once they arrive in the country they are my partner's responsibility but I still need to monitor them and keep in touch with how they are getting on and ask them how are you getting on. What I say to the volunteer is once you're there, report to so and so who will be looking after your needs. If you've got any
problems let that person know and if you don't get any joys with them then tell me and I will try and sort it out for you, because, you know, sometimes there are little things that are not quite right and need sorting out. [Interview 23, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

At times these organisational arrangements were confusing for the volunteers, who do not always know who to contact if they experience any issues during a programme.

So if there's problems while the volunteers are in country, I mean it's interesting really because in theory you'd think they would go to the partner organisation, but actually often they'll come to us first. Not all volunteers, but sometimes they feel more comfortable sending us an email and saying this is what's going on. Obviously we're here (in sending country) so then we have to contact that organisation anyway. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

*So you have a contract to make sure everybody knows what they're doing?*

Exactly. And again that's really hard and a blurred line because the volunteer might then phone the wrong organisation when they should be phoning the other organisation if that makes sense? [Interview 15 For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Such operational arrangements resonate with the liquid organisations metaphor in that volunteer focused monitoring becomes ambiguous and fragmented within a broader network of organisations and partnerships. It is unclear to the volunteer, and sometimes to organisations, who is responsible for the volunteer whilst they are at the project. Some organisations employ an in-country coordinator, who is usually locally based. Their role is to check in on the volunteers at the placement or project from time to time and act as a point of contact for them. Five participating organisations operate in this way. For example, when Interviewee 31 was asked how their organisation monitors the volunteers when they are at the project they replied:

Ok, well that's the role of our in-country team. The in-country team will be in close contact with the volunteers, particularly in the first few days at the project. They'll either be with them for
the entire day making sure everything's going well from both sides, from both the volunteer and the project side and then we kind of step back gradually, so if a volunteer is there for four or five weeks for example we wouldn't be with them every single day but we might be close to them for the first couple of days and then gradually step back so they take control of the situation themselves. [Interview 31, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

As with those organisations using online communication to monitor volunteers, the lack of direct involvement with the project means that the monitoring of volunteers is done from a distance and responsibility for the volunteers is transferred to in-country host partners. This means that the sending organisations are unable to directly monitor how the volunteers are getting on and have to rely on the host partner organisation to attend to any issues that the volunteer may be facing. In contrast, for those organisations operating in Direct Partnerships, they are engaged with the programme at the project level and they considered the monitoring of volunteers to be their own responsibility. As a result, ambiguity surrounding responsibility for the task is removed and the extent to which volunteer focused monitoring is undertaken is more thorough, direct and proactive. Monitoring is often done face-to-face with the volunteers, both formally in regular meetings and also in-situ throughout the programme, as explained by Interviewees 21 and 30:

For our volunteers we hold feedback sessions every week on a Saturday at the centre and we make sure that anything is flagged up immediately whether it be, you know, whatever it's about, we get really varied feedback, and then that gives us the chance to immediately sort it out then and there. [Interview 21, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Because we've got full time staff working with the groups there's a constant informal monitoring and evaluation as well of the individuals, so you know, just the sitting around the campfire and chatting is actually where you get a lot of valuable information informally and so from that we can really work out where people are happy and where people aren't and decide whether it's appropriate to make changes... [Interview 30, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]
Volunteer focused evaluation is also influenced by the organisations' operational arrangements. Not to the same extent, however, as monitoring because this information is usually gathered once the volunteers had returned home and so the distance between the sending organisation and the volunteers experienced in Multi-layered Partnerships is removed. All of the organisations represented in the interviews sought volunteer feedback on their volunteer travel programmes. This was most commonly done (for 18 organisations) by asking volunteers to fill out either hardcopy or online feedback forms when they had returned from their trip. Four organisations seek verbal or email feedback from the volunteers once they have returned. For organisations in Direct Partnerships a further level of volunteer focused evaluation was involved, with seven organisations running pre-departure feedback/debriefing sessions before the volunteers returned home in addition to feedback forms or returned volunteer meetings when they have had time to reflect on their experiences.

**Host partner organisation monitoring and evaluation within partnerships**

As a result of the operational arrangements of organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships, the volunteers play a significant role in the monitoring and evaluation of host partner organisations. *Volunteers as monitors of host partners and projects* emerged as a recurring theme within this group of organisations. For example, because organisations do not have a presence at the volunteer tourism programme, they rely on the volunteers to inform them of any issues to do with the programme or the host partner organisation. The volunteers have more direct contact with in-country host partner organisations and projects than the sending organisations do and so are more knowledgeable about the day to day running of the programme. Therefore, volunteers are a useful monitoring mechanism for the sending organisation when they themselves do not visit and monitor the projects directly.

We're very hot on evaluation, and the main reason for that is because we can't go and visit the projects, as much as we'd love to, we can't, the only way we get feedback is from the volunteer. So we try to make it, well we don't make it compulsory but we make the volunteer very aware that it's very important for us to have their feedback. [Interview 13, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

We want more people to be volunteering and to be coming back and part of that's providing good programmes that people are
enjoying and feel that they are making a difference and although we don't have much of a direct say in that because we work with local partners so we obviously have to be quite careful about how the programmes are run when they're there and are organised, so basically a lot of that comes down to volunteer feedback. So we try and visit the programmes about once a year or so, each of the programmes, but because we are so spread across the globe, for some areas it's hard to get there that frequently, so we rely a lot on volunteer feedback. [Interview 29, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

The theme of volunteers as monitors of host partner organisations also resonates with the principal-agent theory perspective of collaborative relationships (principal-agent theory is discussed in detail in chapter 6). The volunteer's feedback alerts sending organisations if host partners are not doing what was agreed to within the partnership. What this means, however, is that most organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships rely greatly on the volunteer tourists to flag any potential problems with a programme or host partner.

... just using the example of the person who told me they went out to Africa to do water systems and the water system was to put water into the garden of the coordinator, so you know, that kind of thing where we've got people on the ground who are going and seeing it and if they were to see that they would be like well this isn't a project this is just somebody doing a garden! ...the volunteer's the person who spends the most time in that country so the volunteer is often able to feedback, you know, there's something amiss here or actually there was a really good thing they did there or I really respected all the work they did and all that kind of stuff. [Interview 19, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Relying on volunteers as monitors of host partner organisations and projects is further demonstrated by Interviewee 2. They talked about a recent situation where their organisation chose to end their relationship with a host partner after volunteers had raised concerns about a host partner organisation:

Well basically we had a partner in a country and we had ongoing issues and we tried a whole range of things to try and address those issues. The main issue was around accountability of money so it was an issue for both (name of organisation) and (name of organisation) fundraising branch, and with (name of organisation) fundraising branch. We ended the partnership first because we were getting a lot of feedback from volunteers that the donation money was misused or that double-dipping was going on, so basically our partner was reporting to me that the
funds were being used for something but then he was also taking funds directly from volunteers in country for that same thing. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

So the volunteers themselves are a good source of information?

Yes. And sometimes what they say has to be taken with a pinch of salt. The volunteers can be a little self-righteous or I guess just have expectations of how things should be and not recognise that different cultures do things in different ways. So we don't take what volunteers say, you know, to be the absolute truth from the beginning, but they're saying how they see it and we obviously get the partners perspective as well, but the volunteers are a really good source of feedback. And they are really good for the fundraising branch too because even if we can't visit and monitor every single project that we provide a grant for, if something dodgy is going on we'll hear about it from the volunteers. So that's really helpful to have them there. And the volunteers are, on the whole, good people and wanting good things, so even if they perhaps don't fully understand how things work locally their feedback is usually still powerful and can still be balanced with the local perspective and then we figure out what's going on and try and sort it out. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

A potential issue with volunteers as monitors of host partners is that volunteers are in a position of power as a paying volunteer who takes part in a programme for a relatively short period of time and then leaves again. However, as highlighted by Interviewee 2, they may lack understanding of the local and cultural context so it is essential that sending organisations recognise this and do not rely unconditionally on volunteer feedback. The earlier admission from Interviewee 31 that they decide whether or not to continue with partnerships and programmes based on volunteer ratings means that programmes and their beneficiaries run the risk of being at the mercy of volunteers who may misread a situation and the subsequent value judgements of a distant sending organisation.

Host community focused monitoring and evaluation within partnerships

Host community focused monitoring and evaluation was also considerably influenced by the operational arrangements of volunteer tourism organisations, particularly with regard to who is considered responsible for monitoring and evaluation from a host community perspective. The interviews revealed that for those organisations engaged in Multi-layered Partnerships, the responsibility for
host community focused monitoring and evaluation was predominantly considered to sit with host partner organisations, who in many cases were considered representative of the wider host community. Thus, host partner focused monitoring and evaluation and host community focused monitoring and evaluation were overlapping areas in some cases. This approach is demonstrated by Interviewee's 27 and 11:

We use our grass roots organisations as that bridge between the community and ourselves, it's just how we operate...we really use the grass roots as that middle ground, they obviously have their own ways of surveying their success and marking their success in their operations that they're doing so we listen to them in that. [Interview 27, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

It's regulated by an in-country partner and I suppose there are some holes in that. It's pretty hard to get feedback directly from a community because the way it works is that we work with an in-country partner who is the liaison person, if you like, for the local community. [Interview 11, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

From a liquid organisation perspective, the loose networks of partnerships mean that the sending organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships remain distanced from and directly unaccountable to the host community. In contrast, for Interviewee 10, the director and founder of an organisation which recruits volunteers for both host partner organisations and their own sister NGO, they considered the responsibility for host community focused monitoring and evaluation to be theirs and not just that of their partners. This demonstrates that in some Multi-layered Partnership situations host community focused monitoring and evaluation should not necessarily be assumed the sole responsibility of host partner organisations, rather it can be a collaborative task between all organisations in the partnership.

How important is host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes?

It's our number one priority. Again volunteers have to be, we have a duty of care to volunteers and their experience is very important to us so they would be very close but the host community is the main driving factor and our motivation for doing what we do and recruiting the volunteers to go out to the projects, so they're our number one priority at the end of the day and if the feedback from the host communities or our evaluation shows that we're not making any progress or achieving anything
that would be what we want to do something about ahead of anything else really, so it's very important to us. [Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Contrary to organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships, those that are engaged in Direct Partnerships are more closely involved with the host community at the ground level. In most cases, some members of the host community are also engaged in the planning and execution of monitoring and evaluation processes, as opposed to only providing feedback. For these organisations the importance placed on host community focused monitoring and evaluation was matched by the extent to which it actually took place. These organisations were strongly driven by their values of wanting their programmes to be of benefit to the local community, who were the main intended beneficiaries of the programmes. These motivations were reflected in their monitoring and evaluation practices and their desire to gather feedback from beneficiaries that can help to improve the programmes from the perspective of host-communities. Chapter 6 focuses in further depth on host community participation in monitoring and evaluation.

Dealing with ethical dilemmas that arise within partnerships

As stated earlier in section 5.8 by Interviewees 2, 13, 19 and 29, the volunteers are often a useful source of information for organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships. However, the feedback can pose ethical dilemmas to the sending organisations who, because of their partnership arrangements, are not directly accountable, or have to take responsibility for, the actions of their partner organisations. Interviewee 2 gave an example of a case where volunteer feedback alerted the organisation to a partner organisation's mismanagement of finances:

We had a partner in a country and we had ongoing issues and we tried a whole range of things to try and address those issues. The main issue was around accountability of money...we were getting a lot of feedback from volunteers that the donation money was misused or that double-dipping was going on... There was no proof exactly but it just kept coming back to us and ultimately it was really affecting (name of organisation's) credibility and we decided to end the partnership. So it does happen and it's really messy and disappointing when it does because ultimately we fully acknowledge that us ending the partnership there is going to have an impact on the kids in those projects but because of the partnership arrangement we can't
really control it. A lot of our volunteers are saying well you know "fire the director and get a new director" but it's not our organisation, it's our partner, so we can't do that, we don't have that power. So the only way we could continue working in that country was to end that partnership and find a new partner.

[Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Interviewee 2 also discussed another incident where a volunteer had sent an email to their organisation to say that they were concerned that children at the project they had been sent to were being beaten by one of the local workers:

So with something like that obviously here in (name of sending country) we can't do anything so we have to pass that on to our partner organisation. They've been great, they've responded straight away and they've set up a meeting with the director of the orphanage...So they're going to have a meeting, talk about the feedback and address it in country and they'll report back to us so we can report back to the volunteer. So often we are kind of that middle man I guess... [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Although organisations gain information via monitoring and evaluation, Multi-layered Partnerships not only challenge an organisation's capacity to address the issue from a practical perspective, but it also relieves them from any accountability or responsibility for having to do so. In the first example, despite Interviewee 2 expressing concern that ending the partnership will have consequences for the beneficiaries, their organisation is not accountable for any ramifications or impacts on the beneficiaries, in this case children, that ending the partnership would have. In the second example, Interviewee 2 was made aware that children are potentially being mistreated, however there was only so far that their organisation felt it could intervene. Instead, they rely on their partner to address the issue and for future volunteers to report any concerns. The liquid structures and partnership networks within the volunteer tourism environment, particularly in Multi-layered Partnerships, reduce the level of responsibility and action that they are required to take, and the participant accepts that beyond a superficial level of acknowledgement and follow up, that they are the 'middle man' and such issues are not theirs to deal with. This situation can be compared to Bauman's argument that liquid modernity represents a time of adiaphorization, the moral distancing of individuals, which in this case also includes organisations,
from their decisions and acts (Bauman & Donskis, 2013). Rather, "mechanisms of limiting liability, exposure, accountability, and, ultimately, responsibility are the order of the day" (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2014, p.8).

The more partners that an organisation has the more difficult it becomes to monitor and evaluate the programmes in an immediate and direct way. The monitoring of host partner organisations was often done from a distance, using Skype and emails to check in with how things are progressing, with few organisations making site visits from time to time. Interviewee 2, for example, represents a not-for-profit sending organisation which works with 63 projects spanning 20 countries and 5 continents:

So one thing is obviously to try to maintain regular and open communication with the partner organisations, so a lot of our partners have Skype which is awesome so they can message each other, email obviously is a big one, phone calls, we try to do site visits and that's where a member of staff from (name of organisation) or (name of organisation) fundraising branch will go to the partner organisation to visit, to go around to the projects, to ask questions to see how everything is going. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

For this organisation, host partner focused monitoring and evaluation is something that they "try to maintain" across large geographical areas. However, this distance between themselves and their partners means that they rely predominantly on technology to communicate along with the feedback from the volunteers. In contrast, Interviewee 5 represents a for-profit organisation that partners with one NGO and accompanies the volunteers to the projects whilst they are there, removing the barrier of physical distance and facilitating a closer relationship with their partner organisation and the community.

The NGO that we partner with and also the local community leaders, everybody, we meet, we sit down and we evaluate together to make sure we're heading in the right direction so it really is inclusive, which is so important...I meet with each one of my NGO directors as often as possible just to make sure things are going along the right track. So they always feedback and we always act on that. [Interview 5, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

5.9 Monitoring and Evaluation of Programme Outcomes

The final area of monitoring and evaluation that this chapter will discuss is programme outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation, i.e. did the programme achieve what it set out to achieve? Survey participants were asked how important their organisation considers the monitoring of the 'Progress of programme in relation to its goals', and 67% indicated that this was 'Extremely Important', which was significantly lower than the importance of monitoring the three other areas of focus (volunteer focused, host partner organisation focused and host community focused). In addition, when asked how often this aspect is monitored, less than half of respondents (47%), said 'Always'. Similar results were found with regards to the importance of evaluating the 'progress of programme in relation to its goals', with 69% selecting that this was considered 'Extremely important'. Feedback from volunteers followed by host partner organisations was most frequently gathered in evaluation activities compared to 'Numerical data (e.g. number of dwellings built, number of students taught)' which 35% of respondents selected their organisation 'Always' sought. Programme outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation was considered less important and engaged with less frequently than the three other areas of volunteer focused evaluation, host partner focused evaluation and host community focused evaluation. The interviews also found that fewer organisations engaged with this aspect of programme monitoring and evaluation compared to the other areas, with just 11 of the 29 organisations actively monitoring and evaluating programme outcomes (Interviewees 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 17, 20, 21, 24, 26, 30). In addition, operational arrangements also influenced programme outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation. For organisations in Multi-layered Partnerships programmes this aspect was considered the responsibility of their host partner organisations.

A continuum of deep to shallow approaches and interpretations

As with the other areas of monitoring and evaluation, the ways and extent to which programme outcome focused monitoring and evaluation take place also ranged from informal to formal and unstructured to structured. Again, this varied from organisation to organisation and programme to programme. Additionally, it was also the case that only a small number of organisations (Interviewees 21, 26 (& 30)) were required to monitor and evaluate specific areas and outcomes as required by their funding agencies. Organisations which engaged in programme
outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation utilised a variety of different methods which gathered both qualitative and quantitative data.

The main focus of organisation greatly influenced what the organisation monitored and evaluated. For example, for Interviewee 12 representing an NGO focused primarily on disease prevention, they assess for disease prevalence after the volunteers have visited the community. The organisation represented by Interviewee 21, who runs nutrition and bio-garden programmes, reported that they are required by their funders to collect quantitative data on the nutrition levels of members of the host community. Interviewee 10, whose organisation is engaged with a range of programmes, discussed the different types of information that they monitor and evaluate at the project level, which differs according to the context of each project:

Some of it can be very factual based, for example, we're doing a bilharzias (parasitic disease) treatment programme at the moment in (name of country). So we collect direct data about morbidity, prevalence etc., about the disease and then when we do a repeat testing and treatment we can collect information about how that's improved directly so that's easy for us to see the results of that actual project. What's a little bit harder to see is where we're doing home based care training for example, we're training up local volunteers to give primary and palliative care in the community. It's difficult to see a direct result from that apart from we can assess that the group of volunteers that we're training up that their knowledge is improving and we can assess that as we go along. So really that's them, feedback comes from them and those groups and pretty much every community, rural community in the countries we work in in (name of continent) has a community based organisation, which is a very good way to tap into the community and find how the community feels the projects are actually going, where things can be improved etc. So in that case we would be getting feedback directly from the group members, like the HIV/AIDS support group that we work with, the home based care groups, the community based organisations, as to monitoring how they feel the projects are going and what they feel the achievements are, and because we're very much on the ground and our staff are very much on the ground or the co-op or the managers of the NGOs we're involved with are on the ground it's easy for us to see what is being achieved. Wound care for example, how many people are we treating at the primary schools, how is attendance picking up, how is attendance going? If we're working in pre-schools for vulnerable children, how many children are attending so at that
The impact of the liquid organisational arrangements on monitoring and evaluation was also highlighted by Interviewee 10. They discussed how the lack of clear accountability and responsibility for various programmes and projects that they work with, in other words, liquid processes and liquid structures, complicate the gathering of data and information, making monitoring and evaluation at the level of programme outcomes difficult.

...the barrier to that can sometimes actually be getting hold of the right people that you need for various reasons. It's not a hard and fast rule but some people are busy, some people are unfortunately lazy and that can be difficult to get the relevant information in order to monitor or assess a programme or plan a programme or plan improvements to a programme. Quite often in the type of programme we're working in, there's a national level, a district level, then there's an even more local management level and then there's actually the guys who put into effect the programme on the ground. There's quite often inefficient monitoring and reporting processes that actually goes on, so the feedback and information that's fed from one level to the next, no one's really made accountable quite often, or follows up directly. Because there's not often a very good reporting process or a lack of accountability at any real level it can be quite often difficult to get an accurate representation of how something has gone. Obviously that can be a barrier for us evaluating or monitoring and planning our programmes. But again, usually eventually you get to the bottom of it, it can just take time. Ideally it might take a week to get that information and it often takes months to get the information you're actually looking for. [Interview 10, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Despite the barriers that the liquefied environments of volunteer tourism pose to monitoring and evaluation, Interviewee 10's organisation continues to gather and value this information for use in developing and improving the programmes. In contrast to the approach outlined above by Interviewee 10, more dubious approaches to programme outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation were discussed by some organisations:

I guess we don't do a lot of programme evaluation. Um, our most successful programme is probably our school in (country), we're taking the children and teaching them their ABCs and working through it. I guess the indicator of success of that programme are how desperate people are to get their kids into
that programme. So we also do you know, what I mentioned before about taking their English level before and measuring it later on, that has been a good idea, but it really only works if they have some sort of English ability to start with, and a lot of kids in our school are zero. So it is what it is, they can't help but improve. Someone from the local people actually raised a very challenging question for us, we were teaching students that were 8, 9 and 10 and he saw our programmes and he said to us you are wasting your time and these children, these people just aren't going to learn, you're wasting your time, and you know, that's not the kind of thing you want to hear from someone but I think in some sense he was correct and so it was one of the reasons we shifted our focus to the younger children...We did do some tests with them, we'd show them the letter A, we'd twist it around, turn it upside down and get them to try and work out what it was, so I guess there wasn't very good monitoring, I guess is the short answer. [Interview 3, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

One organisation measured 'positive impact' on communities by the number of volunteers that they were sending. What is disconcerting here is the neocolonial assumption that just the presence of a volunteer equates to a positive impact on the local people (Palacios, 2010). There is limited consideration of the potential for negative impacts:

...our mission is to positively impact 20 million people by 2020, so the idea is if they go on a programme to an orphanage and there is 25 people at the orphanage, which we know are part of the programme, that for us counts as positively impacting 25 people, and then that is all being calculated and added up, the theory is then that by 2020 that should add up to 20 million people that are connected and hopefully impacted in a positive way by someone at (name of organisation), by one of our participants... [Interview 15, For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Overall, there was an overarching lack of depth and effort to evaluate the programme outcomes of volunteer tourism programmes and shallow interpretations of monitoring and evaluation were apparent.

5.10 Conclusion
The aim of this chapter was to identify and critically examine the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their projects (Objective 3). In addressing this aim, this research has contributed to bridging the gap in understanding with respect to how, and indeed
if, volunteer tourism organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes. The findings reveal five key observations:

First, this research has highlighted that while the vast majority of organisations engage with monitoring and evaluation and consider it to be important, interpretations of what constitutes monitoring and evaluation, and the different ways and extent to which organisations engage with the monitoring and evaluation of their programmes varies greatly.

Second, this research has revealed that approaches to monitoring and evaluation are largely informal and liquid in nature and practices were found to exist along two intersecting continuums: 1) level of formality and 2) level of structure. A key finding is that the liquid organisational contexts of many volunteer tourism organisations makes it difficult to implement structured, systematic and formalised monitoring and evaluation processes. On the one hand, for organisations that have a strong voluntary commitment to monitoring and evaluating their programmes and have the skills and knowledge to do so, this liquidity allows organisations the flexibility and freedom to evaluate their programmes in ways that are appropriate and useful to their specific contexts. However, on the other hand, it also permits organisations to overlook some or even all aspects of monitoring and evaluation altogether and to focus predominantly on market-based interests. This risk is exemplified in the next key finding, outlined below, which highlights the uneven emphasis on different stakeholder perspectives.

The third key finding this chapter highlights is that the volunteer tourists are the stakeholders who currently receive the most attention in monitoring and evaluation. This market-based interest dominated the focus of programme monitoring and evaluation for the majority of organisations, including both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. However, there were some exceptions to this and a small number of both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations were engaged in in-depth approaches to host partner organisation and host community focused monitoring and evaluation. Nevertheless, as argued by Guba and Lincoln (1989), evaluation processes can disempower and marginalise stakeholders when they are not consulted appropriately. Thus, the dominance of volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation highlights the potential risk that the monitoring and
evaluation practices of such organisations may disempower and marginalise host communities and host partner organisations.

Fourth, this research also revealed that the presence of organisational partnerships and specifically Multi-layer Partnerships, significantly influence monitoring and evaluation from three angles: 1) on a practical level, being partnered with numerous organisations across multiple geographical locations makes it more difficult to gain direct information about a programme and uphold monitoring and evaluation efforts; 2) in terms of responsibility, it is often ambiguous who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating various aspects of a volunteer tourism programme within a partnership and responsibility for monitoring and evaluation host community perspectives is often delegated to host partner organisations; 3) the liquefied, privatised and unregulated organisational contexts mean that there is no requirement or expectation within many volunteer tourism partnerships to engage with monitoring and evaluation. Consequently, organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships appeared to be particularly prone to adiaphorization, distancing themselves from moral obligations (e.g. Bauman, 2000; Bauman & Donskis, 2013). For example, some participants used their organisation's partnership arrangements as a rationalisation for not engaging more rigorously with host community focused monitoring and evaluation. In doing so they relieve themselves of responsibility and accountability for some of the issues that have been experienced at volunteer tourism projects. As stated by Clegg and Baumeler (2010, p.1728), "Liquid modernity produces organizations no longer akin to repertory theatre: directorial supervision and surveillance are lacking, roles not well rehearsed, scripts improvised, and performances unpredictable". In contrast, organisations in Direct Partnerships as opposed to Multi-layered Partnerships indicated that they took more considered and thorough approaches to monitoring and evaluation, engaging with a range of stakeholders. Therefore, operational arrangements and not profit status were most indicative of an organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices.

Fifth, this research has highlighted that the monitoring and evaluation of programme outcomes currently receives the least amount of attention from organisations. Few organisations indicated their engagement with assessing the actual impacts and outcomes of their programmes on communities and other
stakeholders. For example, Interviewee 15's description of determining impact on communities by the number of volunteers that they have sent to programmes is used to legitimise their activities, yet it appears to be nothing more than a naïve marketing exercise. This finding supports current concerns within the literature that there is a lack of knowledge and understanding of the potential impacts of volunteer tourism (e.g. Power, 2007). This research demonstrates that not only is there a lack of knowledge of impacts on host communities from within academia, but that there is also a lack of engagement from volunteer tourism organisations in determining the outcomes of their programmes and their impacts on host communities. Given the potential for negative impacts, as outlined in Chapter 2 (e.g. Guttentag, 2009), these issues remain of concern.

This chapter has highlighted the lack of volunteer tourism organisations' engagement with host community perspectives in monitoring and evaluating their programmes. As previously discussed, evaluation processes can disempower and marginalise stakeholders when they are not consulted appropriately (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). To better understand this issue in volunteer tourism, barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation are examined in the next chapter.
6 HOST COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1 Introduction
This chapter seeks to identify, from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations, barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes (Objective 4). In Chapter 4, the fluid and dynamic organisational contexts of volunteer tourism organisations were interpreted as liquid organisations. Chapter 5 established that these liquid organisational contexts deeply influence the ways and extent to which the volunteer tourism organisations monitor and evaluate their volunteer tourism programmes. In particular, the presence of organisational partnerships shapes the ways and extent to which host community focused monitoring and evaluation takes place. In this chapter the partnerships in volunteer tourism are conceptualised as principal-agent (P-A) relationships and principal-agent theory is used to examine the relationships present in Multi-layered Partnerships and Direct Partnerships. In doing so, opportunities and barriers to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation are identified. Building on chapters 4 and 5, P-A relationships are examined acknowledging the liquid organisational contexts they are situated in.

In order to address these issues the chapter is organised in the following way: First, the importance of including programme beneficiaries in monitoring and evaluation efforts is discussed. P-A is then introduced and its relevance to examining barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation is outlined, followed by discussion of the findings.

6.2 Programme Beneficiaries and Monitoring and Evaluation
For monitoring and evaluation to respond to the needs of programme beneficiaries, these people should be included in monitoring and evaluation processes (e.g. Guba & Lincoln 1989). It is important to highlight here that the intended beneficiaries or "communities" hosting volunteer tourism activities are not homogenous (Zahra & McGehee, 2013). 'Host' or 'local' communities often comprise individuals and groups with both shared and conflicting social, cultural
and economic values and interests (Blackstock, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013). Volunteer tourism organisations, therefore, need to take this into account and consider appropriate monitoring and evaluation methods to gather information relevant to stakeholders and the intended beneficiaries of a volunteer programme (Mascarenhas et al., 2010).

In the context of monitoring and evaluation in the field of international development, Binnendijk (1989, p.216) reflects on the importance of host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation, stating "project experience has shown again and again that failures are often due to not understanding the perceptions and the local context of the intended beneficiaries". Early evaluation efforts in development were traditionally economically focused and 'supply side driven', reflecting the interests of donors (Binnendijk, 1989). There has since been a push towards approaches that meet the needs of a wide range of stakeholders, not just donors (Conlin & Stirrat, 2008). However, Mueller-Hirth (2012, p.659) observes that monitoring and evaluation practices in development continue to be "shaped by relations of power", contending that "Decisions about what and how to monitor and evaluate reflect the power relations that also underpin other development activities and relationships". It was discussed in the previous chapter that decisions about what to monitor and evaluate in volunteer tourism are largely determined by volunteer tourism organisations and their, often market-based, interests.

Further, Gregory (2000) argues that asymmetric power relations between donors and beneficiaries affect the degree to which beneficiaries truly 'participate' in evaluations. Asymmetric power relations in volunteer tourism were exemplified in Chapter 2 by Sin's (2010) research, which found beneficiaries to be wary of offending donors for fear of missing out on assistance. Rebien (1996 in Gregory 2000, p.180) distinguishes between beneficiaries actively participating in evaluation, for example through involvement with identifying information needs, as opposed to "merely having passive roles as objects and mere sources of data".

In the context of this study, host community participation in itself is not viewed as a panacea to any shortcomings in an organisation's programme monitoring and evaluation practices, nor is it considered synonymous with empowerment (e.g. see debates by Butcher, Weaver, & Singh, 2012). However, host community
participation is viewed as one, highly important and significant, part of a broader ethical and justice-based tourism development framework (Jamal & Camargo, 2013). Thus, understanding barriers to and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluating volunteer tourism programmes requires further attention within volunteer tourism.

6.3 The Principal-Agent Perspective on Partnerships
Despite the importance attributed to the inclusion of beneficiaries and host communities in monitoring and evaluation, Chapter 5 revealed that host communities were the stakeholders that received the least amount of attention when compared to volunteer tourists and host partner organisations. The ways and extent to which host community focused monitoring and evaluation took place was also influenced by the volunteer tourism organisation's partnership arrangements. For example, organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships often delegate responsibility for host community focused monitoring and evaluation to host partner organisations, relying on host partners to represent the interests of host communities. P-A focuses on problems that can occur in cooperative/collaborative efforts (Dees, 1992; Eisenhardt, 1989). This chapter conceptualises partnerships in volunteer tourism as principal-agent relationships, examining how host community participation in monitoring and evaluation in volunteer tourism manifests in the collaborative efforts of Multi-layer and Direct Partnerships.

This section first outlines the structural characteristics of P-A relationships. Next, potential P-A relationships in volunteer tourism are identified. The potential for principal-agent problems that are relevant to the P-A relationships in volunteer tourism are then discussed.

P-A, also known as agency theory, derives from organisational economics (Eisenhardt, 1989; Wright, Mukherji, & Kroll, 2001). It is a flexible theory\textsuperscript{16} that has been applied to a variety of settings from within a diverse range of disciplines\textsuperscript{17} including organisational management (Jensen & Meckling, 1976),

\textsuperscript{16} Applications of P-A can range from quantitative, linear and prescriptive models to using P-A as a qualitative analytical tool (Dees, 1992). This chapter uses P-A in the context of the latter to facilitate discussion about barriers to and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation.

\textsuperscript{17} See Kiser (1999) for an overview of variations in applications of P-A across disciplines.
political science (Miller, 2005), sociology (Shapiro, 2005), corporate governance (Wiseman, Cuevas-Rodriguez, & Gomez-Mejia, 2012), tourism management (Huang, Huang, & Chen, 2004; Mason, Thibault, & Misener, 2006), accountability in the non-profit sector (Ebrahim, 2003; Prakash & Gugerty, 2010), international relations (Rittinger, 2012), foreign aid policy (Milner, 2006), and international development (Aerni, 2006; Barder, 2009; Gibson, Andersson, Ostrom, & Shivakumar, 2005; Watkins, Swidler, & Hannan, 2012). Applications of P-A in international development (Aerni, 2006; Barder, 2009; Gibson et al., 2005; Watkins et al., 2012) and accountability in the non-profit sector (Ebrahim, 2003), are deemed most relevant to the objective of this chapter.

According to Ebrahim (2003, p.196) "the theory is premised on the observation that some individuals (principals) attempt to have their agendas carried out by other individuals (agents)". Principals delegate to agents in order to carry out a task more efficiently (Eisenhardt, 1989; Wright et al., 2001), because the agent possesses greater expertise or specialised knowledge about the task to be carried out (Aerni, 2006; Milner & Tingley, 2013), and/or for reasons related to burden sharing and diffusing direct accountability (Hamman, Loewenstein, & Weber, 2010). P-A relationships exist not just between individuals but also between "collections or teams of principals (or agents)" such as organisations (Shapiro, 2005, p.267). It is also often the case that "actors are not just principals or agents, but often both at the same time – even in the same transaction or hierarchical structure” (Shapiro, 2005, p.267).

P-A relationships are common in international development. Aerni (2006, p.27), uses P-A to analyse organisational relationships in international development and identifies two key stages of delegation. The first P-A relationship occurs when a donor (the principal) pays an 'Organisation Involved in Development Assistance' (OIDA), usually based in a developed country, to carry out projects in a developing country. The second delegation occurs when the OIDA (this time they are the principal), hires a local partner (the agent) to bring the project to fruition. Similar scenarios of delegation are also reflected in Multi-layer Partnerships in volunteer tourism where host partner organisations serve as intermediaries between volunteer tourism organisations and host communities. Rather than working directly with host communities and beneficiaries, volunteer tourism
organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships generally work through an 'aid chain' of intermediary organisations (Barder, 2009; Watkins et al., 2012). In Direct Partnerships the organisations collaborate more closely with intermediary organisations and beneficiaries rather than delegating from a distance, reducing the size of the aid chain.

Glaringly absent from Aerni's above example of P-A relationships in international development are host communities and beneficiaries. Aerni's (2006) paper provides an enlightening starting point for understanding P-A relationships in volunteer tourism and how they affect host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. Drawing attention to the contradictory, top-down nature of international development that P-A highlights, Aerni (2006, p.28) states:

If the fight against poverty would be the primary goal then the poor should be, in theory, the principals or clients (because their needs are supposed to be addressed) rather than the donors. OIDAs (as agents) would then be accountable to the poor rather than the donors.

However, because development programmes exist within a market where they are reliant on donors for funding then OIDAs (as agents) remain primarily accountable to their donors (principals). Consequently, beneficiaries remain 'recipients' of, rather than participants in, development. Accordingly, Michaelowa and Borrmann (2006, p.2) state "development cooperation can be considered a hierarchical system of principal-agent relations". A similar market exists in volunteer tourism where volunteer tourism organisations (agents) predominantly rely on volunteer tourists' (principals) payments and donations for funding. Problems caused by the dominance of these 'top-down' P-A relationships and the 'perverse incentives' they cause are discussed in greater detail in section 6.5 (Gibson et al., 2005).

6.3.1 P-A Relationships in Volunteer Tourism

The examples of P-A relationships in international development outlined above by Aerni (2006) are similar to those found in volunteer tourism. For example, as outlined in the literature (e.g. Raymond, 2008) and further discussed in Chapters 4 and 5, it is common for volunteer tourism organisations based in developed countries (principals) to partner with locally based host partner organisations.
(agents), with the volunteer tourism organisation that is sending the volunteers delegating the task of carrying out a volunteer tourism project to the host partner organisation (as outlined in Chapters 4 and 5 in discussions of Multi-layer Partnerships). Examples of further potential P-A relationships in volunteer tourism are outlined in Table 6.1, demonstrating their multi-levelled nature. Given this chapter’s interest in exploring both barriers to and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation, the potential for host communities to act as principals to volunteer tourism organisations and/or host partner organisations is included, despite being excluded from Aerni’s (2006) example above. The examples in Table 6.1 were identified through reviewing the P-A literature and the volunteer tourism literature in combination with analysing the qualitative and quantitative data of this research. In conceptualising volunteer tourism partnerships as P-A relationships this research contributes to the volunteer tourism literature by extending existing discussions of partnerships in volunteer tourism in a way that has, to the author’s knowledge, not been done before.

P-A relationships in volunteer tourism are complicated by the fact that they are embedded in broader social and cultural contexts and power relations (e.g. McGehee, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2008, 2009; Sin, 2010). Material constraints, dependency and instrumental incentives that result from broader social structures affect the agency relationship (Kiser, 1999). The nature of these contexts affects how problems within the P-A relationship manifest themselves (Adams, 1996; Aerni, 2006; Ebrahim, 2003; Lubatkin, Lane, Collin, & Very, 2007; Shapiro, 2005; Watkins et al., 2012; Wiseman et al., 2012). Hill and Jones (1992, p.134) for example, state that differentials of power, where one party (the agent, for example) is more dependent on the other (the principal for example) than vice versa, are likely to exist. As demonstrated in Chapters 4 and 5, volunteer tourism also takes place within liquid organisational contexts, which are prone to adiaphorization, the distancing of organisations from their moral obligations. Therefore P-A relationships in volunteer tourism are interrogated taking these contexts into account.
Table 6.1 Examples of Principal-Agent Relationships in Volunteer Tourism. Source: Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal/s</th>
<th>Agent/s</th>
<th>Example of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer tourists</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisation</td>
<td>Volunteer tourists pay volunteer tourism organisations to delegate project creation and appropriate host community/beneficiary selection to volunteer tourism organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisation</td>
<td>Volunteer tourists</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisations delegate to volunteer tourists the role of acting as ambassadors for the organisation and to carry out volunteer work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisation</td>
<td>Host partner organisation</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisations delegate to host partner organisations to implement and manage projects on their behalf at ground level, to manage volunteers and to seek appropriate host communities/beneficiaries to receive projects and volunteers. Volunteer tourist organisations provide payment, funding and/or other resources, such as volunteers to host partner organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner organisations</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisation</td>
<td>Host partners delegate to volunteer tourism organisations the recruitment of appropriate volunteers, funding projects and design of projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host communities</td>
<td>Volunteer tourism organisation and/or host partner organisation</td>
<td>Host communities/beneficiaries offer themselves and environments to be 'voluntoured' and may delegate the creation and implementation of volunteer tourism projects, fundraising and volunteer tourist recruitment to host partners and volunteer tourism organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Principal-Agent Problems

P-A relationships are susceptible to principal-agent problems. A range of principal-agent problems are cited within the various disciplines and strands of P-A literature. Principal-agent problems of particular interest in the context of host community participation in monitoring and evaluation are related to 'information asymmetry' (Aerni, 2006; Rauchhaus, 2009; Shapiro, 2005) and 'perverse incentives' (Gibson et al., 2005). Principal-agent problems tend to promote uncertain organisational environments for both principals and agents, as outlined below (Watkins et al., 2012).
Looking first at information asymmetry, agents typically know more about the task they have been delegated than principals and it is usually difficult and/or costly for principals to directly observe the actions of agents. For example, when it comes to monitoring and evaluating a volunteer tourism project that takes place in the context of Multi-layer Partnerships, the host partner organisation (agent) based in the country where the project takes place is likely to be better informed about the progress of the project, and the views of beneficiaries, than the volunteer tourism organisation (principal) based in the country sending the volunteer tourists. The volunteer tourism organisation (principal) relies on the host partner organisation (agent) for their feedback and to evaluate the programme from a host community perspective. This information asymmetry, whereby the agent is better informed about the progress of a task (in this case the volunteer tourism project) than the principal, can encourage two major problems: 1) 'Moral hazard' and 2) 'adverse selection' (Aerni, 2006; Rauchhaus, 2009; Shapiro, 2005).

Moral hazard occurs when agents are opportunistic and take action that is of detriment to the principal/s, 'shirking' on the original task that they had agreed to do (Aerni, 2006; Rauchhaus, 2009; Shapiro, 2005). For example, in Chapter 5, Interviewee 2 discussed how the director of a host partner organisation had kept volunteer donations for themselves and not used them to support the project as was originally agreed.

Adverse selection occurs when agents only pass on information to the principal that is in the agent's interest to do so (Aerni, 2006; Rauchhaus, 2009; Shapiro, 2005). For example, this may mean that agents only share feedback on positive aspects of a volunteer tourism programme to ensure ongoing funding, or in the case of individual agents responsible for overseeing a volunteer tourism programme, to secure their own job. Further, acknowledging the unequal structural contexts that volunteer tourism takes place in, host partner organisations and host communities may engage in adverse selection due to 'risk aversion'. To illustrate, Eisenhardt (1989, p.60) states that "agents who are unable to diversify their employment should be risk averse and principals, who are capable of diversifying their investments should be risk neutral". In the case of volunteer tourism for example, this might mean that host communities and host partner organisations become risk averse agents because they are dependent on a
volunteer tourism organisation for funding or to provide volunteers or other resources. Thus, they are not willing to risk offending a volunteer tourism organisation by making suggestions for the improvement of a project (e.g. Sin, 2010). In contrast, wealthy volunteer tourism organisations for example, as risk neutral principals, are in the position of being able to offer funding and volunteers to a wide variety of host communities and host partner organisations and can potentially take their programmes elsewhere. This perspective draws attention to the complexity in seeking open and honest feedback from host partners and host communities. This complexity may have negative implications for the effectiveness of evaluation processes, stressing the importance of building trust between volunteer tourism organisations, host partner organisations and communities. That P-A relationships in volunteer tourism also exist within liquid environments and liquid organisational contexts may further exacerbate issues related to adverse selection and trust, and is explored in this chapter.

Whether or not agents engage in moral hazard or adverse selection can depend on the incentive structures that are in place. For example, Aerni (2006) argues that in development, the 'market for international development assistance' is driven by donors who fund initiatives. Therefore the dominant P-A relationship institutionalised in international development is that between donors (principals) and international development organisations (agents). Consequently, 'perverse incentives' encourage upward accountability towards donors rather than downward accountability towards beneficiaries (Aerni, 2006; Gibson et al., 2005; Prakash & Gugerty, 2010). Aerni (2006) argues that this situation has undermined development initiatives that sought to promote local entrepreneurship in Africa. The issue of perverse incentives further highlights the unequal power relationships present in volunteer tourism. Issues related to accountability in the P-A relationships found in volunteer tourism are also explored in this chapter.

6.3.3 Extending Traditional Limitations of P-A

Dees (1992), Ebrahim (2003) and Watkins et al. (2012) observe that traditionally, P-A focuses on the actions and behaviour of agents, concentrating on how to encourage agents to fulfil their obligations to the principal. The obligations of the principal to the agent are generally ignored. Ethical dimensions of the relationship and consideration of what sort of relationship would be best from an ethical point
of view tend to be overlooked (Dees, 1992). As Watkins et al. (2012, p.289) point out "Just as uncertainty is the lot of principals who are far from their agents yet must depend on them, so also agents may be affected by the actions of distant organisations". In the context of volunteer tourism, to focus only on the actions of the agent would be a limiting outlook in seeking to identify barriers and opportunities to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation, especially given that the dominant P-A relationships appear to cast volunteer tourism organisations as principals. Rather, as outlined in Table 6.1, by 'flipping' the conventional P-A model the potential for assigning host communities to the role of principal and volunteer tourism organisations to the role of agent becomes possible and opens up a new perspective on principal-agent relationships. Thus, this chapter extends traditional applications of P-A and focuses on the obligations of principals to their agents, and considers what sort of relationships are most conducive to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation.

In the next sections of this chapter, P-A and liquid organisations are used to interpret the findings of this research in terms of organisation's perspectives of the barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. The discussion is built around four broad, organising themes that emerged from a systematic review of the quantitative survey results and the qualitative interview data which helped to expand and explain the quantitative observations: 1) A discrepancy between stated importance and perceived effectiveness of host community participation; 2) Challenges in identifying and defining the 'host community'; 3) A lack of trust in unequal partnerships; 4) Accountability to beneficiaries and humanistic approaches to monitoring and evaluation. Key themes that emerged within these organising themes are identified and discussed.

6.4 Host Community Participation: Importance Versus Effectiveness

There was general consensus within both the survey and interview data that host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation is important to organisations. In the survey, the majority of respondents indicated that host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes was considered either 'Extremely Important' (58%) or 'Somewhat Important' (35%) to their organisation. Likewise, in the interview data, host community participation was
also considered important to the majority of organisations. A common theme from within both sets of data was that gaining feedback from the host community is important because the community are considered key stakeholders:

We consider host feedback to be the most important aspect of our entire operation. The projects are entirely structured to provide benefit to the villagers and achieve key aims that have been designed by the communities themselves... [Survey 65]

It's critical, it's of upmost importance that we have involvement and participation of the local community members in what we're doing because we like to completely hand over the programmes to them. [Interview 14, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

It's obviously really important, with them being the whole reason why we're working there. It's very important that local people let us know what they think about the projects. [Interview 24, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

However, despite the importance accorded to host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation in both the survey and interview data, just 39% of survey respondents considered host community feedback an 'effective way to monitor a volunteer travel programme' and 31% of survey respondents considered it an 'effective way to evaluate a volunteer travel programme'. The survey comments offered some initial lines of enquiry regarding the discrepancy between the stated importance and perceived effectiveness of host community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes and were followed up in the interviews. For example, the survey comment below highlights the issue of complex power relations between organisations and host communities, which complicates gaining host community feedback, a concern also identified in the literature on volunteer tourism (e.g. Sin, 2010).

...our purpose is to serve the host communities – however I think it is often difficult to get 100% honest feedback due to the complex power relations involved. [Survey 47]

In analysing both the survey and interview data, further issues affecting host community participation in monitoring and evaluation were identified. Issues were related to 1) the practical aspects of involving host communities in monitoring and evaluation and is represented in the theme Identifying and defining the host community and 2) the nature of relationships between
stakeholders, which reflect various configurations of principal-agent relationships, and is represented by the theme *Getting 'honest' feedback*. These themes and how they manifest in Multi-layer and Direct Partnerships are discussed in the following sections.

### 6.5 Identifying and Defining the 'Host Community'

Chapter 5 highlighted that there are different ways and extents to which organisations engage in host community focused monitoring and evaluation. In addition, who from within the host community is involved varies depending on the context of the organisation's operational arrangements and the programme itself. Existing tourism literature has discussed potential issues with defining a host community in tourism contexts (Blackstock, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013) and so it was of interest to understand who is considered the host community in the volunteer tourism context. Emerging from the data analysis, the overarching theme *identifying and defining the 'host community'* reflects cases where participants considered it difficult to actually identify and define who the host community is, thus impacting who from the host community is involved in monitoring and evaluation processes. Thirteen organisations displayed this theme; these were predominately organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships. Interviewee 2 reflects on the different levels of host community involved in their volunteer tourism programmes, which complicate identifying and defining who should be involved in monitoring and evaluation processes.

*Who do you consider to be representative of the host communities?*

Well I think it's a really tricky one because, um, I'm not sure. I'm not sure if the host community is everyone in the town for example, where we're sending volunteers, or is it just the people who have direct contact with the volunteers? Because, I think that the only feedback that we really get is from the people who work directly with the volunteers so the staff of our partner organisation, occasionally the staff or beneficiaries of the projects and occasionally the host parents, by that I mean if volunteers are staying with a host family. So them themselves, but actually, we would never hear from a host family here in (name of sending country). When I worked in (name of developing country) for the partner organisation, the partner organisation gets all that feedback so they hear about, they obviously have lots of communication with the host family and
lots of communication and contact with the projects themselves.  
[Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Identifying the host community for Interviewee 2 is also further complicated by the nature of their partnership arrangements. Organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships (principals), as Interviewee 2 outlines, rely on host partner organisations as their 'agents' to act as an intermediary between themselves and the host community. In delegating the task of representing the interests of beneficiaries and the wider host community to host partner organisations, there is a 'broken feedback loop' between the host community and the volunteer tourism organisation and so Interviewee 2 is uncertain who exactly the host community is (Barder, 2009).

It became apparent that geographical contexts and the spatial distribution of projects also complicate efforts to define 'the host community'. For organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships with projects in towns or cities, it is a very different context than for those organisations operating in small villages, where the parameters of the host community are more clearly identifiable and definable. Highlighting the nebulous nature of "community", the following quote raises the issue of direct and indirect beneficiaries of volunteer tourism and debates surrounding at what point to put a boundary around host community representation.

It is often difficult to identify the 'community' in any project, as they can include the neighbours and the accommodation, the local shop owners and the general people of a town, village or city as well. [Survey 27]

For the above organisations, the 'host community' is a vague and ambiguous concept, which can change according to a particular volunteer tourism programme, or the location in which it takes place. For organisations with particularly liquid characteristics that continue to engage in ever-growing numbers of partnerships across diverse geographical locations, this issue becomes even more pronounced with these volunteer tourism organisations relying heavily on intermediary host partners to represent the interests of wider 'host communities'. Consequently, volunteer tourism organisations are, at times, not certain who the host community are.
In contrast, for volunteer tourism organisations in Direct Partnerships that work more directly with communities rather than through an 'aid chain' of intermediary organisations, identifying and defining the host community was less fragmented. This was particularly so for those organisations which displayed a greater propensity for 'solid' as opposed to liquid organisation qualities. As discussed in Chapter 4, 'solid' qualities include maintaining close and stable relationships with partners and working towards long-term goals and commitments rather than loose, unstable relationships with short-term goals. In addition, for organisations that operate in an area with more definitive geographical boundaries such as a small village, or in one location, the host community is viewed in terms of the community as a whole as opposed to individuals or smaller organisations within a wider, shape-shifting community. The smaller size of the wider population increases opportunities for including more members of the host community in monitoring and evaluation processes.

**Who do you consider to be the host community in the case of the programmes and projects that you're involved with?**

Quite literally the community that we're doing the work in and that would involve the community leaders, the families, everyone. Almost all of these projects are in tiny villages in the rural highlands, so this means that everyone is going to know about you, when you're at the project site. Everyone is going to recognise who we are, and that to me is what defines the host community, it's truly everyone in that community. Now there may be projects in the future where we're in larger communities, then the definition might be a little bit different, it might be limited to you know, certainly the mayor of the town or village would be involved, the local workers and their families, the local schools for example, these would all be part of it in some way, but so far the communities are just so tiny that it's truly everyone within the community, so that's really kind of cool.

[Interview 5, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

**In the context of your organisation, who do you consider to be the host community?**

Ok, there's various levels of the community as a whole. There's the target population which are the youth from about 8 to 20 years old that we target with the education programmes, a lot of it in school and out of school, environmental conservation classes, English classes, and then social entrepreneurship activities. As well, on the community level, we involve different families, those are some of the most needy families within the community and we know who they are because of our
community diagnostic of essentially going house to house and interviewing the families there. We're able to do that because it's only about 1,000 people in town. So that's another way that really informs our activities, is through that community consultation process. [Interview 14, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

For these organisations, defining the host community was not a puzzle. The participants have a very clear idea of who their programme beneficiaries are. It is easier therefore for them to identify who from within the community should be involved in their monitoring and evaluation activities. These organisations value host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation highly and this is reflected in their actual monitoring and evaluation practices which seek to encourage host community participation, as is further discussed in sections 6.6 and 6.7.

However, regardless of whether or not organisations find it difficult to identify and define who represents the host community for their projects, for those organisations (principals) that delegate responsibility for the well-being and representation of the host community to host partner organisations (agents), they generally do not consider this issue their responsibility. Rather, responsibility for identifying beneficiaries is diffused through an 'aid chain' of other organisations. These relationships are similar to the 'top-down' principal-agent relationships described by Aerni (2006) in international development. In this context, the volunteer tourism organisations are also agents to volunteer tourists at the same time that they are principals to host partner organisations, and so predominantly focus their monitoring and evaluation efforts on the perceptions and experiences of the volunteers (principals) who fund the volunteer tourism organisation and/or the volunteer tourism project. In such principal-agent relationships accountability tends to flow upwards to donors and direct representations of the 'intended beneficiaries' or 'host community' are neglected (Aerni, 2006). This contributes to understanding why host community focused monitoring and evaluation receives the least amount of attention when compared to host partner organisations and volunteer tourists.

**Overcoming narrow representations of the 'host community'**

As outlined above, there is often a broken 'feedback loop' (e.g. Barder, 2009) in Multi-layer Partnerships between the host community, who are supposedly the
intended beneficiaries of volunteer tourism, and the volunteer tourism organisations who make decisions about the projects. It is well acknowledged that different individuals and groups within a host community can hold different values and interests (Blackstock, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013). This is no different in volunteer tourism contexts (e.g. Zahra & McGehee, 2013), and in some cases relying on one group or organisation to represent the wider group was identified as a barrier to a more comprehensive representation of the host community. This problem is highlighted below by Interviewees 25 and 24.

Interviewee 25 represents what could be considered a more solid than liquid organisation in that they are focused on working in one community and building a close relationship with the community (see Chapter 4, Table 4.1 for differences between solid and liquid organisations). They reflect on their early operations, not long after they had arrived in the community, and demonstrate how their lack of cultural understanding and local knowledge led them to only consult with one group within the community, the local school. Interviewee 5's assumption that the local school alone would have the local expertise and knowledge to represent the interests of the wider community led to the organisation using their resources in a way that drew criticism from the wider community.

Last year we painted five houses so some people made suggestions that we should not paint houses and just paint more public areas so it's not specifically benefitting just one family. So if there are one hundred houses and you only paint five, obviously some people are like 'why aren't you painting my house?' etc. Yeah, I mean we chose the houses, the school advised us on which houses we should paint based on the need I guess, the poorer people they recommended for us to go and paint, we actually were led by the school. But when we spoke to some of the villagers they said that some people were wondering why we hadn't chosen their house, but you're going to get that all the time aren't you? They said that if we just painted more public places then you won't get that problem. [Interview 25, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

In contrast, Interviewee 24 grew up in the region where their organisation takes volunteers, and holds a far deeper level of cultural understanding than that displayed by Interviewee 25 above. They explained how they navigate the complex dynamics and varied interests which can exist, stressing the need to understand and appreciate local contexts and not depend on narrow
representations of the host community. For this participant, their view of local was at the ground level and they warn against relying on the potentially self-serving local elite to represent the wider community.

I'll give you an example, using an example of a big corporation. If a big corporation comes to a place, in most cases that big corporation will have its own people who will come and speak with the local, you know try to see who is the king maker in that village or that town is, who the consumer is, so that they can create that consumer store that they want to build there –that's different from local input because the king maker may be so good at just advocating one side of things because he will benefit from this. Our approach is actually getting the actual local community. By the actual local village community I mean you go there, you talk to, we call them local councils in East Africa. So the local village will have a local council, so you go to that local council, the local council will have its own team but they have sittings where there is something that the government wants to communicate to the local people, this is the channel they use. So we go there recognising that system is already in place but making sure we do not antagonise or get involved in any of the local politics because it's not for the political class, it's for the masses, for the local people, it's for the village. In this case of the clinic a collection of three villages are going to benefit from this clinic, so in this way it is not just for the political class. We want to stay as far away from politically sensitive people as possible. For example, we don't involve high-ranking politicians to come and open, say if we help to build a classroom we don't want it opened by a high-ranking politician, we try to bring someone in from the local industry or local business once it is done. We prefer to do that than bring in a big-wig politician. [Interview 24, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

As discussed in section 6.3.2 of this chapter, because of information asymmetry between the volunteer tourism organisation (principal) and the organisation/s or individual/s (agents) that they delegate responsibility for host community representation to, there remains the potential for principal-agent problems including moral hazard and adverse selection whereby agents act in favour of their own interests and not those of the intended beneficiaries. Interviewee 24's background knowledge and understanding meant that they were highly aware of the potential for an individual or group who are part of the local elite to abuse their political power and serve their own interests above others, so they take steps to minimise this risk through facilitating opportunities for the intended beneficiaries to represent themselves. However, for volunteer tourism
organisations that have numerous projects across multiple and diverse social, cultural and geographic contexts and rely heavily on host partner organisations to represent the host community, the risk of principal-agent problems is far greater, as exemplified in earlier discussions in Chapter 5 of Interviewee 2 and the corrupt host partner organisation director.

The theme identifying and defining the host community has demonstrated that many volunteer tourism organisations find it difficult to identify and define the 'host community', presenting a barrier to host participation in monitoring and evaluation. Representations of the host community vary from situation to situation, with organisations in Multi-layer partnerships most likely to rely on host partners or in-country coordinators to represent the wider host community, as demonstrated by Survey 27 and Interview 2. Whilst these 'agents' may be considered by 'principals' (volunteer tourism organisations) as best placed to represent the host community, this can also set in motion a limiting conceptualisation of the host community which overlooks wider community interests and is prone to principal-agent problems. Organisations in Direct Partnerships were not immune from narrow conceptualisations of the host community either, as demonstrated by Interviewee 25. However, because organisations in Direct Partnerships do not operate through long chains of other intermediaries, as discussed in the case of Interviewee 25, the host community were able to express their dissatisfaction directly to the volunteer tourism organisation. As a result, the organisation has since developed a deeper appreciation of host community dynamics and realised the importance of broader community consultation, not only in the monitoring and evaluation of their programmes, but also in their programme planning.

6.6 Lack of Trust within Unequal Partnerships

Another barrier to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation is encapsulated in the theme Getting 'honest' feedback. The notion of difficulty in gaining 'honest' feedback on volunteer tourism programmes from members of the host community was raised in Sin's (2010) research, with Guttentag (2011) also warning against the potential for biased evaluations of volunteer tourism programmes. Both authors attribute unequal power relations between members of the host community and volunteer tourism organisations as the underlying reason.
why communities may be wary of criticising programmes. Gaining 'honest' feedback was also highlighted as an issue by Survey Participant 24, who also cites power relations as a barrier:

Because our purpose is to serve the host communities – however I think it is often difficult to get 100% honest feedback due to the complex power relations involved. [Survey 47]

The value-laden and political nature of Getting 'honest' feedback was also a recurring theme for interview participants in 16 cases, including for-profit and not-for-profit organisations, and across the different types of organisations (e.g. Travel company, NGO). The theme most often occurred when participants were asked if they had any difficulties in gathering any information that would be useful to their monitoring and evaluation efforts. Interviewee 2 felt that their organisation's position as a funding body to host partner organisations often has implications for getting 'honest' feedback from host partners.

I'm very aware that (name of organisation) fundraising branch is the organisation with the money and our partner organisations are the organisations that need the money, and that can in itself create an unbalanced relationship if you're not careful. Partners can tend to tell you what they think you want to hear as opposed to what's really going on, so yeah having that relationship with them and them being confident and comfortable that they can tell you that this didn't work or, you know, we built this well but it didn't quite work out as planned or whatever – we want to know that stuff and we'd much rather know it than hear it through our volunteers. So forming those relationships and maintaining them so that they do feel they can tell you that stuff and it doesn't mean that we're going to stop sending the volunteers or stop sending the money or something like that, that we are partners and we want to help each other. [Interview 2, Not-For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Interviewee 2 highlights the nature of the unequal partnerships in volunteer tourism, in that host partner organisations are often reliant and dependent on the resources and funding that the volunteer tourism organisation provides them with. As discussed previously, host partner organisations that are dependent on resources and funding are likely to be risk-averse and reluctant to offer negative reports that could jeopardise future support. Consequently, this unequal relationship gives rise to an uncertain environment for both the volunteer tourism organisation and the host partner organisation. Host partner organisations lack
confidence that the volunteer tourism organisation will still support them if they report project failures and volunteer tourism organisations cannot be sure of the outcomes or progress of the project they are funding if partners are not confident enough to give constructive feedback (Watkins et al., 2012).

However, Interviewee 2 felt that these issues can be overcome by developing trust in the partnership. They went on to talk about a recent trip where they had been to visit some of their partner projects in person. For the most part their organisation relies on technology and volunteer feedback to communicate with host partner organisations. They compare projects that they have built stronger relationships with over time with those that they have newer partnerships with.

It was a really interesting process because I was just spending one day and one night at each orphanage...it was tricky because I wasn't really forming relationships in that short time with the projects...the projects that were not so well developed that were really struggling, they would just tell me what they thought I wanted to hear, so they would tell me "oh the volunteers are great, the funding is great, it's making such a difference" you know, and I'd think, ok, I'm not really learning anything here! Whereas some of the more developed projects I think had a bit more confidence to express some of the challenges that they faced with volunteers and that they had faced with funding and things like that. [Interview 2, Not- For-Profit, Multi-Layered Partnerships]

Whilst Interviewee 2 recognises the need to develop a trusting relationship with their partner projects, their organisation's principal-agent relationships are also further situated within liquid operational arrangements which rely on technology to communicate from a distance rather than through face to face contact with their partners, exacerbating issues of uncertainty and lack of trust in their partnerships. Bauman (1993, 1995 in Davis, 2013) argues that meaningful face to face contact is fundamental to an ethical life and that the reliance on technology in the current liquid era poses a threat to such contact. Although technology has helped speed up and facilitate communication, Davis (2013) argues that in liquid times such technology has also become self defeating, indeed Bauman argues that "the advent of virtual proximity renders human connections simultaneously more frequent and more shallow, more intense and more brief. Connections tend to be too shallow and brief to condense into bonds..." (Bauman quoted in Blackshaw, 2005, p.98). This argument also applies to volunteer tourism in some cases, such as that
described by Interviewee 2. While technology has helped speed up and facilitate communication to a certain degree, which has assisted in the proliferation of volunteer tourism partnerships, face to face encounters which facilitate the building of trust and communication between organisations, particularly for those in large scale Multi-layer Partnerships, have not been able to keep up with the scale and breadth of partnerships and programmes. Rather, there appears to be a trade-off between the ease of forming numerous partnerships and the level of trust and commitment that can be formed within the partnerships. Thus, bonds between partners are more akin to liquid than solids – beneficiaries and host partner organisations are apprehensive about volunteer tourism organisations withdrawing their commitment to them. The liquid relationship highlighted by Interviewee 2 is similar to Bauman's 'tourists' and 'vagabonds' metaphors (Bauman, 1998). The organisations represent the 'tourist' who comes to visit the organisation and then leaves again, with the power to decide whether or not to continue funding or to find a new partner "when more exciting opportunities beckon elsewhere" (Davis, 2008, p.144). Whereas the host partners and beneficiaries are more akin to the 'vagabonds' in that their movements are controlled by actions beyond their control, such as market trends and the preferences of volunteer tourists. Therefore they do not possess the same freedom of choices as the volunteer tourism organisations and volunteer tourists and are not at liberty to pick and choose partners (Bauman, 1998; Davis, 2008).

Difficulties in gaining meaningful, constructive feedback were also experienced by Interviewee 3 who was frustrated by this situation.

*Do you have any difficulties getting feedback or information that you think would be useful to your organisation?*

Well we do have difficulty because nobody says a bad word about us. One of the policies we have is, our managers in these countries are female. We're hoping in (name of potential new destination) as well but it's a much more male dominated society and it might just be impossible. One of the things I actually say to them is, you know, I would be happiest if you turned around to me and said (name of interviewee) you're doing a crap job, this is terrible and this is stupid. I would be so happy if they said that to me.

*Oh, really?*
Yeah, that would be good. When I was in (name of country) I interviewed lots of people for the job. At one stage, I can't remember what it was, but I said something that was outrageously dumb, it was a terrible idea, anybody could see that it was a terrible idea, so I was really hoping that someone would turn around and say that's a terrible idea. None of them did. Which was a shame. I keep emphasising, tell us if we are doing something wrong, tell us if we can improve something, but they don't. I don't know what it is? It might be a culture thing, you know, you don't tell your boss what to do? You just do what you're told? We're constantly trying to, get feedback from the managers but it's hard. So, yeah, it's very hard to get feedback from the people you are relying on contact with, and I'm sure we are doing some things wrong, but it's very hard to get from them. [Interview 3, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Further discussion with Interviewee 3 revealed some of the organisation's liquid practices which, it is argued, would likely intensify a community's anxiety about the volunteer tourism organisations commitment. When Interviewee 3 was asked if they felt their organisation had the capacity to make changes to a project if needed, they replied:

Well most of the time we just yank the programmes because we just see the fundamental problems with it, like the mangrove project, the school programme as well, I guess the contraception one, our lessons are learned. [Interview 3, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

It became apparent throughout the interview that the organisation had developed somewhat of a track record for starting and then pulling out of programmes when they did not go as planned. It is also noteworthy to comment here, as discussed in Chapter 5, Interviewee 3's organisation engages in very minimal monitoring and evaluation practices. Programme monitoring and evaluation in these situations could have potentially helped to understand why projects were failing and what changes could have been made, as opposed to "yanking" them (Rebien, 1996). Bauman (2001) argues that in liquid modernity "Power is measured by the speed with which responsibilities can be escaped" (in Bauman & Tester 2001, p.95, also in Clegg & Baumeler, 2010, p.1727), and it is clear that it is not particularly difficult for this organisation to end their engagement with a project and to consider other options. Reinforcing an image of Bauman's tourist, they were about
to travel to a new country to explore possibilities for setting up a new project, commenting:

One of the things that we might say after our big trip to (name of country) is let's not do (name of country). It might be too hard because it's such a mountainous country. If that's the case then we are going to look at South America somewhere, maybe Peru or something like that. [Interview 3, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

The organisation's freedom of movement and their fluid commitment to projects makes it almost unsurprising that communities are reluctant to "give honest feedback". The host partner organisations and programme managers (agents) are already risk averse in that they depend on the volunteer tourism organisation (principal) to provide funding and resources, however their lack of trust in the relationship is intensified by the liquid nature of their partnership, demonstrated by volunteer tourism organisations' low level of commitment to projects, and the relative ease of forming new liquid partnerships in new locations. Hence, differentials of power in unequal principal-agent relationships are further compounded by the liquid organisational context that they are situated in.

**Nurturing trust in principal-agent relationships**

Following the conversations with Interviewees 2 and 3, the issue of getting 'honest' feedback was also discussed with Interviewee 4, who from the very beginning of the interview (and even in prior email communication to arrange the interview), made it clear that they believed the volunteer travel experience should be mutually beneficial for all involved and should not exploit the host community. This participant was sceptical of many volunteer travel organisations, particularly those engaged in multiple Multi-layer Partnerships, and was very passionate about the need to build trusting relationships with host partner organisations and the host community. They commented:

I only really ever thought that these sort of gap type trips were something that I could involve myself in about ten or twelve years into the whole experience, when I had built up very, very strong relationships. [Interview 4, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Interviewee 4 fervently expressed their viewpoint that difficulty in getting 'honest' feedback stems from a lack of trust and confidence in the partnership and
should not be accepted as the norm, rather it is the responsibility of the organisation bringing volunteers to the community to build that trust:

About a year and a half ago I started working with a small orphanage down near (destination) that was getting clients, as in volunteers, from another UK gap year company, quite a big one and the lady had been doing it for about, I don't know three or four years and we knew her because we took some of her children at the orphanage into school and we got to know her very well and she was a lovely lady and, we got to know her socially, and eventually she said to us do you know this company? So I said yes of course I know that company, she said well I've been taking volunteers from this company for about three years now and every time they come I'm hoping that they'll bring some money but they never do, the company never gives me anything and in fact it costs me because I have to feed them and provide, you know I have to pick them up from the airport and do all of that but I never actually get anything and I said to her well why don't you tell them that? And she said oh I could never do that, they're a big, big company in (sending country), I could never do that, they're too big and important and I wouldn't even know who to speak to, I've got no email address and I don't know anything about them. So I then invited that company to come to that orphanage with me and talk to the lady...so I sat there as a sort of arbitrator and the women, the local lady said it all, she said exactly everything and the lady from the company was almost in tears, in tears, and she said I can't believe that my company is doing this and I said well I think you should spend a little bit more time getting to know this lady before you start sending people here because you're actually beggaring her, she's using her personal money to fund your visitors just because she lives in hope that one day her orphanage will benefit from all these western people coming to visit...They (the volunteer tourism organisation) are the ones bringing in the visitors, the onus is on them to create the level of honesty and feeling whereby those local people can say anything, do anything and be a part of that whole relationship, that whole product that is going on...[Interview 4, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Again, in the example given by Interviewee 4, uneven power relationships between organisations and host communities prevail, and insecure principal-agent relationships are exacerbated by liquid bonds. In contrast to Interviewee 3, Interviewee 4 took a very committed and solid approach to engaging with people from the host communities in which they work. They view the development of strong and trusting relationships to be part of their organisations ethical obligation to their partners and the community. This was further evidenced by Interviewee 8,
who is employed as director of the sister charity to Interviewee 4's travel company. As a child, Interviewee 8 had themselves been a beneficiary of Interviewee 4's charitable work.

Ok, (name of charity) is supported by (name of company). (Name of company) is a company on its own and runs tourism, but apart from that it pays for the bills in (name of charity), in that if you have a volunteer coming, they come together, they volunteer with the charity, but the other logistics like transport, accommodation, it's done by (name of company), so they are working together. And the fact that most of the people employed in (name of company) were beneficiaries of the charity, including the (name of country) director, he used to be a street boy, he was supported by the charity, went to school, got his diploma, got some training from (name of founder of company and charity) and also people like (name of person) and also from the locals like the local tour guides and the tour managers, now he's managing the (name of charity). [Interview 8, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Interviewee 8 talked further about the organisation's long-term engagement with their beneficiaries and the community, all of which have contributed to a strong and trusting relationship. This approach is quite the contrast to the fluid approach taken by the organisation represented by Interviewee 3.

Because the charity has a principle of long-term support, what you've done is given an opportunity for young people to work, and not just work but work in order of skills, in learning skills which have made it possible for them to go an extra mile for themselves and their family. An example would be the boys who come from the streets and who are not able to go to secondary school, and instead they have got skills in terms of building and construction so they've kind of been able to use their skills with the projects that we have in (name of country). But apart from that we have been able to create a youth group so they are in a position now to be able to get contracts to be able to build people's houses, do the renovations and this has given a big boost because you can imagine the boys who have come from the streets now have a big family just looking after them. So we have a long-term focus, in case we don't have any projects, they are going to be able to say yes we can go and look for our own jobs, so long-term support is important. [Interview 8, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

Dependency on funding for projects and/or volunteers is a central issue that can be a barrier to gaining 'honest' feedback that, as discussed in the literature by Sin
(2010) and Guttentag (2011), is underpinned by unequal power relationships caused by broader structures of economic and social inequality. This inequality is further exacerbated by the liquid bonds that some organisations display. The liquid nature of partnerships promotes insecurity and a lack of trust in the volunteer tourism organisations commitment. Evidently organisations have different attitudes towards the issue of getting 'honest' feedback. On the one hand, organisations such as Interviewee 4 take the stance that it is the responsibility of every volunteer tourism organisation to endeavour to create a safe and secure environment where the host partners and host community members feel comfortable with speaking openly. On the other hand, there are organisations that readily accept difficulties in getting 'honest' feedback and assume it as 'the norm', facilitating a system of evaluation that further marginalises the host community through biased evaluation feedback (e.g. Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Guttentag, 2011).

It should not be assumed, however, that unequal access to resources automatically means that host communities are passive recipients of volunteer tourism. There are evidently situations where host community members do speak up, such as the example given by Interviewee 25 where they received negative feedback from host community members, disgruntled by the way the organisation had chosen to paint only a small number of houses in the community.

**The value of cultural understanding**

In contrast to those organisations associated with either experiencing or facilitating barriers to host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation, there were eleven organisations, predominantly in Direct Partnerships, which presented various opportunities for involving host community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes. A key theme was that 'cultural understanding' facilitated the development of culturally sensitive monitoring and evaluation methods which in turn encourage more meaningful and constructive host community feedback.

Interviewee 24 was asked about their experience of getting feedback from host communities. This participant was originally from one of the destination countries
they take volunteer tourists to and so their 'insider' perspective on the matter was of particular interest.

_Do you ever have any difficulties in getting feedback from host communities?_

That's where I told you, if you remember, you have to be very careful because people who are already involved, the local community and if you are asking the local people who are already involved in the projects, they will never tell you if there's anything wrong. If there's something that after starting the project they are not happy about they won't tell you, because, ok what we are talking about is you are going into a community where the need is so huge that after something has been done they're not going to say we hate actually the way it looks or we hate or we actually don't like this, so this is where mystery shopping comes in. No one, I guarantee you, I can bet you on this, no other organisation uses this technique. I am only able to use it because I have an understanding of the culture because I am one of them. When I say I am one of them it means I know, for example, (name of local people) are very loyal people. They are very appreciative people, they are not going to come and slag you and say oh that's horrible, and other things. For example, in Uganda if you are a girl and ask a guy 'how does this dress fit me?', 'does this top look nice on me?', if it looks hideous they are just going to say it looks hideous, in these circumstances they are so good at giving you their best honest opinion. For example, when I go I ask someone how do I look these days and they tell me (name of interviewee) you are getting fat and they will say to you as they want because that's who they are. But, when it comes to something that is going to affect them then some may tell you and some may be reluctant to tell you the specific feedback or negative feedback that you may want. As far as positive feedback they always tell, but you have to employ a couple of techniques as I just mentioned to you (e.g. 'mystery shopping', described in Chapter 5). [Interview 24, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

That Interviewee 24 is originally from the region that they now take volunteers to is unique, and obviously not all organisations can draw from such 'insider' knowledge. However, there were examples of other organisations who recognise the value of cultural understanding and the need to develop culturally sensitive methods. For example, Interviewee 20 discussed how, in their experience, developing cultural competence led them to create more culturally appropriate methods that facilitated more meaningful host community participation in monitoring and evaluation.
Do you ever have any difficulty getting any information that you think would be helpful?

Yes, sometimes. I think that's why we brought in the anonymous questionnaires and things like that to try and get at it because sometimes the villagers wanted to be more honest with how the interaction was with the volunteers, but generally I think we've got a good system, like I said it's developing. I guess at the start of the projects we did and that's when different things have been brought in, the whole concept of the local spokesperson, this was a role that was developed to have this local contact that's always there because when we're actually joining a community it's difficult because, you know, people want to be so respectful to you because you're there so sometimes issues weren't brought up. Now they 100% do, well as much as they can be with the local spokesperson. I guess it's understanding again, this is where it's so important again that we focus on one area or just know the area so well because it's about understanding (name of country) culture, understanding protocol, understanding how the village works, the mindset of the people, the language that they use, it's understanding all of that because I see what we do as a very (name of country) model. The government developed it, it is a very (name of country) model of development and that's why it's so important to us to have (name of country) staff, to have an understanding of the language and the culture so that you limit those barriers. I think you could easily go to a community and miss things because you don't understand the culture or the customs. It's about having that local understanding. [Interview 20, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

These two examples demonstrate 1) the value of developing in-depth understanding and appreciation of the social, cultural and political contexts in which their relationships with communities and host partner organisations are situated in and 2) using this knowledge to adapt their monitoring and evaluation efforts accordingly.

6.7 A Humanistic Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation: Being Accountable to Beneficiaries

It has been discussed that many of the relationships between volunteer tourism organisations and host partner organisations and host communities reflect top-down principal-agent relationships. The nature of these relationships supports several barriers to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation, including difficulties in identifying and defining the host community and getting 'honest' feedback. These issues are further exacerbated by liquid organisational
contexts. For organisations in such top-down principal-agent relationships accountability tends to flow upwards to the volunteer tourists who fund their operations. This is reflected in their monitoring and evaluation efforts which are largely volunteer focused. In contrast to these organisations, there were examples of organisations who reported relationships with host communities and host partner organisations that leaned more towards being flipped or reversed principal-agent models in that the host communities are the principals, requesting specific tasks to be done and contracting the volunteer tourism organisation (as their agent) to carry out the projects. The organisations take actions which suggest that they view the host communities as, what Aerni (2006) describes as their 'clients' rather than their 'aid recipients'. In doing so, the nature of the relationship promotes greater opportunities for building trust and developing cultural understanding, which in turn facilitates greater opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. This key finding supports Aerni's (2006) argument that if relationships between communities and development organisations reflected this reversed principal-agent model as opposed to the traditional top-down model then such relationships would be more conducive to community driven approaches to development and would promote greater accountability to beneficiaries.

For example, Interviewees 26 and 30 (representing the same NGO) reflect on their organisation's own organisational context which is very much integrated into the local community. They feel that this close partnership overcomes many of the social and cultural barriers which other organisations face.

...It's very important that local people let us know what they think about the projects. I mean, as I said before with them being locally requested we know we're doing something that's actually in their interests to start with, but as projects are implemented it's really important to listen to communities. As I was saying, most projects that we run, the communities are heavily involved in anyway. It's kind of like an ongoing dialogue I guess between staff members and community members as to what's working and what's not. I'd say it's ongoing...even our staff for example that are working in (name of country), we're sort of one of the biggest employers in the region, we have about 60 or 70 local staff. They're all from the communities that we're working in, so it's almost like they're working on the projects but they're also part of the community dialogue as well. It's really connected in that way. We're focused
on such a small area that we're very much integrated with the community. So it's not like some organisations, which might go and work in an area and then expand out to cover the whole country then not have too much connections locally so they have to be really tight with getting communication on how things are going. We've been there for so long and working so closely with communities that it's a dialogue that's a bit more organic. [Interview 26, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

A lot of our work is about sitting down with the communities and finding out what they need and how they want it done. I think this is where (name of organisation) is at quite a big advantage to other organisations, because we are a local NGO that is completely independent of the UK organisation and that employs the vast majority of people – we employ some 80 staff in (name of destination country) who are local, they are led by their own board and they have their own staff hierarchy. A lot of those people are actually involved in the villages and they'll be representatives in areas where we do the projects. So it means that we're kind of embedded among that community so we're able to get feedback where other organisations aren't. I think a lot of organisations go in and surround themselves with a kind of European bubble of staff and they never really properly engage, I mean the problem for us to be honest, is really the opposite, because we're so engaged with the community, because we're able to have constant kind of focus groups and constant dialogue with the communities and the people who are actually benefitting from the projects, there's just an ever expanding need, for every school that we build there's two schools requested by the communities that are surrounding. So it's kind of exponential and I think that is very much encouraged by the dialogue which we have. [Interview 30, Not-For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

In this context the host community are on-going, and active participants in monitoring and evaluation processes including in making decisions about what is monitored and evaluated and how, rather than just viewed as 'mere sources of data' to obtain feedback from (Gregory, 2000, p.180).

In addition, the organisations shared an underlying fundamental characteristic in common. They each had the interest and motivation to extend their monitoring and evaluation practices so that they facilitated host community involvement. For example, as Interviewee 20 states, just attempting to seek out information is one thing but actually ensuring that you get the information that you want is another. Through being aware of barriers such as lack of cultural understanding and trust,
organisations with the interest and motivation to seek accurate perspectives from
the host community have adapted their approaches in order to increase the
likelihood of getting it.

...it's not just good enough to go and say how was the project,
it's about making sure you get the right feedback, just as you're
doing with the project you go to organisations and you say look
I want information but I won't tell your name, no one will know
who you are, it's the same thing...overall it's better for it to be
anonymous because you get a true reflection of the whole
experience for them. The government then meet with us and
they'll go through the feedback, we'll sit down and they'll tell us
all the things the villages said to them and we'll sit down and
discuss together different ways we can make the project better
and that's it, every project is about making it better and better
from preparing to arriving, achieving to leaving. [Interview 20,
For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]

This is in contrast to those organisations which readily accept difficulties in
getting host community feedback as the norm and something that comes with the
territory, or as Bauman would describe it, adiaphorization or a distancing of the
organisation from their moral obligations (Bauman & Donskis, 2013; Davis,
2008). Interviewee 29 is one such example:

It (host community focused monitoring and evaluation) is
something that we try and do but it's a bit difficult in certain
places because of the language barrier. Obviously I can go to
visit our programmes and I can see that they are doing stuff that
to me looks really good...but there's a limit to how much I can
communicate with the local community and find out whether
they value that as much as we would or whether it's something
they could do without, so part of it is just kind of common sense
– we would assume they would be happy with that and they are
eager to have more and more volunteers, in a way we just let
that kind of speak for itself, if they didn't want the volunteers
they wouldn't accept them to come and help their community.
At the end of the day it's their choice, we just look at it from a
kind of business model, if there's demand there then that's
because people want it. [Interview 28, Not-For-Profit, Multi-
Layered Partnerships]

However, it is possible for organisations to change their approach to monitoring
and evaluation. Interviewee 17, as previously discussed in Chapter 5, represents
an organisation which had recently decided to change the way they approach
monitoring and evaluation. The organisation had begun to take a more active role in involving host communities in monitoring and evaluation as opposed to predominantly relying on their partner organisations to provide that feedback. They felt that formalising their monitoring and evaluation efforts would assist in demonstrating the worth of their activities to third parties and also to formally involve and encourage the host community to participate in developing and assessing their projects. New, more formalised approaches to involving host communities in monitoring and evaluation processes included training staff on new techniques such as stakeholder mapping workshops and developing 'consequence chains', which as demonstrated below further highlight the complexity of identifying and defining the host community, validating the use of more thorough processes.

So this year on all of the projects we've asked our leaders to sit down with some community members and do a stakeholder analysis where we ask community members who they think is important, who they think influences their project, the success of a project. We'll ask them to plot those onto a grid, so we'll work out who is the most important for the project, which might end up being the children, for example if it's a children's project, but then who influences it most might end up being local government officials who we might think are completely unimportant in terms of what we consider our success for the project but you know, who we'll have to keep sweet essentially and work with. Whereas the children might be the most important but really have quite little influence really...So that's one of the tools we've done with each of the projects...Another tool that has been used is like I said, these consequence chains. So asking about the impacts. I think I've actually got (lifts up example cement bag consequence chain to camera)...

*ok, so it's like a big mind map*

We were asking some of the members of the community group that we were working with, what they thought the impact of this dam we were building would be. The positive thing about that was that it was a really simple tool, really easy to explain, across language barriers and things like that, that wasn't a concern at all, it was really, really clear and obvious. It was also something that pretty much gave the floor entirely over to them, because it didn't involve a lot of explaining it also meant I didn't have to sit and direct... [Interview 17, For-Profit, Direct Partnerships]
Despite the organisation's roots originally being in offering expeditions they now recognise their involvement in community development through their volunteer tourism programmes and have begun the process of developing monitoring and evaluation activities that reflect that and better facilitate host community involvement. Even though they are not required to do so, the organisation is driven by their own motivation and interest in monitoring and evaluating their specific input into projects and being accountable to their programmes' beneficiaries. This is in contrast to other organisations engaged in Multi-layer Partnerships who rely on their partner organisations to provide feedback, maintaining a moral distance from the responsibility of engaging with host communities, akin to adiaphorization (Bauman & Donskis, 2013; Davis, 2008). Interviewees 17 and 20 demonstrate that having the interest and motivation to engage in more extensive monitoring and evaluation processes can open up opportunities for host community involvement that were not previously visible.

To respond to Dee's (1992) call for the need to consider what sort of relationship is best from an ethical point of view, discussions with participants suggest that in volunteer tourism it is those that are modelled with host communities and host partner organisations as principals, rather than volunteer tourism organisations and volunteer tourists as principals, that appear the most conducive to facilitating host community participation in monitoring and evaluation.

6.8 Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to identify, from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations, barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation (Objective 4). In addressing this aim, this study revealed six key observations:

First, this chapter highlighted that the nature of relationships between stakeholders reflect various configurations of principal-agent (P-A) relationships. In conceptualising volunteer tourism partnerships as P-A relationships this research highlights the impact of P-A relationships on host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. In doing so, this research contributes to the volunteer tourism literature by extending existing discussions of partnerships in volunteer tourism in a way that, to the author's knowledge, has not been done before.
Second, the survey results of this study revealed a discrepancy between the stated importance and perceived effectiveness of host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. Building upon the quantitative survey data, the qualitative interview data identified that key challenges to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation are related to 1) the practical aspects of identifying and defining the host community in the first place and 2) gaining meaningful and constructive feedback from host communities.

The third key finding this chapter highlights is that some organisations struggle to identify and define the host community in the first place. Consequently, narrow representations of the host community which lack appreciation of host community dynamics and broad community representation were apparent. This problem was predominantly found in Multi-layer Partnerships that exhibited characteristics akin to top-down P-A relationships. In these contexts, limited conceptualisations of the host community mean that organisations risk overlooking wider host community interests. Moreover, difficulties in defining and identifying the host community is an issue that has ramifications which extend beyond monitoring and evaluation and impacts host community participation in volunteer tourism at all levels, including the ability to plan projects that reflect host community interests in the first place.

Further, the fourth key finding this study revealed was that organisations exhibiting top-down P-A relationships tend to focus on upward accountability to volunteer tourists and responsibility for identifying beneficiaries is diffused through an 'aid chain' of other organisations. This finding contributes to understanding why host community focused monitoring and evaluation receives the least amount of attention and volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation received the most.

Fifth, this research highlighted that many organisations experience difficulties in gaining meaningful and constructive feedback from host communities. This key finding reinforces Sin's (2010) case study that found because of uneven power relationships host community members can be wary of giving 'honest' feedback. This research extends the findings of Sin's (2010) case study, firstly by gathering data from a large cross-section of volunteer tourism organisations to corroborate that her findings are widespread, and secondly by identifying that unequal power
relationships between organisations and host communities are intensified in partnerships that reflect top-down principal-agent relationships which are further exacerbated by the liquid organisational contexts that they are situated in.

The sixth key finding was that cultural understanding and building trust in partnerships were identified by organisations as opportunities to facilitate constructive and meaningful host community participation. However, for organisations in top-down P-A relationships with liquid organisational characteristics, their liquid bonds and commitments are not conducive to developing cultural understanding or building trust. In contrast, for those organisations exhibiting more solid characteristics such as a strong commitment to communities and close partnerships, cultural understanding and building trust were viewed by these organisations as key factors for developing positive relationships with host communities. In these relationships, partnerships between organisations and host communities are more akin to a reversed principal-agent model, whereby host communities are considered the principals and the organisations, as their agents, are accountable to communities in ensuring that volunteer tourism projects are appropriate and meet their needs. In these contexts, the volunteer tourism organisations have the attitude that overcoming issues of trust and lack of cultural understanding is part of their ethical obligation to the host community and so work towards creating opportunities to overcome them, rather than maintaining a moral distance from their obligations.
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7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Towards Understanding Current Practices: Closing the Gap

The overall aim of this research was threefold: To critically examine the current project monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations; to assess the extent to which host communities participate in these processes; and to identify opportunities and barriers to improved practices. It was based on the premise that better understandings of the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations are needed, particularly with regards to the issues associated with host community participation. The research responds to a gap in that despite increasing concerns surrounding the impacts of volunteer tourism on host communities (e.g. Guttentag, 2009), and the current lack of regulation and monitoring of volunteer tourism activities, to date, very little research has explored such impacts or approaches to the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes. In order to mitigate negative impacts and optimise positive effects on host communities, there is a strong impetus for developing evaluation and monitoring of volunteer tourism projects that incorporate host community participation.

This study has taken a qualitatively-driven, post-disciplinary approach to examining the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. In doing so, this research offers unique and original insights into, and understandings of, the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. Key findings relating to the objectives of this research, discussed below, are organised to respond to the objectives introduced in Chapter 1.

Current Knowledge of Monitoring and Evaluation

The findings from the literature review presented in Chapter 2 addressed Objective 1, To examine current knowledge of the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations. Set within growing concerns about the increasing commercialisation of the volunteer tourism industry and the potential for negative impacts on host communities, the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes was identified as essential for responsible tourism management and ensuring that volunteer tourism benefits the host
communities. However, this study also identified that current knowledge of monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations is limited, highlighting the gap in understanding of how, and indeed if, organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes, to what extent and to what end. In the context of current concerns surrounding the negative impacts of volunteer tourism on host communities, the contributions offered by this study in understanding current practices will assist in developing monitoring and evaluation practices and provide guidance to organisations in their future monitoring and evaluation efforts. In addition, from the literature, Chapter 2 identified four broad and intersecting dimensions of volunteer tourism that may influence monitoring and evaluation:

1. **Markets** (i.e. the various markets and their characteristics which drive the demand for volunteer tourism).
2. **Organisations** (i.e. the various types of volunteer tourism organisations and their organisational contexts).
3. **Programmes** (i.e. the various types of programmes offered and the nature of their engagement with volunteer tourism).
4. **Stakeholders** (i.e. the various stakeholders and their objectives and motivations for engaging with volunteer tourism).

Together, these four intersecting dimensions (and their sub-dimensions) reveal the highly contextual nature of volunteer tourism and the complexity and diversity of interests and settings which can shape the how, when, where, why, and indeed if monitoring and evaluation is undertaken. This is an important contribution that highlights the need for both researchers and practitioners to understand how these dimensions influence, and pose potential challenges to, how monitoring and evaluation is approached.

**The Organisational Contexts of Volunteer Tourism**

Objective 2, *To critically examine the organisational contexts within which the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects take place*, was addressed in Chapter 4. The findings highlighted that traditional typologies such as 'not-for-profit/ for-profit', 'travel organisation' or 'NGO' are no longer reliable
as sole indicators for an organisational identity due to increasingly fluid and ambiguous organisational structures as well as rapidly shifting markets and interests. An important insight emerging from this study therefore is to question taken-for-granted classifications of volunteer tourism organisations, and to better understand the nature of organisations and their working contexts when considering how monitoring and evaluation process should be framed and implemented. Further, in the context of current industry and academic discussions about how to promote responsible volunteer tourism practice, this finding would appear to suggest that while broad sector-wide guidance has a place, it must also be balanced against the more nuanced understandings of a particular organisation's characteristics.

This research also revealed that the liquid organisations' metaphor is an appropriate lens to understand volunteer tourism organisations. In doing so, this research represents a new and original perspective on volunteer tourism organisations. While blurred boundaries and overlapping relationships between NGOs and commercial tour operators have been discussed in existing literature (e.g. Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Lyons & Wearing, 2008a) the fluid and liquid nature of volunteer tourism organisations has received minimal, if any, attention. This study has also cast light on a spectrum of varying degrees of organisational liquefication. Some organisations, particularly those that expressed a stronger affinity with development rather than tourism, still retain some aspects of traditional, 'solid' organisations such as clear organisational structures and identities, long-term commitments and goals, and standardised processes and structures. Nevertheless, these organisations recognise that they are situated within an increasingly globalised and liquefied world in which they are predominantly reliant on the volunteer tourist to fund and support their existence. Consequently, organisations are acutely aware of the need to be able to adapt to meet the consumer demands of the volunteer tourist and a growing trend towards increasingly liquid organisational characteristics was apparent. In conceptualising volunteer tourism organisations as liquid organisations, this research makes a significant contribution in extending current conceptualisations and understandings of volunteer tourism organisations beyond that of increasing commercialisation (e.g. Coghlan & Noakes, 2012; Tomazos & Cooper, 2012;
Vodopivec & Jaffe, 2011). It also offers insight into liquid behaviours and practices that have ramifications for the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes, as highlighted below.

In finding that many organisations are characteristic of liquid organisations, this research highlighted the need to consider the moral and ethical implications of this liquidity for the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations and the well-being of the host communities that volunteer tourism organisations claim to serve. The moral distancing of organisations from their decisions and actions, also known as adiaphorization (e.g. Bauman, 2000; Bauman & Donskis, 2013), was identified as a potential moral and ethical implication of liquid volunteer tourism organisations and adiaphorization provided an analytical undercurrent for Chapters 5 and 6. Existing literature has identified and discussed the potential negative impacts of volunteer tourism (e.g. Guttentag, 2009), yet actual impacts, and organisations' behaviours and attitudes towards the impacts of their volunteer tourism activities remain largely unexplored. In identifying adiaphorization as a potential moral and ethical implication of liquid volunteer tourism organisations this research highlighted the importance of understanding the behaviours and attitudes of volunteer tourism organisations with regards to mitigating negative impacts on host communities.

Organisations' Engagement with Monitoring and Evaluation

Objective 3, To identify and critically examine the ways and extent to which volunteer tourism organisations engage in the monitoring and evaluation of their projects, was addressed in Chapter 5. Five key observations were revealed.

First, this study highlighted that while the vast majority of organisations engage with monitoring and evaluation and consider it to be important, interpretations of what constitutes monitoring and evaluation, and the different ways and extent to which organisations engage with the monitoring and evaluation of their programmes varies greatly from no or minimal engagement to in-depth approaches. Given that the sector was shown to be extremely diverse, that it operates globally in a wide range of jurisdictions by different types of organisations with different goals, motives and interest and there was little global oversight over the sector, this finding is perhaps not surprising.
Second, this research revealed that approaches to monitoring and evaluation were largely informal and liquid in nature and practices were found to exist along two intersecting continuums: 1) level of formality and 2) level of structure. A key finding was that the liquid organisational contexts of many volunteer tourism organisations made it difficult to implement structured, systematic and formalised monitoring and evaluation processes. On the one hand, for organisations that have a strong voluntary commitment to monitoring and evaluating their programmes, and have the skills and knowledge to do so, this liquidity allowed organisations the flexibility and freedom to evaluate their programmes in ways that were appropriate and useful to their specific contexts. However, on the other hand, it also permitted organisations to overlook vital aspects of monitoring and evaluation such as determining whether or not a project was benefitting host communities. Rather, organisations are able to focus their monitoring and evaluation efforts primarily on market-based interests. This risk was exemplified in the next key finding, outlined below.

Third, this research has also highlighted that the volunteer tourists are the stakeholders that currently receive the most attention in monitoring and evaluation. This market-based interest dominated the focus of programme monitoring and evaluation for the majority of organisations, including both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations. However, there were some exceptions to this and a small number of both for-profit and not-for-profit organisations were engaged in in-depth approaches to host partner organisation and host community focused monitoring and evaluation. Nevertheless, as argued by Guba and Lincoln (1989), evaluation processes can disempower and marginalise stakeholders when they are not consulted appropriately. Thus, there is a danger that the current dominance of volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation is facilitating the marginalisation of host communities. The unbalanced focus on volunteers in monitoring and evaluation combined with liquid organisational characteristics, including adiaphorization, which appears to reprieve some organisations of their responsibilities to host communities, also encourages the exclusion of host communities from monitoring and evaluation. This issue is further compounded again by the partnership arrangements of some organisations, as discussed in the next key finding.
Fourth, this research also revealed that the presence of organisational partnerships and specifically Multi-layer Partnerships, significantly influenced monitoring and evaluation from three angles: 1) on a practical level, being partnered with numerous organisations across multiple geographical locations made it more difficult to gain direct information about a programme and uphold monitoring and evaluation efforts; 2) in terms of responsibility, it was often ambiguous who was responsible for monitoring and evaluating various aspects of a volunteer tourism programme within a partnership and responsibility for monitoring and evaluation host community perspectives was often delegated to host partner organisations; 3) the liquefied, privatised and unregulated organisational contexts mean that there was no requirement or expectation within many volunteer tourism partnerships to engage with monitoring and evaluation. Consequently, organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships appear to be particularly prone to adiaphorization. There were several examples of participants distancing themselves and their organisations from their moral obligations. For example, some participants used their organisation's partnership arrangements as a rationalisation for not engaging more rigorously with host community focused monitoring and evaluation. In doing so they relieved themselves of responsibility and accountability for some of the issues that have been experienced at volunteer tourism projects. In contrast, organisations in Direct Partnerships as opposed to Multi-layered Partnerships indicated that they took more considered and thorough approaches to monitoring and evaluation, engaging with a range of stakeholders. Therefore, operational arrangements rather than profit status were most indicative of an organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices. Whilst Wearing and colleagues (Wearing, 2004; Wearing et al., 2005; Wearing & Ponting, 2006) have previously argued that NGOs may represent best practice in volunteer tourism and present a challenge to commodified approaches, the clear finding of this research was that operational arrangements rather than profit status were the most informative of an organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices. This appears to reinforce Goodwin's (2011) assertion that organisational status does not necessarily translate into responsible practice and Simpson's (2008) argument that all types of organisations can have both positive and negative implications for community-based tourism initiatives. This finding emphasises the need to look beyond profit-status before making sweeping judgements about an organisation's approach to
volunteer tourism. Rather, all volunteer tourism organisations, regardless of status, can potentially benefit from improved and more reflexive monitoring and evaluation practices.

Fifth and finally, this research highlighted that the monitoring and evaluation of programme outcomes currently receives the least amount of attention from organisations. Few organisations indicated their engagement with assessing the actual impacts and outcomes of their programmes on communities and other stakeholders. For example, Interviewee 15’s description of determining impact on communities by the number of volunteers that they have sent to programmes is used to legitimise their activities, yet it appears to be nothing more than a naïve marketing exercise. This finding supports and goes beyond current concerns within the literature that there is a lack of knowledge and understanding of the potential impacts of volunteer tourism (e.g. Guttentag, 2009; Power, 2007). This research demonstrates that not only was there a lack of knowledge of impacts on host communities from within academia but that there was also a lack of engagement from volunteer tourism organisations in determining the outcomes of their programmes and their impacts on host communities. Given the potential for negative impacts, as outlined in Chapter 2, a deficit of engagement in evaluating programme outcomes was evident in this research. This is flagged as an area of concern warranting further attention within the industry. Increasing and encouraging educational opportunities within the volunteer tourism sector that are focused on improving the monitoring and evaluation of programme outcomes from a more critical and action-oriented perspective would facilitate organisational learning (Preskill & Torres, 1999) and programme development (Meyer, 2012; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007) which in turn would increase opportunities to enhance the volunteer tourism experience for both volunteers and communities.

Host Community Participation in Monitoring and Evaluation

Objective 4, To identify, from the perspective of volunteer tourism organisations, the barriers and opportunities for host community participation in monitoring and evaluation processes, was addressed in Chapter 6.
Chapter 6 highlighted that the nature of relationships between stakeholders reflect various configurations of principal-agent (P-A) relationships. In conceptualising volunteer tourism partnerships as P-A relationships this research sought to explore the (a)symmetries of relationships and the impact of these relationships on host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. In doing so, this research extended existing discussions of partnerships in volunteer tourism in a way that, to the author's knowledge, has not been done before. Current literature has suggested that volunteer tourism partnerships can be a source of opportunity for leveraging resources and skills (Eddins, 2013) and has highlighted the importance of a strong trusting relationship between volunteer tourism organisations and host partner organisations (Raymond, 2008). However the effect that partnerships can have on the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects, and specifically host community participation in monitoring and evaluation, has received insufficient attention. Key observations and their implications are discussed below.

First, the quantitative survey results of this study revealed a discrepancy between the stated importance and perceived effectiveness of host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. Exploring this observation further in the qualitative interview data, key challenges to host community participation in monitoring and evaluation were related to 1) the practical aspects of identifying and defining the host community in the first place and 2) gaining meaningful and constructive feedback from host communities. This finding is important because it sheds light on the difficulty of engaging with appropriate communities of interest, and the need for greater reflexive engagement in designing monitoring and evaluation processes that take into account a range of implicit and explicit factors that impede participation. In other words, increasing participation in monitoring and evaluation is insufficient in itself and if monitoring and evaluation are to aid in the pursuit of a more conscious and responsible form of volunteer tourism then it must be undertaken in full awareness of the imbalances of power and potentially conflicting political interests that can silence some voices and amplify others.

A second key finding highlighted by this research is that some organisations struggle to identify and define the host community in the first place. Consequently, narrow representations of the host community which lack
appreciation of host community dynamics and broad community representation were apparent. This problem was particularly dominant in Multi-layer Partnerships that exhibited characteristics akin to top-down P-A relationships. In these contexts, limited conceptualisations of the host community mean that organisations risk overlooking wider host community interests, which as others have highlighted (e.g. Blackstock, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013; Zahra & McGehee, 2013) can vary greatly. Moreover, difficulties in defining and identifying the host community is an issue that has ramifications which extend beyond monitoring and evaluation – this issue impacts host community participation in volunteer tourism at all levels, including the ability to plan projects that reflect host community interests in the first place.

A third finding revealed was that organisations exhibiting top-down P-A relationships tend to focus on upward accountability to volunteer tourists and responsibility for identifying beneficiaries is diffused through an 'aid chain' of other organisations, similar to the institutional arrangements typically found in international development (Barder, 2009). This finding is an important insight into why host community focused monitoring and evaluation receives the least amount of attention and volunteer focused monitoring and evaluation receives the most. It suggests that monitoring and evaluation processes need to account for the effect of different types of partnerships in order to ensure that all volunteer tourism programmes, regardless of their organisational arrangements, can benefit from robust monitoring and evaluation processes which involve a wide range of key stakeholders.

A fourth significant finding highlighted was that many organisations experience difficulties in gaining meaningful and constructive feedback from host communities. This key finding reinforces Sin's (2010) case study that found because of uneven power relationships host community members can be wary of giving 'honest' feedback. Unequal power relationships between organisations and host communities are intensified in partnerships that reflect top-down principal-agent relationships and this inequity is further exacerbated by the liquid organisational contexts that they are situated in. The loose bonds between organisations and communities and the fluid commitment displayed by some organisations was a barrier to building close, trusting relationships. This finding
further highlights the negative issues and outcomes that can arise in the adverse combination of unequal power relationships, liquid organisational characteristics and top-down P-A relationships that was prevalent in the sample..

Finally, this research highlighted that cultural understanding and building trust in partnerships were identified by organisations as opportunities to facilitate constructive and meaningful host community participation in monitoring and evaluation. These findings support Raymond's (2008) assertion that trust is important in volunteer tourism partnerships and extends Raymond's (2008) discussion by exploring how trust is manifest in the P-A relationships situated in liquid organisational contexts. This research highlighted that for organisations in top-down P-A relationships with liquid organisational characteristics, their liquid bonds and commitments are not conducive to developing cultural understanding or building trust. In contrast, for those organisations exhibiting more solid characteristics such as a strong commitment to communities and close partnerships, cultural understanding and building trust were viewed by these organisations as key factors for developing positive relationships with host communities. In these relationships, partnerships between organisations and host communities were more akin to a reversed principal-agent model, whereby host communities were considered the principals and the organisations, as their agents, are accountable to communities for ensuring that volunteer tourism projects are appropriate and meet their needs. In these contexts, the volunteer tourism organisations had the attitude that overcoming issues of trust and lack of cultural understanding was part of their ethical obligation to the host community and so work towards creating opportunities to overcome them, rather than maintaining a moral distance from their obligations and potentially perpetuating a model of volunteer tourism that is inappropriate or even harmful to host communities.

7.2 Significance and Implications
This research has made significant contributions to closing the gap in understanding of how, and indeed if, organisations monitor and evaluate their programmes and to what end. Pertinently set within the current context of concerns about the potential negative impacts of host communities, the monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes was identified as an important part of an organisation's responsibility to both host communities and
volunteer tourists. Guided by a CMS framework, this study examined the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism organisations from a critical perspective, and in doing so highlighted issues of inequality, power, and politics in monitoring and evaluation that tend to be overlooked in (post)positivistic quantitative approaches. In taking a post-disciplinary perspective, this thesis has synthesised the findings with diverse fields of literature and analytical concepts that have not yet been discussed in volunteer tourism, including liquid organisations and the related concept of adiaphorization, evaluation studies and P-A. As a result, this research has revealed unique insights into and understandings of the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer tourism, that not only have implications for monitoring and evaluation but also for the future of volunteer tourism and ensuring that volunteer tourism is appropriate for and benefits host communities.

This research found that many volunteer tourism organisations possess characteristics of liquid organisations and it discussed the implications of liquid organisations on an organisation's monitoring and evaluation practices. While their liquid organisational arrangements have facilitated a speedy network of volunteer tourism partnerships, the bonds and relationships between them appear shallow, at times misguided and their values and interests misaligned. This, of course, raises serious questions about the long-term value of volunteer tourism programmes because such disparate interests, values and objectives can only be held together for a limited time. Inevitably, marginalised communities that do not possess the power, expertise or mobility will be the subject of the fallout.

The research also revealed examples, of organisations which appear more likely to be able to achieve appropriate volunteer tourism for host communities due to their increased ability to facilitate host community participation, and their ongoing commitment to developing cultural understanding and building trust in their relationships. These examples were situated more towards the 'solid' end of the liquefication spectrum. However, the apparent increasing trend towards the liquefication of organisational practices and the potentially harmful consequences of this increasingly liquefied organisational context should not be ignored. For example, Wearing (2004) has argued that if volunteer tourism is to live up to its potential to being a reciprocal form of travel that mutually benefits hosts and
guests then volunteer tourism organisations that are driven by the values of maintaining the well-being of local communities and not by their own economic benefit are essential. Alignment between the values and interests of host communities, volunteer tourists and volunteer tourism organisations is crucial for ensuring a sustainable future for volunteer tourism. However, the increasingly liquefied context of volunteer tourism appears to elevate the importance of meeting market demands above the interests of the host community. In these contexts monitoring and evaluation that reflects the volunteer tourism organisations’ self-interests and overlooks community interests will only serve to further exacerbate this problem.

This research shone a light to the moral distancing of volunteer tourism organisations from their ethical obligations and actions, or adiaphorization, regarded as a symptom of liquid organisations. Some volunteer tourism organisations distance themselves from critical issues that come to their attention and fail to explore others. This issue has far-reaching implications beyond monitoring and evaluation, particularly where vulnerable groups and individuals are concerned. Organisations need to engage more sincerely and more reflexively with their moral and ethical obligations to host communities if they are to facilitate appropriate models of volunteer tourism that benefit host communities (Jamal & Camargo, 2013). This research therefore reinforces the pivotal role that volunteer tourism organisations hold in facilitating positive outcomes in volunteer tourism (e.g. Hammersley, 2013; McGeehee, 2012; Raymond, 2008). It is highly worrying then that if the trend for liquefied practices increases, so too does the likelihood that moral conundrums facing the sector, and captured in the theoretical notion of adiaphorization, are likely to continue and even intensify. This finding clearly points to not only a need for higher levels of reflexive engagement in monitoring and evaluation, but importantly, also ensuring that there is sufficient support, information and expertise available to, and within, the sector to achieve this.

In light of the current push towards increased accountability and greater regulation of the volunteer tourism sector, the findings of this research suggest that the liquid organisational characteristics and trend for Multi-layered partnership arrangements will make efforts towards increased regulation difficult.
The ambiguous nature of some organisations and their activities make it hard to pin-point and specify which organisations and which programmes should be regulated, let alone how this should be done. That there were examples of organisations already taking self-regulation and improvement through monitoring and evaluation seriously is encouraging. However, for organisations with more adiaphoric tendencies it is likely that business will continue as usual unless a new culture of reflexive engagement with monitoring and evaluation and taking ownership of moral responsibility is encouraged.

This thesis has critiqued the monitoring and evaluation practices of the volunteer tourism organisations that took part in this research. However, as argued by Bramwell and Lane (2014), it is also important to consider the actual implementation of improved tourism practices. The next section proposes and outlines an analytical framework for volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation which is aimed at improving monitoring and evaluation in volunteer tourism in order to increase host community participation in monitoring and evaluation with the aim of improving the outcomes of volunteer tourism for host communities.

7.3 Moving Forward: Developing an Analytical Framework for Volunteer Tourism Programme Monitoring and Evaluation

Drawing on the insights gained throughout this research, this section addresses Objective 5, To identify strategic, action oriented recommendations with respect to how monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism projects may be enhanced.

The largely informal and liquid nature of volunteer tourism makes it difficult to implement formal, highly structured monitoring and evaluation processes, therefore flexible approaches to monitoring and evaluation are deemed most appropriate. Indeed, the findings of this study suggest that some evaluation approaches, particularly those that take a positivist stance (e.g. Campbell, 1969), would be poorly suited to the dynamic nature of the liquid organisations that took part in this research. Further, the ad-hoc and highly liquid nature of some organisations' practices made their engagement with monitoring and evaluation questionable and limited. Consideration of more thorough processes would most
likely be of value to such organisations, and their stakeholders. In addition, monitoring and evaluation was skewed towards focusing on the perceptions and experiences of volunteer tourists, while programme outcomes focused monitoring and evaluation and host community focused monitoring and evaluation are often overlooked. Indeed, there was often an air of adiaphorization with regard to these aspects of monitoring and evaluation with many organisations implicitly ignoring their ethical and moral obligations to ensure meaningful and constructive host community participation in their organisation's monitoring and evaluation activities. With these issues in mind, the author believes that a framework aimed at promoting 1) more comprehensive approaches to programme monitoring and evaluation, and 2) deeper consideration of stakeholder engagement at various stages of monitoring and evaluation, would be highly valuable to efforts which seek to encourage responsible practice in volunteer tourism.

As demonstrated in this thesis, the context surrounding volunteer tourism programmes can vary greatly, including the stakeholders, organisations, markets and the nature of a programme's engagement with volunteer tourism. Thus, taking into account the areas of oversight and concern in current practice that this research has identified, and the highly contextual nature of volunteer tourism, the next section outlines a broad framework for volunteer tourism organisation practitioners and staff to develop their organisations' monitoring and evaluation practices. To be clear, such a framework is not offered as a prescription, but rather as a reflexive tool to assist organisations to be more conscious of decisions with regards to how they frame and implement monitoring and evaluation processes within a particular context.

A 'context first' approach to monitoring and evaluation

Literature from within evaluation studies recognises that evaluations are highly contextual in nature (Conner, Fitzpatrick, & Rog, 2012; Fitzpatrick, Christie, & Mark, 2009; Rog, 2012), arguing the need to "foreground the background" and make the often implicit acknowledgement of context explicit (Rog, 2012, p.25). In acknowledging the varied and liquid contexts in which volunteer tourism programmes are situated, this section builds on Rog (2012) advocating for a 'context-first' approach to monitoring and evaluation.
The various contexts surrounding a programme will influence how evaluation is approached, for what purpose it is carried out and how the findings are utilised and reported. Consequently, context impacts upon the outcomes of programme evaluation (Rog, 2012). Despite this, context does not usually take a leading role in evaluation practice and is often "more of an afterthought when the work does not go as planned or findings emerge that are difficult to interpret" (Rog, 2012, p.26). Rog (2012) argues that "context matters" and that "context-sensitive evaluation" can help evaluators determine the appropriate way for them to approach and carry out an evaluation, improving evaluation practice.

Traditionally evaluations are driven by a "methods first approach" and an ongoing discussion within the field of evaluation has been "how best to match designs and methods to particular programme and policy contexts to produce the most useful and actionable evidence" (Rog, 2012, p. 267). Stemming from these discussions, and drawing from Rog and others' experiences as programme evaluation practitioners in a variety of settings (including interventions for homelessness, environmental interventions and educational programmes), Rog (2012) argues that it is inappropriate to select a particular evaluation method without first understanding the particular context of a programme and the (potentially competing) needs of stakeholders. Rather, Rog's (2012) Context Assessment Framework takes a 'context first approach', following which evaluators can then decide which methods, such as the examples summarised in Chapter 5 Table 5.1, or which impact indicators, such as the examples discussed by Lupoli et al. (2014) might be most appropriate.

The framework, described in Taplin et al. (2014) and presented in Figure 7.1 below, proposes four key areas of context that affect evaluation practice from design of the evaluation right through to how findings are reported. These five key areas are the phenomenon and the problem (e.g. the issue that a volunteer travel programme is trying to address), the nature of the intervention (i.e. the actual programme to be evaluated, e.g. the volunteer programme itself), the broader environment/setting (e.g. market drivers, stakeholders involved and organisations offering the programme), the evaluation context (e.g. the parameters of the actual evaluation which does/ does not take place), and the decision-making context (e.g. who decides what is monitored and evaluated and how, e.g. volunteer travel
organisations, host communities, host partner organisations, donor agencies). With this in mind, how (and indeed if) volunteer tourism organisations engage with the monitoring and evaluation of their programmes will be influenced by the "myriad of variables at play" in the complex volunteer tourism landscape (Benson, 2011, p.43). As derived from the findings of Chapter 2, four key areas of context that volunteer tourism programmes are embedded in represent a multitude of possibilities, priorities and values that underpin monitoring and evaluation: 1) Markets (i.e. the various markets and their characteristics which drive the demand for volunteer tourism); 2) Organisations (i.e. the various types of volunteer tourism organisations and their organisational contexts); 3) Programmes (i.e. the various types of programmes offered and the nature of their engagement with volunteer tourism); 4) Stakeholders (i.e. the various stakeholders and their objectives and motivations for engaging with volunteer tourism).

In acknowledging the varied and liquid contexts in which volunteer tourism programmes are situated, this thesis builds on Rog's (2012) 'context-first' approach to develop an analytical framework for volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation.

Figure 7.1 aims to promote discussion and deeper consideration of the issues that have been outlined in this thesis. In doing so it has the potential to provide a deeper and more critical approach to monitoring and evaluation that, if findings are acted upon, may improve the positive impacts of volunteer tourism on local communities.
In line with the discussions throughout this thesis, the hybrid framework shown in Figure 7.1 incorporates both consideration of context and the various dimensions that may influence volunteer tourism programme monitoring and evaluation. In addition, some basic, generic monitoring and evaluation processes are outlined, whilst recognising that specific processes and methods will likely differ by case. Each component includes CMS inspired guiding considerations, which highlight critical decision points and opportunities for engaging key stakeholders, including host communities, that can be utilised by organisations to promote improved monitoring and evaluation practices. These CMS inspired guiding considerations are further discussed below and can be utilised by both organisations seeking to improve their programme monitoring and evaluation efforts and also for those
wishing to examine and analyse an organisations monitoring and evaluation practices in future research.

1. Programme to be evaluated: Understanding dimensions of context that influence the volunteer tourism programme

The activities and goals of volunteer tourism programmes differ from programme to programme. They are set within diverse organisational contexts and driven by different markets and stakeholder interests. For organisations to engage in monitoring and evaluation that is reflexive and relevant to key stakeholders, it is important that organisations are aware of, and pay attention to these contextual influences which shape their volunteer tourism programmes and can influence the monitoring and evaluation processes outlined below.

2. Determine purpose for monitoring and evaluation

The purpose for monitoring and evaluation will vary between organisations according to the nature of the volunteer tourism programme and will likely reflect the values and interests of the organisation (Bourne & Jenkins, 2013) and power imbalances between stakeholders (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Mertens & Wilson, 2012). Important questions, for both organisations reflecting on their own monitoring and evaluation practices and also from an academic perspective in future research, are whose interests does the organisation's current and/or proposed monitoring and evaluation activities represent? Are the interests of other stakeholders being overlooked and if so, why? For example, taking a critical perspective it would be necessary to question the motives of an organisation which predominantly focuses on the monitoring and evaluation of market-focused interests at the expense of host community and beneficiary interests.

3. Identify programme beneficiaries

An important consideration here is for organisations to reflect on, and address discrepancies between the intended beneficiaries of a programme (for example, host communities) and the actual beneficiaries (for example, volunteer tourists, or even the organisations themselves). It was also found in this study that organisations in Multi-layer Partnerships had difficulty in identifying their respective beneficiaries and host communities and often did not see this to be their
responsibility. Taking time to identify and create opportunities to engage with the intended programme beneficiaries and key stakeholder groups should be a priority (Cousins & Whitmore, 1998; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Mascarenhas, et al., 2010; Mertens & Wilson, 2012; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). It is at this decision point that organisations have an opportunity to both empower and disempower beneficiaries through critically examining the ways and extent to which beneficiaries are included in their monitoring and evaluation processes.

4. Determine appropriate approach and methods

A broad spectrum of monitoring and evaluation methods and approaches exist and it is up to individual organisations to consider which methods and approaches are appropriate to their own particular context (Meyer, 2012; Rog, 2012). Nevertheless, this study has demonstrated that unequal power relationships prevail between stakeholders, particularly in the context of organisations that exhibit liquid relationships and top-down P-A relationships. It is important therefore that organisations recognise that different methods and approaches may be needed to gather information from different stakeholders. For example, it is important for organisations to engage in culturally sensitive and appropriate methods in order to encourage beneficiaries to participate actively and not just passively in monitoring and evaluation (Rebien 1996 in Gregory, 2000). It should also be recognised that feedback may be influenced by the inequitable power relationships between the organisation and stakeholders (e.g. Sin, 2010) and cannot necessarily be taken at face value.

5. Collect data through monitoring and evaluate

Collecting information that is relevant to the aims and goals of the programme is obviously important. However, an essential question to be considered both prior to, during and after data has been collected is whose interests are represented in the data and information that is to be/ has been gathered? Organisations should seek to gather information that is not only useful to themselves but that is also meaningful and relevant to stakeholders and the intended beneficiaries of the programme (Mascarenhas, et al., 2010). Again, it is also necessary throughout this stage to acknowledge any influences that may have biased feedback from stakeholders such as uneven power relationships or personal interests.
6. **Review findings and disseminate**

Monitoring and evaluation should not be 'tick box' exercises that are carried out for their own sake. Rather, findings that are reviewed, acted upon and disseminated responsibly offer an opportunity to develop programmes (Meyer, 2012) in ways that enhance the experiences of both volunteers and host communities.

7. **Make programme revisions based on information gained via monitoring and evaluation**

To maximise the benefits of carrying out monitoring and evaluation it is essential that, where possible, organisations revise programmes as appropriate (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). Whilst it is important to acknowledge and appreciate that organisations can face practical challenges and ethical dilemmas due to a lack of resources or other impediments (Alvesson & Ashcraft, 2009), it is essential that organisations do not distance themselves from their moral obligations and fail to take appropriate action when it is needed (Bauman, 2000; Bauman & Donskis, 2013).

Further recommendations for future research are discussed below.

7.4 **Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research**

Future research that uses the guiding considerations in Figure 7.1 to assess and examine a volunteer tourism organisations' monitoring and evaluation practices, as discussed above, would help individual organisations to improve their processes. Qualitative, critical case studies and action research approaches would be particularly suitable. Such studies could allow organisations to adapt and develop the framework according to their own contexts. Developing further understanding of how the contextual dimensions of volunteer tourism (Markets, Organisations, Programmes and Stakeholders) influence and pose challenges to the decisions made at each of the processes depicted in the model would further assist efforts to apply regulatory frameworks to volunteer tourism to better understand the highly contextual nature of volunteer tourism activities. This research has focused on monitoring and evaluation from the perspective of
volunteer tourism organisations that offer community development programmes and that are based in Australia, New Zealand, UK, Canada and the USA. Future research that includes organisations based in other countries, particularly those organisations in developing countries, would also be valuable in broadening understandings of organisations' monitoring and evaluation practices and in determining differences in perspectives and practices. It is also acknowledged that the research design in this study is limited in its capacity for generalisation of the findings beyond the study participants. Perspectives from host communities and host partner organisations were not part of this research. Chapters 5 and 6 found that many organisations acknowledged that host community participation in monitoring and evaluation was limited. Further, when host-community focused monitoring and evaluation does take place, unequal power relationships between volunteer tourism organisations and host communities can hinder meaningful and constructive host community participation. Therefore, future research that expands understanding of host community perspectives on, and their experiences of 1) monitoring and evaluation and 2) relationships with volunteer tourism organisations could further extend the findings of this research and be a useful addition to the volunteer tourism literature.

It would also be useful to further explore, both in theoretical and practical contexts, the impact of liquid volunteer tourism organisations on other aspects of volunteer tourism. For example what are the social, cultural and economic impacts of liquid versus more solid volunteer tourism organisations? Another line of enquiry could involve exploring what are the volunteer tourists' perspectives on and experiences of liquid volunteer tourism organisations compared with more 'solid' volunteer tourism organisations? For instance, in striving to meet market demands do liquid organisations deliver programmes that meet the expectations of the volunteer tourist? From a host community perspective, are there facets in the relationships between liquid organisations and host communities that host communities can leverage to improve their experience of volunteer tourism? Can/do liquid relationships offer host communities anything that more solid organisations do not?

Finally, the quietly insidious problem of adiaphorization that has permeated this research and which is closely tied to liquid organisations requires further
theoretical and empirical attention in order to ensure that volunteer tourism organisations really are doing all that they can to ensure that their volunteer tourism activities promote the well-being of host communities.

**Epilogue**

The people who took part in this research were generous and enthusiastic in sharing their experiences. Thanks to them, I had the opportunity to gain insight into the highs and the lows of their organisation's engagement with volunteer tourism. While some stories have been concerning others have been inspirational and heartening. Wherever an organisation sits (or drifts) on the solid-liquid continuum, I hope that this research inspires and encourages all organisations to continually assess, and act on, their ethical obligations to the communities and individuals who host volunteers.
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Appendix 1: Online Survey Template

(Created and disseminated from Qualtrics)

Welcome to this survey on volunteer travel.

We invite you to take part in this survey about how volunteer travel works in practice. We want to find out more about: (1) the different organisational contexts of volunteer travel providers (2) their programme monitoring and evaluation practices. The survey is part of an independent PhD research project.

Your responses are completely anonymous and will not be linked to yourself or the organisation that you represent.

Who are we looking for?

- Does your organisation offer volunteer travel programmes that are:
  - short-term (less than 3 months in duration)
  - open to non-professional/non-skilled volunteers
  - have a community development/service focus
  - take place in developing countries?

If yes, then we want you to take part in this survey. All questions are asking about your organisation’s activities in relation to the above programme criteria.

How long will it take?
10 -15 minutes. Participation is voluntary and you can withdraw from the research at any time.

Do you want to know the outcomes of this research?
Information about the findings can be made available to you as the project progresses. Please provide your email address at the end of the survey if you would like to be kept informed.

Any questions?
For further information about the project please click HERE or contact the principal researcher Jessica Taplin at jessica.taplin@scu.edu.au
Thank you for your time and consideration.

*Please note: This survey is asking about the context and practices of the organisation that you represent and the volunteer travel programmes that it engages with.
Please provide some basic information so we can understand who is answering the survey.

1. Which of the following best describes your role within the organisation?
   - CEO
   - Director
   - Operations manager
   - Marketing manager
   - Volunteer coordinator
   - Administrative staff
   - In-country representative
   - Other (please describe)

2. To what extent are you involved in the implementation of your organisation's volunteer travel programme/s?
   - Not at all
   - Minimally
   - Somewhat
   - Considerably
   - Extensively

ABOUT YOUR ORGANISATION

This section asks questions to help us understand the different types and contexts of volunteer travel providers.

3. Is your organisation
   - For-profit
   - Not-for-profit
   - Other (please describe)

4. How is your organisation best identified?
   - Non-government organisation (NGO)
   - Government organisation
   - Travel organisation
   - Registered charity
   - Philanthropic organisation
5. What is the main focus of your organisation?

☐ Alternative/niche travel  
☐ Volunteer travel  
☐ Service learning  
☐ Gap year activities  
☐ Religious activities  
☐ Host communities  
☐ Other (please describe)

6. To what degree does your organisation consider the following its key roles and responsibilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing a travel service to volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing volunteer travel programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising for partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning volunteer travel programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring volunteer travel programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating volunteer travel programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABOUT YOUR ORGANISATION'S VOLUNTEER TRAVEL PROGRAMME/S

7. How often, if at all, does your organisation engage with the following types of volunteer travel programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Type</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term &quot;one off&quot; projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that are part of ongoing programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Placements with partner organisations
Programmes where volunteers spend time at different projects or placements
Other (please describe, enter text here)

8. Approximately what percentage of time do volunteers spend volunteering on your organisation's programmes (as opposed to sightseeing and other recreational activities)? Please enter a number between 1 and 100. ________________

**FUNDING**

In this section we want to learn about the funding arrangements of volunteer travel providers.

9. How often, if at all, does your organisation receive funding from the following sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How often, if at all, is funding allocated to the following functions of your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTNERING

Partnering means that two or more organisations work together for the purpose of being able to offer volunteer travel programmes.

11. Is your organisation partnered with any other organisations in order to provide volunteer travel programmes?
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No (if no skip to question 15)
   ☐ Don't know

12. How often, if at all, does your organisation partner with the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-country host partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor/funding agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Does your organisation partner with the following types of organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Approximately how many organisations is your organisation partnered with in order to provide volunteer travel experiences?

[ ]
MONITORING

To learn more about how organisations currently engage with the monitoring of their volunteer travel programmes, this section asks questions about your organisation’s engagement with programme monitoring.

Monitoring is defined as:

"The purposeful checking of, and gathering information on, how a volunteer travel programme’s activities are progressing".

15. How often, if at all, is the monitoring of volunteer travel programmes the responsibility of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host partner organisation/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How important, if at all, does your organisation consider the monitoring of the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer behaviour/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of programme in relation to its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Does your organisation monitor its volunteer travel programmes?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No (Skip to question 19)
- [ ] Don't know
18. How often, if at all, does your organisation monitor any of the following aspects of its volunteer travel programme/s?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer behaviour/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of programme in relation to its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what extent, if at all, do the following factors influence why your organisation does not monitor volunteer travel programmes? If answered 'no' at question 17, this question is not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It takes up too much time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires too many resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not the responsibility of our organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of guidance available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION**

Organisations may monitor but may not evaluate volunteer travel programmes, this section wants to learn more about how organisations currently engage with the evaluation of volunteer travel programmes.

Recognising that there is not one best method or model for carrying out programme evaluation and that evaluations may be conducted formally or informally, for the purposes of this survey evaluation is defined as:

"The process of determining the merit or worth (value) of a volunteer travel programme, and the extent to which a programme has achieved its goals or objectives".

20. How often, if at all, is the evaluation of volunteer travel programmes the responsibility of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host partner organisation/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. How important, if at all, does your organisation consider the evaluation of the following aspects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer behaviour/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of programme in relation to its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Does your organisation evaluate its volunteer travel programmes?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No (Skip to question 27)
- [ ] Don't know

23. How often, if at all, does your organisation evaluate any of the following aspects of its volunteer travel programme/s?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer behaviour/performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress of programme in relation to its goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. How often, if at all, does your organisation seek the following information when conducting evaluation activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner organisation feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical data (e.g. number of dwellings built, number of students taught)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. In evaluating the success of a programme, how important, if at all, is feedback from the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your organisation's own staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. How often, if at all, is the information gained from evaluation processes used for the following purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To apply for future funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To satisfy existing funding requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To inform future project planning and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make changes to a programme if necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide feedback to volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide feedback to host partner organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide feedback to host communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. To what extent, if at all, do the following factors influence why your organisation does not monitor volunteer travel programmes? _If answered ‘no’ at question 22, this question is not applicable._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Significantly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It takes up too much time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It requires too many resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not the responsibility of our organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of guidance available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe, enter text here)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is only one section left!

**HOST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

This section wants to learn about host community involvement in the monitoring and evaluation of the programmes that your organisation offers.

28. How important, if at all, does your organisation consider host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes?

- Not at all Important
- Somewhat Unimportant
- Neither Important nor Unimportant
- Somewhat Important
- Extremely Important

29. Is host community feedback currently an effective way for your organisation to _monitor_ a volunteer travel programme?

- Yes
- Sometimes
- No
30. Is host community feedback currently an effective way for your organisation to evaluate a volunteer travel programme?

☐ Yes
☐ Sometimes
☐ No

31. If your organisation seeks host community feedback on volunteer travel programmes, who does your organisation seek feedback from? (Please describe, e.g. local leaders, host partner organisation staff, government agencies)

..........................

32. Why does your organisation seek feedback from these host community members?

..........................

Thank you for taking part in this survey.

If you have any further comments please add them here:.....................

Survey Findings

☐ Click here if you would like to receive a summary of the findings from this survey. Then enter your name and email address below.

..........................

Invitation to Participate in an Interview

☐ Click here if you are interested in taking part in an interview via Skype or telephone to further discuss your organisation's engagement with volunteer travel. Then enter your name and email address below.

Important: Your name and email address will be de-linked from the survey and your responses will remain anonymous.

Name

[ ]

Email

[ ]
## Appendix 2: Interview Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me about your role within (name of organisation)?</td>
<td>• Focus and role of the organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is (name of organisation) involved with volunteer travel?</td>
<td>• What aspects of volunteer travel are they responsible for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Type of organisation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you talk a bit about the kinds of partnership with other organisations,</td>
<td>• Type/s of organisation/s partnered with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that (name of organisation) is involved in?</td>
<td>• Roughly how many?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other area I’m interested in is programme monitoring and evaluation,</td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how important is this to your organisation?</td>
<td>• Monitoring more important than evaluation or vice versa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the <strong>monitoring</strong> of volunteer programmes take place within the</td>
<td>• Who initiates it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context of your organisation/ (name of organisation)?</td>
<td>• Who is responsible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The processes that take place?</td>
<td>• The processes that take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who’s involved?</td>
<td>• Who’s involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What sort of information and/or feedback sought?</td>
<td>• What sort of information and/or feedback sought?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purposes for doing? - What type of information is important to the</td>
<td>• Purposes for doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisation?</td>
<td>• Purposes for doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why?</td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulties in getting feedback or information that would be really useful?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does <strong>evaluation</strong> of volunteer programmes take place within the</td>
<td>• Who initiates it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context of your organisation (name of organisation)?</td>
<td>• Who is responsible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The processes that take place?</td>
<td>• The processes that take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who’s involved?</td>
<td>• Who’s involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What sort of information and/or feedback sought? - What type of information is important to the organisation?</td>
<td>• What type of information and/or feedback sought? - What type of information is important to the organisation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Purposes for doing?</td>
<td>• Purposes for doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why?</td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does your organisation do with the information it gets from monitoring and/or evaluation?</td>
<td>• Difficulties in getting feedback or information that would be really useful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s done with information gained?</td>
<td>• What’s done with information gained?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity to make any changes based on M&amp;E outcomes?</td>
<td>• Capacity to make any changes based on M&amp;E outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any reason there would be for organisation to terminate a programme or its involvement with a community or host partner? Example of when this has happened?</td>
<td>• Any reason there would be for organisation to terminate a programme or its involvement with a community or host partner? Example of when this has happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the context of your organisation and the programmes you run, how important is host community involvement in these processes to (name of organisation)?</td>
<td>• Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who is considered to be the host community in the case of the programmes that you run? /Who do they consider to be representative of the host community?</td>
<td>• Who is considered to be the host community in the case of the programmes that you run? /Who do they consider to be representative of the host community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does getting host community feedback on a programme or project work in practice?</td>
<td>• From the organisations perspective, any examples which they consider to work well in gaining host community feedback of programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• From the organisations perspective, are there barriers to host community participation?</td>
<td>• From the organisations perspective, are there barriers to host community participation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Difficulties with getting useful feedback from host communities?</td>
<td>• Difficulties with getting useful feedback from host communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there anything else you would like to add?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any questions about the research?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION TO SUMMARY OF SURVEY FINDINGS

Towards understanding the monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer travel organisations

Background

This report provides a summary of survey findings to participants in an online survey that forms part of an independent PhD research project being undertaken by Jessica Taplin at Southern Cross University, Australia. The overall aim of this research project is to understand the current programme monitoring and evaluation practices of volunteer travel providers, the extent to which host communities participate in these processes, and opportunities and barriers to improved practices. Participants were invited to take part in two stages of research (1) an online survey and (2) an interview. This report summarises the results from the online survey with the purpose of dissemination to survey participants for their information. The purpose of the survey was to further understand how volunteer travel works in practice. Questions focused specifically on finding out more about (1) the different organisational contexts of volunteer travel providers and (2) their programme monitoring and evaluation practices. The survey was carried out during October and November 2012.

Sample population

This research focuses on organisations which meet the following inclusion criteria: They are based in Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada or the UK and offer short term (3 months or less) volunteer travel opportunities to non-professional volunteers on programmes which have a community development/service focus in developing countries. Organisations were identified by carrying out searches on Google.com.au, Google.co.nz, Google.com, Google.ca, Google.co.uk using the search terms “volunteer abroad”, “volunteer programmes”, “volunteer projects”, “gap year volunteer programmes/projects”, “volunteer travel”, “volunteer tourism”, “voluntourism”. Organisations were also identified via searching the following databases: volunteerglobal.com, transitionsabroad.com, gonomad.com, goabroad.com, volunteerinternational.org.

192 organisations were identified as meeting the above inclusion criteria. An invitation email outlining the details of the research was sent to representatives from each of the 192 organisations. Representatives from 16 organisations responded to say that they were too busy to participate and there was no response from 64 organisations. Representatives from 112 organisations replied indicating their interest in the research and the survey was sent to those individuals. In total, 80 participants representing 80 different organisations completed the survey, capturing 41% of the sample population.
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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following provides a summary of the survey findings according to the questions that were asked.

PART 1 ABOUT YOUR ORGANISATION

1.1) Is your organisation

- For-profit -35%
- Not-for-profit -55%
- Other -10%

Just over half of the survey respondents (55%) represented Not-for-profit organisations and 35% of respondents identified their organisations as For-profit. 10% of respondents selected ‘Other’ and their descriptions demonstrated that it was ambiguous as to whether or not these organisations could be categorised as ‘for-profit’ or ‘Not-for-profit’. Respondents who selected ‘Other’ described how their organisations did not fit into either the ‘For-Profit’ or ‘Not-for-profit’ categories. Examples of comments include:

“Non-profit, for-profit hybrid”, “company that supports our own charity”, “company for a good cause”, “we are a regular company, but we operate on a non-profit principle for program fees. I.e. 100% of program fees go to the local community”.

These descriptions demonstrate ambiguity surrounding the profit status of organisations which offer volunteer travel.

1.2) How is your organisation best identified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisation (NGO)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel organisation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered charity</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic organisation</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social enterprise</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGOs and Travel Organisations each represented 25% of how organisations were best identified followed closely by Registered Charities at 24%. Respondents that selected ‘Other’ commented that they were best identified as a Limited Company, an Educational Travel Organisation, and as organisations which support their own registered charities. The findings highlight the various organisational contexts of organisations which offer volunteer travel programmes.

1.3) What is the main focus of your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/niche travel</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer travel</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service learning</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap year activities</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious activities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host communities</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development*</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (65%) indicated that volunteer travel was the main focus of their organisation. Volunteer travel was followed equally by Alternative/niche travel (7.5%), Service learning (7.5%) and Host communities (7.5%).

*Please note: Sustainable development was not listed as an option in the survey, however it was a common answer described in ‘Other (please describe)’ so it is now represented in the data.
1.4) To what degree does your organisation consider the following its key roles and responsibilities?

- Providing a travel service to volunteers – 46% said Significantly
- Recruiting volunteers - 85% said Significantly
- Implementing volunteer travel programmes -60% said Significantly
- Fundraising for partner organisations -38% said Not at all
- Supporting partner organisations – 59% said Significantly
- Planning volunteer travel programmes -80% said Significantly
- Monitoring volunteer travel programmes -72% said Significantly
- Evaluating volunteer travel programmes -65% said Significantly

Respondents indicated that Recruiting Volunteers was Significantly (85%) a key role and responsibility of their organisation, this was followed by Planning volunteer travel programmes (80% Significantly). Monitoring Volunteer Travel Programmes was considered slightly more of a key role and responsibility (72% Significantly) than Evaluating Volunteer Travel Programmes (65% Significantly).
PART 2 FUNDING

2.1) How often, if at all, does your organisation receive funding from the following sources?

- Volunteer fees - 82% said Always
- Donations - 25% said Always
- Government Funding - 77% said Never
- Grant Funding - 53% said Never
- Corporate Social Responsibility Programme - 60% said Never
- Philanthropic Funding - 55% said Never

Volunteer fees were the most frequent source of funding (82% Always), this was followed by Donations (25% Always). Organisations were least likely to receive government funding (77% Never).

2.2) How often, if at all, is funding allocated to the following functions of your organisation?

Respondents indicated that funding was allocated relatively evenly between the listed functions of their organisation. Programme Monitoring was most frequently allocated funding (32% Always) followed by Planning (31% Always), Programme Evaluation (29% Always) and Marketing (26% Always). Research was least likely to be allocated funding (16% Never). Respondents also commented that there were many more costs to running their organisations such as general day to day running costs (e.g. insurance, advertising, staffing) and the costs of implementing the volunteer programmes.
PART 3 PARTNERING

Partnering was defined in the survey as follows:

“Partnering means that two or more organisations work together for the purpose of being able to offer volunteer travel programmes.”

3.1) Is your organisation partnered with any other organisations in order to provide volunteer travel programmes?

- Yes -78%
- No -22%

The majority of respondents (78% Yes) indicated that their organisations partners with other organisations in order to provide volunteer travel programmes.

3.2) How often, if at all, does your organisation partner with the following?

![Bar chart showing partnering frequency]

The majority of respondents selected that their organisation always partners with In-country host partner organisations (61% Always). Partnering with Tour operators (34% Never) and Donor/funding agencies (41% Never) was least common. Respondents commented that other partners can include universities, schools, churches, insurance companies and industry groups.
3.3) Does your organisation partner with the following types of organisations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-profit</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisations</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government organisations</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents indicated that their organisation partners with Not-for-profit organisations (97% Yes), followed closely by Non-government organisations (92% Yes). Partnerships were also evident with For-profit organisations (63% Yes) and Government organisations (51% Yes).

3.4) Approximately how many organisations is your organisation partnered with in order to provide volunteer travel experiences?

This was an open ended question, where participants were asked to enter a number. There were 45 responses to this question. The number of organisations partnered with ranged from 1 organisation to 300 organisations. Most organisations were partnered with 1 to 5 organisations (29%) then 6 to 10 organisations (27%).

![Number of organisations partnered with](chart.png)
PART 4 MONITORING

In order to learn more about how organisations currently engage with the monitoring of their volunteer travel programmes, this section asked questions about engagement with programme monitoring.

Monitoring was defined in the survey as:

"The purposeful checking of, and gathering information on, how a volunteer travel programme’s activities are progressing".

4.1) How often, if at all, is the monitoring of volunteer travel programmes the responsibility of the following?

The majority of respondents indicated that the monitoring of volunteer travel programmes was the responsibility of their Own organisation (66% Always), followed by Host partner organisations (38% Always) and then Host communities (21% Always). It was also indicated that monitoring was Never (12%) or Rarely (18%) the responsibility of the Host community. Further comments stated that it was dependent on the specific project/programme as to whose responsibility monitoring is.

4.2) How important, if at all, does your organisation consider the monitoring of the following aspects?

- Volunteer satisfaction - 94% said Extremely Important
- Host community satisfaction - 90% said Extremely Important
- Host partner satisfaction - 81% said Extremely Important
- Volunteer behaviour/performance - 79% said Extremely Important
- Financial costs - 61% said Extremely Important
- Progress of programme in relation to its goals - 67% said Extremely Important

4.3) Does your organisation monitor its volunteer travel programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vast majority of respondents indicated that the organisation they represent monitors its volunteer travel programmes. For those that answered ‘No’, ‘There is a lack of guidance available’ is ‘Significantly’ a factor which influences why their organisation does not monitor volunteer travel programmes.

4.4) How often, if at all, does your organisation monitor any of the following aspects of its volunteer travel programme/s?

- Volunteer satisfaction - 86% said Always
- Host community satisfaction - 54% said Always
- Host partner satisfaction - 63% said Always
- Volunteer behaviour/performance - 56% said Always
- Financial costs - 60% said Always
- Progress of programme in relation to its goals - 47% said Always

Volunteer satisfaction is most frequently monitored (86% Always) and this correlates with the level of importance placed on monitoring Volunteer satisfaction (94% Extremely important (see 4.2)). However, despite 90% of respondents indicating that monitoring Host community satisfaction was Extremely Important (see 4.2) to their organisation, the percentage of respondents that indicated their organisation Always monitors Host community satisfaction was less (54% Always).
PART 5 EVALUATION

This section of the survey asked questions to learn more about how organisations currently engage with the evaluation of volunteer travel programmes. The following introduction and definition was provided in the survey:

*Recognising that there is not one best method or model for carrying out programme evaluation and that evaluations may be conducted formally or informally, for the purposes of this survey evaluation is defined as:*

"The process of determining the merit or worth (value) of a volunteer travel programme, and the extent to which a programme has achieved its goals or objectives."

5.1) How often, if at all, is the evaluation of volunteer travel programmes the responsibility of the following?

The majority of respondents indicated that the evaluation of volunteer travel programmes was most often the responsibility of their Own organisation (72% Always), followed by Host partner organisations (32% Always/ 33% Very Often), then the Host community (37% Sometimes).

5.2) How important, if at all, is the evaluation of the following aspects to your organisation?

- Volunteer satisfaction -94% said Extremely Important
- Host community satisfaction -81% said Extremely Important
- Host partner satisfaction -75% said Extremely Important
- Volunteer behaviour/performance -70% said Extremely Important
- Financial costs -62% said Extremely Important
- Progress of programme in relation to its goals -69% said Extremely Important

5.3) Does your organisation evaluate its volunteer travel programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the monitoring of volunteer travel programmes (4.3), the vast majority of respondents indicated that the organisation they represent evaluates its volunteer travel programmes (95% Yes). For those that answered ‘No’ (5%), ‘There is a lack of guidance available’ was ‘Significantly’ a factor which influence why their organisation does not evaluate volunteer travel programmes. ‘It takes up too much time’ and ‘It requires too many resources’ were ‘Somewhat’ factors which influence why their organisation does not evaluate volunteer travel programmes.

5.4) How often, if at all, does your organisation seek the following information when conducting evaluation activities?

- Volunteer feedback -88% said Always
- Host partner organisation feedback -58% said Always
- Host community feedback -34% said Always, 36% said Sometimes
- Numerical data (e.g. number of dwellings built, number of students taught) -35% said Always
- Financial data – 43% said Always

As with monitoring Host community satisfaction (see 4.2 & 4.4), respondents indicated that although organisations consider evaluating Host community satisfaction important (81% said Extremely Important), Host community feedback is not always sought (34% said their organisation Always sought Host community feedback when conducting evaluation activities and 36% said their organisation Sometimes sought Host community feedback when conducting evaluation activities).

5.5) In evaluating the success of a programme, how important, if at all, is feedback from the following?

- Volunteers -90% said Extremely Important
- Host Partner organisation/s -83% said Extremely Important
- Your organisation’s own staff -79% said Extremely Important
- Host community members -75% said Extremely Important
PART 6 HOST COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION

6.1) How important, if at all, does your organisation consider host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes?

The majority of respondents indicated that Host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes was considered either Extremely important (58%) or Somewhat Important (35%) by their organisation.

6.2) Is host community feedback currently an effective way for your organisation to monitor a volunteer travel programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite Host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes being considered extremely important by 58% of respondents (see 6.1), 39% of respondents indicated ‘Yes’, host community feedback is currently an effective way for their
organisations to monitor a volunteer travel programme, whilst 48% answered ‘Sometimes’ and 13% answered ‘No’.

6.3) Is host community feedback currently an effective way for your organisation to evaluate a volunteer travel programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with monitoring (see 6.2), despite Host community involvement in monitoring and evaluation processes being considered extremely important by 58% of respondents (see 6.1), 31% of respondents indicated ‘Yes’ host community feedback is currently an effective way for their organisations to evaluate a volunteer travel programme, whilst 56% answered ‘Sometimes’ and 13% answered ‘No’.

The following questions were open ended.

6.4) If your organisation seeks host community feedback on volunteer travel programmes, who does your organisation seek feedback from? (Please describe)

Common themes included partner organisation staff (who in turn connect with the local community or are members of the local community themselves) and local leaders. In contrast, some respondents described seeking feedback from multiple sources at multiple levels which may include representatives from various government agencies, community based organisation members and programme beneficiaries or participants, for example:

“We would seek feedback from local leaders to parents, religious heads and government officials, not forgetting the children. Not only would we prefer a broad range of community involvement and feedback but we would also ideally favour the local communities’ views from the ground up rather than top down through say local leaders who may be unduly influenced or biased one way or another.” (Participant #77)
Other respondents commented on the complexity of actually identifying and defining the ‘host community’, for example:

“It is often difficult to identify the ‘community’ in any project, as they can include the neighbours and the accommodation, the local shop owners and the general people of a town, village or city as well.” (Participant #27)

“We do not work with host communities as such. Instead, we work with networks of schools, libraries and clinics within a region.” (Participant #9)

6.5) Why does your organisation seek feedback from these host community members?

A common theme was that members of the host community are key stakeholders. Another common theme was that gaining feedback from the host community was necessary in order to improve programmes and processes and for determining the worth/value of a project or programme. Host community involvement was also seen as integral to the success of a programme, necessary for future planning and required for the future sustainability of a project or programme. Other interesting comments which further highlight issues involved in seeking host community feedback included:

“...The feedback from the host community is probably the most important feedback that we consider, as long as it is combined with a degree of training in how to manage and run a community based organisation or co-operative.” (Participant #28)

“Because our purpose is to serve the host communities – however I think it is often difficult to get 100% honest feedback due to the complex power relations involved.” (Participant #47)

“Often it is not possible to get regular feedback from the local community on a regular basis because of language barriers and lack of connectivity. We aim to visit communities about one time per year. In between times we work with our partners who in turn communicate with the local community.” (Participant #69)

“Without the host community’s approval and involvement, without them buying into the idea of what we want to achieve, relations in the community will be more difficult to maintain and ultimately greater tensions may arise. In addition, we would rather serve the community as per their ideas and wishes, creating and developing a project which will in fact benefit them rather than projecting our “idealistic” westernised views and theories on them. The projects will ultimately be self-sustaining and run by the communities, not for profit and not for the gain of officials higher up in the community.” (Participant #77)
PART 7 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The survey findings provide a broad overview of the different organisational contexts of organisations which engage with volunteer travel. The findings also provide descriptive data on organisation's programme monitoring and evaluation practices, an area which is currently under-researched. The data from the survey was also used to inform and refine the questions used in Stage 2 of the research, the interviews. The interviews provided an avenue to further explore some of the issues raised in the survey findings. A thesis will be made available at a later date for those wanting a more comprehensive understanding of the research. If you require any further information or have any comments please contact the principal researcher Jessica Taplin at Jessica.taplin@scu.edu.au
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## Appendix 5: Top-line Profile of Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Number</th>
<th>Partnership Arrangement</th>
<th>'Official' Profit Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit with charity arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit with charity arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit with charity arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit with charity arm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Multi-layered</td>
<td>For-profit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>