Chapter 4: Expert Leadership and Hidden Inequalities in Community Projects

Christine Mortimer and Brendan Paddison

4.1 Abstract

This chapter explores the development of a mid-range theory that can be used in organisations when considering how to engage multiple stakeholders in a project that requires expert input. The case study presented here is concerned with a ground-breaking approach to integrate heritage, culture and social benefit through the medium of archaeology and heritage. The findings indicated that the 'expert' as a leader of the project created hidden inequalities in the team, preventing the longer-term social outcomes of the project from materialising. A Realist Evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997a) protocol was developed which created an 'intervention', permitting the non-linear complex interactions between multiple groups and multiple stakeholders to be observed and evaluated. This allowed for the political, strategic, organisational, operational and individual perspectives to be addressed making it a suited evaluative approach to this type of multiple stakeholder project.

4.2 Introduction

The premise of this chapter is to identify the hidden inequalities that can emerge in community projects which are led by an 'Expert Leader'. The primary objective of the research was to develop an intervention that would potentially address these hidden inequalities, once exposed. The research was commissioned for a rehabilitation project which has a national and international reputation concerning the unprecedented use of archaeology and heritage for the rehabilitation and reintegration of military veterans and service personnel into the wider community. The research sought to identify a sustainable intervention that addressed the four main objectives of the social outcomes required. These objectives were:

1. Sustainable social benefit to individuals and the community;

2. Engagement and involvement with hard to reach sectors of the population;

3. Community legacy and benefits to the local economy;

4. Generating positive attitudes towards the importance of community heritage.

The project consisted of a number of stakeholders which raised the risk of certain groups experiencing hidden inequalities thereby reducing the positive effects of community engagement. The framework of the study and recommendations for intervention were developed within a realist evaluation protocol. Realist evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997a) has its philosophical foundations in Critical Realism (Bhaskar, 2008). Critical realism suggests that there is a real social world but our knowledge of it is gathered and interpreted through our senses and brain, filtered through language, culture and past experiences (Greenhalgh et al., 2015). This implies that each person responds to experiences, resources and opportunities according to their own particular personal, social, historical and cultural frameworks. Greenhalgh et al. (2009) interpret Pawson and Tilley's (1997) foundational elements of realist evaluation as a view that any intervention into the social world needs to evaluate what works in what contexts and for whom, rather than simply, does it work. Although used widely in the health service (Currie et al., 2015; Geenhalgh et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2015), the pioneering nature of a critical realist evaluation protocol within the social aspects of both business and community projects is as yet unexplored. However, it does provide a framework that can identify an intervention that is measurable against agreed multi-stakeholder outputs (Jagosh et al., 2015). This research has relevance to the business world where there is still a need for theoretical development and measurement tools that advance understands of and monitor interventions that engage with wider networks of stakeholders, inclusivity and performance enhancement (Sturm et al., 2016; Heslin and Keating, 2016; Cullen-Lester et al., 2016).

4.3 Realist evaluation protocol

Kazi (2003:23) comments that within realist evaluation the power of interventions lies not in individual events but in the complexity of different structures operating at different levels. In other words, it is a methodological position that has a pluralist approach (Pitman, 2016) enabling the context of multiple stakeholders and their interactions with resources and strategies to be explored. This means that the political, strategic, organisational, operational and individual perspectives can be addressed making it suited to this type of multiple stakeholder project. The key lies in the development of a middle-range theory that is big enough to test and refine (Pawson and Tilley, 1997b).

Vareilles et al. (2015) suggest that realist evaluation is particularly useful when the outcomes of an intervention are the result of non-linear interactions between several groups of people. Therefore, the involvement of multiple stakeholders, complex tasks and multiple and variable outcomes would all suggest the use of realist

evaluation as an ideal methodology particularly in the context of the community project explored in this study. Lacuouture et al. (2015) summarises the methodology as a theory based evaluation in which it is vital that the specific logic of the intervention (the mid-range theory) and implementation are distinguished. The theory is the set of hypotheses that explain how and why the intervention will produce the agreed outcomes. However, there are some discrepancies in how the theory is defined (Marchal et al., 2012). For example, Vareilles et al. (2015) and Doi et al. (2015) identify a distinction between the mid-range theories, suggesting it is a more abstract concept usually taken from other disciplines to inform the development of what they call the programme theory. Jagosh et al. (2015) and Currie et al. (2015) both use Pawson and Tilley's (1997a) original definition of a middle range theory tested against observable data from a case study.

Therefore, using a combination of the four phases, suggested by Doi et al. (2015), and the configuration of developing the context-mechanism-outcome from Vareilles et al. (2015), the intention was to develop a mid-range theory as originally defined by Pawson and Tilley (1997). Table 4.1 identifies the four phases of the research protocol and the methods used to develop the mid-range theory.

Please insert here 4-1 table.

Phase 1 involves completing a literature review that considers definitions of a community of heritage, community leadership research and perspectives of identity, authority and expertise. A case study is developed based on data from public publications of previous community heritage and archaeology projects and interviews with primary stakeholders of this specific planned community project.

4.4 Phase One: Exploring the literature and context

This section documents an understanding of 'a community of heritage', together with a focus on community/collective leadership and perspectives of power, authority and identity. These particular literatures, concepts and theories are appropriate to understanding the notion of a community of heritage that engages multiple stakeholders with varying levels of expertise.

4.4.1 What is a Community of Heritage?

Heritage is a multi-faceted "concept of complexity" (Ashworth and Howard, 1999, p.5) which is subject to contestation. It is often regarded as a symbol of elitism inequality (Dicks, 2015; Smith, 2006), with representations of heritage framed and presented by those with expert knowledge to identify the innate value and significance (Smith, 2006). Whilst the disputed nature of heritage is well documented (Graham, 2003; Hall, 2005; Howard, 2003; Smith, 2006; Urry, 2002; Waterton, 2005; 2010; Watson and Waterton, 2011), understandings of heritage can significantly contribute towards a sense of place, value creation, cultural and social identities (Smith, 2006). The construction of identity can be influenced by a number of factors, including heritage, of which the historic environment is the most obvious material manifestation (Belford, 2011). The recovery of material culture and the interpretation of cultural sites and landscapes can contribute to both an individual's and a community's sense of identity and belonging (Miller and Kim, 1998). Consequently, there has been a growing concern to further identify and engage with communities in the interests of heritage and the co-creation of knowledge (Smith, 2006).

There is little consensus regarding the definition of the term community. The concept has a variety of meanings (Delanty, 2003; Hickey et al., 2015; Hoggett, 1997; Little, 2002), which are elusive and vague, with many inconsistencies (Cohen, 1985; Day, 2006). Despite this, the term remains one of the most commonly used by politicians, policy makers and the public (Perkin, 2010), bringing with it ideas of inclusion and social cohesion (Day, 2006; Hoggett, 1997; Riley and Harvey, 2005). The notion of community is often an implied unified, homogeneous group. Within the context of heritage and tourism, community was originally summarised in the seminal work by Hillery (1955) as people living in a particular geographic location, where the members have a shared notion of culture, values and attitudes and are engaged in social interaction. The geographic location and the notion of a unified group is still a common definition (Aas, Ladkin and Fletcher, 2005; Wisansing, 2008).

However, Stepney and Popple (2008) claim that in the modern, post-industrial society it is important to acknowledge the diversity of communities, the different groups that exist and the relationships within and between them. Crooke (2010) suggests that by widening the definition of community to include the diverse customs, landscapes, history artefacts and monuments creates an opportunity to capture the power of community as a concept and form of engagement. Community, therefore, is not just about the location of a group of individuals that happen to live in the same place, but it is also concerned with the bonds which hold them together and the common values and beliefs shared (Little, 2002; Bauman, 2001).

The use of the term community, particularly using archaeology and heritage as vehicles for community development, has prompted strategies and mission statements that emphasise the importance of community consultation and involvement (Sandell, 2002; Witcomb, 2003; Newman et al., 2005; Crooke, 2007; Message, 2007; Watson, 2007). Community engagement has, therefore, become a popular sentiment, leading to significant emphasis placed on the importance of community consultation and involvement, with community participants actively encouraged to contribute to the construction of heritage meanings and identity (Perkin, 2010). In response, organisations often develop and direct community-based projects to fulfil their own prescribed ideals for engagement. Contemporary archaeological approaches challenge the more traditional heritage management and interpretational methods by enabling community-led and non-expert interpretations of objects and the landscape. These alternative narratives provide a capacity to empower those individuals involved (Riley and Harvey, 2005). Community engagement projects may also develop in response to grass-roots campaigning from the community groups that larger organisations may seek to engage. Such projects often evolve from an identified need or area of importance, and often have established participants and community support. This form of community-driven engagement has the potential to move beyond the ambitions of a council or collecting institutions to create meaningful on-going collaborations between organisations and local communities (Perkin, 2010). Although community engagement can be extremely successful, it can result in tokenistic and unsustainable projects that erode the trust of communities, leading to a lack of support for future initiatives. For Waterton and Smith (2010), this is particularly problematic in that it perpetuates an apolitical, naturalised view of heritage and an expert-led approach that gives a passive role to communities.

A tension can arise between the local heritage communities and the archaeologists positioned as the 'experts of the past' (Kok, 2009, 138). The inclusive narrative has created a position change with many archaeologists feeling that communities should be able to participate in heritage projects (Emerick, 2009). However, the type of academic discourse used creates hidden inequalities between community participants (Kok, 2009) and the 'expert leader', leading to a frustrating experience for all:

> 'Archaeologist E doesn't want to dictate to us and tell us to do this, this and this. I think that he wasn't used to saying "we want to do this, this and this", but even if we say that we don't always know how to achieve it and we don't know where to go to achieve it…he wasn't used to being in a community led group' (Smith and Waterton, 2009, p.164).

The problem identified by Henson (2009) is that archaeology is a well-defined body of theory and practice that is structured and coherent as a profession. The processual underpinnings of objectivity, rigorous discipline through scientific methods, immediately create identity positions of the 'expert' and the 'lay-person' generating hidden inequalities within the relationships. From experiences in Africa and Australia (Greer, 2014; Breen et al., 2015), a post processual theorizing has come into being which focuses on interpretation rather than just the object itself. This involves the acceptance of multiple narratives and new interpretations based on an emotive root to the past (Jackson et al., 2014; Stepney and Popple, 2008; Greer, 2014). This does, however, require equality between the community and expert voice, without hidden inequalities becoming manifest (Kok, 2009).

This engages with the wider political questions concerning forms of community and the public life that we create. With heritage community engagement, there is a traditional view which emphases the objects, artefacts and lead role of the professionals in interpreting and conserving these objects (Breen et al., 2015). Greer (2014, p.59) would liken this to a processual way of thinking about heritage and the role of archaeology in developing the narrative of the 'objects and sites on which the scientific discourse is focused'. There needs to be a post or critical processual stance that privileges notions around 'practices' based on experiential and actor-driven understanding of place and objects found (Hickey et al., 2015). However, in order to enable the local voice to develop there needs to be an acknowledgement that the heritage expert is in fact the community in which the archaeologist is working (Stephens and Tiwari, 2015). This raises issues around the politics of identity (Breen et al. 2015) and the type of leadership required.

4.4.2 The politics of identity and leadership

Henson (2009) identified that the rigorous discipline of archaeology, through its scientific methods, creates the role of 'expert' in community groups. This then sets the stage for the development of particular identities within the community group, which generates hidden equalities around the notion of the 'expert' and 'lay' voice (Smith, 2006). However, as Miller and Kim (1998) comment, the recovery and interpretation of cultural sites and landscapes can contribute to an individual's and community's sense of belonging. Therefore, it is important to unpick the ideas behind the 'expert' voice and the ensuring identities that are developed.

The first is the notion of ontological politics proposed by Annemarie Toi (in Law, 1999). She defines this philosophical perspective as developing a multiple reality which depends on performance, perception and construction of the individuals involved. Within this idea of politics, Foucault (1975) specifically examines the politics of representation asking why particular voices have the right to articulate certain knowledge. Within a developing community of heritage, who does have the right to define and give meaning to the past is a significant question (Belford, 2011). Perkin (2010) expresses the concern that currently it is government policy to view cultural institutions in the role of building social cohesion, reducing hidden inequalities, improving lifelong learning and self-esteem. This, however, requires the expert to engage with the community interpretation of the objects, artefacts and site (Greer, 2014), rather than 'reporting, describing or mirroring an objectively existing reality' (Watson, 2000, p.499). The later performance reverts meaning-making to a 'top-down' model that subsumes 'the community' interpretations (Jackson et al., 2014; Smith and Waterton, 2010; Judson et al., 2014), preventing the richness of meaning coming forth (Perkin, 2010), and reinforcing hidden inequalities based on ideas of authority, power and expertise, within the community group.

Homi Bhabba (1989, pp.234-41), writing from a post-colonial perspective, articulates the link between the way an identity is written and the influence this has on the performance of an individual as 'the problem of authority'. Perkin (2010) suggests that this authority leads to issues of top-down approaches by the 'educated elite' deciding what disadvantaged communities need rather than enabling the interpretation of alternative and diverse histories and empowering communities to celebrate their own unique identities. Jackson et al. (2014) also point to the notion that communities are not something that people or places have, they are what people do in the place they value. For example, there is a danger that the UK government's focus on the 'Big Society' will create projects carefully managed by experts with a passive community voice (Breen et al., 2015). What is required is for the 'expert-voice' to become mediators and advocates for knowledge, providing the tools not the information for communities to explore their own ideas and reach their own conclusions (Perkin, 2010).

By bringing these ideas together it is possible to develop a link between the 'politics of authority', the development of a community group and hidden inequalities created by perceptions of what is valued knowledge and who has the authority to articulate that knowledge. The mid-range theory needs to provide the avenue for exploring issues around the representation of community members, why certain voices prevail and others are dismissed, why certain groups have the authority to speak thereby silencing others and why people act in certain

ways. The question then develops if a top-down approach increases the chance of hidden inequalities developing in a multi-community group, what sort of leadership would enable the community group to grow equally, with the same authority and power?

The aim of this project was to develop a sustainable community that provided social and economic benefit as well as legacy and positive attitudes towards community heritage. The challenge was leading and managing such as project to ensure sustainability and on-going engagement. There is an added challenge as it is an archaeological project and the politics of authority, centred on ideas around who has the 'expert' voice, represents an important factor ensuring that hidden inequalities do not develop. When considering the vast range of leadership styles available the term collective leadership, as used by Militello and Benham (2010) in their community change initiative, would appear to be appropriate here. For them it is anchored in notions of social justice, culture and spirituality (Benham, 2005; Rawls, 1999). This covers factors such as quality of treatment, individuality, that people in the past, present and future are connected, and that the context – the place and environment- defines people and communities together with a focus on celebratory and appreciative relationships.

Freidrich et al. (2009) also suggest that collective leadership takes into account that teams of people are not a homogenous group but that each individual brings a range of skills and expertise to the group, which enables different people at different moments to take on the leadership role. The most important aspect is that of process and role within teams. Collective leadership is defined as social problem solving and is focused on what needs to be done rather than what should be done (Zaccaro et al., 2001). This enables a consideration of collective leadership as being emergent, informal and dynamic (Contractor et al., 2012). Friedrich, Griffith and Mumford (2016) also identify the importance of network development within collective teams and that it works best in a management of change agenda.

4.4.3 The context: Case Study

Data for this study has been collected from a range of public sources from three main community heritage and archaeology projects, together from interviews with key stakeholders involved in the project, for which this intervention is being developed. There are three discernible communities within the projects explored in this study. The first are the archaeologists including students and professional academic members of the

archaeologist community, the second are the veterans, serving personal and their families from the army, and the third is the local communities.

The Army itself is a community of heritage. One of the ways the Army forms such close-knit units is using historical narratives of those particular units. Crooke (2010) suggests that its customs, language, landscape, history, artefacts and monuments define a community. This applies to the Army, which has its own language, a barrier between itself and the civilians it protects and monuments found nationally and within individual Army camps. The history, stories about acts of loss and bravery, feats of courage, defeats of shame pass from one new intake to the next, the past and the present provide a sense of belonging. Regimental badges, flags and customs that come with inauguration into that regiment all contribute to particular units in the army being a community (Belford 2011; Crooke 2010), drawing on an emotive root which is at the heart of engagement with the past (Judson et al. 2014).

Within the official publication from the dig, there is an overwhelmingly positive experience from the student archaeologists using words such as 'inspirational'. More senior archaeologists described the opportunity to teach veterans how to 'properly excavate, draw and record archaeological features was a privilege'. One respondent discussed the idea of community archaeology saying that he 'learned a whole new perspective on community archaeology' with the Defence Archaeology Group (DAG) representing 'the best of community archaeology; a self-sustaining group'. However, this comment is rooted in the processual, scientific ideals of archaeology, not within the wider aspect of heritage. It was about teaching veterans the 'reporting, describing or mirroring an objectively existing reality' (Watson, 2000, p.499).

Another participant describes a community team of, 'Archaeologists, serving military personnel, archaeology students, veterans and other volunteers'. What is interesting here is the ordering of the groups including the group of 'other volunteers, or the local community. Another interesting phrase used was 'considerable enthusiasm by Time Team Wanabes and their slightly more educated colleagues'. Other interesting phrases included one community member describing himself as 'only an ex squaddie'. There are issues of identity and authority politics in these comments generating hidden inequalities within the ordering of groups associated with the dig and also around the description of community members. Another aspect missing was the 'interpretations these folk made from the artefacts found'. As the overseeing community archaeologist stated in

an interview that, 'the finds, duly and scientifically recorded were taken away for examination and not open for interpretation'.

Overall, the respondent felt that the dig was a success and it offered a range of experiences to the serving personnel and veterans. This included personal and reflective space with the option of using creative tools such as painting and writing. However, within the interview, there was also recognition of the power dynamic at play between the serving military personnel who had a management position on the dig, the archaeologists who were the 'expert' leaders, the veterans and other volunteers, and it was felt that there was perhaps a lack of clarity around roles and responsibilities, linking to the purpose of the dig. This was particularly in terms of interpretation of the dig, and the lack of voice given to the veterans and volunteers, as 'non-experts'. This is where the respondent felt there should be more clarity around the dig and its purpose, as many possible perspectives and interpretations were lost from the military perspective, i.e. what could have been happening at the fort set against what would the modern day links be to current armed forces activity aboard. The very fact that the historical soldiers were 'aboard' on deployment was missing through the lack of less scientific interpretation of the artefacts. This to some extent is the area of expertise that the veterans could add to the human element of the dig interpretations. This was also identified on a previous community project (Smith and Waterton, 2009, p.161), where a local resident had completed her own research. She found mention of a wharf, some distance from the river, in the York Minister Fabric Scrolls, and is convinced that she has seen the remains of those wharves in Cawood, and the respondent stated that, 'there is a little bit of "he knows better than me"-, he said he would need to see the Latin'.

The positive side of the dig, however, included a core of people skilled in archaeological digs and culture heritage management to assist the veterans and volunteers. For the veterans there was a range of normalisation activities both on the site and in terms of visits throughout the dig. It also provided a safe environment for normalisation activities to take place. Veterans agreed with this point of success. One interesting statement was concerned with trust, 'trust is a big one, because I would say in the civilian sector that a lot of people want to hold your hand'…this is echoed by others, 'you are working as part of a team, but you've got your own area'. There were also issues raised around the opportunity to join in something that appears to be the purview of experts, 'Archaeology has always appealed to me, but I never thought in a million years that I would ever get a

chance. I thought you would have to go to University'. Again in this statement, there are issues generated from the 'Politics of Authority' that the dig was seen as something that had to be learnt, required University education and a lack of value attached to the solder's own expertise. The primary voices silenced in all the literature available from the two previous community projects was that of the local community.

4.5 Phase 2: the realist review

In order to start the process of developing a mid-range theory based on a case study of the two projects already completed and the literature review, it was important to develop the research questions, based on the objectives of the project, the literature and discussions with key stakeholders:

1. What assumptions do the implementers have regarding the development of a sustainable community?
2. What were the conditions during the first two projects that may affect the stakeholders and the expected outcomes?
3. Which theories may explain the behaviours of all stakeholders?
4. What are the expected outcomes of the new project?

The mid-range theory is something that is not explicit in the intervention but drives the intentions of the intervention as well as revealing the contextual factors that influence the mechanisms determining the outcomes (Pawson and Tilley, 1997; Kazi, 2003; Vareilles et al., 2015; Jagosh et al., 2015). The realist review uses evidence from the previous sections to complete a table of evidence gathered, based on the research questions identified above. The initial research question concerned the assumptions made by the project implementers regarding the development of a sustainable community. The data was identified through publicly available information and reports on the first two community projects, and interviews with the primary project manager of the previous two projects and the forthcoming project. Table 4.2 identifies features which engaged with inclusivity, the post-processual (Greer, 2014: Breen et al., 2015) understanding of landscape and artefacts which takes into account all voices involved in the interpretation. Another major assumption was that the local community would want to be involved. The final important assumption from Table 4.2 was the accessibility of the project site, which had not been considered in the previous digs.

<div align="center">Please insert Table 4-2 here</div>

Table 4.3 recognises specific context details in the first and second projects which need to be taken into account when designing the third project. These include ideas around the expertise that the army veterans have in team

building and comradeship. More specific opportunities for the engagement with artefact and landscape interpretations, which then would enable the triggers for memory and experience. In terms of context, there was a clear identification that the archaeology in these community projects is a vehicle to enable other socially constructive events to take place, rather than being the purpose in and of itself.

Please inset Table 4-3 here

Linking the literature review to the case study, several interesting mechanisms can be identified through the behavioural factors of various stakeholders on the project. Perkin (2010) suggests that in order to enable specific opportunities for engagement the 'expert-voice' needs to become a mediator and advocate for knowledge, providing the tools for the community to embark on a journey of discovery. This would unlock the links between past and present identifying what and why we did things (Henson, 2009). This links to the type of leadership required in these projects. It needs to identify with all stakeholders and create a network development of the team in order for it to grow and become sustainable in the long term (Benham, 2005; Friedrich, Griffth and Mumford, 2016). Table 4.4 identifies other aspects of work behaviours demonstrate on the first two projects, linking to theories that may help identify suitable interventions and mechanisms to prevent the hidden inequalities from developing in expert-led community groups.

Please insert Table 4-4 here

The final table in this section (Table 4.5) focuses specifically on all the outcomes required in this new project. The outcomes have been developed from both those stated on the project funding sheet and those articulated by the stakeholders from the documentation of the two previous projects. The table captures all the official and unofficial understandings of the project objectives.

4.5 Theory refinement

These areas are particularly important as they form the foundations of the theory based on a consideration of the assumptions made regarding 'the community', the 'context' of the intervention, the 'mechanisms' or theories/models which could inform the intervention and the 'expected 'outcomes'. The results of the critical review have been developed into a grid which covers the theory area, the context, mechanism and output expected from each area (Table 4-6).

Please insert Table 4-6 here

Taking the main points identified in the theory refinement it is possible to consider the element missing in the original dig, which has led to the hidden inequalities developing in the community project. These hidden equalities included the loss of positive agency, acknowledgment of non-academic expertise, and a lack of importance given to the ideas around 'the practice' associated with artefacts, the way the artefacts may have been used. This lack of importance removed the community voice and their engagement with and commitment to the on-going project potential. The consequences included a lack of sustainable engagement from the local community and a loss of opportunities for the veterans to develop the softer skills of mentoring and self-esteem improvement through community engagement.

4.5 Conclusion

The mid-range theory for the intervention suggests that there needs to be a change in the style of leadership for these types of community project, particularly where traditional leadership approaches appear to create hidden inequalities. By using a form of collective leadership, together with an understanding of what this means, the mechanisms for a sustainable project fulfilling the project objectives would be possible. The mechanisms include being clear about roles with the 'experts' becoming mediators and advocates of knowledge rather than recorders and keepers of artefacts. This would support multiple experiences and narratives enabling voice to be given to community ideas and conclusions. The outcomes would then provide the legacy of rich narrative involving the 'human experience' of the past and present, social inclusion through the veterans mentor involvement, economic benefit, increased transferable skills for all those involved and an increase in individual confidence as leadership is collective rather than attached to the 'expert'.

> 'The use of collective leadership and management (**Intervention**) will enable the 'experts' to become mediators and advocates of knowledge, supporting multiple experiences and narratives, generating alternative community driven ideas and conclusions (**Mechanisms**) providing legacy, social inclusion, economic benefit, increased transferable skills and individual confidence (**Outcomes**) in a sustainable community of heritage (**Context**).'

It has been identified within the context of this case study that using specific mechanisms the outcome potential of community-driven engagement to create meaningful on-going collaborations between organisations and local

communities is achievable. The specific roles identified would enable the facilitation of social cohesion, reducing social exclusion, improving individual self-esteem and encouraging life-long learning. The mechanisms advised included moving to a collective leadership model, with specific roles for each of the groups, as detailed in Figure 4-1.

Please insert Figure 4-1 here

Within a business and Human Resource Management (HRM) context it is possible to see how the development of a mid-range theory based on the context and required outcomes can inform interventions in the workplace, particularly where multiple stakeholders are involved. The research methodology provides the mechanisms needed and identifies exactly what outcomes would be expected from the intervention. This provides a tracking tool that would identify whether the mechanisms were successful. In addition, it provides a continuous improvement model that enables the mechanisms in respect to the context and outcomes to be refined in light of actual experience and progress monitored.

4.6 References

Aas, Christina, Adele Ladkin, and John Fletcher. 2015. "Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management." *Annals of tourism research* 32.1: 28-48.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. "Identity in the globalising world". *Social Anthropology*, *9*.2:121-129

Belford, Paul. 2011."Archaeology, community, and identity in an English new town." *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* 2.1: 49-67.

Benham, Melissa K. 2014."*From utility to significance: Exploring ecological connection, ethics, and personal transformation through a gardening and environmental literacy program within San Quentin prison"*. San José State University.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1985. "Signs taken for wonders: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical inquiry* 12.1: 144-165.

Bhaskar, Roy. 2008. *Dialectic: The pulse of freedom*. Routledge.

Breen, Colin, Gemma Reid, and Max Hope. 2015. "Heritage, identity and community engagement at Dunluce Castle, Northern Ireland." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21.9: 919-937.

Cohen, Erik. 1995. "Contemporary tourism-trends and challenges: sustainable authenticity or contrived post-modernity?." *Change in tourism: people, places, processes.* 12-29.

Contractor, Noshir S., Leslie A. DeChurch, Jay Carson, Dorothy R. Carter, and Brian Keegan. 2012. "The topology of collective leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 23.6: 994-1011.

Crooke, Elizabeth. 2010. "The politics of community heritage: motivations, authority and control." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16.1/2:16-29.

Cullen-Lester, Kristin L., Cynthia K. Maupin, and Dorothy R. Carter. 2017. "Incorporating social networks into leadership development: A conceptual model and evaluation of research and practice." *The Leadership Quarterly* 28.1: 130-152.

Currie, Jane, Mary Chiarella, and Thomas Buckley. 2015. "Preparing a Realist Evaluation to Investigate the Impact of Privately Practising Nurse Practitioners on Patient Access to Care in Australia." *International Journal of Nursing* 2.2:1-10.

Day, Graham. 2006. *Community and everyday life*. Routledge.

Delanty, Gerard. 2003. "Citizenship as a learning process: disciplinary citizenship versus cultural citizenship." *Int. of Lifelong Education* 22.6: 597-605.

Dicks, Bella. 2015. "Heritage and Social Class." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research*. 366-381. London. Palgrave Macmillan.

Doi, Lawrence, Ruth Jepson, and Helen Cheyne. 2015. "A realist evaluation of an antenatal programme to change drinking behaviour of pregnant women." *Midwifery* 31.10: 965-972.

Ebenso, B.E., Uzochukwu, B., Manzano, A., Etiaba, E., Huss, R., Ensor, T., Newell, J., Onwujekwe, O., Ezumah, N., Hicks, J. and Mirzoev, T., 2015. 'De-constructing a complex programme using a logic map: Realist Evaluation of Maternal and Child Health in Nigeria', http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/95381/ Accessed on November 26th 2017.

Emerick, Keith. (2009), 'Archaeology and the Cultural Heritage Management 'toolkit': The example of a community heritage project at Cawood, North Yorkshire', in *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*. Edited by Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith Cambridge Scholars Publishing: UK, pp. 91-116

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and punish [1975]*. na.

Friedrich, Tamara L., Jennifer A. Griffith, and Michael D. Mumford. 2016. "Collective leadership behaviors: Evaluating the leader, team network, and problem situation characteristics that influence their use." *The Leadership Quarterly* 27.2: 312-333.

Friedrich, Tamara L., William B. Vessey, Matthew J. Schuelke, Gregory A. Ruark, and Michael D. Mumford. 2009. "A framework for understanding collective leadership: The selective utilization of leader and team expertise within networks." *The Leadership Quarterly* 20.6: 933-958.

Graham, Brian. 2003. "Interpreting the rural in Northern Ireland: place, heritage and history." *Rural Planning and Development in Northern Ireland*. 261-282.

Greenhalgh, Trisha, Charlotte Humphrey, Jane Hughes, Fraser Macfarlane, Ceri Butler, and R. A. Y. Pawson. 2009. "How Do You modernize a health service? A realist evaluation of whole-scale transformation in London." *The Milbank Quarterly* 87.2: 391-416.

Greenhalgh, Trisha, Geoff Wong, Justin Jagosh, Joanne Greenhalgh, Ana Manzano, Gill Westhorp, and Ray Pawson. 2015. "Protocol—the RAMESES II study: developing guidance and reporting standards for realist evaluation." *BMJ open* 5.8 e008567. Accessed on June 25th 2017.

Greer, Shelley. 2014. "The Janus View: Reflections, Relationships and a Community-Based Approach to Indigenous Archaeology and Heritage in Northern Australia." *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage* 1.1: 56-68.

Henson, Don. 2009. 'what on Earth is Archaeology', in *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*, Edited by Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 117-135

Heslin, Peter A., and Lauren A. Keating. 2017. "In learning mode? The role of mindsets in derailing and enabling experiential leadership development." *The Leadership Quarterly* 28.3: 367-384.

Hickey, Andrew, Paul Reynolds, and Lisa McDonald. 2015. "Understanding community to engage community: the use of qualitative research techniques in local government community engagement." *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration* 37.1: 4-17.

Hillery, George A. 1955. "Definition of community." *Rural sociology* 20:111-123.

Hodges, Andrew, and Steve Watson. 2000. "Community-based heritage management: A case study and agenda for research." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6.3: 231-243.

Hoggett, Paul. 1997. *Contested communities: Experiences, struggles, policies*. USA: MIT Press.

Howard, Peter. 2003. *Heritage: management, interpretation, identity*. A&C Black.

Jackson, Stella, Rob Lennox, Cath Neal, Steve Roskams, John Hearle, and Louise Brown. 2014. "Engaging Communities in the 'Big Society': What Impact is the Localism Agenda having on Community Archaeology?" *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice* 5.1: 74-88.

Jagosh, Justin, Paula L. Bush, Jon Salsberg, Ann C. Macaulay, Trish Greenhalgh, Geoff Wong, Margaret Cargo, Lawrence W. Green, Carol P. Herbert, and Pierre Pluye. 2015. "A realist evaluation of community-based participatory research: partnership synergy, trust building and related ripple effects." *BMC public health* 15.1: 725.

Kazi, Mansoor. 2003. "Realist evaluation for practice." *British journal of social work* 33.1: 803-818.

Kok, Marjolijn. 2009. "The Dilemma of Participating." *Taking archaeology out of heritage*. 135-158.

Lacouture, Anthony, Eric Breton, Anne Guichard, and Valéry Ridde. 2015. "The concept of mechanism from a realist approach: a scoping review to facilitate its operationalization in public health program evaluation." *Implementation Science* 10.1: 153.

Little, Adrian. 2002. *The politics of community: Theory and practice*. UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Marchal, Bruno, Sara van Belle, Josefien van Olmen, Tom Hoerée, and Guy Kegels. 2012. "Is realist evaluation keeping its promise? A review of published empirical studies in the field of health systems research." *Evaluation* 18.2: 192-212.

Martiskainen, Mari. 2017. "The role of community leadership in the development of grassroots innovations." *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 22: 78-89.

Miller, Nancy J., Soyoung Kim, and S. H. E. R. R. Y. SCHOFIELD-TOMSCHIN. 1998. "The effects of activity and aging on rural community living and consuming." *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 32.2: 343-368.

Newman, Janet. 2005. "The new public management, modernization and institutional change: Disruptions, disjunctures and dilemmas". In *New Public Management*. 89-104. UK: Routledge

Pawson, Ray, and Nick Tilley. 1997a. "An introduction to scientific realist evaluation." in "The coming transformations in evaluation." *Evaluation for the 21st century: A handbook* Edited by Eleanor Chelimsky. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 405–18.

Pawson, Ray, Nick Tilley, and Nicholas Tilley.1997b. *Realistic evaluation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Perkin, Corinne. 2010. "Beyond the rhetoric: negotiating the politics and realising the potential of community-driven heritage engagement." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16.1: 107-122.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice na:* 1999. USA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Riley, Mark, and David Harvey. 2005. "Landscape archaeology, heritage and the community in Devon: an oral history approach." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11.4: 269-288.

Rycroft-Malone, Jo, Christopher R. Burton, Joyce Wilkinson, Gill Harvey, Brendan McCormack, Richard Baker, Sue Dopson. 2015. "Collective action for implementation: a realist evaluation of organisational collaboration in healthcare." *Implementation Science* 11.1: 17.

Sandell, Richard. 2002. "Museums." *Society, Inequality*. 7.

Smith, Melanie K. 2006 ed. *Tourism, culture and regeneration*. Cabi.

Stephens, John, and Reena Tiwari. 2015. "Symbolic estates: community identity and empowerment through heritage." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 21.1: 99-114.

Pitman, David 2016. *Twentieth Century Christian Responses to Religious Pluralism: Difference is Everything*. UK: Routledge.

Popple, Keith, and Paul Stepney. 2008. *Social work and the community: A critical context for practice*. USA: Palgrave Macmillan

Sturm, Rachel E., Dusya Vera, and Mary Crossan. 2017. "The entanglement of leader character and leader competence and its impact on performance." *The Leadership Quarterly* 28.3: 349-366.

Urry, John. 2002. *The tourist gaze*, 2nd Ed. London: Sage

Vareilles, Gaëlle, Jeanine Pommier, Sumit Kane, Gabriel Pictet, and Bruno Marchal. 2015. "Understanding the motivation and performance of community health volunteers involved in the delivery of health programmes in Kampala, Uganda: a realist evaluation protocol." *BMJ open* 5.1: e006752. Accessed March 18th 2017.

Waterton, Emma.2005. "Whose sense of place? Reconciling archaeological perspectives with community values: cultural landscapes in England." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 11.4: 309-325.

Waterton, Emma. and Laurajane Smith. 2009.'There is no such thing as Heritage' in *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*, Edited by Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith. 10-26. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing: UK.

Watson, Steve. 2009.'Archaeology, viuality and the Negotiation of Heritage, in *Taking Archaeology out of Heritage*. Edited by Emma Waterton and Laurajane Smith. 28-47. UK:Cambridge Scholars Publishing: UK.

Watson, Steve. and Emma Waterton. 2011. "Heritage and community engagement: finding a new agenda". *Heritage and community engagement: Collaboration or contestation*.1-11.

Wilson, Patricia, Elspeth Mathie, Julia Keenan, Elaine McNeilly, Claire Goodman, Amanda Howe, Fiona Poland. 2015. "Health services and delivery research." *ReseArch with patient and public invOlvement: a RealisT evaluation-the RAPPORT study. Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library*.

Wisansing, Jutamas.2008. "The three waves of internationalisation sweeping Thailand's tourism and hospitality education: Current progress and future prospects." *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education* 20.1: 13-19.

Witcomb, Andrea. 2003. *Re-imagining the museum: Beyond the mausoleum*. USA: Psychology Press 2003.

Zaccaro, Stephen J., and Richard J. Klimoski, 2002. eds. *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders*. Vol. 12. John Wiley & Sons.