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Abstract

Human trafficking, or the use of fraud and coercion to enslave people in exploitative conditions, is a growing phenomenon that affects millions of victims in Southeast Asia. Despite the severity of the problem, knowledge of the issue remains low. As a result, there is a need for anti-trafficking organizations to work with community-based organizations to educate at-risk communities to prevent themselves from the risk of human trafficking. With the recent recommendation by bilateral agencies and the United Nations, collaboration has become a widely utilized strategy to address the problem of human trafficking. Although collaboration is growing rapidly, little is known about why collaboration is valued as a strategy to plan and implement anti-trafficking interventions. Other questions of interest include how collaboration is formed, what factors are significant in enabling an effective collaborative process, how collaborative outcomes are measured as successful, and what the key ethical dilemmas of collaboration that should be considered in the anti-trafficking interventions are. Answers to these questions are crucial to assist policy makers and anti-trafficking actors to understand the values of their collaboration and develop better strategies to effectively respond to the problem. Two cases of community-based collaboration against human trafficking in Thailand and the Philippines were conducted in this current study. Guided by the antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics framework of collaboration, this thesis utilized data from 16 in-depth interviews with key members of the anti-trafficking coalitions and document review of program reports, Memorandum of Understanding and meeting minutes. Findings generated 22 factors of collaboration and a revised model of community-based collaboration that could be useful in assisting anti-trafficking actors to effectively assess,
design, monitor and evaluate their community-based collaboration in human trafficking prevention interventions.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Human trafficking is a growing social problem in which human beings are bought and sold for profits through forced prostitution, bonded labor, or involuntary domestic servitude (Department of State, 2010). The United Nation's International Labor Organization (2006) estimates that there are currently about 2.5 million people who are victims of trafficking and over half of these people are located in Asia and the Pacific. Other estimates range from 4 million to 27 million (Department of State, 2008). The magnitude of human trafficking is tremendous as traffickers profit over US$32 billion every year (ILO, 2005) and it is the second most lucrative criminal activity in the world after illegal drugs trafficking (Belser, 2005).

Thus, human trafficking clearly is a significant public health issue as victims are grievously harmed through physical and emotional exploitation. Victims of forced labor work in dangerous conditions that may lead to short-term health issues such as chronic pain, hearing and vision problems and long-term illnesses such as respiratory problems or cancer. It is not uncommon for them to experience bruises and scars from abuse and torture (Department of Health and Human Services, 2007). Those who are forced into prostitution are susceptible to permanent damage to reproductive organs, sexually transmitted diseases, and HIV/AIDS (Zimmerman, et. al., 2006; Department of State, 2007). In order to cope with despair and trauma, many victims also become addicted to drugs (Department of Health & Human Services, 2007). Apart from negative physical health outcomes, psychological health issues such as depression, sleep disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder and fatalistic feelings are prevalent (Zimmerman, et. al., 2006).
The effects of human trafficking reach far beyond the individual victims and their families. Society is gravely affected as it exacerbates the concerns for human security as the money fueled into trafficking is used to feed organized crimes and terrorism (Department of State, 2009). Asia is one of the biggest breeding grounds for human trafficking due to its enormous population, persistent poverty and unemployment (UNFPA, 2006). These factors have lured young people with limited choices and resources to migrate to developed or emerging economy to seek a better life, putting them at considerable risk of being exploited by human traffickers (UNESCAP, 2010).

The United States of America led the world stage by passing a sweeping legislation called the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) in 2000 to tackle this issue, influencing the United Nations to subsequently introduce “The Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons” in 2003. This measure was gradually adopted into legislation by over 80% of the United Nations members around the world, expanding the international efforts to battle human trafficking over a relatively short period (UNODC, 2009). Despite a growing consensus by state and non-state actors to acknowledge human trafficking as a problem, there is still much tension among the anti-trafficking community over the definition of trafficking, the scope and scale of the problem and how it should be solved (Gulati, 2010). In addition, resources spent to combat human trafficking is relatively small compared to drug trafficking, the largest illegal trade in the world (UNODC, 2005). For example in the fiscal year 2009, the US federal government allocated approximately $103.5 million for domestic and international anti-trafficking programs (Siskin & Wyler, 2010) while over $14.1 billion was budgeted under the National Drug Control Strategy (The White House, 2008). This
discrepancy demonstrates that anti-trafficking efforts are in the nascent stage as researchers, practitioners and policy makers are still trying to understand the nature of the problem and develop plans to address it.

**The Importance of Collaboration in the Anti-Human Trafficking Movement**

The review of literature on human trafficking reveals that anti-human trafficking efforts are under researched all around the world (Laczko, 2005; Mattar, 2004; Schauer & Wheaton, 2006). Most of the recent publications focus on the horrific narratives (Farr 2004; Kangaspunta 2003; Kligman & Limoncelli 2005), the magnitude of the problem (Raymond & Hughes 2001; Weitzer 2007; Zhang 2007), the root causes and actions taken to address the problem (Friman & Reich 2007; Gallagher 2006), and the evaluations of enacted policies or programs (Adams, 2003; UNHCR, 2006; Agahatise, 2003; Munro, 2006; Schuckman, 2006; Samarasinghe & Burton, 2007). Among these evaluation studies, the lack of inter-organizational collaboration within and between anti-trafficking organizations across the public and private sectors is mentioned as one of the reasons why efforts to combat the problem remain largely ineffective (Foot, 2011). This sentiment is reflected by the US Government Accountability Office report (2007) which states that more strategic collaboration among government agencies are needed to investigate and prosecute trafficking crimes since a single agency cannot tackle the problem by itself because the issue is transnational in nature and intersects across agency jurisdictions. Establishing a collaborative framework that includes mutually agreed upon outcomes, strategies, roles and responsibilities, protocols, referrals, and other day to day operations can assist agencies to better address the complex challenges of human trafficking.
For almost a decade, the US State Department and the United Nations included the 3 Ps of prevention, protection, and prosecution in their policy framework to combat human trafficking. Wilson (2010) observed that organizations working in the field of human trafficking were having difficulty to independently plan and implement programs to address prevention of trafficking incidents (e.g., public awareness campaigns and community watchdog groups), protection of victims (e.g., providing rehabilitation, health care, psychosocial support and reintegration services), and prosecution of criminal offenders (e.g., training law enforcers to detect and investigate human trafficking cases). Activities under the 3 Ps do not take place in a vacuum and demand inter-organizational collaboration within and across sectors. For example, preventive campaigns that encourage local residents to report suspicious human trafficking activities through the hotline require resources from anti-trafficking organizations to develop campaign materials. Community-based organizations, local business companies and media agencies subsequently cooperate in distributing campaign messages through their networks. Hotline operators must be equipped with trained personnel to receive and screen authentic calls and pass down the information to law enforcement agencies that will promptly investigate reported cases and rescue victims. Health providers have to identify and provide care and treatment services to victims to recover from the physical and psychological trauma. Local non-profit organizations can also play an important role by providing victims with long-term rehabilitation that include places to live, education and jobs training. In the meanwhile, public prosecutors must carefully work with victims to provide testimony and build a case against human traffickers who are put up for conviction. An expert from anti-trafficking coalition concludes that “inter-agency
collaboration is the only way in which trafficking cases are successfully able to serve survivors. No one agency can truly provide all the necessary services survivors of human trafficking need because their needs are so diverse.” (Wilson, 2010, p. 125).

Collaboration recently emerged as an overarching strategy after 1,200 representatives from governments, parliaments, civil society, media and private organizations met at the first-ever global forum against human trafficking in Vienna in 2008. This led to the subsequent addition of the fourth P for partnership under the response umbrella by both the United Nations and the US government (UN, 2008; Department of State, 2010). Since then, anti-trafficking players around the world have adopted collaboration into their organizational goals and missions. Recent communication scholar like Foot (2010) confirms the growing prevalence of collaboration. In her content analysis study of 164 anti-trafficking websites across the globe, Foot finds that 65% report engaging in coalition building as part of their program activities.

Kara (2009), the leading academic researcher in human trafficking, further builds a case for collaboration against human trafficking by explaining that human trafficking is driven primarily by massive profits and the crime rate is growing because of low risk (cost of being caught and prosecuted by state) and high reward (net profits generated from exploited victims). For example, in Asia Pacific, the average cost of acquiring a sex slave is estimated to be only 750 USD while the annual profits generated from exploiting a victim can be as high as 33,000 USD (Kara, 2009, p. 207). Moreover, the risk of being arrested and prosecuted is almost zero due to weak legislations, lax law enforcement and widespread corruption (Kara, 2009, p. 208). In order to effectively abolish the business of
sex trafficking, Kara (2009) advocates for collaboration among anti-trafficking organizations, economists, business leaders, lobbyists, prosecutors, law enforcers and researchers to establish a coalition to significantly increase the risk of operating a business tainted by trafficking activity. This includes building a collaborative grassroots movement to demand policy makers and law enforcers to enact harsher penalty and sanction against recruiters, business owners, and buyers of sex slaves. The goal is for the coalition to create a hostile environment for human traffickers to the point where the risks (e.g., fine, imprisonment and bad publicity) outweigh the financial returns. All these evidence point to the growing importance of collaboration as strategy in the anti-trafficking movement.

**Defining Collaboration**

Collaboration is defined by Thomson, Perry and Miller (2007) as “a process in which autonomous or semi-autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions.” Collaboration is a coveted value among anti-trafficking actors as stakeholders can contribute expertise and leverage resources from diverse areas such as human and labor rights, health services, law enforcement, campaigns and communication that will collectively facilitate more effective and swift response against human trafficking. Other examples of collaboration include alliances between governments and garment industry that work together to introduce protocols and compliance guidelines to ensure slave-free supply chains, and coalitions of nongovernmental organizations that coordinate to provide services for victims and
advocate common policy to the authority in their jurisdiction (Department of State, 2010). Public and private donors of anti-trafficking initiatives often make it compulsory for grantees to adopt collaboration as strategy, with the belief that it can enhance the accomplishment of program goals through mobilization of resources, building community capacity and sustaining intended impacts (Thomson, Perry & Miller, 2007). The complexity of the problem points to the need for a systematic response such as community-based collaborations.

**Community-Based Collaboration and Its Benefits in Prevention Interventions**

Scholars in the field of public health have recommended that community-based collaboration is one of the common characteristics of effective interventions and should be adopted as best practice to achieve prevention goals (Bond & Hauf, 2004, 2007; Durlak, 2003; Weissberg & Kumpfer, 2003). Community-based collaboration is referred as collaborative efforts among individuals, groups and/or organizations that are directly or indirectly affected by an issue within the community (Bond & Hauf, 2007). With the combined advantages of collaboration and community involvement, community-based collaboration increases the probability of effective program design by mobilizing resources and expertise from different stakeholders while encouraging community participants to take ownership of the intervention, develop a sense of commitment to the process and share accountability and sustainability of the outcomes (Bond & Hauf, 2007). In addition, stakeholders in the community provide public health practitioners and researchers with knowledge on local cultures, history, values, norms and beliefs that should be taken into consideration in the initial needs assessment of the problem, the subsequent planning of the intervention, and monitoring and evaluation of the program.
activities. Community-based collaboration ensures that intervening parties are sensitized to the strengths and weaknesses of the social, cultural and environmental conditions that must be deliberated before delivering the prevention activities.

The benefits of community-based collaboration have led to widespread formation of coalitions to address issues such as adolescent health, substance abuse and violent crimes. It is possible that anti-trafficking actors are taking notice of the popularity of community-based collaboration from other preventive fields, and subsequently adopt the approach for their intervention efforts. Questions remain if community-based collaboration is in fact the best option to achieve intervention outcomes. Much research that promotes the use of community-based collaboration often is not supported by empirical evidence, and among those that do, weak correlations are found between collaboration and community outcomes (Brown, et al., 2008). How then could we explain the growing adoption of collaboration in prevention interventions despite its limitation in solving the identified problem? It is plausible that other than the problem resolution outcome (e.g., reduction of human trafficking incidents), stakeholders may gain secondary benefits such as having a community platform in which coalition members can regularly attend and voice issues, sharing of resources unrelated to the identified problem (e.g., lending each other agricultural equipments), and building networks with public and private agencies to assist community members on other priorities such as employment, education, and sanitation. Lack of theory-driven design, low fidelity of program implementation, short study period, unreliable and invalid measures are also cited as potential reasons that explain why collaborative programs fail to influence intervention outcomes (Brown, et al. 2008).
Effective Model of Community-Based Collaboration

In order to justify that collaboration is the best option for the prevention interventions, researchers have to identify tested and successful models of community-based collaboration that rectify the target problem. One of the few collaborative models that has been tested in a randomized control trial and demonstrated to possess qualities of successful coalitions is Communities That Care (CTC). CTC is a coalition-based prevention system that guides community stakeholders to collaborate on the planning and delivery of scientific-driven prevention interventions (Arthur et al., 2010). CTC requires the engagement and establishment of a community prevention board with diverse members across different sectors in the community. The community prevention board subsequently follows a process by (i) developing clearly defined, specific and realistic goals for healthy development of young people in the community; (ii) identifying and appraising risk and protective factors on issues such as alcohol and substance abuse, juvenile delinquency and violence in communities through systematic data collection and measurement tools; (iii) prioritizing risk and protective factors for community mobilization, (iv) planning and implementing evidence-based interventions that minimized the risks and enhanced protective factors with fidelity and (v) monitoring, evaluating and making necessary adjustments to effectively attain outcomes that are meaningful to the community (Hallfors et al., 2002; Hawkins, et al., 2002; Arthur, et al., 2010; Brown, et al, 2008). A randomized control trial between 12 community coalitions that employ CTC system and 12 non-CTC community coalitions has shown that CTC coalitions are more likely adopt effective coalition practices to assess community needs through epidemiology data; to build the capacity of coalition members to implement
scientific-driven prevention interventions with risk and protection-oriented approach; to create clearly written intervention plans; to implement evidence-based programs; and to monitor and evaluate the effects of the program (Arthur et al., 2010).

The study on collaborative processes within the CTC coalitions has also found that coalitions with higher levels of cross sector inter-agency collaboration (how often coalition members from different agencies and sectors interact with each other) and higher frequency of prevention collaborative activities (e.g., sharing of information, coordination of activities and strategies) are more likely to adopt the approach of scientific-driven interventions (Brown et al., 2008). The adoption of scientific-driven interventions in turn will increase the probability of coalitions to attain intervention outcomes.

**Community-based Collaboration in Anti-Human Trafficking Interventions**

Given the recent interest in community-based collaboration to combat human trafficking, it is not surprising to discover only a dearth of studies that explore the subject. Of those that do focus in this area, collaboration is analyzed in the context of legislative process (Tichenor, 2007; DeStefano, 2007), cross national collaboration between state agencies (Reichel, 2008), synergy between government and faith-based organizations (Wilson, 2010), best practices of initiatives that utilize partnerships for program planning and implementation (UNODC, 2008) and community partnerships for victim identification and service needs (Small, 2007). Most of these literatures explore how collaborations are formed, identify general principles of stakeholders’ relationships, discuss benefits and challenges of collaboration, and provide recommendations on how to increase effectiveness of collaborative efforts. Similar to collaboration research in other
disciplines, case study is often employed as a research method to gather data for these studies.

Among the aforementioned research on human trafficking collaboration, the only study that emphasizes community-based programs is a doctoral dissertation by Small (2007). Her work is based on three years of data collection in three cities that implemented a community justice partnership program to identify, rescue and provide need services for victims of human trafficking. Community justice partnership is defined as a cooperation between two or more organizations that work together (Rosenbaum, 2002) in a process where community stakeholders participate to collectively seek solutions that improve community safety, build community capacity for unified action, and provide services to crime victims (Roman, Jenkins & Wolff, 2004). In this study, Small utilized a conceptual framework of community justice partnerships by Roman and his colleagues (2002) to describe characteristics of the anti-trafficking partnerships. Her findings present several factors that emerge from effective partnerships such as number and type of organizations, shared norms and vision, capacity and resources to combat human trafficking and strong networks to the community. These factors, as well as the best practice model of CTC, can provide scholars in the field of human trafficking as a guiding framework to investigate and test other community-based collaborative interventions.

**Common Actors in Community-based Collaboration against Human Trafficking**

Community-based collaborations which are formed to increase prevention of human trafficking in Southeast Asia often include partnerships among local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), faith-
based organizations (FBOs), international non-profit organizations (iNPOs), bilateral agencies, multilateral agencies and government agencies. Collaborative intervention policies are often formed by iNPOs (e.g., Save the Children), bilateral agencies (e.g., US Agency for International Development), multilateral agencies (e.g., United Nations) and local governments at the regional level due to their large resources and political power. These organizations make decisions to channel funds to support community-based collaborations in target at-risk communities, and iNPOs and FBOs with strong networks with local NGOs and CBOs in the communities become involved at this level. While the origins of local NGOs and CBOs are similar, there are a few differences, distinguished by the level of formalized structure, resources and capacity. CBOs are often initiated by community members who share common grievances or interests in the local area. CBOs are normally informal in structure as they include neighbors, friends and family members who volunteer to address pressing community issues. As CBOs mature over the years and become more professionalized in their structure (e.g., collaborating with more external organizations, increasing more expertise on specific issues, having the ability to raise financial resources to pay for staff salaries and registering the organization as a legal entity), CBOs can transform itself into local NGOs. Community-based coalitions with these players subsequently work together by dividing their roles and responsibilities to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate human trafficking prevention interventions such as public awareness campaigns and peer education activities.

Local NGOs and CBOs do not normally focus their efforts exclusively on the issue of human trafficking, but work on a range of issues that occur in the community such as poverty reduction, domestic violence, human rights, labor rights, HIV/AIDS and
refugee services (Clawson, et al., 2004). The underlying cause of human trafficking often stems from a combination of factors such as uneven economic opportunity between rural and urban areas and attraction for affluent lifestyle in big cities (Betz, 2009). Local NGOs and CBOs working to prevent human trafficking would therefore offer holistic intervention programs that include income generation activities to discourage risky migration, life skills education to prepare necessary knowledge for those that still choose to migrate to understand what to do when they are faced with a trafficking situation, and social movement activities to advocate for the rights of ethnic minorities and migrant workers. It is therefore not surprising to find local NGOs and CBOs whose primary mission is to serve a certain segment of population such as the hill tribe villagers, migrant workers, rural farmers and sex workers to become part of the same anti-trafficking community coalition.

Faith-based organizations have a long history of raising public awareness and mobilizing resources to advocate policy makers against human trafficking (McDonnell, 2007). Due to their religious conviction and ideological standing against slavery and exploitation of women and children, faith-based organizations who are most active in the human trafficking issue in Southeast Asia are of Christian faith. The key players such as International Justice Mission, World Vision and Chab Dai play critical roles in providing shelter services, offering rehabilitation, food, housing and health treatment to victims of trafficking (Small, 2007). Given their operation in remote locations along national borders where there are high frequency of trafficking, and reliable funding from international Christian ministries, government grants and other private donors, they
become important partners who have sufficient resources in reaching vulnerable populations and delivering prevention activities.

**Challenges of Collaboration**

Despite consensus on the purpose and benefits of collaboration, it is rife with challenges due to conflicting organizational agenda, mistrust of information sharing, perceived unequal distribution of benefits, and burden on organizations that have limited resources (Foot, 2010). Interpersonal relationships, different ideological standing about the problems, and failure by participants to commit to the synergized approach are other factors that hinder collaboration (Coughlin, et al., 1999; Hooper, 1995; Margerum, 1999). Critics have also voiced concerns that stakeholders are not created equal and some parties could exert unreasonable influence on the intervention decisions and policies that may not serve the best interests of target population and local community (Dukes, Firehock and Birkhoff, 2011). Particularly within the anti-trafficking sector, unclear definitions of human trafficking, different legislation across locations, inadequate knowledge about the issue, lack of communication among partnering organizations, and ideological differences between FBOs and feminist organizations are mentioned as the most common collaborative challenges (Wilson, 2010).

Collaboration also could raise the dilemma of exploitation on community organizations (Guttman, 2000, p. 196). Community-based collaboration may overwhelm the limited resources of local community organizations that may need to focus their priorities on other pressing health or social issues. Interventions created by outsiders with the goal of institutionalizing program activities into local organizations after funding ends can create unrealistic expectations that a community should be able to sustain the
activities on its own (Capek, 1992; Green, 1989). This is especially problematic for cases where community members do not have initial inputs of the intervention goals, objectives and tactics. Ethical concerns arise and community’s safety is threatened from collaborative activities (e.g., new anti-trafficking law stirs retaliations from human traffickers who target the community with violence and coercion). It is therefore important for researchers to identify, document and analyze how successful collaboration should be conducted for anti-trafficking interventions. Questions that need to be explored are the pros and cons of community-based collaboration, how to develop a successful collaboration model, key factors that facilitate the formation of effective collaboration, and the ethical dilemmas that should be taken into consideration before launching an intervention.

**Problem Statement, Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

Human trafficking is the fastest growing and second largest criminal industry in the world (Belser, 2005) and causes devastating impact on local communities by subjecting vulnerable populations to sexual and labor exploitation for commercial purposes. Human trafficking also drains resources from the mainstream economy into the underground networks of criminal activities. In order to counter this illegal activity, government agencies, NGOs and FBOs are beginning to form community-based collaboration with grassroots organizations to design and implement human trafficking prevention interventions. These interventions often consist of training and empowering community members to become activists or volunteers to develop their own initiatives to address the problems in their community. Despite the growing consensus and documented benefits of collaboration, it is plagued with challenges and little is known if
collaborative activity does enhance intervention outcomes. Challenges can disrupt collaborative process, weaken trust among participating actors, place community members at unintended risks and hinder the prevention of human trafficking problems. Researchers and practitioners therefore need to develop a better understanding of the collaborative process if they want to assist communities in combating this crime.

This thesis will advance our understanding on collaboration and its application to community-based anti-human trafficking interventions. The purpose of this research is to investigate the process of collaboration among the coalitions of anti-trafficking organizations, at-risk communities, donor agencies and local governments who play different roles in designing, implementing and evaluating human trafficking prevention interventions. The current study poses the following research questions:

1. In what ways do anti-human trafficking actors view community-based collaboration as an effective approach in human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the perceived factors that enable them to form a coalition to initiate anti-trafficking interventions?

2. How do anti-trafficking coalitions manage the collaborative process in designing and implementing community-based human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the factors perceived by coalition members to have facilitated the collaborative process?

3. What are collaborative outcomes that are valued by coalition members?

4. Do anti-trafficking coalitions face ethical dilemmas during the design and implementation of a community-based collaboration? If they do, what are those ethical dilemmas?
This chapter introduces the problem of human trafficking, the growing importance of collaboration as strategy to combat human trafficking, the benefits, challenges and common actors of community-based collaboration in anti-trafficking interventions. The second chapter reviews the relevant literature on collaboration and the conceptual framework that is developed to answer the research questions in this study. Chapter three describes the research methods, case selection criteria, study sites, sample selection of interviewees, data collection instruments, type of analysis and trustworthiness in the study. Chapter four includes background of the cases which include history and context of the selected collaborations, and findings of the four research questions are described and discussed. Chapter five focuses on the conclusion of this study, and discusses the limitations and implications for future research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter begins with an overview of collaboration in the context of human trafficking and its definitions, followed by the theoretical model of collaboration that consists of pre-conditions of collaboration, process of collaboration and outcomes of collaboration. The review moves on to discuss ethical dilemmas that may occur during the design and implementation of community-based collaborative interventions. The chapter concludes with the development of a conceptual framework of antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics that is used as a guidance to answer the research questions in this study.

Overview of Collaboration in the Context of Human Trafficking

A literature review on collaboration reveals there are multiple terms that are used to describe the concept across disciplines. Terms such as “partnership,” “coalition,” “alliances,” “task forces,” “consortiums,” “inter-organizational relationship,” “joint working group,” “councils,” and “multi-party” are used to represent two or more parties who engage in a group decision making process to address particular needs or problems (Henderson, 2010). It should be noted that within the anti-trafficking community, “partnership” is a more commonly used term to describe the process of collaborative relationship while “coalition” is often used to represent an entity of two or more organizations who work together to achieve with a common goal (Wilson, 2010). Some scholars have distinguished nuances between “partnership” and “collaboration” based on stakeholders’ level of understanding of the problem and complexity of the issue to be solved. In a partnership, the problem is clearly identified and easily understood by
involving parties (James, 1999). Partnership therefore represents an issue with fairly simple solutions and predictable outcomes such as a partnership to organize a fundraising event to raise money for a charity. In a collaboration, not one party has a complete understanding of the problem and collaborative members bring in different perspectives to create solutions that otherwise may not be possible by an individual party (Gray, 1989). Collaboration is more applicable to novel and complex issues that require more resources and diverse expertise to generate solutions. This study will therefore use “collaboration” rather than “partnership” as it is a more appropriate term to describe the process in which actors from different sectors work together to plan and implement anti-trafficking interventions.

**Defining Collaboration**

Gray (1989, p. 5) defines collaboration as a process “through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible”. This definition is an attempt to go beyond practical description to deeper understanding of theoretical issues involved in forming and maintaining collaborative efforts (Gray & Wood, 1991). However, the definition has its limitation as it does not break down the concept into variables that are observable and measurable in the real world settings. The problem is further exacerbated by the lack of consensus of collaboration definition across disciplines. In order to assess, measure and evaluate collaborative programs and compare findings across studies, researchers need to develop the meaning from review and systematic analysis of definitions from case research that has predominantly contributed to the literature on collaboration.
In a ground-breaking issue of Journal of Applied Behavioral Science that devoted its focus on collaborative alliances, Wood and Gray (1991) began the task of defining collaboration by collating different definitions from nine research studies in the multidisciplinary field of collaboration (Gray, 1989, 2000; Huxham, 1996; Huxham and Vangen, 2005), inter-organizational relations (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994) and organizational behavior (Hellriegel, Slocum, and Woodman, 1986). With the goal of defining a term that answered the questions of “who is doing what, with what means and toward which ends?”, common elements of collaboration definition in each study were identified, compared and analyzed. This led to the revised definition of collaboration that expanded on Gray’s (1989, p. 5) earlier version:

Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain.

This definition identifies six elements that commonly appear in the collaborative process. They are “stakeholders of a problem domain,” “autonomy,” “interactive process,” “shared rules, norms and structures,” “action or decision,” and “issues related to the domain.” The “stakeholders of a problem domain” are groups or organizations with an interest in the problem domain that choose to participate in collaboration. “Autonomy” displays the common characteristic of stakeholders who still mostly have the independent power to act or decide on any joint activities, even when they agree to follow the shared rules of the coalition. In the meantime, all participating stakeholders are involved in the “interactive process”, indicating the dynamic communication among collaborative members who influence each other to arrive at the action or decision during the period of
collaboration. Participants in a coalition have to establish the “shared rules and norms” that will manage their interaction and organize the “structures” to plan the duration of the collaborative alliance. Actors in collaboration create shared rules, norms and structures so they can have a mechanism to “act or decide” on “issues related to that domain.” In other words, the action or decision is carried out with the goal of addressing the problem of interest. In the context of human trafficking prevention, issues related to the domain could be broad like advocating for anti-human trafficking policy or specific like created watchdog groups to monitor suspicious visitors who could be human traffickers in target communities.

The definition of collaboration by Wood and Gray (1991) helps to advance our understanding of collaboration as a process with observable forms and elements that are theoretically built from synthesis of research studies across multiple disciplines. Since then, Thomson, Perry and Miller (2007) has gone further to strengthen and expand the definition by incorporating more field research data from interviews with 20 organizational directors and two case studies that were published in 1998 and 1999 (Thomson 1999; Thomson & Perry 1998). The definition is described as followed:

Collaboration is a process in which autonomous or semi-autonomous actors interact through formal and informal negotiation, jointly creating rules and structures governing their relationships and ways to act or decide on the issues that brought them together; it is a process involving shared norms and mutually beneficial interactions. (p. 25)

This definition keeps all of Wood and Gray’s (1991) elements, adds more specificity, and categorizes into five dimensions which are (i) governance,
administration, (iii) norms, (iv) mutuality and (v) organizational autonomy. The five dimensions inform us that collaboration is a process concept with organized structure (governance and administration), social capital that facilitates the process (norms and mutuality) and agency status for each actor (organizational autonomy).

**Five Dimensions of Collaboration**

Thomson and her colleagues (2007) suggest that using the five dimensions to appraise and monitor a coalition would help practitioners to manage the process of collaboration effectively, and increase the likelihood of achieving desired outcomes. These five variable dimensions are mutually dependent, dynamic rather than sequential, and are affected by preconditions (Gray & Wood, 1991) and other factors such as members drop out, environmental uncertainty and shifting accountabilities (Huxham & Vangen 2000; Ospina & Sag-Carranza 2005). In a research study of 422 collaborations, Thomson and Miller (2002) finds wide variations on the five dimensions. The score levels in each dimension are rarely recorded at the extremely high end. In another study by Ostrom (1990, p.39), the levels of the five dimensions fluctuate throughout the study as stakeholders intensify or decrease their interaction process. Given the complex interactions and interdependent nature among the five dimensions, the researchers conclude that instead of pursuing the unrealistic goal of achieving the highest level in each dimension, collaborative partners should find the right combination by assessing the costs of investment and the likelihood of attaining successful outcomes.

The five dimensions of collaboration by Thomson and Perry (2006) are described and discussed in details below:
**Governance:** Similar to Wood and Gray’s (1991) definition, governance refers to the ground rules that control how participants behave and who get to make decisions, describe what actions are permissible or discouraged, set guidelines on how information is communicated, and specify how resources are to be allocated among group members (Ostrom 1990, 51). The rules promote conducive environment for members to come to joint agreement and minimize potential conflicts that may arise during the negotiation process.

**Administration:** This dimension focuses on management of participating partners to implement agreed upon actions to achieve collaborative goals. Administration is the management structure that transitions governance into action. Administering collaboration can be difficult because actors are independent or partially independent and participation is often voluntary, making conventional coordinating systems such as power structure, standardization and routinization less applicable (Huxham 1996; Huxham & Vangen 2005; O’Toole 1997; Powell 1990; Wood & Gray 1991). Due to these challenges, it is important for collaborative partners to identify a lead agency that acts as a social coordinator (Freitag & Winkler, 2001). The social coordinator must have authority and skills to disseminate information, remind participants of established rules, manage partners’ tension that stems from self and collective interests, and monitor activities based on agreed upon roles and responsibilities.

**Organizational Autonomy:** Thomson and Perry (2006) calls organizational autonomy as “the defining dimension of collaboration” as it describes the arbitrary nature of collaborative actors who have dual identity: one with motivated self-interest for their own organization and the other as a participating agency with shared responsibility and
collective interest to achieve goals for their partnerships (Bardach 1998; Tschirhart, Christensen, & Perry 2005; Van de Ven, Emmett, & Koenig 1975; Wood & Gray 1991). Representatives from collaborating organizations are prone to the “autonomy-accountability dilemma,” the term created by Huxham (1996) that describes the feeling of conflicting tension between being obligated to the interests of their organization and the interests of collaborating stakeholders. The autonomy-accountability dilemma often slows down program planning and implementation as participants need to countercheck with their organizations before committing to governance and administration of partnerships. In addition, when goals of collaboration are not aligned with individual organizations, partnership suffers as potential partners refuse to compromise and drop out altogether.

Given the frequent autonomous status of collaborative participants, not one organization has the absolute authority over the other. Contributions by partners are therefore voluntary and based largely on informal relationships (Huxham, 1996). Scholar like Innes (1999) views the lack of formal power structure between collaborative actors as a positive thing, noting that rigid hierarchical power between organizations can obstruct change while the environment with more synergized structure can promote innovation, particularly when tension between individual and collective interests are effectively managed. This brings us to the next dimension called mutuality.

Mutuality: This dimension refers to the state in which parties who share similar or different interests receive mutual benefits from participating in the collaboration. Rooted in the resource dependence theory (Pfeffer 1997; Pfeffer & Salancik 1978) and the study of inter-organizational relations (Levine & White 1961; Van de Ven, Emmett & Koenig
1975; Warren et al. 1975), organizations can optimize benefits by exchanging skills, expertise and other resources with one another to accomplish a joint task, as long as the partnership does not affect themselves negatively (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Practitioners who intend to form collaboration often start out by identifying shared interests and related similarities such as organizational missions, values, target populations and professional ideology (Lax & Sebenius 1986). Sharing commitment to the same target populations is found to be a good indicator of mutuality as organizations that serve similar constituents are more likely to see the mutual benefits of working together to solve persisting problems (Thomson, 1999). Mutuality is closely associated with the last dimension of collaboration called norms of reciprocity and trust.

**Norms of trust and reciprocity:** Trust and reciprocity are closely related concepts in this dimension. Collaborative actors often participate based on perception of reciprocity in actual distribution of costs and benefits among the actors. Reciprocity can be the main motivation for collaboration, especially when partnership is in its inception and inter-organizational relationships are fragile. As collaboration progresses, the concept of reciprocity out of “fair dealing” may transform into norms of trust (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). The norms of trust is a general notion among partners that each party will attempt “good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit and implicit,” “be honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments,” and “not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available” (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996).

In a way, trust is higher order of the collaboration dimension because it takes time to develop and requires recurring interaction among members in order for them to feel
committed to the partnerships (Axelrod 1984, 1997; Ostrom 1990). Once trust is gained among partners, things can be accomplished more effectively as implementation becomes less complex and collective action can be decided fairly quickly (Chiles & McMackin 1996; Ostrom 1998; Smith 1995). Trust and reciprocity are also associated closely with reputation (Ostrom, 1998). As collaborative actors interact, they build interpersonal relationships and organizational reputations that they are trustworthy in trying to meet agreed upon commitments. Reciprocity of costs and benefits become less important and “psychological contracts” appear to replace formal contracts (Ring & Van de Ven 1994, 103). The psychological contracts indicate that partners are comfortable in trusting one another to be responsible in meeting collective goals and this growth of informal relationships is a good indicator of sustained collaboration over time.

Collaborative is a complex process and requires large amount of resources such as time, labor and money from the stakeholders in the domain to initiate and maintain the efforts. The five dimensions above can be used as a systematic approach for collaborative actors to carefully understand what it takes to manage the process and make an informed decision if they should utilize collaboration as a strategy to accomplish their goals.

**Theoretical Model of Collaboration**

From the review of collaborative research, Gray and Wood (1991) identify three additional issues that frequently appear in the attempt to build a theoretical model of collaboration. They are “(i) the preconditions that make collaboration possible and that motivate stakeholders to participate, (ii) the process through which collaboration occurs, and (iii) the outcomes of the collaboration,” (Gray & Wood, 1991, p. 13). The three issues are referred simply as an antecedents-process-outcomes model (see Table 1) by
Thomson and Perry (2006). The model is created with the assumption that there are particular conditions that bring potential stakeholders together and enable them to join a collaborative alliance. When these pre-conditions are met, participating actors form a coalition engage in the collaborative process to achieve the intended outcomes. Careful management of the collaborative process should subsequently increase the likelihood of attaining the collaborative outcomes. This model is therefore useful for researchers and practitioners to adopt as a conceptual framework to describe and analyze collaborative programs. While the model is framed in a way that indicate linear relationships among variables in the pre-conditions, process and outcomes phases, previous studies have not confirmed the correlation or cause-effect relationships (Huxham & Vangen 2005; O’Leary & Bingham 2003). This is because of the complex and dynamic process of collaboration. Outcomes are embedded and take place at different periods of collaboration. In the meantime, each dimension of collaboration influences outcomes differently. In order to examine the relationships between pre-conditions, process and outcomes, a longitudinal study must be conducted to measure the variables of interest throughout the research. Given the extensive resources required to carry out such study, there is still a paucity of research that can shine the light on the validity of the links between the pre-conditions, the process and the outcomes (Thomson, Perry & Miller, 2008). Exploring these relationships is beyond the scope of this study as I am more interested to answer the research questions on how anti-trafficking coalition is formed, what factors are considered as important to enable and facilitate the collaborative process and what outcomes are determined to be accomplished. This section will henceforth focus on describing the factors in each stage of the collaborative model of antecedents-process-
outcomes and how they can be utilized to develop interviewing questions and conduct data analysis for this research study.

Table 2.1 The antecedents-process-outcomes framework (adapted from Wood and Gray, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High levels of interdependence (Logsdon, 1991)</td>
<td>• Governance</td>
<td>• Problem resolution or goal achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for resources and risk sharing (Alter and Hage, 1993)</td>
<td>• Administration</td>
<td>• Generation of social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource scarcity (Levine and White, 1961)</td>
<td>• Organizational autonomy</td>
<td>• Creation of shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each partner has resources that other partners need</td>
<td>• Mutuality</td>
<td>• Changes in network structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Norms of trust and reciprocity</td>
<td>• Shifts in the power distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• History of efforts to collaborate (Radin, et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex issues (O’Toole 1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community readiness (Roman, Moore, Jenkins and Small, 2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Antecedents of Collaboration**

Under the antecedents-process-outcomes model, antecedents are preconditions that enable individuals or organizations to take part in the collaboration. Thomson and Perry (2006) describe six preconditions which support successful collaboration as followed:

*High levels of interdependence.* This precondition refers to the level of interdependence with other parties that an organization perceives to be essential to tackle the problem effectively (Logsdon, 1991). Organizations that consider participating in collaboration have to recognize the importance of coordinated action to achieve the
solution. Even when collaboration is acknowledged as a strategy, actors may still not participate due to lack of incentives and motivation to act. In essence, reciprocity, the social norm that mutual incentives can be obtained through contribution among party members, becomes a valuable motivational factor that enable actors to realize interdependence and make a decision to join in the collaboration (Oliver, 1990).

**Need for resources and risk sharing.** In order to design and implement a health intervention, resources such as money, space, equipments, skills and expertise, information and networks are needed to fulfill the day to day operation (Alter & Hage, 1993). A complex problem like human trafficking requires different actors across disciplines and sectors who possess different resources to contribute into an intervention. Need for resources is therefore a good indicator for a program that should utilize inter-organizational collaboration. An intervention to improve community health needs to address a range of risk factors at the individual, institutional and community levels (Lasker, et al., 2001). Risk sharing in this case refers to the cost of managing a risk that is distributed among the collaborative partners. An intervention with multiple program activities that aim at people and organization across different levels should require higher level of risk sharing as more stakeholders are expected to be affected to be involved in the process.

**Resource scarcity.** This concept stems from the assumption that organizations should exchange resources to attain their goals under the environment of scarce resources (Levine & White, 1961). The reality of community-based intervention is rife with limited funds, human labor and people with the right expertise, stakeholders who are affected by
a particular problem subsequently have to pool resources among themselves to optimally achieve their mutual goals and objectives.

Each partner has resources that other partners need. This condition falls under the same concepts of need for resources and resource scarcity (Chen & Graddy 2005; Gray 1989; Gray & Wood 1991; Pfeffer & Salancik 1978; Thomson, 2001a). In a health intervention in which the program requires different type of resources in which some organizations have more than the other, it may be the most advantageous for these parties to form a partnership to complement one another.

**History of collaborative efforts.** Organizations that have previously collaborated tend to have existing infrastructure, system and protocols that are essential in responding to the community problem (Radin, et al., 1996; Roman, et al., 2002). In addition, interpersonal relationships among the members have been formed and the parties are exposed to each other’s style of communication, working methods, and reliability. Past efforts in collaboration can therefore indicate if the same coalition can participate in another intervention that will likely achieve successful outcomes. It should be noted that history of failed efforts may have created conflicts and mistrust among collaborative members. Researchers should carefully investigate the best practices and challenges of past efforts and make a collective decision with potential participants if another community program will serve the best interests of the involving parties.

**Complex issues.** Complex issues are those in which there is less certainty about the attainment of desired outcomes and low level of agreement among different parties on how to tackle the problem successfully (O’Toole 1997). With only recent emergence of intervention efforts and lack of documentation on best practices, human trafficking falls
into the category of complex issues that necessitate collaboration to formulate and carry out appropriate intervention activities.

In addition to the aforementioned six preconditions for collaboration, Roman and her colleagues (2002) offered other significant factors that are particularly important in the community-based intervention context. These factors can be categorized under \textit{community readiness}. Community readiness includes the impetus for collaboration, community structure, capacity of local organization partners, and willingness for the community to change and evolve.

Pertinent to this research study is answering the questions of why anti-trafficking organizations perceive community-based collaboration as an effective approach for their prevention efforts and what are the main factors that lead them to form a coalition to initiate anti-trafficking interventions (RQ1). The preconditions of collaboration (Thomson & Perry, 2006) and community readiness (Roman et al., 2003) can be used as a guiding framework to explore if anti-trafficking actors take these variables into consideration before making a decision to initiate a collaborative program. Understanding how and why practitioners and researchers conduct pre-collaboration assessment and community readiness will also reveal if it will improve the design and implementation of the intervention activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2 Antecedents of collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High levels of interdependence (Logsdon, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for resources and risk sharing (Alter and Hage, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource scarcity (Levine and White, 1961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each partner has resources that other partners need (Chen and Graddy 2005; Gray 1989; Gray and Wood 1991; Pfeffer and Salancik 1978; Thomson, 2001a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Previous history of efforts to collaborate (Radin, et al., 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complex issues (O’Toole 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community readiness (Roman, Moore, Jenkins and Small, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process of Collaboration

Scholars have come up with a few frameworks to describe the process of collaboration. Gray (1989) conceptualized the process of collaboration as a series of phases which consist of problem setting, direction setting and implementation. Each phase consists of different steps, length of time and complexity, depending on the makeup of stakeholders, their power structure, impetus to collaborate and intended outcomes. While the three phases proposed by Gray above help scholars to explain collaboration as a linear process, critics argue that it is a rather simplistic model that does not reflect the reality of collaboration, which can be dynamic and cyclical in nature. Actors in collaboration do not necessarily move in one direction from the problem setting to the direction setting and to the implementation. They interact, negotiate and reassess the sets of commitments and implement those commitments throughout the duration of collaboration. Conflicts may arise and partners may reevaluate the process based on their perception of reciprocity, go back to renegotiate prior agreements and make appropriate changes to their collaboration.

Table 2.3 The collaborative process (Gray, 1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Problem setting</th>
<th>Phase 2: Direction setting</th>
<th>Phase 3: Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Common definition of problem</td>
<td>• Establishing ground rules</td>
<td>• Dealing with constituencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment to collaborate</td>
<td>• Agenda setting</td>
<td>• Building external support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of stakeholders</td>
<td>• Organizing subgroups</td>
<td>• Structuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Legitimacy of stakeholders</td>
<td>• Join information search</td>
<td>• Monitoring the agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convener characteristics</td>
<td>• Exploring options</td>
<td>and ensuring compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of resources</td>
<td>• Reaching agreement and closing the deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ring and Van de Ven (1994) subsequently describe this alternative framework as a cyclical process of collaboration. This framework places significant value to informal elements such as interpersonal relationships between actors, psychological contracts and
verbal agreements instead of merely relying on formal elements such as established rules and regulations, memorandum of understanding and legal contracts.

Figure 2.1 A process framework of collaboration (Ring and Van de Ven, 1994)

Building from the earlier frameworks, Thomson (2001) identifies five dimensions of collaboration process which are governance, administration, organizational autonomy, mutuality, norms of trust and reciprocity. The five dimensions have been discussed in details in the previous section. Within the context of this study, the five dimensions provide us as a tool to answer how a coalition is managed by collaborative members to design and implement anti-trafficking interventions and determine if governance, administration, organizational autonomy, mutuality and norms of trust and reciprocity are viewed as factors that facilitate the collaborative process (RQ2).

**Outcomes of Collaboration**

Assessing outcomes of collaboration is important as participating partners can gain valuable information about how their inputs and contributions are translated into amelioration of the problem in which the coalition is committed to solve. In a landmark
article that discusses multiple concepts and methods in assessing inter-organizational collaboration, Gray (2000) identifies five outcomes of collaboration which are based on different approaches. The five outcomes are derived from multiple theoretical perspectives such as transaction cost theory that emphasizes efficiency, resource dependence theory that focuses on dynamics of power structure, institutional theory that relates to how collaboration affects institutional or community norms and values (Gray & Wood, 1991). Understanding multiple theoretical perspectives to assess collaboration is important as scholars have pointed out that there is no definitive way of measuring all aspects of collaboration (Gray, 2000). The five outcomes of collaboration by Gray (2000) are described below.

*Problem resolution or goal achievement:* For a community-based coalition, the ultimate outcomes of collaboration are reflected by the degree to which the identified problem has improved (e.g., lower incidents of human trafficking) or positive outcomes have occurred (e.g., increased awareness of the issue or establishment of community watchdog groups to identify and rescue victims). Brown and Ashman (1995) conducted and analyzed 13 community-based collaboration programs and suggested that problem resolution outcome should include “the scope of their program-solving impact (e.g., how many people were affected by the initiative),” “the availability of resources to sustain the projects over time,” and “the development of local capacity (e.g., grassroots people have acquired skills, participated in problem solving, etc.)” Other than solving a problem, achievement of goals and objectives can also be an outcome ((Bardach, 1998; Gray, 2000). This measure may be more specific to accomplishing objectives of coalition activities such as building networks of youth activists in high risk communities.
Generation of social capital: Social capital is “the aggregation of actual or potential resources that can be mobilized through social relationships and membership in social networks,” (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). This outcome can be measured by the level of norms of trust and reciprocity among participating members (Putnam, 1993; Coleman, 1990). This measure is similar to the factor in the collaborative process. Norms of trust are divided into three types by Lewicki & Bunker (1995). They are (i) calculus-based trust, the first level of trust which occurs when parties begin to interact and develop expectations of particular behavior (e.g., attending required meetings and contributing agreed amount of time and labor); (ii) knowledge-based trust, the next level of trust that takes place when frequency of communication among party members is high and each party comes to understand the nature of the relationship; (iii) identification-based trust, the deepest level of trust in which partners form social ties among themselves based on shared understanding of each other’s needs. Norms of reciprocity takes shape when collaborating partners come to agree on fair distribution of costs and benefits among members, and create group guidelines such as the right to voice objection (Evans, 1996). Based on this description, social capital is created when grassroots organizations build ties to international NGOs and come to work with each other based on mutual needs (Gray, Wesley & Brown, 1998).

Creation of shared meaning: This outcome takes place when multiple stakeholders have a shared understanding about the identified problem and actions that should be implemented to solve it (Gray, 2000). At the start of collaboration, stakeholders often have different interpretation of a problem and ideological perspectives about how to tackle it (Nathan & Mitroff, 1991; Vaughan & Siefert, 1992). In order to maximize the
benefits of collaboration, stakeholders need to appreciate different views, knowledge and expertise of each party to understand the overall situation of the problem (Gray, 2000). Only when shared understanding of the problem is realized, stakeholders can come to an agreement on what should be done to ameliorate the problem. Shared meaning can be assessed by tracking individual party’s interpretations of the problem across time during collaboration. Each party can be asked how their interpretations evolved and influenced by other members. For example, in a human trafficking prevention intervention, participants with conflicting views about who are the risky victim groups may come to change their views that human trafficking should be extended to cover undocumented workers who may voluntarily ask traffickers to help them seek employment, but end up as exploited slaves at the workplace. It should be noted that outcome of shared meaning can constitute more than a single interpretation. Diverse concepts (Vancina & Taillieu, 1997), increased voice (Gray, 1989) and multi-voicedness (Bouwen & Steyaert, 1995) can be positive outcomes as inclusion of community voices that may be previously ignored is a good indication of empowerment (Hirshmen, 1970).

*Changes in network structure:* This outcome is assessed by the number and type of connections that take place among collaborating organizations (Van de Ven & Walker, 1984; Gulati, 1995b; Provan & Milward, 1995). The assessment can be counting the number of interactions among partners (e.g., meetings and client referrals) during the collaboration and note changes that occur in the inter-organizational network structure (Van de Ven and Walker, 1984). The inter-organizational networks become denser as the number of interactions increases, and subsequently enhance the level of institutionalization of the overall sector (Gray, Wesley & Brown, 1998). Densely
connected inter-organizational networks are found to be more effective in accomplishing their goals (Provan & Milward, 1995) as frequent interactions can often demonstrate mobilization of resources and timely collective response to address challenges. With more connections, partners develop more trust and personal relationships that would further strengthen the governance of the collaborative group (Gulati, 1995a). While density of network interactions can be measured to predict increased institutionalization or system change of the domain, it should not be used in solidarity as the main predictor because the correlation may not be found at the higher level of institutionalization (Gray, Wesley & Brown, 1998). Researchers should assess other collaborative outcomes and utilize all the data to explain the positive institutionalization results.

Shifts in the power distribution: The degree to which power is distributed among parties is the final outcome that can be used to assess collaboration (Gray, 2000). Most scholars consider the transformation of collaboration with lopsided power distribution among partners to that of a more equal distribution to be a desirable outcome (Gricar & Brown, 1981; Gray, Wesley & Brown, 1998; Hardy & Phillips, 1998). This is particularly applicable to the community-based collaboration, in which grassroots organizations and community members often have lower power on the collaborative programs in the beginning (Gricar & Brown, 1981; Brown & Ashman, 1995). As collaboration progresses, it is expected that there will be a shift from top-down decision making by external actors (e.g., government agencies, donors or international NGOs) to a more participative process in which voices of the community-based actors have greater power of authority and influence on the program (Gray, 1989). The different types of power that can be measured include “the power to mobilize to gain voice,” “the power to organize a
forum for discussion about the domain,” “the power to strategize about what domain-level actions to take,” “process control,” and “the power to authorize actions by some on behalf of all stakeholders” (Gray, 1989). It can be difficult to accurately measure the power distribution outcome because weaker actors may not be comfortable in stating that they have less access to power, particularly if they rely on the more powerful parties for survival (Gray, 2000). To identify this pitfall, researchers should inquire collaborative parties if (i) they arrive at the new understanding of the problem, (ii) the new understanding is accomplished at the cost of their own interest and (iii) the process is dominated by certain parties (Michelman, 1989). Researchers should then evaluate how each party perceives distribution of power and be aware of researchers’ biases during the assessment process (Gray, 1994).

Table 2.4 Outcomes of collaboration (Gray, 2000)

- Problem resolution or goal achievement
- Generation of social capital
- Creation of shared meaning
- Changes in network structure
- Shifts in the power distribution

These five outcomes represent a collection of different perspectives that can be used to evaluate collaboration efforts (Gray, 2000). These outcomes can be a framework to evaluate if (i) collaborative efforts have contributed to the intervention goals, (ii) sustainable social capital has been created, (iii) new understanding of the domain problem and intervention response have been shared among partners, (iv) interactions among partners lead to meaningful changes in inter-organizational network structure and (v) power dynamics among stakeholders are redistributed in a way that the disenfranchised has the voice to influence and affect changes. It is expected that the problem resolution or the goal achievement should be the priority outcome for most
collaborations while social capacity is considered the next important outcome if the coalition wants to be sustainable. Nevertheless, it may not be necessary to measure all of the five outcomes as each coalition can prioritize what outcomes are most desirable in their situation. These outcomes should be utilized as an evidence-based tool, created from a systematic review of research that explores collaborative outcomes. Researchers and program evaluators should retain the flexibility to choose what outcomes are most useful for the community to measure. This study will therefore ask anti-trafficking actors to reflect their experiences on what collaborative outcomes are most valued within the coalition (RQ3).

The collaborative model of antecedents-process-outcomes is described as an important theoretical framework to guide scholars to understand how the concept is applied in the community-based anti-trafficking interventions. The component that is often ignored from collaborative model is the consideration of ethical dilemmas that may arise out of the planning and implementation of collaboration. Ethical dilemmas may create negative consequences toward the stakeholders, especially community members with less power who have to remain in the intervention site after implementation of the intervention activities. The next section will discuss the most common ethical issues that should be carefully considered by the actors of collaboration.

**Ethical Dilemmas in Community-based Collaboration**

Health communication interventions that aim to involve community and influence their behavior are laden with ethical dilemmas because they may interfere with ingrained beliefs and social values (Guttman, 2003). For anti-trafficking interventions, ethical concerns may arise when stakeholders need to convene and make decisions on specific
human trafficking issues that should be tackled, which communities should be targeted, how to implement effective responses, and what indicators should be assessed for success (Hornik, 1990; Ratzan, 1994). Given the nature of collaboration, conflicts are bound to take place because partners have different ethical stands, ideological perspectives and values on the problem. By scanning potential ethical dilemmas and addressing specific concerns during the process of collaboration, the intervention has a greater likelihood of accomplishing its goals because trust and respect are gained among participating partners and target populations (Guttman, 2003).

Three types of ethical dilemmas related to power and control are prevalent in community-based collaboration. They are the privileging dilemma, the exploitation dilemma and the control dilemma and are described below (Guttman, 2000).

*The privileging dilemma:* For a community-based collaboration that emphasizes on launching a human trafficking prevention intervention, the coalition is in essence imposing this issue as a priority over other problems. This evokes ethical concerns over who is privileged, deliberately or unknowingly, by the intervention and how this privilege will affect the rest of the society (Guttman, 2000, p. 195). Other questions such as the degree to which each stakeholder’s perspectives, interests, social values and beliefs are weighed in the collaboration, how resources and legitimacy are distributed, and why one party is given more privilege over the other can inform researchers if a particular collaboration may actually perpetuate the existing hierarchy of power instead of increasing the voices of the underprivileged. Understand the issues within the privileging dilemma will allow collaborators to be cognizant in not overlooking the perspectives and
interests of the less privileged parties, especially if they will be impacted by the decisions of the intervention activities.

*The exploitation dilemma:* Given the reality that an increasing number of anti-trafficking interventions are mandated by funding agencies to involve community-based organizations to implement the planned activities (UNODC, 2008), ethical concerns arise when local organizations and voluntary groups are expected to sustain the activities once the funded program is over (Guttman, 2000, p. 196). The goals of institutionalizing intervention activities into community-based organizations may distract them from other community priorities and make public agencies less accountable in performing tasks that should originally be their primary functions (Green, 1989). Exploitation of community organizations may occur especially in cases where local members are not involved in the initial design of intervention goals and activities, increasing the likelihood that community interests will not be served in the long run (Guttman, 2000, p. 197). In addition, collaborative programs in which external actors dominate the intervention design may impose unnecessary control over the local framing of human trafficking issue. To avoid this issue, it is critical to engage community partners in the initial design of the program and discuss if institutionalizing planned activities is a feasible option. One way to decrease exploitation is to assess community readiness to ensure the local partners have the impetus, willingness and commitment to get involved in the interventions and that they will not be imposed with sanctions by external agencies if they decide not to participate. This leads us to the next ethical dilemma on control.

*The control dilemma:* The by-product of implementing community-based collaborative interventions is the surveillance of target population behavior that can be
pervasive and violate the rights to privacy (Duncan & Cribb, 1996). During the implementation of an intervention, stakeholders may have access to sensitive information from community groups. This is particularly dangerous for an issue of human trafficking, in which target populations are often undocumented migrants, sex workers or ethnic populations without legal status. For example, law enforcement agencies who are part of the coalition may leak information about where undocumented migrants reside and they may be harassed, arrested and deported. Participating government agencies, especially in countries with harsh state control, may overstep their role by promoting sanctions against community organizing that is deemed disruptive, despite it being a necessary tactic to increase public awareness on the plight of undocumented workers who are victims of human trafficking. On the other hand, anti-trafficking interventions in which foreign agencies are involved may try to exert what is good, bad or normal, and the intervention becomes a function of control (Duncan & Cribb, 1996). This can be problematic if function of control refers to empowering target communities to demand human rights or participate in public discourse, which may disrupt the function of local authority or human trafficking rings. This disruption invites retaliation against local communities, especially those that are shunned by the public, as they are perceived to not be in the position to establish what is right or wrong in the society. To prevent the negative consequences of the control dilemma, protocols of maintaining participants’ confidentiality should be clearly implemented. NGOs or FBOs should never initiate an intervention that violate laws of the local jurisdiction and place target participants at risks of arrest and prosecution. Buy-in from governmental agencies should be achieved before the intervention is launched.
The above ethical issues lead me to the final research question to inquire if anti-trafficking coalitions face any ethical dilemmas during the design and implementation of a community-based collaboration. And if they do, what are those ethical dilemmas? (RQ4). Understanding these ethical dilemmas can help anti-trafficking coalitions to prepare and minimize the unintended consequences that may occur in collaboration.

**Conceptual Framework**

The research questions in this study are driven by the antecedents-process-outcomes framework of collaboration (Wood & Gray, 1991; Thomson & Perry, 2006) and the ethical dilemmas of collaboration (Guttman, 2000). The conceptual framework is helpful as it guides researchers to (a) identify who should or should not be included in the study, (b) explain relationships based on logic, theory and/or experience, and (c) equip the researchers with tools to categorize general constructs into defined themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 18).

Figure 2.2 The antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics framework of collaboration *Adapted from Wood & Gray (1991), Guttman (2000), Thomson & Perry (2006)
The conceptual framework of antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics is expected to change as data are gathered and analyzed if they fit into the variables under the antecedents, process, outcomes and ethical dilemmas categories. Findings from interviewees and document review in this study will reveal the prominent variables that are valued by members of anti-trafficking coalitions during various stages of collaboration. This conceptual framework also provides a practical structure for report as it confines the parameters of findings (Baxter & Jack, 2008) that would be useful to answer the four research questions. While a conceptual framework serves as a useful tool to guide this study, it may limit the inductive approach, given the novelty of collaborative research in the context of anti-trafficking interventions. Semi-structured interviews are therefore employed to mitigate the risks of overreliance from the framework by giving participants room to narrate their experiences of collaboration that may not be prompted by the variables of this framework.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The overarching aim of this thesis is to advance our understanding on community-based collaboration and investigate the collaborative process within the coalitions of anti-trafficking organizations, at-risk communities, donor agencies and local governments who play different roles in designing, implementing and evaluating human trafficking prevention interventions.

In this chapter, I will describe the research methods, case selection criteria, study sites, sample selection of interviewees, data collection instruments, type of analysis and establishing trustworthiness in the study. This case study will utilize data from two community-based human trafficking prevention interventions in Thailand and the Philippines in 2011. Sixteen interviews from two anti-trafficking coalitions who were directly involved in the community-based human trafficking prevention interventions were conducted to reveal the answers to our research questions. In addition, review of documentation such as project documents, meeting agendas, meeting minutes and evaluation reports are collected to describe the context and history of each case.

Exploratory Case Study

An exploratory case study of community-based collaboration in anti-human trafficking interventions will be conducted by collecting and analyzing data from document review and semi-structured interviews. The units of analysis are meaningful statements within the discourse of the interviewed members and the documents from the two anti-trafficking coalitions that were formed to plan and implement human trafficking prevention interventions in two countries in 2011. Case study context and history were
established through analysis of meeting minutes, memoranda of understanding, and other project documents while individuals’ perspectives on the coalition and its process were collected in interviews.

The qualitative case study is a methodological approach for research that allows exploration of a complex phenomenon in context through collection of multiple data sources from a single entity or event (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The triangulation of data sources is one of the main strengths of a case study approach as it enables researchers to look at the studied phenomenon through multiple lenses, leading to more comprehensive understanding of the issue. Due to its flexibility and robustness, case study generates more in depth and richer sources of data and can be used to explore individuals, organizations, interventions, relationships, communities, or programs and develop theory, understand process of interventions and evaluate programs (Yin, 2003).

Yin (1984, 2003) suggests that case study should be considered under the following conditions: (a) the purpose of the research is to answer “how” and “why” questions; (b) the behavior of research participants cannot be manipulated; (c) the contextual factors relevant to the study are to be explored; (d) ambiguous understanding of relationships between the phenomenon and context and (e) there is a low frequency of occurrence in the natural environment. An exploratory case study is therefore appropriate for this study because most of the research questions emphasize on the “how” and “why”, the inability of the researcher to control the collaborative processes in the selected cases, the main focus in exploring contextual factors that facilitate collaboration, and the lack of empirical research that provides solid understanding of the anti-trafficking collaborative process. Similar research on collaborative models have also employed case study as a
method within the anti-human trafficking context. Small (2007) utilized data from two cases in the US to explore characteristics of effective community justice partnerships to identify, rescue and provide need services for victims of human trafficking. In another study by the Department of Justice (2002), partnership models to provide service for human trafficking victims in Denver city were found to be successful through the examination of a case study research.

One of the common pitfalls associated with case study is that there is a tendency for researchers to attempt to answer a question that is too broad or a topic that has too many objectives for one study. In order to avoid this problem, several authors including Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) have suggested that placing boundaries on a case can prevent this problem from occurring. Suggestions on how to bind a case include: (a) by time and place (Creswell, 2003); (b) time and activity (Stake, 1995); and (c) by definition and context (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Given limited resources and timeframe for this thesis study, the parameters of data collection in each of the two cases would utilize the conceptual framework of antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics and focus on the community-based collaboration among stakeholders who were involved in the planning and implementation of the anti-trafficking youth forum activities in Thailand and the Philippines in 2011.

**Overall Procedures**

This study uses a multiple case study design with data collected from two collaboration cases in Thailand and the Philippines. Multiple case study design contains more than a single case, allows the researcher to examine differences within and between cases, and gives us more confidence on the validity of findings than a single case study.
(Yin, 2003). Each of the two cases is carefully selected and is expected to generate similar replications because each case represents an anti-trafficking coalition that collaborate to plan and implement the same program of a prevention intervention. An important step to obtain replication is the development of a conceptual framework that outlines the conditions and factors in which the issue of interest is likely to be found (Yin, 1994). Two data sources will be used to answer the four research questions in each case. First, I will conduct a document review to describe the history of collaboration, lay the context of a community-based anti-trafficking intervention and outline the process in each case setting. Documents include meeting minutes, project documents, memorandum of understandings among partners and evaluation reports. Second, semi-structured interviews with coalition members are conducted to gather participants’ views and a story of collaboration. The themes that emerge out of these two data sources are analyzed under the antecedent-process-outcome-ethics of collaboration framework (Wood & Gray, 1991; Guttman, 2000).

Case Study Selection

The two cases of community-based anti-trafficking collaboration were identified through purposive selection, which is a nonrandom strategy of selection when the cases of interest are rare (Yin, 1993). The criteria for case study selection were (a) Multi-party population which were involved in a collaborative intervention on human trafficking prevention in a community-based setting, (b) Included diverse stakeholders, particularly international NGOs, community-based organizations and youth groups, (c) the intervention had been launched, implemented or completed within the past two years to reduce recall bias, (d) permitted access to project documents, meeting minutes and related
agreement documents, (e) diverse participants with varied geographical and cultural context to generate data with width and depth, and (f) willingness to participate in the study.

After the case study criteria were developed, I identified Foundation A as an entry point to provide me with access to potential cases of community-based anti-trafficking collaborations. Foundation A is a charity founded by a global television network and is well known for its large-scale anti-trafficking campaigns across the world. I made a telephone interview with a community outreach associate at Foundation A to inquire if they were willing to participate in this study and allowed me to access documents and stakeholders’ contacts in the project sites where they had implemented community-based collaboration for the anti-trafficking youth forum interventions. After understanding that the purpose of this study was to investigate the preconditions, process, outcomes and ethical dilemmas of collaboration in the context of human trafficking prevention programs, Foundation A agreed to participate as this research would provide them with valuable reflections from their partners, lessons learned and recommendations on how the interventions could be improved in the future. In addition, I had to sign a confidentiality agreement with Foundation A that I would not refer any organizations in the coalitions by real names and disguised any identifiable information of the research participants to preserve their privacy (see Appendix A). The two cases selected were located in Thailand and the Philippines respectively. Each case consisted of an anti-trafficking coalition of Foundation A, international non-profit organizations (iNPOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations
(CBOs) and youth groups who were involved in the community-based collaboration to plan and implement the youth forum activity in their country.

**Case Study Population**

This research utilizes data of two cases from the same anti-trafficking campaign in Thailand and the Philippines. This campaign was launched in Southeast Asia in the mid 2000s to create awareness and increase prevention of human trafficking among youth through dissemination of documentaries, public service announcements (PSAs) and music videos on cable and local TV channels. Since its focus on television broadcasting during Phase I (2006 - 2008), the campaign has expanded its activities in Phase II (2009 – 2010) to include large-scale concerts and outreach activities such as documentary screenings with local NGOs and CBOs. The campaign became one of most visible anti-human trafficking efforts in the world due to its innovative use of entertainment education, high quality production and multi-media channels in reaching millions of young people to be aware of the danger of human trafficking. Despite wide audience reach, the program suffered from fleeting continuity, attributed to the lack of involvement with community-based organizations and at-risk communities who could take ownership of the campaign after the main activities (e.g., television broadcasting and concert events) ended.

Realizing this gap, a national youth forum was introduced as an additional component during the third phase (2011 – 2012) of its campaign. The goal was to create a new batch of young activists to become peer educators and active community organizers who would sustain campaigning efforts by promoting human trafficking awareness and prevention activities in their local communities. Using collaboration as a model,
Foundation A engaged anti-trafficking organizations and community-based organizations to form a coalition to design and implement this training activity. Youths from identified at-risk communities in Thailand and the Philippines were recruited to participate in a national forum where they received intensive training on topics such as human trafficking, campaign planning, scripting, media production, film editing, and presentation skills. The youths were 15 to 28 years old, fluent in native language, had good computer literacy and were active with community-based organizations that worked on anti-trafficking activities. Peer education was utilized in this intervention due to its popularity as a strategy in promoting healthy behavior among youths in developing countries (Agha & Rossem, 2004; Brieger, et al., 2001; Merati, et al., 1997).

The two youth forum events in this study represent a shift in focus towards collaboration with stakeholders and beneficiaries. It is through collaboration with local organizations and youth leaders that Foundation A aims to increase sustainability for its anti-trafficking campaign. 140 youths from over 40 communities in Thailand and the Philippines were recruited to participate in the two national youth forums during the period of 2011. The youth forums were organized under the collaboration of the following entities; (i) bilateral donor agencies from the United States of America and Australia; (ii) managing agency: Foundation A, the main intervention grantee and lead agency that specializes in multi-media production and campaigning; (iii) international non-profit organizations (iNPOs) and international faith-based organizations (iFBOs) that have large presence on human trafficking and youth development in Southeast Asia; (iv) local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) with working experience on human trafficking
prevention and maintain close working relationships with local communities and youth groups; (v) youth organizations that are active in volunteering on social issues; and (v) private companies: corporate sponsors and volunteers from advertising, public relations, and creative industries. Each forum included an intensive training on human trafficking, campaigning, media production, performance arts and presentation techniques. The training culminated into a closing ceremony in which the youths presented their final work to policy makers, media, collaborative partners and public audience.

It should be noted that Thailand was the first country in Southeast Asia that piloted this community-based collaboration initiative. A similar forum was subsequently implemented in the Philippines with some adjustment to the collaborative model based on lessons learned and local cultures. Each of the two cases consisted of a different combination of coalition members from donor agencies, Foundation A, iNPOs, FBOs, local NGOs, CBOs, private entities and youth groups. Most of the coalition members had previous working relationships before participating in planning and implementation of the youth forum activities. While each forum event lasted for only five days, the collaborative activities had long-term timelines as youth beneficiaries went back to their communities and continued to work with community-based organization partners to plan and implement human trafficking prevention campaigns. In addition, the forum did not take places in a vacuum but as part of strategic series of other campaigning activities such as national television broadcasting of documentaries, PSAs and a large-scale concert in which 25,000 to 50,000 people attended, a capacity building workshop for local anti-trafficking organizations, and road shows in the target areas where youth participants
originated from (outdoor screening of documentaries and related programs, and small concerts with a few thousand attendees).

Data Collection Tools and Procedures

The purpose of this exploratory collective case study is to understand the process and important aspects of community-based collaboration in the anti-trafficking interventions. The study utilized methodological triangulation, the use of multiple methods to study a single topic to gather rich data that had different layers of depth and perspectives (Denzin, 1978). The two methodological tools of data collection employed in this research were document review and semi-structured interviews. The research also used a similar case study protocol across all cases to enhance internal validity and keep focus on the variables of interest (Yin, 1993).

The sources of evidence and their functions in this study are summarized in Table 3.1 and described in details in the section below.

Table 3.1 Sources of evidence and their functions (adapted from Henderson, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Goal</th>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Analytical Method</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop case contexts, parameters, problem, participants and process</td>
<td>Documents (e.g., meeting minutes, project documents, memorandum of understandings and evaluation reports)</td>
<td>Content analysis</td>
<td>Web search, official document requests and informal interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify factors that enable antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics of collaboration and describe how these variables interact</td>
<td>Interviews of key representatives from the two anti-trafficking coalitions (e.g., project managers, coordinators, outreach officers, etc.)</td>
<td>NVivo software Coding based on the antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics conceptual framework</td>
<td>Recorded and transcribed semi-structured interviews (by Skype phone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Document Review**

The research used documents for an initial appraisal of each case (Yin, 1994; Susskind et al., 1999). Each review included meeting minutes, project documents, evaluation reports, memorandum of understanding documents among partners in the collaborative interventions, and press releases/articles from January to December 2011. The documents were obtained from official requests to project staff at Foundation A and its partners. I also signed an agreement that all the documents would be used as data for this academic research only and would not be distributed in their original formats to other parties.

I started to review project documents to understand the background for the need to form an anti-trafficking coalition, the stakeholders involved in the intervention and the goals of the collaboration. Program activities were then analyzed to provide the context of the problem and answer the research questions of why collaboration was chosen as an approach and what were the pros and cons that were considered before the program initiation. Information on needs assessment of the problem in each project location could also provide insights on the pre-conditions of collaboration and any ethical concerns that were addressed before the program began. Memorandum of understanding (MOU) and meeting minutes identified all the partners that were officially involved, and describe the collaborative process, especially governance and administration of the coalition (e.g., rules and regulation, management of the stakeholders, who was doing what, and how members made decisions). MOU and meeting minutes could also inform the expected frequency of interaction from the coalition members. Evaluation reports would be helpful in identifying what factors were measured during the implementation of the intervention
activity. These factors could reveal what collaborative dimensions and outcomes were valued by the anti-trafficking coalition and what was the expected level of change to achieve the goals of the collaboration. Press releases and related articles confirmed what particular activities had taken place and the information that was chosen to be communicated to the public. It should be noted that these documents were created to serve specific aims and used as communication evidence among the parties within the coalition. The data might not represent the absolute truth and the author would identify contradictory information and explored them further in the interviews.

The review of these documents resulted in a written summary of the case settings, the main collaborating actors, rationale for collaboration, the problem of human trafficking in each site, intervention goals and objectives, the process of collaboration and allocated resources for the program. This information and the antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics conceptual framework would assist the researcher to develop a code list for the transcribed interviews. In addition, key collaborating players for the interviews were identified and crosschecked with the contact recommendations by representatives from Foundation A.

*Semi-structured Interviews*

Interviews are considered one of the most important sources of information for case study, and they are often open-ended in nature to allow respondents to narrate the facts, opinions, and propose personal insights on the occurrence of interest (Yin, 1994, p. 84). Semi-structured interviews are selected for this study: they are a method of data collection in which an interviewer asks questions of a respondent either face-to-face or by telephone, using a set of pre-determined questions, but also allow flexibility for an
interviewer to pursue other questions that emerge in spontaneity from the discussion with participants (Polit & Beck, 2006; DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Semi-structured interviews provide numerous advantages to this study. By using pre-determined questions that are developed from the conceptual framework, the responses are expected to fall within the parameters of the research questions. As this study attempts to explore the nuances and factors within the anti-trafficking coalition, a relatively new territory of research with a dearth of empirical evidence, I can investigate data that contradicts or supplement the adopted conceptual framework of collaboration. In addition, the interviews situate me not only as an objective recording tool, but also an adaptive, emphatic and inquisitive person who must be skilled in building trust, encouraging in-depth responses and observing meticulously verbal and non-verbal details without imposing certain views on the interviewees (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The method also elicits examples, narratives, stories, comparisons, motivations and explanations from the interviewee. Not only that, misunderstandings could be clarified and corrected when I summarized my interpretation of the interviewee’s point of views. The downside of the semi-structure, in-depth interviews is its reliance on one-on-one interaction between the interviewee and the researcher. Quality data may be compromised if the interviewee is unfamiliar with semi-structured interviews, apprehensive about the research agenda or not culturally proficient in disclosing personal experiences (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). To overcome these disadvantages, I tried to build rapport and understanding with participants by introducing the scope of the research study and the overview methodology and allow them to ask any questions or concerns about the study before moving on to the interviewing questions.
A semi-structured interview guide included items focused on the variables of interest from the research questions and the conceptual framework. I conducted interviews with 15 members of anti-trafficking coalitions who were involved in the planning, implementation or participation of the youth forum activity. As a lead agency of the intervention, I interviewed a project staff from Foundation A first to identify key participants from the coalition in each project site. Coalition members in each site were then approached for an interview. The sampling criteria for the participants were as followed: (a) consistent attendance in the project meetings, (b) a significant role (e.g., lead contact of the participating organizations, manager of a forum section, etc.), (c) at least one participant from each major stakeholder group, and (d) provided crucial resources (labor or funding) for the intervention. Twenty-five coalition members were initially approached to participate in the study. Ten people were dropped from this study as they failed to meet the sampling criteria. Despite the drop out, at least one individual from a major stakeholder group in each coalition participated in the interview. In the end, 15 participants participated in the study with 9 for the case in Thailand and 7 for the case in the Philippines. The total number of participants is 15 instead of 16 because one participant from Foundation A was interviewed twice as she was heavily involved in both cases (see Table 3.2 for the breakdown of interviewed participants in each case). Sixteen interviews in total were conducted and they ranged in length from 31 minutes to 1 hour and 50 minutes with 1 hour and 14 minutes being the mean length. All of the interviews were conducted via Skype, audio-recorded through a computer software that captured the conversation and I transcribed the audio files for analysis.
Table 3.2 Breakdown of the interviewed participants in Thailand and the Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNPOs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBOs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Human participants research approval was obtained from the Office for Research Protections at the Pennsylvania State University. Each participant was recruited by phone or email with an invitation to participate in a one-on-one Skype interview. About one week prior to the interview schedule, consent form was emailed to the participant so he/she could agree to participate by replying to the email. Before the interview, I identified myself as a Penn State researcher, informed the participants that the study was being conducted for a research purpose, gave them description of the procedures that the participant would do as part of the study, stated that participation was voluntary, could end at any time if they wished, and that they could choose to not answer any specific questions (see Appendix B).

The interview questions for this study (see Table 3.3) were structured to answer the four research questions and were developed from the conceptual framework of antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics that were described in details in chapter two. The main interview questions were translated from the research questions to help participants have an easier time in answering from their own experiences, rather than diving directly into discussing the theoretical understanding of the issue (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). In order to elicit effective responses, the main questions that asked respondents to describe what happened, how it happened, and under what situation that it happened would be better in
generating concrete answers. This was because most participants were more comfortable in describing situations that took place, than discussing about deeper and more complex issues that would need background build up and explanation of concepts. For example, under research question one, the main interview question started out with “Could you step me through the circumstances that led you to decide to join the coalition for this intervention?” The wording of this question started out broadly to let the participant walk me through the situation that explained the factors that led them into the anti-trafficking coalition. It also gave the respondent opportunity to talk about the program context and historical background that was important for further discussion.

After hearing the description, I used follow-up and probe questions to examine factors that underlay the topic of interest. This question was followed by “Specific to this program, how do you think collaboration was more effective than working alone?” This led the respondent to answer more precisely on why they think collaboration was an effective strategy in the anti-trafficking intervention. The order of this questioning led participants to reveal potential factors of interest such as need for resource mobilization within the sector and history of collaborative efforts that were essential in initiating a coalition. I then used probes, largely adapted from the operationalization of variables by Thomson, Perry and Miller, (2007, 2008) that have been used to measure collaboration. Probes provide me with more elaboration of the particular concept. For example, probes such as “What were the resources required to plan and implement this intervention?” and “How were these resources divided among members of the coalition?” would provide the interviewer with insights on the necessary pre-conditions that allow the stakeholders to be able work together. While this study aimed to identify factors that enable and facilitate
collaboration, I also made sure to ask interviewees on the factors that hindered, broke down or caused conflicts. Some of these questions included description of any incidents that the participants felt they were being exploited or lost out in the coalition, any tensions that occurred during the collaborative process, if they were satisfied with the eventual make-up of the coalition members and reflected if anyone had been deliberately excluded.

The interview questions in this study used chronological order that were found in the process of collaboration, e.g., their reflections on how they were recruited into the coalition, the factors they considered before their participation, what happened during the process of collaboration, what they think of the outcomes of the coalition, and ethical dilemmas that they considered during the collaborative process. This logical sequence helped the interviewer to have an easier time in recalling their experiences from each stage of the event, and explained the potential consequences of one action to the next (e.g., from pre-condition stage to collaborative process stage). This strategy was also useful for coding of data, as recorded discussion could be extracted under the sequence of conceptual framework.

It should be noted that not all of the follow-ups and probes in Table 4 were used in this study. Unless raised by the participants, follow-ups and probes could mislead them to discuss collaborative variables from the literature review that I thought would be salient in their experiences. Rather than pushing for the discussion of all 20 variables in the conceptual framework, I was flexible in letting the participants answer the initial main questions and took their time to reflect their experiences. I made appropriate probes and follow-ups spontaneously, depending on the flow of the conversation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ. 1) Why do anti-human trafficking actors view community-based collaboration as an effective approach in human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the perceived factors that enable them to form a coalition to initiate anti-trafficking interventions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions related to pre-conditions of collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Could you step me through the circumstances that led you to decide to join the coalition for this intervention? How were you recruited into this intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What were some of the key factors that you and your organization consider before committing to participate in the coalition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What were the criteria for selecting the local partners and youth participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Were you satisfied with the eventual make-up of the coalition members? Did you think anyone was excluded?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential follow-ups and probes**

- Could you describe other approaches to deliver an intervention that you have been involved and found to be as successful?
- Interdependence
  - Specific to this program, how do you think collaboration was an effective approach than working alone?
  - Why do you think community-based collaboration is necessary for this anti-trafficking intervention? Please describe your experience when collaboration assisted you to accomplish goals, objectives or activities that you would not otherwise have accomplished.
- Resource scarcity, need for resource and risk sharing
  - What were the costs/resources required to plan and implement this intervention?
  - How were these costs/resources divided among members of the coalition?
  - Did each coalition partner have resources that others did not have?
- History of efforts to collaborate
  - Could you describe the previous working experiences with the coalition members?
  - How did previous experiences help you to decide to participate in this intervention?
- Community readiness
  - How did you make sure the community participants have sufficient resources, capacity, networks and motivations to join the activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ. 2) How do anti-trafficking coalitions manage the collaborative process in designing and implementing community-based human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the factors perceived by coalition members to have facilitated the collaborative process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions related to process of collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After the coalition is formed, could you walk me through the collaborative process to plan and implement this intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How did the coalition arrive at the intervention goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potential follow-ups and probes**

- Governance
  - How did the coalition decide on the rules that govern how each member behave (e.g., how program ideas were generated and who made decisions)?
  - Did the coalition take your opinion seriously? Explain.
- Administration
  - Please describe your role and responsibility toward the coalition.
  - Did you understand others’ roles and responsibilities? Describe.
  - What was your contribution on the coalition goals? Do you think all coalition members were aware of those goals?
- How did information get communicated among the coalition members?
- How often did the coalition meet before the youth forum event? How did the meetings help the function of the coalition?
- Organizational autonomy
  - Did you have independence to decide what you should or should not do in this coalition? What were some of the internal organizational process before you can agree to commit to certain tasks?
  - How did your involvement in this intervention affect your existing responsibility for your own organization?
  - Please describe any specific incidents where your independence was compromised to fulfill your roles in this coalition.
- Mutuality
  - What are the common interests (e.g., organizational mission, values and target population) that you share with other coalition members?
  - How do you think other coalition members perceived your contribution?
  - Could you describe a particular incident that you think your contribution has strengthened other members’ operation?
  - What do you think of the distribution of resources, costs and benefits among partners?
  - Were there any incidents when you felt you were exploited or lost out by being involved in this coalition? Please explain.
  - What were the benefits that you gain from this participation? Compared to other members, are you satisfied with your benefits? Please explain.
- Norms of trust and reciprocity
  - How would you define trust between you and other coalition members?
  - How long did it take for you to develop trust with other members to accomplish assigned tasks?
  - Was there any point during the collaboration that you felt like leaving the coalition? Why?

RQ. 3) What are the main collaborative outcomes that are valued by coalition members?

Questions related on outcomes of collaboration
- How did the coalition decide on the key outcomes of this collaboration?
- What are those outcomes?
- What changes have you seen from collaborating with the partners in the coalition? (e.g., trust, network ties and knowledge)
- Were there any negative outcomes? Please explain.

Potential follow-ups and probes
- Problem resolution/goal achievement
  - What are the goals of the intervention by the coalition? How would you contribute collaboration in accomplishing those goals?
- Social capital
  - Describe how trust and working relationships are created during the collaboration and how they produce benefits within and outside of this intervention.
- Creation of shared meaning
  - How did collaboration help you to better understand the problem of human trafficking? Please describe how you other members’ views could or could not help you to develop your future prevention interventions.
- Changes in networks structure
  - Would you continue to collaborate with your coalition members? How would increased interactions help your organization?
- Shifts in power distribution
  - How would you access the change in distribution of power among coalition members
I made reflective memos, the written thought that occurred to the interviewer during and after the interview, to describe the nuances in verbal reactions, valiant narratives, contradictions and limitations (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). These memos helped me to reflect significant interruptions that may obfuscate my interpretations of the data and enhance my self-reflexivity during and after the interview with each research participant. It also helped me to refine research questions and make connection of themes and concepts to the literature review.

Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed, coded, and analyzed using NVivo software. The primary data for analysis in this study were project documents, meeting minutes, evaluation reports, press articles, sixteen audio files of recorded interviews and self-reflective memos. An analytic plan in this study consisted of three steps, which were
sorting, coding and analyzing data. First, transcripts and related documents were scanned for sections and phrases of concern to trim data to a manageable size to particular categories or themes. Selected phrases were then transferred from the transcripts and related documents to the NVivo program, phrases from each of the two cases were filed separately so as not to confuse observed variances between the cases.

Second, through the process of open coding, which is “naming and categorizing of phenomena through close examination of data,” phrases were coded according to themes and categories that emerge from the interview questions outline (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 62). A constant comparison technique (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was employed to develop and refine the codes by comparing and contrasting old and new findings to check if they were different or similar. Axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was subsequently performed to connect codes into central categories that represent key themes. Four themes were created to organize the four research questions as (i) antecedents of collaboration (RQ1), (ii) process of collaboration (RQ2), (iii) outcomes of collaboration (RQ3), and (v) ethical dilemmas of collaboration (RQ4). Using the conceptual framework of antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics, approximately 23 categories were assigned under the four themes. Phrases selected were coded into an appropriate category that matched its definition and description, and were expected to display rich explanation with examples of the studied phenomenon. Table 6 displayed the organization of themes and categories in this study.
Table 3.4 Interview codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Potential Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antecedents of collaboration</strong></td>
<td>- Mandatory policy from funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource mobilization among diverse stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cultural relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased likelihood of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need for resources and risk sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource scarcity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- History of collaborative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process of collaboration</strong></td>
<td>- Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Organizational autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mutuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Norms of trust and reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes of collaboration</strong></td>
<td>- Problem resolution/goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creation of shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changes in network structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shifts in the power distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical dilemmas of collaboration</strong></td>
<td>- Privileging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, using the data coded into the NVivo program, data were examined to extract meanings and to verify conclusions (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Since the purpose of this research was to explore the collaborative process of community-based anti-trafficking interventions in two different sites, data were compared and analyzed between the two cases using the theme-oriented strategy (Huberman & Miles, 1994). Cross studies comparison could increase the external validity of findings. However, the process could also eliminate unique, outlier details found in an individual case as I had to make judgment calls to generalize the replications. To avoid this problem, summaries for both
cross-case and within-case were written to capture the replicated and individual findings as organized under the five themes (Patton, 1990).

Finally, in order to improve the validity and accuracy of the study, interviewed participants were offered to review each case narrative and analysis for content errors. Participants were also given opportunities to raise any concerns of sensitive information that might expose their identity or put them in harmful position and the information was altered to make them anonymous. In addition to the above analytic approach that was used to reduce weaknesses of qualitative research, this study also identified four widely used protocols to ensure the quality of this case study. They were described in the next section.

Validity and Trustworthiness

This study followed the basic protocols that are recommended to establish the quality and trustworthiness of the case study research (Baxter & Jack, 2008). They are described below.

*Research questions are clearly stated and substantiated:* The four research questions in this study were carefully developed and substantiated from a thorough review of collaboration theories from multiple disciplines, including those within the context of human trafficking and those theories are integrated into the antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics framework that became a foundation of the data collection instrument. The literature review should strengthen construct and internal validity of the case study.

*Case study design is appropriate for the research questions:* To answer the four research questions which consisted of ‘how’ and ‘why’ of an event that has taken place
and the researcher has no control, case study is the preferred method of investigation. Quantitative methods such as experiments and surveys were not used as this study was exploratory in nature. The author was interested to learn from anti-trafficking members on their perspectives on the collaborative process and salient factors they experience during the design and implementation of an intervention. The pre-determined categories of coding were mainly created from the conceptual framework that was based on the literature of collaboration in the context of public administration and health communication. A qualitative study was employed to explore if these variables were common occurrence in the context of anti-trafficking collaboration. Since no prior empirical studies have utilized a multi-disciplinary, theory-driven method of investigation to analyze anti-trafficking coalitions, it was more appropriate to use case study design to confirm findings, and subsequently use the results as a basis for quantitative research in the future.

In order to enhance data credibility, triangulation of two data sources was utilized in this study. This ensured that collaboration issue could be explored from multiple lenses. In addition, two cases were employed to allow comparison and confirmation of data under different context and settings. As a former employee in an anti-trafficking organization in Southeast Asia, I have significant exposure and experience on the issue of human trafficking intervention and have personal connections and rapport with several organizations in this study. This helped me to gain trust and valuable insights quickly, but also increased social desirability of responses (Krefting, 1991) as participants might still associate me with my former employer. While some personal biases might exist, I addressed this issue by clearly stating my status as an independent academic researcher.
from Penn State University and that participants’ identity would not be revealed to donors or managing agencies.

*Appropriate purposeful sampling strategies have been applied:* Six purposeful sampling criteria were developed for case study selection to ensure the two cases consisted of accessible, documented and diverse multi-party actors in anti-trafficking interventions with significant information on collaboration. Interview participants were also selected based on careful consideration of their roles in the function of the collaborative intervention, and ability to provide unique perspectives that represented an important stakeholder group. The sampling strategies were shared and discussed with Foundation A to accommodate the reality of the potential participants.

*Data are collected and managed systematically:* Similar data collection protocols were maintained across the two cases to ensure consistency. To strengthen the credibility of collected data, I wrote reflection memos immediately after each interview to note valiant reactions, contradictions and limitations. At the analysis stage, dependability of the data was confirmed by a process of double coding, in which I revisited the same set of data to ensure they were coded correctly (Krefting, 1991).

*Data are analyzed correctly:* To ensure that data were collected and analyzed correctly, I would share the research summary and interpretation of data results with participants so they could verify information, remove inaccuracy and expand on any issues of interest that may arise after the interviews were conducted (Russell et al., 2005).

The five protocols were carefully adopted into the study to ensure this thesis was rigorously designed to maximize credibility, validity and trustworthiness. The steps of this process were clearly stated in hope that the study could be replicated or compared
with similar studies of collaboration in the context of human trafficking prevention interventions.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS DISCUSSION

This chapter presents results of the analyses from the two cases described in Chapter 3. I will first narrate the context of the two cases and describe key coalition members and their roles in the planning and implementation of the anti-trafficking intervention. I will then discuss the findings with excerpts and examples from the document review and interview data under the four research questions.

Context of the Two Cases in Thailand and the Philippines

This section includes the review of Foundation A’s documents which included project proposals, reports and memorandum of understanding (MOU) as the sources of information. The review resulted in the summary of the origin of the anti-trafficking intervention and Foundation A’s collaborative engagement strategy in the two cases.

Foundation A renewed a cooperative partnership agreement with the US and Australian governmental agencies in 2010 to extend the support for its campaign activities to 2013. Both governmental agencies provide foreign assistance to developing countries on issues such as global health, human rights and democracy. Both countries see international aid as advancing their foreign policy interests and values as well as promoting stability and prosperity in the Asia Pacific region. The US’s commitment to combat human trafficking stems from the passage of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) in 2000. On the other hand, Australia’s motivations are guided by the pursuit of the eight Millennium Development Goals that include poverty eradication and gender equality, two of the main underlying factors that increase the susceptibility of people to traffickers and exploitative employers. Since 2006, a total of over $10.75 million was
directed by these agencies to support anti-trafficking campaigns by Foundation A. While the two governments primarily played the role of donors, they also had input into campaign design (e.g., advising on project site selection), leveraged resources through international networks such as recruiting high-level policy-makers to participate in the activities, and conducted auditing for purposes of program transparency and accountability.

Under this renewed partnership, Foundation A proposed a national youth forum as the new component of the ongoing anti-trafficking campaign activities which included television broadcasting of documentaries, PSAs and music videos, and organization of large scale awareness-raising concerts in target countries. The goals of the forum were to create a network of youth activists, who they would be trained to promote human trafficking awareness in their own communities, and to build a sustainable coalition of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs) and government agencies to support the youth participants in implementing anti-trafficking activities. Each of the two cases in this study focused on the community-based collaboration between Foundation A and related stakeholders that were involved in the design and implementation of the national youth forum activity in Thailand and the Philippines respectively.

The youth forum intervention employed a Use-Collaboration Model which depended on the high involvement with CBOs to carry out the goals of the intervention (Guttman, 2000, p. 143). The goal of the youth forum was already defined by Foundation A before other organizations and community groups were approached to get involved in the project. However, community involvement is high as a strategy because Foundation
A had to rely on collaborative efforts with local NGOs, CBOs and youth groups. The participation of local NGOs and CBOs is valued as a mean to achieve the predetermined goal (Guttman, 2000, p. 153) of this intervention since they are expected to help design the forum activities and continue working with the youths to roll out campaigning activities in the local communities. The end product of the community involvement strategy is the institutionalization of the campaign (Lefebvre, 1990): encouraging local NGOs, CBOs and youth groups to take over the objectives of the intervention once Foundation A withdraws.

In order to carry out the youth forum intervention, Foundation A initiated contact with international non-profit organizations (iNPOs), faith-based organizations (FBOs), local NGOs, CBOs and youth groups in each target country to join a Foundation A-led coalition to plan the youth forum, recruit at least 40 youths from at-risk communities, design appropriate protocols and agenda that would achieve the goals of the youth forum, implement the activity and continue to support youths in conducting anti-trafficking prevention activities in their communities. In this case, a coalition is defined as an inter-organizational, cooperative and synergistic working alliance who agree to work together to achieve a common goal on a long-term basis (Butterfoss, et al., 1993). While there were variations in the number of participating organizations in the coalition in each case, the structure of the roles of the coalition members was similar across the two sites (see Figure 4.1).
Foundation A approached relevant organizations, groups and individuals that met at least one of the following conditions: (a) the shared view of utilizing community-based collaboration as a strategy for anti-trafficking interventions; (b) similar interests on the issue of human trafficking prevention, youth development and empowerment; (c) existing networks with at-risk youth populations who could be recruited into the program; (d) local presence which allowed continual collaboration with the youth participants after the event ended; (e) finance and forum logistics: financial and/or labor resources to contribute to the planning and implementation of the youth forum, (f) child protection and youth management: experience on managing and ensuring the safety of youth participants during the forum implementation, and (g) forum training: expertise and capacity to deliver training sessions on human trafficking, and creative communication campaigns. As an organization with extensive media resources and the lead initiator of the intervention, Foundation A performed the roles of forum management, finance and media relations in both cases in Thailand and the Philippines. I will now describe the composition of collaborative members, their organization background and respective
roles in each case. I will also discuss the strategy of selecting some of those coalition members to become the research participants in this study. The information for the following section of Case #1 and Case #2 is derived from document reviews of Foundation A’s project proposals, reports, MOU, and meeting minutes, and interviews with the 15 participants.

Case #1: Coalition Members and their Roles in Thailand

Thailand was the first country in which the youth forum was implemented. A major city in the north was chosen as the event site due to its location as a hub with high level human trafficking activity (Yamada, 2011). The city has one of the largest populations in Thailand and attracts a high number of undocumented migrants, hill tribe villagers and stateless populations who come to seek employment opportunities. The city also is geographically situated near the Burma border and surrounded by highland areas, indicating proximity to at-risk communities that should be reached for campaigning efforts.

Table 4.1 shows the breakdown of key organizations that participated in the coalition to plan and implement the youth forum activity in Thailand. The table also displays the pseudonymous names of the coalition members from their respective organization that were interviewed in this study. Their corresponding roles in the youth forum were also summarized.

I started the interviews with Sarah from Foundation A as she is the lead coordinator for all of the youth forum events in the two cases. Sarah is a foreign expat from United Kingdom in her late 20s and has volunteered for an anti-trafficking organization in Cambodia for a year before joining Foundation A in Bangkok, Thailand.
Table 4.1 Roles of coalition members in Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Interviewed coalition members*</th>
<th>Positions in their organization</th>
<th>Roles in the youth forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation A</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Outreach Associate</td>
<td>Lead coordinator of the coalition, forum management, finance, logistics and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanida</td>
<td>Forum Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNPO A</td>
<td>Worawan</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Finance, child protection and youth management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iFBO A</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Regional Program Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO A</td>
<td>Chai</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Forum training director and trainer on anti-trafficking campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO A</td>
<td>Pimparn Korn</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Trainer on human trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO A</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Campaign Coordinator</td>
<td>Trainer on campaign development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO B</td>
<td>Kaew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All the names have been changed to maintain the confidentiality agreement with the research participants

She was recruited in early 2011 specifically to manage the youth forum interventions.

Sarah was responsible for identifying and engaging potential collaborators into the coalition, managing the forum event, budgeting, providing directions to other coalition members to fulfill their roles and responsibilities and preparing financial and project reports. She was also responsible for developing event agenda and content of individual sessions, recruiting appropriate trainers and supporting them with training materials.

Sarah provided me with an overview of the youth forum program, its goals, her engagement strategies with other collaborative partners, and gave me a recommended list of coalition members who I could contact to participate in this research study. I subsequently moved on to conduct interviews with other coalition members based on the chronological order in which they became part of the coalition. This interviewing order
helped me to better grasp the sequences of the collaborative process from Sarah’s engagement strategy with other parties, to when each coalition member made a decision to join the coalition, to how their roles in the youth forum were negotiated, and to what kind of planning and meeting that took place before the day of the event.

As Foundation A is located in Bangkok, Sarah first identified key stakeholders in the same city who had worked extensively on the issue of human trafficking and had existing networks with youths from at-risk communities. iNPO A and iFBO A were approached individually in early 2011 to be part of a coalition to organize the youth forum activity. iNPO A is a large international non-profit organization that operates in over 100 countries around the world and works primarily in child rights protection. Collaboration is officially published as one of its organizational values. iFBO A is an international faith-based organization with a large global network. Christian faith is the core value that drives them to help vulnerable children, families and communities to overcome poverty and injustice. iFBO A has large presence in Southeast Asia, with offices in local communities that served more than 100,000 children and youths across Thailand. In addition to the shared approach of helping at-risk youths through leadership skills and community empowerment, both organizations had previously collaborated on another youth forum, a regional event in Southeast Asia that gathered young delegates to discuss their views on migration and human trafficking, and subsequently presented their policy recommendations to the local governments.

According to Sarah, the goals of Foundation A’s forum were aligned similarly to the interests of iNPO A and iFBO A which had collaborated on the regional youth forum on migration and human trafficking. First, Foundation A aimed to train youths with
specific multi-media production and campaigning skills so they could produce communication materials that educate their peers, family members and neighbors in the local communities on human trafficking. Second, Foundation A’s initiative was a national event that focused most of its youth beneficiaries from high risk areas. Given the unique and complementary scope of Foundation A’s forum, Sarah was confident that iNPO A and iFBO A would agree to join the coalition to design and implement the event.

In the first meeting with iNPO A, Sarah reported that she met Worawan, a Thai project coordinator who was working on migrant children protection program, an issue where human trafficking falls under as it is one of the main risks that migrant children face in the Thai society. Worawan verified this meeting and stated “After Sarah presented us with the youth forum project, I had an internal discussion with my manager and we agreed that this intervention would be beneficial to our youths. We later confirmed with Sarah that our organization would help her to organize the youth forum.” I chose to interview Worawan for this study because she was the lead contact from iNPO A and subsequently played a significant role in helping Sarah to recruit 8 youth participants from one community in Thailand. In addition to participant recruitment, Worawan was responsible for designing and implementing a protocol to ensure safety and protection of youths who would come to the event. She later trained other chaperones who would be working directly with the youths to adhere to this protocol. For example, they had to be responsible in ensuring child safety at all times, could not develop physical/sexual relationships with youths, initiate inappropriate conducts such as inviting a youth to stay overnight in the room nor exhibit differential treatment to some children over the others. The protocol also called for respect of the rights of children to think and speak freely and
be sensitive to privacy and confidentiality of all children. Worawan told me that she attended all the meetings with Sarah and were present during the days of the forum to fulfill her role in ensuring that child protection protocols were followed and managed chaperones who accompanied youths at the event site.

Sarah proceeded to engage Adam, a regional program manager in Asia Pacific from iFBO A. Adam had been working on the issue of human trafficking for the past few years and was the lead contact from iFBO A. Adam recalled the first meeting with Sarah as follows:

Sarah approached us when Foundation A was developing plan to do anti-trafficking campaigns in Southeast Asia. They have already approached iNPO A and both of us are already working in cross border, education and human trafficking issues with young people…We have offices at the grassroots, the national and the regional levels. We have over 15 years of working relationships in certain local communities…My role in this project is to negotiate with Foundation A at the regional level, and come up with a clear plan, and we invite our national team to take ownership of the implementation of the youth forum.

I interviewed Adam because he was the main contact from iFBO A and was responsible for negotiating and appropriating human and financial resources from his organization in the collaboration with Foundation A. He made the decision to allocate approximately $8,000 to assist Foundation A in covering the costs of food, traveling and accommodation for youth participants. He also assigned a national team in Thailand to recruit 24 youths from 3 communities in their networks to participate in the forum.
Sarah recalled meeting with iNPO A and iFBO A separately for approximately three times in Bangkok to verify their roles and responsibilities and obtain feedback on the design of the forum agenda, and recruitment criteria for the youth participants. Sarah subsequently finalized the recruitment criteria for participants as followed: (i) age 15-24, (ii) fluent in Thai language, (iii) active in their communities and affiliated with a local NGO or a CBO, (iv) literate in computer, (v) equal representation of boys and girls, (vi) diverse economic background and ethnicity, (vii) some experience or interests in promoting human trafficking prevention, (viii) should attend with at least two other participants from the same community to ensure continued peer support upon returning home, (ix) consent to media coverage including filming and taking photographs of the participants during the activity and (x) parental consent for participants under the age of 18. Sarah shared this information with Worawan and Adam and gave them the flexibility to select the participants based on the established criteria. Worawan and Adam informed me that interested youths were nominated by their peers or directly apply to attend the forum themselves. In other communities, staff from local organizations or district offices selected youths with outstanding leadership quality to enroll in the event. Youth applicants also answered a short survey (developed by Foundation A) to report their existing knowledge of human trafficking, computer skills and specific interests in training topics (e.g., video filming, film editing, script writing, public speaking and presentation or campaign planning). The information from these surveys was later analyzed by Sarah to design the training program.

After enrolling iNPO A and iFBO A into the coalition, Sarah made the next plan to travel to northern Thailand to engage local anti-trafficking organizations into the
coalition. It was during this trip that she realized her limitation in Thai language was becoming a barrier for her to engage with local organizations. Sarah reflected “Unlike Bangkok, many of the people we approached in northern Thailand could not communicate fluently in English. In addition, I had to start making logistical plan which included identifying venues and other local vendors. It was impossible to deal with all of these in English. I raised this issue to my manager and we made a swift decision to hire another Thai staff to support me in local coordination.”

Foundation A eventually recruited Vanida to fulfill the position of a local forum coordinator. She became a focal person who managed event logistics which included confirming forum venues, arranging accommodation, travel, food and equipments for the trainers and participants. Vanida said that she came on board approximately one month before the event took place. She had previously worked as a forum coordinator for the regional youth forum on migration and human trafficking with iNPO A and FBO A. She brought with her a wealth of experience and credibility as she was considered a veteran among the anti-trafficking community in Thailand and already had pre-existing relationships with many members of the coalition. Vanida became an obvious choice for me to interview because she was the main Thai staff from Foundation A who was assigned to work on the forum. She was able to provide me with in-depth details of the meetings and interactions among coalition members that took place in Thai language.

Vanida narrated that she and Sarah traveled from Bangkok to the north to approach NGO A, FBO A and CBO A into the coalition. NGO A is a local anti-trafficking coordinating agency in northern Thailand. It functions as a network center to provide a range of services in prevention, protection and prosecution by coordinating
with local governments, law enforcement agencies, shelters and CBOs. Given its status as a coordinating agency on human trafficking, NGO A has extensive expertise and local knowledge on human trafficking situation in the country and could join the coalition as forum trainers to educate youth participants on human trafficking topics. Vanida further explained the rationale for approaching NGO A:

We approached Pimparn, the director of NGO A, to become a trainer in the youth forum. We thought that having a local expert who understands the unique human trafficking situations across Thailand would be beneficial for our youth participants who were recruited from five different communities around the country…. She accepted our invitation to be part of the coalition as the goals of the forum activity matched respectably with her organization mission. Pimparn also pulled in her deputy director, Korn, to assist her in planning and delivering training sessions on human trafficking.

Vanida continued to recount that her team moved on to engage FBO A, a local faith-based organization in northern Thailand that serves young ethnic minority women, especially those in remote hill tribe populations who are especially vulnerable to become victims of human trafficking. Sarah and Vanida met with the director of FBO A who assigned Nat to join the coalition as a trainer to support in the implementation of the youth forum intervention. Nat is a campaign coordinator at FBO A and is responsible for managing community-based anti-trafficking campaigns in the remote hill tribe areas for the past five years. As an experienced community campaigner, Nat would lead a training session on campaign development.
Sarah added that Pimparn referred her to meet with Chai, the director of CBO A, a community-based organization that focuses on educating youths on social issues through the use of community theatre performance and other creative arts. Chai has been working with local youths to deliver anti-trafficking campaigns through street and theatre performances in local villages in the north of Thailand for nearly twenty years. He met with Sarah and Vanida and agreed to join the coalition. Chai stated that “the youth forum was an excellent platform for me to contribute my experience and assist participants to become better anti-trafficking activists for their communities.” He accepted the role of a trainer in a session on grassroots campaign development. Given his long established career in community campaigning, Chai later took on an additional role as a training director to ensure there was seamless integration of human trafficking, child protection and cultural sensitivity content in all of the training sessions in the youth forum. This was an important role as he would guide other trainers, especially those from the private sector with no experience in the field of human trafficking, to not only focus on the artistic and creative aspects in the training, but also on communicating accurate prevention messages.

I made an arrangement to interview Pimparn, Korn, Nat and Chai as they were representatives of local anti-trafficking organizations that could provide me with insights on the collaborative process with the coalition members from Bangkok. All of them were trainers who could reflect on the interactions within the coalition during the planning and implementation of the youth forum activity. They also would be the good sources of information on collaborative outcomes as they were able to observe changes that occur with the youth participants due to their networks with the local communities.
In addition to the trainers from the anti-trafficking sector, Sarah said that she recruited five volunteers from the corporate sector who were specialists in filmmaking, public relations, and advertising campaigns to deliver training in how to design communication campaigns, develop storytelling techniques, shoot a short film, edit scenes, and deliver effective presentation. She explained her decision to bring trainers from the private sector as followed:

Based on our strength as a multi-media organization, we envision our forum to contain more innovative training approaches that would appeal to the youth audience than the traditional workshops offered by existing anti-trafficking organizations in the country. We conducted needs assessment with the youth participants and found that they were keen to learn technical production techniques such as video shooting and film editing. So, we went out to recruit artists and communication professionals from our network to volunteer as trainers for this intervention.

Based on the meeting minutes, all the coalition members from Foundation A, iNPO A, iFBO A, NGO A, FBO A and CBO A, and the five trainers from the corporate sector subsequently met in northern Thailand a few days prior to the forum event to finalize the training program for the youth participants. The forum activities were designed for the youths as followed: Day 1: arrived at the training venue, received overview of the forum agenda and training on child protection; Day 2: attended the opening ceremony and received training on human trafficking and community-based campaigns through media and arts; Day 3: 40 youths were divided into four groups based on their interests and each group attended a training session on campaign planning, video
filming, video editing or speech writing and presentation; Day 4: worked on the campaign plan, PSA production and presentation; Day 5: presented their final work at the closing ceremony.

During the youth forum event, Sarah and Vanida from Foundation A were the main facilitators of the event, managed all logistics and coordinated with all coalition members to ensure timely implementation of the program activities. Coalition members from iNPO A and iFBO A managed chaperones to ensure that they maintained professional roles and adhered to the child protection protocol with the youth participants. Meanwhile, trainers from NGO A, FBO A and CBO A, and five corporate volunteers delivered training in the designated sessions. Foundation A also invited high-level policy makers such as the city governor, US and Australian ambassadors, public officials, and local media to attend the closing ceremony during which youth presented their final work.

In addition to the eight coalition members from Foundation A, iNPO A, iFBO A, NGO A, NGO B and CBO A, I decided to interview Kaew, one of the youth participants, to gain her perspectives as an outsider of the coalition who became a direct beneficiary to this intervention. Kaew was a volunteer for CBO B, a community-based organization which had previously collaborated with iNPO A on skills development and human trafficking prevention for youth migrants. Kaew is now working as a full time staff for CBO B and continues to utilize the knowledge she gains from the youth forum to build a youth network and organize anti-trafficking campaigns in her community.
Case #2: Coalition Members and their Roles in the Philippines

The situation of human trafficking in the Philippines is vastly different from Thailand. In Thailand at-risk populations to being trafficked are mostly ethnic minorities, undocumented foreign migrants, hill tribe villagers and stateless people who live along the national borders. In contrast, the Philippines is an archipelago of over 7,000 islands to the east of Vietnam across South China Sea that does not share borders with any other Southeast Asia nations, and is more of a source country where victims are trafficked out of the country as they try to migrate abroad to look for better opportunities (Department of State, 2011). Over 9.4 million Filipinos or nearly 10% of the country population have migrated out of the country (Commission on Filipinos Overseas, 2010). The large number of migration provides more opportunities for fraudulent recruitment agencies to deceive many of these emigrants to end up as slaves in factories, construction sites, fishing vessels, agriculture plantations and domestic work in Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea, Japan and the Middle East (Department of State, 2011). A survey conducted by Rapid Asia (2010) also showed an alarming rate of vulnerable youth population, 50% of whom responded they had the desire to move abroad and only 20% were familiar with the issue of human trafficking. The youth forum was therefore launched in the Philippines to educate and train youth leaders to become anti-trafficking campaigners in their communities. The event took place in Manila four months after the forum in Thailand ended.

Table 4.2 displays the key organizations that joined the coalition to plan and implement the youth forum in the Philippines. The table also shows the fictitious names and organizational positions of the coalition members who were interviewed in this
study. Their roles in the youth forum were also described. Seven coalition members from four organizations participated in the interview for this study. I adopted the same order of interview as the case in Thailand by reaching out to Sarah, who was the initiator of the coalition in the Philippines. Based on Sarah’s recommended list of collaborators in the Philippines, I moved on to interview other participants based on the order in which they were recruited by Sarah to join the coalition.

Table 4.2 Roles of coalition members in the Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Interviewed coalition members*</th>
<th>Positions in their organizations</th>
<th>Roles in the youth forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation A</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Outreach Associate</td>
<td>Initiate collaboration, finance, and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>Youth Engagement Manager</td>
<td>Not involved in the forum but support the youth participants after the forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Country Coordinator</td>
<td>Youth chaperone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO C</td>
<td>Marizel</td>
<td>Partnerships Officer</td>
<td>Lead coordinator and management of the human trafficking forum, finance, logistics, child protection and youth management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Youth participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO D</td>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Lead coordinator and management of the media camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Group</td>
<td>Hanzel</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Youth participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All the names have been changed to maintain the confidentiality agreement with the research participants

Sarah narrated her strategy in forming the coalition in the Philippines as followed:

Our office is located in Thailand and we do not have a field office in the Philippines. I knew immediately that it would be impractical for me to be the lead coordinator of the forum as I would have to fly back and forth every time an issue came up. I consulted with my team and we agreed that it would be more efficient
to identify a local anti-trafficking organization that has the capacity to play the leadership role in coordinating with all the local NGOs and CBOs to implement the project.

Sarah’s role in the Philippines was considerably different from Thailand in the sense that she did not act as the lead agency for the overall planning and implementation of the youth forum, but more of an external party that initiated the intervention and allowed local stakeholders to take ownership of the necessary roles and responsibility to execute the event. As a result, in the Philippines she was more involved in the beginning of the collaborative process which involved engaging key NGOs into the coalition, deliberating on the methods and criteria of recruiting youth participants, advising on the forum agenda and training content, budgeting and conducting media relations to promote the event.

Sarah favorably recalled that “working for the Philippines event was a real pleasure because of the strong capacity of our two key partners and I managed to avoid many pitfalls that occurred from the trial and error of our pilot project in Thailand.” The two key local partners that she mentioned were NGO C and NGO D. Both organizations had shared interests, resources, capacity and networks to fulfill most of the required roles to plan and implement the intervention. NGO C is a large local non-governmental organization with more than ten offices throughout the country. It has been working exclusively on the issues of human trafficking, migrant and labor rights for over 20 years. NGO C is internationally recognized as one of the best anti-trafficking organizations in the Philippines due to its achievements at the community, provincial and national levels from delivering rehabilitative services to victims of trafficking, building and mobilizing a
national network of at-risk populations to self-organize to advocate for their rights, and
influencing policy makers to pass new legislations to prosecute traffickers, protect
victims and prevent incidents. Foundation A had previously collaborated with NGO C in
2009 during the second phase of its campaign which involved organizing awareness-
raising concerts in three cities in the Philippines. Engaging with NGO C was only natural
because of the already strong working relationships and desire from both parties to
continue that. “No other organizations have the same amount of experience, expertise and
resources across the country to implement human trafficking prevention interventions
like NGO C,” added Sarah.

Sarah continued to explain that NGO C was already planning to organize a
national event which gathered youth members in their existing anti-trafficking movement
networks across the country to come to Manila and learn about the best practices in social
movements and advocacy. Given the similar goals of NGO C’s event and Foundation A’s
youth forum, both actors agreed to share their resources by merging their activities into a
single program called a national youth summit. Each party contributed $20,000 to
organize the intervention and the national youth summit was planned as a five-day event
with two parts, the forum and the media camp. The two-day forum brought 100 youth
participants from the three main islands of the Philippines (Luzon, Visayas and
Mindanao) to learn from prominent directors of anti-trafficking organizations,
government officials, social entrepreneurs and business leaders about current efforts,
latest innovations and best practice strategies to combat human trafficking. As at-risk
populations in the Philippines were different from Thailand, the criteria for recruiting
participants were modified to favor college students from 18 to 28 years old who were
already part of NGO C’s anti-trafficking movement network. The new criteria eliminated the problem of large disparity in the level of learning among participants that disrupted the flow of a few training sessions in Thailand where it was clear that younger participants who had not attended a university were struggling to keep up with the training content.

The forum was immediately followed by a three-day media camp that narrowed its participants down from 100 to 40. There were less spots largely because of limited resources and training facilities to accommodate more than 40 youth participants. In addition, the intensive nature of the media camp required this group of participants to be selected based on substantive experiences in volunteering and community campaigning, and demonstrable skills in creative arts. A media camp included trainings on digital activism, research resources on human trafficking, strategic media campaign planning, and five workshops based on participants’ interests in video production, songwriting, theater performance, graphic design, and journalism.

Sarah stated that she had a meeting with a large number of staff from NGO C. Marizel was later appointed to be the point person from NGO C who would be corresponding with Sarah for this intervention. Marizel held the position of a partnerships officer in her organization and she claimed it was only natural to be assigned as the lead contact for this project as she was responsible in identifying potential partnership opportunities and managing related programs that grew out of those collaborations. I chose to interview Marizel after Sarah because she was primarily responsible for the overall management of the youth summit including finance, coordination with local organizations that assisted the coalition in recruiting participants, identifying and
confirming trainers and speakers for the forum, logistics, developing locally relevant forum content, and ensuring protection and safety protocols were in place for youth participants during the five days of the event. She was involved with the youth summit from the start and offered significant information on the dynamics of local actors in the coalition and the collaborative process that Sarah might not be able to share since she was not involved in all of the day to day planning and meeting before the summit. In addition, Marizel was also responsible in providing continual support for the youth participants who came to the summit and could give me good discussion the collaborative outcomes that she had seen with the youths.

Sarah informed that she had to continue identifying another collaborator because NGO C did not have sufficient expertise to execute the training for the media camp. She was subsequently referred to meet with NGO D by representatives from the Australian governmental agency that funded this intervention. NGO D is a local non-governmental organization with a group of artists, students and individuals who are committed to educate and influence their peers and audiences to be informed and advocate for pressing social issues in the Philippines. The organization mission is to use creative spaces such as films, music, performance arts, writing, and any other forms of arts to inspire and transform their audiences to build a movement that contributes to the positive change in their society. NGO D’s strengths lie in its ability to translate complex issues to simpler, more engaging and appealing messages through arts and media. Sarah said that she met with Alisa who became the main representative from NGO D and took on the lead role in managing the training component of the three-day media camp. Alisa was the third person from the Philippines case that I interviewed because she was the overall manager
of the media camp and played a significant role in designing and developing of the media
camp content, recruiting, confirming and coordinating with trainers from her
organization. Her participation in this study was useful because she brought with her
perspectives of someone who did not have previous collaborative relationships with
Foundation A and NGO C.

Sarah, Marizel and Alisa confirmed that the three organizations had
approximately eight meetings over the span of four months to plan for the event after
they made an agreement to form the coalition. The first meeting was conducted face-to-
face and focused on introducing coalition members to the youth summit goals and
objectives, sharing information on each organizational expertise and resources, and
agreeing on the roles and responsibilities of each party. Marizel also invited three youth
volunteers from each region to attend the first meeting and contribute to the design of the
summit content. I asked Marizel to introduce me to these youths so I could recruit them
into my study. I believed that these youths could give me important insights that might
not be prevalent among professional staff as the youths were also target beneficiaries.

I managed to recruit Carlos, one of the youths in the first meeting into this study.
Carlos was a fourth year undergraduate student in business administration and he became
a volunteer for NGO C after knowing the organization in a youth volunteering conference
in early 2011. Since then, he consistently volunteered twice a month for NGO C and took
on the role of a regional recruiter who promoted the summit application process to his
peers and as a chaperone who facilitated and managed some of the younger youth
participants during the summit. The collaborative process in the Philippines was an
improvement from Thailand as representatives of the youth beneficiaries directly took
part during the initial planning stage of the summit. Their involvement was crucial to tailor to the summit sessions to meet the needs of the youth participants.

Based on the information from the meeting minutes, many of the following coalition meetings were held through teleconference or Skype calls and focused on recruiting youth participants, fine-tuning the structure and content of the summit sessions and ensuring that the forum and the media camp had seamless connection and build on from each other. For example, participants in the media camp were to incorporate campaigning messages from the topics they had learned from the forum sessions. Marizel had to assign experts in human trafficking and child protection to assist the media camp trainers in integrating accurate anti-trafficking messages that were sensitivity to the local culture and survivors of trafficking, and monitored the youths that their campaign plans would not place them in the harmful situations with the local stakeholders. The later meetings focused more on communicating the logistical arrangement of the summit, youth safety protocols, and confirming speakers and trainers. The final meeting took place face-to-face a few weeks prior to the event, and all coalition members, including trainers, were present to agree on the final rundown of the event, understand key points of contact during the event, and discuss the mechanism to support the youth after the summit ended.

In addition to the four coalition members from Foundation A, NGO C and NGO D, I asked Marizel to refer me to a few youth participants who became active campaigners after the youth summit ended. The goal of recruiting at least one of the youth participants in my study was to gain their perspectives as outsiders of the youth summit coalition, but had to be involved as community organizers after the event ended.
The youth participants were expected to give me in-depth discussion on the collaborative outcomes, especially on the coalition goal achievement: educating youth participants in anti-trafficking campaigning and empowering them to organize community-based human trafficking prevention activities. I eventually recruited Hanzel into the study. Hanzel was a youth participant who was also a lead coordinator of the anti-trafficking movement that was initiated by NGO C in Mindanao. He took part in the five-day youth summit and was instrumental in building a strong youth coalition of over 300 members in his region to implement community-based anti-trafficking interventions.

After my interview with Hanzel, I was able to understand most of the community-based campaigning activities that he had done after the youth summit event. In order to explore this component further, I asked Sarah to introduce me to other coalition members who played the role of providing continual support for the youth participants. This led me to enroll two additional staff from Foundation A into the study: Pete and Mary, a youth engagement manager and a country coordinator in the Philippines respectively. Both were hired after the summit had ended, and was directly involved in collaborating with NGO C and NGO D to assist the youth participants. Pete and Mary’s participation in this research study revealed great insights on the third research question which focused on outcomes of collaboration. The inclusion of Pete and Mary in this study also helped me to distinguish how the additional role of youth support, which was absent in the Thailand case, would generate different collaborative outcome results.

**Research Question One: Antecedents of Collaboration**

The first research question of this thesis explores why anti-trafficking actors view community-based collaboration as an effective strategy in human trafficking prevention
interventions and what the perceived factors that initiate them to form an anti-trafficking coalition are. The findings generated seven factors (see Table 4.3 for the number of participants citing in each factor) that were perceived to be important pre-conditions of collaboration. History of collaboration, need for resource mobilization, common interests and community readiness were cited most frequently as the reasons why collaboration was needed as a strategy in anti-trafficking programs. In addition, interdependence, reputation and complex issues were mentioned as important factors to consider before engaging other potential parties and committing in joining the collaboration. Common appreciation and assessment of these seven factors by potential partners were perceived to increase the likelihood of attaining successful collaboration.

Table 4.3 Antecedents of collaboration and the number of participants citing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 History of collaboration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Need for resource mobilization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Common interests</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Community readiness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing affiliation with local NGOs or CBOs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High access and use of communication technologies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local capacity of individuals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Skills and experiences in the issue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership quality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetus to collaborate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Culture of activism</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Personal interests and motivations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organization commitment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Interdependence</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Complex issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 History of collaboration. The findings from the narratives of participants’ interviews revealed that all of them already had previous working relationships with at least one of the coalition members (n=16). When asked why they chose to engage certain
organizations into the collaboration, Pete from Foundation A replied “we already have pre-existing relationships with them and it’s a good one so we want to keep that.”

Working with familiar people can be a good strategy under the principle of utility, in which the desired achievement of outcome is maximized by involving the right people with the right skills to do the right tasks (Guttman, 2000, p. 57). By engaging with the same group of people that Foundation A had worked with, the staff did not have to waste time to identify unnecessary partners nor spent more time to adapt to each other’s style of communication and way of working. This view was also shared by participants who might not have worked directly with Foundation A, but had a history of collaboration with other members who had already joined the coalition. Nat from FBO A in Thailand shared the decision making process within her organization to accept Foundation A’s invitation to join the coalition as followed:

We already know most of the local anti-trafficking actors who have decided to join the coalition to do the youth forum. We sort of know what everyone will be doing, given their expertise. My director and I thought that our organization has a unique strength that no one else has, which is our knowledge and experience to conduct anti-trafficking campaigns with the hill tribe populations in the Mekong region. Since many of the youth participants who are coming to the forum are ethnic minorities from our area, it doesn’t take us a long time to say yes to join the coalition.

Chai further described the nature of anti-trafficking players in the NGO and grassroots sector in Thailand as “brothers and sisters who had a long history of working relationships and friendships. When your brothers and sisters come to you for help, you
help them out.” Chai expressed that Foundation A is an international organization and it was his privilege to have them come to his city to promote human trafficking awareness. In a way, he decided to join the coalition because other local organizations within his network were planning to participate and he also wanted to show that they are “a good host” for this national event. For the Philippines, history of collaboration did not have to be confined with just the key members of the coalition. Before committing to the youth summit, NGO D had not collaborated with Foundation A or NGO C on any projects, but had received funding from the Australian agency who was the main donor of Foundation A. Realizing their unique strengths in creative communication and media trainings, the Australian agency introduced NGO D to Foundation A, who later orchestrated the former into the youth summit coalition. Many of the youth participants were already volunteering for NGO C. Hanzel simply stated that “it was an easy decision to apply to be a part of the summit.”

1.2 Need for resource mobilization. Most of the research participants (n=14) referenced the need for resource mobilization, or the efficacy and efficiency of utilizing resources from different organizations that have funding, equipments, skilled labor and networks with target beneficiaries to plan and execute the youth forum. This concept is closely aligned with interdependence, moving it from the recognition of the value of collaboration and mutual benefits that come with it to actual allocation of resources among coalition members who have the right expertise to implement a particular aspect of the intervention. Carlos, a youth volunteer from NGO C in the Philippines, narrated:

The youth summit required extensive resources as over 100 youths were coming from all over the country to learn and become inspired to lead anti-trafficking
movement in their own community. Each organization in the coalition mobilized its strengths to realize the implementation of the event. Foundation A has the funds, media relations and publicity, NGO C has the local resources and issue expertise to implement the activity while NGO D has the pool of talented trainers to lead creative workshops.

Marizel from NGO C further supported this point, saying “for a large scale project that requires high impact, we always need to engage partners because more resources are needed, and partners can share the costs. You're not shouldering everything on your own and accountability is also distributed among those involved, creating higher level of investment to make it a success.”

In addition to the benefits of sharing costs and risks in collaboration, exchanging resources to strive for the intervention goals makes sense under the climate of resource scarcity, especially for local community-based organizations that are working in the anti-trafficking sector. Chai, the director of CBO A in northern Thailand, recalled that “a lot of resources are needed to make this intervention work. We have limited resources in funding so we can’t help out with the project budget. However, we can contribute labor and reach out to recruit youth participants from the local networks.”

1.3 Common interests. The next most frequently discussed factor by the participants was common interests (n=11). Participants cited having similar organizational missions and goals, and common interests to serve the same target audience as one of the pre-conditions that put them on the same table. Adam from iFBO A revealed that “our organizations have the same target audience group who are the at-risk youths,” and “we have the same organization mission to educate the public to
prevent further human trafficking incidents.” These common interests facilitated his deliberation to join the coalition with Foundation A. It should be noted that the factor of common interests was also used by Foundation A as an engagement strategy to select and recruit other parties into the coalition. This could explain the emergence of this theme as most of the participants are already expected to share similar interests on the issue of human trafficking, youth development and community campaigning. Vanida stated that “Foundation A tried to identify many local NGOs and CBOs in Thailand that were already planning an anti-human trafficking intervention with the same goal of the youth forum: to promote human trafficking awareness.” The strategy paid off as most of the local organizations in northern Thailand who agreed to join the coalition were already working together to plan a national human trafficking awareness day, a separate event that took place prior to the youth forum. They viewed Foundation A’s activity as a complementary continuation of their work and meet the interests of maintaining the momentum of promoting human trafficking awareness among the public community.

1.4 Community readiness. Pertinent to the two cases in this research is to understand some of the key criteria that were used by coalition members to recruit youth participants to increase the likelihood that they would be successful anti-trafficking campaigners upon returning to their local community. Findings that identified three salient sub-factors of readiness are: community structure, local capacity of individuals and impetus to collaborate. These three factors are categorized together as community readiness (n=10), the concept that external organizations often use to assess if a particular community is prepared to be involved in a community-based intervention (Roman, Moore, Jenkins & Small, 2002). The results from the interviews demonstrate that
Community readiness is considered by coalition members as one of the pre-conditions of collaboration with the local NGOs, CBOs and youth participants.

Community structure. Under this factor, priority was given to youth applicants who had strong community structure that support their volunteering efforts (n= 8). Many of the youth participants were found to have existing affiliation with local organizations. Vanida from Foundation A recalled that:

It’s imperative for the youth participants to be affiliated with local NGOs or CBOs that can support so them to run local anti-trafficking campaigns in the long run. Without this support, many youths can easily lose interests and motivations, especially when they are faced with challenges and are not able to turn to more experienced outreach workers for advice.

Hanzel, a youth participant from Mindanao region in the Philippines, felt he was selected because of his strong networks with local community organizations. He commented that:

I work with over 30 active youth volunteers who attend various committees, be it school committees, community organization committees or youth organization committees. Our volunteers have the power to access and gain support from teachers, community leaders, government officials and business sponsors to help out with our volunteering activities.

Another condition that is found to be prominent under community structure in the Philippines coalition is high access and use of communication technologies. Pete, the youth engagement manager from Foundation A, was impressed with how “the online youth volunteering community structure in the Philippines is at the level beyond any other countries in Southeast Asia…youths are very active in using facebook to update
anti-trafficking activities that they are doing to us and this allows us to allocate some budget to support some of their ambitious initiatives like organizing a local awareness concert which drew more than a few thousand people.”

*Local capacity of individuals* is another commonly cited factor (n=8). This included the youths’ skills and experience on the human trafficking issue and their leadership quality. Sarah observed that “in both countries, we found youth participants who have more experience and knowledge on human trafficking and community campaigning to be most active after the forum ended.” Carlos, a youth volunteer from NGO C, expressed that leadership quality of the youth participants is even more important than skills and experiences.

Some of our youth members like Hanzel is a super star. I would contribute the success of the anti-trafficking movement in Mindanao to his leadership. He is instrumental in guiding his fellow volunteers to expand the local group membership to over 300, encourage them to propose campaign ideas and make it happen by engaging local organizations to support his activities.

*Impetus to collaborate*. The third factor under community readiness which stood out from data analysis is impetus to collaborate (n=6), or the drive to be involved in the intervention. This factor is especially salient in the Philippines where four participants made a reference. Both Sarah and Pete commended that there is a real “culture of social activism in the Philippines,” where right from the start, “we received a lot more application responses to attend the youth summit,” and “they are proactive in initiating their own activities after the event.” Personal interests, motivations and commitment to the issue also played a great part in the impetus to collaborate. Kaew, a youth participant
from Thailand, said that “I am a migrant without citizenship myself so I understand the challenges and vulnerability of human trafficking.” With the issue being close to home, Kaew has the vested interests in executing what she learned from the forum and educate her peers and neighbors. She made a profound reflection that:

I think personal commitment to the issue is so important. There were many youths who just came to the human trafficking awareness concert, went home and talked briefly about the issue to their friends at school and thought they had contributed something to the cause. They eventually lose interests and go for other fads. It’s unfortunate but that’s the reality of the situation of our youth generation. So, the key is to reach those with real commitment like me to be involved in the campaign.

It is not necessary for the youths to just have personal interests, motivations and commitment to the issue of human trafficking. Carlos, a youth volunteer in the Philippines, shared his reason for continuing to be actively involved in the anti-trafficking campaigns, “I was about to graduate from my university and I personally was looking to pursue a career in development. Being involved in this campaign as a volunteer had expanded my perspectives in the sector and gained me with some work experience so I can position myself in the job market.”

1.5 Interdependence. Nine participants cited interdependence with other parties as essential to plan and implement community-based anti-trafficking interventions effectively. Worawan, a project coordinator of iNPO A whose office is based in Bangkok, Thailand emphasized:
Contrary to the popular beliefs that professional staffs from international organizations like us are know-it-all who have ready-made solutions for people at the community level, we are really stupid amateurs who are not as knowledgeable on the issues as the local people on the front line. Our organization always collaborates with local partners because we don't have local offices and field staff with daily access to the problems that allow us to fully understand the dynamics of the local situation and sensitivity of the stakeholders. We have to depend on local NGOs and CBOs to be our eyes and ears, and advise us how we can best support them. What we brought to the table for local organizations are international best practice tools that help them to think through things more critically, benchmark what other communities have done and see if those practices can be applicable to their situation, and monitor and evaluate their efforts.

The above narrative elicits the acknowledgement that external agencies with funding to initiate development programs need to rely on the involvement from local community to ensure planned interventions to satisfy their needs. In the meanwhile, local organizations with limited resources and tools see the value of collaboration with outside parties to help them accomplish goals that may not be possible otherwise. “It is the realization of the value of working with other agencies that places collaboration as an ingrained strategy in our approach of work,” stated Korn, the deputy director of NGO A in Thailand, as he described why his organization actively sought collaboration with other parties and eventually accepted the invitation to join Foundation A’s coalition.

In other instances, acknowledgement that collaboration is an effective strategy to tackle the problem might not be sufficient to entice actors to participate. Oliver (1990)
suggests that mutual benefits and reciprocity, or the incentives that can be obtained through collaboration with other parties, may emerge as a motivation and make potential coalition members realize that not only will they need to depend on other parties to accomplish the intervention, but they will also gain mutual benefits in the process (Oliver, 1990). When I asked Alisa from NGO D in the Philippines to describe some of the benefits that she and other partners had gained from working in the youth summit, she said “they (NGO C) are experts in human trafficking and building social movements but their communication is boring even when they’re targeting the youths. They can learn how to do better creative communication from us and we can learn from them about the hard facts and issues. It goes both ways.”

1.6 Reputation. Almost half of the participants referenced reputation as another factor they consider before joining the collaboration (n=7). Sarah specifically cited engaging NGO C in the Philippines because of “their reputation on anti-human trafficking work. No other organizations have the same level of experience and resources at the national level like they do.” Worawan from iNPO A explained “Before committing ourselves into any coalitions, we always do background checks of other organizations to make sure they have good reputation.” Assessing reputation of other potential partners is a normal part of the vetting process to minimize risks against iNPO A’s own reputation. Worawan opined “we certainly do not want to be involved with organizations that had bad reputation such as fraudulent records, low accountability to the target beneficiaries, or exploitative of others’ resources. After researching their records and hearing trusted opinions from people who are familiar with them, we can then make an informed decision to be part of the coalition.” Apart from being a factor to minimize risks,
organizations with good reputation can also draw potential partners who see the benefits of collaborating with them. Carlos described “Foundation A has a big corporate reputation and image of being cool, innovative and trendy among young demographics. We saw the desirability of working with them as our youths can be part of something that is truly exciting among their immediate peer group,”

1.7 Complex issues. The complexity of the human trafficking issue was mentioned by the research participants (n=4) as one reason why collaboration was being adopted. “Human trafficking is complex. It affects people across sectors and we can't work on this alone,” explained Chai from the coalition in Thailand. Carlos, the youth volunteer from the Philippines, offered an insightful trajectory of human trafficking that starts with “consumer demand for cheap products” which leads to increasing number of unscrupulous employers in the private sector who “seek to exploit their workers to lower labor costs and maximize profits.” The issue becomes “more complex” as recruitment agents try to deceive people who live in poverty and are “desperate to get out” of that situation regardless of the risks. These views demonstrated that human trafficking requires complex solutions that target different stakeholders to do their part to end the practice, from educating consumers to be conscious of products from slave-labor, imposing stricter legislation to monitor labor practices within the private sector to increasing the capacity of local community members to become watchdog and report suspicious activities to the authority. Nat from FBO A in Thailand summed up that “collaboration with various stakeholders is needed so we can gain different perspectives and understand how to tackle the problem better.”


**Research Question Two: Process of Collaboration**

The second research question focused on how anti-trafficking actors managed the process of community-based collaboration and identified the key factors that were perceived to be important in the collaborative process. Findings identified governance (n=11), administration (n=10), informal relationships (n=5), autonomy (n=9), mutuality (n=8), and honesty and trust (n=8) as the six factors (see Table 4.4) that played important roles in facilitating or hindering the functioning of the coalition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process of Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Governance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Informal relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Organizational autonomy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Mutual benefits and fairness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Honesty and trust</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.1 Governance.** Governance is referred as the rules that control how the coalition members behave, allocate resources among different parties and divide the roles and responsibilities that each organization has to play to plan and implement the intervention (Thomson and Perry, 2006). Participants mentioned issues related to governance (n=11) when I asked them to walk me through the process of collaboration to plan and implement the youth forum. For the case in Thailand, coalition members vividly described the rules to govern coalition members’ behavior as “ambiguous,” “lack thereof,” “whatever makes sense” and “utter chaos”. Governance was fraught with challenges because all of the coalition members never had the chance to sit down in one table and meet to discuss about the rules to manage the coalition and to understand what each party was doing. It was only a few days prior to the event that all the members got
the opportunity to meet at the forum site to do on the final rundown of the event that everyone was aware of the status of the project and what needed to be accomplished.

The lack of governance could be explained from how Foundation A chose to approach its partners from the beginning. Rather than having a roundtable meeting of all involved parties early in the collaboration, Foundation A approached each organization individually to negotiate and finalize their contributions. Sarah sighed, “We really had limited resources to bring everyone to attend a coalition meeting way ahead of the event. A huge barrier was distance as some were based in Bangkok, while others were living in northern Thailand. That was why the big coalition meeting only took place a few days prior to the event as everyone had to be there to perform their roles and responsibilities.”

However, the problem did not seem to stem from only resources and proximity. Many collaborative actors were not even clear that they were part of a coalition who could influence other aspects of the intervention. One participant lamented on the situation as follows:

In the first couple of meetings that we had individually with Foundation A, they informed us of the youth forum design, asked for some feedback and invited us to partner with them on the event. We ended up helping them with the recruitment and management of the youth participants from our networks. We didn’t really contribute to anything else as we thought it was their project and they were running the show. I mean the event was called Foundation A’s National Youth Forum. We knew they were approaching a lot of organizations, but they did not update us on the final makeup of the collaborative members. We thought they had everything under control. I only realized the forum was in dire shape when we
had a coalition meeting a few days before the event. It was an utter chaos. Some of the facilitators never met each other and did not know the profiles of the youth participants. There was no one acting the role of a training director to oversee the overall content of the forum, making sure every session was connected to the issue of human trafficking and that each session would build participants’ knowledge in succession so they could become thoughtful anti-trafficking campaigners with creativity and production knowhow. My colleague who had previous experience managing large youth forums and already knew most of the anti-trafficking members had to step in to facilitate this meeting. He really should not have to do that but it was apparent Foundation A could not play this role. He verified and confirmed what everyone was supposed to be doing, had trainers from the corporate world matched with those from the NGO sector to ensure integration of anti-trafficking messages in the media production trainings, and made final adjustment to the forum agenda to provide some cultural and friendship-building activities.

I was quite taken aback by the lack of structure in the organization of this intervention so I asked if there were documents that outline what the roles and responsibilities of each party, and detailed information on how the coalition would function. Another coalition member from Thailand commented “Foundation A did develop program activity outline and contact list with the role title of each partner. It was in English so many of our Thai partners could not understand that. The contact list mentioned the role title, but no description of what that person would really do.”
It was the absence of governing rules that subsequently created friction and conflict among the trainers during the implementation of the forum. Several participants recalled that there was “drama” between the trainers from the NGO sector and the commercial sector on the approach to educating the youths. One trainer from the NGO sector recalled:

There was a huge argument between a trainer from our group and the trainer who is an artist. He was extremely hard on the children, berating them and pushing them without taking their capacity into consideration. He had to understand that most of these youth participants were not born and raised in urban cities and they were not exposed to high standard of education. This trainer later defended his approaching by saying he did not care how disadvantaged the youths were. It was exactly this mentality by the NGO people that restricted their potential to be excellent and survive in the real world. In the end, the trainers worked their differences out, but youths had to literally work past midnight to make sure they were ready for the final presentation. The trainers and the youth participants were freaking out because many high-level people were expected to turn up to see their work on the closing ceremony of the youth forum. It was a minor miracle that we managed to pull everything off eventually, but it was a big lesson learned for all of us. I think more discussion had to be made next time on what are realistic to accomplish and how we should behave toward the youths. A lot of the things we did were not planned with the consideration of their limits and well-being.

Anecdotal evidence from the coalition members in Thailand highlighted the importance of governance to set the stage for an effective management of the coalition.
Had the rules and regulations of the coalition were negotiated and promoted at the beginning, Foundation A staff might not be overwhelmed with their scope of work and other experienced coalition members would feel more assured that they were not “stepping on each other’s toes” by offering to take a leadership role in managing other aspects of the forum. Trainers from different sector would also behave more respectfully toward each other as the issues of educational approach, level of expectation and accomplishment of the forum goals could be discussed in advance. Fortunately, most of the pitfalls from the Thailand case were corrected in the following event in the Philippines. Sarah described her experience from the Philippines intervention as a much smoother process, saying:

I made it very clear from the get go that our collaboration was equal, and I would not dictate how this project would work. I allowed local experts to recommend me on what we should do and made sure their advice was built into what we had to do. The collaborative process was very transparent. One good example was when we had to address the concern about the title of our event which originally featured the name of our organization. So, we changed the title to the one that featured the existing name of the local anti-trafficking youth movement group. This helped my work tremendously because now everyone felt it was not just Foundation A’s project, but also their project. Everyone was happy because their experiences and voices were integrated into the final design of the project. Collaboration was more successful.

It also helped that the coalition had only three key partners, making the process more efficient and division of labor more straightforward. A Memorandum of
Understanding (MOU) was also created and the document clearly outlined the financial contributions and duties that each party would be expected to do. Marizel from NGO C reflected:

After agreeing on the terms of our involvement, we developed and signed an MOU which outlined what we had to do. It became an official project and a priority for us. We took on the overall role in managing the summit because we are based here. The youth participants are within our network. The speakers and trainers are all the people we know. We understand who can do what realistically and logistically. Foundation A helped us out by seeking corporate sponsors, branding the event, co-funding the summit and supporting us as much as they could. NGO D took over the responsibility of running the media camp, so it all worked out quite perfectly. In the end, it might seem we did more work but we expected it given it was the event for our youths and it was not like other partners were going out of their way to take advantage of us.

2.2 Administration. The factor of administration or the management of the coalition members by the lead agency was cited by 10 participants in the study. The factor is closely related to governance and it involves communicating information among members, monitoring activities according to the roles and responsibilities of each party and managing conflicts and tensions that may arise from the collaborative process (Thomson and Perry, 2006). Clearly a lack of governance structure challenged administration, but it is possible that coalition members who had previously collaborated in other interventions will informally revert to former governance rules to compensate the
weak administration. In the Thailand case, one participant summed up how she thought Foundation A had managed the coalition:

To their credits, Foundation A tried to communicate what had to be done to other partners in the very beginning, but they did a poor job of keeping us informed on the status of each task. We felt it was their project and everyone was waiting for Foundation A to tell us what to do. In the end, Sarah, who was supposed to be the leader in coalition management, was just overwhelmed by her responsibility in logistics. They should have hired another person to deal with that so she could focus on coordinating and keeping up with the partners.

Another participant made an insightful reflection that language was the main problem that prevented Foundation A from leading the coalition effectively:

I don’t want to blame everything on Foundation A really. Their lead staff is a foreign expat and couldn’t communicate or understand the local coalition members half of the time. They ended up hiring a local staff to help them out but that person was more involved in setting up the venue and confirming youth arrivals and arranging the accommodation. In the final coalition meeting, it was the crunch time, so we could not afford to waste it on translating everything from English to Thai and then to English. The good thing was they were flexible to allow the local coalition members to lead the discussion and move forward and it was probably the best decision because other people had more experience and had been doing this forever.

A trainer from a local NGO in the north further confirmed this point and said:
It was not that there was not enough communication. There was actually too much of it. We were not only involved in the youth forum, but also the big concert. We were cc in so many emails from them that I stopped to look at everything. Besides, the emails were written in English and our staff, who were already preoccupied with our work, just ignored them, unless they were addressed to us specifically.

What ended up pulling the coalition through was “understanding.” A few participants mentioned that it was because of understanding that they began to accept shortcomings and worked together to move the forum forward. A participant opined:

Did we think more senior staff from Foundation A should have come down to work on this? Of course we did. Having someone with more skills in partnership management would be more helpful. However, there was no point to blame each other. The show must go on and we understand their shortcomings. We ended up taking similar roles that we played in other coalitions (many of the coalition members had previous working relationships) and completed the tasks, however short the lead time we had.

The administration of the Philippines coalition went more smoothly. Regular meetings played a significant role for Sarah to manage the collaborative process effectively. She recalled:

With the lessons learned from Thailand, I made sure there were more regular meetings with our key partners. In the first meeting, we included everyone who was interested to introduce the whole campaign which includes the concert, the forum, the road shows and the television broadcasts. This was to make everyone
feel each activity is connected to the big goal of promoting human trafficking awareness and prevention in their country. I then had at least three meetings with NGO C and NGO D in persons or through Skype to refine our roles and responsibilities, develop the summit concept, break down the content of activities in each day and finalize all aspects of the planning and implementation. I was also aware that NGO C and NGO D had a lot more meetings individually since they were based in the same country and had to coordinate with each other on logistics and sharing information on youth participant. I was regularly updated on the progress.

In a way, NGO C was the lead agency in managing the youth summit. However, there were a few challenges as a number of decisions needed to be made together as a coalition and Foundation A’s “lack of presence” in the Philippines became an issue. Marizel lamented, “One of the biggest limitations for us is they don't have local presence. We always need to communicate to their regional office in Thailand to come and deal with pressing matters. Their regional staff are flying all over the place and sometimes we just couldn’t reach them.” Realizing this gap, Foundation A recently hired a local country coordinator to become “an eye and an ear” in the Philippines.

When I asked participants to think about what kind of tools or procedures would help them to manage the coalition better, one participant offered a concluding thought on effective management of a coalition as followed:

It is all about being smart, flexible and understanding the local culture. Many will say we need to monitor more of what everyone was doing. We need to do more communication. I don’t think that really translate in the reality. We had
implemented this protocol to monitor the progress of collaboration by sending out surveys for our partners to answer to make sure they know what was going on. It became another impossible task to chase people to answer the thing. On another occasion, I remember emailing out a document which summarized what decisions had been made, who was doing what and the updated status of all the activities. I swear I did! But there were still people that came to me to ask what was going on. In some areas, people just don’t read emails and you have to call them up individually by phone. We also need to take into account that everyone in the NGO world is overstretched and they’re already working more hours than they should. Another long document in English language in countries like Thailand or Cambodia may not be the smartest way of managing collaboration. You just have to keep things simple and I don't mean that in a patronising way. There are no points in convoluting things. Keep things simple, from point A to point B.

2.3 *Informal relationships*. Within the context of collaboration in the Philippines, participants described informal relationships as a crucial factor for the smooth functioning of the coalition (n=5). Informal relationships are closely related to governance and administration and seem to emerge more prominently when the coalition has a strong governance structure and effective administration. Participants referenced “similar age and personality”, “young and fun people”, “nice and friendly” and “work hard and play hard” as the shared characteristics of the collaborators that immediately drew them closer and had an enjoyable experience in this intervention. One participant summed up the importance of informal relationships for her organization:
In our organization, it is very important to assign someone to a specific project based on their ability to relate and build personal relationships with other people. In this youth summit, the collaboration was a pleasure because we're of the same age group. We hung out after work, and creative discussion came out of those interactions. The work process became very natural and easy. In essence, we quickly build trust and believe that we will help each other to not just get the project done, but also make a difference on this issue.

Informal relationships were not specifically cited by any participants in the Thailand case as a factor that helped their collaborative process. One member from a Thai NGO explained, “I think informal relationships are less important for us. It’s not about having the ability to relate and build friendship with others but more about showing that you have experience and competency. Those qualities will gain you respect. Once you’re respected, people will work with you and get things done.”

2.4 Organizational autonomy. Many participants referenced the “autonomy-accountability dilemma,” (Huxham, 1996) to describe the tension between being obligated to the interests of their organization and the interests of the whole coalition (n=9). This factor added a layer of complexity to the collaborative process. While many participants had the common interests in educating youths on human trafficking prevention and community campaigning, they also had to protect their own organizational interests that might not be explicitly stated. Problems occurred when participants chose to take action that served their own interests instead of the whole coalition. One example was an incident related to the management of media relations for the youth summit in the Philippines. Foundation A was responsible for inviting the media
to attend the youth presentation at the end of the youth summit. A local participant in the Philippines expressed disappointment in the incident:

We told Foundation A in the very beginning that we could help them out with media relations. We had a lot of contacts with the journalists who covered advocacy and social issues. However, it seemed Foundation A was very protective of media relations. I guessed they did not want to lose control on the local media coverage so they didn’t let us help with this work. In the end, none of the media people showed up at the event. We were super annoyed by the whole incident. Youth were disappointed that their hard work was not shown to the media.

As a foundation from the media sector with a well-known brand, Foundation A had to protect its interests and reputation by controlling their campaign communication with the media. In this incident, the interests of their organization took precedence over the interests of the coalition, which was to mobilize as many media contacts as possible to attend and report about the event. The tension from autonomy-accountability dilemma did not only stem from Foundation A’s prioritization of its interests, but also from its local counterparts, as narrated by one participant:

A few months after the youth summit ended, an anti-trafficking youth movement group from one region was very active in planning a large awareness event. They made an ambitious plan to organize a concert where thousands would attend. They reached out to Foundation A directly for support, given the beliefs that Foundation A has more expertise and resources associated with music and media. Foundation A’s staff ended up flying in from Thailand to assist them, covering the
costs of a few things like stage lighting and traveling expenses for the volunteers when local sponsors failed to come through. It was after the fact that the youth groups invited NGO C who initiated their network to attend this event. This created tensions between Foundation A and NGO C as the latter thought they were bypassed and should have been included in this project from the beginning. The situation was so bad that the senior team, including the director of Foundation A, had to fly from Bangkok to meet with NGO C to fix their relationships.

In this incident, NGO C felt their credits of initiating the anti-trafficking youth movement were being violated when Foundation A and the youth group itself chose to communicate with each other directly without involving them as the mediator. If this incident were allowed to continue, it could threaten NGO C’s status as a leading local coordinating agency with national anti-trafficking youth networks as other organizations took advantage of their prior efforts without getting them involved. The tension occurred because NGO C needed to protect its interests, even though what Foundation A had done might have benefited the goal of the coalition, which was to support at-risk youths to promote human trafficking prevention in their local community.

2.5 Mutual benefits and fairness. This factor refers to the state in which collaborative actors receive mutual benefits and perceive that those benefits were fairly distributed based on their participation in the intervention (n = 8). Many participants did not only anticipate the mutual benefits of educating their youth constituents, but also gain publicity for their organization as Foundation A promised to feature collaborators on the media promotion materials and press releases. In addition, perception on the fairness of
the distribution of those benefits based on contributed efforts also emerged from the interview data. A participant in the Thailand coalition complained:

In terms of labor distribution, it was definitely not distributed evenly among the members of the coalitions. For other organizations, the perception of fairness would largely depend on what arrangement was negotiated in the first place. For us, we didn’t contribute much financially but we felt we really stepped in to handle more of the youth forum responsibility than we had anticipated. We were annoyed with one organization who acted like a typical donor. That was not the first time I have seen this behavior from them. They think that by contributing financially to a project, they can get the free ride in not getting involved in the planning and implementation. In fact, during the final days before the event took place, their entire team came down to the forum venue and had a meeting among themselves about something else. A representative from this organization had to keep excusing herself from our forum meeting to attend their own meeting. In the end, this organization received the same credit as us for their involvement.

In this illustration, the contribution of efforts was not perceived as equal during the implementation of the youth forum activity. Coalition members who felt distribution of resources and benefits was lopsided tried to justify the situation by associating the behavior of players who took advantage of others as those who “acted like a typical donor.” In another example, the factor of mutual benefits and fairness was re-evaluated after the intervention. One participant reflected that the expected benefit of high publicity exposure for their organization was not fairly met:
I received harsh comments from my manager that we didn't get as much visibility as we have hoped. We thought our logo would be featured on their television programs and newspaper articles among many others. It turned out we just got a small logo on the stage banner in the youth forum event. This certainly made us more cautious of future collaboration. We would need to see some sort of agreement in writing of how our organization would share the benefits of public exposure before committing in another collaboration.

Failing to meet the expected fair share of the benefits of brand promotion in exchange of resource contribution caused collaborative actors to lose trust and became wary of continuing future collaboration with each other. Managing mutual benefits and fairness among collaborative members is therefore essential in building and maintaining good working relationships in the long run.

2.6. Honesty and trust. Eight participants made a reference on honesty and trust as another important factor during the planning and implementation stages of the collaboration. This concept is particularly prevalent in the Philippines coalition (n=5), as stated by one participant, “I think our collaboration mostly worked mainly because we were open and honest from the beginning. We were all pretty honest with each other about how much budget we had, what we wanted to deliver versus what was realistic for us to accomplish. We then could level our expectations and made things happen.”

Open honesty should be promoted during the initial phase of collaboration when resources and commitments are negotiated. Honesty built the norms of trust that is crucial in facilitating the collaborative process as an intervention progresses (Cummings and Bromiley, 1996). Trust allows coalition members to accomplish tasks more efficiently as
decisions can be made fairly quickly as members believe all parties have the collective interests of the group. Trust takes time to develop and requires frequent interactions to strengthen the belief (Axelrod, 1984, 1997; Ostrom, 1990). When collaborative members do not have long history of collaboration, trust has not been tested and strengths of the new member of collaboration may not be fully utilized. NGO D who did not have prior inter-organizational collaboration with Foundation A or NGO C reflected:

Apart from the media relations incident that took place on the last day of the summit, we felt we were prevented from contributing more to the concert event. We are an artist organization and we have many personal relationships in the music industry. We repeatedly told Foundation A that we could help them out on not only the media camp, but the concert event. We could brief local artists with information on human trafficking so they would be more prepared to advocate the issue to the public audience and the media. In the end, we were not allowed to access the artists and it was embarrassing that many of the local artists knew less about human trafficking in the Philippines than artists from overseas. We understand that the concert was not part of our responsibility but our collaboration could be maximized more strategically.

For the case in Thailand, a few coalition members (n=3) felt there was low level of open communication from the beginning, especially on what Foundation A could manage and deliver. The lack of openness in the beginning led to the situation where a few members of the coalition felt they had to take over the role of management during the final days of the forum. One participant commented “We were somewhat misguided that they already had a solid plan for their event and only needed people to help them
implement certain tasks. That was not the case when the forum was about to happen. We felt a little bit exploited when we had to take over the management role. This experience will make us pause before committing to collaborate with them again.” Failed collaboration can lead members to mistrust each other and hinder future interactions. Honesty and trust is therefore a delicate factor that practitioners should be mindful of when planning and implementing a collaborative intervention.

**Research Question Three: Outcomes of Collaboration**

This section describes the findings about the collaborative outcomes that are valued by members of the anti-trafficking coalitions. Since all of the interviews took place approximately 7 to 10 months after the youth forums were implemented the participants had some time to reflect on the outcomes that they had observed since the interventions. I started out by asking research participants to discuss the original outcomes of collaboration that they expected to achieve when they joined the coalition, whether those outcomes had been met now that they had time to reflect on them, and described any other outcomes that they might not anticipate but had observed occurring among the collaborative members after the event. I gave participants opportunities to discuss both the positive and negative aspects of each outcome. Findings generate three outcomes: goal achievement (n=16), changes in network structure (n=12) and social capital (n=10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Goal achievement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Changes in network structure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Social capital</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Goal achievement. All of the participants referenced goal achievement as the most important outcome for their collaboration (n=16). Everyone understood from the beginning that the reason for the formation of their coalition was to “train young people to do something positive for the society” and “to create community awareness on human trafficking prevention.” A few participants were adamant in stating that the goal to train and educate youth participants superseded other individual interests and benefits such as gaining publicity for their organizations or personal development. “For our organization, the benefits are not related to our organization, but to the youths. It's what they get out of the forum. It should not be about what we gained,” stated a coalition member in Thailand. Another research participant in Thailand agreed, “As long as the youths in our networks receive the education and training from the forum, we're content with it. We think this is the ultimate goal.”

When I further asked participants to assess if the goal of educating youth to become anti-trafficking campaigners had been met, the outcome was perceived differently in Thailand and the Philippines. While all participants in Thailand mentioned goal achievement as the expected outcome of their coalition, they reflected only one youth group that they were aware of had fulfilled the goal of the forum. A local NGO member explained:

A lot of the participants are poor migrants and hill tribe villagers in limbo status. After finishing mathayom (equivalent to high school education), most of them need to stop their education and move into the workforce to support their family. College is not their top priorities since they don’t have access to financial aid and tuition fees can be a huge expense. They don’t have the luxury of doing activism.
Only a few of these youths view volunteering and social activism as a viable career path. That’s just the reality of the situation and it will take time for the system to change and enable them to become what we want.

To explore the reasons why only one out of five Thai youth groups had still remained active in organizing community-based campaigns on human trafficking, I interviewed a youth leader from this group. She explained her continual efforts on the issue:

I was still a youth volunteer for a community-based organization at the time of the forum, and I’m now serving as a full-time staff in this place. This work is now part of my life. I don’t think that I’m only doing this because of salary or career growth. It’s not about that as our work is full of personal risks. I continue to work on this issue because of love, personal commitment and motivation to fight human trafficking.

Another factor that contributed to unsustainable efforts from most of the youth participants stemmed from the lack of resources and structural support. A member from a local NGO lamented, “There was no leading agency to pull various agencies to follow up with these youths. The youth forum event became more of an ad-hoc project. Only one group survived because of a strong leadership from the youth group and an active community-based organization that supports their work. Foundation A should think of a more sustainable system to support the youth participants.”

There are various elements that contributed to the failure of the goal achievement in this collaboration. Youth participants were selected from the target group that would have less likelihood to commit to the community campaigning process. There was also no
vetting process to ensure youth groups from each region have an active CBOs or NGOs that would continue to support their work. Many of the coalition members still viewed Foundation A as the key responsible party who should ensure youths were keeping up with the anti-trafficking campaign efforts, rather than viewed it as a shared role among all coalition members. All these problems could be traced back to the weak collaborative process that took place prior to the youth forum event.

The coalition members in the Philippines had a different interpretation on the goal achievement outcome. There was less concern about the total number of youth groups who managed to carry out campaigning activities, but more on what can be achieved from their campaigning efforts. A local coalition member opined:

We question if this community awareness campaigning strategy really reduces any number of human trafficking. In some way, we felt uncomfortable in Foundation A’s refusal to get involved in public advocacy. They were training the youths to create awareness but not advocating for change. Without advocacy, no actions will be taken to make structural changes and all the efforts could get lost in the media hype. So, that was really our main worry.

While the goal of the coalition was to educate and train youth participants to become community campaigners on the issues, tensions still existed in the control of how anti-trafficking campaigns were carried out by the youth groups. Given Foundation A’s status as a grantee of the US and Australian governments, they have restriction in being involved in advocacy campaigns that aim to influence local politics or engage in disruptive social movement tactics that target local governments to amend or introduce a new law against human trafficking. This limitation caused local coalition members who
believed in advocacy approach to feel they had lost an opportunity to train youth to carry out more effective campaigning strategy that could really create change.

3.2 Changes in network structure. The next theme generated discussion on how collaboration of the youth forum had created any changes in the network structure or increased interactions among members in the coalition (n=12). Again, the interpretation of this category differed by country. In the Philippines, coalition members described increased interactions and credited them as the outcome from the youth summit collaboration. Research participants in the Philippines stated increased interactions resulted in more collaborative projects beyond the scope of anti-trafficking interventions, but they also experienced negative consequences from these interactions. Meanwhile, Thailand also experienced increased interactions among coalition members but only with those who already had pre-existing relationships. The increased interactions did not extend to the people they had not collaborated before the youth forum.

For the case in the Philippines, members continue to collaborate in projects that are not only related to the youth summit. A country coordinator from Foundation A remarked that “NGO C is now inviting me to attend their stakeholder meetings in other things. We are also engaging NGO D to collaborate on our anti-trafficking road-show activities” A staff from NGO D commented favorably that “After the youth summit, we continue to collaborate with NGO C on other activities. In fact, we have 3 ongoing projects with them right now.” Another coalition member associated with NGO C who moved on to join another organization also utilized this coalition network, saying “Right now, I'm organizing an event to showcase innovative NGOs and I have invited NGO C and NGO D to participate in the event.” The youth summit collaboration had increased
interactions among coalition members, strengthened their relationships and increased mobilization of resources among one another to accomplish other goals.

Increased interactions did not only cause positive outcomes. Negative and unintended consequences could also occur. One of the youth groups chose to bypass NGO C and made direct contact with Foundation A to support their campaigning efforts, which resulted in tensions between the two organizations. A local staff explained the situation:

NGO C feels they own the anti-trafficking youth movement group. As a mother organization, they have a vision and their own agenda for what this youth group should be doing. Having Foundation A comes in to interfere without their knowledge is problematic. Fortunately, this issue was immediately addressed and the two organizations reconciled.

Tensions were not only created between NGO C and Foundation A, but also among the youth groups in different regions of the country. Increased interactions between youth group in one region and Foundation A stirred unhealthy competition and jealousy among youth groups in other geographic areas. A project staff from NGO C recalled the incident:

When the youth leaders from two other regions found out that Foundation A has been giving monetary support to the group that was organizing a big awareness event, they became upset and started to ask questions on why they were not equally supported. We did not anticipate to be viewed as showing favoritism on one group over the rest. The last thing we want is for the youth network in each region to try to outperform each other rather than sharing ideas and strategies to
promote the cause. We finally managed to come up with a resolution by working with Foundation A to allocate equal amount of funding of $6,000 for each region and it will be managed by us to ensure transparency and fiscal accountability.

In Thailand, a few interactions among coalition members were noted by the participants. CBO A informally approached iNPO A to assist them in their organizational strategic planning and proposal development. iNPO A also asked NGO A to collaborate with them on a flood relief project. FBO A mentioned recruiting staff from NGO A and CBO A to deliver an anti-trafficking campaigning training for another group of youth beneficiaries. However, most of the Thai coalition members stressed that these interactions were not directly the result of the youth forum collaboration. One local participant explained:

We are already part of the local anti-trafficking community and have been working together on various projects. The youth forum may have provided us with an opportunity to be in the same room and rekindled our relationships, but we mostly continue to collaborate with people who have pre-existing relationships.

This insight explained why many of the youth participants did not benefit from increased interactions among members in the collaborative network. It was because they did not have prior relationships with a majority of the coalition members who were active on the issue of human trafficking. This led us to the next outcome finding, social capital, which is closely associated with changes in network structure.

3.3 Social capital. The concept of social capital refers to the accumulation of resources that are mobilized through social relationships in the social networks (Nahapiet
and Ghoshal, 1998). It is closely related to changes in network structure since the increased interactions among the coalition members often involve exchange of resources to accomplish particular activities that they have common interests. It appears that the collaborations were seen by many as developing social capital that could be used to address a variety of issues. For example, a participant from iNPO A in Thailand narrated:

We had an emergency situation of flooding across the country toward the end of 2011. We urgently need someone with the knowledge in English and strong communication skills to work with us on that project. We immediately thought of the trainer at the youth forum who delivered the session on effective speech and presentation. We end up recruiting her into our organization. She is now a full-time staff and continues to work with us on various projects. We also reached out to NGO A to assist us in distributing information and collecting community needs during and after the floods since they are a coordinating agency with many connections in communities across the northern region.

A research participant from FBO A gave another example of utilizing social capital:

We have been referring trafficking cases to NGO A. We have also started to discuss with them in pulling our resources to conduct joint campaigning activities in 3-4 districts in the north. We are also exploring collaboration opportunities with iFBO A as they have the same working areas in Laos and we’re planning to reach at-risk hill tribe villagers in those areas. So, we are trying to utilize our resources to help our target groups.
The two examples from the Thailand cases above demonstrated that social capital was created when local organizations took advantage of ties to other organizations and agree to work with one another based on mutual needs and interests (Gray, Wesley and Brown, 1998).

As the youth groups in the Philippines were at the more advanced level in terms of self-organizing ability and possessed stronger impetus to drive anti-trafficking movements in their communities, a more complex challenge was created when there was inadequate social capital that could be mobilized to support their activities. A youth participant in the coalition expressed this concern:

The anti-trafficking youth movement is quickly becoming its own entity. Youths are very active in building their coalitions, expanding memberships and engaging local partners on their own. I think NGO C is not really prepared to handle the growing requests of resources from these youths. This is expected because NGO C is a large organization and they have other priorities that do not serve just the youth population. Their staff is overstretched and I think this could potentially hinder the growth of the youth movement if they did not allocate more staff and resources to cater to these youth participants.

Expectations that social capital could facilitate further collaboration is likely to strain scarce resources from collaborative members who do not have well-designed mechanisms to meet the growing demand, leading to disappointment and frustration that may result in youths withdrawing from the anti-trafficking movement. The outcome of social capital should therefore be carefully assessed in the beginning of the community-
based collaboration so coalition members could anticipate how many resources are needed to fulfill these expectations.

The practice of sharing intervention approaches was also described by research participants as the result of social capital. One participant from a local NGO in Thailand raved about the knowledge that she had gained from collaborating in the intervention as followed:

Despite the challenges during the implementation of the youth forum, we gained many benefits from this work. We come to know new ways of campaigning. We start to integrate some of Foundation A’s approaches such as inviting influential people like ambassadors, government leaders and local artists to create awareness about human trafficking. In the past, we just use our trainers or human trafficking experts to speak to the audience and that can be boring. Now we are making efforts to connect with influential leaders to join the campaigns. We also adopt Foundation A’s concert model in our outreach activities. We recruit and train artists who have hill tribe roots to become advocates for our work and they have been speaking out to our target audience during our outreach events.

Another participant in the Philippines coalition agreed:

One of the reasons for us to join this collaboration was to learn new ways of engaging youth and empower them to do anti-trafficking work. We have widened our perspectives on other creative approaches such as educating youths on media production and song writing instead of doing traditional tactics like marching and poster exhibitions. We have observed that overall, youths are more receptive to
these kinds of trainings and I hope to integrate more of that into our projects in the future.

It should be noted that sharing of intervention approaches was not confined to adoption of practices, but also collaborative strategies. A few participants viewed Foundation A as an organization from the corporate sector given its brand association with a large media network. They considered this collaboration as an opportunity to learn how to work with corporations on social development issues. The strategies of engaging corporations as sponsors and recruiting them as volunteers were referenced as best practices learned from the collaboration.

**Research Question Four: Ethical Dilemmas of Collaboration**

The fourth research question in this study asked about ethical concerns during the collaboration. Findings generated three ethical dilemmas (see Table 4.6): message control (n=3), exploitation of local organizations (n=4) and disruption of norms and cultures (n=5). Participants had difficulty understanding the concept of ethical dilemmas of collaboration and most participants viewed it as the negative outcome that was the result of the youth forum. I made a decision to not give examples of the ethical dilemma concept as I feared it could mislead them to discuss those examples. After conducting five interviews and still failing to get any desired responses, I decided to explain the concept based upon Guttman (2000, p. 174)’s discussion of ethical dilemmas which included the choices, values or working approaches that were during the collaboration that might interfere with the ingrained beliefs and social values of other stakeholders and the possibility of those decisions causing unintended harm to the target beneficiaries. This explanation enabled me to gather more substantial responses from the remaining
research participants who mentioned at least one ethical dilemma that occurred or was anticipated from the collaboration.

Table 4.6 Ethical dilemmas of collaboration and the number of participants citing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Dilemmas of Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Disruption of norms and cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Exploitation of local organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Message control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Disruption of norms and cultures. In community-based collaboration, there could be an ethical dilemma of disruption of local norms and cultures when external organizations created an intervention that imposes certain values that deviates from the traditional beliefs and practices of the target population (Duncan and Cribb, 1996). In this study, the youth forum approach was perceived to create conflict as traditional values and identity among the youth beneficiaries are threatened. One participant from a Thailand coalition remarked:

There's a negative feedback that Foundation A doesn't promote marginalized culture, their customs and traditions. Youths just wear shirts with Foundation A’s logo and imitate the acts of foreign cultures instead of focusing on telling stories of the challenges that they face in their community. Getting youths to stand in front of the camera to just say "Stop Trafficking!" really doesn't change anything.

Another challenge faced by the youths in Thailand is the culture of seniority, as pointed by one coalition member, “Students in Thailand are used to be recruited as participants and waited to be told what to do by teachers and adults. The youth forum’s approach is to train them to organize campaigns on their own. It flies in the face of local culture, so they will have some difficulty in breaking the tradition.”
The above examples pointed to the need for anti-trafficking coalition to carefully consider if the intervention approaches would cause significant disruption to the local norms and cultures. While not all changes in traditional beliefs and practices are perceived as bad by all community members, precautions should be taken to communicate these concerns to the local stakeholders and the coalition can make a decision if the potential disruption of norms and cultures are worth the risk.

4.2 Exploitation of local organizations. The exploitation dilemma is described by Guttman (2000) as a situation in which community-based organizations are exploited by external agencies who expect CBOs to sustain the intervention activities. The ethical dilemma is exacerbated when the intervention does not necessarily serve the interests of the local community and requires CBOs to overstretch their resources to maintain the activity. Results suggested that a few participants from local NGOs and CBOs felt used and that their efforts were not reciprocated in the long run (n=4). One participant from a local organization in Thailand lamented:

We try to contact Foundation A to support us with our local event in the later part of 2011, but no one responded to our request. We were disappointed because we set aside a lot of time and resources to help them out in their event, but they are not interested to work with us afterward. This makes me question their agenda if they’re really committed to end human trafficking or use this as a public relations stunt for their company. They should sit down to talk with local partners and get involved with some of our local projects.
To pacify the situation, Foundation A mentioned they would be more open about their intention and limitation in the next phase of the campaign. A staff from Foundation A concluded:

We understand that they might see us enjoying the spotlight and then take off. We will be open about our resources, show them that we have financial commitment to them, to the youth, and they can see what is going on so they have control and that we want to complement their work. Given our expertise, we may not be able to fully participate in local activities but we can help them with other things like promoting their events or connecting them to people in our networks.

4.3 Message control. In this study, the issue of control was focused on campaign messaging (n=3). In this community-based collaboration, the goal was to educate and mobilize youth participants to become campaigners in their communities. This strategy exposed youth beneficiaries to create their own messages and communicate them to the local community without interference from the more professional coalition members. However, this means that control of the message shifts from program to the youth, an issue in many community-based collaborations. The issue frequently emerges about the balance between campaign strategy, often, as in this case, established a priori by program organizers, and the emergent, community based messages that may stray from the strategy. A staff from Foundation A outlined his strategy to minimize the risks of losing message control to youth participants:

We have developed a guideline for youths to follow as they carry out their campaigning activities. We carefully addressed this issue during our youth events. We told them to always try to work with local partners and have their campaign
messages crosschecked whenever they are doubtful. We told them of the differences between awareness raising activities and disruptive shaming of politicians, traffickers or calling for rescuing of victims. It’s not about being freedom fighters to wage wars against trafficking. That could put them at risks of retaliation from human traffickers or their enablers. We don’t set an expectation that they’re going to end human trafficking in the community, but just play the role of educating their peers to be cautious and seek help if they are ever in that situation. We also talked about risks of social media platform, telling them to never pose pictures with their addresses or include faces of the victims. We tell them to be careful of publishing things online as those things cannot be easily erased.

Message control was anticipated to become a potential problem that caused inadvertent harm to the youth campaigners. Fortunately, none of the youths in the program had been reported to communicate grossly inappropriate campaign messages or engaged in tactics that put them at risks. It was possible that the preventive guideline by Foundation A had so far mitigated those risks. However, coalition members also noted that the issue might come up when the youth participants had more time to implement anti-trafficking activities. It is therefore important for local NGOs and CBOs to continually work with the youth groups to revisit the campaign message guideline.

**Chapter Summary**

The results of this chapter were derived from all the interviews and the textual analyses of their transcriptions. Overall, the study generates 19 important factors of community-based collaboration under the four categories of (1) antecedents of
collaboration, (2) process of collaboration, (3) outcomes of collaboration and (4) ethical dilemmas of collaboration. Seven factors which include history of collaboration, need for resource mobilization, common interests, community readiness, interdependence, reputation and complex issues are referenced by research participants as the significant pre-conditions that enable them to make a decision to join an anti-trafficking coalition. Governance, administration, information relationships, organizational autonomy, mutual benefits and fairness, and honesty and trust emerged prominently as the six factors that assisted coalition members to manage and control the process of collaboration.

Participants also cited three important outcomes of collaboration, which are goal achievement for the coalition, increased changes in network structure among collaborative actors and development of social capital for other projects or tasks. Three ethical dilemmas which are disruption of local norms and cultures, exploitation of local organizations and message control also surface as crucial issues during the anti-trafficking collaboration. Table 4.7 summarizes these factors of community-based collaboration in their respective category.

It is important to note that these 19 factors are the collective view of 15 anti-trafficking actors from the sector of non-governmental organizations, faith-based institutions, grassroots organizations and youth groups. The results are more representative to the context of anti-trafficking community-based collaborations in Thailand and the Philippines. Researchers therefore should not assume that the emergent findings in this study are the absolute collection of all the factors of community-based collaboration across disciplines and settings. The results in this chapter are intended to contribute to the small, but growing literature on collaboration against human trafficking.
Table 4.7 Factors of community-based collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedents of Collaboration</th>
<th>Number of Participants Citing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 History of collaboration</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Need for resource mobilization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Common interests</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Community readiness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local capacity of individuals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impetus to collaborate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Interdependence</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Complex issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Governance</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Informal relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Organizational autonomy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Mutual benefits and fairness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Honesty and trust</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Goal achievement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Changes in network structure</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Development of social capital</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Dilemmas of Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Disruption of norms and cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Exploitation of local organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Message control</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions of the study. I will discuss the implications of the research results to the refinement of the model of community-based collaboration. I will also provide personal reflections on the process of gathering data, analyzing and interpreting results and discuss the limitations of the study. I will conclude this chapter by laying out future directions for research on community-based collaboration in human trafficking prevention interventions.

**Implications on the Model of Community-based Collaboration**

The goal of this study was to advance our understanding on community-based anti-trafficking collaborations and identify the salient factors that are important in enabling, facilitating and accomplishing the goals of the coalition. Based on the extensive literature review on the topics of collaboration and community-based interventions, I developed an antecedents-process-outcomes-ethics framework of collaboration (see Figure 2.2 in chapter 2) and used this conceptual framework to guide the research questions in this study. The original framework of collaboration contained four related components: (1) antecedents of collaboration, the important pre-conditions that enable individuals and organizations to take part in the collaboration; (2) process of collaboration, the factors that facilitate coalition members to manage the process; (3) outcomes of collaboration, the outcomes that are expected to occur as the result of collaboration and; (4) ethical dilemmas of collaboration, the potential ethical dilemmas that raise significant concerns during collaboration and may have unintended implications to the stakeholders (Wood & Gray, 1991; Roman, Moore, Jankins & Small, 2002;
Guttman, 2000; Thomson & Perry, 2006). My intention during data collection, coding and results analysis was to verify if the research data would match most of the factors in this conceptual framework, and also to explore if there were any other prominent collaborative factors that emerged from the cases of community-based anti-trafficking interventions. In a way, this study attempted to verify and refine the original conceptual framework into a revised model of community-based collaboration. The development of a revised model is necessary because it can provide researchers and practitioners with a more valid and useful tool to plan, manage and monitor anti-trafficking community-based collaborations.

Figure 5.1 displays the revised model of community-based collaboration that includes 22 factors under antecedents of collaboration, collaborative process, outcomes of collaboration and ethical dilemmas of collaboration. The results from the two cases in this study generated 15 factors that were similar to the original conceptual framework of collaboration, and also 4 additional variables (noted with*) that were found to be salient in the community-based anti-trafficking collaborations. I have also retained 3 original factors (noted with**) that did not emerge from this study, but warrant further research as they still can be useful in other collaborations. I will now discuss the implications of the results of this study on the development of a revised model of community-based collaboration.
Antecedents of Collaboration

Findings from the two cases in this study generated seven factors that can be considered as pre-conditions of collaboration. All of the seven pre-conditions except common interests and reputation are found to match the variables under the antecedents section on the original conceptual framework (refer to Figure 2.2). Overall, history of collaboration was most frequently cited \((n=16)\), followed by need for resource mobilization \((n=14)\), common interests \((n=11)\), community readiness \((n=10)\), interdependence \((n=9)\), reputation \((n=7)\) and complex issues \((n=4)\).

The summary of the definitions of the seven pre-conditions of collaboration in the revised model is described as followed: (1) history of collaboration, the condition that describe partners with previous working relationships can enhance the likelihood that
collaboration will be successful; (2) need for resource mobilization, the understanding that exchanging of resources among members of coalition would increase the efficacy and efficiency of the planning and implementation of an agreed intervention (3) common interests, refers to similar organizational goals and missions, target groups, ideological standing and working approach; (4) community readiness, a key factor that is used to assess the engagement and recruitment of community members into the coalition.

Community members with strong community structure, high capacity of individuals with desired skills and experience on a particular issue and impetus to be involved and sustain the intervention activities with the coalition are more likely to succeed in the collaboration; (5) interdependence, the recognition that organizations are dependent on each other to effectively plan and implement anti-trafficking interventions. This belief will increase when collaborative members equally value collaboration as a strategy and perceive mutual benefits can be gained from collaboration; (6) Reputation, a factor which emerges as important for potential partners with little or no history of collaboration as good reputation increases members confidence that the collaborative efforts will be favorable; and (7) complex issues, the shared beliefs that human trafficking is a complex issue that requires collaboration among actors with different expertise and resources to solve the problem.

Common interests, the new factor that emerged from this study, was not mentioned in the original framework because previous studies have shown that actors occasionally do not consider common interests as a necessary requirement to engage in collaboration as those with different interests may decide to work together as long as they have beneficial reasons to do so (Gray, 2000). The prominent reference of common
interests in this study could be attributed to Foundation A’s strategy in using common interests as a criteria to approach and enroll other parties into the coalitions. The use of common interests as a strategy is explained by the theory of homophily that describes the tendency for people to select others who are similar into their networks because they will have easier time to communicate, build trust and reciprocity, and predict interactions and behaviors (Monge & Contractor, 2003). I still would advocate for researchers to incorporate common interests as a pre-condition for anti-trafficking collaboration because it focuses on the important role of interpersonal relationships in influencing the formation of a coalition. This factor is particularly useful for collaboration that consist largely of actors within the same sector who serve similar target groups and have the similar organization mission of preventing human trafficking. The inclusion of common interests may be more complex in an inter-sector collaboration that involves actors with more diverse interests, e.g., those in the private sector who wish to get involved in the issue as part of corporate communication strategies to mitigate risks of consumer retaliation against brands that employ forced labor. Nevertheless, it still should be helpful for potential partners who want to increase their confidence that there are intersecting area of interests among different parties who are about to form collaborative relationships.

Reputation is another new factor that emerged from the data in this study. Reputation can be observed to have an inverse relationship with history of collaborative efforts as participants who cited reputation tended to have little or no history of collaborative efforts with other members of the collaboration. The inclusion of this factor in the collaborative model is therefore useful in the cases where substantial number of stakeholders have little or no records of previous collaborative relationships.
It should be noted that the factor ‘need for resource mobilization’ did not appear in the original framework but its meaning are similar to ‘need for resources and risk sharing’ and ‘resource scarcity’ from the original framework. The two concepts are closely related as anti-trafficking practitioners mentioned they were operating in an environment with scarce resources and need to mobilize resources and share risks with other parties to increase the efficacy and efficiency of an intervention. ‘Need for resource mobilization’ is created to concisely combine the meaning of the two concepts.

The final model includes seven factors that are instrumental for the successful formation of anti-trafficking coalitions and should be used as an assessment tool to identify and evaluate potential parties that should or should not be invited to join the collaboration. Failure to carefully vet the antecedents of collaboration will result in problematic relationships among collaborative members in the later stages of interventions. While it may not be realistic to fully meet all of the seven antecedent conditions, potential collaborators should be mindful of the risks and benefits in collaborating with someone when many of the factors fall short.

**Process of Collaboration**

This research divided the process of collaboration into six dimensions which were governance (n=11), administration (n=10), informal relationships (n=5), organizational autonomy (n=9), mutual benefits and fairness (n=8), and honesty and trust (n=8). All of the dimensions except informal relationships matched with the collaborative process concepts from the original framework.

The summary of the definitions of the six collaborative process factors are (1) governance, the rules that control the behavior of coalition members and the division of
resources, roles and responsibilities among the parties to achieve the goals of the collaboration; (2) administration, the ability of lead agency to manage the coalition members through effective communication of essential information, monitoring of the fulfillment of agreed activities and mediating tensions and conflicts that occur during the process; (3) Organizational autonomy, the balance of maintaining the interests of coalition without violating organizational interests; (4) Mutual benefits and fairness, the perceived fairness of distribution of resources and benefits among coalition members during the planning and implementation of the intervention; (5) informal relationships, the ability of individuals to relate and build interpersonal bonds with other collaborative members; and (6) honesty and trust, the significant characteristics of a successful coalition whose members are open to disclose one’s expectations, constraints and goals which lead to development of trust that quicken the accomplishment of shared decision making process and accomplishment of tasks.

Informal relationships emerged as an additional factor especially in the Philippines coalition where participants attributed strong interpersonal bonds as one of the main reasons that facilitated the smooth functioning of their collaboration. The emergence of informal relationships is not surprising, as collaboration scholars like Ring and Van de Ven (1994) suggest that informal elements such as camaraderie and friendship between actors are typical characteristics of successful coalitions. Informal relationships go beyond the formal elements such as rules of the coalition, memorandum of understanding or legal contracts that merely lay the structure of the coalitions and divide roles and responsibility among participating members. This study demonstrates that a coalition with strong informal relationships tend to experience positive
collaborative process as members develop honesty and trust (another collaborative process dimension in this model) which help them to pacify conflicts and tensions. The informal relationships also allow coalition members to commit to verbal agreements, instead of relying on the lengthy process of creating MOUs and legal contracts, and this makes planning and implementation of the coalition activities more efficient. The inclusion of informal relationships in the revised model is therefore useful.

I made a slight change in the wording of the original concept ‘mutuality’ to ‘mutual benefits and fairness’ for the revised model. Mutuality is explained as the state in which collaborative parties receive mutual benefits from being involved in the coalition (Thomson and Perry, 2006). The change to ‘mutual benefits and fairness’ stemmed from the results data where participants associated perceived fairness with the distribution of resources and benefits among coalition members. The addition of fairness to mutual benefits is significant because the presence of mutual benefits may not necessarily indicate the dynamics of the coalition. Participants often compare against others the ratio of their input of resources and efforts to the returned benefits. Members who view the distribution of resources and benefits as unfair may start to lose trust with their partners, decrease their participation and eventually withdraw from the collaboration.

‘Honesty and trust’ is the last factor of collaborative process that was revised slightly from ‘norms of trust and reciprocity’ in the original conceptual framework. Ring and Van de Ven (1994) suggest that the recurring interactions among coalition members which start out based on the principle of reciprocity (where members believe their contributions and returned benefits are distributed fairly) will gradually transform into the norms of trust. The norms of trust help the coalition to function more efficiently as
members who trust each other can make decisions and assign tasks fairly quickly (Chiles & McMackin, 1996; Ostrom, 1998; Smith, 1995). However, the interview data from this study pointed out that honesty is a more important precursor to the development of trust. A coalition in which participants are more honest in their expectations, constraints, and goals will build the norms of trust that prove to be beneficial during the process of collaboration. Members with trustworthy quality are perceived to make genuine efforts to fulfill their obligations, raise any issues during its inception and prevent the escalation of problems that can disrupt the coalition. ‘Honesty and trust’ is therefore a more appropriate term to represent the collaborative process factor.

The six factors under the collaborative process in the revised model could be used to access, monitor and manage the collaborative process. A coalition that carefully consider the dynamics of the six factors should have a more enjoyable and effective collaborative experience while those that pay less attention to the six factors will be more likely to suffer mistrust, disappointment and unable to achieve the goals of the coalition.

**Outcomes of Collaboration**

Goal achievement (n=16), changes in network structure (n=12) and development of social capital (n=10) are the three outcomes of collaboration from the original conceptual framework that emerged from the analysis of data in this study. They are defined as followed: (1) goal achievement, the assessment if the coalition has successfully attain the intervention goals; (2) changes in network structure, the increased number of interactions that occur among coalition members after the collaborative intervention; (3) development of social capital, the accumulation of
resources that are mobilized through social relationships in the social networks and the sharing of intervention approaches from other coalition members.

I chose to keep the remaining two outcomes of ‘creation of shared meaning’ and ‘shifts in the power distribution’ in the revised model. ‘Creation of shared meaning’ is the outcome that takes place when collaborative actors generate a shared understanding about the identified problem and collectively create new, innovative actions to solve it (Gray, 2000). Participants did not cite ‘creation of shared meaning’ primarily because of the nature of the intervention in this study. In the two cases, the general goals and approaches of the youth forum intervention were already pre-determined by Foundation A before the formation of a coalition. Hence, the participants did not make any references on new understanding of the human trafficking problem or creation of novel intervention activities by the whole coalitions. This outcome would be more applicable to anti-trafficking collaborations that bring together actors across sectors to brainstorm and create new intervention approaches collectively from the start. This may include the coalition that calls all of its members to draft a new anti-trafficking legislation to address contentious situation in the region or to brainstorm a pilot intervention that tracks and reports the traffickers’ use of internet in commercial trade of child prostitution.

‘Shifts in the power distribution’ or the extent to which power is redistributed within the collaborative members in such a way that those with less power become increasingly influential to the decision-making process at the later stages of the collaboration (Gray, 2000). This outcome is not salient from the two cases as the interventions were not designed to include grassroots organizations and the youth groups in the early stage of the collaboration to shape the goals and strategies of the youth
forum. They were recruited at the later stage to become implementers or participants of the program. This outcome therefore will be more applicable to a coalition which has the aim to transform the culture where powerful stakeholders like government agencies and international donors gradually transfer the process of decision-making and control to parties with less power such as CBOs, local NGOs and youth organizations.

The five outcomes of collaboration in the revised model can aid researchers and practitioners to look beyond the goal achievement as the sole outcome of their collaboration. ‘Changes in network structure,’ ‘development of social capital,’ ‘creation of shared meaning,’ and ‘shifts in the power distribution’ should be considered as additional outcomes that are to be monitored and evaluated as they capture the value-added benefits of collaboration. They can also indicate sustainability of the intervention and the coalition, if good practices are diffused to create ripple effects across the networks of collaborative actors, whether new solutions or understanding are made and if collaboration empowers the less privilege instead of perpetuating the power hierarchy in the society.

**Ethical Dilemmas of Collaboration**

The final component of the revised model of community-based collaboration outlines the four issues of ethical dilemmas that should be considered. They are: (1) disruption of norms and cultures \((n=5)\), the intentional or unintentional influences of external agencies on local community that disrupt the local norms and cultures; (2) exploitation of local organizations \((n=4)\), the situation in which resource-scarce community-based organizations are expected to sustain the intervention activities that are initiated by external agencies and may not necessarily serve the community interests; (3)
message control (n=3) the loss of control in the creation and distribution of anti-trafficking messages as community members are conducting the campaigns by themselves and; (4) privileging, the dilemma that some stakeholders are given more privileged than the others during collaboration and reinforces the existing hierarchy of power instead of empowering the voices of the underprivileged.

It should be noted that ‘disruption of local norms and cultures’ is the new ethical concern that emerged from this study while ‘privileging’ is the ethical dilemma in the original conceptual framework that I choose to retain in the revised model. We can notice that the issue of ‘privileging’ is closely associated with ‘shifts in the power distribution’ outcome from prior section. Given the nature of the two cases in this study which did not identify power redistribution as one of the goals during the intervention design phase, it was not surprising that none of the participants mentioned ‘privileging’ as their ethical concern.

While results in this study find limited occurrences of ethical dilemmas in community-based collaboration, researchers and practitioners in collaboration should still be wary of how their values, intervention approaches and choices can pose unintended risks, disrupt local ways of life or put other coalition members in an unfair and disadvantaged position. The careful consideration of the four ethical dilemmas from the revised model will prepare collaborative actors to effectively address potential concerns and mitigate negative consequences that may occur at any point during the implementation of the anti-trafficking interventions.
Linking Antecedents, Process, Outcomes and Ethical Dilemmas in the Model

The primary goal of this research is to explore the complex process of community-based collaboration in anti-trafficking interventions and identify the prominent factors that enable, facilitate, hinder or support the entire collaborative process. Apart from understanding the 22 factors in the model of community-based collaboration, we also should be mindful of the dynamic interplay among the four categories of antecedents, process, outcomes and ethical dilemmas of collaboration. While this study may not set out to investigate the nature of relationships among the variables between each category of collaboration, results analysis demonstrates compelling narratives from participants that the status of each stage of collaboration can influence the success or failure of the others. For example, a coalition with weak governance, administration and informal relationships in Thailand experience more conflicts and tensions that cause negative perception on mutual benefits and fairness, and honesty and trust. Coalition with fragile collaborative process experience more tensions and conflicts that lead to more unintended consequences that fracture collaborative relationships and increase the probability of failure in accomplishing the goals of the interventions. Ethical dilemmas also tend to surface more frequently. On the other hand, the Philippines case was depicted to possess stronger collaborative process and that led the coalition members to effectively handle conflicts, accomplish desired outcomes and minimize the risks from ethical concerns. This helps me to conclude that careful management and consideration of the factors in each stage of collaboration can influence the likelihood of success in the others.
Nevertheless, collaboration scholars have cautioned that we cannot assume a linear cause-effect relationship between the antecedents-process-outcome (Huxham and Vangen, 2005; O’Leary and Bingham, 2003; Thomson, Perry & Miller, 2008). The entire process of collaboration is complex and evolves over time, the relationships among the four categories of collaboration can change, making the prediction of patterns difficult if data collection is not done across longer period of time. More complex studies with longitudinal design have to be conducted to verify the assumption of the direction of relationships among the four collaborative categories in this revised model.

**Personal Reflections**

My decision to utilize case study as a method of investigation in this research stemmed from my appreciation of the constructionist approach in helping researchers to explore, describe and explain the complex mechanism of community-based collaboration in the context of anti-trafficking interventions. The entire process of case study research has made me reflect on my previous efforts in the work of anti-trafficking campaigns. I began to critically question the choices that I have made in previous collaborations, whose interests that I served, if my work resulted in positive changes or if it just perpetuated the status quo of the current players in the field of human trafficking. For example, my efforts to form collaborative relationships with other stakeholders might not have been carefully planned as a long-term strategy to establish my organization in the local anti-trafficking community, but rather short-term to accomplish ad-hoc tasks at hand. This was problematic as some of the local partners would gradually view us in the negative light and assumed we had no long term commitment to the local community and just wanted to take advantage of their resources and networks to promote our campaigns.
Many of the community-based collaborative programs did not follow the rigorous process of community involvement where local committees should be established to provide input to the campaign development. In a way, we sacrificed the adoption of the right community-based approach to save time and just get things done. The thesis also leads me to think about the roles of funders in the collaboration. Funders play an important role in providing financial resources that make it possible to launch an intervention. They often have the privilege to influence the final make-up coalition and in the process could end up perpetuating the hierarchy of power within the anti-trafficking community. For example, players who are from multi-lateral agencies and international organizations will usually get to sit at the table in the initial meetings to design the programs while community-based organizations are approached last and have minimal influence on the direction of the intervention. In order to redistribute power dynamics, it may be worthwhile to set up a different funding mechanism in which organizations channel financial resources to the coalition and allows the committee members to decide how the money is to be allocated in an intervention. The coalition could also work together from the start to create a proposal to external funding organizations so the less powerful organizations can have some influence during the planning stage.

In addition to the above reflections, I also notice the shift from the criminal justice frame to the public health frame as I move from the introduction and literature review chapters to the results section. The criminal justice frame focuses more on the formal collaborative networks to identify and prosecute traffickers while the public health frame relies more on the informal, dynamic networks of collaboration to identify risks and protective factors to implement preventive measures for the target population. It is not
surprising to see the emergence of new collaborative factors such as common interests, informal relationships and reputation as they are normal characteristics of people in the informal communication networks (Monge & Contractor, 2003). The results of this study demonstrate the importance of interpersonal relationships and similarity of age, interests and occupation that assisted the self-selection of partners in the anti-trafficking coalitions. This points to the integration of interpersonal communication and communication network theories in collaboration research to increase the rigor of our understanding of the process.

This thesis makes me realize that practitioners can make better decisions and avoid potential problems by carefully consider the important factors within the process of collaboration. It also demonstrates that there is a big opportunity for researchers of collaboration to reach out to practitioners in the anti-trafficking community to improve their intervention efforts through testing and application of their theories, models and conceptual frameworks.

I came in to this study with the dual identity as an academic researcher and a practitioner who has been working in the anti-trafficking sector for a few years. This gave me a few advantages. I was able to gain access and immediately build rapport with the participants as majority of them have personally met me through previous collaboration. Many participants expressed genuine interests and willingness to participate in this research project because they see the benefits of having a trained researcher to evaluate their efforts. I also have direct field experience in Thailand and the Philippines, which allows me to understand the different cultural contexts, the nature of collaborative situations and anti-trafficking campaigns in the two countries. The dual identity also
broadens goals for this research to not only advance the academic field of human trafficking and collaboration, but to also provide anti-trafficking actors with evidence-based tools that can be used in the design, implementation and assessment of their community-based collaboration.

With this goal in mind, I always ended my interview with a question to the research participants to share with me on what they hoped to see in my research study or described the things that they thought would be most useful to help them manage collaborative projects better. Many participants said that they wanted to see an effective model of collaboration with step by step instructions on how to form the coalition, what points to consider, how to manage the coalition members during the planning and implementation of the intervention and how to measure impacts and outcomes. It is my hope that the revised model of community-based collaboration in this study will provide them with the starting point to plan and administer a coalition.

Limitations

While my dual identity offers a few advantages, it has also created a few challenges that may affect the validity of the raw data. While my primary role is an independent academic researcher, research participants might still associate me with my former employer who was one of the collaborators in the youth forum interventions. I tried to mitigate this risk by informing my research subjects both in writing and through verbal conversations that I am no longer working for this organization and all of their contributions, including their name and organization, will be kept confidential. I stressed that this study was not conducted to serve the interests of any particular organization and should not jeopardize their status in the coalition. I tried my best to ask questions that
allow participants to critically evaluate their own choices, shortcomings and best practices. Despite adopting these approaches, I still felt that a few participants, especially those in the more prominent positions, were inclined to give socially desirable responses. They were reserved in making critical comments for fear that those comments would paint others in the negative light and harm their relationships. A few participants were uncomfortable in discussing their organizational interests and even claimed it to be inappropriate to question the sincerity of their involvement on the issue. It was important for me to understand my bias in assuming that most participants should have a hidden agenda to serve their organizations rather than working altruistically for the interests of youth beneficiaries and the human trafficking cause. In retrospect, I would have spent more time to explain my position as an academic researcher whose goal is to critically assess the complex process of their collaboration, and uncomfortable discussion of negative experiences may be necessary to not only advance knowledge about the topic, but also assist practitioners to identify the challenges that could be addressed in their subsequent collaboration.

It should also be noted that participants were interviewed approximately seven to eleven months removed from the youth forum activity. Fallible memory and different stages of collaboration could be significant factors that generated different results. The collaborative intervention in Thailand took place approximately four months before the Philippines. Though participants in Thailand gave me rich and insightful data, the time difference could be makes the data less trustworthy. During the time of data collection, most of the coalition members in Thailand were not currently working with Foundation A, the lead agency of the coalition. The absence of collaborative relationships could also
explain why there were more bias and negative responses, especially during the discussion of outcomes which touched on sustainability. On the other hand, Foundation A did have ongoing projects with the coalition members in the Philippines. This put the participants at the different stages of collaboration and hence different results.

I started out this study with the plan of using multiple case study design and collect data from three cases in Cambodia, Thailand and the Philippines. Given limited resources and short timeframe to complete the study, I could only manage to gather my interview data through Skype calls. As a speaker of Thai and English languages, I had no major challenges in communicating with my research participants in Thailand and the Philippines. That was not the case for Cambodia and it became apparent during data collection that my inability to converse in Khmer language seriously hindered probing of more insightful and complex explanation on topics of interests. I managed to only gather 5 hours and 14 minutes of interview data from six participants in Cambodia, compared to 8 hours and 12 minutes from seven participants in the Philippines and 11 hours and 47 minutes from nine participants in Thailand. Given the skewed amount of raw data, I decided to drop Cambodia from this study to increase validity and trustworthiness of my results. At the same time, my attempt to increase validity of the study by dropping the Cambodia data also reduces the confidence of the validity of my findings. The main limitation of this study is the small number of research participants (n=15) and the small number of cases (2). The transferability of this research to other cases will be improved when there are more replicated studies to confirm the findings. Most research participants are actors from the sector of non-profit and community-based agencies. The two cases did not involve research participants from the government, multi-lateral and bilateral
sectors. Therefore, the transferability of this study may be more limited to the collaboration with mostly anti-trafficking players in the non-profit and community-based sector.

**Future Directions**

This case study is only a primary exploration of the conditions and process of the community-based collaboration in the anti-trafficking interventions. The study has generated 22 factors and a revised model of community-based collaboration that could be useful to practitioners and researchers in designing, assessing, managing, monitoring and evaluating other collaborative projects. Suggestions for the future directions of this research include: (1) increase validity and transferability of the key findings by conducting another case study research with more cases; (2) include participants from more diverse sectors such as those in local government agencies, foreign government agencies, private companies and survivor groups to understand the inter-sector organizational collaboration; (3) design a longitudinal case study research in which researchers collect data at least four different points before the formation of the coalition, during the planning of the community-based collaboration, during the implementation of the intervention and a few months after the intervention. The case study should incorporate more sources of evidence in addition to document review and interviews. I propose the inclusion of ethnography (field observations in coalition meetings and face-to-face interviews) to obtain more insightful data by taking into account the interpersonal behavior, both verbal and non-verbal, among coalition members. The new sources of evidence will contribute to further refinement of factors in the model of community-based collaboration. This study also should develop factors of collaboration into survey
items and test their correlations, causal relationships, significance, validity and reliability across larger research samples; (4) Utilize the revised model of community-based collaboration and its survey items to assess, monitor and evaluate more coalitions in other contexts such as drugs prevention, HIV/AIDS, environmental protection, etc; (5) conduct a randomized control trial by comparing anti-trafficking coalitions that are trained to adopt stronger community-based collaboration design against controlled coalitions and see if the treatment group is more successful in accomplishing its goals and sustaining its coalition.

These suggestions are some of the ways that should be explored to advance the academic field of anti-trafficking collaboration. The model of community-based collaboration will also provide researchers and practitioners with evidence-based tools that can be systematically applied in the real world to improve the effectiveness of their collaboration.
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Appendix A

Letter of Agreement with Foundation A on the Master’s Thesis “Community-based Collaboration in Human Trafficking Prevention Interventions”

Dear Sir or Madam,

As a masters student at the Pennsylvania State University, I have decided to focus my thesis study on investigating the process of collaboration of different actors within the anti-trafficking coalitions who play different roles in designing, implementing and evaluating human trafficking prevention interventions. In order to carry out this research, I have selected your organization as a case study to answer the below questions.

1. Why do anti-human trafficking actors view community-based collaboration as an effective approach in human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the perceived factors that enable them to form a coalition to initiate anti-trafficking interventions?
2. How do anti-trafficking coalitions manage the collaborative process in designing and implementing community-based human trafficking prevention interventions? What are the factors perceived by coalition members to have facilitated the collaborative process?
3. What are collaborative outcomes that are valued by coalition members?
4. Do anti-trafficking coalitions face ethical dilemmas during the design and implementation of a community-based collaboration? If they do, what are those ethical dilemmas?

I would like to request two sources of data from your organization: (i) document review and (ii) interviews with key stakeholders in your anti-trafficking coalitions.

(i) For document review, I would like to request access to the project documents, proposals, meeting minutes and evaluation reports that are related to the design and implementation of the national youth forum and youth outreach program Activities.

(ii) For interviews, I would like to request for a permission to contact and speak with key stakeholders who were involved in the design and implementation of the youth forum and outreach activities. The key stakeholders can be staff members from your organizations and related government and non-governmental partners in these program activities.

This is a letter of agreement between Prawit Thainiyom and Foundation A that permits Prawit Thainiyom to obtain relevant data in the above section. This letter also guarantees that any documents and interviewing data obtained for this study will be used exclusively as raw information for this thesis study. All collected data will be kept confidential and
stored in my personal computer with password protection and no other persons will have access to the collected files. The original data will be deleted in its entirety by the year 2013. In addition, original documents obtained from Foundation A will not be distributed to any other parties.

This research will not reference Foundation A or its campaign by name. In addition, this research will not mention the names of organizations that are involved in the activities, nor will personally identifiable information of the research participants be shared. All the names of the persons who appear in the internal documents and those who choose to participate in the interviews will be kept confidential in the event of publication or presentation of this study. Once the research is complete, Foundation A will have the option to be referenced by name. This is contingent upon Foundation A’s written approval, otherwise its name will remain anonymous in this study.

If you agree to the above terms, please sign your name and indicate the date below. You will also be given a copy of this letter of agreement for your records.

__________________________________________  __________________________
Official representative from Foundation A        Date

__________________________________________  __________________________
Prawit Thainiyom                               Date
Masters Candidate
The Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
The Pennsylvania State University
Appendix B

Letter to Request for an Interview for the Research on “Community-based Collaboration in Human Trafficking Prevention Interventions”

Dear XXX,

As a masters student in communication arts and sciences, I am interested to investigate the process of collaboration of different actors within the anti-trafficking coalitions who play different roles in designing, implementing and evaluating human trafficking prevention interventions. I have selected Foundation A as the case study for my research study with the goals of identifying the rationale for the growth of community-based collaboration as strategy in anti-trafficking interventions; documenting and analyzing best practices and challenges of the collaborative process; exploring what outcomes of collaboration are prioritized and valued; and discovering if there are any ethical concerns that occur during the program implementation.

In order to gather relevant data for the above goals, I will need to interview key anti-trafficking partners who were involved in Foundation A’s youth forum activities. As you are the main representative from XXX, an organization that is an official partner with Foundation A in Thailand, I believe that your perspectives will greatly contribute to this research project.

Our interview will follow the standard protocol from the Office for Human Research Protections at the Pennsylvania State University. To minimize the risks for our research participants, your contribution to this research will be kept confidential and I will not reference you and your organization by name, nor will any other personally identifiable information be shared in the event of research publication or presentation. Once the research is complete, I will also share my report with you. Please find the attached consent form and sign if you agree to participate in this study.

I hope that you will be interested to participate in this study and we will have the opportunity to discuss this project further. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Prawit Thainiyom

Masters Candidate
234 Sparks Building
The Department of Communication Arts and Sciences
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA, 16802-5201
Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Community-based Collaboration in Human Trafficking Prevention Interventions: A Case Study in Southeast Asia

Principal Investigator: Prawit Thainiyom, Graduate Student
Sparks Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 777-0033; pot5036@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Michael Hecht
501 Keller Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-0945; mlh10@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to understand the roles and collaborative process of the anti-human trafficking coalition in planning and implementing the anti-human trafficking interventions.

2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to participate in an online skype interview and answer a few questions about your involvement with the youth training forum. The interview will be audio recorded. The audio file will be stored in a researcher’s personal computer which is password protected, and will be destroyed by 2013. Only the principal investigator will have access to the file. You can still participate in this study if you do not want this interview to be audio recorded. Choose ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ to reflect your agreement to the audio recording at the end of this form.

3. Duration: It will take about one hour to complete the interview in this study

4. Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology being used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties. The interview data will be stored and secured at a researcher’s personal computer in a password protected computer. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared.

5. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact Prawit Thainiyom at +1(814) 777-0033 or pot5036@psu.edu with questions or concerns about this study.

6. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.
You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Do you agree to the audio recording of this interview?  ___Yes  ____No

If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

_____________________________  _______________________
Participant Signature  Date

_____________________________  _______________________
Person Obtaining Consent  Date