

The Stakeholders of Voluntourism, Community-Based Tourism, and Regenerative Tourism: An Integrated Framework

Minna Tunkkari-Eskelinen and Rositsa Röntynen

Jamk University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, Finland

minna.tunkkari-eskelinen@jamk.fi

rositsa.rontynen@jamk.fi

Abstract: Voluntourism, community-based tourism, and regenerative tourism represent three complementary approaches that collectively enhance tourism's responsibility. Each of them offers unique insights and methodologies that, when combined, can reinforce the others, promoting a more sustainable and ethical tourism landscape. To fully account for stakeholder responsibilities within this integrated framework, a comprehensive mapping of stakeholders is essential. This theoretical exploration conducts a literature review to synthesize core features of stakeholders across voluntourism, community-based tourism, and regenerative tourism, identifying both direct and indirect indications of their roles and functions. The analysis highlights key categories of stakeholders, including tourism demand, supply, intermediaries, the regulative system, and the natural and cultural environment. By comparing the characteristics and responsibilities of these stakeholders, the review reveals significant commonalities among the three tourism approaches, while also identifying potential areas for improvement. Furthermore, the inputs and outputs of stakeholders are integratively defined. Ultimately, the study aims to broaden the understanding of each approach and emphasize the importance of collaborative responsibility among stakeholders in fostering a more sustainable tourism ecosystem. The insights gained from this exploration contribute to the ongoing discourse on responsible tourism practices and offer practical implications for stakeholders seeking to enhance their roles in this evolving landscape.

Keywords: Voluntourism, Regenerative tourism, Community-based tourism, Stakeholder mapping, Responsible tourism

1. Introduction

For stakeholders to be accounted for their responsibility in tourism, the spectrum of stakeholders should first be mapped thoroughly. This study synthesizes some of the core features of stakeholders in voluntourism (VT), community-based tourism (CBT), and regenerative tourism (RT) from direct, but more often indirect indications of their roles and functions in scientific literature. Comparing the characteristics of the three concepts, there is much in common, but also much that could be loaned from each other to broaden the understanding about each tourism approach. The research question is: *Who are the stakeholders in voluntourism, community-based tourism, and regenerative tourism, and what similarities and differences could be identified between their roles and responsibilities to improve responsibility?*

This paper is a continuation of our previous research on voluntourism (Röntynen & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, 2022; Röntynen, 2022; Tunkkari-Eskelinen & Röntynen, 2023; Röntynen & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, 2024) as we noticed the need of expanding and concretizing the theoretical framework of voluntourism.

2. Research Methods

This theoretical exploration is based on an integrative literature review (Snyder, 2019) of the separate concepts of VT, CBT, and RT, enabling the development of a new theoretical framework (Torraco, 2005). A comprehensive search of scientific databases was conducted with an emphasis on more recent publications, but through a snowball effect more relevant papers were included. The literature review on each of the chosen tourism approaches is presented narratively, and inductive thematic analysis is used to identify, report, and analyse the patterns which organically emerge from the theory without predefined categories or themes.

The study applies the tourism destination ecosystem approach (Röntynen, 2024) to categorize stakeholders and particularly allow for the inclusion of the natural and cultural environment as stakeholders. Example, which the study refers to, states that "such a business ecosystem consists of not only intermediaries and industry partners, but also various stakeholders including governments, visitors, and the natural environment" (Selen & Ogulin, 2015, 167). The analysis also utilizes the input-output framework. Traditionally used in economic modeling (Thomassin, 2018), input-output analysis is adapted here as a qualitative framework to trace stakeholder interactions and emphasize responsibility in tourism.

3. The Stakeholders: Literature Review

3.1 Voluntourism

The most explored stakeholders of VT are the volunteer travellers, described both “as volunteers and tourists”, not fully matching the characteristics of either of these groups (Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020, 2). They make the decision to endeavour a volunteering trip by a combination of altruistic and selfish reasons (Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020; Mustonen, 2005; Wearing & McGehee, 2013). They wish to change their daily life environment and have meaningful and memorable experiences, learn something new and self-improve, interact with new cultures to better understand them, build new or restore natural environments, infrastructure, and social structures in the destination, as well as contribute to the local economy (Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020; Bentele, 2023; Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018; Pompurová et al., 2018). The majority of voluntourists come from Europe and North America (Bentele, 2023), which positions their origin in the developed world. The imbalance between selfish and altruistic motivation of voluntourists is seen as a basis of commodification of locals’ challenges and decrease of benefits (Bentele, 2023; Wearing, Young & Everingham, 2017). Moreover, the lack of training and ephemerality of visits of volunteers affect the received benefits negatively (Anderson, Kim & Larios, 2017; Bentele, 2023; Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018). Historically, voluntourism has been seen as international activity (Wearing & McGehee, 2013), but more recently domestic voluntourists are also accounted for (Pompurová, Sokolová & Cole, 2020).

In the context of VT, locals are oftentimes mentioned as a mere object of the volunteering activity – the community which needs support from outside (Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018; Bentele, 2023; Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020) and are neglected as active and complex stakeholders (Bentele, 2023, 9). This could lead to neocolonialist attitudes, white saviorism, and establishment of unequal power relations between locals, tourists, and intermediaries (Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Bentele, 2023). Sometimes not only local needs but even members of the community, like children (e.g., van Doore & Nhep, 2023) and marginalized social groups (McGehee & Andereck, 2009), are commodified. A shift is observed from the traditional understanding that VT is practiced only in developing countries towards a more power-equalized and broader understanding that the community in developed countries could also offer opportunities for travellers to volunteer (Pompurová et al., 2018; Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Röntynen & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, 2022). Residents could be seen as an inseparable element of any type of contemporary tourism, being both a resource and a driver of tourism development (Richards & Hall, 2002), and aligning with tourists demands for cultural exchange, authenticity, and sustainability (Ribov, 2014; Bentele, 2023; Pompurová et al., 2018). It is difficult to account for the whole spectrum of stakeholders belonging to the local community with their versatile roles (Wearing & McGehee, 2013). Many locals function as hosts of volunteer trips, either as accommodators or also volunteer task providers, as this type of alternative tourism brings tourists closer to the daily life in the destination (Wearing, 2001). By that, residents promote their culture and share everyday struggles with travellers, maintain an open dialogue, and gain knowledge and new ideas from other cultures (Bentele, 2023). In other cases, however, locals are prevented from participating in VT activity due to socio-cultural, economic, or language barriers (Wearing & McGehee, 2013). The understanding of locals regarding VT may vary depending on the value of volunteering in the respective society, but in general locals perceive voluntourists differently than conventional tourists: sometimes too positively and uncritically (Bentele, 2023), other times as unwanted intruders (e.g., Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018).

Although locals and tourists are brought together in VT for direct, personal interactions, Wearing implies the presence of more participants in this mix by defining VT as volunteering “in an organized way” (Wearing, 2001, 1). Intermediaries could be tour operators and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), based in the tourism generating locations or the destinations, curating the volunteering visit experiences (Bentele, 2023; Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Brown, 2005; Pompurová & Marčeková, 2017), but their roles in the destination are studied insufficiently (Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018). Some authors point out that oftentimes NGOs organizing the voluntourism activity come from non-tourism-related industries and do not understand tourism (Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Röntynen & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, 2022). When the activity is well organized and managed, intermediaries are putting tourists in new situations and offering them to explore the unknown to enable their transformative experience (Bentele, 2023) while balancing with the benefits for the local community (Anderson, Kim & Larios, 2017) and ensuring the sustainability dimensions (Pompurová et al., 2018). On the downside, the presence of volunteer tourist organizations in the destination accustoms locals to receiving external help and benefit, shifting the responsibilities away from the community (Bentele, 2023; Anderson, Kim & Larios, 2017). The intermediary role is a powerful one, as it could influence attitudes and actions of tourists and locals alike, both positively and negatively (Bentele, 2023; Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018). According to some authors, the commercially operating intermediaries are

predominantly concerned with profit than the needs of the local community (e.g., Wearing, Young & Everingham, 2017; Anderson, Kim & Larios, 2017). The recent technological developments allow bypassing the conventional intermediaries via digital platforms and social media (Wearing & McGehee, 2013), however this establishes a new type of intermediaries, setting their own rules, starting with crafting new terms for VT (Röntynen & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, 2022).

Cocreating the VT product between tourists, locals, and intermediary organizations fits the contemporary understanding of tourism (Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018), but even more stakeholders could be found. In addition to the consumer, service provider, and intermediary role in voluntourism, the nature environment and the local culture are often discussed in research. Some of the environmental activities practices on a volunteering trip are improving animal welfare, conserving the environment and recovering it post-disaster (Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020, 1). In most of the studies, they are presented as a contribution to the local community (e.g., Bentele, 2023; Wearing & McGehee, 2013) although, by a more biocentric approach (see Hall & Page, 2006, 325), nature would rather be seen as receiving the benefits (e.g., Pompurová et al., 2018, 2). VT allows for deeper interactions between visitors and nature, e.g., in a protected area, leading to transformative benefits for the tourist (Bentele, 2023). Another reason to separate nature from the community is pointed out by some authors: compared to economic and social benefits, VT currently accomplishes little environmental benefits (Hernandez-Maskivker, Lapointe & Aquino, 2018). While local culture is an attraction for voluntourists to enjoy on their trip (Han, Lee & Hyun, 2020), cultural exchange is emphasized as a main reason for practicing VT, especially in its newer modes which could be distinguished from the power-loaded pro-poor forms (Wearing & McGehee, 2013; Wearing, Young & Everingham 2017). The regulative system holds an important role in ensuring VT's ethicality and responsibility, e.g., labor regulations ensure that local jobs are not endangered by the presence of volunteers (Bentele, 2023), and child protection regulations preclude the trafficking and abuse of orphans (van Doore & Nhep, 2023).

3.2 Community-Based Tourism

As a bottom-up approach, CBT focuses on locals as a main stakeholder group, aiming to empower and prioritize them by offering an active role in tourism development and management (Blackstock, 2005; Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021; Ngo & Creutz, 2022). Oftentimes they represent poor or marginalized social groups, even indigenous peoples, in rural and remote locations (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012; Zielinski et al., 2020; Naranjo Lluport, 2022), which, however, does not imply application of the concept only in developing countries (Zielinski et al., 2020). They possess limited resources, competencies, and market connections, which establishes barriers to participation in tourism (Liang, 2022; Lee & Joo, 2023; Goodwin & Santilli, 2009). This necessitates external support of tourism development, which can lead to power relations (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012). Locals play roles in the tourism supply as employers, employees, and entrepreneurs (Blackstock, 2005). Moreover, tourism's success depends also upon residents' positive attitude towards tourists (Blackstock, 2005). Often in CBT, the community is perceived as a homogenous group instead of accounting for the contradicting values and power relations within it (Blackstock, 2005). Community could be defined by its locality or by the sense of identity (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012) and should be ultimately considered as a network (Zielinski et al., 2020). By CBT, residents can minimize economic leakages (Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021) and maximize tourism benefits (Ngo & Creutz, 2022), but tourism industry sometimes opposes their involvement in decision-making, fearing it would raise costs and lower profits which often limits public participation to a tokenistic formal approval for legitimacy (Blackstock, 2005). This opposes the conventional structures of tourism supply, such as large and medium-sized international mass tourism companies, to the small locally owned companies of CBT. It is not only important to have locally owned and run tourism businesses to minimize leakages, but local producers should be linked to tourism by procurements of tourism companies (Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021).

As an alternative form of tourism, CBT enables the interactions between locals and visitors where the latter receive immersive cultural experiences when involving in community-based activities (Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021). Moreover, it provides visitors with the opportunity to give back to the host community (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012, 37). Contemporary tourists demand authenticity, which could be provided by CBT (Zielinski et al., 2020). Most visitors are of urban and international origin, drawn by the allure of rural peacefulness and unknown cultures (Zielinski et al., 2020). Tourists act as cocreators of tourism through social interactions, and this role stems from their motivation to be satisfied as customers (Liang, 2022). Some of the main motivations to participate in CBT are learning and recreation (Liang, 2022).

CBT needs intermediaries for mobilization of locals because, due to the forementioned barriers, participation and empowerment do not emerge spontaneously (Lee & Joo, 2023). Intermediaries include local and international NGOs, sustainability-focused agencies, community associations and tourism organizations, and private companies, such as tour operators (Wolters, 2021; Liang, 2022; Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012). Universities are also named as intermediaries of CBT (Liang, 2022, Lee & Joo, 2023). Agencies external to the community running community-based projects should have a facilitative role to foster local leadership or support the destination's access to markets, however sometimes they exploit the community for own benefit (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012); thus, the use of community's resources should be locally controlled (Dangi & Jamal, 2016). NGOs often bridge the community with government aid and facilitate its use (Lee & Joo, 2022). In addition to supporting the community, the intermediaries of CBT encourage visitors to engage with and learn from local culture, e.g. through hands-on activities, and thus maximize the benefits of their experience (Liang, 2022). Digital technology plays a special role in CBT, compensating for the lack of market connections of locals by enabling them to attract tourists directly, and allowing for new ways of digital empowerment (Keskinen et al., 2020; Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, 2022).

Nature environment and local culture are presented as resources owned and managed by the locals, and requiring the responsible action of tourism businesses and visitors, while the locals ensure their sustainable use (Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021; Ngo & Creutz, 2022). As local resources they hold greater value for the community than for other stakeholders (Liang, 2022; Chatkaewnapanon & Lee, 2022). Culture is related to visitors learning experiences, while nature contributes to their health (Naranjo Llupart, 2022). The emphasized self-reliance of the local community does not mean functioning in isolation but interacting with the surrounding stakeholders in a mutually beneficial way (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012). Governments could encourage tourism businesses in the community towards responsible practices by developing competencies, providing infrastructure, financial incentives and administrative support (Mtapuri, Camilleri & Dłużewska, 2021; Lee & Joo, 2023; Naranjo Llupart, 2022). But the regulative system is also seen as channeling the neocolonialist influences of globalization locally through policies (Giampiccoli & Mtapuri, 2012).

3.3 Regenerative Tourism

“All stakeholders in the tourism value chain, including travellers, businesses, employees and communities have a shared responsibility in preserving the local assets and enabling the destination as a whole to develop” (Heslinga, 2022, 6). RT principles align with the ecosystem approach emphasizing the understanding of the interrelations between all stakeholders and the subsequent impact for the entire complex system, necessitating partnerships with more than the conventional economic dimensions (Heslinga, 2022). Moreover, it indicates an interdependence between the social and economic systems with “all life on this planet” (Pollock, 2019, 5). Consequently, everyone and everything is a stakeholder in RT, engaging into transformations and regeneration of the self and the environment (Bellato, Frantzeskaki & Nygaard, 2022).

Most tourists do not realize their need for transformation, despite their loss of roots in the globalized and digitalized world, but they could be externally driven towards making positive impact on themselves and the surroundings (Hossain, 2023). In RT, visitors aim to leave the destination in better condition than it was before their arrival, taking an active role by which they also gain memorable and transformative experiences (Heslinga, 2022). They engage in regenerative action which could be manifested as volunteering, ideating and cocreating (Cave & Dredge, 2020). They gain new knowledge and skills, especially regarding regenerative techniques (Heslinga, 2022). Moreover, they play a cocreator role by conveying the regeneration message further and raising awareness (Heslinga, 2022). Their participation in tourism is quality instead of quantity-oriented, which opposes them to the conventional tourists causing climate change acceleration, overtourism, and other degradation, and being responsible in their unequal numbers for the maintenance of power relations with the hosts and residents (Pollock, 2019).

In RT, hosts represent the local community of the destination. Often, they belong to indigenous communities, as regeneration is rooted in indigenous and traditional knowledge and principles (Heslinga, 2022; Bellato, Frantzeskaki & Nygaard, 2022; Hossain, 2023). Pollock (2019) argues that communities consciously choosing how to represent their identity, interact with guests and becoming aware of the need for consolidating in order to create the holistic tourist experience will bring the change towards regeneration. The emphasis is on the potential of the community instead of on identifying its problems and applying solutions (Bellato, Frantzeskaki & Nygaard, 2022).

Among intermediaries, tour operators facilitate RT experiences, offering authentic community-based visits and community-benefitting hands-on activities (Heslinga, 2022). Destination management organizations (DMOs)

role is expanded from marketing and sales to asset management to foster the thriving of the destination (Pollock, 2019). International agencies providing development aid should prioritize local needs and improve long-term impact (Cave & Dredge, 2020). Digital technology plays an intermediate role, e.g., as a transmitter of the regenerative principles, an enabler of innovations (Heslinga, 2022) and a facilitator of the direct contact between tourists and locals (Cave & Dredge, 2020).

Nature is an object of the restorative activities (Heslinga, 2022) and the necessity is established by its role of a “life support system” (Pollock, 2019, 3). It is not separated from humans but complementing them (Hossain, 2023). Moreover, regeneration requires an expansion of perspective from considering only the shareholders and stakeholders towards including the community and the planet into an understanding of the world as a living system instead of a resource pot (Pollock, 2019). Culture is an asset, a source of collective intelligence (Pollock, 2019). It sets different contexts to different destinations, necessitating pluriversal approach to RT, which cannot be reduced from the complexity of the real world; it enables the combination of indigenous knowledge with western and modern science (Bellato, Frantzeskaki & Nygaard, 2022). RT does not manifest itself only as activity offerings, but sometimes also as regulations and restrictions to tourism, imposed by local authorities or tourism boards, to drive stakeholders towards regeneration (Heslinga, 2022). On the other hand, regulations might hinder regenerative tourism by not recognizing structures of the informal sector where regenerative practices are established in the community, especially in developing countries and indigenous societies; thus, the regulative system should incorporate alternative-capitalist and non-capitalist practices in addition to the capitalist ones to enable regenerative tourism (Cave & Dredge, 2020). To date, there are no regenerative certifications to designate the regenerative action (Heslinga, 2022).

4. Results

Table 1 summarizes the findings on different aspects of stakeholders’ characteristics, roles and responsibilities. In all three tourism types, the experience is cocreated, requiring sensible relationships between stakeholders. In all types, tourists are defined by their desire for meaningful and memorable experience, learning and recreation, self-transformation and, to a different extent, willingness to transform the destination for the better. To increase their responsibility, they should diversify, including tourists from developing countries and such with understanding of the rurality and indigeneity, and become more conscious of their role. The intermediaries, regardless of its type, should balance between its own interests, the requirements of tourists, and the local needs. Those coming from tourism background might not fully understand how to support the locals, while those of non-touristic origin might not be able to construct a holistic experience which motivates the travellers; thus, they should cooperate. CBT could particularly benefit from a combination or benchmarking of VT and RT, because it currently experiences deficiencies in the market links of the destination. Caution should be exercised regarding digital intermediaries which sometimes provide benefits, but other times could set new challenges and inequalities. Local community has multiple roles – approving or disproving tourism activity in its home, hosting tourism, initiating change, providing transformative benefits in the interaction with tourists, safeguarding important traditional knowledge. Many times, however, residents lack the resources, experience barriers to participation, or are simply marginalized in the global power play, although all three observed tourism types seemingly provide approaches emphasizing the locals’ importance. The regulative system, being it on a local, national, or international level, could both inhibit and promote responsible practices in tourism; thus, it should be strategically developed to serve at best. Nature and culture and specific, non-human stakeholders evident in all three tourism types, however, only the RT approach fully accounts for their active role in the ecosystem, while in VT and CBT, they could easily be overlooked as mere resources or objects.

Table 1: Comparison of the stakeholders of VT, CBT, and RT

| Stakeholders | Volontourism | Community-Based Tourism | Regenerative Tourism |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| <i>Tourism Demand</i> | international and domestic tourists mostly from the West; vacation and volunteering oriented | urban and international tourists, immersing into local culture for learning and recreation | conscious or externally motivated tourists; quality instead of quantity |
| <i>Intermediaries</i> | NGOs supplying volunteers to destinations (according to local needs), not always understanding tourism | intermediary organizations aiding local communities in finance and capacity acquisition | non-touristic organizations appropriating tourism products for regeneration of the community; should prioritize local needs |
| | tour operators selling volunteering trips | almost no role of tour operators for the weak links of the locals to the market | tour operators facilitate RT experiences |
| | digital platforms removing the need for other intermediaries, setting own rules | digital platforms compensating for the lack of market links and empowering locals in new ways | digital technology as an enabler of the contacts between visitors and locals and a transmitter of the regenerative message |
| <i>Tourism Supply</i> | local community as an object of voluntary activity and a source of transformation for tourists, versatile and heterogeneous, hosting VT when able to participate, not always approving of VT | local community as an owner, developer, and beneficiary of tourism; often from marginalized, indigenous, rural, remote origin, from developing and developed countries; heterogeneous and networked, representing tourism service providers, local producers, residents | local community as an object of regeneration, a source of knowledge about means of regeneration, a catalyzer of change; often indigenous |
| <i>Regulative system</i> | ensuring the ethicality (e.g., local jobs, children's rights) | governments as a source of funding, motivator of responsibility; policies not always accounting adequately for peripheral regions and communities, channelling neocolonialism | governing agencies externally motivating tourists into transformative travel, promoting regeneration by imposing regulations and restrictions, but hindering it by not recognizing the informal sector |
| <i>Nature</i> | nature as an object and beneficiary of volunteer activity and a motive to travel | nature as a motive to travel, source of health for tourists; a resource most significant for locals and owned by them | nature as a fundamental support system, complementing society; a source of collective intelligence and an object of regeneration |
| <i>Culture</i> | cultural exchange in and through voluntary activity; learning about new cultures as a motive to travel | learning about new cultures as a motive to travel, cultural heritage preservation as a goal; a resource most significant for locals | culture as an asset and a source of collective intelligence; an object of regeneration |

To further concretize the research results, the study employs an input-output analysis to examine stakeholders in VT, CBT, and RT (Table 2). The input-output analysis identifies direct, indirect, and induced impacts on tourism responsibility. The table presents stakeholder inputs and outputs as they are conceptually intended within VT, CBT, and RT, without applying a critical lens to their current practices or assessing discrepancies between intended and actual responsibilities. This integrative approach assumes that VT, CBT, and RT function as parallel complementary models, learning from each other to address their respective shortcomings, ethical gaps, and conceptual ambiguities. By structuring stakeholder roles through an input-output perspective, the analysis highlights how responsibility is embedded in each stakeholder's contributions (inputs) and the resulting effects (outputs). The table systematically captures these interactions, emphasizing how direct contributions, such as financial expenditures, policy enforcement, or cultural stewardship, generate cascading effects that shape local economies, community empowerment, and long-term transformations. The results of the analysis not only reveal the interdependencies between stakeholders but also highlight the necessity of a responsibility-driven approach in tourism development. The findings support the understanding of how VT, CBT, and RT can reinforce one another, guiding stakeholders toward more ethical, responsible, and regenerative tourism practices.

Table 2: Integrative Input-Output Analysis of Stakeholder roles in VT, CBT, and RT

| Stakeholder | Input | Output | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | Direct impact | Indirect impact | Induced impact |
| <i>Tourism demand (travellers)</i> | Financial expenditure, motivation, expectations, ethical choices in travel, respect for local culture, sustainability awareness | Economic benefit to local businesses, participation in cultural exchange, labor contribution (volunteering), responsible consumption and interaction | Local employment opportunities, demand for ethical tourism services, influence on cultural perceptions, empowerment of local entrepreneurs | Long-term influence on sustainability attitudes, transformation of travel habits towards more responsible tourism |
| <i>Intermediaries (e.g., NGOs, tour operators, digital platforms)</i> | Logistics, funding mechanisms, marketing, volunteer coordination, commitment to fair trade, ethical tourism promotion, inclusive business models | Organization of responsible travel experiences, market access for local providers, digital facilitation, transparency in operations, respect for local autonomy | Growth of sustainable tourism-related businesses, financial redistribution, capacity-building in communities, integration of community voices in decision-making | Policy influence, development of long-term sustainable business models, raising awareness on regenerative principles |
| <i>Tourism supply (local communities)</i> | Hospitality, cultural resources, labor, service provision, stewardship of natural and cultural assets, community-led tourism initiatives | Revenue generation, empowerment, knowledge exchange, self-determined tourism models, cultural preservation | Business expansion, improved infrastructure, enhanced cultural appreciation, local leadership in tourism development, increased self-sufficiency | Strengthened social cohesion, increased resilience, sustained local traditions, intergenerational transfer of cultural knowledge |
| <i>Regulative system (governments, institution and their policies)</i> | Legislation, funding, ethical standards enforcement, commitment to equitable policies, protection of vulnerable communities | Protection of local interests, environmental conservation, incentive programs, promotion of responsible tourism development | Economic redistribution, improved public services, accountability of tourism businesses, balancing growth and sustainability | Long-term shift towards sustainable tourism governance, regional development, transformation of tourism into a tool for regeneration |
| <i>Nature (environment, biological ecosystems)</i> | Ecosystem services, environmental setting | Attraction for tourists, contribution to wellbeing, integration of eco-friendly tourism practices | Enhancement of local environmental awareness, nature-based solutions for sustainability, preservation of ecological balance through tourism revenue | Climate resilience, restoration of degraded areas, integration of nature into wellbeing tourism, responsible use of natural assets for future generations |
| <i>Culture (heritage, traditions, knowledge)</i> | Cultural identity, local knowledge, traditions, intangible heritage, community consent in cultural representation | Tourism appeal, preservation of cultural heritage, education of tourists, cultural tourism designed with ethical considerations | Strengthened cultural economy, revitalization of traditions, increased recognition of indigenous and marginalized cultures | Global cultural exchange, increased representation of diverse voices, heritage continuity, long-term sustainability of cultural traditions |

5. Conclusions and Discussion

This study has identified key similarities and differences in stakeholder roles and responsibilities across VT, CBT, and RT, demonstrating how these approaches can complement each other to enhance responsibility in tourism. By examining their input-output relationships, it becomes evident that integrating their strengths can address ethical and structural gaps, ultimately fostering a more accountable and sustainable tourism ecosystem.

A key insight from the analysis is the essential role of intermediaries in shaping responsible tourism experiences, particularly through ethical decision-making, fair trade practices, and digital facilitation. Likewise,

local communities, as both hosts and beneficiaries, emerge as central stakeholders whose agency in tourism development must be strengthened. The regulative system remains a crucial factor in ensuring ethical tourism operations, though policy frameworks should evolve to better recognize informal and community-led initiatives. Furthermore, nature and culture are not merely passive resources but active contributors to tourism's sustainability, requiring holistic stewardship across all three approaches.

By integrating VT, CBT, and RT, this study provides a conceptual basis for improving tourism governance and stakeholder collaboration. A key limitation of this study is its reliance on theoretical stakeholder mapping, which, while comprehensive, does not account for contextual variations in different destinations, particularly important within the regenerative concept, or empirical validation of stakeholder interactions. Future research could examine how these approaches function in practice, what is the degree of awareness of stakeholders of their respective roles, and how they navigate conflicts between intended and actual responsibilities.

References

- Anderson, A., Kim, R., & Larios, K. (2017) Voluntourism: The Economic Benefit and Societal Costs of Short-Term Mission Trips. *International Journal of Health and Economic Development*, 3(2), 28-37.
- Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (2022) *Handbook on developing community-based entrepreneurship (CBE) in rural tourism through digital empowerment*. APEC Secretariat. <https://www.apec.org/publications/2022/02/handbook-on-developing-community-based-entrepreneurship-%28cbe%29-in-rural-tourism-through-digital-empowerment>
- Bellato, L., Frantzeskaki, N., & Nygaard, C. (2022) Regenerative tourism: a conceptual framework leveraging theory and practice. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(4), 1026–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2022.2044376>
- Bentele, N.E. (2023) *Transformative travel and volunteer tourism: their interaction and influence on local communities and tourists*. Hochschule Harz.
- Blackstock, K. (2005) A critical look at community based tourism. *Community Development Journal*, 40(1), 39-49.
- Brown, S. (2005) Travelling with a purpose: understanding the motives and benefits of volunteer vacationers. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8(6), 479-496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500508668232>
- Cave, J., & Dredge, D. (2020) Regenerative tourism needs diverse economic practices. *Tourism Geographies*, 22(3), 503-513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2020.1768434>
- Chatkaewnapanon, Y., & Lee, T. (2022) Planning Sustainable Community-Based Tourism in the Context of Thailand: Community, Development, and the Foresight Tools. *Sustainability*, 14(12):7413, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127413>
- Dangi, T.B., & Jamal, T. (2016) An Integrated Approach to “Sustainable Community-Based Tourism”. *Sustainability*, 8(475), 1-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su8050475>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Mtapuri, O. (2012) Community-based tourism: An exploration of the concept(s) from a political perspective. *Tourism Review International*, 16, 29-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/154427212X13431568321500>
- Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R. (2009) Community-Based Tourism: A Success? *ICRT Occasional Paper 11*, 1-37.
- Hall, C.M. & Page, S.J. (2006) *The Geography of Tourism and Recreation: Environment, place and space* (3rd edn). Routledge.
- Han, H., Lee, S. & Hyun, S.S. (2020) Tourism and Altruistic Intention: Volunteer Tourism Development and Self-Interested Value. *Sustainability*, 12(5): 2150, 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su12052152>
- Hernandez-Maskivker, G., Lapointe, D., & Aquino, R. (2018) The impact of volunteer tourism on local communities: A managerial perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(5), 1-10.
- Heslinga, J. (2022) Regenerative tourism: moving beyond sustainable and responsible tourism. <https://www.cbi.eu/market-information/tourism/regenerative-tourism>
- Hossain, A. (2023) Human Relationship with Nature, Indigenous Ways of Living and Regenerative Tourism Framework. *Journal of Sustainability and Resilience*, 3(1), 1-9.
- Keskinen, P., Arvila, N., Winschiers-Theophilus, H. & Nieminen, M. (2020) The Effect of Digital Community-Based Tourism Platform to Hosts' Livelihood. *Evolving Perspectives on ICTs in Global Souths. IDIA 2020*, vol 1236. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52014-4_1
- Lee, S., & Joo, D. (2023) Intermediary organizations as supporters of residents' innovativeness and empowerment in community-based tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 32(8), 1534–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2023.2247179>
- Liang, A. (2022) Consumers as co-creators in community-based tourism experience: Impacts on their motivation and satisfaction. *Cogent Business & Management*, 9:1, 2034389, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2034389>
- McGehee, N. & Andereck, K. (2009) Volunteer tourism and the “voluntoured”: the case of Tijuana, Mexico. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(1), 39-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669580802159693>
- Mtapuri, O., Camilleri, M., & Dłużewska, A. (2021) Advancing community-based tourism approaches for the sustainable. *Sustainable Development*, 30(3), 423-432. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2257>
- Mustonen, P. (2005) Volunteer tourism: postmodern pilgrimage? *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 3(3), 160-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766820608668493>
- Naranjo Llupart, M. (2022) Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Community-Based Tourism: Contribution to Sustainable Development. *Sustainability*, 14(17):10635, 1-41. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710635>

- Ngo, T., & Creutz, S. (2022) Assessing the sustainability of community-based tourism: a case study in rural areas of Hoi An, Vietnam. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8:1, 2116812, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2116812>
- Pollock, A. (2019) Flourishing beyond sustainability. *ETC Workshop in Krakow*.
- Pompurová, K. & Marčeková, R. (2017) Are the Volunteer Projects Included in Package Holiday Tour? Case Study Evidence from the Slovakia and Czech Republic. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 8(15), 19-26.
- Pompurová, K., Marčeková, R., Šebová, L., Sokolová, J., & Žofaj, M. (2018) Volunteer Tourism as a Sustainable Form of Tourism—The Case of Organized Events. *Sustainability*, 10(5):1468, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10051468>
- Pompurová, K., Sokolová, J., & Cole, D. (2020) Domestic Volunteer Tourism Demand in Slovakia. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 25:1509, 1-15.
- Ribov, M. (2014) In search for solutions for the challenges to tourism. *11th International Scientific Conference "Smart Specialization of Bulgaria"*, 753–764.
- Richards, G. & Hall, D. (2002) The community: a sustainable concept in tourism development? In: *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. Routledge. 1-14.
- Röntynen, R. (2022) Voluntourism in Finland: between profitability and public benefit. In: Tunkkari-Eskelinen, M. & Törn-Laapio, A. (Eds.), *Special Issues in Responsible Tourism Vol. 2*, 56-81. <https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-830-667-5>
- Röntynen, R. (2024) Aspects of Ecosystem Approach in Governing a Tourism Destination. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Tourism Research 2024*, 7(1), 443-451. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ictr.7.1.1991>
- Röntynen, R., & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, M. (2022) The Potential of Voluntourism in Central Finland. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Tourism Research 2022*, 5(1), 353-361. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ictr.15.1.143>
- Röntynen, R. & Tunkkari-Eskelinen, M. (2024) Voluntourism in the Context of Community-Based Tourism, and Regenerative Tourism: A Theoretical Exploration Focusing on Responsibility. *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Tourism Research 2024*, 7(1), 340-348. <https://doi.org/10.34190/ictr.7.1.2019>
- Selen, W. & Ogulin, R. (2015) Strategic Alignment across a Tourism Business Ecosystem. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 2(3), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.30958/ajt.2-3-3>
- Snyder, H. (2019) Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusres.2019.07.039>
- Thomassin, P.J. (2018) The Evolution of Input–Output Analysis. *Applications of the Input–Output Framework*, 9-36. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1507-7_2
- Torraco, R.J. (2005) Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, 4, 356–367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484305278283>
- Tunkkari-Eskelinen, M., & Röntynen, R. (2023) Designing a model of commercial voluntourism services. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Tourism Research*. 6(1), 490-495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.34190/ictr.6.1.1353>
- van Doore, K., & Nhep, R. (2023) Orphanage Trafficking and the Sustainable Development Goals. *Institutionalised Children Explorations and Beyond*, 10(1), 76-84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/234930032311559>
- Wearing, S. (2001) *Volunteer tourism: Experiences that make a difference*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Wearing, S. & McGehee, N. G. (2013) Volunteer tourism: A review. *Tourism Management*, 38, 120-130.
- Wearing, S., Young, T., & Everingham, P. (2017) Evaluating volunteer tourism: has it made a difference? *Tourism Recreation Research*, 42(4), 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2017.1345470>
- Wolters, M. (2021) *Measuring the effect of community-based tourism*. Hochschule Harz.
- Zielinski, S., Jeong, Y., Kim, S., & Milanés, C. (2020) Why Community-Based Tourism and Rural Tourism in Developing and Developed Nations are Treated Differently? A Review. *Sustainability*, 12(15):5938, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155938>