

[Tim Forsyth](#)

Environmental responsibility and business regulation: the case of sustainable tourism

**Article (Accepted version)
(Refereed)**

Original citation:

Forsyth, Tim (1997) Environmental responsibility and business regulation: the case of sustainable tourism. *The geographical journal*, 163 (3). pp. 270-280.

Stable Link: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3059723>

© 1997 [Blackwell Publishing](#)

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/4733/>

Available in LSE Research Online: May 2008

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final manuscript accepted version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this version and the published version may remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Geographical Journal 163:3 270-280. 1997

**Environmental responsibility and business regulation:
the case of sustainable tourism**

Timothy Forsyth

**London School of Economics and Political Science,
Houghton Street,
London, WC2A 2AE.**

E-mail: T.J.Forsyth@LSE.AC.UK

Geographical Journal 163:3 270-280. 1997

Environmental responsibility and business regulation: the case of sustainable tourism

Abstract

This paper adds to the growing literature within geography on environmental regulation of business activities. The adoption of voluntary practices of environmental responsibility is discussed as a form of environmental regulation, and then applied to tourism using a survey of 69 companies and institutions in the UK outgoing tourism industry. Results indicate that business has adopted a wide range of practices, but considers them to be weak regulatory instruments because ultimate responsibility for change lies with host governments via legislation. However, environmental protection may enhance business performance if voluntary practices could differentiate mass-market holiday packages and allow companies to compete on more than price alone. This paper therefore supports research from other industries which states that environmental practices may lead to commercial advantage if adopted proactively rather than in response to market demand for ethical or green products. However, change may be accelerated by labeling 'green' or 'sustainable' tourism as 'quality' tourism, and by acknowledging that populist market demand may lead to stereotypical approaches to minorities or ecotourism not helpful to equitable development. Future debate should focus on common ground between regulators and business, and on shared responsibility for excluding 'free-rider' companies not willing to adopt practices.

KEYWORDS: business and environment, sustainable tourism, environmental responsibility, marketing, self regulation

Introduction

At a recent conference on tourism, a delegate was overheard to say that regulating tourism was like shackling Santa Claus: a killjoy interference with people's recreation. Yet as evidence mounts that unrestricted tourism growth may create unwanted social and environmental impacts at destinations, there is a growing call to develop environmental regulation which reduces these impacts, but allows the industry to continue. The complex nature of tourism, dependent on

elaborate images and consumer trends, may allow companies and regulators to devise new and creative techniques to achieve this.

This paper discusses approaches taken to regulate tourism by companies and institutions involved with sending UK tourists overseas. As such, it contributes to existing literature on new forms of regulation. However, in particular, it assesses the role of self regulation, or voluntary practices of environmental regulation, as a regulatory form acceptable to both business and environmentalists. Self regulation has been described as preferable to traditional command-and-control forms of regulation because it allows companies to use environmentally-responsible practices to increase competitive advantage (see Smith, 1990; Eden, 1993). However, critics have suggested such measures may be too shallow to produce effective regulation, or that the full commercial advantage of these measures have yet to be utilised (Cairncross, 1995:188; FOE, 1995).

Much has already been written on the direct, physical impacts of tourism on ecosystems and host communities (e.g. Matthieson and Wall, 1982; Jenner and Smith, 1992; Price, 1995). Yet so far, only a few researchers have attempted to explore ways in which industry may be involved creatively in regulation (e.g. Poon, 1993; Goodall, 1995; Eaton, 1996). This paper seeks to expand on this research by discussing the nature of self regulation and how this relates to tourism. It then uses a survey of businesses and institutions to assess the current adoption of voluntary practices, and suggestions from business leaders as how these may be better implemented. Throughout the paper, 'sustainable tourism' refers to the improved social and environmental impact of all forms of tourism including mass tourism. As such, this survey considers more than just 'ecotourism', or niche holiday products focusing specifically on nature or remote cultures.

Voluntary environmental regulation and business

Researchers of business regulation are increasingly seeking an acceptable middle ground between laissez-faire allocation of resources by the market; and draconian command-and-control measures through state legislation. Many have now proposed that a pro-active response to environmental responsibility may actually result in environmental regulation plus competitive advantage in business (e.g. Elkington *et al*, 1991; Schmidheiny, 1992; Gladwin, 1993; Cairncross, 1995; Porter and van der Linde, 1995). Table 1 shows a spectrum of regulatory devices which may be used by both business and government with varying intervention to reliance on market forces.

[Table 1 here]

Practices of environmental responsibility by businesses may make good business sense by reducing harmful impacts of industry before the introduction of restrictive legislation. It may also provide marketing tools to add value to products, or improve the corporate image with the public. For example, the UK Chemical Industries Association adopted a responsible care programme in 1989 (Simmons and Wynne, 1993), and in 1994 the packaging industry created the Producer Responsibility Group, aiming to reduce wasted packaging paper by 58 percent of its value by the year 2000 (FOE, 1995:21; Eden, 1997). Such voluntary practices have increased rapidly in the UK during the 1980s and 1990s (Eden, 1993).

However, critics have questioned how far these practices have been adopted because they are considered to be genuinely good for environment and business, or instead simply a marketing tool responding to perceived short-term demand for environmental protection in the market place (FOE, 1995). Market interest for goods seeking to avoid environmentally or socially negative impacts has been called 'ethical consumerism' and has been dated to the early 1970s (Anderson and Cunningham, 1972). However, 'green consumerism', or the specific association of ethical goods with environmental impacts, grew rapidly in the 1980s. This accompanied public concern about pollution, global warming, and the ozone layer, and provided commercial incentives for companies to respond to this by producing goods overtly associated with environmental protection (Peattie, 1995:84).

Campaigners have argued public demand for 'environmentally-friendly' goods may put consumer pressure onto producers to supply goods that consume less resources, or are manufactured in an ethically more acceptable way (e.g. Elkington and Hailes, 1988; Stone *et al*, 1995). However, others have claimed that market-based responses to environmental concerns reflect only populist definitions of environment, and are susceptible to short-term changes in public taste, and belt-tightening under economic recession. For example, between 1990 and 1992 in the UK, the average 'green premium' paid for environmental retail goods fell from 6.6 percent to 4.5 percent apparently because of these two factors (McKinsey and Company, in Cairncross, 1995:183).

Furthermore, critics have also claimed that voluntary practices of environmental responsibility may seek only to pre-empt imposed regulation, or to legitimise business activities which degrade the environment (Baker and Miner, 1993; Brophy *et al*, 1995). In addition, critics have claimed that some companies have assumed certain practices achieve aspects of sustainable development in the face of uncertainty or alternative viewpoints. For example, the presentation of indigenous rainforest people by The Body Shop has been called degrading and stereotypical by the campaigning group, Survival International (Corry, 1994).

Yet research by business theorists has indicated many companies are reluctant to adopt self regulation because they fear their position may be undermined by companies that do not comply with codes of conduct — or so-called ‘free riders’. Such companies may be able to operate at lower costs than more ethical companies, and therefore gain competitive standing in the marketplace. This problem was noted during the introduction of the Producer Responsibility Group of the packaging industry, resulting in the apparent paradox of industry representatives calling on the government to pass legislation to enforce compliance to the voluntary regulation measures (FOE, 1995:21; Eden, 1997).

As a result of this, voluntary practices of environmental responsibility may be seen as a commercial opportunity. Yet genuine change to business practices to protect the environment may require some government intervention, or legislation to prevent ‘free riders’. Such combinations of limited legislation and innovation by companies is increasingly urged by business theorists who see the need to overcome organisational inertia in companies, or who seek regulation of activities where the costs of protection are higher than likely financial benefits (Gladwin, 1993:52; Porter and van der Linde, 1995:128).

Sustainable tourism and regulation

The term, ‘sustainable tourism’ emerged in geographical debate in the 1990s to describe tourism development without such negative environmental or social impacts (e.g. Nelson, *et al*, 1993; Burns and Holden, 1995; Coccossis and Nijkamp, 1995). In an ideal form it addresses all forms of tourism, both mass and niche markets, and also aims to provide sustainable profits to industry. Table 2 shows a list of principles identified by the World Wide Fund for Nature and the UK campaigning group, Tourism Concern.

[Table 2 here]

As such, sustainable tourism must not be confused with the related term of ‘ecotourism’. Ecotourism generally refers specifically to recreation in natural landscapes or threatened ecosystems such as rainforests or coral reefs. However, studies have suggested ecotourism may actually accelerate land degradation, or not represent local communities in development (Cater, 1993, 1995). In addition, ecotourism is generally a niche product appealing only to a small proportion of the market. Wheeler (1994) has labeled ecotourism ‘egotourism’.

However, there is still debate about the meaning and purpose of sustainable tourism. Few now deny the need to protect destinations against the kind of deterioration experienced in locations

like the Mediterranean coast of Spain. However, campaigning groups like the Bangkok-based Ecumenical Coalition for Third World Tourism, or the UK-based Tourism Concern also urge the banning of sex tourism, or the boycott of tourism to Burma because of its attitude to human rights. Such moralistic attitudes have led critics to say such groups do not understand business. As a result, an increasing number of researchers argue that discourse should abandon the term 'sustainable tourism', and instead seek to define practical environmental and social standards for business which may indicate progress towards sustainable development (Goodall, 1995; Goodall and Stabler, 1996; MacGillivray and Zadek, 1995).

Regulation of tourism is difficult because of its characteristics. Firstly, tourism, or recreation, has no tangible lasting product but is based on image and presentation, often involving 'gazes' or stereotypical visions of foreign destinations (Urry, 1990, 1995). From a sales perspective, package holidays have 'time value', meaning that tour operators and travel agencies have the urgent task of selling holidays before the starting date or else they cease to exist (Middleton, 1994).

Secondly, there is no 'one' tourism industry, but instead a combination of many activities ranging from construction and transport, to tour and hotel management. Each activity has different markets and business objectives, plus varying environmental and social impacts. Therefore not all environmental problems are the responsibility of the industry as a whole, and not all sectors can act together to overcome problems.

Thirdly, the UK tourism market is characterised by extreme price competition under oligopoly, and the trend to send more tourists further distances for decreasing profit. Companies are therefore very resistant to any change in business practices which may increase costs. In particular, the three main mass-market competitors in the UK, of Thomson, Airtours, and First Choice (previously Owners Abroad) comprise vertically-integrated sectors of travel agencies, charter-flight companies, and resorts, and therefore may become bankrupt if charter-flight seats are not filled. Charter flights have been claimed to cause both overcrowding at destinations and dependency on price cutting as a form of competition (Josephides, 1994). However, given the collapse of the large company International Leisure Group in 1991 as a result of competition, it is not surprising that companies continue to focus on short-term profit horizons rather than on long-term environmental sustainability.

Such problems have usually been blamed for the so-called 'boom-and-bust' cycles of development in tourism destinations, where tourism has led to rapid overdevelopment and decline, and also the helplessness of individual companies to induce change by themselves.

Legislation to regulate tourism activities has included the 1988 Spanish Shores Act, which banned construction near shorelines and allowed demolition of buildings without proper planning permission. In 1991, the Balearic Islands passed legislation to reduce building work and the numbers of tourists accommodated in apartments (Gamero, 1992). The 1992 EU draft policy on transport proposed to discourage short-term air travel in favour of trains in order to reduce emissions (Middleton, 1994:265).

Increasingly, self regulation has been adopted either as independent actions by large companies, or as collective action by companies united by professional bodies, or tourism associations. These, such as the 1993 *International Hotels Environment Initiative* have sought to educate tourists or increase environmental responsibility by recycling waste in hotels (Mason and Mowforth, 1995; UNEP, 1995). Liaison between tourism associations like the International Federation of Tour Operators has done much to establish new ideas in planning-permission procedures, often with the cooperation of hotel chains (Goodall, 1996).

In addition, the WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council) has established the WTTERC (World Travel and Tourism Research Council) and the Green Globe Program as world-wide environmental management and public awareness programmes for tourism companies, including advice on integrating Agenda 21 into business management (WTTC *et al*, 1995).

However, campaigners have claimed such groups offer legitimisation for damaging activities. For example, Green Globe has praised Kandalama Hotel in Sri Lanka and the Phuket Yacht Club of Thailand for their environmental achievements (Green Globe, 1996:20). However, both of these have been targets for international campaigns: the Kandalama Hotel for allegedly damaging local water supplies and victimised local communities, causing a protest of about 50,000 people in 1992 (Mihikatha Institute and Perera, 1994); and the Yacht Club for allegedly closing access to public land (Kanjananavit, 1992). Green Globe has also been criticised for a conflict of interest in being financially supported by the same companies it assesses, and for keeping assessments secret from public scrutiny (Epler Wood, 1994).

In contrast to this kind of approach, some smaller companies have responded by marketing niche products offering 'green' or environmentally-conscious holidays. In the book, *Holidays that don't cost the earth*, Elkington and Hailes (1992) attempted to create consumer interest by evaluating the environmental performance of different holiday products. However, public understanding has often confused good environmental practice by companies sending tourists on a variety of holidays, with other companies that simply specialise in ecotourism. In such cases, practices like careful consultation with host communities before development may not be as visibly

environmental as companies featuring tours of rainforests (see Desforges, 1997). In addition, public interest in the environmental impact of tourism has generally been lower in the UK than other major European countries. In 1991, a survey suggested that 33 percent of UK holidaymakers considered mass tourism to offer no threat at all to environment, compared with 10 percent of Germans and 21 percent of French (The Henley Centre, in Bywater, 1992:9).

The study: self regulation in the UK outgoing tourism industry

A survey was conducted of senior staff in tourism companies in 1993 to assess industry's own perceptions of sustainable tourism and regulation. The survey sought to identify which self-regulatory practices had been adopted; what might prevent the achievement of sustainable tourism; what measures should be introduced and by whom. In addition, a one-day seminar was held with industry members in June 1996 to discuss these issues and monitor developments since the findings of 1993. Full empirical details of research, including list of participants, are described in Forsyth (1996).

The survey was restricted to institutions involved in sending UK tourists overseas only. This was to assess the problems of achieving environmental regulation with diverse partners around the world. Domestic tourism in the UK was not addressed, although this may also require regulation.

The survey divided the tourism industry into seven sectors. These were tour operators; travel agents; hotels; passenger carriers (airlines and cruise liners); tourism associations; national tourist offices; and consultancies offering advice to companies sending tourists overseas. It was originally intended to have a survey of at least 80 companies, but limited time and resources meant only 69 could be approached. Companies were selected in advance for their representativeness of each sector, and interviews sought only with senior, decision-making staff. The survey paid particular attention to tour operators because these are most closely involved with sending UK tourists overseas.

Research was sponsored by the World Wide Fund for Nature (UK) and Tourism Concern. Before interviews, each company was sent a copy of the publication, *Beyond the green horizon: a discussion paper on principles for sustainable tourism* (Tourism Concern and the World Wide Fund for Nature, 1992). The book was sent to provide a working definition of sustainable tourism to guide discussions (see Table 2), and also to publicise it to people who may not have read it. Reviews of *Beyond the green horizon* have either praised it for urging badly-needed revisions to

industry practice (Leslie, 1993; Singh, 1993), or criticised it for lacking practical business advice (Ashcroft, 1993; Interpretation Journal, 1993).

Information was gathered by a combination of 28 face-to-face interviews with so-called key informants considered particularly representative or important, and 41 telephone interviews with other institutions conducted by a team of researchers. Face-to-face interviews lasted between one and two hours, and aimed to let respondents describe their responses to *Beyond the green horizon*, and how they saw the problems of sustainable tourism. The telephone interviews lasted 20-30 minutes and used a semi-structured checklist in order to provide further information about industry practices. All interviews were transcribed and analysed later. Consistency between answers gained in interviews was achieved through careful discussion of concepts and questions with the team before and after interviews, and by the reliance on the longer interviews for analysis.

Interviews were kept anonymous in order to get frank, honest responses. The aim of the survey was to be representative, rather than exhaustive, and consequently for some sectors (such as cruise liners) responses came from only one or a few companies considered especially representative. One possible source of bias in this survey is that results come only from companies willing to contribute. This therefore meant that results reflected companies interested in sustainable tourism — from a commercial or philanthropic perspective. However, the survey included all major operators in the UK travel market — the largest survey of tourism companies in the UK to date.

Results and discussion

The results of the survey are presented in Tables 3 to 7. These show the self-regulatory practices currently adopted; the perceived obstacles to adopting practices; and priorities, responsibilities and practical actions available to the industry.

Four main types of practice were identified: cost-cutting (such as recycling paper or waste products); value-adding (such as providing information about destinations, sometimes known as ‘sympathy booklets’); long-term investment (such as staff training); and legislation (such as tourist taxes, or controls on tourism development by host governments).

[Tables 3,4,5 here]

Tour operators were most active with value-adding practices such as providing 'ecotips' in brochures, or promoting specialist 'green' holidays. Hotels and passenger carriers, however, carried out few duties other than simple cost cutting, as encouraged by programmes such as the *International Hotels Environment Initiative*. Travel agents adopted very few practices, and generally saw themselves as powerless to achieve change.

However, companies generally saw themselves as powerless to introduce change. This was partly because of the fear of 'free riders', or the commercial threat from companies not willing to undertake regulation, and because they saw regulation as ultimately the responsibility of governments. Nearly 64 percent of those questioned said they saw responsibility as lying with governments (Table 6), but the words of one interviewee from a major operator indicated that the problem of introducing change without legislation: "If the Gambia allows operators to trash the environment, then why should we be blamed if we do ? ...OK, so we *do* put more people into apartments in Majorca than they were originally built for. But then so does everyone else !"

[Table 6 here]

These kinds of findings indicate that self regulation may not produce effective regulation of tourism destinations, and that companies themselves do not believe in the ability to produce long-term change without legislation. However, some respondents argued that effective regulation could be achieved by presenting practices of environmental responsibility as 'quality', rather than 'environmental', because this may appeal more to tourists' wishes.

This use of 'quality' as an umbrella term for notions of ethical practice has already been proposed in tourism (Middleton, 1994:373), and has been generally used in business theory as means to add value to products, and gain reputation in the market place. In tourism, it has been supported by market research. In a 1993 survey indicated that 49 percent of UK consumers would pay an extra £20 on a £300 holiday if they were guaranteed a clean beach and sea, with an additional 26 percent saying they would pay £40 more (MORI, in TPR, 1993:7-5). In such cases, there is a clear overlap between sustainable tourism practice and what tourists may perceive to be desirable. However, this may also work for different types of tourism development.

For example, one tour operator gave an example of a location in Corfu had been spoilt in the 1980s by the business practice known as 'allocation-on arrival'. This is a practice by charter-flight operators to ensure that flights and hotels are full by offering holidays at discounts on the basis that tourists would not know the final destination of the holiday until the day of arrival.

In the example, some tourists only interested in beach holidays were sent on this scheme to Neohorio, a hill resort popular with walkers and bird watchers. As a result, the tourists were bored and local entrepreneurs converted buildings into cheap bars, which effectively spoilt the location for hill-walking tourists, yet also never satisfied the beach tourists because the site was over a mile from the coast. Thus potential high earnings from specialist holidays like hill walking were lost for the sake of short-term allocations, whereas keeping it at a higher quality would have maintained its high-earning status.

Without this redefinition of 'sustainable' as 'quality', companies were generally pessimistic about market demand for sustainable tourism. This is possibly because, in the mass market, practices of environmental responsibility are not always obvious or attractive to tourists. In 1992, Elkington and Hailes wrote, "It is perfectly possible for consumer pressure to turn the tourism industry around" (1992:17). However, this survey suggests that a rise in ethical consumerism related to tourism products may not take place because of a lack of clarity about what represents ethical tourism, and also because tourism is associated with relaxation rather than altruism.

In addition to this, other research in tourism suggests that mass-market demand may reinforce the perception that sustainable tourism has to be a niche product focusing on specific aspects of environment or culture, rather than a improvement in mass tourism. For example, work on ecotourism or the 'othering' and commodification of remote landscapes and people has been claimed to lead to the stereotypical presentation of such places according to the wishes of tourists rather than what may create equitable development (Silver, 1993; Hughes, 1995; King and Steward, 1996). As such, this indicates that allowing market interest to define business responses to sustainable tourism may not result in the development or environmental management defined by campaigning organisations like Tourism Concern.

Consequently, the adoption of practices of sustainable tourism may be in commercial interests of companies if these are presented as 'quality', rather than 'environmental'. Furthermore, these should be done proactively rather than in response to consumers overtly interested in ecotourism or holidays featuring remote cultures. Some respondents in the survey suggested using such techniques may reduce price competition in the mass market by allowing companies to differentiate between products, rather than all rely on the same combination of sun and sand. Table 7 shows the practices proposed in the survey which could be adopted now by different industry sectors. This may be compared with Table 1, showing the theoretical range of regulatory instruments available to government and business.

[Table 7 here]

In addition to this, some respondents suggested large companies like Thomson, First Choice, and Airtours should seek to make such practices the industry standard, by adopting them and marketing holidays on their basis. Such action may be opposed by the UK government's Office of Fair Trading, which opposes practices that may produce barriers to market entry. However, the announcement in July 1996 that ferry companies in the English Channel would be allowed to merge and therefore end price cutting has shown that such opposition need not always exist (Harper and Gow, 1996).

Similarly, consumer groups may oppose actions which lead to price increases. However, a common theme in environmental policy debates is the need to internalise environmental costings through direct or indirect taxes or pricing, and consequently this may have to be accepted. Many interviewees stated how UK holidaymakers generally pay less for holidays than abroad. One said: "the insistence that cheap is beautiful has been an illness in the British tourism industry for too long."

Conclusion

Tourism, like other industries, has environmental impacts. However, the ability to achieve effective environmental regulation in tourism is difficult because its main product of recreation is varied and experienced differently by each customer. In addition, tourism is not one industry but many. It also depends on consumer perceptions of landscape and culture which may not support domestic development objectives. This paper has used a survey of 69 companies and institutions in the UK outgoing tourism industry to assess how far regulation may be achieved by voluntary practices of environmental responsibility.

Results indicated that companies had adopted a wide range of practices, and that most companies perceived the need for environmental regulation of tourism development. However, all commercial sectors of the industry interviewed saw ultimate responsibility for change as lying with host governments via legislation. This indicated that current practices of voluntary environmental responsibility were considered to be ineffective by the industry itself. In addition, many companies wanted regulation in order to prevent environmental degradation, and abuse of the market by 'free-riding' companies who act irresponsibly in environmental or financial terms. However, this did not mean that self regulation was ineffective in all forms. A small number of informants believed that self regulation could result in environmental protection plus competitive advantage if it was presented as 'quality' rather than 'environmental' to consumers, and adopted

proactively rather than in response to perceived consumer wishes. This would enable sustainable tourism to be more readily applied to the mass market, plus also demonstrate that such practices do not require an increase in consumer demand before they make commercial sense (see also Eaton, 1996). It also supports arguments from other researchers that sustainable tourism needs to be defined more closely in terms of achievable targets of social and environmental performance for business (Goodall, 1995; Goodall and Stabler, 1996).

Furthermore, a proactive approach to sustainable tourism may also allow the redefinition of tourism away from stereotypical images which are not helpful to equitable development (e.g. Silver, 1993). Market-led demands for ecotourism or ethnic tourism may reinforce such unhelpful images, yet also be considered to be 'environmental' by misinformed companies and consumers.

Hence, the achievement of sustainable tourism may therefore depend on a change in discourse of both campaigners and industry in order to identify common ground more easily, and to communicate this more effectively to the marketplace. However, to wait for overt market demand for 'sustainable tourism' may result in losing opportunities to implement commercially attractive practices in the short term, and also risk reflecting populist demands for 'environment' which may not achieve sustainable development or allow business to deal proactively with competition and environmental damage in the mass market.

Such progress may not be made without protection against 'free riders' from legislation or coordinated industry action. Similar to other industries, environmental regulation of tourism may therefore depend on shared responsibilities between governments and business, and on the establishment of legislation which allow companies to develop their own flexible responses to environmental problems and market opportunities without fear of losing competitive advantage (Porter and van der Linde, 1995:128). Future research may therefore focus on participatory regulation involving business, governments, and campaigners with a greater view to common ground.

Acknowledgements

Research was funded by the World Wide Fund for Nature (UK) and Tourism Concern. Interviews were conducted with the help of Nancy Bigg, Andrew Carton Kelly, and Janice Nunn. The author would like to thank participants in the survey, plus Tricia Barnett of Tourism Concern, Richard Tapper of the World Wide Fund for Nature, Sally Eden, Andy Gouldson, and two anonymous referees for valuable comments.

References

- Anderson, W.T. and Cunningham, W.H. (1972) "The socially conscious consumer", *Journal of Marketing* 36:4 23-31
- Ashcroft, Peter (1993) "Review of Beyond the Green Horizon: a discussion paper on principles for sustainable tourism", *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 1:2 146
- Baker, J.A. and Miner, K.J. (1993) "Corporate environmentalism — cooperation or cooptation", *Journal of Environmental Health* 56:2 25-27
- Brophy, Michael, Netherwood, Alan, and Starkey, Richard (1995) "The voluntary approach: an effective means of achieving sustainable development?", *Eco-Management and Auditing* 2: 127-132
- Buhalis, D. and Fletcher, J. (1995) "Environmental impacts on tourist destinations: an economic analysis", pp3-24 in Coccossis, Harry and Nijkamp, Peter (eds) (1995) *Sustainable tourism development*, Aldershot: Avebury
- Burns, Peter and Holden, Andrew (1995) *Tourism: a new perspective*, London: Prentice Hall
- Bywater, Marion (1992) *The European tour operator industry*, EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit) Special Report 2141, London: EIU
- Cairncross, Frances (1995) *Green Inc.: a guide to business and the environment*, London: Earthscan
- Cater, Erlet (1993) "Ecotourism in the Third World: problems for sustainable tourism development", *Tourism Development* April 1993, pp85-90
- Cater, Erlet (1995) "Environmental contradictions in sustainable tourism", *The Geographical Journal* 161:1 21-28
- Coccossis, Harry and Nijkamp, Peter (eds) (1995) *Sustainable tourism development*, Aldershot: Avebury
- Corry, Stephen (1994) 'Harvest moonshine' taking you for a ride: a critique of the 'rainforest harvest' — its theory and practice, London: Survival International
- Desforges, Luke (1997) "Guilt tripping: the construction of ethical expertise in long-haul travel", *Proceedings of the RGS-IBG Annual Conference, Exeter '97*, Exeter: University of Exeter

- Eaton, Brian (1996) *European leisure businesses: strategies for the future*, ELM Publications: Huntingdon
- Eden, Sally (1993) "Constructing environmental responsibility: perceptions from retail business", *Geoforum* 24:4 411-421
- Eden, Sally (1997) "The politics of packaging in the UK: problems of business self-regulation as environmental policy", *Environmental Politics* (in press)
- Elkington, J., Knight, P. and Hailes, J. (1991) *The green business guide*, London: Gollancz
- Elkington, J. and Hailes, J. (1988) *The Green Consumer Guide*, London: Gollancz
- Elkington, J. and Hailes, J. (1992) *Holidays that don't cost the Earth*, London: Gollancz
- Epler Wood, Megan (1995) "The Green Globe program", *Environment and Development: World Travel and Tourism Environment Research Centre 1994 Review*, pp7
- FOE (Friends of the Earth) (1995) *A superficial attraction: the voluntary approach and sustainable development*, London: Friends of the Earth
- Forsyth, Tim (1996) *Sustainable tourism: moving from theory to practice*, London: World Wide Fund for Nature (UK)
- Gamero, E. (1992) "Legislation for sustainable tourism, Balearic Islands", pp49-52 in Tourism Concern and World Wide Fund for Nature, *Beyond the green horizon: a discussion paper on principles for sustainable tourism*, WWF and Tourism Concern, London
- Gladwin, Thomas N. (1993) "The meaning of greening: a plea for organisational theory", pp37-62 in Fischer, Kurt and Schot, Johan (eds) *Environmental strategies for industry: international perspectives on research needs and policy implications*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press
- Goodall, Brian (1995) "Environmental auditing: a tool for assessing the environmental performance of tourism firms", *The Geographical Journal* 161:1 29-37
- Goodall, Brian (1996) "The limitations of environmental self-regulation: the case of the Guernsey hospitality industry", paper presented at the *International Conference on Integrating Economic and Environmental Planning in Islands and Small States*, organised by the Islands and Small States Institute of the Foundation for International Studies in collaboration with the Directorate of the Planning Authority, Malta, Valletta, Malta, March 1996
- Goodall, Brian and Stabler, Mike (1996) "Principles influencing the determination of environmental standards for sustainable tourism", paper presented at the *Sustainable Tourism:*

- Ethics, Economics and the Environment Conference*, organised by Newton Rigg College in association with the University of Central Lancashire, Newton Rigg College, April 1996
- Green Globe (1996) *Green Globe Annual Review 1995/96*, London: Green Globe
- Harper, Keith and Gow, David (1996) "Ferry ruling spells end to Channel price war", *The Guardian* 17th July 1996, p19
- Hughes, G. (1995) "The cultural construction of sustainable tourism", *Tourism Management* 16:1 49-59
- Interpretation Journal (1993) "An industry that lacks sensitivity", *Interpretation Journal*, 52, pp3, Journal of the Society for the Interpretation of Britain's Heritage
- Janssen, H.; Kiers, M. and Nijkamp, P. (1995) "Private and public development strategies for sustainable tourism development of island economies", pp65-84 in Coccossis, Harry and Nijkamp, Peter (eds) *Sustainable Tourism Development*, Aldershot: Avebury
- Jenner, Paul and Smith, Christine (1992) *The tourism industry and the environment*, EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit) Special Report 2453, London: EIU
- Josephides, Noel (1994) "Tour operators and the myth of self-regulation", *Tourism in Focus* Winter Issue 1994 (number 14), London: Tourism Concern
- Kanjanavit, Ing (1992) *Thailand for sale*, video for television
- King, D.A. and Steward, W.P (1996) "Ecotourism and commodification: protecting people and places", *Biodiversity and Conservation* 5:3 293-305
- Leslie, David (1993) "The growing debate...Beyond the Green Horizon", *Tourism Society Bulletin*, 7 pp12-13, July/September 1993
- MacGillivray, Alex and Zadek, Simon (1995) *Accounting for change*, London: New Economics Foundation
- Mathieson, Alistair & Wall, Geoffrey (1982) *Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts*, London: Longman
- Mason, Peter and Mowforth, Martin (1995) *Codes of conduct in tourism*, University of Plymouth, Department of Geographical Sciences, Occasional Papers in Geography no. 1
- Middleton, Victor T.C. (1994, 2nd edition) *Marketing in travel and tourism*, Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann

- Mihikatha Institute and Perera, Clem (1994) "Buddhists, Christians and Muslims unite in a unique campaign", *Tourism in Focus* Spring Issue 1994, 11: 10-11
- Nelson, J.G., Butler, R. and Wall, G. (eds) (1993) *Tourism and sustainable development: monitoring, planning, managing*, Department of Geography Publications Series no.37, University of Waterloo, Canada
- Peattie, K. (1995) *Environmental marketing management*, London: Pitman
- Poon, Auliana (1993) *Tourism, technology and competitive strategies*, C.A.B. International, Wallingford
- Porter, Michael E. and van der Linde, Claas (1995) "Green and competitive: ending the stalemate", *Harvard Business Review* September-October 1995, pp120-134
- Price, Martin (1995) *Tourism in fragile environments*, Chichester: Wiley
- Schmidheiny, Stephan, with the Business Council for Sustainable Development (1992) *Changing course: a global business perspective on development and the environment*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press
- Silver, Ira (1993) "Marketing authenticity in Third World countries", *Annals of Tourism Research* 20:2 302-318
- Simmons, Peter and Wynne, Brian (1993) "Responsible care: trust, credibility, and environmental management", pp201-226 in Fischer, Kurt and Schot, Johan (eds) *Environmental strategies for industry: international perspectives on research needs and policy implications*, Washington, D.C.: Island Press
- Singh, Tej Vir (1993) "Review of Beyond the Green Horizon: principles for sustainable tourism", *Tourism Recreation Research* VIII:2 69-71
- Smith, N.C. (1990) *Morality and the market: consumer pressure for corporate accountability*, London: Routledge
- Stone, G., Barnes, J.H., and Montgomery, C. (1995) "Ecoscale — a scale for the measurement of environmentally responsible consumers", *Psychology and Marketing* 12:7 595-612
- Tourism Concern and WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature) (1992) *Beyond the green horizon: a discussion paper on principles for sustainable tourism*, ed. Shirley Eber, WWF and Tourism Concern, London

TPR (Tourism Planning and Research Associates) (1993, 4th edition) *The UK tourist outbound: a market profile*, London: TPR

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) (1995) *Environmental codes of conduct for tourism*, UNEP Industry and Environment Technical Report no. 29, UNEP, Paris

Urry, John (1990) *The tourist gaze*, London: Sage

Urry, John (1995) *Consuming places*, London: Routledge

Wheeller, B. (1994) "Egotourism, sustainable tourism and the environment - a symbiotic, symbolic, or shambolic relationship", in Seaton. T. (ed.) *Tourism: the state of the art*, John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, UK

WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council), WTO (World Tourism Organisation), and the Earth Council (1995) *Agenda 21 for the travel and tourism industry: towards environmentally sustainable development*, London: WTTC

Table 1: Environmental policy instruments available to business and government

(after Janssen *et al*, 1995:75)

	government	←—————→	market forces
indirect 	1) providing education and information to consumers	4) providing infrastructure, but no market intervention	7) free market allocation of resources
 	2) market-based instruments, eg. subsidies/ taxes/ pricing (eg. PPP)	5) agreements or partnerships between government and industry	8) niche or 'green' marketing
direct	3) legislation	6) permissions quota	9) long-term investments in market

Table 2. Beyond the Green Horizon: principles for sustainable tourism

(From Tourism Concern and the World Wide Fund for Nature, 1992:3)

1. **Using resources sustainably.** The conservation and sustainable use of resources — natural, social, and cultural — is crucial and makes long-term business sense.
2. **Reducing over-consumption and waste.** Reduction of over-consumption and waste avoids the costs of restoring long-term environmental damage and contributes to the quality of tourism.
3. **Maintaining diversity.** Maintaining and promoting natural, social, and cultural diversity is essential for long-term sustainable tourism, and creates a resilient base for the industry.
4. **Integrating tourism into planning.** Tourism development which is integrated into a national and local strategic planning framework and which undertakes environmental impact assessments, increases the long-term viability of tourism.
5. **Supporting local economies.** Tourism that supports a wide range of local economic activities and which takes environmental costs and values into account, both protects those economies and avoids environmental damage.
6. **Involving local communities.** The full involvement of local communities in the tourism sector not only benefits them and the environment in general but also improves the quality of the tourism experience.
7. **Consulting stakeholders and the public.** Consultation between the tourism industry and local communities, organisations and institutions is essential if they are to work alongside each other and resolve potential conflicts of interest.
8. **Training staff.** Staff training which integrates sustainable tourism into work practices, along with recruitment of local personnel at all levels, improves the quality of the tourism product.
9. **Marketing tourism responsibly.** Marketing that provides tourists with full and responsible information increases respect for the natural, social and cultural environments of destination areas and enhances customer satisfaction.
10. **Undertaking research.** On-going research and monitoring by the industry using effective data collection and analysis is essential to help solve problems and to bring benefits to destinations, the industry and consumers.

Table 3: Practices of sustainable tourism currently adopted

The number of responses from the survey are included in brackets

DIRECT INTERVENTIONS (influencing practices of the sector)	INDIRECT INTERVENTIONS (influencing practices of other sectors)
Tour Operators (n = 36)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donating to local charities and schools (13) • Promoting specialist 'green' holidays (8) • Recycling brochures (8) • Selecting tour guides from local communities (7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing "ecotips" and advice in brochures (13) • Sponsoring research into impact/management of tourism (9) • Lobbying of destinations to improve infrastructure etc. (8) • Providing tourists with "sympathy leaflets" (6) • Forging partnerships with local groups over waste management (6)
Travel Agents (n = 6)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycling paper and brochures (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing specialist knowledge about responsible tourism (2)
Hotels (n = 3)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abiding to the International Hotels Environment Initiative (recycling, waste management, etc.) (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaising with local governments about sustainable tourism (1)
Carriers (n = 5)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring fuel emissions, noise, sea waste management (5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing tourists with "ecotips" and information in magazines (2) • Educating tourists for selected, "fragile" cruise destinations (1)
Tourism Associations (n = 6)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Ecolabelling" — using Green Flag International / Green Globe logo to indicate quality (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising members on sustainable tourism (6) • Developing links with research and charities (5) • Raising awareness of governments (3) • Requesting members to contract only with suppliers of specified quality (2)
National Tourism Offices (n = 5)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversifying tourist attractions throughout country (3) • Avoiding charter flights (1) • Enforcing operators to work with local charities and groups (1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researching the impact and management of tourism (5) • Supporting legislation to control tourists and tourist development (4) • Lobbying to provide adequate infrastructure (3)
Consultancies (n = 8)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising companies in long and short term (8) • Training or briefing industry representatives (6) • Conducting research (6) • Writing "sympathy leaflets" (2) • Establishing awards for sustainable practice (1)

Table 4: Perceived obstacles to adopting practices of sustainable tourism

Responses are ranked according to frequency of response.

Tour Operators (n = 36)

- 1 The belief that others are responsible, especially governments (18)
- 2 The fear of taking steps not matched by competitors (12)
Difficulties in educating tourists (12)
- 3 The belief that operators are powerless to produce change (8)
Apparent lack of demand for sustainable tourism in the UK market (8)
Perceived intransigence and corruption amongst host authorities (8)
- 4 The need to fill seats on charter flights (7)
Confusion over which practices of recycling to use, etc. (7)
- 5 The perception of sustainable tourism as academic and irrelevant (4)
- 6 The rapid movement of staff prevents adequate training (2)

Travel Agents (n = 6)

- 1 The belief that travel agents are powerless to produce change (6)
- 2 The apparent lack of demand from the UK market (3)
The fear that introducing new measures may upset the fragile balance of business (3)
- 3 The desire not to undermine quality image by responding to short-term “green” fad (1)

Hotels (n = 3)

- 1 The belief that hotels are powerless to produce sustainable tourism (3)
- 2 The desire not to preach to high-spending guests (2)

Carriers (n = 5)

- 1 The belief that carriers are marginal to the main tourism industry, and hence powerless to change it (4)
- 2 The lack of power resulting from owning no land or resorts in destinations (2)
- 3 The lack of interest in environmental issues from the cruise liners’ main market of elderly people (1)

Tourism Associations (n = 6)

- 1 The widely-held view that holidays have to be cheap (5)
- 2 The low margins and high fragility of profits amongst tour operators (4)
- 3 The belief that governments will not listen to tourism companies (3)
- 4 The likely opposition to trade restrictions from the UK Government Office of Fair Trading (1)

National Tourism Offices (n = 5)

- 1 The tendency for governments to see mass tourism as the only tourism (4)
- 2 The belief that large tour operators do not listen to governments or national tourism offices (3)
- 3 The problems of making long-term agreements with tour operators because of the likelihood they will become bankrupt (2)

Consultancies (n = 8)

- 1 The simplistic marketing of holidays to promote only one aspect of holiday locations (7)
- 2 The false idea that sustainable tourism must be a niche product (6)
- 3 The lack of respect for environmentalists by the tourism industry (4)
- 4 The incorrect image of desirable tourism held by host governments (3)
The reluctance of large operators to deal with small indigenous companies (3)
The lack of mechanisms to force reinvestment into destinations by tour operators (3)
- 5 The availability of a new, large market from eastern Europe to fill degraded resorts (1)

Table 5: Perceived priorities for all tourism, by sector

Responses are ranked in order of frequency of response.

Tour Operators (n = 36)

- 1 Increase awareness of sustainable tourism amongst tourists (13)
Increase awareness amongst host governments (13)
- 2 Increase the quality, and therefore value, of holidays (9)
- 3 Train staff in tour operators, hotels and travel agents (7)
Enforce government controls on tourists and tourism development (7)
- 4 Increase gifts from tourists to charities (5)
Increase leadership for sustainable tourism by major companies (5)
- 5 Introduce a sustainable tourism guidebook for companies to use in the contracting process (4)
Introduce tourist tax at destinations by governments (4)
- 6 Introduce and enforce waste management at destinations

Travel Agents (n = 6)

- 1 Increase the awareness of tourists, therefore increasing the range of holidays currently valued by the market (6)

Hotels (n = 3)

- 1 Introduce new designs for hotels (3)
- 2 Increase public awareness of sustainable tourism (2)

Carriers (n = 5)

- 1 Educate tourists about the cultural and environmental diversity of destinations (4)
- 2 Put pressure on suppliers for quality products (3)

Tourism Associations (n = 6)

- 1 Increase awareness of tourists (6)
Increase awareness of governments (6)
- 2 Provide guidelines for operators to use for contracting (3)
- 3 Promote enclave tourism to control negative effects of tourism, and allow positive marketing (2)

National Tourism Offices (n = 5)

- 1 Maintain the quality of resorts so visitors will spend more and revisit (5)
- 2 Introduce land zonation to allow the coexistence of enclave tourism and protected areas (4)
- 3 Educate tourists about diversity and sensitivity of cultures and environment (3)
- 4 Research ways in which different forms of tourism can coexist (2)
- 5 Maintain the quality of tourism and destinations by aiming for high margins rather than large numbers of tourists (1)

Consultancies (n = 8)

- 1 Increase awareness of tourists (8)
Increase awareness of governments (8)
- 2 Long-term marketing to achieve a differentiation in the standard holiday package to allow competition on more than price (7)
- 3 Develop mechanisms to attract reinvestment in destinations by tour operators (5)
- 4 Introduce land zonation to allow the coexistence of enclave tourism and protected areas (4)

Table 6: Who should be responsible for implementing sustainable tourism?
 Numbers of responses per sector.

Responsibility lying with:

	Host governments	Operators & Host governments	Operators alone	Associations
<i>Sector questioned:</i>				
Tour Operators (n = 36)	21	12	-	3
Travel Agents (n = 6)	6	-	-	-
Hotels (n = 3)	3	-	-	-
Carriers (n = 5)	5	-	-	-
Tourism Associations (n = 6)	1	4	1	-
Tourism Offices (n = 5)	3	2	-	-
Consultancies (n = 8)	5	3	-	-
Total responses	44	21	1	3
% of total survey (n = 69)	63.8 %	30.4%	1.4%	4.4%

Table 7: Sustainable tourism practices and responsibilities as identified by the tourism industry

Sustainable tourism practices identified by industry members:

	COST-CUTTING	VALUE-ADDING	LONG-TERM INVESTMENT	LEGISLATION
<i>Sector responsible:</i>				
TOUR OPERATORS	Recycle brochures. Rely less on luxury resorts.	Sympathy booklets. Clean beaches etc. Pressurise suppliers. Diversify product (ie. supply more varied holidays).	Staff training. Research. Lobby governments to provide infrastructure.	Lobby governments to ensure satisfactory laws.
TRAVEL AGENTS	Recycle brochures.	Provide specialist advice.	Staff training.	
HOTELS	Recycle waste. Reduce fuel use.	Information packs. Sympathy booklets. Pressurise suppliers.	Staff training.	
CARRIERS	Reduce fuel use.	In-flight videos. Sympathy booklets.	Research. Staff training.	
TOURISM ASSOCIATIONS	Urge recycling and reduced consumption.	Information packs. Sympathy booklets.	Research. Lobby governments to provide infrastructure. Staff training.	Lobby governments to ensure satisfactory legislation.
GOVERNMENT TOURIST OFFICES	Waste management.	Education of tourists.	Provide adequate infrastructure. Research. Staff training	Controls on tourists and development. Land-use zoning. Tourist tax.