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Executive Summary

The Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ) scheme is part of the Ministry of Tourism’s efforts to improve the sustainability of tourism industry practices. This research seeks to understand why businesses incorporate sustainable practices through RTQ, and how tourists respond to the concept of responsible tourism.

Accordingly, this research has the following objectives:

- To study how and why businesses incorporate RTQ accreditations into their business practices, and to evaluate how they perceive RTQ delivers the promised quadruple bottom line outcomes.
- To study the ways in which tourists respond to the new RTQ accreditation, and whether this enhances their experience.
- To make recommendations for improved implementation of RTQ.

To elicit this information the research comprised two elements: (1) semi-structured interviews conducted with senior management of the New Zealand Responsible Tourism Qualmark scheme accredited businesses (N=24); (2) self-administered surveys completed by tourists staying at RTQ accredited businesses (N=66).

Results indicate that both businesses and tourists have confidence in the RTQ’s ability to deliver responsible practices. A large range of motivations and drivers instigated businesses to engage in responsible tourism practices. Likewise, tourists demonstrated their support for the responsible tourism concept, in principle. However, this support has not yet translated into actual pressure.

In addition to identifying the motivations and drivers, businesses’ environmental commitment was measured by classifying businesses according to the extent respondents expressed their belief in the importance of environmental protection. Data analysis involved identifying the degree of commonality in the motivations and drivers in light of the relative level of environmental commitment.

Businesses holding a high level of environmental commitment are motivated by altruistic values with no linkages to external drives; the businesses holding low levels, or even no environmental commitment, are motivated by legitimacy and competitiveness values with association primarily to the supply-chain or economic advantage drives. Additionally, the unique constraints associated with the different levels of environmental commitment were revealed. Consequently, by better understanding the drivers of change, while acknowledging businesses’ constraints, operator engagement in responsible tourism practices could be increased. This research therefore recommends: (1) attracting more businesses into the Endorse/Star Qualmark schemes; (2) attracting more businesses into the RTQ schemes; and (3) raising the standards of the RTQ as a way of further improving the sustainability of tourism industry practices. This can be achieved with the following nine initiatives:

- Improving Qualmark’s role as a marketing tool (e.g., by introducing the Qualmark symbol into all Tourism New Zealand advertising campaigns).
- Forming a significant point of difference between Qualmark’s accredited businesses and non-accredited ones (e.g., offering free workshops to help raise business standards in the area of customer service and business management).
- Increasing businesses’ return on investment (i.e., upfront payments made to Qualmark could be made closer to time of inspection, or when the auditing process is over, thus giving businesses an instant return on their investment).
• Attracting businesses driven by a legitimacy value by maintaining the Tourism New Zealand requirement for Qualmark accreditation as a benchmark for businesses who wish to participate in its marketing campaigns.

• Maintaining responsible tourism as part of the Endorse/Star Qualmark assessment as a first stage of increasing businesses’ awareness of sustainable tourism.

• Attracting businesses driven by a competitiveness value by emphasising the RTQ benefits (i.e., helping tourism providers to maintain a viable business, improving their business performance, and giving business owners peace of mind).

• Referring businesses to the economic benefits responsible tourism will bring them. This would be likely to help eliminate the antagonism and constraints associated with implementing the RTQ scheme.

• Maintaining the three levels of accreditation as a way to encourage businesses to improve their performances in all five areas of responsible tourism.

• Aligning the RTQ requirements with international standards.


Chapter 1
Introduction: The New Zealand Industry and the Clean Green Image

The New Zealand clean, green image and 100% pure claim came under scrutiny in the British Guardian newspaper: in his column ‘Greenwash - exposing false environmental claims’, Fred Pearce criticised New Zealand for not meeting its obligation under the Kyoto Protocol, writing that New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image was nothing but a mirage (NZPA, 2009; Pearce, 2009). According to that view, New Zealand has been accused of ‘dressing’ rather than ‘keeping’ the Garden of Eden. However, one should distinguish between poor practices and genuine barriers to sustainability such as New Zealand’s distance from its tourism markets and the inevitable long flights to get there. In this context, Bell’s (2008) study of the backpacker sector showed that when it came to ‘environmental responsibility’ most establishments (i.e. 23 out of 25) had a limited commitment to match their practices to the clean, green image and 100% pure claim. Consequently, assuming that Bell’s study reflects the practices of the backpacker sector, and that that sector represents the local tourism industry, then New Zealand may deserve Fred Pearce’s ‘greenwash’ accusation.

The New Zealand environment has constantly played a fundamental role in its marketing campaigns. For example ‘Scenic Wonderland’ (an early tourism advertising slogan) was based upon the ‘pristine, beauteous and abundantly productive environment’. From the 1970s New Zealand has taken pride in being ‘clean and green’, and from the mid-1980s as being ‘nuclear free’ (Bell, 2008). In the last decade, the ‘100% Pure’ campaign has been used for branding New Zealand products as environmentally friendly (Bell, 2008; Tourism New Zealand, 2009). All of these campaigns present New Zealand as a pristine and pollution-free country, and alongside the Lord Of The Rings film trilogy, have led to world recognition of New Zealand’s clean, green image and 100% pure claim (Bell, 2008; Tourism New Zealand, 2009). This recognition has resulted in a substantial booming for at least one of New Zealand’s products - its tourism industry. Visitor arrivals have substantially increased: almost 2.5 million visitors came to New Zealand in 2008, compared with 1.6 million in 1999, and total international visitor arrivals are expected to increase at a rate of 3.3% annually to almost 3 million by 2015 (Ministry of Tourism, 2009; Tourism New Zealand, 2009). Tourism is an important part of New Zealand’s economy (Ministry of Tourism, 2009). In the year to March 2009 tourism directly and indirectly contributed $15 billion, which is 9% of New Zealand’s GDP (excluding GST and import duties). At the same time, international tourist expenditure accounted for $9.3 billion, making up 16.4% of New Zealand’s total export earnings. Today, tourism supports 9.6% of the total workforce in New Zealand (with 94,600 direct and 90,200 indirect full-time equivalent jobs). Thus, any accusations that are damaging to the clean, green image and 100% pure claim are likely to prove destructive to the tourism industry, and hence also the local economy.

In the last decade, New Zealand has won over forty international tourism competitions under the ‘best destination’ and the ‘top country’ categories (Tourism New Zealand, 2009). In 2009 Lonely Planet once more named New Zealand as one of the top ten destinations in the World (‘The Lonely Planet names top 10 destinations for 2010,’ 2009; NZPA, 2009; Tourism New Zealand, 2009). The Lonely Planet writer, Nigel Wallis, remarks that New Zealand’s leading role in ‘spearheading the ecotravel revolution, with its ethos towards responsible travel (comprising minimising visitor impact and involving locals in sustainable tourism practices)’ was an important factor in their choice (‘The Lonely Planet names top 10 destinations for 2010,’ 2009; NZPA, 2009). One of the tools New Zealand is using in this ‘ecotravel revolution’ is the ‘Responsible Tourism Qualmark’ (RTQ). New Zealand’s Ministry of Tourism (2008) has identified the need to turn current tourism industry practices into sustainable ones, thus balancing between dressing and keeping the Garden of Eden. This need was incorporated as the third and fourth desirable outcomes of the 2015 Tourism Strategy, covering environmentally and socially sustainable practices respectively. In launching the RTQ accreditation...
(in August, 2008) the Ministry of Tourism\(^1\) has hopefully given the industry the necessary tool for achieving those desirable outcomes (Qualmark, 2010). Thus, given this content, the aim of this report is to conduct a comparative evaluation of the supply and demand-side perceptions of this new RTQ accreditation. By doing so, this study will examine whether New Zealand’s tourism industry is genuinely trying to protect the country’s clean, green image and the 100% pure claim, or whether it deserves accusations such as those of Fred Pearce and Claudia Bell, of being nothing but ‘greenwash’.

Accordingly, this research has the following objectives:

- To study how and why businesses incorporate RTQ accreditations into their business practices, and to evaluate how they perceive RTQ delivers the promised quadruple bottom line outcomes.
- To study the ways in which tourists respond to the new RTQ accreditation, and whether this enhances their experience.
- To make recommendations for improved implementation of RTQ, thus reducing the social and environmental damage caused by tourism and better catering for the public’s environmental concerns.

In responding to these objectives, this report comprises five further chapters:

**Chapter 2** is the literature review and covers three main themes: (1) sustainable development and the exogenous and endogenous pressures conceptual framework describing businesses’ motivations for involvement; (2) the ways codes of practice are used to implement sustainable developments and the associated difficulties; and (3) the RTQ as a case study (this will involve reviewing the development of the responsible tourism concept as well as the tourist response).

**Chapter 3** will explain the methods used in the two phases of the research: the qualitative study of businesses incorporating the RTQ, and the quantitative study of tourist attitudes to and perception of the RTQ.

**Chapter 4** will present and discuss the qualitative results. This chapter will describe how and why businesses incorporate RTQ accreditations into their business practices, as well as their perceptions of the RTQ’s promised outcomes. Following this, the ability of the exogenous and endogenous pressures to describe how and why businesses incorporate RTQ will be critiqued, and the merit of integrating respondents’ environmental awareness into the exogenous and endogenous pressures conceptual framework will be discussed.

**Chapter 5** will present and discuss the quantitative results. This chapter will describe how tourists perceive the New Zealand image, and their perception of the responsible tourism concept, particularly the RTQ.

**Finally, chapter 6** will conduct the comparative evaluation of the supply and demand-side perceptions of RTQ accreditation. In this chapter feasible ways of improving the RTQ will be discussed.

---

\(^1\) Qualmark was founded in 1993 and is a government and private sector partnership (owned by Tourism New Zealand and the New Zealand Automobile Association) (Qualmark, 2010).
Chapter 2

Literature Review: The Responsible Tourism Concept

New Zealand was allegorised as ‘God’s Own’ by the late 19th-century poet Thomas Bracken. For many years New Zealand was a well-kept secret in the South Pacific, but with the development of modern tourism ‘God’s Own’ has become a desirable and well visited destination (Ministry of Tourism, 2008, 2009; Tourism New Zealand, 2009). The rise in tourist numbers has not happened without impacting on the environment, and increasingly New Zealanders are being reminded not to spoil ‘God’s Own’: if we do, no one will be able to restore it again.

This chapter will present and discuss what motivates businesses to incorporate sustainable development, the basic assumptions for implementing sustainable development, and the case study of responsible tourism. More specifically:

- Section 2.1 will introduce the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development.
- Section 2.2 will introduce the exogenous and endogenous pressures frameworks describing why and how businesses incorporate sustainable development.
- Section 2.3 will explain the basic assumptions needed for successfully implementing sustainable development, and what the associated limitations are.
- Section 2.4 will present the research case study, the Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ). This section will therefore start by setting the responsible tourism concept in its historical context, before exploring the RTQ scheme.
- Section 2.5 will present the ways tourists responded to the sustainable development schemes currently on offer.
- Section 2.6 will explore the role of this report in shedding light on the unexplored areas of sustainable development and responsible tourism.

2.1 Sustainability and Sustainable Development

The idea that exponential growth can be sustained by finite resources was criticised by Hardin (1968), who argued that our world can only support a finite population and its needs. The term ‘sustainability’ therefore refers to the ability of humans to continue to live within environmental constraints (Robinson, 2004). The concept of sustainable development emerged in the 1980s as a way to bridge the gap between environmental concerns (e.g., the cost of ecological degradation as consequences of human activity) and socio-political concerns (e.g., poverty and human rights issues) (Robinson, 2004). Sustainable development was defined as ‘development that meets the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987; cited in Robinson, 2004). The sustainable development concept is criticised in the following three areas (Robinson, 2004):

- Its vagueness: the definition of sustainable development can be interpreted in many ways. This has extended the debate between the ‘Preservationists’ who are driven by their spiritual approach to emphasize dualistic typology (i.e., the relationship between humanity and nature), the ‘Conservationists’ who are driven by their more utilitarian approach which emphasises the triple bottom line (i.e., the social, ecological and economic dimensions).
- The likelihood of attracting hypocrites (i.e., greenwash): sustainable development language may be used to promote unsustainable activities. This criticism has resulted in the development of sustainability standards and certification for products and services (RTQ, the focus of this report, is such a certification).
• Its ability to foster delusions: development is seen as synonymous with growth, and, therefore, sustainable development means restructuring, rather than challenging, continued economic growth. Thus, the term ‘sustainable development’ has been seen by some as an oxymoron, as growth and development cannot coexist with ecological (and in some cases social and economic) sustainability (see Hardin, 1968). For those seeing the oxymoron, sustainable development only postpones the inevitable collapse. Another delusion-related criticism is based on the notion that sustainable development is a tool used by the political and economic sphere to divert the debate away from the topics of injustices associated with world energy use, emissions, property ownership, poverty, militarism and the ‘systematic breakdown’ in modern economic and governance paradigms.

Sustainable development should, however, be considered as a vital component of a resilient society (Robinson, 2004); in other words the ability of a society to comprehend the concept that the resources it relies upon are finite, and to manage those assets in the best possible way, is the fine line separating its feasible future from its collapse (Diamond, 2005). This research, however, has not attempted to test whether sustainable development is achievable or to try to establish exact objective measures of the level of sustainability RTQ-accredited businesses hold, but rather explores the supply and demand side’s thoughts and attitudes towards the responsible tourism 2 concept (a task that according to the literature reviews has not so far been conducted).

2.2 Frameworks for Explaining Business Adoption of Sustainable Developments

2.2.1 Exogenous and Endogenous Pressures

Exogenous and endogenous pressures have been used to explain business implementation of sustainable developments (Berry & Rondinelli, 1998; Ramus & Montiel, 2005; Claver-Cortés, Molina-Azorín, Pereira-Moliner, & López-Gamero, 2007; Kasim, 2007). Exogenous pressures include implementing environmental regulations, perceived threats from future law and/or greater government supervision, and trade association memberships. Endogenous pressures occur as businesses take on the implementation of sustainable developments. These are driven by either bottom-to-top or top-down approaches. Of these endogenous pressures, the top-down process, initiated by a directive from CEOs and top managers, has been identified as the strongest driver for change. For example, Kasim (2007) reports that the Shangri-La Hotel chain became ISO 14001 certified after the CEO made an executive decision.

Exogenous and endogenous pressures are the bases of the two main frameworks describing why and how businesses incorporate sustainable development. The drivers of change framework looks at the external influencing factors (i.e., the exogenous pressures), while the organisational values framework examines the internal influencing factors (i.e., endogenous pressures).

2.2.2 The Drivers of Change Framework

Exogenous pressures can be clustered into four categories: regulation, economic advantage, pressures from the businesses environment, and pressure from stakeholders (Berry & Rondinelli, 1998; Ramus & Montiel, 2005).

• Regulatory: companies are obliged to follow environmental and social laws in their everyday practice (e.g., the New Zealand 1991 Resource Management Act regulates access to natural and physical resources with the principal goal of sustainable use). Hence, the more strictly the law is

---

2 Responsible tourism is a form of sustainable development; see section 2.4.2.
enforced and the higher the associated costs of breaching the law are (both in personal liability and/or financially), the stronger the drive for change.

- **Pressures from the business environment:** supply-chain pressure to conform to sustainable and responsible practice (e.g. holiday marketing companies who will work only with sustainable and responsible certified hotels or pressure from the brand which the business is operating under (Miller, 2003; Font, 2007; Kasim, 2007)). Additionally, a company which operates the accreditation scheme and wishes to raise awareness of this option will market the new operational practices.

- **Economic advantage:** companies adopt sustainable and responsible practices because they believe it could enhance business performance (e.g. reducing operating costs and improving efficiency, developing innovative products and services for access to new markets, and reducing a company’s liabilities through integrated risk management).

- **Pressure from the stakeholder environment:** increasing environmental awareness amongst customers and providers alike leading to sustainable development being implemented. There is empirical evidence demonstrating tourists’ good intentions in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products, however, the development of this pressure is slow (Miller, 2003; Font, 2007). Likewise, shareholders who believe in sustainable development have influence on the operators to adopt responsible practices.

All four categories influence all businesses at a micro level (i.e., within the same industry of a specific country) (Claver-Cortés et al., 2007). For example, all hotels are engaged in the same type of industrial activity (i.e. providing accommodation) and face the same environmental regulations, and are likely to submit to the same types of consumer pressure while operating a profitable business. Although all four categories have an equal influence, businesses differ in the way they respond. These responses can be divided up according to their degree of reactivity towards responsible management practices: from proactive through to intermediate and reactive (Claver-Cortés et al., 2007).

### 2.2.3 The Organisational Values Framework

Endogenous pressures can be clustered into three categories according to different core organisational values: competitiveness, legitimacy, and altruism (Bohdanowicz, 2006; Diefa & Font, 2010). Competitiveness relates to cost efficiency or new market opportunities. Legitimacy relates to relationships with different actors, such as supply chains, regulatory bodies, and customers. Altruism relates to a shareholder’s belief that responsible products are ‘the right thing to do’. The organisational values separate executives who consider environmental protection as a top priority from those who consider environmental protection as a way to please stakeholders and/or to enhance business performance. It has been argued that firms which are dominated by altruistic values show a stronger willingness to adopt sustainable development (Bohdanowicz, 2006; Diefa & Font, 2010). Conversely, those firms which overemphasise the competitive organisational values are less likely to engage in more proactive green marketing practices.

Organisational values are influenced by the society a business is operating in (Bohdanowicz, 2006). For example, Bohdanowicz’s (2006) comparative study of Swedish and Polish hoteliers found higher environmental awareness amongst the Swedish respondents. Thus, the Swedish hoteliers tended to have an altruism organisational value with regard to sustainable development, whereas their Polish counterparts tended to have a competitiveness organisational value.

### 2.2.4 The Exogenous and Endogenous Pressures as a Single Conceptual Framework

The preceding two frameworks are usually discussed separately; however, they can be combined into a single conceptual framework. Public pressure originating from the increased environmental
awareness of stakeholders directly influences the business environment (which wishes to please consumers), regulators (who wish to please voters), and business owners (who see a new business opportunity). The organisational values separate respondents who consider environmental protection a top priority from those who consider environmental protection as a way to please stakeholders and/or to enhance their business performances. An organisational value then ties with a driver of change to motivate engagement (Figure 2-1):

- An altruism organisational value links to shareholders motivated by their own beliefs (i.e., a stakeholder driver).
- A legitimacy organisational value connects with legal liability, supply-chain pressure or customer demand (i.e., regulation, business environment, and stakeholder drivers respectively).
- A competitiveness organisational value connects with cost saving via improved resource consumption, the threats from fines, or the need to keep up with the spread of new principles and emergence of new business opportunities (i.e., economic advantage, regulation, business environment, and stakeholder drivers respectively).

**Figure 2-1**
Exogenous and endogenous pressures as a conceptual framework

![Diagram](image-url)
2.3 Managing For Sustainable Development

Sustainable development can be, and usually is, managed for by using voluntarily implemented certified Codes of Practice (COP) or Environmental Management System (EMS) schemes (Font, 2002; Robinson, 2004). COPs are based upon businesses meeting a set standard, whereas EMSs are typically based upon businesses measuring their impacts and reducing or mitigating those impacts (Font, 2002). Successful implementation of such voluntary schemes relies on the following six basic assumptions (Ostrom, 1990, p. 211):

a) A relatively small and stable number of actors are gaining from the commons.

b) Actors wish to sustain the commons.

c) Actors share the belief that unless an alternative way of managing the commons is adopted, all will lose.

d) All actors will be similarly affected by the new scheme.

e) There is a low cost associated with adopting the new scheme.

f) Actors share norms, trust, and binding social capital.

2.3.1 The Difficulty of Managing Codes of Practice

The preceding six basic assumptions are also the reasons why managing COP or EMS schemes can prove difficult.

The greater the number of actors controlling a common resource pool, the more difficult it can be to establish a scheme that will protect the common effectively (Haase, Lamers, & Amelung, 2009). For example, the establishment of the International Association of Antarctic Tour Operators (IAATO) limited docking in Antarctica to a small number of vessels carrying up to 100 passengers (Haase et al., 2009). However, larger vessel operators have now joined IAATO, resulting in a five-fold increase in vessel size. As a greater number of actors bring increasing numbers of tourists, protecting the ‘Antarctic common’ becomes more difficult (Haase et al., 2009).

Different businesses are likely to associate themselves with different types of commons. The greater the number of commons types there are, the more difficult it is to establish a scheme effectively (Stanford, 2008). For example, Kaikoura-based businesses typically associate with an environmental common, while Rotorua-based businesses typically associate predominantly with a cultural common (Stanford, 2008). It is likely that different actions are needed to protect these different commons.

Some actors may perceive changing their behaviour as unlikely to improve their economic performance (Ramus & Montiel, 2005), hence they are less likely to implement environmental policies and practices beyond any compliance minimum.

As norms, trust, and binding social capital should be shared at all levels of the business, line management and employee involvement is necessary for the successful implementation of a scheme (Ramus & Montiel, 2005). However, the commitment phase (i.e., when management decides to implement sustainable and responsible tourism) and the implementation phase (i.e., when an employee takes on the needed action) often evolve separately and the implementation phase may involve overcoming employee opposition.

COPs or EMSs usually target large manufacturers who have large environmental impacts which are direct and easily measurable and where cleaner operating systems can be more easily implemented (Ramus & Montiel, 2005; Sambataro & Hughey, 2006). Thus, Small to Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) (e.g., according to Smeral (1998), 95% of EU hotels and restaurants are small firms with less

---

3 Resource which is shared alike by two or more or all in question (Webster, 1996).
than nine employees)) are often left out of the main picture regarding education for sustainability (Sambataro & Hughey, 2006). Despite this, due to the accumulated social, economic, cultural and/or environmental impacts SMEs cause, they could and should play an important role in sustainable development (Sambataro & Hughey, 2006).

2.4 The Tourism Industry as a Case Study

2.4.1 Choosing the Tourism Industry as a Case Study

There are four reasons behind our choice of the tourism industry as a case study for exploring supply-side attitudes toward sustainable developments, and the demand-side adaptations:

a) Tourism is a well established industry within New Zealand (as alluded to in Chapter 1, tourism is one of the most important parts of New Zealand’s economy).

b) The RTQ accreditation is offered to the local New Zealand tourism industry (as Chapter 1 alluded to, in launching the RTQ accreditation the Ministry is hoping to build operator capacity in delivering sustainable products and services).

c) Little is known about why businesses choose RTQ or how tourists respond to its presence.

d) The availability of the Ministry of Tourism Research scholarship, of which Raviv is one of the 2009 recipients.

For a better understanding of the RTQ scheme, one should first be familiar with the responsible tourism concept.

2.4.2 The Responsible Tourism Concept

The phenomenon of ‘mass tourism’ typifies the last half century (Smith, 1990; Leiper, 2004). Many of the social, technological, economic, political, cultural, and psychological changes that have taken place since World War Two have transformed all fields of human life (Smith, 1990; Leiper, 2004). One of those transformations is that tourism has ceased to be a notably elitist activity, and with the accumulation of middle-class involvement it has become a mass tourism phenomenon (e.g., 880 million international tourists were reported for 2009 by the World Tourism Organization, 2010). This mass involvement has not evolved without having an impact on the bio-physical, socio-economic, and socio-cultural environments. Tourist activity has direct and indirect impacts on the bio-physical environment (e.g., the spread of the exotic freshwater algae Didymo by recreational users, or climate change through airplanes emitting greenhouse gases into the atmosphere) (Hammitt & Cole, 1998; Becken, 2002; Gössling, Hansson, Hörstmeier, & Saggel, 2002; Becken, Simmons, & Frampton, 2003). Additionally, tourism development has impacts on the socio-economic environment: on the one hand, tourism provides improving quality of life elements, such as employment opportunities and infrastructures; but on the other hand tourism can cause a rise in the cost of living and an increased crime rate (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005). Finally, tourism via the demonstration effect has impacts on the socio-cultural environment: members of the host community, while copying tourist behaviour and spending patterns, change their own cultural behaviour (Fisher, 2004). These newly adopted changes (e.g., dress or language) are likely to challenge the traditional value systems, leading to conflicts and consequently resulting in negative socio-cultural impacts (Fisher, 2004; Andereck et al., 2005).

With projections of future tourism growth, the need for developing alternatives to mass tourism which could sustain physical and cultural carrying capacity has become apparent (Smith, 1990; Cohen, 2002; Murphy & Price, 2005; Stanford, 2008). In 1989, the Algerian government together with the World Tourism Organisation convened a seminar on ‘alternative’ tourism (Smith, 1990). The outcome of this seminar defined ‘alternative’ tourism as: ‘all forms of tourism which respects the host’s natural, built, and cultural environments and the interests of all parties concerned’ (Smith,
The focus for this alternative to mass tourism (with its myriad of adverse socio-economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts) was small-scale, locally owned businesses with low import leakages and a higher proportion of profits retained locally (Cater, 1993).

One of the first such alternatives was ‘ecotourism’, a nature-based activity. The prefix ‘eco’ is driven from the word ‘ecology’ - the study of the relations between biological organisms and their environment (Webster, 1996). This gives the impression that ecotourism always implies a better kind of tourism (Stanford, 2008). However, ecotourism has been criticised for having negative impacts as it is usually located in fragile, remote and marginal areas, which are likely to be more susceptible to the impacts of tourism (Bell, 2008; Stanford, 2008). Thus, eco-tourists may simply be purchasing little more than a clear conscience, while ecotourism may be critiqued for being nothing but a ‘greenwash’ (Stanford, 2008). Moreover, for the most part, ecotourism only targets small-scale nature-based activities, and thus cannot be considered an alternative to mass tourism.

This preceding understanding gave rise to the responsible tourism concept as another alternative to mass tourism. Tourism is beneficial to many interest groups, from the tourists to the protected area managers, the tourism industry, and governments (Manfredo & Driver, 2002). The tourism industry is only facilitating the tourists’ experience, which is driven by their quest for ‘authentic’ natural and cultural environments (Figure 2-2) (MacCannell, 1973; Gunn & Var, 2002). Thus, by adopting responsible tourism practices that will ensure sustainability of resources, the industry is hoping to preserve its future while conserving the natural and cultural attractions (Figure 2-2) (Gunn & Var, 2002; Carasuk & Fisher, 2008; Ministry of Tourism, 2008). Responsible tourism aims not only to alleviate damage due to mass tourism, but also to benefit host communities socially (on both socio-economic and socio-cultural levels), while also conserving the physical environment (World Tourism Organization, 2009). Therefore, according to Stanford (2008, p. 260) responsible tourism:

- Embraces a quadruple bottom line\(^4\) (i.e., considers the cultural, social, environmental, and economic aspects).
- Covers all forms of tourism (i.e., eco and mass tourism alike).
- Benefits all those involved (i.e., tourists, tourism providers, and the local community).

\(^4\) Thus the responsible tourism concept is driven by those holding a conservation world view and is motivated by their utilitarian approach for sustainable development (see section 2.1; Robinson, 2004).
The responsible tourism concept, by embracing a quadruple bottom line and aiming to benefit all those involved, is trying to overcome the social problems associated with poverty, intergenerational equity concerns, and loss of cultural diversity (topics which are to some extent ignored by the general concept of sustainable development; see section 2.1).

Following on from these understandings and with the Agenda 21 adopted by the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit held in 1992 in mind, the World Tourism Organization and other organisations in 1995 came out with the call to align the entire tourism industry within ‘responsible tourism’ practices (France, 1999). This call was reinforced by the Cape Town Responsible Tourism in Destinations Declaration that was part of the World Summit on sustainable development held in Johannesburg in 2002 (World Tourism Organization, 2009). Thus, a growing awareness of the damage tourism causes to the social and bio-physical environments has led to the paradigms of sustainable tourism development and responsible tourism becoming the tourism industry’s leading concept (Cohen, 2002; Murphy & Price, 2005).

The responsible tourism concept, however, has its own critics:

- First, responsible tourism does not challenge the idea of continued growth despite tourism’s heavy reliance on finite resources, notably fossil fuels (Becken, 2008).
- Responsible tourism has a worldwide view emphasising the sustainability of resources, while ignoring the role of tourist demand (Liu, 2003).
- Sustainability within the responsible tourism context is often restricted by the preservation world view, thus failing to manage resources as a complex and dynamic concept (Liu, 2003).
- Advocacy for intergenerational equity comes, in some cases, at the expense of intra-generational equity (Liu, 2003).
- Socio-economic benefit will always impact on socio-cultural integrity via the demonstration effect. Thus responsible tourism cannot coexist with cultural sustainability (Liu, 2003; Fisher, 2004).
- In the responsible tourism context, the term sustainability has not yet been clearly defined, nor are there appropriate measuring indicators (Liu, 2003).
Finally, responsible tourism is linked to simplistic or naïve views, as it has not yet been proven as a solution for a sustainable and growing worldwide tourism industry (Liu, 2003).

With these preceding understandings in mind, this research attempts to explore the supply and demand side’s thoughts and attitudes to the responsible tourism concept.

2.4.3 The Responsible Tourism Qualmark

Several responsible tourism COP accreditations operate in New Zealand. Some have a regional scope (e.g., Sustainable Tourism South, and the Nelson Tasman Sustainable Tourism Charter), while others are offered throughout the country (e.g., Green Globe and the RTQ). These last two have a notable number of accredited businesses: at August 2009 (the time this research was started) RTQ had accredited 350 businesses while Green Globe had accredited 57 businesses (which is a significant number of the total of 700 businesses accredited worldwide) (Green Globe, 2010; Qualmark, 2010). Due to the large number of businesses accredited under the RTQ this COP was chosen for research.

Qualmark was founded in 1993. It is a government and private-sector partnership (owned by Tourism New Zealand and the New Zealand Automobile Association) operating only in New Zealand. Qualmark is New Zealand’s official quality agency and it is well established within the tourism market with over 2200 businesses having an Endorsed/Star Qualmark (ESQ) accreditation (Qualmark, 2010). In the New Zealand Tourism Strategy (2008) four goals were set for the Qualmark Company:

- Ensure that Qualmark’s assessment systems are consistently applied, and are recognised and supported by the tourism sector.
- Continue raising tourism sector standards.
- Ensure that the rating and endorsement system is readily recognised and clearly understood by tourists.
- Help build operator capability in delivering environmentally sustainable products and services.

In response to the last goal, in August 2008 the RTQ accreditation was launched. The RTQ was formed to help achieve the third and fourth outcomes of the 2015 Tourism Strategy - covering environmental and social sustainable practices respectively (Ministry of Tourism, 2008). The cost of certifying under the new RTQ is covered by the all-inclusive Qualmark quality certification fees (about NZ$700 per annum). All tourism businesses are now encouraged to improve their sustainability performances since between 5% and 8% of the ESQ accreditation evaluation process is based on the new RTQ criteria.

Businesses who wish to join the RTQ are required to meet some ‘minimum requirements’ by complying with at least five practices within each of the following criteria (Qualmark, 2010):

- Energy efficiency (e.g., using energy-efficient light bulbs).
- Water conservation (e.g., using native flora in the landscape which consume less water than a lawn).
- Waste management (e.g., recycling waste when possible).
- Conservation initiatives (e.g., supporting a habitat restoration project).
- Community activities (e.g., supporting a community group).

By September 2009 (the time phase 1 of this research started) 14% of businesses accredited with ESQ were also accredited with RTQ (see Table 2-1) (Qualmark, 2010).
### Table 2-1
Percentage of RTQ accreditation by the three tourism sub-sectors (September 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Endorsed /Star</th>
<th>Responsible Tourism</th>
<th>Percent RTQ accredited out of total ESQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backpackers</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest &amp; host</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday home</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday Park</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student accommodation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Accommodation</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Activity</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Qualmark Accreditations</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RTQ accreditation has three levels: ‘Bronze’, ‘Silver’, and ‘Gold’. Businesses that meet the requirements of three of the five criteria are accredited with ‘Bronze’; four of the five criteria are accredited with ‘Silver’; and all five of the criteria are accredited with ‘Gold’. By the time this research ended in late August 2010, RTQ had doubled to over 600 accredited businesses - see Table 2-2 (Qualmark, 2010).
Table 2-2
Level of RTQ accreditation by the three tourism sub-sectors (August 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>Exclusive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Backpackers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guest &amp; host</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-contained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student accommodation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Accommodation</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Activity</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total RTQ Accreditation</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Qualmark Company promotes this new accreditation by promising that businesses who join will achieve the following:

- Give their customers confidence that the business is caring for this part of the world.
- Contribute to New Zealand’s reputation as a sustainable destination.
- Make positive changes in their business helping both the environment and the local community.
- Enhance visitor experience.
- Benefit their business and its place in the community.

2.5 Tourist Response to the Responsible Tourism Concept

The Theory of Stages of Change argues that more tourists are likely to change their behaviour to preferring responsible tourism (over the more ‘trainload’ forms associated with mass tourism) as more data is revealed to them over time (Prochaska & Velicer, 1997; Donnelly, 2008). The Theory of Stage of Changes conceptualises six stages of behavioural change: (1) pre-contemplation: the stage at which people are unaware or under-aware of their problems and, therefore, hold no intention of behavioural change in the foreseeable future; (2) contemplation: the stage in which people are aware of a problem, but have still not seriously thought about overcoming it; (3) preparation: the stage that combines intention and evaluation of behavioural change; (4) action: the stage in which individuals modify their behaviour in order to overcome their problems; (5) maintenance: the stage in which people behave in the new form; and (6) relapse: the stage in which people are not aware of their new behaviour or may change it to deal with new problems.
These six stages of behavioural change can be linked to tourists’ environmental awareness\(^5\) (Figure 2-3). Tourists can be divided into four types according to their environmental awareness as done by Donnelly (2008) in his study of the German and UK markets: (1) the indifferent: those who hold no environmental concern nor take any action that benefits the environment when they travel; (2) watching and waiting: those who hold some environmental awareness, but are currently not taking any action that benefits the environment when they travel; (3) doubting Thomas: those who hold some environmental awareness, and are currently taking some actions that benefit the environment when they travel; and (4) disciples: those who hold a high environmental awareness and act in a responsible manner (i.e., book eco-friendly accommodation and avoid plane flights).

Figure 2-3
Theory of Stages of Change in the context of tourist responses to climate change
(Based on Donnelly, 2008)

1. Pre-contemplation  “Climate change is nonsense”  Indifferent
2. Contemplation  “There may be something in what they’re saying”  Watching and waiting
3. Perpetration  “I’ve checked out one of those carbon footprint calculators”  Doubting Thomas
4. Action  “I’ve chosen a domestic holiday over going to Australia”  Disciples
5. Maintenance  “I only stay at responsible accredited businesses”
6. Relapse  “I don’t think about it anymore – it’s a part of my life!”

Currently, most tourists are represented by the Indifferent and the Watching and waiting types, i.e., those who are not taking any actions that benefit the environment when they travel (Miller, Rathowe, Scales, Holmes, & Tribe, 2007; Donnelly, 2008). Although tourists are aware of their environmental impacts, for the majority of tourists the predicted satisfaction from having a vacation supplants their environmental concerns (Miller et al., 2007; Donnelly, 2008). Therefore, although tourists may have adopted an environmentally responsible behaviour in their everyday life, they have tended to leave this responsible behaviour behind while on holiday (Miller et al., 2007; Donnelly, 2008; Stanford, 2008). This is demonstrated by the idea that as one is doing the ‘right thing’ all year, one should not need to worry while on holiday (Donnelly, 2008). Consequently, the majority of tourists are often presented as laissez-faire travellers, those who abandon all sense of social and environmental responsibility while on their two-week annual break (Stanford, 2008). The nature of these tourists’ behaviour is likely to be shaped by confusion and by the hedonistic spirit of travelling. The current very large number of scattered voluntary schemes (e.g., in New Zealand there are more than eight such schemes; see section 2.3.3.) has confused tourists to the point where some either prefer to ignore these green messages or perceive them as greenwash (Font, 2002). Tourists also have confused perceptions of how their tourism activity is contributing to global climate change.

---

\(^5\) Awareness is defined as knowledge that something exists, or understanding of a situation or subject at the present time based on information or experience (Webster, 1996).
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The hedonistic spirit of the tourism activity means that vast amounts of resources are consumed by the individual during their vacation, notably while travelling (Becken, 2002). Yet, studies such as Miller (2003) and Font (2007) have found empirical evidence demonstrating tourists’ good intentions in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products. Thus, one should distinguish between genuine barriers to sustainability, such as the inevitable environmental impact resulting from the current mode of transport, and laissez-faire behaviour.

2.5.1 Changing Environmental Attitudes

There is little doubt that media coverage and public awareness of climate change and peak oil has increased in recent years. The record spike in oil prices to almost US$150 per barrel in July 2008 and the release of former American Vice-President Al Gore’s documentary *An Inconvenient Truth* in 2006 are both likely to have contributed to this phenomenon. There is evidence that the environmental values of citizens in the world’s key inbound markets are changing. For example, the Pew Global Attitudes Project (2007) found that the proportion of respondents who viewed environmental degradation as a major threat to the planet increased significantly between 2002 and 2007 in 20 out of 35 countries for which trends were available. Today, 70% of Japanese, 46% of British, 45% of Germans, and 37% of Americans view environmental degradation as a major threat to the planet. Moreover, substantial majorities in 25 of the 37 surveyed countries felt that climate change was a ‘very serious’ problem.

Although these numbers are a cause of concern for the tourism industry, surveys of the general population may not be representative of the subset of the population who are likely to travel. Furthermore, they do not indicate whether general environmental concern will translate into action. Currently the majority of tourists are at the early stages of their environmentally related behavioural changes (e.g., 66% of German and 48% of UK tourists were in the contemplation and pre-contemplation stages) (Miller et al., 2007; Donnelly, 2008). Nonetheless, those tourists have indicated that they have already made small changes to their day-to-day life, such as starting to recycle and changing to energy-efficient lightbulbs. However, they also indicated being in great confusion: some thought that recycling is what will help to prevent climate change, and that long-haul flights emit a similar amount of CO₂ to short flights (Miller et al., 2007; Donnelly, 2008).

Nevertheless, public awareness of environmental issues is likely to continue growing: Hollywood keeps focusing on the topic and religious leaders have recently joined the environmental crusade. Blockbuster movies such as *The Day After Tomorrow* and *2012* predict gloomy environmental outcomes (mainly of climate change), while movies such as *The Age of Stupid* are linking tourist behaviour (mainly air travel) with negative environmental outcomes. The Archbishop of Canterbury (2009) has appealed to personal responsibility in protecting God’s creation with encouraging rubbish recycling and the scaling down of air travel which ‘unquestionably will save the world within six months’. Thus, it is likely that consumer pressure for environmentally and socially responsible products will increase.

2.6 The Report’s Role in Further Exploring Sustainable Development

This chapter has reviewed and discussed the exogenous and endogenous framework explaining business motivation for adopting sustainable development (section 2.2). After that the background behind the responsible tourism concept was given alongside the predicted tourist responses (sections 2.4 and 2.5). As discussed in section 2.4.2, a substantial body of literature covers the need for responsible tourism practices. However, according to Font (2007), more research is needed to establish whether COPs such as the RTQ have led accredited firms along the road of sustainable development. Accordingly, by evaluating how businesses perceived the level to which RTQ delivers the promised quadruple bottom line outcomes, this research hopes to help answer that question.
Furthermore, by studying the incorporation of sustainable development practices within the tourism business, this research hopes to examine the accuracy of the exogenous and endogenous pressures conceptual frameworks and whether they are relevant to this industry. Finally, while a few studies explore tourist response to environmental issues, virtually none explore tourist perception of a responsible tourism concept or certified schemes. Hence, evaluating how tourists respond to the RTQ accreditation could help fill this gap, while exploring whether a laissez-faire approach is the only behaviour that should be expected from the travellers.

Having now developed an understanding of the theoretical background for the research and its goals, the next chapter will present the tools used for achieving these goals i.e., the methods.
Chapter 3
Method

This chapter will present and discuss the methods used to understand why businesses incorporate sustainable practices through Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ), and how tourists respond to the concept and practice of responsible tourism. More specifically:

- Section 3.1 will explain the reasons for choosing the qualitative methodology and describe the sample of RTQ-accredited businesses, the qualitative instrument, and the procedure used for the requirement of respondents.
- Section 3.2 will explain the reasons for choosing the quantitative methodology and describe the sample of tourists, the quantitative instrument, and the procedure used for recruitment of respondents.
- Section 3.3 will cover the study limitations.

3.1 Phase One: Studying the Supply Side

3.1.1 Methodology

In order to study the supply-side perceptions, 24 qualitative in-depth, semi-structured interviews with selected tourism operations were conducted between 15 September and 8 November 2009. The goal of the research was not to try to establish exact objective measures of the level of sustainability RTQ-accredited businesses hold, but rather to explore the owners’ thoughts and attitudes to the responsible tourism concept in general, and in particular the extent to which Qualmark plays a part in their strategy of delivering a responsible product. Since the supply-side perceptions, thoughts, and attitudes had not yet been comprehensively researched, an investigative approach was needed. In qualitative research, the issues and concepts are defined by the subjects rather than the researcher (Veal, 1992; Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Thus, a qualitative methodological approach was selected as the mostly likely to produce richly detailed findings, as it is mainly used as an exploratory rather than a testing method (Veal, 1992; Ticehurst & Veal, 2000).

3.1.2 The Businesses Sample

The sample consisted of 24 businesses accredited on all three levels of the RTQ scheme (three, nine, and twelve of the transport, accommodation, and activity/service sub-sectors respectively, Figure 3-1). The sample consisted of businesses located throughout New Zealand (from Auckland to Central Otago; Figure 3-2), with an equal number of rural and urban representatives. The sample consisted of 13 small to medium enterprises (i.e., firms with less than nine employees), and 11 large organisations.

---

6 From the time of conducting interviews to the time of analysis the level of RTQ accreditation was upgraded for four businesses. For two the level was raised from bronze (one receiving silver and the other gold), and for the other two the level was raised from silver to gold. The later level was used during analysis.
3.1.3 Interview Instrument

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with business owners or with top management employees, notably in marketing positions. During the field work, the researcher tape-recorded all

7 In seven of the eleven large organisations, Qualmark is perceived as a marketing tool and as such is part of their marketing employees’ portfolio and therefore these positions were interviewed.
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The taped interviews averaged about 35 minutes, and in most cases the researcher spent extra time observing and touring around the businesses (averaging about 25 minutes). This observation gave a better insight into the specific initiatives businesses were adopting while incorporating responsible tourism practices.

The interviews included questions on the following issues and concepts:

- The exogenous and endogenous pressures that motivated businesses to implement responsible tourism initiatives.
- The reasons businesses became accredited under the RTQ (including the degree of difficulty certifying under the RTQ, and whether they considered other schemes).
- Commitment and implementation phases (including the changes respondents incorporated into their business).
- The extent to which RTQ delivers on its promises (including customer response, criticism, and whether RTQ could be considered as a greenwash).

The taped interviews were later transcribed by research assistants. The interviews were coded into separate libraries according to the above-mentioned issues and concepts using the NVivo 8 software (this was done to lower the environmental impact of this research, see Epilogue, Responsible Research). Each of the codes was analysed by finding commonality amongst the respondents’ answers.

A respondent’s exogenous pressure was determined by their degree of emphasis on what led them to join the RTQ scheme. A respondent’s endogenous pressure was determined by their degree of emphasis on what RTQ is achieving for their business. In addition to the identified exogenous and endogenous pressures, businesses were analysed with respect to their degree of environmental awareness. A respondent’s environmental awareness was determined mainly by their responses to the conservation initiatives and community activities criteria in the RTQ scheme; the respondents’ environmental awareness has formed a new typology. The commonality amongst the respondents’ answers regarding the commitment and implementation phases and the extent to which RTQ delivers on its promises were later linked to that newly formed typology.

3.1.4 Procedure

The sample was set to represent the three tourism sub-sectors equally, rather than their respective proportion within the RTQ scheme. This decision was made because the research is interested in the New Zealand tourism industry as a whole rather than its different segments. Choosing the randomly selecting recruitment technique allows this research to represent the tourism industry as a whole, rather than possible guilds within that industry that a snowball sampling technique might have led me to follow. Qualitative research uses a small sample size as data saturation is usually obtained after a relatively small number of interviews (Veal, 1992; Marshall, 1996; Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Thus, 30 businesses were randomly selected from the 250 businesses that were accredited with RTQ as at 15 August 2009 (ten businesses within each of the three tourism sub-sectors: transport, accommodation, and activities). The list of RTQ-accredited businesses was obtained from the Qualmark website. Microsoft Excel software was then used to randomly generate numbers with which to select the businesses used in the research sample. For the transport sub-sector, which at the time included 13 listed businesses, 3 were randomly excluded. For the activities/service sub-sector, which at the time included 66 businesses, 10 were randomly selected. For the accommodation sub-sector (which included six different categories) all remaining business were listed and ten numbers generated. In the case where this random number related to a business that was not accommodation the next accommodation-related business in the list was selected.
Out of the 30 randomly selected businesses, one accommodation and one activity were excluded as they are remotely located (the West Coast and the Catlins regions of the South Island), which meant that conducting face to face interviews with them would have been an expensive exercise - beyond the means of the research budget. One business was randomly selected twice under two different categories (i.e. transport and activity) and according to its core performance was considered as belonging to the activity sub-sector. Twenty-seven businesses were approached via telephone by the researcher. During that phone call, the researcher gave a brief overview of the research and a description of what would be required if the business chose to participate, and then asked if they would be interested in participating. One business was unwilling to participate and another four were not able to meet with the researcher at the time that he visited their area (due to tight scheduling and budget). These were predominately in the transport sub-sector. Thus, the researcher interviewed 22 businesses out of the initial 30 randomly selected (73% response rate).

The researcher conducted two additional unscheduled interviews, with an I-site (tourist information) and with a business that was accredited under both the Green Globe and RTQ schemes. These opportunities arose during interviewing two randomly selected respondents who linked me with their colleague (snowball sampling method). Finally one respondent who was recruited under the transport sub-sector was later clustered into the service sub-sector which is the business’s core activity.

In this research new themes stopped emerging after about 16 interviews, data reached saturation after about 20 interviews\(^8\), and an acceptable interpretative framework was constructed after 24 interviews, so no further recruitment was needed.

### 3.2 Phase Two: Studying the Consumer Response

#### 3.2.1 Methodology

In order to study customers’ thoughts and attitudes to the responsible tourism concept in general, and to the RTQ in particular, 66 quantitative self-administered questionnaires were conducted between 1 and 29 May 2010. Since in this part of the research the aim was to examine the issues and concepts that emerged from phase one of the research, a testing approach was needed. Quantitative research is used for testing topics and ideas defined by researchers in a consistent way (Veal, 1992; Ticehurst & Veal, 2000). Thus, a quantitative methodological approach was selected as the most likely to produce robust, detailed findings.

#### 3.2.2 The Tourist Sample

Questionnaires were offered to all customers (‘sample of convenience’) staying in Christchurch RTQ-accredited accommodation businesses during May 2010. A total of 66 questionnaires were collected. Twenty-four questionnaires were collected from higher-priced accommodation (i.e., B&B or Motels); the rest (n=42) came from tourists staying in budget style accommodation (i.e., Backpackers or Caravan Park; Figure 3-3). Six questionnaires were collected from an accommodation accredited with the bronze level of RTQ; the rest (n=60) came from businesses accredited with silver (Figure 3-3). The sample comprised 29 males and 37 females, including both domestic and international tourists (11 and 55 respectively, Figure 3-4). Twenty-eight respondents had been in New Zealand shorter than the average length of vacation time of 20 days and 33 had been longer (data on the average length of stay was obtained from Ministry of Tourism, 2010). The mean age of the sample was 45.7 years (sd = 18.28 years; minimum = 18 years, maximum = 78 years).

---

\(^8\) This was recognised while conducting the interviews and later reconfirmed during the analysis.
3.2.3 Survey Instrument

For data collection, a self-administered written questionnaire was used (see Appendix A). The questionnaire contained 13 questions divided into four sections:

- In Section 1, five questions requested the demographic data of the participants.
- Section 2 dealt with their perceptions of New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image. Participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert-type scale the extent to which they agreed with five statements relating to the Tourism New Zealand marketing slogans.
- The third section dealt with their experience of tourism businesses that are operating in a sustainably and environmentally concerned manner. Participants were asked whether they had encountered such businesses and to explain their answers. Survey respondents were presented
with trademark logos of four tourism accreditation schemes and the Tourism NZ and the 100% Pure NZ trademarks, and were asked to indicate which brands they recognised. Participants were asked what they thought the business in question did in order to gain RTQ accreditation. Finally, participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point Likert-type scale the extent to which they agreed with six statements relating to the RTQ promised outcomes.

- The fourth section dealt with the variables that influenced their choice of tourism businesses. Participants were asked to rank nine criteria from the most important to the least important.

Microsoft Excel software was used to allocate the question order within each of the sections randomly, in order to prevent any inherent bias from the order in which questions appear.

### 3.2.4 Procedure

Studying the general tourist population would likely have given sufficient data on the tourists’ thoughts and attitudes to the responsible tourism concept; but as tourists’ recognition of the relatively new RTQ scheme is likely to be low, using the general tourist population was unlikely to adequately explain tourists’ thoughts and attitudes to the RTQ. Therefore only tourists visiting RTQ accredited business were recruited, thus increasing the prospect of gathering the relevant data.

Ten RTQ-accredited Christchurch accommodation providers were randomly selected from the 84 local businesses that were accredited with RTQ as at 25 April 2010. The list of RTQ-accredited businesses was obtained from the Qualmark website. Microsoft Excel software was then used to randomly generate numbers with which to select the businesses used in the research sample. These premises were approached via phone and were asked for permission to be visited once a week for the duration of an hour to conduct the research. Permission was granted by two businesses, four businesses declined, and the remaining four, while declining the original request, offered instead that the researcher could leave the questionnaires at reception.

Questionnaires were offered to all customers (‘sample of convenience’) staying in two Christchurch B&Bs and two motels during May 2010. A total of 24 questionnaires were collected. Additionally, the researcher visited a caravan park and a backpacker-style accommodation between once and twice a week, each for the duration of an hour, during May 2010. The exact time and days were varied in order to avoid any time-based biases in sampling. The researcher stationed himself in communal spaces (i.e., foyers, kitchens, and lounges). All customers located in those areas were approached. The researcher identified himself, gave his purpose for approaching them, gave a brief overview of the research and a description of what would be required if they chose to participate, and then asked if they would be interested in participating. If they agreed, the researcher informed them of their rights as participants, answered any questions they might have had in relation to those rights, and then gave them a questionnaire to complete. Upon completion (at the site), the participants returned the questionnaire to the researcher. At this point, the researcher asked them if they had any further questions. After these were dealt with, the researcher politely thanked them for their participation and moved on to recruit the next person. A total of 42 questionnaires were collected (a response rate of 73%).

Choosing the randomly selecting recruitment technique allows this research to represent the visiting tourist population, rather than possible sub-groups that a more target sampling technique might have led me to follow.

The gathered data was entered into computer spreadsheets and analysed using the SPSS statistical package, including standard descriptive analysis (means, standard deviations, frequencies) as well as generalised linear models (GLMs).

GLMs are used to infer whether there are real differences between the means of groups in a population, in cases where these groups have unbalanced sizes and/or the data is skewed (Crawley,
In this study, the groups included sex, place of origin, age group, length of visit, accommodation style, or level of RTQ accreditation of the respondents, which all had unbalanced sizes (see section 3.2.2). The measured means were constant regarding respondent perceptions towards the New Zealand environmentally friendly image, the RTQ scheme, and the variables that influenced their choice of tourism provider (see section 3.2.3).

For the GLMs analysis ‘do not know’ was calculated as 3 on the 5-point Likert scale (similar to ‘neither agree nor disagree’). Though ‘do not know’ clearly has a different meaning to ‘neither agree nor disagree’, this was done to reduce the effect that missing data would have on the analysis.

The SPSS output of a GLM analysis is composed of two parts: first, a table output where the differences in variant (group) means is identified, and secondly, a table output identifying the constant where these differences accrued. The reporting of the first outputs was summarised in a table and the constant in which the differences occurred was reported in the text.

3.3 Limitations

This study has a few limitations. Problems encountered during business recruitment (i.e., unwillingness or inability to participate) resulted in the sample being skewed in favour of the activities sector (Figure 3-1). Thus, the sample does not represent the three tourism sub-sectors equally. In this research new themes stopped emerging after about 16 interviews and data reached saturation after about 20 interviews. At this point we believed that the sample adequately represented the process of incorporating responsible tourism into the local market despite the skewing mentioned above. Likewise, the problems encountered during tourist recruitment (i.e., the declining of access by businesses) resulted in a relatively small and unbalanced data. However, with the use of the GLMs analysis technique the problems that unbalanced data had posed were resolved, allowing the sample to produce valid data (Crawley, 2002). Additionally, declined access by large hotels where organised Asian tourists group are usually staying resulted in the Asian tourists group being under-represented in the sample (Table 3-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-1</th>
<th>The percentage of international tourists coming to New Zealand as a percentage of the four leading markets compared with the sample region of origin (data taken from the Ministry of Tourism, 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of international tourists visiting New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>9% (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>7% (USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>7% (China)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A notable qualification is that the research is based on the data gathered from a single respondent from each company, with the assumption that their beliefs represent those held by the business. While this is not an issue in small to medium enterprises, it may have been necessary to combine the opinions of more than one source in larger organisations - which comprised half the sample. However, most respondents (75%) of the larger organisations are those who initiated the implementation process in the first place and they are therefore the appropriate informants as to why and how their businesses incorporated sustainable practices through the RTQ.
Finally, the phase one results are a snapshot of the small segment of the New Zealand industry that has incorporated responsible tourism accreditation. Hence, further research into the industry as a whole is needed to deepen the understanding of the research findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Similarly, phase two results are a snapshot of a small segment of tourists staying in businesses incorporating responsible tourism practices. Respondents are likely to be those for whom the responsible tourism concept is not a complete novelty, leading to a bias in their described opinions. Therefore, the findings of this part of the research need testing on a larger data set covering all visiting tourists.

Following this understanding of the tools this research has used, the next chapter will present the results of why and how businesses incorporate sustainable practices through the RTQ scheme.
Chapter 4  
A Journey among Devotees, Compliers and Opportunists;  
Exploring the Supply-Side Perceptions of Qualmark

This chapter will present and discuss the data gathered from businesses (the supply side) accredited with the Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ). The overall research objectives for the supply side are, first, to study why and how respondents incorporated the RTQ accreditations into their business practices; and second, to evaluate to what extent they perceived the RTQ delivers its promised quadruple bottom line outcomes. More specifically, section 4.1 will describe the results of the four leading themes:

- Why was the RTQ the chosen form of accreditation?
- The exogenous and endogenous pressures and the respondents’ environmental awareness that led them to incorporate the RTQ accreditation.
- How respondents incorporated the RTQ: the initiatives they incorporated and the form of their commitment and implementation phases.
- Respondents’ perceptions of the RTQ scheme, their perceptions of its promises and any criticisms they may have had of it.

Section 4.2 will discuss the results through:

- An analysis of the reasons leading to the domination of RTQ in the local market.
- An examination of the reasons that led respondents into responsible practice and a critique of the ability of the exogenous and endogenous pressures framework to describe this process.
- A final presentation and evaluation of a new framework integrating respondents’ environmental awareness will then be examined.

4.1 Results

4.1.1 What has Brought Respondents into Tourism?

There are four reasons why the respondents were involved in tourism: (1) family ties (one respondent is managing the business established by his parents); (2) lifestyle change (seven respondents had no hospitality backgrounds, but new business opportunities had led to their career change and its associated new lifestyle); (3) professional career development (ten subjects indicated that after graduating from tertiary education they saw an opportunity for a career development in the tourism industry; additionally two respondents became business owners, shifting from the accommodation into the activity sector); and (4) the direction of the life course of four respondents has brought them into tourism.

4.1.2 Why Respondents Chose the RTQ Accreditation

Respondents raised four reasons that motivated them to become accredited with the RTQ: (1) Qualmark’s system is perceived as user-friendly, i.e., not too demanding or time-consuming. Similarly, Qualmark entry levels are perceived as achievable - these entry levels were reached by stating what respondents were already doing in their business, and/or by incorporating low-cost, readily available initiatives. (2) Likewise, Qualmark has an attractive price, i.e., the cost of certifying under the new RTQ is covered by the all-inclusive Qualmark quality certification fee (about NZ$700 per annum). (3) Additionally, Qualmark covers all aspects of the local tourism market and it is accrediting companies of all sectors and sizes. (4) Finally, Qualmark is perceived as the most likely
scheme to dominate the market, because it is owned by Tourism New Zealand and the Automobile Association.

Apart from the RTQ, several tourism Codes of Practice (COP) accreditations operate in New Zealand (see Chapter 2, section 2.3.3). Three respondents are accredited with additional COPs in addition to the RTQ (two respondents are accredited with Green Globe and one respondent holds the Nelson Tasman Sustainable Tourism Charter, which is one of the few regional accreditations offered around the country). The remaining 21 respondents raised four reasons which constrained them from becoming accredited under those alternative schemes:

- The processes of accreditation under these alternative COPs were perceived to be too demanding and time-consuming.
- Similarly the high fees charged by those COPs constrained respondents (e.g., Green Globe charge about NZ$2000 per year for small businesses; personal communication Mark Olsen, Earth Check, 19 August 2010).
- These COPs were perceived to be focusing on large-scale businesses, and, hence not suitable for half of the sample who operate small to medium-sized enterprises.
- These additional COPs were perceived as lacking customer recognition.

After examining why respondents chose to become accredited under the RTQ, we now investigate why respondents decided to incorporate responsible tourism practices in the first place.

4.1.3 The Exogenous and Endogenous Pressures

Exogenous and endogenous pressures have been used in describing why and how businesses incorporate sustainable development. The ‘drivers of change’ framework looks at the exogenous pressures (see section 4.1.3.1), while the ‘organisational values’ framework examines the endogenous ones (see section 4.1.3.2).

The Drivers of Change Framework

Respondents were led into adopting responsible tourism practices by the exogenous pressures, as presented by the four categories of drivers of change, and as will be explained below (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.2; and Figure 4-1). Six respondents were driven by two of the categories (four of these by the stakeholders and economic advantage categories, one by the business environment and economic advantage categories, and one by the stakeholders and business environment categories). The remaining 18 respondents were driven by one category (1, 2, 4, and 12 respondents were driven by only the regulation, economic advantage, business environment, and stakeholders category respectively). The economic advantage and the stakeholders’ exogenous pressures influenced businesses accreditation at all levels of RTQ (i.e., gold, silver, and bronze), whereas the business environment did not appear at the gold level and regulation only appeared at the bronze.
Regulation was the driver for one respondent; under the Resource Management Act (RMA) he was obliged to install a treatment plant at his company head office and workshop.

The business environment drove five of the respondents. These businesses were already accredited under the Endorsed/Star Qualmark (ESQ) accreditation and because RTQ became integrated into Qualmark, those respondents were also led into incorporating responsible tourism practices. The two main reasons pushing those respondents into accrediting under the ESQ in the first place were increasing their business competitiveness, and supply-chain pressure to conform to Qualmark. Respondents believed that the ESQ would increase their business competitiveness, either by helping them to put good business plans and policies in place (two respondents), or by helping them keep up with market trends as other companies are Qualmark accredited (one respondent). Additionally, supply-chain pressures came from both the respondents’ brands setting Qualmark as a standard (two respondents) and Tourism New Zealand setting Qualmark as a requirement for participating in its marketing campaign (e.g., official websites and the annual TRENZ marketing event) (two respondents).

Some respondents who comply with business environment pressure have developed antagonism to the Qualmark Company and the Tourism New Zealand. As one respondent noted:

*Tourism Industry Association recommends you be a part of Qualmark. They don’t force you to be part of Qualmark but basically they have you over a barrel* (Transport; Canterbury; Qualmark Silver).

Economic advantage was the driver for seven respondents as they were looking at ways to enhance business performance and/or investment in their business by making it more ‘sellable’. This was mainly achieved by cost saving through improved resource consumption. As one respondent stated:

*We’d already put in solar hot water heating, we’d already done all the eco bulbs and stuff around here, so, because economically for us that was good, because it was going to cut down our*
overheads... but also we’re not getting any younger, and what we do is we are creating something that is going to become really sellable. So the lower we can make our overheads the more sellable the business becomes (Accommodation; Canterbury; Qualmark Silver).

The stakeholder environment drove 17 respondents. This was due either to business owners believing in operating according to a responsible tourism concept, to demand by corporate clients (two respondents), or to perceived customer demand (driven by perceived increasing tourist environmental awareness) (one respondent). As this respondent stated:

Particularly now with the ‘pure’ campaign and our whole clean, green image, people want to see that we perform (Activity; Central Otago; Qualmark Bronze).

Out of those 10 owners who, due to their environmental awareness, believed in operating according to a responsible tourism concept (see footnote 9), three were specifically approached by the Qualmark Company, asking them to become RTQ accredited as a way to promote the new scheme. As one respondent stated:

Qualmark organisation and Tourism New Zealand wanted to get a few runs onto the board very fast and also because I know they’d already made some commitment in terms [of at] this point the Japanese market with big operators over there, regarding setting up an enviro programme...there was a lot of pressure on us to get up to standard very fast (Activity; Central Otago; Qualmark Silver).

After exploring the external pressures we will now explore the internal ones, i.e., the organisational values.

**The Organisational Value Framework**

In the sample, the process of adopting responsible tourism practices was only initiated from a top to bottom approach. All three core organisational values are apparent in the sample (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.3; Figure 4-2). A respondent’s organisational value was determined by qualitative analysis of their emphasis of what RTQ is achieving for their businesses. This analysis revealed that the sample’s organisational values included five legitimacy, nine competitiveness, and ten altruism respondents (Figure 4-2).

Respondents who emphasised adoption of responsible tourism practices in order to satisfy customers, supply chains, or regulatory bodies are driven by a ‘legitimacy’ organisational value. As one respondent stated:

[Tourism operators] are all coming on board and doing it because, like I say, you are feeling the pressure from the corporate clients and big companies that come in (Accommodation; Canterbury; Qualmark Bronze).

---

9 While ten respondents are driven by their own environmental awareness, for four additional respondents, responsible tourism was mainly linked to the culture they had grown up in - a conserving resources one. Thus, they may be considered as motivated by the economic advantage rather than the stakeholder drive as they are not shareholders who believe in sustainable development.

10 The corporate client’s demand may be considered a business environment rather than a stakeholder driver. This is because this customer demand originates in clients who are trying to achieve an environmental accreditation for their own business, and as part of that process need to demonstrate that they are staying in ‘green hotels’.
Respondents who emphasised the economic advantage associated with responsible tourism practices are driven by a ‘competitiveness’ organisational value. As one respondent noted: *Sustainability is a gain, it’s more about smart business practices rather than going down the ‘green’, ‘greenie’ side of things so it’s just a gain looking at the business, making sure we’re running it as efficiently* (Activity; Central North Island; Qualmark Silver).

Respondents who emphasised that operating responsibly was ‘the right thing to do’ are driven by altruism as an organisational value. As one respondent noted:

*I think when Joni Mitchell sang ‘They painted paradise put in a swimming pool’\(^\text{11}\), I think that that struck a chord with that generation, and we were the first generation I think en masse, globally, to actually think about the environment* (Accommodation; Auckland; Qualmark Gold).

![Organisational values by RTQ status](image)

The competitiveness organisational value was held by businesses accredited at all three levels of RTQ (i.e., gold, silver, and bronze), whereas the legitimacy organisational value did not appear at the gold level and the altruism organisational value did not appear at the bronze level Figure 4-2.

### 4.1.4 Respondent Environmental Awareness

Respondents can be divided into three types according to their environmental awareness:\(^\text{12}\)\(^\text{13}\)

- The ‘Devotees’ are those who hold high environmental awareness and demonstrated their understanding of the need for environmental protection.

---

\(^{11}\) In the original lyrics in the Big Yellow Taxi by Joni Mitchell are ‘a parking lot’.

\(^{12}\) Awareness is defined as knowledge that something exists, or understanding of a situation or subject at the present time based on information or experience (Webster, 1996).

\(^{13}\) The division between Leaders, Followers, and Laggards is commonly used for describing business incorporation of sustainable development. However, this study only sampled the leaders (RTQ accredited businesses are 14% of the total number of ESQ accredited businesses). Thus, in order to portray the sample, a new terminology was developed by the researcher to describe the divisions within the leaders group.
The ‘Compliers’ are those who have some environmental awareness.

The ‘Opportunists’ are those who hold no environmental awareness.

Bohdanowicz (2006) suggested that caution is needed when classifying businesses, as respondents may overstate their environmental commitment when they feel pressured to appear to be responsible tourism providers. Thus, respondents were categorised as ‘devotees’ only after repeatedly expressing their belief in the importance of environmental protection. Respondents who expressed their environmental concern to a lesser extent (i.e., only once or twice during the interview) were categorised as ‘compliers’. Respondents were categorised as ‘opportunists’ in cases where they did not express any belief in the need for environmental protection, or raised their own disbelief in that need, as for example was expressed in the following statement:

Hey, I’m a cynic about all of this, and I, I’m not even a believer in global warming (Service; Central North Island; Qualmark Silver).

The analysis of respondent environmental awareness revealed that the sample comprised six opportunists, eight compliers, and ten devotees (Figure 4-3). Opportunists’ businesses are accredited at all levels of RTQ, whereas compliers’ businesses are not represented at the gold level and devotees’ businesses are not represented at the bronze level (Figure 4-3).

The opportunists are business-oriented. Three of them came into tourism in search of professional career development after graduating with commerce or engineering degrees. The other three, for whom tourism meant a lifestyle change, came from strong business backgrounds. The compliers are those who have some environmental awareness; this awareness seems to be driven by the recent trends of changing environmental values (see Chapter 2, section 2.5.1). Conversely, the devotees’ high environmental awareness seems to be shaped by their culture and past experiences. Most devotees are ‘baby-boomers’ who grew up amidst a culture of saving resources. Through campaigns

---

While acknowledging that respondents’ environmental awareness are on a continuous scale for the clarity of the new typology I clustered this scale into three groups. Therefore, one should be aware that the typology is a model and as such is only reflecting reality and thus the division between the different types should be taken with some caution in mind.
such as ‘Save Manapōuri’\textsuperscript{15} or the North American flower power culture, most devotees have adopted a romantic view of nature and so care for the environment. Finally, as most devotees have experienced environmental degradation first hand, these personal experiences have strengthened their environmental consciousness to the point that they are environmentally aware. For example:

I’ve seen Antarctica; I’ve seen what global warming’s been doing there. I’m aware of that (Transport; Canterbury; Qualmark Silver).

4.1.5 How Businesses Incorporate Responsible Tourism Practices

RTQ follows the idea of alleviating all bio-physical, socio-economic, and socio-cultural damage caused by the tourism industry, while socially benefiting host communities and conserving the physical environment. The RTQ accreditation monitors business performance based on five criteria. The first three criteria relate to the industry’s resource consumption (energy efficiency, water conservation, and waste management), while the last two criteria relate to community activities and conservation initiatives (Qualmark, 2009).

Respondents holding a competitiveness or legitimacy organisational value mainly commented on the way they perceived the RTQ ability to contribute to the operational sides of their businesses. These respondents chiefly commented on the first three criteria, while for some of them the last two criteria seemed beyond their scope, as they did not comment at all on these criteria despite being prompted several times by the researcher. These respondents were likely to incorporate only initiatives which have a proven return on investment, preferably a short term one, and were more likely to invest in the first three criteria rather than the last two. In addition, they were more likely to invest in cheap ways of reducing their business’ resource consumption in order to cut operating costs. These reductions were made by incorporating cheap new technology (e.g., installing compact fluorescent eco bulbs, water meters, and worm farms/composters), changing the pattern of use (e.g., using full washing machine loads and cold-water wash cycles, using cloths to dry/clean their vehicles, and buying in bulk to reduce packaging waste), and by educating their guests (e.g., putting out signs asking customers to reuse their towels and recycle their waste).

In contrast, respondents holding the altruism organisational value commented on all five criteria. These respondents were likely to incorporate costly initiatives with longer terms of return on investment, and to invest in all five criteria. These investments included costlier initiatives (e.g., wall and roof insulation alongside double glazing, solar water heating, and heat pumps); being willing to pay extra for changing a pattern of use (e.g., paying for recycling); and educating their guests (both on the need to protect the environment, and what their guests can do for achieving that).

4.1.6 Commitment and Implementation Phases

The commitment phase is the point at which management wishes to implement responsible tourism practices; the implementation phase is when the employees take on the needed action. Ten respondents set up their businesses to operate responsibly from day one (eight based on their altruism organisational value and two through their competitiveness value). These 10 respondents did not experience a cultural shift within their company, nor its associated commitment and implementation phases. The three further respondents who initiated the process towards responsible tourism practice within an established business were sole employees. As they were the only employee, these three respondents, although experiencing a commitment phase, did not experience an implementation phase. In contrast, 11 respondents initiated the process towards

\textsuperscript{15} This campaign, begun in 1969, opposed the scheme to raise the level of Lake Manapōuri in Fiordland National Park for the purpose of increasing electricity production from a proposed hydroelectric power station. This campaign started a growing awareness of conservation issues in New Zealand (Te Ara - the New Zealand encyclopaedia, 2010).
responsible tourism practice within larger established businesses; either because they had joined an already operating business introducing their altruism organisational value, or because they had adopted RTQ because of their competitiveness or legitimacy organisational value (two, four, and five respondents respectively). These 11 respondents experienced a cultural shift within their companies, and the associated commitment and implementation phases.

Generally, these 11 respondents indicated that the number of employees supporting the management decision to adopt responsible tourism practices was higher than the number of those opposing it. Opposition was mainly driven by employees who were reluctant to change their well established daily routines, or by those who held low or no environmental awareness. In order to alleviate opposition, respondents made responsible behaviour an accessible and easy practice. Additionally, respondents used educational programmes to increase staff awareness of the new practices and to highlight the benefits of behaving in a ‘responsible’ manner (mainly the economic benefits that staff were likely to benefit from). Generally, explaining the economic benefits of behaving in a ‘responsible’ manner was the most effective means for enabling opposition.

4.1.7 Respondents Perceptions of RTQ uptake

At the time of interviewing, about 14% of the total businesses accredited with the Endorsed/Star Qualmark (ESQ) were also accredited with the RTQ (see Table 2-1). When respondents were asked about their views on the above percentage, all regarded this number as too low and showed their disappointment at what they regarded as ‘a low uptake’. Likewise, the few respondents (n=4) who commented that the low uptake may give their businesses a competitive edge only saw that as a short-term benefit, and believed that it would be better in the long run if more businesses were accredited with the RTQ.

4.1.8 Respondent Perception of the Extent to which RTQ has Delivered its Promises

The Qualmark Company promises five outcomes to businesses that join the new scheme. The first three are related to the environmental, social, and cultural bottom lines, the fourth relates to customer response, while the fifth relates to the economic benefits. Most respondents believed that RTQ had delivered its promises (n=22). Respondents holding a competitiveness or legitimacy organisational value were more prone to discuss how successful RTQ is in building a smart and prosperous business. Conversely, respondents holding an altruism organisational value held the perception that their altruism value was acknowledged by Qualmark and that RTQ was contributing to New Zealand’s reputation of being a sustainable destination.

Respondents were asked whether they thought RTQ was a greenwash. Respondents believed that greenwash was occurring where there was a gap between marketing claims and actual practice. Since all respondents had to incorporate changes before receiving their Qualmark accreditation, they believed Qualmark had eliminated this gap; hence the greenwash idea was rejected.

4.1.9 Respondent Criticisms of the Qualmark Schemes

Respondents were given the opportunity to raise their criticisms of Qualmark’s ESQ and RTQ schemes. Respondents commented that they perceived the different emphases of the two Qualmark schemes to be causing clashes. Clashes arose where either the different schemes had opposing requirements (e.g., under the ESQ, businesses are forbidden from installing timers on

16 Giving their customers’ confidence that the business is caring for our part of the world; contributing to New Zealand’s reputation as a sustainable destination; making positive changes in their business, helping both the environment and the local community; enhancing the visitor’s experience; benefiting their business and its place in the community.

17 The focus of the ESQ scheme is to enhance customer services and visitor experience, while the focus of the RTQ scheme is alleviating environmental impacts (Qualmark, 2009).
heaters provided for guests, while the RTQ encourages their use); or where customer service may be compromised by complying with the RTQ. This notion was either tangible (e.g., one business was asked to run its shuttle only when servicing several customers) or intangible (e.g., changing shower heads was perceived to alter not only water consumption, but also customer experience).

The remaining criticisms were linked to different organisational values and are represented accordingly. Respondents holding an altruism organisational value critiqued Qualmark for being driven by the competitiveness value rather than the altruism one (n=8). When launching the RTQ scheme, Qualmark sent an e-mail outlining the criteria to all businesses accredited to them. Businesses were also made aware that all the relevant information could be obtained on the Qualmark website. In addition to that, Qualmark printed this same information on glossy paper and sent it to all businesses. This last action was criticised as ‘gimmicky’ and inappropriate because of the wasteful message it was perceived to be sending. Respondents holding an altruism organisational value also perceive the benchmark for the RTQ scheme as being too low in comparison to international standards (n=7). They hoped Qualmark would measure business deeds rather than intentions as a way of truly alleviating the environmental impact of tourism. This notion was raised as Qualmark requires businesses only to monitor resource consumption. Respondents could not see any merit in this requirement without the added obligation of future improvement.

Respondents holding a legitimacy organisational value who were driven by business environment pressure (n=3) criticised Tourism New Zealand for inappropriately generating such pressure. They felt that Tourism New Zealand ought to help and promote tourism businesses rather than pressure them into behaviours they did not believe in (two of these respondents did not seem to believe that RTQ had delivered its promises).

Respondents holding a competitiveness organisational value thought Qualmark ought to add a greater competitive benefit to their businesses. This notion was linked to competitive edge, the costs associated with implementing the Qualmark accreditations, and return on investment.

**Competitive Edge**

Criticisms related to competitive edge were based on the perception that being a Qualmark accredited business had yet to prove the basis for any significant point of difference with non-accredited businesses. Some respondents (n=6) who held a competitiveness organisational value commented that although Qualmark was promoting itself as a marketing tool, it was only attracting a small fraction of their customers. These respondents linked their perception that Qualmark was not a recognised brand among international tourists with its failure as a marketing tool. Moreover, Qualmark accreditations were accused of being ambiguous, thus customers who may have recognised Qualmark still did not understand what it really meant.

Some respondents (n=5) displaying the competitiveness organisational value perceived that each inspector had a different emphasis when auditing a business, resulting in inequalities between the Qualmark inspectors. These differences were seen to result in a lack of consistency in the standard of the Qualmark accreditations. Furthermore, Qualmark was perceived as accrediting businesses with the star rating that the business desired, rather than the one they truly deserved. This notion was driven by the perception that Qualmark was easily deceived; either because the Qualmark inspectors were not reading through the statements and conducting rigorous checks that would test those written statements, or because businesses could masquerade. They knew when the yearly inspection would take place and they chose which part of their premises to present to the Qualmark inspector. Some respondents (n=6) perceived the benchmark for the ESQ scheme as being too low in comparison with international standards. Hence, those respondents perceived the low criteria to have resulted in Qualmark accrediting businesses having a higher star rating than they really
deserved. Respondents perceived their competitive edge was being lost through the inequality of auditing.

Under the ESQ, businesses within the transport, service, and activity sectors are only being marked as endorsed in comparison with the five marking levels under the star system. Most respondents under the endorsed scheme (14 out of 15) thought that incorporating a rating system would give them a competitive edge. They had hoped this move would introduce a way of acknowledging the high performance of their businesses, differentiating them from the ‘rest of the pack’.

**The Costs of Implementing Qualmark**

Respondents who operated small to medium-sized enterprises (n=13) perceived themselves to be disadvantaged in the Qualmark evaluation process compared with larger-scale businesses. This notion was driven by Qualmark accreditation requiring time and financial resources which respondents perceived they struggled for in comparison with larger businesses. These respondents also thought that fewer initiatives were available to them from which to gain credits (e.g., staff training), and that the Qualmark evaluation process is based on measuring quantity rather than quality. Thus, in their mind, Qualmark considers a 10% reduction in resource consumption made by them as negligible in comparison to a 1% reduction made by a larger business.

Some respondents (n=5) holding a competitiveness organisational value perceived the need for Qualmark to consider a moderating system when evaluating the different initiatives businesses are incorporating. This notion was driven by the fact that the different costs involved in incorporating different initiatives are ignored by Qualmark.

**Return on Investment**

Respondents criticised the excessive time it took for the Qualmark Company to accomplish the process of accreditation. Qualmark demanded upfront payments at the beginning of the assessment process; however, the inspection itself only occurred several months later, with two more months needed for Qualmark to process the gathered data. Hence, businesses only received the service they paid for more than six months later. Additionally, Qualmark was criticised for not providing respondents with a clear explanation of what was required of them when applying for the RTQ, resulting in even longer accreditation processes. In several cases, despite informing an inspector of their wish to be accredited, it was not adequately explained to respondents that they need to launch an official request with the Qualmark Company, as one respondent noted:

‘Well you haven’t even applied yet’. And I said, ‘well yes we have’ and she said, ‘no no you haven’t, you’ve been on line to apply.’ So I said, ‘I didn’t know I had to’ (12. Transport, Canterbury, Qualmark Silver).

Eight respondents perceived the need for Qualmark to consider business uniqueness within the auditing process. This was driven by the notion that Qualmark’s inspectors work by the book and are, therefore, less flexible in addressing ‘unusual’ initiatives. For example, an activity provider was asked to explain how his business would deal with aging car parts, ignoring the fact that he was replacing his cars at the end of each season.
4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 RTQ and the Local Market

Successful adoption of sustainable development relies on six basic assumptions, one of which is that low cost should be associated with adopting the new COP (Ostrom, 1990). Respondents perceived the process of accrediting under the RTQ as being low cost as it is not too demanding or time-consuming, and has financially achievable entry levels and an attractive price tag. In contrast, respondents perceived the process of accrediting under the alternative schemes as an inhibitive one due to their being costly, demanding, not suitable for small to medium-sized enterprises, and not recognised by their customers. Consequently, the low costs associated with the RTQ accreditation have helped its fast penetration into the New Zealand tourism market. Additionally, Qualmark is well established within the New Zealand tourism market, accrediting companies of all sectors and size, and has the government’s support through Tourism New Zealand. All of these reasons have resulted in Qualmark dominating the New Zealand tourism market with over 600 RTQ accredited businesses.

Economic advantage was the driver for seven respondents joining RTQ. However, the respondents holding a legitimacy or competitiveness organisational value (five and nine respectively) were only likely to incorporate low-cost initiatives. Moreover, because community activities and conservation initiatives are less likely to benefit businesses directly, these fourteen respondents were unlikely to incorporate these last two criteria. It appears that ‘low cost’ works as a double-edged sword: on the one hand, it has driven seven respondents into adopting responsible tourism practices; but, on the other hand, it has also constrained most respondents from supporting community activities and conservation initiatives, to the point that they seemed to perceive these criteria to be beyond their scope.

Currently only a small percentage of ESQ businesses (14%) are also accredited with the RTQ (see Table 2-1). This may be evidence that when it comes to ‘environmental responsibility’ most establishments still had a limited commitment to responsible practices. Hence, claims made by Cohen (2002) and Murphy and Price (2005) that the paradigm of responsible tourism is becoming a leading concept appear to be questionable.

Respondent disappointment with the low uptake is linked to one of Ostrom’s (1990) six basic assumptions regarding COP implementation: that actors share the belief that unless an alternative way of managing the commons is adopted, all will lose. In the New Zealand context, respondents linked the need for raising business commitment in matching practices with the clean, green image. As one respondent put it:

*I think those [businesses] who are here, genuinely here for the long term, will continue to provide a good service and do the ‘enviro’ and do what’s right, because our country can’t sustain any other tourism other than what we are marketing which is that clean, green image, 100% pure, and we’ve got to keep it that way, because if we don’t then we risk losing it* (Activity; Central Otago; Qualmark Silver).

4.2.2 What has Led Respondents into Responsible Practice?

Through the understanding of exogenous and endogenous pressures, and their associated frameworks, this research explored the reasons why respondents incorporate sustainable development into their businesses, and how they do so. In all of the sampled businesses, the process towards responsible tourism practice was initiated by a top-to-bottom approach (i.e., through business owners or top management employees). This supports Kasim’s (2007) idea that companies are more likely to adopt sustainable development in cases where CEOs and top managers initiate the process.
The drivers of change framework has revealed the various exogenous pressures that have driven respondents. It has been argued that exogenous pressures have an equal influence upon all businesses (for example see Claver-Cortés et al., 2007; Kasim, 2007). If that is the case, one would expect respondents to be influenced by all four categories. However, 18 respondents indicated that they were driven by only one category, while the remaining six were driven by only two categories. Moreover, the stakeholder category had the greater influence, with 17 respondents identifying it as a driving force, whereas only one respondent identified the regulation category as a driving force. One explanation could be that the related environmental laws are so well established that respondents considered them a ‘norm’, rather than an exogenous pressure. For example the consent process required under the 1991 RMA or for those who operated on Department of Conservation (DOC) land may be regarded by respondents as a due course rather than as a driving force. While this may explain the reason why regulation was only highlighted by one respondent, it fails to explain why the remaining three exogenous pressures were not equally influential on all businesses (respondents only felt pressure from one or two of the remaining three drivers of change). An examination of the endogenous pressures may help to clarify this.

It could be that respondents may only be relating to the drivers of change that tie in with their organisational values. A respondent’s organisational values set their professional behaviour for achieving their business’s goals. Some exogenous pressures are likely to be beyond the behavioural evoked set and thus ignored. For example: those businessmen holding the competitiveness organisational value are only likely to consider regulation once fines are involved, whereas those holding the altruism organisational value are only likely to consider economic advantage as added value for doing the right thing. Hence, the organisational values indicate the exact driver of change as they separate respondents who considered environmental protection a top priority from those who consider environmental protection as a way to please other actors and/or to enhance their business performance (see Chapter 2, section 2.2.4). This is why specific respondents were pressured by a specific driver of change, and why exogenous pressures did not equally influence all the businesses.

Organisational values are the key for understanding the reasons why respondents incorporate sustainable development into their businesses. The exogenous and endogenous pressures framework does not explain how respondents came to hold their organisational values. This is crucial for truly understanding why respondents became responsible providers.

### 4.2.3 Respondent Environmental Awareness

The level of respondent environmental awareness in terms of their organisational values influences their attitude towards the responsible tourism concept, hence their motivation to incorporate behavioural change. The devotees hold high environmental awareness and are notably driven by their internal pressure to do the ‘right thing’ (only one devotee was also driven by economic advantage). Most devotees came into tourism in search of lifestyle change. In this career change, the devotees incorporated their passion for the environment into their professional life. Hence, the devotees’ ‘professional paradigm’ has both business and the environment at its centre of attention, e.g.,

*I had an opportunity to become involved up here after we had sold our farm up at Oxford. And I’ve always been passionate about the hills and conservation, and when I saw this piece of land, it’s an extraordinary bit of land so, yeah, totally fell in love with it* (Activity; Nelson & Marlborough; Qualmark Bronze).
The devotee respondents, for whom their paradigm is having both business and the environment at the centre of their attention, are motivated by their own beliefs in the responsible tourism concept (i.e., altruism organisational value). Devotees are driven by the stakeholders’ ‘exogenous’ pressure as they are the shareholders who, by believing in sustainable development, have influenced themselves to adopt responsible practices.

In contrast, the opportunist are business-oriented: as they hold no environmental concern and thus see no need for protecting the environment, they hold a ‘professional paradigm’, having only the business at their centre of attention. As one opportunist observed:

And it’s finding that balance between doing things correctly and wearing a hairshirt, and we’re not in the hairshirt-wearing business (Accommodation; Central North Island; Qualmark Gold).

Similarly, compliers are also business-oriented: although compliers are environmentally aware, for them this is a relatively new idea and is less likely to have influenced their ‘professional paradigm’. Compliers only incorporated responsible tourism practices that enhanced their business performance. Hence, compliers have the business rather than the environment at their centre of attention. As one complier observed:

We care about our environment, we also care about our business (Activity; Central North Island; Qualmark Silver).

The opportunist and complier respondents, for whom their paradigm is having the business at the centre of attention, are motivated by the need to operate a ‘smart business’. For them, incorporating responsible tourism is either a way of satisfying business brand standards and/or customer demands or a way of achieving an economic advantage (i.e., legitimacy or competitiveness organisational values). Therefore, respondents holding a legitimacy organisational value are driven by the regulatory, business environment and/or the stakeholder (in form of customer demand) exogenous pressures. Conversely, respondents holding a competitiveness organisational value are driven by the economic advantage exogenous pressures.

4.2.4 How Respondents Incorporated Responsible Practice

The level of respondent environmental awareness in terms of their organisation values determined how they incorporate responsible behaviour into their business practices. The opportunists and compliers, whose paradigm is having the business at the centre of attention, are driven by the need to operate a ‘smart business’. These views explain why they predominantly incorporated only low-cost, preferably short-term initiatives with proven returns on investment. In addition they explained why they were also less likely to invest in the last two criteria that do not directly benefit their business. In contrast, devotees whose paradigm is caring both for their business and for the environment are driven by the need to operate a ‘responsible business’. These explain why they contributed to all five criteria, while incorporating costly initiatives with longer terms of return on investment.

The 11 respondents who experienced employee opposition during the implementation phases used the same strategy of explaining the economic benefits of behaving in a ‘responsible’ manner to overcome those antagonisms. This was because most opposition was driven by employees holding a low level of environmental awareness and not unable to see any merit for acting responsibly. Thus, the provision for gaining individual economic benefit was the only way to change established routines.

---

18 Four opportunist and complier ‘baby-boomers’ were the shareholders who believed in operating according to a responsible tourism concept, as it aligned with the culture of resource saving that they had grown up with.
4.2.5  Respondent Perception of the RTQ

Most respondents believed that RTQ had delivered on its promises. It is likely that this perception was driven by Qualmark meeting their expectations: the compliers and opportunists who were driven by the competitiveness organisational value were more prone to discuss Qualmark’s fifth promise (i.e., the economic bottom line). They held the perception that Qualmark encouraged them to incorporate initiatives that delivered economic benefits and that their expectation was met. Compliers and opportunists driven by the legitimacy organisational value were also likely to discuss Qualmark’s fifth promise. They held the perception that, although they were ‘forced’ into the scheme, Qualmark had delivered economic benefits and they were pleased with the RTQ’s fifth promise. Finally, the devotees held the perception that their altruism value was acknowledged by Qualmark, that RTQ was contributing to New Zealand’s reputation as being a sustainable destination, and that their expectations were met.

4.2.6  A New Framework

Firms dominated by altruistic values showed a strong willingness to adopt responsible behaviour. These findings are supported by the Bohdanowicz (2006) study, showing that environmental awareness, thus organisational value, is influenced by cultural context. The higher environmentally aware Swedish hoteliers had well-established pro-ecological programmes and initiatives. In contrast, the actions of the relatively low environmentally aware Polish hoteliers’ actions were mostly aimed at achieving immediate economic benefits or were those required by law. According to the Diefa and Font (2010) findings, marketing managers who overemphasise the competitiveness organisational values are less likely to engage in more proactive green marketing practices. Following from this, one wonders why, despite this strong willingness, devotees make up less than half of the sample (41%), and why not all of them hold a gold accreditation (only 50% of them do). Diefa & Font (2010) have noted that other factors such as a broader organisational context are more important in explaining business implementation of sustainable developments than exogenous and endogenous pressures. Accordingly, it is likely that by further exploring the constraining and facilitating factors, one could more precisely explain why and how respondents incorporated the RTQ accreditations into their business practices.

The Crawford, Jackson & Godbey (1991) Hierarchal Ladder of Leisure Constraints argues that in order to engage in specific behaviour one should overcome many constraints on three different levels (i.e., intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural). The intrapersonal constraint is an outcome of the individual psychological states and attributes which interact with behavioural preferences. The interpersonal constraint is an outcome of the interaction between self and others. The structural constraint is an outcome of the interaction between the behaviour preferences and participation.

In the context of adopting sustainable development, individuals with low or no environmental awareness are likely to encounter intrapersonal constraints because acting responsibly does not even occur to them. Hence, the opportunists and compliers are likely to be constrained from going the extra mile, with their professional paradigm constraining them from incorporating initiatives beyond the minimally required ones. Consequently, firms which are dominated by competitiveness or legitimacy organisational values show a low willingness to adopt responsible behaviour.

Interpersonal constraints should be examined as the tangible ability to lead change within the business. For example, environmentally aware employees may be constrained by their business

---

19 Two respondents motivated by their legitimacy organisational value who complied with business environmental pressure developed a high level of antagonism to the point that they did not see any benefit from the RTQ, thus ignoring its promised outcomes.
owners who do not see the need for practising responsibly (in the sample, four devotees were constrained by their business owners). Additionally, two devotees operated unique businesses for which Qualmark did not know how to assess their incorporated initiatives. For example, one business was not linked to the power grid, thus this respondent could not supply data about energy consumption, which is a requirement for complying with the Qualmark energy efficiency criteria. Hence, these respondents were accredited with a level lower than the one which they were striving for or thought they deserved.

Structural constraints are linked to internal and external factors. The internal factors are linked to the business type and size (e.g., small businesses are constrained by limited financial and time resources). The external factors are linked to the context of the municipal legal environments (e.g., some councils offer limited recycling options while other councils decline resource consents for installing environmentally sound practices such as collecting rainwater and using grey-water, thus they are constraining businesses from incorporating significant changes).

Furthermore, external facilitating factors should also be considered. For example, the businesses of one complier and two opportunists are situated on DOC land. As they are obliged to protect the environment anyway, by default they also achieved the Qualmark conservation criteria. It is likely that in a different situation they would not have attempted to comply with these criteria.

By combining respondents’ environmental awareness with endogenous and exogenous pressures, and by linking these with constraints and facilitating factors, a new framework is developed. This new framework clearly explains the general process of implementing sustainable development (Figure 4-4).

This new framework can clearly explain the process of implementing RTQ (Figure 4-5): devotees hold the altruism organisational value and are driven by the stakeholder ‘exogenous’ pressure. They strive to adopt all practices of responsible tourism and, therefore, aim for the gold level, but for some interpersonal and structural constraints divert them into the lower levels of RTQ.

The opportunists and compliers holding the legitimacy organisational values are motivated by their need to satisfy pressure coming from legal liabilities, supply-chain, and/or customer demand. They only respond to those external pressures and, therefore, will adopt the minimum required practices and thus in most cases will only aim at the bronze level. The opportunists and compliers holding the
competitiveness value are driven by the economic advantage drivers of change. They only strive to have a profitable business which works as a double-edged sword (i.e., only adopt cost-effective practices and ignore the community activities and conservation initiatives; see section 4.2.1), and thus will be likely only to gain the bronze level. For some opportunists and compliers, though, facilitating factors divert them into the higher levels of RTQ.

**Figure 4-5**
The new framework for the RTQ implementation process

4.2.7 Incorporating Followers and Laggards into the New Framework

It is worth exploring whether the new framework can explain why other businesses are followers and laggards, i.e. have not yet incorporated sustainable development or joined the RTQ. To do so the following three types are added to the respondents’ environmental awareness typology (Table 4-1):

- The apathetic: those who neither hold any environmental concern nor incorporate any action that benefits the environment into their business.
- The greenwashers: those who hold little or no environmental concern, but instead of incorporating actions that benefit the environment, only portray themselves as if they were environmentally concerned.
• The restrained: those who hold some environmental awareness, but are currently not incorporating any action into their business that will benefit the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Laggards and Followers</th>
<th>Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Awareness</td>
<td>Do Nothing</td>
<td>Falsely represent themselves as responsible providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Apathetic</td>
<td>Green washers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Restrained</td>
<td>Compliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the apathetic, acting responsibly is not likely even to come to mind, whereas for the green washers, falsely claiming that they do act responsibly seems to them adequate. Moreover, it is likely that although the restrained understand the need for incorporating sustainable initiatives, they are constrained by limited financial and time resources, and/or by their business owners who do not see the need for practising responsibly. These constraining factors explain why the apathetic, green washers, and restrained are followers and laggards whereas the opportunists, compliers, and devotees who overcome their constraints are leaders. However, further research is needed to explore these added types and their associated constraints hypothesis. Similarly, further research could attempt to better measure businesses’ awareness with quantitative rather than qualitative tools.

### 4.3 Conclusion

This study has shown the need for integrating exogenous and endogenous pressures with the respondents’ environmental awareness and constraining and facilitating factors. By doing so a new framework has been developed. This framework more clearly explains respondent commitment phases (i.e., the ‘why?’ question), and their devotion to the sustainable development concept (i.e., the ‘how?’ question). This framework also explains the implementation phases (i.e., if there was one, and what has driven opposition); and the extent to which respondents perceive that RTQ delivers on its promises and their criticisms of it. Finally, this study puts forward a hypothesis that the new framework can explain why followers and laggards are failing to incorporate sustainable development into their businesses and/or to join the RTQ.

Following this discussion of businesses’ perceptions, the next chapter will present customers’ responses to the concept of responsible tourism, particularly to the RTQ.
Chapter 5
Quantitative Results; Exploring the Demand-Side Perceptions

This chapter will present and discuss the quantitative data gathered from tourists (the demand side) staying in accommodation accredited with the Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ). The overall research objectives for the demand side are to study the ways in which tourists respond to the new RTQ accreditation, and whether this enhances their experience.

More specifically, section 5.1 will describe the four leading themes contained within the results:

- Respondent perceptions of New Zealand’s tourism image.
- Respondent experience of sustainable tourism businesses.
- Respondent perceptions of the responsible tourism concept; particularly of the RTQ scheme.
- What tourists consider when choosing a tourism provider.

Section 5.2 will discuss the results through the role New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image plays in the respondent visiting experience, and respondents’ good intentions in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products.

5.1 Results

5.1.1 New Zealand’s Environmentally Friendly Image

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate five statements regarding their perceptions of the New Zealand tourism image, using a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree (1-5; Figure 5-1). Respondents held highly positive perceptions towards the New Zealand clean green image and regarded New Zealanders as friendly people (77% and 98% respectively of surveyed respondents agreeing with these statements). Respondent perception towards the remaining three statements was less clear with 49%, 39%, and 46% respectively who expressed a ‘do not know’ or ‘neither agree nor disagree’ with these statements. Respondent perception towards the idea that the New Zealand tourism industry was only interested in making money and that businesses do not manage their environmental impacts very well (35% and 51% respectively of surveyed respondents disagreeing with these statements). Respondents were more likely to hold positive perceptions towards the New Zealand 100% pure claim (40% of surveyed respondents agreed with this statement, while 19% disagreed).
As shown in Table 5-1, females were significantly more in favour of the idea that New Zealand is clean and green than males ($F_1=5.79$, $p<0.02$, mean response of 1.84 and 2.21 for females and males, respectively). Females were also significantly more in favour of the idea that New Zealand is 100% pure than males ($F_1=4.83$, $p<0.033$, mean response of 2.53 and 3.17 for females and males, respectively). Finally, females were significantly less likely to reject the idea that tourism in New Zealand is just about money-making than males ($F_1=12.63$, $p<0.001$, mean response of 3.17 and 3.37 for females and males, respectively).

Table 5-1 also shows that those who had been in New Zealand longer than the average length of time of 20 days were significantly less likely to reject the idea that tourism in New Zealand is just about money-making than those who had been in the country less than 20 days ($F_1=16.76$, $p<0.000$, mean response of 3.06 and 3.48 for those who stayed longer and shorter respectively).

Respondent evaluation of the five statements regarding tourist perceptions of the images to New Zealand tourism was not influenced by their place of origin, age group, accommodation style, or level of RTQ accreditation (Table 5-1).
### Table 5-1

**Generalised linear model for respondent perceptions of images to New Zealand tourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Roy’s Largest Root test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>$F_{5,38}=6.02$, $p&lt;0.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above / Below the Average stay in New Zealand</td>
<td>$F_{5,38}=3.29$, $p&lt;0.014$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>$F_{5,37}=0.00$, $p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>$F_{5,37}=0.00$, $p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Standard</td>
<td>$F_{5,38}=2.32$, $p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTQ Accreditation Level</td>
<td>$F_{5,38}=1.67$, $p=ns$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1.2 Brand Recognition

Survey respondents were presented with the logos of four tourism accreditation schemes and the Tourism NZ and 100% Pure NZ trademarks, and were asked whether they recognised these logos. Sixty percent recognised at least one of these logos. Close to half of the sample recognised the Tourism NZ and Qualmark Company logos (45% and 43%, respectively). About a quarter of the sample recognised the RTQ and 100% Pure logos (28% and 24%, respectively). The Green Globe and Sustainable Tourism South logos were recognised by 3% of the sample.

### 5.1.3 Respondent Experiences of Responsible Businesses

Survey respondents were asked whether they experienced any tourism businesses that were operating in a sustainably and environmentally concerned manner, and to explain their answers ($n=58$). Forty-seven respondents thought they had experienced such businesses and 11 thought they had not.

Out of the 47 respondents who thought they had experienced such businesses, 15 gave relevant examples and these are matched to the RTQ criteria (Figure 5-2). Twelve respondents explained their answers with examples focusing on business initiatives that are lowering environmental impacts through improving resource consumption (the waste management criterion was the most noted with eight respondents, followed by the energy efficiency criterion with four respondents). Three respondents also mentioned businesses incorporating environmental initiatives such as involvement in restoration projects and an ‘eco-tourism’ business minimising its impact on marine wildlife. An additional eight respondents gave irrelevant examples: six respondents simply named a place they had stayed in, and two respondents mentioned high levels of customer service as examples of sustainable and environmentally concerned businesses.

Out of the 11 respondents who thought they had not experienced such businesses, four explained their answers. All four respondents perceived that the standards of local practices did not stand up to their expectations. These notions were driven by the perception that local standards of waste management, house insulation, and energy use were lower than those required under European law. The lack of consistency in the practice of different providers exacerbated this notion. Two respondents specifically accused businesses of showing a limited commitment to matching their actual practices with their claims of being environmentally friendly providers.

Survey respondents were asked what they believed the business in question was doing to gain its RTQ accreditation ($n=54$). Respondents mainly gave examples that related to the five criteria of the RTQ ($n=42$; Figure 5-2). The waste management criterion was the most noted, with 27 respondents.
Energy efficiency followed with eight respondents. Finally, four, three, and one respondents noticed water conservation, conservation initiatives, and community activities respectively.

Eighteen respondents had no idea why the business they were staying in was accredited with the RTQ. Among these were also most of the respondents who thought they had not experienced any business operating in a sustainably and environmentally concerned manner (9 out of 11).

![Figure 5-2](image)

### Reasons given for respondent experience of responsible businesses

- **NZ wide experience of business sustainability n=15**
- **RTQ business in question n=42**

5.1.4 Responsible Tourism Concept

Survey respondents were asked to evaluate six statements regarding their perceptions of the responsible tourism concept on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree (1-5; Figure 5-3). Most respondents had confidence that RTQ accredited businesses were caring for the environment, and that responsible tourism business practices contributed to New Zealand’s reputation as a sustainable destination (78% and 73% respectively of surveyed respondents agreeing with these statements). Respondents were more likely to reject the idea that RTQ was just another form of greenwash (35.5% disagreeing and 13% agreeing). Respondent visitor experience was more likely to be enhanced by RTQ accreditation with 37.7% of surveyed respondents acknowledging this. However, the visitor experience of 56% of respondents was not influenced by RTQ accreditation (42.4% were ambivalent or did not know and 16.5% disagreed with the statement). Finally, most respondents (63.4%) believed that the RTQ was a useful tool for turning business practices into environmentally and socially responsible ones, and that the New Zealand government should force all businesses to operate in such a manner (70% of surveyed respondents agreeing with these statements).
Respondent evaluation of the six statements regarding tourist perceptions towards the responsible tourism concept was not influenced by their sex, place of origin, age group, length of visit, accommodation style, or level of RTQ accreditation (Table 5-2).
Table 5-2  
Generalised linear model for respondent perceptions of images relating to responsible tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Roy’s Largest Root test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>F_{6,32}=0.83, p=ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>F_{6,32}=1.24, p=ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>F_{6,31}=0.00, p=ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above / Below the Average Stay in New Zealand</td>
<td>F_{6,32}=0.51, p=ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Standard</td>
<td>F_{6,32}=0.32, p=ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTQ Accreditation Level</td>
<td>F_{6,32}=0.83, p=ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.5 Variables that Influence Tourist Choice

Survey respondents were presented with nine variables that they would be likely to consider when choosing a tourism provider, and were asked to rank them from the most important to the least important (1-9). During analysis these rankings were re-clustered into three groups.

The first group is made up from rankings considered most important by tourists (i.e., rankings 1 to 3). The second group is made up from rankings considered slightly less important (i.e., rankings 4 to 6). The third group is made up from rankings considered least important (i.e., rankings 7 to 9); this last group of variables could be considered to be those that do not matter at all.

Results are presented in Figure 5-4. The business location, whether it was recommended (e.g., by friends/travel book), and its price are the variables most considered by tourists when choosing a provider (mean response of 2.7, 2.8, and 3 respectively). The provided level of service/quality follows in importance (mean response of 3.9). The random factors (e.g., it is the right business at the right time and right location), whether a business is accredited under a quality assurance system (i.e., stars), and whether it is operating in an environmentally and socially responsible way, are variables considered to a lesser extent (mean response of 5.3, 5.3, and 5.4 respectively). Whether the business is New Zealand-owned and whether it is a known brand are the factors least considered by tourists when choosing a provider (mean response of 6.2 and 7 respectively).
Respondent ranking of the nine variables tourists were likely to consider when choosing a tourism provider was not influenced by their sex, place of origin, age group, length of visit, accommodation style, or level of RTQ accreditation (Table 5-3). Likewise, tourist perception of whether or not they had experienced any tourism businesses operating in a sustainably and environmentally concerned manner did not influence the order in which they ranked the nine variables (Table 5-3).

Table 5-3
Generalised linear model for variables that influence tourists’ choice of a tourism provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Roy's Largest Root Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>$F_{9,27} = 1.00, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Origin</td>
<td>$F_{9,27} = 1.74, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>$F_{9,26} = 0.00, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above/Below the Average Stay in New Zealand</td>
<td>$F_{9,27} = 1.49, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Standard</td>
<td>$F_{9,27} = 1.77, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTQ Accreditation Level</td>
<td>$F_{9,27} = 1.93, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced a Responsible Operator</td>
<td>$F_{9,22} = 0.52, p=ns$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Discussion

Tourists have a positive perception of New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image. This positive notion is likely to be linked with the tourism marketing campaigns, as shown by the recognition of the Tourism NZ and 100% Pure NZ trademarks (45% and 28% respectively). The less clear perception of the 100% Pure claim compared to the clean and green one may be linked to the length of time those campaigns have been running for (see Chapter 1). Another explanation could be that the 100% Pure claim is a more abstract idea compared with the more tangible clean and green image.

In all four cases where significant statistical differences between segments of the sample were noted, it was a subtle one (i.e., no larger than 0.6 of the 5-point Likert scale); hence the sample
should be seen to have a cohesion of perceptions of New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image. However, understanding what has created these subtle differences may have an effect on the local tourism industry’s future. While it is hard to explain the difference in perceptions noted between males and females, the deterioration over time in tourist perception of the idea that tourism in New Zealand is just about money-making may be linked to recent claims raised by Peter Bills (2010). During his last visit to New Zealand, he felt that touring the country had become expensive: not only due to the exchange rate, but also due to what he regarded as products being overpriced. It is likely that over time tourists may be exposed to situations of overpricing, making them feel that the New Zealand tourism industry may only be interested in making money. Currently, these are a minority (only 15% of respondents thought that way, while 37% disagreed and the remaining 48% were ambivalent). Nonetheless these feelings should not be ignored by the tourism industry as they may damage the industry in the long run.

Overall most tourists thought that the New Zealand tourism industry was doing well in managing its environmental impacts\(^\text{20}\). This notion was reinforced by respondents reflecting on their own personal experience and a high proportion thinking they had come across a responsibly operating business. Likewise, a majority of tourists had confidence in the RTQ’s ability to help businesses deliver environmentally and socially responsible products. This was apparent from respondent confidence that RTQ-accredited businesses were caring for the environment, and a rejection of the idea that RTQ was just another form of greenwash. Thus tourists feel assured that RTQ-accredited businesses hold high commitments to matching their practices to the clean, green image and 100% pure claim. This notion was more likely to enhance respondent visitor experiences.

Nonetheless, the small portion of respondents who perceived the standards of local practices as lower than those required under European environmental laws should not be overlooked. For this small portion of respondents, even RTQ-accredited businesses did not stand up to their expectations.

Finally, it seems that the sampled tourists fall into the category of ‘Doubting Thomas’: those who hold some environmental awareness, and are taking some actions that benefit the environment when they travel (see section 2.5). Tourists did notice such initiatives as waste management; therefore the idea of responsible behaviour was not totally ignored by them. However, the least influencing factor when choosing a provider was whether a business operated in an environmentally and socially responsible manner (the two remaining least considered factors are not likely to matter at all in tourist considerations). Thus, the sampled tourists only demonstrated good intentions in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products. This notion is reinforced by the fact that while respondents were more than happy to see the New Zealand government forcing all businesses to operate in a responsible manner, most respondents could not explain what being a responsible operator actually meant (only a handful could explain their general experience of any responsible tourism businesses). Likewise, respondents were more likely to reflect on the meaning of being a responsible provider only after being asked by the researcher. Hence, it seems respondents considered responsible practices within a business as an added bonus and some even expected businesses to deliver such products, but they did not show any real commitment to ensuring such services were available.

---

\(^{20}\) One may suggest that respondents may overstate their environmental commitment when they feel pressured to appear to be responsible tourists. Similarly, respondents may feel pressured to overstate their confidence in the RTQ scheme. Thus caution is needed when interpreting results regarding tourists’ attitude of the responsible tourism concept and their thoughts towards the RTQ. However, the anonymity of the surveys may counteract the need for such caution.
5.3 Conclusions

It seems that for the sampled tourists, visiting New Zealand has meaning beyond that of the typical hedonistic spirit of tourism: these tourists wished to be a part of New Zealand’s environmentally friendly image. Hence they did not represent the laissez-faire21 travellers described by Stanford (2008). This idea supports the Miller (2003) and Font (2007) empirical evidence which shows the good intentions of tourists in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products. However, it seems that while tourists are pleased to have such products, they do not do much in terms of developing customer pressure to ensure the availability of such services. Therefore, further research is needed to establish whether increased public environmental awareness will in the future be translated into real commitment to sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products.

Following this exploration of tourist views, the next chapter will cover the comparative evaluation of the supply- and demand-side perception of the RTQ scheme.

---

21 Those who abandon all sense of social and environmental responsibility while on their two-week annual break.
Chapter 6
Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter will present the comparative evaluation of the supply- and demand-side perception of Responsible Tourism Qualmark (RTQ; section 6.1). It will then explore the options for better utilising Qualmark in achieving the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015 goals, and will also outline its recommendations (making recommendations is the study’s last objective; section 6.2). Finally, the research contributions and the overall conclusions will be presented (section 6.3).

6.1 Responsible Tourism Qualmark Accreditation: A Comparative Evaluation of Tourism Businesses and Tourist Perceptions

The Qualmark Company can be pleased with its achievement of having over 600 accredited businesses within the first two years of its RTQ scheme. This number of accredited businesses makes RTQ, based on size alone, one of the world’s leading schemes (Green Globe, for example, has 700 businesses accredited; see section 2.4.3). Analysis of results indicates that both businesses and tourists have positive attitudes towards the responsible tourism concept and have confidence in the RTQ’s ability to deliver responsible services and products. This is seen in the fact that supply-side respondents believed that the RTQ helped them in improving their business performance while protecting the environment; tourists believed that RTQ accredited businesses were caring for the environment, and that this was likely to enhance their visitor experience. Moreover, tourists demonstrated their support for the responsible tourism concept. This was apparent as they recognised New Zealand’s clean green image and believed that the New Zealand government should force all businesses to operate in a responsible manner (see section 5.1.4). However, while tourists are pleased with such responsible tourism products, they hold low purchasing commitment towards them; hence tourists are not particularly proactive in terms of developing customer pressure. This low customer pressure was observed in the supply-side data where only one respondent indicated that perceived customer demand had motivated him22.

At the time of interviewing, about 14% of the total businesses accredited with the Endorsed/Star Qualmark (ESQ) were also accredited with the RTQ (see Table 2-1). While the number of businesses incorporating responsible initiatives has increased in the last two years23, most businesses are not explicitly trying to protect the country’s clean, green image and the 100% pure claim (i.e., at September 2010, 70% of businesses accredited under the ESQ scheme had not been accredited under RTQ, Qualmark, 2010). Thus, the New Zealand tourism industry may deserve accusations such as those made by Fred Pearce and Claudia Bell of being nothing but ‘greenwash’. This idea was apparent in the supply-side analysis where respondents regarded that 14% RTQ-accredited businesses was too little and showed their disappointment of what they regarded as ‘a low uptake’ and hoped that more businesses would join the scheme.

22 The corporate clients’ demand that drove two businesses is a business environment pressure rather than a customer demand one.
23 For example, Bell (2008) found that only 8% of backpacker businesses were operating in an environmentally responsible manner, whereas today 28% of backpacker businesses which have the ESQ are also accredited with the RTQ.
6.2 Recommendations for Better Utilising Qualmark in Achieving the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015 Goals

The Ministry of Tourism and the Qualmark Company could use the results of this research to influence more businesses to join the Qualmark schemes and to operate more responsibly. This research can therefore be used as a way of better utilising Qualmark in achieving the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015 goals.

6.2.1 The First Goal

The first goal is to ensure that Qualmark’s assessment systems are consistently applied, and that they are recognised and supported by the tourism sector. This goal could be better achieved by the following six initiatives which aim to attract more business into the ESQ scheme:

- By continuing to portray itself as the tourism industry’s official quality assurance, Qualmark will attract businesses that wish to assure their customers of higher standards.
- Qualmark can promise businesses that joining the scheme will help them to maintain a viable business, improve their business performance, and give business owners peace of mind.
- Improve Qualmark attraction as a marketing tool for tourism business. This could be done by introducing the Qualmark symbol into all Tourism New Zealand advertising campaigns (notably its overseas ones, an initiative started to some extent in 2009).
- The Qualmark Company could increase its value to the tourism sector by increasing businesses’ return on investment. Upfront payments made to Qualmark could be made closer to time of inspection, so businesses will receive the service they paid for closer to the day of payment. It would be even better if Qualmark could charge businesses when the auditing process is over, thus giving businesses an instant return on their investment.
- Attract business by maintaining the Tourism New Zealand requirement for Qualmark accreditation as a benchmark for businesses which wish to participate in its marketing campaigns (e.g., official websites and the annual TRENZ marketing event; an initiative that attracted two respondents).
- Form a significant point of difference between Qualmark’s accredited businesses and non-accredited ones. The Qualmark Company could offer workshops to help raise business standards in the area of customer service, responsible tourism, and business management. By doing so, accredited business quality and standards would be likely to rise, and so would the level of tourism-sector support for the Qualmark Company.

These initiatives are likely to attract businesses holding legitimacy or competiveness organisational values into the ESQ scheme.

6.2.2 The Second Goal

The second goal is to continue raising tourism-sector standards. This goal could be better achieved by the following three initiatives that aim to raise Qualmark standards and to retain the credibility of its auditing process:

- Qualmark standards could be aligned to the more robust international ones (an initiative Qualmark was considering in its 2009 review; personal communication, Brian Shirley, Qualmark’s head of sales and accounts, November 6, 2009).
- By replacing the endorsement of the transport, service, and activity sectors with five marking levels similar to the accommodation star rating system, Qualmark could continue raising the standards of these tourism sectors as businesses will have a real incentive for improvement.
- Qualmark auditing was criticised as Qualmark was perceived as accrediting businesses with the star rating that the business desired, rather than the one they truly deserved (see section 4.1.9). This notion was driven by the perception of inequalities between the Qualmark inspectors and
the possibility that Qualmark was easily deceived. Hence, any inequalities between the Qualmark inspectors should be eliminated and the auditing process should be tightened by conducting rigorous checks that would test the businesses written statements. In addition, the introduction of ‘mystery shoppers’ to conduct unscheduled inspections would help Qualmark retain its credibility.

6.2.3 The Third Goal

The third goal is to ensure that the rating and endorsement system is readily recognised and clearly understood by tourists. This goal could be better achieved with the following two initiatives:

- Qualmark should utilise accredited businesses by giving them easy access to different signage (i.e., road signs, stickers, etc.) for both schemes. These might help expand the Qualmark brand recognition beyond the current levels of 43% and 24% respectively for its ESQ and RTQ schemes.
- Customers’ access to more information about the Qualmark schemes should be improved (currently Qualmark gives ambiguous and general explanations; customers could be given access to the standards businesses are measured upon).

6.2.4 The Fourth Goal

The fourth goal is to help build operator capability in delivering responsible services and products. This goal could be better achieved by attracting more operators into the RTQ scheme. As shown by this research, the level of respondent environmental awareness in terms of their organisation values influences their attitude towards the responsible tourism concept, hence their motivation to incorporate behavioural change.

Devotees holding the altruism organisational value are already incorporating responsible practices, and RTQ is in most cases just an official acknowledgement. Studies such as those by Diefa and Font (2010) and Bohdanowicz (2006) have concluded that environmental training will close the behavioural gap among leader and follower/laggard companies. However, while environmental training may help to increase business owners’ environmental awareness, the timeframe needed for this new understanding to be translated into changing their organisational values is unknown. Moreover it is also questionable whether it will influence their behaviour (notably for the opportunists who have no environmental awareness). This gap between attitude and behaviour was evident in the tourist responses as, although their environmental awareness has increased in recent years 24, it has not yet translated into real behavioural change or pressure.

With the assumption that increasing environmental awareness has a limited impact on businesses’ environmental behaviour, the next logical step is to examine the ability of the exogenous pressures to lead that change. All four drivers of change are likely to influence businesses, but with differing levels of success.

Regulatory: the Tourism Strategy Group could require businesses to comply by making the Qualmark scheme compulsory. However, while this option would be likely to shorten the time required for Qualmark’s assessment systems to be consistently applied to all members of the tourism industry, this move would be unlikely to be accomplished without mounting antagonism, thus jeopardising the needed industry support.

---

24 The sampled tourists were ‘Doubting Thomases’, those who are at the ‘Preparation’ stage of their behavioural change. This is a higher stage than the one reported two years ago in studies such as Miller (2007) and Donnelly (2008) where most tourists were represented by the ‘Indifferent’ and the ‘Watching and waiting’ types who are at the ‘Pre-contemplation’ and ‘Contemplation’ stages.
Pressures from the business environment: supply-chain pressures coming from Tourism New Zealand (e.g. setting Qualmark as a requirement for participating in the annual TRENZ marketing event; see section 4.1.3.1) have influenced businesses. However, as with the regulatory pressures, this move would be unlikely to be accomplished without mounting antagonism.

Stakeholder environment: pressure from increased customer demand. This research supports empirical evidence by Miller (2003) and Font (2007) which showed the good intentions of tourists in sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products. However, it seems that while tourists are pleased to have such products, they do not do much in terms of developing customer pressure. This lack of pressure may be linked to tourist confusion formed by the very large number of scattered voluntary schemes (Font, 2002). Thus, education of customers on the rating and endorsement system including its RTQ component will not only lead to Qualmark being readily recognised and clearly understood by tourists, but will reduce confusion. This, alongside increased tourists’ environmental awareness, may in the future be translated into real commitment to sourcing environmentally and socially responsible products25.

Economic advantage: encouraging businesses via their competitiveness organisational value is likely to attract more operators to join the Qualmark schemes. By doing so, individuals with low or no environmental awareness are likely to consider acting responsibly as a valid way to improve their business performance, overcoming their intrapersonal constraint. This may also alleviate interpersonal constraints as environmentally aware employees may no longer be constrained by business owners who see little merit in responsible practices. Finally, small businesses that are constrained by limited financial and time resources may consider RTQ as an excellent investment, thus overcoming their structural constraints.

It seems that the economic advantage drivers of change have the biggest prospect of changing businesses’ behaviour. This research therefore recommends that Qualmark concentrate on using the economic advantage driver to attract businesses through their competitiveness organisational value, by explaining that conserving resources, via energy efficiency, water conservation, and waste management, not only enhances business economic performance, but also helps protect the environment. This protection, alongside the conservation initiatives and community activities, helps sustain the tourist attractions which their business relies upon. Moreover, better education could reduce business frustration. For example, those who perceived the need for Qualmark to consider the cost associated with different initiatives may understand that the Qualmark judgement is about the level of improvement in resource consumption and not the level of cost associated with that specific initiative.

6.2.5 Truly Build Operator Capability in Delivering Responsible Tourism

As shown, economic advantage works as a double-edged sword: on the one hand it attracts compliers and opportunists into adopting responsible tourism practices, but on the other hand those businesses are likely to incorporate only low-cost initiatives with lower environmental benefits. It also constrains these businesses from supporting community activities and conservation initiatives which are less likely to directly benefit them (see section 4.2.1). Thus, in order to truly build operator capability in delivering responsible products and services, the RTQ scheme should be designed to minimise the revealed behavioural gap between the devotees and their complier and opportunist counterparts.

One option for minimising that gap is by setting a higher entry level to the RTQ scheme. Qualmark needs to find a balance between minimal and too low. However, remembering that the existing low

25 New Zealand is likely to be one of the first places to notice such change as tourists visiting New Zealand are not part of mass hedonistic tourism; they do not abandon all sense of responsibility while on their two-week annual break.
standards of RTQ mean that its implementation is low cost (as it is not too demanding or time-consuming) and that more businesses can easily join the scheme, it is recommended that the entry level should remain as it is.

The system of having three levels of accreditation seems an appropriate start in encouraging businesses to improve their performance by investing in all five criteria. However, the current compliance which includes only five easy initiatives does not stand up to international standards and does not agree with tourist expectations, and may thus lead to the perception that the RTQ is nothing but a greenwash. Some devotee respondents suggested that some initiatives should be made compulsory in order to align with European law (e.g., making recycling and low-energy light bulbs a requirement). Qualmark could also consider introducing a mechanism that would encourage businesses to set and meet targets for improving their resource consumption. Those targets could be set by the businesses themselves. In other words Qualmark could consider turning RTQ into an Environmental Management System rather than a Certified Code of Practice (see section 2.3), resulting in businesses measuring their impacts and reducing or mitigating those impacts rather than only meeting a set standard. This recommendation would be likely to raise the standards of the tourism sector, thus lifting the quality of the services accredited businesses are providing for their guests, minimising the gap between devotees and their counterparts, and boosting the reputation of Qualmark and the New Zealand tourism market.

6.3 Overall Conclusion and Further Research

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study that has considered both the demand and supply sides of responsible tourism. As such the research contributes ideas that, in an integrated way, provide the basis for future policy initiatives that could enhance the prospect for responsible tourism in New Zealand, a goal that is in keeping with the New Zealand Tourism Strategy (Ministry of Tourism, 2008). This study has showed the need for integrating exogenous and endogenous pressures with the respondents’ environmental awareness and the constraining and facilitating factors for understanding how and why businesses incorporate responsible tourism. This study has also found that while tourists respond positively to the new RTQ accreditation, this has yet to translate into real purchase commitment. These insights were used to propose ideas to help change follower and laggard behaviour in the hope that more operators will incorporate responsible tourism practices. However, further research is needed to test the validity of the laggard and follower constraints hypothesis in explaining why businesses are failing to incorporate sustainable development; that is, whether implementing the recommendations will lead more businesses to match their practices with the clean, green image and 100% pure claim.
Epilogue

Responsible Research

This study presented the Ministry of Tourism with recommendations to help elevate the current poor practices as a way to genuinely protect the country’s clean, green image. When conducting the research, we thought it important to set a personal example. With this in mind Raviv set his Master’s research to have the lowest environmental impact possible. Rather than printing I conducted an online literature review (using PDF files), and an online digital analysis of the 24 interviews (using the NVivo 8 software). These practices have saved hundreds if not thousands of printed pages. Careful consideration has also been given to how best to lower the environmental impact of any printing required (i.e. survey forms and the report itself). I have found that printing using space and a half with Times New Roman font is one of the most environmentally friendly options (and is included within the Lincoln University, 2010 house rules). This choice reduces the ink and number of pages used when compared to the other options (Agarwal, 2010).

I have endeavoured to use a bicycle as often as possible and during the year-long research I have commuted over 4000km on it. I cycled to Lincoln University from my Christchurch home about three times a week and I cycled when surveying tourists or conducting interviews in Christchurch. I also cycled around Auckland in the week I stayed there. For my time outside Christchurch, I compared different environmental outcomes when choosing the accommodation style for the 10-night stay. Staying in backpacker-style accommodation was not only a cheap option from a budget point of view, but it was also the most environmentally sustainable one (Becken, 2002).

For the research 17 businesses were randomly selected to be interviewed from outside of Christchurch. To help reduce my carbon footprint I was able to schedule two of the interviews to be held in Christchurch while the business owners were visiting the city. The other 15 interviews were scheduled to be carried out during three road trips. On two of the road trips interviews were conducted as I was driving through the interviewee’s region while on my annual vacations (these included a journey to Fiordland and one to North-East Nelson). The third trip covered the North Island, from Wellington to Auckland via Napier and Taupo. I chose to relocate a rental car back to Auckland with the knowledge that this car would have completed the trip anyway. I later completed my return journey by train. By choosing to travel by train rather than aeroplane there was a reduction of 240kg of CO₂. An additional 100kg of CO₂ was also saved by choosing the rental car option instead of flying (Landcare Research, 2008). Unfortunately, to conduct this trip solely by public transport an extra three nights’ accommodation would have been required. Although this option would have been more environmentally friendly it would have cost an extra $300 which my budget would not allow.

Finally, to offset my carbon emissions I am involved in two restoration projects where I have planted over 400 native trees. I have also set $200 of my budget for carbon offsetting.

This money was donated to the Maurice White Native Forest Trust who support the Hinewai Reserve on the Banks Peninsula which has 1230 ha of regenerating native bush.

Therefore, when embracing your own research think of the many available environmentally sound options. Plan ahead and make sure you are using your study time here not only to develop your academic life, but also to turn you into a better person.
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Appendix 1
Tourists questionnaire

Q.1 I am....... years old I.D number ......
Q.2 What is your sex? (please circle one) Male Female
Q.3 What country are you from ..........................
Q.4 I have been in New Zealand for .............days
Q.5 What are your reasons for visiting New Zealand (please circle all those who apply): Vacation Business Visiting family Visiting friends Education Other (please specify)...........................................................................................................
Q.6 What influences your choice of tourism businesses (Please rank the following 9 criteria: as 1 the most important criteria to 9 as the least important criteria)
............Random factors (e.g. it is the right business at the right time right location)
............Known brand (e.g., MacDonald’s, Hilton)
............New Zealand owned and operated business
............Quality assurance system (i.e. 5 stars)
............Level of Service/Quality
............Business operating in an environmentally and socially sustainable way
............Location
............Recommendation from friends / travel book / I-site / the web/ extra
............Price
Are there any other considerations that influence your choice of tourism businesses (please specify)...........................................................................................................

Q.7 Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please read each statement carefully before choosing your response and marking the appropriate box:
The options given were: Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know.

- New Zealand is Clean Green
- New Zealanders are friendly people
- Tourism in New Zealand is just about making money
- I believe that New Zealand tourism businesses do not manage their environmental impacts very well
- New Zealand is 100% Pure

Q.8 Have you experienced a tourism business that is operating in a sustainably and environmentally concerned manner? Yes ..... No ...... Please specify what lead you to that conclusion.................................................................

Q.9 Please mark underneath the brands you recognise

You are currently located in a ‘Responsible Tourism Qualmark’ accredited business.
In order to be accredited with ‘Responsible Tourism Qualmark’, businesses need to meet some minimum requirements in five criteria covering environmental and social performances.

Q.11 What do you think this business (where you are currently located) is doing that meets those criteria? (Please specify) ........................................................................................................................................

Q.12 Keeping this business in mind (where you are currently located), please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please read each statement carefully before choosing your response and marking the appropriate box.
The options given were: Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This business has given me confidence that it is caring for the environment</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible tourism business practise contribute to New Zealand’s reputation as a sustainable destination</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Responsible Tourism Qualmark, is just another form of greenwash- (i.e., businesses are dishonestly presenting their products as environmentally friendly).</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing that this business has ‘Responsible Tourism Qualmark’ accreditation has enhanced my visitor experience</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Responsible Tourism Qualmark accreditation is a useful tool for turning business practices into becoming environmentally and socially responsible</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Government should enforce all business to be operating in a environmentally and socially responsible way</td>
<td>Strongly agree; Agree; Neither agrees nor disagrees; Disagree; Strongly disagree; Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q.13 Are there any comments you wish to add? If so, please write them here.................................................................................................................................................................................................

........................................Thank you for your time........................................