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ABSTRACT

The concept of an All-Inclusive holiday has been attractive for tourists for decades. Travelling to a destination and knowing everything is paid for in advance, is perhaps what makes it most attractive. However, with raising concerns of the economic, social and environmental impacts these holidays have on the host destination, it is believed sustainability should be at the forefront of business operations.

It is established that though tour operators are believed to have an awareness and tourists are believed to have an interest in sustainability, the way in which the tour operators portray these ideas across to the tourists is missing from the literature. As a result, the following study investigates tourist perception and their awareness of sustainability as well as how tour operators are communicating their sustainability methods to their target market.

The study aim was to investigate tourist perception of the All-Inclusive holiday and sustainability and their accessibility to information on sustainability through UK tour operators. To satisfy this aim, the researcher created five objectives in which quantitative and qualitative data was conducted. The distribution of 100 surveys to tourists alongside a content analysis of tour operator’s media was used to answer the title and aim of the dissertation.

The dissertation that follows entails six chapters in which the researcher introduces the need for the study, reviews the literature surrounding the topic and the methodology. Following this, the author analysed and discussed the results founded from the primary research and concluded the study with a best practice model which tour operators should use to ensure sustainability practices are reaching all tourists regularly.

After completing all chapters mentioned above, the researcher concluded tourists have minimal awareness of the impacts of All-Inclusive holidays but do have an interest in sustainability. Additionally, tour operators are inconsistent in their approach to translating sustainability schemes across to the customer. This confirms raising customer awareness of sustainability would impact positively on the host destination.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.0 Introduction.
This chapter will outline the purpose of the dissertation, the topic up for discussion, locating the study and the reasoning behind the study. This will then lead to the establishment of the research title and the aim and objectives proposed.

1.2. The History of the All-Inclusive Holiday.
Agreed by both Kelly (2014) and The All-Inclusive Club (2016), the All-Inclusive (AI) holiday originated in the 1930s at UK Summer Camps. These getaways included food, accommodation and entertainment for a fixed price.

From this, Gerard Blitz became inspired and opened his first AI campsite in Mallorca in the 1950’s. This is where the international expansion began and in the 1970’s the Caribbean adopted the idea to become competitive in the tourism industry (Kelly, 2014). However, it is important to recognise that it was in the Caribbean where negative impacts of the AI holiday became apparent.

Kelly (2014) acknowledged that AI spots became gated for the tourist’s protection and security. Although Mansfeld and Pizam (2006) agree, they add that this had “a negative effect on small tourism businesses, which feel shut out and reinforce the perceptions of inequality between tourists and local residents” (Mansfeld and Pizam, 2006:19).

In 1981 Sandals, a luxury AI holiday provider for the Caribbean, opened. They took the initiative to notice – instead of ignore - the negative impacts the AI resorts are creating and created the Sandals Foundation. This scheme runs across the whole company and aims to address issues within the community, education and the environment at host destinations (Sandals, 2016).

Since then, the AI holiday has become more appealing to tourists due to its fixed price. In addition, the economic recession has made the holiday type more attractive because of its one upfront payment which is shown by the amount of tourists embarking on these holidays growing by over a third in the space of five years (Mawer, 2012). Whilst on holiday abroad, many tourists
worry about the amount of disposable income they will spend on eating out and day trips. As a result, the fear of the unknown deters people away from researching and booking a self-catering hotels when all the hassle can be saved by booking an AI package.

1.3. The Issues with All-Inclusive Holidays.
Although AI holidays for the most part seems like an ideal holiday with everything the average tourist needs in one enclaved resort; for the host destination it is a different story. While there are benefits for the host communities such as the creation of jobs (Christie et al, 2014), the disadvantages have the tendency to overshadow them.

Tourists who choose these holidays tend to “have little incentive to go anywhere else, hire local guides, eat in local restaurants or pay entry fees to see local natural or cultural heritage” (Responsible Travel, 2011).

In turn, Tourism Concern (2014) have realised how businesses have been forced to close causing a depreciation in income and a fall in GDP for the people living at the host destinations.

It is a vicious circle; for every advantage there seems to be a more prominent disadvantage; this is the reason why the researcher has chosen this to study the AI holiday for the dissertation.

1.4 Sustainability.
In order to minimise impacts, often sustainability schemes are put into place by businesses. As mentioned previously, Sandals are an AI tour operator with a focus on being sustainable.

“Business sustainability is often defined as managing the triple bottom line - a process by which companies manage their financial, social and environmental risks, obligations and opportunities” (Financial Times, 2017).

Though some tourism businesses may have these schemes in place, the translation of them across to tourists is sometimes missed.

Despite the effects of the AI holiday on the host destination being recognised in academic literature and the media, research into tourist’s awareness of these impacts and tour operator’s portrayal of sustainability is missing from
studies. This forms the basis to why the researcher has chosen to investigate this matter further.

1.5. The Purpose of the Dissertation.
The purpose of the following dissertation is to identify whether customer awareness is a way in which the adverse effects of AI resorts can be minimised. It aims to study both tourist perception of AI holidays and sustainability and tour operator’s portrayal of sustainability. From the research into tourists and tour operators, the researcher will answer the title of the dissertation - ‘What affect would raising customer awareness of the impacts of the AI holiday have on the host destination?’

1.6. The Dissertation Process.
As with any dissertation, the study has to go through different stages. Figure 1.1 shows the process this dissertation will go through, in order to reach the proposed aim of the study.

As part of stage one of the dissertation process, the aim and objectives need to be established. These are as followed:

Aim: An investigation into tourist perception of the All-Inclusive holiday and sustainability and their accessibility to information on sustainability through UK tour operators.

Objectives:

(A) To critically review the literature surrounding All-Inclusive holidays, sustainability and tour operator and tourist perception theory.
(B) To use quantitative research to survey a range of tourists in order to discover their perceptions of All-Inclusive holidays on host destinations.

(C) To investigate Thomson, Thomas Cook and Virgin Holidays communications to their customers of their sustainability practices using a qualitative content analysis.

(D) To compare the findings of the research to the literature in order to evaluate All-Inclusive tourists and tour operator’s accessibility and awareness of sustainability

(E) To develop a best practice model for tour operators to assist them in developing and communicating their sustainability practices.

Stage two, shown in Figure 1.1, is the literature review which will evaluate the existing academic literature surrounding the research topic. Following this, a methodology will be conducted in stage three to explain the researcher’s approach to data collection.

Subsequently, the data will be collected using the following methods. To measure tourist perception of AI holidays and sustainability, quantitative primary research will take place using surveys. The survey will ask tourists to comment on their awareness of the impacts of AI holidays and their willingness to be sustainable whilst on holiday.

A content analysis will take place on three UK tour operators to assess their awareness of sustainability and how they translate this to the customer. To do this, the researcher will look at the tour operator’s website, social media and brochures.

The three tour operators chosen for investigation were Thomson, Thomas Cook and Virgin Holidays for two main reasons. The first being they all sell AI holidays and the second is simply due to their awarding winning customer service levels. Thomas Cook won a Customer Service Award in 2016 (TNS, 2017), Thomson won the 2013 Best Large Holiday Company for Customer Service award (Roberts, 2013) and Virgin Holidays have been awarded the 2015 Bronze Best AI Holiday Company (Virgin Holidays, 2017). This shows
their desire to satisfy customer needs and focus on delivering the best customer service possible. However, as tourists are becoming more sustainably aware (Gossling and Hickler, 2006), customer service satisfaction may fall in the future if tour operators (TO) do not adapt according to satisfy changing tourist needs.

Only with the findings mentioned above will the researcher be able to complete stage four, to compare and evaluate results to develop a best practice model for tour operators to assist them in developing and communicating their sustainability practices.

The researcher believes the contribution of a model to the industry will not only help tourists understand their impact and help them adapt accordingly, but help tour operators to be more consistent in regards to their sustainability approach in the hope the negative impacts of the AI holiday are minimised at the host destination.

Lastly, stage five, shown in Figure 1.1 will conclude the researcher’s findings and evaluate the dissertation process as a whole.

1.7. Conclusion.

In conclusion, the researcher aims to learn the effect of raising awareness of the impacts of the AI holiday. The use of five aims and objectives which include an in depth literature review, a qualitative content analysis of three major tour operators, a quantitative study using questionnaire’s on tourists, a comparison of the two research techniques and developing a best practice model, should lead the researcher to an answer and optimistically, encourage people in the future to travel with a more sustainable and ethical approach.
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Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.0 Introduction.

In this chapter, the researcher will examine the literature which surrounds the research question in an attempt to support the need for the data collection in the next chapter.

“A literature review is a written document that presents a logically argued case founded on a comprehensive understanding of the current state of knowledge about a topic of study. This case establishes a convincing thesis to answer the study’s question” (Machi and McEvoy, 2009: 4).

For a dissertation, it is important to analyse the literature surrounding the topic as it will give the researcher a greater understanding of the study and draw attention to missing information in which the researcher aims to fill.

The following literature review will investigate five topic areas which are associated with the dissertation aim. These are as followed:

i. The All-Inclusive Holiday.
ii. The Impacts of the All Inclusive Holiday.
iii. Sustainability Theory.
iv. Tour Operator’s Perception.
v. Tourist Perception.
2.1 The All Inclusive Holiday.

All-Inclusive (AI) holidays have increased in popularity over the years especially since the UK’s 2008 recession (McGivney, 2017). Despite its popularity, the concept of the AI holiday has been loosely defined. Finding a specific definition which wholly defines the term in academic literature is merely impossible and has therefore resulted in individuals and companies creating their own definition of what it is.

Evans (2016) is one of the only authors which attempts to define the holiday type saying all a tourist needs to do at an AI holidays is be there. Evans (2016) added that a tourist will not need money when holidaying this way because everything is provided.

Lougheed (2011), Kohn (2005), Grant (2016) and Mawer (2012) have all raised the question of what does an AI holiday mean and include, yet none of the authors have defined it - simply because there is a variety of AI resorts which include or exclude certain products and services such as alcohol.

As there is no conclusive definition, tourism businesses have been able to manipulate it to their advantage; Ozdemir et al (2012) states the “content of all-inclusive packages may vary from property to property” (Ozdemir et al, 2012:112); and Llewellyn and Mylne (2008) notice the term ‘All-Inclusive” varies in different locations.

Horner and Swarbrooke (2004), in the book *International Cases in Tourism Management*, investigate this matter further by looking at how tour operators (TO) and their hotels vary in regards to what each resort offers. Horner and Swarbrooke (2004) studied Sandals, a tour operator which sells AI holidays, to see how TO vary internally in regards to what is included in an All-Inclusive package deal.

Table 2.1 shows part of the result of the author’s study. The fields marked with an ‘x’ demonstrate that the resort in question possesses the feature listed. Horner and Swarbrooke (2004) found all resorts were consistent in regards to the inclusion of meals and drinks however, variation does occur across the resorts in regards to additional facilities. It is noticeable that
Sandals Royal Hicacos, Montego Bay and Antigua do not allow their visitors to dine at neighbouring resorts whereas the other resorts in question do. Similarly, Sandals resorts Ocho Rios, Royal Caribbean and Royal Bahamian do not offer full room service.

This inconsistency can be seen as the tour operator exploiting the tourist’s vulnerability; in an investigation of AI tourists, Mawer (2012) found that in a survey from the Post Office, more than three-quarters of AI tourists ended up paying extra for things they thought were covered in the original price; additionally Yue (2012) states the belief that the tourists sometimes assume that everything is being covered in a package holiday but as shown by Horner and Swarbrooke (2014), this is not always the case.

**Enclave Tourism**

As different resorts and TO interpret an AI holiday differently, enclave tourism could be used to help gain a deeper understanding of what the holiday type is. Enclave tourism is a type of tourism which is known to concentrate on the AI

### Table 2.1: Sandals All-Inclusive Resort Analysis
(Extracted from Horner and Swarbrooke (2004:227))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel Type</th>
<th>Sandals Royal Hicacos</th>
<th>Sandals Royal Bermuda</th>
<th>Sandals Royal Barbados</th>
<th>Sandals Grand St Lucian</th>
<th>Sandals Grenada</th>
<th>Sandals Antigua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total rooms and suites</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concierge service in selected room categories</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main freshwater pools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirlpools</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and drink</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited premium brand drinks</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourmet speciality restaurants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim-up pool bars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full room service (in selected rooms)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dine in neighbouring Sandals or Beaches resorts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily organized activities including pool games</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discotheque/nightly club</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightly entertainment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
holiday type in remote locations as well as have the tendency to disregard the local communities in regards to their needs (Anderson, 2011; Telfer, 2002).

AI enclaves are proven to cause debate over what is included as well; Carlisle describes it as either a resort or entire holiday destination which involves a prepaid system in which food, beverages and services are all included within one fixed price.

Conversely, Koss-Feder (1994) argues some enclave resorts (ER) include unlimited food and beverages, transport, accommodation and leisure facilities whereas others places limits to meals and may add additional costs where necessary. Wong and Kwong (2004) support this proposing a similar idea, stating that ER usually cover meals, transport, accommodation and entertainment but there is no fixed consensus.
2.2 An Academic Evaluation on the Impacts of the All-Inclusive Holiday

AI holidays have been central to a large amount of negative press in the 21st Century. The growth of media over the years has meant the ease of publicising information has improved and the tourism industry has not be protected against this (Mansfeld and Pizam, 2006; Norton and Ivanovic, 2008; Mwasimba and Abdull, 2016). As with any holiday type, there are advantages and disadvantages to each of the stakeholders involved.

How do tourists benefit from an All-Inclusive Holiday?

Literature identifies the financial benefit of booking an AI holiday for the tourist; Laws (1997) believes that “the key social achievement of the industry is its ability to provide easy and affordable international travel to large numbers of people” (Laws, 1997:11). Equally, Sharma (2004) identifies how money is saved for tourists and Swarbrooke and Horner (2011) recognise the money saving aspect in relation to its ‘package’ element.

AI resorts provide tourists with protection against tourist based crime and increasing danger; Abdool and Carey (2004) believe the resorts protect tourists; and McElroy et al (2008) believes heightened security at AI hotels is needed in some countries to protect the tourists. AI resorts are known “for attracting visitors through their promise of a safe and secure accommodation” (Rhiney, 2011:124), it is for this reason that many tourists choose AI holidays (Pearce, 2012).

From a theoretical perspective, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs can demonstrate what tourists expect from an AI holiday. Maslow (1954) created a hierarchy in which a person travels through in order to gain complete satisfaction. Only once the needs of the latter are satisfied will an individual focus on the next need in the hierarchy as seen in Figure 2.1 (Montana and Charnov, 2008; Thompson, 1996). In regards to the hospitality sector, it is recognised after basic needs such as a hotel reception and air conditioning, protection from danger is next for resort users (Jaume, 2014; Reid and Bojanic, 2010).
Positive Impacts on the Hosts.

Though tourists are personally benefiting from the holiday type, there are various discovered benefits in literature of AI resorts profiting the host destination.

It is alleged that hosts will benefit from an increased demand of supplies to be used at the resorts; Christie et al (2014) states many resorts use local supplies and local people in order to run the hotels on a day to day basis; Boniface et al (2012) similarly recognises the hotels are likely to create permanent rather than seasonal work however, Timothy and Teye (2009) agree with Christie et al (2014) but, recognise not all resorts source supplies locally.

Hosts benefit indirectly through the improvements in infrastructure as a result of multinational companies improving the accessibility to the resorts; Pirnar (2016) states the improvements in infrastructure increases destination competitiveness. Jreat (2004) further supports this idea suggesting the power of AI developers can push local Governments to improve infrastructure.
However, Jreat (2004) further identifies funds use to invest infrastructure can deter Government investments away from crucial developments in education and health.

**Negative Impacts on the Hosts.**

Though some benefits are identified, the literature tends to focus on the negative impacts; Weeden and Boluk (2014) states that the negative impacts have the tendency to overshadow the opportunities for all the stakeholders.

There is belief that the AI holiday is discouraging travel outside the resort resulting in multiple impacts; Nagle (1999) stated the ancillary sector have a lack of involvement with AI resort user. Goldberg et al (2014) recognised the resorts’ lack of integration with the local economy. Additionally, Simons (1997) believes the resorts are discouraging tourists to travel outside of the enclave and therefore money is not being leaked into the local economy through tourist expenditure; and Nagle (1999) recognises a reduction in transportation demand for tourists who choose to stay at this resort type.

Furthermore, research by Smith and Stewart (2014), explains only around 20% of the money generated in an AI package deal will go to local businesses with TO, airlines and other sources absorbing all the finances; showing the extent of deprivation of money to local communities. Supporting this, Pattullo’s (2005) research found, that aside from workers at Sandals resorts, AI resort employees complained of low wages.

To overcome the negative impacts, sustainability schemes are often put in place to ensure businesses can still operate but, taking into consideration the impacts they have whilst in operation.
2.3 Sustainability Theory

To reduce and manage impacts of AI holidays, a sustainable approach is needed. The literature shows how business sustainability has been defined differently by several authors;

“Business sustainability is often defined as managing the triple bottom line - a process by which companies manage their financial, social and environmental risks, obligations and opportunities” (Financial Times, 2017).

White (2009) describes sustainability as “the process of conducting business in ways that protect the earth and its inhabitants from irreparable damage caused by human activities” (White, 2009:1).

Barton (2016) defines sustainability as; “…a systemic shift in culture towards the triple bottom line; that is, putting planet and people on a level playing field with profit when it comes to innovation (Barton, 2016).

Similarly, The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) defined sustainable development as the introduction of change in all aspects of business to meet current and future consumer needs.

These definitions of sustainability conclude its focus on protecting the globe from negative impacts caused by human activity; thus the reason why the tourism industry should aim to be sustainably aware.

The Triple Bottom Line Theory

The Triple Bottom Line (TBL) was coined in 1997 by John Elkington and is a theory which relates to sustainability. Although unintentional, the TBL has been used in relation to tourism. Elkington “considered there to be three prongs of business that should inform all corporate strategies: social, environmental and financial” (Beeton, 2006:63).

The TBL’s ability to encourage and assist the sustainable goals of a tourism organisation, has been recognised through literature published by Slaper and Hall (2011) and Buhalis and Darcy (2011). Spenceley (2008) additionally recognised the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSP) further
support the idea of the TBL; noticing the need to support present and future needs from economic, social and environmental perspectives.

**Sustainability, the Triple Bottom Line and the Tourism Industry.**

There are various debates whether the tourism industry can obtain complete sustainability thus satisfy the TBL;

The first perspective is presented by Sustainable Tourism (2014); believing tourism will never be completely sustainable however, adjustments can be made in order to make the industry more sustainable. Lansing and de Vries (2007) agree stating that the consumption of tourism products is not vital and there is an equality disparity between the hosts and the tourists across the globe; and for these reasons tourism will never be sustainable.

Butler (1999) poses another viewpoint, stating the industry cannot be merely defined as sustainable or unsustainable but, it is possible for the tourism industry to have sustainable contributions in the host destination (Moscardo, 2017).

The third perspective is the tourism industry can be sustainable. In *Sustainable Tourism Management*, Swarbrooke (1999) identified The Campaign for Environmentally Responsible Tourism (CERT) as an initiative which fully believe the tourism industry can be sustainable in the long term and are making the steps to ensure this happens.

Despite the different perspectives on whether sustainability can be achieved in the literature, it is noticeable how minimally the tourism industry are implementing sustainability and the TBL into business operations.

The Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI) is a measurement tool used to calculate how sustainable a company is using scores established in each named category. Of the all the listed companies across a variety of sectors included in the DJSI, TUI is the only tourism company recognised for its commitment to sustainability at a national and international level (TUI, 2016).

Additionally, there is publicised criticism with the way the tourism industry are using the TBL; “With the increased scope, scale and visibility of tourism’s
impacts, there has been recognition of the need for tourism to improve its triple bottom-line performance and contribute to a better world” (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013:330).

In addition, Harms (2010) expressed the belief that although some businesses have placed a project or program in place to satisfy the TBL, they are not always recognised or are used only when convenient for the company. Harms (2010) uses the term ‘nice to have’ suggesting businesses are addressing the aspects of the TBL as desirables rather than a necessity.
2.4 Tour Operator Perception

It is recognised that the TBL is not always used effectively in tourism. Because of this tourism businesses may be causing negative impacts upon themselves;

Spector (2012) created ten reasons why a business should care about the environment. These include money saving, creating further customer demand, tax reduction and it improves brand image/reputation. Allen (2015) supports this believing that “businesses can make money by improving efficiencies and by making and selling green products” (Allen, 2015:36).

Harms’ (2010) research identifies a business shown improving welfare of local communities is beneficial for success. In addition, Patterson (2015) found that consumers are becoming increasingly aware of their environmental impact and to ignore this can reduce competitiveness and be detrimental to company success. Patterson’s (2015) also found that many tourism organisations will eventually begin to notice a change tourist demand; tourists are beginning to switch to more sustainable methods of travel; therefore it is beneficial for TO to note this movement.

Tour Operators and Sustainability

TO play a crucial role in promoting sustainability as they are claimed to be the transitional medium between a tourist and their desired destination;

The Tour Operators’ Initiative for Sustainable Tourism Development (2003) state TO have a dominant role as an intermediary between tourists and hosts and can therefore influence “the choices of consumers, practices of suppliers and the development pattern of the destinations” (The Tour Operators’ Initiative for Sustainable Tourism Development, 2003:6).

Sigała (2008) and Font and Cochrane (2005) support this viewpoint arguing TO, as a transitional medium, play a critical part in distributing tourists to different locations across the world and therefore have important role to play in regards to promoting sustainability.
As established in Sub-Section 2.3 tourism as an industry has been criticised for its Triple Bottom Line usage. TO, as a stakeholder in the industry, are also argued to be dismissing this responsibility;

Font and Cochrane (2005) added that because of their positioning, TO sometimes argue most responsibility lies with those closer to the destination such as suppliers and local authorities. Miller and Twinning-Ward (2005) add that some TO believe they do not have impacts on the host destination outside of their offices; Lubbe (2000) believes TO are concerned with their business growth more than their sustainable responsibility; and research by Swarbrooke (1999) found TO believe sustainability is the responsibility of the Government and others rather than directly their own.

**Tour Operators and Tourist Education**

Although some TO believe they do not take direct responsibility in regards impacts on the host destination, they are aware of the idea of being sustainable (Gössling et al, 2009). Because of this and their positioning in the industry, they are believed to be capable of translating sustainability schemes across to tourists successfully.

Dwyer et al (2010) believe TO can influence tourist behaviour whilst at a destination and Peeters et al (2009) also found TO play influential role in tourist’s decision making.

From this, it is important to acknowledge that although mass tourism is dualistic, tourist’s education through the TO, can help minimise the negative impacts caused by AI holiday resorts;

Smith (2003) and Moscardo (2015) believe tourist education will help manage impacts inflicted on a destination. Likewise, Jones and Haven-Tang (2005) believe if consumers were/are aware of the impacts through a campaign/scheme, it could change tourist perceptions. This would be beneficial for both TO, who will benefit from more consumer demand and locals, as they can “exploit opportunities arising from tourism development” (Jones and Haven-Tang, 2005:69).
Additionally, Krippendorf (1987) believes the damage tourism creates to the host destination is kept out of view of the tourist, as a result they are oblivious of the impacts they are creating; subsequently education would bridge this gap. Supporting this, Moscardo (1998) believes education whilst being a tourist can be the only chance a person may learn about their impacts on their surroundings.

It is however, argued that TO have already recognised the need for tourist education, and have implemented schemes already to help tourists notice the impacts of AI holidays;

Standish (2009) identifies how TO are seeking to push tourist education to the forefront of their operations by encouraging them to be environmentally and socially respectful to their hosts.

However, in the book Island Tourism, Cooper and Erfurt-Cooper (2011) recognise TO are aware of what they need to do themselves but fail to translate these ideas across to the tourists efficiently. Similarly, Bernini et al (2015) research discovered that it is;

“…worth noting that the most visible sustainable initiatives have not been noticed by tourists. This leads to think that the destination should make a stronger effort in order to increase the visibility of all its activities, otherwise, the investments and work on renewable energy, waste management and water purification remain unnoticed” (Bernini et al, 2015:18).

This quote insinuates TO are not communicating sustainability efforts across to tourists, potentially causing their efforts to be unrecognised and not as effective. Gössling et al (2009) believes this is a mistake of the TO as “educating the consumer will be crucial to gain support and marketability of adapted travel products and full emissions compensation” (Gössling et al, 2009:272).
2.5 Tourist Perception

Perception in relation to tourism, “is the process of sorting and filtering the vast array of information about a particular area” (Sussmann and Unel, 2012:208). Reich (1999) and Sönmez and Sirakaya (2002) believe understanding perception is vital when attempting to establish sustainable tourism initiatives.

Van and Frankcken (1984) describe perceptions of a destination as being important as they determine a destination’s success - they can motivate tourists to travel to a new destination or a destination they have previously visited.

The Tourist Gaze

In order to understand a tourist’s perception, John Urry created the idea of Tourist Gaze (TG). This idea stems from the belief that tourists have a perception of a destination before they travel - “it is about what they see, are aware of, expect and are conscious of” (Buddhabhumbhitak, 2010:141). Urry (1990) believes tourist’s choose a destination because of a fantasy they have constructed in their mind which can be as a result of images from “film, TV, literature, magazines, records, and videos” (Urry, 1990:3), resulting in the destination pulling the tourist to the area.

Focusing on the images created by the tourists, there is a widespread consensus that media focus on only negative aspects of global activity;

Gruman et al (2016) states that people notice the media only focus on the negative; Wilson et al (2015) notices the media do not focus on positive stories and Soroka (2014) similarly believes mass media stories has a significant negative focus.

These beliefs are supported by news articles about the AI holiday which focus on the negative; Fieser (2016) wrote an article about countries threatening to limit the package deal due to the negative impacts; McVeigh (2014) researched the rumours that AI resorts are causing of loss of business to the locals.
As the media has an influential role in society (Croteau et al, 2012), the negative approach these authors are taking have the opportunity influence tourist’s gaze on the AI Holiday.

Along with media, marketers and destination managers can be deemed as creating the image the tourist’s ‘gaze’ upon. Being in a highly competitive market, leading TO and destination managers are under increased pressure to make their product more attractive to the clientele over their competitors (Lubbe, 2000). To do this, they tend to only illustrate luxurious pictures on their marketing platforms which focus on authentic and natural aspects to the destination (Urry, 1999) - this is called the ‘romantic gaze’. By doing this, TO are masking reality facing the destination and its hosts, potentially creating a barrier to tourist education.

**Tourist Awareness of Sustainability**

Because of the differing impacts, the general public are becoming more aware of sustainability in the AI tourism industry:

Lucas (1979) and Marion and Lime (1986) have both conducted research focused on tourist perceptions of the environment. Each discovered tourists have limited knowledge of deterioration impacts but are aware of physical and visible impacts such as increased litter.

Conversely, Hammit, Bixler and Noe (1996) argue some tourists do have knowledge of sustainability, adding that a sustainable tourism industry needed in order to satisfy that stakeholder. Additionally, Patterson (2015) found that consumers are becoming increasingly aware of their environmental impact. This is supported by research by Tourism Concern (2015) which found 55% of holidaymakers were aware of the impacts of AI holidays.

**Theoretical Tourist Types**

Though it is important to discuss tourist perception in general, it is vital to distinguish that all tourists are different (Woodside and Martin, 2007; Pearce, 2005) and their views/perceptions will affect the way in which they holiday. Although there are a variety of tourist types, each tourist will share either similar or conflicting opinions on the AI holiday due to their own morality.
Egoism is a type of teleological ethical view and is when a person will only complete an action to benefit oneself and oneself alone (Kay, 1997). The only dispute to this is when an individual will benefit from doing something for another as it will increase the chance of that individual reaching their own goal (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013:12). Often egoism can be accused of being a selfish and Blackburn (2003) supports this with his belief that egoism is one of the seven ethical threats to society.

Adapting the mind-set of an egoist would be difficult but, as recognised by Lovelock and Lovelock (2013), it is achievable if the action will impact the tourist positively.

Though an egoist may choose not to holiday in an AI resort, Cohen (1972) recognises that ‘institutionalised tourists’, those who rely on the industry to organise travel, may choose to travel to an AI destination. Furthermore, Plog (1974) categorised tourists into several categories and, identified the ‘individual mass tourist’ and ‘organised mass tourist’ as those who “seek out safe spaces and ‘tourist bubbles”’ (Puczko and Smith, 2012:271) and therefore would likely take an AI holiday.
2.6 Conclusion

Understanding the AI Holiday and what is included gives the researcher an insight into the reasoning why a tourist will or will not choose to take an AI holiday. Though enclave tourism offers a deeper insight into what the AI package is about; the diverse range of definitions in academic can be deemed as misleading to tourists and could act as a deterrent to individual tourist groups i.e. an egoist.

It is noticeable upon assessing the impacts of the holiday type, there are advantages and disadvantages to AI holidays. Despite this, authors have the tendency to sway towards the discussion of negative impacts, which in turn, can influence tourist perception of the holiday type.

In order to reduce the impacts of AI holidays, a sustainable development strategy is needed. The TBL theory assesses sustainability using three approaches – financial, environmental and social. Upon reviewing the literature, it is noticeable the TBL can be used a basis to assist sustainability initiatives in the tourism industry (Slaper and Hall, 2011; Buhalis and Darcy, 2011). In order for the following dissertation to create a best practice model (proposed in Objective E), the researcher believes adding to the TBL as the basis of the model will be most effective and efficient. This is shown in the Conceptual Framework in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Conceptual Framework: The Triple Bottom Line.](image)

TO are noticed to play a crucial role in influencing choice and as the transitional stage for the tourist between home and the destination, the way they portray sustainability can be pushed through business operations. Though some TO are mindful to sustainability, the literature acknowledges
that some schemes have gone unnoticed by tourists - outlining the need for further study.

Tourist perception towards the AI holiday is missing from the literature, however there is variety of resources which discuss tourist awareness of sustainability. There are conflicting opinions from different authors about the level of tourist awareness outlining the need for additional investigation.

To bridge the gap in the literature, this study aims analyse the level of awareness tourists have of AI impacts and sustainability. In addition, an assessment of current TO sustainability strategies will also be used to see how they market their sustainability plans to the tourists. A combination of both will answer the dissertation title - What affect would raising customer awareness of the impacts of the AI holiday have on the host destination?
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Chapter 3: Methodology

3.0 Introduction

“When you leave for a vacation and you’ve never been to your destination before, you’re likely to make a list of things you need or want to do before, during and after the trip. You might also take a map along so you know how to get there and not get lost or sidetracked along the way” (Vacca, 2010:257).

This is essentially what a methodology does, it assesses the way in which an outcome can be achieved by looking at the different steps taken to get there.

This chapter will identify the methods the researcher adopted in order collect the primary data to determine an appropriate and valid conclusion. It will look closely at study and justify the reasoning behind the research methods chosen.

3.1 Primary vs Secondary Research

Primary and secondary research are two ways in which a person can collect data specific to a topic of study. Whilst primary data is “data that a researcher has collected for a specific purpose, secondary data are collected by another researcher for another purpose” (Sarstedt and Mooi, 2014:28). As established in the literature review, there is lack of information available to the researcher with relevance to the aim and objectives of this dissertation. This resulted in the primary research approach being adopted.

3.1.1 Primary Research Strategy: Qualitative vs Quantitative Research

Within primary research, there are two distinct ways the researcher can collect the data need – a qualitative approach or a quantitative approach. Maimon and Rokach (2005) distinguished the main differences between the research types in question. The conclusion drawn was qualitative data can be put into a categorical order and involves more detailed research whereas quantitative takes a numerical approach e.g. surveys.

In regards to the aim, the most appropriate method for the examination of tourist perception is quantitative. Matsuo (2005) supports this as a large variety of people need to be questioned and it is less time consuming than qualitative. However it can be seen that because of the large sample size, it can lead to over generalisation (Nykiel, 2007) causing validity issues.
On the other hand, a qualitative approach is needed to examine the All-Inclusive (AI) tour operators (TO) and their approach to sustainability. Although Matsuo (2005) believes it is more time consuming and interpretation of the material provided can be difficult to establish, Matsuo (2005) also notes it is effective in understanding processes.

The use of both qualitative and quantitative research in this project is called a mixed method approach. This is the best approach as:

“..the limitations of one method can be offset by the strengths of the other method, and the combination of quantitative and qualitative provide a more complete understanding of the research problem than either approach by itself” (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007:8).

3.2 Quantitative Research
Upon deciding the mixed methods approach was best for the study, Figure 3.1 outlines the data collection process and determines different methods which can be used in order to collect primary data. Looking at the quantitative side of the model, options include self-completion and interview-completed surveys and observation (Hair et al, 2011).

The researcher decided a survey will be used to collect the data as they are flexible and can be custom designed (McNabb, 2004). Throughout supporting literature, it is expressed that internal and external validity are dampened in survey data collection; internal validity is reduced as attitudes are unable to be measured accurately and externally, a faulty sample could obtained due to a lack of responses (Cargan, 2007; Mitchell and Jolley, 2010; Rahman et al, 2010). However, as the research is descriptive and is scheduled to take place during the Christmas period, external and internal validity should not be affected. Due to the time constraint on this study, the researcher believed the use of ‘shopping mall interview-completed surveys’ was the best method as data can be given and received without a prolonged waiting time.
3.2.1 Survey Design
The survey initially made was a pilot and given to ten individuals to analyse and give feedback on. A pilot survey “represents a complete run through the entire survey process, often with variants of instrument, procedure, sampling and so forth” (Stopher and Metcalf, 1996:24).

Using a pilot survey was advantageous to the researcher as it allows correction of any faults with the survey to avoid any unreliable results (Bowles and Metcalf, 2002; Thrusfield, 1986).

Upon carrying out a pilot survey (See Appendix 1), the feedback from both the Ethics Committee and the respondents, gave an insight into faults made and enabled time for adjustments to be made, to allow questions to become more concise and less repetitive. The use of a table format involving tick boxes instead of a list was recommended to make the survey attractive and easy to read (See Appendix 2).

3.2.2 Sampling and Implementation
For the purpose this dissertation and to ensure fairness, it was important to gain a random sample of people to provide a general consensus of general tourist perception.

“A random sample is defined as a sample selected from the population by a process that ensures that (1) each possible sample of a given size has an
To do this, the researcher handed out surveys in a main street in Cardiff, to 100 random individuals. This ensured the results were unbiased, reliable and valid.

### 3.2.3 Analysis
To analyse the data, a range of pie charts and bar charts were used to display the information collected alongside a table for the qualitative data. Bonita et al (2006) wrote how graphs will enable the reader to view numerical data in a visual way making it memorable. The use of computer software was also used to create the graphs.

### 3.3 Qualitative Research
A content analysis is described as a research method which intersects qualitative and quantitative data. It is used to examine organisational portrayal and the literature used (Duriau et al, 2007).

According to Royse (2007), a content analysis is advantageous due to it being cheap to conduct and its ability to deal with large data amounts.

The use of a content analysis is relevant for the purpose of this dissertation because of the need to analyse the TO ways of promoting AI holidays. It also allows investigation into how accessible the information regarding the sustainability is.

The researcher chose to assess the three TO in question using both online resources and brochures which can be selected from in store to examine their marketing techniques in relation to AI sustainability.

To examine the TO, the researcher chose to use brochures, social media and website analysis. The researcher chose to analyse brochures as it is regarded as “of interest to customers who are searching for a more specific holiday” (Blackman et al, 2005:221) such as an AI. However, it is argued that the brochures are “infrequently effective in getting the attention” (Moutinho, Ballantyne and Rate, 2011:105) of the tourist therefore examining other platforms was necessary. Looking at online platforms such as social media
and websites was productive and gave a deeper insight into tourists’ accessibility and TO awareness and promotional skills as online purchasing of package holidays has become more popular (Moller and Schuckert, 2006).

3.4 Reliability and Validity
“When we discuss reliability we are describing a quality of something or someone that is ‘dependable’ or ‘trustworthy’” (Giannatasio, 1999:145). Babbie (2002) outlined a definition of reliability describing it as “a matter of determining whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, will yields the same result each time” (Babbie, 2002:79). In order to produce a reliable study, triangulation can be used.

3.4.1 Triangulation
The use of a literature review, a survey and a content analysis is used during data collection and analysis for this dissertation. Using of a combination of data sets is called triangulation – a method involving the identification of similar results from different types of data (Trauth, 2001). Figure 3.1 shows a model of triangulation showing how each source can support another.

![Figure 3.1: Triangulation (Blankenship, 2010:122).](image)

This mixed methods approach will assist in answering multiple questions (Markula and Silk, 2011) using a vast range of data and therefore triangulation is known to increase validity of a study (Choi, 2001; Greene, 2007).
Furthermore, Yin (2003) outlined that use of case studies will improve the qualitative aspect of this project by increasing validity.

### 3.4.2 Validity

“Any component of a research study that introduces questions or raises doubts about the quality of the research process or the accuracy of the research results is a threat to validity” (Gravetter and Forzano, 2011:168). Lincoln and Guba (1985) concluded that in order for a project to be valid, it must be reliable; thus the use of triangulation makes the study both valid and reliable.

### 3.5 Ethics

Before conducting any form of research, the consideration of ethics must take place. At Cardiff Metropolitan University, any form of research needs to be authorised by the University’s Ethics Committee otherwise, the researcher cannot carry out the data collection; whether primary or secondary.

In order to gain authorisation, the researcher completed an ethics form, including all the considerations needed to ensure the study was ethical. This was approved and the researcher was delegated an ethics number (see Appendix 3).

### 3.6 Conclusion

After analysing both the strengths and weaknesses of the two types of data collection, the researcher found using a mixed methods approach would be best due to the advantages and disadvantages of each counteracting each other. The use of both a survey and a content analysis will generate all the information needed to create a valid conclusion.

Ensuring ethical, validity and reliability issues are minimised through the chosen data collection techniques will create a successful survey.

Upon reflection, the content analysis went well as the information was already existing and therefore analysing and discussing it was simple. Problems raised for the researcher when trying to carry out the quantitative research. Trying to stop people in a public place was difficult and could seem intimidating to participants. Collecting surveys therefore took longer than expected. Because of this, if the researcher carried out quantitative research
in the future, they would create an online survey as it is less intimidating for partakers.
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Chapter 4: Research, Analysis and Discussion

4.0 Introduction
The current chapter encloses the results found during the primary research stage. The data was collected with the use of a survey and a content analysis. The survey was distributed and completed by 100 respondents and was designed to gain consumer insight on the All-Inclusive (AI) holiday and, to assess their awareness of the impacts the holiday type has on the host destination. The content analysis will focus on the most influential stakeholder, the tour operator (see Chapter 2), assessing both their websites, social media and brochures to discover what they are doing to support the host destination. In addition, the researcher examined the accessibility to the information the tour operators (TO) provide for the consumer.

As the completion of Objective A, B and C was carried out in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 respectively, this chapter will aim to answer the remaining objectives;

(D) To compare the findings of the research to the literature in order to evaluate All-Inclusive tourists and tour operator’s accessibility and awareness of sustainability.

(E) To develop a best practice model for tour operators to assist them in developing and communicating their sustainability practices.

Following this, the quantitative surveys and qualitative content analysis will be used to analyse the literature further and help the researcher draw valid conclusions.
4.1 Survey Results, Analysis and Discussion

4.1.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

The first question asked the age of the participant. As stated in Objective B, there should be a range of tourists answering the questions in order to gain a random sample. The survey results show that the greatest number of participants were from the age bracket 45-54 in which 28 of the 100 participants belonged. Following this, the 35-44 age bracket with 25 participants, the 18-21 bracket with 17 people, 55-64 bracket with 13 and 22-34 bracket with 10 participants. The lowest represented age groups were the 65-74 and 75+ age brackets with 6 participants and 1 participant accordingly. This data represents the UK population effectively as the ONS (2016) found that 63.5% of the population in the UK are aged between 16 to 64 and 17.5% are 65 and over.
The pie chart displayed above represents the gender of those person’s whom completed the survey. Out of the 100 completed, 63% were female and 37% were male. Though this seems to create a gender imbalance with survey results, the sex ratio in the UK shows the survey results are similar to the UK population due to a national gender disparity – 96.9 men per 100 women (ONS, 2016).

Figure 4.2: Gender of Survey Participants.

Figure 4.3: Residency of Survey Participants.
Of those surveyed, 100% of the participants were British residents with no other residency being represented in the survey. Though the outcome happened by chance, it gave the researcher a greater understanding of British tourist perception.

4.1.2 Participation in All-Inclusive Activity

Figure 4.4 shows how many of those surveyed have taken part in an AI holiday with relation to a provided definition (See Appendix 2). This was to avoid misinterpretation of what an AI holiday is, as this was a problem found in the literature review (See Chapter 2). The results show 72% have been on an AI holiday and consequently 28% have not been of a holiday of this type. From this result, it is possible to say that AI holidays are a popular holiday type amongst British tourists. The report by McGivney (2017) identified in the literature supports this, stating since the 2008 UK recession AI package holidays have increased in popularity.
4.1.3 Participant’s Actions at the All-Inclusive Resorts

Questions 2 to 7 on the survey ask about partaker’s actions whilst/if visiting an AI resort (See Appendix 2).

![Graph showing participant view towards hotel dining.](image)

Figure 4.5: Participant view towards hotel dining.

Figure 4.5 shows to what extent the participant will dine at the hotel when on an AI holiday. The results found 98 of those surveyed will always dine at the hotel whilst the remaining 2 people would dine at the hotel most of the time. From this it can be said that a great proportion of people will only eat on the hotel premises and not off site. This supports Nagle (1999) and Goldberg et al (2014) who believe the resorts do not integrate with local businesses well, showing a similarity in findings.
Participants were asked if they do/would dine at locally-run restaurants whilst on an AI holiday. The results shown in Figure 4.6 show that 98 people will never dine at local restaurants and 2 people will dine out ‘sometimes’, reinforcing the answers given in Question 2 (See Appendix 2). This result complies with Responsible Travel (2011), with the belief AI tourists have little incentive to travel outside the resort for food as it is included within the initial price of the holiday (Nagle, 1999; Goldberg et al, 2014; Simons, 1997).

Figure 4.6: Participant view towards dining off premises.

Figure 4.7: Participants whom use external/internal sources for excursions.
Figure 4.7 shows the responses to how often the respondent would use the external and internal sources for excursions whilst on an AI holiday.

Series 1, which shows the results from the external excursions, illustrates some participants are willing to take part in excursions run outside of the hotel e.g. locally run trips. The majority (40%) would aim to use external excursion sources ‘most of the time’ and ‘sometimes’ (24%). 10% of respondents would use them ‘always’ and 7% would use them ‘about half the time’. However, 19% of respondents said they have/would never partake in an externally run excursion whilst on an AI holiday.

Series 2, shows participants who would take part in an internally sourced excursions. 30% participants said they would ‘sometimes’ take part in this excursion type, followed by 24% whom responded ‘most of the time’ and 20% who said they would ‘always’ book an internal excursion.

It is noticeable that 19% of respondents chose to never take an excursion of any type. This demonstrates that these people may be focussed of the money-saving aspect of the holiday, noticed by Sharma (2004) and Swarbrooke and Horner (2011) in the literature, and refuse to spend additional money whilst being an AI tourist.

Overall, Figure 4.7 suggests that most tourists are willing to leave the premises and travel beyond the resort on an excursion. Despite Simons (1997) belief that AI resorts discourage tourists to travel outside of the resort, the survey results show that AI tourists are both willing and do book excursion activities both internally and externally whilst on holiday.
Figure 4.8 shows the responses when participants were asked about purchasing local products/souvenirs. All of the respondents said they either would ‘always’ (70%) or ‘most of the time’ (30%) buy local produce even when on an AI holiday.

Similarly, when asked about travelling to see local nature and cultural heritage sites (See Figure 4.9), the responses are comparable. Responses were heavily in agreement that they would/do travel to the sites with 82% of respondents saying they go ‘most of the time’, 16% saying ‘always’ and 2% saying never.
Both Figure 4.8 and 4.9, demonstrate that tourists are willing to travel outside the resort, buy memorabilia and see unique sites to make the trip memorable. This response disagrees with Simons (1997), Nagle (1999) and Goldberg et al (2014) belief that the AI resorts actively discourage holidaymakers to travel outside the resort. The results shown display how there is a demand for people to travel beyond their resort even when travelling All-Inclusively.

4.1.4 Participant Awareness of the Impacts of All-Inclusive Holidays

Questions 8 to 15 were written to access the awareness survey respondents have of the impacts of AI holidays (See Appendix 2). To do this a series of statements about the AI holiday were shown and participants had to respond with how strongly they agree or disagree with the statement in question.

**Economic Impacts**

When asked whether AI resorts provide jobs for the local people, 100% of the respondents ‘strongly agreed’. The results confirm there is a high level awareness that AI resorts create jobs people living in the area. This supports the literature as Christie et al (2014) identifies the resorts have the tendency to locally source people for jobs on the complexes.
Equally, when participants were asked whether AI resorts create an income for the local people, 100\% of the respondents ‘strongly agreed’. This demonstrates a lack of awareness of the respondents as the literature disagrees. Research by Smith and Stewart (2014) found only 20\% of money from this holiday type goes to the local people and their businesses. From this, it could be concluded that tourists are not educated enough and therefore an awareness is needed, confirmed by Lucas (1979) and Marion and Lime (1986).

Figure 4.10 shows respondents answer to the statement ‘people who work at All-Inclusive Resorts are employed all year round’. There is an uneven distribution of results across all possible responses given however, there is a noticeable trend of uncertainty shown by 73\% of the respondents neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement.

The level of uncertainty demonstrated by the results is also portrayed in the literature. Boniface et al (2012) states the resorts are likely to create permanent rather than seasonal work (Boniface et al, 2012) demonstrating that there is no guarantee of job security.
‘All Inclusive resorts provide fair pay for all their workers’ was Question 11 in the survey (See Appendix 2). By looking at the results in Figure 4.11, it is possible to say that most of those surveyed (86%) strongly agree that the resorts distribute fair pay to their workers. This shows that some tourists have a lack of understanding in regards to fair pay in the industry. Pattullo’s (2005) research found, that aside from workers at Sandals resorts, AI resort employees complained of low wages.

![Figure 4.11: Responses to the statement ‘All Inclusive resorts provide fair pay for all their workers’](image)

Social impacts

An understanding of social issues alongside economic and environment will help the researcher help the TO promote complete sustainability. To discover the level of awareness survey respondents were asked to react to each of the following statements

1. ‘All Inclusive resorts force local business to stop operation/shut down’
2. ‘All-Inclusive resorts create a social divide’.

When asked about local business’s closure, respondents had a mixed reaction. 43% ‘strongly agreed’ with the statement, 21% ‘agreed’ and the remainder ‘neither agreed nor disagreed’. The results could demonstrate there is a general awareness of this social issue as the majority of
respondents somewhat agreed with the statement. It could be supported by the literature findings which show media has a great influence (Croteau et al, 2012) over the tourism industry or it could be due to personal experiences whilst on holiday. The Tourist Gaze (TG) is perhaps noticeably ‘unromanticised’ due to the visibility of business closure (Urry, 1999).

It should be noted that the 28% of respondents who have never been on an AI holiday either selected the ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’ answer for this question. These findings demonstrate social impact could be an influencing factor when they are choosing a holiday; therefore TO providing a solution/creating an awareness of this issue may lead to an increased demand in the AI holiday sector.

From the literature review, it was established AI holidays are accused of creating a social divide (Horner and Swarbrooke, 2004). Though several authors recognised this, there is no investigation into tourist awareness of this. Question 15 (See Appendix 2) asked the respondents to determining the agreement with the following statement – AI resorts create a social divide.

38% of the participants disagreed, 12% agreed and the remaining neither agreed nor disagreed. From this it could be conclude that the respondents are uncertain of how to respond to this statement as none of the 100 participants strongly agreed or disagreed.

John Urry’s TG could also be the reason for this. Because of the glamorised image portrayed, the tourist’s gaze has the tendency to avoid issues within the destination. This is due to TO attempt to attract a person to a destination (Urry, 1999; Lubbe, 2000). As a result, tourists do not see problems within the destination such as a social divide.

**Environmental Impacts**

Figure 4.12 shows participants response to the statement ‘All-Inclusive resorts create environmental issues such as water inequality’. The results show that 62% of respondents either strongly disagreed or disagreed with this statement. Additionally, 11% agreed or strongly agreed and the outstanding 27% neither agreed nor disagreed.
According to the literature, there is research to suggest there are negative environmental impacts associated with the AI holiday (Weeden and Boluk, 2014). Knowing this, it is clear there is minimal awareness of the impacts created which could be a results of Urry’s theory of the tourist gaze (Urry, 1990).

Additionally, the literature found that Lucas (1979) and Marion and Lime (1986) believe tourists are aware of physical and visible impacts such as increased litter. Hammitt, Bixler and Noe (1996) also argued some tourists do have knowledge of sustainability and Patterson (2015) found that consumers are becoming increasingly aware of their environmental impact. This proposes that tourists do have an environmental awareness, however the survey results do not reflect this.

4.1.5 All-Inclusive Tour Operators and their Influence on the Tourists
Discovering how much influence TO have on tourist choice is essential in order to create a successful best practice model (Objective E). Questions 16 to 20 were created in order to find the true extent of TO influence and what methods are best to communicate sustainability initiatives to the tourists (See Appendix 2).
Question 16 asked the participants whether they would take an alternative holiday type rather than AI (See Appendix 2). Of the 72% of participants whom have been on an AI Holiday, 97% would only ever take an AI holiday in the future. This demonstrates a loyalty to the AI holiday once they have participated in the holiday type, perhaps insinuating these tourists the ‘individual mass tourist’ or the ‘organised mass tourist’ as identified by Plog (1974). Of the 28% who have never been on an AI holiday, half-board and bed and breakfast were most popular. This shows a package deal is popular but there is a factor which is deterring these respondents from booking an AI package holiday.

Figure 4.13 asks respondents about TO and sustainability. The question asks participants “If tour operators such as Thomson, Thomas Cook and Virgin Holidays provided easy access to information about what the AI resorts do to help the community in relation to sustainability, would you read and consider it before booking a trip?”

![Figure 4.13: Respondents willingness to read and consider tour operator's sustainable practices.](image)

60% of respondents said they would look at sustainability practices, 33% said they may consider it and 7% responded that they would not look at sustainability before booking a trip. This can be seen as supporting Gossling.
and Hickler (2006) who believe tourists are becoming more sustainably aware.

When asked whether the participant would be surprised if TO already offer access to information regarding sustainability, 60% of the responses strongly agreed with the remaining 40% selecting disagree. Interestingly, of the participants who have never been on an AI holiday, all strongly agreed with the statement showing there is a lack of awareness. Research in literature review supports this argument, noting TO need to make their sustainable initiatives more visible to tourists (Bernini et al, 2015).

Figure 4.14 identifies which methods of communication is best to translate ethical and sustainable practices from the tour operator/hotel to the tourist. By looking at the results it is possible to say, handout at offices/shops, handouts at the resort and online advertising are most popular amongst the participants. Miller and Twinning-Ward (2005) found that TO believe they have no influence outside of their offices. However, the findings shown in Figure 4.14 show TO brochures/handouts and online communication are the most influential demonstrating TO are not communicating sustainability across to the customer efficiently (Bernini et al, 2015; Cooper and Erfurt-Cooper, 2011).

Figure 4.14: Which methods of communication are best to promote sustainable practices?
Following the outcome of the previous question, participants were asked to outline what information they would like included in the chosen method (See Figure 4.15). Participants ideas varied however, the most popular, with 45%, was to include all of the methods mentioned. This includes facts and figures, recommendations of local restaurants, water reduction ideas, ideas to help give back to the locals and recommendations of local shops. Additionally, the information of ideas to help give back to the community gained 32% of the votes followed by fact and figures with 19%.

From this, it is clear the majority of respondents would like to physically help the locals by either giving back to them or finding ways which they can reduce their impact on the locals. In the literature review, Gössling et al (2009) identifies the importance of educating tourists yet no literature identifies what tourists are willing to do. This question answers that and shows the extent tourists will go to, to help.

Figure 4.15: Information participants wish to be included in marketing method.
4.2 Content Analysis Results, Analysis and Discussion

This section will assess Thomson, Virgin Holidays and Thomas Cook’s sustainability approach and how it is translated across several media platforms. Appendix 4 displays the content analysis tables carried out for each of the TO whereas the following section will analyse and discuss the results with relevance to the literature. When analysing the websites, brochures and social media, the researcher will look both tour operator’s sustainability awareness and portrayal and tourist’s accessibility to sustainability information.

4.2.1 Tour Operators Websites

The following section outlines what the TO do to be sustainable, if anything, and will assess how accessible it is for a potential tourist to locate the information on sustainability.

Thomson

Upon analysis of the Thomson website, it is noticeable Thomson do not provide direct access to a sustainability page. It is not easily located and a customers whom would use this website would not find the sustainability page without searching for it. The researcher found the sustainability content of the company under an unrelated link located at the bottom of the page called ‘2017 TUI Group’ (See Figure 4.16).

![Figure 4.16 – Screenshot of Thomson Website (Thomson, 2017).](image)

Unlike the other TO under analysis, Thomson is subsidiary of the travel group, TUI (Thomson, 2017). This could possibly be the reason sustainability programs are not directly linked the website. Furthermore, once the user has
established Thomson is part of TUI, it takes three clicks to reach the sustainability page.

The sustainability page brings the users attention to social, economic and environmental impacts. It is noticeable Thomson are part of several schemes to ensure they are helping the host destinations to the best of their ability; they aim to minimise their “ecological footprint, respect cultures and people and promote economic development in the host countries” (Thomson, 2017).

To do this, Thomson invest in young persons within the destination to solve social problems, implement energy saving schemes to help environmentally and employ local people to dampen economic problems. However Thomson fail to educate tourists on what they can do to help which ignores the 32% of tourists who would do this whilst on holiday, as found in the survey.

Thomas Cook

The Thomas Cook website is easy to navigate in order to find the sustainability page. However, the sustainability link is located at the bottom of the opening screen which means customers will not find it if they are looking at the screen at a glance. Once at the bottom of the screen, the researcher found a link called ‘Sustainable Tourism’ which takes the user directly to an address in which tourists can find all information necessary on the company’s sustainability scheme.

Thomas Cook have both an assessment of the all impacts they implement on the environment and ways they are attempting to address these issues. Unlike Thomson, Thomas Cook provide detailed information on how tourists can be involved with helping reduce the impacts at the host destinations; satisfying the 77% of survey respondents who would like this information to be included when TO communicate their ethical and sustainability schemes.

However, it is noticeable that Thomas Cook are inconsistent throughout their website in regards to their sustainability policy. The company are seen to encourage tourists to book excursions through local businesses on their sustainability page however, on the Thomas Cook Blog (which can be found directly through the website), they encourage tourists to book with TO only.
Figure 4.17 shows Thomas Cook attempting to encourage tourists to use their excursions rather than local excursions because they do not provide the “same degree protection or quality assurance” (Thomas Cook, 2014).

Virgin Holidays

The Virgin Holidays’ website provides a link located at the bottom of the page, similar to both Thomson and Thomas Cook. The link is titled Responsible Tourism and takes the user directly to detailed information of sustainability in one click.

Once at the page, there is detailed information about the social, economic and environmental impacts the TO has and how they are adjusting themselves to reduce this e.g. Virgin Holidays are part of a scheme called ‘Switch Off – Save Big’ whom encourage the Caribbean hotels who they are in partnership with, to save energy.

Though Virgin Holidays have schemes in place, it is noticeable that they tend to be focussed in specific destinations rather than company-wide scheme. Virgin Holidays offer scholarship schemes to people in the Caribbean only as well as only implementing the Switch Off – Save Big campaign in that destination also. This is inconsistent with other aspects of the website which uses phrases such as “promise to give back to the communities” (Virgin Holidays, 2017) which insinuates all communities will benefit.

Website Translation and the Tour Operators

The acknowledgement of social, economic and environmental impacts on the TO website show the three TO acknowledge the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) theory. This also further supports Gössling et al (2009) belief that TO are
aware of what sustainability is. However, it concludes that Font and Cochrane (2005), Miller and Twinning-Ward (2005), Lubbe (2000) and Swarbrooke (1999) belief that sustainability is less of a priority as neither correct nor incorrect. The fact sustainability is addressed shows that it’s a priority of the company’s however the varied accessibility to the information on the topic does not reflect this.

4.2.2 Tour Operators Social Media
Though all investigated TO seem to be both aware and provide access to sustainability pages via their websites, social media is used to communicate with customers online. This section investigates the TO as how they converse their sustainability efforts on the social media platforms, Twitter and Facebook.

Thomson

The results from the content analysis show that of 254 Twitter posts published in a 6 month time frame, only 6 were related to sustainability (Thomson, 2017). Of those 6 Twitter posts, all of them related to social sustainability with no posts published on economic or environmental sustainability within that time frame (Thomson, 2017).

Figure 4.18: Thomson Hotel Dining Twitter Post (Thomson, 2017).
Despite Thomson recognising sustainability on Twitter, there are elements of contradiction. A post on Thomson’s Twitter (See Figure 4.18), shows the tour operator encouraging tourists to dine at hotel restaurants. It is this inconsistency which may be the reason why tourists choose to dine on site rather than at local restaurants (See Figure 4.5).

Of 75 Facebook posts made in the same time frame, 6 of the posts were related to sustainability; and of those, all were encouraging social sustainability through encouragement of tourists to travel beyond their resorts in particular destinations.

Thomas Cook

Upon analysis of Thomas Cook’s social media platforms, it is noticeable sustainability is not translated well. Of 193 Twitter posts Thomas Cook published, 5 related to sustainability, of which 4 attempt to encourage tourists to be socially aware and 1 is related to environmental sustainability (Thomas Cook, 2017).

On the other hand, of 119 Facebook posts made in the same given time frame, 5 related social sustainability and 2 looked at economic sustainability (Thomas Cook, 2017).

Virgin Holidays

The Virgin Holidays’ social media analysis concluded that of 358 Twitter posts, 15 were related to sustainability and of 80 Facebook posts, 1 mentioned a sustainability related topic (Virgin Holidays, 2017).
Each of the Twitter posts related to sustainability were focussed on social impacts. Though not directly demanding the customer to travel beyond the resort, Virgin Holidays are proposing an itinerary to tourists which has the potential for tourists to travel beyond the AI resorts (See Figure 4.19).

**Social Media Translation and the Tour Operators**

From each tour operator, it is noticeable that the sustainability concepts each company hold is not translated across to the customer as well as on social media as it is on their websites. This supports Harms (2010) idea that TO tend to use the Triple Bottom Line theory when convenient for them and is seen as a ‘nice to have’ rather than a necessity. Furthermore, Lubbe’s (2000) idea that TO are under intense competition could be linked to their lack of communication to customers. TO display of a romanticised image (Urry, 1999) to attract customers, does not run alongside addressing sustainability issues and therefore TO could be seen to avoid this when destination marketing is concerned.

**4.2.3 Tour Operators Brochures**

Holiday brochures are a platform in which TO try to sell their holidays to a potential customers. In the brochures there tends to be a variety of information about the resorts on offer and the facilities they have. This part of
the analysis will look at the brochures on offer and whether they give information on sustainability to the user.

Thomson

Upon analysis of an AI Thomson brochure, it is noticeable to the researcher that their sustainability scheme is not presented to the customer. Any information regarding economic, social or environmental sustainability has not been included in the published brochures. The only sustainable information founded by the researcher was on Page 1 whereby, Thomson encourage the brochure user to recycle the brochure or return it to the branch (See Appendix 5) – “Just bring it into a Thomson shop and we will recycle it for you” (Thomson, 2016). This outlines inconsistency throughout Thomson’s media platforms which supports Lovelock and Lovelock’s (2013) statement which outlines the idea that TO need to improve their use of the Triple Bottom Line Theory as well as Harms (2010), suggestion that TO use the TBL when convenient for them.

Thomas Cook

Thomas Cook’s brochure analysis showed no information on sustainability. Despite all the schemes and the sustainable customer involvement scheme shown on their website, Thomas Cook do not use brochures to translate sustainability across to their customers. This could also be seen to support Harms (2010) belief that TO view sustainability as ‘nice to have’. This is because Thomas Cook do have an awareness of sustainability however, they are not promoting this idea across all customer communication platforms.

Virgin Holidays

When studying the Virgin Holidays brochures, the researcher found information regarding sustainability. Clearly labelled in the contents page (See Appendix 6), there is section of the brochure is dedicated to ‘Being Responsible’. This gives the reader an insight into what the company do to help the local people (See Appendix 7). Like the website, the brochures have information on The Branson Centre of Entrepreneurship as well as The Virgin Pledge (Virgin Holidays, 2017). The two schemes mentioned cover both
social and environmental impacts however, they do not solve the economic aspect of the TBL. This supports the literature whereby Standish (2009) states that TO are aiming to put tourist education to the front of their plans, by inspiring tourists to be socially and environmentally aware whilst at the host destination.

**Brochure Translation and Tour Operators**

It is recognised that the TO are not portraying the sustainable schemes they have proposed on their websites across to the customer. As recognised by Lovelock and Lovelock (2013) and Harms (2010), this shows TO need to improve their use of the TBL. Spector (2012) and Allen (2015) support this idea as TO will benefit themselves as well as benefiting the hosts by acting sustainably.
4.3 A Tour Operator's Best Practice Model

From the outcome of both the quantitative survey and the qualitative content analysis, it is clear AI tourists are interested in sustainability as well as the majority showing a willingness to help the host destination. However, the TO investigated show though they have an awareness of sustainability themselves, they are inconsistent in their portrayal of sustainability across different media platforms. Additionally, some evidence shows the TO even contradict themselves on their media platforms. From this, the researcher believes creating a best practice model for TO to use will help the companies have structure to their sustainable initiatives and ensure it is reaching all potential customers, whether online or in-store.

The model shown in Figure 4.20 is the best practice model the researcher has created in order for TO to ensure their sustainability practices reach all customers. The model is an extension of the Conceptual Framework, shown in Figure 2.2, and uses both feedback from survey respondents and analysis of the TO.

The model starts with the three issues John Elkington founded to create the Triple Bottom Line theory. From these issues, the tour operator should establish reduction strategies to create a sustainable practice.

Once this has been done, the TO should translate their sustainable practice across the three media platforms – social media, websites and brochures. Consistency across all communication platforms is key as it is clear from the primary research that those who tourists book and search for holidays online will find information on sustainability effortlessly.

The final stage in the model shows how TO should communicate their ideas to the public using the most popular methods founded in the quantitative survey i.e. online and using handouts. It is important tourists can access sustainability information on websites and in brochures with ease as well as have regular communication about the topic on social media.
Figure 4.20: Conceptual Framework: Tour Operators Best Practice Model.
4.4 Conclusion

The results, analysis and conclusion chapter found data on tourist perception on AI holiday impacts and TO role in sustainability.

The quantitative data collection looked at both tourist’s actions on an AI holiday and tourist awareness of the AI holiday. From the participant’s responses, it is noticeable that most AI tourists do act sustainably. They were found to carry out activities beyond the resort showing their willingness to travel outside of the AI complex. This shows AI TO promotion of sustainability will not be severely affected by an increase in awareness of the impacts of the holiday type as tourists already do or would travel outside the resort but, still choose to holiday All-Inclusively.

Additionally, the survey results demonstrated the need for tourists to be educated of their impacts whilst on an AI holiday. When asked to respond to a series of statements, it was recognisable that tourists had a lack of awareness of their impacts i.e. 86% of respondents believe AI resorts provide fair pay for all their workers.

However, it was identified that most of those surveyed show an interest in sustainability whilst on holiday; thus are willing to contribute to the host destination. The survey also found that tourist are unaware of TO sustainability schemes as 60% were ‘shocked’ to find there are schemes in place to reduce environmental, social and economic impacts in the host destination.

The conclusion from the content analysis confirms that TO do have knowledge on sustainability. This conflicts with the literature review where it was established TO have more important priorities over sustainability practices (Miller and Twining-Ward, 2005; Lubbe, 2000). However, the accessibility of sustainability information to tourists is inconsistent. The majority knowledge about sustainability is only shown on TO websites and, across social media and brochures, the sustainability policies are either minimal or non-existent.
Being consistent, and using the internet and handouts, was identified as the main choices of communication from the tourists themselves. From this, it is clear that if TO had a model to ensure the sustainability practices reached tourists, it would implement positive impacts onto the host destination through increased awareness.
Chapter 5:
Conclusion

1.0 Introduction.................................................................64
5.1 Summary of Aim and Objectives and Key Findings..................64
5.2 Recommendations..........................................................65
  5.2.1 Industry Recommendations........................................65
  5.2.2 Recommendations for further study...............................66
5.3 Conclusion........................................................................67
Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.0 Introduction
In this chapter, the researcher will conclude the findings established during the study. Additionally, the researcher will summarise the success and flaws within the research and make suggestions for future research.

5.1 Summary of Aim and Objectives and Key Findings
As a result of research undertaken, it is apparent that raising customer awareness of the impacts of the All-Inclusive (AI) holiday would lead to positive effects on the host destination.

The dissertation aim was ‘an investigation into tourist perception of the AI holiday and sustainability and their accessibility to information on sustainability through UK tour operators (TO).’

To satisfy this aim, the researcher created five key objectives (See Chapter 1). Objective A involved critically reviewing the literature surrounding topic of study. This aim was achieved as the researcher recognised trends and imbalances in author’s thoughts and opinions of each identified topic. The outcome of this objective then formed a basis in which the researcher could refer back to for the rest of the study.

Objective B aimed to use quantitative data collected in primary research to survey a range of tourist’s perceptions on AI holidays and sustainability. From the successful collection of 100 surveys, this aim was achieved. The survey results concluded that the majority of those surveyed chose do travel beyond their resorts however, most refuse to go beyond the resorts for food. The survey also found that AI tourists had an interest in sustainability. From this the researcher believes if communication between the TO and the tourists was stronger, the negative impacts of AI holidays could be reduced by tourists being aware of their influence in the host destination.

Objective C was to investigate Thomson, Thomas Cook and Virgin Holidays communications to their customers of their sustainability practices using a qualitative content analysis. It was discovered that although TO have an awareness of sustainability on their websites, they are inconsistent in their
portrayal to the customers through social media and brochures. Furthermore, Thomas Cook and Thomson were both found to contradict themselves on their media platforms. This confirms that Objective C was answered successfully.

The successful completion of Objective D, a comparison in the findings of the research to the literature, was also achieved. The results shown in Chapter 4 confirmed aspects of the literature as well as identifying disparities. This objective further confirmed that sustainability is recognised by both tourists and TO however, TO are not promoting it well to their customers.

The final Objective (E) was to create a best practice model for TO to assist them in developing and communicating their sustainability practices. This objective was achieved by using the results from the study to create the Tour Operator Best Practice Model (See Figure 4.20). Combining both the Triple Bottom Line sustainability theory and primary research results, the researcher was able to create a model in which a tour operator could use to raise awareness of sustainability to their customers thus improve the lives of the people in the host destination.

5.2 Recommendations
Throughout the study, the researcher found ways in which they believe the industry could improve to solve the problem posed in this study. Additionally, the researcher’s study did have some restrictions and constraints in regards to the data collection potentially creating access for further study.

5.2.1 Industry Recommendations
What the researcher found interesting from the study is the outcome of the TO content analysis. Discovering how inconsistent the TO are in regards to their communication of sustainability practices, outlined the need for them adjust their approach to managing and portraying sustainability schemes to tourists.

As founded in the literature review and primary research, TO have a major role to play in the tourism industry, therefore sustainability exposure is critical for success. Ignoring or contradicting these issues on social media, websites and brochures look unattractive to potential AI tourists in the future; as survey responses show tourists have a clear interest in sustainability.
To change, the researcher recommends the tourism industry as a whole needs to adapt its approach to sustainability. This is supported by the lack of information and understanding of sustainability from the literature review, in regards to both TO and the industry as a whole.

5.2.2 Recommendations for further study
It is clear the researcher feels the aim and objectives of this study were met (See Section 5.1). However, the researcher identified throughout the investigation there were stages which could be supported by further research. Reflecting on the quantitative data collected from the tourist survey, it was evident there could be an additional research process which could involve in depth interviews with tourists to find out why they have their beliefs i.e. why they chose to source their excursions internally rather than externally. This could strengthen the outcome of this dissertation further.

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the researcher chose to use a mixed method approach. This approach was believed to be the best as Matsuo (2005) believed the weaknesses of one method, surveys, can be offset by the strengths of the other method, content analysis. Though this ensured the results were valid, it was a time consuming process as a large amount of potential participants were unwilling to take part thus, data took longer to collect. If the researcher had started the data collection earlier in the academic year, they could have conducted the research at the TO offices to ensure all those taking the survey had an interest in Al holidays. This may have led the researcher to a more valid conclusion.

Additionally, the study only looked at three TO whom offer the Al holiday package. If more time was available, an analysis of more Al TO may have provided a more valid conclusion.
5.3 Conclusion

In conclusion the researcher believes the aim and objectives of the study were fully met. Though the researcher understands there were areas for improvement, the researcher believes the dissertation was a success.

From the study, the researcher has gained a great amount of knowledge in the topic area. The conduction of the dissertation has been influential on the researcher’s learning by teaching them how to work under time restrictions. The study has therefore helped the researcher’s time management skills which will be beneficial in their chosen career path of teaching.

As for the outcome of dissertation itself, the researcher found it informative. The content analysis provided an eye-opening reality check in regards to how inconsistently sustainability is portrayed by the TO. The contradictions found within websites, as well as the lack of interaction through social media and brochures, shows how confusing this may be for tourists. Though this made the study more interesting to research, the researcher believes this issue is a serious matter and should be addressed; as doing so will benefit the host destination positively.

To close, the researcher’s study shows that an increase in tourist awareness of impacts of the AI holiday, through TO, will impact host destinations positively. As tourists are willing to comply with the Triple Bottom Line (TBL), TO raising a greater awareness of sustainability through their media platforms (See Figure 4.20) will benefit the hosts, via the reduction of negative impacts.
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