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Annex A: Methodology

**Qualitative research**

The approach taken in this project was qualitative, rather than quantitative. In qualitative research participants are encouraged to give a full description of their activities, experiences, and views, and to explain the reasons underpinning them, rather than answering preset closed questions.

Qualitative research is valuable for several reasons. Firstly, it retains the participant’s point of view in its original expression. Secondly, it obtains detailed responses so that understanding is gained of factors that affect activities, experiences, and views. Thirdly, it allows unexpected issues to emerge because activities, experiences and views are discussed in an open ended way. Fourthly, it allows complex interrelationships and the context of activities, experiences and views to be explored. It is therefore ideally suited to qualitative research such as this project.

In qualitative research it is not meaningful to report the number of participants expressing particular views or describing particular experiences. This is because of the small size of the sample and the purposive way in which it is selected (described below). Also in focus groups not every participant is asked to comment on every issue. Therefore only a very broad indication of prevalence is possible in terms of overall recurrence of issues and the factors underpinning them.

1.1 Great care needs to be taken when generalising from qualitative research¹. This annex highlights features of the research design that may limit the inferences that can be drawn. For validation, we would refer to the findings from the leisure and tourism literature (see Annex B) and the other project in Defra’s research programme. These are broadly consistent with the findings from this project.

---

**Focus groups**

Focus groups are useful when discussing issues that participants may not have given much thought to before, such as sustainable leisure and tourism. Comments from one participant can prompt others to have ideas that would not have occurred to them outside the group context. Focus groups may also be useful when information that is new to participants is presented.

**Selection and recruitment of participants**

14 focus groups were carried out with participants, six on leisure and eight on tourism. The location and composition of the focus groups were planned to ensure that a wide range of views and experiences would be heard. Characteristics of focus group participants are summarised in Tables A1 and A2 below.

Participants were recruited by a professional recruiter, working to a quota set by the researchers. Eight participants were recruited for each focus group. The recruitment questionnaires are shown in Annex C.

The leisure focus groups were held in the following locations, with two focus groups in each: Brighton (south east, urban area in small city), Leeds (north, suburban area in large city), Chipping Sodbury (south west, rural area). The tourism focus groups were held in the following locations, with two focus groups in each: Bournemouth (south west, small airport very nearby), Brighton (south east, large airport fairly nearby), Manchester (north, large airport very nearby), Watford (south east, large airport fairly nearby).

There were separate focus groups for high and low income households, using housing tenure as a rough proxy for income. All groups included men and women, a range of ages (except for one group composed of 16 to 21 year olds), participants with different levels of activity and views about environmental issues (except for one group composed entirely of ‘green activists’ as defined below), different day trip or holiday frequencies, different recent holiday destinations (tourism groups). This question was incorrectly answered in several of the recruitment questionnaires so is not recorded in Table B2. Although still within target, overall in the leisure focus groups there
were considerably more men than women and almost half of participants had made 11 or more outings in the last 12 months.

The following three groups of people were not included in the focus groups because it was felt that communication and behaviour change strategies would be more effectively focused elsewhere in the immediate future. The needs of these other parties will be clarified in ongoing Defra research.

- People who had not taken an outing in the last year (leisure focus groups) or had not taken a holiday in the last two years (tourism focus groups)
- People who had not flown in the last year for environmental reasons (tourism focus groups)
- People who are not at all interested in the environment (in the ‘disinterested’ environmental segment as defined below) There were in fact many participants in the sample with very little interest in the environment but they were classified as ‘long term restricted’ or ‘basic contributors’ rather than ‘disinterested’.

Environmental segments

The recruitment questionnaires included a question intended to allocate participants to Defra’s environmental segments. This question was based on recruitment questionnaires used by other projects in Defra’s research programme on public understanding of environmental issues. Participants were shown seven statements and asked which most closely reflected their beliefs. Each statement related to one of Defra’s environmental segments. The statements described how much people did for the environment and mentioned a distinguishing characteristic associated with each environmental segment (future intentions, motivations, or barriers to pro-environmental behaviour). The statements were:

- I don’t really do anything for the environment and I don’t see any reason to start. (Disinterested)
- I do my bit for the environment but I don’t think that people like me can make much difference. (Basic contributor)
• I do my bit for the environment but I can’t do more because there are
too many other things to think about. (Long term restricted)

• I do what I can for the environment and I will do more soon, when I
have the time and money. (Currently constrained)

• I do what I can for the environment but I draw the line at making large
changes to my lifestyle. (Consumer with conscience)

• I do what I can to use resources carefully because I don’t like waste.
(Wastage focused)

• I do everything I can for the environment, even if this means putting
myself out. (Green activist)

Definition of leisure and tourism

For the leisure groups, participants were asked about day trips defined as
activities carried out outside the home, for pleasure, taking at least ½ day,
with no overnight stay away from home. For the tourism, they were asked
about holidays defined as going away from home, for pleasure, with at least
one overnight stay.
### Table A1. Background information about leisure focus group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Sodbury</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social housing tenants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupiers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic groups including black</td>
<td>Minimum 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>Minimum 12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 60</td>
<td>Maximum 24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>Minimum 12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Minimum 18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minimum 18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental segment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterested</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic contributor</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term restricted</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently constrained</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer with conscience</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastage focused</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green activist</td>
<td>Minimum 6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day trip frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No day trips in last 12 months</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 day trips in last 12 months</td>
<td>Minimum 12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 day trips in last 12 months</td>
<td>Maximum 24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more outings in last 12 months</td>
<td>Minimum 12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2. Background information about tourism focus group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td>Social housing tenants</td>
<td>Minimum 24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupiers</td>
<td>Minimum 24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tenure/not known(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>Ethnic groups including black</td>
<td>Minimum 4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>Under 30(^3)</td>
<td>Minimum 24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 60</td>
<td>Maximum 24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>Minimum 16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Minimum 24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Minimum 24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental segment</strong></td>
<td>Disinterested</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic contributor</td>
<td>Minimum 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term restricted</td>
<td>Minimum 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently constrained</td>
<td>Minimum 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer with conscience</td>
<td>Minimum 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastage focused</td>
<td>Minimum 8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green activist(^4)</td>
<td>Minimum 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday frequency(^5)</strong></td>
<td>No holidays in last 2 years</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or fewer holidays in last 12 months</td>
<td>Minimum 16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 holidays in last 12 months</td>
<td>Maximum 32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more holidays in last 12 months</td>
<td>Minimum 16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The group of 16-21 year olds were not asked about tenure. Some participants living in other tenures were mistakenly recruited.

\(^3\) One focus group in Brighton was composed entirely of 16-21 year olds

\(^4\) One focus group in Brighton was composed entirely of green activists

\(^5\) People who had not flown in the last 12 months for environmental reasons were excluded
**Procedure for focus groups**

The focus groups were guided by two moderators. The discussion covered the issues listed in the topic guides (Annex D). Participants were encouraged to talk freely around the issues, rather than being asked a series of preset closed questions. The topic guide listed open questions and issues to cover. After asking each open question, the moderators prompted participants to ensure that key issues were discussed and probed to ensure that participants’ views were fully explored. The moderators directed the discussion so it broadly followed the order of issues shown in the topic guide, although there was some flexibility to respond to issues raised by participants.

The focus groups included two card sorts of leisure or tourism destinations and activities. The materials used in the card sort are described below (see materials) and included in Annex E (leisure) and Annex F (tourism). Participants were asked to sort the cards first by desirability and later by environmental impact. Having sorted the cards on their own, participants were asked to explain their thinking to the group.

To see if information changed participants’ views, they were told about the impact of travel to different destinations by different modes of transport. This information was given towards the end of the focus groups. In the leisure focus groups, a sheet of printed information was handed out to participants and then read out by a moderator. In the tourism focus groups, information was printed on the back of the cards used in the card sort. Participants were asked to turn over several of the cards while a moderator read out the information. The information is described below (see materials) and included in Annex G (leisure) and Annex H (tourism).

There was some concern about the reliability and validity of the environmental segment statements used in the recruitment questionnaire. Therefore towards the end of the focus groups, participants were each given a sheet showing the environmental segment statements and they were asked to explain which statement most closely reflected their beliefs. These explanations, other views expressed in the focus groups, and answers at recruitment were combined to classify participants into environmental segments for the purpose of analysis, rather than relying entirely on the recruitment questionnaire.
The focus groups lasted two hours. They were held in hotels, with the venues chosen to be easy for participants to reach and comfortable without being intimidating. An incentive of £40 cash was given to each participant.

**Material for focus groups**

*Cards*

12 photographs of tourism destinations and activities and 11 photographs of leisure destinations and activities were used for the card sort. The photographs are shown in Annex E (leisure) and Annex F (tourism).

The photographs were chosen to include some destinations and activities that support Defra’s behaviour goals, as well as some that do not, for comparison purposes. Defra’s behaviour goals that were not addressed through the photographs (i.e. using cars less, and travelling less/combining travel) were fully discussed in the focus groups nevertheless.

The leisure photographs included:

- Activities making use of nearby green spaces (walking in the countryside for rural participants, picnic in the park for urban/suburban participants) and activities that require travelling further afield
- Activities that are likely to contribute a great deal to the local economy (e.g. farmers markets) and activities that are likely to contribute less (e.g. shopping centres)
- Outdoor activities (e.g. walking in the countryside, picnic in the park, bird watching) and indoor activities (e.g. shopping centre, museums and galleries)

The tourism photographs included:

- Domestic, short haul and medium/long haul holidays of the same type (beach holiday, city break, activity holiday)
- Destinations that could be reached easily without flying (Cornwall, Scotland, France) and destinations that could not (the rest)
- Holidays that involve outdoor activities (golf, skiing and trekking) and holidays that do not (city breaks, EuroDisney, wine tasting)
• Activities with a negative impact on biodiversity (e.g. golf, cruise)

• Activities that are likely to contribute a great deal to the local economy (e.g. wine tasting and trekking) and activities that are likely to contribute less (e.g. EuroDisney)

Information on impacts

The environmental impact of travel was presented in two ways: tonnes of CO₂ emitted from the journey and light bulb weeks (i.e. how long a 100W light bulb would have to be left on to emit the same amount of CO₂ as the journey). There were precedents for presenting information in terms of CO₂ emissions and in terms of everyday equivalents. For instance, a recent DfT advertisement presents carbon savings associated with emptying the car boot. Energy Saving Trust’s energy calculator presents energy consumption in terms of CO₂ emissions as well as several everyday equivalents, including number of dishwasher cycles and number of A4 pages printed on a laser printer.

In the leisure focus groups, the information given to participants showed the CO₂ emissions associated with travel. In the tourism focus groups, it showed the CO₂ emissions associated with travel and also the contribution to the economy of the host country. This information on economic impacts was included because a secondary purpose of the project was to explore public understanding of impacts besides environmental impacts. In fact, due to time constraints, the information on economic impacts was not read out or discussed in the focus groups (except in one group where it was remarked on by a participant).

Information on CO₂ emissions came from the following sources:

• CO₂ emissions from flying were taken from www.climatecare.co.uk

• CO₂ emissions from driving and train journeys were taken from Defra (2005) Guidelines for company reporting on greenhouse gas emissions

• CO₂ emissions from Eurostar were taken from Eurostar’s website www.eurostar.com

The conversion factor for light bulb hours was provided by the Energy Saving
Trust (a 100W lightbulb on for 1 hour uses 0.1kWh, associated with 0.043 kg CO$_2$).


**Data analysis and reporting**

The focus groups were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. This allowed detailed analysis to be carried out and participants’ views to be reported in their own words.

Information from the transcripts was systematically sorted and recorded in thematic matrices. Material relating to each theme was recorded in a column of the matrix and material from each participant was recorded in a row of the matrix. There were seven matrices, one on each of the following issues:

- Personal details
- Everyday pro-environmental behaviour and views about environmental issues in general
- Views about the impacts (environmental and other) of leisure/tourism
- Leisure/tourism experiences i.e. what participants said they had done, enjoyed, not enjoyed etc
- Leisure/tourism aspirations i.e. what participants said they would and would not like to do
- Responses to leisure/tourism behaviour goals i.e. what changes participants said they would be prepared to make
- Requests for government and industry

The matrices were examined to identify key issues; find explanations for particular views; note where differences or consensus existed among participants; and suggest how differences may relate to the characteristics of participants. When looking at differences between participants, two approaches were taken. Firstly, participants’ explanations were noted (for instance, did participants give reasons to suggest why certain behaviour goals were particularly easy or difficult for people with children?). Secondly,
associations between characteristics and activities, experiences and views were examined (for instance, did participants with children tend to mention certain motivations or barriers more or less than other participants?)

As mentioned above, there was some concern about the reliability and validity of the environmental segment descriptions used in the recruitment questionnaire. Therefore additional information was used to check allocation to segments. Markers for the segments, such as level of environmental understanding and concern, were identified. For each participant, their views in relation to the markers were noted from comments in the focus groups; then the markers were compared with environmental segment at recruitment and at the end of the focus group. Where a mismatch occurred between the markers and environmental segment at recruitment or at the end of the focus group, participants were allocated to a more appropriate segment. 19 participants in the tourism focus groups and 13 participants in the leisure focus groups were re-allocated in this way.

Key issues are reported in the text, illustrated by examples or by quotes from the focus groups which are shown in italics. Longer quotes are followed by a brief description of the respondent, sufficient to provide useful background information but to preserve anonymity.
The following summary has been structured according to the behaviour goals established by Defra. A range of academic databases have been searched for this review, plus a review undertaken of the ‘grey’ literature, consisting of reports from government, NGOs, think tanks and consultancy organisations. For the topic, this grey literature was a more fruitful source than academic material, which has largely shunned consideration of public attitudes in preference for examples of the impacts of tourism and more recently on establishing methods for monitoring these impacts. This summary of the literature does not claim to be a complete review of all available sources owing to the nature of the grey literature. Further, this review was conducted during April and May of 2007. Since that time, the issue of sustainability and tourism and leisure has continued to sit high on the political agenda and material has been produced that it was not possible to include in this report.

**Focus on UK as holiday destination**

The international tourism industry has been one of the economic success stories of the post-war period. In 1950 there were estimated to be 25 million international arrivals worldwide, while in 2004 this had increased to 763 million arrivals, an annual increase of 6.5%. International arrivals are predicted to top one billion by 2020, with long haul inter-regional travel expected to grow faster (5.4%) than intra-regional travel (3.8%). Currently, the balance between short haul and long haul tourism is around 82:18, but this is anticipated to shift to 76:24 by 2020 (UNWTO, 2006).

Within the UK £26.4bn was spent by UK tourists in the UK, compared to £28.1bn spent by UK residents abroad in the same period. £16.8bn was spent by overseas tourists visiting England in 2003. The number of trips taken by UK residents in the UK has increased to 151 million in 2003, with 56% of these trips for two nights and less. The average spend per trip is £175 and average spend per night is £45. The effect of September 11th saw a reduction in UK residents taking holidays overseas (and an increase in domestic
tourism), but since 2003 the number of holidays taken overseas has increased to 66.3 million in 2005 (UKTS, 2004).

Tourism relies on disposable income and the number within the UK unable to afford an annual holiday has declined by nearly 50% in the last 6 years (nVision, 2006). Although disposable income may reduce in years to come, evidence shows that tourism has become more important to people and will be prioritised over other non-essential expenditure. Those of higher social grades take more holidays of all types, but take relatively more short breaks than long holidays and are relatively more likely to take overseas holidays than holidays at home. UKERC (2006) found that the number of international leisure trips made from the main UK airports by people earning less than £29,000 p.a. fell between 2000 and 2004. The 2003 British Social Attitudes Survey showed that nearly half of those in professional and managerial occupations flew three times or more per year. UKERC (2006) conclude that the growth in aviation has occurred because more wealthy people are flying more often rather than a new class of traveller being introduced to overseas tourism. Lower social grades are more likely to take longer holidays in the UK, while middle social groups take longer holidays and fewer short breaks, hence higher social grades can be seen to be the bigger impacters. nVision (2006) research shows nearly two-thirds of consumers consider a holiday to be ‘absolutely necessary’ to live properly, a 50% increase since 1993, the highest rated embodiment of luxury. Similarly, 27% of adults are currently saving for a holiday. The rise of non-ostentatious consumption has given rise to an increase in experiential tourism, whereby people want to have new experiences. This may drive the trend for overseas holidays as people strive to experience new cultures and environments. The challenge in promoting domestic tourism is to stress that holidays in the UK can create experiences to match those perceived to be possible abroad.

Research by TripVision shows the younger age groups are more likely to want to travel abroad, with 55% of those up to the age of 25 saying they will travel abroad more. While the research found none of the 66 year old group plan to travel abroad more than they do presently, 46% of those aged 36-45 wanted more overseas travel (TripVision 2006). Of the same group, only 13% of those who holidayed abroad in the preceding 12 months reported the environment being a concern that influenced their choice of destination. Conversely, of those who had only taken a UK holiday in the previous 12 months, 45% stated that environmental issues were a reason behind their choice of holiday
destination. Such a figure is perhaps surprisingly high, and would suggest that people do in fact recognise the impacts of their holidays. Yet, what much of the quantitative research does not distinguish between is those who simply want to enjoy a clean environment, and those for whom the protection of the environment in the places they holiday is a demand motivator.

In terms of who is most likely to stay within the UK for holidays, research by VisitBritain (2004) identified eight groups of UK consumers according to their travel patterns. Of these, three groups the ‘cosmopolitans’, ‘discoverers’ and ‘high streets’ were held to be the most potentially likely groups to persuade to shift towards UK holidays rather than overseas holidays. ‘Cosmopolitans’ take frequent short breaks, as do the discoverers, although this group tend to focus on last minute deals and prefer the UK than overseas, while the ‘high streets’ are more traditional in taking a longer overseas holiday. The research indicated that the built heritage and unspoiled countryside of England were the key strengths to the domestic tourism product, but the beaches and coast, as well as limited ability to see wildlife in its natural setting were identified as weaknesses. Interestingly, the research showed the effect of whether respondents had children as being important in influencing positive attitude towards tourism in England. The research showed that families were not impressed by the range of activities on offer for families in England.

Similar research by nVision (2006) describes five groups of holiday maker, one of whom, the ‘local culture vulture’ shuns overseas holidays in favour of domestic holidays in order to absorb the culture and environment of their destination. This group is 54% male and tends to comprise consumers from higher social grades. The ‘experimenter’ is similarly keen on domestic holidays, but wishes to combine this with overseas holidays. This group of people are also from higher social grades and see tourism as a chance to sample something new and are less driven by price. However, the ‘sunsationalist’ and the ‘escapist’ both wish to take overseas holidays and are drawn from the middle and lower social grades. The research also describes a group of consumers who rarely go on holiday, primarily for financial reasons, but which also includes 10% of the highest social grades who have no interest in travel.

Despite the increasing draw of experiencing the culture of a destination, Mintel (2005) reveals that the guarantee of nice weather is still the second most important factor in determining an enjoyable holiday, after good quality accommodation, and so a driving factor for holidays overseas. Interesting
sightseeing and local cuisine are the third and fourth most important factors. For 35% of the population experiencing a different culture makes the holiday enjoyable (4th highest rank), while for 27% visiting a country or area they have never been to before is what makes the holiday enjoyable (5th highest rank). Such factors set the challenge of promoting domestic tourism in context.

Consumers are looking for new experiences and are able increasingly able to afford to travel abroad to gain this experience. With spending from overseas tourists to the UK stagnating and the threat of terrorism hanging over inbound tourism, domestic tourism represents an important market to support UK tourism and meet the needs of UK consumers. Higher social grades and middle aged consumers represent the most fertile ground for converting short break overseas holidays to short break domestic holidays, but younger consumers represents the most valuable prize as they currently desire overseas holidays most strongly and have their travel careers ahead of them. The relatively high value of the Euro against the pound, and the anticipation of this ratio continuing in the medium term will set the conditions to allow for domestic holidays in the UK to appear good value. Although, the rate of the pound against the US dollar looks set to benefit UK consumers for the medium term, working against the UK domestic tourism industry and in favour of holidays to the US.

**Travelling less/combining travel**

There is very little evidence to suggest that people are willing to travel less often. Indeed, all the evidence presented in part one of this report illustrates the trend is for increased travel, rather than less. UKERC (2006) reports that air travel is growing at 8% p.a. First Choice’s (2005) consumer trends report shows 40% of those surveyed now take two or more holidays per year by plane. While later sections in this review will show that there is some evidence of frequent flyers exhibiting a greater awareness of the impacts of travel, and a greater willingness to act to reduce their impacts, this does not extend to flying less.

As with tourism, trends within leisure point very much towards an increase in leisure time available, and with this, more travel. The Leisure Day Visits Survey for 2002-03 shows 80% of the adult population took a day trip over the previous two week period, giving a total of 5.2bn leisure day visits during
2002/3 and a total expenditure of £71.1bn. However, this number is decreasing as more people travel overseas for short breaks.

It was not possible to find any evidence discussing the willingness of the public to combine travel.

**Choose more sustainable travel methods**

Although the behaviour goals for transport describe tourism and leisure separately, this review will consider them together because of the overlap in reasons why people resist modal change.

Currently, over three quarters of all visits abroad are by air and 64% of all UK air passenger movements are either domestic or to EU15 (nVision, 2006). Shaw and Thomas (2006) argue that although the surge in low cost flying is a recent phenomenon, ‘democratisation is difficult to dampen down’ and make comparisons with the increase in car ownership in the 1960s. However, such a position misunderstands the growth in air travel and presumes the ‘democratisation’ has come from encouraging new people to fly, whereas UKERC (2005) assert that the expansion has been through more affluent people travelling more. The CAA (2006) shows that the average household income for leisure passengers departing by air from Gatwick, Luton and Stansted was over £50k p.a, Research by nVision (2006) show the numbers of British air passengers from DE social groups has declined from 1999 to 2005 with only a small rise in C2 groups, although a relative decline. The largest growth has come from the urban middle classes of the C1 social grade, which now comprises 40% of the flying public, against 43% for the AB group.

However, Shaw and Thomas (2006) do correctly identify the low cost airlines’ targeting of young consumers in order to influence travel patterns for life. Drivers of this phenomenon include increasing disposable income, a reduction in insularity and an increase in exposure to distant sights and sounds through the internet and TV. Research has shown that 16-24 year olds exhibit a desire to gain self-awareness through contact with other societies before they accept the responsibilities of life, employment and becoming a parent (Shaw and Thomas, 2006; Locker-Murphy and Pearce, 1995; Murphy, 2001; Seekings, 1995). Previously this travel was typified by low cost rail, coach and hitch-hiking, but would now appear to have been replaced by low cost air travel. Shaw and Thomas (2006) conducted focus groups with young travellers and
found a high willingness to travel, explained in terms of education, the desire to see new things and to keep in contact with friends and relatives. The research showed little awareness of the impacts of flying or what could be done about it. Where there was limited understanding of the impacts, the respondents described perfectly the tragedy of the commons (Hardin, 1968) whereby the individual is not prepared to make an individual sacrifice for the greater benefit to the wider community. Recognising the paucity of data on this area, Shaw and Thomas (2006:214) conclude, “The tracking of travel behaviour as well as opinions on the sustainability of air travel will be critical over the coming decade”.

For leisure travel, the challenge of modal shift is more typically away from the car and towards public transport, although research by COI and DEFRA (2006) showed little support for willingness to reduce the use of car. Figure 1 identifies the reasons for cutting down on car use, emphasising the need to appeal to personal reasons, rather than collective challenges. The car is by far the most popular mode of transport used for leisure day trips, used for 58% of trips, as opposed to walking (29%). The average distance travelled for trips varied by destination, with people prepared to travel an average of 30 miles to visit the coast, 18.7 miles to visit the countryside and 13.2 miles to visit towns and cities (GB Leisure Day Visits Survey, 2004). Leisure travel accounts for over 40% of all distance travelled and over 30% of all personal trips in the UK (Guiver et al, 2006). Most consumers live the majority of their lives within a 6 mile radius, illustrating the need for local transport solutions. Holidays and leisure represent the main reason why consumers travel more widely, and the trends outlined above have resulted in the UK public now spending more on transport, travelling further and more frequently than ever before.
Cutting down car use

Selected reasons given for cutting down use of car, by gender and age

"What were the main reasons, if any, for cutting down your use of a car for short journeys (during the last 12 months)?"

nVision (2006) evidence a 35% increase in miles travelled across all income groups, with the wealthiest members of the public travelling nearly 12,000 miles per year, but those in the lowest income quintile travelled on average only 4000 miles per year – illustrating the effect of mobility on income and vice versa. Long distance rail travel increased 37.8% from 1996/7 to 2003/4, whereas domestic air increased by 30% over the same period (nVision, 2006). The fact that people are travelling by train represents an opportunity to encourage more people to travel by public transport if the product can address the dissatisfaction users raise. In terms of expenditure, despite the falling cost of flying, there has been a 778% increase in expenditure on air travel from 1971 to 2006 at constant 2003 prices, a 38% increase in expenditure on rail, but a 17% decline in spending on motoring. Expenditure on rail and tube fares as a proportion of weekly expenditure on all transport has increased from 17% in 1989 to nearly 25% in 2005 (nVision, 2006). The
highest expenditure on rail and tube is by those in the highest income decile group.

The Council for National Parks (2006) recognise that for visitors to be attracted out of their cars, a strong public transport brand, good design and distribution of publications and visible marketing are needed. Integration of tickets and timetabling between transport and attraction/destination aids modal shift. Reasons commonly cited for not using public transport include cost, speed, convenience and safety (nVision, 2006). The success of the bus varies inside and outside London. Inside London numbers of bus journeys have increased 60% over the period 1992/3 to 2005.6, whereas outside London there has been a 13% fall in number of bus journeys across the same period. Yet, as a proportion of the distance travelled by all road passenger vehicles, bus and bicycle have declined consistently since 1962 to now be only around 1% each. Online ticketing methods or schemes such as the Oyster card in London offer a solution to the problem of convenience in travel planning.

For rural tourism, visitor attractions are often the only reason for trips to the region, and so are the prime generators of any congestion that accrues as a consequence. Leisure related travel tends to be longer than utility journeys, yet car occupancy will be higher. The ETC (2001) showed that 75% of leisure related journeys are still less than 40 miles in distance, and so presents an opportunity for a change towards public transport. Leisure related travel involves discretion not just as to the mode of travel, but whether to travel at all, and at what time of the day to travel. Leisure facilities will typically involve arrivals during 11am to 3pm and with numbers far greater than most employers. Hence, travel plans, following the examples of large employers represent a potential source of behaviour change for day visitors. Such travel plans might include the provision of information and advice, car park restrictions, improving public transport links, multi-modal tickets, discounted entry and better provision for cyclists and pedestrians (Lumsdon et al, 2006). Yet, Guiver et al (2006) conclude from their research that many visitors choose their travel mode before they decide where they are going to visit. Such a situation could result in those attractions seeking to shift visitors away from private transport suffering a reduction in visitation. In an example of those who had shifted from the car to public transport using a ‘Wayfarer’ ticket in Greater Manchester and the Peak District National Park, parking problems were cited as the number one reason for switching (The Centre for
Environmental Conservation and Outdoor Leisure, 2004). Other factors included the ability to relax and travel stress free, an improved travel experience and the cost of driving. ‘Protecting the environment’ was only cited by 50 people, and ranked 11th as a reason to switch to public transport. The research showed the ticket appealed to older age groups, but also supported the notion that the travel is a large element of the activity, and so to assume it is simply a means to get to the attraction would be to understate its importance. However, with the ability to look at the scenery, read, walk about and also to experience the company of others on public transport means that trains and buses do have the opportunity to promote the experiences possible that are not possible when driving.

Dickinson and Dickinson (2006) report on the potential effect congestion could have for leisure related travel. They argue that the discretionary nature of leisure travel will exacerbate the felt effects of congestion, as opposed to that experienced when driving to work. As such, the effect on leisure providers of congestion could be greater than the effect on workplaces. The need to reduce traffic congestion is well known to the National Trust, who cite dissatisfaction and falling attendances at properties in the South West as being due to an excess of visits utilising private transport (National Trust, 2005). National Parks generate significant leisure traffic, with over 90% of visitors to parks arriving, and travelling around by private car (Council for National Parks, 2006). Additionally, the visual blight of large car parks, noise and air pollution as well as the cost of the infrastructure to cater for the motorist are all reasons to move away from dependence on visits by car drivers. To this end, the National Trust has participated in numerous schemes to reduce their reliance on the car, which include discounted entry for those who have travelled by train, promoting cycle paths, restricting parking and providing more information about access to properties by public transport. Yet, they concede that such measures have ‘only touched a minority of the visitor market’. The belief is that travel planning results in a different type of visitor to the attraction, rather than persuading existing visitors to switch to different forms of transport.

To make a significant difference, National Trust argue sustained funding, of the order beyond private companies, is needed to establish long term commitment to public transport and to enable consumers to become used to the idea of there being alternatives to the car. This is a conclusion supported by the Council for National Parks, who argue that the creation of a ring-fenced
Sustainable Transport Fund would highlight the importance of the issue, but concede currently measures to restrict the use of cars by leisure travellers are a low priority for many National Park Authorities. The National Trust (2005) believe that to reduce reliance on the car it is necessary to improve the infrastructure of public transport, particularly on Sundays, one of the main days when people are wishing to take leisure breaks. The lack of cycle paths and unconnected cycle paths further act to discourage alternatives to the car. They recognise that an opportunity to create a modal switch is to stress the role of the journey as part of the leisure break. Public transport can be seen as part of the experience of the trip, in a way that private transport cannot. Yet, a seven day service is needed for this to be realised, and the network extended and improved to allow for weekend leisure travel to the countryside.

Users of public transport contribute more to the local economy than do car users, and so provide an incentive for the local region and RDAs to advance sustainable leisure plans. One negative perception of using public transport is that it is expensive. A challenge is needed to this perception to remind visitors that the cost of running a car is spread throughout the year, rather than concentrated on one day. However, for public transport schemes to be evaluated fairly, they need to recognise the social benefits and so not be judged purely against economic criteria. Or, if economic criteria are to be used, then the full economic advantage of providing a bus service needs to be assessed. As an example, the Brecon Beacons National Park Authority estimates that the 2526 passengers using the new bus service created an additional spend of £55,572. Similarly, the Moorsbus Network generated an additional £303,444 from the passengers travelling in and around the North York Moors (The Centre for Environmental Conservation and Outdoor Leisure, 2004). Monitoring of a range of performance indicators can provide such services with the ammunition to defend themselves against criticism of high cost and low usage. Monitoring also would enable park authorities to compare themselves and to assess the effectiveness of their actions.

Choose more sustainable activities

There is a plethora of material relating to public attitudes towards the environment in general. More difficult to establish is if, and how, people adjust this awareness for tourism and leisure. Hillery et al (2001) conclude that tourists are not very perceptive of their own impacts on tourism, although to a greater extent they are able to notice direct effects of other tourists, such as litter and vandalism. According to Mintel (2005) 25% of the UK public
recognise that tourism has an impact on the environment and 21% feel tourism can ruin local cultures. As an example, Harriott (2002) held that tourists to the Great Barrier Reef had a poor understanding of the ways in which tourism could impact on the environment, although visitors were sure that there would be negative impacts. Tourists reported a desire for more information about the specific ways in which their behaviour could manifest itself in negative impacts. Hjalager (1999) argues that the lack of information provided to consumers hampers their ability to make informed choices. However, simply requesting more information lacks sophistication. It is important to know what kind of information, when is it required, from whom, about what, in what form and to what end?

Mintel (2005) in their study of ethical holidays identify only 1% (about 450,000 holidays) of all outgoing holidays that could be described as ‘hard eco-tourism’ with a strong emphasis on the environment. Yet, they predict this number rising to 2.5 million by 2010, despite their research showing a 10 percentage point reduction since their 2002 survey in the number of people who rate booking an eco-tour as an important factor. The research does show an increase in awareness of environmental impacts and an increasing interest in the cultural aspects of tourism. Of a suite of statements presented to respondents, issues relating to the environment were only rated 5th and 6th, with preference given to social and economic issues. This finding is consistent with nVision (2006) research who place ‘meeting local people’ and ‘understanding the local culture’ as more important than environmental factors. This evidence does illustrate the opportunity for tour operators to provide holidays that meet consumers’ needs for more authenticity and more experiences on holiday than has traditionally been the case with the beach holiday. Events such as the Asian tsunami may have influenced people’s thinking about the social and economic impacts of tourism. It is clear that there is an interest amongst the public in the impacts of tourism, but that this has not translated into a change in behaviour, or even proactive consumerism. There is an opportunity for tour operators to capitalise on this market, but the consumer needs to be engaged with in a different way to presently. What is ‘authentic’ will be open to debate, but it would appear that tourists are becoming more keen to avoid obviously staged events, and more sophisticated in their understanding of what makes an event authentic.

ABTA (2000) found 64% of consumers who claimed to be willing to pay an extra £10-£25 for their holiday to guarantee its sustainability, yet the same
survey showed that only 17% had decided not to have their towels washed every day for environmental reasons and only 18% switched off the air conditioning to save energy. Mintel (2005) report 19% of holidaymakers who said they were prepared to pay more to use companies that are environmentally friendly, but only 7% of respondents had sought a holiday with an ethical code of practice. Hjalager (1999:16) describes the gap between the general awareness of sustainability by consumers and willingness to make personal sacrifices as ‘considerable’.

Research conducted by Mintel (2005) has led it to devise a typology of four groups of consumers; the ‘ethical holidaymaker’ (17% of adults who have taken a holiday abroad), the ‘aware’ (15%), the ‘self-interested’ (27%) and the ‘unethical traveller’ (41%). The characteristics of the groups are as the names suggest, but even the ethical traveller will include people who just wish to experience something different and to get away from the beaten track. The final two groups stress the importance of the weather and price, but this does not mean that holidays for these groups cannot be more sustainable, just that the consumers themselves will not respond to a sustainability agenda. Indeed, the research by Mintel seems to reflect a view that for holidays to be sustainable the consumer must be driving the agenda and be aware of the issues. Given the high relative impact of the travel component of a holiday, the package holiday in Europe with its high load factors on the planes may be more sustainable than aware eco-tourists flying to Costa Rica on a scheduled flight with lower load factors. The research would appear to show that females are more likely to describe themselves as aware, while males are more likely to be described as self-interested. Similarly, ethical holidaymakers and the more ethically aware are comprised of more people from higher social grades, a finding confirmed by First Choice (2005).

First Choice’s (2005) Consumer Trends report declares the public does not really have any engagement with the term ‘responsible tourism’ although consumers seem aware of some of the negative impacts of tourism, but less so the positive returns. The ABTA (2000) survey of consumer attitudes showed 85% of consumers felt it was important holidays did not damage the environment, and 71% felt tourism should benefit the people in the local destination. These figures had risen to 87% and 76% respectively by the 2002 survey (ABTA, 2002). Yet, this awareness translates into a disappointing level of action, with only 8% having claimed to have taken a company’s environmental performance into account when booking a holiday. While the
survey shows resistance to the idea of flying less, and even paying extra to offset, although there was a greater level of support for actions tourists were prepared to take in resort. 54% were prepared to take public transport, 50% planned to recycle (although 80% recycled at home), 44% were happy to try to consume local brands of food and drink, but still only just over one third were prepared to reduce the amount of times their towels and bed linen was changed, and just under one third would buy souvenirs that would not deplete local resources. Overall, the report demonstrates the relatively low willingness of consumers to act in any way that impinges upon their holiday. Such a position does not make it impossible to introduce sustainability into tourism, but it does mean that relying on customer awareness and demand for sustainable tourism may not be the most effective means of moving forward.

Krippendorf (1987) describes the need for ‘rebellious tourists’ to shake the industry, but Hjalager (1999) believes the tourism industry has not yet been ‘invaded’ by radical expressions of green consumerism. It is clear that consumers are prepared to some extent to do things differently if they are able to recognise the sustainability issue. However, they are not prepared to do different things, regardless of the sustainability concern. Such a position is typical of the ‘weak sustainability’ paradigm described by Baker, Kousis, Richardson and Young (1997) and demonstrates the potential value of ‘choice editing’ to amend behaviour away from the most unsustainable activities.

Choose leisure closer to home

The average distance travelled by UK residents for all day trips in 2002/3 was 35 miles, whereas for those trips to the seaside, the average distance was 61 miles and 41 for trips to the countryside (Star UK, 2007). In 2004 71% of the distance travelled by UK residents for domestic tourism was by car, a percentage that has remained consistent since 2000 after a large rise during the late 1980s (Star UK, 2007; The National Trust, 2005). Similarly, the percentage of distance travelled by train by UK residents for domestic tourism has been fixed at around 13% across the same period. Yet for trips to the countryside the percentage using their car rises to 86% and falls to 69% for trips to the town or cities. Only 2% of arrivals in the countryside were by public transport in 2003 (UKTS, 2004).

Research by nVision (2006) shows that of ten leisure activities, the eight most commonly undertaken are within a very small distance of home. Indeed, only ‘being a spectator at a sports event’ and ‘visit an historic building’ the 9th and
10th items in terms of popularity are likely to be any distance from home. Instead, activities such as going out for dinner, visiting the cinema, going to the pub, taking a walk, doing DIY are all activities most likely to be participated in close to home. When the ABC1 group, and 16-34 year olds are asked about their leisure, the same pattern of behaviour is revealed. Yet, with such an increase in leisure time available, although the activities where there is a larger travel component are relatively few compared to the most popular activities (see figure 2), their absolute number still creates a problem of congestion and emissions. Under 40 year olds will engage in an average of 22 leisure activities per year, a 50% increase within a generation, while adjusted expenditure on out of home leisure has increased from £65bn in 1980 to £144bn in 2005. The percentage of people who regard sufficient leisure time as being essential to live properly has increased since 1992 from 58% to 84% in 2004. According to nVision (2006) 56% of the population will visit an historic building at least one time per year, nearly 50% will visit a museum over the same period, 47% a theatre and 40% an art gallery.

Fig.3 illustrates how far people are prepared to travel for leisure activities compared to their day to day lives. Shopping for clothes, cars and computers, as well as to attend the theatre are all activities people are prepared to travel further than the average commute for, at around eight miles. However, most other activities are less than eight miles – demonstrating the potential for public transport to enjoy heavy patronage if it can not only meet consumer needs, but communicate these changes.
Proportion engaging in specified leisure activities at least once a month

Go to theatre or concerts
Go to the cinema
Do voluntary work
Watch live sport
Attend local groups
Attend evening classes
Go out for a drink
Eat out
Do DIY or auto maintenance
Work in garden
Walk, swim, play sports

Retired
Pre-Retirement

Source: British Household Panel Study/nVision
Base: 2,795 UK Adults Age 55+, 2004

Figure 2: Proportion engaging in various leisure activities at least once per month
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Choose more sustainable leisure activities/make more use of outdoor spaces

24% of all day visits were to the countryside in 2002/3 (GB Leisure Day Visits Survey, 2004), against 71% were to a town or city. The most popular activities were eating and drinking out (15%), visiting friends and relatives (14%) and going shopping (11%). The most popular activity of those visiting the countryside was to walk and ramble. Yet, the conclusion of research by the Centre for Environmental Conservation and Outdoor Leisure (2004) in a report undertaken for the Countryside Agency is that it is extremely difficult to find any reliable data on participation in outdoor recreation activities. They believe participation rates are stable, although some activities, such as cycling and canoeing are increasing. Walking has long been the most popular sport in the UK, with a four weekly participation rate of 44.5% according to the General Household Survey in 1996. The survey believes improvement to facilities, infrastructure and the provision of greater information about routes etc could release latent demand for cycling and horse riding. Whereas demand for canoeing and paddling appears to be limited by restrictions to access, as there is unmet demand for motorised sports in the countryside, which is currently restricted, or at least displaced. The report recommends involving activity groups to see how their usage of the outdoor resources can be enhanced and increased, but involving a wide spectrum of stakeholders in order that specific user groups do not dominate. They also recommend greater links with educational sector to encourage an appreciation of the outdoor environment before a negative representation is created.

The importance of outdoor space is recognised, with 91% of people believing that public parks and open spaces improve the quality of their life (CABE Space, no date). Research questioned if improving the condition, appearance and facilities and management of parks encourages people to have greater respect and improved behaviour in parks. Such thinking builds on Kelling and Wilson's (1982) ‘Broken Window’ theory, whereby people are more likely to litter in areas where there is already litter, and less likely to in places where there is no litter. The paper identifies a series of actions that can help to reclaim parks and to make them areas local people are more likely to want to use. The details of these initiatives are beyond the remit of this review, but what is key is that dirty, unwelcoming parks are known to be reasons for locals not taking advantage of local parks, and for this to change, the parks
must be improved. Clean parks encourage a sense of community, freedom, enable relaxation and a sense of escape, as well as provide an opportunity for children to enjoy nature and play.

Encouraging more people to use outdoor spaces will ensure conflicting leisure pursuits become more acute, for example horse riding and mountain biking are often incongruous activities, as even can be picnics and dog walking. Such a conflict can only result in greater zoning of leisure spaces, and the public having to recognise that they are not free to undertake any form of leisure in any location. The diversification of rural land in particular, away from farming and towards alternative, new leisure pursuits will draw more people to the countryside, but create conflicts and congestion in ways that traditional land pursuits have not. Additionally, the people drawn to the countryside will be from more urban locations, where standards of behaviour and social norms differ, so creating the potential for social impacts from leisure.

Any shift in the amount of leisure undertaken by the public needs to be accompanied by a huge change in attitudes towards public transport lest the pollution, noise and congestion increase manifold. ‘Honeypots’ hold the potential to absorb large numbers of visitors, but these will need to include extensive travel plans and restrict accessibility by private cars. There is a clear paradox in that by attracting more people to make greater use of outdoor spaces, so the risk of traffic congestion increases. If the experience is to become a positive one, then using ‘sticks’ to force people onto public transport is likely to have a very negative effect, and contrary to the need to create a positive experience for new groups of people and a positive representation of the activity created. Curry (1994) suggests the risk of improving access to the countryside, is that like improving access to low cost flights, instead of public policy intervention enabling more people to participate in outdoor activities, the current group of participants participate more.

The barriers to outdoor recreation identified by the Henley Centre (2005) from the literature include the dislike by the public of being told where what activities were permitted, particularly for ‘everyday’ activities such as dog walking. Further, as much of the attraction of being in the countryside is the discovery of things to do and places to go, to have this restricted would reduce the intrinsic appeal of the journey. Other factors include the need for all facilities to be provided within the immediate area, for such areas to be accessible, convenient and connected to other facilities nearby. The creation of ‘hubs’ of entertainment offers the opportunity for leisure trips to be
combined with other forms of leisure, although in the national parks, minimum charges have been introduced in car parks in order to reduce the ‘grazing’ of tourists, who stay for very short periods of time in a destination before moving on to the next stop. By staying in an area for longer, more money is retained per car journey – but if there is insufficient attraction in each stop, then reducing the ability to graze may reduce the number of people who participate at all.

The Henley Centre research identifies an image problem of the outdoors for younger people, who, the report generalises, prefer instead to impress their friends with stories of what they have been doing. To this end, walking in the countryside does not create the desired positive impression. Similarly, parents do not wish to appear dated and to disappoint their children, so places like Legoland are prioritised over trips to the countryside. Additional barriers to undertake a trip to the countryside include the cost and perceived hassle, indicating the need to simplify the experience and to make it free at the point of delivery if a younger generation are to be attracted. Yet, research by nVision (2006) shows that although 16-24 year olds have the lowest support for the environment and make least effort to see it regularly, 75% did still recognise its importance. Related to the expense of a trip to the countryside is the relative cheapness of activities within the home such as watching TV, DVDs, PS2, which all occupy the time and attention of children, while affording parents a break. The final barrier cited by the Henley Centre (2005) is the challenge of finding an outdoor activity that holds interest for all the family, including children, parents and grandparents. These barriers indicate the need for a cultural shift if a next generation are not to grow up without experience of the countryside. As with tourism, people are looking for an experience with which they can impress their friends, but which will hold the attention of all the family. The challenge for leisure providers is clear and needs to be met in order to arrest the cultural shift away from outdoor leisure activities.

The majority of literature about sustainable travel within leisure relates to improving access for disadvantaged and minority groups as a method for reducing social exclusion. Within this literature, the main barriers to access are; physical barriers, lack of accessible information, lack of confidence/experience, cost, limited range of activities and a poorly maintained environment (Countryside Agency, 2005a). Interestingly, the barriers cited by able-bodied visitors for not undertaking more outdoor
activities and using public transport do not appear dissimilar to those cited by disabled travellers.

Related research examines how the known benefits of access to the countryside can be made more available to those from black and ethnic minorities, who are often more negatively affected by health problems and poverty compared to the population as a whole. The Countryside Agency (2005b) conducted research amongst black and minority ethnic group members, disabled people and young people to explore their attitudes to the countryside. All three groups opposed the countryside to the city, saw the countryside as being far from the cities and felt the way of life was slow and simple, based on traditional English values and hence for an elderly and socially conservative population. Specific to each group, people from ethnic minorities expected to feel excluded and conspicuous in the countryside, whereas disabled people expected to be welcomed, but anticipated feeling vulnerable at the lack of facilities for them. Young people felt the countryside held few attractions and little excitement for them. All groups recognised the benefits to their physical and psychological health from outdoor activities in the countryside, as well as for their personal identity and to encourage their social inclusion.

Responsibility

The question of who is responsible for the impacts of tourism and leisure is a contested one, with consumers, tour operators, suppliers, destinations and government all claiming not to have the power to effect change. In a survey by Mintel (2005) more than one quarter of respondents felt travel companies should do more to preserve the local environment and support local people. Research for Responsibletravel.com (2004) found 88% of respondents held tour operators responsible for preserving the local environment and culture. While nVision (2005) showed that over two thirds of respondents believe companies should be penalised for failing to care for the environment. A survey by Tearfund (2000) found 54% of consumers held the tour operators responsible for the provision of information about sustainability issues. Travel agents were also deemed to have a responsibility, but interestingly, the survey did not ask if consumers themselves felt they had a responsibility in this arena. Miller (2001) did ask this question, and the results showed that although consumers were prepared to accept some responsibility, this was only when they also identified others as having a shared responsibility.
In terms of what action is expected to accompany this sense of responsibility, IPSOS-MORI's (2005) annual business behaviour survey found 94% of those polled felt companies should be obliged to report on their impacts on society and the environment. ABTA's (2000) annual survey showed 78% of package holiday respondents thought information about the environmental and social impacts was important for tour operators to include in their brochures.

Providing information to consumers is important if they are to make informed decisions. The nature of this information reflects the interests of the consumers, with 46% of respondents in a survey by Tearfund (2002) interested to receive information about local customs and appropriate forms of dress and behaviour. This was by far the most popular item identified by consumers, with only 18% wanting to receive information about ways to protect the natural environment and reduce waste. In a survey by Co-op Travelcare (1998) terrorism was cited as the number one thing consumers wanted to know about, but 76% wanted information about pollution levels and 73% wanted to know about the effects of tourism on the natural environment and on the way of life in the area. Reflecting the more aware status of co-op customers, 67% were keen to know what the country's human rights record was before they travelled.

Beyond calling for more information, DfT (2006) research shows that 70% of the public understand that air travel harms the environment, with frequent flyers, higher income groups and managerial/professional occupations recognising this relationship most keenly. These levels have grown from a similar survey in 2002. Yet, the nature of the understanding shows confusion as to how air travel impacts on the environment, with the most frequent unsolicited response being it affects air quality (cited by 84%), noise (40%) and a combination of climate change, global warming and ozone depletion (35%). Shifting from recognising the impacts to feeling a sense of responsibility, 79% of respondents felt that they should be allowed to continue flying as much as they want, although once environmental impacts were mentioned unqualified support fell to just 17% (DfT, 2006). Yet, support for environmental taxes is growing. Research by nVision (2006) shows over 40% of the public agree with the need for taxes to prevent environmental pollution. This support is strongest amongst those 65 years of age and over and those in the AB social bracket. Those least in favour of environmental taxes are 25-34 years old and in C2 social grades, although support here is still above 30%. More recently, TripAdvisor (2007) found 25% of respondents felt air
travel should be avoided where possible in order to help preserve the environment, while 38% were willing to pay more to offset their emissions. Yet, in terms of actions, only 3% had purchased carbon credits.

DfT (2006) research on the question of paying for environmental damage shows 63% of respondents who accepted flying causes environmental impact would be prepared to pay 'a bit more' as a consequence. When this equation is extended to make flying 'much more expensive' then support falls to just 47%, yet still only 33% oppose the increase in price. Older respondents were more likely to support the increase in expense, as were managerial/professional occupations for small increases with frequent flyers less supportive of large increases, but equally supportive of small rises to non-flyers. However, in the 2002 study, when the public were presented with information about the impact of air travel and its current tax situation 79% stated they would accept a 5% increase in airfares and 50% were willing to accept a 10% rise (DfT, 2002). The results presented by First Choice (2005) suggest only 12% were prepared to reduce the amount they flew, but 28% said they would be prepared to pay a small additional charge to offset their carbon emissions, but the majority of respondents resisted this suggestion. One third of consumers were willing to have the brochures they take from travel agents on loan, and return them afterwards. Such an action may reduce the large number of wasted brochures printed every year, but whether they would be returned in a condition that would allow them to be re-used is doubtful.

In terms of actions taken by companies themselves, the Tearfund (2000) survey of tour operators and their responsible tourism practices revealed 71% of the companies surveyed gave money to charity, 50% had a responsible tourism policy, and more than half of those without a policy were planning to introduce one shortly. The companies surveyed for this report were selected as those most likely to be taking action, so are not representative of the whole industry, lending weight to Anita Roddick’s (2004) criticism of the industry that it is 10-15 years behind other industries in terms of its corporate responsibility. The Travel Foundation was established by the main UK tour operators in 2002. This organisation aims to share best practice on corporate responsibility and monitoring of the impacts of the industry.

However, there is widespread recognition of the role played by many of these same large tour operators who established the Travel Foundation in lobbying against the eco-tax introduced in the Balearic Islands of Spain in 2000. The
eco-tax was an attempt to internalise the cost of many of the externalities caused by tourism to these popular islands. The tax was charged through accommodation, with the funds being used for environmental projects on the islands. The introduction of the tax led to a reduction in the number of tourists visiting the islands, and the subsequent withdrawal of the tax after pressure from external lobbying by the tourism industry. The head of the UK Federation of Tour Operators, Andy Cooper, has said subsequently that the FTO do not support the principle of eco-taxes imposed on the tourism industry and would lobby again against any such proposal. Similarly, the proposal by the Swedish government to introduce an airport tax was met with a threat by Ryanair to withdraw its services to Sweden in protest, the same tactic to that employed when Newquay imposed a £5 ‘tourist tax’ (e-tid, 2006).

There is little doubt that in respect of every issue relating to travel, the picture painted by the surveys conducted is very confused. Yet, what does appear to be clear is that consumers would like to pay more attention to sustainability issues, that these attitudes are aspirational, and if companies can meet these aspirations then consumers will be willing to book accordingly. This degree of consumer concern neatly sidesteps the problem of who is responsible and provides tour operators, suppliers and destinations with the motivation to encourage a transition to a more sustainable tourism industry.
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Annex C: Industry workshop

Industry workshop held Wednesday 6th June, 2007
Defra, Ashdown House, 123 Victoria Street, London

The workshop considered four questions;

1. Do the results of the research fit with the experience of those in industry?
2. What actions can industry take to promote sustainability?
3. What policy options should be recommended to Defra?
4. What further research does industry want?

What follows immediately below is a summary of the answers received to the four questions set followed by a list of attendees.

**Do the results of the research fit with the experience of those in industry?**

- The findings of the research conducted by the University of Surrey were consistent with research conducted by both VisitBritain and First Choice holidays, as well as the experience of all others present. All agreed that getting tourists to change their behaviour will be a considerable challenge. Albeit that niche market segments may respond differently to concerns about sustainability from the mass market.

- The finding that sustainability is not a major issue for tourists matched industry experience. Where tourists cite a desire for clean, unspoiled destinations it is likely to be more for reasons of self-interest, than reasons of global sustainability. However, whether there are significant groups who are motivated by sustainability is largely unknown.
**What actions can industry take to promote sustainability?**

- The group felt the UK tourism industry was ahead of the world in terms of the actions it was taking (through the Federation of Tour Operators and Travel Foundation), but recognised there was still a lot of work to do to catch up with other industries and to educate large parts of the tourism industry about what is needed to be more sustainable.

- Specifically, those present felt a system of sustainability indicators needs to be developed in order that operators know what they can measure, and begin the task of monitoring their performance. Much progress has been made in auditing properties through work with the FTO, but the number of properties and the range of issues means government assistance will be invaluable in speeding up this task. Once an audit can be completed, the results can be printed in brochures to arm consumers with information about the sustainability of various properties. This will enable properties to compete on non-price terms, but also to begin to compile evidence as to whether more sustainable properties become more popular with consumers. Such evidence will create a strong rationale for property owners to make changes to current and future developments. It was recognised that there is strong potential to exploit the positive image that comes from taking actions on sustainability.

- Attendees felt the APD and fuel taxes should be administered through the operators themselves and not the consumers. Such an approach would allow for the age of the planes and load factors to be considered, in a way that consumer-led schemes do not. A more sophisticated scheme that recognised efforts made by operators to improve the efficiency of their fleet and their operations would be supported.

- For some of the attendees, domestic tourism held the potential to reduce many of the impacts associated with travel and should be promoted more fully – although this would be contrary to the mission of the outbound tour operators.
**What policy options should be recommended to Defra?**

- Programme of work that encourages consumers to think about the impacts of their tourism and consequently to do things differently, as well as consider doing different things.

- Use funds from APD to explain to the public the need for APD and to justify its existence. Similarly, funds from the APD could be used to explain to the public why additional levels of taxation may be needed to combat climate change, and the role of aviation in this process.

- A person to be appointed within government to act as liaison with the tourism industry. The separation of discussion about tourism within government leads industry to feel divorced from decision-making and a role is needed that brings these discussions together with industry.

- Need to consider a legislative intervention to promote sustainability – akin to the boost health and safety received from tightened legislation.

- Government to help industry work on an indicator programme that would allow the tourism industry to monitor its impacts and seek amelioration techniques.

**What further research does industry want?**

- Work on a carbon calculator that allows the impacts of tourism to be assessed, and compared relative to day to day activities. This may allow for an estimation of what an annual carbon allowance might be, and what the consequences of this would be for the tourism industry.

- A more definitive position from government on whether carbon offsetting is a positive thing, or just guilt alleviation. Can carbon offsetting solve the problem of climate change?

- Work on indicators and monitoring systems that allow for the internal and external reporting of the impacts of tourism.

- There was much discussion of the value of a food labelling type approach to tourism, which recognised that different forms of tourism and different operators can have widely varying levels of impact. A system alerting
the consumer to the likely type and order of impact caused by purchasing a holiday, would serve to educate the tourist, as well as put pressure on operators offering holidays with negative sustainability implications. A programme to explore the issue and consider what are the most important impacts, and so what should be the key elements to any tourism label.

• How to make tangible the problem of sustainability, so that people are prepared to change their behaviour. How can sustainable tourism tap into people’s self-interest?

• What are the impacts caused by various forms of tourism, for instance, mass versus specialised, packaged versus independent etc? What are the impacts of domestic tourism versus those of overseas tourism? The publication of such information to make industry, policy makers and the public more aware of the relative impacts caused.

• Why do people choose environmentally friendly holidays?

*In attendance:*

Noel Josephides    Sunvil Holidays
Rochelle Turner    Holiday Which?
Jenny McGee        VisitBritain
Luke Gaskins       First Choice Holidays
Jenny Swift        SQW
Richard Denman     The Tourism Company
Nancy Brock        Thomas Cook
Pip Tyler          Nielsen Active Holidays
Jonathan Hodrien   former Director Friends of Conservation
Andy Jefrries      BTCV
Rachel Muckle      Defra
Graham Miller      University of Surrey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tribe</td>
<td>University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Scarles</td>
<td>University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten Holmes</td>
<td>University of Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Rathouse</td>
<td>Independent Social Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D: Recruitment questionnaires
RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE:
Version No. 2 (TOURISM)     Date 19th March 2007

PROJECT NAME: TOURISM/LEISURE     JOB NO: 7261

Interviewer Name: ___________________________ Interviewer No. ________________

Date and Time of Group/Depth _______________________________________________

Respondent Name: _______________________________________________________

Full Postal Address: _______________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________ Post Code_________

Tel.____________________ (Hm) ___________________ (Wk) _______________(Mobile)

(DO NOT RECRUIT UNLESS TELEPHONE NUMBER IS GIVEN.)

METHODS OF RECRUITMENT ALLOWABLE

Telephone free find ✓

Telephone snowballing* ✓

Door to door ✓

In street, face to face ✓

From lists x

*This refers to approaching people who may know other respondents who fit the quota, but who are NOT attending the group discussion themselves. You must not knowingly recruit people who know each other. After they have been initially approached, you must recruit these people yourself according to the quota.

I am recruiting respondents to take part in a group discussion on holidays. The discussion is part of a project being carried out by the University of Surrey. The purpose of the discussion is for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to understand more about how people choose their holidays.

Q.A  Do you or do any of your close friends or relatives have anything to do with the following occupations? (PLEASE CIRCLE)
Q.B1 Have you ever taken part in a market research depth interview or group discussion on any subject? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Yes 1 → Q.B2
No 2 → STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

Q.B2 When did you last take part in a market research depth interview or group?

In the last 6 months 1 CLOSE
Over 6 months ago 2 CONTINUE

Q.B3 What was/were the group(s) on?

IF TOURISM OR ENVIRONMENT, CLOSE.

Q.B4 How many group discussions would you say you have attended in the last 2 years?

3 or more 1 CLOSE
less than 3 2 CONTINUE

WE ARE KEEN TO AVOID RESPONDENTS WHO ARE VERY FAMILIAR WITH MARKET RESEARCH. PLEASE PROBE. IF IN ANY DOUBT PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE.
### Sex

### Age

### Tenure

| Owns | 1 |
| Council | 1 |

### Ethnicity

| White | 1 |

### Tourism

| Concerned about environmental | 1 | THANK AND CLOSE |
| England | 1 |

### Views about a topical issue

- I don’t really do anything for the environment and I | 1 | THANK & CLOSE |
- I do my bit for the environment but I don’t think that | 2 |
- I do my bit for the environment but I can’t do more | 3 |
- I do what I can for the environment and I will do more | 4 |
- I do what I can for the environment but I draw the line | 5 |
- I do what I can to use resources carefully because I | 6 |
- I do everything I can for the environment, even if this | 7 |
### STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

**OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENT (Please write in)**

| Job Title: _____________________________ |
| Industry: _____________________________ |
| PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER* |

**OCCUPATION OF CHIEF WAGE EARNER - IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE (Write in)**

| Job Title: _____________________________ |
| Industry: _____________________________ |
| PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER* |

*ASK OFFICE IF UNSURE

Please tick in boxes as appropriate

#### SOCIAL STATUS

| A | B | C1 | C2 | D | E |

#### MARITAL STATUS

- Single without children
- Single with child/children*
- Partnered without children
- Partnered with child/children*

*ASK IF RESPONDENTS HAVE CHILDREN

**Does/do your child/children still live at home?**

- **YES**  
  What ages is/are your child/children  
  (WRITE IN)

- **NO**

#### WORKING STATUS

- Non working
- Working part time
- Working full time
- Student
- Retired

Ensure that respondents are informed at the time of recruitment that they will be audio recorded at the group. These recordings will only be used for the research.
I declare that this interview has been carried out strictly in accordance with the specification and has been conducted within the MRS Code of Conduct with a person unknown to me.

SIGNED ___________________________ DATE

______________________________
RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE:
Version No. 2 (LEISURE)  Date: 19th March 2007

PROJECT NAME: TOURISM/LEISURE  JOB NO: 7261

Interviewer Name: ___________________________  Interviewer No. ________________

Date and Time of Group/Depth _______________________________________________

Respondent Name: ___________________________________________________________

Full Postal Address: ___________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Tel. ___________________ (Hm) ___________________ (Wk) _______________ (Mobile)
(Do not recruit unless telephone number is given.)

Methods of Recruitment Allowable
Telephone free find  ✓

Telephone snowballing*  ✓

Door to door  ✓

In street, face to face  ✓
From lists  x

*This refers to approaching people who may know other respondents who fit the quota, but who are NOT attending the group discussion themselves. You must not knowingly recruit people who know each other. After they have been initially approached, you must recruit these people yourself according to the quota.

I am recruiting respondents to take part in a group discussion on leisure activities. The discussion is part of a project being carried out by the University of Surrey. The purpose of the discussion is for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs to understand more about how people choose their leisure activities.

Q.A  Do you or do any of your close friends or relatives have anything to do with the following occupations?  (Please circle)
Q.B1 Have you ever taken part in a market research depth interview or group discussion on any subject? (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Yes 1 ➔ Q.B2
No 2 ➔ STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

Q.B2 When did you last take part in a market research depth interview or group?

In the last 6 months 1 CLOSE
Over 6 months ago 2 CONTINUE

Q.B3 What was/were the group(s) on?

IF LEISURE OR ENVIRONMENT, CLOSE.

Q.B4 How many group discussions would you say you have attended in the last 2 years?

3 or more 1 CLOSE
less than 3 2 CONTINUE

WE ARE KEEN TO AVOID RESPONDENTS WHO ARE VERY FAMILIAR WITH MARKET RESEARCH. PLEASE PROBE. IF IN ANY DOUBT PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2a. ASK ONLY IF HOUSEHOLD RENTS HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leisure**

| None       | 1 THANK AND CLOSE |

**Views about a topical issue**

1. I don’t really do anything for the environment and I  
2. I do my bit for the environment but I don’t think that  
3. I do my bit for the environment but I can’t do more  
4. I do what I can for the environment and I will do more  
5. I do what I can for the environment but I draw the line  
6. I do what I can to use resources* carefully because I  
7. I do everything I can for the environment, even if this
STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENT (Please write in)

Job Title: ________________________________
Industry: ________________________________
PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER*

OCCUPATION OF CHIEF WAGE EARNER - IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE (Write in)

Job Title: ________________________________
Industry: ________________________________
PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER*

*ASK OFFICE IF UNSURE

Please tick in boxes as appropriate
SOCIAL STATUS
A ☐ B ☐ C1 ☐ C2 ☐ D ☐ E ☐

MARITAL STATUS
☐ Single without children
☐ Single with child/children*
☐ Partnered without children
☐ Partnered with child/children*

*ASK IF RESPONDENTS HAVE CHILDREN

Does/do your child/children still live at home?

YES ☐ ☐ What ages is/are your child/children (WRITE IN)
NO ☐

WORKING STATUS
☐ Non working
☐ Working part time
☐ Working full time
☐ Student
☐ Retired

Ensure that respondents are informed at the time of recruitment that they will be audio recorded at the group. These recordings will only be used for the research.
I declare that this interview has been carried out strictly in accordance with the specification and has been conducted within the MRS Code of Conduct with a person unknown to me.

SIGNED _____________________________ DATE

______________________
RECRUITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE:
Version No. 2 (TOURISM - 16 TO 21 YEAR OLDS) Date 19th March 2007

PROJECT NAME: ___________________________ JOB NO: 7261

Interviewer Name: ___________________________ Interviewer No. ________________

Date and Time of Group/Depth _________________________________

Respondent Name: ____________________________________________________

Full Postal Address: ____________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________ Post Code________

Tel. ___________ (Hm) ___________ (Wk) ___________ (Mobile)
(DO NOT RECRUIT UNLESS TELEPHONE NUMBER IS GIVEN.)

METHODS OF RECRUITMENT ALLOWABLE

Telephone free find ✓

Telephone snowballing* ✓

Door to door ✓

In street, face to face ✓

From lists ×

*This refers to approaching people who may know other respondents who fit the quota, but who are NOT attending
the group discussion themselves. You must not knowingly recruit people who know each other. After they have
been initially approached, you must recruit these people yourself according to the quota.

I am recruiting respondents to take part in a group discussion on holidays. The
discussion is part of a project being carried out by the University of Surrey. The
purpose of the discussion is for the Department for Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs to understand more about how people choose their holidays.

Q.A Do you or do any of your close friends or relatives have anything to do with
the following occupations? (PLEASE CIRCLE)
Market Research 1 Close

Journalism 2 Close

Advertising 3 Close

Marketing 4 Close

Television 5 Close

Public Relations 6 Close

Tourism/Leisure 7 Close

Environment 8 Close

None of these 9 Recruit

Q.B1 Have you ever taken part in a market research depth interview or group discussion on any subject (PLEASE CIRCLE)

Yes 1 ➔ QB2

No 2 ➔ STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

Q.B2 When did you last take part in a market research depth interview or group?

In the last 6 months 1 CLOSE

Over 6 months ago 2 CONTINUE

QB3 What were the group(s) on?

IF TOURISM OR ENVIRONMENT, CLOSE.

QB4. How many group discussions would you say you have attended in the last 2 years?

3 or more 1 CLOSE

less than 3 2 CONTINUE

WE ARE KEEN TO AVOID RESPONDENTS WHO ARE VERY FAMILIAR WITH MARKET RESEARCH. PLEASE PROBE. IF IN ANY DOUBT PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE.

RECRUIT FRIENDSHIP PAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

ALL RESPONDENTS 16-21
### Living and working arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>THANK AND CLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In full-time education or training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

| White | 1 |

### Tourism

### Concerned about environmental

| England | 1 | THANK AND CLOSE |

### Views about a topical issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I don’t really do anything for the environment and I</th>
<th>1 THANK &amp; CLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do my bit for the environment but I don’t think that</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do my bit for the environment but I can’t do more</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do what I can for the environment and I will do more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do what I can for the environment but I draw the line</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do what I can to use resources carefully because I</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do everything I can for the environment, even if this</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARD PERSONAL DETAIL SHEET

OCCUPATION OF THE RESPONDENT (Please write in)

| Job Title: _________________________________ |
| Industry: _______________________________ |
| PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER* |

OCCUPATION OF CHIEF WAGE EARNER - IF DIFFERENT FROM ABOVE (Write in)

| Job Title: _________________________________ |
| Industry: _______________________________ |
| PLEASE EXCLUDE ANY INDUSTRY RELATED TO THE SUBJECT MATTER* |

*ASK OFFICE IF UNSURE

Please tick in boxes as appropriate

SOCIAL STATUS
A  B  C1  C2  D   E

MARITAL STATUS

| Single without children |
| Single with child/children* |
| Partnered without children |
| Partnered with child/children* |

*ASK IF RESPONDENTS HAVE CHILDREN

Does/do your child/children still live at home?

YES  NO

What ages is/are your child/children

(WRITE IN)

WORKING STATUS

| Non working |
| Working part time |
| Working full time |
| Student |
| Retired |

Ensure that respondents are informed at the time of recruitment that they will be audio recorded at the group. These recordings will only be used for the research.
I declare that this interview has been carried out strictly in accordance with the specification and has been conducted within the MRS Code of Conduct with a person unknown to me.

SIGNED ______________________________________   DATE

_______________________
Annex E: Topic guides
DEFRA SCP Sustainable Tourism
Topic Guide

Introduction (2mins)

My name is GM/CS I work for the University of Surrey, this is KR who is an independent social researcher.

We have been commissioned by DEFRA to speak to people throughout England about the holidays you take, where you aspire to go to, how you travel, what issues you think about when deciding where to go and how you get there.

The discussion will be recorded, but that is to help us with writing our report. Everything you say will be completely anonymous and the results are reported in such a way as no-one will be able to be identified from what you say. We are working to guidelines as set down by the MRS.

In focus groups there are no right or wrong answers, we are just looking to hear what you have to say and then we can report these back to DEFRA.

Only house rule is that only one person speaks at one time, otherwise it is very difficult to record what people have said

Warm Up (15mins)

Just to begin with, I would like each person to introduce themselves briefly, saying your name, a little about yourself, whether you live alone or with other people (probe about children’s ages), and what you do with your time

Go round the room taking note of names, household composition, employment and leisure activities.

To start with, we’d like to ask you about the last place you went on holiday
Where did you go?
Probe who with, how they travelled, how long stayed, where stayed, and what did

Why did you choose to travel to the place you mentioned?

How often do you take holidays?
Did you take similar or different holidays each time?

Understanding of consumer aspirations (20mins)

What I want you to do now is to look at the 12 cards in front of you and to put them into three piles: holidays you’d like to take, holidays you wouldn’t like to take and ones you’re not sure about. Don’t think about it too carefully, just first thoughts.

Give 2 mins.

Who has chosen XXX as the place you would like to visit? What appeals about it?

Who has chosen it as a place you wouldn’t like to visit? Why?

Prompt for activity, mode of travel, accommodation, length of stay
FOCUS DISCUSSION ON;
• A UK holiday
• A European holiday (that can be reached by train)
• A holiday outside Europe
• An outdoors holiday
• A city break
• Golf/cruising holiday

How often would you like to go on holiday? Would you choose similar or different holidays each time?

Consumer understanding of ST (30mins)

We have talked a bit now about what you get out of your holiday, what I want you to do now is think a little more widely about the holidays we have been talking about.

Have you noticed any impacts on the holidays you have taken?
Prompt for awareness of environmental, economic, social impacts at host destination as well as globally, negative as well as positive

Of all the impacts you’ve mentioned, which do you think are the most important?
Prompt for what aspects of the holiday threatens the sustainability the most e.g. the flight, the economic leakages, the social impact? Do they consider the positive impacts justify the negative?

Now I’d like you to focus on the environmental impacts. There are no right or wrong answers to this exercise, but thinking about the environmental impacts, now, what I would like you to do is to take the same 12 cards and to sort them into three piles: one pile for holidays that you think have high environmental impacts, medium environmental impacts, and low environmental impacts.

Why is each card in each pile?

Where have you put XXX?

FOCUS DISCUSSION ON;
• A UK holiday
• A European holiday (that can be reached by train)
• A holiday outside Europe
• An outdoors holiday
• A city break
• Golf/cruising holiday

Behaviour change (45mins)

Thinking about the impacts we have talked about above, do you ever consider any of these impacts when planning your holiday?
Prompt which impacts they have considered

How has this affected your choice of holiday? Have you ever decided to travel using a different method of transport because of the environmental impacts of flying/driving?
Prompt for considering travelling less, different travel methods, travelling to different places
Probe for reasons
Prompt: Do you think that these actions can make a difference?
Prompt about the pros and cons of each method suggested

Which change would you be most prepared to make?
Prompt:
Would you be prepared to take a holiday in the UK instead of overseas?
Would you be prepared to fly closer to home
Would you be prepared to take alternative forms of transport?
Would you be prepared to avoid activities if you knew they had a negative impact on cultures/environments e.g. aquaria, 4x4 driving, golfing
Would you be prepared to travel less?
Would you be prepared to offset?
Check whether they have different views for first, second and subsequent holidays – e.g. OK, you wouldn’t be keen on a holiday in England for your main holiday, but what about for your second holiday?

Probe for why they would be prepared to make certain changes?

What would encourage you to make these changes?
What would stop you from making other changes?

OK, what we are going to do now is turnover the cards in front of you. Can you turn over the card for Paris/Edinburgh/Cornwall/Australia
Introduce information about carbon emissions from flights for four destinations.
Ask:
Does that surprise you?
Do you think this would make a difference in deciding where you next travel and what you decide to do? Why/why not?
Prompt for whether the existence of impacts makes the holiday less appealing?
How important is environmental compared to the other impacts they mentioned earlier e.g. social, cultural and economic impacts?

LOW PRIORITY (ONLY DISCUSS IF TIME ALLOWS) Where do you get information about the impacts of holidays? Do you feel you have enough information or would you like to know more?
Who would you expect to give you this info? Who would you trust?
Prompt for any sources of information used. Who is credible? Is there a lack of information?

Expectations of who should be held responsible (10mins)

So far we have talked about actions you can take as consumers to be more responsible, but who do you think should be taking action to improve sustainability?
Prompt for UK Government, Industry, Destination governments, own responsibility. Look for balance of responsibility

What action do you think the government/industry should be taking?
What shouldn’t the government/industry be doing?

Sustainability in everyday life (10 mins) – LOW PRIORITY EXCEPT SEGMENT IDENTIFICATION (ONLY DISCUSS IF TIME ALLOWS)

We’ve talked quite a bit about sustainable holidays. Now we’d like to ask you a little bit about whether you consider sustainability in your day-to-day lives.

How interested are you personally in environmental issues? We’re not expecting that you are – we’re just asking to get a feel for your views.
Probe why/why not.

Do you do anything like saving water, saving energy or reducing rubbish at home? Probe why or why not. Prompt concern about the environment, to save money, don’t like waste.

How important do you think these day-to-day activities are compared to the holidays you take?
(e.g. John, it sounds like you do a lot at home but don’t worry quite so much about the environmental impact of your holidays - why is that do you think?)

Show segment descriptions and ask them which they think they fit into and why

**Warm down and farewell (5mins)**
Just finally, what key messages would you like us to pass back Defra about how to encourage people to reduce the environmental impacts of their holidays

*Check for any further questions*
Thank you very much for coming
DEFRA SCP Sustainable Leisure
Topic Guide

Introduction (2mins)

My name is GM/CS I work for the University of Surrey, this is KR who is an independent social researcher.

We have been commissioned by DEFRA to speak to people throughout England about the day trips you take, where you aspire to go to, how you travel, what issues you think about when deciding where to go and how you get there.

The discussion will be recorded, but that is to help us with writing our report. Everything you say will be completely anonymous and the results are reported in such a way as no-one will be able to be identified from what you say. We are working to guidelines as set down by the MRS.

In focus groups there are no right or wrong answers, we are just looking to hear what you have to say and then we can report these back to DEFRA.

Only house rule is that only one person speaks at one time, otherwise it is very difficult to record what people have said

Warm Up (15mins)

Just to begin with, I would like each person to introduce themselves briefly, saying your name, a little about yourself, whether you live alone or with other people (probe about children’s ages), and what you do with your time

Go round the room taking note of names, household composition, employment and leisure activities.

To start with, we’d like to ask you about the last trip you took

We are defining a ‘trip’ as something that lasts at least half a day, but does not involved an overnight stay

Where did you go?

Probe who with, how they travelled, how long stayed, where stayed, and what did

Why did you choose to travel to the place you mentioned?

Roughly, how many trips have you been on this year?

Do you tend to take similar or different trips each time?

Understanding of consumer aspirations (20mins)

What I want you to do now is to look at the 12 cards in front of you and to put them into three piles: trips you’d like to take, trips you wouldn’t like to take and ones you’re not sure about. Don’t think about it too carefully, just first thoughts.

Give 2 mins.

Who has chosen XXX as the place you would like to visit? What appeals about it?

Who has chosen it as a place you wouldn’t like to visit? Why?

Prompt for activity, mode of travel, accommodation, length of stay
FOCUS DISCUSSION ON:

1. Activities making use of nearby green spaces (walking in the countryside for rural participants, picnic in the park for urban/suburban participants)

2. Activities that involve travelling further afield.

3. Activities that have a positive impact on biodiversity (bird watching) and others that have a negative impact (football match, shopping mall).

4. Activities that contribute to the local economy to some extent. Some do so more than others (e.g. farmers market versus shopping mall).

5. Outdoor activities (e.g. walking in the countryside, picnic in the park, bird watching, Glastonbury festival); the rest are mostly indoors.

How often would you like to go on trips? Would you choose similar or different trips each time?

Consumer understanding of ST (30mins)

We have talked a bit now about what you get out of your trips, what I want you to do now is think a little more widely about the trips we have been talking about.

Have you noticed any impacts on the trips you have taken?
Prompt for awareness of environmental, economic, social impacts at host destination as well as globally, negative as well as positive

Of all the impacts you’ve mentioned, which do you think are the most important?
Prompt for what aspects of the trip threatens the sustainability the most e.g. the travel, the economic leakages, the social impact? Do they consider the positive impacts justify the negative?

Now I’d like you to focus on the environmental impacts. There are no right or wrong answers to this exercise, but thinking about the environmental impacts, now, what I would like you to do is to take the same 12 cards and to sort them into three piles: one pile for trips that you think have high environmental impacts, medium environmental impacts, and low environmental impacts.

Why is each card in each pile?

Where have you put XXX?

FOCUS DISCUSSION ON;

- Activities making use of nearby green spaces (walking in the countryside for rural participants, picnic in the park for urban/suburban participants)
- Activities that involve travelling further afield.
- Activities that have a positive impact on biodiversity (bird watching) and others that have a negative impact (football match, shopping mall).
- Activities that contribute to the local economy to some extent. Some do so more than others (e.g. farmers market versus shopping mall).
- Outdoor activities (e.g. walking in the countryside, picnic in the park, bird watching, Glastonbury festival); the rest are mostly indoors.

Behaviour change (45mins)

Thinking about the impacts we have talked about above, do you ever consider any of these impacts when planning your trips?
Probe which impacts they have considered

How has this affected your choice of trip? Have you ever decided to travel using a different method of transport because of the environmental impacts of flying/driving?
Prompt for considering travelling less, different travel methods, travelling to different places
Probe for reasons
Prompt: Do you think that these actions can make a difference?
Prompt about the pros and cons of each method suggested

Which change would you be most prepared to make?
Prompt:
Would you be prepared to travel closer to home
Would you be prepared to take alternative forms of transport?
Would you be prepared to avoid activities if you knew they had a negative impact on cultures/environments e.g. aquaria, 4x4 driving, golfing
Would you be prepared to travel less?
Would you be prepared to offset?
Check whether they have different views for first, second and subsequent trips – e.g. OK, you wouldn’t be keen on changing for your main trip, but what about for other trips?

Probe for why they would be prepared to make certain changes?

What would encourage you to make these changes?
What would stop you from making other changes?

OK, what we are going to do now is turnover the cards in front of you. Can you turn over the card for Edinburgh/Cornwall/
Introduce information about carbon emissions from travel for two/three destinations.
Ask:
Does that surprise you?
Do you think this would make a difference in deciding where you next travel and what you decide to do? Why/why not?
Prompt for whether the existence of impacts makes the trip less appealing?
How important is environmental compared to the other impacts they mentioned earlier e.g. social, cultural and economic impacts?

LOW PRIORITY (ONLY DISCUSS IF TIME ALLOWS) Where do you get information about the impacts of trips? Do you feel you have enough information or would you like to know more? Who would you expect to give you this info? Who would you trust?
Prompt for any sources of information used. Who is credible? Is there a lack of information?

Expectations of who should be held responsible (10mins)

So far we have talked about actions you can take as consumers to be more responsible, but who do you think should be taking action to improve sustainability?
Prompt for UK Government, Industry, Destination governments, own responsibility. Look for balance of responsibility

What action do you think the government/industry should be taking?
What shouldn’t the government/industry be doing?

Sustainability in everyday life (10 mins) – LOW PRIORITY EXCEPT SEGMENT IDENTIFICATION (ONLY DISCUSS IF TIME ALLOWS)

We’ve talked quite a bit about sustainable trips. Now we’d like to ask you a little bit about whether you consider sustainability in your day-to-day lives.

How interested are you personally in environmental issues? We’re not expecting that you are – we’re just asking to get a feel for your views.
Probe why/why not.

Do you do anything like saving water, saving energy or reducing rubbish at home? Probe why or why not. Prompt concern about the environment, to save money, don’t like waste.

How important do you think these day-to-day activities are compared to the trips you take? (e.g. John, it sounds like you do a lot at home but don’t worry quite so much about the environmental impact of your trips - why is that do you think?)

Show segment descriptions and ask them which they think they fit into and why

Warm down and farewell (5mins)
Just finally, what key messages would you like us to pass back Defra about how to encourage people to reduce the environmental impacts of their trips?

Check for any further questions
Thank you very much for coming
Annex F: Leisure photographs
Annex G: Tourism photographs
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Annex H: Leisure information
MANCHESTER TO EDINBURGH DAY TRIP

**Driving** from Manchester to Edinburgh (return) *per car*
- Emissions: **0.13 tonnes** CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **18 weeks**

**Train** from Manchester to Edinburgh (return) *per person*
- Emissions: **0.03 tonnes** CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **4 weeks**

**Flight** from Manchester to Edinburgh (return) *per person*
- Emissions: **0.10 tonnes** CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **14 weeks**
Annex I: Tourism information
CORNWALL, BEACH HOLIDAY

Driving from London to Cornwall (return) per car
- Emissions: **0.16 tonnes** CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **22 weeks**

Train from London to Cornwall (return) per person
- Emissions: **0.03 tonnes** CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **4 weeks**

Tourism contributes **1.7%** to UK economy
GREECE, BEACH HOLIDAY

Flight from London to Greece (return)
• Emissions: 0.61 tonnes CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for 84 weeks

Tourism contributes 6.3% to Greek economy
Flight from London to Thailand (return)
• Emissions: **2.78 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **385 weeks**

Tourism contributes **8.0%** to Thai economy
EDINBURGH CITY BREAK

Flight from London to Edinburgh (return)
• Emissions: **0.14 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **19 weeks**

Train from London to Edinburgh (return)
• Emissions: **0.05 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **7 weeks**

Tourism contributes **1.7%** to UK economy
PARIS, CITY BREAK

Flight from London to Paris (return)
• Emissions: \textbf{0.11 tonnes} CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for \textbf{15 weeks}

Eurostar from London to Paris (return)
• Emissions: \textbf{0.01 tonnes} CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for \textbf{2 weeks}

Tourism contributes \textbf{2.0\%} to French economy
NEW YORK, CITY BREAK

Flight from London to New York (return)
• Emissions: 1.54 tonnes CO₂
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for 213 weeks

Tourism contributes 1.0% to USA economy
SCOTLAND, GOLF

Flight from London to Edinburgh (return)
• Emissions: **0.14 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **19 weeks**

Train from London to Edinburgh (return)
• Emissions: **0.05 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **7 weeks**

Tourism contributes **1.7%** to UK economy
FRANCE, SKIING

Flight from London to Meribel, France (return)
• Emissions: **0.19 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **26 weeks**

Tourism contributes **2.0%** to French economy
Flight from London to Nepal (return)
- Emissions: 2.07 tonnes CO$_2$
- Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for 287 weeks

Tourism contributes 3.9% to Nepalese economy
EURO DISNEY

Flight from London to Paris (return)
• Emissions: **0.11 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **15 weeks**

Eurostar from London to Paris (return)
• Emissions: **0.01 tonnes** CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for **2 weeks**

Tourism contributes **2.0%** to French economy
CARIBBEAN CRUISE

Flight from London to Miami (return) to embark on cruise
• Emissions: 2.00 tonnes CO₂
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for 277 weeks

Tourism contributes 21.6% to Jamaican economy
AUSTRALIA, WINE TASTING

Flight from London to Australia (return)
• Emissions: 4.59 tonnes CO$_2$
• Equivalent to one 100W light bulb on non-stop for 635 weeks

Tourism contributes 2.8% to Australian economy