The Role of UK Charities and the Tourism Industry

**Rochelle Turner, Researcher, School of
Management Studies for the Service Sector,
University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey,
GU2 5XH**

**Dr Graham Miller, Lecturer in Tourism,
University of Westminster, 35 Marylebone
Road, London, NW1 5LS**

**Dr David Gilbert, Professor of Marketing,
Surrey European Management School,
University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2
5XH**

Contact email: D.Gilbert@Surrey.ac.uk

** Author for correspondence*

ABSTRACT

This article presents three different ways in which the involvement of charities in tourism in the UK can be considered and what implications this may have for the industry. Those charities involved *outside* the industry seek to engage in tourism purely because of the fund raising potential that it offers. These charities can achieve high profits from these activities yet are not directly concerned with the tourism industry. The second level of involvement with tourism concerns charities that can be seen to operate *within* the industry and offer travel to sites of concern for their members. Finally, charities that operate *above* the industry seek to influence the industry through tactics similar to those of pressure groups. The way that this final group raise funds to support their activities differs from the first two groups, however they are tied more closely to the tourism industry in that it represents their reason to exist.

Running Title

The Role of UK Charities and the Tourism Industry

INTRODUCTION

The Oxford Dictionary (1995; p220) tells us that a charity is "an institution for helping those in need". A charity is value driven with moral leaders instead of shareholders as profit is not the driving force. Membership is often based on a commitment to the mission of the charity. Chesterman (1979) stresses that a charity by definition, is not permitted to be substantially political. Thomas (1992; p125) uses the umbrella term "Voluntary organisations" (which given the professionalism of modern charities is perhaps itself a misleading term), and states that they "depend primarily on shared values as the basis for mobilising human and financial resources. People contribute their time, money and other resources to a voluntary organisation because they believe in what it is doing".

However, this article shows that the way tourism is used by the organisations may not always promote a commitment to the mission of the charity. With the rise of tourism as one of the world's largest industries, Roekaerts and Savat (1989) believe that there is an important need for charity involvement in tourism. The role that charities can play in tourism is offered clearly in the Manila Declaration of the WTO (1980) where the official bodies state that tourism is to be practised to support and preserve the originality of culture, the liberation of people, and equality of destiny of all, and that these spiritual elements must take precedence over technical and material elements (Art.20). Further, requirements for tourist activities must not prejudice local populations or jeopardise the historical, cultural and religious sites of the destinations (Art.18), but be implemented in a manner consistent with other activities and needs of the society (Art 23). As with business, charities have the opportunity to benefit financially from tourism and yet the integral nature of their reputation to future fund-raising means that charities can help to ensure that the pledges made in this declaration are more than just empty words and in so doing influence the nature of the tourism industry.

METHODOLOGY

The specific intention of this research was to look at the various types of involvement of UK charities in the tourism industry. Secondary research of web pages, newspapers, magazines, brochures and advertisements identified seventy-seven different UK charitable organisations involved with tourism and these were each contacted by letter to determine the extent of this involvement. In addition to this

initial request, follow-up telephone calls were made within ten working days to non-respondents and then a further call was made after another ten days. This technique yielded a response from thirty-four of the organisations (44 percent response rate). Of the charities involved in tourism, ten semi-structured interviews with senior charity employees were conducted either in-person where possible, or by telephone. The information and contacts obtained in these interviews then led to an additional five semi-structured interviews (face to face and telephone) with tour operators that help to co-ordinate charity fund-raising efforts.

A FRAMEWORK OF CHARITY INVOLVEMENT IN THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

"Tourism is a business not a charity" Krippendorf (1987; p137)

Insert Figure One here

CHARITIES OPERATING *OUTSIDE* OF THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

Charities on the outside of the tourism industry who use tourism solely as a means of fund-raising are often the charities with the most access to fund-raising and investment management advice; they are some of the largest 235 registered charities who receive over 40 percent of the total annual income (Charity Commission, 1997). The added professionalism, investment and resources given to raising money has increased the commercialisation of fund-raising and special events in the last few years.

While charities have long used sponsored events as fund-raising opportunities, the involvement of charities and sponsored holidays began with a small number of the charities, notably Oxfam and Water Aid, organising field trips to show supporters how their money was being spent (Hurdle, 1996). The arrangements of these trips tended to be organised in-house, taking up a lot of time and effort in the planning stages while raising concerns about over-burdening the field stations in the destinations. Within the past five years however, UK charities have teamed up with tour operators to establish combined fund-raising and adventure holidays. “Over the past two years, sponsored charity tours have become one of the fastest growing sectors of the holiday market” (Marriott 1999; p49). Not only do these events raise significant amounts of money for the charity, they help to raise its profile and educate its members of the charity’s purpose. Louise Maunder, events manager at the National Deaf Children’s Society confirms, “this is a great way of offering something exciting in return (for raising money). And it’s also a good opportunity to tell people about the work the society does” (in Marriott, 1999). Capturing a niche in the ever-growing tourism market has produced significant gains for the charities, however with private tour operators organising the events, it is perhaps not too unfair to tour operators to consider where the balance lies between the profit motive and more ethical considerations. The struggle now for these charities using special events such as tourism to bring in more money is thus two-fold; not to appear too commercialised and therefore outside the realm of what the public believes a charity should be, while simultaneously to raise as much money as possible.

Travel event fundraising

Sponsored events such as bike rides and walks have long been a popular way of raising money for a charity while at the same time increasing awareness of the charity's name and of the scope of its work. First organised by local community groups or in-house by the charity's fund-raisers, the idea of sponsored events has been expanded in line with the growth of world leisure and tourism.

The event, whether a bike ride, trek or run is organised as a package tour, providing transport, accommodation, food and medical support for the group as well as the necessary equipment and mechanical backup. It depends almost wholly on sponsored support and is therefore not advertised as a holiday, but rather as a 'challenge' or 'experience'; the distinction is not entirely semantic as the event involves a gruelling combination of strenuous physical exercise and difficult geological terrain. Recent challenges from Mencap, National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC), Macmillan Fund, Oxfam have included: whitewater rafting, mule trekking, safari trails, mountain walking with each trip being packaged together to include flights, transfers and basic food and accommodation (see Marriott, 1999; Hodson, 1996).

The NSPCC has a Special Events Unit which creates travel events as part of a campaign to benefit from fund-raising and provide a forum to create awareness of the NSPCC and its work - *appealing to people at their life-style level*" (NSPCC, 1997). Megan Munsell, Special Events Executive at NSPCC stated that the international travel events have become too large and therefore too risky for in-house development

and are conceived of and operated in conjunction with a few entrepreneurial tour operators who spotted a niche in the travel market in the early 1990s. Charles Getliffe director of Classic Tours, one of the tour operators used by the NSPCC, disclosed that between 1992 and 1996 they had organised charity events for 3,494 people with total funds of £6,275,000 being raised (Classic Tours, 1997).

For those charities operating outside the tourism industry, three basic donation schemes exist. The first is where the price of the challenge is determined so as to give the charity a minimum donation after the costs of the trip and the commission of the tour operator have been removed. The tour operators charge a flat fee per person, scaling downwards when numbers are increased. Rowan Patterson, Chief Executive of the tour operator Worldwide Journeys and Expeditions says that his company also contributes a lump sum to the charity but insists that the project is a commercial venture (Worldwide Journeys, 1997). In order to reduce not only the overall trip costs, but also to raise as much money for the charity as possible, numbers run high, often as many as 150 people participate at a time (Classic Tours, 1997; Marriott, 1999). Most trips require both a minimum deposit and a minimum guaranteed fund-raising amount. In some cases, such as Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (GDBA), “Journey to the Tsars” 10-day bike ride from St Petersburg to Moscow, the registration fee of £200 is non-refundable, while £2000 is the minimum sponsorship requirement (GDBA, 1997).

The second financing option requires the individual to pay the trip fee and then raise money for the charity, the costs of the trip are then refunded if the amount raised in sponsorship passes a certain figure. This is the incentive that has been used in the

NSPCC Cork to Kerry bike ride, organised by the tour operator, Bike Events; a relatively inexpensive trip costing £229 for one week, riders are offered £100 back if they raise £300 for the charity and the entire tour price back if they raise over £600 (Bike Events, 1997). Such a system could readily be integrated into a much wider range of tourism products. For example any tour operator could join with a charity and offer, for example, £100 off the holiday price if the individual raises £300 for the nominated charity, with the tour operator then being refunded and the charity receiving the remaining £200. In this way the tour operator benefits from association with the charity while the charity benefits financially. Obviously such an idea could only be applied to holidays where there was opportunity to raise funds from the public, and this would point towards adventure holidays and those with a strong physical element. This does however, raise the question of whether charities are helping to fuel the demand for adventure and perhaps more ethical tourism by whetting the appetite of consumers or whether charities are responding to demand by enabling those who otherwise could not afford such a holiday to partake.

The third pricing system used by charities does not require participants to gather donations, instead the price of the event includes a generous charitable donation. NSPCC has used this method in its Trek Tanzania event. Would-be adventurers pay £1995 of which, for an all inclusive trip to Tanzania, £250 goes directly to the NSPCC (NSPCC, 1997a). The charity expects to raise £30 000 with this event. To date, the charities have had enormous success in filling the places available on their events, to which a huge new growth area within the tourism market has been spawned. Marriott (1999) highlights the 24-hour brochure hotline set up by NDCS (National Deaf Children's Society) as evidence to the high demand. The resulting partnership

between tour operators and charities is symbiotic. Charities use the professionalism and experience of the tour operator to ensure the smooth running of the trip. Staying on the outside of the industry minimises the risk to the charity not only in financial terms but also with respect to the reputation of the organisation whose operations in tourism may not be conducive to the image the charity wishes to portray to the general public. Conversely, the tour operator tries to soften their image and gain positive PR by association with the charity.

In industry beyond tourism, the World-Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) receives financial support from a variety of companies and in return the companies are permitted to use the famous panda logo on their products. Although the companies are vetted, their use of the logo is not an endorsement by WWF of the product that their logo adorns. The financial benefits to both charity and company are large, however the risk that the charity takes with their reputation and trade mark is also considerable (WWF, 1999). Paradoxically, in many cases, the more a company is in need of positive PR, then the more risky the venture becomes for the charity.

Whichever of the pricing systems utilised, it is clear that for charities the benefit of tourism lies not just in raising money but also in increasing the depth of their donor base and re-positioning their appeal and image. Megan Munsell, fund-raising executive at the NSPCC confirms, “in this way we aim to create a more youthful and modern image of the NSPCC and reach a new audience of potential supporters whose primary interest is in the event itself rather than the NSPCC but who, through the event learn about the work of the NSPCC” (NSPCC, 1997).

CHARITIES OPERATING *WITHIN* THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

Capitalising on the public's increased leisure time in order to fill the omnipresent need for funds, charities have also developed volunteer strategies as ways of turning leisure time into fund-raising, labour and awareness opportunities. Charities that operate within the tourism industry do so to fulfil goals of education, scientific research and conservation; in many cases to find alternative sources of economic development for areas threatened by consumptive resource use. Most of these charities grow from a natural history background with scientists or nature enthusiasts as members and because of their origins, bring a credibility and respectability to their cause and receive substantial sums in grant aid (Yearly, 1993; p62). In recent years however, they have been using their scientific expertise to yield profits from wildlife holidays led by natural history experts, conservation work, consultancy and lectures. These projects bring in money and increase a charity's independence from government and trusts, enabling it to be more outspoken in campaigning should a need arise. These holidays translate the message of the 1980 IUCN (World Conservation Union) World Conservation Strategy in which the sum of individual environmental achievement was heralded to represent a major impact in the conservation of culture and environments. Working holidays appeal to the growing numbers of tourists concerned with the protection of habitats and ecosystems and the education component of their holiday choice. A 1988 survey by the National Tour Association, the largest organisation in North America, found that 93 percent of people surveyed believed that the opportunity to learn while travelling was an important consideration in the choice of

travel (Ayala, 1995). The types of holidays promoted by these charities encourage people to take practical action to conserve and understand their environment by providing a true “hands-on” learning experience and thereby allowing people to make a positive contribution to all aspects of environmental preservation

Working holidays in the UK have been operating for over thirty years, providing people young and old with the opportunity to make a difference within their communities (see British Trust for Conservation Volunteers 1999; National Trust, 1997). The idea that volunteers are central to environmental preservation has been recognised since the beginning of the environmental movement. The work of conservation volunteers has reflected the environmental concerns over the years focusing on the management of nature reserves in the 1960s, the response to changes brought about by modern agricultural techniques in the 1970s, the protection of the urban environment in the 1980s and now in the 1990s, the need to integrate economic, environmental and social issues, especially at the local level (BTCV,1999). Methods of operation have evolved with increased management professionalism and heightened response to people’s own environmental agendas often within the local community. The focus is now on providing an organised, fun, learning experience directed at “hard core” or dedicated nature tourists and is characterised by a higher claim to meet ecotourism criteria than the larger operators. These tourists “are happy with basic to primitive conditions since they expect not international glamour, but rather intact wilderness” (Boo, 1990: p41). As this type of tourism is supply, rather than demand driven, the relationship that exists between the charities and the local community is based on voluntarism and mutual understanding rather than control of the operation’s development. Local people are taught new skills and develop

confidence in their own abilities, empowering them to gain independence and power. These charities go beyond the “window dressing” (Cater, 1991) of green consumerism and indeed promote truly environmentally conscious and active operations.

At the forefront of conservation working holidays in the UK are the acronymic organisation TOC H, The National Trust and The British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (BTCV). Sustrans (a charity committed to the task of developing a UK-wide cycle network) also organises weekend projects to help in building the National Cycle Network, but these take place on a much smaller scale. The holidays are all similar in that people “vacation” in very basic conditions yet amidst beautiful surroundings to work extremely hard completing their project. As none of these organisations operating in the UK uses the working holidays as a method of raising funds for their causes, the holidays are inexpensive and the volunteers provide a vital workforce for the charities.

The National Trust is a charity operating within the tourism industry with whom a total of more than 65 000 participants had taken holidays to 1997. It is one of Europe’s leading conservation charities and is now the largest private landholder in England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The National Trust plays a significant role in UK tourism, enjoying a 15 percent share of all visits to historic sites and in some regions is the largest single operator of visitor attractions. The National Trust is the largest UK charity working within the tourism sector to promote sustainability. Its role in promoting sustainable tourism stems from its statutory responsibilities in which it must ensure conservation and access are protected in harmony with the local community (The National Trust, 1997). All National Trust work takes place in small

groups on National Trust land, providing a valuable service for the charity in the areas of archaeology, construction, biological data collection and conservation work. .

TOC H is a social charity based upon Christian principles, which in the thirty years since it began planning volunteering activities has organised 1500 projects involving over 14 000 people. TOC H aims to bring people from many different backgrounds together in an attempt to create a more compassionate and less prejudiced society. It believes that one way of achieving its goal is through organising working weekend breaks and holidays based around community, renovation and conservation projects throughout the country (TOC H, 1997).

BTCV train over 7500 volunteers each year in practical conservation activities and to date have enabled over 85000 people to experience a “Natural Break”. First established as the Conservation Corps in 1959 to provide a volunteer work force for the management of nature reserves, BTCV was set up in 1970 as an independent organisation. Currently the fourth largest environmental charity in the UK, the philosophy of BTCV is “The development of a movement that encourages people to take practical action and to conserve and understand their environment and thereby offer society a positive solution to many environmental concerns”(BTCV, 1999).

Charities within the tourism industry are not though confined to working within the UK. Raleigh International is a UK charity which operates conservation and development working holidays abroad. However, the motivations behind Raleigh are somewhat different however from those of BTCV and other charities operating working holidays in the UK. Launched in 1984 as an international youth

development organisation, Raleigh focuses on personal growth and sees conservation and research as a means to achieving this. Raleigh limits its volunteers to people under the age of 24 all of whom must pass an assessment weekend in which commitment, motivation and teamwork skills are tested. Successful volunteers then face a daunting challenge of raising up to £3000 in sponsorship for their expedition and thus provide Raleigh's most important source of funding. Often working with other charities such as Save the Children Fund, WWF or Surgical Eye Expeditions (SEE) International, projects are also planned, funded and executed with governmental organisations in each country, commonly the national parks authority. Raleigh operates ten expeditions per year and has visited over 35 countries in its attempt to contribute to the development of youth world-wide (Raleigh International, 1997).

International conservation working holidays are also provided by BTCV which attempt to foster the same spirit of friendship and contribution abroad as its operations in the UK. Operating to over 20 countries and working in partnership with the members of the Alliance of European Voluntary Services Organisations, the projects operate on a national or regional basis but always in co-operation with local communities, giving individuals from different countries the chance to work together (BTCV, 1999). These small scale projects in developing countries are commended by Cohen (1989; p136) who highlights the opportunity they provide for visitors to interact with locals as equals, and for a "comprehension of their 'real' life and problems, unadulterated by embellishments; the visitors are understood to pay for their stay and no exploitation is involved."

Unifying the charities which raise funds through tourism and those which provide the opportunity for tourists to perform the work of the charity is the charity Coral Cay Conservation (CCC Trust). This is the only UK charity which devotes itself to raising awareness of the importance of coral reefs and monitoring marine habitats and is able to raise funds from volunteers who then perform the work of the charity in the destination (CCC, 1997c). Working in collaboration with different governments, universities and other voluntary organisations, CCC operates expeditions to Belize, the Philippines and to Indonesia, while it also has a working relationship with the Isles of Scilly Environmental Trust and English Nature. CCC is dependent entirely on volunteers for its income and hence the appeal of the destination commercially is an integral element (CCC, 1997c). CCC surveyed the Bacalar Chico reef in Belize in 1994 and 1995 contributing important scientific information and highlighting important marine ecosystems necessary for the protection of the area and leading to its designation as a national park and marine reserve (CCC, 1997a). In the Philippines, where there is a high population density, CCC is helping to create sustainable alternative livelihoods for local people, educating them about the benefits of a healthy reef and marine environment (CCC, 1997b).

In addition to the organisations above and those unmentioned of a similar ilk, there are a small number of UK charities that work from within the tourism industry yet do not operate tours or holidays for research or conservation purposes. Such an organisation is *North South Travel*, a non-profit travel agency which at the time of the research is the only one in Britain, which passes all of its profits through the NST Development Trust to charitable causes. All profits generated by North South Travel

contribute to environmental and developmental projects in the Third World especially those that contribute to the promotion of sustainable tourism (North South Travel, 1997).

Other notable charities are: *Earthwatch*, an international science and education foundation which considers itself to be a “bridge between science and the community”, (Earthwatch, 1997a) providing over 500 volunteers to different projects in 50 countries each year. As one of the largest non-governmental funders of field research in the world, the UK operation contributes over 500 volunteers to the 4500 required by the entire organisation to assist over 300 scientists with 150 projects in 50 countries each year (Earthwatch, 1997b; Moore 1991); *Frontier Expeditions* whose tropical biodiversity projects operate on a similar model to CCC but collect a broader range of data. Their survey results for the Mafia Island reefs and other coastal ecosystems have been used in the management proposal which is being put to the government of Tanzania to create its first functional marine park (Horrill and Ngoile, 1992 as cited in Wells, 1995); The *Royal Geographical Society* (RGS), (with The Institute of British Geographers) which dates back to the days of the Elizabethan explorers and through the Victorian Empire days operated the first “working holidays” when aristocrats drove frontiers forward through Africa and Asia. Grants are available from the RGS for geographical research and exploration that has significant scientific content; *Trekforce Expeditions*, a non-profit company funded by the International Scientific Support Trust (ISST). The objective of the ISST is to help international conservation, science and community projects and it concentrates its activities on the endangered rainforests and wildlife of Belize and Indonesia. The trust works in partnership with local organisations and other scientific and

conservation bodies to select locally supported projects that are useful now and will continue to have a use for the community. Trekforce caters to young people, with most of the volunteers recent school leavers or in their gap years at university (ISST, 2000).

Implications of charities operating within the industry

There has been criticism in the literature about the true implications of holidays which provide opportunities for scientific research or environmental conservation in that although the tourists may gain a deeper understanding of the places, their new appreciation does not necessarily help those areas practically or economically (Norris, 1992, in Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). Learman and Perdue (1989) go further to state that “‘science tourism’ tends to foster a pattern of creeping commercialisation and environmental stress. Though scientists retain their conservation ethic, they invariably become tourists and regular repeat visitors exploring cultures and engaging in various adventures. In addition, they attract a relatively substantial inflow of other visitors who are less ecologically sensitive” (In De Albuquerque and McElroy, 1995; p26). The lack of funding for conservation is cited by Coral Cay Conservation (CCC, 1997c) as the reason many sensitive areas have been opened up to amateurs assisting the work of scientists. This however, creates a difficult dilemma between providing money for conservation and exposing the area to the potentially negative forces of tourism. The charity response to this criticism has been to point out that much of the research that is undertaken is done so on land owned by universities or other bodies which normally restrict access and thus the tourism activities have a negligible impact on the local communities (CCC, 1997c). Moreover, the work by the volunteers of ‘conservation holidays’ is always found to be of extremely high quality, attributable to

the belief that since volunteers are not paid, their only reward is the satisfaction that their work is done well. Cohen, who labels the type of tourism offered by conservation and environmental charities “concerned alternative tourism”, believes that its success is based on the fact that it is able to operate at a very small scale level and carefully select the character of its public. If it were to seek to expand its projects and attract a less selective travelling public, “it may not only provoke the opposition of the tourist establishment, but also undergo similar processes of routinisation and commercialisation which have marked the counter-culture variety of ‘alternative tourism’, and thus lose its distinctive ‘concerned’ character” (1989; p137).

The scientific community has also shown concern about the value of the data collected by volunteers. Most of the methods used by non-professionals have been adapted from standard scientific techniques to suit the capabilities of amateurs. The main criticisms are that amateurs cannot adequately identify species and habitat types, and that they cannot correctly estimate size and area or collect quantitative data (Wells, 1995). These criticisms have resulted in some charities conducting and publishing independent assessments of the data collected from volunteers in order to determine, and then strengthen the weaknesses that surround the use of volunteers (Mumby, Harborne, Raines and Ridley, 1995). Training is essential for charities collecting scientific data especially as volunteers most often do not need any particular training to participate in the projects. Organisations have found that mistakes made in species and habitat identification can be greatly reduced with increased training programs involving qualified professional staff to support the volunteers.

CHARITIES OPERATING ABOVE THE TOURISM INDUSTRY

Henning (1974; p15) states that “decisions affecting environmental policies grow out of a political process. This process involves the *values* of individuals, groups and organisations in the struggle for *power* through human interaction relative to the decision.” The tourism public policies enacted thus represent the value choices made by those in the position to do so. Similarly Simmons et al. (1974; p457) note that “it is value choice, implicit and explicit, which orders the priorities of government and determines the commitment of resources within the public jurisdiction” (in Hall and Jenkins:1995; p33). Charities aim to influence the individual values in society, and ultimately impact public policy decisions. While many charities operate in the same areas as the authorities, there is a perceived functional and qualitative difference that distinguishes them both from public and private sector bodies (Curson, 1995). Their actions challenge the agendas that dominate popular thinking in the areas of government tourism policy, industry practices and education for and about tourism. This process involves the adoption of values through various forms of pressure, communication and human interaction. The tourism public policies enacted thus represent the value choices made by those in the position to do so. Such values, whether implicit or explicit, underpin the priorities which government apply to the commitment of public resources to environmental action. Charities above the industry seek to influence government and tourism policy through their influential positions as mediators and relayers of international public opinion. Indirectly they attempt “to shape the demands that other groups and the public make on the

government” (Hall and Jenkins, 1995; p49), while directly, they communicate their beliefs to government officials, high commissions and national newspapers to raise awareness and stimulate discussion and involvement of individuals or local communities who are experiencing problems as a result of tourism.

Charity involvement into public tourism policy takes roughly two forms of organisational structure. The first, is a group made up of consumer, social justice and environmental charities that work on an international or national level to promote their cause. Within the UK, charities such as Tourism Concern, the National Trust, Ramblers, and the Council for the Protection of Rural England work to contain the spread of development. Their work has been instrumental in helping to conserve and preserve cultural and natural habitats and they are credited with placing sustainability on the contemporary tourism policy agendas. One of Ramblers’ Association’s most eagerly fought campaigns was for the creation of national parks in the 1940s. With the passing of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act in 1949, they have continued their work pressing for more protected areas, for public inquiries into ending military activities within the parks, and for adequate planning controls of major agricultural and forestry operations. The National Trust believes that a revision of Planning Policy Guideline Note 21 in Tourism (PPG 21) is needed together with PPG 17 (Sport and Recreation) to give more emphasis to the potential impact of tourism development and related activities upon the environment and the need to “protect the environment *above all* in areas which are sensitive to tourism and tourist development” (Stirling, 1995; p8). Removing activities such as clay pigeon shooting, use of land for caravan sites and war games from the category of permitted development within National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and placing tighter restrictions on them, are also recommendations made by the Trust to

government. Conservation organisations, while still active in hands-on protection of the environment, are realising that lobbying MPs to alter environmental policies is often a much quicker and easier method of conserving and enhancing an area's habitat (Yearly, 1993).

The second form of organisational structure is much smaller and its existence most often revolves around the belief in one tourism-specific cause. Born from local problems and needs, these groups are too small to have the necessary resources to take on the challenges posed by the industry, although notable exceptions include the charity ECPAT (End Child Prostitution in Asian Tourism) whose plight has had considerable success abroad. The importance of these bodies can be seen from the example of the campaign against sex tourism. The emotive campaigns, especially relating to child prostitution in Eastern Asian countries, have had the backing of a number of UK charities. Christian Aid and Save the Children have both produced reports on sex tourism damning the extent to which British men have indulged in this form of exploitation (see Christian Aid, 1995, Save the Children, 1993). Save the Children found in a 1993 study that Britons are the second or third largest group of men deported for sexual abuse against children in the Philippines and Sri Lanka (Save the Children, 1993). To gain greater political clout, in March 1994 a number of charities including Christian Aid, Anti-Slavery International, Catholic Foundation for Overseas Development (CAFOD), the Jubilee Campaign and Save the Children (UK) established The Coalition on Child Prostitution and Tourism (the British affiliate of ECPAT). Among its recommendations for government, the coalition has pressed for tougher legislation against British nationals who commit sexual offences against children abroad. Apart from their contributions to their individual (and collective) causes, the existence of these small specific-interest based charities is worthy of note

as many of the larger more all-encompassing organisations began their existence in this manner.

Educating Tourists

In addition to the work described above, charities above the tourism industry focus a great deal of their attentions on the education of tourists. Charities working in areas that are quickly becoming destinations for nature based travel are developing a number of codes of conduct directed at the tourists. These voluntary codes are aimed at limiting damage to the environment and culture at the destination in order to promote more responsible tourism in developing countries. Codes have been developed at different scales to suit general aims or specific objectives. Tourism Concern's Himalayan Tourist Code (Tourism Concern, 1995) states that by following its guidelines, visitors "can help preserve the unique environment and ancient cultures of the Himalayas". Less area-specific, "Danger Tourists" produced by Survival International (1996) sets out cultural guidelines to be followed when entering any area owned by tribal people while environmentally, the Marine Conservation Society's "Coral Code" has developed a comprehensive guide for safeguarding the natural ecosystems at any marine location (Tourism Concern, 2000). The effectiveness of these codes has been called into question however as it is extremely difficult to measure changes in visitor attitudes and behaviours, and especially difficult to determine if the change is due to a specific change agent (Mason and Mowforth, 1995). If they are to be of use, the message they carry must also be widely disseminated. Mason (1990 in Mason and Mowforth, 1995) found in research conducted on behalf of the Annapurna Conservation Area Project in Nepal that

although 70 percent of the trekkers were aware that the region had a tourist code, less than half knew of the information and instructions contained in it. The goal for these charities now is to spread the message in the codes to the widest range of people possible. While opinion varies on where responsibility for spreading this message lies (Weiler 1993, Miller 1999) opportunities for charities to change a government's direction to tourism policy are strictly limited unless considerable pressure is placed on the industry itself (Lea, 1993).

Implications of charities operating above the industry

There is recent evidence that the work of charities and the values of the general public is bringing about change in the industry, especially with regard to environmental concerns. More and more businesses are developing partnerships and support links with non-profit organisations, contributing significant proportions of their profits to nature conservation or to development projects in the Third World. These partnerships are supported by Chapter 27 of Agenda 21, the global framework for action on sustainable development issues.

Companies are finding that it is not only sound business practice to act responsibly within their own industry, but that their public is demanding that they do so.

“Investing in the community is not simply an optional, charitable extra for companies, it is part of core business for sound commercial reasons and like crime prevention should be on the agenda of directors as well as staff” (Patten, 1991:6). Charities are now benefiting from the partnerships that have arisen, having greater resources and

funding available to enact and enforce regulations that will benefit both people and their environments. With the proliferation of nature based tourism, companies are also finally ready to listen to advice from the charities and integrate new policies into company values. The new partnerships between charities and the corporate sector stem from the success of new approaches to encourage direct action and education in conservation and fair trade in the industry. Getting businesses to commit to charity goals has resulted in a number of campaigns and committees which aim to change the nature of the tourism product offered:

- The Ark Environmental Foundation ran a highly successful and widely acclaimed responsible tourism campaign on collaboration with Manchester Airport, Thompson Travel and the European Commission. The “Green Travel Bug Campaign” featured a video, “The Art of Travelling Light” that was shown on Britannia flights in 1992-1993. The video highlighted topics of waste, conservation, local cultures and wildlife protection (Ark, 1997).
- The Centre for the Advancement of Responsible Tourism (CART), was launched to seek fairer contracts and respect between travellers and their hosts in the UK and world-wide (Millman, 1989:275). It works with the Plunkett Foundation for Co-operative studies in Oxford to develop tourism co-operatives in the Third World and help conserve human communities and local habitats.
- Friends of Conservation (FOC) established the Travel and Tourism Committee in 1991 to address concerns that tourism and conservation were not working together to preserve and control the delicate East African habitats. Representatives from the travel industry and media who have specific interests in developing East Africa as a tourism destination without compromising conservation issues were brought together to help promote the work of FOC within the travel sector, to promote

tourist education within East Africa, to encourage greater participation from the travel industry in conservation issues and to contribute financially to conservation (FOC, 1997).

- Survival International targets travel agents and tour operators who sensationalise and patronise the lives of tribal peoples. They lobby these companies to explain the impact of their actions and pressurise them to respect the rights of tribal people (Survival International, 1996).
- The Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society works with tour operators to encourage careful whale watching trips. They produce brochures for their members with advertisements of a number of recommended whale watch operators who are known to follow responsible and informative practices (Whale & Dolphin Conservation Society, 1998).

CONCLUSION

Boo (1990) notes that although more tour operators now recognise the potential of tourism to protected areas, few contribute to the conservation of the destinations. The ones that do accept the need for a more sustainable form of development are most often the small companies who specialise in adventure or nature based tours and whose clients expect a commitment to the environment. Managers of these smaller companies often have a deep rooted interest in the environment and see their donations not only as a business expense, necessary to preserve and promote the company image, develop markets and attract resources, but also as a social responsibility unrelated to commercial considerations (Tropical Places, 1997). They contribute a significant portion of their tour fees or a fixed sum per client to charities

for resource base conservation or for local development initiatives. This has been the traditional view of charity involvement in tourism, however, this paper has presented an initial framework to demonstrate a wider involvement. However, as this involvement develops then the framework may need to be extended further, as such, this research represents a starting point only. However, the whole area of charity involvement with tourism is under researched. Further areas for study could include the extent to which charities influence the promotion of domestic tourism over international tourism, influence the destinations chosen and even influence the behaviour of tourists once on holiday. These issues reflect much of the research taking place with regard to tourism in general but as yet has gone unexplored with regard to charities.

Figure One: Framework of charity involvement with tourism

REFERENCES

- Ark Environmental Foundation 1997. <http://www.planetark.org/index.cfm>
- Ayala, H (1995) From Quality Product to Eco-Product: Will Fiji Set a Precedent? *Tourism Management*, vol.16, no.1, pp39-47
- Bike Events (1997) Telephone interview with Paul Hobbs. June 15.
- Boo, E. (1990) Ecotourism: The Potentials and the Pitfalls. World-Wide Fund for Nature, Vol 1.
- British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (1999) February. <http://www.btcv.org.uk>
- Cancer Relief Macmillan Fund (1997) Telephone Interview with Ms Catherine Norman, Macmillan Challenge Team, June 23.
- Cater, E. (1991) Sustainable Tourism in the Third World: Problems and Prospects. Reading University. Department of Geography. Discussion Paper 3.
- Ceballos-Lascurain, H (1996) Tourism, Ecotourism and Protected Areas. The World Conservation Union, Gland.
- Charities Advisory Trust (1997) Telephone interview with Mr Hussain Ibrahim, April 9.
- Charity Commission (1997) April. <http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk/>
- Chesterman, M (1979) Charities, Trusts and Social Welfare. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.
- Christian Aid (1995) An Abuse of Innocence: Tourism and Child Prostitution in The Third World. Christian Aid, London.
- Classic Tours (1997) Interview with Charles Getliffe, Director, June 13.
- Cohen, E (1989) “‘Alternative Tourism’ - A Critique. In T.V. Singh, H.L. Theuns, F.M. Go (eds) Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries. Peter Lang, Frankfurt.
- Coral Cay Conservation (1996) Newsletter. Issue 5.
- Coral Cay Conservation (1997a) Newsletter Issue 6.
- Coral Cay Conservation (1997b) Expeditions, Brochure
- Coral Cay Conservation (1997c) Interview with Mr Alastair Harbourne, Science Co-ordinator, May 19.

Curson, T (1995) "Can you Place your Trust in Them? The Role of Charitable Trusts in Leisure Management" in D. Leslie (ed) Tourism & Leisure - Perspectives on Provision. Leisure Studies Association, UK.

De Albuquerque and J.L. McElroy (1995) "Alternative Tourism and Sustainability" in Conlin, M.V. and T. Baum. Island Tourism: Management Principles and Practice. Wiley.

Earthwatch (1997a) What is Earthwatch? Press Release. January.

Earthwatch (1997b) Earthwatch – Because Tomorrow's World Needs You Today. Press Release. January.

Friends of Conservation (1997) Current and Completed Projects. Friends of Conservation.

Guide Dogs for the Blind Association (1997) Telephone Interview with Mr Nick Chetwood, Fundraising Projects Officer, June 18, 1997.

Hall, C.M. and J.M. Jenkins (1995) Tourism and Public Policy. Routledge, London

Henning, D.H (1974) Environmental Policy and Administration. American Elsevier, New York

Hodson, Mark (1996) "Art of Darkness." The Sunday Times. 15 September, p17.

Hurdle, S (1996) "Charity Fair". In Focus. Autumn, p12-13.

International Scientific Support Trust (2000)
<http://dialspace.dial.pipex.com/towm/parade/hu15/>

Krippendorf, J (1987) The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel. Heinemann Professional Publishing, Oxford.

Lea, J (1993) "Tourism Development Ethics in the Third World". Annals of Tourism Research. Vol 20 pp 701-715.

Marriott, E (1999) "Charity Now Begins Abroad". Evening Standard, March 5, p.49.

Mason, P. and M. Mowforth (1995) Codes of Conduct in Tourism. University of Plymouth. Occasional Papers in Geography. No. 1.

Miller, G (1999) Indicators for Sustainable Tourism: Results of a Delphi Survey. University of Surrey. Unpublished at time of press.

Millman, R (1989) "Pleasure Seeking vs the 'Greening' of World Tourism". Tourism Management 10 (4) p275-278.

Moore, C (1991) "Earthwatch" Outdoor Action. January, pp 46-47.

Mumby, P.J., A.R. Harborne, P.S. Raines and J.M. Ridley (1995) "A Critical Assessment of Data Derived from Coral Cay Conservation Volunteers." Bulletin of Marine Science 56(3) pp 737-751.

National Trust (1997) Facts and Figures Compendium. The National Trust, London.

Norris, 1992, in Ceballos-Lascurain, H. (Ed.) (1996) Tourism, Ecotourism and Protected Areas. The World Conservation Union, Gland.

North South Travel (1997)

<http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepage/Leisureconsult.nsttf.htm>

National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (1997) Interview with Ms Megan Munsell, Special Events Executive, June 3, 1997.

National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (1997a) Trek Tanzania. NSPCC.

National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (1997b) The Special Events Unit. NSPCC

Oxford Concise Dictionary (1995) 9th Edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Patten, J (1991) "Government, Business and the Voluntary Sector. A Developing Partnership." Policy Studies 12(3) pp. 4-10.

Raleigh International (1997) Information Pack

Roekaerts, M. and K. Savat (1989) "Mass Tourism in South and SouthEast Asia - A Challenge to Christians and Churches." in T.V. Singh, H.L. Theuns, F.M. Go (eds) Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries. Peter Lang, Frankfurt.

Save the Children (1993) Wish You Weren't Here, pamphlet, London.

Siesta Holidays International Holidays Limited (1997) Personal Communication with Bernard T. Carroll.

Singh, T.V., H.L. Theuns and F.M. Go (eds), (1989) Towards Appropriate Tourism: The Case of Developing Countries. Peter Lang, Frankfurt.

Stirling, Sir Angus (1995) "Environment Impact of Leisure Activities" The National Trust. Paper Submitted to Government Environment Committee, 13 February. The National Trust. 1996. The National Trust Magazine. No. 79. August.

Survival International (1996) Parks and People: Tribal Peoples and Conservation. Survival International. Pamphlet, October, London

Thomas, A (1992) "Non-Governmental Organisations and the Limits to Empowerment." in M. Wuyts, M. McIntosh and T. Hewitt (eds) Development Policy and Public Action. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Tourism Concern (1995) The Himalayan Code. Tourism Concern, London

Tourism Concern (2000) <http://www.gn.apc.org/tourismconcern/>

TOC H (1997) Telephone interview with Ms Simms, Project Co-ordinator, June 28.

Tropical Places Ltd (1997) Telephone Interview with Mr J. Grieves-Cook, Managing Director, June 27.

Weiler, B (1993) Educating the Tourist; Who's Responsible? Ecotourism Conference Papers, pp288-292

Wells, S.M. (1995) Reef Assessment and Monitoring Using Volunteers and Non-Professionals. A Report for the International Year of the Reef, 1996. The Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science. University of Miami, USA.

Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (1998) Whale and Dolphin Watching, Pamphlet, London

Worldwide Journeys and Expeditions Ltd (1997) Telephone interview with Mr Rowan Patterson, Chief Executive, July 7.

World Tourism Organisation (1980) The Manila Declaration on World Tourism.

World-Wide Fund for Nature (1999) Personal interview with Steve Waygood, WWF UK, Godalming, Surrey.

Yearly, S (1993) "Standing in for Nature. The Practicalities of Environmental Organisations' Use of Science." In K. Milton (ed.) Environmentalism: The View from Anthropology. Routledge, London, pp 59-72.