12-2013

FAIR TRADE TOURISM: CONCEPTUAL EVOLUTION AND POTENTIAL MARKET PROJECTION

Dongoh Joo
Clemson University, joo.dongoh@gmail.com

FAIR TRADE TOURISM:
CONCEPTUAL EVOLUTION AND POTENTIAL MARKET PROJECTION

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
Applied Economics and Statistics

---

by
Dongoh Joo
December 2013

Accepted by:
Dr. David W Hughes, Committee Chair
Dr. David B Willis
Dr. William C Norman

ABSTRACT

Fair trade tourism commonly refers to any attempts to ensure and maximize the benefits from tourism for stakeholders in destination areas (Tourism Concern, online; FTT_a, online). It is drawing recent attention as a means of reducing associated economic and social costs that undermine the validity of tourism as a development tool, and to make tourism more sustainable. To achieve these goals, the principles of the commodity-based fair trade movement (a set of well-established efforts designed to result in a more equitable distribution in product markets) are introduced to tourism. However, both the nature of tourism - as intangible and destination-oriented products - and the large potential scale of tourism impact prevent unaltered adoption of commodity-based fair trade principles. Thus, a tailored approach is needed that can reflect the natures of tourism while retaining the essential elements of the fair trade movement. Seeing fair trade tourism as a type of sustainable tourism especially focusing on community-wise fairness and benefits can provide a framework to better understand the concept and distinguish it from other similar concepts. A survey of 191 fair trade consumers confirmed the following set of hypothesis: 1) there exists a positive correlation between attitudes toward commodity-based fair trade and willingness to participate in fair trade tourism, 2) economic and social sustainability possess higher priority than cultural and ecological sustainability, though all four sustainability domains are considered important, 3) consumers of fair trade products are willing to pay a premium for a fair trade tourism experience, and 4) willingness to pay for such premium is affected by enthusiasm toward and experience with the commodity-based fair trade movement. Based on the findings, it is suggested that promoting fair trade tourism on a domestic level can be advantageous for visitors, host communities, and fair trade organizations as it can lower barriers to participate in fair trade tourism and utilize unexplored business opportunities.

Key Words: Fair trade, Fair trade tourism, Sustainable tourism, Community-based tourism, Pro-poor tourism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I extend my gratitude to all those who supported my research and time at Clemson University. If it were not for their understanding, guidance, and dedication, this thesis could never be finished.

Among many, my greatest thanks should go to Dr. David W Hughes, who is my committee chair. Without his encouragement and guidance, I would still be struggling to get my research started. He provided me right advice and guidance whenever I needed them, making me a real fortunate student.

Dr. David Willis and Dr. William Norman also deserve acknowledgement for their help in finishing this thesis. As members of my thesis committee, they have been very willing to share their ideas and knowledge.

I also thank the Ten Thousand Village store in Greenville, SC, for allowing me to survey their customers. Staffs of the store, including Ms. Deborah Plosky who is the manager, provided me with the necessary assistance and information.

Last but not least, I deeply appreciate my parents for their unconditional support, both financially and spiritually throughout my degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Study Background

Tourism stands as a popular policy option to spur regional development thanks to its purported large multiplier effects in terms of income and job creation, possible effect in transforming economic structures, and often relatively small levels of capital investment (Wall & Mathieson 2006; Goeldner & Ritchie 2009; Fleischer & Felsenstein 2000). However, skeptics insist that economic and social costs that tourism development may bring to a destination can more than offset its benefits (Britton, 1982; Williams & Shaw, 1998).

Fair trade tourism has arisen as one of the latest attempts to minimize the negative side effects of tourism. The goal of fair trade tourism advocates is for visitors, host communities, and locally-owned tourism businesses to all benefit from tourism development. Fair trade tourism has adopted its principles and systems from the goods-based fair trade movement. Fair trade tourism destinations are primarily located in countries that produce fair trade products, and the certification system in fair trade tourism was designed based on that of fair trade commodities. Academic works focusing on how to institute fair trade in tourism are presented by writers like Clevedon and Kalisch (2000), Klemm and Parkinson (2001), and Tapper (2001).

Proponents of pro-poor tourism or community-based tourism also share many of the goals of fair trade tourism advocates such as poverty alleviation through tourism development and community empowerment (Harrison, 2008; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011). Elements of fair trade tourism are also found in volunteer tourism, green tourism or rural tourism as forms of participating in a community projects, selling local products at site, and supporting small and medium sized businesses.

The implicit existence of these various efforts to lower social and economic costs of tourism call into question the novelty of the concept of fair trade tourism. Should fair trade tourism be seen as an expansion of conventional fair trade scheme to the tourism industry, or should it be seen merely as a type of sustainable tourism? How can one's attitude toward conventional fair trade movement be translated into one's interest and understanding in fair trade tourism? Answering these questions provides insight into the concept of 'fair trade

tourism,' and projecting its market viability.

1.2. Aims of the Study

Through theoretical and statistical analysis, the intention here is to achieve the following goals: First, to suggest a framework that provides a better understanding of fair trade tourism. Accordingly, the basic nature and the various impacts of tourism are examined as well as the overlap between the concepts of fair trade movement and sustainable tourism. By comparing fair trade tourism to other similar ways of examining tourism, such as sustainable tourism, the novelty of fair trade tourism is investigated.

Second, to investigate the preferences of potential participants of fair trade tourism through a survey conducted at a Ten Thousand Villages store in Greenville, SC (a fair trade handicraft store) from April, 28, 2013 to May, 24, 2013. The survey (as shown in Appendix - 1) was designed to test four main hypotheses as follows: a) that one's attitude toward goods-based fair trade movement and his understanding of and willingness to participate in fair trade tourism would be positive correlated, b) that potential fair trade tourists would primarily focus on social and economic sustainability of a destination, c) that survey respondents will indicate a willingness to pay a premium for a fair trade tourism experience, and d) that the willingness to pay such a premium would be correlated with one's experience with and frequency of fair trade shopping.

1.3. An Overview of the Contents

The thesis consists of four sections as described in the following: literature review, conceptual analysis, statistical analysis, and discussion.

In the literature review, important concepts and features of tourism, fair trade movement, sustainable tourism, and fair trade tourism are discussed. Since fair trade tourism is a convergence of fair trade movement and sustainable tourism, it is important to know the key elements and paths of development for both concepts.

The conceptual analysis following the literature review addresses the issue concerning whether fair trade tourism should be seen as a branch of the fair trade movement or as a form of sustainable tourism. The distinct natures of tourism product and the impacts of tourism development are key elements in this discussion.

The statistical analysis section presents detailed illustration of survey process and analysis. Descriptive statistics is used to test the four main hypotheses. By seeing if the mean outcomes for dependent variables (willingness to participate, concern for sustainability domains, and willingness to pay) differ significantly by changes in independent variables (experience with and frequencies of fair trade shopping), possible relationships between these variables are examined.

In the discussion section, a summary of and commentary on the main concepts as examined under the statistical results is presented. In particular, implications for businesses, policy makers and destination communities are drawn from conceptual and statistical analysis presented in the previous sections. Furthermore the limitations of the research are presented and suggestions for future research are.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

To better understand significance and nature of fair trade tourism, it is important to know which characteristics of tourism make sustainability an important issue in the industry and what are the major impacts of tourism as revealed in previous studies. Also, as fair trade tourism stands at a confluence where sustainable tourism and fair trade movement meet, this chapter reviews the evolution and the principles of both concepts.

2.1. Understanding Tourism

2.1.1. Uniqueness of Tourism as an Industry

Tourism, as an industry, has distinctive features that set it apart from other industries. Besides the intangible and perishable[1] characteristics of tourism as a service, the industry is also multi-sectorial and destinations-specific in nature. It is necessary to understand the uniqueness of tourism industry to better analyze fair trade tourism.

Tourism is a multi-sectorial industry in that various types of businesses function together to provide tourism experience to visitors to a region (Leiper, 1979; McKercher, 1993; Wall & Mathieson, 2006; Stabler, Papatheodorou & Sinclair, 2010). Travel agencies, airlines, restaurants, hotels, retailers, and others industries all provide products and services to tourists, but each exists under a different industry category. Further, many of these firms also serve non-tourist (locals or non-tourist travelers) markets and even this distinction can vary from place to place. For example, in some regions, agriculture is heavily involved in tourism, where in others it is not. Such multi-sectorial nature of tourism makes it its impacts more pervasive and less discernible requiring more thorough investigation and management.

In addition, tourism impacts, especially cost side impacts, tend to be destination-specific. Because of the intangible and perishable natures of tourism products and services, their consumption and production are usually conducted simultaneously at a site, thus forcing the destination to bear most impacts (De Kadt, 1979; McKercher, 1993; Cleverdon & Kalisch, 2000). Arguably, destinations are likely to experience greater changes

---

[1] Tourism is primarily a service and hence not storable for future consumption (Reisinger, 2001).

in its economic, social, cultural, and environmental composition as a result in comparison to other industries where impacts are more dispersed. Considering that tourism relies heavily on cultural and environmental qualities of a destination, this destinations-specific nature highlights the importance of conducting tourism activities in a sustainable way.

2.1.2. Economic Impacts

The economic aspects received the greatest amount of attention in the initial research concerning the impacts of tourism. Economic impacts are usually easier to quantify than socio-cultural or environmental impacts. Further, government and business leaders have a strong interest in determining the economic impacts of tourism as a possible benefit (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Arguably, in an overall weighting of social benefits and costs, the greatest weight is given to economic impacts.

Tourism has been promoted as an effective tool to create income and jobs not only in sectors that serve visitors directly, but also in sectors that indirectly support tourism activities. Developing countries have been active in utilizing tourism to advance their economies, as their availability of natural environment and sufficient supply of labor provide natural advantages. However, a growing number of developed nations are also turning to tourism as a means of revitalizing regions, which lost their conventional growth engines, and to engender growth in general (Gannon, 1994; Fleischer & Pizam, 1997).

Furthermore, the literature indicates that tourism helps to earn foreign exchange (Dubarry, 2004), stimulate regional economies (Seckelmann, 2002), redistribute wealth both between regions and individuals (Fleischer & Felsenstein, 2000; Seckelmann, 2002) and transform economic structures (Dubarry, 2004). However, it is true that such benefits can also be achieved by developing other industries (Hughes & Shields, 2007), and the real strength of tourism as a vehicle of economic development rather lies at its strong inter-sectorial linkages, labor intensive nature, lower trade barriers, and possible associated improvement in infrastructure.

In particular, one can argue that tourism has a greater-than-average multiplier effect due to its stronger inter-sectorial linkages and larger direct-expenditures by visitors which both are crucial in deciding the amount of money that stays within an area. For example, in their study of Hawaii's top 20 tourism related industries Cai,

Leung and Mak (2006) found that the majority had substantial backward linkages (i.e., purchased relatively large amounts of locally-sourced inputs).

Arguably, the development of tourism industry can be an excellent policy tool for generating local employment opportunities. A study by Bond and Ladman (1972) compared job creation generated by equal levels of spending in the Mexican tourism, petroleum, and metal industries. They found that tourism generated markedly more employment opportunities. However, at the same time, critics argue that tourism jobs often tend to be low skilled, often part-time, and hence low paying in nature. For example, a study conducted by Hughes and Shield (2007) concerning the economic impact of tourism in rural Pennsylvania indicated that impacts tend to be concentrated with lower income, and hence less educated and less formally skilled, households.

The non-commodity nature of tourism also decreases the likelihood of trade barriers for that sector. Trade barriers (tariffs, quotas, or bans) often mean unfavorable conditions for developing countries. Typically, visitors are allowed to move with only a limited level of barriers (Sharpley, 2002). Also, unlike other goods and services, for which international markets or agreements may play significant roles in determining prices, prices of tourism products and services remain largely under the control of governments and markets in the hosting regions (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

Tourism development may also mean improvement in the overall quality of public infrastructure for a region. To better cater to the needs of tourists, investments that enhance the quality and quantity of roads, water and sewage, accommodations, and public health are often made (Sharpley, 2002). Besculide, Lee, and McCormick (2002) revealed that residents of a Colorado county acknowledged such improvements in infrastructure quality induced from tourism development. Such improvements may be beneficial not only to local residents but also other local industries (Dwyer & Forsyth, 2006).

However, others argue that the economic costs of tourism often outweigh the benefits and hence tourism is not an effective tool for achieving economic prosperity. They argue that economic costs can be substantial and point to high leakage rates for tourism income (and hence a low multiplier effect) (Smith & Jenner ,1992; Min & Wall, 2002), increased inflation (Wall & Mathieson, 2006), and the instability of tourism-based earnings

(Wilson, 1994) as the economic costs of tourism.

For areas that are highly dependent on imports or where possibly government-imposed taxes and fees are large, net local returns from tourism can be quite limited. Even at the national level, payments to outside businesses, for example, can be large. For instance, one report indicates that 70% of tourist expenditure in Thailand leak outside the country (UNEP[2], online). Inflation in a destination region can be an issue as well. For example, as large numbers of relatively affluent outsiders visit and spend in an area, local retailers will often set prices at levels affordable to tourist but beyond the means of most residents (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). This is an issue that is need of further research.

Tourism demand is sensitive to changes in environments, thus making tourism earnings unstable. Seasonal fluctuation in tourism demand poses difficulties for destinations, and potentially undermines profitability. During the high season, excessive demand can cause shortage of goods and services. During the low season tourism facilities and associated labor are idle (Butler, 2001; Cuccia & Rizzo, 2011). Further, natural disasters, diseases, and conflicts may cause tourism earnings to plunge. The SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome), a viral respiratory disease, outbreak of 2003 (Pine & McKercher, 2004) and the 9/11 Terrorist Attack in 2001 (Goodrich 2002) are examples of such events that had temporary but still negative and real effect on tourism markets.

Whether a country or a region receives the full economic benefits from tourism is a function of economic structure, the nature and volume of tourist visit and spending, and the capacity and quality of tourism services. Stronger ties between regional or in-country economic sectors that result in fewer imports and greater tourist spending for locally produced products are keys in boosting local economic gains from tourism (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2009).

2.1.3. Socio-Cultural Impacts

As it is often difficult to draw a clear distinction between social and cultural impacts (Wall & Mathieson, 2006), such impacts are more often viewed together. Hawkes (2001) insisted that cultural impacts are as important as

---

[2] United Nations Environmental Program

economy, environment, and society impacts, and hence warrant separate treatment. Considering that culture is often an important component of tourism demand, the separate treatment of cultural impacts is a noteworthy concept.

Pizam and Millan (1984, p. 11) defined the sociocultural impact of tourism as a force which induces changes in "value systems, individual behavior, family relationships, collective lifestyles, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremony and community organization," while Wolf (1977) described the process as "people impacts," (i.e., the changes which the people of a destination area experience as a result of an increased number of visitors). In this thesis, sociocultural impacts of tourism are illustrated as two separate components, that is, as a separate social and cultural aspect.

2.1.3.1. Social Impacts

A tourist destination may experience changes in belief, value and behaviors of individual resident and community as a whole when promoting tourism. Definitions of social impact can be subjective and intangible, and may involve various influences ranging from health and livability to family and gender related issues. It is not only the direct visitor-host interaction which brings social changes to the community. Inflow of expatriates, who are motivated by benefits from tourism, can also be an important source of social impact (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

Frequently found social impacts that are deemed beneficial are increases in youth and female employment and accompanied improvement in their social status as verified in Haralambopoulos and Pizam's study of Samos Island in Greece (1996). Tourism industry requires relatively low levels of job specialization, and this offers viable job opportunities for people with less education and training to work. This, in turn, can promote the rights of women and youth, thereby weakening the chauvinistic nature of a given culture.

However, tourism development may also bring social costs to a community which may be substantial and disturbing. One possible social cost of tourism is the rise in undesirable activities such as prostitution and crime (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Opperman, 1999), disruption of traditional family and social order, limited opportunities in high-paying and managerial positions for original residents (Wall & Mathieson, 2006), and

unfair distribution of resulting income (Blake, Arbache, Sinclair, & Teles 2008).

While tourism can cause negative social impacts, it is difficult to separate the influence of tourism versus other sources of social change (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). For instance, growth and structural change in population, and enhanced social status of women result from the modernization process in general, and occur in areas where tourism is not prevalent.

People may also perceive the changes engendered by tourism differently, based on their dependency on the industry, age, gender, and temporal and emotional attachment to the region. In fact, Mvula's study of Gambia (2001) showed that there exists a considerable difference in how residents view tourism based on how much they are gain from the tourism. Such difficulties in studying human behaviors and perceptions may have caused social sustainability to receive less attention (Hardy, Beeton, & Pearson, 2002).

2.1.3.2. Cultural Impacts

Defined in the widest sense, cultural impacts are hardly distinguishable from social impact. For instance, Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary (2003) definition of culture includes

"… the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious, or social group; also: the characteristic features of everyday existence (as diversions or a way of life) shared by people in a place or time" and "… the set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterizes an institution or organization…"

The most widely recognized cultural benefits of tourism are boosting inter-cultural dialogue and understanding (D'Amore, 1988) and conservation and re-vitalization of traditional culture (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002). D'Amore claimed that tourism promotes cross-cultural exchange and understanding between tourists and residents, by helping residents to learn about the world outside their community, and enabling tourists to experience indigenous cultures and share their experiences with no visitors. Studies by Besculides, Lee and McCormick (2002) and Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) revealed that tourism enhanced residents' cultural identity while preserving uniqueness of their culture.

Yet other analysts are skeptical concerning the cultural benefits of tourism. Both Hasan (1975) and Stebbins

(1996) argue that there is little room for cross cultural dialogues with mass (large groups) tourism (often the prevalent form of tourism). In addition, mass influx of ignorant and arrogant tourists to a region may slowly deteriorate traditional culture (Liu, 2003). As for revitalization of traditional art form, Wall and Mathieson (2006) acknowledge that the original meaning and authenticity of a culture may be deprived by excessive commercialization, where "fake cultures," and "stage authenticity" prevail, while MacCannell (2001) expressed his concern for commodification of culture.

2.1.3.3. Demonstration Effect

The demonstrate effect refers to the tendency of local people to imitate the actions and attitudes of visitors thereby causing major social and cultural changes (Fisher, 2004; Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Material or even spiritual affluence displayed by visitors can lead to imitation by local residents. It is important to understand that the demonstration effect can have either beneficial or harmful impacts on local societies. For instance, residents may institute desirable social norms or a more open political system because of the demonstrate effect (Liu, 2003). However, they may also imitate extravagant (i.e., beyond their financial means) and hedonic behavior resulting in local discontent, degradation of the local moral code, and animosity against tourists.

2.1.4. Environmental Impacts

Environmental impacts of tourism have received the most attention since the 1970s when the idea of continuous growth was first contested. Writers may define environment impacts in different ways, but impacts typically refer to the natural environment, while Wall and Mathieson (2006) also include the impact on man-made (or built) environment. If we consider environment as something that visitors may encounter and depend on during their visit, it is reasonable to include the man-made environment, since a large portion of the tourism experience comes from the built environment as well as from nature.

Tourism can result in the degradation of natural assets, such as loss of vegetation and wildlife, decline in water, soil, and air quality, and damage to landscape. Some impacts occur during the development of tourism facilities, while others result from tourist visits. Similarly, possible impacts on mad-made assets include infrastructure overloading, architectural pollution (new constructions spoiling the landscape or cultural ambience), traffic congestion, and segregation of tourists and residents) (Wall & Mathieson 2006).

`

2.2. Understanding Sustainable Tourism

2.2.1. Evolution of Sustainable Tourism

Though the idea of sustainability development has existed for centuries, modern usages of the term started in 1970s, when people began to be aware of environmental degradation as a byproduct of economic development. The most widely used definition is found in the Brundtland Report (published by the UN WCED[3] in 1987) which defines sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generation to meet their own needs" (p. 41). While this definition serves as a good starting point, its vagueness has led to numerous interpretations. According to Steer and Wade-Gery (1993), more than 70 different definitions have been proposed, implying that a universal definition is unobtainable.

Despite this definitional problem, the concept has gained instant popularity and has been applied as means of analyzing the costs and benefits of tourism. Rapid and continuous post-World War II economic growth triggered huge and rapid growth in international and domestic tourism. UN WTO[4] reported that international tourist arrivals increased from 25 million to 405 million between 1950 and 1989 (1989). Though no figure was presented for domestic tourism, it is typically assumed that the size of domestic tourism has been as much as ten times larger than that of international tourism. This unbridled expansion raised concerns about social, cultural, and environmental impacts.

Bramwell and Lane (1993, p. 2) wrote "… in a fascinating parallel, tourism's critics have slowly passed through a similar evolution in their thinking to that experienced by the environmental critics of the classical general economic growth model…" Just like sustainable development, the allied concept of sustainable tourism faces with problems in regard to definition and measurement. Clarke (1997) explained that the understanding of sustainable tourism has followed the four phases of polar opposite, continuum, movement, and convergence adding flexibility in seeing the concept as the phases develop.

Initially, conventional mass tourism, which was dominant in the 1970s and 1980s, was seen as a major cause of

---

[3] United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development
[4] United Nations World Tourism Organization

the negative impacts of tourism, while sustainable tourism was considered as an ultimate solution. That is, the scale of tourism was seen as the most important criteria affecting sustainability; in particular, small scale developments were considered more sustainable than large scale developments. However, small scale tourism still requires much of the infrastructures and system of mass tourism. Further, factors other than number of visitors affect sustainability. Also, totally replacing large-scale mass tourism with small-scale alternative tourism has proven to be not viable in many cases.

More recently, sustainable tourism has been viewed as an achievable objective for all types of tourism (Clarke, 1997), regardless of scale. Rather than focusing on the scale of tourism development, a combination of managerial know-hows and sustainability techniques are seen as a key for mitigating the economic, social, cultural, and environmental costs to destinations and for achieving a balance between sustainability and efficiency. In any case, sustainable tourism has the potential of losing its sustainable aspects if improperly managed (Clarke, 1997).

Because a universal definition of sustainable tourism has been deemed impossible to determined, UN WTO and others indicate that applications of the concept must be site-specific in nature (Manning, 1999). This site-specific nature has important implications for understanding fair trade tourism.

2.2.2. Domains of Sustainability Tourism

Hawke (2001)'s categorization of sustainability in terms of four domains (economic, social, cultural, and ecological) explained earlier is useful in understanding the sustainable tourism. For example, eco-tourism is a type of sustainable tourism that pays special attention to the local ecology. Similarly, pro-poor tourists may concentrate on enhancing social and economic sustainability of a destination, while volunteer tourists wish to spend time and money in an area with the goal of achieving a particular outcome that they deem as desirable. For example, some tourist may choose to volunteer for a bio-diversity effort in a given place, while others prefer to pay attention to labor exploitation issues. However, it is important to note that, despite the concentration of concerns, other aspects of sustainability must be considered for the various types of tourism outlined here. For example, to be considered as a sustainable tourist, an eco-tourist must not neglect human rights and poverty alleviation issues.

2.3. Understanding Fair Trade Movement

2.3.1. Evolution of Fair Trade Movement

Though, some may trace it farther back, it is commonly acknowledged that the idea of fair trade first became visible during the post-World War II period. Religious groups and Non-Governmental Organizations started to notice the possibility of helping the poor by establishing fairer trading relationships for marginalized nations or groups. The pioneers of the concept perceived trade relationships between the developed North and the less-developed South nations as unfair and exploitative, and called for a transformation (Renard, 2003).

Religious organizations have been the most prominent in promoting fair trade. The Ten Thousand Villages, which is an active fair trade group in the United States, has its root in the Mennonite faith and remained a part of the Mennonite Central Committee until 2012. SERRV (Sales Exchange for Refugee Rehabilitation and Vocation) International is a United States based fair trade group that was found by the Church of Brethren, but is supported by a variety of faith groups including the Catholic Relief Services and the Jewish Fund for Justice (DeCarlo, 2007). Other early supporters were more politically oriented with some organizations in the 1960s attempting to help politically and economically isolated groups by finding output product markets. Indeed the first attempt to sell coffee through alternative distribution channels was associated with Sandinista militant groups in Nicaragua (Renard, 2003).

These different initiatives have currently converged as fair trade has penetrated conventional markets (Renard, 2003). The process began in 1988 with the introduction of the fair trade label (which certifies and labels products as satisfying fair trade standards) by Max Havelaar in the Netherlands as to respond to requests by Mexican coffee growers. Before the introduction of the labeling system, fair trade products were primarily sold through alternative stores[5], which stood outside conventional distribution systems, and which often lacked sufficient convenience and available supply for consumers. Labeling has also increased customer confidence that purchased products actually benefit the poor, whereas previously such verification was not possible Renard (2003).

---

[5] Alternative Stores specialize in selling fair trade products. The Ten Thousand Villages is an example of alternative stores.

A variety of fair trade label certifying organizations currently exist. While these organizations have slightly different principles and practices, their core requirements are consistent. For instance, WFTO[6], a global association of fair trade businesses around the world, mandates to provide opportunities for the economically disadvantaged, transparency and accountability in operation, fair price, good working atmosphere, and environmental sustainability in their requirements (WFTO, 2011). All label certification organization aim to assist the poor through equitable trading relationships and capacity building.

In comparison to its early years, fair trade has expanded significantly in geographic coverage, product variety, and market size. Fair trade products are sold throughout the world as opposed to being exclusively sold in Europe and the United States as in the 1970s. Also, the product mix has diversified from primarily handicrafts to one dominated by handicrafts, coffee, tea, and fresh fruits. In particularly, both in sales and market share, coffee have become the most popular fair trade commodity, with sales volume growing by 191% between 1997 and 2005 (FLO[7] 2005, 2006). FLO reports € 4.36 billion in coffee sales in 2010, a 27 percent increase from 2009 (2010). The growth is remarkable in view of the global recession during that time.

The FLO, established in 1997 as an umbrella organization, consistently enhances coordination and cooperation between 25 different fair trade organizations[8] from around the world. To insure transparency and credibility of their labeling activities, the overarching organization was divided into FLO, which sets standards and support producers, and FLO-cert, which inspects producers and traders for compliance with standards[9]. Traders who wish to be certified by FLO must a) pay a price which covers the costs of sustainable production, b) pay a premium that can be invested in regional development, c) make at least partial payment in advance when requested, and d) make a commitment to long term trade. FLO also tries to insure fairness among producers by requiring the following: a) that decision making is democratic and that profits are fairly shared among

---

[6] World Fair Trade Organization

[7] Fair Trade Labeling Organization International

[8] The 25 member organizations include 19 national fair trade organizations, 4 fair trade marketing organizations, and 2 applicant members (FLO$_a$, online).

[9] The separation was instituted to guarantee the impartiality and the independence of the certification process while further preparing for ISO 65 accreditation which require a certification system to satisfy the following four components; independence, transparency, quality (of decisions) and equality (of all producers) (FLO-cert, online).

producers, b) that fair trade premiums are managed in a transparent process, c) that workers have the right to join an independent union and bargain collectively, and d) that management provides equitable and sound working conditions (FLO_b, online).

Finally, despite its recent success, the idea of fair trade still remains vague, with different interpretations. This definitional problem originates from the philosophic basis and contradictory nature of the idea. In particular, the concept of fair trade movement embeds fairness, which is inherently a philosophic concept, into the market, where efficiency is the primary criteria.

CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS OF FAIR TRADE TOURISM

Fair trade tourism can be seen from two perspectives, with varying emphasis. It can be either seen as the fair trade movement extended to the tourism industry or as another form of sustainable tourism. It is important to maintain the ideals of fair trade – that is to ensure benefits go to local residents –, while reflecting intangible and multi-sectorial nature of tourism industry. This chapter provides a framework within which the fair trade tourism can be better explained with this key point kept in mind.

3.1. Fair Trade Tourism as a Subset of Fair Trade

Though elements of fair trade tourism may be found under different names such as responsible tourism or ethical tourism, the idea can also be understood within the framework of fair trade in goods. That is, any attempts to define fair trade tourism can start from an understanding of fair trade goals, principles, and mechanism. In fact, the first systematic approach to instituting fair trade scheme in tourism was founded upon the practices and the conventions of fair trade in goods.

Existing initiatives in fair trade tourism share common goals concerning the same major aspects of sustainability as commodity-based fair trade. FTT[10] (Originally Fair Trade in Tourism South Africa), lists their key principles as "fair wages and working conditions, fair purchasing and operations, and equitable distribution of benefits" (FTT$_b$, online). These principles are identical to those of most fair trade labeling initiatives. Furthermore, much like the certification systems for commodity markets, the FTT certification system is a voluntary and incentive-based process. Indeed, FLO-cert, the auditing body of FLO, is also the auditing body for FTT, thus supporting the argument that standard and practices are quite comparable between commodity-based fair trade and fair trade tourism.

The research concerning fair trade tourism has been limited. Cleverdon and Kalisch (2000) adopted the frameworks of fair trade in commodity markets to explain fair trade tourism. They analyzed the flow of international traveler from the relatively-rich Northern countries to destinations in the relatively-poor South.

---

[10] Fair Trade Tourism

Evans and Cleverdon (2000) predicted growth in fair trade tourism based on increased activity in the conventional fair trade using survey data compiled by NOP, a market research firm. The majority of survey respondents expressed a willingness to pay extra for commodity-based fair trade products. However no empirical study was done to test if demand for fair trade commodities translated into demand for fair trade tourism.

3.2. Incompatibility of Adopting Fair Trade Model in Tourism

However, viewing fair trade tourism only as a subset of conventional fair trade movement fails to reflect the uniqueness of the tourism industry. Possibility issues in using the conventional fair trade concept in examining tourism have been acknowledged by Cleverdon and Kalisch (2000) and Evans and Cleverdon (2000).

First, in tourism as opposed to goods-based markets, there is a greater possibility of direct communication between producers (residents) and consumers (visitors), as consumption occurs at the site of production. In goods-based markets, consumers typically exert little direct influence on producers and as direct consumer-producer interaction is nonexistent (i.e., the two sides do not meet in person). Retailers, whether they are alternative or conventional, and labeling organizations for fair trade, are market links that stand between consumers and producers, which serve as indirect communication channels between consumers and producers (Raynolds & Long, 2000). In tourism, on the contrary, it is necessary for visitors to be involved in direct interaction with residents who provides tourism services and products. Visitor-resident interaction is a necessary part of the tourism experience, and also a main cause of the social and cultural impacts of tourism development. Without any buffer, such as retailers or labeling organizations, responses between visitors and residents are transmitted directly (Wall & Mathieson, 2006).

Secondly, some of the key fair trade principles require clearly definable producer- and consumer- groups, which is often not the case in tourism. For instance, in fair trade coffee, there are obvious groups of producers, traders, and consumers, thus decisions about price, premium, and working conditions can be made with relatively few difficulties. However, in tourism, because of its multi-sectorial nature, producers and other stakeholders may be much harder to discern, and it is almost impossible to organize industry-based efforts that include all major stakeholder (McKercher, 1993). Cleverdon and Kalisch (2000) also highlighted the lack of

collective organizations for both producers and consumers of tourism as an obstacle. Reaching agreements among tourism producers requires extensive expenditure of time, money, and effort. Thus, instituting a fair trade tourism administrative system such as FLO would be difficult.

Thirdly, the rich-North and poor-South framework found in conventional fair trade system limits the scope of fair trade tourism to international tourism. Even in relatively well-developed nations, tourism has been widely favored as a regional development tool by marginalized and under-developed regions usually through agro tourism or ecotourism. Hence, there are opportunities for fair trade tourism within a developed nation at a regional level. Destinations in the developed world (Utah in the US and Quebec in Canada) are currently promoting themselves as fair trade tourism sites (Amerika Venture, online).

3.3. Fair Trade Tourism as a Subset of Sustainable Tourism

Fair trade tourism can also be interpreted as a type of sustainable tourism that particularly stresses the economic and social sustainability of a destination. However, the intangible, multi-sectorial, and destination-specific nature of tourism precludes a rigid application of the fair trade concept to tourism.

As reviewed earlier, a multitude of alternative ways of conducting tourism in an economic and socially sustainable fashion have been discussed. However, even among the many attempts to ensure economic and social sustainability, and with the possible exception of pro-poor tourism (Ashley, Boyd, & Goodwin, 2000; Roe, 2001), few if any, of these approaches has stressed fairness to the degree of fair trade tourism, and as Harrison (2008) suggested the term should rather be understood as an orientation or a state than a specific type of tourism. As it is in sustainable tourism, pro-poor tourism can also be any types of tourism which incorporate key components

Adopting the idea of fair trade movement in commodities, the focus of fair trade tourism is not only limited to reducing poverty, but to ensure the largest and fairest distribution of benefits to all native residents of a community. In other words, regardless of their economic status (unlike pro-poor tourism) fair trade tourism attempts to bring benefits to all local people by ensuring them a fair price and a premium. So the term fair in fair trade tourism not only implies economic sustainability for certain poor residents, but economic and social

sustainability in the entire community as whole.

The term community-based tourism may cause some confusion with fair trade tourism as both highlight community aspects. However community-based tourism primarily emphasizes empowering and including local residents in tourism development efforts, focusing on process rather than benefit. So the term is neither identical to nor incompatible with fair trade tourism. For desirable development of fair trade tourism, the community based-tourism approach can be useful (Okazaki, 2008).

Despite the compatibility issues raised above, fair trade tourism still stands as a genuine attempt which focuses substantial attention on community-wise fairness. Though rigid application of principles of fair trade in commodities may cause some incompatibility issues, such problems are commonly observed in many such systems that have a relatively short history.

`

CHAPTER 4

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS

No previous studies have examined the relationship between people's attitude toward fair trade in commodity markets and understanding about and interest in fair trade tourism. To investigate the relationship, a survey of fair trade commodity shoppers, whose experiences with fair trade commodities vary, was conducted. Specifically, four major hypotheses were examined in this regard.

4.1. Research Hypotheses

Statistical analysis of the survey was used to test four key hypotheses as followings.

First, that there is a positive correlation between a respondent's attitude toward fair trade movement in commodities and one's willingness to participate in fair trade tourism. The relationship was tested by observing how one's willingness to participate (dependent variable) based on experienced (as measured by years of fair trade shopping) or frequencies of fair trade shopping. In other words, it was hypothesized that a respondent who has been buying fair trade products longer or more frequently would also be more likely to participate in a fair trade tourism experience. Validating this hypothesis would support market projections for fair trade tourism based on observations of fair trade in commodity markets.

Secondly, the study tested the hypothesis that fair trade consumers would consider social and economic sustainability of a destination to be more important than cultural and environmental sustainability. That is, it was anticipated that social and economic aspects would be their prime areas of concern. The hypothesis was designed to identify the key sustainability domains of tourism that potential participants would like to support through their participation in fair trade tourism. Findings from this hypothesis test will help designing fair trade tourism experience in accordance with the concerns of possible participants.

Thirdly, we tested the hypothesis that consumers of fair trade commodities would be willing to pay a price premium for a fair trade tourism experience. Lastly, it was suspected that respondents' willingness to pay for fair tourism experiences (dependent variable) would be affected by variables such as experience with and frequencies of fair trade shopping, household income, and education level. Our expectation was that with more

experience, more frequent shopping, greater the willingness to participate in, higher the income and education would also lead to greater willingness to pay. These results could also assist businesses in setting prices for fair trade tourism experiences.

Further, respondents were also asked about factors that hindered participating in fair trade tourism, types of fair trade tourism activities they wish to participate in, and factors considered when choosing vacation destinations. Though these questions were not designed to shed light with regard to any of the main hypotheses, responses carry implications for a variety of relevant business and policy decisions.

4.2. Survey Questions

Figure 4.1
Examples of the 5-point-Likert scales used in the survey

11. How much do you think the followings hinder you from participating in 'Fair Trade Tourism?'

It is difficult to participate in fair trade tourism due to ...	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
Lack of available fair trade tourism products	1	2	3	4	5
Higher prices of fair trade tourism products	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of transparency and credibility	1	2	3	4	5
Distrust about quality of fair trade tourism	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

12. In Fair Trade Tourism, 'Premium' refers to an additional payment over the market price that supports sustainable development of a destination. How important are the following attributes in your decisions to pay a premium?

	Not Important		Moderate		Highly Important
Guarantee fair wages and working conditions for local workers.	1	2	3	4	5
Preserve of the local environment.	1	2	3	4	5

Except for one open-ended question, every survey question was in a yes-or-no, multiple choice, or 5-point-Likert scale format. With regard to the Likert scale questions, 1 indicates strong disagreement or least importance for the statement in question, while 5 means strong agreement or greatest importance. 3 as the mid-point is reserved for a neutral or moderate response (Figure 4.1). Also, respondents were able to skip any

questions they choose not to answer.

The first section of the survey asked about respondents' enthusiasm toward fair trade product in general, and the factors motivating their purchase. Respondents were asked to answer questions about their years of experience as fair trade product consumers, frequencies of fair trade shopping, items they buy most often, and motivations for buying fair trade product.

The second section of the survey was designed to test respondents' familiarity with fair trade tourism, their willingness to pay for and participate in fair trade tourism, and expectations concerning the fair trade tourism experience. Respondent were asked if they have had direct or indirect experiences in fair trade tourism and if they wish to visit places where fair trade products are produced. Also, the respondents were also asked about types of fair trade tourism activities they would like to experience, and the attributes that they consider to be important for tourism in general and fair trade tourism in particular. Respondents were also asked how much of a premium they would be willing to pay for a fair trade tourism experience (i.e., one where local residents receives a fair share of the revenue generated by the trip). Further, respondents were asked about obstacles that could inhibit their participation in fair trade tourism.

In addition to the research-specific sections, basic demographic information was collected including respondents' gender, birth year, marital status, education and household income level, and ethnicity.

4.2.1. Willingness to Pay

People place different values upon different aspects of the goods and services, and it is possible that they value the same item differently by expressing dissimilar willingness to pay. Such subjectivity in value makes it difficult to put appropriate monetary values on goods and services, and the difficulty intensified for those that do not have well-established markets and rely on hypothetical situation. The absence of observable market behavior, which reveal preferences, has directed significant academic interest toward methods that estimate individual's willingness to pay through survey (termed stated preference methods) (Accent & Rand Europe, 2010).

Besides their application to different settings (i.e. revealed preference methods are applicable only to real goods), the two methods have their own advantages and disadvantages. For instance, Kjaer (2005) explained

that revealed preference methods maximize external validity since what is observed is what really happened, whereas outcomes from stated preference methods may be questions for their validity (i.e. what is stated may not develop into real action). On the other hand, revealed preference methods are limited in its application to goods and services traded in the market and prevent researchers to looks into the values of separate attributes that are associated with the goods or services, whereas stated preference methods can offer what revealed preference fails to offer (Kjaer 2005). So the two methods are again divided into different sub-methods on the basis of direct- or indirect- information (Breidert, Hahsler, & Reutterer, 2006) though there tends to be variation in naming and classifying the sub methods.

Among the different sub-methods, the ones that have been most widely used to assess values of environmental attributes and non-priced tourism resources (such as beach, forest, historic buildings and others) are contingent valuation, choice modeling, hedonic pricing, and travel cost (Stabler, Papatheodorou & Sinclair, 2009). Contingent valuation and choice modeling are stated preference methods (relying on surveys) whereas hedonic pricing and travel cost are revealed preference methods (relying on observations). The choice modeling method is becoming increasingly popular (Accent & Rand Europe, 2010) as it provides a more direct valuation of individual attributes by asking questions about goods and services with different combinations of attributes. The method can offer greater implications for managerial and policy decision makings as such decisions are made based on marginal changes in attributes (Accent & Rand Europe, 2010). The application of choice modeling method is found studies of the environment (Blamey, Bennett, Louviere, Morrison, & Rolfe, 1999), health care (Hall, Viney, Haas, & Louviere, 2004), and tourism (Lee , Lee, Kim, & Mjelde, 2010; Lacher, Oh, Jodice,,& Norman, 2010).

Primarily because of a lack of literature and an under-developed market, this study used contingent valuation method, where surveys are used to directly ascertain respondents' willingness to pay. Because fair trade tourism is a relatively new concept with a relatively under-developed market the use of revealed preference methods was infeasible. Lack of knowing concerning the concept prevented the use of other forms of stated preference methods such as choice modeling. Louviere and Timmermans (1990) stated the construction of a choice model should involve steps identifying salient attributes including various levels of such attributes.   Due to their lack

of familiarity, respondents would have found it at best highly difficult to identify various levels of salient attributes. Further, there is no body of literature regarding fair trade tourism to use in helping to identify the salient attributes. Accordingly, the study was done by making a direct inquiry about respondents' willing to pay an extra charge for an all-inclusive tour. Like other stated preference methods, contingent valuation method is often criticized for providing inaccurate results i.e., not reflecting actual behavior (Kroes & Sheldon, 1988). However, the flexibility of the approach allows for capturing the valuation of a wide variety of non-market goods and services.

4.3. Data Collection

Fair trade in commodity markets and fair trade tourism are concepts that may both be unfamiliar to the general public. Accordingly, it was important to seek out consumers with knowledge of at least commodity market fair trade. This niche market is an obvious way of developing the even newer idea of fair trade tourism and to minimize errors due to ignorance and misunderstanding.

Accordingly, a Ten Thousand Villages store in Greenville, South Carolina (as previously described a fair trade vendor) was approached with a request to survey its consumers. As a result, the store sent e-mail requests to its customers to encourage participation in an online version, and also allowed surveying to be conducted onsite. It is assumed that the visitors to the store are more knowledgeable about the concept of fair trade than the general public.

The survey was conducted both online and onsite from April, 28, 2013 to May, 24, 2013 for 27 days. To assure continuous participation to the online survey, e-mail reminders were sent to the target group on a weekly basis during the survey period. Onsite survey was done from May, 16, 2013 to May, 18, 2013. The dates were selected because the store was expecting a large flow of visitors prior to Mother's Day (May, 19, 2013).

4.3.1. Survey Location

Ten Thousand Villages is one of the largest fair trade organizations in the world and is also a founding member

of the WFTO[11]. For 50 years, the organizations had operated as a project of Mennonite Central Committee until it became an independent, not-for-profit organization in 2012. As of 2011, annual revenue was $24.9 million with $7.2 million paid directly to producers in developing nations (Ten Thousand Villages, 2011). Its stores mainly sell handicraft items made by artisans from 38 countries, but also provide other fair trade products such as coffee and chocolate certified by fair trade labeling organizations. In addition to its prime goal of building a stable trade relationship that can assist the livelihood of skilled, but disadvantaged artisans, the organization has been also active in raising the public awareness of the fair trade movement. For instance, the store in Greenville is taking an initiative in making Greenville a fair trade city. Today, there are more than 390 retail stores (including Alliance stores) across the United States including an online store (Ten Thousand Villages, online)

The store in Greenville is the only Ten Thousand Villages store in South Carolina. Most of its customers are white females, but customers vary in age from teenage students to the elderly. Compared to the racial and gender composition of the surrounding Greenville area, the store has higher ratio of white and female customers than the local average (Plosky, personal communication, 2013).

4.3.2. Survey Methods

Ten Thousand Villages at Greenville sent e-mail requests to approximately 6,500 people who were on their mailing lists. The e-mail requests contained brief explanations of study goals, study background, and the incentive offered for participation. A link was provided with the e-mail that re-directed people to the online survey questionnaire set up at Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com). The survey was also promoted using the Facebook fan page of Ten Thousand Villages at Greenville.

In addition, printed flyers, containing the same content as the e-mail requests, were placed in the store for visitors who were not on the mailing list. For those, who were less internet-literate or were not aware of the online survey, a copy of the survey was distributed at the store.

To encourage active participation to the survey, a 25 per cent discount coupon for a single item was provided to

---

[11] World Fair Trade Organization

all respondents (thanks to the generosity of the Greenville Ten Thousand Villages store management).

Participants either received an instant discount for their purchase at the store or a printed coupon that can be

used by October, 31, 2013.

4.4. Survey Result

4.4.1. An Overview of Participants

Table 4.1
Demographic overview of the survey participants

	Respondents			Greenville County Residents
	Overall	Onsite	Online	
Gender				
- Male	20 (11.4%)	8 (14.8%)	12 (9.9%)	48.50%
- Female	155 (88.6%)	46 (85.2%)	109 (90.1%)	51.50%
Median Age	41.93 (n=166)	44.32 (n=50)	40.9 (n=116)	37.2
Average Household Income	$94,176 (n=164)	$ 100,529 (n=52)	$ 91,228 (n=112)	$ 66,158
Educational Attainment (High school graduate or higher)	175 (100%)	53 (100%)	122 (100%)	85%
Races				
- Native American	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.2%
- Asian	5 (2.9%)	2 (3.8%)	3 (2.5%)	1.9%
- Black / African American	2 (1.2%)	1 (1.9%)	1 (0.8%)	17.9%
- Hispanic / Latino	4 (2.3%)	2 (3.8%)	2 (1.7%)	8.1%
- White / Caucasian	160 (93%)	48 (90.5%)	112 (94.2%)	70.3%
- Pacific Islander	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0.0%
- Other	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	1.6%
Average Years of Experience	5.34 yrs (n=179)	5.00 (n=54)	5.48 yrs (n=125)	-

Note. The figures for Greenville (SC) residents obtained from 2010 US Census.
Note. The percentage figures were rounded off to the nearest tenth.
Note. Median for each response category was used to calculate the average values of house hold income and years of experience.

A total of 191 responses (135 online, 56 onsite) were collected over a three week of data collection, and among

them 179 surveys were found to be statically viable.[12] Considering that around 6,500 requests were sent, the

response rate is around 2.9% which may call into question the legitimacy of the survey result. However, in

terms of the onsite effort, the response rate is 76.7% (56 responded for 73 requested) when people were asked

onsite, implying the overall rate would have been higher, if the survey had been exclusively administered onsite.

---

[12] Results from twelve respondents were excluded from data analysis due to incompleteness and other issues. Some surveys were excluded because in own judgment, the respondents in question did not take the process seriously.

(Survey data was analyzed using JMP Pro 10.0.0, a statistical software package developed by the SAS Institute in 2012. Extended statistical results are provided in Appendix – 2.)

Compared to the general population of Greenville County, SC, survey respondents had a higher probability of being mid-aged white females with the higher average household incomes and levels of education attainment (Table 4.1). Considerable demographic gap between the survey respondents and general residents implies that the fair trade market is a niche, and the survey results based on the niche market would be limited in its implication to an overall population. Discussions with the management of the Ten Thousand Villages store in Greenville indicated that survey respondents were a representative sample of their shoppers.

4.4.2. Experiences in Consuming Fair Trade Products

Virtually all respondents (176, 98.3%) had previous experiences of buying or using fair trade products (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2
Prior experience of using or buying fair trade products

Collection Method	Yes	No
Online (n=125)	125 (100.0%)	0 (0%)
Onsite (n=54)	51 (94.4%)	3 (5.6%)
Overall (n=179)	176 (98.3%)	3 (1.7%)

Note. The percentage figures were rounded off to the nearest tenth.

When asked about their years of experience as fair trade customers, most of the respondents were moderate to highly experienced consumers, as those who have more than three years of experience account for 67.6% of all participants. Only 24 (13.4%) of respondents indicated having less than a year of experience (Table 4.3). The overall distribution for the responses to this question was bell shaped, albeit slightly skewed to the right.

Table 4.3
Years of experience of fair trade shopping

Collection Method	1 yr or ↓	1 to 3 yrs	3 to 5 yrs	5 to 10 yrs	10 yrs or ↑
Online (n=125)	14 (11.2%)	27 (21.6%)	26 (20.8%)	41 (32.8%)	17 (13.6%)
Onsite (n=54)	10 (18.5%)	7 (13.0%)	16 (29.6%)	15 (27.8%)	6 (11.1%)
Overall (n=179)	24 (13.4%)	34 (19.0%)	42 (23.5%)	56 (31.3%)	23 (12.8%)

Note. Respondents without any prior experience of fair trade shopping (n=3) were counted as the least experienced (1 yr or ↓) group.
Note. The percentage figures were rounded off to the nearest tenth.

Most respondents bought fair trade products at least once a quarter (81.5%)(Table 4.4). This result is due to non-consumable natures of many items sold at the Ten Thousand Village store. The Greenville store sells consumable items such as coffee, tea, and cookie mix, but these products only account for a small portion in overall inventory. Though the distribution of the responses to the shopping frequency showed skewness to the right, it was bell shaped in nature.

Table 4.4
Frequencies of fair trade shopping

Collection Method	Once a week or more	Twice a month	Once a month	Once a quarter	Once a half year or less
Online (n=125)	10 (8.0%)	21 (16.8%)	22 (17.6%)	50 (40.0%)	22 (17.6%)
Onsite (n=54)	5 (9.3%)	5 (9.3%)	14 (25.9%)	19 (35.2%)	11 (20.4%)
Overall (n=179)	15 (8.4%)	26 (14.5%)	36 (20.1%)	69 (38.5%)	33 (18.5%)

Note. Respondents without any prior experience of fair trade shopping (n=3) were counted as the least frequent (Once a half year or less) group.
Note. The percentage figures were rounded off to the nearest tenth.

We considered the question that 'years of experience' and 'frequencies of shopping' may be related positively (i.e., more experienced shoppers were more likely to shop more often). However, we found no statistically significant connection between the two variables. Such result may have resulted from durable nature of items sold at the store.

4.4.3. Testing Hypothesis 1: Willingness to Participate in Fair Trade Tourism

When asked about their awareness concerning fair trade tourism, 69 respondents (38.8%) said that they have heard about the concept (109 or 61.2% indicates no familiarity). Considering the fact that fair trade tourism is a relatively recently introduced concept, the level of awareness is impressive.

Table 4.5
Awareness of fair trade tourism by years of experience

Years of experience	Awareness of fair trade tourism		Total
	Yes	No	
10 yrs or ↑	12 (52.2%)	11 (47.8%)	23 (12.9%)
5 to 10 yrs	29 (52.7%)	26 (47.3%)	55 (30.9%)
3 to 5 yrs	13 (31%)	29 (69%)	42 (23.6%)
1 to 3 yrs	9 (26.5%)	25 (73.5%)	34 (19.1%)
1 yr or ↓	6 (25%)	18 (75%)	24 (13.5%)
Overall	69 (38.8%)	109 (61.2%)	178 (100%)

Note. The percentage figures were rounded off to the nearest tenth.

Another notable finding is that as people are more experienced in fair trade, they are more likely to be aware of fair trade tourism. The ratio of people who answered yes to the question increased from 25% (1 Year or less), to 26.5% (1 to 3 years), 31% (3 to 5 years), 52.7% (5 to 10 years) and 52.2% (10 years or more) as experience accumulated, showing a positive correlation between the awareness and the experience (Table 4.5). The chi-square test result indicated that the result is significant at an alpha equal to 0.05 with a chi-square value of 12.079 and a p-value of 0.0168.

As a follow up question, those who were aware of fair trade tourism were asked if they plan to or have participated in such an experience. Among 69 responses, only six respondents (8.7%) said that they have had a fair trade tourism experience. All six respondents with a fair trade tourism experience had at least three years of experience in buying fair trade products. While the insufficient sample size precludes statistical analysis, a meaningful relationship between direct experience in fair trade tourism and years of experience as fair trade consumers may exist.

Table 4.6
Willingness to visit places where fair trade products come from by year of experience and frequencies of shopping

Years of experience	Willingness to travel by years of experience	Frequencies of shopping	Willingness to travel by shopping frequency
10 yrs or ↑	4.17_a (n=23)	Once a week or More	4.27_a (n=15)
5 to 10 yrs	4.02_a (n=55)	Twice a month	4.31_a (n=26)
3 to 5 yrs	4.02_a (n=41)	Once a month	4.03_a (n=34)
1 to 3 yrs	3.94_a (n=34)	Once a quarter	3.90_a (n=69)
1 yr or ↓	3.17_b (n=24)	Once a half year or Less	3.33_b (n=33)

Note. ANOVA test statistics for willingness to travel;
  - By years of experience: F=3.8732, p=0.0049
  - By shopping frequency: F=4.2469, p=0.0026
Note. For the columns of willingness to travel, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).
Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not at all interested, 2-Not very interested, 3-Neutral, 4-Somewhat interested, and 5-Highly interested.

Up to a point, people's willingness to visit areas where fair trade products are produced increased with longer use of fair trade products and more frequent shipping as shown in Table 4.6. People in the least experienced group are significantly less willing to travel (with a mean value of 3.17), as are the people in the least frequent shopping group (3.33). In either case, Student's t-test result tells that their means are significantly different from the mean responses of all others, both in terms of shopping experience and shopping frequency.

However, once a minimum level of shopping experience (i.e. a year) is accumulated, respondents showed little difference in their willingness to participate in a fair trade tourism experience. In other words, people with more than a year of experience in shopping for fair trade products were all equally willing to participate in fair trade tourism. It is interesting that shopping frequency showed a similar result. That is, only up to a point does fair trade shopping frequency influences willing to participate in a fair trade tourism experience (Table 4.6).

One concern was a possible difference in willingness to travel between those who participated in the survey onsite versus those who responded online. However, Student's t-test result showed that the difference is responses between the two groups is statistically insignificant at an alpha equal to 0.05 level (Table 4.7). The overall mean score for willingness to travel was 3.91 indicating that respondents were somewhat interested in participating in fair trade tourism (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7
Willingness to visit places where fair trade products come from by onsite- and online- respondents

Collection method	Willingness to travel
Onsite	3.85_a
Online	3.94_a
Overall	3.91_a

Note. ANOVA test statistics; F=0.2498, p=0.6178
Note. Means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).
Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not at all interested, 2-Not very interested, 3-Neutral, 4-Somewhat interested, and 5-Highly interested.

4.4.4. Testing Hypothesis 2: Key Sustainability Domains in Fair Trade Tourism

One of the key hypotheses that the study intended to verify was whether fair trade tourism is a type of tourism where greater attention is paid by potential participants to the economic and social sustainability of a destination.

Overall mean values of relevant survey responses are presented in Table 4.8. On average, respondents considered economic (4.65) and social (4.50) sustainability more important but still maintained their support for cultural (4.29), and ecological (4.02) sustainability[13]. In matched-pairs t-tests, all four overall values for economic, social, cultural and ecological values were found significantly different at an alpha equal to 0.05 level.

---

[13] Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

The fact that all four domains gained ratings higher than 4.0 validates the idea that no single domain should be neglected when promoting fair trade tourism. No significant difference was found between respondents, who participated onsite versus those participating online (Table 4.9).

Table 4.8
Key sustainability domains of fair trade tourism as perceived by the respondents

Years of experience	Sustainability domains			
	Ecological	Social	Cultural	Economic
10 yrs or ↑	4.61_a (n=24)	4.78_a (n=24)	4.70_a (n=23)	4.86_a (n=24)
5 to 10 yrs	$4.29_{a, b}$ (n=34)	4.59_a (n=33)	$4.48_{a, b}$ (n=33)	4.77_a (n=33)
3 to 5 yrs	$4.05_{b, c}$ (n=41)	4.49_a (n=41)	$4.29_{b, c}$ (n=41)	4.59_a (n=41)
1 to 3 yrs	$3.68_{c, d}$ (n=55)	4.52_a (n=56)	$4.03_{c, d}$ (n=56)	$4.64_{a, b}$ (n=56)
1 yr or ↓	3.29_d (n=23)	4.00_b (n=23)	3.65_d (n=23)	4.29_b (n=21)
Overall	4.02_l (n=177)	4.50_m (n=177)	4.27_n (n=176)	4.65_o (n=175)

Note. ANOVA test statistics for;
- Ecological Sustainability: F=10.2184, $p<0.0001$
- Social Sustainability: F=3.7967, $p=0.0055$
- Cultural Sustainability: F=7.1779, $p<0.0001$
- Economic Sustainability: F=3.1256, $p=0.0164$

Note. For the columns of sustainability domains, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).
Note. For overall, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within the row).
Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

Table 4.9
Key sustainability domains of fair trade tourism as perceived by onsite- and online- respondents

Collection method	Sustainability domains			
	Ecological	Social	Cultural	Economic
Onsite	4.04_a	4.45_a	4.26_a	4.64_a
Online	4.02_a	4.52_a	4.28_a	4.66_a
Overall	4.02_l	4.50_m	4.27_n	4.65_o

Note. For the columns of sustainability domains, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).
Note. For overall, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within the row).
Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

A notable outcome is that cultural sustainability was considered to be slightly more important than ecological sustainability. Such outcome was not anticipated, but one possible explanation is that artistic and decorative nature of the items sold at Ten Thousand Village stores may have influenced the respondents to be more culturally aware.

Student's t-tests revealed that the participants with less experience in buying fair trade products tend to be less concerned about every sustainability domain than those who have more experience. For all four domains (economic, social, cultural, and ecological) a considerable discrepancies existed between the least experienced group and all others. However, when similar analysis was conducted for the relationship between frequency of shopping and concerns about the four domains, the relationship remained less clear.

As shown in Table 4.10 below, respondents' understanding of key sustainability domains becomes less clear as it may not extend to types of fair trade tourism activities they are interested, implying a possible gap between perception and action.

Table 4.10
Fair trade tourism activities that the respondents wish to participate in

Years of experience	Fair trade tourism activities				
	Learning about fair trade production	Staying at local accommodations	Participating in classes	Hiring local guides and travel agencies	Volunteering for local community projects
10 yrs or ↑	3.70_a (n=23)	$4.13_{a, b}$ (n=23)	$3.87_{a, b}$ (n=23)	4.13_a (n=23)	$3.18_{a, b}$ (n=22)
5 to 10 yrs	3.70_a (n=54)	4.11_a (n=54)	$3.75_{a, b}$ (n=53)	3.94_a (n=53)	3.47_a (n=53)
3 to 5 yrs	3.15_b (n=41)	$3.25_{c, d}$ (n=40)	$3.44_{a, b}$ (n=41)	3.78_a (n=40)	$2.90_{b, c}$ (n=41)
1 to 3 yrs	$3.32_{a, b}$ (n=34)	$3.65_{b, c}$ (n=34)	3.94_a (n=34)	3.85_a (n=34)	$3.32_{a, b}$ (n=34)
1 yr or ↓	2.38_c (n=24)	3.04_d (n=24)	$3.33_{a, b}$ (n=24)	2.88_b (n=24)	2.33_c (n=24)
Overall	3.32_l (n=176)	$3.68_{m, n}$ (n=175)	$3.67_{m, n}$ (n=175)	3.76_n (n=174)	3.11_o (n=174)

Note. ANOVA test statistics for;
- Learning about fair trade production: F=9.0304, $p<0.0001$
- Staying at local accommodations: F=7.4459, $p<0.0001$
- Participating in classes: F=1.7801, $p=0.1350$
- Hiring local guides and travel agencies: F=6.1432, $p=0.0001$
- Volunteering for local community projects: F=4.5850, $p=0.0015$

Note. For the columns of fair trade tourism activities, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).

Note. For overall, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within the row).

Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

People showed greater interest in activities like 'hiring local guides and travel agencies' (3.76), 'participating in classes' (3.67), and 'staying at a local accommodation' (3.68), while activities like 'experiencing and learning about production of fair trade products' (3.32), and 'community volunteering' (3.12) were considered to be moderately interesting. The activities attracted greater interest are those can be done easily and in a more amusing manner while the activities requiring serious involvement of labor and time were deemed less

interesting by survey respondents.

Besides 'participating in classes,' and 'hiring local guides and travel agencies,' the result showed less clear relationships between preferred activities and respondents' years of experience. According to F-test, the respondents showed similar level of interest in 'participating in classes,' at an alpha equal to .05 level (F=1.7801, p=0.1350). However, as for 'hiring locals,' the group with less than a year of experience was significantly less interested in doing so with a mean response of 2.88 as compared to the other groups (means of 3.78 or higher) (Table 4.10).

There tends to be trend between the least experienced group and the most experienced group in their levels of interests in certain activities. In other words, the respondents with less than a year of experience were significantly less interested in all activities, except for 'participating in a class,' than those with more than 10 years of experience. For example, individuals with at least five years of shopping experience seem to be more interested in staying at a locally owned accommodation as opposed to less experienced shoppers.

4.4.5. Testing Hypothesis 3: Willingness to Pay for a Premium

The third hypothesis was that consumers of fair trade commodities would be willing to pay a premium in a fair trade experience, and survey results verify the hypothesis. Among 174 respondents who answered to the question asking about their willingness to pay a premium, only five respondents[14] (2.9%) stated that they are not willing to pay anything premium. The result implies that consumers of fair trade commodities are generally likely to pay a premium (Table 4.11).

Results indicate that there tends to be an upward increase in participant's willingness to pay the premium as their years of experience as fair trade consumers increases. On average participants with the shortest experience were willing to pay a 4.8% premium, while groups with the greatest level of experience were willing to pay a premium of 8.7%. Student's t-tests revealed a considerable gap between groups with longer than 5 years of experience and less than 5 years of experience. Arguably, participants' willingness to pay for premium will increase significantly, once their experience with fair trade experience exceeds five years.

---

[14] Distribution of those who were not willing to pay anything premium is as follows: 2 from '1 year or less experience', 2 from '1 to 3 years of experience,' and 1 from '3 to 5 years of experience.'

Table 4.11
Willingness to pay for a fair trade tourism premium by years of experience

Years of experience	1 yr or ↓	1 to 3 yrs	3 to 5 yrs	5 to 10 yrs	10 yrs or ↑	Overall
Amount of a premium willing to pay	4.8%$_a$ (n=24)	6.5%$_a$ (n=32)	6.6%$_a$ (n=40)	8.7%$_b$ (n=56)	8.7%$_b$ (n=22)	7.3% (n=174)

Note. ANOVA test statistics; F=5.7831, p=0.0002
Note. Means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level while means sharing a subscript do not differ.
Note. For statistical convenience, an arbitrary value of 15% was assigned to those who answered they are willing to pay more than 10%.

It is possible that household income, education level and shopping frequencies may explain the willingness of survey respondents to pay a premium for a fair trade tourism experience. F-test analysis was conducted to verify any possible relationship between the willingness to pay and each of these possible explanatory variables. However, no statistically significant relationship was found between at an alpha equal to .05 level. F-Ratios and p-values for each independent variable are presented below in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12
F-Ratios and p-values for suspected independent variables to project willingness pay for a premium

Suspected independent variable`	ANOVA test statistics
Household income	F=2.9415, p=0.0883*
Education level	F=1.7460, p=0.1266
Frequencies of fair trade shopping	F=0.7802, p =0.5395

Note. * - Significant at an alpha equal to .10 level.

When asked about the activities they want their premiums be spent, the respondents rendered the greatest supports for 'enhancing women's and children's rights in destinations' (4.49). What followed after are 'ensuring fair wages and working conditions' (4.38) and 'supporting local development projects' (4.26) (Table 4.13). The result is impressive as it stands in lieu with what was found in the section 4.4.5, where the results showed that the respondents gave higher priority to social and economic sustainability.

Other activities like 'preserving environment' (3.98), 'using more local products' (4.05), 'preserving cultures and traditions' (4.06), and 'supporting community empowerment programs' (3.95) all earned ratings around 4.0 showing modest support by respondents (Table 4.13). However, it is interesting to see that 'supporting community empowerment programs' did not have a more positive response despite the significance such activities play in enhancing economic sustainability of a region. The result may have occurred because of a lack of understanding concerning the term community empowerment (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13

Important attributes in making the decisions to pay a premium in fair trade tourism

Years of Experience	Attributes						
	Ensuring fair wage and working conditions	Preserving environment	Using more locally produced goods	Preserving cultures and traditions	Promoting women's and children's rights	Supporting local development project	Support community empowerment programs
10 yrs or ↑	4.78_a (n=23)	4.48_a (n=23)	$4.22_{a, b}$ (n=23)	4.52_d (n=23)	4.78_a (n=23)	4.48_a (n=23)	4.43_a (n=23)
5 to 10 yrs	$4.41_{a, b}$ (n=56)	4.27_a (n=55)	4.30_a (n=56)	4.30_{cd} (n=56)	4.68_a (n=56)	4.34_a (n=56)	4.25_a (n=56)
3 to 5 yrs	$4.27_{b, c}$ (n=41)	3.90_b (n=41)	$4.02_{a, b}$ (n=41)	4.02_{bc} (n=41)	$4.49_{a, b}$ (n=41)	4.32_a (n=41)	$4.05_{a, b}$ (n=41)
1 to 3 yrs	$4.47_{a, b}$ (n=32)	$3.75_{b, c}$ (n=32)	3.94_b (n=32)	3.88_b (n=32)	$4.34_{b, c}$ (n=32)	4.25_a (n=32)	3.75_b (n=32)
1 yr or ↓	3.96_c (n=24)	3.29_c (n=24)	3.46_c (n=24)	3.33_a (n=24)	3.96_c (n=24)	3.75_b (n=24)	2.92_c (n=24)
Overall	4.38_l (n=176)	3.98_m, (n=175)	$4.05_{m, n}$ (n=176)	$4.06_{m, n, o}$ (n=176)	4.49_p (n=176)	4.26_q (n=176)	$3.95_{m, n, o}$ (n=176)

Note. ANOVA test statistics for;
   - Ensuring fair wage and working conditions: F=3.6051, *p*=0.0075
   - Preserving environment: F=7.8057, *p*<0.0001
   - Using more locally produced goods: F=4.7954, *p*=0.0011
   - Preserving culture and traditions: F=7.7636, *p*<0.0001
   - Promoting women's and children's rights: F=5.0606, *p*=0.0007
   - Supporting local development project: F=3.1651, *p*=0.0154
   - Support community empowerment programs: F=10.9119, *p*<0.0001
Note. For the columns of attributes, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within columns).
Note. For overall, means that do not share a subscript differ at the .05 level, while means sharing a subscript do not differ (Compare within the row).
Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

In general, a monotonic trend was found in respondents' understanding of and interest toward fair trade

tourism. That is, as respondents are more experienced fair trade shoppers, they tend to show greater interest in

fair trade tourism in general, and such tendency also extends to specific activities of fair trade tourism (Table 4.

5, 4.6, 4.8, 4.10, 4.11, 4.13).   For most questions, more experienced fair trade shoppers showed more positive

responses.   In general, there was a considerable gap in attitudes between those with the most experience and

those with the least experience in terms of fair trade shopping.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

When considered together, survey findings provide useful insights for further nurturing development of the fair trade tourism market. Preferences of potential consumers and factors affecting their willingness to pay suggest ways to exploit currently untapped fair trade tourism markets. However, as this study targeted a limited number people in a niche market, inferences based on model results are, to a certain degree, limited.

5.1. Managerial Implications

Survey results also provide insights that could be useful to current and prospective business owners for both fair trade tourism operations and fair trade commodity operations. Operating fair trade travel to places where fair trade products are made is one possible business opportunity. In general, survey respondents showed modest interest to visiting and participating in such tourism activities[15]. Considering that only 3 out of 178 respondents (3.4%) had direct experience in fair trade tourism, this is a major finding suggesting a strong potential for market development. That is, survey results demonstrate the potential for developing consumers of fair trade products into consumers of fair trade tourism by asking about respondents' willingness to participate in and pay for a fair trade tourism experience. While few of the respondents have experienced fair trade tourism, there were general interests in participating.

On average, survey respondents were willing to pay 7.3% more for a fair trade tourism experience as a part of an all-inclusive tour (Table 4.11). However, they were less interested in labor- or time- intensive activities such as experiencing how fair trade products are made and volunteering for local community projects (Table 4.10). Results imply that the respondents wish to keep their holiday amusing and relaxing while maintaining an ethical commitment. The superficial interest to sustainability was also verified in the survey result where the respondents gave lowest consideration to 'sustainability' as a factor in their vacation travel destinations decisions (Table 5.1). At a mean response of 3.53, survey respondents were only moderately concerned about sustainability as a factor in their destination decisions. Based on matched pair t-tests, sustainability was less

---

[15] The overall score for willingness to travel was 3.91, with the lowest score 3.17 from those who have less than a year of experience in fair trade shopping. For further detail, see Table 4.6 and Table 4.7.

important than all other factors provided in Table 5.1 (i.e., the difference between the response and all other

responses was statistically significant).

Factors such as cost (4.20) and safety (4.42) were found to be the most important elements in picking a

vacation destination (Table 5.1). Safety is probably particularly important in the travel decisions of the target

market examined here, which is primarily older and female. Concerns about safety also appeared as a fairly

strong obstacle to participation in fair trade tourism in general with a mean response of 3.56 (Table 5.2).

Table 5.1
Factors which the respondents consider when making a holiday decision

Factors	Importance
Safety at destinations	4.42
Cost	4.20
Local Culture	3.99
Weather/ Climate	3.95
Accessibility	3.94
Tourist Attractions	3.93
Local Activities	3.93
Local Food	3.78
Sustainability	3.53

Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Not important, 2-Somewhat not important, 3-Moderate, 4-Somewhat important, 5-Highly important.

Safety is also important in traveling decisions to places that fair trade commodity are produced. As stated earlier,

fair trade tourism does not always have to involve traveling to places where fair trade products are produced.

Though no survey question directly addressed the issue of travel to such places, demand would presumably be

greater if it is not limited to production sites (i.e., the respondents were offered a full range of destinations,

including fair trade production sites and other locations). In particular, areas where fair trade products are

produced are often under-developed or unstable regions where lack of amenities or concerns about safety may

exist.

In addition, the study result revealed a possibility of developing fair trade tourism domestically. Fair trade

tourism on a domestic level may at least to some extent resolve the respondents concerns about safety, reduce

the burdens of time and money required, increase availability of the experience, and promote domestic

economic growth in disadvantaged areas (such as Indian reservations). By developing and promoting fair trade

destination within borders, general public would be able to learn about and participate in fair trade tourism and

probably consume less time and money. The destinations could benefit from increase in visitors and their spending.

Survey result also implies that fair trade tourism advocates need to be more visible and vocal (Table 5.2). To the respondents, lack of available fair trade tourism products and more importantly a lack of familiarity or lack or information about the concept was the most important barrier to participate in fair trade tourism. These factors even outweighed safety concerns. Hence, the best managerial approach would be tourism products developed and especially promotion by well-credited fair trade organizations. Fair trade tourism destination might want to consider partnering with outlets for fair trade commodities (such as stores like the Ten Thousand Villages and other places where fair trade products are sold, such as churches) in promoting their destinations.

Table 5.2
Obstacles preventing the respondents from participating in fair trade tourism

Obstacles	Mean Rating
Unfamiliarity with the idea or lack of information	3.97
Lack of available FT tourism products	3.68
Concerns about safety issues at destinations	3.56
Higher prices of FT tourism products	3.37
Lack of transparency and credibility	3.02
Distrust about quality of FT tourism	2.79

Note. Each number in the scales indicates the followings; 1-Strongly disagree, 2-Somewhat disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Somewhat agree, and 5-Highly agree to a statement that an obstacle is preventing his participation in a fair trade tourism experience.

Providers of fair trade tourism can also seek managerial and policy implications from providers of wine tourism. Wine tourism occurs when travel is motivated by preferences for a commodity produced in a particular location (Hall et al, 2000); thus putting production of a commodity as a core and including relevant activities such as education, experience, and sale offered to visitors. Brown and Getz (2005)'s results imply that wine preferences affect travel choices by working as both push and pull factors.

Further, small scale wineries typically rely on onsite sales in a market that is increasingly dominated by global wine firms and distributors (Carlsen, 2004). Further, wine tourists are more likely to be older and more socially aware (Carlsen, 2002; Heaney, 2003). These results suggest that certain leisure and lifestyle interests are important factors in motivating individuals to visit a particular destination (Brown & Getz, 2005). Such findings

are relevant for providers of fair trade tourism.

Wine tourism is also based on partnerships among producers, travel agents, and regional governments (Telfer, 2001) and on a proper combination of product, destination, and cultural attributes (Getz & Brown, 2006). Providers of fair trade tourism products could possibly benefit from emulate these approaches. Further, Brown and Getz (2005) found that proximity exert a strong influence on wine tourists' destination decisions. Their finding is consistent with the preference for domestic travel as indicated by survey respondents in this study.

5.2. Limitations of the Study

The goals of this study included proposing a framework for understanding fair trade tourism and investigated the attitude of potential participants. Limitations regarding research results form the basis for suggested future research both detailed and conceptual levels.

A limited sample size reduces the credibility of certain survey results. In particular, fair trade product consumers with relatively small or relatively large levels of shopping experience or frequency were underrepresented. For instance, fewer than 30 responses were collected for survey respondents with both with 'less than a year of experience' and for those with more than '10 years of experience.' As for the shopping frequency, the number of respondents in the 'once a week' and 'twice a month' groups were both fewer than 30 in number. As a consequence, for certain questions, the transitivity problems we observed were likely a result of these sample size issues.

More importantly, the high ratio of white middle-aged female respondents can be a cause of some unexpected outcomes. Clearly, a potential market would be composed of people who are different from those surveyed. Though income or education level may be similar, the portion of males, young adults, and other races would probably increase in the actual market. So, for example, individuals in the broader market may consider cultural sustainable and women's right issue less significantly than the survey outcome presents. Furthermore, for most couples, a vacation travel decisions are topic for continuous idea sharing and coordination. This means that expressed preference of an individual may not develop into actual action if one's companion does not agree to the preference. Reiterating our previously made point, results of the study apply to the target market in

question, and do not necessarily translate into considerations about a broader market. In this regard, an interesting area of future research would be a survey of a broader, more representative sample, of potential fair trade tourism consumers.

It is also possible that the survey questions were presented in inappropriate formats. As for the question regarding willingness to visit the places where fair trade products come from, or the question about willingness to pay for a fair trade tourism premium, a slight change in the way that the questions are posed may cause considerable changes in outcomes. Furthermore, for some questions, respondents were asked to express opinions about multiple attributes combined in a single statement, and this may preclude clear illustration of the respondent's opinion.

Lastly, there may be considerable discrepancies between the respondent's real preferences and the actual outcomes. Respondents may have expressed greater supports toward the statement that are deemed to be desirable as opposed to expressing their true preferences. For example, respondents may have expressed a greater willingness to pay a premium for a fair trade tourism experience because of concerns about being perceived as selfish or stingy (even with blind survey results). As Breidert, Hahsler, and Reutterer (2006) argue, survey respondents may overstate their willingness to pay for a product or good in question or may lack a clear understanding of items in question. For these and other reasons, valuation expressed in surveys does not always translate into actual purchasing behavior.

5.3. Conclusion

Despite growing interest in fair trade tourism, few studies academic studies have examined the topic. While the fair trade movement may have played a pivotal role in shaping the core principles and the frameworks of fair trade tourism, there are compatibility issues resulting from inherent difference between the natures of tourism and other commodities.

Rather than a rigid adoption of the frameworks used to analyze fair trade in commodities, seeing fair trade tourism as a subset of sustainable tourism that pays special attention to securing and maximizing benefits for residents of destinations may be a better way to delineate the concept from other similar theoretical approaches

(such as pro-poor tourism). A survey of potential consumers of fair trade tourism revealed that fair trade tourism consumers may highlight social and economic sustainability, while maintaining concern about cultural and ecological aspects. Survey results also tell that respondents' support for conventional fair trade can extend to fair trade tourism, and people with greater experiences in shopping for fair trade products are likely to show greater willingness to pay for a premium in fair trade tourism. Our analysis of survey results also suggested a possibility of developing fair trade tourism domestically, which can lower the barriers to fair trade tourism and provide new opportunities to destinations and fair trade organizations.

`

APPENDICES

`

Survey Questionnaire

Fair Trade Tourism – Conceptual Evolution and Market Projections

Fair Trade Tourism is designed to maximize benefits to indigenous host communities from tourists by properly accounting for social, economic, cultural, and environmental sustainability of host. Buying more local products, participating in volunteer work, supporting local culture at a destination can all be actions of Fair Trade Tourism.

This survey is designed to investigate 1) how much fair trade product consumers are familiar with the term 'Fair Trade Tourism,' and 2) how much consumers are willing to participate in and expectations are about Fair Trade Tourism.

Participation is completely voluntary. Please feel free to skip any question. The survey should take approximately 10 minutes, and all your answers would be completely confidential. Your answers will be used in helping facilitate tourism that benefits visitors, host communities, and tourism-based businesses. Thank you for your participation!

Dr. David Hughes (Clemson University)
Dongoh Joo (Clemson University)

1. Have you tried using or buying any fair trade products?

① Yes (Go to Question 2) ② No (Go to Question 6)

2. How long have you been a consumer of fair trade products?

① Less than 1 yr ② 1 to 3 ys ③ 3 to 5 yrs ④ 5 to 10 yrs ⑤ More than 10 yrs

3. How often do you buy fair trade products?

① Once a week or more ② Twice a month ③ Once a month ④ Once a quarter ⑤ Once a half year or less

4. What fair trade product do you buy most often?

① Jewelry / Accessories ② Personal Care ③ Toys / Games ④ Tabletop
⑤ Home Decor ⑥ Stationery ⑦ Coffee / Tea ⑧ Chocolate

Others (Please specify): _____

5. How do the followings attributes motivate you to buy a fair trade product?

I buy fair trade products …	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
to help others and to practice my personal or religious belief.	1	2	3	4	5
because they have high quality.	1	2	3	4	5
because they have exotic and diverse nature.	1	2	3	4	5
because they are environmentally and human friendly packaged.	1	2	3	4	5
because I trust their supply chains which meet fair trade standards.	1	2	3	4	5
because they are more affordable.	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

6. Have you heard of the term 'Fair Trade Tourism'?

① Yes   ② No

└ 6.1 If yes, have you planned or participated in a 'Fair Trade Tourism' holiday?

① Yes   ② No

7. To what degree, are you willing to travel places where fair trade products are made?

① Not at all   ② Not very   ③ Neutral   ④ Somewhat   ⑤ Highly Interested
  Interested   Interested   Interested

8. How important are the following attributes in deciding your Fair Trade Tourism experience?

	Not Important		Moderate		Highly Important
Experiencing and learning how fair trade products are produced.	1	2	3	4	5
Staying at a locally owned and operated accommodation.	1	2	3	4	5
Participating in local history, cooking, or art classes.	1	2	3	4	5
Hiring local tour guides and use local travel agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
Volunteering for local community works.	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

9. On a typical vacation, how important are the following factors in your destination choice.

	Not Important		Moderate		Highly Important
Weather / Climate	1	2	3	4	5
Accessibility to the destination	1	2	3	4	5
Cost	1	2	3	4	5
Tourist Attractions (Natural / Manmade)	1	2	3	4	5
Safety of the destination	1	2	3	4	5
Local activities	1	2	3	4	5
Local food	1	2	3	4	5
Local culture	1	2	3	4	5
Sustainability (Environmental, Social, Cultural, Economic)	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

10. How much do you think the following attributes are important to 'Fair Trade Tourism?'

	Not Important		Moderate		Highly Important
Ecological Aspects - Preserving biodiversity, Using renewable resources, Reducing waste	1	2	3	4	5

Social Aspects - Fair working conditions, Equal income distribution, Community empowerment, Eliminating Discriminations	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural Aspects - Preserving traditions and cultural heritages, Minimizing cultural conflicts	1	2	3	4	5
Economic Aspects - Increasing income, Creating regional jobs, Alleviating poverty, Developing infrastructure, Using more local products	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

11. How much do you think the followings hinder you from participating in 'Fair Trade Tourism?'

It is difficult to participate in fair trade tourism due to …	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
Lack of available fair trade tourism products	1	2	3	4	5
Higher prices of fair trade tourism products	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of transparency and credibility	1	2	3	4	5
Distrust about quality of fair trade tourism	1	2	3	4	5
Concerns about safety issues at destinations	1	2	3	4	5
Unfamiliarity with the idea or lack of information	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

12. In Fair Trade Tourism, 'Premium' refers to an additional payment over the market price that supports sustainable development of a destination. How important are the following attributes in your decisions to pay a premium?

	Not Important		Moderate		Highly Important
Guarantee fair wages and working conditions for local workers.	1	2	3	4	5
Preserve of the local environment.	1	2	3	4	5
Support a greater use of locally produced products.	1	2	3	4	5
Preserve local traditions and cultures.	1	2	3	4	5
Promote rights of local women and children.	1	2	3	4	5
Support local development project (Build schools, hospitals, roads etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
Support community empowerment programs (Support and educate local guides and entrepreneurs, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

Others (Please specify): _____

13. How much more money would you be prepared to pay for the benefits chosen in question 10 in an all-inclusive 'Fair Trade Tourism' holiday? Please see the premium as an <u>extra</u> that you would be willing to pay in addition to a typical tourism trip.

① 1% (for example, $ 10 on a holiday of $ 1,000)
② 2% (for example, $ 20 on a holiday of $ 1,000)

③ 5% (for example, $ 50 on a holiday of $ 1,000)
④ 10% (for example, $ 100 on a holiday of $ 1,000)
⑤ More than 10%
⑥ Nothing

14. Please feel free to express any of your opinions or ideas about 'Fair Trade Tourism.'

_____

_____

---

15. What is your sex?

① Male   ② Female

16. In what year were you born? _____

17. What is your marital status?

① Single   ② Married

18. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, check the highest education completed.

① Some high school
② High school or GED
③ Some college
④ Two-year college degree (A.A. / A.S.)
⑤ Four-year college degree (B.A. / B.S.)
⑥ Masters or professional degree
⑦ Doctoral degree

19. What do you expect your 2013 family income from all sources before taxes to be?

① Under $ 25,000
② $ 25,000 to $ 39,999
③ $ 40,000 to $ 54,999
④ $ 55,000 to $ 69,999
⑤ $ 70,000 to $ 84,999
⑥ $ 85,000 to $ 99,999
⑦ $ 100,000 to $149,999
⑧ Over $150,000

20. Would you describe yourself as

① American Indian / Native American
② Asian
③ Black / Africa American
④ Hispanic / Latino
⑤ White / Caucasian
⑥ Pacific Islander
⑦ Other

This is the End of the Survey. Thanks for Participating!

JMP RUN RESULTS

1. Contingency Analysis of Fair Trade Tourism Awareness

1.1. By Years of Experience

Contingency Table

Awareness Years of Exp.	YES Count Total% (Col% / Row %)	NO Count Total% (Col% / Row %)	Total Count Total%
1 Year or Less	6 3.37 (8.70 / 25.00)	18 10.11 (16.51 / 75.00)	24 13.48
1 to 3 Years	9 5.06 (13.04 / 26.47)	25 14.04 (22.94 / 73.53)	`34 19.10
3 to 5 Years	13 7.30 (18.84 / 30.95)	29 16.29 (26.61 / 69.05)	42 23.60
5 to 10 Years	29 16.29 (42.03 / 52.73)	26 14.61 (23.85 / 47.27)	55 30.90
10 Years or More	12 6.74 (17.39 / 52.17)	11 6.18 (10.09 / 47.83)	23 12.92
Total Count Total%	69 38.76	109 61.24	178

Tests

N	DF	-LogLike	RSquare (U)
178	4	5.7537409	0.0484

Test	ChiSquare	Prob>ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	11.507	0.0214*
Pearson	11.420	0.0222*

1.2. By Shopping Frequencies

Contingency Table

Awareness Shopping Frequencies	YES Count Total% (Col% / Row %)	NO Count Total% (Col% / Row %)	Total Count Total%
Once a week or More	6 3.37 (8.70 / 40.00)	9 5.06 (8.26 / 60.00)	15 8.43
Twice a month	12 6.74 (17.39 / 46.15)	14 7.87 (12.84 / 53.85)	26 14.61

Once a month	14	21	35
	7.87 (20.29 / 40.00)	11.80 (19.27 / 60.00)	19.66
Once a quarter	30	39	69
	16.85 (43.48 / 43.48)	21.91 (35.78 / 56.52)	38.76
Once a half year or Less	7	26	33
	3.93 (10.14 / 21.21)	14.61 (23.85 / 78.79)	18.54
Total Count Total%	69 38.76	109 61.24	178

Tests

N	DF	-LogLike	RSquare (U)
178	4	2.9604014	0.0249

Test	ChiSquare	Prob>ChiSq
Likelihood Ratio	5.921	0.2051
Pearson	5.559	0.2346

2. Oneway Analysis of Willingness to Participate in Fair Trade Tourism

2.1. By Years of Experience

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.082631
Adj Rsquare	0.061297
Root Mean Square Error	1.018656
Mean of Response	3.909605
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	177

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	16.07621	4.01905	3.8732	0.0049*
Error	172	178.47746	1.03766		
C. Total	176	194.55367			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	3.16667	0.20793	2.7562	3.5771
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.94118	0.17470	3.5963	4.2860
3 to 5 Yrs	41	4.02439	0.15909	3.7104	4.3384
5 to 10 Yrs	55	4.01818	0.13736	3.7471	4.2893
10 Yrs or More	23	4.17391	0.21240	3.7547	4.5932

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97385	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
10 Yrs or More	A		4.1739130
3 to 5 Yrs	A		4.0243902
5 to 10 Yrs	A		4.0181818
1 to 3 Yrs	A		3.9411765
1 Yr or Less		B	3.1666667

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

2.2. By Shopping Frequencies

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.089888
Adj Rsquare	0.068723
Root Mean Square Error	1.014619
Mean of Response	3.909605
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	177

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Frq	4	17.48810	4.37203	4.2469	0.0026*
Error	172	177.06557	1.02945		
C. Total	176	194.55367			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
Once a week or More	15	4.26667	0.26197	3.7496	4.7838
Twice a month	26	4.30769	0.19898	3.9149	4.7005
Once a month	34	4.02941	0.17401	3.6860	4.3729
Once a quarter	69	3.89855	0.12215	3.6575	4.1396
Once a half year or less	33	3.33333	0.17662	2.9847	3.6820

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97385	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
Twice a month	A		4.3076923
Once a week or More	A		4.2666667
Once a month	A		4.0294118
Once a quarter	A		3.8985507
Once a half year or less		B	3.3333333

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

3. Oneway Analysis of Key Sustainability Domains as Perceived by the Years of Experience

3.1. Ecological Sustainability

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.192009
Adj Rsquare	0.173218
Root Mean Square Error	0.839178
Mean of Response	4.022599
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	177

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	28.78394	7.19599	10.2184	<.0001*
Error	172	121.12566	0.70422		
C. Total	176	149.90960			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	3.29167	0.17130	2.9536	3.6298
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.67647	0.14392	3.3924	3.9605
3 to 5 Yrs	41	4.04878	0.13106	3.7901	4.3075
5 to 10 Yrs	55	4.29091	0.11315	4.0676	4.5143
10 Yrs or More	23	4.60870	0.17498	4.2633	4.9541

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97385	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level					Mean

Level					Mean
10 Yrs or More	A				4.6086957
5 to 10 Yrs	A	B			4.2909091
3 to 5 Yrs		B	C		4.0487805
1 to 3 Yrs			C	D	3.6764706
1 Yr or Less				D	3.2916667

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

3.2. Social Sustainability

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.081132
Adj Rsquare	0.059763
Root Mean Square Error	0.739079
Mean of Response	4.497175
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	177

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	8.29565	2.07391	3.7967	0.0055*
Error	172	93.95294	0.54624		
C. Total	176	102.24859			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	4.00000	0.15086	3.7022	4.2978
1 to 3 Yrs	33	4.51515	0.12866	4.2612	4.7691
3 to 5 Yrs	41	4.48780	0.11542	4.2600	4.7156
5 to 10 Yrs	56	4.58929	0.09876	4.3943	4.7842
10 Yrs or More	23	4.78261	0.15411	4.4784	5.0868

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97385	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level				Mean
10 Yrs or More	A			4.7826087
5 to 10 Yrs	A			4.5892857
1 to 3 Yrs	A			4.5151515
3 to 5 Yrs	A			4.4878049
1 Yr or Less			B	4.0000000

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

3.3. Cultural Sustainability

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.143765
Adj Rsquare	0.123736
Root Mean Square Error	0.778087
Mean of Response	4.272727
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	176

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	17.38249	4.34562	7.1779	<.0001*
Error	171	103.52660	0.60542		
C. Total	175	120.90909			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	23	3.65217	0.16224	3.3319	3.9724
1 to 3 Yrs	33	4.03030	0.13545	3.7629	4.2977
3 to 5 Yrs	41	4.29268	0.12152	4.0528	4.5325
5 to 10 Yrs	56	4.48214	0.10398	4.2769	4.6874
10 Yrs or More	23	4.69565	0.16224	4.3754	5.0159

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97393	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level					Mean
10 Yrs or More	A				4.6956522
5 to 10 Yrs	A	B			4.4821429
3 to 5 Yrs		B	C		4.2926829
1 to 3 Yrs			C	D	4.0303030
1 Yr or Less				D	3.6521739

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

3.4. Economic Sustainability

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.068506
Adj Rsquare	0.046589
Root Mean Square Error	0.628254

Mean of Response	4.645714
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	175

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	4.934798	1.23370	3.1256	0.0164*
Error	170	67.099488	0.39470		
C. Total	174	72.034286			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	4.29167	0.12824	4.0385	4.5448
1 to 3 Yrs	33	4.63636	0.10936	4.4205	4.8523
3 to 5 Yrs	41	4.58537	0.09812	4.3917	4.7790
5 to 10 Yrs	56	4.76786	0.08395	4.6021	4.9336
10 Yrs or More	21	4.85714	0.13710	4.5865	5.1278

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97402	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
10 Yrs or More	A		4.8571429
5 to 10 Yrs	A		4.7678571
1 to 3 Yrs	A		4.6363636
3 to 5 Yrs	A	B	4.5853659
1 Yr or Less		B	4.2916667

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

4. Matched Pairs Tests of Sustainability Domains

Social – Ecological

Sus-Soc	4.49711	t-Ratio	7.086181
Sus-Eco	4.02312	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.47399	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.06689	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.60602	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.34196		
N	173		
Correlation	0.47405		

Cultural – Ecological

Sus-Cul	4.2659	t-Ratio	4.419203
Sus-Eco	4.02312	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.24277	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.05494	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.35121	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.13434		
N	173		
Correlation	0.66821		

Cultural - Social

Sus-Cul	4.2659	t-Ratio	-4.0974
Sus-Soc	4.49711	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.2312	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.05643	Prob > t	1.0000
Upper 95%	-0.1198	Prob < t	<.0001*
Lower 95%	-0.3426		
N	173		
Correlation	0.57331		

Economic – Ecological

Sus-Econ	4.64162	t-Ratio	8.574529
Sus-Eco	4.02312	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.6185	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.07213	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.76087	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.47612		
N	173		
Correlation	0.31477		

Economic – Social

Sus-Econ	4.64162	t-Ratio	3.290587
Sus-Soc	4.49711	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.14451	Prob > |t|	0.0012*
Std Error	0.04392	Prob > t	0.0006*
Upper 95%	0.23119	Prob < t	0.9994
Lower 95%	0.05783		
N	173		
Correlation	0.67825		

Economic – Cultural

Sus-Econ	4.64162	t-Ratio	6.809937
Sus-Cul	4.2659	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.37572	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.05517	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.48463	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.26682		
N	173		
Correlation	0.54449		

5. Oneway Analysis of Types of Fairtrade Tourism Activities by Years of Experience

5.1. Learning about fair trade production

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.174398
Adj Rsquare	0.155085
Root Mean Square Error	0.968259
Mean of Response	3.318182
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	176

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	33.86487	8.46622	9.0304	<.0001*
Error	171	160.31695	0.93753		
C. Total	175	194.18182			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	2.37500	0.19765	1.9849	2.7651
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.32353	0.16606	2.9957	3.6513
3 to 5 Yrs	41	3.14634	0.15122	2.8478	3.4448
5 to 10 Yrs	54	3.70370	0.13176	3.4436	3.9638
10 Yrs or More	23	3.69565	0.20190	3.2971	4.0942

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97393	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level				Mean
5 to 10 Yrs	A			3.7037037
10 Yrs or More	A			3.6956522
1 to 3 Yrs	A	B		3.3235294
3 to 5 Yrs		B		3.1463415
1 Yr or Less			C	2.3750000

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

5.2. Staying at a locally owned accommodation

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.149079

Adj Rsquare	0.129058
Root Mean Square Error	1.035161
Mean of Response	3.68
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	175

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	31.91493	7.97873	7.4459	<.0001*
Error	170	182.16507	1.07156		
C. Total	174	214.08000			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	3.04167	0.21130	2.6246	3.4588
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.64706	0.17753	3.2966	3.9975
3 to 5 Yrs	40	3.25000	0.16367	2.9269	3.5731
5 to 10 Yrs	54	4.11111	0.14087	3.8330	4.3892
10 Yrs or More	23	4.13043	0.21585	3.7044	4.5565

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97402	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level					Mean
10 Yrs or More	A	B			4.1304348
5 to 10 Yrs	A				4.1111111
1 to 3 Yrs		B	C		3.6470588
3 to 5 Yrs			C	D	3.2500000
1 Yr or Less				D	3.0416667

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

5.3. Participating in local history, cooking, or art classes

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.040202
Adj Rsquare	0.017618
Root Mean Square Error	1.105423
Mean of Response	3.674286
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	175

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	8.70102	2.17526	1.7801	0.1350
Error	170	207.73326	1.22196		
C. Total	174	216.43429			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	3.33333	0.22564	2.8879	3.7788
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.94118	0.18958	3.5669	4.3154
3 to 5 Yrs	41	3.43902	0.17264	3.0982	3.7798
5 to 10 Yrs	53	3.75472	0.15184	3.4550	4.0545
10 Yrs or More	23	3.86957	0.23050	3.4146	4.3246

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97402	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
1 to 3 Yrs	A		3.9411765
10 Yrs or More	A	B	3.8695652
5 to 10 Yrs	A	B	3.7547170
3 to 5 Yrs	A	B	3.4390244
1 Yr or Less		B	3.3333333

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

5.4. Hiring local tour guides, and using local travel agencies

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.126944
Adj Rsquare	0.10628
Root Mean Square Error	0.989003
Mean of Response	3.764368
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	174

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	24.03549	6.00887	6.1432	0.0001*
Error	169	165.30359	0.97813		
C. Total	173	189.33908			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	2.87500	0.20188	2.4765	3.2735
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.85294	0.16961	3.5181	4.1878
3 to 5 Yrs	40	3.77500	0.15638	3.4663	4.0837
5 to 10 Yrs	53	3.94340	0.13585	3.6752	4.2116
10 Yrs or More	23	4.13043	0.20622	3.7233	4.5375

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97410	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
10 Yrs or More	A		4.1304348
5 to 10 Yrs	A		3.9433962
1 to 3 Yrs	A		3.8529412
3 to 5 Yrs	A		3.7750000
1 Yr or Less		B	2.8750000

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

5.5. Volunteering for local community projects

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.097897
Adj Rsquare	0.076546
Root Mean Square Error	1.163713
Mean of Response	3.114943
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	174

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	24.83661	6.20915	4.5850	0.0015*
Error	169	228.86454	1.35423		
C. Total	173	253.70115			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	2.33333	0.23754	1.8644	2.8023
1 to 3 Yrs	34	3.32353	0.19958	2.9295	3.7175
3 to 5 Yrs	41	2.90244	0.18174	2.5437	3.2612
5 to 10 Yrs	53	3.47170	0.15985	3.1561	3.7873

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
10 Yrs or More	22	3.18182	0.24810	2.6920	3.6716

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97410	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level				Mean
5 to 10 Yrs	A			3.4716981
1 to 3 Yrs	A	B		3.3235294
10 Yrs or More	A	B		3.1818182
3 to 5 Yrs		B	C	2.9024390
1 Yr or Less			C	2.3333333

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

6. Matched Pairs Tests of Fairtrade Tourism Activities

Staying at Local Accommodation – Experiencing fair trade production

FTT-Local Acc	3.6763	t-Ratio	4.962414
FTT-FT Exp	3.30058	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.37572	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.07571	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.52517	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.22627		
N	173		
Correlation	0.57901		

Participating in cultural classes - Experiencing fair trade production

FTT-Class	3.66474	t-Ratio	4.08858
FTT-FT Exp	3.30058	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.36416	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.08907	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.53997	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.18835		
N	173		
Correlation	0.41778		

Participating in cultural classes - Staying at a local accommodation

FTT-Class	3.66474	t-Ratio	-0.13895
FTT-Local Acc	3.6763	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.0116	Prob > |t|	0.8897
Std Error	0.0832	Prob > t	0.5552

Upper 95%	0.15266	Prob < t	0.4448
Lower 95%	-0.1758		
N	173		
Correlation	0.51923		

Hiring local residents - Experiencing fair trade production

FTT-Local Job	3.76301	t-Ratio	5.712253
FTT-FT Exp	3.30058	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.46243	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.08095	Prob > t	<.0001*
Upper 95%	0.62222	Prob < t	1.0000
Lower 95%	0.30264		
N	173		
Correlation	0.48636		

Hiring local residents - Staying at a local accommodation

FTT-Local Job	3.76301	t-Ratio	1.109572
FTT-Local Acc	3.6763	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.08671	Prob > |t|	0.2687
Std Error	0.07814	Prob > t	0.1344
Upper 95%	0.24095	Prob < t	0.8656
Lower 95%	-0.0675		
N	173		
Correlation	0.55033		

Hiring local residents - Participating in cultural classes

FTT-Local Job	3.76301	t-Ratio	1.139385
FTT-Class	3.66474	DF	172
Mean Difference	0.09827	Prob > |t|	0.2561
Std Error	0.08624	Prob > t	0.1281
Upper 95%	0.2685	Prob < t	0.8719
Lower 95%	-0.072		
N	173		
Correlation	0.45282		

Volunteering for local community projects - Experiencing fair trade production

FTT-Volun	3.10405	t-Ratio	-2.66919
FTT-FT Exp	3.30058	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.1965	Prob > |t|	0.0083*
Std Error	0.07363	Prob > t	0.9958
Upper 95%	-0.0512	Prob < t	0.0042*
Lower 95%	-0.3419		
N	173		
Correlation	0.6397		

Volunteering for local community projects – Staying at a local accommodation

FTT-Volun	3.10405	t-Ratio	-6.28931
FTT-Local Acc	3.6763	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.5723	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.09099	Prob > t	1.0000
Upper 95%	-0.3927	Prob < t	<.0001*

Lower 95%	-0.7519
N	173
Correlation	0.47052

Volunteering for local community projects - Participating in cultural classes

FTT-Volun	3.10405	t-Ratio	-6.26132
FTT-Class	3.66474	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.5607	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.08955	Prob > t	1.0000
Upper 95%	-0.3839	Prob < t	<.0001*
Lower 95%	-0.7374		
N	173		
Correlation	0.48794		

Volunteering for local community projects – Hiring local residents

FTT-Volun	3.10405	t-Ratio	-7.09222
FTT-Local Job	3.76301	DF	172
Mean Difference	-0.659	Prob > |t|	<.0001*
Std Error	0.09291	Prob > t	1.0000
Upper 95%	-0.4756	Prob < t	<.0001*
Lower 95%	-0.8424		
N	173		
Correlation	0.41944		

7. Willingness to Pay for a Premium by Years of Experience

Summary of Fit

Rsquare	0.120399
Adj Rsquare	0.09958
Root Mean Square Error	0.038909
Mean of Response	0.072759
Observations (or Sum Wgts)	174

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	Prob > F
Yrs	4	0.03502108	0.008755	5.7831	0.0002*
Error	169	0.25585479	0.001514		
C. Total	173	0.29087586			

Means for Oneway Anova

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
1 Yr or Less	24	0.048333	0.00794	0.03265	0.06401
1 to 3 Yrs	32	0.064688	0.00688	0.05111	0.07827
3 to 5 Yrs	40	0.065500	0.00615	0.05336	0.07764
5 to 10 Yrs	56	0.087321	0.00520	0.07706	0.09759

Level	Number	Mean	Std Error	Lower 95%	Upper 95%
10 Yrs or More	22	0.087273	0.00830	0.07090	0.10365

*Std Error uses a pooled estimate of error variance

Comparisons of means for each pair using Student's t
Confidence Quantile

t	Alpha
1.97410	0.05

Connecting Letters Report

Level			Mean
5 to 10 Yrs	A		0.08732143
10 Yrs or More	A		0.08727273
3 to 5 Yrs		B	0.06550000
1 to 3 Yrs		B	0.06468750
1 Yr or Less		B	0.04833333

*Levels not connected by same letter are significantly different.

REFERNCES

Accent & Rand Europe (2010). *Review of Stated Preference and Willingness to Pay Methods*, London, UK: Competition Commission.

AmerikaVenture. (online). *Ecotourism and Fairtrade Tourism*, Retrieved on Aug, 11, 2013 from http://www.amerikaventure.com/eng/ecotourism.php

Ashley, C., Boyd, C., & Goodwin, H. (2000). Pro-poor tourism: Putting poverty at the heart of the tourism agenda. *Natural Resource Perspective*, 51, 1-6.

Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perception of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303-319.

Blake, A., Arbache, J. S., Sinclair, M. T., & Teles, V. (2008). Tourism and poverty relief. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), 107-126.

Blamey, R. K., Bennett, J. W., Louviere, J. J., Morrison, M. D., & Rolfe, J. (2000). A test of policy labels in environmental choice modelling studies. *Ecological Economics*, 32(2), 269-286.

Bond, M. E. & Ladman, J. R. (1972). Tourism: A strategy for development, *Nebraska Journal of Economics and Busines*s, 11(1), 37-52.

Bramwell, B. & Lane, B. (1993). Sustainable tourism: An evolving global approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1(1), 1-5.

Breidert, C., Hahsler, M., & Reutterer, T. (2006). A review of methods for measuring willingness-to-pay. *Innovative Marketing*, 2(4), 8-32.

Britton, S.G. (1982). The political economy of tourism in the third world. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(3), 331-358.

Brown, G., & Getz, D. (2005). Linking wine preferences to the choice of wine tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 266-276.

Butler, R. (2001). Seasonality in tourism – issues and implications, In T. Baum & S. Lundtorp (Eds.), *Seasonality in tourism*, Oxford, UK: Elsevier

Cai, J., Leung, P. S., & Mak, J. (2006). Tourism's forward and backward linkages. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(1), 36-52.

Carlsen, P. J. (2002). Segmentation and profiling of the wine festival visitor market, In C. Cullen, G. Pickering & R. Phillips (Eds) *Bacchus to the Future: The Inaugural Brock University Wine Conference*, St. Catharines: Brock University Press.

Carlsen, P. J. (2004). A review of global wine tourism research. *Journal of Wine Research*, 15(1), 5-13.

Clarke, J. (1997). A framework of approaches to sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(3), 224-233.

Cleverdon, R., & Kalisch, A. (2000). Fair trade in tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2(3), 171-187.

Cuccia, T. & Rizzo, I. (2011). Tourism seasonality in cultural destinations – Empirical evidence from Sicily. *Tourism Management*, 32(3), 589-595.

D'Amore, L. J. (1988). Tourism - A vital force for peace. *Tourism Management*, 9(2), 151-154.

De Carlo, J. (2007). *Fair Trade – Beginners Guides*, Oxford, UK: Oneworld

De Kadt, E. J. (1979). *Tourism-passport to development?: Perspectives on the social and cultural effects of tourism in developing countries* (Vol. 65). A World Bank Research Publication.

Durbarry, R. (2004). Tourism and economic growth: the case of Mauritius. *Tourism Economics*, 10(4), 389-401.

Dwyer, L. & Forsyth, P. (2006). *International Handbook on the Economics of Tourism*, Cheltenham, UK & Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar

Evans, G. & Cleverdon, R. (2000). Fair trade in tourism – community development or marketing tool? In G. Richards & D. Hall (Eds.) *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*, 137-153, London, UK: Routledge

Fisher, D. (2004). The demonstration effect revisited. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 428-446.

Fleischer, A. & Felsenstein, D. (2000). Support for rural tourism – Does it make a difference? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 1007-1024.

Fleischer, A. & Pizam, A. (1997). Rural tourism in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 18(6), 367-372.

FTT[a] (Fair Trade Tourism) (online). *Welcome.* Retrieved on Aug, 1, 2013, from http://www.fairtradetourism.org.za

FTT[b] (Fair Trade Tourism) (online). *Becoming certified.* Retrieved on Aug, 1, 2013, from http://www.fairtradetourism.org.za/content/page/becoming-certified

FLO[a] (Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International) (online). *Fair trade organizations*. Retrieved on Aug, 8, 2013, from http://www.fairtrade.net/fairtrade-organizations.html

FLO[b] (Fairtrade Labelling Organizations International) (online). *Aims of Fair Trade Standard.* Retrieved on July, 9, 2013, from http://www.fairtrade.net/aims-of-fairtrade-standards.html#c3947

FLO-cert (online). *Our Goals.* Retrieved on Oct, 9, 2013, from http://www.flo-cert.net/flo-cert/30.html

Gannon, A. (1994). Rural tourism as a factor in rural community economic development for economies in transition. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1-2), 51-60.

Getz, D., & Brown, G. (2006). Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: a demand analysis. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 146-158.

Goeldner, C. & Ritchie, J. R. (2009). Tourism: principles, practices, philosophies (11th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Goodrich, J. N. (2002). September 11, 2001 attack on America: a record of the immediate impacts and reactions in the USA travel and tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 23(6), 573-580.

Hall, C.M., Longo, A.M., Mitchell, R. and Johnson, G. (2000). Wine tourism in New Zealand. In C.M. Hall, L. Sharples, B. Cambourne and N. Macionis (Eds), *Wine Tourism Around the World: Development, Management and Markets*, Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Hall, J., Viney, R., Haas, M., & Louviere, J. (2004). Using stated preference discrete choice modeling to evaluate health care programs. *Journal of Business research*, 57(9), 1026-1032.

Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism – The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526.

Hardy, A., Beeton, R. J., & Pearson, L. (2002). Sustainable tourism: An overview of the concept and its position in relation to conceptualisations of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(6), 475-496.

Harrison, D. (2008). Pro-poor tourism: a critique, *Third World Quarterly*, 29(5), 851-868

Hassan, R. (1975). International tourism and intercultural communication: the case of Japanese tourists in Singapore. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), 25-38.

Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability; culture's essential role in public planning*. Melbourne, Australia: Cultural Development Network.

Heaney, L. (2003). Tapping the barrel: profiling domestic wine tourists, 1998-2001, *BTR Tourism Research Report*, 5(1), 39-43, Canberra: Bureau of Tourism Research

Hughes, D. W., & Shields, M. (2007). Revisiting tourism regional economic impact: Accounting for secondary household employment. *The Review of Regional Studies*, 37(2), 186-206.

Klemm, M. & Parkinson, L. (2001). UK tour operator strategies: causes and consequences. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(5), 367-375.

Kjær, T. (2005). *A review of the discrete choice experiment-with emphasis on its application in health care*. Syddansk Universitet.

Kroes, E.P. & Sheldon, R.J. (1988) Stated preferences methods: An introduction. *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, 22, 1, 11-25.

Lacher, R. G., Oh, C. O., Jodice, L. W., & Norman, W. C. (2013). The Role of Heritage and Cultural Elements in Coastal Tourism Destination Preferences A Choice Modeling–Based Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(4), 534-546.

Lee, C. K., Lee, J. H., Kim, T. K., & Mjelde, J. W. (2010). Preferences and willingness to pay for bird-watching tour and interpretive services using a choice experiment. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(5), 695-708.

Leiper, N. (1979). The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 390-407.

Liu, Z. (2003). Sustainable tourism development: a critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(6), 459-475.

Louviere, J., & Timmermans, H. (1990). Stated preference and choice models applied to recreation research: a review. *Leisure Sciences*, 12(1), 9-32.

MacCannell, D. (2001). Remarks on the commodification of cultures. In V. L. Smith & M. Brent (Eds.), *Hosts and guests revisited: tourism issues of the 21st century*, Elmsford, NY: Cognizant Communication.

Manning, T. (1999). Indicators of tourism sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 179-182.

McKercher, B. (1993). Some fundamental truth about tourism: Understanding tourism's social and environmental impacts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 1(1), 6-16

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2003). *Culture*. In Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (11th ed.) Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191-204.

Min, Y., & Wall, G. (2002). Economic perspectives on tourism in China. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(3), 257-275.

Mvula, C. D. (2001). Fair trade in tourism to protected areas—A micro case study of wildlife tourism to South Luangwa National Park, Zambia. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(5), 393-405.

Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), 511-529.

Opperman, M. (1999). Sex tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 251-266.

Pine, R., & McKercher, B. (2004). The impact of SARS on Hong Kong's tourism industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 139-143.

Pizam, A. & Milman, A. (1984). The social impacts of tourism. *UNEP Industry and Environment*, 7(1), 11-14.

Raynolds, L. T. & Long, M. (2007). Fair/Alternative Trade – Historical and empirical dimensions. In L. T. Raynolds, M. D. Murray & J. Wilkinson (Eds.). *Fair Trade – The challenge of transforming globalization*. Abingdon, UK & New York, NY: Routledge.

Reisinger, Y. (2001). Unique characteristics of tourism, hospitality, and leisure services. In J. Kandampully, C. Mok, & B. Sparks (Eds.), *Service Quality Management in Hospitality, Tourism, and Leisure*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Hospitality Press

Renard, M. C. (2003). Fair trade: Quality, market and conventions. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19(1), 87-96.

Roe, D., & Urquhart, P. (2001). *Pro-poor tourism: harnessing the world's largest industry for the world's poor*. London: IIED.

Seckelmann, A. (2002). Domestic tourism – A chance for regional development in Turkey? *Tourism Management*, 23(1), 85-92.

Sharpley, R. (2002). Tourism: a vehicle for development? In R. Sharpley & D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development: concepts and issues*. Clevedon, UK & Tonawanda, NY: Channel View Publications.

Smith, C. & Jenner, P. (1992). The leakage of foreign exchange earnings from tourism. *Travel and Tourism Analyst*, 32(3), 52-66.

Stabler, M. J., Papatheodorou, A., & Sinclair, M.T. (2010). *The economics of tourism* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, UK & New York, NY: Routledge.

Stebbins, R. A. (1996). Cultural tourism as serious leisure. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 948-950.

Steer, A. & Wade-Gery, W. (1993). Sustainable development: Theory and practice for a sustainable future. *Sustainable Development*, 1(3), 23-35.

Tapper, R. (2001). Tourism and socio-economic development: UK tour operators' business approaches in the context of the new international agenda. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(5), 351-366

Ten Thousand Villages. (2011). *People, Purpose, Passion, Working Together to Fulfill Our Mission,* Akron, PA: Ten Thousand Villages

Ten Thousand Villages. (online). *About Us.* Retrieved on June, 7, 2013 from http://www.tenthousandvillages.com/about-us/

Telfer, D. J. (2001). Strategic alliances along the Niagara wine route. *Tourism Management*, *22*(1), 21-30.

Tourism Concern. (online). *Advice and Guidelines* (within *Ethical Tour Operators*). Retrieved on Aug, 6, 2013 from http://www.tourismconcern.org.uk/how-to-do-it.html

UN EP (United Nations Environmental Program). (online). *Negative Economic Impacts of Tourism.* Retrieved on Sep, 10, 2013 from http://www.unep.org/resourceefficiency/Business/SectoralActivities/Tourism/FactsandFiguresabout Tourism/ImpactsofTourism/EconomicImpactsofTourism/NegativeEconomicImpactsofTourism/tab id/78784/Default.aspx&sa=U&ei=k0bHUcDINeuviQfIioG4Dg&ved=0CAcQFjAA&client=interna l-uds-cse&usg=AFQjCNFDhIxFeLbIRZpIiyQq6xLp6VibNg

UN WCED (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development). (1987). *Our common future.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

UN WTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization). (1989). *Seminar on alternative tourism: introductory report.* Madrid, Spain: UN WTO.

Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism: change, impacts and opportunities*. London, UK & New York, NY: Longman.

WFTO (World Fair Trade Organization) (2011). *Charter of Fair Trade Principles.* Retrieved on Oct, 30, 2013, from http://www.wfto.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1082&Itemid=334&limit=1 &limitstart=1

Williams, A. M. & Shaw, G. (1999). Western European tourism in perspective. In A. M. Williams & G. Shaw. (Eds.), *Tourism and economic development: Western European experiences* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Wilson, P. (1994). Tourism earnings instability in Singapore, 1972-88, *Journal of Economic Studies*, 21(1), 41-51.

Wolf, C. P. (1977). Social impact assessment: the state of the art updated, *SIA Newsletter*, 29, 3-23.

Zapata, M. J., Hall, C. M., Lindo, P. & Vanderschaeghe, M. (2011). Can community-based tourism contribute to development and poverty alleviation? Lesson from Nicaragua, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(8), 725-749.