SAJTH, January 2016, Vol. 9, No. 1

Measurement for Responsible Tourism: Development of A Stakeholder-Based Scale

MOLI P. KOSHY*, VIJAY KURIAKOSE** and PAUL V. MATHEW***

*Prof. Moli P Koshy, Ph.D., Professor, Director, School of Management Studies (SMS), Cochin University of Science and Technology, CUSAT
**Vijay Kuriakose, Research Scholars, SMS, CUSAT
***Paul V Mathew, Research Scholars, SMS, CUSAT

ABSTRACT

Gauging Responsible Tourism (RT) seems difficult, being it consists of multiple, complex and intangible indicators. At the same time, many tourism destinations adore with the tag of Responsible Tourism, without considering its dueness and theoretical underpinnings, which makes it an elusive construct. The issue becomes more crucial when the concept is gaining global attention due to its increased impact on community and livelihood. Hence also, a need aroused to define the indicators of Responsible Tourism to demarcate destinations on the basis of its responsibility towards various stakeholders. In this juncture, authors attempt to provide a theoretical frame work on responsible tourism along with designing a measurement tool, for tourism destination. As the community residing in the destination is considered as the real feelers of tourism impact, present study considers feed-backs from diverse stakeholders of tourism in the destination community as the edifice of the scale.

KEYWORDS*: Responsible Tourism (RT), Sustainable Development, Triple-bottom line, Scale Development*

Introduction

Tourism has a significant role in the creation of buoyant economies along with eradication of poverty while considering it as the largest growing industry in the world. An ideal tourism development benefits local people economically and socially, and concerned about the conservation of natural environment. Contrary to this, development of tourism sometimes derails from this concept and progress at the cost of local community. Being lives of residents in the destination are affected by tourism and the participation of local community is essential for the sustainable management of destination, impacts of tourism and Quality of Life (QOL) of destination community become an index of destination competitiveness and clean image. It was in the wake of this scenario, an alternative and a sustainable concept "Responsible Tourism" (RT) comes in to the picture. Based on the principle of triple bottom line (TBL), Responsible Tourism aims at the economic, social, and environmental empowerment of destination. Deviating from the facts, many tourism destinations brand themselves as 'Responsible Tourism destinations' without considering the principle indicators of the concept. This throws light in to the requirement of designing and defining of Responsible Tourism.

Problem Definition

Tourism has diverse impacts on the lives of communities residing in the destinations positively and negatively; when one stakeholder is influenced by the economic impacts of tourism, other group experiences socio-cultural impacts, while another is affected by environmental issues (Andereck, et al., 2007; Carmichael, 2006; Gursoy, et al., 2002; Jurowski, et al., 1997; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2012; Kreag, 2001; Wang, 2006; Lankford, 1992; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). As these impacts are the determinants of development of a destination, it cannot be simply ignored (Breugel, 2013). According to Kim (2002), destinations have a carrying capacity that determines the intensity of impact; growth beyond its threshold may create negative socio-economic and environmental impacts. It is hard to know that the marginalized, poor and underprivileged are the victims of every irresponsible activities of business. At the same time, some researchers noted that tourism creates greater awareness and consciousness among people for the conservation and preservation of natural resources (Var & Kim, 1989). It was in the wake of this realization, international community came-up with a novel concept 'responsible tourism', aims at an inclusive approach, which quickly emerged as a call of this hour. However, destination authorities, industry players and various stakeholders start to call themselves as 'responsible' without considering the well-intended measures of the concept that made confusion among tourists and researchers. Responsible Tourism being considered as a sustainable strategy worldwide, effort to strengthen this concept theoretically, gains immediate importance.

Objectives of the Study

- To give an overview of the concept of Responsible Tourism and successful RT experiences in the international tourism arena
- Identify indicators of Responsible Tourism
- Development and validation of a Responsible Tourism Measurement Scale

Literature Review

Responsible Tourism (RT)

Tourism development often uses multiple terms like fair trade tourism, green tourism, sustainable tourism, ecotourism and alternative tourism to portray its meaningful interventions (Stanford, 2006). But the general concise is that an ideal tourism should provide better holiday experiences for guests, good business opportunities for enterprises and better living for the destination community (Paul and Manesh, 2014; Paul and Manu, 2014; UNEP, 2005; Venu and Goodwin, 2008). The idea of Responsible Tourism was actually hinted by Jost Krippendorf in the 1980's as a way out strategy to the Alpine plateaus of Switzerland where tourism has had significant negative impacts on the planet and people. Krippendorf in the 'Holiday Makers' (1987) called for "rebellious tourists and rebellious locals" "to develop and promote new forms of tourism, which will bring the greatest possible

benefit to all the participants - travelers, the host population and the tourist business, without causing intolerable ecological and social damage." Bernard Lane (2003), an editor of the Guardian, notes that being one of the founding fathers of sustainable tourism, Krippendorf stood for channelizing benefits of tourism into environmental and cultural conservation and to the host communities. It was not intended to regulate but to help the industry to look long term and to become more responsible for its actions and impacts.

The term Responsible Tourism was used by Smith (1992) in his report on the seminar convened by the World Tourism Organization (WTO, 1990) on "Alternative" Tourism in Tamanrasset in Algeria. After a series of discussions, 'alternative tourism' emerged socially responsible and environmentally conscious, which defined as all forms of tourism which respect the host's natural, built, and cultural environments and the interests of all parties concerned. The term 'alternative tourism' was best replaced by 'responsible tourism' as the latter phrase was less ambiguous (Smith, 1992; Stanford, 2000). Subsequently Harrison & Husbands (1996) describe responsible tourism as "tourism itself can be practiced in ways that minimize and mitigate its obvious disbenefits. Product development, policy, planning, and marketing can all be instituted in ways to ensure that tourists, host populations and investors reap the long-term benefits of a vibrant and healthy industry".

South Africa's Tourism White Paper (1996) defined Responsible Tourism as *'enabling local communities to enjoy a better quality of life through increased socio-economic benefits and improved natural resource management'* (Spenceley, et al., 2002). It clearly states that Responsible Tourism (RT) focuses on assessing and monitoring the environmental, social and economic impacts of tourism, maintaining and encouraging natural, economic, social and cultural diversity and avoiding waste and over-consumption, and promoting the sustainable use of local resources. An online portal 'www.responsible travel.com' defines responsible tourism as "*a project which make a positive contribution to conservation and the economies of local communities, while minimizing the negative impacts that tourism can have"* (Responsible Travel.com, 2004).

Kerala Tourism, one among the pioneers of practicing RT, defines responsible tourism as a *"tourism management strategy embracing planning, product development, management, and marketing to bring about positive economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts. For tourism operators it is about providing more rewarding holiday experiences for guests whilst enabling local communities to enjoy a better quality of life and conserving the natural environment".* Harold Goodwin, a champion of Responsible Tourism initiatives in the contemporary world and the founder of International Centre for Responsible Tourism (ICRT) has already made a significant contribution towards research and development in this area. Instrumental behind the Kerala Declaration of Responsible Tourism as part of the of the Second International Conference of Responsible Tourism in Kochi, Kerala; he

conceptualized that 'RT is *about creating better places for people to live in and better places for people to visit'*. From providing cost savings to increasing economic stability and ensuring the long-term appeal of a destination, responsible tourism practices simply make good business sense (Kerala Tourism, 2008).

Based on the above definitions and considering the opinions of RT practitioners and policy makers; Responsible Tourism is a tourism management strategy embracing planning, management, product development and marketing to bring about positive economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts.

Responsible Tourism – an Indicator Framework

The Cape Town Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations organized by the Responsible Tourism Partnership and Western Cape Tourism as part of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002 supposed to be stated first on the principles of RT. South Africa's Tourism White Paper (DEAT, 2002) also provides an idea about the key elements of Responsible Tourism whereas FEDHASA policy statement on Responsible Tourism (Goodwin, et al.,) framed a pro-active approach on tourism sector to the promotion of balanced and responsible tourism which is underpinned by sustainable environmental, social and economic principles.

It is conspicuous that Responsible Tourism embraces the widely accepted ideology 'triple bottom line (TBL) in all the theoretical frame work designed so far (DEAT, 2002, Spenceley, et al., 2002, Kerala Tourism, 2008, Paul and Rupesh, 2012). Global Code of Ethics by WTO (Article 5) states that the engagement of local communities in economic, social, and cultural process should be ensured equally in tourism development. Tourism Policy of Kerala Tourism states that the basic principle of tourism policies should be focusing towards improving the standard of living of the people and the enhancement of livelihood opportunities of host (local) communities (Kerala, 2012). The essence of Cape Town Responsible tourism Policy statement (2009) is that Responsible Tourism approach is aimed at bringing positive economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts. The declaration made a commitment to *'. . . work with others to take responsibility for achieving the economic, social and environmental components of responsible and sustainable tourism'.* Frey & George (2010) concluded that these approaches have one in common, objective of minimizing negative social, economic and environmental impacts, whilst maximizing the positive effects of tourism development. It is implicit that responsible tourism aims at achieving sustainable destination management as designed by the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC, 2011). In line with the theme of sustainable development; Responsible Tourism envisions "the 'triple bottom line (TBL)' concept by giving equal weight to three tiers of sustainability: (i) economy; (ii) society; and (iii) environment. The TBL responsibility has been explained by the Cape Town Declaration (2002) and Kerala Declaration (2008) is being considered as the guiding principle of Responsible Tourism.

Responsible Tourism Experiences

The Department of Environmental and Tourism Affairs (DEAT) South Africa aims at managing tourism in the framework of sustainable development in such a way that it contributes to the improvement of the quality of life of all South Africans (DEAT, 2012; Goodwin, et al., 2001). It also emphasized on stakeholders involvement, socio-cultural development, environmental conservation, and promotion of sustainable practices among stakeholders of tourism. Responsible tourism initiatives in South Africa, New Zealand, and Malaysia are also produced substantial improvement in destination quality, clean image and competitiveness (DEAT, 2011; Paul and Manu, 2014; and Wild Asia, 2006). Issue of beach boys was severe in Srilanaka where tourists were hassled and local community and business were hugely disturbed by their indecent activities. Responsible tourism ventures strategically incorporated or employed them in various enterprises to get rid from a common crisis and contributed for social sustainability (Maelge, 2012). In the UK, in Birmingham, tourism initiatives have provided 31,000 jobs and contributed to the local economy £1,013 for every 87p of council tax spent on generating tourism (Sunday Times, 21 Nov 2004). Greenwich tourism had a very high unemployment in the 1990s as it lost traditional jobs. After the implementation of responsible tourism programmes, 25% of jobs are provided by tourism and £327 million is generated to the local economy. Governments like Malaysia, Sri Lanka, UK etc. envisage mutually beneficial plans to equip the local community to be a part of industry by taking leverage out of employment opportunities and local enterprises development, and encourage industry to use the locally available skills and produces, to benefit destination community.

The Responsible Tourism initiative of Kerala developed a conducive environment for local bodies, Self Help Groups, NGOs, farmers' group, Department of Agriculture & Animal Husbandry, forest, fisheries, traditional industries etc. to work together for developing and utilizing entrepreneurial opportunities and to create Local Level Entrepreneurs (LLE) in identified areas (Kerala Tourism, 2012). A study on the impacts of responsible tourism in Kerala (Paul and Rupesh, 2013) invariably proved that RT has played a significant role in the sustainability of destination. The public private participation strategy adapted by the Kerala Government effectively minimized social and environmental concerns; and improved local economic benefits. The study also reported that Kumarakom in Kerala is emerged as a model for sustainable tourism development. Considering the positive socio-economic impacts of responsible tourism; (Michot, 2010) called this initiative 'pro-poor tourism'.

Responsible tourism initiatives in and adjacent to National Parks in Ottawa produced desirable outcomes like sustainable design, management, and planning; reduced waste generation and effective resource management; productive mitigation strategies, pollution control, community participation, cultural preservation and local empowerment, increased local economic benefits and

stakeholder consultation. Experiences from Ottawa hints that RT strives to achieve sustainability of meaningful endeavors of destination. Impacts of best Coastal Tourism practices in the Wider Caribbean Region (UNEP, 1997) helped to successfully maintain energy and waste management; facilities management, public/social interaction, and environmental efforts. A study on the impacts of tourism initiatives on the livelihoods of rural residents in parts of Namibia revealed that focus on livelihoods offers a useful perspective on tourism for enhancing local benefits. Additionally, tourism's contribution to livelihoods can be improved by a fruitful involvement of stakeholders (Ashley, 2010).

Spenceley et al (2008) reported that Community Based Tourism Enterprises (CBTE) initiative under responsible tourism enhanced ownership of community organizations/N.G.O's and 50% of community responded that the host community has substantial role in the management and function of local enterprises through committees or village councils. It also found that 94.7% of employees are from local community. According to Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC, 2011) and Responsible Tourism Criteria, Kerala (RTC, 2012), it is far above the desired level of sustainability in employment.

A case study from the Klein's Camp in CC Africa found that responsible tourism brought appreciable changes in the social, economic and environmental dimensions (Howse, 2012). It led to economic empowerment, women participation, wildlife and environmental conservation, community development, and development of various other human and social indicators. Lessons from the Responsible Tourism development in Gambia is an evidence for meaningful contributions of tourism. Responsible Tourism programs created sustainable employment opportunities and earnings for the informal sector by improved access to the tourism industry and to tourists thereby disseminated best practices (Bah, 2012).

Hummel (2012) cited in (UNESCO, 2014) reported that RT initiatives in Bhutan gained wide acceptance and produced significant outcomes in socio-economic areas. Another study revealed that innovative tourism experiment in partnership with private tour operators in Luangnamtha in Lao PDR improved the benefits of tourism to local communities (UNESCO 2004). A study on the impacts of sustainable tourism at Thekkady (Narayan and Saji, 2010) concluded that sustainable tourism programs managed to achieve the mission of community engagement in tourism and greater engagement of community in conservation and tourism has manifold impacts on sustainable development of the destination. Tourism has been reported as 'transformational' in central-west Queensland, a remote region in Australia where sustainable tourism activities facilitate the transition from a declining predominantly primary industry economy to a service economy thereby promote local employment, and enhanced community infrastructure and now an emulating model for sustainable development in transition economies (Greiner, 2010).

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) suggested that tourism attractions or products can be used to meet pro-

poor tourism objectives. A responsible tourism strategy to provide new skills, better access to education and health care, improving access to clean water and transportation networks can improve the quality of life. Lessons from responsible tourism initiatives proved that improved access to information and market opportunities, and community institutions under the banner of responsible tourism enhanced the well being of individuals and community at large (Roe and Goodwin, 2001).

From the above discussion, we can infer that responsible tourism is about making destinations environmentally friendly, ethically strong and a respectful choice for travelers. In essence, Responsible Tourism benefits everyone involved with and gives space to travelers, business people, and the destination community by embracing a triple bottom line (TBL) responsibilities; contributing to local communities, preserving culture, enhances environmental quality, and minimize negative social and environmental impacts. In short, the indicator frame work of responsible tourism consists of socio-cultural, environmental, and economic responsibilities (RTC, 2012). Among these objectives, policy makers give immediate priority to the economic empowerment of destination community (Kerala Declaration, 2008 and Paul and Rupesh, 2014).

Operational Definitions of the Variables

Economic Responsibility: Responsibility of tourism towards local economy by benefitting local communities and minimizing negative impacts on local livelihoods along with developing and marketing quality products that reflects the natural, cultural and social integrity of the destination while ensuring equitable business practices.
Social Responsibility: It is the responsibility exhibits by the destination in empowering and involving local communities in tourism development along with preservation and promotion of local art, culture and traditions.
Environmental Responsibility: Endeavors of tourism to ensuring negative impacts are reduced to the minimum and maximizing positive ones

Methodology

The initial step was to generate items for the three dimensions; viz. economic, social and environmental responsibility both deductively and inductively (Hinkin, 1995) through literature survey, followed by in-depth interview and an expert opinion survey with an expert group consisting of 13 academicians, responsible tourism practitioners, and social scientists. In order to determine the items, four major RT policy guidelines & Responsible Tourism Guidelines of South Africa (DEAT), Responsible Tourism Criteria (RTC Kerala), Cape Town Declaration and Kerala Declaration have been considered. The listed items were then converted to suitable statements after removing redundant items, which reflect the variables, with the help of experts (Khalid, 2004). Further, a preliminary study was carried out

to finalize the initial list of items for the study. Data were collected from 452 respondents from a stake holder list provided by the Responsible Tourism Cell, Government of Kerala consisting respondents from local residents, tourism officials, responsible tourism practitioners and enterprise owners. In order to determine the validity and the factor structure of the instrument, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were done. The study was conducted in three tourism destinations in Kerala: Kovalam, Kumarakom, and Thekkady; selected based on the criteria suggested by experts, which are given below.

1. There should be specified influential area of tourism activity
2. There should be sufficient natural resources or attractions
3. There should be a sufficient tourist inflow (minimum1000 foreign travelers/ year)
4. There should be a strong entrepreneurial community (presence of all types of classified hotels/resorts under Kerala Tourism)
5. It should be resilient in any of the triple bottom line responsibility areas of Responsible Tourism

Beyond this, destinations were selected on the basis of resilience - the availability of plenty of natural resources, skilled manpower, supportive entrepreneurial community, strong local self governments, civil society organizations, multitude of micro enterprises, streams of professionals and academicians, responsible media and responsive tourism industry - provide the state an ideal setting to implement and practice 'Responsible Tourism' as suggested by Rabeendran (2009).

Table 1 : Brief analyses on the destination and selection criteria

Destination	Resources/Attractions	FTA* (2012)	Classified Hotels	TBL Resilience	Destination Score**
Kovalam	Beaches and Village tours	221435	38	Economic	68
Kumarakom	Backwater, Bird Sanctuary and Village Tours	4867	35	Social	65
Thekkady	Periyar Wild Life Sanctuary ,Tribal Settings, and Boating	4988	35	Cultural and Environmental	89

**FTA - Foreign Tourist Arrival*

*** As per the Community Feedback Survey (Kerala Tourism, 2009) - Average score consists of employment opportunities, regional development and enterprise development*

Also, Government of Kerala had officially declared these destinations as responsible tourism destinations and have been implementing RT from 2008 onwards.

DATA ANALYSIS

First and foremost STEP in data analysis is the verification of the quality of collected data which is essential to finalize the tools of analysis (Rejikumar, 2012). It includes steps such as:

- Verification of missing values
- Identification of Outliers
- Analysis of Normality
- Analysis of Validity and Reliability

The data collected from 452 respondents were tested to identify missing values and found 17 cases where respondents failed to mark their responses; hence these cases were deleted. Similarly, some cases of outliers were eliminated. To determine the normality of the distribution of the data, the skewness and kurtosis of each variable were examined using the SPSS software package. Being the critical value for both of these measures of normality is drawn from a z distribution, zero value of the calculated skewness and kurtosis assumes perfect normality in the data distribution (which is seldom achieved), ± 2.58 indicates rejecting the normality assumption at the 0.01 probability level, and ± 1.96 signifies a 0.05 error level (Hair et al. 1998). Chou and Bentler (1995) suggested that absolute values of univariate skewness indices greater than 3.0 seem to describe extremely skewed and the kurtosis index greater than 10.0 may suggest a problem. It is found that no variable fell outside the ±1.96 range for skewness aS all the variables fall under the kurtosis value of 3, inferring that all of the variables for the study are reasonably free from skewness and kurtosis was not problematic in this research.

According to Norusis, (1990, p.82), another data characteristic that was considered is the kurtosis: how observations "cluster around a central point" for a given standard distribution. Distributions that are more peaked than normal are called "leptokurtic," whereas those that are flatter than normal are referred to as "platykurtic." Positive values for kurtosis show that a distribution has a higher than normal peak (Kim, 2002). None of the items fell outside ±2.56 range for kurtosis. Therefore, in this study none of the variables was leptokurtic or platykurtic.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The analysis of reliability and validity is based on the assumption of unidimensionality (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994). The data were splitted into two to confirm the factor structure through EFA and CFA. In order to determine the scale dimensionality, EFA with a principal component method was conducted for each construct and the sub-constructs. As the items of each sub-construct were predetermined, a separate principal component analysis was conducted for each sub construct. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett's test of sphericity were examined to determine the appropriateness of factor analysis. Interpretive adjectives for the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy are: 0.90's (marvelous), 0.80's (meritorious), 0.70's (middling), 0.60's (mediocre), 0.50's (miserable), and below 0.50 (unacceptable) (Gaskin, 2014). In order to assure that each factor identified by EFA has only one dimension and that each attribute loads on only one factor, attributes that had factor loadings of lower than 0.5 and attributes loading on more than one factor with a loading

score of equal to or greater .50 on each factor were eliminated from the analysis (Chen & Hsu, 2001).

Bases for assessing Responsible Tourism

As stated earlier, the responsible tourism has three responsibility areas: economic, social and environment.

Economic Responsibility: Employment opportunities, Skill development, Standard of living, Local procurement, Local enterprise support, and Tourism integrated local economy were the **six items** proposed to measure economic responsibility, retrieved from the literature.

Social Responsibility: Promotion of local art and culture, Promotion of local souvenirs, Culture, Heritage and Traditions (CHT); Local community engagement, Social development programs, Local infrastructure development, Preservation of local landscape, Cultural exchange, Employment opportunities for backward people, Improvement of basic amenities, Support for enterprises by disadvantaged people, Training for engagement, and Public awareness (13 Items).

Environmental Responsibility: Nature conservation, Environmental Awareness, Waste minimization, and Waste Management (4 items).

Since the factor structure of each dimension was pre-determined, a separate factor analysis was conducted for each sub-dimension. All the pre-determined sub-constructs except social responsibility proved right. After the principal component factor analysis, two components emerged as factors from the component social responsibility. Items such as Local community engagement, Employment opportunities for backward people, Social development programs, Local infrastructure development, Improvement of basic amenities, Support enterprise by disadvantaged people, Training for engagement, and Public awareness (8 items) formed one group which fall under the social dimension. Promotion of local art and culture, Promotion of local souvenirs, Cultural exchange, Promotion of culture, heritage and traditions (CHT), Preservation of local landscape (5 items) formed a second group. The second group items was found to reflect cultural components. In tune with the responsible tourism criteria of Kerala Tourism (2012), Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) and Responsible Tourism Guideline of South Africa (DEAT, 2012), these two were treated as sub constructs and a separate EFA was performed for both the sub constructs named social responsibility and cultural responsibility.

Table 2 clearly shows that the Cronbach's reliability estimate for all four sub dimensions of the responsible tourism is greater than 0.70 and hence exceeded the requirement of acceptable level (Field, 2005). Also, the variance explained for all four sub-dimensions of responsible tourism are above .50, indicating that variance due to measurement error is smaller than the variance captured by the factor. Therefore, it can be concluded that responsible tourism can be measured by four sub constructs namely economic responsibility, social responsibility, cultural

responsibility, and environmental responsibility consisting OF six, eight, five, and four items respectively. It can also be concluded that all items are valid and reliable.

Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is the variance extracted estimate, which assesses the amount of variance that is captured by an underlying factor in relation to the amount of variance due to measurement error. It is desirable that constructs exhibit estimates of .50 or more, because estimates less than .50 indicate that variance due to measurement error is larger than variance captured by the factor (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggested that variance extracted is a more conservative measure than construct reliability. As a rule of thumb good reliability is suggested if Cronbach's alpha estimate is higher than 0.7 and the Variance extracted (AVE) for a construct is larger than 0.5 (Hair et al 1995; Holmes-Smith 2001). The composite indicator reliabilities and variance extracted estimates were calculated using the formula recommended by Fornell and Larcker (1981). Table 2 presents the standardized loadings, composite reliabilities, and the variance extracted estimates of the constructs. All of the composite reliabilities are above .7 and all variance extracted estimates are above.5.

Table 2 Factor analysis of Responsible Tourism Construct

Constructs and Scales	Loading	Eigen Values	Variance Explained	AVE**
Economic Responsibility	.849*	2.640	66.08%	0.66
Employment opportunities	.761			
Local Procurement	.660			
Skill development	.535			
Local Enterprise Support	.684			
Standard of Living	.732			
Tourism integrated local economy	.673			
Kaiser-meyer-olkin msa	.742			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	.000			
Social Responsibility	.884*	3.428	68.57%	0.67
Local community engagement	.851			
Employment opportunities for backward people	.864			
Social development programs	.834			
Local infrastructure development	.845			
Support for enterprise by disadvantaged people	.807			
Training for engagement	.820			
Improvement of basic amenities	.743			

Constructs and Scales	Loading	Eigen Values	Variance Explained	AVE**
Public awareness	.797			
Kaiser-meyer-olkin msa	.851			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	.000			
Cultural Responsibility	.902*			
Promotion of local art and culture	.955	1.823	91.15%	0.95
Cultural exchange	.571			
Preservation of local landscape	.632			
Promotion of CHT	.955			
Promotion of local souvenir	.732			
Kaiser-meyer-olkin msa	.5			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	.000			
Environmental Responsibility	.850*	1.739	86.94%	0.92
Environmental awareness	.932			
Nature conservation	.873			
Waste minimization	.934			
Waste management	.932			
Kaiser-meyer-olkin msa	.5			
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	.000			

** Reliability coefficient (Cronbach's Alpha) **Average Variance Extracted*

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

This study has adopted Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using AMOS for validating the scales developed for measuring constructs. CFA is to confirm the measurement scale properties. As the constructs consisted of sub-dimensions, before testing the measurement model properties of the whole proposed measurement model, a separate confirmatory factor analysis was required to be performed on each sub-dimension of the constructs to check the reliability and validity of the indicators. The observed variables that were grouped together in the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) were utilized to perform the confirmatory factor analysis. To perform Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), the second group of the splitted data was used.

After assessing the unidimensionality of each sub dimension individually, a measurement model for each pair of constructs was estimated by combining them. Afterwards, the overall measurement fit of the construct was tested by a Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the measurement models and the structural model of Responsible Tourism dimension are given in Table 3.

Comparative fit Index (CFI) is a measurement of unidimensionality.

Standardized root mean square residual or Standardized RMR (SRMR) is the average difference between the predicted and observed variances and covariance in the model, based on standardized residuals. PCLOSE tests the null hypothesis that RMSEA is not greater than .05. If PCLOSE is less than .05, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the computed RMSEA is greater than .05, indicating lack of a close fit. Root mean square error of approximation, RMSEA, is also called RMS or RMSE or discrepancy per degree of freedom. Hoelter's critical N issued to judge sample size adequacy. By convention, sample size is adequate if Hoelter's N > 200.

The normed alpha, RMSEA and CFI were above the permissible level. The resulting model was found to be a good fitting model with recommended indices as illustrated in Table 3. All the paths in the model are found to be significant as critical ratios were above 1.96. The eight indicator variable model related to "social responsibility" dimension was suggesting a poor fitting model in the first estimate. The normed alpha, RMSEA and CFI were above the permissible level. As per modification indices, an error correlation was added between indicator variables "public awareness" and "community engagement" and "support for the enterprises of backward" and "employment opportunities for backward" considering the theoretical grounds, as to correlate error terms there needs to be a strong theoretical justification behind such a move (Joreskog and Long, 1993) to develop a well-fit and significant model as illustrated in Figure 5.5. In the first case, variables represent responses related to community engagement and public awareness; as the participation in public awareness may have relation with community engagement, theoretically there is a chance for their error variables to have correlation. Also, two items - development of local infrastructure and improvement of basic amenities – were found cross loaded and the latter was removed. All the paths shown in the model are significant as critical ratios are above 1.96.

Structural equation models with latent variables (SEM) are more usually used to analyse relationships among variables. The relationships among latent variables were tested only after obtaining a statistically significant well-fitting model which represents the data. The statistical significance of relationships among Responsible Tourism and its extracted dimensions such as economic responsibility, social responsibility, cultural responsibility, and environmental responsibility were of interest to this study. The well-fit measurement models of Responsible Tourism dimensions such as economic responsibility, social responsibility, cultural responsibility, and environmental responsibility are taken together to arrive at a fitting structural model for Responsible Tourism.

All the critical ratio values are proven significant at a probability level of .05; it should be > ±1.96 for statistical significance. Also, the standard residual co-variance should be less than 2.58 to conclude statistically significant co-variance between two variables (Barbara. M. Byrne, 2010). Non-significant parameters, with the exception of error variances, should be removed from the model in the interest of

scientific parsimony, as it can be considered unimportant to the model (Rejikumar, 2012).

On verification of modification indices of social responsibility dimension of responsible tourism construct, one indicator variable " supporting enterprises of backward people' was showing cross loadings to many other variables and was found to be a major cause for poor fit and hence removed. The four sub constructs model "responsible tourism" dimension was suggesting poor fitting model in the first estimate. In order to improve the fitness, two error correlations were added between indicator variables considering the theoretical grounds. All the paths shown in the model are significant as critical ratio were above 1.96.

Table 3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Sl. No	Considerations	Threshold Values	Observed Values				
			Eco	Soc	Cul	Env	Overall
1	**CMIN/DF**	<3	1.801	0.11	0.93	0.63	2.3
2	**SRMR**	<0.08	0.024	0.03	0.004	0.04	0.043
3	**CFI**	>0.9	0.996	1	1	1	0.974
4	**RMSEA**	<0.08	0.063	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.061
5	**PCLOSE**	>0.05	0.309	0.986	0.519	0.612	0.11
6	**HOELTER'S CRITICAL N**	>200	515	1184	2512	512	237

Convergent validity of the measurement was established when the relationship between measurement items and the factor were significantly different from zero. Parameters having a critical ratio greater than 1.96 were considered significant based on the level of p=0.05 (Anderson and Gerbing, 1988). The present analysis found all of the measurement items representing their factors significantly, as the critical ratio of every item exceeded the 1.96 value; hence, all of the measurement items satisfied the convergent validity test. Additionally, the standardized regression weights should be significantly linked to the latent constructs and have at least loading estimate of 0.5 and ideally exceed 0.7 (Hair et al 2006). As a rule of thumb composite reliability is considered high if squared multiple correlation ("smc") R2 is greater than 0.5, moderate if between 0.3 and 0.5, and poor if less than 0.3 (Holmes-Smith 2001), suggesting construct reliability.

Final Scale is given in the Table 4.

Table 4 : Stakeholder-Based Scale to Measure Responsible Tourism

	Please put a tick mark (✓) to the appropriate code against each statement. [1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree]					
	Responsible Tourism					
	Economic Responsibility					
1	Tourism creates more employment opportunities for residents in the community	1	2	3	4	5
2	Tourism increases demand of local produces	1	2	3	4	5
3	Tourism programs provide skill development and vocational	1	2	3	4	5

	training opportunities for local residents					
4	I think Tourism promotes locally owned business	1	2	3	4	5
5	I feel tourism improves the standard of living of local community	1	2	3	4	5
6	Tourism is well integrated within the local economy and is developed alongside other sectors	1	2	3	4	5
	Social Responsibility					
1	Tourism development encourages engagement of local community in the decision making process of destination management/development	1	2	3	4	5
2	Development of the destination provides opportunities for socially and economically backward people	1	2	3	4	5
3	Destination development brings social programmes and schemes for the local community					
4	I think tourism helps to improve our roads, local services and other related infrastructural development	1	2	3	4	5
5	I believe local community gets sufficient support to engage in tourism development					
6	Present tourism programs persistently focused on different awareness programs					
	Cultural Responsibility					
1	Tourism promotes and preserves local culture, art forms and traditions	1	2	3	4	5
2	I think tourism contributes for effective cultural exchange thereby generate respect and pride among community member about their culture					
3	Tourism development is appropriate to local environmental conditions which preserves the quality of local landscapes	1	2	3	4	5
4	Tourism promotes historic heritage, authentic culture, traditions and distinctiveness of the host communities..	1	2	3	4	5
5	Tourism promotes local arts, handicrafts, and souvenirs	1	2	3	4	5
	Environmental Responsibility					
1	Destination management focuses on environmental awareness/conservation	1	2	3	4	5
2	Destination development takes care of natural areas, biodiversity, and habitats/wildlife	1	2	3	4	5
3	Tourism encourages minimizing waste and where necessary disposing of it with care	1	2	3	4	5
4	Destination is clean and free from environmental pollution and related hazards	1	2	3	4	5

Conclusion

Responsible Tourism emerges as a growing concept in destination marketing and management. When travelers as well as destination community call for responsible practices to achieve sustainability of destinations; tourism planners, business enterprises and travel agents are forced to ensure clean image and competitiveness of tourism destinations, in order to maintain good tourists inflow. Also, national and international agencies like World Tourism Organizations, United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) Initiative etc. put forth comprehensive guidelines for tourism planners and operators to assure sustainable tourism management. Such endeavors, in a way, prompt stakeholders to brand themselves as 'Responsible' without considering the essence of Responsible Tourism.

The developed and tested scale can be used to rate destinations on the basis of its responsibility towards local economy, efforts for social development and cultural preservation, and towards environmental conservation. This will guide the creative endeavors of policy makers, tourism planners, researchers, and tourism related experts in strengthening sustainability initiatives in improving destination quality and related interventions especially in providing incentives. When opinion surveys are gaining momentum these days, this stakeholder – based tool also invites more hope for participatory approach and stakeholder consultation. Measurement indicators being destination specific, due care is required while adapting it in various locations. However, the procedure adopted to develop the scale seems comprehensive and theoretically valid, even though the concept still is in embryonic stage, at least in implementation.

Reference

Andereck, K. L. (1995). Linking tourism, the environment, and sustainability. In S. F. McCool, & A. E. Watson, *Environmental consequences of tourism: a review of recent researchenvironment, and sustainability.* Minneapolis: The national Recreation and Park Association.

Andereck, K., & Jurowski, C. Tourism and quality of life.Quality tourism experiences. In G. Jennings, & N. P. Nickerson. Oxford: Elsevier.

Andereck, K., Valentin, K., Vogt, C., & Knopf, R. (2007). A Cross-cultural Analysis of Tourism and Quality of Life Perceptions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism , 15* (5), 483-502.

Ashley, C. (1995). *Tourism, communities, and the potential impacts on local incomes and conservation.* Windhoek, Namibia: Directorate of Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

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

Ashley, C., Goodwin, H., McNab, D., Scott, M., & Chaves. (2006). *Pro-Poor Tourism*

Partnership and the Caribbean Tourism Organisation. UK: UK Travel Foundation.

Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W. "Structural Equation Modeling in practice: A Review and Recommended two-step approach", Psychological Bulletin. Vol. 103, No. 3, pp. 441-423, 1988.

Bah, A. (2008). Responsible Tourism Development; Lessons from Gambia. *The Second International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations.* Kochi: Kerala Tourism.

Breugel, v. L. (2013). *Community-based tourism: Local participation and perceived impacts; A comparative study between two communities in Thailand.* Master Thesis, Faculty of Social Sciences, Radboud University Nijmegen.

Cape Town. (2009). *RESPONSIBLE TOURISM POLICY FOR THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN.*

Carmichael, B. A. (2006). Linking Quality Tourism Experiences, Residents Quality of Life, and Quality Experiences for Tourists. In G. Jenning, & N. P. Nickerson, *Quality Tourism Experiences.* New York: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.

Chen, J. & Hsu, C.H.C. (2001). Developing and validating a riverboat gaming impact scale. Annals of Tourism, 28 (2), 459-476.

Chou, C. P., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Estimates and tests in structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and Applications. In R. H. Hoyle. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

DEAT. (1996). *A White Paper on the Development and Promotion of Tourism .* South Africa: Department of Environment and Tourism.

Fan, X., Thompson, B., & Wang, L. (1999). Effects of Sample Size, Estimation Methods, and Model Specification on Structural Equation Modeling Fit Indexes. In *Structural Equation Modeling* (Vol. 6, pp. 56-83).

Field, A.P. "Discovering Statistics using SPSS", Sage Publications, Thousand oaks, UK, 2005.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1985). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research* , 39–50.

Frey, N., & George, R. (2010). Responsible tourism management: The missing link between business owners' attitudes and behaviour in the Cape Town tourism industry. *Tourism Management , 31*, 621-628.

Gaskin. J. www.statwiki.org, accessed in 23rd December, 2014

Goodwin, H. (2006). *Community-based tourism failing to deliver?.* London: ID 21 Insight 62.: Department for International Development.

Goodwin, H. (2011). *Taking responsibility for tourism: responsible tourism management.* Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers Limited.

Goodwin, H., Spenceley, A., & Maynard, B. *Rural Livelihoods and the Tourism Industry; Development of Responsible Tourism Guidelines for South Africa.* U.K. Department of International Development (DFID) and the South African Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism Affairs (DEAT).

Greiner, R. (2010). Improving the Net Benefits from Tourism for People Living in Remote Northern Australia. *Sustainability , 2*, 2197-2218.

(GSTC-D). (2013). *Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria for Destinations (GSTC-D).* Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria for Destinations ver. 1.0 – 1 November 2013.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research , 29* (1), 79-105.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis.* 5th ed., Prentice-Hall Inc., Upper Saddle River.

Hair, J., Bush, R., & Oranitu, D. (2000). Marketing Research: Within a Changing Information Environment. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Holmes and Smith, P. "Introduction to Structural Equation Modelling using LISREAL", Perth: ACSPRI-Winter training Program, 2001.

Harrison, L. C., & Husbands, W. (1996). *Practicing responsible tourism: International case studies in tourism planning, policy and development.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Howse, C. (2008). Klein's Camp, A case study from CC Africa. *The Second International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations.* Kochi: Kerala Tourism.

Hinkin, T.R., 1995. A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. Journal of Management 21 (5), 967-988.

Joreskog, K. and Long, J.S. "Testing Structural Equation Models", In Kenneth. A. Bollen and J. Scott Long(Eds), Newbury Park, CA, Sage, pp. 294-316, 1993.

Jurowski, C., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance Effects on Resident Attitudes Towards Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research , 31* (2), 396-312.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, C., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Tourism Research , 36* (2), 3-11.

Kerstetter, D. L., & Bricker, K. S. (2012). Relationship between carrying capacity of small island tourism destinations and quality of life. In M. Uysal, R. R. Perdue, & M. J. Sirgy, *Handbook of tourism and quality of life research: Enhancing the lives of tourists and residents of host communities* (pp. Kerstetter, D. L., & Bricker, K. S. (2012).). New York: Springer.

Khalid, S. (2004). Development and Validation of the Index of Personal Growth (IPG) and the familial and Dispositional predictors of personal growth. *Ph.D. Thesis* .

Kim, K. (2002). The Effects o f Tourism Impacts on Quality o f Life o f the Residents in the Community. PhD Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management.

Kim, K. (2002). *The Effects of Tourism upon the Quality of Life Residents in the Community.* Blacksburg, Virginia: Doctoral Thesis.

Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Joseph, S. M. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management* , 527-540.

Kreag, G. (2001). *The Impacts ofTourism.* Minnesota Sea Grant: The University of Minnesota.

Krippendorf, J. (1987). The holiday makers: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel. Heinemann: Oxford, England.

Krippendorf, J. (1982). Toward new tourism policy, the importance of environmental and socio-cultural factors. *Tourism Management* , 135-148.

Lankford, G. (1992). Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. *Journal of Travel Research* , 34-43.

Maelge, C. (2008). Sri Lanka's Responsible Tourism Story and Achievements. *The Second International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations.* Kochi: Kerala Tourism.

McGehee, N., & Andereck, K. (2004). Factors Predicting Rural Residents‟ Support of Tourism,. *Journal of Travel Research , 43*, 131-140.

Michot, T. (2010). Pro-Poor Tourism in Kumarakom, Kerala, South India: Policy Implementation and Impacts. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* .

Norusis, M. (1990). *SPSS Introductory Statistics Student Guide.* Chicago: Illinois.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). Psychometric Theory. New York: McGrawHill.

Paul, V. M. (2014). *Responsible Business - Problems and Prospects.* Kochi: Green Life India Network.

Paul, V. M., & Manesh, N. A. (2014). Outcomes of Responsible Tourism (RT) as Antecedents for The Sustainable Commitment for Cultural Preservation – A Proposal. *Global Journal for Research Analysis , 3* (10), 76-78.

Paul, V. M., & Anton.J (2014). Telecommuting: A Responsible Business Approach of Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) Organizations. *Indian Journal of Applied Research , 4* (11), 112-114.

Paul, V. M., & Manu, M. J. (2013). Responsible Tourism; Contribution towards Millennium Development Goals. *MDG* (pp. 34-39). Chennai: VELS University.

Paul, V. M., & Moli, P. K. (2014). Responsible Tourism – A Strategy for Sustainable Development; Lessons from Kumarakom. *Global Research Review , 11* (3), 55-61.

Paul, V. M., & Nimmy, A. G. (2014). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a Strategy for Inclusive Development-Learning from Oil Companies in India. *Maha Journal of Education , 1* (1), 22-30.

Paul, V. M., & Rupesh, K. K. (2013). Responsible Tourism: a Strategy for Grass root level Empowerment. *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences (IIAAS) , 7* (1), 54-71.

Paul, V. M., & Rupesh, K. K. (2013). Responsible Tourism: a Strategy for Grass root level Empowerment. *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences , 7* (1), 54-71.

Paul, V. M., & Rupesh, K. (2013). Responsible Tourism - Charting New Trend in

Destination Marketing. *International Journal of Social Science Tomorrow , 2* (10), 1-7.

Rabeendran, K. (2012). *Responsible Tourism, Kerala Experinces.* Trivandrum: GITPAC International.

Reed, M. G. (2000). Collaboration & Partnerships: Politics, Practice and Sustainability. In B. Bramwell, & B. Lane, *Collaborative tourism planning as adaptive experiments in emergent tourism settings.* Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Reji Kumar, G. (2009). Recession Proof marketing Practices. *RVS Journal of Management* .

Rejikumar, G. (2013). A Pre-launch Exploration on Customer Acceptance to Usage Based Vehicle Insurance Policy. *IIMB Management Review , 25* (1).

Roe, D. (2004). *The millennium development goals and conservation: Managing nature's wealth for society's health.* New York (UNEP): United Nations Development Programme.

Responsble Tourism Initiative, Wild Asia, retrived on 12th Novemeber 2014, www.rt.wildasia.org

Saji, M. P., & Narayanasamy, N. *Tourism Product Development in Ecologically and Culturally Fragile Areas – Observations from Kerala in India.* Tamil Nadu: Gandhigram Rural Institute Of Management.

Smith, R. A. (1992). Beach resort evolution: Implications for planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* , 304-322.

Spenceley, A., Relly, P., Keyser, H., Warmeant, P., McKenzie, M., Mataboge, A., et al. (2002). *Responsible Tourism Manual for South Africa.* Pretoria: Department for Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

Stanford, D. (2000). *A review of the education of tourists to achieve sustainable tourism.* Lancaster: Lancaster University.

Stanford, D. (2006). *Responsible Tourism, Responsible Tourists:What makes a responsible tourist in New Zealand?* Wellington: for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Tourism Management, Victoria University of Wellington.

UNEP. (2010). *Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism (GPST).* New York: Global Partnership for Sustainable Tourism (UNEP).

UNEP. (2005). *Integrating Sustainability Into Business A Management Guide for Responsible Tour Operations.* Paris CEDEX 15, France: United Nations Environment Programme.

UNEP. (2003). *Tourism and Local Agenda 21: The Role of Local Authorities in Sustainable Tourism, International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives.* Paris: United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).

UNEP, & WTO. (2005). *Making Tourism more Sustainable; A Guide for Policy Makers.* UNEP & WTO.

UNESCO. (2004). *IMPACT: The Effects of Tourism on Culture and the Environment in Asia and the Pacific:Tourism and Heritage Site Management in Luang Prabang,*

Lao PDR. Bangkok: UNESCO.

UNWTO. (1988). *Guide for local authorities on developing sustainable tourism.* Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.

UNWTO. (2004). *Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destinations. A Guidebook.* Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.

UNWTO. (1997). *The global code of ethics for tourism (GCET).*

Var, T., & Kim, Y. (1989). Tourism impacts and its control, Quality of Life Studies in Marketing & Management. *Proceeding of the Third Quality-oflife/Marketing life/Marketing Conference* (pp. 292-302). Virginia polytechnic Institute & State University.

Venu, V., & Goodwin, H. (2008). *The Kerala Declaration on Responsible Tourism.* Thiruvananthapuram: Department of Tourism, Government of Kerala.

Wang, Y. (2006). Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism Development: A Case Study of Washington, NC. *Proceedings of the 2006 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, (p. 14).

WTO. (2010). *Tourism and the millennium development goals.* World Tourism Organization (WTO).

WTO. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Tourism Destination Management.* Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.

WTO. (2009). *Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destination: A guidebook.* World Tourism Organization.

WTO. (1988). *Sustainable Tourism.* The World Tourism Organization (WTO).

WTTC. (2012). *Travel & tourism economic impact.* London, UK: World Travel & Tourism Council.

WTTC. (2014). *WTTC Travel and Tourism Economic Impact.* UK: World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC).

❐❐❐