



AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sera E. Janson for the degree of Master of Science in Forest Resources presented on November 24, 2008.

Title: Applying the McDonaldization Thesis and Norm Activation Model to Examine Trends and Effects of Commercial Outdoor Recreation and Tourism in Juneau, Alaska

Abstract approved:

---

Mark D. Needham

As recreation and tourism visitation increases and government budgets decrease, public land management agencies are using private commercial operators as an alternative source of offering products and services. Changes and trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism such as a large scale increase in the number of visitors can affect communities, visitors, and natural resources. Objectives of this research were to focus on commercial outfitters on the Tongass National Forest in the Juneau, Alaska area, and examine their: (a) changes in visitors served and activities offered, (b) awareness of effects of commercial recreation and tourism on visitors and local communities, (c) ascription of responsibility for these effects, and (d) behavior to improve conditions. Data were obtained from 23 semi structured interviews of commercial outfitters in the Juneau area. Findings showed that the Juneau area has experienced changes such as an increase in the number and diversity of visitors served and activities offered mainly due to the influence of the cruise industry. These changes reflected principles of McDonaldization (i.e., efficiency, calculability, predictability, control) despite some seemingly contrary evidence of uniqueness, customization, and flexibility. Results also showed that outfitter perceived effects of and behavior toward commercial recreation

and tourism were mostly social and managerial in nature. Awareness of negative effects included more general impacts of the tourism industry (e.g., crowding, noise), whereas positive effects were more specific to the outfitter (e.g., tour service, infrastructure provisions to community). Impact ownership and personal initiative played important roles in outfitters' ascription of responsibility and proactive behaviors, and largely focused on self enforced and industry created codes of conduct (e.g., Tourism Best Management Practices). Informal sanctions (e.g., desire to be good neighbors, obligation to environment) offered important means to improve conditions.

© Copyright by Sera E. Janson  
November 24, 2008  
All Rights Reserved

Applying the McDonaldization Thesis and Norm Activation Model to Examine Trends  
and Effects of Commercial Outdoor Recreation and Tourism in Juneau, Alaska

by  
Sera E. Janson

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Master of Science

Presented November 24, 2008  
Commencement June 2009

Master of Science thesis of Sera E. Janson presented on November 24, 2008.

APPROVED:

---

Major Professor, representing Forest Resources

---

Head of the Department of Forest Engineering, Resources and Management

---

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

---

Sera E. Janson, Author

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With humility and respect, I express gratefulness to those who have helped me complete this thesis. I extend sincere appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Mark Needham, for his mentorship and friendship throughout this research process. He continues to go above and beyond to push me further than my imagined dreams. In addition, I am grateful for my committee – Drs. Linda Kruger, Randall Rosenberger, and Lori Cramer—who each honored me with their time, ideas, and spirit. Randy and Linda both offered key support and timely mentorship, as well as valuable feedback at various stages of the research process. In addition, Melanie Stidham, my elected student mentor, offered unwavering emotional, academic, and qualitative research support. I thank the Forest Service PNW Research Station for funding for this project. Thanks also to Dr. Glen Howe from OSU’s College of Forestry who provided funding through a flexible summer assistantship during my data collection. Drs. Mark Needham, Bo Shelby, and Jo Tynon supported me through provision of GTA opportunities. I also thank all research participants for their time and perspectives that contributed to both this research and my learning. During this process, I have found myself surrounded by the largest population of phenomenal individuals I know. These kind, interesting, and intelligent friends, colleagues, and neighbors have helped me succeed in my goals. I also thank my parents for encouraging me to pursue higher education and supporting me to learn what I love. Finally, I am so grateful for Nicolas Zegre, who I met the day I arrived at OSU. In admiration, I mimicked his work and play habits. He provided balance and reality amid this humbling process, becoming a great mentor, a best friend, and my life partner.

## CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS

Dr.'s Mark Needham and Linda Kruger were involved in the overall concept and design of this research. Dr.'s Needham and Kruger each provided conceptual feedback on chapters two and three and Dr. Randall Rosenberger provided conceptual feedback on chapter two. Dr. Mark Needham assisted with detailed editing of chapters one, two, three, and four.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Chapter 1 -- Introduction .....	1
Study Area and Context.....	2
Thesis Objectives and Research Questions .....	4
Thesis Organization.....	5
References .....	6
Chapter 2 – McDonaldization and Commercial Outdoor Recreation and Tourism:	
Trends and Changes in the Juneau, Alaska Area .....	9
Introduction .....	9
Study Area and Context.....	10
Conceptual Foundation .....	12
Research Questions .....	14
Methods .....	14
Sample and Data Collection.....	14
Data Analysis.....	17
Results and Discussion.....	18
Visitor, Activity, and Employment Trends.....	18
Evidence of McDonaldization.....	26
Evidence of Customization and Flexibility.....	33
Summary and Implications.....	37
References .....	43
Chapter 3 –Applying the Norm Activation Model to Examine Effects of Commercial Outdoor Recreation and Tourism in Juneau, Alaska.....	47
Introduction .....	47
Study Area and Context.....	48
Conceptual Foundation .....	50
Research Questions .....	52
Methods .....	52
Sample and Data Collection.....	52
Data Analysis.....	55

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Results .....	57
Awareness of Effects .....	57
Responsibility and Behavior .....	65
Discussion.....	73
References .....	84
Chapter 4 -- Conclusion.....	90
Summary of Findings .....	90
Management Implications .....	93
Theoretical and Future Research Implications .....	95
References .....	100
Bibliography .....	102
Appendices .....	107
Appendix A. Interview Schedule for Tour Operators .....	107

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
2.1. Interview list.....	15
3.1. Interview list.....	53
3.2. Examples of operationalization of outfitter behavior and determinants.....	57
3.3. Summary of outfitters' awareness of effects.....	58
3.4. Examples of outfitter responsibility by types of responsibility and effects .....	66

## **CHAPTER 1 -- INTRODUCTION**

The tourism and travel industry plays an important role in global social and economic sectors. In 2008, for example, this industry accounted for \$2.0 trillion in direct spending and created over 80 million jobs worldwide (WTTC, 2008). In 1998, the World Tourism Organization predicted that five types of tourism would become more popular by 2020: adventure travel, cruises, ecotourism, cultural tourism, and thematic tourism. These forms of tourism often depend on natural resources and resource based communities. In the United States, for example, these types of tourism frequently take place on publicly owned and federally managed lands, especially in the 13 western states including Alaska (WSTPC, 2005). Travel and tourism is among the three largest industries in these states and is a major economic force generating over \$120 billion per year from domestic and international travel and tourism expenditures (WSTPC, 2005).

Recreation and tourism visitation is increasing across many federally managed lands, but government budgets for managing this type of use have been declining. Public land management agencies, therefore, are using private commercial operators to offer some recreation and tourism products and services such as facility maintenance and management (e.g., campgrounds, parking, reservation systems), guided tours (e.g., guides, outfitters), food and rental services, interpretive and educational programs, transportation and accommodation, and policing and safety services (Absher, Kasul, & Chang, 2003; Eagles, 1999; Quinn, 2002a, 2002b; Ritchie, 1999; Sem, Clements, & Bloomquist, 1996; Weaver, 2001). This commercialization can create both positive and negative effects. More visitors participating in a wider array of nature based activities,

for example, can affect communities by stimulating economic growth and diversity (e.g., employment), but can also create negative social and environmental impacts such as crowding, conflict, and pollution. This thesis identified and examined trends and effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau, Alaska area.

### Study Area and Context

Alaska contains over 240 million acres of federally managed public land, which is the most among all western states. Tourism is the fastest growing industry in this state with many visitors now participating in nature based, adventure, and cruise tourism (Allen, Robertson, & Schaefers, 1998; Colt, Dugan, & Fay, 2007). In southeast Alaska, which mostly borders western British Columbia, traditional industries of timber harvesting and wood products manufacturing have declined (Colt et al., 2007). The recreation and tourism industry, however, has increased its contribution to this region's economy (Allen et al., 1998). In Alaska's state capital of Juneau, for example, tourism now generates nearly 2,000 jobs and \$130 million of income for the local economy during the summer months (USDA Forest Service, 2004).

In the early 1900s, southeast Alaska was considered to be a tourism destination of the traveling elite. Since the 1980s, however, the cruise industry has helped to instigate an increase in the number and diversity of travelers visiting southeast Alaska (Colt et al., 2007). The ability of large ships to navigate the Inside Passage caused more people to visit southeast Alaska towns such as Juneau (Hall, 2007). Since 1990, the number of visitors arriving in southeast Alaska by cruise ship has more than doubled (Colt et al., 2007). In Juneau, for example, the number of cruise ship visitors increased

from approximately 85,000 in 1980 to nearly one million per year between 2002 and 2007 (Allen et al., 1998; JCVB, 2007).

Recreationists and tourists are attracted to southeast Alaska by its scenery, wildlife, glaciers, and other natural attributes (Dugan, Fay, & Colt, 2007; Kruger & Mazza, 2006). These attributes are found in the region's federal forests, national parks, and designated wilderness areas. The Tongass National Forest, for example, is the largest national forest in the United States and encompasses over 80% of the land in this region (i.e., 17 million of 21 million acres). The remaining 20% of land in southeast Alaska is managed by the National Park Service (15%) (e.g., Glacier Bay Park and Preserve), Alaska Native Corporations (2.5%), state government (1%), boroughs and communities (0.5%), and private landowners (0.1%) (Allen et al., 1998).

Private operators (i.e., commercial outfitters) typically apply for and may be granted permits, leases, or contracts to undertake commercial activities on these lands (Quinn, 2002b; Weaver, 2001). In the Juneau area, for example, private recreation and tourism outfitters offer an assortment of nature based activities such as guided flightseeing, hiking, biking, kayaking, zipline tours, marine charters, salmon bake outings, and glacier excursions. Some local outfitters have contractual relationships with the cruise lines to provide cruise passengers with the opportunity to participate in these shore excursions while they are in port (Cervený, 2005; JCVB, 2007). Even if outfitters do not have contracts with cruise lines, many still receive business from cruise passengers who schedule commercial shore excursions either before their cruise or after they disembark the ship (i.e., do not pre-book trips on the ship).

The number and variety of commercial nature related activities has increased in the Juneau area. In 1993, for example, 73 permits were granted to commercial entities to operate on the Tongass National Forest. Five years later, the number of permits had increased to 262 (Cervený, 2005). Currently, there are at least 62 recreation related outfitters operating in the Juneau area (USDA Forest Service, 2007). Commercial recreation and tourism activities such as marine charters and flightseeing tours depend on and impact local communities and natural resources (e.g., jobs, pollution). It is important, therefore, to understand and document any changes, trends, and effects of these commercial activities because they can influence visitor experiences and challenge public land managers who are often tasked with balancing needs of visitors, residents, and resources. However, there is limited understanding of changes and effects of recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska in general and the Juneau area in particular (Brooks & Haynes, 2001).

#### Thesis Objectives and Research Questions

The overall objective of this research was to help address this knowledge gap by identifying and examining outfitters' perceptions of changes and effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. This thesis examined five specific research questions. First, to what extent do outfitters perceive that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism visitors, activities, and employment have changed in the Juneau area since the rise of the cruise industry in the area? Second, do these perceived changes reflect principles of macro sociological phenomena such as McDonaldization or customization? Third, what are outfitters' perceptions of positive and negative environmental, economic, and social effects of commercial recreation and tourism on

visitors and community members in the Juneau area? Fourth, to what extent are outfitters aware of and ascribe responsibility for these effects? Fifth, what behaviors are outfitters engaging in to improve conditions and mitigate any negative effects?

### Thesis Organization

This thesis contains two separate articles that address these questions using data from 23 semi-structured interviews of commercial recreation and tourism outfitters in the Juneau area. The first article in this thesis (chapter two) identifies and examines trends and changes in visitors served and activities offered by these outfitters. This article uses the principles of Ritzer's (1983, 1998) McDonaldization thesis—efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control—to help understand and explain these trends and changes.

The second article in this thesis (chapter three) examines positive and negative effects (e.g., social, managerial, environmental, economic) of commercial recreation and tourism operations on visitors and local community members. Schwartz's (1968, 1977) norm activation model, which proposes that behavior is influenced when individuals are aware of consequences of their behavior and ascribe some degree of responsibility for their actions, is used to understand outfitters': (a) awareness of effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism, (b) ascription of responsibility for these effects, and (c) behaviors to improve conditions. These two separate articles are followed by a chapter that briefly summarizes the major findings of this thesis and their implications for managers, theory, and future research.

## References

- Absher, J. D., Kasul, R. L., & Chang, W. H. (2003). Methodological and conceptual issues in the development of customer service measures for the national recreation reservation service. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (pp. 54-59). Newton Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.
- Allen, S. D., Robertson, G., & Schaefers, J. (1998). *Economies in transition: An assessment of trends relevant to management of the Tongass National Forest*. PNW-GTR-417. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Brooks, D. J., & Haynes, R. W. (2001). *Recreation and tourism in south-central Alaska: Synthesis of recent trends and prospects*. PNW-GTR-511. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Cervený, L. K. (2005). *Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: Case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska*. PNW-RP-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Colt, S., Dugan, D., & Fay, G. (2007) *The regional economy of southeast Alaska*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Dugan, D., Fay, G., & Colt, S. (2007). *Nature-based tourism in southeast Alaska: Results from 2005 and 2006 Field Study*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Eagles, P. F. J. (1999). International trends in park tourism and ecotourism. In *Proceedings of protected areas management and sustainable rural development: How can they be reconciled?* Harare, Zimbabwe: World Conservation Union.
- Hall, J. E. (2007). *The lure of Alaska – a history of tourism in the great land*. Juneau, AK: Alaska State Museum.
- Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau (JCVB). (2007). *Cruise passenger traffic to Juneau Alaska*. Website data. On file with Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, Juneau, AK.
- Kruger, L. E., & Mazza, R. L. (2006). *Alaska communities and forest environments: A problem analysis and research agenda*. PNW-GTR-665. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Quinn, T. (2002a). *A public utility model for managing public land recreation enterprises*. PNW-GTR-543. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.

- Quinn, T. (2002b). *Public lands and private recreation enterprise: Policy issues from a historical perspective*. PNW-GTR-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Policy formulation at the tourism / environment interface: Insights and recommendations from the Banff-Bow Valley study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 100-110.
- Ritzer, G. (1983). The McDonaldization of society. *Journal of American Culture*, 6(1), 100-107.
- Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1968). Awareness of consequences and the influence of moral norms on interpersonal behavior. *Sociometry*, 31, 355-369.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221-279). New York: Academic Press.
- Sem, J., Clements, C. J., & Bloomquist, P. (1996). Tourism and recreation management: Strategies for public lands. *Parks and Recreation*, 31(9), 92-105.
- US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USDA Forest Service) (2007). *List of recreation related outfitter/guides who operate on Admiralty National Monument and Juneau Ranger District*. [Fax]. On file with Brad Flynn, Juneau Ranger District, AK.
- US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USDA Forest Service) (2004). *Shoreline Outfitter / Guide Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: FEIS*. R10-MB-519b. Tongass National Forest, Ketchikan, AK: Alaska Region.
- Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Sydney, Australia: Wiley.
- Western States Tourism Policy Council (WSTPC). (2005). *Tourism and public lands in the west*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.dced.state.ak.us/wstpc/index.htm>.
- World Tourism Organization (WTO). (1998). *Tourism 2020 vision – Global forecast and profiles of market segments*. Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2008). *Tourism satellite accounting*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.wttc.org>.



## **CHAPTER 2 – MCDONALDIZATION AND COMMERCIAL OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM: TRENDS AND CHANGES IN THE JUNEAU, ALASKA AREA**

### Introduction

Tourism contributes to global social and economic sectors in important ways. In 2008, for example, the tourism and travel industry accounted for \$2.0 trillion in direct spending and creation of over 80 million jobs worldwide (WTTC, 2008). The World Tourism Organization (1998) predicted growth in five tourism products by 2020: adventure travel, cruises, ecotourism, cultural tourism, and thematic tourism. These products often depend on natural resources and resource based communities. In the United States, for example, tourism often occurs on publicly owned and federally managed lands, located mostly (i.e., nearly 93%) in 13 western states including Alaska (WSTPC, 2005). Travel and tourism is among the three largest industries in these states and is a major economic force given that domestic and international travel and tourism expenditures contribute over \$120 billion per year to the economy (WSTPC, 2005).

Although recreation and tourism visitation is increasing, government budgets for managing this type of use are decreasing. In response, public land management agencies look to private commercial operators as an alternative source of offering recreation and tourism products and services (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b). These operators provide products and services such as facility maintenance and management (e.g., campgrounds, parking, reservation systems), guided tours (e.g., guides, outfitters), food and rentals, interpretive programs and educational materials, transportation and accommodation, and policing and safety services (Absher, Kasul, & Chang, 2003; Eagles, 1999; Parr, 2000; Ritchie,

1999; Sem, Clements, & Bloomquist, 1996; Weaver, 2001). This privatization of outdoor recreation and tourism can have both positive and negative effects. An increase in the number and diversity of visitors and activities, for example, can affect communities, visitors, and natural resources by causing such effects as crowding, conflict, and pollution. This research examined changes and trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau, Alaska area.

### *Study Area and Context*

In Alaska, which contains approximately 240 million acres of federal public land (most of all the western states), the fastest growing industry is tourism (e.g., nature based, adventure, cruise travel; Allen, Robertson, & Schaefer, 1998; Colt, Dugan, & Fay, 2007). In southeast Alaska, which encompasses land that mostly borders western British Columbia, traditional industries of timber harvesting and wood products manufacturing have declined (Colt et al., 2007), whereas the recreation and tourism industry has increased its contribution to the economy (Allen et al., 1998). Tourism, for example, contributes nearly 2,000 jobs and \$130 million of income to the local economy of Juneau, Alaska's state capital, during the summer months (USDA Forest Service, 2004).

Alaska was a tourism destination of the traveling elite in the early 1900s. Tourism growth in southeast Alaska since the 1980s, however, can be attributed largely to the cruise industry (Colt et al., 2007). The ability of large ships to navigate the Inside Passage increased the number of tourists to Juneau and other towns in southeast Alaska (Hall, 2007). The number of cruise ship passengers to southeast Alaska has more than doubled since 1990 (Colt et al., 2007) and cruise ship visitors to Juneau increased from

approximately 85,000 in 1980 (Allen et al., 1998) to nearly one million per year between 2002 and 2007 (JCVB, 2007).

Federal forests and designated wilderness areas attract recreationists and tourists to southeast Alaska (Kruger & Mazza, 2006). The Tongass National Forest, the largest national forest in the United States, makes up 80% of the land in this region (i.e., 17 million of 21 million acres) and an additional 15% of land is managed by the National Park Service (e.g., Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve). The remaining 5% of land consists of Alaska Native Corporation lands (500,000 acres), state lands (180,000 acres), boroughs and communities (53,000 acres), and 11,000 acres of private lands (Allen et al., 1998). Given landownership patterns and that tourists are drawn to southeast Alaska by its wildlife, glaciers, and other natural attributes (Dugan, Fay, & Colt, 2007), tourism activities in this region are dependant on publicly owned land.

Private operators (i.e., commercial outfitters) typically apply for and may be granted permits, leases, or contracts to conduct commercial activities on public lands (Quinn, 2002; Weaver, 2001). Commercial recreation and tourism outfitters in Juneau, for example, provide a variety of nature based activities including hiking, flightseeing, kayaking, marine charters, and glacier excursions. These commercial activities are influenced by cruise lines that have contractual relationships with local outfitters to provide shore excursions for cruise passengers while they are in port (Cervený, 2005; JCVB, 2007). Even if outfitters do not have cruise contracts, many still receive business from cruise customers who schedule commercial activities when they disembark (i.e., visitors who do not pre-book trips).

In the Juneau area, the amount and diversity of commercial nature related activities has increased. The number of permits for commercial entities operating on the Tongass National Forest, for example, increased from 73 in 1993 to 262 in 1998 (Cervený, 2005). According to the US Forest Service, 62 recreation related outfitters now operate in the Juneau area (USDA Forest Service, 2007). These commercial activities depend on and impact local communities and natural resources. There is a need, therefore, to understand changes and trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism because these changes influence visitor experiences and create challenges for public land managers who often attempt to balance needs of visitors, residents, and resources. There is inadequate understanding of changes and challenges that accompany expansion of recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska (Brooks & Haynes, 2001). This research helps to address this knowledge gap by identifying changes and trends in visitors served and activities offered by commercial outdoor recreation and tourism outfitters in the Juneau area.

### *Conceptual Foundation*

Changes such as the large scale increase in the number of cruise visitors have led some people to liken Juneau to Disneyland (Egan, 2000). Both Disneyland and the cruise industry have been compared to the McDonalds restaurant chain using Ritzer's McDonaldization thesis (Bryman, 1995; Ritzer, 1998; Ritzer & Liska, 1997; Weaver, 2005). This thesis states that the principles of the fast food industry—efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control—dominate many sectors of American society and other societies in the world (Ritzer, 1983). Efficiency means "choosing the optimum means to a given end" and can be characterized by such things as drive-thru's

and ready-made meals at McDonalds (Ritzer, 1996, p.35). This restaurant chain demonstrates calculability (i.e., ability to be counted, quantified) and predictability (i.e., certainty, no surprises) by ensuring that products and services are identical (Ritzer, 1998). Control is defined as the use of technologies to minimize inefficiency, uncertainty, and unpredictability in humans and their surroundings (Ritzer, 1998). In this context, technologies not only include computers and assembly lines, but also elements of bureaucracy such as regulations and guidelines (Ritzer, 1996). McDonalds displays control over employees, for example, by replacing them with technological advancements such as conveyor belts and automated drink machines (Ritzer, 1998).

This phenomenon is present in the tourism industry. Disneyland, for example, exhibits principles of efficiency, predictability, and control; ironically, the original Disneyland opened its doors the same year as the first McDonalds (Bryman, 1995; Ritzer & Liska, 1997). Disneyland demonstrates efficiency in the way that it manages large numbers of people at one time, and predictability (i.e., certainty) by offering consistent customer service (Ritzer & Liska, 1997). Control is exerted over employee language and dress through the Disney Institute (e.g., mandatory employee training) and Employee Handbook (Bryman, 1995; Ritzer & Liska, 1997). These principles of McDonaldization are also apparent in the cruise industry. Through a controlled system, tourists can efficiently visit many ports on a predictable and calculated schedule (Weaver, 2005). Weaver (2005) suggests, however, that the McDonaldization thesis offers an incomplete interpretation of the cruise industry because it does not address

client preferences for unique and individualized products such as customization of cruise vacations with the purchase of additional items (e.g., guided shore excursions).

McDonaldization builds on and has much in common with Fordism (Ritzer & Liska, 1997; Smart, 1999), defined by efficiencies that create mass production of homogeneous products. Package tours are examples of Fordism in the tourism industry (Ritzer & Liska, 1997). In contrast, tourists may want individualized products such as a customized tour that challenges the efficiency and predictability of more standardized leisure experiences (Mullins, 1999). McDonaldization deserves more consideration in the tourism sector (Weaver, 2005) because this sector demonstrates other characteristics (e.g., customization, unpredictability) beyond what can be explained by the concept. This article extends McDonaldization beyond the cruise industry and Disney model to recreation and tourism in more resource oriented settings.

### *Research Questions*

This article uses perceptions of commercial tour outfitters in the Juneau area to examine two broad research questions. First, to what extent do outfitters perceive that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism visitors, activities, and employment have changed in the Juneau area since the rise of the cruise industry in the area? Second, to what extent do these perceived changes reflect principles of McDonaldization and other phenomena such as desire for customization?

### Methods

#### *Sample and Data Collection*

Data were obtained from in-depth semi-structured interviews of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism outfitters in the Juneau, Alaska area (Table 2.1).

Interviews were used because they capture complexity and depth of contextual meanings and real world phenomena, and offer rich and detailed understandings of issues through the structure and responsiveness of the research process (Berg, 2007; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Table 2.1. Interview list

#	Pseudonym	Interview duration (minutes)	Activity type
1	<i>Nancy</i>	94:96	Marine Charter
2	<i>Dave</i>	87:02	Adventure
3	<i>Joe</i>	76:32	Flightseeing
4	<i>Kristen</i>	56:49	Adventure
5	<i>Richard</i>	80:36	Marine Charter
6	<i>Jessica</i>	60:44	Sightseeing
7	<i>Sam</i>	38:33	Marine Charter
8	<i>Mike</i>	97:54	Adventure
9	<i>Marianne</i>	60:09	Marine Charter
10	<i>Matthew</i>	63:33	Flightseeing
11	<i>Leon</i>	76:19	Marine Charter
12	<i>Marc</i>	53:59	Sightseeing
13	<i>Suzanne</i>	62:56	Adventure
14	<i>Jeff</i>	75:40	Flightseeing
15	<i>Truman</i>	93:56	Sightseeing
16	<i>Phil</i>	59:47	Sightseeing
17	<i>Ryan</i>	59:03	Adventure
18	<i>Jane</i>	54:09	Flightseeing
19	<i>Chris</i>	55:26	Flightseeing
20	<i>Melanie</i>	56:33	Marine Charter
21	<i>Troy</i>	66:15	Marine Charter
22	<i>Wyatt</i>	71:53	Adventure
23	<i>Hans</i>	88:55	Sightseeing

Purposive and snowball sampling were used to identify participants. A purposive sample helps gain insight about perceptions and phenomena rather than empirical generalization from a sample to a population (Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Given that information-rich cases are selected (Patton, 2002), a purposive sample often ensures certain types of individuals representing attributes are included, but

generalizability of a purposive sample can be limited (Berg, 2007). Snowball sampling (i.e., chain referral, respondent driven; Berg, 2007) involves asking participants to identify other potential participants (Patton, 2002). Snowball sampling is often one of the most useful ways of locating subjects with attributes necessary for a particular study (Berg, 2007).

Participants in this study included company owners and other personnel chosen based on seniority within their company. To attain a broad array of perspectives, participants were selected to maximize diversity in activities offered, travelers served, ownership type, business size, and membership in voluntary industry created codes of conduct such as Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP). Tourism related businesses represented a range from those in their first year of business to those in their 35<sup>th</sup> year of operation.

Consistent with previous research (e.g., Cerveny, 2005), respondents (i.e., outfitters) were grouped according to a typology consisting of four broad categories of activities offered: (a) flightseeing (e.g., helicopter, fixed wing), (b) marine charters (e.g., half to multi day trips on water), (c) adventure (e.g., adventure carts, zipline, biking, kayaking), and (d) sightseeing (i.e., passive sightseeing on land such as tram, glacier, fish hatchery, salmon bake tours). Participants were given pseudonyms (e.g., Nancy, Joe) to help ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

In total, 23 semi-structured interviews of 40 to 95 minutes were conducted with outfitters in the Juneau area during August and September 2007. Semi-structured interviews require a set of questions to serve as a guide, but allow for flexibility and

comparability (Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). A two-page interview schedule was developed integrating previous research and relevant concepts and theories (Appendix A). Interview questions relevant for this article examined operator perceptions of changes in visitors served and activities offered in the Juneau area (e.g., "how have the types of customers that you serve changed," "did your company offer different activities when it first started"). Although interviews followed the schedule, adaptability of responsive interviewing permitted use of additional questions to explore individual responses (Berg, 2007; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Saturation occurred when no new major data emerged (i.e., dimensions, relationships). With participant agreement, interviews were digitally audio recorded and transcribed verbatim into word processing software (Patton, 2002).

### *Data Analysis*

Strauss and Corbin (1998) defined qualitative analysis as both a science and an art; "the interplay between research and data" (p. 13). Data were coded and analyzed, therefore, using both inductive and deductive approaches with NVivo qualitative software (QSR International, Version 7). Data were approached with presupposed conceptual approaches and frameworks (e.g., McDonaldization), but themes also emerged independent of these existing frameworks.

The initial stage of analysis involved creating thematic codes (e.g., efficiency, customization) through an open coding process (Berg, 2007). In this stage, themes emerged freely from the interview data and existing frameworks, producing almost 300 free codes. These initial codes were refined, organized, and operationalized through definitions. Activity trends, for example, included any changes, trends, or future fads in

products and services offered by commercial outfitters. In the second and more analytic stage of coding, axial codes were created by relating and categorizing similar themes, and maintaining both in vivo (i.e., in situ) and literature guided codes (e.g., efficiency, customization). Both free (i.e., independent) and tree (i.e., hierarchical) codes were created to code and interpret interviews. Principles of McDonaldization such as efficiency and calculability (Ritzer, 1983) were subtopics grouped within a predetermined tree code called McDonaldization, whereas free codes (i.e., emerged independent of theoretical frameworks) such as customization, seamlessness, and flexibility were coded independently. Code refinement occurred during both coding and analysis. The bulk of analysis was interpretive, exploring concepts, relationships, and meanings such as the nature of visitor and activity trends.

In addition to analysis of the interviews, secondary data (e.g., economic and federal reports, books, newspapers, planning documents) were used to supplement interview data by providing context and background, as well as additional perspective about topics from the interviews. Major themes were unveiled using existing trend data and information from interviews to demonstrate various trends and changes in visitors served and activities offered.

## Results and Discussion

### *Visitor, Activity, and Employment Trends*

*Increase in Number of Visitors.* Cruise passengers have constituted the majority of seasonal travelers to the Juneau area since 1990, whereas the number of independent travelers remained relatively constant from 1993 to 2001 at slightly over 100,000 people per year (JCVB, 2007). The number of cruise visitors to Juneau has increased

more than tenfold since the 1980s when cruise ships began operating in Alaska at full scale (JCVB, 2007). Between 2002 and 2007, southeast Alaska hosted nearly one million cruise passengers annually (JCVB, 2007). Many of these cruise and independent travelers participate in nature based activities. The number of people served by permitted outfitters operating in the Tongass National Forest, for example, increased from approximately 1,550 in 1994 to 15,700 in 2001 (USDA Forest Service, 2004). Visitation to one of the most popular locations in Alaska, the Mendenhall Glacier Visitor Center in Juneau, increased from approximately 94,000 in 1985 to over 367,000 in 2005 (Allen et al., 1998; Dugan et al., 2007).

All interviewed outfitters agreed that the number of visitors to the Juneau area has increased since the 1980s and they largely attributed this trend to increases in both the number and size of arriving cruise ships. According to outfitters, cruise ships in Juneau have increased in size from smaller (e.g., 250 ft. long) "Love Boat" style ships of the late 1970s to exceeding "Panamax" size (i.e., 1,000 ft. long; maximum that can fit through the Panama Canal). *Troy*, a marine charter outfitter, has witnessed the size increase: "They keep bringing bigger ships, more people and more ships and all of that, no matter what." *Nancy*, another marine charter outfitter, explained her future outlook:

The ship companies just send bigger ships. For the future, I think that [the cruise lines] will probably send bigger ships. I think that they're probably building bigger ships now, as we speak.

*Truman*, a sightseeing outfitter, offered his perspective on the trend of increasing ship size and visitor numbers:

If you would have told me then that there were going to be a million people here in Juneau, I would have asked you how the [expletive] you were going to fit that many people on those small ships.

Outfitters associated with cruise lines also reinforced witnessing the increase in cruise ship size and passenger capacity. *Marc*, a sightseeing outfitter, said that “the ports have grown...to meet the increasing number and size of the vessels.” Outfitters mentioned that few Juneau residents in the 1970s (i.e., early days of cruise tourism) could anticipate tourism’s future dominance of the Juneau area. In 1964, only 11,000 visitors arrived by cruise ship, but by 1986, Alaska hosted 700,000 vacationers (Hall, 2007). Currently, approximately four or five large ships, each carrying over 2,500 passengers, are docked daily in Juneau during the tourist season (Hall, 2007).

*Changes in Visitor Demographics.* Although once a destination of the traveling elite, the Juneau area has evolved to serve more families and multigenerational groups, and people who are younger, less affluent (i.e., higher proportion of middle class), and from other countries (Hall, 2007). According to some outfitters, the rise in trip affordability has encouraged a broader diversity of people to visit Alaska. Outfitters repeatedly mentioned that cruise lines’ economies of scale influence visitor demographics; through mass production, the cruise industry has created budget trips that attract more and diverse visitors. Dave, an adventure outfitter, spoke to the change in customer affluence in the past 20 years:

And now the cruise line companies are being able to take something that was once for the elite and...bring it down to a level where the middle class can afford it—the middle of the middle class even, maybe even lower. Some of those cruises are pretty cheap.

Likewise, *Suzanne*, another adventure outfitter, said that “it’s almost more affordable to cruise than to fly by airline.” Outfitters also suggested that this more diverse clientele included “educated shoppers” searching for more value and quality in their experiences.

*Increase in Number and Diversity of Activities.* Commercial recreation in the Tongass National Forest has increased in the past decade (USDA Forest Service, 2004). The number of commercial outfitters permitted to operate in the Tongass tripled between 1993 and 1998 (Cervený, 2005). Flightseeing tours began in the Juneau area in the 1980s and three of the four permitted flightseeing outfitters began offering dog sled tours in the late 1990s. In addition, two zipline companies began operating in Juneau in 2006 (Dugan et al., 2007). *Nancy* discussed Juneau’s businesses: “There are new tourism entities...every year...last year [2006] they actually put in one zipline, with another one hot on its heels.” *Matthew*, a flightseeing outfitter, claimed that “the amount of tours are increasing in Southeast Alaska, be it another kayak tour, be it another salmon bake, or the zipline.” *Hans*, a sightseeing outfitter, was impressed with the number of new activities that emerge annually: “Every year you say to yourself, ‘people can’t come up with anything else, there can’t be anything else new,’ ...it’s just unbelievable.”

Outfitters emphasized a connection between the prevalence of the cruise industry and the increase in the number and diversity of activities offered. Many outfitters, for example, categorized these new activities as active and adventure based, albeit of short duration and "soft" in nature (Weaver, 2001). *Wyatt*, an adventure

outfitter, explained that cruise visitors to Juneau can now participate in numerous somewhat "softer" and "shorter" outdoor activities including kayaking and biking:

[They can] get everything—you know, one stop shop— with a cruise ...[but] the experience is nothing similar – a 45 minute sea kayak trip in Juneau has nothing in common with a five day camping trip.

Similarly, marine and adventure outfitters who receive the majority of multiday visitors explained that their clients now desire more comfortable adventure activities. According to *Wyatt*, his multiday non-cruise clients began demanding “softer, shorter” types of adventures in the late 1990s. *Chris*, a flightseeing outfitter who described his trips as "softer," claimed that a more active company “scared people off” with marketing that focused on more demanding and challenging adventures. *Wyatt* mentioned changes in visitor preferences since the 1990s:

People are less willing to go to one area and have an in-depth wilderness experience. They want to hop around more, see more, and do more... just quicker, shorter experiences that still get people back to lodges and showers and bathrooms and comforts...good wine and food, short wilderness experiences as opposed to ... seven days in one wild place, sleeping on the ground.

*Wyatt* discussed the recent popularity of trips marketed as “quick escapes” and attributed lack of time to influencing visitors’ changes in desires: “So it seemed to be a time factor, people having less time and wanting to do more.” Likewise, *Mike*, a marine charter outfitter, said that “people don’t want to take five or six days out of their lives...they want to see it all in three days.”

Declining use of US Forest Service cabins may be another indicator of declining multiday independent adventure travelers. According to the US Forest Service, overnight cabin use on Admiralty Island has declined since the mid 1990s. This trend

(i.e., use below capacity) has also occurred for total overnight cabin use in the Tongass National Forest (USDA Forest Service, 2004). Anecdotally, *Mike* discussed declines in wilderness cabin use and commercial and private overnight use of the Tongass by kayak, canoe, or foot. Other outfitters offering multiday trips spoke of similar declines in overnight use and increases in "softer" day use activities. Some outfitters blamed rising fuel costs and decreasing cruise costs for deterring travelers interested in more independent multiday adventures.

Outfitters noted that because of decreasing travel costs and increasing diversity of types of visitors, their clients tend to be less specialized in activities. *Dave* explained: "Here you get to reach an audience that we think a lot of these people wouldn't normally do that kind of experience." Given declines in cost of cruises, length of vacations, and visitor desire for "hard" adventure, cruise ships have attracted all types of "softer," but "adventure-driven" clientele that are typically less experienced in particular activities than independent travelers. Some outfitters speculated about possible reasons for shifts away from "hard" recreation such as visitor desires to experience predictable and safe activities, and to participate in more activities in a shorter amount of time.

*Changes in Employee Demographics.* In 1986, due to the influx of nonresident oil workers, the State of Alaska enacted legislation specifying a hiring preference for resident employees (ADLWD, 2006). Perhaps due to this legislation, most outfitters claimed that they seasonally hire mostly Juneau and Alaska residents. One company, an Alaska Native Corporation, hires over half of its employees under shareholder hire, which encourages hiring corporation shareholders and their decedents, spouses, or other

residents of Alaska. Most outfitters expressed an intention to hire locally. *Kristen*, an adventure outfitter, explained:

It's really important to market local community...if we're going to have a tour and bring people in from other places, they want to see representation of people who live in the area and can speak from experience.

Most outfitters explained that they have increased their proportion of non local (i.e., not from Juneau or Alaska) seasonal employees. According to Alaska's Department of Labor and Workforce Development (ADLWD, 2006), however, Juneau's proportion of nonresident workers in the private sector (i.e., excluding state, local governments) declined between 1997 (19.4%) and 2006 (15%), but was higher in 2005 (21.6%) than 1997, demonstrating variability in the proportion of nonresident workers. Some outfitters, however, claimed no changes in employment, calling themselves "mom and pop operations" and explaining that their business has always employed only themselves and their spouses. *Leon*, a marine charter outfitter, expressed a theme common among marine outfitters that "my deckhand is my wife."

According to most interviewed outfitters, there are limited numbers of qualified local workers in Juneau, and competition driven by the increased need for employees has spurred hiring people from outside the area. *Phil*, a sightseeing outfitter, explained that companies recruit from other areas because "Alaska cannot supply the [employee] demand." *Truman* explained challenges of finding employees and hiring locally:

There aren't enough employees in town for the amount of work there is. You look in today's paper and see every tourism company has ads in it, trying to get employees. And they've got those same ads for the last four weeks and there's nobody there. You could call job service and they...only...have...people who haven't been able to pass the pee tests

for the new Wal-Mart store or Home Depot. It's gotten to be very tough to find employees. There's so many job opportunities; not everybody's knocking on the door wanting a job.

*Melanie*, a marine charter operator, explained that although she attempts to hire locally, "I don't have much luck...It's not a year round living wage." Of the flightseeing outfitters interviewed, each mentioned challenges with finding pilots, claiming the necessity of hiring nonresidents.

The larger the business, the larger the number of seasonal employees hired. Operators who described themselves as "mom and pop" businesses, on the other hand, work year round on tasks such as client booking and equipment repairs during the off-season. The majority of employees of larger businesses are seasonal (e.g., up to 80% during late spring to early fall), but they do employ a higher number of year round management and maintenance staff than smaller companies. Most seasonal staff consisted of college students who study in Alaska, Washington, and other western states (e.g., Oregon, Utah); teachers and professors; and retirees. *Dave* explained that "we'll have people retired maybe from the state...and then we'll have people who are trying to get through college and they're home for the summer." Most seasonal employees worked full time. According to outfitters, their part time employees work for fun to supplement their income (e.g., retirees, teachers). *Marc* discussed an employee in her eighth season who works with her children: "She doesn't have to work, but she likes to." Outfitters emphasized high return rates of their seasonal employees, especially for pilots and guides. *Joe* echoed outfitters' claims that "our employee retention is incredible for this industry for a seasonal company."

*Evidence of McDonaldization*

Given these increases in the number of visitors served, diversity of activities offered, and proportion of non local seasonal employees, the Juneau area has evolved into a location that some outfitters now consider “large scale industrial tourism.” To cater to this type of tourism, elements of standardization must occur. To operate highly efficient and / or predictable tours that serve large numbers of visitors, some outfitters relied on “cookie cutter” approaches, which *Mike* described as “the McDonalds approach to recreational tourism.” Outfitters described current and future developments in the area by the cruise lines as large scale packaged “one stop shop” wilderness destinations. *Truman* discussed one future cruise development outside Juneau that “ultimately could hold as many as three Panamax ships” and explained that this development is headed by Disneyworld’s developer. Overall, tourism in the Juneau area offers evidence of the principles of McDonaldization (i.e., efficiency, control, predictability, calculability).

*Efficient Activities.* The primary principle of Ritzer’s (1996) McDonaldization thesis is *efficiency*. In the Juneau area, efficiency was reflected in the proliferation of short duration activities offered by commercial outfitters. Most commercial outdoor recreation and tourism activities were time limited (i.e., partial to full day) mainly due to constraints of cruise ship itineraries. The type of activity determined its duration. Flightseeing tours, for example, occur for one to three hours, whereas marine charters are a few hours to multiple days in length. Activity type and duration also partially allow for itinerary flexibility and customizability. A customizable itinerary, for example, existed on some multiday marine charters, whereas the nature and duration of

flightseeing tours necessitated more standardization. Sightseeing and flightseeing tours in the area, however, contain elements of customization through “Guide’s / Pilot’s Choice” tours. Given that cruise ships spend limited time in Juneau’s port (i.e., five to 12 hours), most shore excursions are a partial to full day in duration.

Given that Juneau is surrounded by the Tongass National Forest and public lands are ubiquitous in the area, minimal time and effort is required for residents and tourists to visit public lands. *Dave* described Juneau’s efficient accessibility: “There’s plenty of places where the amount of effort required...[for a]...wilderness experience ...doesn’t have to be very great.” Many outfitters offered the example of the ability to drive to a glacier. *Nancy* explained: “Because the Mendenhall Glacier is one of the few in Alaska that you’re able to drive to, it’s certainly a major attraction here in Juneau.” The convenience and efficiency of a glacier accessible by vehicle facilitates an experience for diverse visitors with limited time. *Joe*, a flightseeing outfitter, claimed that his one to three hour flightseeing tours offered visitors a “taste” of Alaska. Given that most Juneau area tours are short in duration due to the constraints of cruise itineraries, outfitters agreed that the spatial distribution of commercial activities was concentrated around the urban center near transportation corridors, facilities, and developed and hardened sites.

Outfitters recognized advantages and disadvantages of visitors’ limited time in the Juneau area. *Joe* realized the opportunity to show many visitors "their" Tongass National Forest: “It’s our largest Federal forest and it’s a jewel. It’d be fun to let them explore all of it, but we just get to show them little tiny, tiny parts of it.” Others

expanded on the disadvantages of visitors' limited time. *Nancy* commented on consequences of cruise ship partial day stops in Juneau:

I think that it's a less quality service for passengers because they get limited time in Juneau—what good is it to you to be in Juneau from 7am 'till 1pm? ... I think that's negative to the community... It's not fair to the customers, because you're really reducing and limiting their time. And that's got adverse effects on just about everybody except for [the cruise company] who can sell twice as many tickets.

Outfitters expressed other challenges associated with offering commercial activities on a limited time schedule. For example, outfitters who cater at least in part to cruise passengers expressed the necessity and difficulty of developing an efficient, short duration, and high quality tour. *Leon* described working within the cruise line schedules to take their passengers fishing: "Here's six people, four hours, go take 'em fishing, and it could be the worst four hours for salmon fishing of the day, but you still [have] got to go out and try to catch some fish."

*Control of Activities Offered.* Another principle of McDonaldization is control, which is typically represented by standardized means of power exerted over customers or employees (Ritzer, 1996, 1998). In the Juneau area, many outfitters credited the cruise industry with control over large scale changes in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism products, employees, and visitors. Truman discussed control when referring to a joint venture between a cruise entity and a Native Corporation in Alaska to develop a wilderness destination port: "There is tight control that the cruise companies have that are difficult to overcome." Outfitters also discussed how cruise lines exert control over development of activities offered to visitors by way of their supply of visitors. The cruise industry has influenced shore activities and products by attempting, for example,

to accommodate the short duration of time that ships spend in port (Cervený, 2005).

Suzanne discussed her company's need to create a shorter tour to accommodate cruise passengers:

We were offering trips that were like 10 or 11 hours in duration. Well, no one off the cruise is going to do that, so...we had really limited numbers...we need[ed] to offer a product that is short enough to work for cruise ship clients...we had to find a product...that we could sell to independent bookers like cruise clients that are finding us in other means besides booking on the ship.

This importance of catering to cruise passengers provided examples of cruise industry control over the nature of activities (i.e., shorter and more efficient) offered in the Juneau area.

For each outfitter type, cruise line control was demonstrated through the sheer volume of clients who were cruise passengers. According to most interviewed outfitters, the majority of their customers were cruise passengers rather than independent travelers or people visiting friends and family. The proportion of cruise travelers, however, varied by outfitter type. Flightseeing outfitters, for example, almost entirely catered to cruise passengers, whereas marine charter outfitters predominantly served non cruise (i.e., independent) travelers. One adventure company, offering multiday adventure tours, operated solely for non cruise passengers. All other adventure companies mostly catered to cruise visitors.

Outfitters also mentioned a more extreme example of the cruise industry's large scale control of land based activities occurring outside Juneau. In this example, one cruise line controls most elements of multiday land excursions, typically to Alaska's Interior, which occur before or after the stop in Juneau. Control is exerted mainly

through large scale ownership of transportation, tours, lodging, and some of the land where the excursions occur. In this case, ownership assures product availability and certainty of quality. In Juneau, however, cruise lines maintained some control over activities offered through high proportions of cruise visitors and negotiated contractual relationships with outfitters.

*McDonaldization and Tour Packaging.* Tour packaging offered another example of McDonaldization in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. Outfitters discussed packaging as an effort to create seamless tours. A few larger cruise lines, for example, provided seamlessness by using their own transportation from ships to shore activities. This practice of *control* over the transportation component of the tour ensured *efficiency* and *predictability* that benefits outfitters, customers, and cruise lines. According to outfitters, the number of package tours have increased and become a trend in the cruise industry. A few outfitters speculated that the popularity of packages was based on visitors' desire to do more (i.e., increased variety, quantity) for less (i.e., better value).

Tour packaging exhibited additional elements of *efficiency*. Not only does the customer assume a discounted price, but a package could allow for an efficient "taste" of multiple options. *Jessica*, a sightseeing outfitter, explained that one cruise line has combined cruising with land tour itineraries in over 28 cruise tour packages "so people don't just purchase cruising, they purchase a tour package that includes cruising." This tour packaging ensures efficiency, predictability, and some control through provider continuity. Outfitters worked to accommodate tourist desires to "see and do it all" by

packaging tours to include multiple dimensions. One of the newer tours in the Juneau area, for example, is the product of a partnership between outfitters – a half day combination zipline and mountain bike tour. *Nancy* discussed this necessary and ubiquitous package: “We, of course, like everybody else, offer a combination.” This approach was also evidenced in outfitter marketing. *Truman* explained:

We try to market ourselves as being like ‘coffee with your meal’ or ‘fries with that, you know, we’re ... easy to do with everything else you do in Juneau. You need an hour, hour and a half, well, unless you want to go for a really long [time].

*Truman*’s description of his company’s offerings supports that efficient short duration activities lend themselves to packaging, or vice versa. Combination package tours offered efficient means to satiate visitors’ diverse desires; these tours, however, also exerted control over visitors and their individual preferences to appease a variety of different customers and create a marketable tour.

*McDonaldization in Flightseeing Tours.* Specific commercial activities in the Juneau area also provided examples of principles of McDonaldization. Flightseeing tours, for example, operated within a *predictable, efficient, and quantifiable* (e.g., *calculable*) timeframe that allowed passengers to return to their cruise ships before departure. *Matthew* explained the efficiency of their flightseeing tour:

The [aircraft] comes back and picks up another group. So, we’ll actually take one group up, drop them off, pick up a group, bring them back. We just try to keep the [aircraft] going back and forth, which is kind of nice because then you don’t have all the modern stuff out there, per say. You really get a feel [for] glaciers and suck in the aura of Mother Nature out there, which is nice.

This back and forth of the aircraft demonstrated tour efficiency; one tour group explored the glacier while another was picked up for transport to the same spot. These tours were also described as quantifiable to a quarter of an hour. *Matthew* explained that “roundtrip from pickup to drop off...is about two hours and 15 minutes.” Likewise, *Joe* discussed his company’s short flightseeing tours: “We don’t do any long term, just all short, one, two and three hour tours.”

Aware of the tour duration, customers can determine if their time in port allows such a trip. In addition, customers can assume a safe and timely return. Taken together, these elements of the customer deciding to take a flightseeing tour are not dissimilar to those of a McDonalds customer choosing to order a hamburger; the customer benefits from the knowledge that not only will that hamburger be calculable in terms of cost and time of receipt, but there exists an element of predictability, as the hamburger will most likely safely satiate hunger.

Flightseeing outfitters also provided evidence of predictability in describing their tour. *Matthew* said that “it’s similar on all of our tours... picking the people up, safety briefing.” The tour guide's words and actions were partially scripted, as they split passengers up by weight, took them out to the tarmac, loaded them into the aircraft, and ensured that seat belts were secured. *Jeff*, another flightseeing operator who also operates dog sled tours, discussed the predictability of the yearly close of business:

And then we do a drop dead date of September 1<sup>st</sup> ... when it’s done because between fighting with the weather and keeping the dogs up there and trying to get everybody down and how it’s choreographed to start up and shut down. In our business we think a no is better than a maybe.

Predictability was evident in the unwavering date, removal routine, and business mantra “a no is better than a maybe.”

Regulations provided the primary evidence of *control* over flightseeing tours. Flight paths, for example, are regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and landing boundaries are specified by the US Forest Service operating permit. Obligatory adherence to legal safety standards and minimum risk measures controlled much of employee and visitor behavior. To adhere to safety standards, control was also exerted over guides and visitors during safety briefings, take-offs, and landings. The tour guide maintained elements of a verbal and behavioral script to adhere to safety protocols. Through standardization and control of employee practices and visitor behavior, these tours maintained efficiency, calculability, and predictability.

#### *Evidence of Customization and Flexibility*

Elements of customization and flexibility, somewhat in contrast to McDonaldization, were also present in recreation and tourism products offered in the Juneau area. Evidence from outfitter experiences and activity trends indicated that visitors desire some level of flexibility and uniqueness in their onshore experience. *Jessica*, for example, wanted her clients to leave feeling “touched by Alaska.” She continued by saying that “they don’t get a packaged corporate deal; we don’t want to seem like that.” Outfitters demonstrated efforts to accommodate this desire for uniqueness through Pilot's Choice Tours, independent booking, and guide flexibility.

*Pilot's Choice Tours.* Several outfitter types and tours attempted to accommodate their clients' desires for unique and customized products. One example included the “Guide's / Pilot's Choice” tours, which are designed to offer some

customization in a predictable, efficient, and calculable schedule. On these tours, for example, a pilot guides clients on a flightseeing tour of his or her choice, showing visitors “their own little favorite spots” or the experience of witnessing natural occurrences such as watching a glacier calve. *Matthew* discussed how his company's Pilot's Choice tour is the “Rolls Royce of all [aircraft] tours,” offering more flight time and the pilot serving as the guide and choosing where to land:

It changes departure by departure. Sometimes there's a waterfall that opens up for a week or two and they may see that. [The pilots] know what's kind of unique up there, so they'll go and land in those areas.

During these tours, pilots provided elements of both diversity and standardization. After flying and landing, for example, *Jeff's* pilots “do an alternate flight back.” *Jeff* elaborated on the variety that his pilots offer: “they'll...try not to fly over the same spot twice.” This type of customization (e.g., Guides' Choice tour) also exists with some bicycling and hiking tours in the Juneau area.

These adjustable tours occur alongside examples of McDonaldization. In other words, these offerings provide examples of “mass customization” where elements of customization exist in addition to principles of McDonaldization. The Pilot's Choice flightseeing tours, for example, still operated within a predictable, efficient, and calculable timeframe that allowed passengers timely return to their cruise ships. In addition, these customizable flight paths are controlled by regulations and boundaries specified by agency operating permits.

*Independent Booking.* Independent booking is another example of customer desire for choice and diversity within the current suite of activities offered by

commercial outfitters in the Juneau area. Outfitters explained witnessing a trend, mostly among cruise passengers with a standardized itinerary, toward what *Truman* and others called “smart shopping.” Cruise passengers, he claimed, educate themselves more now than in the past on details (e.g., options, companies, prices) of shore excursions. *Truman* mentioned a trend that his company has witnessed in the last four years: “People are more educated ... more sophisticated as far as shopping.” Rather than booking activities on the ship, outfitters explained how more cruise visitors are booking shore excursions independently (i.e., either in advance or day of). *Jane*, a flightseeing operator, explained motivations of visitors who independently book their tours: “More people are wanting to do their own thing and not get locked into taking a tour with a ship or go through another booking agent.” Outfitters accommodated this phenomenon by “holding back” tour space from cruise line preseason tour purchases for what they call “independents” who are mostly cruise passengers booking independently of the ships, rather than independent travelers who travel by air or ferry to the region.

*Guide Flexibility.* Another example of variation within the industry was the repeated theme of flexibility related to outfitter lifestyle or visitor interpretation approaches. Many outfitters discussed how they offer their guides informational materials as background to create their own unique interpretive talk, which could then be customized based on client interest. *Ryan*, an adventure outfitter, discussed how his guides used their 15-page information handbook to inform interpretation: “We like people to personalize it.” Some outfitters explained how their hiring practices reflected this importance of individuality; they claimed to hire guides primarily for their

personalities. An individual touch, outfitters explained, can help create memorable lifetime experiences they strive to offer.

Some outfitters also explained that their motivations to start their businesses were based on a desire for a flexible lifestyle. They expressed how their business afforded travel in the off-season and the ability to visit distant family or tend to ailing parents. *Suzanne* explained how the types of activities that she offers reflect her lifestyle: “We like diversity; we don’t want to be doing the same thing over and over, cookie cutter style, that’s just our preference. So, that’s why we started our business.”

*Jane* noted how flexibility afforded to guides benefits the community:

That part of Juneau would really be missed if the tourism industry left because those are the people who take the time to do [volunteer work and community support]. Whereas, if you’re in an office environment, you work from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. always, you don’t have that flexibility.

*Custom Multiday Marine Charters.* The most activity specific example of customization was demonstrated by an entire market of completely customizable itineraries – the multiday marine charter. With the ability to charter a variety of types and sizes of boats, marine charters offer visitors the ability to design their entire trip (e.g., itineraries, meals). *Troy* described how his charters differ from cruises:

The difference is these are usually completely customizable itineraries. They go wherever the charter client wants to go and do what they want to do. So it’s not a routine, set itinerary. The itinerary is set with the client. The client says, ‘I want to go to Glacier Bay or whatever’...and that’s how it’s done, it’s customized.

Outfitters involved in this type of tourism claimed that the demand for customized trips is increasing. The supply of commercial tour operators have increased with that rising

demand filled by what some call a “natural transition,” from commercial anglers in the seafood industry crossing into customized charters in the tourism industry.

Most outfitters described visitors interested in multiday charters as independent (i.e., non cruise) travelers with flexible schedules and who were more compatible with independent businesses. *Marianne*, a marine charter outfitter, described her clients as people who wanted an extended and intimate experience:

[My client's are] looking for something unusual, they're looking for a more intimate experience, they're more spontaneous and they have a greater imagination, rather than just allow a cruise ship to organize every aspect of their charter, they're never going to see me. They're never going to see the small restaurant off the road; they're not going to go to ... the small little places. Their itinerary is very organized and scheduled.

Marine charters also afford an element of flexibility to day visitors. One marine charter outfitter, for example, kept his boat on a trailer to allow “flexibility to kind of decide which way I want to go” depending on tide, weather, and customer desires. Taken together, these examples suggest that customization and flexibility, which are somewhat contrary to McDonaldization, are present in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. Although there is evidence of McDonaldization, it is not the only phenomenon characterizing this industry in this region.

#### Summary and Implications

This article used perceptions of commercial tour outfitters to examine trends in visitors served and activities offered in the Juneau, Alaska area, as well as the extent to which these trends reflected principles of McDonaldization. Findings suggest that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area has changed primarily due to the influence of the cruise industry. There are now more people visiting the area and the

diversity of these visitors has increased (e.g., less affluent, more multigenerational). Changes in visitors served have also contributed to an increase in diversity of commercial activities characterized by improved accessibility and decreased duration (i.e., creating "soft" and "shorter" adventures). These patterns of change also have increased demand for employees.

Results suggest that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism activities in the Juneau area illustrate tenets of McDonaldization (i.e., efficiency, predictability, calculability, control). The relatively large scale nature of commercial activities in the Juneau area necessitates elements of McDonaldization such as the efficiency of shorter and packaged shore excursions, and control that the cruise industry exerts over commercial outdoor recreation and tourism through contractual relationships with outfitters. Evidence of customization and flexibility, however, occurred both alongside (e.g., Pilot's Choice tours, independent booking, guide flexibility) and independent of (e.g., marine charter tours) evidence of McDonaldization. The McDonaldization thesis alone, therefore, does not completely describe changes and trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in Juneau.

*Theoretical Implications.* Defined by efficiencies that create mass production of homogeneous products, Fordism and McDonaldization both illustrate efficiency. In the tourism industry, package tours can be examples of both McDonaldization and Fordism (Ritzer & Liska, 1997), whereas tour customization runs somewhat counter to McDonaldization. In cruise tourism, Weaver (2005) found that McDonaldization offers a unique but incomplete interpretation of cruise tourism because it does not address the

pervasiveness of customers' desire for choice. Weaver (2005) found that customization exists alongside aspects of McDonaldization. Ritzer (1996) addressed customer desire for diversity and customization within the McDonaldization thesis as a manifestation of "standardized sameness" or "mass customization." Ritzer and Liska (1997) argued that customization becomes easier as McDonaldization becomes more prolific in society. Although cruise cuisine, for example, was formerly part of a tour package, increasing McDonaldization has enabled cruise visitors to choose their own "local" cuisine among food chains in each port that provide predictable and efficient meals. In this way, McDonaldization facilitates "customization." Weaver (2005), however, argued that Ritzer understated the pervasiveness of customization in society. Findings from this research suggest evidence of customization and flexibility both outside of (e.g., multiday marine charters) and within (e.g., Guide's Choice tours) a McDonaldized product, supporting the notion that there may be some compatibility between customization and McDonaldization. It is possible, however, that McDonaldization may never completely explain trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism.

This research extends Ritzer's (1996) McDonaldization thesis to a more resource oriented setting. More understanding and empirical application of McDonaldization in tourism, however, is needed to strengthen theory and inform practice. This study, for example, only examined perceptions of commercial outfitters; it did not examine perceptions of visitors or other residents. Future research should

examine perspectives of other stakeholders and the extent to which their opinions and desires parallel broader phenomena (e.g., McDonaldization, customization).

*Managerial and Practical Implications.* Application of concepts and theories such as McDonaldization can inform management of commercial recreation and tourism activities, as well as the public lands on which they depend. Applying McDonaldization in Juneau casts a new light on the nature of the recreation and tourism industry and, conceivably, society. Findings suggest that proliferation of principles of the fast food industry (i.e., McDonaldization) into commercial outdoor recreation and tourism can increase the number of visitors exposed to guided activities through increased supply and decreased cost. A broad demographic of visitors benefits from efficient and accessible experiences, and controlled and predictable experiences enable accessibility to a diversity of visitors beyond the select rich or highly skilled. In addition, aspects of the McDonaldization process (e.g., efficiency, predictability) may increase the opportunities (e.g., income, employment) for new businesses catering to cruise or independent visitors.

Principles of the fast food industry influence many successful businesses; possible consequences, however, include homogenization of communities and denaturalization of ecosystems, which are described by what Ritzer (1996) calls “the irrationality of rationality” (p. 121). Large scale commercial use of towns and surrounding natural systems, for example, can create ecological and social impacts (e.g., overuse, exploitation). Industrial scale tourism can commodify the visitor experience and community lifestyle (Cervený, 2005). Findings suggest that the proliferation of

short, efficient, and accessible urban interface outdoor recreation activities provides evidence of McDonaldization, but creates potential consequences such as limited visitor flexibility in their outdoor experiences. Although some homogenization is necessary for outfitters to cater to large numbers of people in a limited time, the outdoor experience in the Juneau area risks evolving into an experience more similar to visits to a zoo or Disneyland. The limited time that visitors spend in the Juneau area contributes to the necessity of tour efficiency and the need for predictable and calculable activities. Ritzer (1998) argues, however, that “something vital is lost about life when all of the things we consume, and experiences we have, are highly predictable” (Ritzer, 1998, p. 114). In Juneau, McDonaldization could not only threaten the vitality of the visitor experience, but also communities and resources near these activities.

Social and ecological ramifications of large scale tourism exist in the Juneau area. The nature of the commercial outdoor recreation and tourism industry in the area, coupled with the limited amount of time that visitors experience the area, can create consequences such as short term overuse of public natural resources. Surrounded by the Tongass National Forest, the Juneau area facilitates the ability of many visitors to "park and play;" similar to a fast food where one can park and eat, there is minimal effort exerted or time necessary to experience desired outcomes (i.e., food, adventure). Site hardening techniques may be able to concentrate impacts near convenient access points, but if visitors desire a more remote setting, the spatial distribution of activities and impacts into more fragile and remote areas will increase. By exceeding social and ecological capacities, outfitters risk disturbing experiences and displacing people.

Managers must, therefore, weigh costs and benefits of decisions concerning management of commercial activities. Managers must also adhere to legal requirements such as the Wilderness Act. Not all public protected areas and natural systems, for example, were intended to accommodate significant numbers of tourists, yet management of these areas is becoming increasingly dependent on tourism revenues to help offset management costs (Weaver, 2001). Agencies, therefore, need better qualitative and quantitative data to enable monitoring and management of resources according to site plans and objectives (Manning, 1999). If agencies, for example, cannot quantify trends in overnight cabin use in forests and wilderness areas, how can they detect and manage use changes?

A cautionary note is necessary for application of study findings. Qualitative research methods help to capture complexity and depth of contextual meanings and real world phenomena (Berg, 2007). A purposive sample, however, can lack generalizability to larger populations (Berg, 2007). Although this data cannot be applied to all commercial outdoor recreation and tourism settings, it provides a deeper understanding of perceptions in the Juneau area that might not have been gained by using quantitative methods (e.g., surveys). Future quantitative research may be able to use information from this study to tailor survey questions that address broad societal trends (e.g., ask tourists about desired conditions or activities). Attributes of the Juneau area (e.g., commercial tourism focus, dependency on public lands, cruise influence) should provide a starting point for application of research concepts and findings to other activities, interest groups, and locations. Future research should examine commercial

outdoor recreation and tourism trends and their implications near gateway communities to natural resources such as Juneau, incorporating perspectives of managers, residents, and visitors.

#### References

- Absher, J. D., Kasul, R. L., & Chang, W. H. (2003). Methodological and conceptual issues in the development of customer service measures for the national recreation reservation service. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (pp. 54-59). Newton Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.
- Alaska's Department of Labor and Workforce Development (ADLWD). (2006) *Nonresidents working in Alaska 2006*. Juneau, AK: Jeff Hadland. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from <http://almis.labor.state.ak.us/>
- Allen, S. D., Robertson, G., & Schaefer, J. (1998). *Economies in transition: An assessment of trends relevant to management of the Tongass National Forest*. PNW-GTR-417. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Brooks, D. J., & Haynes, R. W. (2001). *Recreation and tourism in south-central Alaska: Synthesis of recent trends and prospects*. PNW-GTR-511. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Bryman, A. (1995). *Disney and his worlds*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Cerveney, L. K. (2005). *Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: Case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska*. PNW-RP-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Colt., S., Dugan, D., & Fay, G. (2007) *The regional economy of southeast Alaska*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Dugan, D., Fay, G., & Colt, S. (2007). *Nature-based tourism in southeast Alaska: Results from 2005 and 2006 Field Study*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Eagles, P. F. J. (1999). International trends in park tourism and ecotourism. In *Proceedings of protected areas management and sustainable rural development: How can they be reconciled?* Harare, Zimbabwe: World Conservation Union.

- Egan, T. (2000, August 20). A land so wild, it's getting crowded. *The New York Times*.
- Hall, J. E. (2007). *The lure of Alaska – a history of tourism in the great land*. Juneau, AK: Alaska State Museum.
- Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau (JCVB). (2007). *Cruise passenger traffic to Juneau Alaska*. Website data. On file with Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, Juneau, AK.
- Kruger, L. E., & Mazza, R. L. (2006). *Alaska communities and forest environments: A problem analysis and research agenda*. PNW-GTR-665. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). Qualitative research methodologies. In *Practical research planning and design* (8<sup>th</sup> ed., pp.133-160.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Manning, R. E. (1999). *Studies in outdoor recreation: Search and research for satisfaction*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Mullins, B. (1999). Globalization, tourism, and the international sex trade. In K. Kempadoo (ed.), *Sun, sex and gold* (pp. 55-80). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Parr, D. (2000). *Management practice for allocation of recreation concessions*. Science and research internal report 184. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Conservation.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Quinn, T. (2002). *Public lands and private recreation enterprise: Policy issues from a historical perspective*. PNW-GTR-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Policy formulation at the tourism / environment interface: Insights and recommendations from the Banff-Bow Valley study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 100-110.
- Ritzer, G. (1983). The McDonaldization of society. *Journal of American Culture*, 6(1), 100-107.
- Ritzer, G. (1996). *The McDonaldization of society: Explorations and extensions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

- Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer G., & Liska, A. (1997). 'McDisneyization' and 'post-tourism': Contemporary perspectives on contemporary tourism. In C. Rojek, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory* (pp.96-109). London, UK: Routledge.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sem, J., Clements, C. J., & Bloomquist, P. (1996). Tourism and recreation management: Strategies for public lands. *Parks and Recreation*, 31(9), 92-105.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USDA Forest Service). (2007). *List of recreation related outfitter/guides who operate on Admiralty National Monument and Juneau Ranger District*. [Fax]. On file with Brad Flynn, Juneau Ranger District, AK.
- US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USDA Forest Service). (2004). *Shoreline Outfitter / Guide Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: FEIS*. R10-MB-519b. Tongass National Forest, Ketchikan, AK: Alaska Region.
- Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Sydney, Australia: Wiley.
- Weaver, A. (2005). The McDonaldization thesis and cruise tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 346-366.
- Western States Tourism Policy Council (WSTPC). (2005). *Tourism and public lands in the west*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.dced.state.ak.us/wstpc/index.htm>.
- World Tourism Organization (WTO). (1998). *Tourism 2020 vision – Global forecast and profiles of market segments*. Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2008). *Tourism satellite accounting*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.wttc.org>.



## **CHAPTER 3 –APPLYING THE NORM ACTIVATION MODEL TO EXAMINE EFFECTS OF COMMERCIAL OUTDOOR RECREATION AND TOURISM IN JUNEAU, ALASKA**

### Introduction

As recreation and tourism visitation to public lands increases and government budgets decrease, public land management agencies are using private commercial operators as an alternative source of offering products and services (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b).

Commercial operators provide products and services such as facility maintenance and management (e.g., campgrounds, parking, reservation systems), guided tours (e.g., guides, outfitters), food and rental services, interpretive programs and educational materials, transportation and accommodation, and policing and safety services (Absher, Kasul, & Chang, 2003; Eagles, 1999; Parr, 2000; Ritchie, 1999; Sem, Clements, & Bloomquist, 1996; Weaver, 2001). Private operators typically apply for and may be granted permits, leases, or contracts to undertake commercial activity in a specific location for a particular duration of time (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b). In the United States, for example, over 2,000 national forest campgrounds are managed by concession operators (Quinn, 2002b). Ubiquitous across public land management agencies, privatization has both positive and negative effects. Privatization of goods and services on public lands, for example, may be more cost effective for agencies, but may exclude individuals unable to pay for these provisions. Privatization may also distance the public from land managers (Mowen, Kerstetter, Graefe, & Miles, 2006). The research reported here examined effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau, Alaska area.

*Study Area and Context*

In Alaska, which contains over 200 million acres of federal public lands, the fastest growing industry is tourism (Allen, Robertson, & Schaefer, 1998; Colt, Dugan, & Fay, 2007). In southeast Alaska, which encompasses the portion of land that mostly borders western British Columbia, the recreation and tourism industry has increased its contribution to the economy (Allen et al., 1998), whereas timber harvesting and wood products manufacturing have declined (Colt et al., 2007). In Alaska's state capital of Juneau, for example, tourism now generates nearly 2,000 jobs and \$130 million of income for the local economy during the summer months (USDA Forest Service, 2004). A nature based tourism outfitter was one of the top 10 employers in Juneau in 2006 (JEDC, 2007). Visitation to the Mendenhall Glacier Visitor Center, located on the road system near Juneau, increased from approximately 94,000 in 1985 to over 367,000 in 2005 (Allen et al., 1998; Dugan, Fay, & Colt, 2007). Southeast Alaska and the Juneau area host a variety of commercial nature based activities including hiking, mountain biking, kayaking, dog sledding, flightseeing, marine charters, wildlife viewing, and glacier excursions (Dugan et al., 2007).

Federal forests and wilderness areas attract recreationists and tourists to southeast Alaska (Kruger & Mazza, 2006). The Tongass National Forest makes up 80% of the land in this region (17 million of 21 million acres) and an additional 15% is managed by the National Park Service (e.g., Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve). The remaining 5% of land consists of Alaska Native Corporation lands (500,000 acres), state lands (180,000 acres), boroughs and communities (53,000 acres), and 11,000 acres of private land (Allen et al., 1998). Commercial outfitters in the Juneau area rely on

permits from agencies (e.g., US Forest Service) to operate organized tours on these lands. According to the US Forest Service, 62 outfitters currently operate in the Juneau area (USDA Forest Service, 2007).

Tourism growth in southeast Alaska since the 1980s can be attributed largely to the cruise industry (Colt et al., 2007). The number of cruise ship visitors to Alaska's capital of Juneau (population of 30,000), for example, has increased from approximately 85,000 in 1980 (Allen et al., 1998) to nearly one million per year between 2002 and 2007 (JCVB, 2007). Many cruise lines have contractual relationships with outfitters to provide activities for cruise passengers while ships are in port (JCVB, 2007). Even if outfitters do not have contracts with cruise lines, many still receive business from cruise passengers who schedule commercial activities in advance or when they disembark (i.e., visitors who do not pre-book shore excursions through the cruise companies). The influence of cruise lines coupled with outfitters' reliance on public lands contributes to the complexity of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area.

Commercial recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska generates positive and negative social, environmental, and economic effects. One million annual visitors to Juneau, for example, provides benefits such as employment and income, but can also cause negative social (e.g., crowding) and environmental (e.g., pollution) impacts (Cervený, 2005). There is inadequate understanding of changes and challenges accompanying expansion of recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska (Brooks & Haynes, 2001). To understand these changes and their implications, community leaders

and land managers need to examine interactions among commercial activities, resource management, and communities (Kruger & Mazza, 2006). This article helps address this knowledge gap by using a qualitative approach and behavioral theory (i.e., norm activation) to examine commercial outfitters': (a) awareness of positive and negative social, managerial, environmental, and economic effects of their operations on visitors and the community in the Juneau area; (b) ascription of responsibility for these effects; and (c) behavior to improve conditions.

### *Conceptual Foundation*

*Effects of Commercial Recreation and Tourism.* Some research has addressed effects of commercial guides and outfitters on independent travelers and local visitors. Beeton (1999), for example, found that non-commercial hikers and horseback riders were dissatisfied with the presence of commercial horseback groups. Commercial jeep tours affected non-motorized recreationists' experiences by increasing user density and decreasing their ability to attain desired recreation benefits (Behan, Richards, & Lee, 2001). Research examining effects of commercial guides has also shown the value of providing interpretation and education to visitors, thus assisting with management (Randall & Rollins, 2006; Roggenbuck, Williams, & Bobinski, 1992). Some research has examined visitor preferences for concession services (e.g., Mowen et al., 2006). Limited research, however, has specifically examined effects of commercial outdoor recreation guides and outfitters on stakeholders other than visitors (e.g., local residents). This article aims to address this knowledge gap by examining outfitters' perceptions of effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism on local communities and independent travelers.

*Norm Activation.* To understand effects of commercial operations, researchers can explore outfitters' perceived effects and subsequent behavior. Schwartz's (1968, 1973, 1977) norm activation model proposes that behavior is influenced when individuals are both aware of the consequences of their behavior (i.e., awareness of consequences – AC) and ascribe some degree of responsibility (i.e., ascription of responsibility – AR) for their actions. This line of research defines a behavioral norm as a culturally specified standard or rule of what constitutes good or bad interpersonal interaction (Schwartz, 1973). Norms are socially accepted and agreed upon standards of behavior that individuals should or should not do (Vaske & Whittaker, 2004). Norms may be internalized and enforced through formal (e.g., regulations, laws) or informal sanctions (e.g., bad looks from others, guilt), which can influence behavior (Blake & Davis, 1964; Grasmick, Blackwell, Bursik, & Mitchell, 1993; Heywood, 2002; Schwartz, 1973).

Studies have used this theoretical approach to help explain environmental behaviors. Van Liere and Dunlap (1978), for example, found that awareness of environmental consequences (i.e., AC) of air pollution from yard burning alone does not always determine behavior; individuals must also ascribe responsibility (i.e., AR) for their actions and resulting consequences to initiate behavior. Vaske, Covey, and Donnelly (in review) reported that boaters who were aware of consequences of their actions on the environment and health of others, and ascribed personal responsibility for solving environmental problems, were more committed to responsible environmental behavior when boating. The norm activation approach has also been used to explain

recycling, littering, and other behaviors (e.g., Christensen, Needham, & Rowe, 2008; Heberlein, 1975; Van Liere & Dunlap, 1978). Little research, however, has applied this approach to understand effects of commercial recreation and tourism. By applying this model to these commercial activities, research may reveal links or disconnects between outfitters' perceived effects (i.e., consequences) of actions of their industry, and the extent to which they take responsibility for these effects and adjust their actions. Increased understanding may enable planning and managing agencies to minimize negative effects and maximize positive effects (e.g., social, economic, environmental).

### *Research Questions*

This article extends Schwartz's (1968, 1973, 1977) model and examines three research questions. First, what are outfitters' perceptions of positive and negative environmental, economic, and social effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism on visitors and local community members in the Juneau area? Second, to what extent are outfitters aware of and ascribe responsibility for these effects? Third, what behaviors are outfitters engaging in to improve environmental, economic, and social conditions (i.e., mitigate negative impacts, enhance positive effects)?

### Methods

#### *Sample and Data Collection*

Data were obtained from in-depth semi-structured interviews of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism outfitters in the Juneau, Alaska area (Table 3.1). Interviews were used because they capture complexity and depth of contextual meanings and real world phenomena, and offer rich and detailed understandings of issues through the structure

and responsiveness of the research process (Berg, 2007; Leedy & Ormrod, 2005; Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005).

Table 3.1. Interview list

#	Pseudonym	Interview duration (minutes)	Activity type
1	<i>Nancy</i>	94:96	Marine Charter
2	<i>Dave</i>	87:02	Adventure
3	<i>Joe</i>	76:32	Flightseeing
4	<i>Kristen</i>	56:49	Adventure
5	<i>Richard</i>	80:36	Marine Charter
6	<i>Jessica</i>	60:44	Sightseeing
7	<i>Sam</i>	38:33	Marine Charter
8	<i>Mike</i>	97:54	Adventure
9	<i>Marianne</i>	60:09	Marine Charter
10	<i>Matthew</i>	63:33	Flightseeing
11	<i>Leon</i>	76:19	Marine Charter
12	<i>Marc</i>	53:59	Sightseeing
13	<i>Suzanne</i>	62:56	Adventure
14	<i>Jeff</i>	75:40	Flightseeing
15	<i>Truman</i>	93:56	Sightseeing
16	<i>Phil</i>	59:47	Sightseeing
17	<i>Ryan</i>	59:03	Adventure
18	<i>Jane</i>	54:09	Flightseeing
19	<i>Chris</i>	55:26	Flightseeing
20	<i>Melanie</i>	56:33	Marine Charter
21	<i>Troy</i>	66:15	Marine Charter
22	<i>Wyatt</i>	71:53	Adventure
23	<i>Hans</i>	88:55	Sightseeing

Purposive and snowball sampling were used to identify participants. A purposive sample helps gain insight about perceptions and phenomena rather than empirical generalization from a sample to a population (Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Given that information-rich cases are selected (Patton, 2002), a purposive sample often ensures certain types of individuals representing specific attributes are included, but generalizability of a purposive sample can be limited (Berg, 2007). Snowball sampling (i.e., chain referral, respondent driven; Berg, 2007) involves asking

participants to identify other potential participants (Patton, 2002). Snowball sampling is often one of the most useful ways of locating subjects with attributes necessary for a particular study (Berg, 2007).

Participants in this study included company owners and other personnel chosen based on seniority within their company. To attain a broad array of perspectives, participants were selected to maximize diversity in activities offered, travelers served, ownership type, business size, and membership in voluntary industry created codes of conduct such as Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP). Tourism related businesses represented a range from those in their first year of business to those in their 35<sup>th</sup> year of operation.

Consistent with previous research (Cervený, 2005), respondents (i.e., outfitters) were grouped according to a typology, consisting of four broad categories of activities offered: (a) flightseeing (e.g., helicopter, fixed wing), (b) marine charters (e.g., half to multi day trips on water), (c) adventure (e.g., adventure carts, zipline, biking, kayaking, hiking), and (d) sightseeing (e.g., passive sightseeing on land such as tram, glacier visit, salmon bake). Participants were given pseudonyms (e.g., Nancy, Dave, Joe) to help ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

In total, 23 semi-structured interviews of 40 to 95 minutes were conducted with outfitters in the Juneau area during August and September 2007. Semi-structured interviews require a set of questions to serve as a guide, but allow for flexibility and comparability (Patton, 2002; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). A two-page interview schedule was developed integrating previous research and relevant concepts and theories

(Appendix A). Interview questions relevant for this article examined operator awareness of effects and the extent to which they ascribed responsibility for these effects, as well as attitudes and behavior regarding management. Although interviews followed this schedule, adaptability of responsive interviewing permitted use of additional questions to explore individual responses (Berg, 2007; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Saturation occurred during the interview process when no new major data (i.e., dimensions, relationships) emerged. With participant agreement, interviews were digitally audio recorded and transcribed verbatim into word processing software (Patton, 2002).

#### *Data Analysis*

Strauss and Corbin (1998) defined qualitative analysis as both a science and an art, “the interplay between research and data” (p. 13). Data were coded and analyzed, therefore, using both inductive and deductive approaches with NVivo qualitative software (QSR International, Version 7). Data were approached with presupposed conceptual frameworks (e.g., norm activation), but themes also emerged independent of these existing frameworks.

The initial stage of analysis involved creating thematic codes (e.g., social, managerial effects) through an open coding process (Berg, 2007). In this stage, themes emerged freely from the interview data and existing frameworks, producing almost 300 free codes. These initial codes were refined, organized, and operationalized through definitions. Social effects, for example, included any effect that had a social consequence such as the impact of flightseeing noise on residents. This noise was framed as impacting humans, so it was coded as a social effect; if framed as a detriment

to wildlife, however, this would have been coded as an environmental effect. In the second and more analytic stage of coding, axial codes were created by relating and categorizing similar themes, and maintaining both in vivo (i.e., in situ) and literature guided codes (e.g., responsibility, behavior). Both free (i.e., independent) and tree (i.e., hierarchical) codes were created to code and interpret interviews. Effect types, for example, were subtopics grouped within a tree code called effects, whereas responsibility and behavior were coded independently as free codes. Code refinement occurred during both coding and analysis.

Theoretically based codes included awareness of effects, ascription of responsibility, and behavior. To illustrate, *Suzanne*, an adventure outfitter, provided examples of these concepts:

We hike out...for our trips and I see trash, you know, we pick it up...we want to make sure this place remains the same place, so obviously the more people you get, the more impact is going to be in the place.

*Suzanne*'s recognition of impact due to increased use was coded as effect awareness. Her desire to maintain the place demonstrated some level of ascription of responsibility, so this was coded as responsibility. The act of picking up litter while operating a tour provided an example of a behavior, operationalized as any behavioral commitment or self-reported action to improve conditions or mitigate negative effects. This interview statement and those listed in Table 3.2 provide examples of how concepts were coded and operationalized.

Table 3.2. Examples of operationalization of outfitter behavior and determinants

Awareness	Responsibility	Behavior
Flightseeing noise impacts	“Helicopters aren’t exactly the quietest machines out there.” - <i>Joe</i> , flightseeing outfitter	TBMP mitigation flight zoning
Trash (i.e., water bottles)	“It’s really important to do more than just respond to calls, but take the initiative to start a program.” - <i>Kristen</i> , adventure outfitter	recycling program

## Results

### *Awareness of Effects*

*Social / Managerial Effects.* Interviewees most frequently discussed the social and managerial effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. The most commonly discussed positive social and managerial effects fell into two main categories: (a) providing tour services and infrastructure (i.e., physical, technical), and (b) valuing the community (Table 3.3). Outfitters emphasized how they provide the community and visitors services such as “high levels of hospitality” and choices of “high end” tours. *Dave*, an adventure outfitter, said that “you get to reach an audience...that wouldn’t normally do this...They’re [visitors] actually able to get out and appreciate the forest and wildlife.” Outfitters understood that they operate on and provide access to public land. *Joe*, a flightseeing outfitter, explained their provision of a “unique opportunity to see our federal lands that we all have some ownership on.” He emphasized that “I think everyone should have a chance to see what it is that we’re paying our taxes for.”

Table 3.3. Summary of outfitters' awareness of effects

Effects	Positive	Negative
Social/ Managerial	Contributions to service (e.g., tour) & infrastructure (i.e., physical, technical) Valuing community (e.g., TBMP)	Congestion due to volume of people Noise (i.e., flightseeing tours) <sup>1</sup>
Environmental	Environmental education & appreciation Adherence to low impact practices	Pollution (e.g., air, water) Day use impacts
Economic	Employment (i.e., college students) Economic diversification, tax income Cruise marketing, large visitor quantity	Non-local seasonal business (e.g., cruise related retail & employees) Cruise control of price and product Exclusion of independent travelers

<sup>1</sup> Flightseeing noise was most frequently discussed as a personal or community impact rather than a wildlife impact, so it was coded as a negative social effect.

Other outfitters also mentioned provision of physical and technical support of public lands. *Mike*, a marine charter outfitter, reinforced that as land management budgets decline, agencies look to private operators to provide services. He said that “the Forest Service would have liked to have done all this stuff that we’ve done, but they have no budget for it.” Outfitters emphasized technical contributions they provide through employee training and certification. These contributions, some explained, ripple from employees to visitors, community members, and management agencies. Outfitters also emphasized physical contributions to infrastructure such as trails and urban developments that are made possible through tourist head tax revenues.

In addition to service and infrastructure contributions, most outfitters spoke to how they valued the community. *Phil*, a sightseeing outfitter, expressed this sentiment, which was echoed in most interviews: “We understand that if we don’t do our business with the thought of the community in mind that we will not have business to do.” In the interest of valuing the community, commercial outfitters collaborated in 1997 to create

voluntary industry codes of conduct called Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP). The primary obligation of operators adhering to these codes is to respond to concerns expressed on the TBMP hotline, a telephone line created to enable communication among community members and outfitters. According to interviewees, including 17 TBMP participants and six non-participants, most outdoor recreation and tourism operators in the Juneau area voluntarily participate in TBMP.

Outfitters' most commonly discussed negative social and managerial effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism were segmented into two categories: (a) congestion from volume of people, and (b) noise effects. *Suzanne* described crowding in and around Juneau: "There's people flying over you, on the trails, there's like millions of people!" Some outfitters spoke to changes the Juneau area has witnessed with the increased number of cruise visitors. *Dave*, for example, said that "when you have almost a million people come to your community in the scope of five months, you've become a destination." *Nancy*, a marine charter outfitter, explained that on some days Juneau doubles its population with cruise arrivals. Congestion complaints, framed as affecting both the community and visitors, generally focused on the influence of cruise tourism rather than commercial outfitters.

Outfitters also mentioned impacts of noise on visitors and the community. Although some outfitters spoke of complaints involving fog horns, most noise concerns focused on flightseeing tours. *Mike*, for example, said that "we had helicopters flying... every single day and there'd be 13 in a row, like mosquitoes down there...they now go over a popular hiking trail." *Richard*, a marine charter outfitter, emphasized that "I go

out and work in my yard in the summer and it's kind of like Chinese water torture because you get these damn helicopters and all that background noise all day long.” Flightseeing noise was a prevalent negative effect mentioned by almost every outfitter; even flightseeing operators recognized the noise problem. *Joe*, a flightseeing operator, admitted that “helicopters aren't exactly the quietest machines out there.” *Jane*, another flightseeing outfitter, fondly called aircraft sounds “the noise of summer” and explained how flightseeing operators have addressed some noise concerns through measures such as flight path zoning.

*Environmental Effects.* The most frequently discussed positive environmental effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism were environmental education and adherence to low impact practices; the most common negative effects were pollution and day use impacts (Table 3.3). Outfitters discussed their ability to encourage education and appreciation of the forest, glaciers, and wildlife that surround Juneau. *Mike*, for example, described benefits of a multiday recreation tour by saying that “your awareness and learning ability is heightened.” He claimed that these trips provide the opportunity for greater environmental appreciation.

In addition to providing environmental information and education, outfitters also claimed that they encourage minimum impact behavior. *Leon*, a marine charter outfitter, said that “most people up here are very conscious and very protective of nature.” Outfitters spoke of their adherence to personal environmental values, industry created codes of conduct, and formal regulations and laws. *Kristen*, an adventure outfitter, discussed her company's environmental practices by saying that “our values are more...

surrounding the environment and enjoying it and observing it than taking from it what we can.” Outfitters claimed that they serve as role models for their clients through adherence to low environmental impact practices.

Commonly discussed negative environmental effects included more general concerns about air and water pollution, primarily from cruise ships that bring most visitors to Juneau. Some outfitters spoke about steps taken by the cruise industry to mitigate pollution, but others were skeptical. *Nancy*, for example, said “definitely...the cruise ships come in and they deposit waste, there have been several of them with big fines because of their pollution.” *Richard* discussed an encounter with a polluting cruise ship near a remote fjord: “I don’t know what they were doing in there.” He witnessed the ship burning bunker sea oil in the daylight, indicated by black soot from the stacks; “that’s absolutely illegal,” he said, and because of a weather inversion, “that smoke hung in there for three days.” *Matthew*, a flightseeing outfitter, echoed portrayals of community fears of cruise waste and air pollution. He explained, however, that since legislation to regulate dumping and pollution was enacted in 2005, “the cruise ship industry now is probably the cleanest it’s ever been.” Although some outfitters approved of these mitigation measures, most expressed concerns about environmental impacts of cruise ships.

Outfitters also expressed specific concerns with environmental impacts from day use, especially near the wildland-urban interface. *Troy*, a marine charter outfitter, explained that “Alaska’s a big place...but a very small percentage of people overall go to...remote lodges, places...not in a population center.” According to outfitters,

commercial outdoor recreation use in the Juneau area seemed to be partially explained by the "95-5 rule" where 95% of use and impact occurs in 5% of land area (Weaver, 2001). Outfitters recognized the convenience of Juneau's location surrounded by forest. Many interviewees focused on accessibility to public lands and nearby attractions such as glaciers (e.g., Mendenhall) when discussing environmental impacts. Although most environmental impacts from commercial activities are near Juneau, *Wyatt*, an adventure outfitter, expressed concern that day use impacts are occurring farther afield. Although he has witnessed declining overnight wilderness use, he perceived threats associated with large scale industrial tourism in wilderness: "You go down to [location omitted] and then you're putting a major industrial complex in the middle of a wilderness area." *Mike* described environmental impacts of these commercial uses of public land as a form of legalized "taking of public lands for private use," depriving the public of land values without just compensation. Jet boat use, *Mike* explained as an example, scours gravel necessary for salmon spawning.

*Economic Effects.* The most frequently discussed positive economic effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area included employment, economic diversification, and tax income; consequences of non-local seasonal business were the most commonly mentioned negative effect (Table 3.3). Most outfitters touted job creation before mentioning any other positive social, environmental, or economic effects. A frequent subtheme within this topic included the value of seasonal jobs for local students. *Melanie*, a marine charter outfitter, said that "we help kids go to college...and we pay them enough so that they don't have to work during the winter to

go to college.” Related effects included hiring locals and supporting local businesses.

A range of outfitter types mentioned benefits of economic diversification, especially given discussions about possibly moving Alaska’s state capital to another city.

Outfitters claimed that tourism provides economic security amid “capital creep,” which can affect local employment. Another frequently mentioned positive economic effect was tax income, which is generated through sales, property, and head taxes (i.e., city and state per visitor fee). Chris, a flightseeing outfitter, explained:

You have tons of money flowing into this place. If you figure you get \$5 a head and you got a million people coming into town...the math isn’t too difficult. And that’s just raw dough, disposable income for [Juneau]. . .That’s just a head tax that the cruise lines pay for each person that gets off the ship—they don’t even have to get off the ship—just if it makes a port call in Juneau, they [have] got to pay it.

Economic effects of the cruise industry on outfitters were also discussed with high frequency and intensity. Some outfitters mentioned positive aspects of cruise lines marketing the Juneau area and their product. Some outfitters also viewed cruise visitors as a “renewable resource.” *Chris* explained the benefits of the cruise influence by saying that “we don’t have to go out and advertise...when you have 10,000 people rolling into town in one vessel, you’ve got a captive audience.” Conversely, some outfitters appeared frustrated by the influence of cruise lines, especially by contractual relationships that control their product and customers. *Richard*, for example, emphasized that “I see Juneau...just falling all over themselves to accommodate cruise lines, without much thought to independent travelers – to the exclusion of independent travelers.” This diminishing attention toward overnight independent travelers was seen by some as an economic detriment given the financial leakage associated with partial

day cruise visitors. *Suzanne* explained, however, the necessity of working with cruise lines (i.e., cruise contracts): “It’s our bread and butter...we [have] got to put food on the table.”

From a negative perspective, outfitters discussed most often consequences of non-local seasonal businesses, especially the elimination or displacement of year-round locally owned retail stores by tourism related retail stores. *Richard*, for example, noted that this phenomenon has been occurring “all up and down” downtown Juneau and said that “they threw two local guys out of business and created a nonresident owned company that doesn’t hire locals, [and is a] seasonal business.” *Phil* claimed that although some local retail businesses have moved closer to residential areas, “for the most part they went out of business.” Many outfitters blamed jewelry stores targeted at cruise passengers for “taking over” downtown, increasing downtown property values, and eliminating or displacing long-term locally owned shops. Other outfitters connected these tourism trends to larger scale economic changes such as economic leakage from non-local business ownership. *Phil*, for example, explained that “[local retail stores have] been displaced by Costco and the various box stores that have come into this community.” Outfitters agreed that tourism’s prevalence has changed downtown Juneau, but they perceived these changes as a result of the tourism industry in general, which was often synonymous with the cruise industry. In other words, outfitters separated specific effects of *their* commercial activities from the non-local retail shops “invading” downtown. Outfitter awareness of each effect of commercial outdoor

recreation and tourism served as a proxy for awareness of consequences, one behavioral determinant in Schwartz's (1968, 1973, 1977) norm activation model.

### *Responsibility and Behavior*

*Social / Managerial.* The most frequent examples of outfitter ascription of responsibility were for social and managerial effects, which were coded into three main categories: (a) initiative / proactiveness, (b) accountability / responsiveness, and (c) ownership / neighborliness (Table 3.4). First, some outfitters ascribed responsibility for their impacts in proactive ways, especially through creation of and participation in voluntary industry codes of conduct (TBMP). *Jessica*, a sightseeing outfitter, expressed how outfitters have taken initiative to improve conditions by "holding ourselves to a standard that is above and beyond regulations...imposed on us by the city...federal...or state government." *Mike* also expressed his proactive approach to issues: "Let's look beyond all this fray of controversy and litigation and try and make our knowledge more useful to everybody." Many outfitters suggested that their behaviors, ranging from voluntary compliance with codes of conduct to charitable community support, improved conditions. Outfitters repeatedly emphasized the *opportunity* to voluntarily improve conditions on their own and many argued against more regulations. Most outfitters referred to TBMP as an example of industry created standards as a more proactive approach than formal regulations. *Hans*, a sightseeing outfitter, expressed proactive responsibility: "[TBMP] is much better than regulation because it gives us an opportunity to do it on our own." Outfitters seemed to prefer to self regulate through informal means, rather than be mandated by formal regulations.

Table 3.4. Examples of outfitter responsibility by types of responsibility and effects <sup>1</sup>

Effect Type	Initiative / proactiveness	Accountability / responsiveness	Ownership / neighborliness
Social / Managerial	voluntary "opportunities" beyond & before formal rules (e.g., TBMP)	desire to respond to community complaints (e.g., TBMP hotline)	calling the place home, desire to be good neighbors
Environmental	opportunity to improve, responsibility for impacts (e.g., trash, pollution)	n/a	befriending wildlife, a "stake" in environment
Economic	initiative to preserve contributions of overnight independent travelers	n/a	obligation to local community and non cruise clients

<sup>1</sup> n/a indicates evidence of that *responsibility* type did not occur in interviews. There were, however, examples of social, environmental, and economic *behaviors* (e.g., recycling, pollution reduction), discussed below.

One example of an informally enforced proactive approach frequently discussed by all outfitter types was flightseeing outfitters' voluntary attempts at noise reduction. Flightseeing outfitters involved in TBMP mitigated noise impacts by adhering to the "Fly Neighborly" program, mitigating flightseeing noise through temporal (e.g., limited departure hours) and spatial flight zoning (e.g., flight paths and altitudes avoiding neighborhood disturbance).

Some outfitters discussed behaviors beyond voluntary adherence to codes. A few outfitters, for example, initiated a recycling program for tourism businesses in response to increased tourist garbage (e.g., plastic bottles). *Kristen* expressed responsibility for the impacts: "It's really important to do more than just respond to calls, but take the initiative to start a program." *Dave* praised the initiative: "To have tour companies lead the charge...is a really good thing." Outfitters hoped their actions would inspire development of a citywide recycling program.

Second, some outfitters ascribed responsibility through expressions of accountability or responsiveness, especially when referring to their responses to community complaints on the TBMP hotline. *Hans* explained how outfitters hold themselves accountable:

And if we made a mistake...we respond back to them and say, 'ya, you know, you're right. We shouldn't have been doing that and we apologize'... [The hotline] gives us an opportunity to respond.

Outfitters emphasized that the TBMP hotline is the “community’s voice” to which they must respond. *Joe*, for example, said that “the complainer is always gotten back to...to try to figure out how we can prevent it from happening in the future.” Interviewees noted that outfitters see publicly logged complaints and hold offending companies accountable. Those who ascribed responsibility for complaints seemed driven by peer pressure (i.e., informal sanctions) to respond to complaints and adjust their practices.

Third, evidence of neighborliness and ownership toward the community represented the largest proportion of ascription of responsibility for social and managerial effects. *Ryan*, an adventure outfitter, explained that “a lot of us live here and we love this place and really want to make certain that we treat it well.” Most outfitters echoed this sentiment, from those in their first year of business or living in Juneau, to those in their 35<sup>th</sup> year of business and a lifetime living in Juneau. Even outfitters who do not consider Juneau home ascribed some responsibility to minimize impacts because, according to *Leon*, “it is in their best interest.” *Joe* said:

We all want to be good neighbors. We all live here too. We are impacted along with everyone else, negatively and positively. We are the community – we’re a big part of the community...this is my home. I

don't think I count any more or less than anyone else in the community.  
I...try to be the good neighbor.

*Joe* expressed awareness of impacts and ascription of responsibility by emphasizing ownership toward the community; he also referenced his behavior to improve conditions such as participation in TBMP. *Dave* demonstrated neighborliness in response to awareness of trail conflict and crowding that led his company to help develop an alternative trail and cease commercial use on the original trail that was popular with residents.

Outfitters seemed to agree that ownership in and responsibility for the community is easier to achieve as a year-round resident. Although length of time in business could influence outfitter ascription of responsibility, some longtime outfitters were among those who expressed both the most and least frequent evidence of responsibility. *Kristen*, a newer outfitter, for example, expressed valuing the community and feeling “a sense of responsibility to the local community, a sense of gratitude.” Conversely, one seasonal outfitter denied responsibility when asked about her future vision for Juneau: “I really don't have one...because I'm soon to retire and I most likely will not be moving to Juneau during my retirement.”

Participation in TBMP seemed more related to outfitter responsibility ascription than residency status. In general, interviews with outfitters not participating in TBMP lacked evidence of responsibility; instead, those outfitters seemed to operate more autonomously than TBMP participants. A marine outfitter, for example, whose company does not adhere to TBMP expressed some denial of responsibility:

[TBMP] doesn't apply to us...I pretty much mind my own business and I prefer other people keep their nose out of my business. And I'm too busy to pay much attention to what they're doing.

Another marine outfitter whose company also does not participate in TBMP expressed a more proactive intent toward voluntary codes of conduct: "I'm not much of a joiner. I thought of it before they did." Non TBMP participating outfitters identified either no or few behaviors to improve conditions. Being nonparticipants, however, does not necessarily equate to being irresponsible. *Ryan*, for example, explained that the few outfitters who do not participate in TBMP have been "pretty responsible."

*Environmental.* Fewer outfitters ascribed responsibility for negative environmental effects, which were coded into two categories: (a) initiative / proactiveness, and (b) ownership / neighborliness. *Dave* demonstrated initiative by describing each impact as "an *opportunity* to improve" [emphasis added]. He also demonstrated proactive responsibility when discussing environmental impacts caused by his company's use of fossil fuels: "That's something where you take responsibility for your own action; it's not somebody making you do it." *Dave* also discussed behavioral intentions to improve his company's environmental impacts such as future use of biofuels and carbon credits to help offset emissions. A few other outfitters proactively created their businesses to help protect and enhance the Tongass National Forest by exposing potential stakeholders to the forest or even initiating policy informing research.

Some outfitters also expressed responsibility by assuming ownership toward the natural resources on which their companies depend. *Nancy*, for example, exhibited her

relationship with whales encountered on tours by befriending and naming them. She described a particular whale as a “really good” longtime friend and saying that “she will bring her new calves up every year, just introduce them to [the boat captain] like a momma cat will show you her kittens.” *Nancy* expressed the importance of protecting “our wildlife” [emphasis added], demonstrating a level of responsibility to the natural resources through ownership toward them. She also discussed the company’s pro-environmental behavior such as using state-of-the-art and “environmentally friendly” buses and boats. *Matthew* emphasized his flightseeing company’s stake in the environment: “That glacier is my asset. I want to make sure it’s the cleanest.” *Leon* suggested that “Alaskans love Alaska” and will attempt to conserve it by “doing stuff, but have it done responsibly.” He suggested that those who do not ascribe responsibility for environmental impacts are seasonal employees who view the location in terms of profit rather than as a place to live. Other outfitters emphasized that pro-environmental behaviors such as use of sustainable technologies or practices are a product of calling the place home (e.g., ownership, stakeholder).

Although some outfitters blamed seasonal employees and cruise lines for environmental impacts, one outfitter affiliated with the cruise industry discussed his company’s participation in efforts to mitigate visible emissions from ships (i.e., air pollution). This outfitter expressed an awareness of the concern and ascribed responsibility for impacts: “We thought it was the right thing to do, get rid of the visible emissions.” According to the outfitter, the cruise line invested \$6.5 million to enable connection to shore power so that ship engines can be turned off and “plugged in” at the

dock, thus using local hydropower. Revenues from the purchase of excess power are used in the cost of power adjustment, which results in reducing residents' power bills. Given that 100% shore power did not exist anywhere else in the world, this demonstrated proactiveness, but the outfitter also expressed responsibility toward the community to reduce visible emissions from cruise ships.

Conversely, outfitters denied responsibility for environmental impacts. One outfitter, when discussing his company's environmental impacts, said "[the glaciers] haven't changed as a result of our activity." This outfitter demonstrated some denial of responsibility for the company's potential impact, deflecting responsibility and deciding that determining activity appropriateness was a responsibility of the managing agency: "If there were any impacts on the environment, I'm sure we wouldn't be allowed to go there." Another outfitter demonstrated an awareness of environmental impacts from trampling vegetation: "We're going to flatten that when we're hiking, you know, you're going to be stepping on things." Although some awareness of environmental impacts was evident, behavior to reduce negative effects was not discussed.

*Economic.* Few outfitters expressed responsibility for economic effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism. Most outfitter responsibility for economic impacts reflected the desire to be good neighbors, and behavior to improve conditions focused on contributions to the local economy such as hiring residents and supporting local businesses. Some outfitters expressed responsibility toward the community, as being driven by the seasonality of their business. *Chris* explained that because his business is seasonal, "it's good to do community support and be active in the

community.” His company’s behaviors included supporting Juneau’s economy by purchasing uniforms, gas, and rental car services locally. Some outfitters also emphasized local contributions such as rental revenue from employee and business leases. Others described their community support through donations or in kind contributions. *Jane* explained that “all the tour companies are incredibly generous to the community.” Outfitters perceived community support as a mandatory obligation in exchange for the opportunity to operate their business.

A few outfitters described proactive behaviors to mitigate negative economic effects of the dominance of the cruise industry and associated effects on independent travelers. Attempting to balance costs and benefits of cruise affiliations, some outfitters maintained a portion of their business for non-cruise clients (e.g., independent travelers, residents and visiting family members). *Kristen*, for example, expressed an awareness of cruise line passengers dominating business, which resulted in some companies accepting only partial cruise contracts to provide tour space for local residents and independent travelers. Neighborliness to those client types and the initiative to preserve opportunities for economic contributions of independent travelers provoked this behavior.

Awareness of general effects of non-local seasonal business, especially cruise related tourist retail stores, was ubiquitous across outfitters. However, there was little evidence of ascription of responsibility or behavior to improve conditions related to this issue. One outfitter provided an example of responsibility denial for complaints about Juneau’s atmosphere due to non-locally owned jewelry stores downtown: “It’s not our

shop. We have nothing to do with it.” Many outfitters discussed the challenge of finding enough qualified employees. *Jessica*, for example, explained her company’s desired hiring practices:

We put a lot of effort to hire locally. But, with competition with new businesses coming into town and that type of thing – large commercial businesses—the opportunity for us to hire locally is becoming less.

When hiring practices were discussed, outfitters explained challenges associated with hiring locally amid large scale retail expansion, but did not express responsibility for this broad scale economic situation.

#### Discussion

This article examined effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau, Alaska area. Results of interviews with outfitters showed that positive and negative social and managerial effects were more frequently discussed than environmental or economic effects. The most commonly discussed negative social and managerial effects were noise and congestion of people; the most positive effects were the industry’s service and infrastructure contributions. The most frequently discussed positive environmental effects were low impact practices and visitor education about environmental issues; the most common negative effects were pollution (e.g., air, water) and day use impacts (e.g., jet boat use scouring gravel bars). The most frequently discussed positive economic effects were employment, diversification, and tax income; non-local seasonal businesses were the most commonly mentioned negative effect. Negative social, environmental, and economic effects focused more on general impacts of tourism than on specific impacts of outfitters. Conversely, positive effects generally focused on those specific to outfitters.

This article also examined the extent that outfitters ascribed responsibility for these impacts and engaged in behavior to improve conditions. Responsibility ascription was grouped into three categories: (a) initiative / proactiveness, (b) accountability / responsiveness, and (c) ownership / neighborliness. Outfitter behavior to improve conditions seemed to be driven by influences from informal (e.g., guilt, goodwill) and formal (e.g., law, regulations) sanctions.

Where awareness of negative effects and ascription of responsibility occurred, some outfitters initiated behavior to improve conditions, often transforming negative effects into positive effects. Outfitter awareness of and responsibility for congestion and noise, for example, prompted them to contribute to the community through TBMP. Findings suggested two main categories of outfitter behavior to improve conditions: (a) formally sanctioned behavior (e.g., adherence to Coast Guard, NOAA, EPA, and USFS regulations), and (b) informally sanctioned behavior. Examples of informally sanctioned behaviors included outfitters' charitable community support attributable to moral feelings of rightness, and actions resulting from peer pressure such as outfitter responses to community concerns expressed on the TBMP telephone hotline. Outfitters discussed behaviors due to formal influences much less than informal sanctions, which consisted mainly of adherence to guidelines in industry created voluntary codes of conduct (e.g., TBMP). Outfitters involved in these voluntary and informally enforced behaviors engaged in a higher frequency and variety of behaviors to improve conditions, holding each other accountable to voluntarily respond to concerns and improve conditions. Conversely, outfitters not participating in TBMP expressed either

no or few behaviors to improve conditions. Respondents preferred to regulate themselves through these informal approaches, rather than through laws and regulations. In general, evidence of responsibility ascription and behavior to improve conditions were specific to the outfitter rather than tourism in general. Implications of these findings are discussed in the context of multiple propositions.

*Proposition 1: Outfitter awareness of negative effects is more general to the broad tourism industry, whereas positive effects are perceived more specifically to the individual outfitter*

Interviews revealed positive and negative effects of commercial recreation and tourism activities on public lands, but outfitters were more forthcoming in specifying positive effects specific to their own companies (e.g., provide visitor service, education and satisfaction, assist with public land management objectives) than the broader tourism industry in general. Outfitters, for example, focused on specific economic benefits that their companies offer the community such as donations, employment, and income. When discussing positive effects, outfitters also complimented practices of competitors (i.e., other operators). Interviewees, however, did not focus on general contributions to federal forest management through operating permit revenue even though permits, contracts, and leases can create revenue for land management agencies (Sem et al., 1996; Sowman & Pearce, 2000).

Conversely, interviewed outfitters were more forthcoming in specifying negative impacts created by the broader tourism industry in general (e.g., pollution, crowding) rather than impacts of outfitters in particular. Outfitters focused mainly on

community impacts, but research has revealed negative effects of outfitters on independent travelers that may cause displacement or dissatisfaction (Beeton, 1999; Behan et al., 2001; Needham, Wood, & Rollins, 2004b). In addition, outfitters did not express awareness of other known negative effects of commercial operators such as decreased agency visibility (Sowman & Pearce, 2000); degradation of conditions from lack of agency oversight, monitoring, and enforcement (Booth & Cullen, 2001; Eagles, 1999); exclusion of some visitors due to fees for access and services (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b; Sowman & Pearce, 2000); lack of community input in decision making (Weaver, 2001); and replacement of small operators by large companies, resulting in leakage of local revenue (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b).

Outfitters may have emphasized their own positive effects and not disclosed their negative impacts because they might lack adequate training, understanding of appropriate behavior, or concern about social and biophysical effects of their use (Butler & Hvenegaard, 2002; Weaver, 2001). Attributing positive effects to themselves and diffusing negative effects to the broader tourism industry could also be explained by a number of potential social psychological biases. These biases include: (a) social desirability bias where respondents protect self interests when interacting with others; (b) superiority bias where respondents overestimate the degree to which they possess desirable qualities; (c) in-group bias where preferential treatment is given to members of one's own group; and (d) self serving bias where individuals attribute their successes to personal factors, but attribute failures to situational factors beyond their control (e.g., Block & Funder, 1986; Babcock & Loewenstein, 1997).

These findings complement studies addressing contributions of commercial guides and outfitters (e.g., Randall & Rollins, 2006; Roggenbuck et al., 1992). Given that public land management agencies are utilizing private commercial operators as an alternative source of offering products and services (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b), it is important to understand effects of operator actions. Future research could explore actual effects and behavior of guides and outfitters. Methodological techniques such as participant observation (Randall & Rollins, 2006) and survey research (e.g., Needham et al., 2004b) may reveal actual effects of commercial use on visitors and community members, and behaviors that either deteriorate or improve conditions.

Most interviewed outfitters live in the Juneau area either year round or for at least five months per year (i.e., tourist season). This group is also heavily involved in and has substantial understanding of tourism and its effects in the region (Dugan et al., 2007). Social desirability bias, however, could have affected discussions of negative effects or positive behaviors. Future studies, therefore, should also consider perceptions of commercial tourists, independent tourists, local community members, and other stakeholders (Beeton, 1999; Behan et al., 2001; Cerveny, 2005; Mowen et al., 2006; Needham, Rollins, & Wood, 2004a; Needham et al., 2004b). Additional studies are needed to assess the effects of commercial recreation and tourism activities on visitors, residents, natural resources, and land management agencies. If, for example, visitors or community members feel crowded by commercial operators, actions such as spatial and temporal zoning could be one effective approach for mitigating effects. Examining effects of commercial operators on other groups can also help address potentially

competing interests in management decisions. This study provides a starting point for understanding effects (e.g., social, environmental) of these commercial operations.

*Proposition 2: Outfitters have difficulty ascribing responsibility and behaving to improve negative economic and environmental conditions*

Outfitters provided less evidence of ascription of responsibility and behavior to improve economic and environmental conditions than social conditions. Outfitters also mentioned behavior less often than responsibility, which could be due to denial of consequences or responsibility, both determinants of pro-social behavior (Schwartz, 1977). Schwartz (1973) argued that two “modes of neutralization” affect likelihood of participation in behaviors to improve conditions – denial of responsibility and denial of consequences; evidence of both was revealed in this study.

Outfitters seemed aware of general negative economic effects related to commercial recreation and tourism (e.g., non-local seasonal business, exclusion of independent travelers). The few outfitters who both ascribed responsibility and expressed proactive behaviors for negative economic effects focused on personal and social behaviors such as purchasing or hiring locally. When discussing hiring practices, however, outfitters explained challenges of hiring locally due to general economic trends such as proliferation of large scale retail, which may be an example of responsibility denial. Even fewer outfitters ascribed responsibility or engaged in behavior to improve economic conditions such as leakage from non-local seasonal business (e.g., citizen’s initiative and city ordinance to protect downtown from non-local seasonal jewelry store proliferation in Ketchikan).

Outfitters also provided little evidence of ascription of responsibility and behavior to improve environmental effects. Ownership of and accountability toward effects may be easier to conceptualize within the context of a human community (i.e., social) than the environment. Outfitters may feel more accountable and responsible, for example, for increased noise and crowding (i.e., social) than displacement of local stores (i.e., economic) and impacts on trails or wildlife (i.e., environmental). When obvious links between environmental and social conditions do occur, pro-environmental behavior often becomes a “moral” issue (Heberlein, 1975). Findings suggest that when environmental degradation was not a moral issue (e.g., is not perceived to affect humans) pro-environmental behavior was not discussed. One outfitter mentioned trampling vegetation during tours, for example, but did not mention any behavior to mitigate impacts of this practice. Although impact awareness existed, perhaps responsibility was denied because environmental impacts were not considered to be a moral issue. Personal issues (e.g., create financial livelihood for family) may have outweighed environmental concerns. Environmental impacts with social components such as flightseeing noise affecting both people and wildlife offered evidence of both responsibility ascription and proactive behavior. Pro environmental behavior, therefore, seemed to occur more often when people realized an activity’s social components.

*Proposition 3: Ownership of and initiative toward issues and effects are important in outfitter ascription of responsibility and proactive behavior*

Findings revealed deeper understandings of “ascription of responsibility.” Outfitters’ responsibility for negative effects was defined by initiative, accountability,

and ownership toward issues and effects. Evidence of accountability was solely related to outfitters' voluntary responses to community concerns voiced on the TBMP telephone hotline. Given their frequency and variety of use, ownership of and initiative toward effects played important roles in outfitter ascription of responsibility.

Responsibility in the form of feeling ownership (e.g., calling the place home, desire to be good neighbors) suggests that responsibility ascription and behavior to improve conditions seem more likely when impacts are personalized. Evidence of responsibility and behaviors for all effects generally demonstrated a tone specific to the outfitter. Perceived negative economic effects, for example, were acted upon primarily by outfitters hiring locally. No evidence of outfitter responsibility or behavior to improve conditions was related to general tourism impacts such as the proliferation of non-local seasonal business. These results suggest that negative effects specific to a company seem more likely to be acted upon than general industry impacts; impact specificity, therefore, might be related to responsibility and behavior to improve conditions (i.e., minimize negative impacts).

These findings suggest the need for considering additional dimensions of ascription of responsibility. Ascription of responsibility is typically measured using surveys and scale responses where individuals respond to several statements that are tested for reliability and combined into a single index (e.g., Cottrell & Graefe, 1997; Kaiser & Shimoda, 1999; Vaske et al., in review). Statements typically reference behaviors with interpersonal consequences that provide a rationale for ascribing responsibility. Direct measures of ascription of responsibility, however, are often

removed to improve reliability, including seemingly valid measures such as the extent to which respondents “feel responsible for the consequences” of their behavior (e.g., Cottrell & Graefe, 1997). Measures retained in indices often include behavior or intentions, not responsibility ascription. Researchers are encouraged to integrate dimensions of impact ownership and personal initiative into questions and scales designed to measure ascription of responsibility. Research is also needed to improve validity of behavioral determinants and behaviors to improve conditions.

Practical implications of these findings include supporting initiatives to foster stakeholder relationships. Leopold (1947) explained that the critical defect in conservation education is that conservationists have not asked citizens to assume “real responsibility.” He explained that pro-environmental behavior comes from an “ecological conscience,” and argued that important behavioral changes are accomplished through “an internal change in our intellectual emphases, our loyalties, our affections, and our convictions” (Leopold, 1949, p. 343). To mitigate negative effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism, managers could promote educational and informational activities that help personalize negative effects. Perhaps personal initiative and issue ownership were the foci of the US Forest Service in 1944 when they created the longest running public service campaign in US history – the Smokey Bear campaign. This ubiquitous national fire prevention message, “*Only you can prevent forest fires!*” [emphasis added] seems aimed at ascribing responsibility through individual feelings of ownership and initiative. Additional research is needed to

identify ways to foster effective stakeholder relationships between managers, operators, and residents to build community based capacity and inform public land management.

If impact specificity influences outfitter ascription of responsibility and proactive behavior, managers should work with outfitters (i.e., permit holders) to discuss and mitigate effects specific to the outfitter. In addition, if impact ownership and personal initiative play important roles in outfitter ascription of responsibility as suggested by these findings, managers should present outfitters with ‘real’ responsibility. When managers simply ask outfitters to obey regulations (e.g., permit stipulations), most outfitters will practice only what is required, convenient, and profitable. Ownership of and initiative toward issues and effects are important aspects of assuming responsibility, which foster behaviors beyond mere compliance. If managers, for example, can show the link between commercial activities and their impacts such as gravel bar scouring, outfitters might be more willing to help protect the resources on which they depend for operation.

*Proposition 4: Informal sanctions offer important means to encourage awareness of consequences, ascription of responsibility, and behavior to improve conditions*

This discussion focuses on behaviors enforced by informal sanctions such as morals, ethics, and peer pressure. Behavior influenced by formal sanctions (e.g., law, regulations) is beyond the scope of this discussion for two reasons: (a) motivations or deterrents other than awareness and responsibility may exist with legal sanctions, and

(b) results showed that most outfitter behavior to improve conditions was informally sanctioned rather than formally regulated.

Findings suggested that informally sanctioned voluntary codes of conduct (e.g., TBMP) raised awareness of negative effects, fostered ascription of responsibility for these effects, and informally enforced behavior to improve conditions. Outfitters preferred to regulate themselves rather than be mandated by formal laws or regulations. Findings support research identifying the importance of informal obligation as a standard against which behavioral appropriateness can be judged (Heywood, 2002). The informal sanction of obligation (e.g., obligation to environment, desire to be good neighbors) seemed related to outfitters' proactive behavior. Future research should examine roles of formal and informal sanctions in determining outfitter behavior.

Findings offer agencies and managers insight to improve conditions. Informal codes of conduct such as TBMP, for example, seemed to raise awareness of negative effects, foster ascription of responsibility, and informally enforce behavior. Managers, therefore, could potentially improve conditions by facilitating outfitter involvement in the development or maintenance of informally sanctioned standards. Informal cultivation of awareness of recreation impacts and behaviors to minimize impacts is not dissimilar to federal land management agency involvement in educational non-regulatory programs such as "Leave No Trace."

In conclusion, human dimensions of natural resources research can contribute to understanding changes in social, economic, and environmental conditions associated with commercial recreation and tourism in places such as Alaska (Kruger & Mazza,

2006). This study not only contributes to understanding effects of commercial operations on public lands, but it also helps explain factors related to operator behavior (e.g., responsibility). This article also extends the literature on effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism by applying theoretical frameworks (e.g., norm activation model) and qualitative techniques to a commercial outdoor recreation and tourism setting. Although this data cannot be applied to all commercial recreation and tourism settings, it provides an understanding of perceptions in the Juneau area that may not have been gained through alternative methods (e.g., surveys). Managers and planners have practical needs for information about effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism, and knowledge gained from this research can inform planning and decision making. By understanding awareness of and responsibility toward social, managerial, environmental, and economic effects, managers can encourage behavior that may improve conditions.

#### References

- Absher, J. D., Kasul, R. L., & Chang, W. H. (2003). Methodological and conceptual issues in the development of customer service measures for the national recreation reservation service. In *Proceedings of the 2003 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium* (pp. 54-59). Newton Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Research Station.
- Alaska's Department of Labor and Workforce Development (ADLWD). (2006) *Nonresidents working in Alaska 2006*. Juneau, AK: Jeff Hadland. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from <http://almis.labor.state.ak.us/>
- Allen, S. D., Robertson, G., & Schaefer, J. (1998). *Economies in transition: An assessment of trends relevant to management of the Tongass National Forest*. PNW-GTR-417. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Babcock, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining bargaining impasse: The role of self-serving biases. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11, 109-126.

- Beeton, S. (1999). Hoof prints on the mind: An exploration of attitudinal relationships between bushwalkers and commercial horseback tours. *Tourism Management, 20*, 255-259.
- Behan, J. R., Richards, M. T., & Lee, M. E. (2001). Effects of tour jeeps in a wildland setting in non-motorized recreationist benefits. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 19*(2), 1-19.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Blake, J., & Davis, K. (1964). Norms, values, and sanctions. In R. E. L. Faris (Ed.), *Handbook of modern sociology* (pp.456-484). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1986). Social roles and social perception: Individual differences in attribution and "error." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1200-1207.
- Booth, K. L., & Cullen, R. (2001). Managing recreation and tourism in New Zealand mountains. *Mountain Research and Development, 21*(4), 331-334.
- Brooks, D. J., & Haynes, R. W. (2001). *Recreation and tourism in south-central Alaska: Synthesis of recent trends and prospects*. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-511. Portland, OR: USDA, Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Bryman, A. (1995). *Disney and his worlds*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Butler, J. R., & Hvenegaard, G. T. (2002). Interpretation and environmental education. In P. Dearden & R. Rollins (Eds.), *Parks and protected areas in Canada: Planning and management* (pp. 179-203). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Cervený, L. K. (2005). *Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: Case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska*. PNW-RP-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Christensen, A., Needham, M. D., & Rowe, S. (2008). Whale watchers' past experience, value orientations, and awareness of consequences of actions on the marine environment. *Tourism in Marine Environments, 5*(4).
- Colt., S., Dugan, D., & Fay, G. (2007) *The regional economy of southeast Alaska*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage.
- Cottrell, S. P., & Graefe, A. R. (1997). Testing a conceptual framework of responsible environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Education, 29*(1), 17-27.

- Dugan, D., Fay, G., & Colt, S. (2007). *Nature-based tourism in southeast Alaska: Results from 2005 and 2006 Field Study*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Eagles, P. F. J. (1999). International trends in park tourism and ecotourism. In *Proceedings of protected areas management and sustainable rural development: How can they be reconciled?* Harare, Zimbabwe: World Conservation Union.
- Grasmick, H. G., Blackwell, B. S., Bursik, R. J., & Mitchell, S. (1993). Changes in perceived threats of shame, embarrassment, and legal sanctions for interpersonal violence, 1982-1992. *Violence and Victims*, 8, 313-325.
- Heberlein, T. A. (1975). Social norms and environmental quality. Paper presented at the *American Association for Advancement of Science Annual Meetings*. New York.
- Heywood, J. L. (2002). The cognitive and emotional components of behavior norms in outdoor recreation. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 271-281.
- Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau (JCVB). (2007). *Cruise passenger traffic to Juneau Alaska*. Website data. On file with Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, Juneau, AK.
- Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC). (2007). *Juneau 2007 economic overview*. Juneau, AK: JEDC with the McDowell Group.
- Kaiser, F. G., & Shimoda, T.A. (1999). Responsibility as a predictor of ecological behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 243-253.
- Kruger, L. E., & Mazza., R. L. (2006). *Alaska communities and forest environments: A problem analysis and research agenda*. PNW-GTR-665. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). Qualitative research methodologies. In *Practical research planning and design* (8<sup>th</sup> ed., pp.133-160.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Leopold, A. (1947). The ecological conscience. *Bulletin of the Garden Club of America*. September 1947: 45.
- Leopold, A. (1949). *A sand county almanac*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mowen, A. J., Kerstetter, D. L., Graefe, A. R., & Miles, J. P. (2006) *A concession program evaluation for Pennsylvania State Parks*. State College, PA: Report to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of State Parks.

- Needham, M. D., Rollins, R. B., & Wood, C. J. B. (2004a). Stakeholders' perceptions of bear viewing tours at an alpine ski area in the summer. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 9(2), 153-156.
- Needham, M. D., Wood, C. J. B., & Rollins, R. B. (2004b). Understanding summer visitors and their experiences at the Whistler Mountain ski area, Canada. *Mountain Research and Development*, 24(3), 234-242.
- Parr, D. (2000). *Management practice for allocation of recreation concessions*. Science and research internal report 184. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Conservation.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Quinn, T. (2002a). *A public utility model for managing public land recreation enterprises*. PNW-GTR-543. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Quinn, T. (2002b). *Public lands and private recreation enterprise: Policy issues from a historical perspective*. PNW-GTR-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Randall, C., & Rollins, R. (2006). The kayak tour guide: An important influence on National Park visitors. *IntepScan*, 31(4), 5-9.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Policy formulation at the tourism / environment interface: Insights and recommendations from the Banff-Bow Valley study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 100-110.
- Roggenbuck, J. W., Williams, D. R., & Bobinski, C. T. (1992). Public-private partnership to increase commercial tour guides' effectiveness as nature interpreters. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10(2), 41-50.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1968). Awareness of consequences and the influence of moral norms on interpersonal behavior. *Sociometry*, 31, 355-369.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 349-364.

- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221-279). New York: Academic Press.
- Sem, J., Clements, C. J., & Bloomquist, P. (1996). Tourism and recreation management: Strategies for public lands. *Parks and Recreation, 31*(9), 92-105.
- Sowman, P., & Pearce, D. (2000). Tourism, national parks, and visitor management. In R. W. Butler & S. W. Boyd (Eds.), *Tourism and national parks: Issues and implications* (pp. 223-243). New York: Wiley.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- USDA, Forest Service. (2007). *List of recreation related outfitters who operate on Admiralty National Monument and Juneau Ranger District*. [Fax]. On file with Brad Flynn, Juneau Ranger District, AK.
- Van Liere, K. D., & Dunlap, R. E. (1978). Moral norms and environmental behavior: An application of Schwartz's norm-activation model to yard burning. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 8*, 174-188.
- Vaske, J. J., Covey, D., & Donnelly, M. P. (in review). A norm activation model of responsible environmental behavior. *Environment and Behavior*.
- Vaske, J. J., & Whittaker, D. (2004). Normative approaches to natural resources. In M. J. Manfredi, J. J. Vaske, B. L. Bruyere, D. R. Field, & P. Brown (Eds.), *Society and natural resources: A summary of knowledge* (pp. 283-294). Jefferson, MO: Modern Litho.
- Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Sydney, Australia: Wiley.



## CHAPTER 4 -- CONCLUSION

There is an inadequate understanding of changes and challenges accompanying commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in southeast Alaska (Brooks & Haynes, 2001). The two preceding chapters, therefore, presented articles examining commercial outfitters in the Juneau, Alaska area and changes in visitors served and activities offered, awareness of effects of commercial recreation and tourism on visitors and local communities, ascription of responsibility for these effects, and behavior to improve conditions. Data were obtained from interviews with outfitters and the McDonaldization thesis (Ritzer, 1983, 1998) and norm activation model (Schwartz, 1968, 1977) were used as conceptual and theoretical foundations to examine these trends and effects of commercial recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. This chapter briefly summarizes major findings of this thesis and their managerial, theoretical, and research implications.

### Summary of Findings

The second chapter in this thesis identified and examined trends and changes in visitors served and activities offered by commercial recreation and tourism outfitters in the Juneau area, and the extent to which these trends reflected principles of McDonaldization (i.e., efficiency, predictability, calculability, control; Ritzer, 1983, 1998). Results showed that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in this region has changed primarily due to the influence of the cruise industry. There are now more people visiting the area and the diversity of these visitors has increased (e.g., less affluent, more multigenerational) with many now seeking "soft" but adventurous activities (Weaver, 2001). Many commercial activities are now characterized by increased accessibility and decreased duration (i.e., more "soft" and "short" adventures

appealing to a wider range of visitors). These patterns of change have increased employee demand, so operators are recruiting more employees from outside the region.

Findings in chapter two also suggested that commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area reflects some principles of the McDonaldization thesis. The relatively large scale nature of commercial activities in this region necessitates elements of McDonaldization such as the *efficiency* of short duration activities and packaged shore excursions. Contractual relationships between outfitters and the cruise industry also exert some degree of *control* over visitors served and activities offered. Operations such as flightseeing tours demonstrated *predictability* and *calculability* by adhering to predetermined flight paths and timeframes that allowed each passenger to return to his or her cruise ship before its departure. Despite these examples of McDonaldization, there was some evidence of customization and flexibility that occurred both alongside (e.g., Pilot's Choice tours, independent booking, guide flexibility) and independent of (e.g., marine charter tours) evidence of McDonaldization. The McDonaldization thesis alone, therefore, does not completely describe trends in commercial recreation and tourism in the Juneau area.

Chapter three narrowed the research focus from broad trends and changes examined in the second chapter to a more specific examination of outfitters': (a) perceived effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area, (b) ascription of responsibility for these effects, and (c) behavior to improve conditions. Results showed that outfitters discussed positive and negative social and managerial effects more frequently than environmental or economic effects. The industry's service

and infrastructure contributions were the most frequently mentioned positive social effects, whereas noise and congestion of people were the most commonly discussed negative social effects. Low impact practices and visitor education about environmental issues were the most frequently discussed positive environmental effects, whereas pollution (e.g., air, water) and day use impacts were the most commonly discussed negative effects. Employment, diversification, and tax revenue were the most frequently discussed positive economic effects, whereas non-local seasonal businesses were the most commonly mentioned negative effect. Awareness of negative effects (e.g., congestion, pollution) tended to be focused more on general impacts of the tourism industry than on specific impacts of outfitters. Awareness of positive effects, on the other hand, was focused more on effects specific to outfitters such as their service (e.g., tour) and infrastructure (e.g., physical, technical) provisions to the community.

The third chapter also examined the extent to which outfitters ascribed some degree of responsibility for these impacts and engaged in behavior to improve conditions. Responsibility ascription was evidenced through expressions of initiative and proactiveness, accountability and responsiveness, and issue ownership and community neighborliness. Outfitter behavior to improve conditions seemed to be influenced primarily by informal (e.g., guilt, goodwill, desire to be good neighbor, obligation to environment) and formal (e.g., laws, regulations) sanctions. Outfitters, however, discussed behaviors due to formal sanctions much less than informal sanctions, which consisted mainly of adherence to industry created voluntary codes of conduct (e.g., Tourism Best Management Practices [TBMP]). Outfitters associated with

or participating in these voluntary and informally enforced behaviors were more likely to engage in a higher frequency and diversity of behaviors to improve conditions, and hold each other accountable to respond to concerns and improve conditions. Commercial outfitters preferred to regulate themselves informally, rather than through formal laws and regulations. Ascription of responsibility and participation in behaviors to improve conditions were mainly specific to outfitters in particular rather than the tourism industry in general.

#### Management Implications

These results improve understanding of trends and changes, and social, resource, and economic effects associated with commercial recreation and tourism activities in the Juneau area. These findings also offer agencies and managers insight to manage these commercial activities and the public lands on which they depend. Findings in chapter two, for example, showed evidence of the proliferation of short, efficient, predictable, and accessible commercial outdoor recreation and tourism activities in the Juneau area. These changes have allowed visitors to “park and play” where similar to a fast food drive-thru, minimal effort and time are needed for the experience. Possible negative consequences of these trends, however, include limited visitor flexibility and commodification of the visitor experience and community lifestyle. Large scale commercial use in towns and surrounding areas coupled with dispersed locations and times of visitation can also create social and ecological impacts such as overuse and exploitation of natural resources.

Management techniques such as site hardening may be able to concentrate impacts at specific access points, but if visitors desire more remote settings, the spatial

distribution of activities and impacts into more fragile and remote areas may increase.

If social and ecological capacities are exceeded, outfitters risk affecting experiences and displacing people. Not all protected areas and natural systems were intended to accommodate significant numbers of tourists, yet agencies are becoming increasingly dependant on commercial tourism revenues to help offset costs of managing these systems (Weaver, 2001). It is important for managers, therefore, to carefully weigh costs and benefits of decisions associated with commercial activities (e.g., granting permits, permit conditions). Management agencies should also: (a) identify and evaluate implications of current and future changes such as large scale increases in the number of visitors on public lands, and (b) monitor and manage resources according to specific and predetermined management objectives (Manning, 1999).

Findings in chapter three showed the importance of impact specificity, issue ownership, and personal initiative in encouraging behavior that improves conditions. These factors influence outfitter behavior and responsibility, and suggest that managers should work with outfitters to discuss and mitigate effects specific to the outfitter. To mitigate negative effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism, agencies and managers could also promote information and education activities that help personalize negative effects. For example, the Smokey Bear campaign of the US Forest Service, which states that “*Only you* can prevent forest fires!” [emphasis added], seems aimed at ascribing responsibility through individual feelings of ownership and initiative.

If ownership of and initiative toward issues and effects play important roles in outfitter behavior and ascription of responsibility, managers should also inform

outfitters of those types of opportunities for ascribing responsibility. If managers only ask outfitters to obey laws and regulations (e.g., permit guidelines and stipulations), most outfitters will practice only what is minimally required and convenient to ensure that their operations remain efficient and profitable. Issue ownership and personal initiative, however, are important in assuming responsibility and can help foster behavior beyond mere compliance. If managers can help outfitters become more aware of links between commercial activities and their impacts (e.g., gravel bar scouring, impacts to glaciers), outfitters can work to help protect the resources on which they depend for operation and profit.

Findings in chapter three also suggested that informal codes of conduct such as TBMP raised outfitter awareness of negative effects, fostered ascription of responsibility, and informally enforced behavior. Managing agencies, therefore, could help mitigate negative social, environmental, and economic effects of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism by facilitating and encouraging outfitter involvement in developing and maintaining informally sanctioned processes and standards. The non-regulatory educational "Leave No Trace" program is one example of federal land management agency involvement in informally cultivating awareness of recreation impacts and behaviors to minimize impacts.

#### Theoretical and Future Research Implications

This thesis also has theoretical implications and highlights issues warranting future research attention. Chapter two, for example, extended Ritzer's (1983, 1998) McDonaldization thesis beyond the cruise industry (e.g., Weaver, 2005) and Disney model (e.g., Bryman, 1995; Ritzer & Liska, 1997) to a more resource oriented setting.

Results suggested evidence of customization and flexibility in a McDonaldized product, supporting the notion that there may be some compatibility between customization and McDonaldization, and that McDonaldization may not completely explain trends in commercial recreation and tourism. More understanding and empirical application of McDonaldization in recreation and tourism, however, is needed to strengthen theory and inform management. Future research, for example, should examine other stakeholder (e.g., visitors, residents) perspectives and the extent to which their opinions parallel findings in this study (e.g., McDonaldization, customization). Future research should also utilize other methodologies, as well as theoretical lenses other than McDonaldization and locations other than Juneau, Alaska to broaden and balance understanding of trends in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism.

Results in chapter three improved understanding of positive and negative effects (e.g., social, environmental) associated with commercial recreation and tourism activities on public lands. Although most outfitters interviewed in this study live in the Juneau area and are heavily involved tourism, types of biases (e.g., superiority, in-group, self serving) could have affected discussions of negative effects and positive behaviors (e.g., Babcock & Loewenstein, 1997). Outfitters, for example, tended to discuss the broader tourism industry when ascribing responsibility for negative effects, whereas they typically mentioned themselves or other outfitters when ascribing responsibility for positive effects. Future research, therefore, should also consider perceptions of commercial tourists, independent tourists, local community members, and other stakeholders (Beeton, 1999; Behan, Richards, & Lee, 2001; Cervený, 2005;

Mowen, Kerstetter, Graefe, & Miles, 2006; Needham & Rollins, 2005). Examining effects of commercial operations on other groups can also help balance potentially competing interests in management decisions.

Chapter three also complemented studies addressing specific effects and contributions of commercial guides and outfitters (e.g., Randall & Rollins, 2006; Roggenbuck, Williams, & Bobinski, 1992). Given that public land management agencies are utilizing private commercial operators as an alternative source of offering products and services (Quinn, 2002a, 2002b), it is important to understand effects of these operators. Future research should continue exploring effects and behaviors of guides and outfitters. Methodological techniques such as participant observation and survey research may reveal actual effects of commercial use on visitors and community members, and behaviors that either deteriorate or improve conditions.

Moreover, chapter three used qualitative approaches and extended Schwartz's (1968, 1977) norm activation model to commercial outdoor recreation and tourism. Findings suggest the need for considering additional aspects of ascription of responsibility – namely impact ownership and personal initiative – when applying the norm activation model and its dimensions (i.e., ascription of responsibility, awareness of consequences). Ascription of responsibility is typically measured using surveys and scale responses where individuals respond to several statements that are tested for reliability and combined into a single index (e.g., Cottrell & Graefe, 1997; Kaiser & Shimoda, 1999; Vaske, Covey, & Donnelly, in review). These statements, however, typically reference behaviors with interpersonal consequences that are considered by

authors to provide a rationale for ascribing responsibility. Any direct measures of ascription of responsibility are often removed to improve reliability, including seemingly valid measures such as the extent to which respondents “feel responsible for the consequences” of their behavior (e.g., Cottrell & Graefe, 1997). Measures retained in scales and indices often include behavior or intentions, not ascription of responsibility. Researchers should consider integrating dimensions of impact ownership and personal initiative into approaches used for measuring ascription of responsibility. Research is also needed to improve validity of behavioral determinants and behaviors to improve conditions.

Results in chapter three suggest that outfitters preferred to regulate themselves and that informally sanctioned voluntary codes of conduct (e.g., TBMP) raised awareness of negative effects, fostered ascription of responsibility for these effects, and informally enforced behavior to improve conditions. These findings show the importance of identifying informal obligations as standards against which behavioral appropriateness can be judged (Heywood, 2002). Informal sanctions of obligation (e.g., obligation to environment, desire to be good neighbors) seemed related to outfitter behavior to improve conditions. Future studies, therefore, should not ignore the roles of formal and informal sanctions in determining commercial operator behavior.

Other theoretical and research implications specific to each article were discussed in each chapter. Despite these theoretical and applied implications, a cautionary note is necessary for application of findings presented in this thesis. Although qualitative research methods help to capture complexity and depth of

contextual meanings and real world phenomena, purposive samples common in qualitative studies often lack generalizability to larger populations (Berg, 2007). Data for this study were obtained from interviews with a purposive sample of 23 outfitters in the Juneau area. Although results from these data cannot be applied to all commercial outdoor recreation and tourism settings, they provide an initial understanding of issues and perceptions in the Juneau area that might not have been gained through quantitative methods (e.g., surveys). Attributes of recreation and tourism in the Juneau area, such as its cruise and commercial tourism focus and its dependency on public lands, provide a starting point for application of findings to other activities, groups, and locations.

In conclusion, this thesis focused on commercial outfitters operating on the Tongass National Forest in the Juneau, Alaska area and examined their: (a) trends and changes in visitors served and activities offered; (b) awareness of social, managerial, environmental, and economic effects of commercial recreation and tourism on visitors and local communities; (c) ascription of responsibility for these effects; and (d) behavior to mitigate any negative effects and improve conditions. This research improves understanding of commercial outdoor recreation and tourism in the Juneau area, and will inform managers addressing current and future effects of these operations. Researchers are encouraged to examine future research needs identified in this thesis to help build a body of knowledge about broad trends and changes in commercial outdoor recreation and tourism, and specific effects and behaviors of commercial operators. Future research should examine commercial outdoor recreation and tourism trends and effects near gateway communities to natural resources such as the Juneau area,

incorporating perspectives of managers, residents, and visitors. Research should seek to identify effective engagement of managers, operators, and residents to build community based capacity and inform public land management.

#### References

- Babcock, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining bargaining impasse: The role of self-serving biases. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11, 109-126.
- Beeton, S. (1999). Hoof prints on the mind: An exploration of attitudinal relationships between bushwalkers and commercial horseback tours. *Tourism Management*, 20, 255-259.
- Behan, J. R., Richards, M. T., & Lee, M. E. (2001). Effects of tour jeeps in a wildland setting in non-motorized recreationist benefits. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19(2), 1-19.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Brooks, D. J., & Haynes, R. W. (2001). *Recreation and tourism in south-central Alaska: Synthesis of recent trends and prospects*. PNW-GTR-511. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Bryman, A. (1995). *Disney and his worlds*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Cervený, L. K. (2005). *Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: Case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska*. PNW-RP-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Cottrell, S. P., & Graefe, A. R. (1997). Testing a conceptual framework of responsible environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 29(1), 17-27.
- Heywood, J. L. (2002). The cognitive and emotional components of behavior norms in outdoor recreation. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 271-281.
- Kaiser, F. G., & Shimoda, T.A. (1999). Responsibility as a predictor of ecological behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 243-253.
- Manning, R. E. (1999). *Studies in outdoor recreation: Search and research for satisfaction*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Mowen, A. J., Kerstetter, D. L., Graefe, A. R., & Miles, J. P. (2006) *A concession program evaluation for Pennsylvania State Parks*. State College, PA: Report to

the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources,  
Bureau of State Parks.

- Needham, M. D., & Rollins, R. B. (2005). Interest group standards for recreation and tourism impacts at ski areas in the summer. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 1-13.
- Quinn, T. (2002a). *A public utility model for managing public land recreation enterprises*. PNW-GTR-543. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Quinn, T. (2002b). *Public lands and private recreation enterprise: Policy issues from a historical perspective*. PNW-GTR-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Randall, C., & Rollins, R. (2006). The kayak tour guide: An important influence on National Park visitors. *IntepScan*, 31(4), 5-9.
- Roggenbuck, J. W., Williams, D. R., & Bobinski, C. T. (1992). Public-private partnership to increase commercial tour guides' effectiveness as nature interpreters. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10(2), 41-50.
- Ritzer, G. (1983). The McDonaldization of society. *Journal of American Culture*, 6(1), 100-107.
- Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer G., & Liska, A. (1997). 'McDisneyization' and 'post-tourism': Contemporary perspectives on contemporary tourism. In C. Rojek, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory* (pp.96-109). London, UK: Routledge.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1968). Awareness of consequences and the influence of moral norms on interpersonal behavior. *Sociometry*, 31, 355-369.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221-279). New York: Academic Press.
- Vaske, J. J., Covey, D., & Donnelly, M. P. (in review). A norm activation model of responsible environmental behavior. *Environment and Behavior*.
- Weaver, A. (2005). The McDonaldization thesis and cruise tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 346-366.
- Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Sydney, Australia: Wiley.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, S. D., Robertson, G., & Schaefer, J. (1998). *Economies in transition: An assessment of trends relevant to management of the Tongass National Forest*. PNW-GTR-417. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Babcock, L., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining bargaining impasse: The role of self-serving biases. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11, 109-126.
- Beeton, S. (1999). Hoof prints on the mind: An exploration of attitudinal relationships between bushwalkers and commercial horseback tours. *Tourism Management*, 20, 255-259.
- Behan, J. R., Richards, M. T., & Lee, M. E. (2001). Effects of tour jeeps in a wildland setting in non-motorized recreationist benefits. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 19(2), 1-19.
- Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Blake, J., & Davis, K. (1964). Norms, values, and sanctions. In R. E. L. Faris (Ed.), *Handbook of modern sociology* (pp.456-484). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1986). Social roles and social perception: Individual differences in attribution and "error." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1200-1207.
- Booth, K. L., & Cullen, R. (2001). Managing recreation and tourism in New Zealand mountains. *Mountain Research and Development*, 21(4), 331-334.
- Brooks, D. J., & Haynes, R. W. (2001). *Recreation and tourism in south-central Alaska: Synthesis of recent trends and prospects*. PNW-GTR-511. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Butler, J. R., & Hvenegaard, G. T. (2002). Interpretation and environmental education. In P. Dearden & R. Rollins (Eds.), *Parks and protected areas in Canada: Planning and management* (pp. 179-203). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Cervený, L. K. (2005). *Tourism and its effects on southeast Alaska communities and resources: Case studies from Haines, Craig, and Hoonah, Alaska*. PNW-RP-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Christensen, A., Needham, M. D., & Rowe, S. (2008). Whale watchers' past experience, value orientations, and awareness of consequences of actions on the marine environment. *Tourism in Marine Environments*, 5(4).

- Colt., S., Dugan, D., & Fay, G. (2007) *The regional economy of southeast Alaska*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage.
- Cottrell, S. P., & Graefe, A. R. (1997). Testing a conceptual framework of responsible environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 29(1), 17-27.
- Dugan, D., Fay, G., & Colt, S. (2007). *Nature-based tourism in southeast Alaska: Results from 2005 and 2006 Field Study*. Anchorage, AK: Institute of Social and Economic Research University of Alaska Anchorage and Eco-Systems.
- Eagles, P. F. J. (1999). International trends in park tourism and ecotourism. In *Proceedings of protected areas management and sustainable rural development: How can they be reconciled?* Harare, Zimbabwe: World Conservation Union.
- Egan, T. (2000, August 20). A land so wild, it's getting crowded. *The New York Times*.
- Grasmick, H. G., Blackwell, B. S., Bursik, R. J., & Mitchell, S. (1993). Changes in perceived threats of shame, embarrassment, and legal sanctions for interpersonal violence, 1982-1992. *Violence and Victims*, 8, 313-325.
- Hall, J. E. (2007). *The lure of Alaska – a history of tourism in the great land*. Juneau, AK: Alaska State Museum.
- Heberlein, T. A. (1975). Social norms and environmental quality. Paper presented at the *American Association for Advancement of Science Annual Meetings*. New York.
- Heywood, J. L. (2002). The cognitive and emotional components of behavior norms in outdoor recreation. *Leisure Sciences*, 24, 271-281.
- Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau (JCVB). (2007). *Cruise passenger traffic to Juneau Alaska*. Website data. On file with Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, Juneau, AK.
- Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC). (2007). *Juneau 2007 economic overview*. Juneau, AK: JEDC with the McDowell Group.
- Kaiser, F. G., & Shimoda, T.A. (1999). Responsibility as a predictor of ecological behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 19, 243-253.
- Kruger, L. E., & Mazza., R. L. (2006). *Alaska communities and forest environments: A problem analysis and research agenda*. PNW-GTR-665. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.

- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2005). Qualitative research methodologies. In *Practical research planning and design* (8<sup>th</sup> ed., pp.133-160.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Leopold, A. (1947). The ecological conscience. *Bulletin of the Garden Club of America*. September 1947: 45.
- Leopold, A. (1949). *A sand county almanac*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Manning, R. E. (1999). *Studies in outdoor recreation: Search and research for satisfaction*. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Mowen, A. J., Kerstetter, D. L., Graefe, A. R., & Miles, J. P. (2006) *A concession program evaluation for Pennsylvania State Parks*. State College, PA: Report to the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Bureau of State Parks.
- Mullins, B. (1999). Globalization, tourism, and the international sex trade. In K. Kempadoo (ed.), *Sun, sex and gold* (pp. 55-80). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Needham, M. D., & Rollins, R. B. (2005). Interest group standards for recreation and tourism impacts at ski areas in the summer. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 1-13.
- Needham, M. D., Rollins, R. B., & Wood, C. J. B. (2004a). Stakeholders' perceptions of bear viewing tours at an alpine ski area in the summer. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 9(2), 153-156.
- Needham, M. D., Wood, C. J. B., & Rollins, R. B. (2004b). Understanding summer visitors and their experiences at the Whistler Mountain ski area, Canada. *Mountain Research and Development*, 24(3), 234-242.
- Parr, D. (2000). *Management practice for allocation of recreation concessions*. Science and research internal report 184. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Conservation.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Quinn, T. (2002a). *A public utility model for managing public land recreation enterprises*. PNW-GTR-543. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.
- Quinn, T. (2002b). Public lands and private recreation enterprise: Policy issues from a historical perspective. PNW-GTR-556. Portland, OR: USDA Forest Service, PNW Research Station.

- Randall, C., & Rollins, R. (2006). The kayak tour guide: An important influence on National Park visitors. *IntepScan*, 31(4), 5-9.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Policy formulation at the tourism / environment interface: Insights and recommendations from the Banff-Bow Valley study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 100-110.
- Ritzer, G. (1983). The McDonaldization of society. *Journal of American Culture*, 6(1), 100-107.
- Ritzer, G. (1996). *The McDonaldization of society: Explorations and extensions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization thesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer G., & Liska, A. (1997). 'McDisneyization' and 'post-tourism': Contemporary perspectives on contemporary tourism. In C. Rojek, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory* (pp.96-109). London, UK: Routledge.
- Roggenbuck, J. W., Williams, D. R., & Bobinski, C. T. (1992). Public-private partnership to increase commercial tour guides' effectiveness as nature interpreters. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 10(2), 41-50.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1968). Awareness of consequences and the influence of moral norms on interpersonal behavior. *Sociometry*, 31, 355-369.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1973). Normative explanations of helping behavior: A critique, proposal, and empirical test. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9, 349-364.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1977). Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 221-279). New York: Academic Press.
- Sem, J., Clements, C. J., & Bloomquist, P. (1996). Tourism and recreation management: Strategies for public lands. *Parks and Recreation*, 31(9), 92-105.
- Sowman, P., & Pearce, D. (2000). Tourism, national parks, and visitor management. In R. W. Butler & S. W. Boyd (Eds.), *Tourism and national parks: Issues and implications* (pp. 223-243). New York: Wiley.

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- USDA, Forest Service. (2007). *List of recreation related outfitters who operate on Admiralty National Monument and Juneau Ranger District*. [Fax]. On file with Brad Flynn, Juneau Ranger District, AK.
- USDA, Forest Service. (2004). *Shoreline Outfitter / Guide Record of Decision and Final Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: FEIS*. R10-MB-519b. Tongass National Forest, Ketchikan, AK: Alaska Region.
- Van Liere, K. D., & Dunlap, R. E. (1978). Moral norms and environmental behavior: An application of Schwartz's norm-activation model to yard burning. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8, 174-188.
- Vaske, J. J., Covey, D., & Donnelly, M. P. (in review). A norm activation model of responsible environmental behavior. *Environment and Behavior*.
- Vaske, J. J., & Whittaker, D. (2004). Normative approaches to natural resources. In M. J. Manfredi, J. J. Vaske, B. L. Bruyere, D. R. Field, & P. Brown (Eds.), *Society and natural resources: A summary of knowledge* (pp. 283-294). Jefferson, MO: Modern Litho.
- Weaver, D. (2001). *Ecotourism*. Sydney, Australia: Wiley.
- Weaver, A. (2005). The McDonaldization thesis and cruise tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 346-366.
- Western States Tourism Policy Council (WSTPC). (2005). *Tourism and public lands in the west*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.dced.state.ak.us/wstpc/index.htm>.
- World Tourism Organization (WTO). (1998). *Tourism 2020 vision – Global forecast and profiles of market segments*. Madrid, Spain: UNWTO.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2008). *Tourism satellite accounting*. Retrieved October 2008 from: <http://www.wttc.org>.

## **APPENDICES**

### **Appendix A. Interview Schedule for Tour Operators**

#### **A. INTRODUCTION**

This study is being conducted collaboratively by Oregon State University and the US Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station in Juneau, Alaska. Objectives of this study are to: (a) identify products and services being offered by guides and outfitters in the Juneau area, excluding big game hunting and charter sport fishing; and (b) improve understanding of the tourism and recreation industry in this region.

#### **B. BACKGROUND**

1. Please provide me with some background about your company such as the year your business / company began, who started the company, and where you (or they) are originally from.
2. What were the original motivations, ideas, and / or visions for your company?
3. Has your company ever bought / taken over or been bought out / taken over by any other companies? If so, please discuss what happened, when, and why.
4. What is your company's relationship with cruise lines? (e.g., formal / contractual relationships)

#### **C. CURRENT BUSINESS**

##### **Products and Services**

1. What activities, products, and / or services does your company currently offer? Are these day trips, overnight trips, or both? Are these offered year round or seasonally?
2. What places do these trips / tours typically visit and are these places on Alaska Native, Forest Service, state, and / or other jurisdictional land? Have these places changed and if so, how?
3. Did your company offer different activities, products, and / or services when it first started operating? If so, how and why have these changed?
4. Do you have any plans for offering new types of activities in the future? If so, what activities?

##### **Customers**

1. Has the number of customers that you serve increased, decreased, or stayed the same over the years?
2. To the best of your ability, please describe your customers. Have the types of customers that you serve changed (e.g., where they are from, elderly or young, independent versus cruise travelers)?
3. How much of your business comes from cruise ship passengers; local residents; independent travelers?
4. What do you hope customers experiencing your tours come away with and most remember?

##### **Employees**

1. How many of your employees are full time versus part time? How many are year round versus seasonal workers? Finally, where are the employees from (i.e., Juneau, rest of Alaska, not Alaska)?
2. How and where do you typically recruit employees?
3. How many of your employees typically return for the next season?
4. Have your numbers and / or types of employees changed over the years? If so, please explain.
5. What kind of training do your employees get?

6. What types of information / education do your employees provide visitors (e.g., safety, cultural social, environmental; does it focus on facts or behaviors)? *Can we get a copy of this information?*

#### **D. PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACTS**

1. What do you believe are positive and / or negative effects of commercial tour operations in the Juneau area? How do you think commercial tours affect independent travelers, the local community (i.e., residents), and / or the environment?
2. What positive and / or negative effects has your company had on independent travelers, the local community (i.e., residents), and / or the environment? Please discuss.
3. Is your company taking responsibility for each of these impacts? If so, how?
4. Please discuss any complaints or conflict events that you may have heard about or witnessed among: (a) various commercial tour operators, (b) between commercial tour operators and local community residents, or (c) between commercial tour operators and independent travelers in the Juneau area.
5. Would you say that this conflict, if any, originated from: (a) direct face to face negative interactions among groups of people; (b) differences in values, thoughts, and opinions about appropriate and inappropriate activities without any direct face to face interactions; and / or (c) both?
6. How have interactions among/between commercial groups, independent travelers and local residents changed over the past 5 years?
7. In your opinion, have local residents' or independent travelers' attitudes toward commercial tour operators in the Juneau area changed over the years? If so, please discuss.

#### **E. MANAGEMENT**

1. Please tell me about what you know about current federal, state, local, and private guidelines and regulations related to commercial recreation and tourism in the Juneau area. How do you feel about these guidelines and regulations (e.g., are they working, what can be improved)?
2. To what extent is your company involved in politics and / or decision making?
3. Are there any industry codes of conduct or standards that your company and / or any other commercial tour company in the Juneau area follow?
4. Do you feel that codes of conduct / industry standards are good or bad for Juneau tourism operators?
5. How do you think other commercial tour operators in the Juneau area feel about codes of conduct or industry standards?
6. How do you believe that codes of conduct or industry standards in the Juneau area should be enforced (e.g., not enforced, voluntary, mandatory with monitoring and enforcement)?

#### **F. THE FUTURE**

1. What activities, if any, do you anticipate becoming new "fads" or unique tourism opportunities in the Juneau area in the future?
2. Are there any major challenges facing your company? How do you anticipate addressing these?
3. What concerns, if any, do you have for the future of your company and / or the commercial tourism industry in the Juneau area?
4. How would you describe your ideal vision for the future for your company and / or the commercial tourism industry in the Juneau area?
5. Thank you for participating. Is there anything that I should have asked, but missed?
6. Who else could you suggest that I might contact?

