The objective of this paper is to investigate to what extent tourists’ environmental beliefs are reflected in their behaviour at a destination. The study is based on 52 questionnaires filled out by tourists visiting the city of Niagara Falls in the fall 2008.

Introduction

In the last ten years there has been an increased concern regarding global warming, causing consumers to be more environmentally conscious towards their purchases and behaviour. This issue is evident through the enhanced availability of “green products” being sold from groceries, to more fuel efficient and environmentally friendly vehicles, and to businesses and organizations implementing environmental programs. Many individuals are taking initiative at home through recycling, changing light bulbs, and being more conscious about air conditioning and heating. However, there is a question as to whether they carry their sustainable behavior with them while on holidays. Understanding environmental behaviour of tourists is important for a number of reasons. From the perspective of tourism businesses, it is relevant to know whether the sustainability initiatives are of importance to tourists and whether they will affect tourist choices of products. From the perspective of a destination, it is critical to understand tourist behaviour and develop appropriate ways of promoting sustainable tourism choices.

Tourism behaviour in general is a widely researched area (Swarbrooke, 1999). A number of factors affecting tourism behaviour were identified, including an individual’s age, nationality, travel experience as well as their values, attitude, and knowledge. The interest is focusing on tourists’ environmental behaviour in particular. Models such as the new environmental paradigm (Wearing et al., 2002) and the schematic model of environmental concern (Stern et al., 1995) were created to understand tourists’ environmental behaviour. Studies that used these models as well as other tools have however found conflicting findings about tourists’ environmental behaviour. On one hand, the literature is highlighting the emergence of environmentally-conscious tourists, often referred to as eco-tourists or responsible tourists, but at the same time a number of studies show more carless behaviour of tourists while on a trip compared to their behaviour at home. In similar manner, there is a number of conflicting studies on the willingness of tourists to pay extra for more environmentally friendly tourism products.

The objective of this study is therefore to investigate tourists’ environmental beliefs and tourists’ environmental behaviour while on a trip and relationship between these two variables. The research questions proposed in this study are: Are tourists concerned about the environment? Do tourists behave in environmentally friendly way while on holidays? Are tourists environmental beliefs reflected in their behaviour and travel choices while on holidays? The following sections of this paper will present the relevant literature review, methodology of the study, results of data analysis and conclusions.
Literature Review

Tourist behaviour is one of the most widely researched areas of tourism research. Existing studies focus on tourists’ motivations for travel, their choices of destinations and activities, their planning behavior and finally their satisfaction with the experience. It is widely agreed that tourists and their behaviour differ from one another, depending on a number of factors related both to the destination and to the traveler. Among the traveler-related factors affecting tourist behaviour the following were identified in previous research: age, motives, level of affluence (Pearce, 2005), culture, personality, values, experiences, attitudes, nationality (Pizman and Sussman, 1995), the amount of skills a tourist has, perception and learning (Pearce, 2005). With the growth of interest in sustainable development in general and sustainable tourism in particular, a number of studies have been conducted on tourist behaviour towards the environment. Some of these studies proposed theories of environmental tourist behaviour; some attempted to define and classify responsible tourists; while others looked at reasons behind tourists’ responsible or irresponsible behaviour towards the environment.

Several theories were proposed to explain the environmental behaviour of tourists, including the theory of planned behaviour, the schematic model of environmental concern, and the new environmental paradigm. Authors using the theory of planned behaviour (Reiser and Simmons, 2005; Wearing et al., 2002; Budeanu, 2007) to explain the environmentally-friendly tourist behaviour argued that in order to be able to behave in a responsible way, tourists must have a positive attitude towards sustainability, realize there is a need to care for the environment, and have the means available at the destination in order to act responsibly. The schematic model of environmental concern, proposed by Stern, Dietz and Guagnano (1995) and later applied by Wurzinger and Johanson (2006) additionally suggests that a person’s values influence his or her worldviews and broad beliefs towards the environment. According to the theory, these general beliefs lead to more specific beliefs and attitudes, which may lead to the intention to act in a certain way. Finally, also the new environmental paradigm was proposed to explain the relationship between tourists’ environmental attitudes and their purchasing behaviour (Wearing et al, 2002) and relationship between environmental attitudes and nature-based tourism motivations (Luo & Deng, 2008).

A number of studies suggest that tourists are in general aware of environmental and social problems caused by tourism and that they have positive attitudes towards efforts to reduce them (Budeanu, 2007). The increased awareness of the environmental impacts of tourism led to the emergence of a new group of tourists, called, among others, eco-tourists, green tourists or responsible tourists. A large body of literature focuses on these tourists, in attempt to define them and explain their behaviour. For example Wood and House (1991) defined the ‘good tourist’ as the one who behaves responsibly towards the environment and host community while in the destination. Fairweather, Maslin and Simmons (2005) distinguished between people with ambivalent values who are comfortable using nature for economic and social benefits, and people with biocentric values who are cautious about the use of nature and therefore are more likely to behave in ways that are environmentally friendly. A significant amount of research indicates therefore that tourists are on average becoming more aware of the importance of protecting the environment and more involved in practicing environmentally-friendly behaviour on holidays.

However, at the same time, there is a large body of contradictory research that indicates that tourists tend to behave irresponsibly while on vacations and that environmental concern only plays a minor, if any, role in the decision making process of a tourist (Fairweather et al., 2005; Lubbert, 2001). Dolnicar and Leisch (2008) did a study on tourists’ obligation to protect the environment and their results showed that 92% of the respondents felt morally obligated to behave in an environmentally friendly manner at home, while the average pro-environmental behaviour on vacation was only 25% of that at home. Wearing et al. (2002) surveyed tourists on an eco-tour, where most explained that while at home they engaged in a range of ‘modest’ green behaviours, such as recycling and donating to environmental organizations, but not one considered preservation in their eco-tour purchase decision. When asked why they participated in environmentally friendly behavior
at home and not on vacation, the general response was “I don’t know.” Wearing et al (2002) suggested that being in a different environment might account for why people do not practice their usual routines. The travelers’ motivations for engaging in tourism usually are to escape from their everyday environment and relax. While on vacation people want to enjoy themselves and tend to not take care of the environment. Sharpley (2001) also pointed out that tourists are under time and pressure constraints when booking for holidays, which leads to people ignoring irrelevant information, and that sustainability and eco-labels in the current tourism marketplace are in the category of irrelevant information because are not essential to the tourist’s experience. Similarly, Becken (2004) argued that holidays are taken for personal benefits, making environmental risks caused by travel to be underestimated by tourists, and changes in travel behaviour for environmental reasons are not likely to happen, because tourists feel free of responsibilities when they are on vacation. Lubbert’s (2001) research also found that although tourists hold positive environmental attitudes, they did not feel environmentally responsible when on vacation. A possible explanation as to why many tourists do not feel that they have to act environmentally friendly in a holiday destination is because they want to experience the destination and what it has to offer, even if the activity or entertainment is not pro-environmental. According to Fairweather, Maslin and Simmons (2005) visitors may be unwilling to change their travel behavior to achieve environmental benefits, particularly if it would interfere with their enjoyment or not coincide with their travel goals.

These findings are consistent with the more general research on consumer behaviour which suggests that environmental concern does not always convert into environmentally responsible behavior (Fransson & Garling, 1999; Hines et al., 1986/87; Minton and Rose, 1997; Newhouse, 1990; Roberts & Bacon, 1997; Schlegelmilch, 1996; Schultz et al., 1995; Scott and Willis, 1994; Tanner, 1999). Looking specifically at tourists, Wearing et al. (2002) pointed out that the same individuals who claimed to be concerned about the environment and factored these matters into their choice of tourism products, under specific conditions were unwilling to let the concern for the environment affect their specific tourism purchasing behaviour. Similarly, Budeanu’s study (2007) showed that only few tourists would buy responsible tourism products, choose eco-friendly transportation or behave conscientiously towards destination communities. Also Dalton, Lockington and Baldock (2008) found that while in hotels, the majority of respondents favoured non-environmentally friendly choices such as individual soaps, new clean towels daily, and air conditioning rather than opened windows.

One of the reasons of the lack of environmental behaviour that was suggested in previous research is potential price increase. Pembroke (1996) found that if the prices were all the same, 53% of tourists would choose an airline or tour operator that considered environmental issues. When the prices were increased many people were not willing to spend the extra money to be environmentally friendly. For instance, Watkins (1994) found that 70% of respondents were ‘extremely likely’ or ‘likely’ to stay in a hotel that adopts policies to protect the environment, however only a small amount were willing to pay for higher room rates. Similar results were obtained by Manaktola and Jauhari (2007); Dalton, Lockington and Baldock’s (2008) and Fairweather, Maslin and Simmons (2005).

The review of existing literature on tourists’ environmental beliefs and behaviours shows conflicting results, indicating on one hand an increase in tourists’ environmental concerns, and on the other hand, tourists’ tendency to be more careless while on vacations when compared to their behaviour at home. In order to reconcile these two streams of literature, the present study aims at investigating the relationship between tourists’ environmental beliefs and behaviours in more detail and proposes classification of tourists that would explain the different findings in the existing research on this topic.
Methodology

Data Collection

In order to investigate tourists’ environmental beliefs and behaviour, quantitative data was collected through a means of a self-administered questionnaire. The sampling frame in this study consisted of tourists who visited Niagara Falls in summer and fall 2008 for leisure purposes, stayed overnight and were 18 years of age or older. The questionnaire was administered to a sample of 55 tourists approached on a random basis in a close vicinity of Niagara Falls. In total, 52 usable questionnaires were collected.

Questionnaire Design. When designing the questionnaire, effort was made to ensure that the language was simple and easy for participants to understand. The questionnaire was presented in English, which to some degree limited participation. A pre-test of the questionnaire on a group of five tourists was done in order to find any confusion in following directions of how to answer the questions, or phrasing of the questions. Based on the results of pre-test some minor modifications were made in the questions wherein the statements were ambiguous.

The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section focused on demographics including age, gender, nationality and income. Nationality was included because many studies suggest that different nationalities have different values and behaviours towards the environment. Household income or discretionary income was also considered because it could have potentially influenced tourist’s willingness to pay for environmental standards to be in place at a destination. The second section of the questionnaire involved questions on tourists general environmental beliefs. The scale used was a 5 point Likert-scale with 1 corresponding to ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 corresponding to ‘strongly agree’. The third section of the questionnaire collected information on visitors’ trip to Niagara Falls and their behaviour while at the destination. It included questions about the length of stay in Niagara Falls, transportation used, and frequency of participation in a list of environmentally-friendly activities. The last section of the questionnaire looked at Niagara Falls in general and investigated whether it facilitates tourists’ environmentally-friendly behaviour. Once again a Likert-scale was used with 1 representing ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 representing ‘strongly agree’. The reason for inclusion of this section was that if Niagara Falls did not offer the amenities needed to be environmentally friendly, it would significantly limit tourists’ opportunity to engage in environmental initiatives and affect the results of the study.

Data Analysis Techniques. The collected responses were coded and analyzed using SPSS v 16.0. The quantitative data analysis techniques employed were means, standard deviations, relative/absolute frequencies by category and t-tests. Coefficient of variations is reported for each indicator to confirm the reliability of the measure. As a rule of thumb, the coefficient should be less than 0.3 to confirm the existence of a true mean among the sample. Also, t-statistic tests were performed in order to determine the significance of the results. The null hypothesis for the t-test is stated as follows: there is no difference between the mean rating and the mid-point of the scale.

Results

Profile of the Sample

There were 52 usable questionnaires collected for this study. Majority of respondents were females (33 respondents) while remaining 19 respondents were males. In terms of age, there was a good range of participants from every age group. The age group 19-29 accounted for 26.9% of responses, making it the largest group to participate in the study. Those who indicated they were 60-69 were the second most common group with 23.1%. The age group 40-49 made up 19.2% and those 50-59 made up 17.3%. The respondents between the ages 30-39 made up 9.6%, which was the second lowest group to participate. Finally, those 70 and above made up 3.8% of the sample. The most
common income bracket for respondents (34.6%) was over $75,000. The second most common (17.3%), were those who made $60,000 - $74,999 followed by 15.4% of respondents who made $30,000 - $44,999.

In terms of country of origin, there were a total of six different groups. The largest group of respondents was Americans, representing 39% of the sample. Another 35% of respondents were Canadians and 18% were British. There were also four respondents from other countries (2 from Iran, 1 from Australia, 1 from India). All participants in the study stayed in Niagara Falls for at least one night, as this was necessary in order for them to participate in the study. According to the data, participant’s trip information showed that majority of tourists came to Niagara Falls for either 1-2 days or 3-4 days. Due to the fact that majority of participants were American, and Canadian, the most widely used form of transportation to Niagara Falls was by car. Once in Niagara Falls, walking was the main form of transportation.

Environmental Beliefs

A number of indicators were used to assess tourists’ environmental beliefs. Majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements: the present generation should ensure that environment is maintained for future generations, tourists have a responsibility to do what they can to protect the environment, I am an environmentally conscious person, I expect hotels and tour operators to be environmentally friendly, I prefer to stay at hotels and destinations that are considered environmentally friendly and I am willing to pay extra for travel products with less negative impacts on environment. For all those beliefs the mean responses were significantly higher than the mid-point of the scale at confidence level $\alpha=0.01$. The list of environmental beliefs, their means, standard deviations, coefficients of variation and percentage of respondents who agreed are reported in Table 1. The frequencies of responses of agreement, neutral or disagreement with belief statements are presented in Figure 1.

Respondents felt uncertain regarding negative impacts of tourism on environment. Over one third of them (20 respondents) indicated that they are neutral to the statement while another 20 respondents disagreed with the statement. Only 12 participants (23.1%) agreed that tourism had negative impacts on the environment. The mean response is not significantly different from the mid-point.

For a large number of environmental beliefs there is a large group of tourists who feel neutral to them. Examples include: I consider environmental issues in tourism purchases, I worry about environmental impacts while I am travelling, I always look for environmental information about the destination visited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Coef. of variation</th>
<th>% of respondents who agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The present generation should ensure that environment is maintained for future generations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.37 (0.916)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists have a responsibility to do what they can to protect the environment</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.10 (1.100)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an environmentally conscious person</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.92 (0.796)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect hotels and tour operators to be environmentally friendly</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.85 (0.937)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to stay at hotels and destinations that are considered environmentally friendly</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.75 (0.883)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to pay extra for travel products with less negative impacts on environment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.50 (0.980)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider environmental issues in tourism purchases</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.27 (0.843)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I worry about environmental impacts while I am travelling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.17 (1.004)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always look for environmental information about the destination visited</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.83 (1.004)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would only consider accommodation that takes into account environmental issues</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.81 (1.067)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism has negative impacts on the environment</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.79 (0.936)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five-point scale used: 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree.  *α=0.05   **α=0.01
The present generation should ensure that environment is maintained for future generations

Tourists have a responsibility to do what they can to protect the environment

I am an environmentally conscious person

I expect hotels and tour operators to be environmentally friendly

I prefer to stay in environmentally friendly hotels

I am willing to pay extra for travel products with less negative impacts on environment

I consider environmental issues in tourism purchases

I worry about environmental impacts while I am travelling

I always look for environmental information about the destination visited

I would only consider accommodation that takes into account environmental issues

Tourism has negative impacts on the environment

When asked who is responsible for covering the costs of initiatives aimed at reducing environmental impacts of tourism, the respondents most often indicated accommodation (71.2%), tourists (63.5%) and attractions (59.6%), see Figure 2. Half of the respondents also felt that tour operators (51.9%) and destinations (50%) should cover those costs. Large number of respondents felt that the responsibility is shared among all the indicated stakeholders (17 respondents) or three or four of them (14 respondents). Ten respondents saw the responsibility for covering the cost of initiatives aimed at reducing environmental impacts of tourism as resting only on one stakeholder type. The opinions among them were very diverse: 2 respondents saw attractions as the only stakeholders responsible, 2 respondents indicated accommodation, 2 respondents indicated tourists, 2 respondents indicated destination and another 2 indicated tour operators. Of participants who specified who else they felt could be responsible for covering costs, four participants said the government. 1 participant indicated that restaurants and manufacturers were also responsible.
When asked if they would participate in a tree planting program where they would pay $15 to plant a tree to offset some of their greenhouse gas emissions produced from their travels, over half of the respondents (57.7%) indicated they would, 26.9% were unsure and 11.5% said they would not. Overall, the responses suggest tourists’ positive feelings towards environment and willingness to contribute to environmental well-being of destinations.

Comparing demographics with beliefs, it was found that Americans (84%) had more environmentally friendly beliefs than Canadians (78%). Canadians more strongly stated that price is a more important factor than environmental impacts and that while they are on vacation they are not concerned about practicing environmental behaviour. The findings on age and environmental beliefs show that participants aged 50-69 had the most positive environmental beliefs. Comparing gender to beliefs, more females (89%) than males (79%) had positive environmental beliefs. Results for incomes and environmental beliefs reveal that as incomes go up, percentage of respondents who have environmentally friendly beliefs go up. For instance, starting at $15000, the percents were 60%, 75%, 88%, and finally among those who make over $75 000, 94% had environmentally friendly beliefs.

Environmental Behaviour

In order to investigate the relationship between tourists’ beliefs and behaviour, their environmental behaviour was investigated during their trip to Niagara Falls. Majority of participants stayed in Niagara Falls for 2 days (25 participants) or for 3 to 4 days (22 participants). Only four participants stayed for five or more days. Majority of respondents travelled to Niagara Falls from home using only one mode of transportation, either car (26 respondents) or bus (10 respondents). Eight respondents used multiple means of transportation, most often using combination of plane and car or plane, car and bus. In total car was used by 31 respondents, bus by 14 respondents, plane by 13 respondents and train by 3 respondents. When asked whether they participated in a carbon offsetting program to offset their travel, all of the respondents except for one said no. This behaviour is not consistent with the earlier stated willingness of 57.7% of respondents to participate in a tree planting scheme to offset some of the greenhouse gases emission produced as a result of their travel.
In order to capture environmental behaviour of tourists at the destination a number of questions were asked regarding different activities they could engage in. The responses indicating how many participants engaged in each activity while on their holidays and how often are presented in Figure 3.

There was a strong engagement of respondents in a number of activities, such as turning off the TV when not in the hotel room (40 respondents did it always), turning off the light when not in the hotel room (40 respondents did it always) or taking short showers instead of bath (30 respondents did it always). However, for a number of activities the majority of respondents either did not participate in them or participated only sometimes: use recycling bins, get sheets and towels changed only when necessary, turn off air conditioning when leaving the room, and refill water bottles. Notably only six respondents asked the hotel they were staying at about energy use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn off TV when you left the room</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn off lights when you left the room</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take short showers instead of bath</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use recycling bins</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only get sheets and towels changed when necessary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn off air conditioning when you left the room</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refill water bottles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy products with minimum packaging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask hotel about energy usage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Beliefs versus Environmental Behaviour

In order to compare tourists’ environmental beliefs and their environmental behaviour, a composite score for environmental beliefs and a composite score for environmental behaviour were calculated. The environmental beliefs score was calculated as the average of the individual scores for eight environmental beliefs. The following items were included in the composite score of environmental beliefs: I am an environmentally conscious person, the present generation should ensure that the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations, I prefer to stay at hotels and destinations that are considered environmentally friendly, I am willing to pay extra for travel products that have less negative impact on the environment, When I travel I worry about the
environmental impacts, I consider environmental issues in tourism product purchases. I always look for environmental information about the destination I am visiting. I would only consider accommodation that takes into account environmental issues, and I think that tourists have a responsibility to do what they can to protect the environment. The histogram in Figure 4 shows the distribution of environmental beliefs scores for all the respondents.

Environmental behaviour score was calculated based on responses to seven behaviour-related questions after recoding the answers according to the following scheme: response of ‘always practiced’ was assigned 2 points; response of ‘sometimes practiced’ was given 1 point, and response of ‘never practices’ was given 0 points. Environmental behaviour score was calculated as the sum of all the points for behaviour given to any individual respondent. The range of environmental behaviour score was therefore 0 to 14 (2 points for each behaviour). The behaviours included in calculations of the composite score were: use recycling bins; only get sheets, towels and amenities changed when really needed to; turn off lights when left the room; turn off the TV when left the room; turn off the air conditioning when left the room; take short showers instead of a bath; and refill water bottles rather than using the ones provided. The distribution of environmental behaviour scores for all the respondents is presented in histogram in Figure 4.

Figure 4

Histograms of Tourists’ Environmental Behaviour Scores and Tourists Environmental Belief Scores

Correlation between the environmental beliefs score and environmental behaviour score is 0.357 and is significant at the 0.05 level.

In order to further analyze the results regarding the environmental beliefs and behaviour, the following categories were introduced: environmental belief scores equal or higher than 3 were considered to be high and environmental behaviour scores higher than 10 were considered high.

Using the described cut points, 41.7% of the participants had low environmental beliefs score and 66.7% of participants had low environmental behaviour score. The Environmental Traveler Matrix in Figure 5 illustrates how participants’ environmental beliefs were reflected in their behaviour.
Figure 5

Environmental Traveler Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Behaviour Score</th>
<th>Environmental Beliefs Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maverick Tourist</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Activist Tourist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 Participant)</td>
<td>(15 Participants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laissez Faire Tourist</strong></td>
<td><strong>Falsely Committed Tourist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 Participants)</td>
<td>(26 Participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be noted that for the majority of respondents (54%) beliefs towards the environment were not reflected in their behaviour. There were 26 participants who fell under the category of “Falsely Committed Tourists” due to having high environmental beliefs score but low environmental behaviour score. Tourists that beliefs matched their behaviours were “Activist Tourists” (31%) and “Laissez Faire Tourists” (12%).

Conclusions and Limitations

The overall environmental beliefs showed that majority of participants had positive environmental beliefs. For every statement asked, majority of responses were pro-environmental and showed that participants had concern for the environment. The strongest belief held by participants was the belief stating that the present generation should ensure the environment is maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations, as over half of the participants strongly agreed with this. This coincides with the literature which shows tourists shared the beliefs that the environment needs to be protected and is in danger. On the other hand overall results for tourists’ environmental behaviour for this study show majority of tourists do not have environmentally friendly behavior. In order to explain the inconsistencies between the beliefs and behaviour, this study proposed a new classification of tourists into four categories, depending on their environmental beliefs score and environmental behaviour score.

A significant limitation to the methodology used was language barriers. There were numerous international tourists coming through Niagara Falls, many of which did not know the English language or did not know it well enough to understand a questionnaire written in English. If a participant that was not perfectly fluent in English agreed to participate in the questionnaire, they were able to ask the researcher any questions they did not understand. However, there may still have been miscommunication and language barriers.
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