

**Business Practices Among Selected
Adventure Tourism Enterprises
in Bohol vis-à-vis Sustainability**
Fiorita D. Acero and Ernesto O. Golosino

Abstract

With an increasing number of operators and tourists worldwide, adventure tourism is recognized as one of the fastest emerging segments in the tourism sector. It has lately become famous as a tourism niche among tourists who usually desire a certain level of physical activity, adventure, and excitement from their experience. However, the acceleration of this tourism sector drives profit-seekers to exploit the opportunity to amass wealth without putting a premium on the environment.

According to Buckley et al. (2014), there has been a robust demand for adventure-based holiday experiences over the last 20 years. This increased demand has been observed in the province of Bohol, as more establishments have emerged to offer not only natural sights but adventure tour experiences as well.

To determine if adventure tourism establishments subscribed to the mantra of sustainability, the researcher made use of descriptive research design. A questionnaire was employed as a primary tool for data gathering. Out of the six adventure tourism establishments presently operating, the top two institutions were covered by this study. One is operated and owned by a local government unit, while the other is privately owned.

The results of the study showed that the entity managed by the local government unit is inclined to embracing sustainable tourism practices though not much commendable. On the other hand, the private enterprise showed less regard to the dogma of sustainability.

In general, the providers of adventure tourism in Bohol truly cuddle their customers by putting a high premium on the value of their money. On the extreme side, the local folks were placed at the periphery. There is less evidence to show that they took part in the decision-making process. Worst, these local folks received lesser drops of economic benefits.

Keywords: *sustainable adventure tourism, tourism in Bohol*

Introduction

In 2016, the province of Bohol hosted an estimated more than 1.0 million tourists (ppdo.bohol.gov.ph). Compared with the previous year of tourists' influx, 2016 is 66 % higher. Indeed, a significant feat. However, along with massive tourist arrivals are not only substantial economic benefits to the enterprise and its stakeholders but also adverse social and environmental impacts. This reality hounds all subdivisions of tourism, including adventure tourism.

According to the Adventure Travel Trade Association (ATTA), adventure tourism is a "tourist activity that includes physical activity, a cultural exchange, or activities in nature. It is about connecting with a new culture or a new landscape and being physically active at the same time. It is not about being risky or pushing your boundaries" (Wicker, 2017, par 1). Tourism Notes Educational Portal, on the other hand, defines adventure tourism as "the movement of the people from one to another place outside their comfort zone for exploration or travel to remote areas, exotic and possibly hostile areas. It is a type of tourism in which tourists do some adventure activities like skydiving, hill climbing, scuba diving, and it is popular among young age tourists" (Adventure Tourism, nd, par 1).

In the province of Bohol, adventure tourism is also making its name. The privately managed adventure parks offer attractions ranging from ziplines, treetop rope challenges, gymnaskids, butterfly garden, chicken and fish feeding, mountain hiking, horseback riding, wall climbing, Tarzan swing, camping, and many more. The publicly managed parks offer zip lines, root climbing with 15 meters rappelling, glass cliff walk,

Table 1. Provincial Visitor Arrivals

	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009
Total	1,000,186	602,257	455,155	389,767	356,370	338,013	333,932	315,242
Foreign	266,313	215,269	157,536	108,264	105,949	106,124	102,650	99,031
Domestic	731,915	384,838	296,653	281,159	250,421	231,889	231,282	216,211
OFWs	1,958	2,150	966	344				
	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001
Total	282,498	244,718	219,311	187,991	164,661	128,899	90,403	81,040
Foreign	82,888	65,472	50,253	35,118	26,921	18,385		
Domestic	199,610	179,246	169,058	152,873	137,740	110,514		

Source: <https://ppdo.bohol.gov.ph/profile/socio-economic-profile/economic-development/tourism/visitor-arrivals/>

sky ride, plunge, caving, waterfalls chasing and river trekking, kayaking, and cliff diving. Between privately and publicly managed sites, the former hosted more visitors than the latter. Nonetheless, regardless of who hosted more patrons, the reality remains the same-these activities take its toll on the environment.

An adventure park, for example, is usually constructed in rural and mostly undeveloped areas wherein its overall development consequently puts different species of animals to be displaced from their natural habitat. Also, it contributes to air pollution through its use of fossil fuel to set the rides and other facilities in motion. These realities hold water when compared to the private and LGU managed adventure parks, which are the subjects of investigation in this research.

All these problems may diminish the quality of visitor experience and pose a danger to the livelihood of the local community that generates a significant part of their income from tourism. To determine if indeed the tourism establishments partake to the call of embracing sustainability, the researchers used the five pillars of sustainable tourism espoused by the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2018).

The five pillars of sustainable tourism are as follows: [1] sustainable economic growth; [2] social inclusiveness, employment and poverty reduction; [3] resource efficiency, environmental protection and climate change; [4] cultural values, diversity and heritage; and [5] mutual understanding, peace and security. It is the standard set by the United Nations World Tourism Organization in 2015 to ensure the achievement of sustainable tourism.

In determining whether tourism fosters sustainable economic growth, visitors' arrival should not be the only index to diagnose tourism's success. To contextualize these, the mantra of WTO (2018) advances the following critical areas for action to wit: a strong tourism value chain; a favorable business environment; openness and a high degree of connectivity; an emphasis on technology and innovation; a system of measurement to manage tourism growth; and collective partnership.

Engaging in tourism-related activities is much motivated by economic considerations. In the past, these economic considerations primarily focused on profit or financial returns measured using accounting-based indicators to evaluate the performance of organizations (Gjerde & Hughes, 2007). In this perspective, economic performance is derived from a company's competitiveness in terms of operational effectiveness and efficiency as well as maximized utilization of assets.

Bailey and Richardson (2010) explained that the economic goal of optimizing profit, without concern for social and environmental externalities, may explain much of the social discrimination, environmental degradation, and economic inequality, which now describe the current world. Economic sustainability guarantees financial efficiency and careful management of resources in tourism development to provide not only the current but future generations as well (Timur & Getz, 2009).

The aspect of economic or profit, being a component of sustainable tourism, should be understood as financial benefits that the

community also enjoys. It may be viewed as a lasting effect on the economy resulting from the practices of a given organization within the business environment and not just constrained to the net income that a company internally generates. Determining the profit earned should consistently take into consideration the other two elements: social and environmental (Zak, 2015).

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and World Tourism Organization (WTO, 2005) have identified several aspects that must be addressed to guarantee the economic sustainability and competitive advantage of tourism destinations and establishments for them to grow and provide lasting benefits. These are understanding the market, delivering visitor satisfaction, maintaining sound trading conditions, and maintaining and projecting an attractive destination. Thus, it is evident from various studies that the first pillar for sustainable tourism promotes not just the mere siphoning of money among tourist allied industries but making sure that the economic miracles of tourism sprinkle to all.

The second pillar under sustainable tourism embraced the concept of social inclusiveness, employment, and poverty reduction (UNWTO, 2018). In this area, UNWTO transmits the message that tourism is not just a part of a global economy; it plays a vital role in becoming the vehicle to radiate inclusive growth. Its inclusiveness unfolds when it gives favorable impacts to the poor (Durain 2015 as cited in UNWTO, 2018).

In the parlance of adventure tourism, the presence of businesses must afford unlimited benefits to the community where it exists. It is manifested through just and favorable business activities towards

employees, the society, or region where the company performs its activities (Zak, 2015). Likewise, Post, Preston, and Sachs (2002) highlighted in their study that relationships with critical stakeholders define the ability of a company to create sustainable wealth and continuing value in the long-run. They further added that relationships with stakeholders are vital resources that organizations should handle, as they are considered the most significant wellsprings of organizational value. Thus, a company's sustainability heavily relies on the sustainability of its stakeholder relationships (Perrini & Tencati, 2006).

In the tourism sector, sustainable tourism is a concern among various stakeholders whose aim is to promote a balanced utilization of natural resources at the community level and to reduce the social and environmental impacts (Battaglia, 2017). In the same study, Battaglia (2017) identified three potential stakeholders in sustainable tourism, namely, the tourists, the community, and tourism enterprises.

Tourists create a favorable impact and at the same time, negative pressure at the community level. The extent of their satisfaction towards tourism products, services, and travel destination experiences is crucial in the survival of tourism enterprises and destinations. According to Bernini, Urbinati, and Vici (2015), a greater extent of tourist satisfaction is perceived as linked to visitor loyalty, higher price tolerance, and an improved destination reputation.

Furthermore, UNEP /WTO (2005) asserted that the social dimension associated with sustainable development should aspire to deliver a fulfilling, safe, and satisfying visitor experience, accessible to everyone and devoid of any prejudice by disability, gender, or race.

These include making tourism infrastructure and facilities available and usable by disabled individuals and providing holiday opportunities for the financially and socially deprived. Tourism enterprises, also, must keep the visitors safe and secure in the destination. Likewise, it must ensure visitor satisfaction through monitoring and feed backing of the visitors' experience via regular surveys.

Another major stakeholder category in the tourism industry cited by Battaglia (2017) is the local communities and its residents. They are those who are socially, environmentally, or economically affected (favorably or unfavorably) by the firm's activities (GRI Standards, 2016). Tourism destinations in communities may have provided opportunities for local people to generate income and acquire jobs. However, it also exposes them to environmental pressure, such as pollution, waste, and overexploitation of natural resources. More so, tourism brings about social impacts related to disproportionate wealth distribution, risks for new forms of abuse, and negative influence on moral values in the community due to monetary benefits (Battaglia, 2017; Archer, Cooper, & Ruhanen, 2005). Where possible, sustainable tourism exemplified at the organizational level should foresee and circumvent unfavorable impacts on local communities.

The aim, therefore, of any tourism organization should be to improve the standard of living of local communities and at the same time, uphold the wellbeing of their current and forthcoming generations (Fong & Lo, 2015). In a similar note, Murphy and Murphy (2007) asserted that developing sustainable tourism is coherent with improving the quality of life in communities by capacitating local people in the management and

use of cultural and natural assets to provide satisfactory experience among visitors. Thus, the impact of a firm's activities on society and the wellbeing of the local people and communities reflect the extent of its social responsibilities (Elkington, 2004). Among the organizations' social considerations include community relationships, altruistic partnerships, ethics in the workplace, the advancement of employee health and safety, and social justice (Simpson & Radford, 2014).

Social equality is achieved when there is a prevalent and just allocation of social and economic benefits from tourism all over the society, plus expanding opportunities, services, and the income available to the disadvantaged members of the community (UNEP /WTO, 2005). The tourism industry is well-positioned to help the poor, primarily because it is a highly labor-concentrated industry with several related enterprises whose activities are usually engaged within communities. Besides, tourism activities encourage interaction between people, which can boost their dignity and self-esteem.

Empirical studies have also shown that the empowerment and engagement of people in communities in crafting plans and in making decisions about tourism development and management in their area are critical elements in attaining sustainability in rural tourism development (Fong & Lo, 2015). Planning and implementation of tourism projects that require direct participation of local communities have higher chances of becoming sustainable and prosperous in providing benefits to the local people over time (UNEP /WTO, 2005).

The pursuit of sustainability also entails practices which are favorable and fair to employees (Zak, 2015). She further added that

companies have responsibilities to uphold the values of honesty and fairness in employer-employee relationships, create a safe and conducive work environment, ensure reasonable employment contracts, or adequate support for employee development. All of these are critical in ensuring employee's satisfaction that results in the retention of the best and highly competent employees that help the company prosper in a very competitive environment.

The third pillar of sustainable tourism talks about resource efficiency, environmental protection, and climate change (UNWTO, 2018). It is essential that the natural endowments and the environment, in general, must be regarded as the center of gravitational pull. Hence, when nature stops providing the natural glamour which pleases the tourist, the orbit of tourism derails and becomes irreversible. It is not a remote possibility if tourism activities remain environmentally exploitative.

Environmental responsibility is a critical issue in the tourism sector. It is manifested through the firm's efforts towards sustainable environmental protection practices. These efforts may include recycling and waste segregation, the use of proper substances and materials, and installing plants and filters for sewage treatment (Zak, 2015). As pointed out, Kasil (2013), "if an organization gives the people jobs so that they have money to live, it should not, at the same time, destroy or degrade the environment in which they have to live" (p 98).

Proper management and use of the natural environment guarantee a constant source of tourism revenues into the future. Excessive use and the number of visitors accommodated, particularly

during peak seasons, can destroy a destination and diminish its worth. The situation, in turn, may result in reduced visitor fulfillment with tourism activities and products and, therefore, lessen tourist's desire to visit specific destinations (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2011). As cited by Razovic (2013), sustainable tourism is based on utilizing energy efficiently, primarily those from renewable sources, followed by reducing water consumption and waste, protecting biodiversity, preserving traditional values and cultural heritage, and respecting intercultural differences. These factors can be summarized into two categories, namely, physical integrity and resource efficiency.

Physical integrity is achieved when the quality of landscapes is enhanced and maintained, and the degradation of the environment is avoided (UNEP /WTO, 2005). This is exceptionally essential for lasting progress of the tourism industry as the physical appeal of destinations is a crucial component of their attraction to tourists.

Moreover, specific policies are necessary to uphold the attractiveness and integrity of tourism sites. Controlling intrusive new development, structures, and practices that will harm natural landscapes as well as maintaining an optimal amount of open area and tree cover could help preserve the appeal of tourist destinations.

A company's environmental responsibilities are, therefore, focused on its ecological activities that include conserving the natural environment, minimizing the company's ecological footprint, and decreasing the consumption of nonrenewable resources, among others (Bansal, 2005). Of particular concern are those nonrenewable resources that are limited in supply, or important to support life. Tourism, being a

significant user of resources should ensure that resources are utilized efficiently to conserve global resources for the welfare of the host community and the local environment. Efficient resource utilization in tourism will be primarily attained by modifying the consumption behavior and practices of tourists and tourism enterprises (UNEP /WTO, 2005).

Among the resources commonly used by tourism, enterprises are energy and water. For a few organizations, electricity is the only main form of energy they utilize. According to Kumar (2014), energy consumption directly affects the firm's cost of operations and increases exposure to variation of energy supply and prices. The firm's decision on what source of energy to use will significantly shape its environmental footprint.

With more excellent knowledge of the effect of energy consumption on the environment and the tourist destination's sustainable growth, firms have designed preventive strategies on energy management in tourism (Kelly & Williams, 2007). These strategies may include using natural heat, light, and ventilation, applying layouts and materials with good insulation for tourism facilities, employing energy-efficient equipment, generating and exploiting renewable sources of energy by tourism enterprises, and; encouraging tourists to be conscientious in utilizing energy.

Studies conducted on sustainability in the local setting had been very few, and none so far had focused on adventure tourism enterprises. The study of Ong, Storey, and Minnery (2011) examines the dynamic growth of coastal tourism development and sustainability practices in

Boracay, inclusive of broader socio-economic and cultural change and impact. They postulated that the theory of environmental sustainability must be extended beyond visual cleanliness as several initiatives have led primarily to the enhancement of the "visual environment." They also found out that more efforts are still needed on social and cultural sustainability.

Varona (2016) studied the perception of residents on tourism development and the sustainability of San Juan, Batangas. Data revealed that residents have a high perception of the sustainability of their communities' tourism development. Moreover, the study of Guevarra and Rodriguez (2015) showed that the sustainability of the homestay tourism program in Sariaya, a municipality in Southern Luzon, is reliant on the accomplishment of socio-cultural and economic objectives. They further stated that strong coordination among the stakeholders is essential to attain sustainability.

The fourth pillar for sustainable tourism puts a premium on cultural values, diversity, and heritage (UNWTO, 2018). The fourth pillar sees tourism as healthy and equal encounters between and among culture, values, differences, and people. It dissuades the commodification of resources and people, bias, and disrespect of heritage. If taken seriously, adventure tourism becomes the platform that fosters camaraderie between locals and tourists. Likewise, it must become the enablers of inter-cultural harmony amidst diversity.

The fifth pillar for sustainable tourism showcased the importance of mutual understanding, peace, and security (UNWTO, 2018). The interplay between tourism and peace cannot be compromised. Travelers

would generally shy away from conflict zones; hence, if tourism destinations harbor conflicts, crowded destinations will become empty spaces. On the other hand, tranquil destinations lured adventurers to congregate. Their presence provides opportunities for dialogues, fostering friendship, and collaborations. Hence, peace and tourism are essential ingredients in the equation of progress and development.

In its entirety, it cannot be denied that adventure tourism is now gaining spotlight and is heading towards its flying zone. In the local context, it drives profit-seeking institutions and persons to create new destinations to amass wealth out from the pocket of outdoor and adventurous guests. Much of the concentrations are into site development or enhancement. However, these activities only consider the glitters of money as its guiding star. At present, there is no data to support that a study was ever conducted to mainstream the five pillars of sustainable tourism into the heart of the operations of adventure tourism in Bohol.

Methodology

The researchers employed quantitative and qualitative methods of research to get the needed information for this study. For the first method, secondary data was extracted from the official website of the province of Bohol. On the other hand, the honest assessments of the respondents were resorted to by the researchers as the source of information for the qualitative data.

To determine if adventure tourism establishments in the province of Bohol embraced sustainability, the researcher covered two institutions (one run by a local government unit, while a private firm

manages the other). Primary data needed for this study were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire coupled with unstructured interviews among some of the respondents to clarify their responses or answer their queries regarding certain aspects of the questionnaire. The question items were primarily based on Sustainable Tourism: Guide for Policy Makers, which was issued by UNEP and WTO in 2005. This instrument was formulated to assess the extent of sustainable business practices employed by adventure tourism enterprises. It had five (5) dimensions, namely; sustainable economic growth, social inclusiveness, employment and poverty reduction, resource efficiency, environmental protection, and climate change, cultural values, diver and heritage, mutual understanding, peace, and security.

Each dimension was composed of several indicators. Corresponding to each indicator were qualitative scales that correspond to the following interpretations.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
4	Great Extent (GE)
3	Moderate Extent (ME)
2	Less Extent (LE)
1	Not Practiced (NP)

To arrive at a definite interpretation of the scale, the following hypothetical mean range with corresponding meaning was used:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
3.26 – 4.00	Great Extent (GE)	which means that the sustainable business dimension stated is practiced by the enterprise in all cases.

2.51 – 3.25	Moderate Extent (ME)	which means that the sustainable business dimension stated is practiced by the enterprise in majority of the cases.
1.76 – 2.50	Less Extent (LE)	which means that the sustainable business dimension stated is practiced by the enterprise in some of the cases.
1.00 – 1.75	Not Practiced (NP)	which means that the sustainable business dimension stated is not practiced by the enterprise at all.

T-test was used to determine whether there exists a significant difference on the assessments made between the two groups of respondents (management staff versus rank and file), and to give credence to the null hypotheses, to wit;

1. There is no significant difference on the assessment made by the management staff and rank-and-file employees on the extent to which business practices were manifested among the selected adventure tourism enterprises in Bohol in terms of the following dimensions:

- 1.1. economic;

- 1.2. social; and

- 1.3. environmental.

2. There is no significant difference in the extent to which business practices are manifested between the two selected adventure tourism enterprises in Bohol in terms of the abovementioned parameters.

T-test Formula

$$t = \frac{|\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2|}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_2} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_1}}}$$

where:

t = t-value

\bar{X}_1 = mean of first group

\bar{X}_2 = mean of second group

s^2_1 = standard deviation of first group

s^2_2 = standard deviation of second group

n_1 = number of respondents of the first group

n_2 = number of respondents of the second group

Research Respondents

Two groups of respondents were included in this study: the management staff and the rank-and-file employees. These groups of respondents were directly related to the operations of the adventure tourism enterprise and, therefore, could provide the necessary data for this study.

Research Protocol

Before data was collected, a consent to undertake the study was sought by the research proponents from the Mayor of LGU-Danao and Managing Director of Chocolate Hills Adventure Park (CHAP) in Carmen, Bohol where the selected adventure tourism enterprises are located. After the approval, the proponents administered the questionnaires. Attached to the copy of the questionnaires were the permission letter

Table 2. Sampling Distribution

Job Position	Privately-owned Park			LGU-Managed Park			Total
	Population	Sample	%	Population	Sample	%	
Management Staff	4	4	100 %	5	5	100 %	9
Rank-and File							
Adventure Specialists	21	21	100 %	22	22	100 %	43
Eco – Guide	7	7	100 %	26	26	100 %	33
Park keeper/ Maintenance	5	4	80%	18	14	78 %	18
Sales and marketing	2	2	100 %	1	1	100 %	3
Accounting/Cashier	1	1	100 %	1	1	100 %	2
Kitchen and Dining Staff				5	5	100 %	5
Eco-park Guard				1	1	100 %	1
Front Office Staff				3	3	100 %	3
Subtotal	36	35	97%	77	73	95 %	108
Grand Total	40	39	97.5 %	82	78	95 %	117

and the explanation letter for each set of questions. Likewise, the researchers were present while the respondents answer the questionnaire so they could assist and clarify any concerns that would arise.

Results

Sustainable Economic Growth

Table 3 presents the extent of manifestation of business practices among adventure tourism enterprises in Bohol in terms of sustainable economic growth. The weighted mean ($\mu=3.67$) obtained from the responses of the management staff and rank and file employees of both Private-owned and LGU-managed parks indicated that these establishments manifested practices that support sustainable economic growth.

Identifying potential visitors who would provide long-term business transactions ($\mu=3.64$) was manifested to a great extent by both companies.

The result reflects the intensive marketing and promotional activities conducted by these tourism adventure enterprises not only to attract more tourists but also to establish linkages with institutional clients who would provide lasting business engagements with them (Interview, 2018). Moreover, obtaining information as to what their visitors are looking for ($\mu=3.77$) and adapting to new trends and tastes of current guests ($\mu=3.54$) were highly manifested among adventure tourism enterprises. The results confirm practices adopted by both companies. It includes the conduct of monthly profiling of visitors who frequented the destination and getting their feedback regarding their

Table 3. Sustainable Economic Growth n=117

Indicators	Privately-owned Park				LGU-managed Park				Item Average	Description
	Management Staff		Rank and File		Management Staff		Rank and File			
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description		
1. Identifies potential visitors and tourists who would provide long-term business transactions.	3.50	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.47	Great Extent	3.64	Great Extent
2. Obtains information as to what potential visitors/tourists are looking for.	4.00	Great Extent	3.63	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.63	Great Extent	3.77	Great Extent
3. Adapts to new trends changes, travel patterns and tastes of existing markets (visitors/tourists).	3.50	Great Extent	3.47	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.58	Great Extent	3.54	Great Extent
4. Provides visitor experience that meets or exceeds expectations.	4.00	Great Extent	3.56	Great Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	3.62	Great Extent
5. Gives emphasis on the quality of each component of visitor/tourist experience including mechanisms for checking, identifying and improving it.	4.00	Great Extent	3.73	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.66	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent
FACTOR MEAN AND DESCRIPTION	3.80	Great Extent	3.64	Great Extent	3.68	Great Extent	3.57	Great Extent	3.67	Great Extent

overall adventure experience at the park. Information obtained from these activities helped them understand the needs and preferences of their existing guests and served as a basis in projecting potential visitors (Operations Manager 1, 2018).

Moreover, with a high manifestation of this factor by both adventure tourism enterprises, it can be inferred that they recognize the importance of coming up with a realistic market assessment to guide them in crafting competitive strategies for long-term economic growth. Critical to the long-term viability of firms are fulfilled tourists who revisit and invite others to experience the destination. As more visitors are inclined to try a variety of tourist spots and demand for better services or products, the ability of tourism enterprises to meet or exceed tourists' expectations is crucial in generating higher revenue. The respondents well understood this reality as providing a satisfactory experience for visitors ($\mu=3.62$), and giving importance to the quality of every part of visitor experience ($\mu=3.80$) were highly manifested by both companies.

Social Inclusiveness, Employment and Poverty Reduction

The decision-making process of the Private-owned park, being a private entity, was solely vested upon its owners, although it consults with its employees in cases when such decisions affect them (Operations Manager 1, Interviewee, 2018).

Adopting open recruitment policies and hiring local workers ($\mu=2.5$, $\mu=2.36$) as well as patronizing local services and products ($\mu=2.33$, $\mu=2.34$) was manifested by this entity to a less extent. The company is open to all qualified workers for as long as they pass the hiring and selection criteria set by the company, and they do not prioritize workers

Table 4. Social Inclusiveness, Employment, and Poverty Reduction n=117

Indicators	Private-owned Park				LGU-managed Park				Item Average	Description
	Management Staff	Rank	Mean	Description	Management Staff	Rank	Mean	Description		
1. Adopts open recruitment policies and hires workers in the community.	2.50	Less Extent	2.36	Less Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.02	Moderate Extent
2. Voluntarily sponsors activities for the health and social welfare of the people in the community.	2.33	Less Extent	2.78	Moderate Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.56	Great Extent	3.07	Moderate Extent
3. Patronizes locally based service providers and products.	2.33	Less Extent	2.34	Less Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.49	Great Extent	2.89	Moderate Extent
4. Provides opportunities for local residents to get involved in the decision making process about tourism in the community.	1.00	Not Practiced	2.39	Less Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	2.63	Moderate Extent
5. Provides jobs that are stable, permanent and fulltime.	3.25	Moderate Extent	3.49	Great Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent	3.08	Moderate Extent	3.26	Moderate Extent
6. Adopts working hours suitable for seasonal patterns and ensures seasonal workers to be hired each season.	4.00	Great Extent	3.43	Great Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent	3.23	Moderate Extent	3.47	Great Extent
7. Provides the best possible wages, benefits and conditions of work within the framework of government policies.	2.75	Moderate Extent	3.00	Moderate Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.12	Moderate Extent	3.17	Moderate Extent
8. Conducts training for skill development and enhancement.	3.00	Moderate Extent	3.63	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	3.44	Great Extent
9. Respects minimum age admission to employment or work.	3.75	Great Extent	3.56	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.42	Great Extent	3.58	Great Extent
10. Provides adequate safety and health standards and programs for employees.	3.50	Great Extent	3.54	Great Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.55	Great Extent	3.50	Great Extent
FACTOR MEAN AND DESCRIPTION	2.84	Moderate Extent	3.05	Moderate Extent	3.52	Great Extent	3.39	Great Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent

in the community. Similarly, services and products utilized in the park were ensured to be of good quality. They need not necessarily be sourced out within the community (Operations Manager, Interviewee, 2018).

The LGU-managed park, however, has manifested significantly ($\mu=3.60$, $\mu=3.45$) all the business practices that were intended to ensure community wellbeing as assessed by its employees. These results reflect the core of the company's advocacy, being an LGU-run community based eco-adventure project, that is to provide benefit to the municipality and its constituents. According to the Municipal Mayor (July 2018), the establishment of the park was a breakthrough that has indeed magnified the social services, infrastructure, peace and order and local employment of the municipality. Specifically, the income generated by the park gave way to exceptional social services that the people in the municipality are currently enjoying, such as free use of the ambulance, supplemental feeding, rural scholarship program, subsidized hospitalization, and free PhilHealth for the poor. Moreover, the community members were involved in the planning and implementation, thus giving them a sense of ownership and involvement in the park.

Respecting minimum age admission to employment ($\mu=3.58$) was significantly observed by the respondents. Both companies have a recruitment policy in place that explicitly requires them to hire applicants who are of legal age and capacity to do the job well. Likewise, the selected adventure tourism enterprises have provided ($\mu=3.50$) sufficient standards and programs on employees' safety and health.

Both companies implement specific programs that promote the health and safety of their employees, as these are critical given the nature of the activities offered in the park.

The private firm adopted working hours suitable for seasonal patterns and guarantees seasonal workers to be hired each season ($\mu=4.00$, $\mu=3.53$) as assessed by both the management staff and rank and file employees. It implemented a scheme wherein more workers were hired during peak season while fewer during off-peak. Consequently, more than 50% of its workforce were non-regular employees or termed as "on-call" staff (Mayor, 2018). This situation may have influenced the perception of the management staff that the company provided stable and permanent jobs for some workers ($\mu=3.25$) to a moderate extent only. The rank and file employees, however, who were mostly under a contractual employment status, felt that the company had given them stable, permanent, and full-time jobs ($\mu=3.49$) since most of them were re-hired each season. Moreover, the non-regular employment status of most of the workers may have limited its ability to provide the best possible wages and benefits to its workers. The assessment made by its employees reflects this practice to a moderate extent only ($\mu=2.75$, $\mu=3.0$).

Providing stable, permanent, and fulltime jobs ($\mu=3.20$, $\mu=3.08$) was practiced by a public firm to a moderate extent only. Per further interview (July 2018), only the management staff were regular employees of the company while the rest (rank and file), were all "casual" employees or those working under a job order status. These "casual" workers were mostly associated as supporters of the current LGU

officials and may be replaced once the officials' term of office expires. Accordingly, the management staff assessed that this firm had provided them the best compensation packages and a conducive work environment ($\mu=3.80$) while the rank and file employees perceived otherwise ($\mu=3.12$). This result reflects the amount and nature of the salary package that comes with their employment status.

Moreover, adopting working hours suitable for seasonal patterns and hiring seasonal workers each season ($\mu=3.20$, $\mu=3.23$) were manifested by the LGU-managed park to a moderate extent. Regardless of the season (peak or off-peak), the same number of workers were employed by the said entity (Mayor, 2018). Conducting training to develop and enhance employees' skills was ($\mu=3.60$, $\mu=3.51$). Regular training workshops for the front liners were conducted by the said company, which include personal hygiene of the guides, basic courtesy, appropriate way of assisting, and dealing with guests as well as safety measures during the rides. Although most of the front liners employed by this public firm were out of school youth and have not gone into formal education, much good feedback from tourists was received as to how well the activities were handled in the park (Operations Manager, Interviewee, 2018).

Resource Efficiency, Environmental Protection and Climate Change

Just like other businesses, efficient use of resources is expected to be observed in adventure tourism enterprises, most notably because they are taking advantage of the existing surroundings. The manifestation of resource efficiency as a business practice for the studied companies is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Resource Efficiency, Environmental Protection, and Climate Change n = 117

Indicators	Privately-managed Park				LGU-managed Park				Item Average	Description
	Management Staff		Rank and File		Management Staff		Rank and File			
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description		
1. Uses designs and materials for tourism facilities that maximize insulation and the use of natural heat and light.	2.75	Moderate Extent	3.31	Great Extent	2.60	Moderate Extent	3.25	Moderate Extent	2.98	Moderate Extent
2. Reuses and recycles water where possible.	2.00	Less Extent	1.81	Less Extent	2.80	Moderate Extent	2.43	Less Extent	2.26	Less Extent
3. Uses water and energy efficient technology.	4.00	Great Extent	3.16	Moderate Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent	2.86	Moderate Extent	3.31	Great Extent
4. Improves infrastructure and maintenance to reduce water and energy leakages.	4.00	Great Extent	3.68	Great Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent	3.16	Moderate Extent	3.51	Great Extent
5. Persuades visitors to be responsible in their use of water and energy.	3.33	Great Extent	3.74	Great Extent	4.00	Great Extent	3.63	Great Extent	3.68	Great Extent
6. Initiates proper treatment of waste and solid waste reduction program such as waste collection system, reduction in the use of bottled water and encouraging creativity in the reuse or recycling of waste.	4.00	Great Extent	3.50	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.42	Great Extent	3.63	Great Extent
FACTOR MEAN AND DESCRIPTION	3.35	Great Extent	3.20	Moderate Extent	3.23	Moderate Extent	3.13	Moderate Extent	3.23	Moderate Extent

Notably, both companies placed high regard in convincing tourists to exhibit responsible behavior in water and energy consumption ($\mu=3.68$). Conservation initiatives from the companies create awareness among visitors on efficient use of resources, encouraging support from visitors on resource conservation. Additionally, both companies observed proper treatment of waste and reliable waste reduction programs ($\mu=3.63$) such as waste collection system, reduced use of bottled water, and encourage creativity in the reuse or recycling of waste.

On the contrary, the use of designs and materials to maximize insulation was manifested to a moderate extent ($\mu=2.98$) by both companies. Also, the adventure tourism enterprises concerned gave less importance to reusing and recycling water ($\mu=2.26$) as an abundance of water resources is apparent in the area with rivers and streams traversing through the park. While the private firm was giving much consideration in advancing water and energy-efficient technology ($\mu=4.0$) as well as their proper upkeep and improvement ($\mu=4.0$, $\mu=3.68$), the public entity was perceived to have paid lesser attention to investing in resource-efficient technology ($\mu=3.20$, $\mu=2.86$) and proper maintenance and improvement of these facilities ($\mu=3.20$, $\mu=3.16$) as these practices were manifested by the latter to a moderate extent only.

Cultural Values, Diversity, and Heritage

The respondents perceived that the adventure tourism enterprises under study uphold the attractiveness of the natural and cultural environment ($\mu=3.64$), for this is an essential attribute of the park that contributes significantly to visitor fulfilment.

It is quite evident that for both enterprises, setting a limit for the

Table 6: Cultural Values, Diversity, and Heritage n=117

Indicators	Privately-managed Park					LGU-managed Park					Item Average	Description
	Management Staff		Rank and File		Management Staff	Rank and File		Mean	Description			
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description								
1. Upholds the attractiveness of the natural and cultural environment in the destination.	4.00	Great Extent	3.46	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.49	Great Extent	3.64	Great Extent	Great Extent	
2. Designs structures to be in harmony with the landscape and reflects traditional designs.	3.00	Moderate Extent	3.12	Moderate Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.44	Great Extent	3.29	Great Extent	Great Extent	
3. Minimizes physical impact of tourist activity by providing educational activity to tourists and developing codes of conduct.	4.00	Great Extent	3.56	Great Extent	3.80	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	3.72	Great Extent	Great Extent	
4. Controls intrusive new development and minimizes the impact of intrusive structures such as unsightly buildings and power lines.	3.25	Moderate Extent	2.97	Moderate Extent	3.00	Moderate Extent	3.18	Moderate Extent	3.10	Moderate Extent	Moderate Extent	
5. Sets an optimum number of visitors during peak season.	1.00	Not Practiced	2.26	Less Extent	2.20	Less Extent	2.48	Less Extent	1.99	Less Extent	Less Extent	
FACTOR MEAN AND DESCRIPTION	3.05	Moderate Extent	3.07	Moderate Extent	3.24	Moderate Extent	3.22	Moderate Extent	3.15	Moderate Extent	Moderate Extent	

visitors to be accommodated on peak seasons was practiced to a less extent ($\mu=1.99$). It is a safe practice considering that if the number of guests exceeded that of the carrying capacity of the resources being utilized, environmental destruction is on its way, and the outcome is irreversible.

For LGU-managed Park, it only sets a carrying capacity on its caving activity and declares a specified period for the cave to rest. Conversely, the private company accepts all tourists who visit the park and does not set a limit on any of its activities. Nonetheless, it is a flaw, a weakness of both enterprises. Hence, both companies endeavor to inculcate respect, codes of conduct, and provide tourists educational activities to minimize the physical impact of tourists in the park.

While the public entity manifested to a great extent the use of traditional designs of its structure that match the natural landscape ($\mu=3.60$, $\mu=3.44$), the private firm applied quality materials for its facilities and infrastructure with high consideration ($\mu=4.00$, $\mu=3.56$). The public firm, therefore, is perceived to be more concerned with aesthetic appearance rather than the quality of the buildings they construct. This observation could be attributed to the enormity of the damages on physical structures and facilities sustained by the said firm during the big quake that hit Bohol in 2013, which forced the company to shut down operations for almost a year.

In terms of controlling activities that will damage landscapes, the LGU is perceived to have given high emphasis on this endeavor ($\mu=4.00$, $\mu=3.39$) compared to its private counterpart wherein such activity is viewed to be manifested by the latter to a moderate extent

only ($\mu=3.00$, $\mu=3.12$). Despite the differences, both companies were perceived to pay lesser consideration in controlling intrusive new development and structures ($\mu=3.10$) as this practice is manifested to a moderate extent. If not adequately addressed, this may lessen the natural beauty of the park, which is a crucial component of its attraction to tourists.

Mutual Understanding, Peace, and Security

The operations manager of the private firm claimed that the aspect of social responsibility, especially in the conduct of activities that would benefit the community, was something that they still need to regularly and extensively implement (Operations Manager, Interviewee, 2018). In particular; training and education for underprivileged members of the community were not provided by the company except training conducted for their rank and file employees. The same is true in providing opportunities for residents to be involved in the decision-making process ($\mu=1.0$), which was not practiced at all by the company as assessed by its management staff. The decision-making process of the private entity was solely vested upon its owners, although it consults with its employees in cases when such decisions affect them (Interview, 2018).

On the other hand, voluntary sponsorship of activities for the health and social welfare of the people in the community was perceived to be manifested to a less extent only ($\mu=2.33$) by the management staff of the private firm but perceived to be manifested to a moderate extent ($\mu=2.78$) by its rank and file employees. These differing perceptions resulted from irregular and infrequent conduct of health and social

Table 7. Mutual Understanding, Peace, and Security n=117

Indicators	Privately-managed Park				LGU-managed Park				Item Average	Description
	Management Staff		Rank and File		Management Staff		Rank and File			
	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description	Mean	Description		
1. Provides education and training relevant and accessible to the poor in the community.	1.00	Not Practiced	1.93	Less Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.27	Great Extent	2.45	Less Extent
2. Patronizes locally based service providers and products.	2.33	Less Extent	2.34	Less Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.49	Great Extent	2.89	Moderate Extent
3. Provides opportunities for local residents to get involved in the decision making process about tourism in the community.	1.00	Not Practiced	2.39	Less Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	2.63	Moderate Extent
4. Ensures safety and security of visitors in the destination.	4.00	Great Extent	3.89	Great Extent	3.40	Great Extent	3.71	Great Extent	3.75	Great Extent
5. Establishes clear procedures for registering and handling visitors' complaints and for solving problems that they have encountered.	3.50	Great Extent	3.57	Great Extent	3.60	Great Extent	3.58	Great Extent	3.56	Great Extent
FACTOR MEAN AND DESCRIPTION	2.37	Moderate Extent	2.82	Moderate Extent	3.52	Great Extent	3.51	Great Extent	3.06	Moderate Extent

welfare activities by the firm. Some of these activities include sponsorship of meals for doctors during medical missions initiated by OFWs in Canada and modest donations to patient-beneficiaries, which happened only twice in the last five years. The said firm also distributes grocery items during the Christmas season to twelve (12) selected households who live outside the vicinity of the park and gives out free school supplies to selected elementary students in the locality before the start of classes in June (Local Chief Executive, Interviewee, 2018). These activities were mere dole-outs, which may not have a significant impact on uplifting the quality of life among residents. A comprehensive and useful social responsibility program of firms entails a sizeable amount of investment to implement, which may also be the reason why private entities are not so fully inclined to conduct this kind of activity.

The public firm, however, has manifested significantly ($\mu=3.60$, $\mu=3.45$) all the business practices that were intended to ensure community wellbeing as assessed by its employees. These results reflect the core of the company's advocacy, being an LGU-run community based eco-adventure project, that is to provide benefit to the municipality and its constituents.

According to the Municipal Mayor (Hon. Natividad R. Gonzaga, Local Chief Executive of Danao, Interviewee, 2018) the establishment of the park was a breakthrough that has indeed magnified the social services, infrastructure, peace and order and local employment of the municipality. Specifically, the income generated by the park gave way to exceptional social services that the people in the municipality are currently enjoying, such as free use of the ambulance, supplemental

feeding, rural scholarship program, subsidized hospitalization, and free PhilHealth for the poor. Moreover, empowering the community through their involvement in the planning and implementation heightened their inclusion and sense of ownership.

The contrasting views regarding the genuine altruism of the public firm compared to the haphazard altruistic behavior of the private firm emanates from the purpose of the existence of these firms. Though private firms, in general, have varying degrees of expressing their respective corporate social responsibility, the cross-sectional analysis would provide a more unobstructed view that profit must not be compromised in exchange for charity. This is not true for a public firm whose primary mandate is to promote equity unless otherwise moved by personal political whims.

Conclusion

The selected adventure tourism enterprises differ in the extent of implementing sustainable practices in their business operations and did not necessarily reflect a balanced or harmonized implementation of mantra espoused under the five pillars of sustainable tourism.

If the existing practices remain as such, the future of the adventure tourism in Bohol will head towards the road to perdition. For the privately-managed park, the absence of a holistic approach in embracing the concept of sustainable economic growth will soon take its toll upon the entire operation of the firm. The hazy practices of exclusiveness will diminish community sympathy and empathy. The absence of a robust mechanism in protecting the environment will yield enormous business consequences, especially when mother earth demands reparations. The non-institutionalization of engaging the

community and setting them aside as bystanders will later on breed animosity and indifference, thus igniting havoc. The same realities will hound the public firm as well.

Hence, collective efforts must be made by all stakeholders in addressing the vital call set forth under the five pillars of sustainable tourism.

References

- "Adventure Tourism" (nd). Retrieved from <https://tourismnotes.com/adventure-tourism/>
Accessed on 13 October 2019.
- Archer, B., Cooper, C., & Ruhanen, L. (2005). The Positive and Negative Impacts of Tourism. In W. F. Theobald, *Global Tourism* (pp. 79-102). Elsevier Inc.
- Bailey, E., & Richardson, R. (2010). A New Economic Framework for Tourism Decision Making. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(4), 367-376.
- Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving Sustainably: a Longitudinal Study of Corporate Sustainable Development. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(3), 197-218.
- Battaglia, M. (2017). Sustainability in the Tourism Business. *Special Issue of Global Tourism Management*, 122-134.
- Bernini, C., Urbinati, E., & Vici, L. (2015). Visitor Expectations and Perceptions of Sustainability in a Mass Tourism Destination. *3rd International Scientific Conference Tourism in Southern and Eastern Europe*.
- Dorin-Paul, B. (2013). Sustainable Tourism and Its Forms-A Theoretical Approach. *Economic Science Series*.
- Elkington, J. (2004). "Enter the Triple Bottom Line." In A. Henriques, & J. Richardson, *The Triple Bottom Line, Does it All Add Up? Assessing the Sustainability of Business and CSR* (pp. 1-16). London: Earthscan Publications.

- Fong, S.-F., & Lo, M.-C. (2014). Community Involvement and Sustainable Rural Tourism Development: Perspectives from the Local Communities. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 125-146.
- Gjerde, K. P., & Hughes, S. B. (2007, January 1). Tracking Performance: When Less is More. *Scholarship and Professional Work - Business*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Goeldner, C. R., & Ritchie, J. B. (2011). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. Singapore: Wiley.
- Guevarra, S., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2015). Homestay and Tourism in a Philippine Municipality: A Conceptual Framework for Sustainability. *Social Science Diliman*, 11(1), 24-47.
- GRI Standards. (2016). *Consolidated Set of GRI Sustainability Reporting Standards*. Global Sustainability Standards Board. Retrieved from <https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/media/1036/gri-101-foundation-2016.pdf>. Accessed on 17 June 2018.
- Hindle T., 2008, *Guide to Management Ideas and Gurus*. London: Profile Books.
- Jonker, J., Reichel, J., & Rudnicka, A. (2013). *New Horizons: A Guide to Social Responsibility and Sustainable Development*. Lodz, Poland: Center for Strategy and Development Impact.
- Kelly, J., & Williams, P. W. (2007). Modelling Tourism Destination Energy Consumption and Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Whistler, British Columbia, Canada. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 67-90.
- Kisil, A. (2013). *Management by Responsibility. The Basis of Responsible Business*. Warsaw: Difin.
- Kumar, K. (2014). Sustainability Performance Measurement: An Investigation Into Corporate Performance Through Environmental Indicators. *International Journal of Management Research and Review*, 4(2), 192-206.
- Murphy, P. E., & Murphy, A. E. (2007). *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities: Bridging the Gap*. Clevedon, Buffalo; Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Ong, L. T., Storey, D., & Minnery, J. (2011). Beyond the Beach: Balancing

Environmental and Socio-cultural Sustainability in Boracay, the Philippines. *Tourism Geographies*, 13(4), 549-569.

- Perrini, F., & Tencati, A. (2006). Sustainability and Stakeholder Management: The Need for New Corporate Performance Evaluation and Reporting Systems. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15, 296-308.
- Post, J. E., Preston, L. E., & Sachs, S. (2002). Managing the Extended Enterprise: The New Stakeholder View. *California Management Review*, 45(1), 6-28.
- Razovic, M. (2013). Sustainable Development and Level of Satisfaction of Tourists with Elements of Tourist Offer of Destination. *Tourism in Southern and Eastern Europe*, 371-385.
- Reichel J., & Oczyp P. (Eds.) (2011). *Jak uczyć o społecznej odpowiedzialności i zrównoważonym rozwoju. Podręcznik dla nauczycieli*. Retrieved from <http://odpowiedzialnybiznes.pl/public/files/Jak%20uczyc%20o%20CSR.pdf>. Accessed on 17 June 2018.
- Savitz A.W., Weber K., 2006, *The Triple Bottom Line: How Today's Best-Run Companies Are Achieving Economic, Social, and Environmental Success – and How You Can Too*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schianetz, K., Kavanagh, L., & Lockington, D. (2007). The Learning Tourism Destination: The potential of a learning organisation approach for improving the sustainability of tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1485-1496.
- Simpson, B. J., & Radford, S. K. (2014). Situational Variables and Sustainability in Multi- Attribute Decision-Making. *European Journal of Marketing*, 48(5).
- Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The Triple Bottom Line: What is It and How Does it Work. *Indiana Business Review*.
- Stoddard, J. E., Carol E. & Pollard, M. R. (2012). The Triple Bottom Line: A Framework for Sustainable Tourism Development. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 13(3), 233-258.
- Timur, S., & Getz, D. (2009). Sustainable Tourism Development: How Do Destination Stakeholders Perceive Sustainable Urban Tourism. *Sustainable Development*, 17, 220-232.

- UNEP/WTO. (2005). *Making Tourism More Sustainable: A Guide for Policy Makers*. United Nations Environment Programme and World Tourism Organization. Retrieved from <http://www.unep.fr/shared/publications/pdf/dtix0592xpa-tourismpolicyen.pdf>. Accessed on 13 June 2018.
- Varona, A. (2016). Understanding Local Residents' Perceptions on Tourism. Development and Sustainability of San Juan, Batangas, Philippines. *De La Salle Lipa Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1), 56-71.
- Wicker, J. (2017). What is adventure tourism? Retrieved from <https://headrushtech.com/blogs/what-is-adventure-tourism/> Accessed on 30 September 2019.
- World Tourism Organization (2018). *Tourism for Development – Volume 1: Key Areas for Action*, UNWTO, Madrid. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284419722>.
- Žak, A. (2015). Triple Bottom Line Concept in Theory and Practice. *Research Papers of Wrocław University of Economics*.