

REC 3033 Commercial Recreation and Tourism

Class Week 13

Boycotts Purposes and Motivations

- Friedman (1999) identifies two main purposes for boycotts
 - Instrumental--aims to coerce the target to change a disputed policy. Goals are often stated in precise and measurable ways, such as the lowering of prices, or the signing of union contracts for workers.
 - Expressive--are a more generalized form of protest that communicates consumers' displeasure with the actions of the target. Typically, this form of protest is characterized by a vague statement of goals and may simply vent the frustrations of the protesting group.
- Personal motivations for participation include the above two purposes and a third possible motivation from Smith (1990):
 - "Hands Clean"--consumers may participate in order to feel good about themselves and avoid guilt

Boycotts

- Boycotts can serve as a form of social control of business and as a mechanism for promoting corporate social responsibility
- But boycotts have the potential to be socially harmful, e.g., resulting in less environmentally friendly option

Garrett (1987) hypothesized six factors in boycott participation

- 1) the awareness of consumers;
- 2) the values of potential consumer participants
- 3) the consistency of boycott goals with participant attitudes
- 4) the cost of participation
- 5) social pressure
- 6) the credibility of the boycott leadership.

Examples of Operationalizing Motivations

Table 1: Motivations for Boycott Participation

Expressive
I want to express my anger at Nestlé
I want to punish Nestlé
Instrumental
I think that I should use my boycott decisions to voice my opinion
It is important to try to stop the sale of infant formula to poor countries
By participating in this boycott I will help put pressure on Nestlé to change its policies
'Clean Hands'
I would feel guilty if I bought a Nestlé product
Buying Brand X instead of Nestlé would make me feel good
It would make me feel bad if other people saw me eating a Nestlé product

Results from Exploratory Study

Exploring Motivations for Participation in a Consumer Boycott (2001). Working Paper.

Bill G. Klein and Andrew John, INSEAD, France N. Craig Smith, London Business School, U.K.
[http://scholar.google.com/ur?sa=U&q=http://forum.london.edu/lbsfacpubs.nsf/\(httpPublications\)/4DE765129B6DC27380256AF700373143/%24file/01-701.pdf](http://scholar.google.com/ur?sa=U&q=http://forum.london.edu/lbsfacpubs.nsf/(httpPublications)/4DE765129B6DC27380256AF700373143/%24file/01-701.pdf)

- People differ in their reasons for participating in a boycott and that most individuals have mixed motivations for their participation.
- Instrumental motivations were found to predominate among the reasons that subjects said would lead them to participate in the boycott, but clean hands motivations were also common.
- About half of the sample indicated that they would boycott to express anger or to punish Nestlé.
- Opinions about egregiousness of action were highly predictive of boycott intention, actual participation, and brand image.

Survival launches Botswana boycott

Survival International launched a boycott of Botswana in March at the world's largest tourism fair, ITB (Internationale Tourismus-Börse) Berlin. Supporters of the Gana and Gwi Bushmen gave out leaflets outside the fair asking people not to go on holiday to Botswana until the Bushmen are allowed to return to their land in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve and to hunt and gather freely.

Cynically, the Botswana government uses the Bushmen's hunter-gatherer way of life to promote the country to tourists. In fact, the Gana and Gwi were banned from hunting and gathering on their land in 2002, and Bushmen hunting to feed their families now face heavy fines, imprisonment or torture. Other key tourist destinations, such as the Tsodilo Hills, famous for ancient Bushman rock art, have also been emptied of the Bushmen who used to live there..

Survival's director Stephen Corry said today, "The Gana and Gwi are fighting for their very survival, languishing in eviction sites where they are falling victim to alcoholism, prostitution and HIV/AIDS. Please don't go on holiday to Botswana until they are allowed to go home, and write to the president to ask him to let this happen now."

Readers can contact President Festus Mogae by writing to the President's Office, Private Bag 001, Gaborone, Botswana. The telephone number is: +267 581 028 and the fax number is: +267 395 7800. For more information about Survival telephone 020 7687 8700 or check out www.survival-international.org

Burma Campaign Launches Tourism Boycott

Over 70 celebrities and politicians are backing a new public awareness campaign asking people not to holiday in Burma because of human rights concerns. The new campaign, "I'm Not Going", was launched on 1st February 2005. Prime Minister Tony Blair, Conservative leader Michael Howard, Liberal Democrat leader Charles Kennedy and other MPs and MEPs have signed a pledge not to holiday in Burma along with a long list of celebrities, including Anna Friel, Sir Ian McKellen and Joanna Lumley. The Burma Campaign UK is urging people to join them by signing a pledge not to visit Burma on holiday on a new website: www.innotgoing.com. Aung San Suu Kyi, Nobel Peace Prize winner and leader of Burma's democracy movement, has repeatedly asked tourists not to visit Burma. Nowhere else in the world have human rights abuses and tourism been so closely linked. Slave and child labour has been used to build tourist infrastructure such as hotels and roads. The regime says that tourism earns it \$100 million a year. "In Burma tourism doesn't help most ordinary people. Instead it finances the regime that keeps them poor and oppressed," says Yvette Mahon, director of the Burma Campaign UK. "Every tourist that visits Burma puts money into the hands of the regime. That is why Burma's democracy movement has asked tourists to stay away. Please respect their wishes, don't go." For more information contact: Burma Campaign UK, 28 Charles Sq, London N1 6HT. Or visit www.burmacampaign.org.uk

Morocco


a tourism boycott for Morocco's continued illegal occupation of Western Sahara (since 1978) and human rights abuses of the Saharawi people, including in 1999-2000 those aimed at preventing the successful progress of a UN referendum.

Contact: *Western Sahara Group, Oxford Chambers, Oxford Place, Leeds LS1 3AX, 0113 245 4786*

Morocco

a tourism boycott for Morocco's continued illegal occupation of Western Sahara (since 1978) and human rights abuses of the Saharawi people, including in 1999-2000 those aimed at preventing the successful progress of a UN referendum.

Contact: Western Sahara Group, Oxford Chambers, Oxford Place, Leeds LS1 3AX, 0113 245 4786



BOYCOTT CANADA a campaign by **respect for animals** [DONATE NOW](#)

NEARLY ONE MILLION SEAL RUPS HAVE BEEN CLUBBED OR SHOT TO DEATH OVER THE LAST THREE YEARS DURING THE ANNUAL CANADIAN SEAL SLAUGHTER

What you can do

Canada is distinctive of the international opposition to the cruel seal hunt – the largest and most barbaric marine mammal slaughter on the planet.

The Canadian government not only defends but also promotes this cruelty. Canada is also blatantly circumventing a European law (which it signed) that bans seal pup

The seals are used as ingredients for pharmaceuticals of fish stocks, a commercial "resource" and a political football.

Seal Product Import Bans

In 2006, the UK will allow the imports of seal products. In 2008 the trade was valued at over £100 million.

This seal of trade helps make the UK a state that is more in line with the people of Britain than the Government.

It's very important that the UK

Impact of outrage

Groups are considering a boycott of Hillsborough County after the gay pride controversy. Sometimes these movements are devastating. Sometimes they go virtually unnoticed.

By STEVE HUETTEL, Times Staff Writer
Published July 10, 2005

Ruth Crum didn't recognize the first sign of an economic turmoil about to strike his state's tourist industry.

The spokesman for Denver's convention and visitors bureau was in New York City when reporters started asking his office back home about the Bay Area Stripped's call to boycott Colorado as a protest against voters approving a statewide anti-gay rights amendment.

Don't call back and let the stars die over the weekend, Crum advised his staff.

"By Monday, they were all in my office. Dan Rather, NBC, ABC, McNeill, ..."

Within a year of the November 1992 election, when voters approved the amendment, Colorado lost 31 commercial worth \$18 million. That doesn't count groups in Colorado that voted on the state's anti-gay amendment.

Other communities have felt the sting when groups use economic responses to fight political battles. Black artists in Miami led a three-year boycott after



No surprises. No lies. That's the way it's done.

TUCSON REGION

State tourism boycott aims at moves against illegal entrants

Frederic Martine Jr.
Tucson, Arizona | Published: 07-25-2005

Most people don't realize it, but there is a boycott campaign against the state. It's called Boycott Arizona Now.

Organizers of the tourism boycott see it as a protest of the state's immigration initiatives, like Proposition 203, which requires new voters to prove citizenship. They believe that by pressuring one of Arizona's top industries, corporate leaders will pressure state politicians to cease legislative attacks against undocumented immigrants.

However, it's a good bet most state residents would argue the boycott is unnecessary.

Boycotts are a thing of the past,



1151 N. Oracle Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85724-1005

Friends of Animals is a Darien, Conn., animal rights group that supports no-kill animal shelters, promotes a vegetarian lifestyle and launched the Alaska tourism boycott.

One of their previous boycotts was successful in 1992, when then-Gov. Wally Hickel stopped a similar aerial program after just 15 days.

Even without the aid of the Internet, the governor's office was flooded with protest letters. Those letters and protests today, however, are not pushing Gov. Murkowski to do the same.

"I think the different governor made the difference, in that Walter Hickel was probably more sensitive to public pressure and public sentiment," Feral says.

The governor's office says it has received hundreds of thousands of mostly negative comments on the program. It's a program that allows specially licensed pilot-hunter teams to use airplanes to thin wolf packs. But this newest boycott has not deterred a resurgent Alaska tour industry.

"We actually saw a substantial increase in all aspects of our visitor arrivals this last summer," says Ron Peck, president of the Alaska Travel Industry Association.

Industry figures show that the state saw 1.45 million visitors last year, up 140,000 over the year before. And this year?

"Our businesses are already telling us that their advanced bookings for the same time, compared to last year, are up over last year," Peck says.

So why is this boycott seemingly not as effective as the 1992 version?

Conservation biologist scientist Rick Steiner says the boycott is having an effect. "There would have been more tourists coming here had the boycott not been in place, likely."

The travel industry says it is having some effect, as well—just not where it's intended. Peck says the businesses that are hurt the most are the smaller, environmentally sensitive outfits such as backcountry backpackers and eco-friendly guides. Those are the businesses that cater to the type of people most likely to support the boycott.

That's an irony not lost on the travel industry. "The people they're hurting are the people that they're most in tune with," Peck says.

Friends of Animals, undeterred, shrugs off accusations that they are in the Alaska issue for the money. "It's not about money," Feral says. "It's about a culture that needs to change, and people that need to get involved in taking back the power."

Although Defenders of Wildlife say they have seen an increase in donations since they got involved in the wolf-control debate, tax records for Friends of Animals show their donations are actually down since they started the boycott.

"Only Alaskans can change the politicians there," Feral says. "That burden is left to them. And what a pressure group like Friends of Animals is left doing is delivering retributions."

Those retributions include continuing a boycott of Alaska's No. 2 industry—a boycott meant to showcase their view that Alaska is no friend to animals.

Steiner says that, with the lackluster effect the tourism boycott is having on the predator-control program, other boycotts are being considered. He says he's been told that opponents of the aerial wolf hunt are thinking of boycotting other Alaska products, such as seafood, to get their point across.