

## case study

# *Sustainable Collaboration: The case of Green Destination Orlando*

By Amanda "AJ" Templeton and Alan Fyall

## Introduction

The competitive landscape for destinations has increased significantly in recent years with there being a profound need for clear differentiation in the marketplace (Naipaul et al., 2009). Many destinations have explored and adopted sustainable tourism as a competitive advantage, strategically placing them in a position to capitalize not only on tourism for the present but also for the future (Grimstad & Burgess, 2014; Todorovic, 2014). In particular, close attention has been directed to the environmental aspects of destinations, whether it be eco-friendly products, eco-tours, or other trends that can be housed under the wider umbrella of sustainability (Holleran, 2008; Walker & Hanson, 1998). The 'green' trend has not been overlooked at the destination level, with notable destinations such as Orlando, Florida, Portland, Oregon, and Vancouver, British Columbia, placing themselves at the forefront of being a 'green destination' (Eluxe, 2013; Fjelstul, 2014; Fjelstul & Fyall, 2014). Amendah and Park (2008) pose the statement that 'eco-tourist travel does not differ from previous tourism because both types of travel provide some personal gratification to the travelers' (p. 265). They go on to present the viewpoint that eco-travel, as an overall concept, refers to a sense of conserving and protecting the environment which is being visited. In academic literature, the term 'eco-tourism' most notably applies to nature-based locations. However, amongst the varying definitions of eco-tourism there is nothing that excludes large metropolitan/urban areas as being exempt from being seen as 'green destinations' (Amendah & Park, 2008; Holleran, 2008).

## Literature Review Sustainability

### *Sustainable Development*

Sustainable development is a concept that appeared in the 1970s and proceeded to gain momentum into the 1980s. It was pushed into the limelight as a result of the 1980 World Conservation Strategy, the first of its kind, international document on living resource conservation. The document was produced in collaboration between various public and private organizations, with the goal of targeting policy makers, conservationists, and practitioners towards the goals of "protection of ecological processes and life support systems, preservation of genetic

diversity and sustainable utilization of species and ecosystems" (IUCN, UNEP & WWF, 1980). It was later to be defined as 'the development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (Young & Dhanda, 2013, p.3). This definition was coined via a report by the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), aka the Brundtland Report. Between the report and strong support from the United Nations, the concept of sustainable development became globally accepted and endorsed (Weaver, 2006). Today, sustainable development "represents the attractive possibility of continuing economic development that does not unduly strain the earth's environmental, socio-cultural or economic carrying capacities" (Weaver, 2006, p 10).

At its foundation, sustainability is made up of three primary dimensions that encompass its holistic purpose. Often referred to as the "triple bottom line" the environmental, economic, and social dimensions represent various pieces of a whole that have been used to explore the holistic impacts of entrepreneurial activities across local communities and their surroundings (Barbieri, 2013). From these three dimensions researchers have offered expanded dimensions, all of which add a deeper understanding to the various layers that must come together for there to be true sustainable development (Sulewski, Kloczko-Gajewska, & Sroka, 2018). Srinivas (2015) discusses the "Triads of Sustainability" wherein there are seven key dimensions that define and drive sustainability and each of these seven consists of three key components, shown in Table 1. Srinivas (2015) notes that while there are overlaps and linkages each triad can't exist in isolation from the other triads. The challenge of sustainability is that the dimensions, be it three or seven, must be "converted into locale-specific procedures and working methodologies that will achieve the desired result – achieving sustainability" (Srinivas, 2015, n.p.).

### *Sustainable Tourism*

While sustainable development appeared in the 80s, it was not until the early 90s that 'sustainable tourism' came into its own (Weaver, 2006). Specific to tourism, sustainability has become an area of research that has gained traction in both academic writings and in industry. Tourism undoubtedly brings positive benefits to communities not only in the form of economic injections from direct and indirect revenues but also in its ability to promote cross-cultural understanding and as an incentive towards the preservation of a des-

---

**Amanda "AJ" Templeton** is affiliated with Southern Utah University.

**Alan Fyall** is affiliated with University of Central Florida.

---

**Table 1**

## Seven Triads of Sustainability

Key Dimension	Triad Components	Overriding Statement
Participation	Dialogue, Cooperation, Communication	Sustainability is about fostering participation.
Decision-Making	Consensus building, Public review and hearing, Awareness building	Sustainability is about inclusive decision making.
Partnership	Interdependence, Clustering, Networking	Sustainability is about strong partnerships.
Governance	Transparency, Efficiency, Accountability	Sustainability is about good local governance.
Knowledge and Information	Appropriateness, Timeliness, Accessibility	Sustainability is about managing knowledge and information.
Continual Improvement	Monitoring and evaluation, Feedback, Needs assessment	Sustainability is about ensuring continual improvement.
Lifestyle	Behavior, Values, Ethics	Sustainability is about creating good lifestyles.

Source: Srinivas, 2015, n.p.

tionation’s culture (Creaney & Niewiadomski, 2016; Luo, 2018). However, there are negative impacts that can’t be ignored such as degradation of ecological environment, stress put on natural resources as a result of increased demand, damage to cultural heritage, in which local traditions are marginalized and put at risk, and economic vulnerability in the forms of revenue leakages and seasonality, which impacts employment and can lead to ‘drought-deluge cycle (the induction of under-capacity and over-capacity time frames within the destination) (Carlsen & Butler, 2011; Creaney & Niewiadomski, 2016; Weaver, 2006). It is the negative impacts, specifically the negative environmental impacts, which have garnered attention and brought about the drive for sustainable tourism development. Thereby sustainable tourism should maximize the positive and minimize the negative impacts. Sustainable tourism development has been regarded as “the solution to protect the environmental resources, respect the local culture and social development, and ensure the long-term economic gain at an international level” (Luo, 2018, p. 2). Within the literature, it is nature-based destinations that receive lion’s share of the spotlight when discussing sustainable tourism development (Luo, 2018).

As tourism destinations, cities typically receive the greatest amount of tourism traffic, thus leaving a substantial environmental footprint (Miller et al., 2015). It should, therefore, be a natural progression for urban destinations to adopt a greener, more sustainable, approach to destination development. Some studies refer to this as an ‘emerging green tourism market’, while falling under the more general umbrella of sustainable tourism, other studies focus more on pro-environmental efforts such as energy efficiency, renewable energy, recycling, and the use of local products (Bergin-Seers & Mair, 2009; Laing & Frost, 2010). Scott and Cooper (2010, p.1177) differentiated sustainable urban tourism from urban tourism by stating that the former “uses sustainability related innovations to attract customers.”

It is generally agreed that stakeholder collaboration is crucial to the success of a destination implementing the steps necessary to be able to formally identify themselves as a “green urban destination” (Laing & Frost, 2010; Miller et al., 2015). It is only when all relevant stakeholders share goals that sustainability can be truly reached (Timur & Getz, 2009). One of the problems with sustainability and the traditional tourism model is that it is commonly imposed by outside forces with no consideration given to the wider, cumulative and longer-term impacts of tourism (Moscardo & Murphy, 2014). In order to be successful, the concept should stem from inside the community with all stakeholders contributing to the decision. Regardless of how sustainability is framed, there is a trend in the literature showing that it is crucial to have the participation of all stakeholders involved in tourism planning and development in order to realize truly sustainable destination development (Moscardo et al., 2013; Moscardo & Murphy, 2014; Park et al., 2008; Timur & Getz, 2009).

### Collaboration

In a destination context, collaboration happens when a ‘group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures to act or decide upon issues related to that domain’ (Wang & Pizam, 2011, p. 259). Jamal and Getz (1995) point out that cooperation, working together to some end, and collaboration, a process of joint decision making among key stakeholders of a problem area about the future of that area, while similar, have markedly different definitions within academic research. Some research alludes to the fact that collaborative partnerships with destination stakeholders can be an effective means to achieve a specific end goal (Park et al., 2008); all of this further reiterating that it is a key element to a destination’s growth and success.

Collaboration theory has been utilized across several disciplines,

including tourism planning, management and development, and even those studies involving sustainability and environmental problems (Graci, 2013). Zach and Racheria (2011, p.99) proposed a collaboration value model, arguing that collaboration requires “substantial investments in terms of financial and human resources, and managerial time and effort, which in turn build trust and commitment”. Baggio (2011) points out that there are two main parts to examining collaboration: the extent to which it is possible; under which conditions a collaborative effort can be most impactful. Although many theories help explain collaboration, this case study uses the strategic management and stakeholder theory approaches to underpin the examination of Green Destination Orlando.

### **Strategic Management Theory**

Strategic management is one of the foundation disciplines by which Wilson (2003) uses to discuss several underlying concepts of sustainable development, which includes stakeholder theory, as they relate to corporate sustainability. Corporate sustainability is the concept in which a corporation, or enterprise, incorporates sustainable development into its business model and works towards making its business activities consistent with this concept (Rastislav & Petra, 2016). This means that each business decision must strategically be made in order to reflect sustainability across the entire organization and stretching into the business alliances entered into. Rastislav and Petra (2016) noted that the implementation of carefully crafted rules and principles of sustainable development for a firm can have several benefits such as an increase economic and environmental efficiency of a technological process; mitigate the negative impacts on health, environment and property; produce a marketing element that can improve economic results and increase the attractiveness for potential investors.

Strategic management theory, under the umbrella of resource-based theories, serves to explain how organizations work to minimize external threats and maximize external opportunities through collaboration with others (Fyall et al., 2012). The resource-based view (RBV), commonly utilized in strategic management and marketing research, is based on the premise that a competitive advantage can come from the ownership of a valuable resource allowing for superior, or cheaper, performance than that of a competing firm (Flagestad & Hope, 2001; Grey & Woods, 1991). Strategic management theory itself is utilized commonly within business research and while generally it offers a high degree of generalizability and cumulative knowledge development, there is some criticism in terms of its purity (Kenworthy & Verbeke, 2015).

Strategic management theory has been presented as a way to assist in the understanding of collaboration through five key issues: 1) the formation of alliances; 2) the choice of governance structure; 3) the dynamic evolution of the alliances; 4) the performance of the alliances; and 5) the performance consequences for firms entering the alliances

(Gulati, 1998, p.293). In relation to the connection of strategic management to sustainability, Pricop (2012) notes that strategic management theory has yet to be influenced by socio-ecological trends that have become present in economic and other management sciences. However, Pricop points out that while there may not be a current existence of sustainable development strategy within strategic management theory, “nowadays, these factors have become extremely important, given the amplification of society expectations as regards to the corporatists’ responsibility” (p.105).

### **Stakeholder Theory**

Stakeholders can be defined as “the actors with an interest or stake in a common problem or issue and include all individuals, groups, or organizations, directly influenced by the actions others take to solve a problem” (Jamal and Stronza, 2009, p.173). Stakeholder theory, which falls under the umbrella of relationship-based theories, discusses the conclusion that organizations have a variety of stakeholder groups, and each of them operates with its individual goals and objectives. Stakeholder theory has been utilized in a variety of settings including health care, law, public policy and, recently, sustainable tourism development (Cordeiro & Tewari, 2015; Harrison & Wicks, 2013; Todrovic, 2014).

Sustainable tourism development is best achieved through the cooperation of all stakeholders, be it organizations, individuals from the local community, or the tourist consuming the tourism product (Todrovic, 2014). Fyall et al. (2012) present one view of stakeholder theory as having four distinct features: 1) a focus on managerial decision-making; 2) relationship between constituent stakeholder groups that affect and are affected by the decisions made; 3) the outcomes for the stakeholders and organization hinge, partly, on the relationships built; and 4) the interests of all groups involved must have an intrinsic value, with no one set of interests over-ruling others. Cordeiro and Tewari (2015), meanwhile, utilize stakeholder theory from a business environment perspective, specifically discussing the benefit for firms to be “green” and the impact of corporate social responsibility on a firm’s financial performance. The study finds a positive link between a firm’s financial performance and environmental investments, which ties in positively when discussing collaborative sustainability within destinations.

### **Background Study Setting**

This case focuses on Orlando, Florida. This destination has positioned itself as a prime destination to launch a green urban destination initiative with sustainability initiatives such as Drive Electric Orlando (DEO), a program that promotes electric vehicle usage within the hospitality sector and one that partners with the local chapter of U.S. Green Building Council, and Green Destination Orlando (GDO) (Fjelstul, 2014; Fjelstul & Fyall, 2014). The partnership with the U.S. Green Building Council has resulted in Orlando becoming home to

the first Gold LEED certified (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) NBA facility (Amway Center), and the largest LEED certified convention center in the world (Orange County Convention Center) (Visit Orlando, 2015). The Orange County Convention Center has put sustainability at its forefront. For example, in addition to the LEED certification, it is partially solar powered, has achieved recycling and international sustainability certifications, and records just under twenty-percent of the Florida Green Lodging designated properties are located in Greater Orlando (Visit Orlando, 2015). This case focuses specifically on Green Destination Orlando (GDO).

### Green Destination Orlando

GDO is a non-profit organization headquartered in Central Florida. GDO was formed in 2010, in partnership with the Orlando destination marketing organization, Visit Orlando, and the Central Florida chapter of US Green Building Council (USGBC) with the intent to help the hospitality community in Central Florida develop a sustainable future. It is a program that was designed to help properties make significant progress with their green building practices over time. It is not a one-time certification (Vedat, 2011). The mission of the organization changed course in 2014, in which the scope of the mission and vision was broadened to reflect a stance that encompassed all stakeholders within Central Florida (residents, businesses, and travelers). The more holistic view of the organization is reflected in its mission statement, "establish and promote Central Florida as the recognized premier Green Destination and community" (About GDO, 2015), and vision statement, "[towards a] total sustainable culture supporting healthy living, social responsibility, environmental stewardship and economic vitality" (About GDO, 2015). The Board of Directors is currently composed of eleven volunteer members, all of whom work for various organizations throughout the city of Orlando. GDO consists of approximately forty-five members and thirty-seven participants in the

organization, representing over fifty local businesses, in various industry sectors, throughout the Central Florida area. Figure 1 provides an illustration of the simplified framework developed based on the literature (Naipaul et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2013) and themes that emerged from analysis of the interview findings.

### Findings

Interviews with eight of the eleven GDO board members resulted in phases and themes presenting themselves in several areas.

#### Motivations

The motives for participating in an effort such as GDO are grouped into two broad categories: personal motivations and business motivations.

#### Personal Motivations

The interviews revealed that the majority of GDO board members were personally driven to be involved with GDO as a result of their own personal backgrounds, be it schooling and/or beliefs. Several respondents noted that: "[I] wanted to be involved with a like-minded organization," and Respondent 2 noted: "[I have] a personal interest in the environment and wanted to be part of a grass-roots initiative like this [Green Destination Orlando]." The driver for many of the individuals to participate in an organization such as Green Destination is intrinsic. This makes sense as currently all of the board members volunteer their time to GDO and as such must balance their professional responsibilities with those of being involved in GDO. When reviewing the background of both the board members and the general member/participant list, it was common to see a tie to sustainability, or 'green', practices in the professional jobs held by the members/participants.

Figure 1

### Framework for analysis of collaborative activities

(Naipaul et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2013)



**Table 2**

## Respondent Titles

Respondent #	Profession/Title/Background
1	Program manager/ LEED certification consultant
2	Program manager/Recycling
3	Director of Sustainability
4	President/USGBC member/LEED certification consultant
5	Sustainability Coordinator
6	Senior Account Advisor/Sustainability and Energy management
7	Program Coordinator/Environmental studies and Urban planning
8	Program Manager/Environmental Studies

Source: Author

### *Business Motivations*

When questioned as to what drives businesses to collaborate in an initiative such as GDO, a number of responses indicated that of market-ability and recognition that involvement with GDO could be beneficial to the business. "Sustainability is something business are becoming aware of and that consumers are making choices based on those factors," and "consumer interest in being environmentally friendly" quoted Respondents 6 and 8. Most of the participants interviewed found the motivating factors behind business participation to be positive, not all agreed, "It is all about marketability, and right now it [referring to sustainability] is the 'in trend'." Other responses indicated that businesses needed to see how "it will benefit them", while some participants felt that some businesses just want to feel as if "they are part of the community."

### *Process of Collaboration Formation*

During the interviews, GDO board members were asked several questions regarding their thoughts on the collaboration process. This included a discussion on the facilitating factors for collaboration, inhibiting factors for collaboration, the structure of the collaboration process itself, satisfaction with the collaboration process, and future of the collaboration process.

### *Facilitating Factors to Collaborative Success*

An overwhelming majority of the respondents voiced their belief that strong leadership was key to a successful collaborative activity and furthermore the need for 'vocal' leadership that would "push the agenda." A secondary key response was the belief that there must be "buy in" from the people involved, from the employee level of individual businesses to the passion of the people involved with GDO regardless of the level of involvement in the organization. One-on-one networking and the need for a dedicated board were other factors noted as being important to the collaborative success of the organization. Respondent 4 noted that government mandates for energy efficiency was a reason for collaboration to work, which concurs with

motivating factors such as knowledge sharing and learning.

### *Inhibiting Factors to Collaborative Success*

Several items emerged for discussion when participants were asked to voice their thoughts regarding those factors that could cause the collaboration to be unsuccessful. These inhibitors mirror some found in a study by Wang et al. (2013) who highlighted five key areas that inhibiting factors centered on: funding structure, governance, and politics, competition, insufficient resources, power imbalances, and heterogeneous target markets and products. One board member felt that a particular problem was the lack of partner fit. This was mirrored by another member who believed that competing goals could become an issue and hinder the success of the collaborative effort. Other responses focused on the interaction between the stakeholders, citing "lack of communication" and "disorganization" as potential problems. The ability to "not keep things active and fresh" and "being a movement and less cause driven" along with "relying on one industry" were also mentioned as possible factors that could inhibit a successful collaboration. Several respondents noted funding and resources as serious concern, linking this back to lack of "dedicated leadership." One respondent noted that "not sure there is enough leadership at the moment to continue, everyone cares and is passionate but there is no driving staff to focus on engaging private sector companies that have resources to help with funding, and reinventing thoughts on fundraising including going after grants."

### *Stages of Collaborative Process*

The board members were asked to discuss the stages that they went through in the collaboration process. This question received a variety of responses:

- "Formed the Board and then took on distinct projects, formalized into incorporated group, and formally need to become a non-profit and bring on a paid executive;"
- "Attended a meeting, determined if it [the organization] was a fit, and if there is a need;"

- “Organized a meeting, participated and account for meeting, find the right people, focus on one goal, and having fun.”
- “Momentum, re-group, strategic direction, report, and restructuring.”

Other responses were more generalized and included statements that just referred to need for “lower level involvement” or commonalities in goals. There seemed to be a variation in responses for this section of the interview and respondents either replied based on their own personal view or the view of the business.

### ***Satisfaction with Collaboration Process***

When asked how satisfied they were with the process to-date, there was a mixture of responses. Some respondents were very happy with how the organization was growing, even noting that things “are not moving fast enough but I’m just very excited.” Some respondents seemed pleased with how the collaboration process was moving forward, while others felt that there was “room for improvement”. When asked to elaborate Respondent 6 noted that they were “surprised with the lack of structure and not sure what direction the organization is going.” Another respondent voiced that they felt the organization was “floundering at finding a goal and was not sure what trying to accomplish” and “need for better collaboration.” Respondent 8 simply stated that they did not feel they had been with the organization long enough to have true opinion, but that everything “seemed to be doing well.”

### ***Future of Collaboration Process***

The transformation of an organization can lead to variety of different things such as an evolution of stronger partnerships, or the possible finalization of the collaboration project, however prior to this the collaborative steps must be evaluated to determine if changes should be made and benchmark against expectations (Wang & Xiang, 2007). The board members were asked about the future of the GDO and what they are hoping to see as the next step to benefit all stakeholders involved and promote Orlando as a green destination. Some respondents called for more relationship building, for example one member noted “with the county [i.e. Orange county] coming on board it would be great to get other affiliations like Visit Orlando or someone like them to see the benefit in a group like GDO. I think that the new path [regarding the new mission] has been successful and several businesses in Winter Park have completed the check-list, hopefully it can continue to spread onto other municipalities and use this test market as an example and push it [the new initiative] out.” Another respondent discussed the possibility of collaborating with GreenWorks Orlando and getting the local community more involved. Interestingly some members were much more specific in their hopes for the future and discussing specific initiatives that they would like to see GDO become involved with and promote. The majority of the respondents discussed in one way or another the need to promote GDO so that there was more awareness to the ‘story’ of

GDO and the opportunities it provides.

### ***Outcomes of Collaboration Activities***

The results of the collaboration were broken into two sub-categories, those results that have been seen by the respondents (notable outcomes) and those results that have not been seen but respondents hoped to see (unrealized outcomes).

#### ***Notable Outcomes***

There was an overall sense of positivity from the respondents regarding the outcomes that they have seen thus far as a result of collaboration of stakeholders within GDO. For example, several respondents noted the increase in awareness in sustainability practices both within local businesses and the community at large. It was also noted that the hoteliers have become more involved in open discussion and the collaborative efforts have allowed for the building of a fundamental base for the ‘workplace challenge’ (a new initiative being piloted by GDO members and participants with the partnership of the City of Orlando and City of Winter Park). The change in the mission was discussed as a positive outcome of the collaborative effort within GDO. Respondent 8 discussed how when the organization began the focus was solely on the I-drive businesses, mainly hospitality, and now the mission is more “business centered, and reaching residents and tourists alike.” This was brought up by another respondent who commented that “[I] thought the emphasis was on hotels and especially on I-drive and was happy to hear that the mission has expanded and there is still an emphasis on tourism but more opportunity to celebrate what Orlando is doing as a whole - that is going to be a common thread.”

#### ***Unrealized Outcomes***

The positive feedback received did not hinder some respondents from vocalizing their opinions on outcomes that they have not yet seen that they were hoping to see, while others were reserved in offering thoughts. Of common note was the concern in the lack of leadership, more so the lack of a person who can commit to the organization. When asked to elaborate, one respondent noted that with the members being volunteers, a paid person is needed to give GDO the focus and attention that is needed to further guide the mission and vision of the organization. In addition to the need for stronger leadership, one respondent noted that it would be beneficial to engage with “someone who has started a successful non-profit and have them talk with the GDO board regarding how it [their non-profit] got started, how it expanded, and share experiences.” Other comments were made during various interviews indicating that GDO needed to focus on gaining more exposure and ‘telling the story’, in order to gain more traction. One respondent said that they were “disappointed in the lack of participation at the end - considering that really don’t have a paid employee the progress is strong, working on fundraising would be helpful.”

## Summary

In light of the competitive arena for destinations the world over, this case study paper sheds light on the efforts of Orlando, Florida in seeking to differentiate itself as a green urban destination. Despite its considerable scale, the destination-wide efforts of GDO and its inclusive and holistic approach to sustainability appear well received with the collaborative dynamics of its stakeholders critical to its apparent success. Time will tell as to how effective it has been but the omens are good for the continued long-term development of the entire destination.

## Discussion Questions

This case study investigated the collaborative efforts of stakeholders promoting the sustainability of a given destination, specifically as a 'green destination'. When reviewing what motivates the stakeholders involved, Wang and Xiang (2007) discussed three motivating constructs: strategy oriented, transaction cost oriented, and learning oriented.

Based on the interviews it appears that the GDO stakeholders involved are primarily motivated for strategic purposes, be it to bring awareness to their business or develop their product portfolio in order to gain more consumers. The responses from the interviewees indicate that a certain amount of personal motivation is also a driving force to the process, suggesting that it is key to for an organization to select the appropriate personnel as a representative in the collaborative effort. This intrinsic motivation, or passion, could be key in the emergence of a leader for the organization.

When asked about the inhibiting factors to a collaborative process the responses gleaned followed the literature from previous studies, indicating that the collaboration will not be successful if the partners do not have the same goals, and do not effectively communicate (Naipaul et al., 2007). The lack of partner fit, however does not seem to be an issue with GDO, what does seem to be a potential problem is the lack of communication. Despite this the organization appears to be growing and, in the eyes of the board members, so far has been successful in its mission.

Based on the student's understanding of the case, each of the below questions ought to be addressed confidently in the general and specific context to collaboration and the collaborative dynamics of Green Destination Orlando.

- What is the role and dynamics of sustainability in the particular context of tourist destinations?
- What are the means by which destinations collaborate generally, and more specifically in the context of seeking to be a "green" destination?
- How does an understanding of strategic management and stakeholder theory provide a theoretical justification for the collaborative actions of Green Destination Orlando?
- How do the different motivations for participating in Green

Destination Orlando shape the future direction of the collaborative entity;

- What is the process of collaboration formation and how is each "stage" of formation influenced by personal and business motivations;
- How can communication can be enhanced with such a disparate collaborative organization such as Green Destination Orlando?
- What alternative forms of collaboration are possible a destination of your choice wishing to enhance its "green" competitiveness in the market?

## Analysis of Dilemma

Khazaei et al., (2015) found that advancements in stakeholder theory could be divided into themes: "...diversity and heterogeneity within traditionally defined stakeholder groups; engaging marginal and less powerful stakeholders; flexible strategies to account for changing stakeholder motivations; and more collaborative relationships between stakeholders" (p.1055). The change in the organizations' mission has moved GDO from focusing on sustainability in the tourism industry to moving towards the inclusion of the community as a whole, residents, tourists, and businesses. This changing direction of the organization could cause for the need to restructure and re-think the direction of the organization. However, positive feedback has happened, as the broadening of the mission and vision has provided the opportunity to collaborate with stakeholders that were previously not as vested in GDO, such as the cities of Orlando and Winter Park. The buy-in of these stakeholders could be a catalyst to expanding the awareness and recognition that GDO is seeking. The outcomes of the collaboration thus far seem to be focused in social capital building, with relationships being developed amongst stakeholders. It is possible that for GDO to gain the traction that it wishes it may need to find ways in which to offer strategy realization and organizational learning outcomes to its stakeholders. A board member alluded that businesses want to "see what is in it for them" and the ability to offer tangible outcomes may help to increase awareness to the importance of sustainability and begin to inspire the 'buy-in' that moves stakeholders from "being part of a movement to part of a cause."

## Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank all the members of Green Destination Orlando who shared their time and thoughts in the interview process associated with this study.

## References

- About GDO. Retrieved November 17, 2015, from [http://www.greendestination-orlando.org/#!about\\_us/csgz](http://www.greendestination-orlando.org/#!about_us/csgz).
- Amendah, E., & Park, J. (2008). Consumer involvement and psychological antecedents on eco-friendly destinations: Willingness to pay more. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 17(3-4), 262-283.

- Baggio, R. (2011). Collaboration and cooperation in a tourism destination: A network science approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 183-189.
- Barbieri, C. (2013). Assessing the sustainability of agritourism in the US: A comparison between agritourism and other farm entrepreneurial ventures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(2), 252-270.
- Bergin-Seers, S., & Mair, J. (2009). Emerging green tourists in Australia: Their behaviors and attitudes. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2), 109-119.
- Carlsen, J., & Butler, R. (2011). Introducing sustainable perspectives on island tourism, in: J.Carlsen & R. Butler (eds), *Island tourism: Towards a sustainable perspective*, pp. 1-8. CAB: Oxfordshire.
- Cordeiro, J.J., & Tewari, M. (2015). Firm characteristics, industry context, and investor reactions to environmental csr: A stakeholder theory approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, 833-849.
- Creaney, R., & Niewiadomski, P. (2016). Tourism and sustainable development on the Isle of Eigg, Scotland. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 132(3-4), 210-233.
- Eluxe Magazine (2013). "Ultra-Sustainable Urban Destinations". Retrieved October 13, 2015, from: <http://consciouslivingtv.com/travel/ultra-sustainable-urban-destinations.html>.
- Fjelstul, J. (2014). Vehicle electrification: On the "green" road to destination sustainability. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 3, 137-139.
- Fjelstul, J. and Fyall, A. (2014). Sustainable drive tourism: A catalyst for change. *International Journal of Tourism Research*... doi: 10.1002/jtr.2013.
- Flagestad, A., & Hope, C.A. (2001). Strategic success in winter sports destinations: A sustainable value creation perspective. *Tourism Management*, 22(5), 445-461.
- Fyall, A., Garrod, B., & Wang, Y. (2012). Destination collaboration: A critical review of theoretical approaches to a multi-dimensional phenomenon. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 1, 10-26.
- Graci, S. (2013). Collaboration and partnership development for sustainable tourism. *Tourism Geographies*, 15(1), 25-42.
- Grimstad, S. & Burgess, J. (2014). Environmental sustainability and competitive advantage in a wine tourism micro-cluster. *Management Research Review*, 37(6), 553-573.
- Gulati, R. (1998). Alliances and Networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 293-317.
- Harrison, J.S., & Wicks, A.C. (2013). Stakeholder theory, value, and firm performance. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(1), 97-124.
- Holleran, J.N. (2008). Sustainability in tourism destinations: Exploring the boundaries of eco-efficient and green communications. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 17(3-4), 373 -394.
- IUCN, UNEP, & WWF. (1980). World conservation strategy: Living resource conservation for sustainable development. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, ed. from: <http://www.environmentandsociety.org/node/7384>.
- Jamal, T.B. & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 186-204.
- Jamal, T. & Stronza, A. (2009). Collaboration theory and tourism practice in protected areas: Stakeholders, structuring, and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(2), 169-189.
- Kenworthy, T.P., & Verbeke, A. (2015). The future of strategic management research: Assessing the quality of theory borrowing. *European Management Journal*, 33(3), 179-190.
- Khazaei, A., Elliot, S., & Joppe, M. (2015). An application of stakeholder theory to advance community participation in tourism planning: The case for engaging immigrants as fringe stakeholders. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(7), 1049-1062.
- Laing, J., & Frost, W. (2010). How green was my festival: Exploring challenges and opportunities associated with staging green events. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 261-267.
- Luo, W. (2018). Evaluating tourist destination performance: Expanding the sustainability concept. *Sustainability*, 10, 516-532.
- Miller, D., Merrilees, B., & Coghlan, A. (2015). Sustainable urban tourism: Understanding and developing visitor pro-environmental behaviors. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(1), 26-46.
- Moscardo, G., Konovalov, E., Murphy, L., & McGehee, N. (2013). Mobilities, community well-being and sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(4), 532-556.
- Moscardo, G. & Murphy, L. (2014). There is no such thing as sustainable tourism: Re-conceptualizing tourism as a tool for sustainability. *Sustainability*, 6(5), 2538-2561.
- Munanura, I.E., & Backman, K.F. (2012). Stakeholder collaboration as a tool for tourism planning - A developing country's perspective. *Journal of Tourism*, 13(1), 23-39.
- Naipaul, S., Wang, Y., & Okumus, F. (2009). Regional destination marketing: A collaborative approach. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(5-6), 462-481.
- Park, O.J., Lehto, X.Y., & Morrison, A.M. (2008). Collaboration between CVB and local community in destination marketing CVB executives' perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 17(3-4), 395-417.
- Pricop, O.C. (2012). Critical aspects in the strategic management theory. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 98-107.
- Rastislav, R., & Petra, L. (2016). Strategic performance management system and corporate sustainability concept – Specific parameters in Slovak enterprises. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 8(3), 107-124.
- Scott, N., & Cooper, C. (2010). Innovation for sustainable tourism: Some thoughts on best practice. *Revisita de Administracao Publica*, 44(5), 1171-1190.
- Sulewski, P., Kloczko-Gajewska, A., & Sroka, W. (2018). Relations between agri-environmental economic, and social dimensions of farms' sustainability. *Sustainability*, 10(12), 4629-4652.
- Srinivas, H. (2015). The seven triads of sustainability. Concept note series e-007. Retrieved July 19, 2019, from [www.gdrc.org/sustdev/triads.html](http://www.gdrc.org/sustdev/triads.html).
- Timur, S., & Getz, D. (2009). Sustainable tourism development: How do destination stakeholders perceive sustainable urban tourism? *Sustainable Development*, 17, 220-232.
- Todorovic, Z. (2014). The concept of sustainable tourism as a competitive advantage in Montenegro. Faculty of Tourism & Hospitality Management in Opatija. Biennial International Congress. *Tourism & Hospitality Industry*, 661-676.
- Vedat. (2011). New green destination Orlando program launched. Retrieved November 3, 2015, from <http://ftnnews.com/mice/14395-new-green-destination-orlando-program-launched.html>.
- Visit Orlando, Report highlights Orlando's sustainable travel initiatives. Retrieved November 3, 2015, from <http://www.orlandomeeting.com/why-meet-in-orlando/sustainable-meetings-orlando/>.
- Walker, R.H., & Hanson, D.J. (1998). Green marketing and green places: A taxonomy for the destination marketer. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 14, 623-639.
- Wang, Y., Hutchinson, J., Okumus, F., & Naipaul, S. (2013). Collaborative marketing in a regional destination: Evidence from Central Florida. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 285-297.
- Wang, Y. & Pizam, A. (2011). *Destination marketing and management: Theories and applications*. CAB: Cambridge, MA.
- Wang, Y., & Xiang, Z. (2007). Toward a theoretical framework of collaborative destination marketing. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 75-85.

- Weaver, D. (2006). *Sustainable tourism*. Elsevier Butterworth-Heinenmann: Oxford, UK.
- Wilson, M. (2003). Corporate sustainability: What is it and where does it come from? *Ivy Business Journal*, 67(6), 1.
- Young, S. T. & Dhandra, K.K. (2013). *Sustainability: Essentials for Business*. Sage.
- Zach, F., & Racheria, P. (2011). Assessing the value of collaborations in tourism networks: A case study in Elkhart County, Indiana. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 28(1), 91-110.

## Future Readings

- Chester, L. (2018). Study reveals the greenest urban destinations for eco-conscious travelers. *Travel Smart*. Retrieved from: <https://travelsmart2010.ca/study-reveals-the-greenest-urban-destinations-for-eco-conscious-travellers/>.
- Moore, S.A. (2016). Testing a mature hypothesis: Reflection on "Green cities, growing cities, just cities: Urban planning and the contradiction of sustainable development". *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 82(4), 385-388.
- Park, S-Y., & Kohler, T. (2019). Collaboration for sustainable tourism through strategic bridging: A case of travel2change. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 25(1), 99-110.
- Pomeranz, E.F., Needham, M.D., Kruger, L.E. (2013). Stakeholder perceptions of collaboration for managing nature-based recreation in a coastal protected area in Alaska. *Journal of Park & Recreation*, 31(3), 23.
- Rall, E., Hansen, R., & Pauleit, S. (2019). The added value of public participation GIS (PPGIS) for urban green infrastructure planning. *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 40, 264-274.
- Vasiljevic, N., Radic, B., Gavrilovic, S., Sljukic, B., Medarevic, M., Ristic, R. (2018). The concept of green infrastructure and urban landscape planning: A challenge for urban forestry planning in Belgrade, Serbia. *iForest-Biogeosciences & Forestry*, 11(4), 491-498.