CHAPTER-II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
2.0. INTRODUCTION

A literature review is a body of text that is studied comprehensively to make a logical order of the concepts and their relationships. A review is otherwise called as a view of the reviewer on the subjects on which the study area is conducted. Deeper understanding of a particular subject and its interrelationship with other subjects is essentially required when the root of the research problems is traced out. Thus, it aims to review the critical points of historical evolution of knowledge, including substantive findings as well as theoretical and methodological contributions to a particular topic.

Review of literature is an important part of any research work that gives enough insights to understand and frame the logical relationships of key concepts or variables determining the study. The review of previous original works help in developing comprehensive ideas on the research area through continuous readings, discussions and analysis in the same or related fields of studies. In this context, the review of literature helps the researchers find out the key variables to be studied in the research work and logically establish the theoretical gap in the studies. Furthermore, the review widens the scope for identifying the untouched or unexplored research areas to be studied. However, each research scholar strives hard to make the study unique and original for greater recognition and acceptability.

The review of literature usually throws light on the hidden facts and figures and provides scope for clearing ambiguities in many subjects. Many grey areas can be unfolded through extensive collection of relevant literature and reading. The in-depth reading raises several pertinent questions with regard to the area of study and these
questions give shape to the research hypotheses. While reviewing the previous published or unpublished journals, books, periodicals, documents, etc, the researcher come across the qualitative and quantitative research outputs for selecting the key concepts, sampling method and sample size, method of data collection, scale development, reliability and validity test, level of significance, statistical tools, etc.

From the review of literature, major findings and suggestions are referred to build a logical theory and add to the existing body of knowledge. At the end of the research work, a researcher is expected to develop the conceptual framework that must be pragmatic, usable, and implementable. In many cases, the research becomes deductive in nature and the researcher studies the topic in a broader sense to reach at the particular concepts. Finally, narrowing down to the specific research area and getting clarity for conducting the research work in a methodical manner enables the researcher to explain the reasons of the gap and build a theoretical frameworks for enriching the knowledge.

Tourism is a young discipline which is just about four decades old. The discipline is being developed with the basic inputs from other social science subjects. In course of time, several studies have been conducted in the main and sub-themes of tourism, hospitality and travel related areas and these qualitative and quantitative research works have been published in the academic journals of national and international repute. It is frequently noticed that more number of empirical studies in the area of alternative tourism (ecotourism and wildlife tourism) are now being undertaken due to its contemporary relevance in the global context. The present study is a sincere attempt to uncover many hidden facts and figures in the area of sustainable ecotourism in the protected areas by taking both local community and visitors into the scope of the study.
Ecotourism, wildlife tourism, community participation and empowerment, visitor satisfactions, carrying capacity and sustainable tourism have been reviewed extensively from the past and current literatures to understand the meaning, importance, issues, challenges, etc.

In a nutshell, the review of literature in the related areas of ecotourism has given sufficient insights to comprehend the rationale of visitor satisfactions and community empowerment as two important core elements for achieving sustainable ecotourism in the protected areas at the PTR in Kerala.

2.1. BASIC THEORY OF TOURISM

Travelling and exploring places are considered to be among the basics of human nature. People have been traveling for meeting their various needs since time immemorial. The term ‘tourism’ was first used in the 19th century, but it has its origin long back. The word has been derived from the Hebrew word Torah, which means Studying, Learning, and Searching. Today, Travel and Tourism is regarded as one of the dynamic global industries which stimulate international trade and commerce. As the world population is rising, the demand for Travel and Tourism is also increasing at a faster pace. In 2011, 972 million international travelers spent US$230 billion. As a result, tourism is emerged to be the fastest- growing industry in the world. The international tourist arrivals are projected to be one billion in 2012.

Tourism is mainly divided into mass and alternative tourism. Alternative tourism is further divided into natural, cultural, event, etc. The natural attractions are still divided into adventure, indigenous, wildlife and ecotourism. Out of all the types of alternative
tourism, wildlife tourism is the best preferred attraction as regards new-age tourists. Thus, wildlife tourism is defined as a trip undertaken to watch or encounter with wildlife in a natural setting. It can happen in a range of locations from captive to semi captive of the wild and it also encompasses a variety of interactions from passive observation to feeding and touching.

According to Reynolds and Braithwaite (2001), interaction with wildlife is increasing and becoming immensely popular around the world. Another report of the International Ecotourism Society (1998) estimated that 40 per cent to 60 per cent are nature tourists worldwide. Out of which, 20 per cent to 40 per cent were wildlife related tourists. The USA, New Zealand, Australia, China, Kenya, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and South Africa are some of the leading hotspots of wildlife tourism. Hence, there is a need for sustainable wildlife tourism across destinations that largely provide economic benefits to the local community and brings about a planned conservation mechanism to the wildlife and forests.

There should be a combined effort for promoting wildlife tourism as Newsome et al. (2002) highlighted that stakeholder planning may occur at the planning process and on the other hand, local communities should be involved and acknowledged as key groups. Thus, properly managed wildlife tourism has a huge market to be targeted at, but systematic planning and involvement of stakeholders and local community is utmost essential.
2.2. ORIGIN, TYPE AND CONCEPT OF ECOTOURISM

The history of ecotourism may be dated back to the 1950’s and it was not widely recognized or understood as a form of attraction. Some select countries in the African continent have been in the limelight for jungle safari and wildlife watching. Tourism was promoted in the parks and sanctuaries in the name of ecological tourism in Africa in 1950’s with legalization of hunting (Miller 2007).

The need for recreational hunting zones led to the creation of protected areas, National Parks and Game Reserves. Nevertheless, the concept of ecotourism became widely known and was vigorously studied in 1980’s as a subject integrated with ecology, anthropology, sociology, ecology and environmental science.

The concept of ecotourism is embedded with two components: conservation and community well-being. Today, it is seen that tourists are more interested towards activity-based tour rather than sightseeing-based tour. Moreover, tourists are more conscious of conservation of wildlife and plants and they wish to undertake tours for helping the conservation efforts. The governments take it as a means for supporting conservation measures and achieving economic gains.

Honey (1999) remarked that ecotourism was developed within the womb of the environmental movement in the 1970s and 1980s. During this period, the world witnessed the awakening of governments for the preservation of ecology and environment. The literature pertaining to nature tourism and environment impacts of the industry dates back to the late 1970’s. The word ‘Ecotourism’ first appeared within the English language academic literature as a hyphenated term (eco-tourism) in an article by
Romeril (1985). Ecotourism, basically, is regarded as one of the forms of responsible tourism and is an integral part of sustainable tourism development, which was declared as a global strategy during the World Summit at Rio de Janeiro in 1992. Prior to one decade of the World Summit, Krippendorf (1982) coined the term “Alternative Tourism”.

Tourism to natural areas has been touted for its potential to allow sustainable development of ecosystems and to provide incentives to preserve these areas rather than converting them to other uses. Fennel (1970) studied about many ecological zones and eco-tourists at the Trans Canada Highway. Although the origin of the term “ecotourism” is not entirely clear, but one of the first to use the term is Hetzer (1965), who identified the four “pillars” or principles of responsible tourism: minimizing environmental impacts; respecting host cultures; maximizing the benefit for local people; and maximizing tourist satisfaction.

However, it was Hector Ceballos-Lascuraine who provided a precise and acceptable definition on ecotourism. The definition is stated as “travelling to relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated natural areas with the specific objective of studying, admiring and enjoying the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestation (both past and present) found in these areas” Ceballos-Lascurian (1987). At the same time, Laarman and Durst (1987) described “hard” and “soft” dimensions of ecotourism after taking the nature and motivations of eco-tourists into considerations. Wallace and Pierce (1996) strongly argued for promotion of true ecotourism when it minimizes negative impacts and maximizes positive impacts. The early and long-term participation of local people in the decision-making-process is possible through ecotourism. He further suggested for increasing the awareness and
understanding the values of natural and cultural system and its contribution to the conservation and management of protected and other natural areas for more direct economic and other benefits to local people.

Ziffer (1989) included motivation, philosophy, conduct and economic benefit to conservation as the indicators for sustainable ecotourism. In a similar fashion, Kusler (1990) observed that many conservation organizations and governments see ecotourism as the means to both preserve and develop remote areas. For the first time, ecotourism gained direct institutional patronization and it is the International Ecotourism Society (1991) that defined ecotourism as responsible travel to natural areas to conserve the environment and improve the well-being of local people. This Society was intended to promote ecotourism as a form of cooperative tourism that can be more sustainable and viable for the governments and the local community members.

Lindberg and Hawkins (1993) defines ecotourism as a purposeful travel to natural areas to understand the culture and natural history of environment, thereby taking care of not to altering the integrity of ecosystem while producing economic opportunities that make the conservation of natural resources beneficial to local people. The Ecotourism Association of Australia (1992) defines ecotourism as ecologically sustainable tourism that fosters environmental and cultural understanding, appreciation and conservation.

The World Travel and Tourism Environment Research Center in its 1993’s World Travel and Environment Review defines ecotourism as tourism with the specific motive of enjoying wildlife or undeveloped natural areas. Steele (1993) found ecotourism as an economic process where rare and beautiful ecosystems are marked internationally to
attract visitors. Cater (1993) critically stated that ecotourism will not be significantly different from conventional tourism unless it is carefully managed and controlled. Boo (1992) defined ecotourism in similar terms as nature travel that advances conservation and sustainable development efforts, integrating conservation with economic development and providing increased funds to parks, new jobs for local residents and environmental education for visitors. The National Ecotourism Strategy of Australia (1994) highlights that ecotourism is nature-based tourism that involves education and interpretation of natural environment and is managed to be ecologically sustainable.

Tickell (1994) stated that it is a travel to enjoy the world’s amazing diversity of natural life and human culture and without causing damage to either. Wheat (1994) dwelled on ecotourism that it is a niche market for environmentally aware tourists, who are interested in observing nature. Buckley (1994), for example, developed a framework of ecotourism based on four main dimensions: ecotourism being nature based; conservation supporting; sustainably managed; and environmentally educating. Orams (1995) refers to an active approach on the part of tourists to show positive or responsible behavior that respects and contributes to the environment and local community. The World Conservation Union (1980) defines ecotourism as responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of the local people. WTO (1995). It is interesting to note that there is only one reference to protected areas, where ecotourism has been identified as a suitable mechanism for improving links between local communities and protected area managers.
In brief, it may be inferred from these selected and internationally known ecotourism definitions that ecotourism is an offshoot of alternative tourism with larger scope for ecological and environmental conservation with direct and indirect support from community members. Majority of definitions, apart from endorsing ecotourism as a means for economic well-being of the local people, have dwelled on the activities of visitors and their consciousness and responsibilities towards environment and ecology.

An eco-project or an ecotourism destination should be benefited when it fulfills the four important criterion such as it must be economically viable, ecologically sustainable and involving over whelming local community participation. As a result, there should be more scope for research to be carried out.

Wesche (1997) highlighted that numerous indigenous groups in the wilderness peripheries of less developed countries have adopted ecotourism as part of their development strategy. Ecotourism can be the thin edge of a wedge which opens the door to mass tourism, unless policies and measures are put in place early on to manage the potential impact of introducing an ecological area to tourism (Bookbinder et al. 1998; Mow Forth and Munt (1998); Lieberknecht et al. (1998) stated that ecotourism in nature reserves provides opportunities for benefiting local communities, local economy and environmental protection. Ross and Wall (1999) outlined five fundamental functions of ecotourism: protection of natural areas, education and generation of money, quality tourism, and local participation. Fennel (1999) considers ecotourism to be a form of tourism, that focuses primarily on experiencing and learning about nature, and it is ethically managed to be low impact, non-consumptive, and locally oriented.
The Canadian Environment Advisory Council (CEAC) has documented the characteristics of modern ecotourism that enlightens the natural experience and contributes to conservation of ecosystem while respecting the integrity of host community.

Ogutu (2002) and Diamantis (1998) have suggested that the concept of ecotourism needs to exercise environmental auditing to monitor the environmental impacts throughout the tourism lifecycle of a site. Stamer and Smith (2004) could foresee the bright prospects of ecotourism with the rising number of tourists taking part in ecotourism holidays and it is growing three times faster than those choosing the mainstream holidays and by 2024, ecotourism will represent 5 per cent of the global holiday market. Deng et al. (2003) stated that national parks and protected areas have become popular destinations for nature tourism and ecotourism over the past two decades. Stem et al. (2003) stressed on two ecotourism objectives such as generation of financial support for protected area management and generation of local support for conservation.

Stone and Wall (2004) had laid emphasis on the multiple role of ecotourism that is promoted and widely adopted as a strategy for funding conservation initiatives, socio-economic development of host communities and providing for quality tourism experience to the visitors. Hearne and Santos (2004) argued that ecotourism in protected areas has the potential to provide economic development as well as source of funding for maintaining the environmental values of national park in a sustainable manner. The term is prefixed with ecotourism for generating tremendous interest and sales with reference to
eco-travel, eco-vacation, eco-cruise, eco-safari, eco-expedition and eco-hotel. It is a marketing gimmick to impress upon the eco-tourists by providing nature experiences.

Weaver and Lawton (2007) critically commented that the definition of ecotourism leaves a much freedom to the interpretation of the readers, but they more or less cohere around the criteria namely predominantly nature-based attractions; visitor interaction with those attractions for learning or education purposes; and experience and product management principles and practices associated with ecological, socio-cultural and economic sustainability.

In essence, the word ‘ecotourism’ is an appealing label that has no doubt helped galvanize interest in the concept of environmental conservation. The global impact of ecotourism as well as its benefits was recognized with the celebration of International Year of Eco Tourism (IYE) by the United Nations General Assembly in 2002.

2.3. ECOTOURISM SYSTEM

The ecotourism system involves visitors, natural areas, including both public and private areas, authorities, communities, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses, including various combinations of local businesses, inbound operators, outbound operators, hotel and other accommodation providers, restaurants and other food providers. A common phenomenon is that ecotourism can generate both symbiosis and conflict between the stakeholders. The potential for ecotourism results in the creation of symbiosis between conservation (natural areas) and development (businesses). The symbiotic relationship has been widely touted, but the potential for conflict should not be ignored. For example, the natural area managers and ecotourism businesses have a shared
interest in conserving the natural environment. However, there often arises with the conflicts at a point of time when tourism activity jeopardizes the conservation approaches. Bjork (2002) delineated on an expanding livelihood base through ecotourism initiatives that largely reduce local vulnerability to disaster and man-animal conflicts.

2.3.1. Dimensions of Ecotourism

There are basically four dimensions of ecotourism: Environmental, Experimental, Socio-cultural and Economic. Larman and Durst (1987) have divided ecotourism into hard and soft dimensions. Weaver (2001) has described the characteristics of the ecotourism spectrum and divided into hard and soft ecotourism. The hard ecotourism activities need strong environmental commitment, specialized visits, small groups and physical activeness and physical challenge. Other aspects of hard ecotourism include services expected, deep interaction with nature, personal experience and own travel arrangement. In soft ecotourism, it is superficial environmental commitment, multipurpose visits, short trips, large groups, physically passive, physical comfort, service expected, shallow interaction with nature, interpretation and organized tours by travel agents and tour operators.

2.3.2. Types of Eco-tourists

Eco-tourists have positive attitudes in themselves about the environment, culture and development. Learning about the traditions and customs of community, experiencing the cuisine and watching the fairs and festivals are some of the key dimensions of ecotourism that majority of eco-tourists wish to do at the ecotourism sites. Eco-tourists are generally informed about the green practices, the size of group, employment practices
of the company and other organizations associated with the trips. The economic benefit from the trip must percolate down to the local community.

In addition, the history, culture, and geographical features are printed in the brochures for providing reading aids and guests are handed over the brochures during the trip. Further, eco-tourists are expected to behave in a responsible manner in the host community and they are also educated to render their cooperation and support for resource and energy conservation. Respecting local customs, travelling responsibly, and spending money on local enterprises acting as a guest are some of the primary duties of an eco-tourist. Staying for longer time in places visited can provide more interactions and scope for having better understanding about the host people and culture.

When ecotourism was defined and the principles of ecotourism were formulated, there was a need for identifying and classifying the eco-tourists along with their inherent motivations. For example, Kusler (1991) proposed three main groups of eco-tourists, namely do it yourself (those eco-tourists are independent, flexible and mobile), ecotourism on tours (those are up-market group tours with demand for comfort and soft ecotourism activities) and school or scientific groups (their principal focus is to acquire and spread environmental education or research). In the same year, Lindberg (1991) emphasized the importance of dedication and time as a function of defining and classifying different types of eco-tourists on the basis of their travel profiles. He identified four basic types of eco-tourists: hardcore nature tourists, dedicated nature tourists, mainstream nature tourists, casual nature tourists. More interests were shown to study the factors that largely influenced the people to undertake eco-travel to ecologically sensitive places. Eagles (1992) studied the motivations of Canadian eco-tourists and
identified 15 dominant factors encouraging eco-tourists to travel. However, he found that majority of them were motivated towards wilderness and undisturbed nature, lakes and streams or mountains as some of the environmental nature of eco-tourists.

Eagles (1992) studied about motivations of Canadian eco-tourists and identified 15 dominant factors or the pull factors associated with the destination attributes that encourage eco-tourists to travel to nature, lakes and streams or mountains. Mc Claren (2003) underpinned on the “reality tours” offered by specialized organizations that can foster ‘people to people’ tourism and can allow tourists to get involved emotionally and intellectually with local community issues. Weaver and Lawton (2002) explored the hard-soft continuum of eco-tourists through an analysis of the opinions of a sample of 1,180 overnight patrons of two eco-lodges in Lamington National Park in Australia.

Three distinct types of eco-tourists were discerned from Weaver’s work (2002) including harder eco-tourist characterized by high level of environmental commitment, specialized trips, and longer trips, small groups, being more physically active and requiring fewer services. A softer eco-tourist cluster was defined by moderate passive with requirement of more services. The third type is the structured eco-tourist who has a strong pattern of environmental commitment. However, desired interpretation, escorted tours, personalized service and facilities as expected by structured eco-tourists are more congruent with mass tourism.

Mowforth (1993) classified eco-tourists into three categories such as the rough, the smooth and the specialist on the basis of age, travelling, organization of the event, budget and type of tourism. The rough eco-tourists are young to middle-aged travelers;
individually or in small groups; and seek sports and adventures. The smooth eco-tourist belong to the middle-aged to old aged, in groups with a high tour budget, spending for experiencing nature and safari. The specialist eco-tourists are young to old-aged, individually independent relying on special tours with a mid to high budget for travelling, ranging from scientific interest to hobby pursuits.

2.3.3. Ecotourism in Protected Areas

The increasing pressures exerted on the environment by humans make preservation of natural areas crucial for the preservation of biological diversity. Protected areas are one of the most effective tools available for conserving biodiversity. While protected areas can be degraded by external pressures, the majority of terrestrial protected areas are successful at preventing deforestation and mitigating the damaging effects of logging, hunting, fire and grazing. According to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), a “protected area” is a geographically defined area designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives.

Protected areas had received the patronization and support from the governments and the local community members in early 1960’s. Over 80 per cent of the world’s protected areas have been established since the First World Parks Congress, held in 1962. There are 104,791 protected areas covering approximately 18.38 million km on land and 1.89 million km at sea worldwide. It has been seen that there is an increase of 12.65 per cent of earth’s land surface. As protected areas are facing a number of internal and external challenges, many plans and policies were executed as per the declarations of the
First World Park Congress at Seattle, USA. And it was decided to redouble or reinforce the efforts in the World Park Congress in 1972.

Six years later (in 1978), the IUCN unveiled its first official classification system. This system came out with ten categories of Protected Areas included for the discussions during the Third World Park Congress in 1982. However, the ten level systems did not contain an overall definition of Protected Areas. These concerns were highlighted at the Third and Fourth World Park Congresses. Eventually, the IUCN issued its six level criterion for classifying Protected Areas in 1994. This category system was endorsed at the Fifth World Park Congress in 2003. It includes

- **Strict nature reserve**: Protected area managed mainly for scientific research
- **Wilderness area**: Protected area managed mainly for wilderness protection
- **National Parks**: Protected area managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation
- **Natural monument**: Protected area managed mainly for the conservation of specific natural features.
- **Habitat/Species Management Area**: Protected area managed mainly for conservation through management intervention.
- **Protected landscape/seascape**: Protected area managed mainly for landscape/seascape conservation and recreation.
- **Managed resource protected area**: Protected area managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems.
2.4. CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW OF WILDLIFE TOURISM

Wildlife has been a fervent topic in the discussions since the last two centuries. The wild occupies a special place in the consciousness of human civilization. It lies outside its historical and geographical reach. The conservation ethics was imbibed in the sylvan surrounding of the ashram of our sages. The evidence of wildlife in the Indus Valley Civilization and the seals excavated from the excavated sites followed by training of wild horses for warfare. Worshiping animals as gods and goddess by Aryans is an earliest example of love, care and reverence for the wild animals. Ashoka, the Great emperor of the Mauryan dynasty had stopped the killings of animals and birds for wildlife preservation. One of the rock edicts in the foothills of Dhauli, the historic battle place in the erstwhile Kalinga kingdom, shows the king’s decisions to stop the killings of peacocks for cooking in the kitchen. Further, the first recorded game laws were promulgated by Kautilya in the third century B.C.

The Indian mythology is equally important in reference to care, love and benediction for the wild animals. There are references of wild and wildlife in Jataka stories of Buddhism. A poem in the “Yajur Veda” invokes universal “peace of water, peace of air, peace of earth and peace of trees”. This reference to Vedic poetry reveals how responsive the Indian sensibility was in the earliest days to the benediction of nature and wildlife. The Upanishidic speculations about man’s spiritual destiny were undertaken in the deep peace of forest retreats. Different animals associated with different gods symbolize the love and care for animals as a religious sanctity. For example, Rudyard
Kipling’s Jungle Book gives much information regarding wildlife and their habitats in the protected areas in India.

There are about 350 species of mammals, 1200 species of birds with nearly 2100 forms and more than 20,000 species of insects. The love and regard for wildlife is a part of India’s culture (Gokhale et al. 1997). India has a long history of conservation, at both official and people’s levels. Forest areas were protected for the preservation of biodiversity as early as the 3rd century BC during the reign of Ashoka. There are also numerous examples of sacred land/waterscapes especially among the hunters, food gatherers, agriculturists and pastoral communities throughout the country. One recent statement has suggested that about 10 per cent of India might have been covered by the sacred places in the past. Patches of forest and other ecosystems were also kept undisturbed by the strict social sanctions.

Gadgil and Guha (1992) found that even outside such spaces, hunting and fishing communities followed strict rules for not killing the pregnant females and young ones or sub adults, not hunting and fishing in certain seasons and many others. Many individual species were also protected for their religious or social, or economic importance. For example, the Black Buck by Bishnoi Community in Rajasthan, Painted storks and Grey Pelicans in Kokrebellure in Karnataka, the Langur and Ficus species all over the country and many others clearly symbolize the respect for wildlife and denote the hereditary dependence on the wildlife habitats.

Nonetheless, different researchers have defined wildlife from various aspects and dimensions. White (1978) narrated that a place without ‘us’ populated by creatures
(including clandestinely uncivilized humans) at once monstrous and wonderful, whose very strangeness gives shape to whatever we are claimed to be.

The term “wilderness” is derived from Norse and Teutonic languages in the rhetorical terms. The term wild” was derived from “willed” meaning self-willed or uncontrollable. The word “Deor”, from the Old English meaning animals not under the control of man was combined with “Wild” to form “Wilderness”. Thus, “wild-doerness” means “place of wild beast (Nash 1973). Further, the physical wilderness refers to places or regions that are uncultivated and uninhabited. These places include swamps, forest areas, grass plains, savannah, mountains and oceans for perfect wilderness (Hill 1994).

Yuan et.al (2004) defines wildlife tourism based on encounters with non-domesticated (no human) animals in either their natural environments or in captivity. The major components of wildlife tourism comprise nature-based tourism, special interest tourism and ecotourism. Increased level of participation in a particular type of wildlife, specialization of wildlife tourism, consideration of wildlife issues, environmental awareness and recognition of synergies between the wildlife tourism and conservation is figured in most of the definitions of wildlife tourism.

Aspects of sustainability relevant for wildlife tourism are included as financial viability, visitor satisfaction, visitor education and impact of tourism on wildlife and its habitats. Some other issues associated with wildlife tourism include Carrying Capacity, Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) and Precautionary Principle determining a sustainable level of activity for wildlife tourism activities. The study suggested that tour
operators need to adopt best practices of environmental management process for sustainability. Furthermore, adopting the concept of sustainability requires the integration of wildlife tourism development into the national, regional, and local strategic and planning frameworks. However, planning is required to ensure that wildlife resources are not overexploited and the natural environment is protected to provide real benefits to host communities.

On the other hand, local people should be involved in the implementation of best ecotourism practices for the preservation of culture and traditions. Wilderness Act (1964) states that wilderness is a place where one can obtain a primitive travel and recreational experience away from society and the built-environment. Conway (1995) defines that wildlife tourism is based on encounters with non-domesticated animals in either their natural environment or in captivity. It includes both so called non-consumptive forms such as viewing, photography and feeding and consumptive forms that comprise hunting and recreational angling.

Technically, the life in the wild regions includes both flora and fauna, but it is limited to faunal species (animals). As usually, any animal is a member of animal kingdom. In this context, wildlife tourism is overlapped with nature-based tourism, special interest tourism and ecotourism in most of the literature. Historically, wildlife refers only to some game species that people used to hunt. In course of the time, the term ‘wildlife’ includes all living forms even those that are not used for sport. The Cooperative Research Center (CRC) for Sustainable Tourism (2001) describes wildlife tourism as “tourism that involves encounters with no domesticated animals either in their natural environments or in captivity. Furthermore, wildlife tourism experiences provide
opportunities to observe and interact with animals that may be endangered, threatened or rare, and being offered in an increasing number of destinations worldwide (Cousins 2007; Orams 2002; Shackley 1996; Wood and Mascaro 2003).

Moulton and Sanderson (1999) explained that any living non-human and undomesticated organism in the kingdom of Animalia is generally considered to be wildlife. Burns and Field (2001) argued for wildlife tourism as a subset of nature-based tourism that can then be defined as tourism based on interactions with wildlife, whether in its natural environment or in captivity.

One of the main arguments for continuing the development of wildlife tourism attractions is to help secure a long-term conservation strategy for wildlife and habitats to sustain in their own ecosystems without having shortage of basic foods (Higginbottom 2004; Newsome et al. 2004; Reynolds and Braithwaite 2001; Wilson and Tisdell 2001). Reducing negative impacts through the implementation of appropriate policies, planning and management strategies are essentials to the development of sustainable wildlife tourism industry (Higginbottom 2004; Newsom et al. 2004; Rodger et al. 2007.) As a result, the demand for trophy hunting and the opportunity to hunt is diminished because of stricter government regulations and declining number of wildlife.

When a tourist travels to a particular destination primarily for the purpose of having a wildlife experience, obviously wildlife tourism can be seen as a form of special interest tourism. In the areas where the density of wildlife is relatively more, the governments can generally permit the visitors to learn and admire the wildlife viewing or any other non-consumptive activities that can provide economic incentives and revenues
for conservation of natural habitats and wildlife conservation (Higginbottom et al. 2001). Similarly, Jaquemot (1992) argued for tourism based upon wildlife that becomes one of the ways of earning foreign exchange to eradicate poverty and prevent the killings of animals and cutting down the trees by the local tribal people in several countries.

Gauthier (1993) delineated that the great interest in nature and nature-based experience is reflected in increasing demand to experience the wilderness and increasing value being placed on, animals in the wild, as opposed to those in captive or semi-captive situation. Increased level of participation, increased consideration of animal welfare, increased environmental awareness and increased recognition of synergies between wildlife tourism and conservation are some of the recent trends in wildlife tourism.

Duffus and Dearden (2003) linked the growth and development of a recreational relationship with wildlife that is surrounded by several issues like growing societal re-evaluation of wildlife, the growth trends in nature and wildlife-related tourism and the changing attitude to particular species due to the rising interest in wildlife education. The report for Alberta Tourism (HLA, Gaia and Cotton Wood consultant) in 1990 suggested that people involved in consumptive wildlife use were mainly male (90 %) and meager educational degrees (5.6%), while, in consumptive users, the genders were evenly balanced and 60 per cent possessed educational degrees.

Knight and Coley (1995) found four broad causes of impacts on wildlife, harvest, habitat modification, pollution and disturbance. Duffus and Dearden (1993) suggested for recreational use of wildlife that incorporates a wide array of economic and non-economic values. Carney and Sydeman (1999) studied into the human conflict with wildlife that is a
growing concern for conservation problems around the world. Conservation has long been concerned about the effects of human disturbance on wildlife.

Bauer and Giles (2001) revealed that hunting has a lower public profile as compared to wildlife viewing that constitutes a large proportion of “tourists”. Wildlife tourism is a multi-billion dollar industry within the USA alone. Roe et al. (1997) found that the enjoyment of wildlife was reported to be a priority for 90 per cent of holidaymakers in the UK. In the similar findings, Gray (2004) reported that wildlife is a prime attraction for 32 per cent of international tourists to Australia, whereas 80 per cent of international tourists to Kenya and Zimbabwe.

Shackly (1996) made the arguments that the growing interest in, and concern for the natural environment, including wildlife among residents of more developed countries has apparently contributed greatly to increased demand for tourism in viewing animals within their natural environment. All forms of non-consumptive outdoor recreation (hiking, camping, boating and photography can adversely impact wildlife (Boyle and Samson 1985; White et al. 1999). Reynolds and Braithwaite (2001) remarked that the probability of positive encounter with wildlife for visitors is essentially increasing while protecting the wildlife resources.

Aldo Leopold (1966) remarked that the problem of game management is not as to how the deer are handled, but the real problem is one of the actions of human management. Wildlife management is comparatively easy, but human management is difficult. Honavalli et al. (2009) studied about the endangered lion tailed macaque (Macaca Silenus) and this threatened species is endemic to rainforest patches of the
Western Ghats Mountains in the southwestern India. The study has covered the walking speed of lion tailed macaques and the hunting of this species was high between 1960 and 1990 in the areas of Talakaveri, Pushpagiri and Sharatha Valley Wildlife Sanctuaries and their adjacent reserve forests.

Nair (1981) identified eight major areas of distribution of elephants in South India and these areas face a major threat like human activities, hydroelectric and irrigation projects, plantation and spread of agriculture, poaching. Ravindranathan (2004) briefly described about the environment at Sabarimala and its neighboring wildlife sanctuaries like the PTR and its adjacent areas. It is a matter of great concern that the increasing traffic of Ayyapa devotees has also caused serious threats to the wildlife of the sanctuaries. It is estimated that 20-25 tones of plastic material are left littered owing to large-scale pilgrimage activities, thus affecting the wildlife. The Sannidhanam is a natural habitat to Malabar Giant Squirrel, Nilgiri Langur and Great Indian Hornbill. The study has suggested for a firm decision to regulate the vehicular traffic and restriction of accommodation facilities at Pamba and Chalakkayam.

2.5. WILDLIFE AND CONSERVATION

Sudhi (2008) prepared a list of the animals and plants of Kerala under the category of the red list and Black Head Ibis as one of the threatened bird species in the wildlife sanctuaries. For instance, Myristica Malabarica in a swamp forest is under extinct. According to a list of 35 mammals, including critically endangered Malabar Civet, 12 are endangered, 15 are vulnerable and seven are near threatened. The condition of the species outside the protected areas is stated to be critical and poaching continues to be the major threat for the species.
2.6. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The initiative for the creation of protected areas was taken almost 125 years ago for preservation of wildlife and forest resources. The declaration and demarcation of protected areas and their boundaries in the developing countries has resulted in the conflicts between local communities and protected areas authorities. In the last four to five decades, huge loss of animal and human life was reported in the developing countries due to the encroachment of human habitation into the animal habitation. The fundamental cause for this unnatural conflict is the developmental approach that brings benefits to the people and poses permanent threats to the ecosystems. Hence, protected area authorities have embraced the approach of integrating the local population into the conservation of forests and wildlife in a more dignified way.

Community-based ecotourism was started with an aim for supporting biodiversity conservation, particularly in the developing countries linking conservation and local livelihoods, thereby reducing rural poverty and achieving both objectives of sustainability. Ghimire and Pimbert (1997) emphasized that if the protected areas need to be maintained sustainably and the local communities must be given a great role in the decision-making capacity and they should be actively involved in the protected area policies and planning. It is reported that a majority of the local people suffer in one way or other from tourism related developments in and around the protected areas.

Stanley and Perron (1995) identified that protected areas in the North Western Territory in Canada generated CAD$ 12.86 million in the form of labour income while creating employment to 488 persons. Similarly, tourism generated annually about US$ 7,
00, 000 in a year in Rwanda’s Parc National des Volcanoes (WTO/UNEP 1992). Wells (1994) found that receipts from entry to parks and from trekking permit for those parks generally exceed one million US dollar in Nepal. But, it is found that there are some people who are benefited while a vast majority of local people have been displaced due to the declaration of protected areas. For example, the non-locals get menial jobs due to the lack of skills and knowledge for which tourism stakeholders hire skilled tourism professionals from the outside at the Royal Chitwan National Park as it is a protected area promoting ecotourism.

Boo (1990) found out that local people hardly get any benefits from the nature-based tourism activities in the protected areas in Belize, Costarica, Dominica, Ecuador and Mexico. In order to make more community involvement in protected areas, the Zimbabwean CAMPFIRE and the Nepalese ACAP have been established to sensitize community about their roles and responsibilities towards the protected areas. If conservation and local livelihood issues are to be resolved in a much better way, community participation can be more effective with the provision of direct benefits.

Brechin et al. (1991) highlights that “protected areas will not survive for long whenever local people remain impoverished and are denied access to needed resources inside” Honey (1999) found that ecotourism projects have become ineffective in La Gamba due to the lack of community participation. It is reported that there is no much change in demand for local products due to the rise in hotel business. The study suggested that hotels and restaurants should procure the local products and ecotourism operators should work towards better interaction between tourists and local residents through the cultural tours to the villages.
2.7. COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT

Community empowerment is an important dimension of sustainable ecotourism in the protected areas. As it is one of the objectives of ecotourism, the governments largely assign the task to the local people to extend their cooperations to the hotels, restaurants, tour operators, etc in the ecotourism sites. Empowerment is the means to achieve the goals of ecotourism as people largely get freedom for participating and sharing their ideas and thoughts for the ecotourism projects to sustain for long without having any adverse impacts to the ecology and environment. It is proven to be one of the ways for transferring power and authority to take their own decisions and manage the resources for their own benefits and benefits of all those connected with the ecotourism projects.

The word “community” has been used in an aggregated sense to represent a group of citizens in a given geographical space. Godde (1998) defines community which is based on “shared profession, religion, geographical location and interest in tourism” or on “the interactions and relationships between many groups “were all considered. He explained that “Community-Based Tourism” (CBT) could be tourism de-facto planned and managed by a group of individual/households comprising the community as communal enterprise. It could also be managed by a private entrepreneur whose activity agenda is set by community and is accountable to it.

Keshav (2005) suggested that there are two types of community development namely “general and ad-hoc”. The general community development programmes are mostly social in nature and have long-term perspective, whereas the ad-hoc type of programmes is problem specific and have a short-term perspective. Murphy (1985,p.171)
writes that “inputs from the concerned community groups could provide a balance to the sustainable tourism objectives of the business sector and possibly encourage greater variation and local flavor in future projects”, while Simmons (1994, p.98) asserts that “residents of the destination areas are being seen increasingly as the nucleus of the tourism product”. Catley (1999) stressed that the motive behind community development is to educate and remove the stigma of charity and involve local people in the decision-making process.

Aylward and Freeman (1992) cautioned that if the revenue of ecotourism does not get accrued to national parks systems or local communities, there will be little economic incentive for investment in the recurring costs of conservation activities.

Lea (1988) pointed out that community participation is often regarded as one of the most essential tools, if tourism is to make a substantial contribution to the national development of a country. Tosun (2000) commented that community participation is seen as a useful tool for educating locals about their rights and laws and political good sense. Therefore, it is very important for public education through the host-guest relationships. Grossman and Tosun (2000) gave emphasis to the fact that community participation is a tool whose aim is to readjust the balance of power and to modify the local community views against those of the developers or the local authority. Hardely et al. (2002) stated that the call for community participation is based on the assumption that participation lessens opposition to development, minimizes negative impacts and revitalizes economies.
Woodley (1993) regards community participation as a way of ensuring sustainability of tourism places of interest. Similarly, Tosun (2006) pointed out that community participation gives better opportunities for local people to gain benefits from the diverse tourism activities in their localities with positive local attitudes and conservation of local resources. The WCED (1987) has been promoting community participation for the protection and improvement of the quality of life of communities influenced by tourism development. France (1998) mentioned that local participation includes empowerment and involvement of communities in decision making, implementation and identifying the local problems.

Arnstein (1971) has classified eight types of community participation like Manipulation, Therapy, Informing, Consultation, Placation, Partnership, Delegated Power and Citizen Control. Similarly, Pretty’s (1995) has classified seven types of community participations such as Manipulative Participation, Passive Participation, Participation by Consultation, Participation for Material Incentives, Functional Participation, Interactive Participation and Self-Mobilization. Tosun (1999) gives a more precise typology of community participation like Coercive Participation in which the participation is mostly indirect, formal, participation in implementation but not necessarily sharing benefits, paternalism, non-participation, high degree of tokenism and manipulation. Induced Participation is top down, passive, formal, mostly indirect, degree of tokenism, manipulation, pseudo participation, participation in implementation and sharing benefits, choice between proposed alternatives and feedback. Spontaneous Participation includes bottom-up active participation, direct participation in decision making, authentic participation and self-planning.
Munro and Willison (1998) came out with the views that ecotourism cannot exist in isolation from the human systems in the protected areas and it has led to the belief that protected areas must, in some cases, engender a culture of balanced profitability. In this regard, the often quoted notion is “wildlife stays because wildlife pays”. The quote is apt as it suggests a more broadly based context to conserve the resources for sustaining the livelihood in and around the protected areas. Karlsson et al. (2005) stated that citizen participation is regarded as very essential to make the planning process more effective, equitable and legitimate as long as participation is representative in nature with clear focus on collective interest as well as for their own groups.

Telfer (2002) emphasized on the small scale tourism that brings more benefits for locals as it makes use of locally available materials and creates higher multiplier effects. Moreover, most part of the income generated from tourist expenditures is percolated in the local economy in such a way that governments incentivize the small business enterprises to sell the local products directly to the tourists. Mbaiwa (2007) suggests that once local communities fully participate and derive benefits, they can develop a sense of ownership and will use their natural resources sustainably. Scheyvens (1999) emphasized the need for participation that leads to making the people economically, psychologically, socially and politically empowered.

2.8. VISITOR SATISFACTION

Visitor Satisfaction is one of the major aspects for any tourist visiting a particular destination. A good number of studies have been conducted from different aspects of tourist satisfaction. The very word ‘satisfaction’ can be defined as a post-
consumption evaluation of a chosen alternative cause of action to determine if it meets or exceeds expectations (Engel et al. 1993). Satisfaction can also be defined as an emotional response derived from a consumption experience (Spreng et al. 1996). Recently, satisfaction is defined as a cognitive-affective state derived from a consumer experience.

Swarbrooke (2002) comments that the attraction of a tourism product is not viewed as an experience and it is a nebulous concept as the tourist experience is an amalgam of factors that shape the tourist feelings and attitudes towards his or her visit. Yale (1997) states that the success of a tourist attraction lies in the critical areas, such as parking, visitor center, signs and labels, shops, guides, refreshments, toilets, litter bins, seating and disabled provision and off-site amenities like sign posting, local accommodation and local services.

Swarbrooke (2002) emphasizes that a range of elements affects the visitor experience on the site beyond the core aspects of attraction. Tangible elements of the product include retail outlets, cafes, toilet facilities and site cleanliness. Further, the quality of service delivery elements comprises the appearance, attitudes and behaviour and competence of staff. The expectation, behaviour and attitude of the visitors are determined by the climatic conditions of tourism destinations. At the same time, a wide mix of people using the attraction first time also determine the visitor about the amount of experience and the level of satisfaction that tourists want at the destinations. Thus, visitor experience is the product of the combinations and interrelationships of these factors and it may be different for each individual visitor (Bosque and Martin 2008).
The study on visitor satisfaction level helps in maintaining the carrying capacity and it helps in the sustainable growth of the destination since a tourist comes to a particular destination with lots of expectations. Many authors have viewed the crucial roles of visitor satisfaction to support the implementation of ecotourism projects in the protected areas. Hull and Stewart (1995) made a functional approach to the term landscape which combines three basic elements: observed landscape, order of sequence and perception. The observed landscape includes ones’ viewing ability, the people and objects in the landscape observed by visitors. The order of sequence refers to the order with which the visitor perceives the image and object of landscape. Perception involves the subjective element, the method used and the interpretation that visitors attribute to the objects when they observe in the landscape. Visitor experience in natural landscape is considered integral components of visitor satisfaction (Chhetri et al. 2004).

Stoeckl et al. (2006) have conducted a study on community impacts of different types of visitors in North West Queensland. Fallon and Kriwoken (2003) have conducted a study on the involvement of community in tourism infrastructure at Strahan Visitor Center at Tasmania. Obua and Harding (1996) have carried out an extensive study at Kibale National Park in Uganda on visitor characteristics and attitude. In the same line, a study was conducted by Beh and Brayer (2007) at three Kenyan National Reserves to find out visitor motivation level.

Arbatzis and Grigoroudis (2010) have studied on visitor satisfaction perception and the gap analysis at Dadia-Lefkimi-Souflion National Park in Greece. Ballantyne et al. (2011) have studied on visitor memories at one of the four marine-based wildlife tourism venues at Southeast Queensland. Thus, visitor memories of wildlife tourism identified
four levels of visitor response to their wildlife experiences. They are Sensory Impression, Emotional Affinity, Reflective Response and Behavioral Response. In Sensory impression, the tourist refers to the visitors’ report to understand the vivid visual and tactile memories of their responses. Emotional Affinities are the emotional responses to the experience or emotional connections with the animals that they observe. Reflective responses are the visitor reports with regard to the new insights as a result of cognitively processing the experience or making comments as they reflect on what they see or hear. Behavioral response is related to the visitors’ report that takes specific actions in response to their wildlife tourism experiences or report a heightened awareness of the need of such actions.

Akama and Kieti (2003) have conducted a study at Tsavo West National Park to find out the tourist satisfaction level with Kenya’s wildlife safari. The study has suggested that the wildlife tourists identify the wildlife viewing as a primary travel motivation, but their overall satisfactions with the visits generally revolve round few species. Swarbooke (1995); Eagle and Chaiken (1993) attempted to measure visitor satisfaction as the capacity of a tourist destination to fulfill visitors need for recreation and leisure time. Akama and Keiti (2003) and Kerley et.al 2003 identified that tourist motivation can be useful and effective to find out appropriate visitor opportunities and heterogeneous tourists can be segmented easily by these motivation factor. They also suggest a more diversified tourist experience like attracting more tourists with more varied interests and improving tourist’s satisfaction (Awaritefe 2003; Keng and Cheng et al. 2004).
Understanding tourist motivation for visiting protected areas has also proven to be the most useful discriminator of segment groups. All the travelers are engaged in their respective behaviors in order to reach a desired state (Driver 1996; Fondness 1994; Morgan and Hodgkinson 1999; Sarigollu and Huang 2005). In these studies, the motivational factors such as Escapist, Learners and Spiritualist were used to segment the visitors. The Escapist groups look for going to see some serene climate from the hustle and bustle of hectic life and spend some time with nature, greenery and adventure. The Spiritualist prefers to have opportunities for getting away from daily routine and having a sense of self-reflection. Both of these groups could be accommodated by trips to the less visited northern reaches of the park. The largest group is Learners who would get benefited from a more thoughtful and connected education from the reserve staff.

The service quality attributes are used to measure the quality of services and overall visitor satisfaction with tourist products and services of the park (Akama and Kieti 2003). The values of conservation, animal welfare, visitor satisfaction and profitability are often in conflicts in wildlife tourism and trade-offs are necessary (Reynolds and Braithwaite 2001). The influence of push and pull factors to the national parks is regarded as the impact on visitor satisfaction (Kim et al. 2003).

Mc Kerch (1996) brings to light that there is little or no difference between tourists and “wilderness” visitors because they share the same resources and facilities and exert similar impacts when the same activity is undertaken. Increased human presence may lead to disturbances such as litter as well as air and noise pollution caused by the carbon emissions of tourist vehicles. Further, direct impacts on wildlife include breeding, feeding, mother offspring interaction, poaching and killing (usually accidentally) as the
forms of disturbances. Indirect impacts on wildlife include disruption of predator prey relationships.

Even the pressures of photography may impact on wildlife and it is reported to have caused a decline in the breeding success of many coastal bird species in the Galapagos Island (Matheson and Wall 1982). Wildlife may also be directly impacted by visitor management techniques which place a priority on visitor satisfaction. For example, the Yucatan Peninsula boatloads of tourist were driven in two groups of feeding flamingos to approach frigate bird nesting areas (Mackinnon et al. 1986).

Many biophysical impacts also adversely affect the visitor experience and additional impacts on such experience include noise. Moscardo and Saltzer (2004) found that seeing rare or large species and getting close to wildlife in natural settings, learning about the wildlife and settings of the natural environment contribute to the overall visitor satisfaction. Jenner and Smith (1992) pointed out that there is an increase in the desires for interaction with the natural environment in different ways. Various studies have concluded that repeat visits to a particular destination have got a higher level of visitor satisfaction since satisfaction partly motivates these people to revisit the same destination again. Visitors have visited the same natural park repeatedly and they are more satisfied than those compared to first-time visitors. Two important factors which influence tourist satisfaction are the movement and noise (Geva and Goldman 1991; Yuksel 2001; Tian Cole 2002; Rittichainuwat 2002).
Kozak (2001) mentions four research approaches such as fulfillment of expectations, importance of fulfillments, denial and only fulfillment. Browen and Clarke (2002) formulated a framework for visitor satisfaction related to certain unique tourism characteristics such as integrity, heterogeneity and the degradation of tourist product quality with time and uncertainty. A number of models have been developed to evaluate quality and customer satisfaction in different operations. Different methods were adopted for better visitor satisfaction in different fields of tourism. One such method is the Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) which is broadly used in tourism research.

Wade and Eagle (2003) have applied the IPA model at two National Parks at Tanzania in order to examine the importance and performance of tourist (tours and accommodation) and recommended suitable measures to the park authorities for increasing the visitor satisfaction level. Another such method is the Indicator Performance Estimate (IPE) used by the researcher to assess visitor satisfaction based on the different aspects that exist between the visitors and actual conditions.

Akama and Kieti (2003) have found out the reason for the reduction of visitor arrivals to the different National Parks in Kenya and particularly to the Tsavo West National Park with a structured questionnaire. The main reason for the fall in the visitor numbers was attributed to insufficient facilities, poor quality transport network, low quality service and political instability that all have made to decrease the visitor satisfaction. Further, the SERVQUAL Model evolved by Parushuraman et al. (1990) was used in order to examine any differentiations (positive or negative) that exist between expectations of visitors and existing quality of leisure service offered at Tsavo West National Park in Kenya. Similarly Knutson et al. (1995a) designed LODGESERV as an
evaluation instrument for the service quality of lodging industry. In the same year, Knutson et al. (1995b) proposed DINESERV as an evaluation instrument for the service quality of restaurants. MacKay and Crompton (1990) designed RECQUAL as an evaluation instrument for recreation centers. Tibe and Snaith (1998) used the HOLSTAT to evaluate the destination satisfaction of Varadero, Cuba.

Arabatzis and Grigoroudis (2010) have studied about perceptions and gap analyses at Dadia-Lefkimi-Souflion National Park by using Multicriteria Satisfaction Analysis (MUSA) methodology and software to identify the factors affecting visitor’s satisfaction level as well as the critical points. The study suggested the park management to focus on the improvement and action plans.

Tonge and Moore (2007) have redefined (IPA) method to evaluate the differentiations observed in quality of services offered at the various areas of a National Park (Service Quality Gap). Ryan and Cessford (2003) have also used the IPA model in connection with the Service Quality Gap of facility and related issues at National Parks of New Zealand. Swarbrooke (2001) has identified some key factors for visitor attractions like product development and innovation, marketing and promotion, revenue generation and funding, education and training and community and public sector intervention.

2.9. CARRYING CAPACITY

The concept of “carrying capacity” has been the object of numerous publications and discussions in the last 30 years. According to the UNWTO, the maximum number of people that may visit a tourist destination at the same time, without causing destruction of the physical, economic and socio cultural environment and an unacceptable decrease in
the quality of the visitors’ satisfaction’ (UNEP/MAP/PAP 1997). Hunter (1995) gives a more precise definition by distinguishing four different types of carrying capacity: Physical carrying capacity—the limit of a site beyond which wear and tear starts taking place or environmental problem arises. Psychological (or perceptual) carrying capacity—the lowest degree of enjoyment by a tourist is prepared to accept before they start seeking alternative destinations, Social carrying capacity— the level of tolerance of host population for the presence and behavior of tourists in the destination area and /or the degree of crowding of users (tourists) is prepared to be accepted by others (other tourist) and Economic carrying capacity— the ability to absorb tourism activities without displacing or disrupting desirable local activities.

2.10. SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

The term “sustainable tourism development” is derived from the generic concept of sustainable development and the concept was brought to prominence with the publication of the Report “Our Common Future” (WCED 1987). The WTO (1993) defines sustainable tourism that tourism meets the need of the present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunities for the future. Eber (1992) defines that sustainable tourism is a tourism associated with infrastructures that both now and in the future operate within natural capacity for the regeneration and future productivity of natural resources. It recognizes the contribution of people and community, customers and their lifestyles to make tourism experience acceptable. These people must have an equitable share in the economic benefits of local people and communities in the host areas. The Country-Side Commission (1995) explains that tourism sustains local economies without damaging the environment on which it depends.
Payne (1993) views that sustainable tourism must be capable of adding to the array of economic opportunities and opening to the people without adversely affecting the structure of economic activity. Sustainable tourism ought not to interfere with existing forms of social organization. It respects the limits imposed by ecological communities. Woodley (1993) states that sustainable tourism in parks (and other tourism areas) must primarily be defined in terms of sustainable ecosystem. Bramwell (1996) explains that sustainable tourism is a form of tourism while taking into account current accommodation, capacity, the local population and the environment and tourism. It respects the environment and its consequences do not aid its own disappearance. The implementation of the principles of sustainable tourism is especially important in saturated areas and this can be more pragmatic with the practices of responsible tourism. Thus, sustainable development meets the needs of the present generation while saving the resources sufficiently for future generation to meet their own needs.

Li (2003) explored six issues of sustainable tourism development and these issues are: the role of tourism demand; the nature of tourism resources; the imperative of intra-generational equity; the role of tourism in promoting socio-cultural progress; the measurement of sustainability and the forms of sustainable development. Bramwell et al. (1996) has classified them into seven dimensions such as environmental, cultural, political, economic, social, managerial and governmental.

The Ecologically Sustainable Development Working Group (1991) defines sustainable tourism as tourism that is concerned with the quality of experience offered to the visitors. It provides economic return to host communities by ensuring cultural integrity and social cohesion of host communities and protecting biological diversity. It
maintains ecological system and operates within the resources available. It also maintains
the full range of opportunities within and across generations. Finally, it is based on
activities or designs. All reflect the character of the region and allow the visitors to gain
an understanding of the destination and encourage them to be concerned about and
protective of the destination.

Wang et al. (2004) warned that tourism operators need to adopt best
environmental management practices that can contribute to sustainability in future.
Coccossis (1996) suggested that there are at least four ways to interpret tourism in the
context of sustainable development. A sectoral viewpoint explains about the economic
sustainability of tourism and an ecological viewpoint emphasizes the need for
ecologically sustainable tourism. Finally, a viewpoint of the long-term viability of
tourism recognizes the competitiveness of destinations. Generally, a viewpoint accepts
tourism as a part of a strategy for sustainable development throughout the physical and
human environments.

Butler (1993) remarks that the concept of sustainability is not unfortunate, but it
is extremely misleading. Sustainable is a widely used term with a specific meaning and it
is the adjective form of the verb “to sustain” (to sustain or to prolong). In the context of
tourism, an appropriate definition of sustainable tourism is explained as tourism in a form
that can maintain its viability in an area for an indefinite period of time. Eagles and
McCool (1994) made much discussion on sustainable development and tourism
development in the context of environment in which tourism occurs.
Eden et al. (2000); Spangenberg (2002); Spangenberg and Valentine (1999) commonly observed that any tourism promotional effort, however, can have positive and negative ecological, economic and socio cultural consequences. Achieving a balance among these three classical dimensions of sustainable tourism is difficult to realize without an institutional perspective to manage, meditate and facilitate growth.

Spangenberg and Valentine, (1999) emphasized on the participatory decision-making processes to be more effective through public participation and involvement of local people. It is the fourth institutional dimension that builds a strong confidence among the participants in decision making. The institutional dimension calls for strengthening people’s participation in political governance. The dimension of sustainable tourism development is broadly classified into four categories such as ecological, social, cultural and economic sustainability. Butler (1991) and Wright (1993) advocated for alternatives to mass tourism in the form of environmentally sensitive small scale. Therefore, sustainable tourism may be the best form of environmentally sensitive small scale form of “alternative tourism”.

Mow Forth and Munt (2003) precisely define that “alternative tourism” can be interpreted as an umbrella term covering a range of new forms of tourism that emerged during the 1980’s and early 1990’s in response to the perceived costs of mass tourism. It has been described by using varying terms, including Soft and Educational Tourism (Krppendorf 1982), Co-Operative Tourism (Farrell 1986), Appropriate Tourism (Ritcher 1987), Responsible Tourism (Wheller 1991), Special Interest Tourism (Hall & Weiler 1992) and the popular term Ecotourism (Boo 1990 and Ceballous-Lascurine 1991) and the newly emerging Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT)(DFID 1999). Butler (1991) suggested that
alternative tourism rather than a solution to mass tourism may just be its vanguard to open up new and potentially more sensitive destinations to the development of mass tourism.

Jafar (1989) believed that the sustainable tourism debate entered a period typified by a need for knowledge about the different forms of tourism and the potential impacts. Butler (1990) commented with eagerness to promote one form of tourism as a solution to the multiple problems that can be caused by extensive and long-term development and is somewhat akin to selling 19th century’s magic medicine.

2.11. SYNTHESIS OF REVIEW FOR CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The review of literature has covered a wide range of concepts, issues and challenges with regard to finding a harmonious way of meeting the needs of community members and the expectations of the visitors. As such, community members are the fulcrums of the ecotourism projects and visitors are the backbones for generating income and employment. Both the stakeholders directly contribute towards the sustainable ecotourism projects. This is the argument on which many underlying core concepts of ecotourism, wildlife tourism, sustainable tourism, alternative tourism and responsible tourism have been reviewed with much emphasis on their significant contributions to sustainable ecotourism. Nevertheless, ecotourism is a tested western model for meeting the needs and expectations of all these stakeholders linked in ecotourism development. This is an alternative form of tourism that ensures the equitable distribution of tourism revenue among the community members and the ethical practices for the conservation of natural resources.
The study has been significant from three important perspectives: accruing the economic benefits to the community, providing opportunities to the visitors for learning, and experiencing the natural scenic beauty, wilderness and cultural richness and preserving the threatened species and plants. Further, the rationale of the study is relevant for the PTR in Kerala, where some important bird species and plants are considered to be endangered. More importantly, the EDC has been instrumental in reuniting the poachers and primitive people for the cause of conservation of natural forest and wild animals.

After having reviewed some selected empirical studies with reference to ecotourism and wildlife tourism in the protected areas, the study has come out with some arguments that community participation and visitor satisfaction are the two important dimensions of ecotourism in the PTR. In addition, most of the studies have dwelled on facilities, amenities and service quality as the key determinants for visitor satisfaction and income, employment, drinking water, health, sanitation, hygienic and self-respect for the active community participation. With this backdrop, the theoretical gap can better be explained with the help of the conceptual model that has been developed from the review of various main and subthemes of community participation and visitor satisfaction with reference to sustainable ecotourism in the PTR. Figure 2.1 illustrates the conceptual model depicting the logical interrelationship between the community participation and visitor satisfaction for achieving sustainable ecotourism.

The figure implicitly and explicitly explains the participation of community with the direct and indirect influences of the factors such as empowerment, decision-making ability, self-respect, self-pride, dignified life, quality of life, partnership, ownership, mutual help and mutual respect. Both the authorities of ecotourism and service providers
in the adjoining buffer areas of the protected reserve aim to send back visitors satisfied. Satisfying visitors on the various aspects of destination attributes along with core attractions demand for the touristic infrastructures in harmony with the capacity of destinations. However, visitor satisfaction is completely and clearly determined by the factors like facilities, amenities, service quality, safety & security, attachment, participation, mutual respect, activity and value for money.

The figure further intends to explain the role of the governments, NGOs, tourism service providers, handicraft and boutique shops and educational institutions to look into the active community participation and the visitor satisfaction. All these factors of community participation and visitor satisfaction are mediated and moderated by the factors related to meet the benefits, interests and expectations of community members to develop ownership towards ecotourism projects and visitors to develop personal attachment towards the ecotourism attractions. Subsequently, the objective of achieving sustainable ecotourism can be practically possible for the mutual benefits of all the stakeholders. The figure is a theoretical illustration of linkages between the constructs to adequately understand the existing gaps in the conceptual relationships that have been investigated with the help of scientific methods. For example, there are no qualitative or quantitative studies focusing on these numbers of mediators and moderators determining the visitor satisfaction and community participation.

To conclude, the theoretical gaps have been uncovered from the review of previous literatures, in-depth interviews with key stakeholders, field visit and observations. Thus, the study is extremely significant to understand critically the gaps and find out the reasons of the gap and contribute to the existing theories.
Fig. 2.1 Conceptual Model for Sustainable Ecotourism in the Protected Areas
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