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Ecotourism as defined by the Ecotourism Society is: ‘responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and improves the well-being of local people’.

The Ecotourism Association of Australia defines it as: ‘Ecotourism is ecologically sustainable tourism that fosters environmental and cultural understanding, appreciation and conservation.’
World Conservation Union’s (IUCN) Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (CNPPA) defines it as:

‘environmentally responsible travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas, in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features – both past and present) that promotes conservation, has low visitor impact and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local populations (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996, 20)
These can be broken down into 6 key points (adapted from Ross and Wall, 1999):

• Nature based
• Sustainable
  – Local participation
  – Generates income for local people
  – Quality tourism
• Educates local people and tourists
Deep Ecotourism and Deep Ecology

Deep ecology
• mankind integral part of environment
• places more value on ecosystems and species
• considers how humans fit into the ecosphere

Deep ecotourism
• involves the tourist ‘understanding the local culture without disturbing or undermining the local people,’ (Che, 2006)
• respect natural environment
• doing rather than watching
• Ventures making profits purely for tourist pleasure – shallow ecotourism (also known as ecoflops or ecolites)

Ecotourism should be Biocentric
(and can even benefit the environment)

Tourism is usually Homocentric
But is this also ecotourism?
What activities are involved and where?

Originally activities such as bird watching, whale watching, geology tours.

Now emphasis is on spectrum of activities and individuals involved.

Where?

Traditionally remote areas
Now also in areas of reclaimed natural habitat or regenerating forests
Characteristics of hard and soft ecotourism as ideal types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard (Active)</th>
<th>Soft (Passive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong environmental commitment</td>
<td>Moderate environmental commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement sustainability</td>
<td>Steady-state sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized trips</td>
<td>Multi purpose trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long trips</td>
<td>Short trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td>Large groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically active</td>
<td>Physically passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few if any services expected</td>
<td>Services expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on personal experience</td>
<td>Emphasis on interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hard ecotourism is estimated to contribute only 2% to the market share of the tourism market, while soft ecotourism may contribute as much as 20%.

The boundaries between mass tourism and soft ecotourism are blurred. The term Mass ecotourists is now being applied to these people.

Where does Ecotourism fit into the Evolution of tourism?

Jafari (1989) described Four platforms of tourism

1. Advocacy Platform: 1950’s and 1960’s, tourism was considered to be a smokeless industry, the more the better

2. Cautionary Platform: 1970’s, it became a Trojan Horse, that could undermine environmental, economic and socio-cultural integrity of destinations

3. Adaptancy Platform: 1980’s, saw an increase in alternative tourism, including the naming of a specific type of nature tourism as ecotourism

4. Knowledge based Platform: now not looking at whether tourism is big or small, but is assessing the management of each destination.

Ecotourism has caused chaos, not all mass tourism is bad.
Can Mass tourism and Ecotourism benefit each other?

Mass tourism benefiting ecotourism:

• mass tourism provides soft ecotourists
• government take mass tourism more seriously as generates serious revenue
• mass ecotourism could provide alternative to more destructive but potentially lucrative endeavours, e.g. logging, mining, resorts

Ecotourism benefiting mass tourism:

• strengthens product through diversification
• educates mass tourists
• greening of tourism appeals to certain markets
Protected areas benefit Ecotourism

• Are regulated to ensure remain unspoilt
• Attractive because of high value natural area
• Are tourism icons, flagships
• As other less well known ones are degraded, these may be the ones that remain
• Ecotourism helps to sustain them

Then there is the honey pot argument, by drawing people to an area can be severally degraded
Enhanced management allows for ‘site hardening’ measures to increase carrying capacity

Suggestion: ecotourists be provided with high quality interpretation, even virtual reality tours, to further reduce pressure on the environment.

More realistically management measures can be undertaken to reduce pressure.

Example: Yosemite, California, decided that volume of traffic the problem not the tourists, so provided alternative transport in the park
The Search for Sustainability

‘Tourism contains the seeds of its own destruction; tourism can kill tourism, destroying the very environmental attractions which visitors come to a location to experience.’


Tourism concern and Worldwide Fund for Nature define sustainable tourism as tourism that:

• Operates within natural capacities
• Recognises the contribution of people and communities
• Accepts local people must have an equitable share benefits
• Guided by the wishes of all stakeholders

Can be a type of sustainable tourism, but only if it meets these criteria
Argument: Small is beautiful (but in the case of small ecotourism businesses they may not be able to afford the costs of being sustainable)

On the other hand

Mass tourism can provide better infrastructure and pay additional management to carry out environmental audits, recycling, etc.

As Visitation increases, so does impact and potential damage.

New argument suggests: Mass Ecotourists can make business more sustainable by enabling better infrastructure. You can increase carrying capacity by better management
People attracted to ecotourism

- Ecotourism travel literature has changed over the last 20 years
- Shift towards ‘soft’ ecotourism
- Now highlight the peaceful elements of nature
- Suggest becoming part of nature
- Is this ecotourism?
What is an ecotourist anyway?

- lumped together with adventure or nature tourists
- the average ecotourist
  - aged between 31 and 50
  - better educated professionals or business people, dual income households, combined income of over £35,000
  - two main categories: DINC’s (double income no children) or ‘empty nesters’ (couples with grown children)
  - socially minded and interested in culture, history and people in developing countries
As the number of ecotravellers has grown, less experienced clients are taking ecotourist tours and the style of tour has changed

• less interest seems to shown in learning about the ecology of an area
• guides say that where they once talked all day, now a few minutes is all that is needed.
• people are looking for some of the excitement of remote places with all of the comforts of home (long jungle walks are swapped for days kayaking or sitting by the beach)
• tour agencies are picking up on this and are even changing the literature to reduce emphasis on the physical outdoor nature of it all and instead emphasis the chance to feel inner peace and passively enjoy nature.
Condé Nast Traveller magazine outlines 7 golden rules for eco-operators who should:

• link commercial tourism with local conservation programmes
• provide money and other tangible support for development of parks and management of natural resources
• support indigenous businesses by buying local goods and services
• arrange and promote meaningful contact between travellers and local people
• promote ecological research programs
• develop sustainable tourist facilities that minimise environmental damage
• help to repair the damage done by others (such as the Sierra Club’s trail cleanup trips)
Ecotourism today is just a buzz word and an advertising device?

• Does real ecotourism exist or is it a marketing ploy used by firms to increase sales and improve their image?
Consider the following Ecotourism businesses

- CAMPFIRE, Zimbabwe
- Sea Canoes, Thailand
- Tumani Tenda, Gambia
- Bigodi Villiage, Uganda
CAMPFIRE Program, Gonarezhou National Park in SE Zimbabwe

• Established as a Grass Roots Programme (GRP)
• Joint venture established 1989: Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management (Zimbabwe gov’t) + local Shangaan people + Zimbabwe Sun hoteliers + Clive Stockil an advisor
• Theory - enable local communities to benefit economically from wildlife
• Goal – to address poverty alleviation of local people

Main Selling Points:
1) Community Involvement rather than NGO’s
2) Wildlife becomes an asset not a competitor

Based on previous project – WINDFALL (Wildlife Industries New Development for All) that failed:
• Did not address socio-economic issues, mainly concerned with environment
• Local people were not involved in the decision making process
• Underneath it all racial policies of Rhodesian government
CAMPFIRE based on following principles:

- local communities must be able to assess the value of their local assets and understand their differential worth
- better game management = more income
- most proceeds derived from exploitation of local goods should stay in the local community (Rural District Councils (RDC’s) – ensure that 80% of revenue from safari game stays in the local community)
- local councils should be responsible for production and management decisions as well as the distribution of profit from local enterprises

Income also derived from: selling live animals, harvesting natural resources, tourism and selling bush meat
The programme had two fundamental objectives:

1) Poverty alleviation through food access

2) Proactive management to reduce the impacts of environmental degradation by natural crises, such as drought

And

Three fundamental principles:

• Wildlife an agricultural resource
• When land used to best capabilities – no conflict between game and agriculture
• Game management should complement arable agriculture and vice versa
1) Poverty alleviation through food access

- 1989 - USAID awarded $186,268 increasing to US $906,400 by 1996/7
- Start up funding for villages, to be repaid from profits
- 200,000 households involved initially
- Gross income to communities varied from US $8,000 to US $375,000 / annum throughout the lifetime of the project
- Funds were used to develop and improve infrastructure (e.g. health & education), improve transport and subsidize household incomes
- Promised 80% to locals, but only received 52%
What did the average household Receive?

- Average household earned US $8.4 (1996 exchange rates)
- Translated to food = 17.47 kg maize at 1996 prices
- Average household 5.6 persons, maize would last them 6 days (per capita requirement of 0.52 kg of maize / day / person)
- Average household in Sinamusanga Ward, Binga District, produce 582 kg of maize, sorghum and millet per year
- 8.25% (or 48kg) of this to damage by elephants and hippos annually
- Equivalent to 16.4 days of food loss (and estimated they only produce 200 days of edible crops anyway)
- Initially calculated average household would lose 31.5 days of food / annum to wildlife, more recently figures quoted of 96 days.
2) Environmental Management – moderate success, but still conflict with game damaging crops
In addition CAMPFIRE did not work because of current and historical political issues including corruption.

3 Main problem areas:
1) Community ownership and empowerment
2) Legal structure including land ownership and tenure
3) Administrative allocation of resources

1) Community ownership and empowerment -
   - Communities hard to define
   - gender issues
   - Rules for community membership vary
   - Seasonal issues
2) Legal structure including land tenure and ownership

- Redistribution of land promised by Zimbabwe lib movement, CAMPFIRE could have addressed this, but did not own, only managed land
- Historically giving local communities land caused more encroachment into new areas to increase production
- Encouraged immigration causing more destruction
- In 1967 Rhodesian Government Tribal Trust Land Act and the 1969 Land Tenures Act which:
  - evicted blacks from ‘European lands’
  - expanded establishment of black communities in communal areas
  - allowed a land market to be established in communal areas for grazing and arable agriculture
- 1975 Parks and Wildlife Act, gave local communities stewardship (and legal control) over wildlife in these areas, but NOT authority over their land

Without land reform, CAMPFIRE could not succeed.
3) Administrative allocation of resource revenues

- Government acts as manager, administrator, facilitator, ombudsman and general overseer of community resources

- RDC’s manage the land, make decisions about who is using it (e.g. deals with safari companies) and can adopt measures to increase what is essentially their revenues without the agreement of the local people.

  e.g. one RDC was convinced by a safari company to erect an electric fence to control game. The community after much discussion finally agreed to it being assured they would have input into the final decision concerning location, but they were ignored and it was erected ignoring their suggestions
Once 200,000 households were involved in CAMPFIRE

The money has been used in setting up local projects such as schools, mills, water pumps, electricity, telephones

However

when one of the village received their first profit in 1994, Z$2160 was given to the local all male football club, Z$500 each was given to the local school and a sewing co-operative

Inequality of division of resources is an issue in ecotourism
Case Study: Sea Canoe and Siam Safari, Thailand

1989 SeaCanoe established by John Gray in South Thailand
Kayak tours through the caves (hongs) and mangroves of Phang Nga Bay
Trips well run, strict control of clients
Limited number of trips per day, high safety standard
Gray awarded 5 international tourism 1992, copycat businesses set up
Established a Cartel that charged entry fees to the National Park
Gray would not join or pay, business suffered financially, but still operating
Community-based ecotourism, the significance of social capital (Jones 2005)

Tumani Tenda, Gambia is a community initiated and managed ecotourism business

Social capital includes -social organisation (e.g. networks, social or family ties, norms) that enable individuals to coordinate and cooperate for their mutual benefit

Would expect that high levels of social trust, cohesion and cooperation would be inherent in a successful business, but is this the case?

This study looked at this along with the sustainability of the venture
Background

• Tumani Tenda new village (42 years old in 2007)
• Consists of 5 extended families, one is Manjako who are Christian rather than Muslim
• population is 300, with a large number of children
• Men and women work fairly equally in their own fields and in the village garden, 10% of its profits going to village committee.
• Camp adjacent to village - 15 volunteers are cooks, room attendants, barkeeper, receptionist, bird guides and waiters
• Opened in 1999, has 13 rooms, sleeping 2 or 3 per room, in round thatched roof huts, three grass huts, a toilet and shower block
• Offer: boat trips, bird tours, craft classes, fishing, cultural dancing, salt making and guided tours through their forest and village
• Varied wildlife
• 2001, 200 tourists visited the camp, but numbers fell in 2002 due to renovations.
Methodology:

- **Control village** - Kafuta, (no ecotourism, had a project being developed but failed because of intra-family conflict)
- used a structured questionnaire, to ascertain amount community involvement - how well community functioned (conflict, trust, exclusion, decision making)
- Open ended questions asked to discover key operations that might have changed after the business was up and running, e.g. had status changed so some individuals no longer took part in collective activities such as water gathering, forestry, irrigation, horticulture?
- Thirty-five interviews took place with a native Jola speaking interpreter
- Stratified sample used, to attain a sample representative of family composition of the village
- Interviews were also held with key community members.
Results

1) Mutually Beneficial Collective Action:
   - community worked collectively to build the camp
   - when founded, village head required everyone to participate equally in village work
   - Tumani scores highly in cooperation- more than 89% of the respondents doing 4 or more days/ month of free labour (even more since camp built)

(Note that once spending spare time on a community initiative becomes the norm, people who do not take part considered lazy and may be ostracised - Makes the organisation more likely to succeed)
2) Structural Social Capital:
   – Villagers in Tumani Tenda belong to more social organisations than those in Kafuta, (4.7 versus 2)
     (may relate to definition as TT have more group organisations)

3) Cognitive Social Capital
   – Question: Would you prefer to own your own field or share one 2 ½ times as large with someone else?
   – Tumani Tenda scored significantly higher in this, but there was no difference in the other two reciprocity and sharing variables (may be artefact of the methodology)
   – Villagers in Tumani Tenda thought less conflict in their village than Kafuta
   – No significant difference between trust.
4) Power, exclusion, equity and decision making

- Tumani Tenda - felt they had bigger say in decision making (but two families not involved at all)

- Some discord about account keeping in the camp and distribution of profits and benefits from the camp (80% of the villagers were concerned)

- Positions of authority handed down from father to son, bypassing those not already in the system, suggesting favouritism

All photos from Tumani Tenda Web site: www.tumanitenda.co.uk
5) Implications for environmental sustainability

- Fuelwood taken from the forest, but being replanted for fuel and timber
- Energy saving light bulbs are used and bottles are recycled
- Refrigerator has been purchased, but cannot afford the solar panels so it is less environmentally friendly
- Considering buying a car, would make them even less environmentally friendly

Hence although higher social capital does enable better environmental protection, it also facilitates western style developments and the issues associated with these.
Conclusions:

• Tumani Tenda - closely knit community
• With high level of collective action and social cohesion
• still has problems, and I would suggest more brewing
• is a successful ecotourism venture, locally established and run, which appears to be working, at least so far
• one of the few community enterprises that is successful, so it will be interesting to see if it continues
 Resident’s attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi village, Uganda.

Indicator of appropriateness of tourism is resident’s attitudes towards tourism.
• Positive attitudes lead to pro-tourism behaviour and in the case of nature related tourism conservation of resources
• Negative attitudes can lead to unfavourable reactions to tourism, even sabotage of resources

Statistics - Bigodi Village, Uganda
• Small Village – edge of Kibale National Park (KNP)
• Became involved in tourism in 1991
• Offers community forest and wetland, Magombe Swamp (primates & birds)
• Offer guided walks through the forest and the opportunity to learn about local village life and culture

Not an easy choice, villagers at first very negative to idea

- Little contact with outsiders due to war
- Feared tourists would steal their lands

Took two years to develop infrastructure

- Peace Corps Volunteer convinced 6 well respected people to take part
- Developed a cooperative – the Kibale Association for Rural and Economic Development (KAFRED)
- KAFRED a not for profit organisation
- Each member has equal vote, officers elected every other year
- Initially every one paid $10US to join, but gave free membership with all privileges to peasant farmers whose land bordered the area
Bigodi in an idea area, because next to the KNP and it mainly catered for backpackers and drifters, who came to see wildlife and liked staying in remote areas (basic facilities not a problem)

Tourists arrived almost from the start, cooperative has now grown to 42 people, with other people taking part in annual meetings

By 2003, approx. 75 tourists a month
- Tour of swamp $10 US
- Constructed a secondary school with the profits
- One resident has a backpackers hostel
- Woman’s cooperative selling handcrafts
Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA)

- Hierarchical model – behaviour is influenced by intent, intent influenced by attitudes and norms (as perceived by the individual via social pressure) and both influence beliefs
  
e.g. your beliefs will influence how you do something

Use to see if how communities cope or will cope with tourism by explaining residents attitudes towards:

- benefits,
- involvement with decision making,
- stage of destination life cycle,
- tourist type,
- economic dependence
- degree of cultural difference between tourists and locals.
Life cycle of tourism development: Doxey (1976)
• Exploration
• Involvement
• Development
• Consolidation
• Stagnation

In relation to Bigodi – had no experience of tourism, so idea met with suspicion, anxiety and fear

Cooperatives – increased participation by locals in planning and development as well as benefits
Study:
Active interviews with 12.5% of residents (48 out of 385)
• 29 men (60%), 19 women (40%)
• 8 Young adults (16%)  
• 19 adults (39%)
• 14 Older adults (30%)
• 7 elderly people (15%)

14 (29%) directly involved with tourism, either employed by KAFRED, KNP, the hostel or members of the women’s cooperative

90 (23%) of Bigodi directly involved in tourism

29 (60%) had primary education only, 12 (25%) O levels, 5 (10%) high school, 2 (4%) had certificates above high school
Results
• 48 (94%) expressed positive attitudes towards tourism
• 3 who did not express positive attitudes

When pushed one resident said
• ‘What bad things have tourists brought? They don’t steal, they don’t abuse people, when they come they are happy and get along with locals.’

Costs:
• Inflation
• Crop raiding (by wild animals)

Benefits:
• Income
• Improve agricultural markets
• Random good fortune
Why is this a success?

• Local participation: Cooperative developed and managed by local people
• Small scale and novelty value in the area (low demand tourism with regards to facilities required)
• Slow development and acclimatisation
• Income dispersed throughout the community - school
• Benefits dispersed throughout the community
• Integration between tourism and agriculture:
  – demand for products from tourists, but also local people who are now totally employed in tourism so need to buy food from their neighbours (multiplier effect)
  – increased need for food, so farmers making more money
(Important, as often if local people cannot supply the demand for food, it has to be bought in hence greater leakages)
• Inflation still a problem, not just charging locals, but also charging people who work in tourism more
• Crop raiding compensated for by KAFRED
• Locals invited tourists to join in football matches, when they did produced positive feelings towards the tourists
Is there a template for success?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Factors For Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Skills and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Research**
- What makes your project special? Why will people come to see it?
- Who are your key targets?
- How do you deliver?
- What will make them want to return?

**Adequate Skills and Training**
- Emphasis on customer focus
- Must provide both menial and managerial skills as well as specific ecotourism skills

**Sufficient Resources**
- Good planning and financial support particularly in early years when low profits
- Back up money for emergencies
- Read the small print – legislation changes regularly

**Ongoing Monitoring & Evaluation**
- Emphasis on customer focus
- Be flexible and adaptable as the market changes or customer base makes new demands
- Have an alternate plan for when all else fails

Community involvement if it is going to be a viable alternative to current unsustainable livelihoods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Factors</th>
<th>Infrastructure and Superstructure</th>
<th>Tight Regulation</th>
<th>Strong Stakeholder Involvement</th>
<th>X-Factor Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination</strong></td>
<td>Destination should be accessible, political climate stable, in a developing country may have NGO or other external support</td>
<td>Planning laws should encourage entrepreneurship and competition, if it does not damage resources Fair practice Sustainable development</td>
<td>Involvement throughout the development, planning to operational, at all levels including government, but not just for piece of the cake Watch for leakages</td>
<td>Weather Political unrest Natural disasters, should all be included in a risk analysis before beginning the development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Impacts of Tourism & Ecotourism
Tourism has great potential to provide income and opportunities for local people.

But it with benefits come costs

Tourism can have the following impacts (See Table 1)
• environmental
• economic
• socio-cultural

‘Tourism is like a fire, you can cook your food or burn you house down.’
Some of the environmental impacts of Tourism (Table 1)

Direct
1. Overcrowding of tourist area or tourist resource
2. Overdevelopment
3. Recreational use (Boats, fishing, safaris/tours)
4. Pollution (Noise, litter, air, land, water)
5. Vandalism
6. Feeding animals
7. Vehicles (Speeding, driving off-road, night driving)

Indirect
1. Collection of firewood
2. Roads and Murram pits
3. Introduction of exotic plants
4. Power lines
5. Artificial waterholes and salt provision
1. Overcrowding of tourist area or tourist resource

Sewage and waste water is one of the biggest problems in coastal tourist developments (or is it?)

• Surveyed 315 reef sites in 31 countries over 2.5 months
• Found sewage had an impact
• But most reefs not near to main outlets, so fishing worse

Case Study: Macro-algal blooms on southeast Florida coral reefs I. Lapointe, et al. (2005)
• Surveyed reefs off Florida with successive macro-algal blooms
• Sampled tissue of algae
• Nutrient enrichment from sewage cause
• Tourism developments are a problem
2. Overdevelopment

Case Study: Monteverde Cloud Forest Preserve, Costa Rica, Aylward et al. (1996)

- 1500 ha. of cloud forest bought in 1949, 1000 ha. managed for dairy cattle, left 500 hectares
- Purchased by Tropical Science centre, run as forest preserve
- Originally only visited by scientific researchers, but after a BBC documentary in 1978, numbers of visitors rose from 200 to 2000/annum
- Land acquisition continued until reached 10,000 ha by 1992 with other conservation organisations owning 25,000 ha around it
• Thousand species of insects and 2500 plants
• 2 1/2 hours from main road, so not mainstream
• by 1994 49,793 visits were made to the Preserve (average of 1.4 visit per visitor)
• needed to improve infrastructure and management and introduce charging to produce funds
• In 1995 a fee structure from $1.00 for Costa Rican students to $16.00 for tourists on packaged tours (free for local people and members of TSC)
In 1994 the breakdown of income from these categories was:
61% foreigners not on tours
30% from tour packages
6% from foreign students
3% from nationals
negligible from local students

pricing system works, pays for maintenance and administration
Preserve pays for itself and shows a net profit each year.

Increased visitor numbers excellent for income, but there is an environmental cost
3. Recreational Use


- Study looked at the impacts of licensed and unlicensed boats on Dolphins and impact of increasing number of trips per week
- Recorded school size, behaviour, how many boats within 300 m
- Dolphins responded to tourist boats
- Decreased resting time from 67.8% (one boat) to 0.5% (3 boats)
- Milling behaviour increased from 28.4% to 46.4%
- Foraging decreased
- Unlicensed boats had more of an impact
- Increased number of tours meant more disturbance and stress
4. Pollution

5. Vandalism

6. Vehicles

7. Feeding Animals

Alterations of natural behavioural through supplementary feeding

• reduction in time needed to forage and hunt / reduced home range
• increased breeding activity and population density
• alteration in balance of community
• alteration of age of first breeding by females
Dependency and habituation
• may lose hunting skills
• offspring may never learn hunting skills (e.g. carnivores)
• habituation makes the animal more vulnerable

Aggression
• towards humans increases with familiarity
• Intra-specific aggression (within the same species) over food

Health /disease / injury
• If feeding low reduce fitness overall
• Human pathogens can increase disease
• Some foods can harm digestion, cause blockages

Manage by prohibiting, controlling, ignoring

But some species have benefited from supplementary feeding
Indirect

1. Collection of firewood

   • Sagarmatha (Mt. Everest) area of Nepal to assess the impact of deforestation of the subalpine zone from firewood and leaf litter collection
   • deforestation was severely threatening wild bird populations and that coordinated management should be undertaken
   • Grazing should be reduced and controlled, trees felled only with replanting, lodges should use kerosene instead of wood

2. Roads and Murram (Gravel) pits
3. Introduction of exotic plants
4. Powerlines
5. Artificial waterholes
Economic impacts

Mainstream tourism criticised for being:
• Driven, owned and controlled by entrepreneurs from developed nations
• they take profits while using the destination country’s resources and labour.
• pay is low
• employment is seasonal
• justify saying if they didn’t invest no one would
Economic Impacts of tourism on a destination (Table 2)

Benefits
1. Brings in foreign exchange
2. Provides funding for the preservation of architecture and heritage
3. Provides employment
4. Offers a more modern way of life in developing countries
5. Can promote gender equality and employment of disadvantaged groups
6. Pays for improved infrastructure
7. Offers a higher potential income than export of raw materials
8. Requires little in imports in relation to per unit of foreign exchange it generates
1. Brings in foreign exchange / provides employment

2. Provides funding for preservation of heritage sites

Case Study: The impact of tourism on the Old Town of Edinburgh, Parlett et al. (1995)

Considered the impact of tourist spending on the local economy including:
- Direct spending
- Indirect spending
- Induced spending

Found money was being spent on infrastructure, but not on the immediate economy
3. Provides employment

4. Offers potential for a modern life style

5. Can promote gender equality and employment of disadvantaged groups (lower castes, young people) / Change in status quo (who profits, gender / age equality?)
   - Female trekking guides
   - Women on local committees
Costs

1. Inflation, particularly land, labour and foodstuffs
2. Often menial jobs
3. Destruction of traditional life styles
4. Change in status quo
5. Locals may or may not get access to these facilities
6. Leakages can be high,
7. External factors impact on tourism
8. Tourism is price and income elastic
9. Over dependence on single often fashion driven industry
10. Tourism often seasonal
11. Locals see and desire more ‘western’ goods, increasing import demand
12. Neo-colonial relationships of exploitation
Annapurna Conservation Area Project

ACAP Principles

• Participation of local people in all matters of planning, design, decision making and implementation of programmes

• Sustainability: a trekking fee was charged to anyone using the area with the money being used to create an endowment fund for conservation activities

• Role of facilitator, ACAP considers itself to be the *lami* (matchmaker), bringing in outside resources to the local people
6. Development pays for improved infrastructure from basic to clean water and sanitation to facilities such as shopping centres, swimming pools, sports facilities but locals may or may not get access to these facilities

- Clean water and sanitation
- Kerosene fuel supplies
- Encourage and partially support use of solar power
7. Leakages can be high, reducing amount of profit that stays in the area/region/country

Case Study: Case studies from Ghandruk, Contribution of tourist expenditure to the local economy in the Annapurna Area. Banskota and Sharma (1997)
**Sources of Possible Leakage from Lodges from Tourist Generated Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Ghorepani Local %</th>
<th>Ghorepani Import %</th>
<th>Ghandruk Local %</th>
<th>Ghandruk Import %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>96.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>95.88</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>51.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>85.29</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>57.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>85.25</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>79.09</td>
<td>20.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>18.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>98.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>78.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>99.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jam/Butter</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>90.29</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>85.45</td>
<td>14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth/Drinks/</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>94.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattresses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>23.59</td>
<td><strong>76.41</strong></td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td><strong>68.09</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Political unrest, extreme weather conditions, changes in international currency rate of exchanges have uncontrolled impacts on destinations

9. Tourism is price and income elastic (prices can change rapidly, drawing tourists to ‘best value for money’ locations)

10. Overdependence on a single often fashion driven industry (See example of camel trekking in Jaisalmar)

11. Tourism often seasonal, so tendency to increase capacity for the high season, which is grossly under-utilised in the low season.
12. Offers a higher potential income than export of raw materials, particularly with the impacts of world trade agreements and national subsidies on the prices of commodities.

13. Tourism requires little in imports in relation to per unit of foreign exchange it generates but locals see and desire more ‘western’ goods, increasing import demand

14. Neo-colonial relationships of exploitation
Socio-cultural Impacts
Ecotourism offers the opportunity for local to develop a sustainable livelihood, sometimes it works, sometimes it does not.

Four ‘E’s of tourism: (Swarbrooke, 1998)

- Equity: all stakeholders are fairly treated
- Equal: Opportunities: for employees and tourists
- Ethics: honesty in dealing with tourists and suppliers and governments being ethical to host populations and tourists
- Equal Partners: tourists treating locals as equals, not inferiors, managing tourism so local people maintain their dignity and sense of pride in themselves and their community
Main potential impacts of tourism on host cultures and societies. (Modified from: Swarbrooke, J. (1998) Sustainable tourism management, see Table 3)

1. Heritage
2. Language
3. Religion
4. Traditional Arts
5. Traditional Life Styles
6. Values and Behaviours
7. Host Population
Case Study: For love and money-romance tourism in Jamaica. Pruitt and LaFont (1995)

• Jamaica Rastafarians (true cult, believe in justice, peace, simplicity of living, living with nature and lack interest in material goods)
• Rastafarian men, hustling or being hustled by Euro-American women (dreadlocks seem to be main attraction)
• Relationships: usually cross cultural and cross racial, may be short term or part-time long term
• Locals seem to think all single females looking for a ‘partner’
Benefits and down side for the women

Benefits:
• exposed to local culture on a more intimate level
• are allowed to behave outwith their norms
• protected from other hustlers and sex
• often not ‘ideal’ women in their own country

Down side:
• Men can become possessive
• If relationship continues, men can become aggressive (frustration of being ‘kept’, and / or in Jamican culture men the ‘boss’
• women can get tired of supporting the men.
• Problems arise if women take their man back to their own country
• Risk of disease
Benefits and downside for the Men

Benefits:
• Luxurious life style when supported
• may be give them presents, money, even trips abroad
• Sex with a variety of women, which helps their manliness
• Jamaican women – ‘no money no talk’
• Often believe can have a truer relationship with a white women as they are more emotional and tender than Jamaican women
• as a Rasta are not expected to be able to give people cash, so good for poor rural men
• Will maintain multiple girlfriends, until one eventually moves in or sends a plane ticket
Downsides:

- Increasingly ostracised by locals who are working honestly for poor wages
- Most not true Rastas, so giving it a bad name
- Cultural norm – men are not supposed to take money from women so are shamed by the local community;
- Young men further afield come in to hustle female tourists
- Men are supposed to be romantic, not just prostitutes, so difficult position to maintain. Women often return home and never contact them again, which some find hard.
Downside (cont’d)

- Establishing ones maleness is linked with the ability to earn money, desire to be a ‘big man’ involves 3 elements:
  - moral character (partially based on generosity)
  - respectability (maintaining a household)
  - representation (achieving status as a big man based on virility and fathering many children, ability to establish manhood requires income with local women)
- risk of disease

Is it exploitation?
Ecotourism and ecological restoration

Ecotourism can encourage and through development carry out ecological restoration.

Examples:

1) Conservation Corporation Africa - private tourism company
   www.ccafrica.com/vision/cca_vision.asp

• Phinda Private Game Reserve, in Northern KwaZulu-Natal
• have restored 17,000 ha of degraded land
• reintroduced over 2000 head of animals, including: lion, leopard, elephant, black and white rhino and buffalo
• built an ecolodge community now employed and deriving direct benefits

2) Belize, Community Baboon Sanctuary (CBS)
   - preserve the black howler monkey (\textit{Alouatta pigra})
   - local farms to agree to retain a continual corridor of forest along the river and property lines and retain all food sources
   - Monkeys can now travel freely
   - farms and local people benefiting from having ecotourism
Conclusions

Ecotourism particularly Community based tourism has a lot of potential for providing sustainable livelihoods, but it is often mis-sold, mis-managed and mis-understood.

For it to work, it requires a clear realisation of what it is, an understanding of what needs to be done and most important, a Unique Selling Point (USP) so it can be marketed.

Ecotourism also has great potential as part of ecological restoration to start to mitigate some of the damage we have done so far.

Tourism will continue as long as people can afford it and have somewhere to go. Making it responsible tourism is the issue.
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