



Progress in tourism public sector policy: Toward an ethic for non-human animals



Valerie A. Sheppard^{a,*}, David A. Fennell^b

^a Universidade Europeia, School of Tourism and Hospitality, Estrada da Correia, No53, 1500-210 Lisboa, Portugal

^b Brock University, Faculty of Geography & Tourism, 1812 Sir Isaac Brock Way, St. Catharines, L2S 3A1, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Tourism policy
Strategy
Animal ethics
Welfare
Rights

ABSTRACT:

This paper presents the content analysis of 123 tourism policies, from 73 countries, at the national and sub-national level. Specifically, we examined the policies for evidence of growing awareness of and concern for the impacts of tourism development and activities on non-human animals. The analysis reveals that tourism policy has been evolving over time, particularly as it relates to the depth and breadth of issues addressed. Policies that were mostly focused on economics in the 1990s have evolved to now include a broader range of topics related to the welfare of social and natural environments, including concern for the welfare of animals. However, we temper this positive finding by suggesting that until animals are considered a stakeholder in the tourism industry, their rights to exist and thrive will be considered only as it relates to their ability to enhance the attractiveness of and economic potential of a destination.

1. Introduction

This paper continues the trend in the tourism studies literature in the last few years of expanding the circle of morality by focusing on the interests of non-human animals (herein referred to as animals) used in the practice of tourism. These practices range from competitions (greyhound racing) and fighting (bullfights) to being hunted and fished, used for their senses (guide dogs), used for their strength (ridden or harnessed), kept in captive environments (zoos and aquaria), or simply viewed as ecotourism or wildlife tourism attractions (Fennell, 2012a). In all of these cases, animals are used for purposes of entertainment and commerce (see Wearing & Jobberns, 2011 in reference to the commoditization of animals), which often compromise their health and well-being and diminish their inherent value.

Past studies have touched on a range of ethical issues tied to the use of animals in tourism from several moral perspectives (see for example Fennell, 2012a, 2012b, 2013; Fennell & Sheppard, 2011; Shani & Pizam, 2008). Indeed, the moral theory perspective appears to be the most logical manner by which to understand these ethical dilemmas. What is missing in the extant literature, however, is a firmer understanding of how the interests of animals factor into the policy-making discourse of governments at various levels. Tourism policies and strategies are often viewed as the most important benchmarks for the planning, development, and management of tourism within jurisdictions. Assessing these documents over an extended period would

provide an historical snapshot of the types of priorities around the use of animals in these regional contexts and would thus provide a needed standard from which to assess future strategies in this area.

As such, it is the purpose of this study to document concern for animal welfare and or rights within the tourism policies of as many national and state jurisdictions as possible. This will be accomplished using two methods. The first is to implement a key word search looking for evidence of a concern for animal welfare and or rights, and, second, to search for progress toward or away from greater concern for the welfare and rights of animals over time.

2. Literature review

In the following paragraphs we define the key concepts that form the foundation of this research. In doing so, we provide an overview of some of the more salient tourism focused-research related to the following key concepts: policy; strategy; animal rights and welfare. It is not our intention to provide more than a brief overview, as entire texts have been devoted to these concepts. Rather, we focus on laying a relevant foundation for the methods, findings, and discussion section of the paper, and point out a future research direction.

2.1. Tourism policy defined

Tourism policy is one of the most significant influencers shaping the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: Valerie.sheppard@universidadeeuropeia.pt, vsheppard7@gmail.com (V.A. Sheppard).

nature of the tourism industry. It is what enables the socio-cultural, economic, and ecological impacts of the industry. It permits some to benefit from the industry and precludes others from doing likewise (Hall & Jenkins, 1995). Indeed, policy is conditioned by social factors, which are different in diverse social, cultural, and ecological contexts (Dredge & Jamal, 2015). Diverse stakeholders, such as developers, resource managers, communities, et cetera, each have their own agendas and seek, therefore, to protect their own interests. It is this diversity then that is often responsible for the gap between policy endorsement and policy implementation (Pigram, 1990).

Tourism policy is challenging to define and there is little consensus as to what it comprises, or how it should be identified and explained (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). At the broadest of levels, it is defined as *whatever governments choose to do or not to do with respect to tourism* (Hall & Jenkins, 2004, p. 527). Dredge (2006), Hall (1994), Bramwell (2011) and others, contend that government policy is based on collaboration, power sharing, negotiation, compromise, and partnership between all sectors, in a new form of governance (see also Hall, 2011). Some scholars have written on the transformation of conventional governmental policy process and responsibility which has moved away from defining and acting for the public good, to one that is now more strongly oriented towards facilitating and enabling in the face of large-scale influences such as globalization and neoliberalism (Dredge & Jamal, 2015). Others, such as, Fayos-Solá (1996), believe a move toward privatization is unsustainable. He contends that the tourism industry's evolution away from mass tourism toward market segmentation, differentiation of products, and its use of new technologies and new management styles requires changes at the core of tourism policy. These policy changes must focus on business and destination competitiveness, while meeting social, economic and environmental objectives. Overall, he contends that tourism policy must seek a better balance between the private, public, and volunteer sectors.

A review of the literature reveals that much of the tourism policy work has focused on the development and implementation of policy at the country or destination level, as well as the roles of key stakeholders in guiding effective tourism planning. While undeniably important research, Garcia (2014) observes a lack of research that delves deep within existing tourism policy to compare and contrast the various policies at the country level. Perhaps even more troubling, in a comprehensive study of the archeology and discourses of tourism policy and planning by Dredge and Jamal (2015), is the extent to which marginalized peoples and groups are underrepresented in policy, as well as the general nature of these directives. Marginalized peoples and groups are those who are treated as unimportant (Cambridge Dictionary, 2018). They may be subjected to discrimination due to a variety of factors, including gender, religion, culture, ethnicity, sexual orientation, social or occupational status, and or education or income level (European Institute for Gender Equality, 2018). From a tourism policy perspective, this includes those who are prevented from or unable to participate in the decision-making processes related to tourism planning and development.

Dredge and Jamal (2015) write that marginalized groups have started to garner interest from a small but growing sphere of investigation in the tourism literature; however, this represents a relatively small portion of available discourse on the topic (see Dredge, 2010; Jamal & Camargo, 2014; Kimbu & Ngoasong, 2013). What is missing in the broader literature, therefore, is a more intensive treatment of these groups in policy directives and, as we would argue, the expansion of what constitutes a marginalized group into consideration of the interests of animals. Furthermore, it appears that even sustainability and environment must give way to broader interests on development and management, so it is not surprising that these terms are not deconstructed more into their constituent parts, i.e., what is it about the environment or sustainability that needs to be protected or emphasized? As such, it is all well and good to discuss the importance and value of sustainability in tourism policy and planning, but the

generality of such ignores more central questions around the specific needs and requirements for these marginalized groups caught up in the intricate web of relations and actions that define the nature of the tourism domain. How, therefore, are concepts such as rights, ethics, responsibility, welfare, and so on, articulated and operationalized through tourism policy? What are the roles and responsibilities that government has as an enabler and facilitator in a climate of neoliberalism and globalization to affect change in these more marginalized groups?

2.2. Tourism strategy defined

The concept of policy is intertwined with the concept of strategy. Getz (1997, p. 93) defines strategy as *an integrated set of policies and programs intended to achieve the vision and goals of the organization or destination*. Stokes (2008) review of tourism strategies, including a review of two of tourism's top ranked journals, observes that the literature on the concept of *strategy* in tourism centres mostly on national approaches to destination management, and this usage has a focus on *strategic planning*. In this sense of the word, there is a tight connection to strategy as planning (Araujo & Bramwell, 2000; Reed, 2000). Used in a destination management organization context, strategy, Stokes adds, is used almost entirely in a marketing context.

Tourism strategies are critical not only for business success, but also for the regions in which they operate. Lane (1994) argues that both businesses and regions develop on the back of carefully crafted strategies and plans that reconcile competing interests, avoid waste and duplication, and try to fit the right tourist niche with the qualities of the destination. He provides a list of ten strategies useful for achieving sustainability in rural tourism contexts. In brief these are: dialogue between stakeholders; to guide appropriate infrastructure investment, marketing, and interpretation; investment in security; be inclusive of the conservation domain as a positive input; protect all forms of heritage; be supportive of new entrants into tourism; be supportive of new ideas, skills and education; weigh costs and benefits of alternative forms of tourism; be cooperative in marketing and training; and strategy backed by the entire community can leverage funds for new developments and investments.

Although tourism policy, and especially tourism strategy, have largely been interpreted as tourism growth development strategies, sustainable tourism strategies are appearing more frequently, either as a replacement of or to complement new or existing tourism policies (see Appendix A). Indeed, sustainable tourism strategies have been successful, for example, in Jordan to develop a tourism product that fits within both the geopolitical constraints of the region (the importance of the Jordanian government minimizing perceived risks) and the challenges that an arid region poses to certain types of tourists, necessitating a marketing strategy that focuses on a specific niche (Shunnaq, Schwab, & Reid, 2008).

2.3. Animal welfare and rights defined

Animal rights and welfare are used interchangeably; however, their meaning is quite different. Differences between animal rights and animal welfare may be conceived through the cage analogy. Animal rights means empty cages, while animal welfare means bigger cages. Most animal ethics research within the tourism field has focused on animal welfare, as opposed to rights. This seems to suggest that it is acceptable to use animals for tourism or other purposes, but in using animals for these purposes we should be concerned with an animal's wellbeing. If animals are faring well, i.e., well fed, watered, proper housing, free of pain and suffering, being with one's own kind, humans are fulfilling their obligations to animals (Bekoff & Nystrom, 2004).

There is a relatively small base of research that discusses animal welfare in tourism. Some of this work discusses animal welfare in a general context (Orams, 2002; Lovelock, 2003; and; Burns, Macbeth, &

Moore, 2011). Other studies discuss it in reference to specific species or taxa like elephants (Cohen, 2008; Duffy & Moore, 2010, 2011; and Kontogeorgopoulos, 2009), cetaceans (Hughes, 2001; Orams, 2004), or sled-dogs (Fennell & Sheppard, 2011). Turley (1999), Catibog-Sinha (2008), Tribe (2004, 2011), Wearing and Jobberns (2011), and Ryan and Saward (2004) discuss animal welfare and zoos. A comprehensive overview of animal welfare and tourism can be found in Fennell (2013).

The rights argument in animal liberation has been articulated by Tom Regan (2004) who contends that individual animals are in the possession of inherent value—they exist as ends-in-themselves, or have value in their own right, just like humans. Criteria used by Regan to support this position includes the fact that animals are conscious, they are intentional in their actions and thoughts, and they are sentient, which means they experience states like pain and pleasure, among others. Regan's focus is deontological, and derivative of egalitarian formal justice, where one individual is no better and therefore not deserving of better treatment than others. It is therefore hinged on respect, i.e., we deserve the same respect equally. As such, we have formal duties towards animals that have not been taken into consideration with any due regard by tourism theorists and especially practitioners. We should protect the interests of animals, as Regan (2004) notes, “not out of kindness, not because we are against cruelty, but out of respect for their rights ...” (p. 357). Fennell (2012b) argues that in following the true spirit of rights from Regan's perspective, there are at present few animal rights policies in tourism. The only capacity would be for ecotourism purposes where providers place the interests of animals on par with the interests of ecotourists.

The preceding literature review has focused on defining key concepts that serve as the foundation for this research. In this regard, we have provided a brief overview of important published works in these areas. The growing body of literature exploring tourism policy and/or strategy as it relates to the moral aspects of the marginalized (human and animal) is important. We contend that our study adds important information to previous studies by exploring the extent to which national and sub-national tourism policy and strategy has evolved over-time, and how such policies and strategies consider or do not consider the rights and welfare of animals. In the following section, we describe the methods utilized to achieve this goal.

3. Methods

Utilizing a naturalistic inquiry approach, the researchers undertook a summative content analysis of national and sub-national tourism policies from around the world. Researchers utilize a naturalistic approach to understand the social world through observation, description, and interpretation of the experiences and actions of specific people or groups of people (Salk, 2010). Rather than beginning with a hypothesis, researchers develop a general research question that serves as the foundation for the inquiry (Odom & Shuster, 1986). The most significant challenge related to a naturalistic inquiry approach is that two researchers may draw different conclusions from examining the exact same data.

Despite this challenge, Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 35) suggest that a naturalistic inquiry approach enables the researcher to undertake a more meaningful enquiry, particularly related to social and/or behavioural inquiry, in three key areas: research, evaluation, and policy analysis. The authors of this research contend that tourism policy reflects both social and behavioural aspects of specific people or groups of people and therefore a naturalist enquiry approach was an appropriate approach for this inquiry. A summative content analysis involves counting and comparing through the utilization of keywords. It may also involve the analysis of content (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

From a tourism perspective, content analysis has been utilized in past studies that involve the analysis of tourism policy documents. For example, a study by Whitford and Ruhanen (2010) employed content analysis to examine the government of Australia's State/Territorial

tourism policy in two key areas: 1) the development of indigenous tourism policies; and, 2) sustainable tourism content within those policies. More recently and most applicable to this study, Helsinga, Groote, and Vanclay (2018) applied content analysis to study the changing aspects of tourism policy over time (1945–2015). Specifically, they utilized this method to examine local documents from the Island of Terschelling in the UNESCO World Heritage Wadden region in northern Netherlands, in order to identify changes in the focus of these documents over time.

The credibility of the content analysis undertaken in this study is two-fold. First, credibility is established by counting the prevalence of key words and, second, credibility is demonstrated through the use of quotes, phrases, and words drawn directly from the tourism policies. We also provide a table that details the various tourism policies we examined, including the weblinks (See Appendix A). From a reflexive perspective, both researchers acknowledge that their past research and personal values position them as environmentally conscious and concerned, particularly as it relates to the welfare and rights of both human and non-human animals.

Overall, we examined 123 tourism policies and/or tourism development strategies (herein referred to as *policies*), representing a variety of countries, territories, and provinces as found through an Internet search conducted in the months of February and March of 2018. We analyzed past policies and future oriented policies that spanned three decades (1990s through to mid-2020s). Tourism policies that were focused solely on marketing were not included in this analysis; however, some tourism policies focused on a variety of topics, including marketing. Such multi-focused policies were included in this analysis, at the discretion of the researchers. After identifying policies that met the requirements (e.g. mostly tourism development focused), we created a list of initial key words to begin the content analysis. Utilizing the “advanced search” option available through Adobe Acrobat we discovered the need to adjust our list of key words. For example, we initially searched for the key word “conservation” within the policies; however, it quickly became apparent that “conservation” was always connected with a “what” (i.e. conservation of species, wildlife, fauna, flora). The same situation occurred with the key word “photography.” Ultimately our initial list of key words was adjusted and 11 key words were chosen for the analysis, as follows: animal, wild*(wildlife, wild life), fauna, rights, resp*(respect, responsibility), welfare, species, hunt* (hunting, hunters), fish*, angl* (angling, angler), exploit, and protect* (protection). These key words were chosen by the researchers as representing concern for the welfare of animals or encompassing consumptive activities or perspectives that may demonstrate an anthropocentric focus within the policies.

Wherever possible, policies were downloaded and stored in electronic files for further analysis, as required. Some policies were not downloadable and in such cases these policies were analyzed from their various websites. The results of our policy analysis were stored in an Excel document that detailed the country or territory's name, the policy or strategy name, the year, if available, the website where the policy or strategy was found. The Excel sheet was also used for recording key word search results, and for making specific notes of interest during the policy analysis stage. In some cases, a country or territory had multiple tourism policies that spanned decades. For example, we located three separate tourism policies for Tanzania covering the years 1999 through to 2015. Similarly, we analyzed 10 policies emanating from within India, covering the years 2002 through to 2017.

Overall, the content analysis of the tourism policies is focused in two areas: 1) a key word search looking for evidence of what may be deemed indicative of a concern for animal welfare and or rights, and; 2) a content analysis search looking for evidence of progress toward or away from greater concern for the welfare and rights of animals over time. Regarding the latter, we searched both across countries and within countries (where multiple country policies existed), over time. It should be noted that while the focus of this paper is on searching for

evidence of animal welfare and rights, we include findings related to the welfare and rights of the natural environment. This decision derives from our contention that references to the natural environment include, either explicitly or implicitly, references to animals that often share such environments. We present the results of our analysis through qualitative methods.

4. Results

4.1. Key word search results

In the following sections we provide the results of the various key word searches with the aim of providing evidence of concern for animal welfare and or rights within the various tourism policies. For these purposes and because of space constraints, we focus the results of our analysis on the following key words: animals, wildlife, species, protect, exploit, respect, welfare, and rights. We select and provide key examples from the various policies to demonstrate concern or lack of concern for animal welfare and or rights.

4.1.1. Animals, wildlife & species

In this section we present the analysis of three interconnected and related key words: animals, wildlife, and species. Overall, the analysis reveals that from a counting perspective, the words were more likely not to be mentioned than mentioned within the various policies reviewed. Despite this fact, when examined collectively and within context of the policies, there appears to be evidence of concern for the welfare of animals in many policies.

Of the three key words, *animal* appears the least within the various policies. When it is mentioned, it is most often mentioned in terms of controlling, minimizing, separating, or eliminating interactions between animals and humans. In other words, the presence of the word *animal* appears to have more negative connotations within the policies, and rather than demonstrating concern for animals, the use of the word is associated with eliminating interactions. For example, a policy from Saudi Arabia, ~2000 (p. 154) suggests that *suitable barriers be maintained and in place to separate wild animals from visitors*. This statement appears in the *Visitor Attraction Section* of the policy and appears to refer to zoos. Other policies reference the need to control interactions between *disruptive* or *problem* animals and humans. For example, a policy from Uganda, Africa (2015, p. 37) suggests the use of *electric and live fences ... to control problem animals*. Similarly, a Romanian policy (2012, p. 6) references the need to *work with animal protection associations to remove the risk of stray dogs*, which were viewed as a threat to tourists. On the other hand, only a few examples could be found where the application of the word *animals* takes on a tone of concern. For example, the *Responsible Tourism Policy for the City of Cape Town* (2009) speaks of the need to prevent *animal exploitation*. Similarly, the *National Eco-Tourism Strategy for Bulgaria* (2003, p. 6) calls for the *provision of sufficient area of suitable quality for breeding, feeding, hibernation and migratory resting spots for wild animals*.

In contrast to the key word search on *animals*, the key word search on *wildlife* appears to mostly indicate concern for animals and a desire to ensure more positive interactions between humans and animals. For example, some of the policies speak about the necessity to protect wildlife (e.g. Rwanda, 2009, p. 6) or conserve wildlife (e.g. Namibia, 2008, p. 11). Sri Lanka's (2017–2012, p. 88) policy calls for the use of *best practices in wildlife interaction*, and advocates for *open enclosure green sanctuaries rather than caged zoos*. This policy provides a best practices example with the Ridiyagama Safari Park's use of *more spacious conditions* and makes the call for similar conditions and *compassion* for wildlife to be introduced at the Dehiwala Zoological Gardens and the Pinnawela Elephant Orphanage (p. 88).

Similarly, the use of the key word *species* within the policies suggests a desire for more positive interactions and could be viewed as an indication of concern for animals. Indeed, when the word *species* is mentioned in the tourism policies, it is often combined with other

words. For example, the search reveals references to *endangered species* (e.g. Bulgaria, 2012; Curacao, 2010; Jamaica, 2002; 2015; Romania, 2012), *threatened species* (Kenya, 2013–2018), *preservation of species* (e.g. Ghana, 2013–2027) and *conservation of species* (e.g. Cape Town, Africa, 2013–2017). Many of the policies speak of the need to *protect endangered species*, even suggesting an obligation of humans to invest in the protection of animals. For example, the *Responsible Tourism Policy for the Gambia* (2002, p. 5) mentions the need to encourage businesses to invest a percentage of their *profits in species conservation and habitat restoration and management*.

Although, on the surface these three words, animals, welfare and species seem interconnected, it is interesting to note the mostly negative connotation associated with the application of the word *animal(s)* within the various tourism policies. In contrast, the words *wildlife* and *species* are more positive in connotation and often associated with concern for the welfare of animals. Such connotational differences are explored in more detail in the discussion section of the paper.

4.1.2. Protect & exploit

Overall, the analysis on the words *protect* and *exploit* reveals some very interesting and thought-provoking findings. As it relates to the word *protect (ion)*, when it appears within the tourism policies, is often associated with the need to protect animals from the negative impacts of tourism development and activities. On the other hand, the word *exploit*, which is more negative in connotation, was more likely to be applied within the context of concern for humans. In the following section we provide more details as it relates to the analysis of these two key words.

Of all key words examined, *protect* was the most commonly appearing within the tourism policies. Indeed, some of the policies demonstrate a liberal application of the word *protect*. For example, the 2003 *National Eco-Tourism Strategy for Bulgaria*, mentions the word *protect* 281 times. Overall the analysis reveals that the word *protect(ion)* is used in a manner that suggests concern for animals. For example, many of the policies specifically reference the need to *protect species* and *wildlife*, while others apply the word more generally in terms of *protecting* the natural environment. Guyana's *Draft National Tourism Policy* (2014) is an example. It calls for *protection of wildlife*, in view of the threat posed by hunting activities. It calls for legislation with *environmental protection clauses for sensitive and fragile natural tourism areas* (p. 46).

As with the search on the word *protect*, the key word *exploit(ation)* appears frequently within the tourism policies; however, in contrast, its use appears directed mostly toward humans. For example, many policies issued warnings to guard against the exploitation of minorities (e.g. women, children and particularly female children), locals, and tourists (e.g. 2011 *Tourism Policy of Meghalaya*, India), as well as the culture and heritage of local peoples. Other policies speak of the need to better exploit the opportunities provided by tourism activities (e.g. cruise tourism, luxury, yachting, wedding tourism). On the other hand, only a few policies discuss exploitation in terms of the negative impact of tourism activities on animals. For example, Jamaica's 2002 *Master Plan for Sustainable Tourism* lays the blame for the *exploitation of natural habitats above their carrying capacity on motor sport activities* (p. 202). Although, not specifically mentioned, it is likely that the reference to *natural habitats* includes animals. The *Responsible Tourism Policy for the City of Cape Town* (2009) is more specific in the language used. It references responsible tourism guidelines that *discourage the purchase of products that exploit wildlife unsustainably or contribute to the destruction of species or habitats* (p. 31).

In summary, the key words *protect(ion)* and *exploit* are amongst the most commonly appearing key words within the 123 tourism policies reviewed. While the majority of references for *exploit(ation)* demonstrate concern for humans, the word *protect* was frequently used in such a manner as to suggest concern for the welfare of animals. Whether stated directly or indirectly, many of the policies recognize the need to protect the flora and fauna that inhabit natural and marine environments, and which are often negatively impacted by tourism.

4.1.3. *Respect, welfare & rights*

In this final section, we present the analysis of three interconnected and related key words: *respect*, *welfare* and *rights*. It is important to note that the word search on *respect* was limited to meanings associated with *respect for something* as opposed to *in respect of*. Overall, the analysis of these three key words evidences that concern, as it relates to the use of the words *respect*, *welfare* and *rights*, is mostly directed toward humans, and to a much lesser extent and often by extension, animals.

When the word *respect* appears in the policies it is most often referencing respect for human life (e.g. Trinidad & Tobago, 2010), including local people (e.g. Malta, 2006), indigenous people (e.g. Guyana, ~2014), as well as respect for their cultures (e.g. American Samoa, Hawai'i, 2010), heritage and traditions (e.g. Guam, 2014), and religious rights (e.g. Cape Town, 2009; 2013–2017). In contrast, *respect* for animals is not specifically mentioned within any of the tourism policies, with the exception being Cook Islands' *National Sustainable Development Plan, 2016–2020*. This policy calls for respect of *all living things* (p. 9). Indeed, when the word *respect* appears, it is often referencing *respect* for the natural environment, without directly connecting to animals. For example, policies from Canada (2011), Costa Rica (2010–2016), and Vietnam (2012) reference *respect* for the land and sea. Policies from, Bulgaria (2003) and Rwanda (2009) reference *respect* for nature, while Bosnia-Herzegovina's (~2007) policy references *respect* for ecological standards.

The word *welfare* is not a commonly appearing word within the tourism policies. In fact, of all key words analyzed in this paper, it is the least likely to appear. When it is mentioned, it is most often connected to human welfare. In this regard, welfare of *the people* (e.g. Rwanda, 2009; Curacao, 2015; Indonesia, n.d.; Vanuatu, 2008) is the top mention. Some countries specifically mention specific human groups, such as youth (Saudi Arabia, ~2000), or local peoples (e.g. Curacao). Economic (e.g. Anguilla, 2011; Lapland, Finland, 2013; Iceland, 2013; Saudi Arabia, ~2000; Curacao, 2015) and social (e.g. Myanmar, 2012; Saudi Arabia, ~2000; Slovenia, 2012–2016) welfare are also mentioned in many of the policies. Only one policy of the 123 analyzed specifically mentions animal welfare, and this is the *Sri Lanka Tourism Strategic Plan 2017–2020*. This policy calls for *initiatives to monitor over-visitation and promote animal welfare, including natural habitat regeneration* (p. 14). It also calls for *wider animal welfare in wildlife interactions [and] for captive wildlife in rehabilitation centres and zoos* (p. 88).

The key word search on the word *rights* reveals that it is used exclusively in terms of the rights of humans. When it appears in the policies, it is mostly referenced in terms of human rights (e.g. Canada, ~2011; Cyprus, 2006; Myanmar, 2012), the rights of future human beings (e.g. Jamaica, 2002), property rights (e.g. Zambia, 2015; Thailand, 2012), stakeholder rights (e.g. Romania, 2014; Samoa, 2014–2019), including tourists/consumers (e.g. Meghalaya, India, 2011; United Kingdom, 2017), religious rights (e.g. Cape Town, 2009, 2013–2017), and economic rights of both local people (e.g. Cyprus, 2017; Kenya, 2013) and tourism operators (e.g. Romania, 2014). Unlike the analysis related to *respect*, the word *rights* does not appear in reference to animal rights. This is an interesting finding that is explored in more depth in the discussion section.

The analysis of the words *respect*, *welfare*, and *rights* reveals similar findings to the search results on the key words *animals*, *wildlife*, and *species*. Overall, the usage of each of these key words within the tourism policies suggests mostly an anthropocentric focus and concern. Such concern occasionally extends to animals, either through a specific mention or by inference, as described in the preceding sections.

4.2. *Tourism policy progress analysis results*

In this section we present the results of the policy analysis as it relates to evidence of what may suggest progress toward greater concern for animals, in a time spanning approximately 30 years (early 1990s through to a projected time of mid-2020s). Although, some of the

tourism policies are undated, most bore dates, which enabled us to compare the various policies across and within countries, over time. In some cases, we discovered multiple country policies spanning decades. Overall, the analysis reveals that while, perhaps, not an evolution, policy progress is underway in which concern for the welfare of animals appears to be increasing. In the following sections we present the findings of our analysis of this policy progress firstly, across countries and then, secondly, within countries, over time.

4.2.1. *Across countries, over time*

In the following section we provide our analysis as it relates to evidence or a lack thereof, of progress away from a solely anthropocentric focus, to one that includes concern for the welfare of animals and the environments they inhabit. We divide this analysis into three sections. The first section examines the period from 1991 through to 1999. The second section concerns policies dated from 2000 to 2010, while the third section covers policies from 2011 onward.

4.2.1.1. *Tourism policies spanning 1991 through to 1999.* Overall, we were only able to identify five policies within the time period 1991 to 1999. While some of these earlier policies were undated, we were able to assign an approximate date to almost all policies, based upon referenced dates within the various undated policies. Interestingly, these early policies demonstrate that while the development agendas are framed within a sustainability framework, they are mostly anthropocentrically focused and do not specifically demonstrate concern for the welfare of animals. For example, *Tonga's National Tourism Plan*, dated 1991, states an objective to generate *sustainable growth in the tourism sector in a socially acceptable, environmentally sound and economically viable manner*, without referencing animals (p. 5). Similarly, although not framed specifically in terms of sustainability, Tanzania's 1999 *National Tourism Policy* mentions economic, social, cultural, and environmental objectives (p. 6). It outlines the country's desire to align its tourism development objectives to those within Agenda 21 from the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (p. iii) (see United Nations, 2015). The *Tourism Policy for Zambia* (~1997–1999) also demonstrates a focus on sustainability; although, the document makes it clear that the government's concern is for economic sustainability after it *reclassified the tourism sector from a social to an economic category* (p. 2). Interestingly, this policy appears to point out this dichotomy by focusing on the fact that Zambia's National Parks and Wildlife Services (NPWS) organization has increasingly given priority to income generation from the sale of *hunting concessions and safari licenses* to address the desire for economic development. However, the government *Policy for NPWS* (1998) states, *[t]he Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) is there to conserve Zambia's precious and unique wildlife ... and ... to that purpose it promotes the appreciation and sustainable use of wildlife resources ...* (p. 11).

Overall, the policies from this time period demonstrate that concern for sustainability is now clearly in focus. Interestingly, each of these policies also provide an indication that sustainability is mostly focused on the economic pillar. It is not until the 2000s that the policies start to demonstrate a more substantive understanding of sustainability and a greater concern for animal welfare beyond their ability to contribute to the economies of tourism destinations.

4.2.1.2. *Tourism policies spanning 2000 through to 2010.* With the dawn of the new millennium the policies begin to reveal progress in thinking as it relates to recognizing the positive and negative impacts of tourism development, as well as a better understanding of the multi-pillared and interconnected aspects of sustainability. Interestingly, this progress includes an increasing focus on the welfare of animals, whether as part of the tourism experience or as impacted by tourism. This is particularly evident in many of the policies emanating from Africa. For example, the 2009 *Responsible Tourism Policy for the City of Cape Town*, South Africa, utilizes the Global Sustainable Tourism Criteria (GSTC) (2009) as a guiding policy for the

development of tourism in Cape Town (see <https://www.gstcouncil.org/gstc-criteria/gstc-destination-criteria/>). The policy specifically references GSTC criteria that states, *No captive wildlife is held, except by those authorized and suitably equipped to house and care for them* (p. 34). Similarly, the 2009 *Rwanda Tourism Policy* directs that nature is to be respected, wildlife protected, and human-animal conflicts resolved (p. 18). Malta's National Tourism Plan Draft 2006 also demonstrates concern for the welfare of animals, stating its goal to *curb illegal hunting* (p. 26) and *spear hunting practices*, (p. 26). Interestingly, the final version of this policy, *Tourism Policy for the Maltese Islands, 2007–2011*, demonstrates stronger language, stating the need to exploit unique characteristics that add *value to the tourism product, rather than exploited at the expense of the environment* (p. 45). It also specifically mentions the need to protect flora and fauna (p. 29).

Overall, these policies demonstrate a greater understanding of sustainability, including the multifaceted nature of sustainability that should be of concern to tourism destinations. Although, the policies suggest increasing concern for animal welfare, concern for animal rights remains outside the vernacular of such policies.

4.2.1.3. Tourism policies spanning 2011 and beyond. The tourism policies dated from 2011 and onward continue to demonstrate progress in thinking and growing concern for the natural environment and animal welfare. In fact, there are examples that demonstrate growing tensions between consumptive tourism activities and the need to protect and conserve wildlife. For example, Trinidad and Tobago's 2017 *Community Based Tourism Policy* lists *animal poaching* as a threat to tourism. Similarly, Ghana's 2013–2017 *National Tourism Development Plan*, references the *serious* decline in wildlife, and makes a plea for wildlife and marine sanctuaries to protect and conserve wildlife. In contrast, there are still many policy examples that demonstrate little progress in thinking as it relates to the welfare of animals. In fact, some countries, where one might expect to see evidence of concern for animals, are surprisingly silent in this regard. Rather, they appear to promote consumptive and possibly exploitive uses of animals. For example, while Canada's overall tourism plan references the need to respect, protect, and manage ecosystems, British Columbia's (B.C.) *Gaining the Edge 2015–2018*, tourism strategy promotes hunting and fishing as tourism activities. B.C. is Canada's most western province and its provincial marketing board *Destination BC* bears the marketing tag line *Super, Natural British Columbia* (see <https://www.hellobc.com/default.aspx?CC=CA>). Other countries provide evidence through the images contained within their policies that animal welfare is, perhaps, not in focus. For example, *Towards Sustainable Travel and Tourism in Norway: A roadmap*, depicts an image of someone holding a dead grouse upside down by its feet (identified as *local food*), a reindeer pulling a sleigh of, presumably, tourists, as well as an angler holding up a fish – mouth gaping open to reveal the lure. Although the policy is undated, it references a governmental report dated 2016–2017, and is therefore presumed to be dated from 2017 or early 2018.

In summary, the analysis of tourism policies spanning the early 1990s through to and beyond 2017, reveals a movement toward a deeper level of reflection of both the positive and negative impacts of tourism development and activities, as evidenced in the breadth of impacts and the depth to which they are discussed. This movement includes progress toward greater concern for not only socio-cultural aspects (human-focused), but also environmentally focused aspects (both human and animal). However, the policies reveal an instrumental level of concern for animal welfare (i.e. a means to end). Whether or not the policies continue to evolve to reflect a more intrinsic level of concern (i.e. valued for their existence), will only be known as time progresses. This finding will be discussed in greater depth in the discussion section of the paper. In the following section, we explore examples that demonstrate similar progress in concern for animal welfare, as depicted in countries with policies that, in some cases, span three decades.

4.3. Within countries with multiple policies, over time

In the following section we examine the policies for evidence of concern for animal welfare, over time, as evidenced in countries with multiple tourism policies, many of which span up to three decades. Overall, we found a few examples that appear to suggest that some countries are moving in the direction of greater concern for animal welfare; however, we also found many examples that appear to demonstrate little progress over time. For the purposes of our analysis, we present the analysis of two countries which demonstrate this progress over time.

One of the strongest examples of policy progress as it relates to increasing concern for animal welfare is found within three policies emanating from Tanzania, Africa. The earliest of these, the 1999 *National Tourism Policy*, indicates a strong concern for sustainability and includes economic, social and environmental objectives and strategies; however, the policy acknowledges that tourism development in Tanzania is perceived to be more important than *the need and demand for a sustainable environment* (p. 4). Within this policy, wildlife appears to be classified mostly as a tourist attraction. In contrast, a later sub-national policy entitled, *A Strategy for Tourism Development in Southern Tanzania, 2015*, demonstrates progress in welfare concern as it relates to wildlife, particularly in respect of a move away from consumptive to non-consumptive tourism-related activities. This is evidenced in the suggestion to convert hunting blocks to photography blocks (p. 77) and to eliminate dynamite fishing practices (p. 61). This policy is particularly interesting in that it notes the importance of hunting revenue to Tanzania's economy; however, it suggests that hunting activities have the least potential for growth in the future (p. 5). In a policy footnote, it reflects upon the conflicting values of profits over animal welfare:

while hunting companies have incentives to protect a healthy wildlife population in order to protect their future operations, there are competing incentives to over-hunt or to comply with poaching. Thus hunting companies have not necessarily protected the region from the decline in wildlife, particularly for the elephant population (p. 34).

While not focused on animals, per se, two policies emanating from Dominica provide another good example of increasing concern for the natural environment and, by inference, perhaps also animals. The first of these policies, the *Tourism Master Plan, 2nd Draft, Final Report, 2005–2015* appears to be focused mostly on tourism performance, tourism development potential, growth objectives, and infrastructure rehabilitation. While the policy begins by acknowledging the fact that Dominica has a *wealth of ecological attractions*, the policy laments the fact that Dominica has failed to fully capitalize on these resources (p. viii). The policy goes on to state that the objectives of Dominica's government are to *develop the tourism sector as a driver of national economic activity and diversification* (p. viii). It further states that a desire of the Government of Dominica is to *develop a sustainable industry on the one hand and on the other, to take advantage of the expanding market for international travel to and within the Caribbean which is predicted to grow by between 3% and 4% yearly* (p. viii). In other words, although this policy mentions sustainability, it is clearly focused on the economic pillar with its substantive growth objectives. Furthermore, there is no evidence of concern for the welfare of animals that may be impacted by such growth objectives.

In contrast, Dominica's National Tourism Policy, 2020, dated 2013, takes a decidedly more balanced approach. While the focus on tourism as an economic driver is still apparent, a stagnant industry has led the government to downgrade the desired 10 percent annual growth objective to seven percent. Furthermore, this more recent policy provides evidence of a greater understanding of a more balanced approach to sustainable tourism development. For example, the policy acknowledges that it depends upon the natural environment as part of the tourism experience and thereby identifies the need to enhance environmental management as a critical issue facing Dominica (p. 6). By

inference, we might assume that this includes concern for the welfare of animals.

As indicated in the preceding sections, our analysis of policies within and across countries, over time, reveals evidence of changing awareness of the negative impacts of tourism development and activities on the natural environment. However, most of the tourism policies are still mostly focused on enhancing the positive impacts and benefits of tourism development for human benefit. Similarly, while there is limited evidence of increasing concern for animal welfare, their value, as previously mentioned, is decidedly instrumental rather than intrinsic. This finding along with other key findings flowing from the analysis are examined in more depth in the following section.

5. Discussion

There are some noteworthy findings emanating from our analysis, particularly as it relates to what is, undeniably, a deepening and broadening range of issues discussed within the tourism policies, over time. This is particularly the case in terms of greater recognition of the negative impacts of tourism development as it relates to the welfare of social and natural environments, including animals. In the following sections we discuss some of the more salient findings and the implications of these findings as it relates to both the key word search and the content analysis. We conclude our discussion by suggesting areas for future research.

5.1. Discussion related to the key word search analysis

The key word search revealed that, overall, each individual key word, except the word *protect*, was more likely not to appear than to appear within the tourism policies. Certainly, such a finding may, on the surface, suggest that within the tourism policies there is an overall lack of concern for animals; however, it is important to acknowledge that such a finding may be reflective of the fact that animals do not form part of the tourism experience in all tourism destinations. Rather, it is more likely the case that the importance of animals as part of the tourism experience spans a continuum from *not important at all* to *very important* within the tourism destinations represented by the various tourism policies. This conclusion is evidenced by the fact that the analysis revealed that the African policies were more likely than not to contain mentions of some of the key words (i.e. *wildlife*, *protection*, and *exploitation*). In contrast to many tourism destinations, Africa is more dependent upon animals as part of the tourism experience. In other words, it is the extent to which a tourism destination depends upon the natural environment, as part of the experience, that dictates whether these key words appear within the various tourism policies.

Another interesting finding from the analysis relates to the key words *respect*, *welfare* and *rights*. Overall, we found many references to the words *respect* and *welfare*, often in terms of the natural environment, including *wildlife*; however, we did not find any references to the rights of the natural environment and/or animals. As evidenced in the literature review section of the paper, there are important connotational differences between these words that may explain this finding. For example, it could be argued that the use of the words *respect* and *welfare*, within the policies, is reflective of the fact that these words are not associated with any specific actions as it relates to animals. In other words, it is easier to discuss having *respect* for the *welfare* of animals, as such words do not necessarily imply required action.

In contrast the use of the word *rights*, may suggest a call to action in the form of policy, regulations, rules, or laws. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that *human rights should be protected by the rule of law* (see http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Documents/UDHR_Translations/eng.pdf). In other words, references to the rights of animals may suggest that laws need to be or should be developed to protect the rights of animals. Such rights may, potentially, include the right not to be eaten (see Singer, 1993, Chapter 3). Given

the overall importance of gastronomic experiences, as part of the tourism experience, it seems likely that it will be some time, if ever, before the rights of animals become a more explicit focus within tourism policy.

Overall, the findings related to the key word search appear to suggest that an increasing number of countries are becoming more open to acknowledging the negative impacts of tourism development, including hints of increasing concern for the welfare of animals as part of the tourism experience. Interestingly, this finding appears to corroborate Dredge and Jamal's (2015) suggestion that tourism policy is increasingly influenced by globalization. However, in this case, globalization has possibly had a positive effect, as it relates to these two issues. As individual tourism destinations begin to debate and consider ethics-based issues, such as the negative impacts of tourism development and the use of animals in the tourism industry, other destinations may be influenced to move in a similar direction, even if only for competitive and/or reputational purposes. Tourists have many vehicles through which to report what they perceive to be instances of animal abuse (see https://www.tripadvisor.ca/Attraction_Review-g293918-d1453736-Reviews-Island_Safari_Tours-Ko_Samui_Surat_Thani_Province.html). Indeed, ratings and reviews by tourists may be the ultimate driver for change in this regard.

While it is certainly positive to see tourism policy moving in a direction that considers such ethical issues, it is our contention that tourism policy needs to go beyond concern for animals. Indeed, more concrete actions are required to ensure their interests are considered in tourism development. In other words, animals should be considered stakeholders in the tourism industry and provided a representative voice, through appropriate bodies within tourism policies to ensure that their interests are considered. In order for this to happen, however, there needs to be a greater synergy between policy and practice, and this might only be achievable if both policy and practice are dramatically altered away from the tourism growth development model that permeates the industry—globally, as noted above.

5.2. Progress in concern for animals, overtime

When the content of the various policies is examined over the course of three decades (1990s through to mid-2020s), it is apparent that there has been a positive movement toward greater concern for animal welfare within many of the tourism policies. Specifically, the analysis reveals that the negative impacts of tourism development and related activities upon the natural environment are increasingly acknowledged to a greater depth and breadth. This becomes evident when comparing the policies from the 1990s to the those developed after the new millennium. The analysis also reveals growing concern for the natural environment which, either implicitly or explicitly, includes concern for both human and non-human animals. One of the more telling examples in this regard comes from more recent policies deriving from African countries which appear to be debating the economic and, perhaps, moral merits of some tourism activities, such as hunting. In fact, a few of the policies specifically describe hunting activities as consumptive and go on to state that such activities are in direct competition with other tourism activities, such as nature viewing.

Certainly, these findings provide evidence of what we suggest is a maturing of the tourism industry. In other words, the industry has matured to the point where it is now more willing to discuss both the positive and negative impacts of tourism. It could also provide evidence that the industry, as represented through the various tourism policies, is developing a semblance of moral conscience, particularly as it relates to the ethical issues associated with the use of animals as part of the tourism experience (i.e. big game hunting activities). Rather than viewing the negative impacts as a threat to the industry and, therefore, something best swept under the carpet, an argument could be made that the industry appears more willing to acknowledge and work towards lessening the negative impacts. On the other hand, a more

cynical perspective might suggest that industry maturity or morality have nothing to do with this finding; rather, it is merely the fact that wildlife viewing can be more lucrative than hunting. A dead animal will no longer produce revenue for a tour operator or a tourism destination (unless of course its body parts are sold as souvenirs).

The analysis also reveals the important role governments play in the extent to which the negative impacts of tourism development are acknowledged and addressed within tourism policy. This perspective is demonstrated when examining Canada's tourism policy. For example, Canada had a conservatively-focused federal government from 2006 to 2015. This government was considered anti-environment by some scientists (see <http://www.alternativesjournal.ca/policy-and-politics/crimes-against-ecology>). As noted earlier, despite the country's image as a destination rich in natural assets, its policy from this era demonstrates little concern for the welfare of the natural environment and/or animals.

In addition to political influences, tourism policy focus and direction is also influenced by shocks and stressors in the environment (i.e. financial crisis, terrorism, disease). In other words, it is important to acknowledge that the economic focus of some tourism policies may be more an indication of a current political perspective, ideology, financial reality, as opposed to a lack of concern for the natural environment and/or animals.

Finally, and anecdotally, animals are treated very differently in different cultures. Notable examples are particular animals that are considered sacred or special in some religions and amongst some cultural groups. Furthermore, animal welfare and what is accepted as appropriate or not, in terms of human interactions with animals, is highly variable across cultures (whales being but one example). Future research should endeavor to compare tourism policies on animals with a more specific analysis of cultural traditions.

5.3. Limitations

Despite the findings related to evidence of a growing awareness of and concern for the welfare of animals, we acknowledge the limitations of our study. For example, we examined tourism policies written in the English language. In many countries, English is not the first language; however, many policies have been translated to English by the various countries. We, therefore, recognize the potential differences in interpretation, translation, and preference in use as it relates to the various key words utilized in our analysis. Indeed, it is undeniable that the words chosen for our word search are Western-based terms. Further, we acknowledge that examining tourism policy at the national or sub-national level does not provide a full picture of the extent to which concern for animal welfare exists within a destination, including at the tourism operational level. This conclusion leads us to suggest that the next logical step in the research process related to this topic is to examine tourism policy at the operational level. Indeed, as stated earlier, national and sub national tourism policy is often influenced and directed by a variety of factors, such as political ideologies, whereas individual businesses may be less influenced by politics.

6. Conclusion

Overall, we found evidence to suggest there is increasing concern for a broader and deeper set of tourism developmental impacts, including concern for the welfare of animals. On the other hand, the cynic might rightly point out that such a finding is moderated by the fact that humans are increasingly aware of the connection between the health of the natural environment and their own health, as opposed to concern, per se, for the welfare or rights of individual animals. In other words, the policies demonstrate an ecocentrism perspective. Ecocentrism implies that we should not worry about the interests of individual animals, but rather we should place more concern into a broader scale perspective as advocated by Aldo Leopold – harmonious and stable systems

from an ecosystem/community/population standpoint. As long as the land is stable there are no ethical issues and, therefore, it is morally acceptable to hunt and fish individual animals (Leopold, 1949/1966).

Indeed, the analysis reveals that tourism policy remains clearly focused on enhancing human welfare and rights through tourism development. Despite the apparent positive progress of tourism policy over time, not one of the analyzed policies stands as an exemplifier for acknowledging and/or addressing the negative impacts of tourism development and activities on the welfare of animals. It would be, perhaps, overly optimistic, and perhaps naïve, to suggest that tourism policy will eventually evolve to a level where human and animal welfare and, more specifically, rights are considered in tandem. On the other hand, it is our contention that governments and developers of tourism policy have a moral obligation to consider the welfare and rights of all animals, human and non-human. The fact that tourism policy, for the most part, is increasingly considering a broader and deeper range of impacts that includes concern for animals is a step in a more ethical direction.

Declarations of interest

None for both authors.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.11.017>.

References

- Araujo, L., & Bramwell, B. (2000). Stakeholder assessment and collaborative tourism planning. In B. Bramwell, & B. Lane (Eds.). *Tourism collaboration and partnerships: Politics, practice and sustainability* (pp. 272–294). Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Bekoff, M., & Nystrom, J. (2004). The other side of silence: Rachel Carson's views of animals. *Zygon*, 39(4), 861–883. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9744.2004.00645.x>.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4/5), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.576765>.
- Burns, G. L., Macbeth, J., & Moore, S. (2011). Should dingoes die? Principles for engaging ecocentric ethics in wildlife tourism management. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 10(3), 179–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2011.617450>.
- Catibog-Sinha, C. (2008). Zoo tourism: Biodiversity conservation through tourism. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 7(2&3), 160–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724040802140527>.
- Cohen, E. (2008). *Explorations in Thai Tourism*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Cambridge Dictionary (2018). *Marginalize*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/marginalize>.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 269–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.10.003>.
- Dredge, D. (2010). Place change and tourism development conflict: Evaluating public interest. *Tourism Management*, 31(2010), 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.004>.
- Dredge, D., & Jamal, T. (2015). Progress in tourism planning and policy: A post-structural perspective on knowledge production. *Tourism Management*, 51, 285–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.002>.
- Duffy, R., & Moore, L. (2010). Neoliberalising nature? Elephant-back tourism in Thailand and -Botswana. *Antipode*, 42(3), 742–766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00771.x>.
- Duffy, R., & Moore, L. (2011). Global regulations and local practices: The politics and governance of animal welfare in elephant tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 589–604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.566927>.
- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2018). *Marginalized groups*. Retrieved from <http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/thesaurus/terms/1280>.
- Fayos-Solá, E. (1996). Tourism policy: a midsummer night's dream? *Tourism Management*, 17(6), 405–412. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(96\)00061-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(96)00061-1).
- Fennell, D. A. (2012a). *Tourism and animal ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Fennell, D. A. (2012b). Tourism and animal rights. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 37(2), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2012.11081700>.
- Fennell, D. A. (2013). Tourism and animal welfare. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(3), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2013.11081757>.
- Fennell, D. A., & Sheppard, V. A. (2011). Canada's 2010 Olympic & Paralympic Winter Games' legacy: Applying an ethical lens to the post-games' sled dog cull. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 10(3), 197–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2011.617452>.
- García, F. A. (2014). A comparative study of the evolution of tourism policy in Spain and

- Portugal. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 11(2014), 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2014.03.001>.
- Getz, D. (1997). *Event management and event tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communications Corporation.
- Hall, C. M. (1994). *Tourism and politics: Policy, power and place*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hall, C. M. (2011). A typology of governance and its implications for tourism policy analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 437–457. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.570346>.
- Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. (2004). Tourism and public policy. In A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall, & A. M. Williams (Eds.). *A Companion to Tourism* (pp. 525–540). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.12.004>.
- Heslinga, J., Grootte, P., & Vanclay, F. (2018). Understanding the historical institutional context by using content analysis of local policy and planning documents: Assessing the interactions between tourism and landscape on the Island Terschelling in the Wadden Sea Region. *Tourism Management*, 66(June), 180–190.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>.
- Hughes, P. (2001). Animals, values and tourism- structural shifts in UK dolphin tourism provision. *Tourism Management*, 22, 321–329. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00070-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00070-4).
- Jamal, T., & Camargo, B. C. (2014). Sustainable tourism, justice, and an ethic of care: toward the just destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(1), 11–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2013.786084>.
- Kimbu, A. N., & Ngoasong, M. Z. (2013). Centralised decentralisation of tourism development: A network perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40(2013), 239–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.09.005>.
- Kontogeorgopoulos, N. (2009). Wildlife tourism in semi-captive settings: A case study of elephant camps in Northern Thailand. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(5&6), 429–449. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903042873>.
- Lane, B. (1994). Sustainable rural tourism strategies: a tool for development and conservation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1–2), 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589409510687>.
- Leopold, A. (1949/1966). *A Sand County Almanac*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. E. (1985). *Research, evaluation, and policy analysis: Heuristics and disciplined inquiry*. Opinion paper. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED252966>.
- Lovelock, B. (2003). International and Domestic Visitors' Attitudes as Constraints to Hunting Tourism in New Zealand. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 8(3), 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080310001690512>.
- Odom, S., & Shuster, S. K. (1986). Naturalistic inquiry and the assessment of young handicapped children and their families. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 6(2), 68–82.
- Orams, M. (2002). Feeding wildlife as a tourism attraction: A review of issues and impacts. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 281–293. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00090-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00090-2).
- Orams, M. (2004). Why dolphins may get ulcers: considering the impacts of cetacean-based tourism in New Zealand. *Tourism in Marine Environments*, 1(1), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.3727/154427304774865878>.
- Pigram, J. J. (1990). Sustainable tourism – policy considerations. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(2), 2–9.
- Reed, M. (2000). Collaborative tourism planning as adaptive experiments in emergent tourism settings. In B. Bramwell, & B. Lane (Eds.). *Tourism collaboration and partnerships* (pp. 247–271). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Regan, T. (2004). *The case for animal rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ryan, C., & Saward, J. (2004). The zoo as ecotourism attraction - visitor reactions, perceptions and management implications: The case of Hamilton Zoo, New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(3), 245–266. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580408667236>.
- Salk, N. J. (2010). Naturalistic inquiry. In N. J. Salk (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of research design* (pp. 880–885). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Shani, A., & Pizam, A. (2008). Towards an ethical framework for animal-based attractions. *New Zealand Management*, 20(6), 679–693. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810892236>.
- Shunnaq, M., Schwab, W. A., & Reid, M. F. (2008). Community development using a sustainable tourism strategy: a case study of the Jordan River Valley touristway. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.620>.
- Stokes, R. (2008). Tourism strategy making: insights to the events tourism domain. *Tourism Management*, 29, 252–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.014>.
- Tribe, A. (2004). Zoo tourism. In K. Higginbottom (Ed.). *Wildlife tourism: Impacts, management and planning* (pp. 35–56). Altona: CommonGround Publishing.
- Tribe, A. (2011). Zoos and animal welfare. Paper Presented at the International Animal Welfare Conference, AAWC 08. Available at: http://www.daff.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/1046720/78-andrew-tribe.pdf, Accessed date: 25 January 2012.
- Turley, S. K. (1999). Conservation and tourism in the traditional UK Zoo. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 10(2), 2–13.
- Wearing, S., & Jobberns, C. (2011). Ecotourism and the Commodification of Wildlife: Animal Welfare and the Ethics of Zoos. In W. Frost (Ed.). *Zoos and Tourism: Conservation, Education, Entertainment?* (pp. 47–58). Toronto: Channel View Publications.
- Whitford, M. M., & Ruhanen, L. M. (2010). Australian Indigenous tourism policy: practical and sustainable policies? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 475–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669581003602325>.



Valerie Sheppard, PhD, School of Tourism & Hospitality, Universidade Europeia, Portugal, vsheppard7@gmail.com researches in the areas of tourism ethics and destination sustainability and resilience. She is a field notes editor for the *Journal of Ecotourism* and a reviewer for a number of academic journals.



David Fennell, PhD, Department of Geography and Tourism Studies, Brock University, Canada, dfennell@brocku.ca researches mainly in the areas of ecotourism, tourism ethics, and moral issues tied to the use of animals in the tourism industry. A major thrust of his research involves the use of theory from other disciplines (e.g., biology, philosophy) to gain traction on many of tourism's most persistent issues and problems. Fennell is the founding Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Ecotourism* and is an active member on editorial boards of many academic journals.