

Ecotourism in Developing Countries: A Critical Analysis of the Promise, the Reality and the Future

Kennedy Magio O., Mónica Velarde V., María Aida Santillán N.,
and Carlos Alberto Ríos G.

School of Postgraduate Studies (Postgrado)
Doctorado en Gestión de Turismo.
Universidad de Occidente.

Avenida del Mar 1200, CP 82110, Mazatlán, Sinaloa, México.

Corresponding Author: Kennedy Magio O

Abstract

Ecotourism is often positioned as an alternative to mass tourism, however, the understanding and implementation of the concept has been riddled with uncertainty. The ideal balance of conserving and developing at the same time is considered paradoxical not just for ecotourism but also related concepts like sustainability. Using examples and empirical insights from Kenya and México, this paper critically examines the nature and application of ecotourism in developing countries. The study adopted triangulation method which involved examination of two bases of information, on the one hand information from interviews with opinion leaders and scholars in the tourism sector and on the other hand secondary information including books, journals, and periodical bulletins. It was found that ecotourism has not achieved the objective of integrating conservation of biodiversity and the socioeconomic development of adjacent communities; one reason for the existing implementation problems has been the concept itself and how it has been operationalized. Furthermore, ecotourism in the developing countries has been plagued with issues related to non-realization of promised benefits, none or weak development structures and absence of efficient governance and management. The study recommends greater coordination between the stakeholders involved in ecotourism and of key interest, the participation of the government and the local community. The significance of the present study is twofold; theoretical and empirical, the study gives a complete understanding of why the two countries have not been able to sustainably develop ecotourism and provides the concerned parties with crucial insights on the possible actions for achieving the objectives of ecotourism.

Keywords: ecotourism, conservation, development, developing countries.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is increasingly becoming an option for wealth generation in many countries, as acknowledged by Burtler and Hall (1995), it is a global phenomenon with a massive infrastructure, and its influence penetrates the society, politics and culture of many countries. In 2012 for example, UNWTO (2013) notes that international tourist arrivals worldwide surpassed the 1 billion mark for the first time, precisely tourists 1.035 million compared with 995 million in 2011, while international tourism receipts amounted to \$ 1.075 billion in 2012 compared to 1,042 billion realized in 2011. México with 23, 403,000 visitors in 2012 is a prime destination for foreign tourists within Latin America, the ministry of tourism in México (SECTUR¹, 2012) reported that revenues from foreign tourists reached 12.739 million dollars during

the year 2012. Kenya on the other hand received 1, 985, 253 tourists in 2012, which represents about 3.8 percent of the international tourists visiting Africa (UNWTO, 2013).

Related to this growth are concerns about the actual impact of tourism on the environment, the main argument fronted by critics being that mass tourism as beneficial as it may seem, destroys what it seeks to find (Kieti, 2007; Rodriguez, 2010). As a result of this, there are new concepts of tourism that have received much attention in the globalized world including sustainable tourism and the concept discussed in the present paper: Ecotourism. As noted by Tiffin et al. (2008), it is one of the fastest growing forms of tourism, with an estimated growth rate of 10-15%. México and Kenya (see Wishitemi, 2008; Rodriguez, 2010; Egiarte et al., 2004 and Brenner, 2006) are some of the developing countries that have recently been involved in ecotourism activities, although its evolution has been a gradual, passive and marred with challenges and obstacles (Rodriguez, 2010; Kieti, 2007; Wishitemi, 2008).

¹ SECTUR stands for *Secretaría de Turismo*, it is the equivalent of the Ministry of tourism for México charged with the responsibility of governance and management of the tourism activities and resources across the country.

Ecotourism is seen by developing countries as a means not only to ensure conservation, but also to improve the living conditions of adjacent inhabitants with respect to health, education and levels of personal income (Honey, 2002). Citing a comprehensive and multidimensional definition provided by Higham (2007), ecotourism is seen as a form of tourism inspired primarily by the natural history of the area including its indigenous cultures; the ecotourist visits relatively undeveloped areas in the spirit of appreciation, participation and sensitivity, practices a non-consumptive use of wildlife and natural resources and contributes to the visited area through labor or financial means aimed at directly benefiting the conservation of the site and the economic welfare of local residents. However, to what extent ecotourism meets the high aspirations associated with it is open to debate. Critics argue that there is a lack evidence to show that the words about ecotourism have actually being put into realities (Zeppel, 2006). But what is the problem? Perhaps it is important to ask: If ecotourism has been successfully implemented over the last years, why do we still have communities adjacent to ecotourism projects living in abject poverty? Why is ecotourism still associated with many negative ecological impacts which hinder the conservation of protected areas? The above questions point to the weak development structures and capacity of the involved countries to sustainably develop ecotourism. Few topics in the field of tourism are as controversial, with divided opinions and polarized debates, as the concept of ecotourism (Fennell, 2008:2).

The present study attempts to address two sets of research problems, first a theoretical problem and on the other side an empirical problem. Theoretically, the academic weight given to the definition of ecotourism is disproportionate to the general lack of consensus arising from such concerted academic effort² and empirically, there is enough evidence that ecotourism in developing countries has not achieved its objectives³, the authors do not totally discredit the efforts that have been made over the past years; however, they find it necessary to acknowledge mistakes that have been committed over time due to negligence or lack of care, and propose ways in how these could be remedied; this is based on the simple logic that past mistakes should not be unnecessarily buried and forgotten, but studied to be lessons learnt.

² Numerous attempts of varying degrees of merit have been made to define ecotourism (eg Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996; Fennell; Weaver, 2001 and Mok, 2005).

³ At the moment there are three scenarios documented about various countries; first, conservation is not successful, secondly, the quality of life of the adjacent communities is poor and the third extreme case where both the first and second scenarios are evident. A deeper analysis and examples of these arguments can be seen in the work of Eguiarte et al. (2004) and Raimunda et al. (2013) for the case of México and Wishitemi (2008) for the case of Kenya.

To give a comprehensive and penetrating treatment of the concept of ecotourism as applied to the development of tourism in developing countries, the authors present a coherent argument that the development of ecotourism these countries is not sustainable due to lack of capacity and adequate structures to ensure the planning and implementation of relevant policies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study adopted a triangulation research approach which allowed the authors to thematically analyze data from two primary sources; first by semi-structured, in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with academicians and opinion leaders in the tourism sector and secondly, secondary information such as books, magazines and newsletters generated by state organizations in México and Kenya, the combination of these data sources complemented the weaknesses of each other. The sample size (n) for this study was 20 respondents (3 tourism scholars of tourism, 3 tourism business managers, 5 community leaders, 4 community members and 5 tourism official in the corresponding ministries of tourism) who satisfied the carefully designed sampling criteria, purposive sampling technique was used to select the respondents to be interviewed.

It is important to note that naturalistic research studies like the present one are not based on the premise that is observed in the quantitative studies that a larger sample size is better; the sample size in qualitative research is determined by the adequacy of the data (Bordens and Abbott, 2011). According to Stangor (2011), adequacy is achieved when the researcher collects enough data so that saturation is reached; this implies that the researcher performs sampling until repeat responses are obtained. In this study, the researchers determined the saturation after the interviews and focus group discussions with 20 respondents⁴ and there was no new information that emerged from the data. The exploration of the attitudes, experiences and views of the aforementioned stakeholders have illustrated the inherent flavor of this case, with the issues of governance, divergent interests and insufficient impact mitigation efforts identified as some of the key aspects shaping the debate. The examples from the two countries therefore provide an ideal avenue for revealing the complex issue drivers associated with reconciling biodiversity conservation and community development through ecotourism. Even though the study presents crucial empirical insights, it is important to interpret the results in the context of certain limitations which is a common phenomenon

⁴ The researchers performed a total of 2 focus group discussions each with four members drawn from the very 20 respondents, participants of the focus group discussions were not interviewed as this would increase chances of repetition.

in research related to social sciences, within this understanding, it is noted that ecotourism comprises of a wide range of themes some which may not be directly related to nature and conservation and it may not be possible to cover all of them in one study. It was therefore not possible to include other complementary tourism activities that the said communities may engage in for example cultural tourism.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study found out that the concept of ecotourism has been blindly endorsed and applied by the developing countries even though many do not understand its true meaning (see for example Björk, 2007); these differences in understanding are even common among experts and academicians in the area⁵. The above situation hinders effective and sustainable development of ecotourism due to the uncertainty in the policy, planning and development structures that underpin the sector. The main issue of the present study is not the diversity of definitions, however, it is important to emphasize that the absence of a clear statement of what ecotourism entails has created confusion in the implementation of the objectives and hinders its sustainable development; many of the definitions have been criticized (see for example Ollero, 2005; Mok, 2005 and Stem et al, 2003) because they merely describe an ideal situation while ignoring the practical realities of how conservation can be integrated with community development through ecotourism. It has been observed by Stronza and Durham (2008), for example, that many ecotourism projects in the developing countries like México and Kenya are being implemented on the basis of experiences from developed countries in Europe and North America despite the fact that developing and developed countries operate in very different economic, cultural and environmental circumstances⁶. Furthermore, ensuing development pressures are very particular depending on the region in question.

According to the Tourism Competitiveness Index 2011, México got impressive scores (position 10) for its natural resources with many world heritage natural sites and a rich flora and fauna (Blanke and Chiesa, 2011). Kenya on the other hand was ranked 28th for its natural resources, with its two world heritage sites and a rich diversity of fauna. This excellent natural resource base of the two countries puts them in a good position to develop sustainable ecotourism; however, as mentioned by several authors (see De Menezes, 2005; Rodriguez, 2010; Wishitemi, 2008

and Kieti, 2007), there are key issues, challenges and obstacles resulting mainly from the lack of coordinated efforts by the concerned parties. Pertinently, De Menezes (2005) notes the problem of the creation of protected areas and their relation to the development of ecotourism. The model of nature conservation units (protected areas) based on the national parks where local people are practically expelled to pave way for conservation without any plan and without considering the consequences has resulted in a total failure (De Menezes, 2005). The author claims that this social exclusion generates numerous conflicts, often unsustainable in relation to the conservation of nature and social relations between these populations and the management of protected areas; this creates fundamental questions: For whose benefit are the protected areas created? With whose authority? And at what cost? Critically analyzing the answers to these questions, the results show that the creation and management of protected areas basically ignores the participation of communities and effectively denies them direct benefits⁷.

The ministry of tourism in México (SECTUR) has in the recent years conducted several studies in an effort to generate information about ecotourism and find effective ways of developing ecotourism (De Almeida and Suguio, 2011), notable among them is the "Strategic feasibility study for the ecotourism segment in México" (SECTUR, 2001) and "Ecotourism, México with all the elements to become a global powerhouse" (SECTUR, 2006 cited by Rodríguez, 2010). The first study makes an important conclusion; that there are two essential tools for developing ecotourism in México: Territorial and Ecological Management programs as well as environmental impact assessment and its related concept of carrying capacity. The study emphasizes that México has to change the perception of being a "sun, sand and sea" destination and implement greater promotion ecotourism. To achieve this, the ministry of tourism was tasked with the responsibility of establishing a long-term strategy for the development of this activity. The second study indicates that México had made an investment of approximately twenty eight million dollars for the development of ecotourism by 2006, and that there was a commitment by the Mexican Government to further develop this activity. While all the efforts described in the preceding information seem to be sufficient for the development of ecotourism in México, the reality as indicated by several authors (eg, Vargas el Río and Brenner, 2013; Fernández Aldecua et al., 2012; Velazquez, 2006 and Moya et al., 2002) shows a completely different face. On the

⁵The concept of ecotourism is on everyone's lips, and some academicians act as if they are obligated to mention it every time they speak about tourism (Björk, 2007).

⁶In fact, there may be better lessons to learn from the experience of developing countries, but this has received little attention in research.

⁷Actually, some communities like the Maasai living around Maasai Mara National park Kenya in Kenya have accused the government of valuing and protecting wildlife more than human life and welfare.

one hand, there is no public report of how these resources were used and the areas in which it was invested. Fernández Aldecoa (2011) criticizes the actions undertaken by the Ministry of tourism in México, arguing that the agency so lacks the capacity and willingness to efficiently develop ecotourism because the different administrations have failed to understand its (ecotourism) general dynamics and functioning. Velazquez (2006) and Moya et al., (2002) consistent with the sentiments of De Almeida and Suguio (2011) emphasize that the creation of a legal framework is not enough, there is need for the formulation and design of efficient mechanisms for inter-institutional cooperation, research and more effective instruments for the enforcement of the laws. Gallegos (2003) goes further to note that the biggest problem is the lack of continuity in the objectives and plans between the different levels of administration.

In the case of Kenya, there is a concern that ecotourism may have stagnated and requires reorientation (Honey, 2008, the author explicitly states that the donor funding for the development of the infrastructure supporting ecotourism has been significantly reduced. A number of articles on ecotourism in Kenya (eg Wishitemi, 2008 and Kieti, 2007) provide information on the organizational structure, distribution, stakeholders, structures and product management, however, there is little information on the size of the sector in terms of number of ecotourism visitors received by the country, the proportion that ecotourism contributes to the overall tourism income and the amount of investment that has gone into its development. A similar problem was observed in the development of ecotourism in México (Rodriguez, 2010). The distribution of ecotourism in Kenya can be described as uneven, with most projects concentrated in a few regions. The growth and development of ecotourism in Kenya has been faced by numerous challenges (Honey, 2008), some of which are similar to those observed in the Mexican cases (De Almeida and Suguio, 2011). These include; limited financial incentives, increased environmental degradation, poor road connectivity, sub-standard housing, limited recreation opportunities and poor service. Some of the factors that have contributed to this disparity in development include undefined resource ownership structures, investment bias and socio-economic activities of the local population, which in many cases are destructive or they are simply not congruent to the efforts environmental conservation (Adams and Hutton, 2007).

Another major criticism of the development of ecotourism in terms of governance and particularly in developing countries is that stakeholders tend to be excluded from the planning and execution of projects (Reid, 2003: 4). In Kenya, for example, as noted Wishitemi (2008:38), the creation of protected areas

is always justified for reasons of environmental conservation and tourism, but this often leaves indigenous people in desperate situations because they lose access to natural resources, which is an important part of their survival, and this happens without their involvement⁸. As a result, Kenya's tourist areas are typically inhabited or surrounded by poverty-stricken communities (Wishitemi 2008: 38).

In the case of México, the following issues have been identified as the greatest obstacles to the sustainable and economically viable use of protected areas: first, many of these areas are difficult to access or are far from large urban centers; moreover, almost all of them lack proper tourism infrastructure (accommodation, food, information centers, signage, etc.) (Rodriguez, 2010). The author reports that in 2001, only 5% of the protected areas with tourism potential had tourist facilities, including visitor centers. It should be noted with great concern that weak social and political structures have created conflicts between different natural resource users; this tug of war negatively affects the sustainable development of ecotourism, to overcome the aforementioned obstacles, a more holistic approach must be adopted with strong foundation on the principles of ecological and economic sustainability (Brenner, 2006).

CONCLUSIONS

Following the discussions above, it can be concluded that ecotourism is a complex and controversial concept, both in its understanding as well as its application, in fact some authors have termed it as the greatest paradox in the history of tourism; it is a consensus among practitioners that ecotourism activities and operations should be carried out in natural areas (Weaver, 2001), but if this is the case, then developing the infrastructure which Stem et al. (2003) identify as critical for ecotourism operations, such as transportation, accommodation, services and activities should not be allowed. This complexity and uncertainty should be approached with great care to allow a common vision of what ecotourism is or should be. In the case of developing countries, it is concluded that there are significant obstacles and challenges facing the execution of ecotourism, these include; the lack of participation of host communities and other stakeholders in the development of ecotourism with a good example being the exclusion of the local communities in the process of creation and management of protected areas.

⁸ Involvement in this context is understood as the participation of individuals or groups that are not part of the legally designated decision making bodies and especially the participation of the public (citizens and interested and affected groups, scientists, experts, policy makers and regulators in order to make specific governance decisions.

There is a general lack of infrastructure and institutional capacity to achieve the goals of ecotourism and overcoming these obstacles requires more than well-intentioned policies, it requires a new balance of social forces, a move towards broad-based democratic participation in all the stakeholders, as Vargas el Río and Brenner (2013) put it, "it is impossible to conserve and protect natural resources, especially in developing countries while excluding planning for human needs of the local communities". This transition cannot be achieved without changing the way destination managers and ecotourism managers think and do things. There is very little to celebrate in terms of success of ecotourism in developing countries, the concept has been adopted without missions, visions and clear strategies to follow, this lack of direction has resulted in *ad hoc* tourism development, in the sense that it has altered the balance between resource conservation and development, this scenario can only change if considerations are made concerning viable strategies to meet the needs and desires of the host community, meeting the demands of tourists and the tourism industry, and safeguarding the environmental resource base; the *status quo* must be abandoned and focus turned to the more specific issues that are certainly more practical, such as the use of ecotourism as a tool to reduce poverty, protect the environment and achieve social equity. Appropriate strategies to achieve the objectives of ecotourism, which for simplicity, have not seen must respond to the challenges of cushioning the adjacent communities from more suffering and ensure the viability of ecotourism development. Lastly, the success in achieving a transition towards the sustainability of ecotourism the developing countries i.e. the integration of conservation and socio-economic development will be determined not by the mere possession of knowledge, but through its wise use in setting goals, careful examination of the alternatives, the creation of effective institutions, generally fostering good decisions and taking appropriate actions.

REFERENCES

Adams, W. M., and Hutton, J. (2007). People, Parks and Poverty: Political Ecology and Biodiversity Conservation. *Conservation and Society*, vol. 5, num. 2, pp. 147-183.

Björk, P. (2007). Definition Paradoxes: From Concept to definition. In J. Higham, *Critical Issues in Ecotourism: Understanding a complex Phenomenon* (pp. 42-64). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Blanke, J., and Chiesa, T. (2011). *The Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report: Beyond the Downturn*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Bordens, K. S., and Abbot, B. B. (2011). *Research Design and Methods: A process Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Brenner, L. (2006). Áreas naturales protegidas y ecoturismo: el caso de la Reserva de la Biosfera Mariposa Monarca, México. *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia*, vol. XXVII, núm. 105, pp. 237-265.

Butler, R. W., and Hall, C. M. (1995). In *Search Of Common Ground: Reflection On Sustainability, Complexity And Process In The Tourism System*. *Sustainable Tourism*, vol. 3, num. 2, pp. 99-105.

Ceballos-Lascuráin, H. (1996). *Tourism, Ecotourism and Protected Areas*. IUCN (World Conservation Union). Switzerland: Gland.

De Almeida, R. J., and Suguio, K. (2011). Ecoturismo Científico en la Planicie Costera del Extremo Litoral sur del Estado de São Paulo – Brasil. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 20, núm. 5, pp. 1196-1213,.

De Menezes, C. L. (2005). (Eco) turismo en unidades de conservación en Brasil: El caso de la Sierra de Itabaiana-SE. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 14, núm. 3, pp: 197-218.

Eguiarte, A. F., Márquez, A. V., Cruz, F. U., Herrera, J. B., Velasco, H. A., Pérez, M. J., . . . Figueroa, J. J. (2004). Ecoturismo y desarrollo económico sustentable en la delegación La Magdalena Contreras, Distrito Federal. *Gaceta Ecológica*, núm. 70, pp. 67-76.

Fennell, D. A. (2002). *Ecotourism Programme Planning*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.
Fennell, D. A. (2008). *Ecotourism*. New York, USA : Routledge.

Fernández Aldecua, M. (2011). Turismo comunitario y empresas de base comunitaria turísticas: ¿estamos hablando de lo mismo? *El Periplo Sustentable*, núm. 20, pp. 31-74,.

Fernández Aldecua, M. J., López, B. C., and Luna, J. A. (2012). Empresas sociales y ecoturismo en Bahías de Huatulco, México. Diagnóstico de la gestión empresarial. *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 21, núm. 1, pp. 203-224.

Gallegos, C. M. (2003). Reseña de "Manejo y desarrollo para el aprovechamiento sustentable del ecoturismo en las Luminarias del Valle de Santiago" de Niño Gutiérrez, N. S. *Investigaciones Geográficas (Mx)*, núm. 51, pp. 147-148.

- Higham, J. (2007). *Critical Issues in Ecotourism: Understanding a Complex Tourism Phenomenon*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Honey, M. (2002). *Ecotourism and Certification: Setting Standards in Practice*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Honey, M. (2008). *Ecotourism and Sustainable Development: Who Owns Paradise?*. Washington, DC.: Island Press.
- Kieti, D. M. (2007). *The perceived potential of tourism as a tool for poverty reduction. A case study of the Samburu- Laikipia Region in Kenya*. Eldoret: Kenya: D. phil. Thesis, Moi University.
- Mok, S. C. (2005). *Turismo y Ambiente: Un Potencial para el Desarrollo Económico para Costa Rica*. Reflexiones, vol. 84, núm. 2, pp. 25-37.
- Moya, M. P., López, G. N., and Jover Martí, F. J. (2002). *Turismo en espacios naturales: oportunidades en el corredor biológico mesoamericano*. Cuadernos de Turismo, núm. 10, pp. 69-83.
- Ollero, J. S. (2005). *Reseña de "Planificación turística de los espacios regionales en España"*. Revista de Estudios Regionales, núm. 73, pp. 191-192.
- Santana, R., Salvatierra Izaba, B., Parra Vazquez, M. R., and Arce Ibarra, A. M. (2013). *Aporte económico del ecoturismo a las estrategias de vida de grupos domésticos de la Península de Yucatán, México*. PASOS Revistas de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural, vol. 11, núm. 1, pp. 185-204.
- Reid, D. G. (2003). *Tourism, Globalization and Development: Responsible Tourism Planning*. London: Pluto Press.
- Rodríguez, G. R. (2010). *Ecoturismo Mexicano: la promesa, la realidad y el futuro. Un análisis situacional mediante estudios de caso*. El Periplo Sustentable, núm. 18, pp. 37-67.
- SECTUR, Secretaría de Turismo. (2001, December 5). *Estudio Estratégico de Viabilidad del Segmento de Ecoturismo en México: Resumen Ejecutivo*. Retrieved from Centro de estudios superiores en turismo (CESTUR): http://cestur.sectur.gob.mx/pdf/estudioinvestigacion/segmentosyproductos/productos/Viabilidad_Ecoturismo.pdf
- SECTUR, Secretaría de Turismo. (2012, June 5). *Informes Oficiales: Sexto Informe de labores de la secretaria de Turismo*. Retrieved April 20, 2013, from Secretaría de Turismo: http://www.sectur.gob.mx/work/models/sectur/Resource/5784/1/images/SECTUR_6TO_INFORME_LABORES.pdf
- Stangor, C. (2011). *Research Methods for Behavioural Sciences*. Belmont, USA: Wadsworth.
- Stem, C. J., Lassoie, J. P., Lee, D. R., Deshler, D. D., and Schelhas, J. W. (2003). *Community participation in ecotourism benefits: the link Conservation Practices and Perspectives*. Society and Natural resource, 16: 387-414.
- Stronza, A., and Durham, H. W. (2008). *Ecotourism and Conservation in the Americas*. Oxfordshire, UK: CAB International.
- Tiffin, S., Torres, X., and Neira, F. (2008). *Actividades ecoturísticas y clusters en Chile. Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 17, núm. 4, pp. 315-335.
- UNWTO: United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2013, December 7). *UNWTO, Tourism Highlights 2013 Edition*. Retrieved from World tourism organization Network: <http://mkt.unwto.org/en/publication/unwto-tourism-highlights-2013-edition>
- Vargas el Río, D., and Brenner, L. (2013). *Ecoturismo comunitario y conservación ambiental: la experiencia de La Ventanilla, Oaxaca, México*. Estudios Sociales, vol. XXI, núm. 41, pp. 32-63.
- Velázquez, P. (2006). *Diagnóstico y propuesta de zonificación ecoturística en el Paraje Piedra Herrada, Estado de México*. El Periplo Sustentable, núm. 11, pp. 69-96.
- Weaver, D. B. (2001). *The Encyclopedia of Ecotourism*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.
- Wishitemi, B. E. (2008). *Sustainable Community Based Conservation and Tourism Development Adjacent to Protected Areas in Kenya*. Eldoret: Kenya: Moi University press.
- Zeppel, H. (2006). *Indigenous Ecotourism: Sustainable Development and Management*. Wallingford Oxfordshire, UK: CABI Publishing