THE OPEN UNIVERSITY OF TANZANIA

International Conference on the Future of Tourism (ICFT)

16th -17th April 2019

Organized by: The Open University of Tanzania
Venue: Njiro VETA Hotel, Arusha-Tanzania

Proceedings Editors Prof. Jan-Erik Jaensson Dr. France Shayo

The Open University of Tanzania
Kawawa Road,
P. O. Box 23409
Dar es Salaam,
TANZANIA

ISSN - 2507-7821
ISSN - 2507-7872 [Online Publication]

FOREWORD

Dear Authors and Esteemed Readers
It is with deep satisfaction that I write this Foreword to the Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on the Future of Tourism (ICFT) held in Arusha, Tanzania, April 16 - 17, 2019.

ICFT continues a tradition of bringing together researchers, academics and professionals from all over the world, experts in tourism and hospitality.
The conference particularly encouraged the interaction of research students and developing academics with the more established academic community in an informal setting to present and to discuss new and current work. Their contributions helped to make the Conference as outstanding as it has been. The papers contributed the most recent scientific knowledge known in the field of Sustainability of Tourism; Domestic Tourism and SMEs Development; Tourism and Economic Development; Culture and Tourism; Innovation in Tourism; Customer Care in Tourism; Methods of Measuring Tourism; and National Tourism Policy.

In addition to the contributed papers, two invited keynote presentations were given: by Mr. Richald Rugimbana, the Executive Secretary of Tourism Confederation of Tanzania who spoke about the Issues for future tourism development with special focus of Tanzania; and Prof. Zororo Muranda, Pro-Vice Chancellor, Chinhoyi University of Technology in Zimbabwe who gave presentation on the Future of tourism: Tourism of the future.

The Conference was preceded by a tailor made training in *e-Tourism and Management of World Heritage sites*. The facilitators of training were: Prof. George Oreku, a professor of ICT from the Open University of Tanzania and Mr. Erick Kajiru, an expert of Management of UNESCO World Sites from the UNESCO Commission in Tanzania.

These Proceedings will furnish the scientists of the world with an excellent reference book. I trust also that this will be an impetus to stimulate further study and research in all these areas.

We thank all authors and participants for their contributions.

Ladislaus F. Batinoluho, PhD
Conference Coordinator
Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management
P. O. Box 23049, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 767 636606
Email: tourism@out.ac.tz
Website: https://icft.out.ac.tz

ENVIRONMENTAL ATTITUDES OF VISITORS TO NATURE BASED TOURISM DESTINATIONS; OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY BIOLOGICAL GARDEN IN PERSPECTIVE

Ajayi O. O., Alarape A. A. and Oluyisola O. O.
University of Ibadan, Nigeria
omololaajayioa@gmail.com

Abstract
The paradigm of sustainable tourism is partly based on the idea that visitor attitudes, choices and behaviour about the environment critically influence sustainability. Biological gardens are traditional sites for nature-based tourism attracting large volume of visitors. The environmental attitudes of these visitors are however rarely studied. This study therefore examined the environmental attitudes of visitors to a nature based tourism destination in Nigeria, specifically Obafemi Awolowo Biological Garden. The New Environmental Paradigm scale consisting of 12 factors was employed. A total of 383 copies of structured questionnaire were administered to visitors and analysed. Visitors showed high percentage agreement with the factors; 'humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs', and 'mankind was created to rule over the rest of nature'. They displayed the highest percentage disagreement with the factors; 'humans need not adapt to the natural environment because they can remake it to suit their needs', and 'we are approaching the limit of the number of people the earth can support'. Visitors to the garden displayed anthropocentric beliefs and human dominance over the rest of nature.

Keywords: Biological Garden, Environmental Attitude, Nature- based Tourism

Introduction

Nature-based tourism (NBT) or decisive travel to natural areas and attractions has shown significant growth over the past two decades (Kuuder et al., 2013; Balmford et al., 2009). Such areas include National Parks, Biological Gardens, Game Reserves, etc. These areas have been reported by various scholars as consistently capable of attracting large numbers of visitors. Törn et al. (2009) noted that the type of visitors and their activities in natural areas play an important role in determining environmental impacts. Issues of sustainability are particularly crucial for NBT because of its utmost reliance on the continuous availability of her natural resources. The paradigm of sustainable tourism is based on the idea that tourist attitudes, choices and behaviour about the environment critically influence sustainability and should therefore be taken into consideration (Weaver and Lawton 2004; Swarbrooke 1999). Also, Honey (2008) opined that the sustainable development of natural and cultural heritage sites, wildlife attractions in and outside protected areas is based not only on the

measures taken by the government and administrative units, but also on the environmental attitudes and behaviour of tourists during their visits.

Attitudes are generally understood as an individual's degree of favorableness or unfavorableness towards an object or a concept (Ajzen and Fishbein, 2000; Kotler, 2000). When this concerns the environment, it is termed 'environmental attitude'. While no generally accepted definition of environmental attitude exists to date, this concept has always been regarded as being similar to or covered by the concept of environmental consciousness, environmental awareness, and environmental affection. Kaiser et al. (1999) for example divided environmental attitudes into three dimensions: environmental knowledge, environmental values, and ecological behaviour intention. Meanwhile, environmental attitudes incorporate four dimensions: environmental protection, environmental resource, environmental study, and environmental sustainability, according to Lu and Liu (2008). The hierarchical structure of environmental attitudes was proposed to consist of two second order factors; preservation and utilization by Wiseman and Bogner (2003). Preservation is a biocentric dimension that reflects conservation and protection of the environment where individuals with this attitude place priority on preserving nature in its original state, and should not be altered by any human use. The utilization group is an anthropocentric dimension which reflects the use of the natural resources.

The most commonly used measure of environmental attitudes in tourism studies is the new environmental paradigm (NEP) (Dunlap et al., 2000). It is used widely in environmental education, outdoor recreation, tourism, and other domains (Dunlap et al., 2000; Lee and Moscardo, 2005). NEP recognizes the detrimental effect of human-influenced interactions with their surrounding natural environment. It is the opposite to Dominant Social Paradigm (DSP) which favours economic growth, scientific development, competition, free market economy, care for the present population without thinking about the future, exploiting the grow-or-die principle, combining financial and political resources and enduring risks (Kostova et al., 2011). NEP measures three environmental factors, humans over nature, limits to growth, and ecocrisis that combine to form a composite measure of environmental attitudes. The NEP assumes that:
Human beings are but one species among the many that are interdependently involved in the biotic communities that shape our social life; There are linkages of cause and effect and feedback in the web of nature, producing many unintended consequences from purposive human actions; The world is finite, so there are potent physical and biological limits constraining economic growth, social progress, and other societal phenomena.

Many research works on tourist environmental attitudes exist such as Ewert et al. (2005), Hashimto (2005), Lee and Moscardo (2005), Bjerke et al. (2006),

Swanagan (2010) and Mensah and Mensah (2013). However, none of these examined environmental attitudes of visitors in biological gardens. In another light, some factors have been identified as determinants of environmental attitudes; these according to Leonidou et al. (2014) include deontological action, law obedience and political status. The factors are based on the premise that an individual's daily activities such as morals, obedience to laws of the land and participation in social political issues go a long way in influencing the environmental attitude of such individual. For example, a law abiding individual, as a visitor in a nature based tourism destination will obey the laws of the environment and would not litter the environment. This study took a case study approach in assessing environmental attitudes of visitors to a biological garden in southwest Nigeria, as well as the antecedent factors.

Methodology

Study area

Obafemi Awolowo University Biological Garden is located on latitude 7.4667˚N and longitude 4.5667˚E (Ajibade et al., 2010), Osun State, Nigeria. The Garden was established in 1968 and situated at the Zoology Department, Faculty of Science of the institution and occupying a land area of 13 hectare. The garden is comprised of zoological and botanical sections. Generally, a small number of exotic mammals and bird species as well as native fauna are kept in small breeding groups in small enclosures, in conditions as near as possible to their respective natural habitats (Omonona and Ayodele, 2011). It is primarily a facility for biological studies and at the same time for recreation (Omonona and Ayodele, 2011).

Research Design and Methods

The target respondents were visitors to the garden. Data was collected primarily from three hundred and eighty three (383) visitors (18 years and above) using systematic random sampling technique. The sample size was determined from the yearly adult visitors' estimate of 9180, using Yamane formula of sample size determination for a known population.

Scale development for the constructs used in this study was based on prior studies in this field. Environmental attitude was assessed using the New Environmental Paradigm (NEP) as developed by Dunlap et al. (2000). The NEP is divided into three subscales namely Human over Nature (HON), Limits of Growth (LOG) and Ecocrisis (EC). The antecedents of environmental attitudes (influential factors) were adopted from Leonidou et al. (2014). This is divided into three subscales: Deontological status (DES), Law obedience (LOB) and Political action (PAC). Both scales were measured on a five point Likert scale of Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, where mean scores of 1.0-1.7, 1.8-3.4 and 3.5-5.0 signified agreement, indifference and disagreement, respectively.

Following Thompson (2013), this put the visitors as either Pro-ecological, Mid-ecological or Anti-ecological.

In order to determine the reliability of the scales, the Cronbach's alpha was determined for each scale. The various Cronbach's alpha (included on the result tables) showed internal consistency for all the scales.

Two statistical tools; Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 and R (Programming language) version 3.5.0., were used in analyzing the data obtained. The data were subjected to: Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentage, means and standard deviation)
Inferential statistics: Structural Equation Modelling with statistical significance set at $\alpha 0.05$.

Findings and Discussions

Environmental attitudes of the visitors

This is outlined on Table 1. NEP being the most common measure of environmental concern in tourism studies and generally acknowledged as a reliable multiple-item scale for environmental attitudes (Dunlap, 2008; Filby, 2015; Kostova et al., 2011; Ogunbode, 2013) was used for the study. The NEP features four factors that depicts anthropocentric beliefs, they are 'Humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs', 'Mankind was created to rule over the rest of nature', Plants and animals exist primarily to be used by humans' and 'Humans need not adapt to the natural environment because they can remake it to suit their needs'. It is otherwise called the Dominant Social Paradigm. Agreement to these factors therefore portrays human dominance. Other factors reflect ecocentrism (Dunlap et al., 2000), and agreement with them favours the environment. For these two groups, it is reflected in low mean values in this study.

Respondents showed the highest level of agreement with the HON factors (Composite Mean {CM} = 1.84) such as 'Humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs' at 59.8% and 9.9% (Strongly agree (SA) and Agree (A) respectively). The associated mean score (1.72) was the lowest. Others were 'Mankind was created to rule over the rest of nature' at 49.3% (SA) and 27.2% (A) and a mean score of 1.74; 'Plants and animals exist primarily to be used by humans' at 46.7% (SA) and 18.5% (A) with a mean score of 1.91; and 'Humans must live in harmony with nature in order to survive' at 41.3% (SA) and 21.7% (A) and a mean score of 1.99. This HON scale features three of the four anthropocentric statements on the NEP scale, and visitors largely agreed to these statements.

The LOG scale had the second highest level of agreement among respondents (CM = 2.34). 24.5% and 31.3% indicated 'strongly agree' and 'agree'

respectively for the factor ‘The balance of nature is very delicate and easily upset’ at an associated mean score of 2.21. This is followed by other factors: ‘There are limits to growth beyond which our industrialized society cannot expand’ (SA = 16.4%, A= 23.8%); ‘The earth is like a spaceship with only limited room and resources’ (SA = 19.1%, A= 32.4%); and ‘To maintain a healthy economy we will have to develop a "steady-state’ economy where industrial growth is controlled’ (SA = 17.2%, A= 30.3%), and ‘with mean scores of 2.25, 2.32, and 2.37 respectively. The scores were all in the indifference category.

The EC scale had the least level of agreement among respondents (CM = 3.13). 5.7% and 17% indicated ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’ respectively for the factor ‘Mankind is severely abusing the environment’ at an associated mean score of 2.94. This is followed by other factors: ‘When humans interfere with nature it often produces disastrous consequences’ (SA = 7.8%, A= 5.2%); ‘We are approaching the limit of the number of people the earth can support’ (SA = 2.6%, A= 10.2%); and ‘Humans need not adapt to the natural environment because they can remake it to suit their needs’ (SA = 1.6%, A= 6.8%) and ‘with mean scores of 3.01, 3.15, and 3.39 respectively. All the mean scores under the EC scale were in the ‘undecided’ Likert class. This indicates a high level of indifference of the visitors to the abusive use of the environment which results in various detrimental effects. Generally, the rank order showed the factor ‘Humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs’ as the factor with the highest level of agreement while the factor ‘Humans need not adapt to the natural environment because they can remake it to suit their needs’ as that with the lowest level of agreement.

The results exonerate the anthropocentric beliefs of the visitors to the biological garden above ecocentrism. According to Wiseman and Bogner (2003) classification of environmental attitude individuals, the visitors to the garden belong to the utilization group which reflects the use of the natural resources. Largely, these visitors favour the dominance of man and the use to which its resources can be used above care of the environment and sustainability. This agrees with Touhino (2002) who opined that environmental attitudes can be said to be a cultural or social capital rather than as a real concern for nature where there is more or less an intentional or unintentional disregard for the environment. Following the division of Thompson (2013), the visitors were largely mid-ecological.

Table 1: Environmental Attitude of visitors to OAU Biological Garden

Factors	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean	St.D	Order*
Human over nature (α=0.895)						1.84	0.79	1^
Humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs.	59.8	9.9	28.5	1.8	0.0	1.72	0.94	1
Mankind was created to rule over the rest of nature.	49.3	27.2	23.2	0.3	0.0	1.74	0.82	2
Plants and animals exist primarily to be used by humans	46.7	18.5	32.1	2.6	0.0	1.91	0.94	3
Humans must live in harmony with nature in order to survive	41.3	21.7	34.2	2.9	0.0	1.99	0.93	4
Limits of growth(α=0.926)						2.34	0.72	2^
The balance of nature is very delicate and easily upset.	24.5	31.3	43.1	1.0	0.0	2.21	0.82	5
To maintain a healthy economy we will have to develop a "steady-state" economy where industrial growth is controlled.	17.2	30.3	51.2	1.3	0.0	2.37	0.78	8
The earth is like a spaceship with only limited room and resources	19.1	32.4	46.2	2.3	0.0	2.32	0.80	7
There are limits to growth beyond which our industrialized society cannot expand	16.4	23.8	58.2	1.6	0.0	2.25	0.78	6
Ecocrisis (α=0.654)						3.13	0.54	3^
When humans interfere with nature it often produces disastrous consequences.	7.8	5.2	61.4	24.5	1.0	3.01	0.81	10
Humans need not adapt to the natural environment because they can remake it to suit their needs.	1.6	6.8	44.1	46.0	1.6	3.39	0.71	12
Mankind is severely abusing the environment.	5.7	17.0	56.1	20.4	0.8	2.94	0.80	9
We are approaching the limit of the number of people the earth can support	2.6	10.2	60.8	22.5	3.9	3.15	0.75	11

(SA = Strongly Agree, A= Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree; St.D = Standard Deviation * and ^: Rank order by descending mean in total sample)
Source: Field Survey, 2018

Antecedent factors of environmental attitude of visitors to OAU Biological Garden

The result is presented on Table 2. Under the DES scale (CM = 2.51), the factor 'I am interested in conserving natural resources' 'had the highest percentage agreement of 32.9% (SA) and 20.9% (A) with a mean score of 2.34. This was followed by the factors: 'I try to create and provide a better living environment for future generations' (SA = 17.8%, A = 26.1%), 'I reduce unnecessary waste' (SA = 18.5%, A = 24.8%), and 'I am concerned about the environment for my future personal convenience' (SA = 7.8%, A = 20.4%) at mean scores of 2.45, 2.47 and 2.78 respectively.

Under the LOB scale (CM = 2.66), the factor 'I try to avoid committing briberies in my transactions' had the highest percentage agreement (SA = 19.3%, A = 50.4%) and a mean score of 2.14. This was followed by the factors ''I show respect to the laws and especially those for the environment' (SA = 6.3%, A = 29.5%, M = 2.77); 'I abide by the safety law for the protection of the environment' (SA = 4.7%, A = 20.6%, M = 2.83), and 'I try to avoid companies that use misleading environmental practices' (SA = 3.7%, A = 18%, M = 2.83). The factor 'I boycott companies that are not environmentally responsible' had the highest percentage agreement under the PAC scale (SA = 0.5%, A = 17%) and a mean score of 3.40. Other factors:, 'I often intervene with the media in order to combat environmental degradation' , 'I support environmental pressure groups in order to combat environmental degradation' and 'I lobby political representatives to support green issues' with mean scores of 4.06, 4.08 and 4.16 were indicators of the 'Disagree likert class of 4. CM was 3.93. The rank order showed the LOB factor 'I try to avoid committing briberies in my transactions' as the factor with the highest level of agreement while the PAC factor 'I lobby political representatives to support green issues' as that with the lowest level of agreement.

The composite mean values for visitors under the influential factors of environmental attitude were 2.51, 2.66 and 3.92 for DES, LOB and PAC respectively. Following Thompson (2013), this analysis portrays OAU Biological garden visitors as mid-ecological (for DES and LOB) and anti-ecological (for PAC). This finding corroborates Santos et al. (2016).

Table 4.14: Antecedent factors of environmental attitude

Factors	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean	St.D	Order*
Deontological status (DES) (α=0.838)						2.51	0.76	1^
I am interested in conserving natural resources	32.9	20.9	27.7	16.2	2.3	2.34	1/16	2
I reduce unnecessary waste	18.5	24.8	48.0	8.6	0.0	2.47	0.89	4
I try to create and provide a better living environment for future generations	17.8	26.1	49.3	6.8	0.0	2.45	0.86	3
I am concerned about the environment for my future personal convenience	7.8	20.4	58.2	13.6	0.0	2.78	0.78	6
Law obedience (LOB) (α=0.838)						2.66	0.61	2^
I try to avoid committing briberies in my transactions	19.3	50.4	27.7	2.6	0.0	2.14	0.75	1
I show respect to the laws and especially those for the environment	6.3	29.5	44.9	19.3	0.0	2.77	0.83	5
I abide by the safety law for the protection of the environment	4.7	20.6	61.9	12.3	0.5	2.83	0.72	7
I try to avoid companies that use misleading environmental practices	3.7	18.0	62.7	15.7	0.0	2.90	0.69	8
Political action (α=0.850)						3.92	0.65	3^
I often intervene with the media in order to combat environmental degradation	0.0	3.1	13.1	58.5	25.3	4.06	0.71	10
I support environmental pressure groups in order to combat environmental degradation	0.0	3.7	12.5	55.6	28.2	4.08	0.74	11
I lobby political representatives to support green issues	0.0	2.6	12.5	51.4	33.4	4.16	0.74	12
I boycott companies that are not environmentally responsible	0.5	17.0	36.6	33.9	12.0	3.40	0.92	9

(SA = Strongly Agree, A= Agree, U = Undecided, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree; St.D = Standard Deviation * and ^: Rank order by descending mean in total sample)
Source: Field Survey, 2018

Test of Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between visitors' environmental attitude and their determining antecedent factors (deontological action; law obedience; and political status).

This is presented on Table 3. The model was considered satisfactory as Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) of 0.9275 was reported. However, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of 0.2270 and Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) of 0.1485 was recorded. Most of the influential factors of environmental attitude (IEA) (deontological status, law obedience and political action) had positive estimates, and were statistically significant. All the factors under the environmental attitude variable had positive estimates and were statistically significant.

There was a significant relationship between visitors' environmental attitude and their (a) deontological; (b) law obedience; and (c) politically active statuses ($Z = 6.5123$, $p = 0.000$). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. In other words, the environmental attitudes of the visitors can be predicted by one or more of the three categories. An increase in any of these, translates to a more developed environmental attitude. This finding corroborates Leonidou et al. (2014), Dolnicar et al. (2008), Kilbourne and Pickett (2008), Barr (2007), Sparks and Merenski (2000).

Table 4.22: Test of Hypothesis

Variables	Op	Factors	Estimate	SE	Z value	P value	CI lower	CI Upper
AEA	=~							
DES		IEA 1	1	0	NA	NA	1	1
		IEA 2	0.7904	0.0571	13.8446	0.0000	0.6785	0.9023
		IEA 3	0.7901	0.0547	14.4321	0.0000	0.6828	0.8974
		IEA 4	0.5592	0.0527	10.6210	0.0000	0.4560	0.6624
LOB		IEA 5	0.4996	0.0485	10.2911	0.0000	0.4044	0.5947
		IEA 6	0.8018	0.0572	14.0261	0.0000	0.6898	0.9139
		IEA 7	0.6751	0.0547	12.3377	0.0000	0.5679	0.7824
		IEA 8	0.5973	0.0528	11.3159	0.0000	0.4938	0.7007
PAC		IEA 9	0.0498	0.0491	1.0137	0.3107	-0.0465	0.1462
		IEA 10	0.0871	0.0517	1.6861	0.0918	-0.0142	0.1884
		IEA 11	0.0541	0.0514	1.0523	0.2927	-0.0467	0.1549
		IEA 12	0.7429	0.0619	11.9963	0.0000	0.6215	0.8643
EA	=~							
HON		EA1	1	0	NA	NA	1	1
		EA2	0.9267	0.0758	12.2272	0.0000	0.7781	1.0752
		EA3	1.0427	0.0878	11.8691	0.0000	0.8705	1.2148
		EA4	1.1443	0.0894	12.8035	0.0000	0.9691	1.3195
LOG		EA5	1.1415	0.0829	13.7741	0.0000	0.9791	1.3039
		EA6	1.1003	0.0792	13.8922	0.0000	0.9451	1.2556
		EA7	1.0897	0.0806	13.5200	0.0000	0.9318	1.2477
		EA8	1.0804	0.0792	13.6417	0.0000	0.9252	1.2356
EOC		EA9	0.2970	0.0708	4.1925	0.0000	0.1582	0.4359
		EA10	0.2790	0.0622	4.4838	0.0000	0.1570	0.4010
		EA11	0.6892	0.0725	9.5033	0.0000	0.5471	0.8314
		EA12	0.4354	0.0670	6.5028	0.0000	0.3041	0.5666
EA	~	AEA	0.2947	0.0452	6.5123	0.0000	0.2060	0.3833

Test of Hypothesis

(GFI = 0.9275, RMSEA = 0.2270, SRMR = 0.1485, *=statistically significant, EA – Antecedents of Environmental Attitude, EA – Environmental Attitude)

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Implications, Conclusion and Recommendation

Visitors to Obafemi Awolowo University Biological Garden primarily displayed anthropocentric beliefs above ecocentrism. These visitors were largely mid-ecological, showing a great level of indifference to issues of the environment. The environmental attitudes can be said to be a cultural or social capital rather than as a genuine concern for nature, that is, there is more or less an intentional or unintentional disregard for the environment. This study established that environmental attitude can be predicted by the antecedence of deontological; law obedience; and politically active statuses that is an increase in any of these, translates to a more developed environmental attitude. In increasing this, environmental education is very crucial. It is recommended that viable environmental awareness campaigns be carried out through various avenues – social media, print media, mass media, word of mouth, etc. In the face of the terrorizing impacts of climate change, unrepentant harvesting of forest resources without planting and replanting, unsustainable exploitation of wildlife resources, development without planning and an ever increasing population, there is an urgent need to enlighten the populace on the need for developing real concern for the environment upon whom human existence depends on.

References

Ajibade W. A., Adeyemo O. K., Agbede S. A. (2010). Cropoloical survey and Inventory of animals on Obafemi Awolowo University and University of Ibadan Zoological Gardens. World Journal of Zoology 5(4):266-271, 2010.ISSN1817-3098@ IDOSi publications 2010.

Ajzen, I., and Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the attitude–behaviour relation: Reasoned and automatic processes. European Review of Social Psychology, 11(1), 1–33.

Balmford, A., Beresford, J., Green, J., Naidoo, R., Walpole, M., and Manica, A. (2009). A global perspective on trends in nature-based tourism. PLoS Biology, 7(6), e1000144.

Barr, S. (2007). Factors influencing environmental attitudes and behaviors: A U.K. case study of household waste management. Environment and Behavior, 39(4), 435–473.

Dolnicar, S., Crouch, G. I. Long, P. (2008). Environment-friendly tourists: What do we really know about them? Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16(2), 197–210.

Dunlap, R. E. (2008). The New Environmental Paradigm Scale: From Marginality to Worldwide Use. The Journal of Environmental Education, 40(1), 3–18.

Dunlap, R., Van Liere, K., Mertig, A., Jones, R. (2000). Measuring endorsement of the new ecological paradigm: A revised NEP scale. Journal of Social Issues, 56, 425–444.

Ewert A, Place G, Sibthorp J. (2005). Early-life outdoor experiences and an individual's environmental attitudes. Leisure Science, 27, 225-239.

Filby, N. E., Stockin, K. A. and Scarpaci, C. (2015). Social science as a vehicle to improve dolphin-swim tour operation compliance? Marine Policy, 51, 40-47.

Hashimoto A. (2000). Environmental perception and sense of responsibility of the tourism industry in Mainland China, Taiwan and Japan. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 8, 131-146.

Honey, M. (2008). Ecotourism: Who owns paradise? (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Kaiser F G, Wolfing S., Fuhrer U. (1999). Environmental attitude and ecological behavior. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 19, 1-19.

Kilbourne, W. and Pickett, G. (2008). How materialism affects environmental beliefs, concern, and environmentally responsible behavior. Journal of Business Research, 61(9), 885-893.

Kostova, Z., Vladimirova, E. and Radoynovska, B. (2011). The environmental concern of nine-grade students from a secondary professional school, Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy, 5 (1), 178–218.

Kostova, Z., Vladimirova, E. and Radoynovska, B. (2011). The environmental concern of nine-grade students from a secondary professional school, Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy, 5 (1), 178–218.

Kotler, P. 2000. Marketing management: Millennium edition (10th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Kuuder, C.W. Bagson, E. Aalangdong, I. O. (2013). Assessment of Visitor Satisfaction in Mole National Park, Ghana. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure 2. 3.

Lee, W.H., Moscardo, G. (2005). Understanding the Impact of Ecotourism Resort Experiences on Tourists' Environmental Attitudes and Behavioural Intentions. Journal of sustainable tourism, 13 (6). 546-565.

Leonidou L., Coudonaris D., Kvasova O., Christodoulides P. 2014. "Tourist environmental attitude and behavior: Antecedents, moderators, and outcomes" https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261596468. Downloaded on 9th of November, 2016.

Lu J. and Liu L. (2008). On the essence of environmental consciousness and its effects. Ecological Economy,1,40-49

Ogunbode, C. A. (2013). The NEP scale: measuring ecological attitudes/worldviews in an African context. Environment, Development and Sustainability, 15 (6), 1477–1494.

Omonona, A. O. and Ayodele, I. A. 2011. Principle of Zoo management in Nigeria 1st ed, Ibadan University press Publishing House, University of Ibadan: 1-144.

Santos N., Vasconcelos J., Lopes S. and Mouga T.(2016). Tourism environmental attitudes in Berlengas Biosphere Reserve, Portugal. School of Tourism and Maritime Technology, Tourism Research Group, Polythecnic Institute of Leiria Publication

Sparks, J. R. Merenski, P. J. (2000). Recognition-based measures of ethical sensitivity and reformulated cognitive moral development: An examination and evidence of nomological validity. Teaching Business Ethics, 4(4), 359-377.

Swanagan J. S. (2010). Factors Influencing Zoo Visitors' Conservation Attitudes and Behavior. The Journal of Environmental Education Volume 31, 2010 - Issue 4. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00958960009598648

Swarbrooke, J. & Horner, S. (1999). Consumer behavior in tourism: An international perspective. UK:

Thomson, J. (2013), New Ecological Paradigm Survey 2008: Analysis of the NEP results, Waikato Regional Council Technical Report 2013/11. New Zealand.

Törn, A, Tolvanen, A., Norokorpi, Y., Tervo, R., P. Siikamäki (2009). Comparing the impacts of hiking, skiing and horse riding on trail and vegetation in northern boreal and subalpine areas. Journal of Environmental Management vol. 90, 1427–1434.

Touhino (2002). Environmental awareness and environmentally friendly behaviour - case Sulkava Rowing Event Savonlinna Institute for Regional Development and Research. Savonlinna Finland

Weaver, D. B. and Lawton L. J. (2004). Visitor attitudes towards tourism development and product integration in an Australian urban-rural fringe. Journal of Travel Research vol. 42, 286–296.

Wiseman M. and Bogner F. X. (2003). A higher order model of ecological values and its relationship to personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 34, 783-794.