Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Sustainable Tourism

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsus20

An animal welfare syllabus for wildlife tourism

David A. Fennell, Sarah Coose & Tom P. Moorhouse

To cite this article: David A. Fennell, Sarah Coose & Tom P. Moorhouse (2023) An animal welfare syllabus for wildlife tourism, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 31:5, 1071-1089, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2022.2142597

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2142597

Published online: 11 Nov 2022.

JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM
2023, VOL. 31, NO. 5, 1071–1089
https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2142597

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

An animal welfare syllabus for wildlife tourism

David A. Fennell[a], Sarah Coose[a] and Tom P. Moorhouse[b]

[a]Department of Geography & Tourism Studies, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada; [b]WildCRU, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ABSTRACT

An important sector of animal-based tourism is wildlife tourism, which includes a diverse base of attractions in captive, semi-captive and wild settings. We argue that actors (tourists, tourism operators, and academics) must have the prerequisite knowledge of animal welfare to assess animals' conditions in tourism settings. To this end, this paper has two aims. The first is to develop an animal welfare syllabus that should be used to teach students in higher learning institutions (who may ultimately work at animal attractions upon their graduation) as well as operators. The second aim is to mesh the papers in this special edition as case studies within the syllabus in making a case for an enhanced animal welfare educational tool for wildlife tourism. While the animal welfare syllabus is constructed for all animals used in tourism, we apply it specifically to the wildlife tourism sector.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 27 August 2022
Accepted 27 October 2022

KEYWORDS
animal-based tourism; animal welfare; syllabus; curriculum

Introduction

The media has been active in identifying the tourism industry's poor treatment of wildlife in regions worldwide, especially in recent years. Examples include Volunteer Forever (Callos, 2019), which cites issues over taking wildlife out of natural habitats, animal cruelty and abuse, and ignoring animal rights and welfare. In response to these actions, National Geographic (Daly, 2019a) developed tips on how to do wildlife tourism (WT) right, including doing your research, scanning the types of spaces provided for wildlife, looking for red flags, treading lightly, and keeping it wild (Daly, 2019b). Despite these calls, as domestic and international tourism increases, self-interest and the pursuit of pleasure and profit continue to put animals in peril (Fennell, 2015). In responding to these issues, this paper has two aims. The first is to develop an animal welfare syllabus that, we argue, should be used to teach students in higher learning institutions (who may ultimately work at animal attractions) as well as tourism operators. The second aim is to mesh the papers in this special edition within our syllabus in making a case for an enhanced animal welfare educational tool for WT. While the animal welfare syllabus proposed here is constructed for all animals used in tourism, we apply it specifically to the WT sector.

Defined, wildlife tourism is a form of tourism "based on encounters with non-domesticated (nonhuman) animals. These encounters can occur in either the animals' natural environment or in captivity" (Higginbottom, 2004, p. 2). Animal welfare is defined as "the state of an individual [animal] in relation to its environment" (Broom, 1991, p. 4167). More broadly, it is an area of political activism advocating for improved standards of care for animals (Wood, 2021). Good welfare

CONTACT David A. Fennell dfennell@brocku.ca Department of Geography & Tourism Studies, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario L2S 3A1, Canada

practices include several factors that secure animals' mental, social, and physical needs. Such includes basic care, health care, proper animal premises, proper feeding, proper handling, reproduction, stimulation, and proper techniques of euthanasia if needed. (Majuri, 2018; The Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare, 2018). We adopt an animal welfare position because welfare is a primary concern among wildlife tourists of many nationalities (e.g., papers cited within Moorhouse et al., 2017). Moreover, unlike community and conservation impacts, animal welfare conditions are visible and available to be assessed by tourists on-site. "Syllabus" is defined by Curzon (1985) as an order of contents or patterned approach to a topic prescribed logically in the shape of a formal university course, while "curriculum" is conceived as a body of knowledge and associated subjects (Blenkin et al., 1992).

Animal welfare is selected as the theoretical and practical "tool" in our syllabus because it is the most widely embraced approach within tourism, guiding the quality and quantity of care for animals. Other perspectives like posthumanism, animal rights, ecofeminism, care ethics, and justice have value in theory but have not been widely applied in practice. It is not that we do not support these other theoretical positions. We do. However, we view this as an opportunity to advance into animal welfare at a grander scale for the good of animals *now*, with the hope that these other more protectionist perspectives will continue to increase in the future.

We contend that neither tourism operators' practices nor tourists' preferences are always necessarily born out of ill-intent toward animals but can be more closely ascribed to a general lack of animal welfare literacy coupled with the commercial interest of tourism providers and the selfish attitude of tourists. Tourism operators should possess knowledge of acceptable animal welfare standards and customer expectations to mitigate risks of unwanted consequences to the business (Turner, 2017). The same holds for tourists who should pursue knowledge and increase their animal welfare literacy in striving to become more ethical in their use of animals (Fennell, 2022).

The lack of an educational focus on animals in higher learning institutions is not specific to tourism. Animal welfare is already included in the educational training repertoire of many other industrial fields such as agriculture, slaughterhouses, laboratories, and veterinary fields—In the form of training program courses, protocols, seminars, conferences, guides, handbooks, etc. (de Boo & Knight, 2005; Huertas et al., 2014; Mench, 2008). However, as noted by De Vere (2023),

> the inclusion of AWE [animal welfare education] and HE [humane education] within taught curricula is sporadic, which means that the plethora of animal-based professions have a mountain to climb to redress that balance given that most of the student admissions (globally) will arrive with little or no animal welfare knowledge or understanding (p. 484)

The industrial professions to which De Vere refers include veterinarians, farmers, animal care workers, and animal transporters. As such, if we want a caring and compassionate tourism industry, significantly more effort should be placed into animal welfare education and literacy in preparing tourism students as practitioners.

The state of animal welfare in tourism

Research reinforces the ascendant position of animal welfare in tourism. Welfare is the focus of comprehensive statements by Carr and Broom (2018) and Rickly and Kline (2021). An example of a research program on animal welfare applied to a specific region includes work by Haanpää et al. (2021) and Tallberg, García-Rosell, & Minni Haanpää et al. (2021) on the use of sled dogs, reindeer and horses in Finnish Lapland. In addition, a publication on practical tips for the welfare of animals in tourism services in Lapland (Ojuva, 2018) illustrates the value of tourism operators moving from principles to practice.

Not-for-profit organisations and activist travel companies have adopted a strong position on the negative impacts of tourism on wildlife. For example, Wild Welfare (2021) seeks to "end the

suffering of captive wild animals around the world, by uniting the world's leading animal welfare organisations and captive wildlife facilities in providing expert, practical and sustainable solutions to improve animal welfare" (Wild Welfare, 2021). The mission of Responsible Travel (2021) is to "constantly try to improve our knowledge of animal welfare in tourism and talk to travellers, tour operators and animal welfare and wildlife organisations to make sure that we are up to date with current information" (Responsible Travel, 2021).

Practical animal welfare guides for the industry have also been developed. Indeed, mounting pressures on operators are shifting the burden on what practices are considered acceptable, ultimately posing a challenge for those wishing to protect the reputation of their establishments (Turner, 2017). Industry organisations such as ABTA (2017) have developed measurable welfare standards and provided training courses for organisations looking to incorporate these standards into their businesses (Turner, 2017). The Global Sustainable Tourism Council (2021) and the Dutch Association of Travel Agents and Tour Operators (ANVR, 2013) have well-developed animal welfare standards. However, as demonstrated by Font et al. (2019), in their comprehensive study of animal welfare policies and practices of tourism trade associations, intrinsic and empathetic support for animals' welfare is fleeting based on cost-benefit calculations. The authors conclude by suggesting that

> … because of the inherent difficulties in improving performance, TAs [Trade Associations] often choose instead to manage stakeholder perceptions, develop lobbying strategies and co-opt threatening stakeholders, often to introduce considerably lower industry requirements … Our comparative analysis confirms that the meaning of welfare is utilitarian and context-specific, and that an acceptance of responsibility towards sustainability and AW [animal welfare] is still rare … (p. 134).

There is also a shortfall in the development of animal welfare policy. Sheppard and Fennell (2019) investigated 123 tourism policies from 73 countries at national and sub-national levels related to awareness and concern for animal tourism activities. Findings suggest that although animal welfare concern is increasing, it does so through a utilitarian and ecocentric lens. Welfare is actualised through a broader concern for ecosystems and animal populations rather than individual animals. Furthermore, Sheppard and Fennell found that "tourism policy remains clearly focused on enhancing human welfare and rights through tourism development" (p. 141), indicating a robust anthropocentric view on welfare well above the needs of animals.

The preceding recent studies focus on how tourism operators, tourism trade associations and countries have embraced animal welfare in their policies and practices. But what of the leadership in the area of animal welfare from the world's largest tourism institution? The UNWTOs Global Code of Ethics for Tourism is said to be a "fundamental frame of reference for responsible and sustainable tourism" (UNWTO, 2021). However, Fennell (2014) found that the ten Articles of the Code are almost entirely anthropocentric, focusing on the economic, social and less frequently on the environmental aspects of human behaviour. Moreover, similar to the findings of Sheppard & Fennell, 2019) above, an ecocentric stance is adopted in the few mentions of wildlife in the Code. Acceptance of an 11th Article based on the welfare needs of animals drawn into the tourism industry continues not to find traction with the UNWTO.

Although the examples mentioned above of the implementation of welfare in tourism represent positive strides forward, we argue that a move towards enhanced awareness, knowledge, and action can be actuated more formally through the development of dedicated higher learning instructional courses (modules) on the topic. The development of an animal welfare syllabus to provide guidance is the topic of discussion to follow, which includes the example of wildlife tourism and the preceding papers in this edition. Our syllabus speaks to the need for tourism education to be much more proactive in the areas of ethics for a more responsible industry (Fennell, 2006).

Animal welfare course development

Winter (2020) documented how animal ethics research has permeated the tourism studies field, with new research studies expanding into several different frontiers. Given the increasing research interest, we are unsure about the impediments preventing the development of animal ethics and welfare courses, with only three existing courses on the topic based on a survey of global hospitality and tourism programs. Perhaps these impediments are disciplinary or institutional around what a proper or conventional curriculum should look like in tourism studies. However, on the other hand, they might also be epistemological because scholars have yet to build a foundation of knowledge from which to assemble such a course. Regardless, the following discussion outlines the specifics of such a course on animal welfare that we believe will act as a catalyst in moving the animal welfare, animal ethics, and wildlife tourism agendas forward. Accordingly, the proposed animal welfare in tourism syllabus represents state-of-the-art thinking that stems from research inside and outside of tourism, based on essential topics (six themes and 47 components) that students will need to understand the complexities of animal welfare. These themes and components are based on an inductive, emic approach with a qualitative thematic analysis of relevant literature.

Course development

In the case of an animal welfare in tourism course syllabus, the goal or educational purpose is for students to come away with the ability to critically and accurately assess the welfare conditions of animals used in tourism. The idea's genesis partly stems from the work of veterinary scholars who embarked on a similar process in recognition of the poor integration of animal welfare in the curricula of veterinary schools worldwide (de Boo & Knight, 2005). Veterinarians found themselves at a crossroads in the mid-2000s due to increasing pressure from society to improve animal welfare knowledge to support the wellbeing of animals under their care (Siegford et al., 2005). Such is surprising given the role veterinarians play in supporting our pets' welfare and the animals we use. Still, animal welfare was not a staple element in the curriculum of veterinarian programs. A special edition of the *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education* addressed this issue in 2005 (see de Boo & Knight, 2005; Main et al., 2005; McGreevy & Dixon, 2005; Millman et al., 2005; & Siegford et al., 2005). During this time, veterinary scholars found that less than 20% of veterinary colleges in the US had any sort of animal welfare teaching in the curriculum (Estol, 2004; Siegford et al., 2005). The upshot of this disciplinary audit in veterinarian science was the recognition that animal welfare should be taught as a clearly defined subject area in building compassion and empathy in students as they move through the curriculum (Main et al., 2005). A culmination of the studies above prompted de Boo and Knight (2005) to advance three aims in veterinary science:

- To develop an understanding of animal welfare relevant to an animal's physiological and psychological wellbeing;
- To recognise the welfare, ethical, and legal implications of animal use practices and to be able to apply critical analyses from each perspective for different species in different situations; and
- To stimulate focused critical thinking on welfare issues, which can be developed throughout the course and the individual's professional career (p. 452).

Since then, although sporadic, strides have been made in animal welfare in education in veterinary sciences particularly in countries who are members of the World Organization for Animal Health. (Huertas et al., 2014; Mota-Rojas et al., 2018). In Europe, The Federation of Veterinarians of Europe and European Association of Establishments for Veterinary Education have developed

an animal welfare syllabus for veterinary students very similar to the one we now envision for tourism students (De Briyne et al., 2020).

We argue that a similar type of evolution needs to occur in tourism for an animal ethics subfield that has existed for over 20 years. To satisfy this end, Table 1 illustrates an animal welfare syllabus for tourism and hospitality studies assembled from current knowledge both inside tourism (mainly) and outside tourism (minimally). The syllabus contains six principal themes (organised into three separate domains): Introduction to animal welfare, types of use, issues of use, institutional influences, disciplinary connections, and a final theoretical section. In total, 45 different components are integrated into these six different themes. Given the breadth of categories in Table 1, the course is recommended to be taught over one full academic year and not as a half-year course. Alternatively, programs that do not have a stand-alone course because of programmatic constraints could split themes 1-6 over a four-year degree program by integrating these into other courses. For example, courses on sustainability could accommodate these themes, moving from theme A in first-year courses to themes 2 and 3 in the second year, followed by themes 4 and 5 in the third year and theme 6 in the fourth year. Building an advanced syllabus on tourism and animal welfare in the future could develop separate courses on all six themes in Table 1.

The second aim of this paper was to mesh the articles in this special edition as case studies within the proposed course in making a case for an enhanced animal welfare educational tool for wildlife tourism. We developed three overarching domains based on themes that emerged from relevant literature in an inductive, emic approach, with a qualitative thematic analysis. Within each of the three overarching domains, we see evidence of support for increasing animal welfare literacy in tourism (reference to published papers in this edition will include author names only, not date of publication).

Introductory domain

What is animal welfare?. Recognising welfare:

Räikkönen et al. explain that, in wildlife tourism, animal welfare is frequently at odds with economic profitability and tourist satisfaction. Rizzolo specifically calls out the welfare concerns associated with live animal encounters that place tourists close to animals, such as in the case of rides and selfie interaction. Rizzolo also discusses how animal welfare can become a tool for "greenwashing" in which a venue uses it as an advertisement point without investing real value in it. Rizzolo further highlights the naivete of some tourist populations who trust in authorities to regulate wildlife tourism and believe that these authorities would not allow venues with negative animal welfare to exist. Thomsen et al. explain that foregrounding animal welfare and humane education in human-nonhuman relationships can serve to deconstruct the existing power dynamics. They further explain that there exists a substantial body of academic literature devoted to animal welfare theory, but what is lacking is the practical application of these tenants in a cohesive and regulatory manner to real tourism venues (Thomsen et al.).

Indicators of Welfare:

One such practical application of the tenants of animal welfare includes the ability to recognize the various indicators of welfare that an individual animal might display. Räikkönen et al. also highlight that this contention leads to several welfare concerns for wildlife, including physiological (e.g., stress), behavioural (e.g., stereotypes, aggression), and medical (e.g., injury, disease). Thomsen notes that wildlife tourism has been linked to adverse effects on welfare indicators, including behavioural changes related to survival or reproductive stress from increased stimuli and direct and indirect injury and mortality. Furthermore, the welfare of ecosystem functions, in general, is often threatened by increased stressors from wildlife-tourism-related traffic and infrastructure (Thomsen, et al.)

Table 1. An animal welfare syllabus for tourism studies.

Domain	Themes and components	Literature	Specific link to wildlife tourism (authors–this edition)
I. Introductory	A. *Introduction to Animal Welfare* -What is animal welfare -Sentience, consciousness, interests, agency. -Recognising cruelty and violence towards animals. -Suffering and pain (e.g., deprivation, perception) -Physiological indicators of welfare (e.g., stress). -Behavioral indicators of welfare (e.g., stereotypies, aggression). -Emotional indicators of welfare (dealing with the death of conspecifics). -Welfare assessment (e.g., Five Freedoms; Five Domains). -Tourist assessment of welfare	Carr and Broom (2018) Fennell (2012) Flynn (2001) Fennell and Thomsen (2021) Serra et al. (2018) Mason (1991): Get better McGrath et al. (2013) Fennell (2012) Moorhouse et al. (2015)	Räikkönen et al.: animal welfare, Physiological indicators of welfare (e.g., stress), Behavioral indicators of welfare (e.g., stereotypies, aggression). Lee et al. and wildlife tourists reflect on how animals felt in the human-wildlife interaction. Rizzolo: animal welfare, sentience, Suffering and pain (e.g., deprivation, perception), Tourist assessment of welfare Thomsen et al.: Animal welfare, agency, -Physiological indicators of welfare (e.g., stress), Behavioral indicators of welfare (e.g., stereotypies, aggression), Tourist assessment of welfare.
II. Focus on the practical	B. *Types of Use* -Animals as captives (ex-situ): wild and domesticated -Animals forced into competition -Animals as workers -Animals as companions -Wildlife viewing (in situ) -Animals pursued sport and subsistence -Animal pests and vectors -Animals as food	Swaisgood (2007) Markwell et al. (2017) Rickly and Kline (2021) Broom (2015) Moorhouse et al. (2017) Cohen (2014) Nattrass et al. (2019) Kline (2018)	Räikkönen et al.: Animals as captives (ex-situ): wild and domesticated, Wildlife viewing (in situ), Animals pursued sport and subsistence, Rizzolo: Animals as captives (ex-situ): wild and domesticated, Wildlife viewing (in situ), Animals pursued sport and subsistence, Animals as food. Cederholm and Sjöholm, and Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen: Animals pursued in sport Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria: Animals pursued in sport and subsistence, Animal pests and vectors Thomsen et al.: Wildlife viewing (in situ), Animals pursued sport and subsistence, Animal pests and vectors
	C. *Issues of Use* -Transportation of/by animals -Animal slaughter -Commodification, commercialisation and representation of animals -Human-animal conflicts -Provisioning and habituation -Animals in the crossfire: war & natural disasters -Euthanasia - Inappropriate tourist behaviour (touching,	Broom (2003) Grandin (2010) Brooks et al. (2011) Thomsen et al. (2021) Newsome and Rodger (2008) Wise (2021) Government of BC (2012) Moorhouse et al. (2015) Folmer et al. (2013) Sinha et al. (2012)	Karst and Nepal: Good transportation by using horses Thomsen et al.: Transportation of animals, Commodification, commercialisation and representation of animals, and human-animal conflicts. Karst and Nepal: Non-slaughter of animals, although not always practical Cederholm and Sjöholm; Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria; Räikkönen et al.; and Rizzolo: commodification, commercialisation, and representation of animals and human-animal conflicts.

(*continued*)

Table 1. Continued.

Domain	Themes and components	Literature	Specific link to wildlife tourism (authors–this edition)
	selfies) - Pro-environmental behaviours from interactions - The wellbeing of communities from wildlife tourism		Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen: Human-animal conflict Karst and Nepal: Killing or harming animals because of crop damage. Lee et al.: Inappropriate behaviour of tourists Lee et al.: Pro-environmental behaviours from wildlife tourism interactions. Karst & Nepal: The importance of practical welfare (jobs) and agency from ecotourism
	D. *Institutional influences* -The role of veterinary science -Animal welfare organisations -Tourism policy statements (national and state) -Private/commercial policies and practices -Non-voluntary: Animal welfare legislation and law -Voluntary: Codes of ethics -Certification schemes -Enforcement	de Boo (2005) Wilkins et al. (2005) Sheppard and Fennell (2019) Font et l. (2019) Fennell and Coose (2021) Fennell (2014) Fennell and Coose (2021) Moorhouse et al. (2017)	Thomsen et al.: The role of veterinary science, Tourism policy statements (national and state), Private/commercial policies and practices, and enforcement. Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria: veterinary science, animal welfare organisations, tourism policy statements, commercial policies and practices, and codes of ethics. Cederholm and Sjöholm: Animal welfare legislation and law Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen: veterinary science, commercial practice, and enforcement Räikkönen et al.: commercial policies and practices Rizzolo: Tourism policy statements
III. Focus on the academic	*E. Disciplinary Connections* -Evolutionary biology, ethology - -Critical animal studies (social sciences/humanities) -Cultural and philosophical differences in animal welfare between East and West -Humane education and animal welfare literacy	Criscuolo and Sueur (2020) Wolfe (2009) Küçükaltan and Dilek (2019) Fennell (2022)	Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria; Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen; and Rizzlo: Cultural and philosophical differences in animal welfare between East and West Thomsen et al.: Critical animal studies (social sciences/humanities), Cultural and philosophical differences in animal welfare between East and West, Humane education and animal welfare literacy. Lee et al.: interpretation and education for more sustainable wildlife tourism. Karst and Nepal: the practice of non-violence and compassion to sentient beings following Buddhist principles.
	F. Theoretical: Welfare as it applies to, or contrasts with, -Posthumanism -Animal rights -Justice -Care ethics -Ecofeminism -Utilitarianism -Ecocentrism -Contractarianism	Thomsen et al. (2021) Hughes (2001) Fennell and Sheppard (2021) Taylor et al. (2020) Yudina and Fennell (2013) Dobson (2011) Burns et al. (2011) Fennell and Sheppard (2021)	Thomsen et al.: Posthumanism, Animal rights, justice, care ethics, utilitarianism, and ecocentrism Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria: a focus on justice. Cederholm and Sjöholm: Animal rights, care ethics, and utilitarianism Rizzolo: Animal rights and utilitarianism Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen: Justice, ethics of care, and ecofeminism

Sentience, consciousness, interests, agency:

One potential reason that such indicators of welfare might be overlooked is a failure to recognize the sentience, consciousness, interests and/or agency of an animal. This is supported by Rizzolo, who explains that denial to recognise an animal's sentience and agency is one of the common rationalisations employed to justify the failure to provide adequate animal welfare to animals in tourism venues. However, given the widespread growth of the formal recognition of the sentience of animals across many taxa, it is quickly becoming apparent that animals possess hallmarks of sensation, emotion, and subjective experiences that merit them the status of stakeholder with special interests and concerns in the ethics and governance of animal tourism (Baars, 2005; Broom, 2010; Duncan, 2018; 2006; Duncan & Petherick, 1991; Fraser & Duncan, 1998; Hemsworth et al., 2015; Korte et al., 2007; Mellor, 2016; Wemelsfelder, 2007). Thomsen et al. explains that until animals are considered stakeholders with their agency and interests, their welfare in tourism settings will continue to be sacrificed for the pursuit of economic gain and tourist enjoyment. One of Lee et al's. scale items assessed tourists' views on how animals felt in the human-animal interaction.

Suffering and pain:

Rizzolo discusses the link between utilitarian thinking and the tolerance of animal suffering. A meaningful social ethics for animals in society has only recently emerged as a legitimate field during the turn of the 20th century (Fennell & Coose, 2023; Rollin, 2006). While anti-cruelty ethics and laws can be traced back as far back as before the writing of the Old Testament and carried through into the writings and laws of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, the Middle Ages, and early societies of the 1800s, they did not interpret animals as direct moral object (Duncan, 2019, Rollin, 2006). These anti-cruelty ethics and laws did not change significantly until the 1960s in response to the work of Ruth Harrison, who authored the book *Animal Machines* in critique of the suffering of animals brought about by rapid industrialization of agriculture in response to increased demands for cheap food driven by WWII (Duncan, 2019). The public response to Animal Machines was so significant that the British government formed a Committee of Enquiry which determined that there was a lack of evidence to support the subjective emotional experience of animals beyond that of stress (ibid). This changed in 1976 when ethologist Donald Griffin wrote *The Question of Animal Awareness* which legitimized the subjective experience of animals and paved the way for welfare to become the dominant approach in the animal-ethics discourse seen today (Duncan, 2019; Fennell, 2013; Griffin et al., 2014)

Tourist assessments of welfare:

Rizzolo and Thomsen et al. highlight that many tourists, while well-intentioned, are often ignorant of the effects of their tourism activities on the welfare of animals. It is often quite difficult or even, if not impossible, for a tourist to reliably appraise the ethical conditions at a venue solely from what they can observe. Without access to additional inside knowledge of the governance structures, fiscal policies, and husbandry practices that occur in the non-public areas of the venue's operation, the visitor's view is limited (Moorhouse et al., 2015). Regardless of this, it is to these visitors' voices which that operators are most inclined to listen to. Thus, it is the visitors who function as are one of the most significant and influential advocates for animal welfare in tourism (Moorhouse et al., 2017).

Focus on the practical

Types of use. In addition to the introductory concepts described above, it is important that a syllabus also include an emphasis on specific practical types and issues of animal use that arise across different contexts of animal tourism.

Animals as captives (ex-situ): wild and domesticated:

Räikkönen et al. and Rizzolo both mention that wildlife tourism places animals in a variety of environments ranging from captivity (ex-situ) to semi-captivity to free-range or wild (in-situ) and involves consumptive and non-consumptive uses. Rizzolo discusses how the normalisation of keeping animals in captive environments increases the likelihood that a venue will continue to adopt harmful practices like animal rides and selfies and that tourists who visited captive wildlife venues were strongly correlated with the possibility of those same tourists engaging in consumptive tourism activities and purchasing consumptive animal products, unaware of the impacts of their consumption. Thus, the practice of keeping animals in captivity also serves as a potential link to wildlife trafficking.

Wildlife viewing (in situ):

A similar correlation was found between tourists who engaged in wildlife viewing in their natural habitat and consumptive activities and purchases but visiting wildlife sanctuaries or rescue centres was not (Rizzolo). Räikkönen et al. explain that ecotourism is a concept that moves toward more natural, in-situ, and non-consumptive settings for tourism. However, they also criticise these non-consumptive forms of wildlife tourism like wildlife viewing (in situ) and photography because, like consumptive wildlife tourism, the animals, the tourism experience, and the natural environment are still turned into products for commodification. This might help explain why Rizzolo found similar correlations between captive and wildlife tourism and their links to consumptive behaviour (Räikkönen et al.; Rizzolo).

Animals as food:

Rizzolo found a strong correlation between tourists who engaged in consumptive forms of tourism like hunting and fishing and those same tourists consuming wildlife as food. However, they also found that non-consumptive forms were similarly linked to the consumption of wildlife as food, usually by purchasing animal products. The consumption of unfamiliar wildlife as food is considered desirable by tourists due to the “exotic” nature of such a practice (Rizzolo)

Animals pursued for sport and subsistence:

Animals pursued for sport and subsistence typically fall under the umbrella of consumptive tourism, as the mortality of wildlife is often the result (Rizzolo). Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria discuss a particular type of use in their detailed analysis of the sport of safari hunting and the contradictions between the industry and the conservation movement in Botswana. Similarly, Cederholm and Sjöholm discuss recreational hunting in Sweden and how the industry navigates the moral and economic value spheres through different norms and practices.

Animals as pests and vectors:

Mbaiwa, Elizeri, and Hambria discuss wildlife as vectors of disease which can be carried to livestock and threaten agricultural livelihoods. Thomsen et al. add that predatory wildlife can also threaten livestock by killing animals and that large wildlife can be destructive to gardens and crops by walking through them and trampling or breaking plants. Thomsen et al. discuss how negative sentiments toward wildlife often stem from either pest (e.g., damaging property) or competitive (e.g., using up resources) behaviour and circle back to further reinforce and magnify negative sentiments especially in rural areas. Human-human interactions can also fuel anti-wildlife sentiments, such as in the Euro-American contest where "males who surround themselves with similar-minded, conservative-leaning social groups hold the most anti-wildlife perspectives" (Thomsen et al., 2022, p. 9); and Karst and Nepal observe that killing or harming animals because of crop damage, underscoring the potential for animal-human conflict as a

trade-off to the ecotourism industry and the importance of ecotourism as a form of practical welfare (jobs) and agency.

Issues of use. Transportation of animals:

Across these different types of animal use, there are several issues that frequently arise including transportation of animals for various tourism purposes. Thomsen et al. describe the initial stages of wildlife rescue, including the transportation of animals and the importance of training and regulations concerning proper wildlife handling and treatment. Specific stressors associated with transport can include "forced movement, human handling, noise, cage motion, and confinement" (Iossa et al., 2009, pg. 133). Transportation of animals is an example of one of many necessary trade-offs that must be made to successfully balance conservation, animal welfare, tourist satisfaction, and tourism profitability, according to Thomsen et al. It is important to weigh the stress costs of transport with the potential benefits as well as to effectively minimize these stressors when necessary.

Commodification, commercialisation, and representation of animals:

Mbaiwa et al. and Cederholm and Sjöholm discuss use issues, including the killing, commodification, and commercialisation of wildlife entwined in the sport of recreational hunting. Räikkönen et al. expand on these ideas by pointing out how the commodification and commercialisation of nature and wildlife work to construct tourists culturally and socially in different ways. Furthermore, Cederholm and Sjöholm, Rizzolo, and Thomsen et al. raise the critique that virtually all wildlife tourism is anthropocentric and consumptive as it inherently turns the use of and access to wildlife into a commodity, even if the mortality of the animal is not the direct result of the experience. Taking this idea even further, Rizzolo explains that the concepts of conservation and animal welfare have been turned into commodities used to sell more experiences to tourists. Thomsen et al. call for the decommodification of wildlife tourism by elevating animals from a "subaltern" status (Mbaiwa et al.) to that of equal stakeholder status with humans with equal weight to considerations of their livelihoods, agency, and interests.

Human-animal conflict:

Human-animal conflict is said to constitute a formidable threat to biodiversity (Thomsen et al.). Mkono et al. and Thomsen et al. emphasise that human-animal conflict is strongly linked to geographic, political, economic, social, institutional, cultural, and historical factors. Thomsen et al. claim that these conflicts persist "through asymmetrical power relations where special interest groups possess an inequitable stronghold over other species through policy" (p. 2). Mkono, Rastegar, and Ruhanen discuss how the impacts of such human-wildlife conflict often disproportionally affect women as they are generally the primary users of protected areas for resource collection. However, this also leads to a more robust environmental attitude and increased focus on conservation outcomes. Human-wildlife conflict becomes even more challenging to manage when no borders separate wildlife areas and villages (Mkono et al.). For example, Mbaiwa et al. and Cederholm and Sjöholm discuss the human-animal conflicts inherent to recreational hunting in protected areas that overlap with local communities. Lee et al. cited studies dealing with animals' inappropriate use in wildlife tourism.

Institutional influences. Institutions such as academia, non-profit organisations, and government have significant influence over the regulation of the issues of animal use in tourism described above (Huertas et al., 2014).

The role of academia (veterinary science):

Mbaiwa et al. mention the role of veterinary science in the context of veterinary cordon fences, a technology employed to control livestock diseases. However, they also comment on the

negative impact these fences often have on wildlife migratory routes (Mbaiwa et al.). Thomsen et al. also emphasise the importance of the veterinary sciences in rescue and rehabilitation tourism (Thomsen et al.). Mkono et al. and Thomsen et al. discuss how this leads to a demand for "voluntourism", where tourists visit the venue for the express purpose of assisting staff with animal care. Thomsen et al. also observe that voluntourism is quite popular in conservation and restoration efforts.

Drawing further from veterinary scholarship, McGreevy and Dixon (2005) illustrate that education should not stop at one's formal degree termination. Repositories of knowledge should be made available to those in the field from different organisations. The Veterinary Education and Information Network (VEIN), developed by the faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Sydney, is an example of an information service explicitly designed for veterinary practitioners. The Network provides access to top-quality information (which suggests it offers more than just peer-reviewed research) for lifelong learning on topics such as animal welfare information gateways, and various organisations and government bodies on animal welfare.

Animal welfare organisations:

Mbaiwa et al. also mention the role of animal welfare organisations in their influence in political campaigns regarding trophy hunting. They also note the use of tourism policy documents as sources of data and the representation of the voice of the government. However, as evidenced by Cederholm and Sjöholm, the voice of the government is not always obeyed—as in the case of illegal wolf hunting in Sweden, which serves as a demonstration of cultural resistance toward the broader societal and political landscape.

Tourism policies:

Thomsen et al. explain that tourism policy can often be used to maintain asymmetrical power relations that favour certain interest groups over others. They also demonstrate that Western tourism policies dominate tourism in developing countries and often favour social justice, human livelihoods, and economic outcomes over ecological justice, nonhuman livelihoods, or animal welfare outcomes (Thomsen et al.). Furthermore, they discuss how wildlife and tourism policies create "domino effects" that influence and hyper-politicise human-human and human-animal relationships (Thomsen et al.). For example, policies regarding what activities are and are not acceptable on federal lands can lead to complex conflicts between industries like oil companies, agricultural producers like livestock owners, tourists drawn by natural landmarks, government enforcement organisations, and endangered species (Thomsen et al.). In other cases, however, like that of Costa Rica's Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservation or National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), tourism policies can create unification and regulation around specific goals by supporting wildlife and conservation tourism through the provision of funding, training, transportation (Thomsen et al.). Rizzolo argues that tourism and wildlife crime prevention policymakers need to do more to address the correlations between wildlife tourism and related issues like the increased access to and consumption of animal products.

Tourism practices:

Mbaiwa et al. discuss the harvesting strategies and practices adopted by Botswanan trophy hunting to ensure the mutual benefits of wildlife conservation and human wellbeing. Mkono et al. discuss how wildlife conservation practices in Sub-Saharan Africa intertwine closely with consumptive tourism, wildlife conservation, and social justice. They also highlight the importance of understanding and respecting the potential conflicts that emerge from interactions between conservation, tourism, and traditional practices and modes of knowledge. Another interesting point raised by Rizzolo is the blurred lines between legal and illegal wildlife consumption and the potential for *sustainable* wildlife consumption as a conservation practice. There are many calls for change in animal tourism practices. Räikkönen et al. urge nature-based tourism venues to adopt more sustainable ecotourism practices as a response to the consequences of climate

change. Thomsen et al. urge wildlife tourism attractions to adopt more humane practices that respect animal rights, agency, and welfare and reduce the risk of harm.

Voluntary: Codes of ethics:

Mbaiwa et al. mention various codes of ethics developed by Western democracies such as the USA and UK, dealing with human and animal subjects and environmental justice. They note that these Western codes of ethics are ignored in discussions of trophy hunting, human wellbeing, and wildlife conservation in Botswana.

Enforcement:

Enforcement of wildlife protection laws—especially anti-poaching laws—is a complex issue in which it is easy to fall into one of two extremes. Mkono et al. discuss the first extreme in examining how anti-poaching efforts to conserve rhinos in South African National Parks were enforced with para-military presence. They explain that this approach led to several adverse outcomes for local communities, including the deaths of hundreds of Mozambican poachers along the Mozambique-South Africa border and the legitimisation of human-on-human violence through racialization, criminalisation, and dehumanisation of poachers (Mkono et al.). Conversely, Thomsen et al. discuss the second extreme by explaining how lax government enforcement of protected areas leads to several adverse outcomes such as the deaths of endangered animals from unregulated poaching and rampant habitat destruction from failure to enforce protected areas and increased illegal wildlife trade activity. In addition, the lack of government regulation sometimes results in grassroots movements that form non-profit organisations to take practical action to protect wildlife in their local areas without efficient sanctioned enforcement (Thomsen et al.).

Focus on the academic

In addition to the influences of industry on the regulation of animal use issues in tourism, academia also sits in a unique position to draw disciplinary and theoretical connections between ideas that help explain why certain patterns are observed to emerge in the first place.

Disciplinary connections. Critical animal studies (social sciences/humanities):

Thomsen et al. employ a multispecies ethnography lens that leans heavily into the social sciences by considering "mutual dependencies, influences, and hybrid ontologies involving human and nonhuman actors" (p. 7). Similarly, Mkono et al. frame their work through a lens that seeks to understand the emergence of human-nonhuman relationships through examining social justice and gender identity.

Cultural and philosophical differences in animal welfare between East and West:

Mbaiwa et al. discuss cultural and philosophical differences between East and West. They call attention to the fact that citizens of the West tend to view the Orient as “savage peoples and exotic places”, based on “us” and “them” binaries placing non-Western modes of thinking in a “subaltern” category, the expectation that subaltern groups conform to Western modes of thinking, how trophy hunting is unethical, and the belief that only non-consumptive modes of tourism like photo-tourism are an acceptable substitute to trophy hunting. Mkono et al. further highlight the power dynamic of the "white saviour" mentality adopted by Western conservationist donor organisations, which remains disconnected from the views of the people who they seek to “rescue”, causing more dependency not less. This is reflected in the number of Western-developed tourism policies dominating developing countries’ tourism industries (Thomsen et al.). Western tourists also adopt these mindsets and often see the "exotic" nature of the unfamiliar

"other" as an exciting and desirable component of their tourism experience—especially as it relates to eating new exotic foods derived from “exotic” wildlife (Rizzolo). Karst and Nepal also discuss Eastern practices and philosophy through the practice of non-violence and compassion to sentient beings following Buddhist principles.

Humane education and animal welfare literacy:

Both Rizzolo, and Thomsen et al., acknowledge that many, if not most, tourists, while well-intentioned, are often ignorant of the effects of their tourism activities on the welfare of animals (see Moorhouse et al., 2015). The paper by Lee et al. indicates the need for better interpretation services for tourists in wildlife tourism. The study found that service providers need to improve interpretation to more effectively increase reflective engagement to enhance/change behaviour during the experience through their stimulus-organism-response framework.

Theoretical connections. Several papers in this special edition cited animal ethics theories that conform to the broad spectrum of such theories in Fennell and Sheppard (2021). Although not explicit, several papers discussed aspects of ecocentrism which reflect a focus on using animals if the stability and harmony of the natural world are secured—perhaps through sustainable harvest, or conservation and welfare measures.

Animal rights:

Cederholm and Sjöholm, and Thomsen et al., discuss the concept that animals should be assigned rights to life and coexistence. Rizzolo comments on the connection between utilitarianism and animal rights by pointing out that the founders of the animal rights philosophy applied utilitarianism to their ideas.

Ethics of Care:

Cederholm and Sjöholm explore the idea that “true hunters” are those who care for wildlife and who respect their meat beyond merely seeking a trophy. Mkono et al. mention that women are observed to have more robust ethics of care, exhibit more positive attitudes towards animals, and take on more critical roles in environmental conservation. Thomsen et al. also indirectly discuss ethics of care in their discussion of rescue and rehabilitation tourism for injured and orphaned wildlife.

Utilitarianism:

Cederholm and Sjöholm and Rizzolo discuss utilitarian values for tourism in which the primary concern is for the material or practical value of an animal and its products (e.g., as a source of food). Rizzolo explains that utilitarian attitudes in the United States have declined since World War II but remain prevalent in more rural areas. Thomsen et al. point to a strong correlation between utilitarianism and the concept of "dominance". Rizzolo further explains that utilitarian attitudes correlate strongly with wildlife consumption.

Justice:

Mbaiwa et al. discuss justice in the context of various codes of ethics, which animal rights organisations often ignore in discussions of trophy hunting, human wellbeing, and wildlife conservation in Botswana. Thomsen et al. explain this as a favouring of social justice (human well-being) over ecological justice (animal wellbeing). Finally, Mkono et al. discuss justice as it pertains to social justice tenants used to frame local communities and gender identities in how wildlife tourism and conservation initiatives are implemented.

Posthumanism:

Thomsen et al. employ a posthumanist framework for wildlife tourism that places equal moral value on the rights, welfare, and agency of both humans and nonhumans. Several recent studies

adopt a posthumanist perspective on the use of animals in tourism, including a special edition on the topic in the *Journal of Ecotourism* (2022). As we noted above, posthumanism has value as a heuristic tool, but there will be challenges in implementing its ideals under prevailing economic, political, socio-cultural realities (Cohen, 2019).

Discussion

Research in tourism studies increasingly points to the need for a better-educated industry in the face of welfare and conservation concerns over the use of animals in various settings and venues (Aquino, 2022; Moorhouse et al., 2015). Tourism operators, tourists, and academics must embrace a heightened focus on the interests of animals in keeping pace with other animal-using industries both in practice and in theory (Fennell, 2012). Such an observation is confirmed in recent studies that indicate that tourism trade associations (Font et al., 2019) and tourism institutions (Fennell, 2014) are centred more on anthropocentrism and ecocentrism than animal welfare and rights.

Veterinary science went through a crisis of legitimacy over the importance of animal welfare in the mid-2000s. Scholars argue that change for a more caring and compassionate veterinary profession starts with education (Main et al., 2005; see also de Boo & Knight, 2005). We predict the same crisis of legitimacy for tourism in the coming years, so anticipating how the industry should prepare for these changes is necessary now. While several theoretical approaches have been proposed for such change in tourism, including animal rights, ecofeminism, ecocentrism, and care ethics, among others (see Fennell, 2012), we argue that animal welfare is the most rational at this stage in accommodating the needs and interests of animals as well as the tourism industry. While we support these other perspectives in principle, especially those advocating for greater protection of animal interests, future initiatives should continue to work towards implementing these perspectives in practice, which will continue to be a challenge.

The tourism industry has been criticised for failing to emerge from traditional research-practice themes centred on a narrow view of impacts. We argue that the hesitancy to more fully embrace animal ethics is merely a more recent incarnation of this penchant for staying true to past traditions. As such, what is missing is an unwillingness to step outside of anthropocentric, instrumental and neoliberal practices that place profit and pleasure above all else (Pavlović & Knežević, 2017). If a disciplinary audit of the tourism studies field were to take place, especially about themes explored in other social studies disciplines, greater emphasis on animal principles and practices would surely emerge as a topic worthy of more debate.

The Veterinary Information Network of California (VIN, 2022) joins several other veterinarian organisations designed to support those working in the veterinarian field in the same capacity as the Australian VEIN. To our knowledge, no similar tourism organisations provide the same educational purposes of VEIN and VIN above in the service of practitioners and policymakers (Frechtling, 2004). Thomas and Ormerod (2017) claim that tourism studies perform even lower than other social sciences, despite tourism's applied nature. To more effectively bridge the gap between theory and practice, Fennell (2022) proposed the development of a Tourism Knowledge Translation framework that acts as a roadmap to synthesise the best academic studies on tourism and work this knowledge into a useable format that policymakers and practitioners can understand, develop methods and tools for use, and ensure that this knowledge gets into the hands of practitioners quickly. The Tourism Knowledge Translation framework adapted specifically for the benefit of animals in tourism can be used as a knowledge repository to allow industry practitioners to continue to be exposed to new information on best practices for the wellbeing of animals.

The ubiquity of animal-based tourism makes the lack of animal welfare literacy among tourists, tourism operators, and academics an area of concern. This reality makes the development of animal welfare in tourism courses more necessary. For such a course, the main goal is for students to critically and accurately assess the welfare needs of animals used in tourism in theory and practice. More work needs to be done on how classroom and field experiences can build upon each other through various pedagogical strategies employed under an approach that balances theory, process, and praxis—using repetition and revisiting of information to increase student comprehension. Students could be assessed based on their ability to demonstrate their synthesis of material rather than on their ability to recall or regurgitate information on a standardised exam. Accordingly, the pedagogical principles proposed Tyler (1949/1969; see also, Arduser, 2011, and Howard, 2007), on defining goals, establishing corresponding learning experiences, organising learning experiences to have a cumulative effect, and evaluating outcomes should be a topic of ongoing discussion.

The learning goals identified above by de Boo and Knight (2005) can be achieved by establishing learning experiences. Examples include the differentiated, disciplined, and democratic approach to learning vs. the standardized, managerial, and conformational approach often seen in institutionalized education today (Kesson & Henderson, 2010). The approach should be *differentiated* in the sense that learning experiences ought to promote productive idiosyncrasy amongst students and it should be *disciplined* in the sense that this productive idiosyncrasy results in discipline-from-within (Kesson & Henderson, 2010). Rather than a traditional lecture-based classroom experience, lectures ought to be diversified and include more than one method of conveying information. This might include "visual displays, handouts and pre-reading requirements as well as a reduction in speed to allow for thinking time … thought can also be stimulated by problem-centred lectures that present a chain of argument and require students to follow a line of reasoning" (Bligh, 1971, cited in French & Kennedy, 2017, p. 642). Thus, an Animal Welfare in Tourism course ought to incorporate flexibility in its structure which allows students a certain amount of freedom to explore concepts learned in the class on their own volition.

Organising learning for a cumulative effect includes teaching that allows students to disassemble and reassemble concepts in their mind to maximize the applicability of what they have learned—a concept known as constructionism (Howard, 2007). Fundamental concepts should be repeated and revisited as they are built upon, in a spiral-type pattern (Howard, 2007). Consequently, as the course progresses, it builds upon foundational principles such as sentience, stress, and the Five Domains to arrive at an understanding of complex theories such as animal rights and ecofeminism.

In reference to evaluating outcomes, Kesson and Henderson (2010) describe the prevailing attention to test results and associated scripted or prescribed curriculum and instruction as the "standardized management paradigm" (p. 219). This model persists in education because of what Kesson and Henderson argue to be an unwillingness to move away from mainstream approaches to professional development and curriculum leadership. Smith (1996/2000) and Howard (2007) contrast this mechanistic orientation against a "process approach" (students constantly evaluated by their instructor) and a "praxis approach" (students evaluated based on the student's commitment to confront and solve real issues in the field). Ideally, student evaluation ought to be based on all three and not just the first in efforts to reconceptualise, diversify and democratise educational thought in achieving a continuous unearthing of new truths (Dewey, 1929/1999). In the example of provisioning and habituation from Table 1, a student who learned about this topic could be evaluated by being presented with an individual animal on a field trip who has become dependent on humans for food, after which the student could be asked to produce a paper identifying issues they observed for the purpose of generating solutions, infographics, video, or social marketing campaign.

Conclusion

We argue that now is the time to adopt the proposed syllabus (and course) as the tourism studies field continues the rhetoric around claims of responsibility and sustainability. By ignoring the welfare needs of animals used in many ways and contexts, there is a failure to express values, priorities and motivations beyond profit and pleasure. We accept that there are other priorities to consider in striving for a more ethical tourism industry: marginalised populations like women, children, victims of environmental racism, and the disabled—to name but a few. We also accept that other animal ethics theories, more protectionist in orientation, have the potential to advance the interests of animals, but mainly in theory. We further acknowledge that different stakeholders will seek different outcomes from the course, so the proposed course may be altered to fit the more specific needs and interests of other stakeholder groups. Nevertheless, given the poor situation at present over the treatment of animals in tourism, animal welfare is seen as the most rational approach to adopt for the foreseeable future.

Disclosure statement

The authors have no known conflict of interest to disclose..

ORCID

Tom P. Moorhouse http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8889-2175

References

ABTA. (2017). *ABTA holds its first sustainable travel event*. ABTA. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://www.abta.com/news/abta-holds-its-first-sustainable-travel-event.

ANVR. (2013). Vision of the future of tourism in 2025. https://www.anvr.nl/DownloadItem/ANVR-Tourism%20Vision%202025-%20English%20version.pdf

Aquino, J. (2022). Teaching wildlife tourism management: reflections on culture, nature, and wildlife. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, *22*(1), 68–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2021.2016553

Arduser, L. (2011). Warp and weft: Weaving the discussion threads of an online community. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, *41*(1), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.2190/TW.41.1.b

Baars, B. J. (2005). Subjective experience is probably not limited to humans: The evidence from neurobiology and behavior. *Consciousness and Cognition*, *14*(1), 7–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2004.11.002

Blenkin, G. M., Edwards, G., & Kelly, A. V. (1992). *Change and the curriculum*. Sage.

Bligh, D. A. (1971). *What's the use of lectures?*. Penguin Education.

Brooks, S., Spierenburg, M., Brakel, L. V., Klolk, A., & Lukhozi, K. B. (2011). Creating a commodified wilderness: Tourism, private game farming, and 'third nature' landscapes in Kwazulu-natal. *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, *102*(3), 260–274.

Broom, D. M. (1991). Animal welfare: concepts and measurement. *Journal of Animal Science*, *69*(10), 4167–4175. https://doi.org/10.2527/1991.69104167x

Broom, D. M. (2003). Transport stress in cattle and sheep with details of physiological, ethological, and other indicators. *DTW. Deutsche Tierarztliche Wochenschrift*, *110*(3), 83–89.

Broom, D. M. (2010). Cognitive ability and awareness in domestic animals and decisions about obligations to animals. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *126*(1-2), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2010.05.001

Broom, D. M. (2015). New research relevant to companion animal welfare. *Companion Animal*, *20*(10), 548–551. https://doi.org/10.12968/coan.2015.20.10.548

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

de Boo, J., & Knight, A. (2005). "Concepts in animal welfare": a syllabus in animal welfare science and ethics for veterinary schools. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *32*(4), 451–453. https://doi.org/10.3138/jvme.32.4.451

Callos, N. (2019). Redefining wildlife tourism: Ethically interacting with animals abroad. https://www.volunteerforever.com/article_post/redefining-wildlife-tourism-ethically-interacting-with-animals-abroad/.

Carr, N., & Broom, D. (2018). *Tourism and animal welfare*. CABI.

Cohen, E. (2019). Posthumanism and tourism. *Tourism Review*, *74*(3), 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-06-2018-0089
Cohen, E. (2014). Recreational hunting: Ethics, Experiences, and commoditisation. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *39*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2014.11081323
Criscuolo, F., & Sueur, C. (2020). An evolutionary point of view of animal ethics. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 403. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00403.
Daly, N. (2019a). Suffering unseen: The dark truth behind wildlife tourism. *National Geographic*. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/issue/june-2019.
Daly, N. (2019b). How to do wildlife tourism right. https://www.nationalgeographic.com/travel/article/how-to-do-wildlife-tourism-right?utm_source=volunteerforever.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=redefining-wildlife-tourism-ethically-interacting-with-animals-abroad.
De Briyne, N., Vidović, J., Morton, D. B., & Magalhães-Sant'Ana, M. (2020). Evolution of the teaching of animal welfare science, ethics and law in European veterinary schools (2012–2019). *Animals*, *10*(7), 1238. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10071238
De Vere, R. (2023). Animal welfare education and communication. In A. Knight, C. Phillips, & P. Sparks (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of animal welfare*, Routledge (pp. 480–492).
Dewey, J. (1929/1999). *Individualism is old and new*. Prometheus Books.
Dobson, J. (2011). Towards a utilitarian ethic for marine wildlife tourism. *Tourism in Marine Environments*, *7*(3), 213–222. https://doi.org/10.3727/154427311X13195453162976
Duncan, I. J. (2006). The changing concept of animal sentience. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *100*(1-2), 11–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.04.011
Duncan, I. J. H. (2019). Animal welfare: a brief history. In S. Hild & L. Schweitzer (Eds.), *Animal welfare: from science to law*. La Fondation Droit Animal, Ethique et Sciences.
Duncan, E., Graham, R., & McManus, P. (2018). 'No one has even seen … smelt … or sensed a social licence': Animal geographies and social licence to operate. *Geoforum*, *96*, 318–327.
Duncan, I. J., & Petherick, J. C. (1991). The implications of cognitive processes for animal welfare. *Journal of Animal Science*, *69*(12), 5017–5022.
Estol, L. R. (2004). Animal welfare in the veterinary curriculum. In Proceedings of the Global Conference on Animal Welfare: An OIE Initiative (pp. 37–49). Office for Official Publication of the European Communities.
Fennell, D. A. (2022). Progressing towards animal welfare literacy in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *96*, 103461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103461
Fennell, D. A. (2022). The tourism knowledge translation framework: Bridging theory and practice. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *25*(5), 674–691. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1887099
Fennell, D. A. (2014). Exploring the boundaries of a new moral order for tourism's global code of ethics. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22*(7), 983–996. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.918137
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. (2015). The status of animal ethics research in tourism: A review of theory. *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships*, 27–43.
Fennell, D. A. (2012). *Tourism and animal ethics*. Routledge.
Fennell, D. A. (2006). *Tourism ethics*. Channel view.
Fennell, D. A., & Coose, S. (2022). Animals in entertainment. In *Routledge handbook of animal welfare* (pp. 176–189). Routledge.
Fennell, D. A., & Sheppard, V. (2021). Tourism animals and the scales of justice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *29*(2–3), 314–335. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1768263
Fennell, D. A., & Thomsen, B. (2021). Tourism and animal suffering: mapping the future. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *91*, 103317. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103317
Fraser, D., & Duncan, I. J. (1998). 'Pleasures','pains' and animal welfare: toward a natural history of affect. *Animal Welfare*, *7*(4), 383–396.
Flynn, C. (2001). Acknowledging the "Zoological Connection": A sociological analysis of animal cruelty. *Society & Animals*, *9*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853001300109008
Folmer, A., Haartsen, T., & Huigen, P. P. P. (2013). The role of wildlife in emotional attachment to a nature-based tourism destination. *Journal of Ecotourism*, *12*(3), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2013.864297
Font, X., Bonilla-Priego, M. J., & Kantenbacher, J. (2019). Trade associations as corporate social responsibility actors: an institutional theory analysis of animal welfare in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(1), 118–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1538231
Frechtling, D. (2004). Assessment of tourism/hospitality journals' role in knowledge transfer: An exploratory study. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*(2), 100–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268230
French, S., & Kennedy, G. (2017). Reassessing the value of university lectures. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *22*(6), 639–654. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1273213

Grandin, T. (2010). Auditing animal welfare at slaughter plants. *Meat Science*, *86*(1), 56–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2010.04.022

Griffin, A. S., Diquelou, M., & Perea, M. (2014). Innovative problem solving in birds: a key role of motor diversity. *Animal Behaviour*, *92*, 221–227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.04.009

GSTC Council (2016). GSTC destination criteria. Retrieved from: https://www. gstcouncil. org/gstc-criteria/gstc-destination-criteria.

Haanpää, M., Salmela, T., García-Rosell, J.-C., & Äijälä, M. (2021). The disruptive 'other'? Exploring human-animal relations in tourism through videography. *Tourism Geographies*, *23*(1–2), 97–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2019.1666158

Hemsworth, P. H., Mellor, D. J., Cronin, G. M., & Tilbrook, A. J. (2015). Scientific assessment of animal welfare. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*, *63*(1), 24–30.

Higginbottom, K. (2004). Wildlife tourism: an introduction. In K. Higginbottom (Ed.), *Wildlife tourism: impacts, management and planning* (pp. 1–11). Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd.

Howard, J. (2007). *Curriculum development*. Elon University. Retrieved November 28, 2021, from https://www.uwindsor.ca/ctl/sites/uwindsor.ca.ctl/files/curriculum-development.pdf

Huertas, S. M., Gallo, C., & Galindo, F. (2014). Drivers of animal welfare policy in the Americas. *Revue Scientifique et Technique Office International Des Epizooties*, *33*, 67–76.

Hughes, P. (2001). Animals, values and tourism – structural shifts in UK dolphin tourism provision. *Tourism Management*, *22*(4), 321–329. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00070-4

Iossa, G., Soulsbury, C. D., & Harris, S. (2009). Are wild animals suited to a travelling circus life. *Animal Wefare*, *18*(2), 129–140. [Mismatch

Kelly, A. V. (2004). *The curriculum: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Kesson, K. R., & Henderson, J. G. (2010). Reconceptualizing professional development for curriculum leadership: Inspired by John Dewey and informed by Alain Badiou. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *42*(2), 213–229. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2009.00533.x

Kline, C. (Ed.). (2018). *Animals, food, & tourism*. Routledge.

Korte, S. M., Olivier, B., & Koolhaas, J. M. (2007). A new animal welfare concept based on allostasis. *Physiology & Behavior*, *92*(3), 422–428.

Küçükaltan, E. G., & Dilek, S. E. (2019). A philosophical approach to animal rights and welfare in the tourism sector. *Journal of Tourism, Leisure, and Hospitality*, *1*(1), 4–14.

Mason, G. (1991). Stereotypies: a critical review. *Animal Behaviour*, *41*(6), 1015–1037. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80640-2

Main, D. C. J., Thornton, P., & Kerr, K. (2005). Teaching animal welfare science, ethics, and law to veterinary students in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *32*(4), 505–508.

Majuri, K. (2018). Animal welfare. In J. Ojuva (Ed.), *Animal welfare in tourism services: Examples and practical tips for the wellbeing of animals used for tourism in Lapland* (pp. 26–29). Publications of Lapland UAS.

Markwell, K., Firth, T., & Hing, N. (2017). Blood on the racetrack: an analysis of ethical concerns regarding animal-based gambling. *Annals of Leisure Research*, *20*(5), 594–609. https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2016.1251326

McGrath, N., Walker, J., Nilsson, D., & Phillips, C. (2013). Public attitudes towards grief in animals. *Animal Welfare*, *22*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.7120/09627286.22.1.033

McGreevy, P. D., & Dixon, R. J. (2005). Teaching animal welfare at the University of Sydney's Faculty of Veterinary Science. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *32*(4), 442–446.

Mellor, D. J. (2016). Updating animal welfare thinking: Moving beyond the "Five Freedoms" towards "a Life Worth Living. *Animals*, *6*(3), 21. https://doi.org/10.3390/ani6030021

Mench, J. A. (2008). Farm animal welfare in the USA: Farming practices, research, education, regulation, and assurance programs. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *113*(4), 298–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2008.01.009

Millman, S. T., Adams, C., & Turner, P. V. (2005). Animal welfare training at the Ontario Veterinary College. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *32*(4), 447–450. https://doi.org/10.3138/jvme.32.4.447

Moorhouse, T. P., Dahlsjö, C. A., Baker, S. E., D'Cruze, N. C., & Macdonald, D. W. (2015). The customer isn't always right—conservation and animal welfare implications of the increasing demand for wildlife tourism. *PloS One*, *10*(10), e0138939.

Moorhouse, T., D'Cruze, N. C., & Macdonald, D. W. (2017). Unethical use of wildlife in tourism: what's the problem, who is responsible, and what can be done? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *25*(4), 505–516. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1223087

Mota-Rojas, D., Orihuela, A., Strappini-Asteggiano, A., Cajiao-Pachón, M. N., Agüera-Buendía, E., Mora-Medina, P., Ghezzi, M., & Alonso-Spilsbury, M. (2018). Teaching animal welfare in veterinary schools in Latin America. *International Journal of Veterinary Science and Medicine*, *6*(2), 131–140.

Nattrass, N., Stephens, J., & Loubser, J. J. (2019). Animal welfare and ecology in the contested ethics of rodent control in Cape Town. *Journal of Urban Ecology*, *5*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1093/jue/juz008

Newsome, D., & Rodger, K. (2008). To feed or not to feed: a contentious issue in wildlife tourism. In D. Lunney, A. Munn, & W. Meikle (Eds.), *Too close for comfort: Contentious issues in human-wildlife encounters* (pp. 255–270). Mosman.

Ojuva, J. (Ed). (2018). *Animal welfare in tourism services: Examples and practical tips for the wellbeing of animals used for tourism in Lapland*. Publications of Lapland UAS.

Pavlović, D., & Knežević, M. (2017). Is contemporary tourism only a neoliberal manipulation? *Acta Economica Et Turistica*, *3*(1), 59–66. https://doi.org/10.1515/aet-2017-0007

Responsible Travel. (2021). Our stance on captive animals, animal welfare & tourism. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://www.responsibletravel.com/copy/animal-welfare-issues-in-tourism.

Rickly, J. M., & Kline, C. (Eds.). (2021). *Exploring nonhuman work in tourism: From beasts of burden to animal ambassadors* (pp. 1–17). De Gruyter.

Rollin, B. E. (2006). The regulation of animal research and the emergence of animal ethics: a conceptual history. *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics*, *27*(4), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11017-006-9007-8

Serra, M., Wolkers, C. P. B., & Urbinati, E. C. (2018). Physiolocial indicators of animal welfare. *Revista Brasileira de Zoociências*, *19*(2), 70–96. https://doi.org/10.34019/2596-3325.2018.v19.24726

Sheppard, V. A., & Fennell, D. A. (2019). Progress in tourism public policy: Toward an ethic for nonhuman animals. *Tourism Management*, *73*, 134–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.11.017

Siegford, J. M., Bernardo, T. M., Malinowski, R. P., Laughlin, K., & Zanella, A. J. (2005). Integrating animal welfare into veterinary education: Using an online, interactive course. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, *32*(4), 497–504.

Sinha, B. C., Qureshi, G., Uniyal, V. K., & Sen, S. (2012). Economics of wildlife tourism – contribution to livelihoods of communities around Kanha tiger reserve, India. *Journal of Ecotourism*, *11*(3), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2012.721785

Smith, M. K. (1996/2000). 'Curriculum theory and practice' The encyclopedia of pedagogy and informal education. Retrieved December 3, 2021, from www.infed.org/biblio/b-curric.htm.

Swaisgood, R. R. (2007). Current status and future directions of applied behavioral research for animal welfare and conservation. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *102*(3–4), 139–162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2006.05.027

Tallberg, L., García Rosell, J.-C., & Haanpää, M. (2021). Human-animal relations in business and society: Advancing the feminist interpretation of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*,180(1), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04840-1

Taylor, M., Hurst, C. E., Stinson, M. J., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2020). *Becoming care-full*: contextualising moral development among captive elephant volunteer tourists to Thailand. *Journal of Ecotourism*, *19*(2), 113–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2019.1657125

The Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare. (2018). Hyvinvointi. http://www.elaintieto.fi/hyvinvointi.

Thomas, R., & Ormerod, N. (2017). The (almost) imperceptible impact of tourism research on policy and practice. *Tourism Management*, *62*, 379–389. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.009

Tyler, R. W. (1949/1969). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. The University of Chicago Press.

Turner, D. (2017). Animal Welfare in Tourism: meeting customer expectations and protecting your reputation. ABTA. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://www.abta.com/news/animal-welfare-tourism-meeting-customer-expectations-and-protecting-your-reputation

UNWTO. (2021). Global code of ethics for tourism. https://www.unwto.org/global-code-of-ethics-for-tourism

VIN. (2022). About VIN. https://www.vin.com/vin/.

Wemelsfelder, F. (2007). How animals communicate quality of life: The qualitative assessment of behaviour. *Animal Welfare*, 16, 25–31.

Wild Welfare. (2021). Our mission, vision and values. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://wildwelfare.org/vision-mission-values/.

Wilkins, D. B., Houseman, C., Allan, R., Appleby, M. C., Peeling, D., & Stevenson, P. (2005). Animal welfare: the role of non-governmental organisations. *Revue Scientifique et Technique (International Office of Epizootics)*, *24*(2), 625–638.

Winter, C. (2020). A review of animal ethics in tourism: Launching the Annals of Tourism Research curated collection on animal ethics in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *84*(2), 102989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102989

Wise, N. (2021). Animals caught in the crossfire: humanitarian efforts and responsible tourism opportunities. In D. A. Fennell (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of ecotourism* (pp. 231–240). Routledge.

Wolfe, C. (2009). Human, all too human: "Animal studies" and the humanities. *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, *124*(2), 564–575. https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2009.124.2.564

Wood, D. (2021). Issues in animal welfare. Retrieved November 9, 2021, from https://study.com/academy/lesson/animal-welfare-definition-issues.html.

Yudina, O., & Fennell, D. (2013). Ecofeminism in the tourism context: a discussion of the use of other-than-human animals as food in tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *38*(1), 55–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2013.11081729