

Martin Stefanov

A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE NOTION OF ZOOS

A Content Analysis of the Book ‘Zoos and Animal Rights:

The Ethics of Keeping Animals’

Tourism Research, TourCIM

Master’s thesis

Spring 2020

**University of Lapland, Faculty of Social Sciences**

**Title:** A critical perspective on the notion of zoos – A Content analysis of the Book ‘Zoos and Animal Rights: The Ethics of Keeping Animals’

**Author:** Martin Stefanov

**Degree program / Field of study:** Tourism Research, TourCIM (Tourism, Culture and International Management)

**Type of the work:** Master’s thesis

**Number of pages:** 70

**Year:** 2020

**Abstract**

The study is intended to contribute to our understanding of the current perspectives of the human – non-human relationship with animals in captivity in the tourism industry, in the notion of the more ethical and critical turn in tourism studies. Natural Science has already held research on zoos and Animal studies, and we have already witnessed a vivid moral shift also within the studies in Social Science. However, there is a notable lack of research of zoos within the (still new) *ethical turn in tourism studies*. Covering the gap of knowledge on animals in captivity in the notion of the *ethical turn* is well beyond the scope of this study. However, the intended outcome of this research is to bring awareness of the need for re-thinking the human - non-human relationship in tourism studies.

This thesis is not another research on the ethical issues related to the captivity, but rather about *how the evergreen zoo advocates’ arguments stand within the more ethical notion in contemporary tourism studies?* For this, I conduct a *content analysis* and apply *critical theory* for critical evaluation of the book of the zoo advocate Bostock, S. S. C ., 'Zoos and animal rights: The ethics of keeping animals', Routledge, 1993. The intended outcome is a suggestion for re-thinking of the current anthropocentric perspectives on animals in captivity. I choose this book because it is relatively widespread and is advocating the zoo's practices in a very popular way. Furthermore, the book is well organised and can serve well as a summary of all the possible zoo-advocates arguments For this study, I select statements to analyze the methodological framework, methods and paradigms used in the book, and also to investigate which animal ethics methods are overlooked.

To clarify, in this research, I focus on the so-called *wildlife in captivity*. Wildlife is one of the three terms serving to categorise the non-human animals on domesticated, semi-domesticated, and wild. Therefore, in this paper, I do not investigate the human relation to domesticated, semi-domesticated, used in daily life, agricultural activities, tourism, or in any other way. As defined by Orams (2002, p. 283), although most of the animal-based tourist attractions in captive settings typically refer to zoos, they also include a variety of sites such as conventional zoos, marine parks, aquariums, theme parks, safari parks, and sea pens. In this research, I investigate the zoos and the studies about zoos (wildlife in captivity) in my attempt to undermine Bostock's anthropocentric views on animal ethics and to address the need for re-thinking the human-nonhuman relationship.

Main findings indicate biases, overlooked crucial animal ethics methods, and concerns about the credibility and reliability of the investigated book. As a result, the study suggests re-thinking the Animal Ethics studies and raises the critical methodological question of whether scientific data

are to be treated as giving direct access to the truth or as actively constructed narratives which themselves demand analysis?

The paper may contribute to the field of animal-based tourism by suggesting a fresh and more critical overview on using animals for entertainment in the tourism industry and can be used to promote more ethical practices among academia and tourism business.

**Keywords:** Anthropocentrism, non-human, zoo, critical theory, captivity

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 Background.....	6
1.2 Purpose and importance of the study.....	9
1.3 Zoos and Society.....	11
1.4 The role of zoos in tourism.....	14
1.5 Criticism towards zoos and aquariums.....	15
1.6 Structure of the study.....	17
1.7 The position of the researcher.....	17
2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	19
2.1 Critical theory.....	19
2.2 Animal Ethics in Tourism.....	23
2.3 Animals in the Anthropocene.....	28
3. RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN.....	32
3.1 The book “Zoos and Animal Rights. The Ethics of Keeping Animals.....	33
3.2 Content analysis.....	35
3.3 Ethics of the research.....	37
4. FINDINGS.....	40
4.1 Animal ethics theories and animal representation in ‘Zoos and Animal Rights.’.....	40
4.1.1 Bostock on Animal Rights.....	42
4.1.2 Utilitarianism and Animal Welfare.....	44
4.1.4 The white Westerner.....	47
4.2 Which animal ethics theories are neglected/underestimated by the author?.....	52
4.2.1 Ecocentrism and Ecofeminism.....	52
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	60
REFERENCES.....	65
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	70

## 1. INTRODUCTION

*Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.*

Martin L. King, Jr.

Historically, human and non-human animals have built a controversial and unstable relationship, as described by Gannon (2002, p. 589) "We eat them and we cuddle them. We feed them, we play with them, we make money from them, we hunt them, we build tourism around them, we breed them, we teach them tricks, and we pass legislation to protect them. In short, we use them for any purpose we wish." Moreover, the interaction between humans and animals is a *one-side built relationship*, in which the animals do not have a representation due to the lack of representatives with human-verbal communication skills among themselves. This brings probably the most significant challenge for Animal Studies - giving a human voice to animals. As a result, we witness endless varieties of anthropocentric interpretations on what animals "*say*", *feel* and *need*. The attitude towards non-humans varies time and location wise. Consequently, I believe that today humankind has evolved in a moral and philosophical sense, which demands a more complete and up-to-date *re-thinking* the human-nonhuman relationship. Therefore, in my research, I emphasize the crucial need for new bonds to be established between humans and animals.

There will be two main terms in my research: '*moral turn*' and '*animal turn*', while the '*non-human turn*' will have a secondary significance. The *moral turn* stands for the more ethical approach in tourism studies in the past few decades. The *animal turn* is narrowing down the theme in my thesis, limiting it to the animals only. In contrast, the non-human turn brings more abstraction on the entire non-human world, which includes, but it is not limited to, the flora, water, soil, and bacteria.

I aim to bring attention also to another segregative term called speciesism. The segregation of species serves our need for putting non-humans in categories, so we can decide which animal serves as a companion, which is for food, which one we can put in the work, which one is for entertainment or which one we can kill without guilt, even with some pleasure (e.g. mosquitoes).

However, I hope with my research, I can help the reader, if not vanish, at least fade the strong boundaries between human and non-human species. Here I am not suggesting that we can find the truth because Philosophically the truth may not even exist, or there might be more than one truth. However, what does exist it the pursuit of the truth in which way we can get closer to the truth.

I am genuinely intrigued to learn more about the way we, the westerners, understand our relationship with the wild animals in captivity, knowing already that the main purpose of the zoo-phenomenon is entertainment. I believe that exploring that relationship will be beneficial not only for the nonhuman animals but for the human race as well. The social significance of the topic bears directly on my values system and is thus it plays a role in my philosophical presence in society. As an active member of the society, when I notice injustice, I need to act. Here my research is my action.

## **1.1 Background**

There is an evident evolution of the perspectives on animals over time. According to Gannon (2002, as cited in Shani & Pizam, 2008, p. 679) "traditionally, society has accepted the concept of "the manhunter," that is to say, that man can use animals to serve his needs because animals do not have an intrinsic value of their own." Also, only until the early 60's the science had categorically excluded that animals can have feelings or emotions (Goodall & Berman, 1999). Although in the past few decades some Western scholars have conducted a good base of literature on animals in tourism, Mason (2000, as cited in Frost, 2011, p. 7) noted that the research on the topic of zoos is limited, especially studies published on zoos and tourism.

As noted by Orams (2002, p. 287), there are three main camps of philosophical approach towards studies in the human-nonhuman relationship. First is the basic Judeo– Christian (Western world) view that animals are subordinate to humans and that, as a consequence, humans have the right to utilise animals for human benefit. The second view is the Eastern world view, where animals have an equal or equivalent status to humans. The contemporary thinking of deep ecologists, animal rights activists and some eastern religions (at least for some animals) represents this kind

of view. The third is the indigenous people view of reverence where an animal is superior to human. In these societies, people have spiritual understandings, and often animals are worshipped as Gods. Westernification is problematic because as Simmons (2007, p. 61) noted, "the dualistic or dichotomous thinking of Western philosophy has separated human from animal, mind from body, and civilization from nature." As a westerner myself, a challenge for my research is the Judeo-Christian lens that I grew up within. However, in this research, I challenge exactly the fundamentals of the Judeo-Christian Philosophy, because, in the West, animals have been predominantly a subject of othering and putting them into different categories so that we know what to do with certain animal in certain situations. According to Bowd (1984, as cited in Shani & Pizam, 2008, p. 679) "contacts between humans and animals take place in four main areas: as pets, animals in agriculture, animals in science and education, and animals in the wild." In this regard, in the past animals have been studied mainly as participants of these categories. Consequently, animals in tourism were neglected until the late 20th century, which has not given enough time for a new and more ethical approach to the problem.

As noted by Goodall and Berman (1999), in their revolutionary book 'Reason for Hope' "The question of what sets us apart from other animals has occupied humanity for millennia. However, only in the last few decades have animals gone from objects to be observed to fellow beings to be understood, with their complex psychoemotional constitution." Only after the '80s has research been directed towards understanding the development and structures of attitudes relating to the treatment of animals. It appears to me that there is a significant ethical change over time on how we approach the studies of animals. However, the *nonhuman* approach is still too "young" and has great potential for development. According to Simmons (2007, p. 1) only over the last two decades the humanities and social sciences have been experiencing such an event: the '*animal turn*', comparable in significance to the 'linguistic turn' that revolutionized humanities and social science disciplines from the mid-twentieth century onwards. It should be clear by now that there is already a notable scientific effort towards the research in animal ethics. However, as noted by Fennell (2014, p. 983), animal ethics is virtually terra incognita in tourism studies. Therefore, this terra incognita is exactly the field of my thesis.

Including the animals in the "conversation" about what is going to be our relationship in future like, can shake some old-fashioned scholars, who might be used to a more human-centred approach. If humans are not the only possible subjects or objects of study in research, then a wealth of different possibilities emerge. Given the state of the non-human, human-centred research may not be sufficient. However, in a world that contains racism, sexism, violence, and other forms of oppression, the standpoint on the non-human emerges necessarily today. Over time the non-human turn in contemporary science started to bring fresh approaches to our relationship with the animals. According to Ulmer (2017, p. 833) "Scholars such as Rosi Braidotti, Donna Haraway, Claire Colebrook, and Stacey Alaimo suggest that justice involves more than what can be found solely within the realm of human relations. Rather, justice is also material, ecological, geographical, geological, geopolitical, and geophilosophical." Justice is a more-than-human endeavour, and these authors aim is not to remove humans from research but to deemphasize the focus on humans and recognize that non-human elements are always already present.

However, the animals are still underrepresented in science, which also creates a gap between the knowledge in academia and the business. The current literature is stuck on the 'battle' "are the zoos good or bad". For new legislation on animal welfare to be introduced in practice, we need contemporary research. As there is already a fair amount of research proving that zoos are not beneficial neither for the animals nor for the humans, it is time to move on. Yet, it seems that so far studies in tourism have not done enough for the animals. As a result, often animals are not considered at all in the human-centred tourism management, which positions the mere human experience on the top of the pyramid as a primary and most significant aspect of tourism design. Moreover, according to Burns (2015, p. 50), animals are even missing from the UN World Tourism Organisation's Global Code of Ethics for Tourism, where the animals are not only ignored, or at best assumed to be included under labels of Nature, but they are also not considered as tourism stakeholders, even in models that attempt a broad inclusion of interested parties. The codes consist of several human-centric values, defined around the enhancement of human experience and rights to access to tourism, and except 'sustainable development,' there is no a single word about Nature and Animal Ethics. According to Fennell (2014), animals are missing almost entirely from the discussion on the environment is any specific reference, apart from the



need to preserve endangered species of wildlife. What is not apparent in the complexity of how and who we ought to conserve and whose interests are at stake in the political, economic and participatory struggles that emerge from these issues is the intrinsic value of non-humans.

## **1.2 Purpose and importance of the study**

Research on zoos can give answers about the species from both sides of the metal bars. The theme of zoos has significant social value as it teaches both adults and children about how we humans see the animals. To argue that the reduction of non-human animals to nothing more than instruments of toil or pleasure expresses the deep-seated antipathy of reason to life, including human life perhaps leads to more questions than answers (García-Rosell & Hancock, 2020). Generating questions about the zoos inevitably leads to new questions about the human race. Therefore it may reveal some aspects of human nature. Furthermore, due to its scale, the industry of captivity has also political and economic impacts.

Zoos are a laboratory in the sense of representing a situation where animal's lives are restricted by humans. One hardly can think of a better example of human domination over animals. There is something exceptionally cruel about zoos over other examples of human domination. While in cases where animals are used for food, labour or experiments, one can find practicality of using animals, zoos primarily goal is social entertainment. This controversial practice has a significant impact not only over the animals but over the human too.

Challenging the zoo advocates' perspective in academia is an integral part of understanding how we see and interact with animals. Therefore, analyzing and deconstructing Bostock's book will remind us that there is another perspective that we need to include in researches about animals – the view of the nonhuman. Changes in our thinking about animals may lead to the animals' liberation from captivity future. To pursuit these matters, I generated the main research question of this paper:

**How do Bostock's arguments stand within the more ethical notion in contemporary tourism studies?**

Answering this question will tell us what the zoo advocates do not like talking about; what are they missing or hiding; what they fail to understand, and what they choose not to follow? For a deeper understanding of this issue, there will be three sub-questions:

**Which are the animal ethics theories supporting the arguments in the book?**

**How are animals represented in the book?**

**Which animal ethics theories are neglected/underestimated in Bostock's book?**

The goal of this qualitative research is not only to explore the meaning of Bostock's arguments and how he represents the status of the non-human world but also to bring awareness about the need for change in the research design about knowing animals – a transition towards a broader spectre of perspectives and inclusiveness. My research also aims to demonstrate the evolutionary gap between Bostock's views on zoos and the contemporary views on zoos. Therefore, my study is somewhat exploratory than definitive intending to generate more questions than answers. I also seek a better understanding of the contemporary perspectives on the 'animals in captivity in tourism' by introducing the idea of the *non-human point of view*. Therefore, I aim to trigger empathy towards non-humans by building meaning in '*thinking with*' rather than '*thinking about*' the animals. According to Cohen (2009, as cited in Markwell, 2015, p. 4), tourism is an ideal context for the exploration of human-animal relationships because of the various forms of interaction, such as viewing, hunting, fishing, playing and eating. Consequently, I believe that zoos can serve well as a case study for approaching this issue.

Knowledge production is an inevitable concern about my research, and I would like to explore how the author knows what he knows. As noted by Leavy (2017, p. 48), one common effect from the social justice movements is that thorough reexamination of power within the social research enterprise we aim to avoid creating knowledge that continued to collude with factors that oppressed women and other minority groups, or in the case of this study - the animals. Inevitably, in my analysis chapter, I share my concerns about Bostock's way of knowledge production and the possible social consequences. According to Leavy (2017, p. 48) "social justice movements highlighted historical inequities in research that served to exclude minorities from the research process and reinforce dominant ideologies and stereotypes." It might sound irrelevant to pursue

social justice within studies on the non-human world, but zoos are a social phenomenon, and it is a problem that needs to be solved by humans.

I choose Bostock's arguments because they are highly patterned and widely used. Therefore, they can be taken as a universal guideline for zoo advocates. My decision to conduct exploratory research is based on the argument of Leavy (2017, p. 6) who states that we need an exploratory research "when we want to jar specified audiences into thinking about or seeing something differently, promote new learning, or create an awareness campaign, we may research to evoke, provoke, or unsettle. This kind of research may aim to disrupt or unsettle stereotypes or "commonsense" ideologies, serve as an intention, stimulate self-reflection, or generate social awareness." I believe my concerns on the human-nonhuman relationship are extremely relevant exactly in the epoch of Anthropocene when we can see what we have done to Nature. This may be our last chance to fix it before we for sure cause irreversible damages.

The knowledge gained from the study may contribute to the literature of animals in tourism; politics; business; and bring awareness about the need for including the animals in the Declaration on Responsible Tourism. Furthermore, exploratory research, according to Leavy (2017, p. 58), can be used by other researchers aiming to build knowledge in this area. Therefore, this paper suggests a more critical overview of the current Animal Ethics debate, and that inclusive tourism should be set as the fundamental starting point of all tourism design. Perhaps, historically Anthropocene is the end of the radical anthropocentric epoch in social science.

### **1.3 Zoos and Society**

A zoo is a place where animals live in captivity and are put on display for people to view. Or as described by Oxford Dictionary "zoos are an establishment which maintains a collection of wild animals, typically in a park or gardens, for study, conservation, or displays to the public." According to the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA), captivity includes zoological gardens, biological parks, safari parks, public aquariums, bird parks, reptile parks and insectariums.

Zoos have a very long history, and we can trace it about 4500 years back in different places in the world Bostock (1993, p. 3). Collecting and exhibiting animals originates from Ancient Egypt, where private collections were reserved for the higher class population as a symbol of wealth and power (Wearing & Jobberns, 2015, p. 49–50). Some might already know that the word zoo comes from Zoological garden. According to Brightwell (1952, as cited in Bostock, 1993, p. 27) "The Zoological Gardens' became 'the Zoo' one night in 1867 when the Great Vance (a music hall artist) sang: Weekdays may do for cads, but not for me or you, So dressed right down the street, we show them who is who... The O.K. thing on Sundays is walking in the zoo." As the name is somewhat clear, the role of zoos in society remains controversial. Throughout history, as noted by Frost (2011, p. 69) people have given value to other species as means of entertainment, education and spirituality in addition to using them for food and clothing. Zoos become popular attractions at a time when people did not have any other opportunity of seeing a wild animal, and the beginning of this process happened with the opening of the world oldest public zoo in Vienna, Austria. 'Tiergarten Schonbrunn' was founded in 1752, is still functioning (Wien Tourismus). In the 1900s, zoos defined themselves as conservation movements, with a focus on the scientific study of endangered species (Hoage, 1996, p. 137). At the beginning of the 20th-century zoos became an attraction for mass audiences (Beardsworth & Bryman, 2001, p. 88).

It is worth mentioning some historical facts of the zoo's older 'brother' - the circus. Historically the circus is a predecessor of zoos. Identical to zoos, according to Simmons (2007, p. 84) 'conservation' was the keyword in the promotion of circuses. The image of the circus as a 'Noah's Ark' was immensely popular. This is most likely how zoos inherited their most repeated defending cliché 'conservation'. Franklin (1999, as cited in Simmons, 2007, p. 81) argues that contemporary zoos housed these animals as dangerous captives (cages emphasized prison bars); like prisoners of war, they were put on public display for the entertainment of the victorious. Franklin describes the implications in connection with the zoo, which not only shares its roots with the circus but also has much in common with it in terms of the demonstration of particular human-animal relations. Ritvo (1996, as cited in Simmons, 2007, p. 82) referring to the zoo, suggests that "the most powerful visual expression of the human domination of nature was the sight of large carnivores in cages."

Zoos are a social and cultural issue. According to Yasuda (2013, p. 105) "Zoos are not natural phenomena; instead, they are a cultural enterprise." Zoos represent nature in a cultural form. Well-designed zoos attract many tourists. The zoo's front region stages a playful atmosphere creating a sense of amusement. Animal houses, restaurants and souvenir shops are themed carefully with animal images aggressively promoting consumer goods. Bryman (2008, as cited in Yasuda, 2013, pp. 105, 106) confirms that 'theming' helps to provide an entertaining environment. "In such an environment, animal images are enthusiastically consumed by tourists through shopping and taking pictures. The tourists appear interested in gazing at animals through the viewfinders of cameras as well as with the naked eye."

Until less than three decades ago, zoos associated themselves primarily as fun parks. Due to a lack of significant criticism, they had no reason to be something other than a place for mere entertainment. According to Frost (2013, p. 149), since the early 1990s zoos have been in a state of transformation, shifting their strategic focus from recreation and entertainment to conservation-based education in response to changing community attitudes and values. This shift has been argued to elicit a 'crisis of identity' in search of better marketing.

In any case, zoos do not like to be called zoos anymore. For instance, Ranua Zoo, Finland, today is more likely to be marketed as Ranua Wildlife Park. As noted by Engelbrecht & Smith (2004, as cited in Wearing & Jobberns, 2015, p. 79) wary of the sensitive topic of captivity, the Sea World park Orlando staff are instructed to stay away from words such as 'captured', 'cage', 'tank' and 'captivity' and instead to use 'acquired', 'enclosure', 'aquarium' and 'controlled environment'. Employees are also instructed to feign ignorance if they are asked about the welfare of any of "their" animals. The same approach I experienced myself on the class visit to Ranua Zoo, Finland, when I had the chance to ask the zoo manager a question. My question was: How do you deal with the ethical issues attributed to the zoos? He replied: "We are trying to build bigger and bigger cages for the animals" (then he quickly sneaked out the room).

## **1.4 The role of zoos in tourism**

Technically, a zoo displays wildlife to make it visually accessible for the zoo visitors. According to Edensor (2001, as cited in Bone & Bone, 2015, p. 70), "Western society is a society of the spectacle". Morris (1994, as cited in Bone & Bone, 2015, p. 69) noted that the spectacle object could be a human body or an animal body – nothing is exempt from the spectator's gaze. Even while the body is celebrated as the location of pleasure, fertility and generative new life, it too, is the object of ridicule and debasing. Regardless of the rising criticism, according to Wearing and Jobberns (2015, p. 77) stakeholders and supporters of the public display industry maintain that captive viewing contributes to education and conservation and insist that they create a strong supporter basis for a broader population of animals.

According to Ballantyne, Hughes, Lee, Packer, & Sneddon (2018, p. 190), the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums estimate that there are more than 2,800 zoos and aquariums in the world, visited by over 700 million people annually; and in the USA alone, there are at least 355 zoos, and 29 of them have more than one million visitors per year. Nowadays, according to Ryan and Seward (2004, as cited in Shani & Pizam, 2008, p. 686), zoos are primarily places of relaxation and family-oriented trips. According to Winiarskyj (2004, as cited in Wearing & Jobberns, 2015, p. 79), captive animal viewing is most popular with domestic tourists, with estimated 130 million Americans visit zoos, marine parks and aquariums in that country each year. Most of the visitors are children on school excursions and families with young children, who are drawn to marine parks and aquariums to view the more popular dolphins, killer whales and beluga whales.

But why people visit zoos? According to Turley (1999, as cited in Frost, 2011, p. 70), "there has been understanding within zoo-based research that the three key roles of zoos are conservation, education and entertainment. Equally, it is also accepted that these three roles are often conflicting." An investigation by Tribe (2006, as cited in Frost, 2011, p.70) on the attitudes of visitors towards the role of captivity at four Australian and four UK zoos has interesting results. The study concluded that "people visit zoos mainly for recreation, but they believe that their main role is conservation".

The institution of captivity is a vast and robust industry which as such would be hard to vanish away quickly. Zoos are using smart marketing tools to sustain their reputation. As noted by Yasuda (2013, p. 106) "Narratives encoded into tourist text invoke powerful messages appealing to website visitors. Tourist text mediated by the media serves as a powerful promotional method to attract zoo visitors. Anthropomorphism creates psychological intimacy towards animals and helps create an imaginary utopia where humans and animals coexist in a friendly way." This is a suggestion that the business may not have the skills for self-regulation. Therefore, the regulation needs to come either from Science or from higher ethical values in Society.

### **1.5 Criticism towards zoos and aquariums**

Within about a century, the social tolerance of captivity evolved so dramatically. For instance, in the past, even indigenous people were on display along with the animals they were associated with. The circuses were also high on popularity. However, nowadays many societies do not tolerate any more the circus; there is a ban on using wild animals in circus within most of the EU countries, and the zoos are under massive criticism within the developed world. Society's perspectives towards using animals for entertainment are continuously evolving. As noted by Wearing and Jobberns (2015, p. 77), during the 1960s, nature figured prominently in development projects, including such things as the creation of parks, nature resorts and entertainment. By the 1970s environmentalism and animal rights became more firmly established in the West. This led to the questioning of anthropocentrism and the search for more sustainable practices. According to Shani and Pizam (2008, p. 684), the animal-based tourist attractions with captive settings have a growing concern for animal welfare as a result of public pressure.

Nowadays zoos face increasing opposition from the public, not only for the way they are managed but also for their overall purpose. Turley (1999, p. 340) argues that visitor numbers are likely to be steady but at a lower level. This means that there is an overall decline in the public interest. Furthermore, we can witness more and more boycotts and protests against animals based tourism activities.

Zoos are also accused of sending controversial messages and for teaching us of superiority over Nature. According to Beardsworth and Bryman (2009, p.89, as cited in Shani & Pizam, 2008, p. 684) zoos are perceived by many critics as sites for "the exercise of naked power over animals, and as a location for indulgence on an unashamedly recreational gaze over animals". Often seen as a false message is the tension caused by zoos giving humans a misleading sense of security concerning the continuing existence of endangered animals by having them displayed in easily accessible places (Giddings, 1995, p. 147). Selective sampling in their marketing materials is also a reason for discussions. For example, zoos often hide the bad news, but they shout out loud and invite the media when there is a baby birth in one of their cages. Nevertheless, thanks to many animal ethics organizations or activism, or just by some conscious and aware visitors, the truth behind the cages is often released to the public via heart-breaking video materials of animals' suffering. As noted by Shani and Pizam (2008) among the prominent arguments against zoos are a violation of the animals' rights to enjoy freedom, the disruption of animal family and social groups during transport, death during transport, poor captive surroundings with little consideration of animals' welfare.

The tourism industry does not have the capacity for ethical self-regulation, but the increasing ethical concerns among the public can give pressure to the industry. According to The Guardian (2016), TripAdvisor, one of the world's largest travel websites, and its booking service, Viator, will no longer sell tickets to many attractions where travellers come into contact with wild animals or endangered species held in captivity. The attractions include elephant rides, swimming-with-dolphin experiences and the petting of endangered species like tigers. Another recent example, according to WAZA (2019), Barcelona Zoo decided to shut down due to social criticism. In 2019 CNN announced that Canada launched an official ban on dolphin and whale captivity. Canada's House of Commons passed a bill Monday to make it illegal to hold a whale, dolphin or porpoise captive, punishable by fines up to \$150,000 USD (Diaz & Westcott, 2019). These changes, including many other similar, did not come from the industry, neither were they initiated by TripAdvisor. They all came from public pressure.

As noted by Ballantyne et al., (2018, p. 191) long-term survival of zoos and aquariums as a tourist attraction may depend on their ability to convince governments and the general public that



their net effect on the world's non-human species is a positive one. However, even in the article by Ballantyne et al., (2018), whose goal is to promote the zoos' and aquariums' educational and environmental practices, the authors are talking about zoo survival. Therefore, it is hard to say if the general public of the future will be satisfied if the zoos' net effect on the world's non-human species is a positive one. Animal's suffering is not mere accounting, and the future public may prefer to see all the animals liberated from human entertainment purposes.

## **1.6 Structure of the study**

This study contains four main parts representing the introduction chapter, followed by the theoretical framework, which is the lens I use for my research. The third chapter is methodological where I show the methods and research design of this study; this chapter aims to explain how qualitative research methods were used to utilise the critical theory for deconstructing the arguments of the book 'Zoos and Animal Rights'. The fourth chapter draws the analysis and discussion of the study. It indicates the main study findings and aims to answer my research questions and generate new questions. This chapter is followed by the theoretical framework of the study.

## **1.7 The position of the researcher**

There are various ways of approaching research in animals in tourism, and each has its challenges. For example, scholars usually approach the ethical debate on the use of animals in Hospitality and Tourism based on their point of view, and I am not an exception. I love animals, and their state of being subject to oppressive treatment left me with no other choice but to defend them in my research.

The main motivation in the topic came after experiencing something that felt wrong. This feeling I had when I visited Sofia zoo in Bulgaria ten years ago. At the zoo I witnessed sad-looking animals living on concrete, in small cages, walking anxiously back and forth. It was a sunny Sunday leisure day, and I expected to have fun in the zoo, but instead, I felt emotionally drained. I quickly switched my emotions from 'excitement' to 'I do not know how to feel'. It was a

depressing experience, and I regretted my decision to visit that place. I knew this was the last zoo visit in my life. I was very wrong. Five years later I went to Rovaniemi, Finland to do my Master's in tourism. During my studies, I was working as a tourist guide, and often I was supposed to bring clients to the northernmost zoo in the world - Ranua zoo, Ranua, Finland. Guiding there triggered back my negative emotions from the past. I hoped that Ranua zoo would look different from Sofia zoo, assuming that in an economically well-developed country people would have taken better care of the animals. However, although the cages in Ranua zoo were a bit bigger, I did not experience it any differently than Sofia zoo - the same dullness and boredom in the animals' sad eyes, with not enough space for the desired movement. How little I knew back then that it is impossible to build a zoo that is good for the animals.

At that time, I was not educated on the topic of zoos and wanted to believe there was a higher purpose of zoos in our society. I wanted to hear what the zoos have to say. When the time to pick a topic for my Master's thesis came, I realised I had my topic long ago in the back of my mind. Moreover, Master's thesis is hard work and putting so much effort and time should as a minimum, make the world a better place.

Step one in my research was conducting a desk research. I needed to learn more. I was ready for surprises, such as findings proving that my concerns were rootless. As I was not familiar with the topic beforehand and I was ready for anything, including switching my opinion. Not only this did not happen, but the more I learned about zoos, the more enthusiastic I was to accelerate the logical process of shutting the zoo industry down. I was happy with my choice to approach animal ethics via zoos because as Fennell (2013, p. 325) noted, zoos are examples used to illustrate animal welfare challenges in tourism.

While gathering literature, I happened to read the book that becomes the subject of my analysis in this paper. 'Zoos and Animal Rights. The Ethics of Keeping Animals' is a book that helped me establish my position in the research process. In my view, the author of the book has outdated perspectives on our relationship with the non-human world, and also severe ethical lapses which helped him to represent the animals in a way that I consider unacceptable not only in the notion of the more ethical turn in tourism studies but also in the contemporary society.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

In the following chapter, I justify my choice of a framework for this research. I also define the different approaches to narrow the research down to the implementation of Critical Theory on Bostock's book 'Zoos and Animal Rights'. In this chapter, I also justify my choice of methods by reviewing readings and pertinent research studies for theories and analytic models that are relevant to the research problem of my investigation. In this way, I specify the key variables influencing the zoo phenomenon, which will give a basis for my choice of research methods. The core viewpoint in my research for investigating the notion of the zoos in the contemporary critical turn in Social Science is Critical Theory. However, one would have a hard time applying Critical Theory on animals in contemporary tourism studies, without understanding the use of the Five main Animal Ethics Theories suggested by Fennell (2015, p.27) who noted that until recently there had been very little interest on the part of tourism theorists in these types of uses. Therefore, the theoretical framework of my research consists of three main sub-chapters: Critical Theory; Animal Ethics in Tourism (including the Five main Animal Ethics Theories); and Animals in the Anthropocene. Chapter 'theoretical framework' is followed by the chapter 'research method and design'.

### **2.1 Critical theory**

According to Botterill and Platenkamp (2012, p. 47), critical theory was created in the early 1920s in Frankfurt at Frankfurt school as an independent centre for the development of social theory, known as the Frankfurt School. The urge for a new theory came in 1923; as a result, the scientists' dissatisfaction about the situation in the political left in Germany. Critical theory is a theory that does not aim to change the world directly, but rather to challenge the social order, which consequently might lead to changes in the world. Critical theory has strong bonds with ethical issues in which according to (García-Rosell & Hancock, 2020) "there is a notable concern with the ethical life of humanity and how we might live a good life both alongside, and through each other." The definition of this theory according to Kolakowski (1978, as cited in Botterill & Platenkamp, 2012, p. 46) states that "Critical theory is simultaneously a function of the social life and an autonomous theory. It is a historical perspective on developments and contradictions in

society but at the same time, an independent position towards any doctrine." It is also about "The insaneness of society and the need for radical, emancipatory, change." As a concept in social science, Botterill & Platenkamp (2012, pp. 44-49) noted that critical theory is used by students who want to make a difference in the world. Often a student has experienced an awakening event after empirical observation on tourism practices. One of the crucial aspects of critical theory is that its critical arguments against the current forms of tourism are implemented by requesting arguments that went way beyond the mere business logic of tourism management.

Questions about our relationships with nonhuman animals and how we should treat them are among the oldest of philosophical debates in academia but only lately have they re-emerged to become some of the most critical ethical questions of the twenty-first century (Sorenson, 2011, p.188). Critical theory emphasizes the meaning embodied in the text, which makes the best suit for my research as I analyse a book. Furthermore, according to Gunderson (2014, as cited in García-Rosell & Hancock, 2020, p. 4), "prior to the development of the field of animal studies no approach to the critical theorization of society can be said to have 'theorized and problematized society's troubling relationship with animals' more so than critical theory." Critical theory explores the text beyond the mere written words, and it can explore the meaning of the author's assumptions; it helps us understand how was produced the text, as the author does not have the final say over the meanings of the words. Furthermore, critical theory helps us investigate the context in which the text was produced. One of the main foundations states that critical theory rests in the social-scientific contribution to emancipation or the elimination of cruel and repressive practices (see Botterill and Platenkamp, 2012).

Therefore, I utilize the critical theory to analyze the oppressive features and exploitative approach of Bostock's perspectives on animals in captivity. I choose the critical theory to challenge the social order of the human relationship with the zoos as an institutional phenomenon, rather than focusing on specific zoo issues. Critical theory also promotes human anticipation and ensures the representation of excluded groups which in this case are the animals. Notably, Ateljevic, Morgan, and Pritchard (2011) call on tourism scholars to engage in more critical activities; "to empower themselves to investigate matters that challenge the hegemonic rule of neoliberal capitalism, and to pursuit new pathways to alternatives."

According to Ateljevic et al., (2011, p. i) "Critical and multidisciplinary approaches should be encouraged. Consultation and intellectual rigour should be the norm amongst managers. It needs to be a radical shift in our approach to educating future Hospitality and Tourism managers and academia." A fresh and critical overview on methods and theories will as Pyyhtinen (2015, p. 14) noted: "increase our sensibilities, will also create new possibilities for thinking, acting and being; and create a break with the given."

Critical theory and Animal Liberation, as noted by Sanbonmatsu (2011, pp. 12–13) is intended to draw into sharper relief the relationship between the human oppression of the animals. Being on the same page, Ateljevic et al., (2011, p. 2) argue that a critical approach to tourism needs to expand the issue of tourism beyond the mere questions of management and governance, but also to that of reclaiming the world for humanity. Moreover, Pritchard (2011, p. 11) argues that tourism in the contemporary world consists of business or management schools, where critical reflections on the market economy are an exception. Those schools and their leading researchers continually eschew key social, political and ethical questions in favour of the technical, problem-solving research. As a consequence, there is a growing sense that tourism curricula should work for developing more critical thinkers.

One significant thing I learned during my critical approached research was always to ask myself three questions: Who writes the paper? Who benefits from the paper? Who is missing from the paper? Related to my approach Mair (2011, p. 42) notes that "critical tourism scholars are developing tools to situate tourism within the broader social, cultural, political, economic, and ecological context. This also means that in our critical approach, we should pay attention contending with the economic, social and political context within which the knowledge is constructed, how it is used and by whom?" As a result, one may create a hypothesis about 'why this very knowledge was constructed?'. Consequently, Critical theory helps us analyse those who claim they possess the truth and why are they doing this.

Ateljevic et al. (2011) are exploring how critical tourism inquiry can make a difference in the world, linking tourism education driven by the values of empowerment, partnership and ethics to

policy and practice, by stimulating critical thinking and use of multidisciplinary perspectives. Inspired by this idea, my thesis also has an attempt of producing a social change in and through tourism via *critical thinking*, critical education and critical action. *Critical thinking* does not always mean ethical thinking. However, *ethical thinking* comes as a result of *critical thinking*. Therefore, in this research, *ethical* and *critical* terms are rather synonyms.

Challenging the theoretical human-centred studies on animals in the tourism industry means raising ethical concerns. According to Shani and Pizam (2008, p. 680), "in the past few decades, alternative views have emerged, that take into consideration aspects other than the well-being of humans." Also, to my experience, the social science literature in tourism from the last decades had shifted considerable attention towards more ethically responsible approaches and inclusiveness. According to Tribe (2010, as cited in Burns, 2015, p. 49), "social science has been influenced in the 21st century by a 'critical turn' that directed research to subjects like values and ethics." My observation is confirmed by Burns (2015, p. 49) who noted that "in the last decade, scholarship around the topic of ethics in tourism has increased significantly and branched increasingly into more areas of tourism." Beyond mere Economics, the growing shift towards sustainable development has led to a renewed interest in the impacts of tourism on the environment, society, and culture (Northcote & Macbeth, 2006, p. 199).

According to Fennell (2012, p. 239), although tourism researchers have recently started to examine moral issues tied to the use of animals in tourism (the moral turn), there is much work that needs to be done. Therefore it seems logical that I, who got his postgrad education during the moral turn, find Bostock's arguments irrelevant and even offensive. I felt the need to identify a gap in the literature and promote action among researchers, inspiring them to conduct their new investigations "with" the non-human world.

There is potential criticism towards Critical theory concerning that it is both of and in society and will be subject to the shifting changes within society.

## 2.2 Animal Ethics in Tourism.

It is particularly important to introduce animal ethics theories into the tourism lexicon because of the vast number of ways the tourism industry uses animals for commercial and personal benefit (Fennell, 2012, p. 239). According to Fennell and Malloy (2007, p. 17), empirically, there are thousands of codes of ethics in tourism research that are geared towards host communities, governments, service providers, companies, and tourists throughout the world. Codes of ethics are more philosophical and value-based. In contrast, codes of conduct (or codes of practice) are more technical and specific to the actions of an organisation or group in time and space (see Fennell & Malloy, 2007). However, as noted by Fennell (2015, p.27), there are five main Animal Ethics Theories, which all I describe in the following chapter. Although all five theories seem to be working for the same goal in tourism – ensuring animal ethics, one should be careful because they often have more disagreements than agreements. Therefore, in the following paragraphs, I offer a brief introduction of the Five Animal Ethics theories with their pros and cons.

### *Animal Welfare*

Animal welfare is a family of perspectives that deal with scientific and moral questions regarding the use of animals (Fennell, 2015, p. 27). This theory constitutes that if animals are safe and do not suffer, then we can use them for any purpose we wish. Therefore, Animal Welfare and zoos are "friends" so long as zoos follow the ethical guidelines for captivity, which are limited to: the cage of the animals is big enough, the animal is well-fed, and there is a veterinarian control. According to Garner (1993, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 30), animal welfarists maintain that it is morally acceptable to sacrifice the interests of animals for the benefit of humans. In other words, Goodale & Black (2010, p. 69) argue that supporters of a welfare position believe in and work toward the elimination of animal cruelty while maintaining that humans have the right to humanely use nonhumans for research, entertainment, consumer goods, and food. From this view, nonhuman animals should be free from unnecessary pain and suffering, but they should not be granted rights. This anthropocentric approach often results in very different interpretations of what the animals living conditions should look like.

Potential criticism starts with the fact that some animals are less suitable for captivity than others. As noted by Kistler (2004, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 31) animal welfare may be criticised because of the use of blanket assessments and applications, i.e. what is good for one animal or in one situation is suitable for all. Another issue comes from the fact that not all animals are treated with equal respect by animal welfarists. However, Singer (2009, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 34) argues that the perspective of equality should apply to animals as much as it applies to humans because both share the capacity to experience pain and suffering. Animal Welfare advocates are also criticised for their core beliefs that humans understand how other species feel. Those same people convince themselves that animals in zoos are happy animals because they are fed well and free from predators. However, Van (2008, p. 13) observed the animals in captivity "having sad eyes and empty lives", suggesting that welfarists' safety might not be enough for the animal's well being. According to Mccausland (2014, p. 649), Animal welfare is sometimes understood as the view that while nonhuman animals have an interest in not suffering, this and other interests may always be overridden by the rights and interests of humans.

### *Animal rights*

To the uneducated on the topic people, attributing animals with rights is usually something new, but also can be funny, scary, or even radical. However, the rights of animals have been widely debated in academia. According to Goodale and Black (2010, p. 124), the animal rights movement emerged fulsomely in the United States with the creation of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) in 1980. The animal rights were discussed before this moment, but PETA was the first organized group to put the issue on the larger American political stage. According to Sunstein (2005, p. 17) since the early 1990s, the animal rights question has moved from the periphery and toward the centre of political and legal international debate. As a result, in 2002, Germany became the first European nation to vote to guarantee animal rights in its constitution, adding the words "and animals" to a clause that obliges the state to respect and protect the dignity of human beings. According to Mccausland (2014, p. 651), there are five fundamental animal rights (freedoms), at least on a theory:



- Freedom from hunger or thirst by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour
- Freedom from discomfort by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area
- Freedom from pain, injury or disease by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment
- Freedom to express (most) normal behaviour by providing sufficient space, proper facilities and company of the animal's own kind
- Freedom from fear and distress by ensuring conditions and treatment which avoid mental suffering

Apparently, the animals have rights, at least on a paper. The 'Five Freedoms of Animal Welfare' were developed by the UK Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) in 1979 following an investigation into the welfare of intensively farmed animals (Mccausland, 2014, p. 650).

However, Fennell (2012) argues that animal rights theory is almost entirely antithetical to tourism, based on how this use fails to take into consideration the inherent value of animals that make them subjects-of-a-life or ends-in-themselves. For example, the Animal Rights movement wants the zoo cages empty, and the animals to be considered as individuals with feelings and rights. However, the Ethical guidelines for operating of animal-based attractions (see Shani and Pizam, 2008) is built on three elements only: Entertainment, Education, and Animal Welfare. Therefore, Animal Rights are neglected by default by Hospitality and Tourism Management, and the ethical guidelines are meant to serve predominantly anthropocentric needs. According to Shani & Pizam (2008 p. 691) "The animal rights' topic raises concerns that are highly relevant to the ethical development of the Hospitality and Tourism industry and, especially the question of whether it is justifiable to keep animals in captivity for the entertainment and education of visitors." However, as noted by Goodale and Black (2010, p. 135) supporting the animal rights ideology is, for many people, difficult because it means changing personal behaviour (purchasing animal-friendly products, changing food choices), questioning scientific research, and always thinking about the effects of our purchases and behaviours on the well-being of animals.

Criticism challenges the Animal Rights advocates with the statement that, similar to humans, the rights to every being have to be reciprocal to the capability to evaluate the consequences of their actions. This criticism lays on the ideas of McCloskey (1965, 1979, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p.32) stating that is that only a being that can possess things can possess rights, and that rights assume equality, reciprocity and responsibility. Therefore, if animals cannot understand these capacities, they are not deserving of rights. Although animal rights theory appears to be used in greater detail in tourism, especially recently, (see Fennell 2012), what is missing is a comprehensive overview of the theory and meaning of animal rights, and how or if it fits in tourism.

### *Utilitarianism*

In its simplest form, utilitarianism states that pain is the only evil and pleasure the only good (Franklin, 2004, p. 2). According to Fennell (2013, p. 33), Utilitarianism is a teleological or ends-based theory that focuses on the optimum outcomes, ends or consequences of an action. Therefore, the positives should outnumber the negatives. Consequently, an act is wrong if it tends to do otherwise. It is obviously in the self-interest of humans to preserve their environment. According to McDonald (2014a, p. 10) even a utilitarian perspective, the “greatest good of the greatest number” requires preservation of species, since non-humans are more significant in number. However, the utilitarian method in Animal Ethics studies appears somewhat humancentric and takes into account the human outcomes predominantly. According to Mill (2009, p. 31), utilitarian morality does recognise in human beings the power of sacrificing their own greatest good for the good of others [humans]. The Anthropocentric paradigm interprets Mill in a way that it is utilitarian morally to sacrifice animal greatest good for the good of humankind. This is confirmed by Mulgan, (2014, p. 61) who notes that Utilitarianism links morality to the maximization of human happiness.

Vivid criticism towards utilitarianism is found in the work of Singer (2009, as cited in Fennell, 2013, p. 33) who argues that there are other things in life besides the calculation of pain and pleasure that are intrinsically valuable. Singer’s primary theoretical lens is equality, which is rooted in the early pioneers of utilitarianism. According to Mulgan, (2014, p. 93) utilitarianism is

also accused of requiring you to do things to other people that you ought not to, and of forbidding you from doing things for yourself that you should be allowed to do.

### *Ecocentrism*

According to Jamieson (2008, pp. 150–151), the concept of the ecosystem is recent, appearing first explicitly in the work of the British botanist, Sir Arthur Tansley, in 1935. Only after the 1940s, it began to evolve into scientific thinking. Ecocentrism, as noted by McDonald (2014a, p. 2) is more than just an ethic; it also includes the idea that philosophy should centre on environmental concerns and issues, not anthropocentric ones. Ecocentrism is a term used in ecological, political philosophy to represent a nature-centred, as opposed to the human-centred system of values. According to McDonald (2014a, p. 9), Ecocentrism provides a new perspective for cosmopolitanism, in which humans can see their place in a much larger, greater whole, the non-human world. Similar to the Animals Rights paradigm, Ecocentrism suggests rights for the Environment. However, according to Jamieson (2008, p. 149), starting from the traditional idea that humans are morally considerable and have rights, sentientists and biocentrists have struggled to extend these concepts to animals and the rest of the biosphere.

Potential criticism is related to the anthropocentric framework of Ecocentrism. According to McDonald (2014a, p. 3), ecocentric philosophy would place knowledge of the relation of humans within their world at the forefront, while knowledge of the interaction of the diverse parts of a habitat functioning in a whole. Moreover, it would replace epistemological speculations with moral wisdom, in working out the place of a destructive species in its own environment.

### *Ecofeminism*

Ecofeminism is a new term for a pearl of ancient wisdom that grew out of various social movements - the feminist, peace and the ecology movements in the late 1970s and early 1980s (Shiva & Mies, 2014, p. 13). The definition by Enciclopedia Britannica describes Ecofeminism, also called ecological feminism, as a branch of feminism that examines the connections between women and nature. Its name was coined by French feminist Françoise d'Eaubonne in 1974, and it

emerged as a theory during the late 1970s and early 1980s in the US. According to Fennel (2013, p. 37), ecofeminists insist on the interconnection between the domination of women and the domination of Nature in a patriarchal society. A significant con for Ecofeminism is attributed to its ability to have a different feminine lens than the dominant masculine perspective. For example, according to Kheel (2009, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 38) men exist separately from and outside of Nature, while women and Nature are the different 'Other'; they do not conform to the masculine norm, and they are objects and property that exist as a means to an end.

Ecofeminism has contributed a great deal both to activist struggle and to theorising links between women's oppression and the domination of nature after the early 1970s (Plumwood, 1994, p. 1). In other words, a feminine perspective can bring a different lens for looking at the Earth than the masculine. Ecofeminism had two main branches, with significant divergence between each-other. According to Stephens (2013, p. 6), ecofeminism consists of two schools of thinking: 'Nature ecofeminists', which perceives that there is an essential link between woman and nature that is primarily biological and psychological. And 'Cultural ecofeminists', which by contrast, seek to deemphasize the nature-woman connection, which they see as imposed by a socially constructed patriarchal order and degrading.

Ecofeminism has been a subject of criticism as noted by (Fennell, 2015, p. 39) for its proposed ethics of care. Furthermore, Regan (2001, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 39) questions the ecofeminist understanding of the reason/emotion dichotomy. Maintaining that 'emotions without reason can be blind. Moreover, according to Plumwood (1994, p. 1), ecofeminism has been stereotyped in both as theoretically weak and as doubtfully liberated, and also as bounded to cultural feminism.

### **2.3 Animals in the Anthropocene**

Anthropocene is the epoch in which the humankind took over the Earth and have achieved an irreversible impact on Nature. Anthropocene is also a "place" to think. As Goodall and Berman (1999, p. 50) noted, "Anthropocene is the time of the emergence of morality, our purpose in the overall scheme of things – our ultimate destiny." The reason I included this sub-chapter is that living in the epoch of Anthropocene for me is a reminder that we should first try to preserve the

wildlife in the wild, instead of cultivating bodies in an artificial environment. Bodies that once were wild animals that acted and behaved differently. Anthropocene tells us that the time for being is over. The time for being with has come.

As Pyyhtinen (2015, p. 68) argues, "humans have disseminated their trash to every corner of the world. Some geologists, anthropologists and philosophers have asserted that we are witnessing a beginning of an era that they called the Anthropocene - the era of the human." Having a dominant sociological perspective in my paper, and looking through that same human-impact lens, I assume that Anthropocene is the time to start realising that we might have made irreversible changes, and we are not the only ones affected. Thus, as noted by Pyyhtinen (2015, p. 20) 'the other' is a crucial component in the structure of being; being-with-others is essential to the constitution of being. This is also stressed by Simmel (1992a, as cited in Pyyhtinen, 2015, p. 20), who argues that the primary ontological condition of human existence is that "the single human being is not alone on earth but becomes determined through being-with-others. Being-with is nothing added to being. It is no supplement, but being is always already given as being-with."

Although not officially recognised yet, the epoch of Anthropocene is already well known in academia as the ancestor of the Holocene (Huijbens & Einarsson, 2018, p. 14). For example, much of the focus of discussion on the Anthropocene has been centred upon anthropogenic global warming and climate change and the urgency of political and social responses to this problem (Human, 2015, p. viii). However, (Human, 2015, p. xxi) argues that, critical perspectives on non-human futures' shows that assessing the effects of human activity on the planet requires more than just the quantification of ecological impacts on the categorisation of geological eras. It is from the perspective of 'the animal question' - asking how best to think and live with animals. Moreover, studies in Animals in Anthropocene indicate a significant potential for the contribution of a better understanding of the non-human – human relationship. For example, Fowler (2015, p. 247) argues that on a cultural and consciousness level, the new labelling of an Anthropocene and the understanding of its ramifications, mark a significant moment in the transformed human-nature relationship. The ground on which our relationship to Nature is built has shifted, disappeared, become illusory – our previous narratives and discourses relating us to nature have become redundant. Humanity continues to deny this separation through nature documentaries,

restorative conservation efforts or trips to the zoo. However, a critical view of Nature in the Anthropocene requires a realisation that most of what we will hold on to as Nature is a falsehood, virtual and imaginary remembrances of what are largely fragmented and depleted remains. Moreover, the Anthropocene marks a crisis point in our physical relationship to the natural world. It also signifies a barely recognised ideological, emotional and psychological turning point on how we re-calibrate, re-engage and re-enchant our relationship with a transformed natural world and imagine alternative futures – a task we are not ready to navigate.

In Anthropocene understanding, modern tourism is a geophysical force which has contributed to the reshaping of the Earth for human purposes (Gren & Huijbens, 2014, p. 9). This is a highly sophisticated issue. Therefore, I would encourage even more fields to join this discussion because even if it is too early to know if it is already too late, one thing is certain – science needs to take actions urgently before it is for sure too late. Tourism is not only among the biggest but also one of the fastest changing fields. The present is complicated, and the future is unclear. The forecast about the future of tourism industry seems like guesswork. The scholars in tourism barely manage to register and analyse what is happening at the moment, let alone to predict future scenarios. The notion of the Anthropocene is the increasingly framing a host of issues related to environmental change, sustainability, and various relationships between humans and non-humans on a planetary scale, and the Anthropocene thus implies a reconnection of human activities with the ecologies they co-produce with other species (Huijbens, & Einarsson, 2018, pp. 10–27).

As a frame for understanding a period of geological time marked by the significant impact of human activity on the planet (see Human, 2015, pp. vii, viii) Anthropocene has extraordinary potential. This potential is opening up today by showing us clearly that we have gone too far with what we do to the animals. Now, in 2020, we are challenged by COVID-19, which gave us a lot of indoor time to re-think our attitude to make use of everything that moves. It also, at least for a while, makes us experience a moment of one whole life in the zoo. For example, during the period of quarantine, we benefit from all ‘Five Freedoms’ that, according to Fennel (2013, p. 30) are an accepted method by which to pursue animal welfare. Animals are said to be faring well (mentally and physically) if they have: freedom from hunger and thirst; freedom from discomfort; freedom from pain, injury and disease; freedom to express normal behaviours; and freedom from

fear and distress. Similar to the animals in captivity, we are safe from predators, fed well, and we have access to doctors. Yet, somewhat something is missing in our life during the quarantine period.

Inevitably for this research, one important question emerges: What is the role of zoos in the epoch of Anthropocene? The non-human world has a vast spectrum of organisms, many of which are not accessible for a naked human eye. Some even argue that Natural phenomena such as rivers and mountains should also belong to the non-human world. While shifting our attention towards fluffy and cute or scary animals in cages, the zoos neglect many others who are in danger of extinct. Sadly enough for the bacterias living in the soil, they are not beautiful enough. As a result, they are not in the "Schindler's List" of zoos. The epoch of Anthropocene demands recognition not of a few, but to the entire non-human world. Recognition of a few is hypocrisy and disrespect towards the entire human and non-human world. Therefore, as noted by García-Rosell and Hancock (2020, p. 5) "to recognize the ethical responsibilities that people have to each other we must first consider the ethical responsibilities we have to the natural world in general, and non-human animals more specifically."

One may also ask what the message of zoos is in Anthropocene? Are zoos representing *living with* or *distancing from*? On the topic of non-human agency in the age of the Anthropocene Hathaway (2015, p. 221) noted that the notion that non-human animals have agency is just one of an increasing number of challenges to the long-enduring Western conceptual framework that views non-human animals and humans as intrinsically different. According to Fennell (2014), *anthropocentrism*, or human-centredness, gives either exclusive or primary consideration to human interest above the good of other species. This consideration may position the captive institution to be a great empirical example of Anthropocene. Animal keeping may be seen as materialising the act of human dominance over the non-humans until they irreversible lose their habitat - isn't this what Anthropocene means – Irreversible changes done by humans to Nature?

### 3. RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN

In this chapter, I present and justify the choice of research methods of the study and describe the data collection process and data analysis techniques. With the presented methodological approach, I analyze the book; I identify which theories are used in the book, and which theories are neglected; I study in what way the author presented the animal's agency. The chapter concludes with methodological implications, the limitations of the study and opportunities for future research.

The qualitative approach in my study is apparent and somewhat logical. According to Buchanan (1992, as cited in Silverman, 1997, p. 19), the quality of qualitative research cannot be determined by following prescribed formulas. Rather its quality lies in the power of its language to display a picture of the world in which we discover something about ourselves and our shared humanity. I hope that *trust* is achieved in my thesis in several ways by following the goals of the researcher suggested by Silverman (2013, p. 242) who suggests a researcher should think theoretically through and with data; to develop empirically sound, reliable and valid findings; and to use methods which are demonstrably appropriate to the research problem.

A crucial element to the contemporary critical research approach is interdisciplinary cooperation. According to Burns (2015, p. 49) “the search for answers requires moving beyond a focus solely on tourism to the movement towards consideration of ethics across a range of disciplines.” Therefore, we must admit the limitations of the different fields in Science working individually. I associate today's boundaries between natural and social with the material fences we have around our houses. We can get to know our neighbours only if we cross the fence. How can we approach animals in tourism in the epoch of Anthropocene or nonhuman ontology as social scientists if we are not willing to cooperate with Natural Science? Therefore, I understand *research with* as a metaphor of recognition, inclusiveness, and cooperation and a symbolic gesture of acceptance of the idea how can we learn differently together, not only *with* the animals but also *with* other disciplines.



### **3.1 The book “Zoos and Animal Rights. The Ethics of Keeping Animals**

I present a content analysis – undertaken through the *Critical turn* lens – of a book, entitled “Zoos and Animals Rights: The Ethics of Keeping Animals” by Stephen St. C. Bostock (1993). An important note about the author is that Stephen Bostock is the Education Officer for Glasgow Zoo and he read English at Queens’ College, Cambridge, philosophy and zoology at Hull University, and has a doctorate in philosophy from Glasgow University (Bostock, 1993, p. i). First published 1993 by Routledge, this book, in its 227 pages, attempts to convince the reader of the ethics, purpose, and meaning of the act of captivity. Zoos and Animal Rights seem opposed to each other, but Stephen Bostock argues that this need not and should not be so (Bostock, 1993, p. i). After the historical background of zoos, the author devotes considerable attention to conservation and extinction issues. He views conservational captive breeding as the most important role and most proper justification for the continuing existence of zoos. This is especially so in the context of the growing number of endangered species. He also deals with the issue of reintroducing captive-bred animals to the wild, as well as the taking of an animal from the wild, a practice considerably more difficult to justify. In this book, according to Giddings (1995, p. 147), the author seems to have been writing for several audiences with this book. Some sections of the book are accessible and informative while others have a much more philosophical, theoretical flavour. Reviewers find the book rather interesting, yet slightly controversial. According to O’Connell (1993), Stephen Bostock’s book is an unusual combination of zookeeping and philosophy which seeks to address what he terms the ‘particular challenge to zoos’: the right to freedom for animals. However, this slightly biased account does not quite match up to the reality of most zoos today, but as a guideline for zoos of the future and the more enlightened around now, it is a compassionate and well-thought-out book. According to Beirne (1995, p. 215), Bostock offers compelling evidence about the need for a concerted effort to breed animals in zoos and to preserve or reclaim their natural habitats. Still, he is less convincing when he pictures zoos as communities of well-being rather than as prisons for marginal forms of life about whom we indulge in exotic fantasies. In another book review, Giddings (1995, p. 147) noted that Zoos and Animal Rights is worth reading for those of us with a keen interest in our fellow-creatures. The book provides an excellent bibliography for anyone interested in thinking further about these issues. However, several important points which would have provided fertile ground for

argument are dealt with only briefly or entirely ignored. Amongst which were, for example, the lack of regulation of private zoos; the lack of effort of zoos to preserve the natural habitat of animals; the controversial selection of breeding species, and more.

This book *Zoos and Animal Rights* is the core data source of this thesis, where I investigate the meaning embodied within Bostock's statements and discover *how* did the author attempt to represent the animals in captivity, and what did he fail to represent. My study takes a *Critical theory* approach pursuing *deconstruction* of the author's statements. The results generate new questions on Animal Ethics and raise awareness over the scientific value of Bostock's statements within the contemporary *critical* and *moral turn* in tourism studies. I chose this book because it summarizes all arguments known by me defending the captivity. I think it is a rare chance to have all these arguments under the same roof. As noted by Beirne (1993, p. 216), the bulk of the book now unfolds as an unrelenting plea for the moral, educational and conservationist superiority of zoos in the modern world; this plea, voiced from an insider's perspective, is advised with obvious passion and its arguments are wide-ranging and often quite illuminating. O'Connell (1993) argues that as a guideline for zoos of the future and the more enlightened around now, it is a compassionate and well-thought-out book. According to Giddings (1995, p. 148), *Zoos and Animal Rights* is a book worth reading for those with a strong interest in animals. Furthermore, as I noted in the previous paragraph, many essential aspects of ethics of captivity are just barely mentioned or wholly neglected in the book, which to my observation is the main issue with the arguments of captivity advocates in general. In this study, I emphasize the importance of 'saying everything'. Moreover, such a book deserves a new contemporary in-depth review through the still new *Critical turn* in Social Science.

As I stated in the introduction chapter, in my pursuit of generating questions, raising awareness, and answering questions, I formulated the main research question of this paper: **How Bostock's arguments stand within the more ethical notion in contemporary tourism studies?**

Investigating this will help us better understand the need for change in studying the animals and in managing animal-based tourism. On a broader context, answering these questions will also tell us what the zoo advocates do not like talking about; what are they missing or hiding; what they fail to understand, and what they may have chosen not to understand?

To approach the human-nonhuman relationship in the notion of the *critical* and more *ethical turn*, we need to take ourselves out of the centre of the Universe - a process called *human decentralization* and to *think with* the animals, instead of *thinking about* the animals; to recognize the *nonhuman* world as not *less* than humans, and to accept the *interdisciplinary academic cooperation* as an integral part in the scientific research. Therefore, to get moving forward and be more rooted in our investigation, we have to get rid of the classical research approach of the human domination of the white male Westerner. This means we should position the researcher in a different place with a different lens. Therefore, we can no longer get along with the approach “research is something the white westerner does **to** *animals/indigenous people/nonhuman elements* and so forth.

For my data collection process, I conduct a *Literature analysis*, for a reason noted by Leavy (2017, p. 5) who argues that “exploratory research can help us fill a gap in our knowledge about a new or under-researched topic, or approach the topic from a different perspective to generate new and emerging insights.” For this research, I gather my analysis data from one book in an attempt to discover the meaning in the author’s perspective within contemporary Science.

### **3.2 Content analysis**

*Content analysis* as the method of analysis I apply to the book to understand better the meaning embodied in its text. According to Leavy, (2017, p. 146) “content analysis method is widely used across disciplines as an approach for systematically investigating texts. Qualitative researchers use content analysis to understand the meaning that circulates in texts.” This fits perfectly my attempt to understand Bostock's messages beyond the mere written words, e.g. not only the ‘textual content’ but also the context in which it was created. According to Botterill and Platenkamp (2012, p. 63), exploring a text also depends on focusing on what is not said - the silence gaps and omissions - as what is said. Content analysis – the analysis of texts in the form of, for instance, interviews, books, articles and essays that include rich social information – is useful for carrying out rigorous research on critical organizational issues, that are difficult to study (Carley, 1993).

*Inductive approach* tends to be associated with *critical theory*, which the fundamental concept of this paper. As Leavy (2017, p. 9) noted, qualitative research is generally characterized by inductive approaches to knowledge building aimed at generating meaning.

For the practical implementation of the Content analysis, I examined the methodology aspects of the statements in an attempt to understand better which theories are utilized in his book. Afterwards, I indicated the missing Animal Ethics theories in the author's arguments.

To be able to analyze the book, I conducted a *literature review*, which means gathering, summarizing, and synthesizing existing work on a topic (Adler & Clark, 2011, p. 89). In other words, I needed to educate myself on the subject of *Animal Ethics* and captivity to be able to evaluate the information presented in the book and analyze the author's theoretical and methodological framework. *Desk research* is efficient for collecting and analyzing data based on previous research on the topic, and it is the most common research nowadays. This method enables the researcher to gather information from different sources: books, journals, internet, podcasts, and so forth, without being depended on places and people. Drawbacks of this type of research are the collected data may be outdated, or the results of it may be unreliable. To prevent this, I gathered the most recent research on the topic.

Specifically, the analysis included a careful reading of "Zoos and Animal Rights. The Ethics of Keeping Animals" and taking note of several statements. The selection of the statements is based on three criteria:

- a) I choose the statements indicating the theoretical and methodological concepts of the book.
- b) The statements are directly or indirectly related to the three basic zoo advocate's arguments: Conservation; Education; Science and I observe them via the five main Animal Ethics Theories suggested by (Fennell, 2015).
- c) My choice was also led by my overall tolerance of ethical lapses, meaning, I picked the statements that I found most contradicting to the moral and nonhuman critical turn in the academia but also my ethical values. I analyze the data through Critical theory.

### 3.3 Ethics of the research

My main concern is related to the delicate approach in animal studies to give a *voice* to someone who is not able to talk the way humans do. According to Adams (2008, as cited in Leavy, 2017, p. 37) “working with ethics involves realizing that we do not know how others will respond to and/or interpret our work.” In the case of animal studies, we cannot even receive a response; we can only attribute feelings to our study participants. In this regard, it is acknowledging that we can never certainly know either we harm or help with our communicative practices. And ethics involves the simultaneous welcoming and valuing of endless questions, never knowing whether our decisions are “right” or “wrong.” According to Fennell (2012, p. 9), the animals are unable to reveal their thoughts to us, and we cannot fully understand and interpret animal behaviour. Thus we impose our human-centric interpretations of their world, meaning animals are not equally considered, despite their intelligence, uniqueness, or ability to suffer; it all goes down to what the animal means to us or does for us. Therefore, it is by default unethical to claim that captive animals are happy being attributed with human values such as safety from predators and access to health care and food.

Animal studies have considerable responsibility for the nonhuman world by the fact the researchers are giving a *human voice* to the nonhumans. According to Leavy (2018, p. 49), “another way that we engage in reflexive practice is to be attentive to issues of *voice*. Who is seen as an authority? Who has the right to speak on behalf of others? The issue of speaking for those with whom we share differences or who may be members of marginalized or oppressed groups - often referred to as “others” in the social science literature - is an ethical quagmire.” This is why in this study I aim my position to be seen as an attempt to give a chance the animals to “speak” themselves. They are giving us so many signs of what they need with their behaviour that even an uneducated person can “read”. However, some scholars somewhat overconfidently assume they know what the animals need, or they refuse to attribute the animals with respect, suggesting that animals are here to serve us. I would like to avoid putting myself in a position to say what animals feel, as this is far beyond the scope of my academic background. This is why my study is not focused directly on the animals which I suppose is the job of Natural Science, but rather on how we approach the nonhuman world in captivity with Social Science and Tourism industry.

As we have learned from the social justice movements, it is crucial to seek out the perspectives of those who historically have been marginalized for active inclusion in the knowledge-building process. In my experience, the zoo critiques rely on evidence of the struggle of the animals caused by the captivity, while the zoo advocates tend to claim they know how animals feel. However, when studying animals, we must be very mindful of how we interpret the experience and the behaviour of others. In our attempts to be inclusive, we don't want to inadvertently colonize the stories and experiences of others. In this regard, it is essential to be mindful of these issues and to carefully reflect on how we position ourselves in representations of our research. As noted by Fennell (2012, p.11) "Animal ethics is a new and delicate field of study that can guide the future for the tourism industry", and for now it is crucial to remember that every researcher has the responsibility to at least three sides: to the topic of the research; to her/his readers; and her/himself. Furthermore, the responsibility of the researcher studying nonhuman world has its implications due to the fact she/he has to investigate species that do not have any verbal communication skills. The researcher has the moral responsibility to give a voice or silence to the animals, through her/his research.

Regarding my approach to the data collection and more specifically, my selection of statements, I genuinely believe it was objective. It could not be otherwise simply because the entire book and all the accounts have a straightforward goal – to justify the existence of captivity (something that was clarified in the first sentence of the book). Therefore, unethical purposeful sampling was rather impossible. However, due to the limitations of the size of my thesis, I had to make a selection, which I justified above.

Of course, there is no claim of absolute neutrality in my research, but rather an attempt to be reasonably even-handed. *Objectivity* is a central epistemological position in my thesis. Within objectivity, the researcher tables personal biases and feelings. Yes, my research is biased, because I believe humans should re-think their attitude towards nonhuman life, and there should not be captivity in future. Therefore, in the case of this research, I investigate the captivity as a mere social injustice which should end. My initial idea was to apply *Neutrality* as a major perspective of my research, but I quickly got to realize this was impossible in my case as I have negative feelings towards zoos, so I could not be neutral. Moreover, I do not believe in a topic concerning

Animal Rights *neutrality* can be reached, because this is a topic that triggers emotions within the researcher who like all people have life experiences, attitudes, and beliefs that impact how they see think and act. According to Leavy (2017, p. 38) “those working from critical worldviews, in particular, may find objectivity not only impossible but also undesirable as they actively seek to advance social or political agendas, which are necessarily **value-laden.**” I believe an excellent example of this might be if we expect a zoo advocate who is the Education Officer for Glasgow Zoo, to speak from her/his position and claim pure neutrality on the topic of zoos.

## 4. FINDINGS

Chapter **findings** consist of two sub-chapters. The first sub-chapter focuses on research questions *one* and *two*, where I identify *which are the animal ethics theories supporting the arguments in the book*, and *how are the animals represented in the book*. The second sub-chapter is dedicated to research question *three*, where I explore *which animal ethics theories are neglected or underestimated* by the author. In findings, I utilize the Content Analysis method to explore what is said and what is not said by the author. My theoretical perspective is the Critical Theory, and I analyse the data by relying on Critical Theory and the five ethical theories suggested by Fennell (2015). To approach this issue, I expose several quotations of Bostock. These chosen quotations must not be seen as purposeful sampling. Instead, they serve as a summary of Bostock's animal ethics views, and his scientific but also personal perspectives on animals. The personal views are important because according to Shani & Pizam (2008, p. 684) the way people approach the ethical debate on the use of animals in the Hospitality and Tourism industry naturally depends on their point of view.

### 4.1 Animal ethics theories and animal representation in 'Zoos and Animal Rights.'

Citing the American philosopher Dale Jamieson (1985, as cited in Bostock, 1993 p. 3) Bostock summarises the fundamentals of his Animal Ethics theories:

1. *We can deny that animals are comparable enough to humans to make the moral comparison appropriate.*
2. *We can explain that the animals we are keeping captive are actually in a state of well-being, perhaps better off than they would be in the wild.*
3. *We can spell out the advantages to humans-and in some degree to non-humans too-that follow from keeping animals: notably assistance towards conversation, Science and education, plus recreation or entertainment.*

From the first pages, the author sets strong indications for *utilitarian, welfarist, and human-centric* views. It seems that Bostock wants to establish a guideline for the human-animal



relationship early in his book. However, the decision for this relationship in the book is one-sided, e.g. the animals are not included in the conversation about animals, which leads to *objectifying* and *othering*. Jamieson (2008, p. 103) argues that one way of explaining why we treat humans and animals in such different ways is because humans are members of the moral community while other animals are not. In the language of philosophers, members of the moral community have “moral standing”; they are “morally considerable,” while non-human animals are not.

According to Burns (2015, p. 56), “tourism is traditionally a hedonistic activity, with animals viewed as one of its many *objects*. As a tourist product, animals have extrinsic value, but this does not mean we should deny their always present intrinsic value. *Objectifying* is usually accompanied by ‘distancing from’, and ‘othering’ both human and non-human beings. As noted by Burns (2015, p. 47), tourism can ‘other’ or objectify almost anything, and this ‘othering’ is strongly related to the concept of *commodification*. Tourism turns its objects, the focus of the tourist attention, into marketable items that can be bought and sold. Souvenirs are an obvious example of this, but the objectification and commoditization extend to experiences, cultures and animals. Therefore, the animals become commodities and have a market price, objectified, valued as an object for tourist consumption, and such valuation may change their former values.” This statement goes right to the point – *a change of the value*. According to Gruenfeld et al., (2008, as cited in Burns, 2015, p. 46) objectification has been defined historically as a process of subjugation whereby people, like objects, are treated as a means to an end. According to Burns (2015, p. 46), objectification theory is commonly discussed in relation to women’s studies and gender relations. However, the underlying concepts are also pertinent to human-animal studies. According to Lopez (1986 as cited in Burns, 2015, p. 46) ‘Because we have objectified animals, we are able to treat them impersonally’. Bostock’s attempt to change the former and natural value of the animals early in his book helps him to approach the Animal Ethics issue in his personal favour through the entire book. The book reviewer Giddings (1995, p. 148) noted that it sounds strange for a book on zoos and animal rights, but much of the discussion of animals dealt with them in terms of their value to humans rather than their more intrinsic worth as part of the diversity of life.

### 4.1.1 Bostock on Animal Rights

According to the book reviewer, Beirne (1995, p. 2015), readers concerned with the Nature of rights, whether human or animal, will find little of value in Bostock's book. To get real here, Bostock clearly made fun of the idea about Animal Rights making a joke about his dog writing a list of freedoms. The author does not hide his objections towards the idea of attributing animals with rights. What Bostock thinks about Animal Rights is:

*“This, of course, is fine stuff; but who is going to decide what right animals should have? I can imagine the list my dog Wolf would draw up.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 39).

It is hard for me to analyze Bostock's insights on Animal Rights because of his individual understanding of what 'rights' means. It seems that the author understands the importance of giving rights to the animals noting that obviously, the most important thing is that we recognize individual animals as mattering morally, and of course that we actually treat them properly (Bostock, 1993, p. 40). However, to his understanding zoos do not contradict with Animal Rights. Zoos and animal rights seem opposed to each other, but Bostock (1993, p. i) argues that this need not and should not be so. Moreover, the author believes that the animals already have rights. He argues that animals should be not only regarded but fully recognized, as having rights (Bostock, 1993, p. 41). The author's insights on Animal Rights were rather Philosophical, with one attempt for a joke on a sensitive issue that was not covered by any means with some sort of academic conversation. Still, Bostock has a fundamental misunderstanding about the conception of Animal Rights. He seems to understand that theory as attributing animals with rights equal to human rights. However, as Singer (2009, p. 2) noted, the basic principle of equality does not require same or identical treatment, but it requires equal consideration. Consequently, equal consideration for different beings may result in different treatment and different rights.

Bostock (1993, p. 41) admits that the special challenge, for zoos, is the right to freedom, as he presumes not other Animal Rights are violated: After all, in zoos, we don't cause physical pain to animals and we don't usually kill them Bostock (1993, p. 41). However, the author challenges the

idea of the contradiction between captivity and Animal Rights. What is *captivity*, according to the author?

*“Now I do in fact consider that really good captivity is not, to all intents and purposes, captivity at all. Again, we can provide conditions, in my view, which provide enough freedom to make life in a zoo ‘captive’ only in a technical sense.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 44).

This statement is very wrong as none of the zoos in the world can provide enough space for animals such as polar bear, wolf, fox, elephant, birds and many others. For instance, according to Amboseli Elephant Research Project (as quoted by Simmons, 2007, p. 98, 99) elephants in the wild roam over large areas and move considerable distances each day. They are intelligent, highly social animals with a complex system of communication. No captive situation can provide elephants with space they need for movement or with the kind of social stimulation and complexity that they would experience in the wild, which often leads to abnormal behaviour. However, Bostock (1993, p. 88) has his own views on abnormal behaviour in his explanation about the abnormal way of swimming of a polar bear in a small pool in a zoo:

*“Humans, like other animals, can get into the habit of performing series of action not only regularly but identically every time. Somebody swimming in their private swimming pool each day might do this (like the bear)”*.

It is hard to believe, but here Bostock compares the swimming performance of the polar bear with humans’ swimming performance in their backyard swimming pool. Bostock opposes himself saying that captivity (previously he stated that captivity is not captivity) does not antagonize with the animal’s right of freedom (now captivity is captivity, but it is not problematic):

*“But we can go a long way towards providing good conditions in zoos, and this, backed up by the now very serious conservational reasons for keeping animals, means that, given really good conditions, we are not trespassing upon their right to freedom.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 50)

To support his own assumption on captivity, Bostock (1993, p. 122) concluded:

*“Many zoo staff reasonably believe many of their animals are well enough off not to escape if they could.”*

To wrap up Bostock’s perspectives on Animal Right, I have to say that it was hard for me to decide either I should put this subchapter under the question of ‘what are the theories in the book’ or the ‘neglected methods’ of the book. It seems that Bostock applied the Animal Right theory in his Animal Studies. Still, his understanding of Animal Rights is different from the information on Animal Rights one could find. For example, in Bostock understandings, the animals always have enough rights even if the two primary animal rights of *expressing natural behaviour* and *freedom* are neglected.

#### **4.1.2 Utilitarianism and Animal Welfare**

Taking a vivid Utilitarian perspective is another method of Bostock who states that, using animals is morally justified as long as benefits humans. Therefore, the mere economic benefits of zoos should be enough to justify capturing wild animals.

*“Well, unless the use we make of an animal really is, if not actually beneficial, at least not seriously detrimental to it, or essential to us, or better both, then we should avoid it.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 39).

Here we have similar to the Animal Rights problem – Bostock has his own anthropocentric understanding of utilitarianism. I understand the utilitarian methodology in a way that the overall positives should outnumber the overall negatives of the act of captivity. However, Bostock counts the humankind positives from animal captivity. However, as Regan (1997, as cited in Fennell, 2015, p. 32) argues, that “if animals have rights, these rights override the benefits that would be derived by the collective (humans) for gain.” This means that the use of animals for experimentation, or for entertainment in zoos and circuses, is morally unjustifiable.

*“We can hardly hope to justify taking animals from the wild unless we have thoroughly digested the richness of the gains to humans from doing so.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 5).

Based on this assumption, I believe that Bostock considers the animals important only to the extent that they could be exploited to benefit humans, even if this benefit comes to entertainment solely.

Reading his book, sometimes, maybe somehow accidentally, Bostock got few things quite scientifically, which gave me hope for a reasonable academic conversation. However, always, very soon after he gave me these empty hopes he would say things supporting animal-based street performance, or he would call the elephants domesticated animals. After presenting the animals as ‘things’, having rights, and meant to enhance humans’ life Bostock (1993, p. 109) gives an interesting insight into the well-being of animals:

*“A very different approach to keeping animals is training them to perform various tasks and generally treating them as domesticated animals, which camels and llamas are, as we have seen, and perhaps elephants too, though only partially. To have llamas pulling carts and camels giving rides, where possible, seems, in view of their being domesticated animals, unobjectionable and likely to be good for their mental as well as their physical health.”*

With this statement, it becomes clear that people can have a personal interpretation of what is Welfare. The author states that treating wild animals as domesticated makes them domesticated, and camels are more than happy to give a ride to tourists, and on top of it, he calls this a good example of Animal Welfare. The author “evidence” is as shocking as one could expect after having read his arguments above. Shortly, Bostock (1993, p. 96) believes that animals obeying commands by trainers is a good indicator of well-being:

*“Despite (nearly always) having been born in the wild, elephants are usually managed as domesticated animals, and trained by keepers at least to lie down, lift up a foot (as would be necessary for veterinary examination) and so on.”*

Bostock even managed to find a supporter of his view. According to Worthington (1990, as cited in Bostock, 1993, p. 96):

*“There is a close relationship between training and taming, but the training relationship, in its own right, can be a useful indicator of an animal’s well-being, or itself a respect in which the animal is in a state of well-being. That is, the animal is likely to find the relationship satisfying”*

Bostock wants to convince us that happy animals do tricks. We should then restore the dying circus industry and make even more animals happy. However, everyone, even slightly familiar with the process of training a wild animal knows that the only way to obey the animals is a constant cruel torture and endless pain from the time the animals is still babies, until the soul of the animals brakes down. Bostock should know this better than me; therefore, by claiming that animals are in a state of well being by doing tricks does not tell good things about his academic ethics.

Anthropocentrism deserves more attention now, in the epoch of Anthropocene, because it may well be the reason we entered this period. According to Boslaugh (2013) Anthropocentrism is a philosophical viewpoint arguing that human beings are the central or most significant entities in the world. The theory regards humans as separate from and superior to Nature, which I believe brought us into the epoch of Anthropocene. Anthropocentrism holds that human life has intrinsic value. At the same time, other entities (including animals, plants, mineral resources, and so on) are resources that may justifiably be exploited for the benefit of humankind. Now, let us have a closer look at how Bostock justifies the existence of zoos:

*“We can spell out the advantages to humans-and in some degree to non-humans too-that follow from keeping animals: notably assistance towards conversation, science and education, plus recreation or entertainment.”* (Bostock, 1993 p. 3).

*“Zoos, alongside parks in cities and trees in city streets, and flowers and aquariums in homes, are ways in which man enriches his own environment.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 177).

Only these two statements alone would provide enough material for the analysis and discussion chapter. However, again, these are just statements. To justify these attributes and to validate his claims of inspiring conservation and environmental awareness, education purposes, or

whatsoever he claims about the zoos, Bostock needs to address these issues with a scientific approach. However, the author clearly indicates that he has only one perspective in mind – Utilitarian Anthropocentrism. He is either not able to or not willing to accept any other methodology. Thus, his approach does not correlate with the contemporary environment of *inclusiveness, moral turn, interdisciplinary* and *critical thinking* in academia.

#### 4.1.4 The white Westerner

It seems to me, among all the biases and radical anthropocentrism, the white-western perspective is another irresistible barrier for Bostock. He clearly says that taking advantage of animals is justified as long as it benefits humans, acknowledging the importance of entertainment. However, Jennings (2018, p. 9) brings tourism studies to an entirely different dimension claiming that the tourism industry is a socially constructed and determined phenomena that is continuously being reframed and reinterpreted and reconstructed. It is in a constant state of processing and flux with ongoing meaning-making and sense-making and reframing within and between a variety of cultural contexts. Therefore, the dominance of western-centric epistemologies needs also to be challenged critically. However, the Western perspective sets us limitations that a researcher in the topic of animals needs to overtake because it is historically and culturally not in our Western culture to consider animals as capable of suffering. According to Singer (2013), concern for animal suffering can be found in Hindu thought, and the Buddhist idea of compassion is a universal one, extending to animals as well as humans; but nothing similar in our Western traditions where the man is seen as a ruler over the other beings; a few laws are indicating some awareness of animal welfare in the Old Testament, but nothing at all in the New Testament.

It should be clear by now **how are the animals represented in the book** – as commodities for enriching humankind's environment. Still, though the entire book, the author makes Philosophical attempts to defend his statements. For example, on one of the biggest challenges for zoos - to justify how animals end up in the zoo, the author has a fascinating insight. There are two options: either they were born there, or they were captured from the wild. Born captive or captured from the wild, are always taken away from their home and social environment, then put

in a cage on display for human entertainment. This is just as cruel as it sounds, but as you may have already guessed, Bostock can explain it all:

*“The strength of the conservational, scientific, educational and ‘environmental’ cases for keeping animals. For only these, plus the likelihood of the captured animal’s ending in good conditions in a zoo, and adjusted to its life there, can justify taking it from the wild.”* (Bostock, 1993, p. 187)

Then the author continues, by quoting his own assumption Bostock (1981, as cited in Bostock, 1993, p. 187)

*“Perhaps only a strong conservational need alone could justify capturing an animal, or for that matter even keeping it.”*

It is a well-known fact that capturing can be conducted by zoo specialists, but also by anyone, legally or illegally, which inevitably invites the wildlife trade market and poaching. Bostock’s opinion on *wild animals trading* shocked me. According to Bostock (1993, p. 191),

*“The selling of an animal is not necessarily bad in itself. (After all, footballers are sold by their clubs: this does not mean they aren’t respected or treated properly!”*

Zoos are also known for killing the animals that they do not need. Again, in this case, too, Bostock (1993, p. 66) does not see a problem:

*“But at least if any animal has to be killed in a zoo, it should be a humane death.”*

Further, Bostock (1993, p. 147) continues:

*“Some killing is in practice necessary. All such killing I would regard as a necessary evil.”*

Surprisingly enough, Bostock seems capable of understanding that animals can suffer:



*“But I also believe that individual animals claim our respect because they can feel, suffer pain, and experience pleasure, and because, in short, it matters to them how they are treated.”*

(Bostock, 1993, p. 37).

Still, he is taking the anthropocentric utilitarian perspective and admires the captivity, regardless of its cruelty, only based on his belief that it is beneficial to humans. Bostock believes that an act is deemed good if it produces or intends to produce at least as great a balance of good over bad as other alternative acts. However, according to Franklin, (2004, p. 2), once we admit that all sentient beings can suffer pain and feel pleasure, they too must be included in the reckoning. Bostock favours the utilitarian perspective for the mere human benefits. For instance, as noted by Franklin (2004, p. 11), rodeos give much pleasure to a great number of people, so that the aggregate of pleasure for the humans is surely greater than the total of pain caused to relatively few animals. The same reasoning would remove the usual objection to zoos.

It is fascinating the way the author “replies” to the research question of mine on **how are the animals represented in the book**. A major issue is that zoos keep wild animals in cages. How quickly Bostock (1993, p. 53) solves this problem is:

*“But just how wild are the wild animals zoo keep? Even the distinction between wild and domesticated animals is less real than often imagined. And zoo animals, while they are indeed relatively wild, are also, in my view, slightly domesticated.”* - Here the author had just created a new category in which he easily puts all wild animals in captivity: *“slightly domesticated”*.

Bostock calls the animals in zoos in various ways: *wild animals*, *slightly domesticated*, *relatively wild*, and *semi-wild*, depending on what he is trying to convince his audience into. As the controversy is so apparent, Bostock is not even trying to hide it, so he explains his unclear position in a way that sounds to me this way ‘I know it does not make a sense what I am trying to say, but it is what it is.’ Well, his words are slightly different but somewhat the same:

*“I may seem to be trying to have it both ways— to say that animals in zoos are not wild and therefore it is acceptable to keep them; and that they are wild, and that therefore it is very useful*

*conservationally, educationally, and so on, to keep them. But this is the situation, even if it is something of a tightrope to walk.*" (Bostock, 1993, p. 55).

I would like to make it clear that with Bostock I do not have a conflict with a person. Instead, speak up against a pattern of knowledge production that should not be welcomed in academia. By now it became so evident that Bostock is chaotically using whatever arguments hop up in his mind, often controversial to each-other in a superficial attempt to defend the obviously unethical practice on keeping animals. I strongly disagree with the attempts of the higher academic hierarchy to claim possession of 'the truth' based on the level of their higher academic status solely. Whoever the author is, I need proofs of her/his statements, because "*But this is the situation*" does not communicate with Science. Bostock's thoughts emerge one fundamental question: How do we know what we know? People's ideas and knowledge are formed by authorities, such as teachers and parents. The socio-cultural environment and personal experience also play a significant role. For instance, Leavy (2017, p. 4) argues that cultural beliefs are another common source of knowledge. For example, our ideas about race and racism have changed over time as our culture has changed. To understand how biased our cultural understanding can be, consider norms regarding race before the civil right movement. The reason I summarise some basic scientific rules of knowledge production is the fact Bostock's book is only based on his personal beliefs and assumptions, which he sometimes supports with other researcher's beliefs or assumptions, but not with scientific evidence. However, as Singer (2009, p. 185) noted, to end tyranny, we must first understand it. And we can understand it via objective and valid research. Else, no matter how many opinions we use to support our opinion, as a result, we still have just an opinion, and this process would never produce valid knowledge. It is also important to mention that Bostock was quoting other authors that were published on average of about half a century ago. One should be careful when quoting authors on sensitive issues that are subject to a social evolvment. For instance, studies on gender-equal rights from a decades ago have been a subject of evolvment and quoting them does not seem relevant for solving gender or Animal Ethics problems today, unless we seek to emphasize the *change*. This is why Humberstone (2004, as cited in Mair, 2011, p. 44) argued that tourism research "needs to engage with issues around the nature of knowledge and its production". Therefore, I can only accept

Bostock's work as an impetus for our common interests in the topic of animals in captivity as nothing more than just a topic for a research project.

Bostock presents captivity as a source of Science and Education, which is also one of the fundamental claims by zoo advocates in general. However, many studies have shown that people think of zoos as places for entertainment rather than see their value in conservation of species (Frost, 2011, p. 11). Moreover, I find entertaining the way Bostock suggest educational services in zoos because his main argument is that in the zoo we can see the "real" colour of the animals:

*"To have animals— whether few or many, individuals or species— there in front of you is clearly a great advantage in learning about them. You can directly observe their structure, proportions, colour and pattern, details of the hair or whatever the body covering is, details of the sense organs, shape and size of their limbs, and so on. Most of this we might be able to see as well in mounted museum specimens, but the colours of such specimens fade."* (Bostock, 1993, p. 169).

Bostock also mentioned the advantages of "learning" how animals move and interact with other animals, but both are proved to be performed differently in the wild. For example, one of the world most famous conservationist – Jane Goodall, who dedicated her life on studying the chimpanzees in their natural habitat, had an attempt to observe the chimpanzees in London zoo. She noted ( see Goodall and Berman, 1999), that she could not learn anything about the chimpanzees while they are in captivity, because they just do not behave the way they do in the wild. Furthermore, in research in UK's aquaria revealed that 83% of visitors did not read the signs at the live exhibit's from apart from the animals' name and 95% did not read the sign at all Wearing and Jobberns (2011, p. 55).

It appears that Bostock also suffers the so-called "zoo crisis of identity" in which the zoos are testing different public-friendly self-interpretations to find out what is most acceptable by society. This leads to the only possible summary of Bostock's statements so far: the wild animals in zoos are not wild, they are not captive, and they are free, but we should go to the zoo to see the wild animals in captivity.

## **4.2 Which animal ethics theories are neglected/underestimated by the author?**

Including new interdisciplinary perspectives in Science is not always easy. As Goodal (2000, p. 80) beautifully said: “For we are human-bound, imprisoned within our human perspective, our human view of the world”, making a point that it is indeed hard for us to see the world from the perspective of a culture other than ours. For instance, it is hard enough to get to see things from the view of a person of the opposite gender, let alone to see the world from the view of a non-human animal. However, it is every’s researcher moral obligation to include opposing perspectives in her research. According to Pritchard, Morgan, and Ateljevic, (2011, p. 2), new perspectives are emerging across many disciplines and research fields – from relativity theory in physics and the findings of depth psychologists to new approaches in anthropological and ecological studies – as constant revision redefines how we understand our universe and our human race. Still, Bostock does not seem to be influenced by this notion. If we can excuse him for not considering the epoch of Anthropocene, as the idea was way too young at the time when he was working on his book, he does not have an excuse for skipping some of the fundamental theories of Animal Ethics as ecocentrism and ecofeminism. However, the researcher also has a role as a researcher – with its implications of impartiality and judgement, and with ethical responsibilities towards respondents (Imms & Ereaut, 2002, p. 14).

### **4.2.1 Ecocentrism and Ecofeminism**

One common reviewer's critique of the book is that Bostock, intentionally or not, overlooked a few crucial methodologies for approaching animal ethics. Bostock’s study would have benefited (not necessarily in his favour) from including more theories such as the suggested by Fennell (2015) Ecocentrism and Ecofeminism. Shiva and Mies (2014, p. xvi) have repeatedly stressed that the rape of the Earth and rape of women are intimately linked – both metaphorically, in shaping worldviews making the women, Nature, and animals more vulnerable to all forms of violence. According to Shiva and Mies (2014, p. 14), Ecofeminism is about connectedness and wholeness of theory and practice. It asserts the unique strength and integrity of every living thing. And last but not least, the epoch of Anthropocene is the necessary paradigm for re-thinking our fundamental perceptions of the world. Pritchard et al., (2011, p. 3) suggests that our world is right

now at a tipping point environmentally, socially, culturally, economically and perhaps intellectually.

The book could have also benefited by introducing the methods of Environmental Ethics. Ecocentrism is more than just an ethic. According to Fennell (2015, p. 40), we need much more research in the areas of animal welfare, animal rights, utilitarianism, ecocentrism and ecofeminism, to decide how or even if we should use animals in the service of tourism. According to McDonald (2014a, p. 2), Ecocentrism also includes the idea that philosophy should centre on environmental concerns and issues, not anthropocentric ones. Ecocentrism would have contradicted with Bostock radical Anthropocentrism, but this is precisely the purpose of an academic conversation. Also, the insights on Animal Rights in the book were limited to mere Philosophical attempts. Therefore, it is evident that every method that would erode the author's claims was overlooked. Another missing theory was Environmentalism. According to McDonald (2014a, p. 3), the Environmentalism philosophy was justified by some as the extension of rights from humans to animals, and then to the biosphere. As a result, the term Environmentalism was also unwelcomed view in the book.

Conservation is another claim of Bostock, and probably the most persuasive argument used by zoos in general. According to Bostock (1993, p. 149),

*“There is a strong moral demand on us to conserve species if humanly possible— though we cannot conserve all, and some species mean far more to us than others. So obviously we should conserve eco-systems by preference.”*

Related to this, in another book review, Giddings (1995, p. 147) noted that several important issues which would have provided fertile ground for argument are dealt with only briefly in Zoos and Animal Rights. For example, while Bostock emphasized on the importance of preserving habitats and eco-systems, he did not acknowledge that there is little value in keeping species alive in zoos in unsustainable small numbers while doing very little or nothing to protect their habitat (Giddings 1995, p. 147). However, the author does not discuss any further the conservational practices of zoos. Similar to all the captivity advocates, Bostock repeatedly emphasized on the

positive outcomes from captivity, but he strategically skipped the potential criticism. Just a few examples of what the author should have included are the following: as noted by Hall and Brown (2006, p. 145), breeding process within a limited genetic pool can conclude in deformed individuals. Conservation program management is dealing with diseases that appear in captive breeding settings and may damage the population living in the wild after reintroducing individuals from captive settings into their natural habitats. According to Frost (2011, p. 9), some endangered species have died in zoos due to poor management, such as the last Tasmanian Tiger perished in a Hobart Zoo after its keeper forgot to return it to its enclosure on a cold winter night. Looking at the bigger picture, according to Shackley (1996, as cited in Frost, 2011, p. 228) out of the 10,000 zoos worldwide, only 12% (1200) are registered in captive breeding and conservation programs, and only 2% of the world's endangered species are included in conservation programmes, and only 16 zoos in total have successfully reintroduced species into the wild. These were just a few examples of how Bostock should have challenged his arguments after claiming conservation functions. The academic ethics requires more data on how do the zoos conserve and what is the result.

Another emerging Animal Ethics issue in the book is *speciesism* and ignoring the good practices of equality. According to Jamieson (2008, p. 106), the British psychologist, Richard Ryder, coined the 'speciesism' in 1970 to refer to the prejudice that allows us to treat animals in ways in which we would not ever treat humans. Speciesism expands beyond the mere human-nonhuman segregation. Humans have preferences to some animal species over others. According to Giddings (1995, p. 147), the way zoos decide which species they will work with and expend their resources on generally is the cuddly, big and rare which receive the attention, leading to the suggestion that zoos could better be called 'selected charismatic mega-vertebrate conservation centres'. However, Bostock did not mention anything about the controversial animal selection of zoos. This selection is not based on the urgency of extinction, neither on the importance of the animal for the eco-system. It is based on the capacity of the species to attract visitors. As a result, most of the captive species are not in danger of extinction, and 98% of the endangered species are not included in the conservation plans of zoos (Frost, 2011). My apparent criticism of Bostock's work is due to the acceptance of speciesism, which is no different from discrimination. According to Jamieson (2008, p. 106), the basic idea is that speciesism, like sexism and racism, is a

prejudice involving a preference for one's own kind, based on a shared characteristic that in itself has no moral relevance.

Regardless of his attempt, Bostock was not any convincing trying to present captivity of wild animals as not captivity at all. As a result, he goes towards the direction of changing the meaning of the words and terms. As noted by O'Connell (1993), struggling to retain both his belief that animals have rights and that zoos are acceptable, Bostock goes on to ask whether caging them counts as captivity. The word 'captivity' holds ominous meaning in the context of humans, says Bostock, because it conjures up hostages or prisoners of war. Still, he suggests that animal captivity is essentially different, yet he was not convincing. Therefore, according to Bostock (1993), the words 'wild' and 'captivity' have a certain meaning for humans, but a different meaning in the context of animals, which is again, only his opinion. In conclusion, the book reviewer O'Connell (1993) noted that this slightly biased account does not quite match up to the reality of most zoos today.

There were also many instances where the reader was being asked by Bostock to discount the inhumane practices of zoos in the past on the basis that 'things have changed', but insufficient attention was paid to outlining just how the situation has changed (Giddings 1995, p. 147). This book review comment completely resonates with my observation that the author almost always makes a personal opinion statement which he does not bother to further justify or back-up with scientific evidence. Though the purpose of much formal writing is to put forth an opinion, one should avoid stating a personal opinion solely. Unsupported by Science personal statements based on *I think; in my opinion* and *we believe*, erode the objectivity that formal writing is expected to maintain (see Leavy, 2017). One should better work with facts and only support the evidence with her/his personal opinion. However, I understand that Bostock's epistemological position and his relationship with the research participants (captive animals) maintains the *strong objectivity* perspective. According to Leavy (2017, p. 38), whereas there are numerous epistemological positions one might adopt, there are two major perspectives: *objectivity* and *strong objectivity*. In *objectivity*, the researcher tables personal biases and feelings, while in *strong objectivity* the researcher acknowledges and even uses personal biases and feelings.

Personal beliefs are an integral part of a research, but what is missing in Bostock book is sufficient scientific back-up of his arguments. Almost always, his arguments were his mere philosophical thoughts which makes it impossible for me to understand how he gained his knowledge. The process of acquiring knowledge helps us to form up an opinion, and we develop a commonsense understanding of the world. However, as noted by Leavy (2017, p. 4), “although we do learn through daily life experiences, as already noted, there are considerable limitations with these sources of “knowledge”. Therefore, one might develop personal beliefs that wild animals feel very happy in captivity, but knowledge based on research might disconfirm her/his beliefs. *Beliefs* and *knowledge* are not the same.” As Leavy (2017, p. 4) continues, research is needed to challenge and overcome the biases and limitations inherent in “learning” from experts, culture, and personal experiences.

A *critical* overview of Bostock’s research reminds that researchers must overcome any tendency to select a case which is likely to support their arguments. In Bostock’s book, I witnessed plenty of rather exceptional examples and deviant cases given to support his arguments. According to Mason (1996, p. 146), theoretical or purposive sampling is a set of procedures where the researcher manipulates their analysis, theory, and sampling activities interactively during the research process, to a much greater extent than in statistical sampling. Therefore, by ignoring the statistics and choosing unusual cases for supporting his arguments, Bostock does not help the scientific conversation.

Different indications can make me feel that certain research might not be reliable. Sometimes one doubts the validity of an explanation because the researcher has not attempted to deal with contrary cases. This is precisely the case with Bostock’s book. It seems to me that the author did not want to *explore* the topic, but rather he wanted to *convince* his audience. This is why in his book, you cannot find information about the cons of the zoos.

Furthermore, his supporting team was cleverly very subjectively picked: (Bostock, 1993, p. X, XI) “*For long-standing support and help, I thank Richard O’Grady, Director/Secretary of the Zoological Society of Glasgow and West of Scotland, the Society’s President, William MacKenzie, and its Council; among colleagues at the zoo, I thank particularly Graham Law,*



*Leslie Brown, and many other keepers past and present, for information only they could provide; David Hughes for directing my way an endless stream of relevant books and articles; and far from least, Katie Jackson, Maria Park, and many education staff at the zoo for all sorts of help, most of which they will have long forgotten, but I haven't. I must thank also the Librarian of the Zoological Society of London, and his staff.*" This is an impressive army of captivity-benefited people with no single representative of the "opposition". Bostock (1993, p. 39) attempts to justify the selective choice of his research team:

*"Those who work in zoos – like others who actually know animals, and care for them – appreciate how much their animals are individuals and have personalities, and how well they can express their feelings."*

First of all, I did not find any proof of this assumption in his book. Second, people working in zoos might be highly biased due to economic pressure, and one has to be careful when taking into account their opinion. How far can Bostock demonstrate that in his research, he has mobilized the conceptual apparatus of social Science, thereby, helped to build useful social theories? How far can his data, methods, and findings satisfy the criteria of reliability and validity? By now should be bright enough that Bostock had somewhat just a simple descriptive approach on Zoos and Animal Rights. Therefore, as Silverman (2013, p. 299) notes, "without a discussion of the analytic basis for the researcher's account, one's report can only have a journalistic status."

Furthermore, instead of supporting his arguments with scientific evidence, Bostock's humoristic approach on a sensitive issue such as AR, for example, "*I can imagine the list my dog Wolf would draw up.*" does not seem very professional. How is he to convince his audience (and himself) that his 'findings' are genuinely laying on a critical investigation? This is sometimes known as the problem of 'anecdotalism'. To anecdotalism, I refer to Bostock's out-of-context examples, e.g., comparing polar bear's swimming habits with the personal swimming habits of a human being. Anecdotalism, according to Silverman (2013, p. 278), is also found where research reports appear to tell entertaining stories or anecdotes but fail to convince the reader of their scientific credibility. One solution to the problem anecdotalism is simply for qualitative researchers to seek to refute their initial assumptions about their data in order to achieve objectivity (Silverman,

2013, p. 278). What is also missing in Bostock's statements is subjecting his remarks to some critical or analytical test.

By using philosophical quotations, Bostock does not increase the scientific value of his book. Instead, one should systematically demonstrate the steps that she/he has taken to ensure that her/his data are reliable, and the analysis is valid. Furthermore, self-confidence should not mean a lack of appropriate self-criticism, which is another missing aspect of Bostock's arguments. This raises the crucial methodological question of whether scientific data are to be treated as giving direct access to the truth or as actively constructed narratives which themselves demand analysis? Maybe yes, but real research is demanding and expensive, and this might be one of the reasons why Bostock, in fact, did not conduct one. Alternatively, it might also be because of "danger" of finding something he did not want to find. He could have conducted at least a literature analysis, but he decided to write a long essay instead. In his book, Bostock knew very well from the beginning what he wanted to find, and no surprise, he succeeded. Miles and Huberman (1984, as cited in Silverman, 2013, p. 121) noted that knowing *what* you want to find out leads inevitably to the question of *how* you will get the information. This might well be the reason he carefully selected the crew of support – only people from the zoo industry. Outsiders were not allowed to join the conversation, which in fact was a one-sided monologue – very similar to the human-nonhuman relationship.

Apparent in Bostock's paper was his apparent biases. The Nobel Prize laureate Kahneman (2011) noted that cognitive bias and cognitive illusion – this is how we get things wrong. This means that we do not necessarily know when we are wrong. This comes to say that I cannot argue for sure that Bostock gets thing wrong consciously, but I have to admit this crossed my mind. We all have biases, but Bostock did not attempt to overtake his own. It is not only that he gets things wrong, but because of people like him, many people will get things wrong, as errors do not cancel themselves out. Kahneman (2011, p. 30) argues that it is easier to recognize other people's mistakes than our own, and he gives many examples of how even professionals take biased decisions without even realizing it. This problem could have been solved if Bostock had people with different opinions among his research crew.

It becomes evident that Bostock did not include theories that would not have worked in his favour, such as the suggested by Fennell (2015) Ecocentrism and Ecofeminism. One of the weakest points of Bostock's paper is that he did not challenge his own statements, nor did he put them onto a scientific verification. This raises the epistemological question 'what is the relationship between the *knower* (Bostock) and the *known* by him? This question emerges because there must be some motivation behind the attempt of using academia as a stage for persuasion. In this context, the *critical theory* helps us to explore the meaning of the text beyond the written words.

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the following chapter, I will wrap up my research and try to answer the main research question: **How do Bostock's arguments stand within the more ethical notion in contemporary tourism studies?** Critical theory helped me explore the meaning embodied in the text beyond the written words. For example, in chapter 'findings' it becomes evident that in his theoretical framework, Bostock utilized Animal Welfare and Utilitarianism to support his Anthropocentric and rather Philosophical study. Bostock's views are not any different from his fellow zoo advocates. It can not be otherwise because, according to Burns (2017), whether captive or non-captive, wildlife tourism activities have traditionally been dominated by an anthropocentric worldview that recognizes wildlife only for its extrinsic value.

However, it was also clear that the author had somewhat his own interpretation on the meaning of some theories and terms such as wild, captivity, rights, and so forth. These interpretations were often very different from the generally accepted definitions of other authors' work. Moreover, various moral considerations become strongly indicated within both academia and society in the past three decades. Accordingly, terms such as *sustainability*, *eco*, *ethical turn*, animal turn, and so forth become trendy over time. However, it seems that these changes had not influenced Bostock (at least not by 1993) bearing in mind his robust human-centred approach in his book.

In the notion of the more ethical notion in contemporary tourism studies, few of Bostock's methodological approaches deserve a critical investigation. *Objecting*, *commodifying*, and *othering* are the first on the list. Objecting the animals can be very specific when giving a role to every each of the species. We carefully observe in which way every different animal could benefit us. If it is cute, we make it a pet; if it is big, it becomes an attraction; if it is strong – we put it at work; if it is ugly, it becomes food, and so forth. According to Fennell (2015, p. 27), it is a topic of interest given the fact that animals are used in so many different capacities to facilitate the needs of tourists and the tourism industry. One would be hard-pressed to find a destination where animals were not used for tourism purposes – animals held in captivity, circuses, rodeos, racing, fighting, pursued in sports, and as workers. It is a matter of concern because up until recently there has been very little interest on the part of tourism theorists in these types of uses.

I see “*othering and objectification*” as a socially constructed tool that serves us to segregate humans from animals, but also different or even same kind species from each-other. In my opinion, humans conveniently objectify animals and other humans so that they can be commodified for human’s service. As Burns (2015, p. 46) noted, objectifying animals nicely serves the purposes of tourism. The reason for this is that tourism is fundamentally a hedonistic activity, which combined with [Bostock’s] old school human-centric values led to not seeing issues with utilizing animals for human’ entertainment (Fennell, 2008). According to Simmons (2007, p. 2) what makes Animal Studies fresh and challenging is that its practitioners consider humans as animals amongst other animals while refusing to do so from an exclusively or necessarily biological point of view. But how different from us are those ‘others’? Animals and humans are apparently not the same species, but nor they are as different as they appear. Simmons (2007, p. 73) argues, genetic findings also reveal that chimpanzees and the earliest humans engaged in sexual relations and gene swapping for at least 1.2 million years before the two species went their separate ways. Cauchi (2005, as cited in Simmons, 2007, p. 73) makes the connection even more evident by arguing that, recent findings in genetic research have revealed that the chimpanzee shares enough DNA with us (99 per cent) that it would be possible for a human and ape to bear offspring.

It is an ironic paradox, but I believe with their educational programmes zoos are “shooting themselves in the leg”. As Courcy (1995, as cited in Hall & Brown, 2006, p. 145) noted that with the education programs urban zoos sensitise urban people towards animals making them informed enough so people may in a result no longer tolerate the nature of zoos itself. Similar to Bostock, zoos are educating very selectively and carefully their visitours. Therefore the easiest way to deconstruct Bostock’s study would be to present scientific evidence proving his arguments unreliable. However, in this way, I would fall into the conversation ‘are zoos good or bad’, which conversation I stated at the beginning of this study I avoid. The reason I avoid it is because, in my view, there is more than enough evidence that captivity does not benefit either the animals nor the humankind in any reasonable way. The conversation should move further by challenging not the mere arguments of the zoo advocates, but their Methodological Paradigms, and examine them through the Critical and more Ethical turn in Social Science. In this way, we do not only prove their arguments wrong, but we can challenge their Anthropocentric methodology fundamentally.

What kind of message about the animals is sending Bostock and to whom? Bostock is writing scientific literature in a public way which seems like an approach for gathering a wider audience - not only readers with similar or different scientific background but even readers from outside the academia. His primary goal is to persuade a big audience and present zoos as a paradise for animals who were lucky enough to get there. In Bostock's writing animals are represented as commodities, objectified and utilized to serve their ruler – the Human.

According to Pyyhtinen (2015, p. 18), we are bound to misunderstand the Nature of sociological problems unless we acknowledge the fact that we exist amongst others. In our being, we are not only directed toward others, but we are also always already with others. Looking at the non-human in a more inclusive and equal way also suggests a different overview of the *social* and human. By deconstructing the humancentric self-positioning in the Earth, we challenge the socially constructed status of the social being and its vast accepted value over the non-human. In fact, it is quite safe to assume that, as argued by Bennett (2010, as cited in Pyyhtinen, 2015, p. 68) 'humans need non-humans to function more than non-humans need humans.

Zoos are a social phenomenon that represents the egocentrism of humankind. It is a great empirical example of the need to re-think our attitude to Nature fundamentally because "*injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.*" The study of Bostock rose many epistemological questions concerning not only the Animal Ethics in the notion of the more ethical turn in Social Science but also deep concerns about the ethics of knowledge production in general, and the credibility of his study. For example, how moral is to claim, based on a mere opinion, that a zoo can offer perfect conditions for a polar bear, and that polar bear performs different swimming styles for her own entertainment, while according to Van (2008, p. 14) lions and other big cats have 18,000 times less space in zoos than in the wild, and that figure rises to one million times less space for captive polar bears? Credibility, according to Silverman (2013, p. 433) is the extent to which any research claim is based on evidence. Haraway (2003, p.19) argues, to do biology [Science] with any kind of fidelity, the practitioner *must* tell a story, *must* get the facts, and *must* have the heart to stay hungry for the truth and to abandon a favourite story, a favourite fact, shown to be somehow off the mark. The practitioner must also have the heart to stay with a story through thick and thin, to inherit its discordant resonances, to live its contradictions when that

story gets a truth about life that matters. Isn't that kind of fidelity what has made the science of evolutionary biology flourish and feed my people' hunger for knowledge over the last hundred and fifty years?

Some concerns about the limitations of the study shall not be ignored. Regardless of the fact, the investigated book may well serve as a summary of the most popular zoo advocates arguments, there may be other authors with different arguments, presented differently. Although Bostock is using the most common arguments, used by all zoo advocates, other advocates may use different Animal ethics theories, different methods and methodology. However, besides the sample limitations, the chosen theoretical framework, methodology and empirical data created the validity and reliability in answering the main research question. This study opens up ideas for further research on animal ethics in tourism by challenging the anthropocentric approach in Social Science and suggesting an interdisciplinary approach.

The final thoughts of my paper are inspired by the TED presentation "Trust in research -- the ethics of knowledge production" by Gray (2014). With my last words, I am addressing not only Bostock's work but the entire Academia – the Factory of Knowledge Production.

In my early academic years, I still had untouched my youth naïveté. At that time, I believed unconditionally in any proclamation that started with "the scientists found out...". I believed that all scientists practice scientific methods with integrity and make discoveries that push the progress forward. However, with the time passing by, I read papers such as Bostock's book, that apparently required additional scientific verification. These researches did not seem to cover the requirements for validity and reliability. A close examination of these suspicious research papers forced a double-check also who the authors were, where do they work and who has funded the research. In other words, I noticed a possible corruption of knowledge in academia. Sounds like a crime, but is it like that? Who on earth would consciously produce distorted science? Bad people? Most likely not, although this is also possible. The majority of these distortions were not produced by evil people, behaving illegally, but rather they were created by individuals under the daily pressure of work, when some researchers may begin to rationalise little ethical lapses here and there. These rationalisations are somewhat moments when the researchers convince

themselves that what they are doing is right, which helps them to neutralise any guilt they might experience. However, all these little ethical lapses one is willing to make lead to a broader system of increasingly distorted knowledge. The lack of independence can produce wrong knowledge. Lack of freedom is not limited to the only foundation, economic, political and so on outside powers, but can also have an inside influence coming from one's views and beliefs. We all believe we can maintain our integrity, but we do not have to underestimate the synergetic effect of rationalising our little ethical lapses. Saying we have integrity is easy. Maintaining integrity is not easy. What is most important for me as a researcher is to stay true to my ethical values, to fight against injustice, and to make the world a better place.



## REFERENCES

- Adler, E., & Clark, R. (2011). *An Invitation to Social Research: How It's Done*. Belmont, CA: Thomson.
- Ballantyne, R., Hughes, K., Lee, J., Packer, J., & Sneddon, J. (2018). Visitors' values and environmental learning outcomes at wildlife attractions: Implications for interpretive practice. *Tourism Management*, *64*, 190–201.
- Beardsworth, A., & Bryman, A. (2001). *The wild animal in late modernity: The case of the Disneyization of zoos*. *Tourist Studies*, *1*(1), 83–104.
- Beirne, P. (1995). Reviews/Recensions. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, *10*(1), 215–216.
- Bone, K. & Bone, J. (2015). The Same Dart Trick: The Exploitation of Animals and Women in Thailand Tourism. In Markwell K. (Ed.), *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships* (pp. 60–74). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Boslaugh, S. (2013). *Anthropocentrism*. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/anthropocentrism>
- Bostock, S. S. C. (1993). *Zoos and animal rights: The ethics of keeping animals*. New York: Routledge.
- Botterill, D., & Platenkamp, V. (2012). *Key concepts in tourism research*. London: Sage.
- Burns, G. (2015). Animals as Tourism Objects: Ethically Refocusing Relationships Between Tourists and Wildlife. In Markwell K. (Ed.), *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships* (pp. 44–59). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Carley, K. (1993). Coding choices for textual analysis: A comparison of content analysis and map analysis. *Sociological Methodology*, *23*, 75–126. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271007>
- Diaz & Westcott. (2019). Canada passes 'Free Willy' bill banning whale and dolphin captivity. Retrieved May 2, 2020, from <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/06/10/americas/canada-whale-dolphin-bill-intl-hnk/index.html>
- Fennell, D. A. (2012). Tourism, animals and utilitarianism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, *37*(3), 239–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2012.11081712>
- 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. (2014). Exploring the boundaries of a new moral order for tourism's global code of ethics: An opinion piece on the position of animals in the tourism industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *22*, 983–996. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2014.918137>

Fennell, D. A. (2015). The Status of Animal Ethics Research in Tourism: A Review of Theory. In Markwell K. (Ed.), *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships* (pp. 27–43). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Fennell, D. A., & Malloy, D. (2007). Codes of ethics in tourism: Practice, theory, synthesis. Clevedon: Channel View Publications. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=307309>

Fowler, H. (2015) In Human, A. R. N. (. (Ed.). *Animals in the anthropocene: Critical perspectives on non-human futures* (pp. 243–254). Sydney University Press.

Franklin, J. H. (2004). *Animal rights and moral philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Frost, W. (2011). Rethinking Zoos and Tourism. In Frost, W. (Ed). *Zoos and tourism: Conservation, education, entertainment?* (pp. 1–12). Ontario: Channel View Publications.

Gannon, F. (2002). *Animals on the menu*. EMBO reports, 3(7), 589–589.

García-Rosell, J.-C., & Hancock, P. (forthcoming). *Working animals, ethics and critical theory*. In N. Thomas (Ed.) *Animals and Business Ethics*. Cham: Springer.

Giddings, J. (1995). Reviews. *Alternative Law Journals*, 20(3), 147–148.

Goodale G., Black J. E. (Eds.). (2010). *Arguments about animal ethics*. Blue Ridge Summit: Lexington Books.

Goodall, J., & Berman, P. (1999). *Reason for hope: A spiritual journey*. Grand Central Publishing.

Gray, G. (2014). *Trust in research -- the ethics of knowledge production*. TEDxVictoria. Retrieved May 1, 2020, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JSV4VZ8gdUQ&t=8s>

Gren, M., & Huijbens, E. H. (2014). Tourism and the Anthropocene. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(1), 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.886100>

Hall, D. R., & Brown, F. (2006). *Tourism and welfare: Ethics, responsibility and sustained well-being*. Cabi.

Haraway, D. J. (2003). *The companion species manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness*, 1, 3-17. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Hathaway, M. (2015). Wild elephants as actors in the Anthropocene. In Human, A. R. N. (Ed.). *Animals in the anthropocene: Critical perspectives on non-human futures* (pp. 221–242). Sydney University Press.

Hoage, R.J. (1996). Epilogue. In R.J. Hoage & W.A. Deiss (Eds.), *New worlds, new animals: from menagerie to zoological park in the nineteenth century* (pp. 136–140). Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Huijbens, E., & Einarsson, N. (2018). Feasting on friends. In C. Kline (Ed.), *Tourism experiences and animal consumption. Contested values, morality and ethics* (pp. 10–27). New York: Routledge.

Human, A. R. N. (. (Ed.). (2015). *Animals in the anthropocene: Critical perspectives on non-human futures*. Sydney University Press.

Imms, M., & Ereaut, G. (2002). *Introduction to qualitative market research : An introduction to qualitative market research*. London: SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=343980>

Jamieson, D. (2008). *Ethics and the environment: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jennings, G. (2015). Qualitative Research for the University Sector: Paradigms that inform Research. *Imagine Consulting Group International Pty Ltd*.

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Macmillan.

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Mair, H. (2011). Critical tourism research. In Ateljevic et al. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (pp. 42–54). London: Routledge.

Markwell K. (Ed.). (2015). *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Mccausland, C. (2014). The five freedoms of animal welfare are rights. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 27(4), 649–662. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/10.1007/s10806-013-9483-6>

McDonald, H. P. (2014a). *Environmental philosophy: A revaluation of cosmopolitan ethics from an ecocentric standpoint*. New York: BRILL. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1686960>

Mill, J. S. (2009). *Utilitarianism*. Auckland: Floating Press, The. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=435879>

Mulgan, T. (2014). *Understanding utilitarianism*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Northcote, J., & Macbeth, J. (2006). Conceptualizing yield: Sustainable tourism management doi:<https://doi-org.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/10.1016/j.annals.2005.10.012>

O'Connell, S. (1993). Review: Captives of our curiosity. Retrieved from <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg14018954-500-review-captives-of-our-curiosity/>

Orams, M. B. (2002). Feeding wildlife as a tourism attraction: a review of issues and impacts. *Tourism management*, 23(3), 281–293.

Plumwood, V. (1994). *Feminism and the mastery of nature*. London: Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=168813>

Pritchard, A. (2011). Critical tourism research. In Ateljevic et al. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (pp. 11–12). London: Routledge.

Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Creating an academy of hope: an enquiry–learning–action nexus. In Ateljevic et al. *The critical turn in tourism studies: Creating an academy of hope* (pp. 1–10). London: Routledge.

Pyyhtinen, O. (2016). *More-than-human sociology: A new sociological imagination*. Springer. Sanbonmatsu J. (Ed.). (2011). *Critical theory and animal liberation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Shani, A., & Pizam, A. (2008). Towards an ethical framework for animal-based attractions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(6), 679–693. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810892236>

Shiva, V., & Mies, M. (2014). *Ecofeminism*. London: Zed Books. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1644031>

Silverman, D. (1997). The Logics of Qualitative Research. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (Eds.), *Context and method in qualitative research* (pp. 12–25). London: SAGE publications limited.

Silverman, D. (2013). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: SAGE publications limited.

Simmons, L. (2007). *Knowing animals*. Leiden: Brill.

Singer, P. (2009). *Animal Liberation, updated edition*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Singer, P. (Ed.). (2013). *In defense of animals: The second wave*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Sorenson, J. (2011). Constructing Extremists, Rejecting Compassion Ideological Attacks on Animal Advocacy from Right and Left. In Sanbonmatsu J. (Ed.). *Critical theory and animal liberation*. (pp. 188–203) Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Stephens, A. (2013). *Ecofeminism and systems thinking*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.

Sunstein. (2005). In Sunstein C. R., Nussbaum M. C. (Eds.), *Animal rights: Current debates and new directions*. Cary: Oxford University Press, Incorporated. Retrieved from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com.ezproxy.ulapland.fi/lib/ulapland-ebooks/detail.action?docID=280972>

The Guardian (2016). TripAdvisor bans ticket sales to attractions that allow contact with wild animals. Retrieved May 2, 2020, from <https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2016/oct/12/tripadvisor-no-touch-policy-wild-animals-holiday-attractions>

Turley, S. K. (1999). Exploring the future of the traditional UK zoo. *Journal of vacation marketing*, 5(4), 340–355.

Ulmer, J. B. (2017). Posthumanism as research methodology: Inquiry in the Anthropocene. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 30(9), 832-848. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1336806>

Van Tuyl, C. (2008). Zoos and animal welfare. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=HHFWAAAAYAAJ>

WAZA's Open Letter Regarding Barcelona City Council's Zoo Decision. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.waza.org/news/waza-barcelona-zoo/>

Wearing, S. and Jobberns, C. (2015). From Free Willy to SeaWorld: Has Ecotourism Improved the Rights of Whales? In Markwell K. (Ed.), *Animals and tourism: Understanding diverse relationships* (pp. 75-90). Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Wien Tourismus. Schönbrunn Zoo. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from <https://www.wien.info/en/vienna-for/families/sightseeing/schoenbrunn-zoo>

Yasuda, H. (2013). Negotiating entertainment and education: a zoo in Japan. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7, 105–112.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This thesis was supervised by José-Carlos García-Rosell, the senior lecturer of Multidimensional Tourism Institute at the University of Lapland. Although writing my thesis took way longer than intended, I received patient support from my supervisor. I cannot thank enough for the endless amount of feedback I received; for the quick replies on my emails; and for the effort for correcting all my mistakes. I can only regret that I did not have enough time and energy to take full advantage of my supervisor's generous instructions and make a much better thesis.