

## VISITORS' SATISFACTION SURVEY IN MUDUMALAI AND INDIRA GANDHI WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES OF TAMIL NADU

T. SEKAR\*

### Introduction

The World Tourism Organization (WTO) estimated that there were more than 693 million international travellers in 2001 and predicted that tourist arrivals will grow by an average of 4.1% year over next two decades. Tourism the world over has generated nearly 200 million jobs or some 10% of the jobs globally either directly or indirectly (Anon., 2000). Eco-tourism is increasing in the travel and conservation world through an evolutionary process. While eco-tourism has its roots in nature, wildlife and outdoor recreation, recent concepts of eco-tourism lay greater emphasis on its primary role in conservation education. Natural areas and their landscape, flora and fauna with accompanying cultural elements are emerging as major attractions. Eco-tourism refers to travelling to relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated natural areas with the specific objective of studying, admiring and enjoying the scenery and its wild plants and animals, as well as any existing cultural manifestations found in those areas.

Nature tourism is seen as the fastest growing segment in tourism, with the WTO estimates putting nature tourism travel at 20% of all international travels. India is no exception with its vast bio-geographic and cultural variation along its length and breath. Be it the far-flung snow capped

mountains of the Himalayas, the scintillating shorelines with unbroken line of creamy sand or the remote mountain ranges away from the beaten track, hitherto less known tourism destinations have begun to attract increasing number of tourists.

However, the smaller segment of nature tourism sector depending upon wilderness location has to ensure responsible travel and in the process, conserve environment and improve the well being of the local people, if the tourism potential of these areas has to be sustained. Eco-tourism in the Western Ghats, the longest hill range of Southern India, has not evolved as an exclusive activity, particularly in any of the wilderness areas in the State of Tamil Nadu. Tourism is largely confined to Protected Areas like sanctuaries and national parks where certain tourism activities are conducted in the buffer zone, the major limitation being that the facilities are not commensurate with the demand. Visitors' satisfaction is the attribute that primarily determines his willingness to remain in the tourism area for a longer duration or return to the area again. While talking of tourism in protected areas, Sawarkar (1995) observed that visitor use should be monitored and pressures on habitat and infrastructure evaluated. For this purpose, formats should be recommended to obtain feedback. The results of the evaluation should be used in

---

\* Conservator of Forests, Coimbatore Circle, Coimbatore (Tamil Nadu)

improving tourism related strategies. This paper is the result of a month long visitors' satisfaction survey conducted among the tourists arriving at the two most popular wildlife tourism destinations of Tamil Nadu viz. Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary and Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary.

### Study Area

The Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary is spread over 321.00 km<sup>2</sup>. It was the first wildlife sanctuary to be formed in March 1942 in the Nilgiri, Western Ghats of Tamil Nadu, while the Anamalai hill range covering an extent of 959.77 km<sup>2</sup> in Coimbatore Western Ghats was declared as a wildlife sanctuary in April 1976. These represent the two major administrative units in the State brought under Protected Area management with focus on wildlife protection. Ooty-Mysore highway bisects the Mudumalai Sanctuary passing through its buffer zone. It is drained by the Moyar river which meanders close to the Theppakadu Reception Centre and forms its North-Eastern boundary. Mixed moist deciduous forests, moist/dry teak forests punctuated with grasslands and swamps, predominantly occupy Mudumalai, which forms part of the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve. Thus the sanctuary provides an ideal home for a vast variety of animals including elephant, Indian gaur, tiger, panther, sambhar, spotted deer, barking deer, mouse deer, Malabar giant squirrel, wild dog, jackal, bear, wild boar etc. Avifauna and reptilian life is equally striking. In view of expanse of grasslands and swamps and openness of the ground with less ground cover, sighting of wild animals is the best for most part of the year. Rides for the tourists are restricted to the three roads originating from Theppakadu encompassing an area of about 50 km<sup>2</sup>.

Anamalai is unique for its varied forest types ranging from dry thorn forest to montane-temperate shola-grasslands, from dry deciduous type to tropical evergreen forests. These different forest formations support wide range of flora and fauna including the endangered species, the Nilgiri Tahr. The area, open to tourism is limited to the forests around Topslip-Kozhikamuthi Road. Sighting of animals is relatively low in view of the poor visibility caused by dense ground vegetation.

### Methodology

A visitor's satisfaction survey was conducted among the tourists who visited the tourist destinations of Theppakadu in Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary and Topslip in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary between 1.5.2001 and 31.5.2001. A questionnaire both in English and Tamil containing 23 questions covering the aspects of general attributes in relation to the tourism in these locations, facilities and services provided to the tourists while in the sanctuary, the visitor's perception regarding the eco-awareness activities in the protected areas and their overall experience out of the visit was circulated among the visiting public while they arrived at the reception centre. Since most of the tourists reached in groups, only one member of the group was requested to fill in the responses in the language of his preference. The voluntary mode of participation of the tourists in the survey was adopted and the respondents were requested to drop the filled in questionnaire forms in the drop box kept in the reception during the survey period. In all 224 and 103 response forms were received during the month long survey from Mudumalai and Indira Gandhi Sanctuary respectively. The number of

visitors at Theppakadu and Topslip for the corresponding period were 25,140 and 1,573, respectively.

Response of the visitors to various questions were grouped into three major headings viz. (a) visitor's response to general attributes relating to the purpose of visit, mode of arrival, transport, accommodation etc.; (b) visitor's response to available facilities used and the places visited in the sanctuary and (c) visitors' response to the quality and sufficiency of services, nature of eco-awareness activities and the over all experience from the visit. The respondent's choice with reference to a particular attribute form the basis for calculation of percent of total respondents who responded for that attribute.

### Results and Discussion

Basic information on the sanctuaries and the infrastructure and other facilities available to the tourists is summarized in Table 1.

The trend in tourists' arrivals in both the sanctuaries and the revenue receipts from entry fee, rest house rental, fee for vehicle/elephant ride, camera charge etc. are furnished in Table 2. The increasing flow of tourists to Mudumalai is due to the location of the tourism zone on the Ooty-Mudumalai road. The year 1998-99 saw very few tourists' due to the closure of the sanctuary in view of the suspected movement of forest brigand Veerappan in the area. The tourist arrival in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary continues to be low because of its comparative remoteness.

The duration of visitors' stay in the sanctuaries varied depending on the location, accessibility and availability of

the accommodation facilities in the buffer zone. Nearly one out of four tourists arrived in the sanctuary as part of a pleasure trip, while one third combined pleasure with adventure and wildlife viewing.

While vehicle ride remained the most popular tourist attraction in both the places, elephant ride served only one-fifth of the visitors in Theppakadu. Survey results revealed that attraction of tourists to facilities like elephant camp and interpretation centre is governed by the location and accessibility of such facilities. Visitor's response to the anti-plastic campaign in both the sanctuaries has been good. More than 75% of the respondents felt that the signage in the reception area and tourism zone is adequate. About 95% of the respondents either felt very good or returned satisfied from their visits to the sanctuary. Their suggestions for improvement were mainly of the rest houses and roads. Such surveys are expected to help the managers of protected areas to evolve appropriate strategies and action plan for nature based tourism.

#### (a) *General attributes of Tourists' arrival in the Sanctuaries*

The response of the visitors for the general attributes regarding their visit to the sanctuaries is presented in Table 3. While 63.8% of the visitors spent only less than 12 hrs in Mudumalai, 87.4% of the respondents stayed back in Topslip for a duration of 24 hrs or more. This trend indicates that the duration for which the visitors remain in Mudumalai is less due to the fact that many of the visitors make a quick visit to the sanctuary as a part of their itinerary to Ooty, the hill station of Nilgiris District and in view of the location of the sanctuary on the Ooty-Mysore

**Table 1**

*Basic information about Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary and National Park and Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary and National Park*

	Mudumalai WLS&NP	Indira Gandhi WLS&NP
<b>I. Basic Facts :</b>		
Date/Year of Formation	09.03.1942	14.04.1976
District	Nilgiris	Coimbatore
Distance from Distt. HQ. (km)	Ooty - 37/ 67	Coimbatore- 77
Nearest Town and Distance (km)	Gudalur - 17	Pollachi -37
Total area (km <sup>2</sup> )	321.00	959.77
Area of Buffer Zone	Around Theppakadu	Areas around Topslip
Predominant Forest Type in tourism zone	Moist deciduous & Dry deciduous	Wet evergreen; Semi evergreen; Most deciduous
Altitude in tourism zone (m amsl)	876-1050	379-826
<b>II. Facilities :</b>		
No. of Rest Houses/ Dormitories	11	9
Total Beds available for occupation	112	74
Vehicle Ride Facilities	4 (100 seats)	3 (77 seats)
No. of elephants in the camp	29	16
Distance of elephant camp from reception centre (km)	0.200	23.0
Distance of Interpretation centre from reception (m)	200	0
Sighting of wild animals	Good sighting for over 6 months, Jan.-May; Sept.-Oct.	Relatively lesser sighting due to poor visibility.

highway. The reason for longer stay period of the tourists in Topslip of Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary is due to the far away location of tourist zone and relatively poor connectivity in form of public transport. While in both the sanctuaries, majority of visitors are represented by local tourists of the State, nearly one out of four visitors turned out to be from other States at Theppakadu. This is due to the easy accessibility of Mudumalai from Karnataka

and Kerala and its location en-route to Ooty. However, foreign tourists remain at around only 3.0% in both the sanctuaries, suggesting these destinations are not as popular among foreigners as other tourist locations in the nearby hill stations of Tamil Nadu. These figures are in conformity with the trend observed 25 years ago which recorded a composition of 5.7% of foreigners among the 20,000 tourists who visited Mudumalai during 1997-98 (Joseph, 1978).

**Table 2**

*Visitors' arrival at Theppakadu (Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary & National Park) and Topslip (Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary & National Park) between 1997-98 and 2001-02*

Year	No. of visitors							
	Mudumalai Wildlife Sanctuary & National Park				Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary & National Park			
	Indian	Foreigner	Total	Revenue (Rs.)	Indian	Foreigner	Total	Revenue (Rs.)
1997-1998	82600	8820	91420	2504343	6278	194	6472	505584
1998-1999	528	Nil	528	13798	4693	192	4885	1019616
1999-2000	72528	1891	74419	2006381	13200	158	13358	1044470
2000-2001	75045	1776	76821	2158651	11048	163	11211	1402457
2001-2002	103329	1910	105239	2886172	8399	309	8708	1006710

With regard to the origin of the tourists visiting the sanctuaries, people from urban areas dominated the scene with 68.3% and 66%, visiting Theppakadu and Topslip, respectively. Nearly three out of four respondents observed that they had come to know of the tourism areas in these sanctuaries only through their friends and relatives, thus suggesting that 'aggressive marketing of tourism' potential of these areas through wide media publicity hasn't taken root. The reason for adopting such a guarded approach is two fold : (i) the first and foremost objective in Protected Area management is to make the sanctuaries/national parks serve as safe and suitable habitat for wildlife and only controlled and regulated tourism is usually contemplated in the management plans, and (ii) unregulated tourism is potentially capable of strangling Protected Area management (Sawarkar, 1995).

As many as 42.4% and 53.4% the visitors were making their maiden trip to the Theppakadu and Topslip, while the balance of 57.6% and 46.6% of visitors returned to the sanctuary for the second

or subsequent visits, respectively. Greater visibility and easy reach probably make Theppakadu a more frequently visited nature tourism destination as compared to Topslip. In respect of visitors' travel pattern, nearly all (96.0 and 97.1%, respectively) arrive at the reception centres in groups and most of the times in numbers of more than five. This is something to do with the common Indian family system wherein people of the same family travel in large groups, be it a pleasure trip or a pilgrim tour. The arrival of comparatively larger groups in Theppakadu than in Topslip might be due to the availability of a number of private lodgings close to the tourism zone that provides assured accommodation to the visitors. This is corroborated by the fact that 46.4% of the visitors to Theppakadu responded by stating that they stayed in private or other accommodations, while those staying in such halting facilities is nil in respect of Topslip. Hired and private vehicles remained the prominent mode of transport for the visiting public in both the sanctuaries, accounting for 86.6% and 89.3% of the respondents, respectively

**Table 3***Visitor's response to general attributes*

Attributes	Response	% of respondents	
		Mudumalai WLS & NP	Indira Gandhi WLS & NP
Duration of stay	<12 hrs	63.8	12.6
	<12-24 hrs	20.5	55.3
	>24 hrs.	15.7	32.1
Visitors from	Tamil Nadu	71.0	89.3
	Other States	25.5	7.8
	Foreign	3.5	2.9
Area of domicile	Rural	31.7	34.0
	Urban	68.3	66.0
How did you come to know of the sanctuary	Friends & Relatives	64.7	78.6
	Newspapers	8.0	7.8
	Other sources	15.2	9.7
	All	12.1	3.9
How many times did you visit before	0	42.4	53.4
	1	16.5	18.4
	2	13.8	8.7
	>2	27.2	19.5
How have you come	Alone	4.0	2.9
	Group	96.0	97.1
If group, No. of members	<5	4.7	40.0
	>5	95.3	60.0
Whether you have stayed? If so accommodation	Sanctuary	29.5	72.8
	Private	37.5	Nil
	Others	8.9	Nil
	No	24.1	27.2
Mode of Transport	Public	13.4	10.7
	Hired	33.5	41.7
	Private	53.1	47.6
Purpose of visit	Pleasure	35.7	23.3
	Adventure	2.2	Nil
	Wildlife Interest	24.6	45.6
	More than one	37.5	31.1

suggesting that the tourists are willing to pay more for tourism travel, in general and nature based tourism, in particular. The perception of tourists visiting these sanctuaries in respect of purpose of their visit differed significantly between each other. While only 24.6% of the respondents in Theppakadu stated that their visit was primarily because of interest in wildlife, about 45.6% of the visitors indicated so in case of Topslip. Sizable proportion of the respondents considered the outing only as part of a pleasure trip.

**(b) Facilities available and used**

Infrastructure facilities available in the two sanctuaries in terms of capacity of accommodation, vehicle/ elephant ride, and the availability of other eco-tourism attractions like elephant camp, interpretation centre are enumerated in Table 2. Response of the visitors on the use of these facilities is summarized in Table 4. Vehicle ride through the tourism zone remained the most popular tourist attraction in both the places, with nearly half the tourists availing this facility. While 17% of the tourists enjoyed a ride on elephant back in Theppakadu, it is only 6.8% who could avail this facility at Topslip. The major reason for lesser patronage for the elephant ride in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary is non-availability of sufficient number of trained elephants at the reception point and the remoteness of the elephant camp. The simple reason that the elephant camp is located at Varagaliar, about 23 km from Topslip makes it less accessible and consequently less number of visitors (6.8%) to the camp as against 45.1% of the respondents visiting the elephant camp at Theppakadu which is located just about 200 m from the reception centre. The feeding of camp elephants,

**Table 4**

*Visitor's response to facilities used*

	% of respondents	
	Mudumalai WLS & NP	Indira Gandhi WLS & NP
I. Facilities used :		
Vehicle Ride	50.4	51.5
Elephant Ride	17.0	6.8
Both	21.0	23.3
Trekking	Nil	4.9
None	11.6	13.5
II. Places visited :		
Elephant camps	45.1	6.8
Interpretation centre	7.1	50.5
Both	27.6	12.6
None	20.2	30.1

performance of pooja by calf elephants etc. continue to be the major attractions for the tourists in Theppakadu as these events are held at a predetermined location viz., the camp, and time i.e. around 6 pm on a daily basis. Another facility aimed at nature conservation education among the tourists in the interpretation centre is located in both the sites. The one at Topslip is housed in the reception centre itself and therefore attracted nearly 50% of the respondents. The situation is different in the case of Theppakadu where the interpretation centre is situated in a building within the elephant camp, about 200 m from the reception. Its location and restricted hours of opening probably act as a hindrance, thus resulting in only 7.1% of the respondents visiting the same. Sizable number of visitors did not visit both the elephant camp and interpretation centre, the number reaching as high as 30% in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary.

**(c) Visitors' experiences in the Sanctuaries**

In response to a question on the rating of the Elephant Camps, 57.1% of the respondents categorized the one at Theppakadu as good, while only 9.7% considered the camp in Varagaliar as good corroborating with the number, which actually visited the camp (Table 5). Quite a large chunk of visitors (89.3%) failed to provide any response or opinion on the elephant camp in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary, which suggests that this facility remains out of reach to the major section of tourists. As for the interpretation centre, better visibility and access makes the Topslip to be categorized as good by 61.2% of the visitors. On the contrary, nearly 73% of the visitors responded with no opinion in case of Mudumalai Interpretation centre, which is confirmed by the poor visitation rate. An intensive anti plastic campaign was pursued among the tourists, which included an appeal to the visiting public and provision of alternative in form of cloth bags. The campaign has been considered as good by 69.6% and 87.4% of visitors in

Theppakadu and Topslip, respectively. With regard to the visual impact of various sign boards erected around the reception and in the tourism zone, nearly 40% people appreciated them as very good in Theppakadu, which the proportion was 21.4% in case of Topslip. More than half of the tourists felt that the sign boards are adequate, while about 10% of them thought that the signage are inadequate in both the sanctuaries. An assessment of the visitor's overall experience while they were in sanctuary was made through the questionnaire survey, which revealed that 54.5% and 47.6% visitor's rated their experience as very good in Theppakadu and Topslip, respectively. While 42.4% and 47.6% of the respondents, respectively returned satisfied from their visits to those sanctuaries, a small proportion of 3.1% and 4.8% concluded their trip with an unsatisfactory note.

**Discussion**

Wildlife sanctuaries and national parks are organized with the primary goal of protecting wildlife and conserving environment. Towards achieving this

**Table 5**

*Visitors' response to service, eco-awareness and overall experience*

	Good		Not Good		No Response/No Opinion	
	MWLS &NP	IGWLS &NP	MWLS &NP	IGWLS &NP	MWLS &NP	IGWLS &NP
Elephant camp	57.1	9.7	5.4	1.0	37.5	89.3
Interpretation centre	22.8	61.2	4.5	1.9	72.7	36.9
Anti Plastic campaign	69.6	87.4	0.9	—	29.5	12.6
Sign boards	very good 39.2	21.4	Adequate 50.5	68.9	Inadequate 10.3	9.7
Overall experience	Very Good 54.5	47.6	Satisfactory 42.4	47.6	Not Satisfactory 3.1	4.8



objective, extractive forms of resource use like harvesting of timber, firewood, collection of Non-Timber Forest Produce (NTFP), grazing of domestic cattle have been controlled in such Protected Areas (PAs). While the Conservation Act professes to retain the sanctity of PAs by prohibiting the removal of any forest product, tourism gains entry. So we have a scenario wherein tourism is implicitly accepted as complementary to conservation (Swaminathan and Seema, 2000). But early management action plan for wildlife sanctuaries contemplated only controlled or regulated tourism without any undue emphasis (Joseph, 1978). However, of late, role of wilderness recreation in support of management is being increasingly realized. In such a dispensation, the principal goal of tourism in PAs is to strengthen the cause of conservation, in general and of the management of the PA concerned, in particular. It is recognized that this can be achieved though (a) providing informed wilderness experience to visitors (b) enabling the visitors to view a cross-section of PA values (Sawarkar, 1995). Thus, all the existing facilities like elephant/vehicle ride, guided trek along nature trails, stay on watch tour, elephant camps, signage etc. are seen as appropriate tools for providing such experiences to tourists visiting the sanctuaries.

Eco-tourism, a segment of nature tourism, must aim at augmenting appreciation of people for nature and generating income both for the people who live and work within and around biosphere reserves (Rai, 1998). Nature tourism, as such relying on the PA systems, should consider conservation of environment as well as improvement of well being of the local people. In the sanctuaries of the present study, host of tribal population

get employed in various activities in the tourism sector, though indirectly. They serve as elephant men in elephant camps, as trained guides, help in running the other facilities etc.

Present levels of visit rates in the study areas and restriction of visits largely to daytime illustrate that the tourism in these sanctuaries is pursued as an activity, only incidental to forest and wildlife management. Given the protection tasks and other assignment to the park staff, they are not able to effectively take upon the additional task of overseeing tourism. Further, nature tourism has not evolved as a major industry and consequently facilities are not commensurate to the demand. Results of the survey suggest that more than 95% of the tourists felt satisfied about their visit to these sanctuaries with nearly three-fourths of them considering the anti-plastic campaign along with the provision of an alternative in the form of cloth bags as good. Maintenance of the reception area and tourism zone free of garbage and plastic wastes appear to be one of the main factors enhancing visitor's satisfaction in these locations. This concept is corroborated by the study of Roggenbuck *et al.* (1993) who found that littering and human damage to camp site trees were among the most highly rated indicators affecting the quality of wilderness experiences. Littering was a commonly reported resource impact by visitors to Mt. Everest in Nepal and at Gunung Gede Pangraugo National Park in Indonesia (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996).

While the tourist arrival in Mudumalai is showing an upward trend, the same in Topslip is pointing to some fluctuation. It has to be inferred that the quantity of visits is not affected, as there

is no significant reduction in the quality of visitor experience from either resource or experience impacts. When the visitors were requested to make suggestions regarding impairments to infrastructural facilities, 35% and 41% of them in Theppakadu and Topslip, respectively felt that the rest houses should be improved upon. Quite a few of them (4% and 8.7%, respectively) wanted the sanctuary roads to be done up. At present, the revenue generated from tourism is not made available for augmenting the existing facilities. Therefore, developing a thriving eco-tourism industry for a given area calls for, among other things, pumping tourism receipts back into PA systems to overcome chronic problems of under budgeting and inadequate staffing. The corollary is that in the PA, rules and regulations governing tourism must be specific and clear. In the absence of effective planning and management, eco-tourism can lead to

significant negative impacts on vegetation, soil, water, wildlife and historic resources, cultures and even visitor experiences. Such impacts may negatively affect visitor satisfaction and diminish visitation (Marion and Farrell, 1998). It is necessary that the tourism infrastructure is self-reliant and thus precludes generating a borrowing pressure on the protected area's other resources at the cost of other management activities (Sawarkar, 1995). The National Action Plan, 2002 prepared by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India, plans to use increased tourism revenue entirely to augment available resources for conservation (Vania, 2002). Results of such surveys conducted among the tourists are expected to help the managers of national parks and sanctuaries to evolve appropriate strategies and action plans for pursuing a conservation education oriented nature tourism.

### Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the continuous encouragement given by Shri J.C. Kala, IFS, Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and Dr. Sukh Dev, IFS, Chief Wildlife Warden, Tamil Nadu in this work. The assistance rendered by the staff of Mudumalai and Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuaries in conducting the survey and by Shri S. Ramasubramanian, IFS, Assistant Conservator of Forests in the compilation of data are gratefully acknowledged.

### SUMMARY

**Nature tourism travel is emerging as the fastest growing segment in tourism accounting for nearly 20% of all international travel. Wilderness recreation has to ensure responsible travel and in the process, conserve environment and improve the well being of the local people so as to sustain the tourism potential in such locations. Though tourism is at present pursued in most of the Protected Areas only as an incidental activity, its role in support of management is increasingly being realized. As the visitor's satisfaction largely determines his willingness to remain in the tourism area for a longer duration or return to the area again, a questionnaire survey to assess the visitor's satisfaction was conducted in the two Protected Areas of Tamil Nadu viz., at Theppakadu in Mudumalai and at Topslip in Indira Gandhi Wildlife Sanctuary among the tourists during May 2001.**

तमिलनाडु के मुडुमलै और इन्दिरा गांधी वन्यप्राणि अभयारण्यों में परिदर्शकों का संतुष्टि सर्वेक्षण  
टी. शेखर  
सारांश

पर्यटन के अन्तर्गत प्रकृति पर्यटन के लिए यात्रा करना अब उसके सबसे तेज बढ़ने वाले अंग के रूप में उदित होता जा रहा है और सभी अन्तरराष्ट्रीय यात्राओं का यह लगभग 20% बैठता है। वन्यक्षेत्र मनोरंजन को उत्तरदायित्व - पूर्ण यात्रा सुनिश्चित करना होता है और ऐसा करते समय उसे पर्यावरण संरक्षण तथा स्थानीय लोगों के जीवन में भी सुधार लाना होता है ताकि ऐसे स्थानों में पर्यटन संभावनाओं को यथावत् बनाए रखा जा सके। हालांकि वर्तमान में पर्यटन को लगभग अधिकांश रक्षित क्षेत्रों में आनुषंगिक कार्य की तरह ही सम्पन्न किया जाता है, फिर भी स्थल प्रबन्ध करने में सहायता पहुँचाने के लिए इसकी भूमिका को अधिकाधिक मान्यता प्रदान की जा रही है। चूंकि परिदर्शकों की संतुष्टि ही अधिकतर पर्यटन क्षेत्रों में अधिक समय तक बने रहने अथवा पुनः उस क्षेत्र में लौटकर आने की रजामन्दी को विनिश्चित करती है, इसलिए तमिलनाडु के दो सुरक्षित किए हुए क्षेत्रों अर्थात् मुडुमलै में थेप्पाकाडु तथा इन्दिरा गांधी वन्यप्राणि अभयारण्य में टापस्लिप में मई 2001 में आए पर्यटकों की संतुष्टि का आकलन करने के लिए यह एक प्रश्नावली सर्वेक्षण कराया गया है।

#### References

- Anon. (2000). World Tourism Organisation : Scrambling for paradise. *Down to Earth*, **11** (5) : 25-34.
- Ceballos-Lascrain, H. (1996.) *Tourism, Eco-tourism and protected areas*. IUCN: The World Conservation Union, Gland, Switzerland.
- Joseph, S. John (1978). *Management Plan for Mudumalai Sanctuary (1978-79 to 1987-88)*.
- Marion, J.L. and T.A Farrell (1998). Managing Eco-Tourism visitation in protected areas. *Eco-tourism A guide for planners and managers* (Vol.2) (Lindberg K. et al., eds.). Natraj Publishers, Dehra Dun: 155-181.
- Rai, R.K. (1998). Biosphere reserve: concept, characteristics, functions and management. *Biosphere reserve and management in India*. (Maikhuri, K.S. Rao and R.K. Rai, eds.). G.B. Pant Institute of Himalayan Environment and Development. pp. 245-253.
- Roggenbuck, J.W., D.R. Williams and A.E. Watson (1993). Defining acceptable conditions in wilderness. *Environmental Management*, **17** (2) : 187-197.
- Sawarkar, V.B. (1995). *A manual for planning wildlife management in protected areas and managed forests*. Wildlife Institute of India, Dehra Dun. p. 262.
- Swaminathan, L.P. and P. Seema (2000). Forest conservation, tourism and extraction: An economic perspective. *Ind. J. Agric. Econ.* **55** (3): 399-411
- Vania, Rustam (2002). Scrambling for Paradise. *Down to Earth* **11** (5) : 25-34.