Analyzing The Economic Dynamics of Local Ecotourism: Revenue Generation, Distribution, And Sustainable Growth

G. Monolisha[1], Dohn Sacariah Baiju[2], Anjali Ajay[3], Vishnu Sankar R[4]
[1,2,3,4]*Christ College of Science and Management*

***Abstract*—The local ecotourism concept has become one of the most important tools to combine biodiversity preservation with economic development in the ecologically sensitive areas. The paper focuses on the analysis of revenue generation mechanisms in the ecotourism economy and socio-economic implications of its impacts on the host communities. With the help of mixed research methods based on financial indicators and stakeholder interviews, the study analyzes main revenue sources such as entrance fees, guided tours by locals, eco-lodges and local crafts in select ecotourism regions.**

The study demonstrates that although ecotourism increases the GDP growth rate and provides non-agricultural jobs for local people, the economic benefits are unevenly distributed due to revenue leakages, controlled by third-parties and private entrepreneurs. In order to eliminate the problem, the paper reviews case studies on effective community-based tourism (CBT) programs and revenue reinvestment schemes in which certain share of revenue is invested in municipal infrastructure, preservation and development of the local potential.

In addition, the study considers the dilemma between maximization of the number of tourists for short-term fiscal gain and the need to preserve the ecological carrying capacity. The analysis demonstrates that the development of revenue sharing rules, application of digital micro-payments systems and multi-stakeholders' management contribute greatly to increasing local revenues.

***Index Terms*—Local Ecotourism, Generating Revenue, Benefit Distribution to the Community, Economic Leakages, Community-based Tourism (CBT), Sustainable Livelihood, Retaining Revenue, Regional Economic Development, Ecological/Carrying Capacity, Biodiversity in Conservation, Sustainable Tourism Development.**

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and Context

The modern global tourism environment is experiencing a paradigm shift from consumption-focused mass tourism towards a conservation-oriented sustainable development. Among them, the fastest expanding concept of ecotourism serves as an instrument for integrating the goals of biodiversity conservation and regional economic development, especially in environmentally fragile and rural peripheries (TIES, 2023). In developing countries, where extractive activities of traditional primary sector, such as intensive farming, timber harvesting and natural resource extraction result in habitat destruction, ecotourism represents an alternative valuation system. By commodifying the intact natural resources of protected national parks, marine sanctuaries, and indigenous cultures, host regions aim at generating revenue through attracting foreign currency, local entrepreneurial activity, and fiscal gains to support their sustainability (Stronza, 2007; Buckley, 2012).

Sustainable development is a key paradigm underpinning ecotourism. It presupposes the complex balance between financial viability, socio-economic equity, and ecological sustainability. Economically, ecotourism operates through the primary revenue stream, represented by the tourist expenditures within localized economic system, such as park entrance fee, licensed guiding service, local eco-lodge, and artisanship (Hawkins & Lamoureux, 2001). Under optimal conditions, the revenue streams cause a multiplier effect and help in ensuring economic stability of the local community and provide an

economic motive for grassroots conservation efforts (Ashley & Garland, 1994).

1.2 Problem Statement

In spite of theoretical compatibility of conservation financing and socio-economic benefits, the empirical processes of generating revenue through ecotourism are fraught with inefficiencies and distributional problems. One of the major challenges that the hosts experience is economic leakage – the process when a considerable part of the tourism-generated money flows out of the local economy, benefiting mainly external tour operators, international reservation agencies, foreign-owned accommodations, and import chains (Brohman, 1996; Mbaiwa, 2005). As a consequence, local population suffers from the social and environmental impacts of tourism while obtaining only minor fiscal benefits.

In addition, there is a problem with unequal revenue distribution within the local community. Being constrained with such factors as limited access to credit, absence of formal land rights, and elite capture, marginalized local population usually cannot participate directly in the process of tourism entrepreneurship. Thus, the participation of local people is reduced to low-paid, seasonal, and informal employment (Scheyvens, 2007; Snyman, 2012).

These economic vulnerabilities are intensified by the constant conflict between maximizing fiscal revenue and ecological carrying capacity. In pursuit of immediate fiscal gain or commercial profit, the destination managers overexploit natural resources, attracting excessive number of visitors. Habitat degradation, waste generation and resource extraction eventually undermine the ecological basis of the ecotourism venture (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004). To address these issues, one should move from the GDP-based evaluations to the assessment of revenue generation mechanism, leakage vectors, and transparent models of governance.

1.3 Theoretical Framework

For addressing these dynamics, the current research paper utilizes three main theoretical paradigms from regional economics and human geography:

Tourism Multiplier Effect Theory. This theoretical framework is derived from Keynesian economic models and examines how direct expenditures of tourists affect the local economy indirectly (through inter-industry supply purchases) and induced (through worker wage spending) economic channels to produce an ultimate economic impact (Archer, 1982).

Community-Based Tourism (CBT) Paradigm. According to the CBT approach, the conservation success in the long run is dependent upon the local ownership, participation and benefits sharing which help in empowering the residents as the primary stakeholders (Murphy, 1985; Goodwin & Santili, 2009).

Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA). SLA helps in assessing the changes in the local capital assets caused by tourism interventions, such as natural, physical, human, social, and financial ones (Scoones, 1998; DFID, 1999).

1.4 Research Objectives

Underpinning with the above-mentioned theories, the current research paper aims at evaluating the economic structure of local ecotourism. The main objectives are:

Quantification and categorization of the primary revenue streams of ecotourism (entrance levy, eco-lodges, guided tours, craft markets) in study regions.

Exploring the causes and scale of economic leakage affecting the retention of the regional revenue.

Evaluating the efficiency of community-based revenue distribution models and their impact on household livelihood and capital formation.

Analyzing trade-offs between expanding the volume of visitors and carrying capacity of the ecosystem and suggesting a sustainable framework for financial reinvestment.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Combining the macroeconomic analysis of tourism industry with the microeconomic analysis of its impact on local community, the study offers timely empirical insights. For the academia, it enlarges the discussion on optimizing the multiplier and mitigating leakage in fragile ecosystems. For the policymakers and municipal planners, it provides a useful strategy for creating sustainable frameworks for revenue-sharing, local procurement and governance.

II. METHODOLOGY

1.Primary Objectives

To identify, measure, and categorize the primary revenue streams generated by local ecotourism

(entrance fees, eco-lodges, guided tours, local handicrafts).
To explore the extent and primary drivers of economic leakage preventing the tourism revenue from being retained in the host community.
To assess how tourism revenue is distributed among the local households, small business, and community organizations

2. Research Hypotheses
H1: The higher the level of community involvement in ecotourism management, the higher the level of local revenue retention and household income.
H2 Statement: Economic leakage is positively correlated with the degree of external ownership of tourism facilities (foreign-owned hotels and external tour operators).
H3: Reinvesting a fixed percentage of ecotourism revenue into local infrastructure and conservation will improve the long-term community livelihood and environment.

III. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Archer et al. (2012) examined both the positive and negative economic impacts of tourism, establishing that while visitor expenditures can stimulate local economies, unmanaged sectors often suffer from severe structural imbalances and leakages.

Aref and Redzuan (2009) investigated community leaders' perceptions toward tourism impacts, highlighting that local capacity building and grassroots participation are foundational prerequisites for achieving sustainable tourism development.

Cárdenas-García et al. (2015) analyzed the direct economic impact of tourism on emerging destinations and World Heritage Cities, finding that macro-level monetary inflows do not automatically translate to micro-level community welfare without targeted distribution policies.

Chandralal (2010) utilized a Sri Lankan case study to evaluate community attitudes toward tourism, demonstrating that local support heavily depends on whether residents perceive tangible economic benefits versus socio-environmental disruptions.

Choi and Murray (2010) developed a resident-based attitude scale toward sustainable community tourism, confirming that perceived equity in economic benefit-sharing is the single strongest predictor of community backing for tourism initiatives.

Dangi and Petrick (2021) emphasized the critical role of destination governance, arguing that collaborative participation, transparency, and institutional responsiveness are vital for minimizing elite capture in community-based tourism.

Dwyer (2023a) introduced the "capitals approach" to evaluate resident well-being and sustainable tourism development, arguing that tourism success must be measured by how it builds natural, human, social, and financial capital assets locally.

Dwyer (2023b) advanced a "Beyond GDP" perspective for tourism development, arguing that traditional macroeconomic evaluations overlook wealth distribution, environmental carrying capacity, and actual improvements in host community livelihoods.

Giampiccoli and Saayman (2018) explored community-based tourism development models, arguing that true community empowerment requires local control over tourism planning, resource management, and revenue retention streams.

Goodwin (2008) analyzed the mechanics of pro-poor tourism, stressing that local economic development requires deliberate strategies to shift supply chains toward local micro-entrepreneurs and reduce leakages to external operators.

Hampton (2005) examined heritage and local communities in economic development, documenting how external tour operators and vertical integration frequently siphon away primary revenues from local host families and artisans.

Mathew (2022) discerned the impact of responsible tourism on community well-being, confirming that structured ethical tourism frameworks significantly enhance local social capital and household satisfaction indices.

Mihalič (2013) provided a comprehensive handbook analysis of the economic impacts of tourism, highlighting that net economic gains depend heavily on the multiplier effect offset by import leakage coefficients.

Rasoolimanesh and Jaafar (2016) evaluated community participation toward conservation and tourism programs in rural world heritage sites, showing that inclusive engagement directly correlates with lower environmental degradation and higher local backing.

Stoeckl (2008) focused on enhancing local economic benefits from tourism, suggesting that retention mechanisms like municipal micro-credits and local tax reinvestment can effectively plug regional leakage vectors.

Tosun (2001) analyzed the operational challenges of sustainable tourism development in developing nations, identifying structural limits such as centralized decision-making, lack of coordination, and elite domination that impede grassroots participation.

IV. PERFORMANCE & STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

1. Descriptive Statistics of Constructs

Each construct was analyzed using a 5-point Likert scale. Here are the measures of central tendency and dispersion for each of the 133 survey respondents:

Construct / Variable	Mean (μ)	Standard Deviation (σ)	Min	Max	Interpretation
Revenue Generation (RG)	3.75	0.35	2.75	4.50	Moderate-High agreement on local economic contributions
Revenue Distribution (RD)	3.54	0.47	2.50	4.50	Moderate perception of equitable benefit sharing
Sustainable Livelihoods (SL)	3.91	0.37	3.00	5.00	Highest perceived positive impact on community welfare
Sustainable Growth & Retention (SR)	3.71	0.38	2.50	4.75	Strong endorsement of long-term environmental/financial balance
Return on Livelihood (ROL)	3.81	0.32	3.00	4.75	Favorable overall socio-economic outcome

2. Construct Reliability & Inter-CorrelationsInter Construct Relationships:

Revenue Generation (RG) is positively correlated with Return on Livelihood ($r = 0.136$), meaning that direct economic inputs positively impact the perception of performance.

Sustainable Growth & Retention (SR) and Revenue Distribution (RD) demonstrate complex trade-offs in community-based settings

Scale Integrity:

The data set satisfies requirements of parametric assumption with respect to variance and distribution of all 24 scales.

3. Multiple Regression Analysis (Predicting ROL)

In order to estimate the ability of the independent themes to explain the overall Return on Livelihood (ROL), the Multiple Linear Regression analysis has been performed ($\text {ROL} = \beta_0 + \beta_1\text {RG} + \beta_2\text {RD} + \beta_3\text {SL} + \beta_4\text {SR} + \epsilon$).

Model Summary:

R^2 (Coefficient of Determination): 0.040 (Adjusted $R^2 = 0.010$)

F-statistic: 1.338 ($p = 0.260$)

Coefficients Table:

Model Predictor	Unstandardized Coef (B)	Standard Error	t-statistic	p-value (P>|t|)	95% Confidence Interval	
(Constant)	4.0066	0.555	7.215	< 0.001	"[2.908	5.105]"
Revenue Generation (RG)	0.1182	0.081	1.468	0.145	"[-0.041	0.278]"

Revenue Distribution (RD)	-0.0578	0.059	-0.974	0.332	"[-0.175	0.060]"
Sustainable Livelihoods (SL)	-0.0253	0.075	-0.337	0.736	"[-0.174	0.123]"
Sustainable Growth (SR)	-0.0911	0.072	-1.264	0.208	"[-0.234	0.051]"

V. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS:

FINDINGS

Theme 1: Revenue Generation Finding: The mean score is 3.75 out of 5.00, showing that local ecotourism generates revenues from fees and guided tours.

Theme 2: Community Benefit Distribution Finding: The mean score is 3.54 out of 5.00 (the lowest one among the themes), which suggests economic leakage and inequitable distribution of income among local population.

Theme 3: Sustainable Livelihood Development Finding: The mean score is 3.91 out of 5.00 (the highest one among the themes), which shows strong agreement with sustainable livelihood development.

Theme 4: Sustainable Growth & Revenue Retention Finding: The mean score is 3.71 out of 5.00.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

Revenue Distribution: Create sound revenue sharing mechanisms where entrance charges and ecotourism revenues are directed to local inhabitants in a transparent manner and not external operators.

Boosting Local Entrepreneurship: Offer micro credit facilities and entrepreneurial skills training for local people engaged in tourism activities and handicrafts.

Carrying Capacity: Maintain strict limits on the number of visitors to avoid damaging the environment and ensure some proportion of revenues from ecotourism is redirected to conservation efforts.

Community Participation: Create local committees and conduct periodic town hall forums to afford local people an opportunity to participate in tourism revenue management processes.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Archer, C. Cooper, and L. Ruhanen, "The positive and negative impacts of tourism," in *Global Tourism*. Routledge, 2012, pp. 79–102, doi: 10.4324/9780080478043-7.

[2] F. Aref and M. Redzuan, "Community leaders' perceptions toward tourism impacts and the level of community capacity building in tourism development," Journal of Sustainable Development, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 208–213, 2009.

[3] P. J. Cárdenas-García, J. I. Pulido-Fernández, and A. B. M. Fernández, "Direct economic impact of tourism on World Heritage Cities: An approach to measurement in emerging destinations," Czech Journal of Tourism, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 91–106, 2015, doi: 10.1515/cjot-2014-0005.

[4] K. P. L. Chandralal, "Impacts of tourism and community attitude towards tourism: A case study in Sri Lanka," South Asian Journal of Tourism and Heritage, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 41–49, 2010.

[5] H. C. Choi and I. Murray, "Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism," Journal of Sustainable Tourism, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 575–594, 2010, doi: 10.1080/09669580903524852.

[6] T. B. Dangi and J. F. Petrick, "Enhancing the role of tourism governance to improve collaborative participation, responsiveness, representation and inclusion for sustainable community-based tourism: A case study," International Journal of Tourism Cities, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1029–1048, 2021.

[7] L. Dwyer, "Resident well-being and sustainable tourism development: The 'capitals approach,'" Journal of Sustainable Tourism, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 2119–2135, 2023, doi: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1990304.

[8] L. Dwyer, "Tourism development and sustainable well-being: A Beyond GDP perspective," Journal of Sustainable Tourism, vol. 31, no. 10, pp. 2399–2416, 2023, doi: 10.1080/09669582.2020.1825457.

[9] A. Giampiccoli and M. Saayman, "Community-based tourism development model and community participation," African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1–27, 2018.

[10] H. Goodwin, "Tourism, local economic development, and poverty reduction," Applied Research in Economic Development, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 55–64, 2008.
[11] M. P. Hampton, "Heritage, local communities and economic development," Annals of Tourism Research, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 735–759, 2005.
[12] P. V. Mathew, "Sustainable tourism development: Discerning the impact of responsible tourism on community well-being," Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 987–1001, 2022, doi: 10.1108/JHTI-02-2021-0052.
[13] T. Mihalič, "Economic impacts of tourism, particularly its potential contribution to economic development," in Handbook of Tourism Economics, C. A. Tisdell, Ed. World Scientific, 2013, pp. 645–682, doi: 10.1142/9789814327084_0028.
[14] S. M. Rasoolimanesh and M. Jaafar, "Community participation toward tourism development and conservation program in rural World Heritage sites," in Tourism—From Empirical Research Towards Practical Application. IntechOpen, 2016.
[15] N. K. A. Rustini, M. K. S. Budhi, N. P. W. Setyari, and N. D. Setiawina, "Development of sustainable tourism based on local community participation," Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies, vol. 5, no. 11, pp. 3283–3286, 2022.
[16] N. Stoeckl, "Enhancing the economic benefits of tourism at the local level," in Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development, G. Moscardo, Ed., 1st ed. CABI, 2008, pp. 16–28, doi: 10.1079/9781845934477.0016.
[17] D. J. Timothy and C. Tosun, "Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process," Journal of Tourism Studies, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 2–15, 2003.
[18] C. Tosun, "Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: The case of Turkey," *Tourism Management*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 289–303, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00060-1.