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Abstract

Poverty remains the most widespread social problem in developing countries, and despite attempts by national governments and international organisations it continues unabated, due to factors such as neglect of environmental and cultural issues, weak institutions and political instability. Ecotourism has been identified as having the potential to reduce poverty by stimulating pro-poor growth while protecting the environment. Regardless of this potential, and the existence of diverse ecotourism attractions in developing countries, the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction remains a distant hope in host communities confronted with severe poverty. Understanding of the application of ecotourism theory to poverty reduction and its outcomes is limited. This research addresses this gap by focusing on: the potential of ecotourism to contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries; the application of the concept of ecotourism in Ghana; and the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in rural Ghana.

This research is based on pragmatism and mixed methods, using four case study communities around the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA). Qualitative data, using semi-structured and in-depth interviews, were collected from 8 agency representatives and 40 community households respectively from April-July 2012. Quantitative data were also collected in the same period, with 310 household respondents across the case study communities. The data were validated through community meetings and presentations to the agencies from February-March 2014.

The findings indicated that although poverty in developing countries is multidimensional, the dynamics are particularly complex in rural Ghana, where key issues relate to a poor traditional system of governance, farm raids by wildlife and loss of access to resources following the gazettal of the KCA and the introduction of ecotourism. As a consequence, the living conditions of the poor in the communities located around the KCA remain uncertain and difficult. The findings also demonstrated that the introduction of ecotourism into one protected area does not in itself contribute to poverty reduction in the local communities immediately adjacent to the area. The park officials’ lack of adequate engagement with the political process of stakeholder negotiations required to deliver multiple ecotourism benefits across the wider landscape has resulted in community
disillusionment. While the national government and some local people receive economic benefits from ecotourism, the negative effects, such as farm raid by wildlife, lack of access to non timber forest products are widespread in the communities adjacent to the KCA. The relevant agencies’ limited understanding of ecotourism as a political process of negotiations to achieve multiple goals remains a barrier to ecotourism’s contribution to poverty reduction in Ghana.

The research also found that an increase in tourist visitation does not necessarily lead to an increase in local income. Although the KCA remains the most visited ecotourism site in Ghana, communities around it are experiencing severe poverty, because they are not part of the management of, and do not receive economic benefits from the KCA ecotourism. In addition, there is no strategy for integrating the ecotourism experience in the KCA with community ecotourism attractions. Thus, ecotourism in the KCA serves as a revenue generating venture for the national government, and fulfills the agendas of conservation agencies, rather than being a sustainable local development strategy.
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Chapter One
Introduction

1.1 An overview of poverty dynamics in developing countries

Poverty is one of the most widespread and persistent social problems in the world (Deguara, 2008; Holden, 2013; Hossain, 2012; Todaro & Smith, 2006), despite it having a different meaning and impact across different countries (Domfeh & Bawole, 2009). Understanding poverty as human deprivation, in terms of economic opportunity, education, health, empowerment, participation and security, as well as environmental degradation and inability of people to meet economic and social standards of wellbeing (United Nations [UN], 2000), gives a deeper insight into the multidimensional nature of poverty, especially in developing countries (see Chapter 2). Global statistics on poverty indicate that about 1.2 billion of the world’s population, mainly in developing countries live on US$ 1.25 a day (UN, 2013), and are denied basic human development opportunities, including education, health, dignity, freedom, socio-political participation, and access to resources (Vollmer, 2010). Despite the availability of natural resources to alleviate poverty in developing countries, they are finite and with increasing population growth, competition over the access, control and ownership of these resources continues to grow often resulting in increased poverty (Luginaah & Armah, 2012; Taabazuing et al., 2012).

Poverty continues unabated despite the implementation of strategies by national governments and the international community to address it (Cobbinah et al., 2013a; Rupasingha & Goetz, 2003). Poverty reduction approaches have been developed and implemented over the last 50 years (Domfeh & Bawole, 2009; Cobbinah et al., 2013a), focussing on capital investment in physical infrastructure (Singleton, 2003), social investment in health and education development (World Bank, 1980), improvement in economic efficiency and management (World Bank, 2000), and the implementation of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (World Bank, 2003), yet poverty is persistent in developing countries (Todaro & Smith, 2006). It has been suggested by Singleton (2003) and the World Bank (2000; 2003) that the neglect of
environmental and cultural issues, economic crises, weak institutions and political instability are among the major factors contributing to the failure of poverty reduction approaches (see Chapter 2).

A widely held view is that poverty is detrimental to sustainable development (see Section 2.6.3), and that it encourages the practice of unsustainable natural resource exploitation, particularly in developing countries (Ashiomanedu, 2008; United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] & United Nations Environment Programme [UNEP], 2009). The relationship between the environment and the economy is central to sustainable development, thus a worsening poverty situation is detrimental to development and environmental conservation objectives (Pearce & Barbier, 2000). As a result, poverty reduction remains one of the persistent global challenges facing the world today, particularly for developing countries (Redford et al., 2013; UN, 2002). Thus, research into the nature and causes of poverty, and interventions to improve the wellbeing of the poor, continue to be a priority (Bastiaensen et al., 2005; Rao, 2003; UN, 2013).

1.2 Ecotourism as a means of reducing poverty in developing countries

Tourism has been recognised as a tool for reducing poverty in developing countries (Bricker et al., 2012; Cobbinah et al., 2013b; Scheyvens, 2008; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012; Truong et al., 2014; Zhao & Ritchie, 2007). Since 2000, following the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (UN, 2000), the international agreement on the importance of global poverty elimination has established a strong linkage between the natural environment and poverty reduction, especially amongst local communities. This international agreement further identified tourism as one of the few development opportunities with the capacity to reduce poverty (see Chapter 3). Socio-economic gains and environmental conservation have been the driving forces behind the growth of tourism, especially in developing countries (Shah et al., 2002). The use of tourism development as a means of poverty reduction has been the major focus of several development agencies, including the Department for International Development (DFID), the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), and the World Bank, and has become a powerful engine for accelerating
socio-economic development, and for safeguarding biodiversity and cultural heritage (Gossling et al., 2009; UNDP, 2011) (see Chapter 3).

Given its potential to reduce poverty, there is growing recognition that tourism development cannot be detached from the environment and the wellbeing of the local communities, in terms of social and cultural interactions, environmental conservation and delivery of economic benefits (Bricker et al., 2012; Cobbinah et al., 2013b; Honey, 2008; Segbefia, 2008; UN, 2003). Courvisanos and Jain (2006) have identified ecotourism, a sector within the tourism industry, as a potentially prosperous economic industry that delivers ecologically sustainable development to regions endowed with a wealth of natural environment. Ecotourism is defined as small scale travelling to fragile, pristine and protected areas with the fundamental objective of educating travellers, providing funds for conservation, yielding direct benefits for the economic development and political empowerment of the local communities, as well as fostering respect for different cultures and human rights (Baral, 2013; Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Honey, 1999).

Ecotourism has the potential to achieve socio-cultural, economic and environmental targets in developing countries, as it creates opportunities to improve the livelihood of host communities by reducing their poverty levels, stimulating pro-poor growth, empowering local people and preserving local cultural heritage (Bricker et al., 2012; Epler Wood, 2002; Honey, 2008; Scheyvens, 1999; Spenceley, 2010). With its pro-poor growth potential, many scholars (e.g., Ashley et al., 2000; Goodwin, 2009; Rogerson, 2006, Spenceley & Snyman, 2012) are promoting pro-poor initiatives both in ecotourism and in other forms of tourism. The pro-poor tourism approach has poverty reduction as its utmost priority and ensures that tourism delivers benefits to the poor, and does not erode the environmental and cultural resources on which it depends (Ashley et al., 2000; Goodwin, 2009; Jamieson et al., 2004).

Today, a number of developing countries are strongly promoting ecotourism as a means of reducing poverty and conserving the environment (Adams & Infield, 2003; Gurung & Seeland, 2008; 2009), including Indonesia, Nepal, Uganda and Costa Rica (see Chapter 3). Studies (e.g., Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Honey, 2008; Kiss, 2004) have shown that poverty reduction can be achieved when ecotourism planning,
development and management are strongly monitored to ensure that tourism delivers increasing benefits to the poor at the local level while reducing negative impacts.

However, lack of common understanding of the concept of ecotourism amongst stakeholders, including academics (Donohoe & Needham, 2006), coupled with the unsuccessful application of ecotourism theory in host communities (Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Ross & Wall, 1999a), has resulted in limited economic benefits (Sarrasin, 2013), increasing negative environmental effects such as pollution (Roberts & Thanos, 2003), adulteration of local culture and invasion of foreign culture into local communities (Ormsby & Mannie, 2006), long-term dependence on external support (Kiss, 2004), and conflicts over ownership of resources (Hernandez et al., 2005). These factors have limited the potential of ecotourism to reduce poverty in developing countries (Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Schellhorn, 2010).

Generally, there is global recognition and agreement amongst researchers, national governments, international organisations and tourism practitioners that ecotourism has the potential to deliver sustainable outcomes to conserve the environment and improve the living conditions of the people in host communities, particularly in developing countries where poverty is persistent (see Chapter 3). In addition, it is widely reported in the literature and commonly established that there is a gap between the conceptual understanding of ecotourism, and its application on the ground, leading to minimal ecotourism benefits (e.g., Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Honey, 2002; Ross & Wall, 1999a; Weaver, 2005).

The general consensus among researchers (e.g., Charnley, 2005; Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Epler Wood, 2002; Honey, 2008) is that ecotourism cannot be considered sustainable and a panacea to poverty unless the theoretical principles of the concept, including community benefits, minimisation of negative environmental impacts, and protection of local culture, are applied in its development and implementation. Despite the general consensus amongst researchers in relation to the role of ecotourism in achieving poverty reduction, limited studies (e.g., Ross & Wall, 1999b; Stone & Wall, 2004) have assessed the theoretical understanding and principles of ecotourism, how they have been applied in ecotourism destinations, and the outcomes, especially on poverty reduction.
However, Donohoe & Needham (2006) have explained that evaluation of ecotourism remains vital to understanding the operationalisation of the concept, and should be given a high research priority.

1.3 Ecotourism and poverty reduction in Ghana

Poverty in Ghana is multidimensional and largely a rural phenomenon (see Chapter 5). In Ghana, about one-third of the total population live below the poverty line (US$ 1.25 per day) (Ghana Statistical Service [GSS], 2012), and lack access to, quality of and use of basic services such as health, water, sanitation and education (Government of Ghana [GoG], 2003), with increasing deprivation in rural areas (GSS, 2012). Attempts to reduce poverty in Ghana date back to the colonial period (before 1960) (see Chapter 5). However, these poverty reduction interventions have been ineffective, due to overconcentration on economic indicators and limited consideration for the socio-cultural needs of the poor (Aryeetey & McKay, 2004; Asiedu, 2002). Researchers in Ghana (e.g., Asiedu, 2002; Akyeampong 2011), as well as the national government, have identified tourism as a potential strategy to engage more with the poor and promote local level development.

Tourism in Ghana remains the fastest growing sector of the economy, and a major tool for reducing poverty, stimulating economic growth and conserving the environment (Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008). The GoG, upon realising the contribution of tourism to economic growth, has broadened the scope of its economic development pillars (e.g., agriculture) to include tourism (Teye, 2000). In the 1970s, a number of studies were undertaken in Ghana to evaluate the potential social, cultural and economic impacts of tourism (see Chapter 5). These impact studies led to the enactment of the Ghana Tourist Control Authority Act 1973, a legislative instrument to guide and facilitate tourism planning in Ghana. The development of tourism through policy and planning in the 1990s led to the expansion of the sub sectors of the tourism industry, including ecotourism (see Chapter 5). Today, ecotourism has become a viable option for conserving the environment and generating revenue for the government, whilst providing sources of livelihood and income to host communities, especially in rural Ghana where most ecotourism resources exist (Akyeampong, 2011; Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008; Asiedu, 2002).
Since 1993, the government, via the Ministry of Tourism, has promoted all forms of tourism in Ghana through tourism policies, for the purpose of generating wealth, creating employment, reducing poverty and conserving the environment, as well as ensuring national and international cohesion through tourist visitation. The role of the Ministry of Tourism is at the national level. At the regional level, the Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA) acts as the Ministry’s implementation agency. The GTA implements the tourism policies with the objective of ensuring sustainable tourism development by focusing on marketing, research, quality assurance, human resource development, and planning and business development. However, there are no tourism administrative structures at the district level. This situation appears to have resulted in ineffective functioning of the GTA, as it lacks the capacity to implement and monitor all tourism-related activities in the various districts within the regions (see Chapter 5).

The practice of decentralisation of government in Ghana requires all government agencies to have local/district level structures, to ensure effective implementation of policies and programmes (see Chapter 5). Presently, the absence of tourism administrative structures at the local level has resulted in poor planning and implementation of ecotourism activities in Ghana (see Chapters 5 & 7). There is no coordinated approach to ecotourism management in rural host communities, as different government agencies with different vested interests manage ecotourism. Thus, the impact of ecotourism on poverty reduction in rural communities is limited, lost or unknown as poverty conditions in these communities continue to worsen (Asiedu, 2002; Bediako, 2000) (see Chapters 5 & 6). Although there have been studies, in relation to the contribution of tourism to poverty and development in developing countries, including Ghana (e.g., Akyeampong, 2011; Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008; Honey, 2008; Kiss, 2004), there has been limited research to verify and assess the implementation and management of ecotourism, and its outcomes, in developing countries.

1.4 The research gap, aim and key questions

Although the use of ecotourism as a sustainable local development strategy and poverty reduction intervention has been recognised in developing countries, there have been limited in-depth studies focusing on how ecotourism theory has been
applied in host communities, and the resultant outcomes in relation to improving the living conditions of local residents, and achieving poverty reduction. Segbefia (2008) argues that four key questions often remain unanswered when developing a sustainable tourism attraction in developing countries, particularly Ghana: Do local community members endorse the tourism activity? Are they involved in tourism decision making? Do individuals and the local community benefit from tourism activities? And, do community members own and take pride in the tourism activity?

Given the potential of ecotourism to stimulate local level development in developing countries (Asiedu, 2002; Baral, 2013; Cobbinah et al., 2013b; Honey, 2008), Ghanaian people, particularly rural dwellers, should have the opportunity to assess ecotourism implementation, their level of involvement, benefits and challenges, as well as management of outcomes.

Conceptually, this research seeks to evaluate ecotourism implementation and its outcomes on poverty reduction in rural Ghana. This research also responds to the call from ecotourism scholars (e.g., Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Ross & Wall, 1999a) for further research into the design and operationalisation of ecotourism theory, particularly in developing countries.

**Aim of research**

The aim of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the nature and dynamics of poverty, and of the role and potential of ecotourism in reducing poverty, as well as providing an understanding of effective ecotourism implementation and management in developing countries, particularly Ghana. Four key issues in relation to the concept of ecotourism remain unexplored in developing countries:

- Understanding of the concept of ecotourism by ecotourism operators and agencies in host destinations;
- Planning of ecotourism in host destinations;
- Implementation of ecotourism, based on its theoretical principles; and
- Outcomes (i.e. benefits and costs) of ecotourism on poverty reduction (as illustrated in Figure 1.1).
As mentioned in Section 1.2, the concept of ecotourism lacks clear meaning amongst stakeholders. It is therefore important to explore how agencies responsible for ecotourism management in the host regions understand and interpret the ecotourism concept. In this research, agencies whose activities are directly or indirectly related to ecotourism were considered, because there are multiple agencies linked to ecotourism management in Ghana (see Chapter 5). The understanding and interpretations of ecotourism by these agencies are essential in understanding how ecotourism is planned in the host communities.

Ecotourism planning encompasses the policies, plans and institutional framework required to implement ecotourism. Ecotourism planning is imperative to ensure successful implementation of ecotourism, as issues of community engagement and positive experiences are contingent on the effectiveness of available ecotourism policies and plans, and institutional frameworks (see Charnley, 2005; Stone & Wall, 2004). Also, the extent of community involvement and the delivery of positive experiences from ecotourism implementation will largely determine the outcomes of ecotourism in host communities and regions (see Chapter 3). Thus, understanding the concept of ecotourism, its planning and implementation, is critical in assessing the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction in rural Ghana.
Research questions

The research findings reported in this thesis were framed and guided by three broad research questions and a series of sub-research questions, which emerged from a literature review of poverty, development, tourism and ecotourism.

1. How does ecotourism contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries?
   a) What has been the experience of the role of ecotourism on poverty reduction in developing countries?
   b) What are the theories and characteristics of ecotourism?
   c) What is the state of poverty in Ghana?
   d) What is the state of ecotourism in Ghana?
   e) What are the dynamics of poverty in the case study communities?

2. How is the theory of ecotourism applied in and around the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA) in Ghana?
   a) How effective are tourism policies/plans in managing ecotourism activities in and around the KCA?
   b) How is the concept of ecotourism locally interpreted by agencies in and around the KCA?
   c) How is ecotourism in the KCA planned?
   d) How is ecotourism implemented and managed in and around the KCA?

3. What are the outcomes of ecotourism activities in and around the KCA on poverty reduction in the case study communities?
   a) What are the positive and negative outcomes of ecotourism in the case study communities?
   b) How are the outcomes of ecotourism activities distributed amongst the case study communities?
   c) In what ways have ecotourism outcomes contributed to poverty reduction in the case study communities?
1.5 Overview of research methods

Ecotourism researchers (e.g., Ross & Wall, 1999a; Donohoe & Needham, 2006) have argued the need for clarity in ecotourism interpretation and a framework for evaluating its implementation at the local level. Since the 1990s, many ecotourism evaluation frameworks have been developed, such as ‘the Ecotourism Empowerment Framework’ (Scheyvens, 1999), ‘the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework’ (Ross & Wall, 1999a), and ‘a Framework for Sustainable Ecotourism’ (Courvisanos & Jain, 2006). Based on reviews of these frameworks, this research adopted Ross & Wall’s (1999a) Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework to examine ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA (see Chapter 3 for detailed discussion). In addition, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are used as a framework to assess the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities.

This research is guided by a pragmatic paradigm (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), using a mixed methods approach (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This research used the KCA as a case study area (Section 4.4.1 provides justification for the selection of the KCA). Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected from eight relevant agencies responsible for ecotourism management and four case study communities around the KCA. The four case study communities were purposively selected for their diverse and varied experiences with ecotourism and poverty reduction interventions, and for location relative to the KCA (see Chapter 4).

The primary data collection was undertaken from April-July 2012 and follow-up confirmatory research took place in February-March 2014, using four data collection techniques. The first involved semi-structured interviews with officials of the eight agencies – government, private and NGOs – which contributed to answering Research Questions One and Two. The second technique involved a household questionnaire survey with 310 participants from the four case study communities. Data from the household survey helped in answering Research Questions Two and Three. The third technique was in-depth interviews with 10 residents from each of the four communities, based on their understanding of poverty and ecotourism activities as revealed through the household survey. The in-depth interview data contributed to
answering Research Questions One, Two and Three. The fourth technique involved participant observation, which was useful in validating responses provided by the respondents. The confirmatory research phase used presentations and community meetings to validate and seek clarification on issues raised during the first data collection.

Content and descriptive statistical analyses were used to analyse the data, based on an inductive and deductive approach (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Content analysis was used to analyse documents on tourism, ecotourism and poverty with the aid of NVIVO 10 software. Descriptive statistical analysis focused on the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities, using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software package to generate tables and graphs.

1.6 Organisation of the thesis

This research is divided into three parts. Part One provides the background and sets the context for the research. Part Two examines the empirical findings from the case study area, and Part Three discusses and synthesises the research findings.

Part One of the research includes Chapters One to Three. Chapter One provides the introduction and justification for the research. Chapter Two presents the literature review on poverty and development in developing countries. Chapter Three reviews literature on ecotourism and poverty reduction.

Part Two of the research consists of Chapters Four to Eight. In Chapter Four, the research methodology is described. Chapter Five is the first results chapter and describes the case study area. Chapter Six presents the nature and dynamics of poverty in the case study communities. In Chapter Seven, tourism policy and ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA, and the case study communities’ experiences are described. Chapter Eight presents the findings on the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities.

In Part Three of the research comprising Chapter Nine, discussion of the research results, recommendations and a conclusion are presented. Recommendations for further ecotourism and poverty reduction research are also outlined in Chapter Nine.
Chapter Two
Conceptual understanding of poverty reduction:
Unveiling the key issues

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the first of two chapters which present literature for this research, the relationship between poverty and development, especially in developing countries, is reviewed. It focuses on the following major areas: the concepts and definitions of poverty and poverty reduction, development, and sustainable development. This discussion leads to Chapter Three, which addresses issues relating to tourism development and poverty reduction, as well as ecotourism implementation and its associated poverty reduction outcomes. Figure 2.1 shows the major themes from the literature that are covered in Chapters Two and Three.

According to Cobbinah et al. (2013a), the term ‘poverty’ has been described in different ways throughout the world, due to its multidimensional nature (Hossain, 2012). Developed countries mainly focus on social exclusion and inequality in resource distribution in their descriptions of poverty, while the developing countries understand poverty mainly as deprivation, in relation to access to basic services (e.g., food, water) (Morazes & Pintak, 2006). Despite the differences in perspectives, research indicates that about 1.2 billion people in the world live on an income of US$
1.25 or less a day, and are confronted with the reality and severity of poverty (UN, 2013). As a result, both developed and developing countries are seeking permanent solutions to the phenomenon (Morazes & Pintak, 2006).

On the other hand, the concept of development has also undergone significant changes over the past six decades, as will be discussed later in the chapter. However, both the concepts of poverty and development are multifaceted, with their interpretations being influenced by national governments, international organisations, researchers and development practitioners’ philosophies, context, purpose, culture and time (Cobbinah et al., 2011; Hobsbawm, 1972).

To understand the relationship between poverty and development, it is important to establish the theoretical basis of these terms. According to Weaver and Lawton (2007, p.1169)

“… an important indication of the maturation of any field of study is agreement, or near-agreement, over the terms of reference that pertain to the phenomena of interest and subsequently allow them to be investigated, and knowledge accumulated, in an orderly manner”.

This chapter first provides the history and current thinking on poverty. It further examines the causes of poverty and the available poverty reduction approaches with particular emphasis on developing countries. This discussion is followed by a presentation on the relationship between poverty and development which explores the concepts of development and sustainable development.

2.2 Historical perspective and analysis of the concept of poverty

Poverty is endowed with a rich vocabulary in all cultures, regions and throughout history (Philip & Rayhan, 2004; Simon, 1999). According to the *Random House Webster's unabridged dictionary*, the origin of the concept of poverty can be traced back to the 12th century, when the word was used primarily to refer to ‘small means or moderate circumstances’ (Random House Incorporated, 2009). The concept, however, lacked clarification as to what “constitutes small means or moderate circumstances, and basically hints towards both, poverty as means (inputs, such as commodities and income) and ends (opportunities and status in society)” (Vollmer,
Due to the uncertainty regarding the specification of the term, Hobsbawm (1972), in the article ‘The social function of the past’, outlined several factors including culture, space, time, philosophical worldviews, customs and conventions of society that have led to different interpretations of the concept of poverty across different regions.

According to Simon (1999), poverty was perceived on the basis of subsistence needs, and used indicators such as availability of food, clothing and shelter in the 19th century. This was emphasised in Rowntree’s publication in 1901, which was the first to develop a poverty standard for individual families, based on estimates of nutritional and other requirements (Philip & Rayhan, 2004). This interpretation and focus of poverty evolved from the 1900s to the 1960s where more emphasis was placed on economic indicators, and poverty was determined based on per capita income (Vollmer, 2010). The economic indicators that were used shifted the poverty focus from subsistence needs to economic growth (increase in production of goods and services), to the neglect of other socio-cultural factors, including education, housing, health and clothing (Philip & Rayhan, 2004; Simon, 1999). By the late 1960s, people began to question the economic definition of poverty because the model, which explained poverty primarily according to economic criteria (e.g., income), ignored the social and political problems which accompanied poverty. These problems included the collapse of social and political structures, resulting in an increase in crime, deprivation and dependency, as well as increasing inequalities among individuals, groups and regions (Seers, 1969; Thompson, 1981). The definition of poverty was further developed beyond the scope of the economic indicators to focus on satisfaction of basic needs (Seers, 1969). Seers (1969) identified basic needs to include income, employment and physical necessities for a basic standard of living (e.g., shelter and food).

In the 1970s, the problems associated with the economic definition of poverty led to a new interpretation and focus, which considered human welfare. This new focus viewed poverty within the broader concept of development (see Section 2.6), and was first expressed in a statement known as the “Cocoyoc Declaration”, which states:
“... Our first concern is to redefine the whole purpose of development. This should not be to develop things but to develop man. Human beings have basic needs: food, shelter, clothing, health and education. Any process of growth that does not lead to their fulfillment - or, even worse, disrupts them is a travesty of the idea of development” (Ghai, 1977, p.6).

This new focus of poverty emphasised the need to consider equitable distribution of national wealth, and was preceded by Robert MacNamara’s celebrated speech on equitable distribution of wealth presented to the World Bank Board of Governors in Nairobi in 1973 (Philip & Rayhan, 2004; Simon, 1999). This new way of defining poverty was characterised by indicators such as the general quality of human life and the natural environment (Simon, 1999). Other social indicators were highlighted by the UNDP, including living a long and healthy life, being educated, and enjoying a decent standard of living (UNDP, 1990).

During the early 1980s, there was a shift of focus from basic needs to economic means of defining poverty with increasing concentration on using ‘income deprivation’ as an indicator. According to Vollmer (2010), this situation arose as a result of the increased dominance of neo-liberals in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Despite the dominance of public and policy debate on the concept of economic deprivation of poverty (Vollmer, 2010), there were several studies on non-monetary wellbeing, including empowerment, social inclusion, education, health and nutrition, which gained global attention during this period (Chambers, 1983; World Bank, 1980). The mid 1980s witnessed the broadening of the concept of poverty to a wider construct. ‘Livelihood’ was adopted by the Brundtland Commission on Sustainability and Environment, which popularised the term ‘sustainable livelihood’ (Simon, 1999; World Commission on Environment and Development [WCED], 1987). In the late 1980s, the poverty debate gradually shifted its focus from economic means alone to include culture and gender, with policies to empower women (Simon, 1999). Since the late 1980s, several studies have been carried out on culture and gender in relation to poverty (Longres, 2000; Schriver, 2004). For example, Longres (2000) discusses poverty by examining culture and ethnicity, as well as minority experiences, while Schriver (2004) explains poverty by probing into issues of gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and individual families living in poverty.
During the 1990s, the economic focus of poverty was highly contested by a number of researchers (e.g., Nussbaum & Sen 1993; Sen, 1992, 1996) and international organisations (e.g., UNDP, 1990). Simon (1999, p.2) indicates that “the idea of wellbeing came to act as a metaphor for absence of poverty, with concomitant emphasis on how poor people themselves view their situation”. Consequently, the launching of the UNDP ‘Human Development Report’ in 1990, focused on social wellbeing by enlarging peoples’ choices taking into consideration individuals’ physical conditions. The influence of the UNDP and some researchers (e.g., Nussbaum & Sen 1993; Sen 1992) during the 1990s resulted in a different focus on the definition of poverty, and considered both economic (income poverty) and non-economic (human poverty) factors.

Economic (income) poverty, according to the World Bank, refers to individuals earning incomes less than US$ 1.25 a day for the poorest countries, and US$ 2 a day for poor developing countries (Noble et al., 2004; Ravalion, 2003; UNDP, 2005). In relation to non-economic (human) poverty, Sen (1992) puts human beings at the centre of policy, plan and programme through the allocation of entitlements, including command of resources. Vollmer (2010, p.75) adds that “these entitlements were created through endowments (assets owned) and exchanges (production and trade by the individual) and that these entitlements often take place in the non-monetary/non-marketed economy (in the subsistence)”.

The achievement of conditions of individual wellbeing requires policies that focus on the enhancement of people’s capabilities (Vollmer, 2010). As a consequence, the World Bank report ‘Voices of the poor’ validates the importance of entitlements in improving the wellbeing of the poor, through asset endowments (natural, social, financial, human and material assets). Equity in the distribution of the assets is also critical to improving the wellbeing of the poor (World Bank, 1999).

In the mid 1990s and early 2000s there were several international congresses which viewed poverty as a ‘multidimensional phenomenon’, and notable among them was the Copenhagen World Summit on Social Development 1995 (Sumner, 2007). Recognising the multidimensional nature of poverty in the 21st century, the World Bank in the World Development Report 2000 explained poverty “as a pronounced
deprivation in wellbeing” characterised by hunger, lack of shelter and clothing, sicknesses and diseases, and illiteracy. The focus was on poor people, as they are “particularly vulnerable to adverse events outside their control, and are often treated badly by state institutions and society, as well as being excluded from voice and power in those institutions” (p.15). Thus, the multidimensional nature of poverty:

“… arises when people lack key capabilities, and so have inadequate income or education, or poor health, or insecurity, or low self-confidence, or a sense of powerlessness, or the absence of rights such as freedom of speech” (Haughton & Khandker, 2009, p.2).

Inherent in the multidimensional nature of poverty are multiple deprivations (low income, poor housing, poor access to education and health), and the process by which multiple deprivation occurs (Simon, 1999). Table 2.1 summarises the focus and indicators of the concept of poverty from the 1960s to 2000s.

Table 2.1 Focus, Indicators and Challenges of the Poverty Concept, 1960s – 2000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Growth in per capita income, Gross Domestic Product (GDP)</td>
<td>Social and political problems such as deprivation, inequality and dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Basic needs, welfare and economic growth</td>
<td>Provision of services such as education, health and shelter. Redistribution with growth</td>
<td>Increased dominance of neo liberals in the World Bank and IMF, leading to income definition of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Income, sustainable livelihood, culture and gender</td>
<td>Establishment of Breton Woods Institutions and emergence of social development activists</td>
<td>Overemphasis on economic conceptualisation of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Human development</td>
<td>Human development indices (both economic and non-economic) such as income and command over resources</td>
<td>Less emphasis on the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Human development and environmental sustainability</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)</td>
<td>Lack of political will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Philip and Rayhan (2004); Sen (1992); Simon (1999); Sumner (2007); UN (2000); UNDP (1990, 2005); Vollmer (2010); WCED (1987).
The complexities surrounding the focus of poverty over the years paved the way for better indicators, focusing on the multidimensionality of poverty in what has become known as the MDGs (UN, 2000; Vollmer, 2010), which represent the most widely accepted and high-profile statement of international commitment to reduce the number of people living in poverty (Jamieson & Nadkarni, 2009). Although the MDGs further emphasise the economic concept of poverty, and define poverty as individuals living on less than US$ 1.25 or US$ 2 per day (Jamieson & Nadkarni, 2009), other socio-cultural definitions of poverty such as literacy rate, participation, environmental conservation and healthy life, are covered by the MDGs (see Section 2.5.1) (Sumner, 2007; UN, 2000).

2.3 Defining the multidimensional nature of poverty

Although the concept of poverty has evolved over the past half a century, there is little semblance of definitional consensus amongst stakeholders (Cobbinah et al., 2013a). Since its recognition and dominance in international and national discussions, different researchers and international organisations have provided different definitions of poverty (e.g., Pillari & Newsome, 1998; Sen, 2000; Townsend, 1979). As a result, academic interest has been roused, with scholars actively engaged in the challenging task of defining the concept of poverty (Sen, 2000; Vollmer, 2010). This burgeoning interest and proliferation of poverty interpretations, coupled with the lack of a universally agreed definition, have resulted in a great deal of confusion amongst stakeholders regarding the ‘true meaning’ of the concept (Cobbinah et al., 2013a). This section reviews the definitions of poverty that depict and address its multidimensional character, in relation to the situation in developing countries.

As Pillari and Newsome (1998) claim, poverty can be defined as a structural problem causing homelessness, unemployment, and oppression. Sen (2000, p.3), being challenged with the multidimensional nature of the concept, indicates that “poverty must be seen in terms of poor living, rather than just as lowness of incomes and nothing else”. Poverty is basically about inadequate or lack of resources, which makes participation in socio-economic activities and political processes impossible (Whelan, 2007). This definition of poverty is encapsulated in a broader description given by Townsend (1979):
“... Individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the type of diet, participate in activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or are at least widely encouraged or approved, in the society to which they belong. Their resources are seriously below those commanded by the average individual or family that they are, in effect, excluded from ordinary living patterns and activities” (p.31).

Townsend’s (1979) definition broadens the scope of poverty as deprivation, indicating its relativity and the dualistic nature of human beings as both physical and social beings. In congruence, the European Commission (2007) defines poverty as applying to individuals and groups of persons whose limited resources have excluded them from enjoying life at the minimum acceptable level considered by the Member State to which they belong. However, Nyasulu (2010) contests that the latter definition assumes that it is acceptable to be in poor conditions, however deplorable, as long as the Member State has not declared them as such, and thus abrogates the responsibility of focusing on a less contentious issue of ‘person’ or ‘group of persons’ in a Member State. Nyasulu (2010) argues that poverty should be viewed as a condition that undermines individuals’ dignity, and should not be what a Member State says or thinks, or what a particular culture accepts. But rather “poverty is poverty, regardless of one’s geographic location and has everything to do with the dignity of the human spirit in particular conditions, and not what is considered politically correct or culturally acceptable” (Nyasula, 2010, p.149).

Other attempts to understand and describe poverty have been related to the environment and governance (e.g., Adejumobi, 2006; Ajagun & Aiya, 2012; Redford et al., 2013; UNDP & UNEP, 2009; WCED, 1987). In relation to the environment, the UNDP and UNEP (2009) explain that poor people, especially in developing countries, depend excessively on natural resources and the environment for their livelihood, and are most vulnerable to natural and environmental disasters (e.g., floods and droughts). As a result, many regions of the world are trapped in a vicious downward spiral, as poor people are compelled to overuse environmental resources to survive from day to day, leading to environmental impoverishment, which further impoverishes them (WCED, 1987). This situation aggravates the poverty condition and makes survival of the poor more difficult and uncertain (WCED, 1987).
Governance has also entered the global poverty discourse (Adejumobi, 2006; Ajagun & Aiya, 2012). Given that governance provides the institutional, legal and political frameworks for structuring poverty reduction strategies, it has become central to poverty discussions, as without good governance poor policies ensue. The result is a lack of voice and power for the poor and the vulnerable in society (Adejumobi, 2006; Ajagun & Aiya, 2012).

The concept of poverty has also been defined in ‘absolute’ and ‘relative’ terms (e.g., Noble et al., 2004; Sen, 2000; Spicker, 2013; World Bank, 2000). The concept of ‘absolute’ poverty refers to poverty that exists independently of any reference group, and does not depend on the general living standards of the society in which it is conceived (Nobel et al., 2004). Noble et al. (2004) view ‘absolute’ poverty as a situation or condition pertaining to a specific locality or group, not a globally accepted pattern of life, and thus poverty solutions must be context specific. According to the UN (1995) ‘absolute’ poverty is defined as a condition characterised by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information, which Spicker (2013) refers to as survival based on minimal subsistence level. Economically, this approach perceives poverty as not having an adequate income level to enable a person or household to satisfy basic needs such as food, clothing and shelter (Nyasulu, 2010). In this situation poverty is usually measured by the value, in real terms, of the goods required to ensure some form of minimum subsistence, that is, the value of basic food or the minimum income required to have decent lives (Bellu, 2005).

Although Alcock (1993) claims that absolute poverty is objective and represents a scientific notion, it has been argued that definitions of absolute poverty contain some elements of relativity (Noble et al., 2004). The ‘relative’ concept of poverty connotes a standard of living in relation to the position of other people in the income/expenditure distribution (Spicker, 2013), and considers poverty basically as a phenomenon of inequality (Bellu, 2005). The concepts of absolute and relative poverty have been widely debated in the poverty literature (Noble et al., 2004; Spicker, 2013; UN, 1995). Spicker (2013) argues that the concepts of absolute and relative poverty are based on political positions, with the absolute poverty concept...
viewing poverty as a limited problem with restricted state response, while the relative poverty concept considers poverty as a widespread phenomenon caused by structural problems in society. However, Seidl (1988, p.79) indicates that “poverty is neither a strictly absolute nor a strictly relative concept”.

The multidimensionality of poverty is recognised as a global phenomenon as stakeholders are constantly confronted by poverty (Nyasulu, 2010). As a consequence of its universal recognition, the UN (1995) describes it:

“… as mass poverty in many developing countries, pockets of poverty amid wealth in developed countries, loss of livelihoods as a result of economic recession, sudden poverty as a result of disaster or conflict, the poverty of low-wage workers, and the utter destitution of people who fall outside family support systems, social institutions and safety nets” (p.41).

The preceding discussion on poverty has revealed the multidimensional nature of the phenomenon. For the purpose of this research, poverty is defined as a condition of powerlessness (e.g., unemployment, lack of income, social discrimination and exclusion, and lack of participation in decision making) that deprives individuals, groups, regions and countries from protecting the environment and enjoying basic human needs, including food, employment opportunities, education, shelter, and sanitation facilities. This definition is based on the various interpretations of the concept discussed earlier by different authors and organisations.

Although poverty is globally recognised as a multidimensional phenomenon, Domfeh and Bawole (2009) claim that the form and nature vary from one place to another. While the poverty literature in the developed countries describes structural poverty and focuses on social exclusion, literature on the developing countries primarily focuses on issues of deprivation, powerlessness, and access to basic services (see Appendix 1 for details). The next section explores the causes of poverty.

2.4 Causes of poverty

Recent literature acknowledges multiple causes of poverty, comprising economic, social, and political circumstances (e.g., Blank, 2003; Holden, 2013; Hossain, 2012; Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005; Lehning, 2006; Rodgers, 2000). On the economic front, Blank (2003) proposes six approaches for describing the fundamental causes of
poverty, which are applicable to both developed and developing countries. These approaches are explained as follows:

1. **Economic underdevelopment**: Poverty results from the absence of an effectively functioning market. Thus developing countries can overcome their economic underdevelopment through the expansion of markets of less endowed or poor regions;

2. **Human capital development**: The absence of employable (skilled) labour resulting from the lack of opportunities, and the unpreparedness of individuals to participate in the workforce are principal causes of poverty;

3. **Dysfunctional market**: Dysfunctional markets create poverty. In a capitalist society, the cost of labour is made lower through the threat of unemployment. Therefore poverty is managed through regulation of the market;

4. **Social and political forces**: Issues relating to political and social favouritism and racism, which occur outside the market, are a major cause of poverty;

5. **Human behaviour and choices**: Poverty is linked to individual behavioural characteristics and choices, such as marriage, family size or alcohol and substance abuse. Values about work and education that underlie this perspective indicate the problem of poverty is within the control of the poor themselves; and

6. **Poverty traps**: This perspective views poverty as being caused by the efforts to reduce it. Blank (2003) refers to this as the welfare dependency. It has been argued by Jung and Smith (2006) that welfare provides a guaranteed cash incentive while taxation creates a disincentive to work. This creates a situation where short-term cash benefits hamper long-term anti-poverty efforts, thereby causing poverty.

However, the notion that poverty is caused by individual behaviour and choices is contested. Rank (2004) argues that the structural failings of the economic, political, and social system of a country’s economy are the major cause of poverty, and that the focus on individual attributes as the cause of poverty is misplaced and misdirected.

From a sociological point of view, Moreira (2003) identifies globalisation and the spread of capitalism as the major causes of both wealth and poverty. Moreira (2003)
argues that globalisation operates in a selective manner, including and excluding sections of economies and societies from information sharing, resulting in pockets of rich and poor. Turner and Lehning (2006) suggest that Moreira’s resentment against globalisation is due to the dissemination of Western culture’s greed for material goods, which she considers to be responsible for a particular kind of poverty called “Consumerist Poverty” or “Consumerist Syndrome”. However, Lott (2002) sees classism as both a cause and effect of poverty. To Lott (2002), classists purposefully erect barriers to maintain inequities, and also limit access to resources required for ensuring optimal health and welfare. Basing her arguments on ‘Williams’ 1993 classical theory of society’s power structure’ (Williams, 1993), Lott (2002) states that the upper class purposefully classifies people into lower, middle, and upper classes in order to maintain its power, and to prevent the lower classes from receiving an equal share of resources (Turner & Lehning, 2006).

From a political perspective, poverty is caused by lack of participation in political activities, including voting, political protest, or contacting elected officials (Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005). Lehning (2006) indicates that those living in poverty tend to be poorly organised, and that the impacts of anti-poverty policies are felt less by the poor. Another political dimension of the causes of poverty is the ‘culture of poverty’, and it is characterised by the incapacity of a cultural group to work towards any goal beyond the immediate material interest of the nuclear family (Bradshaw, 2006). The culture of poverty impedes the ability of individuals to either engage in political associations, or to create enterprises to promote economic development (Lehning, 2006).

As presented in Table 2.2, Bradshaw (2006) theorises the causes of poverty and summarises them into five categories, which are similar to Blank’s (2003). However, while Blank focuses on only economic causes, Bradshaw’s categorisation of poverty is broader in perspective, encompassing the economic, social, cultural, political and geographic spheres of life (see Appendix 2 for details).
Table 2.2 Five Theories of the Causes of Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Causes of Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual</td>
<td>Economic, Political</td>
<td>Individual laziness, bad choice, incompetence, inherent disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural</td>
<td>Cultural, Economic,</td>
<td>Subculture adopts values that are non-productive, and are contrary to norms of success, such as gender discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Political-economic structure</td>
<td>Political, Sociological</td>
<td>Globalisation and systematic barriers prevent poor from access and accomplishment in key social institutions, including jobs, education housing, health care, safety, political representation, participation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Geographic and environmental</td>
<td>Geographical, environmental</td>
<td>Social advantages and disadvantages concentrate in separate areas (urban and rural).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cumulative and cyclical</td>
<td>Economic, political, sociological</td>
<td>Spirals of poverty, problems for individuals (earnings, housing, health, education, self-confidence) are interdependent and strongly linked to community deficiencies (e.g., loss of jobs, inability to provide social services) etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Bradshaw (2006).

2.5 Evolution of poverty reduction strategies in developing countries

Historically, the term ‘poverty reduction’ in relation to developing countries has been used purposely to refer to direct interventions in the provision of facilities that are lacking, and to finding solutions to deficiencies in infrastructure, utilising investments from international lending agencies (Singleton, 2003). Poverty reduction strategies have evolved over the past 50 years, in response to a deepening understanding of the complexity of development (Domfeh & Bawole, 2009; World Bank, 2000). In the 1950s and 1960s, large investments in physical capital infrastructure, according to Domfeh and Bawole (2009), were regarded as a primary measure of poverty reduction. Despite this approach, poverty was persistent, due to lack of planning for ongoing operation and maintenance of the facilities, limited attention to the development of a sense of ownership by the local community, political interference, and corruption leading to ineffectiveness of investment (Singleton, 2003).

There was a gradual shift of focus in poverty reduction in the 1970s, from physical capital infrastructure development to health and education (Domfeh & Bawole,
The World Development Report 1980 (World Bank, 1980) articulated this understanding, and argued that improvements in health and education were not only important in their own right, but also facilitated and promoted growth in incomes of the poor (World Bank, 2000). However, Fukuda-Parr (2006) believes that strategies to reduce poverty should not be limited to economic growth and redistribution, but rather incorporate interventions in areas such as expansion of education, combating discrimination and achieving social justice.

During the 1980s, another shift of emphasis in poverty reduction occurred following the debt crisis and global recession (World Bank, 2000). Greater emphasis was placed on improving economic management, while allowing greater interplay for market forces (World Bank, 2000). The World Development Report, 1990 states that the 1980s saw a two-part strategy of promoting labour-intensive growth through economic openness and investment in infrastructure, and providing basic services to poor people in health and education (World Bank, 1990, 2000). However, overconcentration on economic growth and development to the neglect of socio-political factors (e.g., health, political participation and representation) impeded this poverty reduction strategy (World Bank, 2000).

The 1990s was characterised by the World Bank’s ‘Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers’ (PRSPs) as a model for reducing poverty in developing countries. The PRSPs focused on improving governance structure and social institutional frameworks, as well as ensuring wider community participation (World Bank, 2003). In spite of the progress made with the introduction of the PRSPs, the World Bank found that increasing political instability coupled with weak institutions in developing countries had prevented the realisation of the PRSPs’ objective of reducing poverty.

Nonetheless, over the past two decades, the PRSPs appear to offer a sustainable development approach in developing countries (Todaro & Smith, 2006), as they have been adopted as blueprints for poverty reduction (Domfeh & Bawole, 2009). Also in 1999, a new framework for PRSPs was endorsed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (Bojo & Reddy, 2002). This new framework ensured that the PRSPs were based on the principles of sustainable development (see Section 2.6.3). The following are the focus of the PRSPs (World Bank, 2001, 2003):
country-driven with broad participation of the civil society;
based on the links between public actions and poverty outcomes;
comprehensive in scope, recognising the multidimensional nature of the causes of poverty and measures to attack it;
oriented to achieve outcome-related goals for poverty reduction;
partnership-oriented, providing a basis for active and coordinated participation of development partners in supporting country strategies; and
based on a medium and long-term perspective for poverty reduction, realising that poverty reduction cannot be achieved immediately.

Recognition of the importance of country ownership and participation in poverty reduction interventions led Stiglitz (2002) to remark that effective change and successful transformation can only result when there is local ownership and participation, and less outside imposition. Highlighting the need for ownership and participation, the ‘World Development Report 2000/2001’ (World Bank, 2000) proposed a poverty reduction strategy which is human-centred focusing on three areas: promoting opportunity, facilitating empowerment, and enhancing security (World Bank, 2000):

1. **Promoting opportunity.** Poor people in developing countries consistently emphasise the need for centrality of material opportunities, including jobs, credit, roads, electricity, markets for their produce, and schools, water, sanitation, and health services that underpin the health and skills essential for work. This strategy emphasises overall economic growth, and requires action by the state to support the build-up of human, land, and infrastructure assets that poor people own or to which they have access.

2. **Facilitating empowerment.** The choice and implementation of public actions that are responsive to the needs of poor people depend on the interaction of political, social, and other institutional processes. Achieving access, responsibility, and accountability is intrinsically political and requires active collaboration among poor people, the middle class, and other groups in society. Such collaboration can be facilitated by changes in governance that promote efficiency in public administration and service delivery, and legal
institutions. This approach aims at removing social and institutional barriers that result from distinctions of gender, ethnicity, and social status.

3. **Enhancing security.** Reducing vulnerability to economic shocks, natural disasters, ill health, disability, and personal violence is an intrinsic part of enhancing wellbeing and encourages investment in human capital. This approach requires effective national action to manage the risk of economy-wide shocks, and effective mechanisms to reduce the risks faced by poor people, including health and weather-related risks.

Since 2000, poverty reduction has increasingly become a rights-based issue, leading to its endorsement by the international community as a universal norm through the MDGs (Adejumobi, 2006; UN, 2000). The MDGs approach advocates for the empowerment and involvement of local community in development decision-making processes, involvement of national and regional governments, and the pursuit of growth oriented projects (Singleton, 2003). The early 2000s has been characterised by improvement in governance and institutions, as issues of vulnerability at the local and national levels moved to the centre stage of global discussion (World Bank, 2000).

However, Todaro and Smith (2006) have argued that, despite attempts to reduce it over the last 50 years, poverty persists in developing countries. This situation has been largely due to the lack of consideration of local poverty issues and inappropriate implementation and management strategies, which led Singleton (2003) to define poverty reduction as an approach that requires interventions involving considerable social and cultural change. According to Singleton (2003), the multifaceted nature of poverty requires more than the technical and engineering solutions which can be provided from the international level. Thus, Asante and Ayee (2004) explain poverty reduction as designing and implementing appropriate strategies to ensure effective use of scarce resources, allocating these to activities that have the potential to yield maximum impact on the poor and to contribute to reducing deprivation and vulnerability in poor communities.

With many poverty reduction strategies implemented, it is important to examine available frameworks for evaluating these strategies in developing countries. This is presented in the next section.
2.5.1 Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries: An Evaluation Framework

Since the 1950s, several theoretical frameworks and indicators for assessing poverty reduction especially in the developing countries have been developed by researchers and international organisations, such as ‘the Sustainable Livelihood Approach’ (DFID, 1999; Scoones, 1998; Serat, 2008), ‘the Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool’ (IFAD, 2009; Cohen, 2009), and the MDGs (UN, 2000). The ‘Sustainable Livelihood Approach’ is applicable across different geographical areas and social groups, and provides a holistic view on what resources or combination of resources are important to the poor, in addition to facilitating an understanding of the underlying causes of poverty, by focusing on the variety of factors at different levels (Krantz, 2001). The basic idea of this approach is to start with a broad and open-ended analysis, however this requires a highly flexible planning situation, which rarely exists (see Appendix 4 for details).

In relation to the ‘Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool’, although it was developed in response to challenges inhibiting holistic analysis of the fundamental dimensions of poverty especially at the rural level (Cohen, 2009), it has been used to assess poverty across different regions and countries with limited local community level application (see Appendix 5 for details). On the other hand, the MDGs have become a global acceptable framework and a benchmark for poverty reduction, and focus on the basic dimensions of poverty (see Table 2.3).

Based on reviews of these aforementioned frameworks, this research adopted the MDGs as a framework for assessing poverty reduction in the case study communities adjacent to the KCA. The next section provides justification for, and the importance of the MDGs in this research.

The MDGs as a Poverty Reduction Framework in this Research

Given the aim of this research, in terms of understanding the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction, the MDGs remain a useful framework, as they stress the importance of developing individuals’ capabilities and of empowerment of the poor in developing countries. The MDGs are used as a framework in this research because of their appropriateness and usefulness in answering Research Question
Three, which focuses on the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities. The following paragraphs provide background to the MDGs.

In the year 2000, the ‘Millennium Declaration’ was adopted by world leaders from 189 countries at the UN Millennium Summit held in New York, which called for global engagement towards developing countries. The declaration represents an international commitment and agreement towards poverty reduction, environmental pollution, child labour, global warming, violations of human rights and the fight against corruption (Bardy et al., 2012). In relation to poverty reduction, the declaration emphasised the importance of freeing the poor from the dehumanising conditions of extreme poverty, to which more than a billion of the world’s population are subjected. The declaration to eliminate extreme poverty in the new millennium led to the formulation of the MDGs, providing poverty reduction targets to be achieved by the year 2015 (UN, 2000). As presented in Table 2.3, the MDGs focused on multidimensional aspects of human development, and documented integrated targets related to enhancing human capabilities (e.g., education) and economic growth (e.g., income generating opportunities).

The attainment of these goals is expected to create a world free from extreme poverty, and characterised by improved human wellbeing (UN, 2000). The focus of the MDGs is on income, education, employment opportunities, environment, healthcare, gender empowerment, and the socio-political and economic systems (e.g., government agencies) that influence the wellbeing of people, which are all important indicators for safeguarding the welfare of the poor.

Considering that the MDGs have become an acceptable measure for determining and influencing poverty reduction interventions (e.g., aid flows) from the developed to the developing countries (Higgins, 2013), they are useful in answering Research Question Three.
## Table 2.3  The MDGs and Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</strong></td>
<td>Between 1990 and 2015, halve the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1990 and 2015, halve the proportion of people suffering from hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, have primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</strong></td>
<td>Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</strong></td>
<td>Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</strong></td>
<td>Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</strong></td>
<td>Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</strong></td>
<td>Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By 2015, halve the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</strong></td>
<td>Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system that includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction – nationally and internationally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address the special needs of the least developed and, landlocked countries and small island developing states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In co-operation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In co-operation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable, essential drugs in developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In co-operation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information communication technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Emergence and meaning of the concept of development

The concept of development dates back to the 19th century, and has been applied in many fields, including natural sciences, social sciences and physical sciences (Abercrombie et al., 2001; Cliché, 2005). For example, in the natural sciences it was used by Aristotle to explain the nature of all things that develop, and by Charles Darwin in his theory of evolution of species (Cliché, 2005). However, in the field of social sciences, the concept of development only emerged during the 1950s and 1960s, following the end of World War II (Harris, 2000; Hettne, 2002), and has continued to be an active and contested term across the globe (Thomas, 2004).

The purpose of this section is to examine how the evolution of the concept of development over the past half a century is connected to poverty reduction, as presented by different scholars. It must however be emphasised that the historical progression of the concept of development is similar to the historical analysis of poverty, but the former emphasises strategies and attempts to improve the quality of human life and reduce poverty. Figure 2.2 summarises the evolution of the concept of development and its focus on poverty reduction.

![Figure 2.2 Evolution of the Concept of Development from 1950s–2000s](image)

2.6.1 Connections between Development and Poverty: An Historical Overview

Since its rise in the second half of the twentieth century (Harris, 2000), the idea of development has traditionally been interpreted as ‘economic growth’, which is measured by per capita income and average annual growth in national income (World Bank, 1980). Gore (2000) asserts that the economic focus of development in the 1950s and 1960s was a vision of liberating people and reducing poverty, through structural transformation. This ‘growth-based’ understanding of development, according to Sant’Ana (2008), was premised on the idea that growth of the economy would benefit the whole of society, either by market-driven ‘trickle down’ effects, or by state-driven social policy. However, Harris (2000) indicates that the benefits of the economic concept of development did not necessarily trickle down to the poor, as the inequality gap between the poor and the rich widened, especially in Africa. Little consideration was given to the evolution of other factors, including inequality, poverty or social wellbeing (Sant’Ana, 2008). Several researchers and international organisations (e.g., Nussbaum, 2000; Sen, 1999; UNDP, 2006) have argued that the economic concept of development does not define the true meaning of development, because it fails to consider individuals’ physical capabilities and conditions.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, the focus of development shifted from economic growth and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to basic human needs (Seers, 1969; Streeten et al., 1981). The central components of the basic needs approach included education, nutrition, health, sanitation, and employment for the poor (Harris, 2000; Seers, 1969). This new focus of development was characterised by relatively less concern with economic indicators, but emphasised the quality of human life and conservation of the natural environment.

It is further indicated by Harris (2000) that this approach led to the establishment of the United Nations Development Programme’s Human Development Index, which is based on health and education indices in addition to GDP, to examine progress of development (UNDP, 1990). This concept of human welfare is also concerned with ‘redistribution with growth’ (distribution of benefits/wealth of development among individuals, groups and regions), and became popular after the Cocoyoc Declaration in Mexico (Ghai, 1977). Seers (1969), concerned with increasing inequality among
the rich countries and poor countries, remarked that a country’s development can be
determined when the state of poverty, unemployment and inequality is considerably
reduced. Seers (1969) further added that a country cannot claim to be developed
when factors, including poverty, unemployment, and inequality are worsening, even
if per capita income doubles.

However, the 1980s was characterised by a dramatic turn in the focus of
development. The debt crisis of the 1980s displaced the centre of gravity in
development thinking from the United Nations’ organs, such as the UN Research
Institute for Social Development and the UN Conference on Trade and Development,
to the Bretton Woods Institutions (World Bank, IMF and other related organs of the
UN) (Sant’Ana, 2008). The concept of development during this period focused on
‘structural adjustment’, emphasising liberalisation of trade, elimination of
government deficits and overvalued exchange rates, as well as dismantling inefficient
parastatal organisations (Harris, 2000). According to Harris (2000), structural
adjustment was seen as, and used as a tool for, addressing the challenges of
government-centred development policies, which resulted in bloated bureaucracies,
unbalanced budgets, and extreme debts. Nonetheless, some international
organisations such as the UNDP (1990) were unhappy, and expressed their
dissatisfaction with the structural adjustment approach, as they found it to be at
variance with the basic human needs concept of development. In addition, the
market-oriented reforms adopted led to greater inequality and hardship for the poor,
even as economic efficiency improved (Harris, 2000).

The focus and definition of development was broadened in the 1990s, following
global agitation for better indicators of development. Focusing on the general
wellbeing of human beings, the UNDP (1990) defines development as a process of
enlarging peoples’ choices, with these choices being available to individuals who
could then lead long and healthy lives, acquire knowledge, and have access to
resources needed for a decent living (Sant’Ana, 2008). These choices were regarded
as key to reducing poverty and improving the wellbeing of the poor. Even though the
UNDP (1990) admits that income is an important indicator of development, it is not
an ‘end’ in itself (Sen, 1999). Development transcends the expansion of income and
wealth, and focuses more on the welfare of people, especially the poor (UNDP, 1990). This notion of development as ‘human centred’ overcame the limitations of the economic growth-based concept of development, which viewed income as an ‘end’ in itself instead of ‘a means to an end’ (Sant’Ana, 2008).

In 2000, development was globally viewed as multidimensional in both conceptualisation and reality (Fukuda-Parr, 2003; Thomas, 2004). The shift in discourse from economic focus to human development indices entailed far more than a formal renaming of the concept (Sant’Ana, 2008). The introduction of gender empowerment measures (to encourage the participation of women in economic, political and professional lives), protection of the natural environment and the eradication of poverty dominated international debate on development (UNDP, 1995; UN, 2000). This period also witnessed a global commitment to improve the quality of life of people through the MDGs, which have become a development indicator in several developing countries, including Ghana. Figure 2.3 presents a progression pyramid of the concept of development.
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**Figure 2.3** Progression Pyramid of the Concept of Development

Source: Cobbinah et al. (2011, p.142).
In summary, it is clear that there is a relationship between development and poverty. Development focus and interventions over the past half a century are directed towards overcoming poverty and improving the wellbeing of people, especially the poor. The above discussion, in relation to the evolution of the development concept, has revealed that development thinking has been broadened to incorporate socio-cultural dimensions, in addition to economic indices. However, despite growing interest in the development discourse, the concept has been characterised by many challenges over the past six decades, in relation to its focus (Cobbinah et al., 2011). Amidst the uncertainties and challenges regarding the focus of the concept of development, the next section examines how the concept of development can be used as a metaphor for poverty reduction in developing countries.

2.6.2 Development as a Metaphor for Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries

Although development has been a constant concern of governments, policymakers, economists and other social scientists both in the developed and the developing countries, there has been little agreement on what constitutes development (UNDP, 1990), with the concept being highly contested both theoretically and politically (Thomas, 2004). The inherent complexity and ambiguity of the concept has led researchers (e.g., Fukuda-Parr, 2003; Myint, 1980; Myrdal, 1974; Thomas, 2004) throughout history to provide different interpretations, based on their philosophies and geographical locations. This section highlights the current discussions on the concept, and elaborates on the poverty reduction concerns which underlie the interpretations of development.

According to Thomas (2004), the concept of development refers to a structural change in society, involving long-term transformation of society. This interpretation suggests that poverty reduction would occur following improvement in the structural composition of society, which is usually long-term. However, Hickey and Mohan (2003) disagree with Thomas’ (2004) interpretation, and argue that increasing international discourse on the concept has resulted in a shift of focus from development being synonymous with structural change to development as a short-term assessment of progress, in particular improvement in human wellbeing – a focus which disregards the multidimensional nature of the concept.
However, the multidimensionality of development cannot be overlooked in the poverty reduction discourse. A number of researchers (e.g., Furtado, 1977; Herath, 2009; Myrdal, 1974) have argued that development is multidimensional and relates to all sectors and systems of society. According to Myrdal (1974), development is defined as the upward movement of the entire social system, including economic and non-economic factors. The economic factors include employment and job opportunities while education, health, distribution of power, social and political stratifications constitute non-economic factors. Myrdal (1974) indicates that development will only result when there is effective growth and interplay between economic and non-economic factors. This will lead to improvement in human wellbeing, especially amongst the poor. Therefore, improvement in human wellbeing and poverty reduction may occur when development is viewed as a multifaceted concept that encompasses several dimensions, including efficient production systems, provision of society’s basic needs (e.g., water, food, shelter) and efficient use of resources in satisfying individual needs, especially the poor (Furtado, 1977).

Broadening the socio-economic perspective of development, Herath (2009) argues that the interpretation of the concept of development should include cultural characteristics, and be sensitive to the local context in which the concept is being applied. Herath (2009) further indicates that the definition of development should be refined to include a wide variety of human needs, which Sen (1999) refers to as freedom. According to Sen (1999) the concept should be interpreted as a process of expanding the freedom people enjoy, adding that the narrower views of development, such as identifying development with growth in gross national product (GNP) and increase in personal income are very important means of expanding the freedom enjoyed by society, but not an end in themselves. Sen (1999) identifies education, health, political and civil rights to be socio-economic determinants of development as freedom, and imperative to poverty reduction, particularly in developing countries. Moreover, Fukuda-Parr (2003), after comparing the real income, basic needs and human development perspectives of development, concluded that the evolution in the prioritisation of capabilities corresponds to a shift in focus from social and economic policies to political institutions and processes, with greater emphasis on participation.
Accordingly, the literature suggests that the concept of development has been explained and interpreted in response to poverty reduction (e.g., Chambers, 2004; Potter et al., 2004). The findings of the aforementioned researchers support Myint’s (1980) claim that the term ‘development’ addresses poverty reduction via a twofold approach: the fight against poverty, and the analysis of long-term economic and social development. To Myint (1980), the fight against poverty approach focuses on short-term measures of reducing widespread poverty, hunger and misery, while the analysis of long-term economic and social development compares socio-economic development between and among regions, countries and historical periods to establish the underlying factors impeding long-term socio-economic development. The concept of development was expanded to include prospects, such as creation of employment opportunities, availability of basic needs and participation, for overcoming increasing inequality and human deprivation (Myint, 1980; UN, 2000).

Fukuda-Parr (2003) summarises the arguments on the concept of development by categorising the different interpretations, based on the recent global discourse. Fukuda-Parr (2003) states that the economic concept, which focuses on efficiency, has dominated the current debate on ‘good’ governance (responsible political system), while the human development approach is concerned with achieving social justice through governance that enlarges participation, power, and influence of people, particularly the disadvantaged including women, ethnic minorities and the poor.

The above discussion has demonstrated a strong relationship between development and poverty reduction, and that development can act as a metaphor for poverty reduction. However, the question is whether the categorisations developed by Fukuda-Parr (2003) and proposals by other researchers (e.g., Chambers, 2004; Myint, 1980; Potter et al., 2004) can be achieved and sustained over time. The next section explores the concept of sustainable development, and its place in poverty reduction, especially in developing countries.
2.6.3 The Concept of Sustainable Development: Its Place in the Poverty Reduction Discourse

Although the concept of sustainable development has been globally embraced and debated within the broader context of development, there is a lack of clear interpretation of what constitutes sustainable development (Daly, 1996; Kates et al., 2005). The idea of sustainable development dates back to the earliest examples of city planning and traditional agricultural systems, but became popular over the past three decades (see Appendix 3 for the history of the sustainable development concept). However, the increasing dominance of sustainable development in global discourse has given rise to vague and different interpretations of the concept (Daly, 1996; Kates et al., 2005; Temple, 1992). Temple (1992), for instance, criticises the vagueness and overuse of the concept, and argues that the word ‘sustainable’ has been used in a variety of situations, including sustainable development, sustainable growth, sustainable economies, sustainable societies and sustainable agriculture, and thus, it has lost its significance. In addition, Daly (1996) indicates that sustainable development has become a household term, but nobody knows the true meaning.

One of the most widely accepted and commonly cited definitions of sustainable development was provided by the Brundtland Commission, which explained the concept as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p.43). Since the first definition and popularisation of the concept by the Brundtland Commission, the concept of sustainable development has continued to evolve (Saxena & Khandelwal, 2010), with a number of scholars (e.g., Kates et al., 2005; Munro, 1995) articulating and defining it from different perspectives, emphasising social, economic and environmental concerns. According to Ogbodo (2010), the popularity of the concept of sustainable development has stimulated a growing literature industry, including ‘Journal of Sustainable Development, the International Journal of Sustainable Development, the International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology, and Sustainable Development International’. Nevertheless, there is no clear, fixed, and immutable meaning of the concept, creating a platform for critics to call sustainable development an “oxymoron: fundamentally contradictory and irreconcilable” (Kates et al., 2005, p.20).
In relation to poverty reduction, Munro (1995) asserts that development is sustainable when it is continual, with its benefits, especially to the poor, being maintained indefinitely. Thus, there must be no inhibiting factor in the process concerned that would limit the time it can endure. As well, it must be worthwhile, meeting social, economic and environmental objectives (Munro, 1995). However, Pearce and Atkinson (1998), being challenged with the worsening state of poverty especially in developing countries, contest that the emphasis on future generations in the globally embraced definition (Brundtland Commission’s definition) of sustainable development is only part of a bigger story, and that meeting the needs of the poor should be the highest priority. Pearce and Atkinson (1998) add that the claim for future generational needs cannot be met if the present generation, especially the poor, are not better educated, not involved in decision making, and do not have control over resources. It is both useless and an insult to the poor, if they must remain in poverty in order to protect the environment. Poverty and underdevelopment challenges cannot be overcome unless there is a shift in sustainable development focus, to one where developing countries play an active role and enjoy enormous benefits (WCED, 1987).

According to Diesendorf (2000), the sustainable development discussion should not focus primarily on poverty reduction, but should comprise all types of economic and social development which protect and enhance the natural environment and ensure social equity. Diesendorf’s (2000) definition highlights three principal aspects (i.e. ecological, economic and social) with the ecological and social equity aspects being primary. Social or economic development is said to be sustainable if it protects and enhances the environment, and ensures equity in the society, in terms of distribution of resources (Diesendorf, 2000).

Expanding on the role of sustainable development in poverty reduction, the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2001) provided a technical definition of sustainable development, as a development process which ensures the maximisation of human wellbeing for today’s generation, without causing a decline in future wellbeing. This definition highlights the importance of people, especially the poor, retaining some level of control so that they are able to respond to future shocks, even when their probability, and the scale and location of their
impacts, cannot be determined with certainty (OECD, 2001). Thus, the purpose of sustainable development is to resolve conflict between “the various competing goals, and involve the simultaneous pursuit of economic prosperity, environmental quality and social equity” commonly referred to as the ‘three pillars’, with technology as the resultant vector (Hasna, 2007, p.48).

Beyond the ‘three pillars’ interpretation, the notion of sustainable development has gained a broader political usage (OECD, 2001), with issues of human wellbeing being enshrined in international documents, including the UNDP Human Development Report and the MDGs (UN, 2000; UNDP, 1990). Components of human wellbeing include access to clean air and water, adequate diet, adequate dwellings, personal security both physical and emotional, opportunities for learning, opportunities for cooperative small-group interaction, an emotional support network, opportunities for creative behaviour, and an environment and lifestyle which do not promote a sense of alienation, of anomie, of being deprived, of boredom, of loneliness or of chronic frustration (Boyden & Dovers, 1997).

Also valuing the above components of human wellbeing, Newman and Rowe (2003) conceptualise sustainable development as meeting current and future generations’ needs by integrating environmental conservation, social advancement, and economic prosperity. The integration of these elements has made sustainable development the pivot around which domestic and regional policy formulation revolves, particularly in poverty reduction, as well as for international relations between countries in the 21st century (OECD, 2001). Within the context of poverty reduction in developing countries, sustainable development should be understood as a process of change that is heavily reliant upon local contexts, needs, and priorities (UNESCO, 2005). Figure 2.4 summarises the relationship between sustainable development and poverty reduction.
Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction

Fairness – economic prosperity should reflect in the social well being of the people
Manageable – Social advancement should lead to environmental protection
Feasible – Economic prosperity should not occur at the expense of environmental conservation

Source: Based on: Diesendorf (2000), Kates et al. (2005), and OECD (2001).

The concept of sustainable development has been debated in relation to developed and developing countries, as a result of the different levels of development attained and desired (Osofsky, 2004). According to Bryner (1999), the level of growth already attained by developed countries has generated major environmental problems, and such growth will generate more environmental concerns if developing countries are allowed to pass through the same process. To Bryner (1999), this approach is unfair to developing countries. Further to that, Osofsky (2004) argues that over-population and increasing consumption are threats to sustainable development, and that the lifestyle in developed countries, which have relatively stable population but high per capita consumption threatens sustainable development. In contrast, developed countries argue that developing countries, though they have relatively low per capita consumption, are characterised by rapid population growth which is detrimental to sustainable development (Osofsky, 2004). Therefore, developed and developing countries often tend to be divided on the issues that threaten sustainable development.
It is against this complex background and these varied interpretations that Todorov and Marinova (2009) emphasise the need to conceptualise and measure the progress humanity is making towards becoming sustainable in relation to poverty reduction and environmental conservation, rather than focusing on the blame game between developed and developing countries.

2.7 Chapter summary

This chapter has provided an overview of and insight into the relevant theoretical literature, regarding the conceptualisations and perceptions of poverty and development as they pertain to this research. The purpose of this chapter has been to establish the origins of the concepts of poverty, poverty reduction, and the relationship between poverty and development, and poverty reduction and sustainable development, within the context of the developed and the developing world. It has been revealed through the literature review that the concepts of poverty and development have evolved over the past 50 years, and there are on-going debates, both locally and internationally, regarding their meanings. There is also considerable evidence from the literature indicating that poverty and development are multidimensional concepts, requiring an interdisciplinary and integrated approach in understanding them.

A number of studies have focused on the economic dimension of poverty and development, which measures poverty reduction and development by economic growth. However, with increasing recognition of the importance of human welfare in the development and poverty literature, the focus of development and poverty has been broadened to include other indicators such as life expectancy and literacy. Despite the increased attention on indicators of poverty and development, the concepts of poverty and development, especially sustainable development, are perceived differently in developed and developing countries. Whereas developed countries are concerned with inequality and increasing consumption with regard to poverty and sustainability, developing countries are challenged with basic needs and increasing population, and thus they require different approaches to addressing these issues. The next chapter examines the potential of tourism to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development.
Chapter Three
Theoretical perspectives on ecotourism and poverty reduction

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the concept of ecotourism within the broader context of tourism, and its contribution to poverty reduction, especially in developing countries. This chapter highlights some of the desired outcomes of ecotourism, in relation to poverty reduction, and perceived challenges to achieving this goal. This review contributes to addressing Research Question One, which is: ‘How does ecotourism contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries?’

Globally, tourism is and continues to be one of the world’s largest industries (Shah et al., 2002; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). Literature examining tourism development shows that the tourism industry has recorded an unprecedented growth over the past 50 years, and it is considered to be one of the most important socio-economic phenomena of the 20th century (Boronyak et al., 2010; Neto, 2003; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD], 2008). Multi-national organisations, donor agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have identified tourism as an industry which could effectively promote economic and human development, by contributing to poverty reduction (Bolwell & Weinz, 2008; Lapeyre, 2010; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012).

Within the tourism industry, ecotourism has been recognised as a sustainable development strategy focusing on environmental conservation, economic development and social improvement (Baral, 2013; Courvisanos & Jain, 2006). Moreover, ecotourism remains one of the fastest growing sectors of the tourism industry (Eagles & McCool, 2002; The International Ecotourism Society [TIES], 2008), and seeks to reconcile the conflicting goals of environmental conservation and tourism development, particularly in developing countries (Baral, 2013). This chapter reviews the concepts of tourism and ecotourism. Literature investigating the role of tourism and ecotourism in poverty reduction, major barriers to tourism development, principles of ecotourism, stakeholders in ecotourism, and the pro-poor potential of...
ecotourism activities in developing countries is also discussed. Frameworks for evaluating ecotourism implementation, especially in developing countries, are presented.

3.2 The concept of tourism

Although the concept of tourism dates back several centuries, literature indicates that its origin remains uncertain and debatable (e.g., Korstanje, 2007; Theobald, 2005). Korstanje (2007) claims that the concept of tourism has its roots in an old Saxon term ‘torn’, which means ‘departure with the intention of returning’, and was used to refer to vacation trips embarked upon by peasant farmers during the 12th century’. Theobald (2005) indicates that the term was derived from a Latin word ‘tornare’, which means movement around a central point or axis. However, both interpretations of the origin of tourism define tourism as movement of people from one place to another with the aim of returning. During the Middle Ages, the term ‘tourism’ was also described from the religious perspective, as people who travelled across continents, mainly for religious purposes, to visit sanctified places and holy shrines were regarded as tourists (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). By the mid 18th century, the ‘Grand Tour’ became popular in Europe. According to Korstanje (2007), the ‘Grand Tour’ was a traditional trip around Europe by middle and upper class young men, mainly British nobility, who embarked on trips for the purposes of education, search and culture exploration. It is believed that the ‘Grand Tour’ set the foundations for modern tourism.

However, the concept of tourism was fully conceptualised in the 20th century (Korstanje, 2007). According to the World Bank (2009, p.393) the meaning of the term tourism has been broadened to encompass all the activities which involve people travelling from their usual environment to, and staying in, a new environment, lasting “for no more than one year for leisure, business, and other purposes not related to an activity remunerated from the place visited”. Thus, the concept of tourism involves people travelling for a wide range of purposes, not just for leisure (Beaver, 2002).

The post Second World War period was characterised by exceptional growth in the tourism industry (Berno & Bricker, 2001). Researchers (e.g., Berno & Bricker, 2001;
Hyde, 2003; Western, 2012) have attributed the growth in tourism to the industrial revolution, which led to improvement in socio-economic conditions, including higher incomes, longer paid holidays, improved transport systems and low travelling costs. The aforementioned researchers claim that tourism during the post Second World War period was characterised by a concentration of high volume sales with high throughputs and turnarounds, shifting of large groups of people to specific developed destinations with the capacity to attract large numbers, and full utilisation of packaged holiday components offered as a single product at an all-inclusive price. Moreover, development of large transport systems, infrastructure, accommodation, supporting facilities and attractions within the destination, and a market approach centred on more hedonistic motives for travel formed part of the growth in tourism (Hyde, 2003). The rapid growth in tourism, due to improved economic conditions, and characterised by increasing consumption and motivation to travel, gave birth to ‘mass tourism’ (Williams, 1996).

3.2.1 The Emergence of Mass Tourism

The literature describes mass tourism as a political, economic, social and geographical phenomenon (e.g., Hyde, 2003; Sharpley, 1999). According to Sharpley (1999), this complex phenomenon is characterised by the movement of people with the aim of enjoying their holidays. Some researchers (e.g., Hyde, 2003; Sharpley, 1999) have identified a number of fundamental features that define mass tourism, including the purchase of commodities produced under conditions of mass production, hedonistic motives, and participation of large number of people, as well as dominance of individual producers in industrial markets with common commodities and relative market choice.

Moreover, it has been espoused by Vanhove (1997) that the engagement of a large number of people in mass tourism creates employment opportunities, and generates income for the wider community. Berno and Bricker (2001) assert that mass tourism was embraced globally during the 1960s and 1970s, as a clean and renewable industry with the potential to stimulate socio-economic development. In relation to developing countries, Western (2012), acknowledging the socio-economic benefits of mass tourism, indicates that the mass tourism phenomenon was widely recognised as
an economic fortune for poor countries, and an impetus for heritage and nature conservation, especially during the 1960s.

However, prior to the 1980s some writers (e.g., deKadt, 1979; Young, 1973) started questioning the negative impacts associated with mass tourism, especially on the preservation of the environment and socio-cultural assets, in addition to the unequal distribution of financial benefits. Obenaus (2005) and Swarbrooke (1999) observed that the environmental and socio-cultural impact of mass tourism manifested in the form of loss of natural habitat for flora and fauna, pollution of air and water bodies, adulteration of local cultures, and unsustainable management of natural environment. Ross and Wall (1999a) have argued that successful tourism ventures should expand beyond economic indicators, to incorporate environmental and social needs. Therefore there needs to be a balance between the demands of economic viability, environmental stability and social and cultural compatibility at all levels, from global to local, in all aspects of tourism operation (Baral, 2013; Bushell, 1999).

Although mass tourism was traditionally viewed as an economic fortune, Western (2012) claimed several international organisations including the World Bank did not recognise tourism in their development agenda in the 1980s. Western (2012) believed this was due to mass tourism’s inability to ensure equitable and sustainable development. According to Western (2012), the lack of recognition of mass tourism by international organisations coincided with a counter-trend in tourism activities, driven by concerned tourists bent on avoiding crowds, supporting local communities, and protecting natural areas, as well as with environmental and political protest movements. This resulted in the sustainable tourism debate in the 1980s.

3.2.2 Making Tourism Sustainable: The Promulgation of the Sustainable Tourism Concept

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the activities of WCED such as the publication of the Brundtland Commission’s report, and the Earth Summit regarding sustainable development raised public awareness of the need for sustainable forms of tourism (Butler, 2006). This recognition increased public awareness of, and concerns over, the impacts of mass tourism (Berno & Bricker, 2001). According to Berno and Bricker (2001), the concept of sustainable tourism was conceived and borne out of the
increasing recognition of both the economic importance and potential threats of mass
tourism. With its focus on economic importance, use of natural resources and
environmental conservation (Neto, 2003), sustainable tourism was captured under the
‘Agenda 21 for Travel and Tourism Industry’ in 1992 (an action plan for sustainable
tourism development) (UNWTO, 2001).

The debate on sustainable tourism intensified in 1997, during the UN General
Assembly special session (Neto, 2003; UN, 1998). The Assembly reviewed Agenda
21 and further deliberated on ways to develop an action oriented sustainable tourism
programme for the world (UN, 1998). The UN Commission on Sustainable
Development, in its seventh annual session, endorsed sustainable tourism as an
approach to economic development (UN, 1999). The call for sustainable tourism
development gained global dominance in 1999, when the UNWTO introduced nine
basic guidelines for governments, tour operators, developers, travel agents, workers,
host communities and tourists, through its ‘Global Code of Ethics for Tourism’
(UNWTO, 2001). Neto (2003) asserted that the tenth guideline was a proposed
strategy for reconciliation, through the creation of a World Committee on Tourism
Ethics, which consisted of representatives from all over the world.

Despite global commitment and attention to sustainable tourism, and the recognition
of the negative impacts associated with mass tourism (e.g., UNWTO, 1998; WCED,
1987), the definition and implementation of sustainable tourism continues to remain a
challenge in tourism development, especially in developing countries. Many scholars
(e.g., Berno & Bricker, 2001; Harrison, 1996; Tao & Wall, 2009) and international
organisations (e.g., UN, 2001) have provided different interpretations of the
sustainable tourism concept, focusing on various aspects of integrating and achieving
a balance in environmental, social and economic resources in tourism development.
For example, the UN (2001) defines sustainable tourism as activities involving
tourists that result in the efficient management of resources in achieving economic,
social and aesthetic needs, while maintaining the integrity of the cultural system,
essential ecological processes and biological diversity, as well as life support
systems. This definition, according to UNEP and UNWTO (2005) and Borges et al.
(2011), is underpinned by three key benefits:
1. *Environmental benefits.* This relates to minimising negative tourism impacts, and conserving natural and cultural resources, as well as efficient use of resources in tourism;

2. *Economic benefits.* This deals with the importance of policy, planning and management, emphasising limits to tourism development, generation of economic profit for, and economic independence of, local people; and

3. *Social independence.* This concerns community participation and information sharing among tourism stakeholders, and cultural sensitivity towards local people and other stakeholders.

In relation to its implementation, Lankford and Lankford (2000) have reported that the realisation of sustainable implementation of tourism will occur when certain conditions prevail. These conditions include participation of host communities in the planning, development and management process, education of both visitors and local communities regarding tourism development, understanding and respecting the protection of wildlife habitat, and investment in alternative modes of environmentally friendly transport. Thus, sustainable tourism is fundamentally targeted at ensuring effective management of all resources, by meeting the economic, social, and aesthetic needs of tourists, while preserving cultural integrity, protecting important ecological systems, and maintaining biological diversity and life support systems for the host communities (UNWTO, 1998).

The complexities surrounding the definition and implementation of the concept make some authors (e.g., Berno & Bricker, 2001; Kennedy et al., 2013; Tao & Wall, 2009) argue that the debate on sustainable tourism lacks practicality. Moreover, Swarbrooke (1999) observes that the concept of sustainable tourism has the potential to create division in society if the distinction between mass (assumed to be bad) tourism and alternative (assumed to be good) tourism continues, as all the adverse effects of tourism are attributed to the influence of mass tourism.

In addition, some researchers (e.g., Butler, 2006; Harrison, 1996) have questioned the clarity and purpose of sustainable tourism in the tourism industry. Harrison (1996) argues that sustainable tourism is an aspect of the dubious process of sustainable development, which he considers a ‘doubly vague concept’. Other writers (e.g., Tsaur
et al., 2006; Young, 1992) believe that the confusion surrounding the meaning and implementation of sustainable tourism can be overcome when the preoccupation of both researchers and practitioners is focused on achieving an environmental, economic and social balance in tourism development. This, according to Sharpley (1997) and Twining-Ward (1999), would ensure that the goals of sustainable tourism are clearly based on and/or related to the basic principles of sustainable development.

However, Butler (1993) indicates that although there is growing scholarly recognition of the concept of sustainable tourism as a form of tourism which can maintain its viability in an area over a period of time, there is limited focus on the impacts of its implementation on the human and natural environment. As a consequence, Tosun (2001) argues that, for sustainable tourism to achieve environmental, economic and social balance, its development should be regarded as an ‘adaptive paradigm’, with an overarching objective of contributing to the objectives of sustainable development. Thus, sustainable tourism, in relation to this research, is explained as:

“… accepting the commitment to providing healthy long term tourism, thoroughly integrated with the other elements of the economy, and with environment and society in such a manner that a policy change in one does not unduly interfere with the optimal functioning of the others” (Farrell, 1999, p.191).

In 2002, global commitment to implementing the concept of sustainable tourism was emphasised during the ‘World Summit on Sustainable Development’ (WSSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa. The WSSD launched ‘Tourism and Poverty Alleviation’ through the UNWTO, and further identified measures to enhance and promote sustainable tourism development and implementation (UN, 2002). In a bid to make certain that tourism delivers sustainable outcomes, sustainable development measures were proposed to ensure that returns from tourism benefit the local people in the host communities, while protecting and preserving cultural and environmental resources, as well as safeguarding ecologically sensitive areas and natural heritage (UN, 2002). Therefore, achieving the purpose of sustainable tourism requires systematic action, and the availability of adequate resources at national and international levels, to ensure ethical management of the industry (Neto, 2003).
In response to the identification of the need for ethical management of the tourism industry, normative or ethical forms of sustainable tourism, including ecotourism, community-based tourism and pro-poor tourism, have emerged, and are considered to be sustainable forms of tourism (e.g., Hardy et al., 2002; Weaver, 2001). Some writers (e.g., Beaumont, 1998; Hall & Lew, 1998) argue that these forms of tourism have in fact existed since the 1950s and 1960s, despite mass tourism being dominant. The next section examines tourism development in developing countries.

3.3 Tourism development in developing countries: Poverty reduction focus

Tourism development in developing countries has largely been linked to poverty reduction and sustainable development (e.g., Aref, 2011; Binns & Nel, 2002). This section explores the various ways in which tourism can contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries.

Developing countries are endowed with rich tourism potential, comprising natural, cultural and historical resources and a wealth of wildlife (Aref, 2011; Okech, 2010). A number of studies (e.g., Honey, 1999; Kiss, 2004; Okech, 2010; Spenceley, 2008; Spenceley et al., 2009, 2010) have highlighted the socio-economic contribution of tourism to the development of host communities (e.g., creation of employment opportunities). However, Shen et al. (2008) explain that poverty reduction has not traditionally been pivotal to tourism development, despite tourism’s capacity to contribute to poverty reduction (Jamieson et al., 2004). Conventionally, the role of tourism in poverty reduction has been measured in terms of its contribution to GNP (Jamieson et al. 2004). However, this measurement does not provide any means of assessing the impacts of tourism on the poor (Jamieson et al. 2004), although it is perceived that tourism benefits would trickle down to the poor (Ashley, 2002).

Today, tourism is recognised as a major foundation for economic growth in developing countries (Bolwell & Weinz, 2008; Holden, 2013), despite the majority of tourism activities occurring in developed countries (Gossling et al., 2009). Recognition that the benefits of tourism to poverty reduction go beyond GNP measurement to include community benefits, provision of basic needs, assets
ownership and employment, has stimulated tourism activities over the past two decades in developing countries (Luvanga & Shitundu, 2003; UNWTO, 2014). For example, the UNWTO (2014) indicates that tourism in the Sub-Saharan Africa and South East Asia grew by 6 percent and 10 percent respectively in 2013, and it is expected that this growth will continue.

Thus, tourism-led development in developing countries has become an important theme, and is increasingly gaining dominance in the literature (e.g., Binns & Nel, 2002; Rogerson, 2001). Both local and national governments are promoting tourism as a locally driven growth alternative to diversify their economies, while protecting the environment (Asiedu, 2002; Binns & Nel, 2002). As a consequence, the local or host community’s involvement in tourism has been encouraged in developing countries, including South Africa, Kenya, Costa Rica, Rwanda and Laos, as a tool for achieving sustainable development through tourism (Binns & Nel, 2002; Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Sebele, 2010; Spenceley et al., 2010; Suntikul et al., 2009).

Within the broad context of sustainable development, a number of areas of tourism intervention in poverty reduction have been identified by some authors (e.g., Scheyvens, 2007; Shah et al., 2002; Sindiga, 1999; Tosun, 2006), including the creation of employment opportunities (e.g., tour guiding), generation of income for individuals, promotion of community participation, conservation of the environment, and protection of vulnerable groups (e.g., women) especially in Asia and Africa. Other contributions of tourism to poverty reduction include dividends from private sector partnership and land rental paid by investors (Shah et al., 2002), foreign earnings and tax revenue to government (Luvanga & Shitundu, 2003; Scheyvens, 2007), and community empowerment and ownership (Simpson, 2008; Tosun, 2006).

Regarding employment creation and poverty reduction, Sindiga (1999) explains that the tourism sector is characterised by a wide range of economic activities which makes it labour intensive, employing both skilled and unskilled labour. For example in 2011, the tourism sector accounted for about 8.7 percent of total global employment, and continues to remain the world’s largest employer (World Travel & Tourism Council [WTTC], 2012). Okech (2010) notes that the tourism industry creates employment for both men and women with varying skills in many areas,
including tour guiding, nature and cultural interpretation, game viewing, travel and transport services, promotion, sport, as well as in the hospitality sector. With income deprivation as a trait of poverty (see Section 2.3), Okech (2010) argues that these employment opportunities serve as a source of income for a considerable number of local people. For example in 2012, China and India had over 63.7 million jobs and 39.5 million tourism-related jobs respectively (WTTC, 2013), and this contributed to reducing unemployment. Compared to other sectors (e.g., manufacturing), the UNDP (2011) adds that tourism is the only sector that employs a greater number of women and young people, resulting in increased incomes, empowerment and social inclusion.

As explained by various researchers (e.g., Domfeh & Bawole, 2009; Stiglitz, 2002; Townsend, 1979; UN, 1995; Whelan, 2007), deprivation or lack of participation in social, economic and political activities and loss of livelihoods are key features of poverty in developing countries, and constitute major targets for poverty reduction (see Sections 2.3 & 2.5). Studies (e.g., Iorio & Wall, 2012; Simpson, 2008; Spenceley et al., 2010; Tosun, 2006) have shown that the tourism industry generates numerous opportunities for host communities when they participate actively in tourism planning, development and management decision-making processes. This participation empowers local communities to have a larger stake in, and more balanced benefits from tourism activities (Muganda et al., 2010). Moreover, the tourism industry provides an opportunity to maintain traditional lifestyles, architectural and building styles and cultural practices, which are often used as a source of livelihood by the host community (UNDP, 2011).

As discussed in Section 2.4, the socio-economic structural failings of a country’s economy remain a key cause of poverty in developing countries. Tax revenues to the government constitute an important benefit from the tourism industry, and empower governments to embark on development projects which are geared towards correcting structural imbalances (Luvanga & Shitundu, 2003). Scheyvens (2007) explains that tourism contributes significantly to economic growth, especially in developing countries, in the form of foreign earnings and public revenues, which aid national and local governments in the provision of basic services and infrastructure. For example, Luvanga and Shitundu (2003) indicate that tourism receipts constitute about 20
percent of the revenue of the governments of Kenya and Tunisia, which supports the assertion by Ashley and Mitchell (2005) that tourism contributes greatly to African economies. The contribution of Africa to global tourism figures however is less than that of Europe and North America. Table 3.1 summarises the benefits and challenges of tourism development in developing countries.

Table 3.1 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats to Tourism Development in Developing Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Availability of cultural, natural and historical resources</td>
<td>Undeveloped and under-developed attractions</td>
<td>Foreign earnings and support</td>
<td>Weak infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment and income generation potential</td>
<td>Lack of government programmes</td>
<td>Private sector partnership</td>
<td>Lack of recognition of tourism in national development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community involvement potential</td>
<td>Lack of organisational capacity</td>
<td>Foreign investment</td>
<td>Environmental degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Environmental conservation prospect</td>
<td>Lack of training or education (human capital)</td>
<td>Availability of transportation and communication services</td>
<td>Promotion of unhelpful behaviours (e.g., prostitution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Labour intensive nature, involving both skilled and unskilled labour</td>
<td>Gender norms and constraints</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>Commercialisation of local customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Potential to preserve local cultures</td>
<td>Poor management of revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of cultural identity (demonstration effect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Strengths – internal factors/conditions that support tourism development
Weaknesses – internal factors/conditions that limit tourism development
Opportunities – external factors/conditions that support tourism development
Threats – external factors/conditions that restrict tourism development


Although tourism is considered one of the largest income generators in developing countries (Shah et al., 2002), some writers (e.g., Christie, 2002; Teye, 1991) believe its contribution to poverty reduction has been minimal, as the industry remains under-developed. Teye (1991) argues that tourism in developing countries, particularly in
Sub-Saharan Africa, is hardly recognised as an industry because of weak infrastructure, poor organisation, and meagre net revenue. Moreover, Christie (2002) reveals that little effort has been made to assess the actual contribution of tourism to poverty reduction at the local level in developing countries. To date the relationship between tourism and poverty reduction has lacked focus in the development plans of several developing countries, where economic growth has been equated to poverty reduction (Bolwell & Weinz, 2008). Although economic growth is necessary, Bolwell and Weinz (2008) contest that it is not sufficient to reduce poverty.

### 3.4 Challenges of tourism development to poverty reduction in developing countries

Despite the potential of the tourism industry to contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries (see Section 3.3), research indicates limited benefits in local communities (Stronza & Gordillo, 2008). This section focuses on the major barriers limiting the role of tourism in poverty reduction, as well as challenges that the tourism industry presents to poverty reduction interventions.

Jamieson and Nadkarni (2009) identify four barriers, which if not resolved may thwart the role of tourism in poverty reduction. These include little recognition of tourism’s potential accorded by aid agencies, especially in Asia; lack of government programmes and organisational capacity to respond to the opportunities provided by tourism development; little or no education or training of tourism officials in using tourism as a poverty reduction tool; and limited access to tourism infrastructure. Bushell and Eagles (2007) also emphasise lack of formal education and foreign language skills, and lack of tourism development and management decision making skills, as barriers to poverty reduction through tourism development.

The Overseas Development Institute (2002) outlines fifteen barriers which prevent tourism from reducing poverty. Key among them include lack of human capital, lack of social and financial capital, and low capacity to meet tourists’ expectations. Another limiting factor is poor management of tourism revenue. Okech (2010) notes that large amounts of foreign exchange are lost due to leakages resulting from structural dependency created through widespread foreign ownership and
management in the developing countries. The Gambia is often cited as an example of a country which has experienced very limited benefits from tourism as a result of leakages (Okech, 2010) despite growing research on responsible tourism (e.g., Bah & Goodwin, 2003; Novelli, & Burns, 2010). Leakages limit the potential of tourism to reduce poverty through broad-based development approaches, including infrastructure provision (Brohman, 1996).

Whilst the aforementioned challenges limit the role of tourism in poverty reduction, there are indications that the tourism industry can also hamper poverty reduction initiatives and compound poverty in developing countries. The UNWTO (1985) explains that tourism can create negative effects on the social, economic and natural environment if not properly managed. According to the UNWTO (1985), major socio-economic and cultural negative impacts of tourism include the proliferation of unskilled labour due to increased demand; promotion of unhelpful behaviours (e.g., prostitution); land speculation; social conflicts because of inequity in the distribution of tourism benefits; inflation in the local economy; foreign dependence; and commercialisation of customs and loss of cultural identity. As an example of negative environmental effects, Kamauro (1996) asserts that the Maasai Mara National Park in Kenya and the Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania have been considerably depleted, as a result of the increased demand for firewood for cooking and heating in tourist camps and lodges.

Moreover, several studies (e.g., Okech, 2010; Spenceley, 2008; Stronza & Gordillo, 2008; Tosun, 2001) in developing countries have proved that the normative and ethical components of tourism (see Section 3.2.2), which are necessary ingredients for sustainable development and poverty reduction, are missing in tourism activities. Indirectly, the tourism industry tends to create a number of social vices in the name of generating employment. For example, child prostitution in the tourism industry, especially in Kenya, Thailand and Sri Lanka, has often generated negative impacts, including an increase in teenage pregnancy and single parenthood, spread of HIV/AIDS and the breakdown of the moral fabric of society (Christian Aid, 1995; Okech, 2010). These social vices compound poverty. It is therefore not surprising that
Sharpley (2002) rarely recognises tourism as a sustainable development panacea and a poverty reduction tool, even in a developed country like Cyprus.

Despite the above challenges, evidence from the literature suggests that host communities, individuals and groups are becoming more mindful of the negative effects of tourism, as tourism attains unprecedented growth globally (e.g., McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Neto, 2003; UNCTAD, 2008). In the midst of the complexities surrounding tourism and its role in poverty reduction, other scholars (e.g., Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Honey, 2008) have identified ecotourism as one of the sectors of the tourism industry having the potential to both conserve the environment and contribute to poverty reduction, especially in developing countries. The following sections explore the meaning of ecotourism, and its relevance in the poverty reduction discourse.

3.5 Historical perspective and meaning of ecotourism

Literature describing the history of ecotourism shows that the concept has been in existence since the 18th century, but by a different name (e.g., Beaumont, 1998; Ceballos-Lascurain, 1987; Hetzer, 1965). Beaumont (1998) classifies the early geographers who toured the world during the period as ecotourists, and indicates that the establishment of national parks, including Yellowstone in the United States of America in 1872 and Banff in Canada in 1885, was evidence of early interest in ecotourism. Whilst some scholars (e.g., Honey, 1999) argue that the term ‘ecotourism’ was coined by Ceballos-Lascurain, a member of the World Conservation Union who was concerned with the conservation of the American flamingo, other writers (e.g., Blamey, 2001; Hetzer, 1965) claim that the concept was first used by Hetzer in his book ‘Environment, tourism, and culture’ to explain the type of relationships that exist between the environment, tourists and local cultures, and to establish the level of interaction thereof. Despite the different opinions on its origin, the emergence of ecotourism was strongly linked with the environment, and was strongly advocated by environmental movements in the 1970s and 1980s (Honey, 1999).
The concept of ecotourism became popular, especially in the 1970s and 1980s, as a result of the negative social and environmental impacts associated with mass tourism, which places greater emphasis on income and growth (see Section 3.2.1) rather than environmental conservation and the socio-cultural goals of host communities (e.g., deKadt, 1979; Young, 1973; Ziffer, 1989). Increasing concerns about the impact of mass tourism on both the natural environment and local communities and cultures, coupled with the emergence of the sustainable development concept (see Section 2.6.3), led to the rise in popularity of sustainable forms of tourism, including ecotourism (Eagles & McCool, 2002). One of the early and formal definitions of ecotourism was given by Ceballos-Lascurain in the 1980s as:

“… 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 (both past and present) found in these areas” (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1987, p.14).

Over the past three decades, the discussion on ecotourism has gained dominance in both environmental and social conferences and journals worldwide (Weaver, 2001), with the definitional interpretations being broadened to incorporate ethical issues or normative components. For example, Ziffer (1989) describes ecotourism as a form of tourism, stimulated primarily by the natural history and indigenous cultures of an area, and one that inspires in visitors the spirit of appreciation, participation and sensitivity. Ziffer (1989) further indicates that ecotourism promotes non-consumptive use of wildlife and natural resources, and contributes to conservation and the socio-economic wellbeing of local residents. The International Ecotourism Society (TIES) provided a simpler definition of ecotourism in 1990 as responsible travel to natural areas, which seeks to conserve the environment and sustain the wellbeing of the local communities (TIES, 2013). This definition by TIES is supported by the World Conservation Union’s (IUCN) explanation of ecotourism, adopted from Ceballos-Lascurain (1996), which describes ecotourism as environmentally responsible travel and visitation to natural areas, with the purpose of enjoying and appreciating nature and other cultural features, as well as promoting conservation, minimising visitor impact and providing for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local people (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). Thus, the concept of ecotourism seeks to conserve
the environment, protect local cultures and deliver benefits to both tourists and the host communities.

In 1999, Honey expanded on the TIES (1990) definition, and introduced another definitional dimension (equity) into the ecotourism discourse. Honey (1999) defines the concept of ecotourism as small scale travelling to fragile, pristine and protected areas with the fundamental objective of educating travellers, providing funds for conservation, yielding direct benefits for the economic development and political empowerment of the local communities, as well as fostering respects for different cultures and human rights. In explaining this definition, Honey (1999) emphasises low impacts on host communities and the environment, as well as empowerment of the local communities through equitable distribution of tourism benefits.

The definition of ecotourism continues to evolve, and remains a hotly debated concept in the social and ecological literature (e.g., Fennell, 2001; Kennedy et al., 2013). For example, Fennell (2001), after analysing available ecotourism definitions, identified five common variables used to describe ecotourism – the natural environment, education, protection or conservation of resources, preservation of culture and community benefits. Fennell (2003) further perceives ecotourism as a sustainable form of natural resource-based tourism, that is fundamentally geared towards experiencing and gaining deeper insight about nature, and which is ethically managed to be low-impact, non consumptive and locally oriented, in terms of control of resources and benefits to the people. In addition, other researchers (e.g., Blamey, 2001; Lash, 2003) have linked the ethical components of ecotourism to educational experiences and the conservation of natural environment and cultural resources, which both remain critical to ecotourism research.

Nonetheless, Drumm and Moore (2002) argue that some people have lost focus of the ethical or normative component of ecotourism, and have abused and misused the term to attract conservation conscious travellers to what, in reality, are simply nature tourism programmes, which have the potential of creating negative environmental and social impacts. The recognition of the possible abuse of the concept of ecotourism appears to have informed Hillel’s (2002) interpretation of it. According to Hillel (2002), ecotourism should integrate the three objectives/pillars of sustainable
development, and involve a positive contribution to the conservation of sensitive ecosystems and protected areas through financial and political support, as well as ensuring active participation from, and economic benefits to local communities and indigenous people, coupled with environmental education of the host communities, professionals and guests. Hillel (2002) believes that this interpretation addresses issues of abuse, equity and sustainability of ecotourism. Figure 3.1 summarises the evolution of the meaning of ecotourism, before 1990 to the 2000s.

**Figure 3.1   Evolution of the Meaning of Ecotourism**

The literature also suggests that while sustainable development remains central to the ecotourism discussion in developed countries, poverty reduction is key in developing countries. For example, in developed countries, previous studies (e.g., Boo, 1990; Swarbrooke, 1999) have interpreted ecotourism as a sustainable concept, which seeks to achieve environmental conservation while delivering tourist satisfaction and minimising negative impacts. Boo (1990) argues that, in order to promote sustainable development principles of ecotourism, the concept should be tagged ‘sustainable ecotourism’, to appeal to the conscience of ecotourism stakeholders and to communicate the need to integrate other dimensions of sustainable development into ecotourism activities, rather than dwelling solely on the economic benefits. Recent research by Donohoe and Needham (2006) also reveals that ‘sustainability’ remains central to the definition of ecotourism in the developed countries such as Canada.
Although sustainable development has been key to the ecotourism discourse in developing countries, research (e.g., Eadington & Smith, 1992; Gurung & Seeland, 2008, Tuohino & Hynonen, 2001) has shown that the interpretations of ecotourism have also been strongly linked to poverty reduction and local development. This is because ecotourism in developing countries largely occurs in protected areas (e.g., Asiedu, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004), and results in changes in the use of protected area resources by, and livelihoods of local people. For instance, the Ecotourism Society Pakistan (ESP) explains ecotourism as a travelling activity that generates direct financial benefits to local people, educates travellers to respect local cultures, and supports small stakeholders to ensure local development, while discouraging mass tourism, mass constructions and activities in fragile areas (ESP, 2002). This definition emphasises the environmental and socio-economic importance of ecotourism to developing countries. Following the UN General Assembly declaration of the ‘International Year of Ecotourism’ in 2002, ecotourism has been recognised as a development strategy and has contributed to economic development in many countries (e.g., Gurung & Seeland, 2008; Tuohino & Hynonen, 2001), including Nepal, Costa Rica, Madagascar and Ecuador.

A careful observation of the perspectives and interpretations of ecotourism shows that there has been a steady shift in the importance placed on the ‘biodiversity conservation’ objective only (Fennell, 2008), to incorporate the upward commitment towards the empowerment of local people, and the education of the traveller and other actors to meet the fundamental objectives of sustainable development (Honey, 2008; Scheyvens, 1999; Spenceley & Snyman, 2012).

Considering that the definition of ecotourism is characterised by uncertainty, the literature indicates that the concept is often described with value-based attributes, including conservation/preservation, ethics, sustainability and education (e.g., Baral, 2013; Donohoe & Needham, 2006). In this research, ecotourism is viewed as an activity that has low impact on protected areas’ natural resources, and involves various stakeholders in the planning, development, implementation and monitoring phases. As an activity, ecotourism promotes respect for local cultures, generates
sustainable and equitable income for conservation purposes and stakeholders, and educates all stakeholders on their role in conservation (Drumm & Moore, 2002).

Nonetheless, other researchers (e.g., Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Ross & Wall, 1999a) have expressed concern about the gap between ecotourism theory and practice. Those researchers have reported that inconsistency in the definition of ecotourism has prevented the use of the concept in practical terms. Thus, while some writers (e.g., Courvisanos & Jain, 2006) believe ecotourism is just a marketing tactic to attract more customers, others (e.g., Fennell, 2008) attribute its impracticability to the several variables involved in its definition.

### 3.6 Applying the concept of ecotourism: Underpinning principles

Characteristically, ecotourism is often located in fragile and pristine ecosystems (see Section 3.5), and has a tendency to damage the environmental assets on which it depends, through the emission of wastes, loss of biodiversity and wildlife habitats (Epler Wood, 2002). Establishing global and national principles to guide ecotourism activities is therefore vital to the successful development of ecotourism ventures, especially in developing countries.

Attempts to develop principles for ecotourism implementation advanced prior to the 1990s (Epler Wood, 2002) in response to the damaging environmental and socio-cultural impacts of mass tourism. Ecotourism scholars and international organisations (e.g., Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Honey, 2008; TIES 2013) have identified and developed principles of ecotourism that are based on the various attributes of ecotourism. There are similarities in the principles of ecotourism developed by researchers and international organisations. For example, the ecotourism principles proposed by Page and Dowling (2002) are similar to those developed by TIES. In addition, Honey (2008) expands on TIES principles and further develops seven key principles of ecotourism. Donohoe and Needham (2006) also identify six normative tenets of ecotourism which are similar to those proposed by TIES (see Box 3.1).
Hetzer’s (1965) Principles of Ecotourism
Hetzer in 1965 outlined four basic principles of ecotourism, including:
1. minimum environmental impacts;
2. recognising and esteeming local culture;
3. maximising economic benefits to the local communities; and
4. meeting and increasing tourists’ expectations and satisfaction.
Source: Hetzer (1965).

The International Ecotourism Society’s Principles of Ecotourism
Ecotourism is about uniting conservation, communities, and sustainable travel. This means that those who implement and participate in ecotourism activities should follow the following ecotourism principles:
1. Minimise impact.
2. Build environmental and cultural awareness and respect.
3. Provide positive experiences for both visitors and hosts.
4. Provide direct financial benefits for conservation.
5. Provide financial benefits and empowerment for local people.
6. Raise sensitivity to host countries’ political, environmental, and social climate.

Page and Dowling’s (2002) Principles of Ecotourism
Page and Dowling’s (2002) identified five principles of ecotourism, including:
1. nature-based;
2. ecologically sustainable;
3. environmentally educative;
4. locally beneficial; and
5. generating tourist satisfaction.

Donohoe and Needham’s Principles of Ecotourism
Donohoe and Needham (2006) identified the following as key tenets and associated elements of ecotourism:
1. nature-based;
2. preservation/conservation;
3. environmental education;
4. sustainability;
5. distribution of benefits; and
6. ethics/responsibility.

Honey’s (2008) Principles of Ecotourism
Martha Honey broadened TIES principles by outlining seven principles of ecotourism, including:
1. involves traveling to natural destinations;
2. minimising impact;
3. building environmental awareness;
4. providing direct financial benefits for conservation;
5. providing financial benefits and empowerment for local people;
6. Respecting local culture; and
7. Supporting human rights and democratic movements.
Drawing from the above perspectives and based on the common features (see Box 3.1), the principles of ecotourism have been abridged into five broad groups, for the purposes of this research (see Figure 3.2). These are environmental conservation, cultural preservation, community participation, economic benefits, and empowerment of vulnerable groups. These principles are discussed further.

**Figure 3.2  Fundamental Principles of Ecotourism**


The literature indicates that environmental conservation remains a fundamental principle of ecotourism (e.g., Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Honey, 2008; TIES, 2013). The environmental conservation principle encompasses all activities related to the natural environment, including nature-based activities, environmental education and protection, and minimal environmental impacts. Page and Dowling (2002) explain that this principle emphasises minimisation of negative impacts on the environment and ensures ecological sustainability. Thus it is considered paramount in the activities of ecotourism (Honey, 2008). As discussed in Section 3.5, ecotourism is praised because of its ability to foster environmental awareness, and support for conservation, amongst both local residents and tourists (Ross & Wall, 1999a). According to TIES (2013), this principle encourages the education of tourists and the host communities on the importance of conservation (TIES, 2013). Donohoe and Needham (2006) indicate that issues of nature-based and environmental protection dominate in both academic and Canadian samples of ecotourism definitions. Moreover, in defining the concept of ecotourism, Cellabos-Lascurain (1987, 1996) highlights the importance of environmental conservation education in ecotourism (see
Section 3.5), which is further supported by Page and Dowling (2002), who argue that ecotourism should be environmentally educative.

In relation to the cultural preservation principle, researchers and international organisations (e.g., Honey, 2008; Ross & Wall, 1999a; Segbefia, 2008; Slinger, 2000; TIES, 2013, UN, 2003) have underscored the importance of cultural values in ecotourism activities. Some writers (e.g., Honey, 2008; Slinger, 2000) have examined this principle by emphasising the promotion of cultural preservation, and respect for local culture. Other researchers (e.g., Ross & Wall, 1999a; Segbefia, 2008) have also described this principle by highlighting the intercultural experiences of tourists and host communities through ecotourism, which they consider essential and which make ecotourism and all other forms of sustainable tourism meaningful. Hence, Page and Dowling (2002) assert that ecotourism should be designed and implemented to ensure that it promotes cultural education.

Another principle of the concept of ecotourism is community participation or involvement (e.g., Honey, 2008; Page & Dowling, 2002; TIES, 2003). Studies (e.g. Gurung & Seeland, 2008, 2009; Lai & Nepal, 2006) have shown that this principle ensures that ecotourism activities engage with local communities, and operate cooperatively with local authorities and tourists to meet local needs, while delivering conservation benefits. This principle of engaging local communities contributes to tourist satisfaction and ensures continuity of ecotourism activities (Page & Dowling, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004).

Ecotourism also operates on the principle of delivering economic benefits to the host country, particularly people living in, and adjacent to natural and protected areas (Page & Dowling, 2002; TIES, 2013). In maximising economic benefits, ecotourism advocates for the promotion of recycling, energy efficiency, water conservation, and the creation of economic opportunities for local communities (Randall, 1987). Honey (2008) further indicates that one of the fundamental objectives of ecotourism lies in its ability to stimulate economic development at both the local and the national level. Therefore, ecotourism is branded as having the potential to diversify and complement the economy (Notzke, 1999). As established in Section 3.5, the growing importance of ecotourism over the past three decades is linked to its principle of creating
employment, and generating funds for the management and conservation of natural and protected areas (Weaver, 1998).

Finally, empowerment of vulnerable groups especially women, remains an important principle of ecotourism (Gauthier, 1993; Honey, 2008; Pradhan, 2001). Honey (2008) explains that this principle supports the protection of human rights and democratic movements, and leads to the empowerment of the wider host community, given that these vulnerable groups constitute the majority of local population. Moreover, ecotourism is applauded by social advocates due to its potential to create social benefits for all, improve the lives of vulnerable groups, and empower host communities (Honey, 2008; Scheyvens, 1999).

As presented in Figure 3.2, the principles of ecotourism cut across the three fundamental pillars of sustainable development: environmental conservation, economic opportunities and society (see Section 2.6.2). The next section examines the pro-poor potential of ecotourism.

### 3.7 Applying the concept of ecotourism: A pro-poor approach

While ecotourism in certain cases has benefited the poor (see Section 3.10), the literature suggests that the rhetoric of ecotourism and other forms of sustainable tourism emphasises conservation (Cattarinch, 2001). Some writers (e.g., Ashley et al., 2001a) believe it is time to develop strategies to enhance net benefits to the poor in the tourism industry, drawing on a range of expertise in pro-poor growth rather than relying on the dominance of sustainable forms of tourism. Other scholars (e.g., Gerosa, 2003) have argued that a necessary ingredient for poverty reduction is a pro-poor strategy in which economic growth is combined with improvement in the living conditions of the poor.

The concept of pro-poor tourism has emerged over the past decade with poverty elimination as its fundamental purpose. The purpose of pro-poor tourism is to unlock opportunities for the poor, by creating conditions that stimulate economic growth in developing countries (Ashley et al., 2001a; Cattarinch, 2001; Goodwin, 2009). Pro-
poor tourism is not a tourism sector, but an approach to tourism development (Ashley et al., 2001a).

The literature indicates that strategies for implementing pro-poor tourism focus on three core areas, which often overlap: increased economic benefits, positive non-economic impacts, and policy/process reform (Ashley et al., 2001a; Cattarinch, 2001; DFID, 1999). Economically, expanding business opportunities, such as small enterprises, particularly in the informal sector, often provide the greatest opportunities for the poor. In addition, pro-poor tourism provides employment opportunities such as unskilled jobs which are much sought after by the poor, although they may be low-paid by international standards. Pro-poor tourism, according to Jamieson et al. (2004), provides economic opportunities for the poor through the creation of full or part-time employment or for the development of small and medium enterprises providing sales to tourism businesses or to tourists.

Regarding non-economic strategies, a pro-poor approach to tourism focuses on building the capacity of, training and empowering the poor through skills and knowledge acquisition, in order to take advantage of tourism opportunities. Mitigating the environmental impacts of tourism resulting from displacement of the poor from their land and from natural resource degradation is another non-economic strategy of the pro-poor approach, as well as addressing social and cultural impacts of tourism (Ashley et al., 2001a; Cattarinch, 2001).

Policy-oriented strategies of pro-poor tourism include building a more supportive policy and planning framework. This is important as many governments see tourism as a means to generate foreign exchange rather than to address poverty. Promoting participation of the poor in decision-making processes to ensure that their priorities are reflected in tourism decisions, in addition to bringing the private sector into pro-poor partnerships are important policy strategies. Ashley et al. (2001a) state that partnership are critical, as locally-driven tourism enterprises may require input to develop skills, marketing links, and commercial expertise.

In relation to ecotourism and poverty reduction, a number of the characteristics of ecotourism enhance its pro-poor potential, including its labour intensive nature;
creation of better and more gender concerned jobs suitable to the informal sector; dependence on natural and cultural assets of the poor; and being suitable for rural areas where poverty is harsher (Ashley et al., 2001b; Gerosa, 2003). The pro-poor approach to tourism puts the poor and poverty at the centre of ecotourism activities, and stresses the importance of minimising or mitigating negative environmental impacts, and the enhancement of local culture (Ashley et al., 2000; Cattarinch, 2001; Spenceley & Goodwin, 2007).

Considering that ecotourism has a number of pro-poor characteristics, it is important to identify the players that may be involved in ecotourism decision making, in order to understand its impacts on poverty reduction (Hvenegaard, 1994). The next section examines the various stakeholders involved in ecotourism implementation.

### 3.8 Applying the concept of ecotourism: The role of stakeholders

The activities of ecotourism are characterised by a wide range of stakeholders with varied interests and roles. Although the stakeholders play complementary roles (Goodwin et al., 1998), some of them are regarded as key stakeholders while others play secondary roles in the process of ecotourism implementation (Petrovska et al., 2009). This section examines the basis of stakeholders’ involvement in ecotourism development, the categorisations and the roles of the various stakeholders. This discussion also draws on the work of stakeholder participation in tourism activities from the community-based tourism literature (e.g., Ioannides, 1995; Kneafsey, 2001; Tosun, 2006; Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Trousdale, 1996).

The activities and involvement of stakeholders in ecotourism can be linked to the ‘stakeholder theory’ propounded by Freeman (1984). The theory suggests that activities of an organisation are influenced by its relationships with various groups and individuals, including employees, customers, NGOs, governments, and members of the communities. Stakeholders in an organisation constitute the groups or individuals who can affect or are affected by the achievement of the organisation’s objectives (Freeman, 1984). Thus, individuals and groups can be classified as stakeholders when they have a legitimate interest in the activities of an organisation.
(Donaldson & Preston, 1995). Sautter and Leisen (1999) consider effective collaboration and coordination amongst the various stakeholders to be necessary to ensure successful implementation of ecotourism. Therefore, the formation of strong partnerships amongst ecotourism stakeholders remains imperative to the achievement of the multiple goals of development and environmental conservation (Drumm & Moore, 2002).

Given that ecotourism implementation engages with a wide spectrum of stakeholders (e.g., local community, institutions and agencies), establishing effective collaboration and coordination may seem difficult. Attempts have been made by some writers (e.g., Mader, 2011; Petrovska et al., 2009) to classify the various ecotourism stakeholders. For example, Mader (2011) categorises the various stakeholders into eight groups, namely locals (e.g., host communities), travellers/ecotourists, governments, media, travel industry, transport, social sector (e.g., academics), and non-human (e.g., animals, plants). Petrovska et al. (2009) classify ecotourism stakeholders into core decision makers (e.g., host communities) and supporting players (e.g., academics). In this research, ecotourism stakeholders have been categorised into eight groups which are not mutually exclusive (see Figure 3.3), and also based on the available literature (e.g., Drumm & Moore, 2002; Mader, 2011; Petrovska et al., 2009; South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism, 1996; Tosun & Timothy, 2003).
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**Figure 3.3** Major Stakeholders Involved in Ecotourism Development

3.8.1 Protected Area Managers

As discussed in Section 3.5, ecotourism in developing countries largely occurs in protected areas, and involves protected area managers and scientists such as biologists, botanists or wildlife specialists. These professionals play a key role to protect marine and terrestrial sites, by conducting inventories, managing wildlife populations, providing criteria for the award of concession/leases to ecotourism operators, and maintaining visitor facilities (Petrovska et al., 2009; South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism, 1996). The protected area managers are required to work closely and knowledgeably with local people and community leaders, as well as with various tourism industry representatives, including tourism operators, tour guides, and others to ensure successful ecotourism operation (Drumm & Moore, 2002). Also, Petrovska et al. (2009) indicate that protected area managers are often the first to notice natural resource changes, including environmental damage from tourism.

3.8.2 Host/Local Communities

In this research, host/local communities are those that are immediately adjacent to the park (KCA), within 10 km from the park boundary (Appiah-Opoku, 2011). Residents of host communities constitute a vital component of ecotourism development, despite the possibility of the local residents having mixed reactions to ecotourism activities. Petrovska et al. (2009) explain that while some local residents want nothing to do with tourists as they strive for their privacy, and do not welcome the changes that tourism brings, others are intrigued by it and are taking steps to develop tourism. Tourism may be particularly alluring if other employment options are limited, or if residents feel tourism may help protect their precious resources (Petrovska et al., 2009). Some researchers (e.g., Tosun, 2006; Tosun & Timothy, 2003) indicate that the involvement of, and use of natural resources by, local communities determines the success of conservation strategies, including ecotourism. Barnes et al. (2003) indicated that participation of host communities in ecotourism and conservation activities is essential in addressing challenges arising from activities such as human wildlife conflict, poaching and illegal logging. Tosun and Timothy (2003) further propose seven principles underlying the importance of community involvement in
tourism activities: (1) community involvement is fundamental in the implementation of tourism policies; (2) it contributes to sustainable development; (3) it meets tourists’ needs; (4) it helps in tourism plan development; (5) it ensures equitable distribution of costs and benefits of tourism; (6) it satisfies local needs; and (7) it ensures transparency in tourism activities. In addition, the literature indicates that local or traditional knowledge is often a key component of the visitor experience and contributes to visitor education, as well as promoting sustainable ecotourism (e.g., Kneafsey, 2001; Petrovska et al., 2009). Ecotourism is often improved with local residents’ input as they can identify and develop ecotourism resources within their communities, and oppose developments that are harmful to the environment (South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism, 1996).

3.8.3 Tourism Industry

The tourism industry is huge recording an annual growth rate of 4.1 percent (UNWTO, 2014) and includes tour operators and travel agents who assemble trips; airline and cruise ship employees; transport operators; staff of hotels and small family lodges; handicraft makers; restaurant owners; tour guides; and all the other community residents who maintain cultural and natural heritage (Petrovska et al., 2009; Tosun 2006). Some researchers (e.g., Madar, 2011; Petrovska et al., 2009) explain that members of the tourism industry understand travel trends, and can influence travellers by encouraging good behaviour and limiting negative impacts in ecotourism sites, as well as promoting ecotourism.

3.8.4 Government Officials

Officials from government departments participate in ecotourism planning, development and management. These departments include tourism, natural resources, wildlife and protected areas, education, community development, finance and transportation. Some authors (e.g., Drumm & Moore, 2002; Simpson, 2008; South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism, 1996) indicate that governments, both at the national and local levels, have several functions in ecotourism development, including provision of leadership, monitoring and evaluation, coordinating and articulating national goals for ecotourism, in addition to planning and policy making. Government policies direct ecotourism activities
through the provision of basic infrastructure, ranging from airlines facilities in large cities to secondary roads leading to remote sites. Government departments provide other services important to ecotourism development, such as health clinics in rural areas and preservation of traditional architecture (Petrovska et al., 2009; UNWTO, 1985).

3.8.5 Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

NGOs are valuable players because they provide a forum for discussion and influence regarding ecotourism. Petrovska et al. (2009) assert that NGOs serve as vehicles for bringing together all the elements of ecotourism, as they act directly as programme managers or site administrators, and indirectly as trainers, advisors, and business partners with ecotourism companies or communities and, in some cases, as providers of ecotourism services. They also deliver education, training and bridging courses to local communities, and conduct environmental tourism and awareness programmes (Petrovska et al., 2009; South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism, 1996). NGOs keep the tourism industry informed about current trends and events, and serve as facilitators between protected area managers, communities and all other stakeholders in ecotourism (Petrovska et al., 2009). Literature further indicates that NGOs may be involved in ecotourism and tourism certification and sometimes initiate ecotourism such as Ecotourism Society of Kenya (ESOK) (Halpenny, 2001; Sindiga, 1999). For example in South Africa, the government issued a White Paper outlining its responsible tourism policy which encourages NGOs to provide seed funding for ecotourism ventures at low interest rates or as grants (Department of Environmental Affairs & Tourism [DEAT] (1996).

3.8.6 Funding Bodies

Funding bodies play a major supporting role in ecotourism activities. Different groups can fund (e.g., loans or grants) the development of ecotourism, including financial investment organisations, bilateral and multilateral donor agencies (e.g., the World Bank, private investors, NGOs and private banks) (Petrovska et al., 2009). According to South Africa’s Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (1996), private sector and donor agencies have and will continue to play an important role in further development and promotion of ecotourism, in the form of delivering
quality tourism services, promoting local involvement through partnership, as well as collaborating with the government. Researchers (e.g., Drumm & Moore, 2002; Petrovska et al., 2009; Simpson, 2008) often regard these contributions as critical for the sustenance of ecotourism activities.

### 3.8.7 Academics

Academics at universities are another group that plays a secondary but valuable role in the planning and daily operations of ecotourism. It is a group that helps to develop ecotourism, and raises questions to ensure that ecotourism meets its stated principles. Petrovska et al. (2009) argue that researchers and academics facilitate learning by asking such questions as: Who exactly is benefiting from ecotourism? How do we measure benefits? How does ecotourism contribute to our existing knowledge about conservation? What are the links between ecotourism and tourism?

### 3.8.8 Ecotourists

The importance of ecotourists in ecotourism development has been emphasised by some writers (e.g., Petrovska et al., 2009; Trousdale, 1996). These researchers explain that ecotourists consist of individuals or groups who are interested in experiencing, enjoying and learning about nature within a natural setting. Ecotourists remain the most vital participants in the sector, and provide motivation for everyone else’s activities, although few participate in formal meetings about ecotourism (Petrovska et al., 2009; Trousdale, 1996). Nevertheless, the choices that ecotourists make when they select a tourism destination, choose a tour operator or travel agent, and, ultimately, the kind of tour in which they wish to participate, have an impact upon the eventual success or failure of ecotourism projects (Petrovska et al., 2009).

As illustrated in Figure 3.3, the activities of ecotourism involve a wide spectrum of individuals, groups and organisations. Consultation, coordination, partnership and collaboration between the various stakeholders may stimulate a sense of inclusiveness (Simpson, 2008). However, some writers (e.g., Hall, 1999; Simpson, 2008) argue that the question of participation still remains elusive; are all stakeholders involved in ecotourism activities? Who is involved and who is left out of decision making processes? Are the communities benefiting from the end result of ecotourism? Thus,
the next section examines the available frameworks for evaluating ecotourism implementation in host communities.

### 3.9 Applying the concept of ecotourism: An evaluation framework

A review of the literature indicates that ecotourism as a concept cannot in itself ensure environmental conservation, reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development, especially in developing countries. However, effective implementation of ecotourism has been shown to be a viable option for promoting environmental conservation, reducing poverty and achieving sustainable development (Donohoe & Needham, 2006; Honey, 2008; Ross & Wall, 1999a). As a result, frameworks for evaluating the success of ecotourism implementation in developing countries continue to evolve (e.g., Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Fennell & Eagles, 1990; Hvenegaard, 1994; Ross & Wall, 1999a; Scheyvens, 1999).

In 1990, Fennell and Eagles developed a conceptual framework for ecotourism in Costa Rica, focusing on the relationship between the service industry (e.g., tour operation, resource management, and community development) and the tourist/visitor (e.g., marketing, visitor management, and visitor attitude). Based on Fennell and Eagles’ (1990) conceptual framework, and after reporting on the status of the ecotourism concept, Hvenegaard (1994) provided an integrated conceptual framework for assessing ecotourism implementation and impact. Moreover, while Scheyvens (1999) introduced the Ecotourism Empowerment Framework to evaluate ecotourism implementation and its impacts on empowering local communities, Ross and Wall (1999a) proposed the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework to assess the effectiveness of ecotourism implementation in protected areas. In 2006, Courvisanos and Jain proposed another ecotourism framework, ‘A Framework for Sustainable Ecotourism’, to assess ecotourism implementation in Costa Rica.

In this research, Ross and Wall’s (1999a) Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework has been used to assess the implementation of ecotourism in the case study communities. Section 3.9.1 provides justification for the selection of Ross and Wall’s (1999a) framework.
3.9.1 The Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework

As discussed in Chapter 1, the conceptual basis for this research is the evaluation of ecotourism implementation and its outcomes on poverty reduction in rural Ghana. This research explores four key issues in relation to ecotourism: local understanding of ecotourism, planning of ecotourism, implementation of ecotourism and the outcomes of ecotourism implementation on poverty reduction (see Figure 1). Ross and Wall’s (1999a) framework is best suited for addressing these issues. As Ross and Wall (1999a) claim, the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework provides an avenue to assess the status of ecotourism implementation in protected areas, particularly in developing countries. The framework focuses on the relationships between three parts – tourism, protected areas, and local community. Ross and Wall (1999a) argue that the framework provides a basis for assessing local level understanding of ecotourism in terms of the implementation of the concept, as it identifies aspects of relationships between the three parts where efforts and strengths have been focused or lacking.

This framework does not only provide an understanding of ecotourism implementation but also an understanding of the concept at the local level, and the outcomes of ecotourism in the local community. Considering this research focuses on a protected area (KCA) and aims to understand the concept of ecotourism, its implementation and outcomes in the local community, the adoption of Ross and Wall’s (1999a) framework is appropriate for achieving the research aim. The following paragraphs describe the framework.

The idea of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework was conceived and developed by Ross and Wall (1999a) in response to the widening gap between ecotourism philosophy and its application, which has inhibited holistic understanding of the ‘actual meaning’ of ecotourism in host regions. Ross and Wall (1999a) explain that the development of a standardised framework is imperative, and has the potential to improve the dynamics of ecotourism, and to contribute to ecotourism planning and management. They describe an ideal ecotourism situation as one where local residents, protected resources, and tourism benefit one another in an interrelated and symbiotic fashion. As illustrated in Figure 3.4, the framework consists of three key
parts: local communities, biological diversity and tourism (see Appendix 6 for details of this framework).
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**Figure 3.4   Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework**  
Source: Adapted from Ross and Wall (1999a, p.130).

Ross and Wall (1999a) explain that efforts to strengthen the relationships between the three parts – local community, natural resources and tourism – should not be underestimated, as ecotourism contributions to biodiversity and the integrity of natural areas are equally important, and potentially beneficial to adjacent communities. Moreover, as shown in Figure 3.4, management options are proposed to conduct, and ensure monitoring of, research programmes in protected areas, as well as enforcement of restrictions in protected or fragile areas, in addition to their role in tourism services and tourist impact management. Management options also seek to carry out outreach programmes and enforce restriction zones in the local communities (see Appendix 6 for details). Therefore, this framework proposes that the success of ecotourism in protected or fragile areas is contingent on positive and harmonious relationships between natural resources and local communities, between local communities and tourism, and between tourism and protected or fragile areas, facilitated by appropriate management (Ross & Wall, 1999a; 1999b).

In terms of application, Ross and Wall (1999b) indicate that this framework has wide applicability for assessing ecotourism achievements at specific sites, and for directing
appropriate management interventions for ecotourism in protected areas. A number of studies (e.g., Ross & Wall, 1999b; Stone & Wall, 2004) have used this framework to analyse the status of ecotourism development in developing countries (see Appendix 6 for details). According to Ross and Wall (1999b) this framework has been useful in identifying areas where efforts and strengths have been focused or lacking, in terms of ecotourism implementation, at different destinations. The framework has been used in this research to evaluate the implementation of ecotourism in and around the KCA, a protected area.

3.10 Relationships between ecotourism and poverty reduction in developing countries

Ecotourism as a concept has the potential to contribute to the global fight against poverty through its principles (see Section 3.6). The attraction of ecotourism is the prospect of connecting conservation and local livelihoods (Kiss, 2004). According to Honey (1999), ecotourism has been hailed globally as a strategy for conservation and local development in poor countries. Although the role of tourism in poverty reduction has been discussed in Section 3.3, this section specifically explores the contribution of ecotourism to achieving the MDGs and poverty reduction. Table 3.2 summarises the major areas in which ecotourism can contribute to poverty reduction and the MDGs (see Section 2.5.1).

Table 3.2 Key Contributions of Ecotourism to Poverty Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of Ecotourism</th>
<th>Dimensions of Poverty</th>
<th>MDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment creation</td>
<td>Lack of employment opportunities</td>
<td>MDG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generation</td>
<td>Income Deprivation</td>
<td>MDG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Illiteracy</td>
<td>MDG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of disadvantaged and minority groups</td>
<td>Gender discrimination</td>
<td>MDG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of local communities leading to local stewardship</td>
<td>Lack of participation and exclusion</td>
<td>MDG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in health conditions</td>
<td>Poor health</td>
<td>MDGs 4, 5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of the natural environment</td>
<td>Unsustainable management of the natural environment</td>
<td>MDG 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive international relations</td>
<td>Lack of cooperation/peace</td>
<td>MDG 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As discussed in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, socio-economic deprivation forms the basis of most definitions of poverty. Ecotourism combats this deprivation by generating direct employment for unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled labour (Coria & Calfucura, 2012). Many people, especially those in host communities, may be employed in direct ecotourism activities, as boat drivers, waiters, tour guides and hospitality staff in hotels. For example, a study by UNEP (2001) revealed that over 40 percent of local people in the vicinity of Hol Chan Marine Reserve in Belize benefit from ecotourism economically, with small business enterprises able to take and spread the benefits. In addition to direct employment, other authors (e.g. Fennell, 2008; Wearing & Neil, 1999) have reported that ecotourism provides markets for locally made goods, especially in the agricultural sector. The activities of local guides in assisting ecotourists provide income for local people, and increase environmental awareness, especially where tour guides are trained (Weiler & Ham, 2002), thus contributing to poverty reduction and achieving MDG 1.

As explained in Section 2.4, Rank (2004) attributes socio-economic structural failings of society as a major cause of poverty. Moreover, Gore (2000) notes that structural transformation liberates people from poverty, and leads to development (see Section 2.6.1). Research (e.g., Honey, 2008; Gurung & Seeland, 2008) has shown that revenue from ecotourism activities empowers both national and local governments to improve local livelihoods, by providing infrastructure and basic services, including health, schools, housing, rural roads, access to drinking water and electricity, as well as increasing local confidence. The improvement in local livelihoods addresses the basic needs dimensions of poverty (e.g., health) (Seers, 1969), and contributes to achieving the MDGs on health and education (MDGs 2, 4, 5 & 6).

As observed by Schriver (2004) in Section 2.2, there is a gender dimension of poverty where women are excluded from decision making and income generating activities. In reducing poverty, ecotourism has the potential to empower the disadvantaged in society, such as women and young people, by opening economic and management roles for them (Gauthier, 1993). These roles range from income generating activities to decision making. The Annapurna Conservation Area in Nepal is an example where women have been involved in ecotourism activities (Pradhan, 2001). Pradhan (2001)
indicates that the occupational involvement of local women in ecotourism business has been exemplary, and has become a source of inspiration for several villages across Nepal. In addition, Chhetri and Lama (2012), using the successful operations of ‘3 Sisters Adventure Trekking’ in Nepal, claim that ecotourism has contributed to women’s empowerment through training and mentoring of village women to become trekking professionals, which is contributing to achieving MDG 3.

Global discussions of poverty show a lack of participation by local people in socio-economic, environmental and political activities (e.g., Hills & Stewart, 2005; Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005; Western et al., 2005). Ecotourism scholars (e.g., Kruger, 2005; Scheyvens, 1999) have reported that ecotourism ventures are more likely to lead to stewardship when locals gain some measure of control, and share equitably in the benefits. This, according to Kruger (2005) and Scheyvens (1999), is fundamental to conservation efforts, since participation remains central to conservation. Courvisanos and Jain (2006) assert that participation in the planning process is a fundamental requirement of ecotourism activities. In relation to poverty reduction, ecotourism encourages local participation, in the form of ownership and management of local resources. Stronza and Gordillo (2008) indicate that local ownership and management in ecotourism can lead to new learning and greater local cohesion.

Unsustainable management of the natural environment is a characteristic of poverty, in developing countries. Many developing countries are characterised by increasing deforestation, pollution of water sources, and loss of genetic diversity (see Section 2.3). Protection of natural environment has been topical in conservationists’ discussions of ecotourism. Ecotourism provides incentives, such as employment and sense of ownership, for local communities to protect the wildlife, forests, and other attractions tourists pay to see (Gossling, 2002; Ross & Wall, 1999a). As a consequence, some host communities have benefited from ecotourism through the support of the conservation community, in the form of project funds, expertise, and technical assistance (Doan, 2000; Kiss, 2004; Stronza & Gordillo, 2008). An example of ecotourism’s success in reducing unsustainable management of the natural environment in developing countries is Rwanda’s mountain gorillas where
ecotourism has restricted access to the protected areas, and provided jobs for those who previously engage in poaching as tour guides (Honey, 1999).

Based on the above discussion, it is evident that ecotourism can contribute to poverty reduction and the MDGs in developing countries. Ecotourism literature reveals the specific areas in which ecotourism can contribute to achieving the MDGs (see Figure 3.5 & Table 3.2). As discussed in Section 2.5.1, the MDGs are adopted as indicators for assessing the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the communities around the KCA (Research Question Three), using Figure 3.5 (see Section 8.8).
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**3.11 Challenges for ecotourism in poverty reduction**

Previous studies (e.g., Landell-Mills & Porras, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004) have raised concerns about the limited ecotourism benefits received by host communities. The challenges facing tourism in relation to poverty reduction have been established in Section 3.4. This section focuses on the challenges that have been reported in ecotourism research – limited socio-economic benefits to local communities, negative environmental impacts, and demonstration effect.
The ecotourism literature indicates that limited socio-economic benefits to local communities from ecotourism activities remain a key problem for ecotourism development in developing countries (Lindberg et al., 1996; Sarrasin, 2013; Stone & Wall, 2004). Although the literature shows that ecotourism generates numerous economic returns (Stronza & Gordillo, 2008), the UNWTO (2002) explains that the benefits are often inadequate to offset the negative effects of ecotourism. As discussed in Section 3.10, local communities have realised limited benefits from ecotourism, because of inadequate involvement of the various ecotourism stakeholders, and lack of programme evaluation (Landell-Mills & Porras, 2002). The Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania is an example where the Maasai community has received limited benefits from ecotourism, due to a lack of policy direction and weak institutions (Charnley, 2005).

Another challenge of ecotourism development is negative environmental impacts. Ecotourism has the potential to provide socio-economic benefits and protect the environment (see Section 3.10). However, studies (e.g., Roberts & Thanos, 2003; World Wide Fund for Nature, 2001) have reported that ecotourism activities often generate negative environmental effects, including pollution, depletion of natural resources, and through the physical impacts of ecotourism development and the activities of tourists. Improvements in infrastructure, such as roads and buildings to support the increasing inflow of tourists, can impact negatively on the environment (Roberts & Thanos, 2003). Other researchers (e.g., Farrell & Marion, 2002; Ormsby & Mannie, 2006) have also argued that ecotourism activities may degrade the natural resources, damage the vegetation cover, and result in the general destruction of the natural environment.

Culturally, researchers (e.g., Clifton & Benson, 2006; Farrell & Marion, 2002; Ormsby & Mannie, 2006) have expressed concerns about demonstration effect in ecotourism activities in local communities. Demonstration effect occurs when rural communities and cultures are fashioned on Western style and behaviour through interactions of the community with tourists (Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Metalka, 1986). Clifton & Benson (2006) indicate that ecotourism can generate conflicts within local communities through invasion of foreign culture (see Figure 3.6).
Figure 3.6  The Relationship between Ecotourism and Poverty Reduction
3.12 Chapter summary

This chapter has discussed the evolution of the tourism industry, and explored various characteristics associated with different forms of tourism. It focussed on the relationship between ecotourism and poverty reduction, which forms the basis of this research. The literature review revealed tourism as one of the largest industries in the world, with the potential to contribute to poverty reduction through different types of tourism, particularly ecotourism, which remains one of the fastest growing sectors of the tourism industry.

The literature review identified three factors relevant to ecotourism development. First, ecotourism can play an important role in reducing poverty because of its pro-poor characteristics. However, to achieve this ecotourism planning, development and management have to be guided by its fundamental principles of achieving sustainable development. Second, there are indications from several case studies suggesting limited ecotourism benefits, especially in developing countries (e.g., Landell-Mills & Porras, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004). This is due to excessive leakage of economic benefits, lack of involvement of key stakeholders, weak institutions and lack of policy direction (see Section 3.11). Third, ecotourism can generate adverse effects if not properly planned and implemented (see section 3.11).

Although the literature provides evidence for ecotourism as a sustainable local development concept, there remains a gap between the theory and practice of ecotourism, as the benefits of ecotourism activities are often perverted, lost or experienced inadequately in host communities. The literature review suggests that ecotourism can contribute to poverty reduction through its fundamental principles. Despite these potential contributions, the poverty phenomenon is persistent in developing countries (Todaro & Smith, 2006).

This research presents an example from Ghana, using the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA) as a case study area, to further the understanding of the potential of ecotourism to deliver poverty reduction outcomes in local communities. In the next chapter (Chapter 4) the research methodology used in this research, as well as the data collection methods and analysis, are examined.
Chapter Four
Research methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes how this research was carried out, in order to answer the research questions outlined in Chapter 1. Literature describing social research indicates that defining the boundaries of key research terminologies, including paradigms, methodologies and methods, remains a difficult task for researchers (Mackenzie & Knipe, 2006). In this research, a paradigm is explained as ‘the world view in relation to a problem/topic’; a methodology as ‘the broad process of studying and describing the research problem/topic’; and methods as ‘the research design and techniques used to address the research problem/topic (Morgan, 2007; Niglas, 2001; Walsh, 2001).

This chapter examines the theoretical basis for the selected research paradigm, methodology, and methods. Discussions focus on social science research paradigms, the mixed methods approach, the case study research method and the sampling approach. Other issues discussed include data collection techniques, data analysis, validity and reliability of data, ethical issues, and the role of the researcher in this research.

4.2 Social science research paradigms

Several researchers (e.g., Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Morgan, 2007; Rossman & Rallis, 2003) have explained a research paradigm as a worldview, or set of beliefs, including shared understandings of reality that guide and inform researchers when undertaking any type of research. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), a research paradigm is an embodiment of ontological (study of existence or nature of reality) and epistemological (the branch of philosophy that studies the nature of knowledge, in particular its foundations, scope and validity) assumptions, as well as a research methodology. Hamilton-Smith and Bricknell (1993, p.360) agree that “there can be no quality research without quality in the researcher's understanding of the ontology and epistemology of his/her research actions”.

Yet there is a long standing epistemological and ontological debate by science philosophers and methodologists about how to conduct research based on an
appropriate paradigm (Amaratunga et al., 2002). This has resulted in the proliferation of social science research paradigms over the past decades (May, 2001). Neuman (1997) identifies three key paradigms that are often associated with social research; positivist, interpretive (phenomenological) and critical (realist) paradigms. The characteristics of the three major paradigms are summarised in Table 4.1, and explained further in Appendix 7.

**Table 4.1 Characteristics of Key Social Science Research Paradigms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Paradigm</th>
<th>Key Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Positivist        | 1. Reality viewed as atomistic, discrete and observable.  
2. Discover fundamental laws of human behaviour.  
3. Objectivity in social reality.  
| 1. Knowledge derived from experiment or comparative analysis based on observations.  
2. Use of quantitative and experimental approaches.  
3. Generalisation and causations.  |
| Interpretivist    | 1. Reality is a product of processes.  
2. Meanings for actions and situations are negotiated by social actors.  
3. Focuses on understanding and explanation of phenomenon.  
| 1. Knowledge results from everyday interpretations and meanings of events.  
2. Use of qualitative and naturalistic approaches.  |
| Critical (Realist)| 1. Combined use of nomothetic and idiographic approaches;  
2. Distinction between empirical, actual and the real  |
|                  | 1. Building models for explaining observable phenomena.  |

Source: Adapted from May (2001) and Neuman (2003).

Despite the apparent methodological differences of the three research paradigms, Blaikie (1991) argues that they cannot be regarded as exclusive boxes for classifying social research. Rather they provide a platform for integrating the central features of major theoretical and methodological traditions of social science which highlight the tensions and dilemmas associated with explaining and understanding social life. Thus, the pragmatic research paradigm has emerged to provide “an immediate and useful middle position philosophically and methodologically; … and … offers a method for selecting methodological mixes that can help researchers better answer many of their research questions” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.17). This research is therefore based on the pragmatic research paradigm (see Section 4.2.1)
4.2.1 The Emergence and Use of the Pragmatic Research Paradigm

Explaining the genesis of the pragmatic research paradigm, Creswell (2009) explains that neither positivist nor interpretivist paradigms are sufficiently suitable for undertaking interdisciplinary social research where analysis of relevant data is required. The issue in research design is not whether one has consistently adhered to prescribed standards or a logical positivist or interpretive paradigm, but whether one has made sensible methods decisions, given the purpose of the research, the questions being investigated, and the resources available (Amaratunga et al., 2002; Creswell, 2009; Punch, 2005). A practical approach that allows for appropriate mixed methods in answering a research question or objective should be promoted and supported, rather than debating about competing research paradigms (Patton, 1990).

The pragmatic paradigm has emerged as an alternative research paradigm (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) with mixed methods approach as its philosophical foundation (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). According to Hoshmand (2003) pragmatism considers the various ways of mixing research approaches successfully, based on the research problem. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the aim of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the nature and dynamics of poverty, and the role and potential of ecotourism activities in reducing poverty in developing countries. In view of this central aim, a research paradigm that provides the most appropriate opportunities for answering the research questions was imperative.

Thus, thinking beyond the limited scope of the positivist-interpretivist divide (Cloke et al., 2004) and recognising the significance of both objective and subjective information, this research was based on pragmatism as an integrated paradigm, using a mixed methods research approach (see Section 4.3.3).

4.3 An overview of research methods

4.3.1 Qualitative Research Methods

With a rise in popularity in the 1980s (McMurray et al., 2004), qualitative research methods have become a major research technique in the social sciences for studying social and cultural experiences (Yegidis & Weinbach, 2009). These methods present a comprehensive summary and an in-depth analysis of all
elements of an event (Sandelowski, 2000b), and further provide meaning to people's social experiences (Neuman, 2003).

This research adopted a predominantly qualitative approach, as these are the research methods most often used in social research to seek in-depth explanations and meanings in a research topic (Neuman, 2003; Sale et al., 2002; Sandelowski, 2000b). The advantages of using qualitative methods in this research include:

1. providing an in-depth understanding of the poverty situation and ecotourism activities in and around the KCA;
2. investigating the behaviour of the people living within the vicinity of the KCA (Hesse-Biber, 2010), in relation to ecotourism and poverty;
3. understanding the processes of ecotourism development, and its meaning to the local people, in relation to poverty reduction (Sale et al., 2002), which is necessary in evaluation research (Kaplan & Maxwell, 2006); and,
4. providing an opportunity to gather adequate data on the dynamics of poverty in Ghana and other developing countries, the implementation and management of ecotourism, and local people’s perceptions and experiences in relation to ecotourism implementation.

Qualitative research methods are criticised for the following reasons: large volume of data involved; complexity of analysis; and details of classification records (Richards & Richards, 1994).

4.3.2 Quantitative Research Methods

With a background in the natural sciences (Neuman, 2003), quantitative research methods focus on numerical data, and testing and validation of theories (Bryman, 2004; Hesse-Biber, 2010). The literature indicates that quantitative research methods are useful in establishing the relationship between dependent and independent variables, as well as testing hypotheses (Neuman, 2003; Walsh, 2001). Surveys, usually with a limited range of predetermined responses, present a cost-effective approach to collecting large quantitative data sets (Sale et al., 2002).

In this research, household surveys were used to gather data on household characteristics (e.g., educational background), and to statistically determine the proportion of local residents who support park officials’ ecotourism and conservation activities in the KCA (Newman & Benz, 1998). This was useful in
understanding the local communities’ attitudes towards ecotourism and conservation of the KCA (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). One of the sub-questions of Research Question Three is to explore how ecotourism outcomes have contributed to poverty reduction (see Chapter 1). Using household surveys, the researcher was able to study the relationship between ecotourism outcomes and poverty reduction in the local community in an objective manner (Sale et al., 2002).

Quantitative research methods are criticised for a number of reasons (Bryman, 2004), including: over-reliance on data collection techniques and procedures that hinder the connection between research and everyday life; analysis of relationships between variables that creates a static view of social life that is independent of people’s lives; and the measurement process that possesses an artificial and spurious sense of precision and accuracy. Yegidis and Weinbach (2009) also note that there are validity challenges with the use of ‘purely’ quantitative research methods.

4.3.3 A Mixed Methods Research Approach

As described in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, the use of only one research method remains a challenge to social research (Onwuebguzie & Leech, 2005). According to McGrath (1982), there is no ideal or ultimate research method, only a series of compromises, and a chosen research method should be a function of the research situation (Yin, 1994). The type of question posed, the control over actual behavioural elements, and the degree of focus on historical or contemporary events are the conditions which should serve as the basis for the selection of an appropriate research method (Yin, 1994).

This research adopts a mixed methods approach, by combining both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Although the use of a single research approach is advocated by some scholars (e.g., Johnson & Onwuebguzie, 2004; Miles & Huberman, 1994) due to factors such as time and resource constraints, others (e.g., Amaratunga et al., 2002; Das, 1983) have argued that a mixed methods approach allows for complementarities of the qualitative and quantitative research methods, and provides deeper insights. According to Das (1983) qualitative and quantitative research methods are not antithetic or divergent, rather they focus on different dimensions of the same phenomenon or situation.
In this research, three main reasons underlie the use of a mixed methods approach: (1) both qualitative and quantitative methods have their strengths and weaknesses; (2) both methods complement each other; and (3) a mixed methods research provides a holistic assessment of a research issue. The mixed methods approach has developed with growing attention focusing on ‘triangulation’ in research. Yin (1994) explains triangulation as the combination of different methodologies in the study of the same situation or phenomenon. The use of triangulation in this research ensured that the limitations of each method were adequately compensated by the counter balancing strengths of another (Amaratunga et al., 2002; Yin, 1994). For example, the information gathered from the quantitative methods informed the design of the qualitative data collection techniques, and the selection of participants, to be involved in the qualitative data collection. This ensured the involvement of respondents with adequate understanding and knowledge of the research topic. Thus, the blending of these methods in this research produced results which highlight the contributions of both (Nau, 1995), with each method supporting the interpretation of data of the other (Jayaratne, 1993) (see Chapters 5, 6, 7 & 8).

The mixed methods research approach is often criticised for the amount of time, resources and effort needed to organise and implement it, as well as its demand for expertise in designing and implementing both the qualitative and quantitative phases (e.g., Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2004; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). However, Collins et al. (2006) indicate that these criticisms have arisen because a researcher with more of a qualitative orientation would likely find it more difficult to design the quantitative component of a mixed-methods approach than would a researcher with a more quantitative orientation, and vice versa.

The use of a mixed methods approach increased the researcher’s understanding of ecotourism and poverty, by exploring convergences in findings yielded from different methods (Onwuegbuzie, 2003; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005).

4.4 The research process: Focus and significance

As illustrated in Figure 4.1, this research involved five stages. The choice of a research process is mostly influenced by the research questions and context. This research began with a review of relevant and related literature on the theories and conceptual underpinnings of poverty and ecotourism, especially in developing
countries. The findings from the literature review determined the purpose of this research. The second stage was the development of the research questions based on the gaps identified through the literature review.

The third stage involved the selection of the data collection techniques and appropriate theoretical frameworks, and the data collection process. Four data collection techniques were employed; household survey, in-depth interviews, semi-structured interviews, and participant observation (see Figure 4.1). In addition, review of secondary data was undertaken. The four data techniques were selected because they provided different perspectives for addressing the research questions, and stimulated rigorous analysis (Patton, 2002).

Another activity performed under the third stage of the research process was the selection of theoretical frameworks. The Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (see Section 3.8.1) and the MDGs and Ecotourism Framework (see Figure 3.6) were used as frameworks for evaluating ecotourism implementation, and assessing the outcome of ecotourism on poverty reduction respectively. These theoretical frameworks were useful in understanding the dynamics and interplay of ecotourism and poverty in the case study site.

In relation to the data collection, there were two field data collection visits. The first in April-July 2012 sought to gather a broad range of data needed in answering the research questions, and involved five phases. The first phase used semi-structured interviews with the relevant agencies, and focused on organisational data on ecotourism policies, and how poverty is reduced through improved living conditions. This data contributed to addressing Research Questions One and Two. The second phase involved a household survey with residents of the four case study communities, focusing on the household socio-economic characteristics, and costs and benefits of ecotourism. The household survey helped answer Research Questions Two and Three, and allowed for comparisons within and across case study communities (Stem, 2001).
Figure 4.1  Summary of the Research Process
The third phase was follow-up in-depth interviews with representatives of selected households to explore further ecotourism and poverty reduction issues in the case study communities. Data from the in-depth interviews provided answers to Research Questions One, Two and Three. The fourth phase of the data collection involved participant observation, which focused on confirming and addressing inconsistencies or gaps identified in the data collected using the household surveys and interviews. Participant observation ensured and strengthened the reliability and validity of responses gathered from the households and the agencies. Table 4.2 presents a summary of the data collection process.

The fifth phase was secondary data collection. Secondary data such as government policies and reports obtained during the data collection were reviewed. This was important in supplementing and compensating for the limitations of other techniques (e.g., semi-structured interviews), and enhanced the validity and reliability of the findings (Mohd Noor, 2008). The secondary data contributed to answering Research Questions One, Two and Three. The sixth and final phase was a confirmatory research process undertaken during the second field visit in February-March 2014. The data collected during the first field visit were validated through community meetings and presentations to the relevant agencies. The confirmatory research phase also sought further explanation, and addressed all gaps and inconsistencies that had occurred during the data analysis.

The fourth stage (see Figure 4.1) of the research process involved the presentation, analysis and synthesis of the empirical data. The use of multiple data sources provided a platform to triangulate responses, and further develop the researcher’s confidence in the findings and interpretations of results. The fifth and final stage of the research process discussed the conclusion and recommendations of the research.
Table 4.2  Summary of Data Collection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Type of Data Required</th>
<th>Data Collection Techniques</th>
<th>Research Participants</th>
<th>Addressed in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
<td>Household Survey</td>
<td>In-depth Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How can ecotourism contribute to poverty reduction in developing countries?</td>
<td>Data on: - history of tourism and ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- definitions and principles of ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- stakeholders involved in ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- dynamics of poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- theoretical link between ecotourism and poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- State of poverty in the case study communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is the ecotourism concept applied in</td>
<td>Data on: - interpretations of ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the available tourism policy/plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ecotourism and poverty reduction targets in those policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- challenges of the policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data on: - management of ecotourism activities (who is responsible, and the design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and around the KCA?</td>
<td>- the involvement of local communities in ecotourism decision making and implementation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- relationship between the communities and the park officials</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the ways in which the minority are involved in ecotourism, and why</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- effectiveness of ecotourism implementation in the communities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- challenges of ecotourism implementation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3. What are the outcomes of ecotourism activities in and around the KCA on poverty reduction in the case study communities? | Data on: | - number of people employed in ecotourism | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.2 |
| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.2 |
| - number of women employed in ecotourism | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.2 |
| - tourist turnout (numbers), types and activities | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 5, Section 5.7.5 |
| - ecotourism revenue and expenditure at the park | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Agencies | Chapter 5, Section 5.7.7 |
| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.3 |
| - perception of negative impacts of ecotourism | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Household, agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.4 |
| Data on: | - available mechanisms for distributing the impacts | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | Agencies | Chapter 8, Section 8.5 |

Source: Researcher’s Construct, January 2014.
4.4.1 Selection of Case Study Area

The case study method is used for this research. According to Yin (2002) case study research method is an empirical enquiry into the dynamics of a contemporary phenomenon. The contemporary nature of poverty and ecotourism, in terms of their impacts on environmental, social and economic wellbeing of individuals, communities and the government, necessitated the use of this method. The case study method allowed for an in-depth investigation into factors that make poverty and ecotourism unusual in the study site (Babbie, 2007).

As the aim of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of the dynamics of poverty and the role of ecotourism in reducing poverty, the case study method provided an explanatory framework, which made it easy to ask and seek answers for the necessary ‘how’, ‘when’ and ‘why’ questions associated with the research (David & Sutton, 2004). The method was useful for identifying research communities rich in information, as well as for the in-depth probing of an area of interest (Rossman & Rallis, 2003; Mohd Noor, 2008).

Considering that case study research can be conducted using either qualitative or quantitative methods or both (Mohd Noor, 2008; Yin, 1981), this research used the case study method both as a research design and a data collection method (Pawar, 2004). This allowed for the collection of data from multiple sources designed to reflect the perspectives of the research participants (Yegidis & Weinbach, 2009). As mentioned in Section 4.5, this research used multiple sources of data from interviews, secondary data, household survey and participant observation. The use of multiple sources of data aided the researcher to conduct in-depth assessment of the research topic, and to address historical, attitudinal and observational issues pertaining to the research (Yin, 1989). This also allowed for data triangulation (Yin, 1994) and validation of data.

The case study method is criticised both for its inadequacy in obtaining ‘hard’ accurate data for statistical analysis and comparisons (Walsh, 2001), and its reliability and scientific rigour (Johnson, 1994). The use of multiple sources of data was useful in addressing the above challenges, avoiding biases and answering the research questions, as conclusions were supported by a chain of multiple evidences from different sources (Chetty, 1996; O'leary, 2006). Hartley (1994)
also asserts that a case study method allows generalisations of results, as the use of multiple cases can lead to some form of replication.

For the purpose of this research, the KCA in the Central Region of Ghana is selected as the case study area for the following reasons:

1. The Central Region of Ghana has a rich variety of natural and man-made resources, based on its large stock of tourism resources, which range from sandy beaches and ecological and cultural resources to historical heritage, and has been the hub of the country’s tourism industry over the past two decades (Akyeampong, 2011);

2. Despite the tourism potential, the Central Region is the fourth poorest region in Ghana (GSS, 2012);

3. The KCA stretches across the Twifo-Hemang Lower Denkyira (THLD) and Assin South Districts, which are among the poorest districts in the Central Region (GSS, 2012);

4. The KCA is Ghana’s foremost rainforest national park, and has attracted a diversity of tourism related interventions, as well as having a large number of potential beneficiary communities (Akyeampong, 2011);

5. Despite the existence of several national parks in Ghana, KCA is the leading nature reserve in Southern Ghana and attracts larger numbers of tourists due to easy accessibility and proximity to the national capital (Akyeampong, 2011);

6. There is existing information on the KCA, which provides important background data to support this research.

Detailed analysis of the profile of the case study area is presented in Chapter 5. In addition, four local communities around the KCA were selected as case study communities. The sampling procedure and reasons for the selection of those communities are discussed in the next section.

4.4.2 Sampling Approach/Process

Literature indicates that mixed methods research often uses the time orientation dimension of sampling, with the qualitative and quantitative phases of the
research either occurring concurrently or sequentially (Creswell, 2002; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). This research followed a concurrent process, and adopted an identical relationship where the same sample population was involved in both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the data collection (Driscoll et al., 2007). The sampling processes for this research are discussed in the following sections.

4.4.2.1 Institutional level sampling process

This research is based on both probability (Teddlie & Yu, 2007) and non-probability (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 2002) sampling methods. The use of purposive sampling, a type of non-probability sampling, provided a greater depth of information from a smaller sample number. Eight agencies were purposively sampled to provide information regarding the poverty situation and ecotourism activities in the case study site (Patton, 2002; Teddlie & Yu, 2007). The use of purposive sampling ensured the selection of agencies with adequate knowledge of the research issue (Guarte & Barrios, 2006).

The agencies involved in the semi-structured interviews were: Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA), responsible for tourism policy implementation and marketing of tourism products in Ghana; Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (GHCT), responsible for ecotourism development and management in the KCA; Twifo-Hemang Lower Denkyira District Assembly (THLDDA), in charge of the socio-economic and physical development of the THLDD; Central Regional Development Commission (CEDECOM), responsible for the socio-economic development of the Central Region; Ghana Wildlife Division (GWD), responsible for the management of the KCA; Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management (DHTM) at the University of Cape Coast (UCC), contributes to the development of tourism policy and research; Conservation International (CI) NGO, key contributor to the design and development of ecotourism facilities in the KCA; and the World Vision NGO who supports poor communities around the KCA.

Also, traditional leaders from the selected communities were purposively selected for semi-structured interviews to provide information on poverty and ecotourism activities at the community level. The involvement of the traditional leaders was useful in broadening the understanding of the application and management of ecotourism in the KCA, which is the focus of Research Question Two.
4.4.2.2 Household level sampling process

The multi-stage sampling method (Kemper et al., 2003) was used to determine the research participants at the household level for the household survey. First, cluster sampling was used to categorise the communities into four geographically stratified clusters (see Figure 4.2). Although the KCA has over 100 communities bordering it (Dei, 2000), only communities located within the range of 1-10 km around the Conservation Area were considered for this research due to their geographical proximity to the KCA (Appiah-Opoku, 2011). The cluster sampling approach provided the researcher with the opportunity to categorise the sample population into groups called clusters, and further allowed research participants to be more concentrated and diverse (Bryman, 2001).

Second, the stratified purposive sampling method was used to select one community from each of the four clusters to be involved in the research, because of resource and time constraints. As illustrated in Figure 4.2, the selected communities were Abrafo, Mesomagor, Adadientem and Nuamakrom.
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**Figure 4.2  KCA and the Case Study Communities**

Source: Adapted from Appiah-Opoku (2011).
This research used Slovin’s Sampling Formula to determine the sample size for the household survey. This formula creates room for a margin of error and makes sampling scientific. Slovin’s formula is as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2} \]

Where

- \( n \) - sample size
- \( N \) - sample frame
- \( e \) - margin of error

The sample frame (\( N \)) represents the total households in each of the case study communities. With a margin of error of 0.08, the sample (\( n \)) was calculated from the sample frame (\( N \)) as presented in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Reason for Selection</th>
<th>Sample Frame N (Total Households)</th>
<th>Sample Size (n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>Major access point to the KCA, increasing ecotourism activities</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>Community-led ecotourism activities, close location to the KCA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>Poor tourist accessibility, relatively far from the KCA, and among the poorest communities in the region.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>Worsening poverty conditions, poor tourist accessibility</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1039</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from THLDDA and Assin South District Development Planning Office Records (2012).

Third, simple random sampling (the lottery method) was used to determine the research participants at the household level within the selected case study communities. Bryman (2001) indicates that simple random sampling remains the most basic type of probability sampling which offers each unit of the population equal chance of inclusion. This sampling method ensured that the researcher
avoided biases, since the process of selecting research participants was entirely mechanical (Bryman, 2001). The final stage of the multi-stage sampling involved the use of purposive sampling. Following the implementation of the household survey, this method was used to select 10 households from each of the four communities for a follow-up in-depth interview, which sought to identify the underlying factors supporting and challenging ecotourism activities in reducing poverty. Based on the responses from the household survey, respondents with knowledge in, and a better understanding of ecotourism in and around the KCA were selected for the interviews.

4.4.3 Adopted Theoretical Frameworks for this Research

As discussed in Chapter 3, this research used two theoretical frameworks. The first framework is the Ross and Wall (1999a) Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (see Section 3.8.1). As the purpose of the second research question is to ascertain how the concept of ecotourism is applied in the case study site, the Ross and Wall framework is used to evaluate the implementation of ecotourism in each of the four case study communities. As established in Section 3.9.1, this framework is tested in different ecotourism destinations in developing countries, especially in Asia. For example, Ross and Wall (1999b) applied the framework in three ecotourism destinations in North Sulawesi, Indonesia, and Stone and Wall (2004) tested it in China. In this research, three reasons informed the use of this framework: (a) it links ecotourism theory to practice; (b) it is based on the principles of sustainable development; and (c) its usefulness in assessing ecotourism implementation in developing countries.

The second theoretical framework used in this research is the MDGs and Ecotourism Framework (see Figure 3.5). This framework is based on literature reporting the contribution of ecotourism to achieving each of the MDGs (see Section 3.9). With the MDGs representing global commitment towards poverty reduction, and with a focus more on developing countries, this framework is used to assess how ecotourism in and around the KCA is contributing to these global goals. Although various poverty reduction frameworks were reviewed, such as the ‘Sustainable Livelihood Framework’ (see Appendix 4) and the ‘Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool’ (see Appendix 5), The MDGs and Ecotourism Framework was used because of its appropriateness and usefulness in answering
Research Question Three, which focuses on the outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities.

4.5 Data analysis and issues of reliability and validity

4.5.1 Data Analysis

In this research, content analysis was used to analyse interview transcripts and secondary data through an inductive and deductive coding process (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). This process was facilitated by the use of the NVIVO 10 software package for coding the data and developing categories. While codes were inductively developed from the research participants’ perspectives on issues such as the nature of poverty (e.g., see Chapter 6), categories such as the principles of ecotourism were deductively created based on the findings from the literature and the research questions (e.g., see Chapter 7). However, guided by the inconsistencies that might arise in the analysis process (Bryman & Burgess, 1994), relationships were established by merging and refining codes and categories into more conceptual categories based on common relationships. This process increased the researcher’s understanding of the whole data set, as the research participants’ perceptions of poverty and ecotourism were reflected in the final categories.

In relation to the statistical analysis of quantitative data, because this research is largely based on qualitative research methods, complex quantitative and statistical techniques (e.g., econometric tools) were not used in the analysis of data and interpretation of results. Responses from the household survey were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) database, to generate simple descriptive statistics, including frequencies, averages, percentages and graphs, as well as to establish relationships between poverty characteristics and ecotourism outcomes. The statistical analyses were mainly based on a deductive approach, as pre-determined codes were used based on the researcher’s knowledge of the literature, the case study site and the research questions. The data analysis process is examined in more detail later in this chapter. Reliability and validity issues are examined in the next section.
4.5.2 Reliability and Validity of Data

The concept of validity is often discussed in connection with reliability in social research, to establish the authenticity of a research finding (Adcock, 2001). Although validity presumes reliability, they have different analytical meanings (Bryman, 2004). Whereas reliability is fundamentally concerned with issues of consistency of, or stability in measurement, the term validity in social research deals with whether an indicator or set of indicators that is devised to gauge a concept really measures that concept (Bryman, 2004). In summary, reliability refers to stability of findings, and validity as truthfulness of findings (Altheide & Johnson, 1994).

In this research, reliability and validity were ensured and strengthened in many ways. First, the researcher used different sources of data with multiple data collection techniques (see Figure 4.1), which strengthened the data collected (Berg, 2001; Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007; Patton, 2002). The use of multiple data collection techniques provided the researcher with an opportunity to validate responses from different sources through triangulation. Second, reliability and validity were strengthened through a pretesting exercise conducted by the researcher to ensure that the data collection techniques addressed the research questions (see Section 4.8.1).

Third, the data gathered from administering the various data collection techniques were checked to ensure consistency. This was done by asking similar questions through the various data collection techniques, as well as posing follow-up questions (probing) to participants. This provided the opportunity to cross-check and to authenticate the responses. In addition, the researcher kept a diary where he documented daily tasks, reflections and emotions of participants during data collection, which was important in assessing the credibility of responses (Etherington, 2004).

Moreover, the research findings were presented to the participants in a follow-up confirmatory research phase to confirm interpretations, seek clarification and to address any inconsistencies that had occurred. This was done through community meetings and presentation to the agencies. Participants’ involvement in checking the interpretation of findings was imperative to ensure accuracy and validity of results (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). In addition, the research findings were
presented to different audiences at the Faculty of Science Annual Seminar at Charles Sturt University for comments. This process provided an opportunity for other academics to assess the adopted research methods and the analysis of the data. The reliability and validity of the research findings were further strengthened through the review of secondary data that were made available, such as the THLDD Development Plans.

4.6 Role of the researcher

The researcher is an important component of the research process, and his/her role is imperative in determining the soundness of the research findings. The background, interests and conceptual understanding often position researchers to assume a role of either an ‘insider’ or ‘outsider’ to their research setting (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002; Breen, 2007), with insider researchers being those who choose to study a group to which they belong, while outsider researchers do not belong to the group under study (Breen, 2007).

In this research, the researcher’s role was more of an insider than an outsider. As an insider, the researcher hails from the study region (Ghana) where he had his basic, senior high and university education. Additionally, the researcher understands, speaks and writes the local language (Fanti) of the study region. The purpose of this research and the selection of the case study area were influenced by the researcher’s experience, connections, training and perspectives with regard to poverty and ecotourism in the case study region. For instance, the researcher’s bachelor’s degree in ‘Human Settlement Planning’ was focused on improving the living conditions of people through land management practices, with the researcher constantly engaging with people, both rich and poor, urban and rural, to understand their socio-economic conditions and cultural characteristics in relation to land management.

The researcher’s role as an insider had both advantages and disadvantages. Underscoring the advantages as an insider, the researcher had an in-depth understanding of the community’s culture, which accorded the researcher the ability to interact naturally with the local community members due to previously established intimacy (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002). The establishment of rapport and trust through the researcher’s knowledge and understanding of the local culture and setting, as well as a well-defined explanation of the research purpose
facilitated the recruitment of participants, especially from the agencies and the local community. The insider’s role was important as immersion into the research setting was key in gaining deeper insight into the various perspectives of poverty and ecotourism.

In addition, the power differential between the researcher, the agencies and the local community was minimised, as the participants saw the researcher as an inhabitant and an advocate. For example, the agencies visited showed interest in the research, and requested that findings of this research should be published and/or be made available to them to help improve ecotourism activities in the study region. This further supports an assertion by DeLyser (2001), and Harklau and Norwood (2005) that insider researchers are often viewed by participating groups as co-investigators, co-learners or advocates rather than researchers, with a resulting reduction in power relations. This was very useful, as participants willingly supported and provided data that hitherto would have been difficult for an outsider to obtain.

A further advantage enjoyed by the researcher as an insider was in the selection of appropriate data collection methods. The researcher’s understanding of the local culture and people was important in the design and selection of appropriate data collection methods. In addition, the researcher’s understanding and personal experience with poverty and ecotourism in the study area was useful in the data analysis, especially in developing codes and categories.

There were three major disadvantages of the researcher’s involvement and familiarity with the study setting. First, due to the familiarity established with the agencies and the case study communities, it was challenging sometimes for the researcher to isolate himself and to ensure a certain level of objectivity. There were times when it was difficult for the researcher to balance his role as a researcher and an insider, as the role of the researcher often separates the insider from the participants in the study setting (Breen, 2007). This was because the researcher sometimes had to assist participants with their activities, in order to encourage them to provide information, regarding their poverty conditions and ecotourism activities. For instance, the researcher helped participants in Mesomagor, Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities, who are predominantly farmers, to dry their cocoa beans while engaging them in an interview
conversation. Guided by the observations of DeLyser (2001) and Hewitt-Taylor (2002) that insider researchers unconsciously make invalid assumptions based on their prior knowledge and/or experience, this challenge was addressed by triangulating the data from multiple sources using both qualitative and quantitative data sources.

Secondly, during the interviews and interactions, the local community and some of the agencies held an assumption that the researcher already knew the situation, and thus the answers to the questions being asked. For example, asking questions regarding poverty conditions and ecotourism management, and probing for further explanation were regarded by some participants as ‘open and glaring’ and as matters that they expected the researcher to know. However, upon explanation of the purpose and ethical issues informing this research, the participants provided data that they would not share with experienced residents. For example, the participants willingly provided data on their income, which is usually considered difficult data to obtain from participants in Ghana.

Again, during the analysis and interpretation of the data, the researcher was aware and guided by the possibility of being biased and subjective due to his role as an insider. It is argued that insider researchers often tend to be advocates instead of being objective, and this raises questions about objectivity and authenticity of their findings (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002). However, it is also naive to argue that isolating oneself from the research environment might reduce or eliminate bias and subjectivity (Breen, 2007). Ellis and Bochner (2000) indicate that all social researchers can be considered insiders who communicate as humans, study human behaviour and communicate with humans, thus immersing themselves in the study. In recognition of these challenges, the mixed methods approach was useful in validating the data through triangulation.

### 4.7 Ethical concerns

Following the approval of the ethics application by the Charles Sturt University Human Ethics Committee to conduct household surveys, interviews, participant observation and secondary data collection (see Appendix 8), data collection began with an introduction of the research purpose to the agencies and the case study communities. Based on the requirements of the Human Ethics Committee, the researcher provided an information sheet and explained to the participants the
purpose of the research and further ensured their confidentiality and anonymity (see Appendix 9).

Regarding the semi-structured interviews with the selected agencies, the information sheet was given to officials to further explain the purpose of the research, and to solicit their participation. Upon understanding and agreeing to participate in the research, consent forms were signed by the participants to indicate their willingness to participate and that their participation was voluntary and not under any form of coercion. Additionally, the participants were informed and their consent sought that the interview would be tape-recorded to reduce interview time and to capture all data needed. The researcher made it clear to the participants that the answers provided would remain confidential and would be used only for the purpose of this research.

At the household level, the researcher explained the purpose of the research to the participants who could read and understand the English language using information sheet. These participants indicated their willingness to participate in the household survey by signing the consent forms. Household participants who could not read, write and understand English agreed to participate based on the explanation and information given to them by the researcher regarding their anonymity and confidentiality, and the purpose of the research. The participants’ willingness and voluntary participation was used as an indication of their consent.

The in-depth interviews with the households from the study communities followed a similar format. The information sheet was given to participants to understand the purpose of the research. They were further given consent forms to complete prior to the interview. All study participants were asked to retain the information sheet. It must be stated that all the participants were guaranteed complete anonymity and confidentiality in this research.

4.8 Application of and Reflections on Data Collection Techniques

As mentioned in Section 4.8, this research used four data collection techniques; household surveys, semi-structured interviews, in-depth interviews and participant observation, as well as secondary data sources. All these techniques were useful in answering the research questions.
4.8.1 Pretesting

Prior to the data collection, a pre-test exercise was undertaken to ascertain the suitability of the data collection techniques to address the research questions. This exercise provided the researcher with the opportunity to modify some of the interview questions to more accurately address the research questions. According to Hunt et al. (1982), pretesting is the use of a sample questionnaire in a small pilot study to determine its suitability. This process is necessary since no amount of intellectual exercise can be a substitute for testing a research technique designed for the purpose of communicating with people (Backstrom & Hursch, 1963). Given that a sample of 12 is satisfactory for pretesting (Ferber & Verdoorn, 1962), 12 participants in Aboabo (a community bordering the KCA) participated in a household survey, while 3 officials from the DHTM participated in semi-structured interviews, as part of the pretesting. The term household is used in this research to refer to a person or group of persons who live in the same dwelling and share the same facilities, but are not necessarily related by blood. The pretesting exercise was useful for checking the strengths of the data collection techniques in answering the research questions.

Each of the four data collection techniques used is presented in the following sections using the format below:

1. Structure of the technique;
2. Sampling and data collection;
3. Data analysis; and
4. Relevance and limitations of the technique to answering the research questions.

4.8.2 Household Surveys

Structure of the technique

The household questionnaire survey comprised both closed and open-ended questions and an unlimited comment field (see Appendix 10). This structure offered respondents the opportunity to provide additional information to support their responses to the closed questions (Driscoll et al., 2007). The use of both closed and open ended questions was important as it prevented the researcher from preempting responses regarding the state of ecotourism and poverty situation.
in the case study communities, as well as ensuring impartiality in the data collection. The questions were structured in an orderly manner, with basic questions relating to the household coming first (see Appendix 10). These were followed by questions pertaining to poverty conditions and ecotourism activities. This approach relaxed and immersed the research participants in the survey.

**Sampling and data collection**

As discussed in Section 4.4.2.2, a total of 310 respondents across the four case study communities were surveyed using a mathematical model – the Slovin’s Formula. The household survey was conducted face-to-face with the respondents, focusing on household heads, as both men and women can be household heads in the case study communities. This also ensured equity in gender participation. Prior to the data collection process, most (75%) of the respondents across the four case study communities expressed concern that the information would be used against them by government and park officials. However, the purpose of the research was explained to the participants and their consent sought before data collection. This, coupled with the researcher’s role as an insider, enabled respondents to relax and develop an interest in the research. Table 4.4 presents a summary of respondents.

**Table 4.4 Gender Characteristics of Household Survey Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>71 (55%)</td>
<td>58 (45%)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>45 (73%)</td>
<td>17 (27%)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>32 (53%)</td>
<td>29 (47%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>40 (69%)</td>
<td>18 (31%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>188 (61%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>122 (39%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey April-July 2012.

Considering that the majority of the local residents are farmers (see Section 5.8), the data collection was undertaken in early mornings and late afternoons, when the local people had returned from their farms and were available. Data collection focused on basic household characteristics (e.g., employment, household size, and education), ecotourism activities, prevailing poverty conditions, and the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction.
The responses from the household survey were hand written by the researcher due to the brevity of responses and the illiteracy of some respondents. Additional household surveys were administered to cater for attrition (non responses), which resulted from some respondents’ unwillingness to participate. The researcher spent an average of 30 minutes to administer each survey questionnaire.

**Data analysis**

The data from the household survey were analysed using SPSS. Responses from the closed questions were cross-referenced with open-ended questions to address inconsistencies. As discussed in Section 4.5.1, the household data were subjected to simple statistical analysis focusing on graphs, frequencies, averages, and relationships. The results from each case study community were further compared.

**Relevance and limitations of the technique**

The household survey technique was useful in answering Research Questions Two and Three. For Research Question Two, the technique was used to collect data on a range of issues relating to ecotourism implementation and management. Specifically, data were collected on community perceptions of the relationship between local residents and park officials. This technique also offered the selected households the opportunity to provide data on the activities and management of the KCA, as well as the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction, which helped address Research Question Three.

The major limitation of the household survey technique related to the unwillingness of some households to participate, for fear that the information would be used against them. This challenge was addressed when the purpose of the research was explained and the consent of the participants sought. Illiteracy in the case study community was also a challenge. However, the face-to-face approach used for the household survey helped address this challenge, as their confidentiality was assured.
4.8.3 In-depth Interviews

*Structure of the technique*

According to Walsh (2001), in-depth interviews constitute an integral part of data collection in social research. In-depth interviews were used for collecting household level qualitative data, and for seeking understanding and explanation of poverty conditions, and ecotourism management. The interviews comprised a list of open-ended questions, and followed a simple structure (see Appendix 11), beginning with general issues on living conditions, which relaxed the respondents, and facilitated the interview process. This also allowed the researcher to probe further for specific details of respondents’ experiences and perceptions of poverty and ecotourism in and around the KCA.

*Sampling and data collection*

The in-depth interviews involved 10 household respondents from each of the four case study communities. These households were purposively selected due to their knowledge and experience of poverty and ecotourism, as revealed through the household survey. As presented in Table 4.5, both male and female heads of households from the case study communities were involved in the in-depth interviews.

**Table 4.5 Households Involved in In-depth Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Field Diary, April-July 2012.

Moreover, the traditional leaders in each of the four case study communities participated in in-depth interviews. This is because background issues and the impacts of ecotourism on poverty are usually better understood by community leaders. Heads of the selected households and the traditional leaders were interviewed to provide detailed information and explanations regarding the state of poverty, ecotourism in and around the KCA, and the outcomes of ecotourism on their living conditions.
The average time for the interviews was between 45 minutes and 2 hours, depending on the respondents’ interest in the research, knowledge of, and experience in ecotourism and poverty, as well as availability for the interview. The interviews were tape recorded, after seeking the participants’ consent. This assisted the researcher to explore and gain a deeper understanding of key issues, and further complemented data collected from the household survey.

**Data analysis**

Data from the in-depth interviews were transcribed, and analysed using inductive and deductive coding processes (Rubin & Rubin, 2005) with NVIVO 10 software (see Section 4.5.1). Common themes arising from the interviews were coded, and categories developed. The responses of the differences between the case study communities were established through an iterative process of grouping, refining and regrouping. The NVIVO 10 software was also useful in identifying the relationships, experiences, perceptions and explanations of ecotourism, local community development and environmental conservation.

**Relevance and limitations of the technique**

The in-depth interviews contributed to answering Research Questions One, Two and Three. For Research Question One, data obtained helped to understand the dynamics of poverty across the case study communities. Data collected on available ecotourism attractions, and local perceptions and experiences regarding ecotourism implementation and management were used to answer Research Question Two. For Research Question Three, data were collected on the positive and negative outcomes of ecotourism in the case study communities.

The time consuming nature and the difficulty of focusing on a specific issue were the limitations of using this technique. Given the unstructured nature of the technique, respondents often discussed issues which were unrelated to this research, which extended the data collection process. However, the researcher’s skill in working from an interview outline and steering participants towards topic areas of interest and relevance to the research minimised this challenge.
4.8.4 Semi-structured Interviews

Structure of the technique

Semi-structured interviews provided the researcher with sufficient flexibility to approach research participants in different ways, while still covering the same areas of data collection (Mohd Noor, 2008). This data collection technique listed the questions based on the research purpose, and gave the researcher room to explore and probe further. The questions were mainly open-ended, and ordered logically, starting with basic questions such as the roles of the agencies (see Appendix 12). This stimulated the interest of the respondents in the process, and provided the researcher considerable discretion in the actual conduct of the interviews (Ellis, 1993). The researcher was able to focus and seek explanations based on the identified strengths and knowledge of the agency participants.

Sampling and data collection

Semi-structured interviews were used in the collection of data from the selected agencies (see Section 4.4.2.1). Purposive sampling was used to select the heads/deputies of the selected agencies based on their knowledge and interest in the research, and their ability to provide information regarding current and future plans to reduce poverty, and to stimulate ecotourism in and around the KCA. One official was interviewed from, and on behalf of each of the 8 selected agencies. A total of 8 officials (6 males and 2 females) from the agencies were interviewed.

The interviews focused on the operations of the agencies and how their activities were linked to poverty reduction and ecotourism management. Data on poverty reduction efforts, and the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction in the communities around the KCA were collected. The interviews were mainly held at the offices of the respondents (as determined by the respondents), and lasted between one and two hours. The use of a tape recorder facilitated the interview process and helped the researcher to focus on issues relating to this research.

Data analysis

The transcripts from the semi-structured interviews were analysed using NVIVO 10 software (see Section 4.5.1). Like the in-depth interviews, common themes from the interviews were coded, and categories developed. The differences in the
agencies’ responses were also established. The NVIVO 10 software was useful in explaining the agencies’ perspectives, efforts and policies/plans, in relation to ecotourism and local community development.

Relevance and limitations of the technique

Data collected using the semi-structured interviews were useful in answering Research Questions One, Two and Three. In relation to Research Question One, data were collected on the agencies’ roles in poverty reduction and response to poverty in the communities around the KCA. For Research Question Two, the agencies provided data on the interpretation and implementation of ecotourism, successes and challenges of tourism policies, as well as ecotourism implementation in the KCA. In the case of Research Question Three, data were collected on tourist visitation to the KCA, use of ecotourism revenue, and the management of ecotourism outcomes.

While this technique was effective for data collection, some agency officials were uncomfortable and reluctant to discuss issues relating to revenue management, and community involvement in, and benefits from ecotourism in the KCA, because of the lack of community involvement in ecotourism management in the KCA.

4.8.5 Participant Observation

Structure of the technique

Although, interviews and survey techniques were effective for gathering both qualitative and quantitative data on ecotourism and poverty, some required data could not be gathered using those techniques. Participant observation is an effective technique often used to gather emotional and physical data. Nichols (1991) indicates that because the researcher participates in the data collection process, participant observation as a data collection technique allows the researcher to support his/her findings by documenting feelings/emotions and observed patterns relating to the topic being investigated. The use of participant observation in this research was to understand the local culture of the case study communities (Walsh, 2001), which was imperative in gathering data on poverty and ecotourism.
Sampling and data collection

The participant observation technique had a direct focus on the emotions of respondents and physical characteristics of the case study communities in terms of poverty and ecotourism. The data collection centred on emotions expressed by the interview and survey respondents. For example, it was observed that the majority (75%) of interviewees across the case study communities expressed frustration when describing the management of ecotourism in the KCA. Moreover, the technique provided observation of local factors such as condition of roads, schools, and housing as mentioned by interview and survey respondents as defining features of poverty in the local community, as well as of the available ecotourism attractions.

Data analysis

Two sets of data were generated from this technique – descriptive and pictorial. The descriptive data set mainly supported the analysis of the interviews by describing the mood of the respondents. It was analysed using NVIVO 10 software. The pictorial data set presented visual evidence in the form of photographs to support data collected using other techniques.

Relevance and limitations of the technique

Data collected using this technique contributed to addressing Research Questions One, Two and Three. For Research Question One, data were collected on the local conditions (e.g., road, water) that contribute to poverty in the case study communities, in addition to the emotions expressed by households when describing their poverty situation. For Research Questions Two and Three, data were collected on the available ecotourism attractions in and around the KCA, in addition to respondents’ emotions.

The main limitation regarding the use of this technique was its subjectivity. However, the use of other techniques helped triangulate the data collected.
4.8.6 Secondary Data Collection

Structure of the technique

According to Merriam (1998), secondary data collection focusing on published and unpublished documents provides useful data for qualitative research, because problems or issues identified in those documents can serve as the basis and provide further guidelines for determining the research focus. The use of this technique was necessary in this research, as poverty reduction interventions and ecotourism development programmes in Ghana are often documented in development plans and policies. Such documents provided useful information (Pawar, 2004).

Sampling and data collection

Secondary data collection focused on documents provided by the selected agencies, including national tourism policies and plans (1970s to 2010) from the GTA and the DHTM, and conservation plans from the GWD and CI. Other documents were the district medium term development plans (2000-2013) from the THLDDA, ecotourism documents (2000-2012) from the GHCT, and the THLDD area development plan (1994-2011) of the World Vision. These documents provided useful information for understanding both the poverty situation in the local community, and ecotourism management in the KCA. These documents were collected prior to conducting semi-structured interviews, which gave the researcher the opportunity to relate interview responses to the information in the documents.

Data analysis

Secondary data were analysed using content analysis with NVIVO 10 software. Key objectives, relating to poverty and ecotourism, were identified, and some cases counted. This provided the researcher with the opportunity to determine the relevance of ecotourism and poverty reduction objectives in the documents. The ecotourism records from the GHCT were used to provide detailed data on the ecotourism revenue and expenditure pattern in the KCA to enrich the data collected using other techniques. Analysis of the secondary data focused on ecotourism and poverty reduction targets in the documents, and the successes and challenges of tourism policies in relation to ecotourism development and poverty
reduction. This analysis was cross-referenced with the interview data to validate the responses.

**Relevance and limitations of the technique**

The secondary data were useful in answering Research Questions One, Two and Three. For Research Questions One and Two, this technique provided data on the tourism policy framework as well as tourism development in Ghana and the KCA. Documents from the GHCT provided detailed information on tourist visitation to ecotourism in the KCA, and ecotourism revenue and expenditure in the KCA, which were necessary to address Research Question Three.

Despite the usefulness of this technique, the voluminous documents provided by the agencies slowed the data collection process, as the researcher had to review the documents before the semi-structured interviews were conducted.

**4.8.7 Confirmatory Research Phase**

In February-March 2014, confirmatory research was undertaken in the case study area to verify the results, seek clarification and probe for further explanation of data collected on the first field visit. The results from the first field research process were presented to the agencies, while the local residents were engaged in informal community meetings in each of the four case study communities. The presentation to the eight relevant agencies lasted for 60 minutes followed by a discussion. The agency representatives sought clarification on some of the findings, which further allowed the researcher to probe for explanations. All eight agency representatives attended the presentation, in addition to some tourism academics from UCC. Again, the agency representatives were guaranteed confidentiality for the data provided for this research.

The average time for the community meetings was two hours, which allowed the local people to ask questions on, and provide further explanations to major issues raised during the first field visit in 2012. About 15 to 25 local residents from each of the four case study communities participated in the community meetings. The researcher reiterated the confidentiality of the data provided by the community residents for this research. The confirmatory research was very useful, as it strengthened the results and ensured the research process was robust.
4.9 Limitations of the research

A major limitation encountered during the data collection was the limited local understanding of the difference between conservation and ecotourism. Given that ecotourism was introduced in 1995 around the same period the KCA was gazetted (1992), the researcher observed that the local people perceived conservation as ecotourism. This situation generally made it difficult for the researcher to collect data on local perspectives on, and experience with ecotourism implementation, as the respondents’ often confused ecotourism with conservation. In addition, it was difficult focusing interview conversation on ‘ecotourism’ as the researcher had to spend more time explaining to the respondents the difference between ecotourism and conservation. Furthermore the high level of illiteracy amongst residents in the selected case study communities (Monney et al., 2010) caused unexpected delays as household surveys had to be conducted face-to-face.

Another limitation was the poor physical accessibility to the case study communities. Aside from Abrafo community which has a reasonable access, the other three case study communities have poor road conditions, which limited the researcher from making frequent visits to the communities. For example, in the Mesomagor community, the road becomes inaccessible by car after heavy downpour. The limited accessibility to the communities caused unexpected change of schedules despite extra effort by the researcher to keep appointment with respondents.

The local politics of showing reverence to traditional leaders in the communities was another limitation of this research, as this influenced the responses of some respondents. The researcher observed that some respondents were hesitant to comment on poverty and ecotourism issues that involve their leaders. For instance, residents of Adadientem were hesitant to criticise their leader despite the leader’s decision to halt the construction of a water facility in their community. This situation made it difficult for the researcher to fully understand the reality of poverty and ecotourism in and outside the KCA. The researcher therefore spent more time with respondents who were willing to discuss these issues under the condition of anonymity, which was necessary to avoid collecting unreliable data.
4.10 Chapter summary

This chapter has explained the research process, focusing on the research paradigm, research methodology and research methods. This research is based on the pragmatic paradigm and a mixed methods approach, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. The use of mixed methods ensured a complementary data collection and analysis process for answering the research questions. A case study method using four communities around the KCA was useful in examining diverse perspectives on poverty and ecotourism at the community level, and provided a deeper understanding of the research topic.

Four primary data collection methods – household surveys, in-depth interviews, semi-structured interviews and participant observation – were used to answer the research questions, in addition to secondary data sources. Using simple random sampling, the household survey focused on basic socio-economic characteristics and knowledge of ecotourism activities in and around the KCA, with 310 participants. The in-depth interviews featured household participants with knowledge about ecotourism and poverty conditions. The semi-structured interviews were conducted with representatives of the selected agencies. Research participants for both the in-depth and semi-structured interviews were purposively sampled. The interviews involved 40 community residents across the four case study communities, and eight agency officials. The participant observation technique was useful in understanding the emotions of respondents, and the physical characteristics of the local communities, in relation to poverty and ecotourism. The secondary data also provided important information on poverty and ecotourism, which served as a basis for, and influenced the researcher’s perspective regarding the conduct of the interviews.

The initial data collection period was from April to July 2012. The data were validated with a follow-up field programme in February-March, 2014. The analysis process was iterative, using both inductive and deductive approaches. The qualitative data were analysed using NVIVO 10 software, and SPSS software was used to analyse the quantitative data. The results of the analysis are presented in Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8.
Chapter Five
Characteristics of poverty and ecotourism in
Ghana: Profile of the Kakum Conservation Area

5.1 Introduction
This chapter is the first of the four results chapters. It describes the profile of the case study area, the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA), and the socio-economic characteristics of the case study communities. The initial sections explore the country of Ghana: its physical, socio-economic and cultural characteristics, as well as its poverty reduction initiatives. The following sections provide an overview of Ghana’s tourism development potential. Issues regarding the state of ecotourism in Ghana, the management of the KCA, the available ecotourism attractions in and around the KCA, tourist visitation to ecotourism attractions in the KCA and the case study communities, the revenue generated from their visitation and how the revenue is managed are discussed in this chapter. The results presented in this chapter answer a sub question: ‘What is the state of poverty and ecotourism in Ghana?’ of Research Question One.

This chapter draws on a review of the literature in relation to poverty and tourism in Ghana, discussions with agency representatives and community residents, and an analysis of secondary data, in order to present Ghana’s socio-economic situation, and understand past and current trends of ecotourism development in Ghana, especially in the KCA. Data presented in this chapter were obtained from household surveys and in-depth interviews with community residents, semi-structured interviews with agency representatives, reviews of secondary data on tourism and poverty, and published literature on Ghana.

5.2 Overview of Ghana
5.2.1 Physical Characteristics of Ghana
With a total land area of 238,537 km$^2$, Ghana is located in West Africa (see Figure 5.1) and is bounded to the west by Cote d’Ivoire, to the east by Togo, to the north by Burkina Faso and to the south by the Gulf of Guinea. Situated on latitudes 4-12°N of the Equator, Ghana is located in the tropical region, and lies on the Greenwich meridian (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996). Figure 5.1 shows the geographical location of Ghana in the context of Africa.
Topographically, half of the country’s land area lies below 152 m (500 ft.) above sea level, and the highest point is 885 m (2,904 ft.). Ghana’s topographical relief includes coastal plains and forest-dissected plateaus. Other prominent topographical features are mountains, ridges, escarpments and ranges. These features, according to Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO (1996), offer scenic views and cooler temperatures suitable for tourism development.

In relation to drainage, the Volta Lake (largest artificial lake in the world) occupies about 5 percent of Ghana’s land area, while the coastline has a total length of 540 km. Other drainage features include the Volta River Delta and lagoons (Keta and Songor) at the eastern coastline. The country of Ghana is also intersected by several water bodies whose major rivers all flow into the sea. As illustrated in Figure 5.2, the major water bodies in Ghana are the Volta, Pra, Tano
and Ankobra rivers, while the minor rivers are many, including the Kakum River which has its headwaters in the KCA.

Figure 5.2 Drainage Characteristics and Vegetation Types of Ghana
Source: CSU Spatial Data Analysis Network (2012).

5.2.2 Climatic Conditions and Vegetation Cover of Ghana

Ghana’s climate is tropical and is influenced by two air masses: the tropical continental air mass (the northeast trade winds) and the tropical maritime air mass (southwest monsoons). Characteristically, the continental air mass is dry and blows over the country from November to February each year, with high temperatures during the day (often more than 40°C), but cool at night to temperatures of 20°C or less. The maritime air mass is associated with average temperatures of about 25°C, and blows over Ghana from March to October every
year, with large cloud formation and resultant rainfall, especially in the southern part of the country where the KCA is located.

There are two major vegetation types in Ghana: the tropical high forests, and the savannahs (Ministry of Environment & Science [MES], 2002). The southern half of the country supports closed forest, whereas the northern part supports savannah and woodland vegetation. In addition to the two major vegetation covers, other minor vegetation types are found in the southern part, including: the coastal savannah, usually referred to as the Accra-Winneba Plains, in the south-eastern part of the country; the strand or coastline vegetation along the seashore; and the mangrove vegetation of the lagoons and estuaries (MES, 2002).

5.2.3 Cultural Characteristics of Ghana

The cultural pattern in Ghana is a mixture of both traditional and modern traits, with the majority of people (mainly rural communities) being accustomed to the traditional culture, life styles, beliefs and customs. It is worth noting that those with modern cultural traits, mainly in urban areas, often maintain their traditional beliefs and practices, making cultural characteristics an important tourism attraction in Ghana (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996).

Moreover, festivals are an important cultural characteristic and are celebrated by all the major ethnic groups in Ghana. Some of the major festivals in Ghana include the Damba and Daa festivals of the Gur people, the Homowo and Koda Kpami festivals of the Ga Adangme people, Hogbetsotso festivals of the Ewe people, and Adae and Odwira festivals for the Akan people. The major festivals provide colourful attractions for tourists (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996).

5.2.4 Social and Political Environment of Ghana

With an increase in population of 30.4 percent since 2000, Ghana’s population currently stands at 24,658,823, with an average annual growth rate of 2.5 percent (GSS, 2012). Ghana’s fast growing population has put pressure on the economically active population due to high dependency levels, with children under 15 years accounting for about 38.3 percent of the total population, while persons aged 65 and above constitute 4.7 percent of the total population (GSS, 2012).
Compared with the 2000 census data, the level of literacy in Ghana has increased from 54.1 percent to 71.5 percent for the population aged 15 years and above in 2010 (GSS, 2012). About 80.2 percent and 68.5 percent of males and females respectively are literate, as recorded in 2010. Regional variations exist in literacy levels. In rural areas, less than 50 percent of the population aged 15 years and older are literate, while between 69 and 89 percent of the population of urban regions are literate (GSS, 2012).

Politically, colonisation in Ghana began during the late 15th century, with the Portuguese being the first to arrive in 1471, followed by other Europeans such as the Dutch, English and the Danes, all with the purpose of trading. Trading activities during this period involved gold, pepper, slaves and ivory from Ghana which were exchanged for items including beads, firearms, alcoholic drinks and clothes from Europe. Given the importance of gold, the name Gold Coast was adopted as the name of Ghana during the colonial period. The Europeans lived in castles and forts along the coast, which are now used as tourist sites. By 1872, all European countries had departed except Britain which ruled and administered Ghana until independence in 1957 (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996).

On gaining independence, the country’s name was changed from Gold Coast to Ghana, with the country being the first European colony to gain independence in Sub-Saharan Africa. From the 1960s to the late 1980s, Ghana was characterised by political instability, with many changes in government. An economic crisis occurred in the 1970s and 1980s resulting from gross economic mismanagement, repatriation of Ghanaians from Nigeria and severe drought.

Ghana has achieved political stability following the adoption of the 1992 Republican Constitution. Today, Ghana is reputed to be one of the most politically stable countries in West Africa, with its successful adoption and practice of democracy and decentralisation in the sub-region over the past two decades (Aryeetey & McKay, 2004). To facilitate development at the grassroots level, the country has been divided into ten administrative regions (see Figure 5.3). In addition, the government introduced the decentralisation policy in 1988, to stimulate locally initiated development. This policy further divided the regions into districts, to facilitate effective administration at the local level. The decentralisation policy allows for the establishment of national government
agencies at the district level, to ensure that development decision making and interventions originate from the local to the national level (bottom-up).

Figure 5.3 Administrative Regions of Ghana
Source: CSU Spatial Data Analysis Network (2012).

Ghana’s political environment has also been influenced by its traditional governance system (Arthur, 2007; Ayee, 2003; Centre for Indigenous Knowledge & Organisational Development [CIKOD], 2010). Whereas the modern political system of governance can be traced back to the impact of colonialism, traditional authorities in Ghana date back to the pre-colonial period, and are recognised and protected by the 1992 Republican Constitution of Ghana (Donkoh, 2005). Traditional authorities in Ghana comprise chiefs, queen mothers, clan heads, elders, youth groups and traditional priests (Guri et al., 2008), and are
“... greatly revered and held in awe as they are perceived to be the embodiment of the spirit of the ancestors and a link between them and the living community and further provide a renewed sense of belonging as well as being a powerful agent of social cohesion and harmony” (Donkoh, 2005, p.2).

Studies (e.g., Arthur, 2007; Donkoh, 2005) have highlighted the important role played by traditional authorities in local development in Ghana and other developing countries. The role of traditional authorities is categorised into statutory and non-statutory functions (Donkoh, 2005). Statutory functions include the collection, refinement, codification and unification of customary laws; adjudication of chieftaincy disputes; compilation of lines of succession to offices in the various traditional areas; and appointment of representations to various government statutory bodies, including the Council of State, Prisons Council, National and Regional Lands Commissions and Regional Co-ordinating Councils.

Non-statutory functions, on the other hand include the mobilisation of their people for development purposes. In this regard, the traditional authorities act as mediums linking their communities with development partners including central government departments, local government organisations, NGOs, diplomatic missions, religious bodies and welfare associations. As an example, traditional authorities use annual festivals to mobilise their people to plan and seek avenues and opportunities for implementing development projects. However, they are constitutionally banned from engaging in active partisan politics (Donkoh, 2005).

In recognition of the role of traditional authorities in complementing the mainstream political system, the Ministry of Chieftaincy and Culture and the National and Regional Houses of Chiefs have been established as the official institutions charged with the responsibility of assimilating traditional knowledge into national policy (CIKOD, 2010). Despite the willingness of the traditional authorities and the modern political system to work together, research has shown that mistrust and fear of conflicting power relations remain a challenge (CIKOD, 2010).

5.2.5 Economic Characteristics of Ghana

About 55.3 percent of Ghana’s total population is economically active (employed and unemployed), while the economically inactive population (not employed, not seeking nor available for work) constitutes 44.7 percent of the total population. Of
the former, 93.1 percent are employed while the unemployed (that is, those without work but seeking and available for work) make up 6.9 percent (GSS, 2012). The private sector is the largest employer in the country, providing jobs for 93 percent of the economically active persons (private informal, 86.1% and private formal, 7.0%), while the public sector employs about 6.3 percent (GSS, 2012).

According to Aryeetey (2005), the economy of Ghana relies largely on agriculture, which accounts for about 40 percent of the GDP. About 41.6 percent of the economically active population aged 15 years and older are employed in the agricultural and forestry sector, with about 21 percent engaged as service and sales workers, and 15.2 percent as craft and related trade workers. Agriculture remains the dominant occupation for both male (45.0%) and female (37.8%) in Ghana, with principal sources of employment including smallholder farming and fishing. The other major industrial activities are wholesale and retail trade, and manufacturing, which employ 18.9 percent and 10.8 percent of the economic active population respectively (GSS, 2012).

Despite the positive economic characteristics, Aryeetey (2005) indicates that poverty in Ghana is pervasive (see Table 5.1). Poverty statistics, using income indicators, show that about one-third of Ghana’s population live below the poverty line (US$ 1.25 a day) (GSS, 2012), with the majority of these living in rural areas (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996).

Table 5.1 Income Poverty in Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Proportion of people living below US$ 1.25 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5.3 Understanding poverty dynamics in Ghana

Ghana’s rapid population growth means increase demand for resources such as food, water and land, a higher dependency burden which forces the young population to work to supplement the family income, and social pressures on the government to provide welfare services such as health, education and housing in
order to maintain a minimum standard of living (Luginaah & Armah, 2012; Taabazuing et al., 2012). However, with Ghana’s population growth unaccompanied by a corresponding growth in the economy, poverty has become persistent in the country (Aryeetey & McKay, 2004; Government of Ghana [GoG], 2003).

Poverty in Ghana is multidimensional: lack of macro-economic stability; low capacities due to poor quality of education, lack of vocational skills and limited entrepreneurial opportunities; exposure to shocks, due to limited use of technology to stem the effects of droughts, floods, crop pests and diseases, environmental degradation and poor health; lack of participation and representation in political and social processes, public policy and resource allocations; gender discrimination especially against women; increasing geographical disparities; and other factors leading to vulnerability and exclusion (GoG, 2003).

In Ghana, the above characteristics of poverty have manifested in the form of low incomes, malnutrition, ill health, illiteracy, lack of access to safe water and sanitation facilities, food insecurity, environmental degradation, and lack of labour resources (Aryeetey & McKay, 2004; GoG, 2003). Despite recognition of the multidimensional nature of poverty in Ghana, economic indicators remain dominant in poverty assessment (GoG, 2003). For example, using economic indicators, official statistics indicate that overall poverty levels in Ghana have been decreasing since the 1990s, with five out of the 10 regions in Ghana having less than 40 percent of their population living in poverty (below the poverty line) from the 1990s to the 2000s (GoG, 2003). Although economic measures have been successful, to a limited extent, in reducing poverty, many regions of Ghana continue to remain in severe poverty. This includes the Central Region where the KCA is located, which is ranked fourth poorest in Ghana, with over 48 percent of its population in poverty.

Literature indicates that the preoccupation with economic indicators for poverty analysis in Ghana over the past two decades has resulted in a situation where there is a limited focus on social and cultural factors such as health and education (Aryeetey & McKay, 2004). According to Aryeetey and McKay (2004), the poverty problem in Ghana is not only related to income and unemployment, but
also includes the low productivity and earnings of people, inadequate basic social services provision, and the absence of effort to change the structure of the economy since colonial times. As a result, gaps exist in quality of, access to, and utilisation of basic services (e.g., health) by the poor, especially in the rural areas of Ghana (GoG, 2003). Although this requires urgent attention, limited research has focused on the dynamics of poverty in rural Ghana, and how those dynamics differ from the situation in the urban areas.

5.4 Poverty reduction in Ghana: The rural context

As noted in Section 5.3, poverty has many dimensions in Ghana, and is largely a rural phenomenon. Attempts to reduce poverty in Ghana date back to the colonial period (see Figure 5.4), and have been linked to the global commitment to poverty reduction (see Section 2.5). Prior to independence in 1957, community development was adopted in Ghana as a strategy to stimulate local development, through self improvement and self help projects, especially in rural communities (Asiedu, 2002). The community development strategy focused on expanding people’s choices through local initiatives and government support. However, it was characterised by challenges such as lack of commitment by the government, and lack of policy direction to involve the local communities (Asiedu, 2002), as well as overconcentration on economic indicators of poverty.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, a number of poverty reduction initiatives were introduced by the GoG as part of the Capital and Social Investment Approach (see Section 2.5). These initiatives were categorised into three types; the accelerated project implementation approach, the social amenity approach and the increased agricultural production approach (Asiedu, 2002; Brown, 1986). The projects focused on the provision of social services and amenities, establishment of regional planning committees to implement government-based projects, and the acceleration of agricultural development (Asiedu, 2002; Brown, 1986). However, Asiedu (2002) argues that lack of political will, lack of involvement of the local people, weak institutions and overconcentration on economic indicators of poverty contributed to the failure of these approaches.

Amidst many poverty reduction initiatives in rural Ghana, the Growth Pole Concept/strategy, proposed by Francois Perroux in 1955, was introduced in the mid-1970s as a regional development framework, to foster and stimulate the
coordination of the various development activities in the various regions of Ghana (Asiedu, 2002). The Growth Pole strategy established Regional Development Corporations in each of the 10 regions as centres for initiating and implementing viable development projects. In the late 1970s, financial misappropriation due to poor management crippled this development initiative, causing the collapse of the Regional Development Corporations (Asiedu, 2002).

Figure 5.4  Poverty Reduction Approaches in Ghana (Prior to 1960-2000s)
Source: Adapted from Asiedu (2002).

In the early 1980s, Ghana adopted the Structural Adjustment and Economic Recovery Programmes as poverty reduction strategies (Hutchful, 1989). These
programmes, according to Asiedu (2002), were introduced and implemented to facilitate and promote economic growth and social development, especially in rural communities. Improvements were recorded in agricultural and mineral production, and in the promotion of non-traditional exports (Asiedu, 2002). Despite the economic improvement, research indicates that benefits from these programmes were not equitably distributed across the country. This compounded the poverty conditions of the people, especially those in rural areas (Asiedu, 2002; Wayo, 1996). Wayo (1996) believes that the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) worsened the poverty of poor peasant farmers, rather than improving it, since it failed to address the social and cultural concerns of the poor. Inherent in the SAP were strategies to remove subsidies on agricultural inputs and to terminate the minimum guaranteed price on agricultural products which, according to Wayo (1996), escalated agricultural input prices in the face of low output prices. Asiedu (2002) further indicates that this situation militated against improved living conditions in the rural areas, as the performance of the agricultural sector suffered huge losses as a result of these programmes.

In the mid-1980s, the GoG recognised that the complex nature of poverty extended beyond economic aspects. This led to the introduction of the ‘Programme of Actions to Mitigate the Social Costs of Adjustment’ (PAMSCAD) in 1987 (GoG, 1987). This programme encompassed a broad range of projects that were implemented in high poverty regions, especially in rural areas. Projects implemented under this programme included the construction and rehabilitation of roads, schools, health and other related facilities and services (Asiedu, 2002). However, the over-reliance on government and donor agencies to implement these projects challenged the realisation of the objectives of the programme (Asenso, 1991; Asiedu, 2002).

The late 1990s and the 2000s have witnessed advances in multidimensional approaches to poverty reduction in Ghana. As illustrated in Figure 5.4, a number of poverty reduction initiatives were introduced during this period, including the National Poverty Reduction Programme, the Emergency Social Relief Programme, and the MDGs. Since 2000, Ghana has integrated the MDGs into its development agenda through the formulation of medium term development plans, including the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy 2003-2005 (GPRS I), the Growth

During this period other development frameworks were devised by various governments, however only the above multidimensional poverty approaches were implemented. For example in 1996, the Vision 2020 was adopted during the regime of the first president of the fourth republic. This framework was a long-term development guide for Ghana, directed towards achieving a balanced economy and a middle-income status. However in 2000, the new government terminated this development agenda (Vision 2020), and introduced Ghana Vision 2015 as the new development focus. This programme was also directed towards achieving a middle income status, as well as making Ghana the lead tourism destination in Africa through the development of rural tourism attractions. Accordingly, the government under the decentralisation policy (see Section 5.2.4) has established the district assembly common fund to promote development, and utilise local resources to improve the conditions of the poor.

Despite the introduction and implementation of these poverty reduction schemes, the living conditions of the rural poor have improved little over the past years (see Section 5.2.5), due to the overreliance on agriculture as the only source of livelihood, and concentration on economic indicators of poverty. These poverty reduction and development livelihood programmes have yielded very limited results, especially in the areas of diversifying the rural economy and empowering the local poor. According to Asiedu (2002), inadequate involvement of the rural poor in the planning, implementation and management of these programmes may have been responsible for the limited results from these development programmes.

Asiedu (2002) further advocates for the introduction and implementation of indigenous approaches that focus on creating avenues for the rural poor to be involved in decisions regarding their development. Increased participation of the poor in decision making, and better understanding of the environment, have the potential to ensure effective stewardship and use of natural resources, which will subsequently lead to improved living conditions and poverty reduction. Thus, Asiedu in 2002 recommended ecotourism as one possible approach to reduce poverty, and diversify rural economies in Ghana. Currently, it is uncertain
whether or not these strategies, including ecotourism, are working, as limited research has been conducted on this topic in Ghana (e.g., Akyeampong 2011; Appiah-Opoku, 2011). The next section examines tourism development in Ghana.

5.5 Tourism development in Ghana: An overview

Official statistics indicate that since the 1980s tourism has grown rapidly, and has become the fastest growing sector of Ghana’s economy (Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008). With an annual growth rate of over 15 percent, tourism in Ghana is an all year phenomenon, attracting both domestic and international tourists (Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008). The tourism industry in Ghana has developed from a home-grown, craft-run business into a contemporary industry with considerable involvement of multi-national enterprises (Akyeampong, 2011). It has been given consideration in the economic development policy of Ghana, following an increase in tourist arrivals and expenditure, leading to an expansion in the sub sectors of the tourism industry (Teye, 2000).

Tourism remains the fourth largest foreign exchange earner after cocoa, minerals and remittances from abroad (GSS, 2004; Teye, 2000). Ghana’s commitment to, and rationale for tourism development is underpinned fundamentally by economic factors, at both the national and local levels (Teye, 2000). Whereas tourism at the national level is directed towards promoting and fostering economic growth, through foreign exchange generation and increases in government revenue, tourism at the local level is focused on stimulating and facilitating job creation, income related activities and revenue distribution to achieve balanced regional development, with the primary aim of improving the quality of life of Ghanaians (Teye, 2000).

As shown in Figure 5.5, regardless of the economic focus, tourism development in Ghana has been facilitated by the existence of several environmental and cultural resources, including the World Heritage listed castles and forts, national parks and traditional festivals. These resources continue to serve as the basis of tourism development in Ghana, providing an all year experience for both international and domestic tourists. Table 5.2, for example, shows tourist visitation to major national parks and protected areas in Ghana in 2011.
Figure 5.5  Tourism Destinations in Ghana
Source: Adapted from Ghana Tourist Board (2009).

Table 5.2  Tourists Visitation to National Parks in Ghana (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Park</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ankasa Resource Reserve</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>3,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobiri Forest and Butterfly Sanctuary</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>3,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyabobo National Park</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mole National Park</td>
<td>8,909</td>
<td>5,790</td>
<td>14,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakum Conservation Area</td>
<td>159,535</td>
<td>201,532</td>
<td>361,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintampo Waterfalls</td>
<td>7,538</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>9,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyabobo National Park</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shai Hills Resource Reserve</td>
<td>9,988</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>12,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagbo Waterfall/Mt. Afadja-Liati-Wote</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>13,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ghana Tourism Authority (2011).
The increasing population of Ghana (doubling every 20 years) has put increasing pressure on the environment, and has necessitated the use of tourism in the protection of the natural environment and sensitive ecological systems. Other negative experiences, such as Ghana’s reliance on declining prices of traditional exports of unprocessed minerals (e.g., gold) and agricultural products (e.g., cocoa), have stimulated the development of tourism as a tool for diversifying the economy (Teye, 2000).

In terms of tourist categories, Ghanaians resident overseas constitute the single largest category of arrivals, and they usually stay with friends and families. Major international arrivals are from Europe and North America and are mostly business people pursuing economic opportunities in the liberalised economic environment (Teye, 2000).

5.5.1 Trajectory of Tourism Development in Ghana

Attempts to develop the tourism industry in Ghana started in the 1970s. A study was conducted to evaluate the various tourism resources, with the primary objective of classifying tourism resources and developing a five year tourism development plan from 1972-1976 (Obuarn Committee, 1972). Following this study was the issuance of the Government White Paper on Tourism, which identified investment areas for foreign participation, concessions and incentives for investors (Teye, 2000).

Between 1972 – 1978, further studies (e.g., tourism development and assessment) were undertaken to explore the various dimensions, sectors and aspects of the tourism industry in Ghana. Crippled by financial difficulties, majority of these studies were undertaken by foreign and international agencies, including United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) (Teye, 2000). However, some locally supported studies, highlighting the impact of tourism, were conducted during this period (e.g., Ayittey, 1975; Ghosh & Kotey, 1973). Issues relating to foreign exchange earnings, social and cultural impacts, and the multiplier effects of tourism were studied during the 1970s.

Ghana’s tourism potential was established by these studies, however there remained the need to develop an all-inclusive and more comprehensive national
tourism development plan to stimulate, guide and manage long-term sustainable tourism development in the country. As a result, several tourism policies have been developed and implemented over the past four decades. For example in 1973, the Ghana Tourist Control Authority Act, 1973 was passed. Based on this legislation, the first tourism plan was prepared (15 Year National Tourism Development Plan, 1975-1990). In addition, a medium-term plan was introduced in 1993 (Medium-Term National Tourism Development Plan, 1993-1995). The Integrated Tourism Development Programme was initiated in 1992 by the GoG with the support of the UNDP and UNWTO, and provided a planned approach to tourism development in Ghana. The programme was designed over a period of 20 years (1992-2013) with various components, including:

1. Five-year Tourism Development Action Programme (1996-2000);
2. Five-year Tourism Development Financial Plan (1996-2000);
3. Regional Tourism Plans;
4. Tourism Marketing Strategy and a Five Year Promotion Programme (1996-2000);
5. Tourism Awareness Programme and Tourist Behaviour Code (1995);
6. Strengthening of technical and managerial capabilities of public and private sectors’ tourism officials;
7. Establishment of a tourism management information system in the Ministry of Tourism; and
8. The National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1996-2010);

Other tourism development plans implemented over the past four decades include the Strategic Tourism Action Plan (2003-2007), and the National Tourism Policy 2006. Although the purpose of these plans has been to ensure sustainable tourism resource development in Ghana, as yet it is unclear whether these plans were or have been successful in developing tourism resources, particularly ecotourism attractions. Chapter 7 of this thesis reviews these tourism policies to determine their effectiveness in tourism development in Ghana. The next section examines the state of ecotourism in Ghana.

5.6 Ecotourism in Ghana

Ghana is rich in ecotourism resources including national parks, historical sites, beaches and game reserves (Tamakloe, 2000). As illustrated in Figure 5.6, some
of the major ecotourism destinations in Ghana include Bia, Bui and Mole National Parks, Kakum Conservation Area, Shai Hills, Ankasa, Kogyae and Bomfobiri Resource Reserves, Owabi Wildlife Sanctuary, Buabeng Fiema Monkey Sanctuary, Lake Bosomtwi and several coastal wetlands (Asiedu, 2002). Most of the ecotourism resources in Ghana are found in rural areas where poverty levels are high, and many remain undeveloped.
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**Figure 5.6**  **Major Ecotourism Resources and Destinations in Ghana**

Source: Adapted from Asiedu (2002).

While it is worth noting that these ecotourism resources present an opportunity to advance environmental conservation and local development initiatives in host communities, recent research (Akyeampong, 2011; Akyeampong & Asiedu, 2008; Asiedu, 2002; Bediako, 2000) has identified multiple challenges facing Ghana’s ecotourism sector. According to Bediako (2000), the ecotourism sector is accorded low priority in the national development framework, particularly by the Ghana Wildlife Division (GWD), the organisation responsible for managing protected and natural areas in Ghana. This situation has resulted in poor quality and inadequate provision of tourist services and infrastructure facilities, and lack of interpretation, which has in turn limited both the level of tourist visitation, and
employment and income generation at the local level (Asiedu, 2002; Bediako, 2000).

In addition, the low commitment to destination development in rural communities, in Asiedu’s (2002) view, means that ecotourism has not achieved its potential to reduce poverty in those local communities. Asiedu (2002) asserts that the development of these ecotourism destinations and associated tourism activity has the potential to spread direct and indirect benefits across the country, which could result in improvements in the living conditions of the poor.

A further challenge identified by Bediako (2000) arises from the limited level of community involvement in ecotourism development in Ghana. Bediako (2000) finds that local communities around ecotourism destinations are dissatisfied by their limited involvement in ecotourism development, and disappointed by the outcomes. Haligah (1998) and Asiedu (1998) argue that local disillusionment, resulting from limited outcomes from, and community engagement in ecotourism, could threaten environmental conservation efforts in Ghana. According to Asiedu (2002, p.8), if such local disillusionment is not resolved, this “could endanger the very principles upon which ecotourism is founded leading to local disinterest in it”. From this it can be inferred that there would be a likely consequence for reducing poverty, conserving environment, and achieving sustainable development. However, little research has been undertaken on this topic in Ghana.

The following sections examine the characteristics of the KCA.

5.7 Kakum Conservation Area: The study area

An evaluation of the GWD’s KCA management plan and CI’s KCA research report shows that the location of the KCA is strategic, in relation to ecotourism and local development. The Central Region in which the KCA is located has a rich variety of natural and cultural resources based on its large stock of tourism attractions. According to Akyeampong (2011) these tourism resources range from sandy beaches and ecological (e.g., national parks) and cultural resources (e.g., traditional festivals) to historical heritage (e.g., castles and forts), and have been the hub of Ghana’s mainstream tourism sector over the past two decades.
As a result, the Central Region has since 1989 attracted the attention of several international organisations (e.g., UNDP), NGOs (e.g., CI), donor agencies (e.g., USAID) and local governments (e.g., District Assemblies), who are committed to the promotion and development of tourism (Akyeampong, 2011). Despite its tourism potential and the attraction of tourism-related support, official statistics indicate that the Central Region remains the fourth poorest region in Ghana, following the three Northern Regions (GSS, 2012). In addition, the KCA stretches across the Twifo-Hemang Lower Denkyira District (THLDD) and Assin South District, which are among the poorest districts in the Central Region (GSS, 2012). The names of these districts, according to the THLDD development plan (2010-2013), connote remoteness and deprivation, due to the continuing worsening of their conditions of poverty.

An analysis of tourism and KCA management plans from the GWD and GHCT shows that ecotourism and the KCA are inseparable, as the major ecotourism attractions located in the KCA have contributed to its effective management (e.g., providing funds for conservation purposes). The document review indicates that ecotourism has ensured the protection of the KCA, which contains the country’s foremost rainforest national park. Moreover, despite the existence of several national parks in Ghana, Akyeampong (2011) explained that the KCA is the leading nature reserve in Southern Ghana, with its ecotourism products attracting larger numbers of tourists than all the other national parks, because of its proximity to the national capital.

Considering that the KCA is located in poor districts despite its ecotourism potential, available literature suggests that the reserve has become an important research destination for both academics and government to explore ways of developing local communities through tourism. Examples of these studies include Akyeampong (2011) who explored community perceptions and experiences regarding pro-poor tourism, Appiah-Opoku (2011) who examined how protected areas can be used for biodiversity conservation, and Dei (2000) who studied the importance of community participation in the management of the KCA. However, little is known about the process of ecotourism implementation and its outcomes on poverty in the local communities. This research therefore builds on these previous studies on pro-poor tourism and community participation in the KCA by
exploring the process of implementing the ecotourism concept in the KCA and its outcomes on poverty reduction in the case study communities.

### 5.7.1 Physical Characteristics of the KCA

Covering a land area of 360 km², the KCA is located about 30 km north of Cape Coast, the capital of the Central Region (see Figure 5.7). The KCA lies in the Upper Guinea forest zone in southern Ghana (Eggert et al., 2003) between longitude 1°30′ W-1°51′ W and latitude 5°20′ N-5°40′ N. The major rainy season is from March to July, while the period from September to November marks the minor rainy season (Monney et al., 2010). The KCA is endowed with faunal diversity with mammals such as elephants, Demidoff’s galago and species of primates such as black and white colobus; reptiles such as dwarf crocodiles and serrated tortoises; a total of 266 bird species; and about 405 species of butterflies (IUCN, 2010). Moreover, the KCA is a reserve that represents the diminishing tropical evergreen forest located within the semi-deciduous forest zone (Appiah-Opoku, 2011; Monney et al., 2010).
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**Figure 5.7   KCA in District Context**

Source: CSU Spatial Data Analysis Network (2012).

### 5.7.2 Background and Purpose of the KCA

Although the date of creation of the KCA remains uncertain, researchers (e.g., Kpelle, 1993; Hawthorne & Musah, 1993; Nchanji, 1994) have indicated that it was established before the 1950s, to protect the watersheds of the Kakum River
and other rivers which supply the water needs of Cape Coast (Central Regional capital) and surrounding communities (IUCN, 2010). With its headwaters lying in the park, the Conservation Area was named after the Kakum River (Akyeampong, 2011). According to Eggert et al. (2003), there was unrestricted access to resources in the KCA, due to poor supervision by the then Ghana Forestry Department, resulting in intensive logging activities between the 1950s and 1980s. However, in 1989 the Central Region Administration suspended logging activities. In 1992, the KCA was officially and legally gazetted as a national park and resource reserve by the Wildlife Reserves Regulations (L1 1525) under the administrative jurisdiction of the Ghana Wildlife Department, now the GWD (IUCN, 2010). As illustrated in Figure 5.8, the KCA comprises the Assin Attandanso Resource Reserve (AARR) and the Kakum National Park (KNP).
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**Figure 5.8**  KCA and Some Surrounding Communities
Source: CSU Spatial Data Analysis Network (2012).

The purpose of the KCA has been described as seeking to restore and maintain the integrity of the rapidly diminishing rain forest reserve, while diversifying the tourism product offerings of Ghana, providing environmental education to both tourists and local communities, and promoting economic development in the
surrounding local communities (Appiah-Opoku, 2011; Conservation International [CI], 1998; Teye et al., 2002). With the assistance of the Conservation International (CI), ecotourism was introduced in 1995 as a catalyst to facilitate effective management of the KCA, and to stimulate development in the local communities (CI, 1998).

5.7.3 Management of the KCA

The management of the KCA has been the responsibility of the GWD under the Ghana Forestry Commission. The GWD is responsible for carrying out surveillance and anti-poaching patrols, conducting outreach programmes on environmental conservation and promoting alternative economic activities in surrounding villages, and for the conduct of environmental and other related educational campaigns (Appiah-Opoku, 2011). An analysis of the Area Development Plan of the World Vision shows that, to ensure sustainable management of the KCA, the traditional authorities/leaders in the surrounding communities, NGOs (e.g., World Vision) operating in the district, and the GWD have formed an association known as the Kakum Attandanso Management Advisory Unit to help educate the local communities in environmental conservation, and to support improvement in their livelihoods through ecotourism.

A review of tourism documents and the KCA management plan provided by the Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (GHCT) and the GWD shows that within the KCA, ecotourism development started with the construction of a canopy walkway by the GoG and the CI with financial support from USAID, and the establishment of a tree platform by the GWD. The GHCT, an organisation established by the CI, is responsible for the management of the canopy walkway. The GWD thus collaborates with the GHCT to manage the KCA and are locally referred to as park officials.

Other community and privately owned ecotourism attractions have developed outside the reserve to leverage off the KCA ecotourism development. Bee keeping, a monkey sanctuary, crafts, and a traditional bamboo orchestra are among these attractions. The purpose of these attractions, are discussed in Section 5.7.4.
5.7.4 Ecotourism Products in and around the KCA

Findings from the community and agency interviews, supported by secondary data, reveal that the KCA region has rich and diverse ecotourism attractions, developed and undeveloped, located both in the KCA and the local communities outside the boundaries of the KCA. The THLDDA official explained the ecotourism potential in and outside the KCA:

... We in this district are fortunate to have such an ecotourism resource [KCA]... Apart from what goes on in the park, some communities outside the park have unique cultural attractions like local festivals which can be developed into ecotourism destinations ... THLDDA, May 2012.

While different ecotourism attractions were widely reported by the community and agency interviewees, they can broadly be categorised into two types based on the interview data: (1) KCA ecotourism attractions; and (2) community ecotourism attractions outside the KCA. These ecotourism attractions and their relative locations are summarised in Figure 5.9 and explained in Sections 5.7.4.1 and 5.7.4.2.

![Figure 5.9 Ecotourism Products in and around the KCA](image_url)
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5.7.4.1 The KCA ecotourism attractions

Within the KCA, the canopy walkway was identified and repeatedly mentioned by the majority of community interviewees (36 out of 40) and agency representatives (7 out of 8) as the bastion of, and the major ecotourism attraction in the KCA region, especially at the western corridor of the KCA. The GHCT official explained the importance of the canopy walkway to ecotourism in the KCA:

... The canopy walkway is the basis of ecotourism activities in the KCA ... Ecotourism in KCA started after the construction of the canopy walkway and it has since been the attraction point for tourists who visit Ghana ... It is the lifeblood of ecotourism in the KCA ... GHCT, May 2012.

Discussions with the community residents and agency representatives further identified the tree platform near the Mesomagor community as another ecotourism attraction located in the KCA. According to community residents, the tree platform provides tourists with an alternative natural experience from the eastern corridor of the KCA. One Mesomagor resident commented that:

... Tourists, who come here, come here purposely to see the tree platform and sometimes spend a night there. It is the major attraction that brings tourists to this community ... Mesomagor 6, June 2012.

The following sections describe these two key KCA ecotourism attractions.

The canopy walkway in the KCA near Abrafo

The canopy walkway was established by the CI and the GoG with financial support from the USAID in the south western part of the KCA in 1995. Its establishment was linked to the promotion of tourism development, and support of the conservation of the KCA. The canopy walkway is about 30 m above the ground and consists of a 350 m long suspended bridge, as well as six tree platforms. According to the CI official, the canopy walkway was officially opened to capitalise on the ecotourism potential of the KCA, and to make it a driving force for tourism development in Ghana:

... The canopy walkway was established purposely to support the conservation of the KCA and also develop the ecotourism resources in Kakum. The project attracted local and international interests. As a result, it was used as the model for developing other ecotourism and tourism sites in Ghana ... CI, May 2012.
The community and agency interviews indicate that the canopy walkway was the first ecotourism attraction to be introduced in the KCA region (see Figure 5.10).

**Figure 5.10  The Canopy Walkway in the KCA**

![Canopy Walkway in the KCA](image)


To ensure that the canopy walkway becomes an all year tourist attraction, the park officials (GHCT and GWD) in 1997 opened a visitor information centre to support educational, social and ceremonial functions, by emphasising the importance of natural resource conservation and demonstrating the relationship between nature and culture in Ghana. The visitor information centre, built with funding from USAID and technical support from CI, is located on a 512 acre land in close proximity to the canopy walkway. In addition, there are walking trails near the canopy walkway to provide self-guided day hiking opportunities. Although basic camping is also available, agency interviews indicate that the close proximity of the canopy walkway to the Central Regional capital Cape Coast (30 km), coupled with relatively accessible road has encouraged tour operators to provide day trips. As a result, there are no hotels in the park or the immediate community of Abrafo.

**The tree platform in the KCA near Mesomagor**

The tree platform, located in the eastern side of the KCA, was established by the GWD. However, given its close location to the Mesomagor community, the Mesomagor residents indicated that they collaborate with the park officials to manage the tree platform. Box 5.1 provides background information on the tree platform in the KCA, which is illustrated in Figure 5.11.
5.7.4.2 Community ecotourism attractions outside the KCA

Across the case study communities, the Frami Monkey Sanctuary, the Craft Village, the Stingless Bee Keeping Centre and the Traditional Bamboo Orchestra were identified by the community and agency interviewees as community ecotourism attractions. According to the CEDECOM and GHCT officials, the purpose of these ecotourism attractions has been to provide auxiliary products for
tourists who visit the canopy walkway and the tree platform in the KCA, and to engage local communities to develop the tourism potential of the KCA. The CEDECOM official commented further:

... Another aspect of ecotourism the government consciously considered in some of the communities, particularly Abrafo, was the craft village to ensure that the local people get some benefit from tourism activities in the Kakum region and also improve the living conditions of the people ...

CEDECOM, July 2012.

The following sections describe these community ecotourism attractions.

**Frami monkey sanctuary near Abrafo**

The monkey sanctuary is located in Frami village close to the Abrafo community and 3 km from the KCA. According to the Abrafo residents, the sanctuary was established by Dutch investors for commercial operation. It serves as home for local animals, such as monkeys, rare white antelope, birds, African civets, grass-cutters and porcupines. Discussions with the agencies show the Frami monkey sanctuary, located on an ancient rock formation (Daktari Terrace), provides tourists with the opportunity to have another view of the rainforest in the KCA, as well as to enjoy refreshments at the sanctuary’s restaurant.

**Craft village in Abrafo**

The craft village in Abrafo was established to introduce local people into non-forest based livelihood activities (e.g., bead making). Agency interviews and secondary data from the CEDECOM revealed that the craft village was set-up mainly to take advantage of growing visitation to the canopy walkway in the KCA, and to support local communities to improve their living conditions. The CEDECOM official explained that:

... Looking at the number of tourists that Kakum attracts both domestic and international, this craft village was set up so that the tourists who visit Kakum will also visit the craft village. The facility does not only provide employment for the local people who hitherto would have been unemployed but also farmers in the local communities because the tourists sometimes buy local farm produce ...

CEDECOM, July 2012.

The craft village is located in a neighbourhood in Abrafo where some local residents have been trained by the government through the CEDECOM, in creative skills such as bead making, basket weaving and dress making. Abrafo
residents regard the craft village as a place where local craft works are showcased and marketed to tourists. A worker from the craft village commented that:

... People who work here have skills in dress making, carving, and weaving. Tourists sometimes come here to learn about how we operate and also buy some of our products ...  
*Abrafo 9, April 2012.*

**International stingless bee keeping centre in Abrafo**

The international stingless bee keeping centre, located on a 20 acre land in Abrafo, was started in 2005 by Department of Entomology and Wildlife of the School of Biological Sciences of UCC with support from the GHCT. According to the GHCT official, the bee keeping centre was established as an environmental educational centre to support environment-related research at the university level:

... The international stingless bee centre was set up by the Department of Entomology and Wildlife of the University of Cape Coast. This is the first time we’ve had such a facility in the whole West Africa ...  
*GHCT, May 2012.*

In recent years, the bee keeping centre has become one of the ecotourism attractions at the south western corridor of the KCA, despite its research-oriented focus. Community and agency interview results indicate that the centre generally only attracts tourists who are interested in bee and honey products. Some interviewees explained that:

... Because it is a research facility, small number of tourists go there ... However, the tourists who visit the facility buy some products [e.g., honey]... 
*GHCT, May 2012.*

... In a week, you will only see about 20 tourists mainly students visiting the bee keeping centre ... they come and learn how the bees are managed and how honey is made from the bees ...  
*Abrafo 7, April 2012.*

**Traditional bamboo orchestra in Mesomagor**

Of all the communities bordering the KCA, only Mesomagor has a community ecotourism attraction which is based on local culture (the traditional bamboo orchestra). The orchestra serves as a key ecotourism attraction at the eastern entry to the KCA. Discussions with Mesomagor residents show the bamboo music,
which is locally called ‘kukyekukyeku’, was introduced into the community by a family from Gomoa Odinna, a town in the Central Region of Ghana. Despite the acceptance and use of the bamboo music as a form of entertainment in the community, the residents indicated that the music ‘faded into oblivion’ following the gazettal of the KCA. A resident from Mesomagor explained further:

... Everyone in this community likes the bamboo music. We use it as a form of entertainment especially among the youth. When the Kakum project began many of the young people had to leave Mesomagor to find work elsewhere because they couldn’t engage in hunting and logging again, so the bamboo orchestra collapsed ... Mesomagor 9, June 2012.

However in 1994, the traditional bamboo orchestra was revived through the effort of the current leader, who organised the local youth in the community with the assistance of an NGO. The leader provided an explanation regarding the group’s revival and development:

... In 1994, I started thinking of ways of making the traditional bamboo orchestra work, I was in Cape Coast then. So I left Cape Coast and returned to Mesomagor where some of my friends show their interest in the group ... the group was organised and we learned more drumming and dancing, and performed war dances, story dances, modern and creative dances which we currently do ... Today, the group performs at different locations when invited. The members are also able to teach traditional drumming and dancing using the bamboo instruments ... the group is what it is today because of the support of AGORO/CILTAD NGO which assisted us to construct our guest house ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

As defined by the Mesomagor residents, AGORO/CILTAD, an NGO involved in the preservation of traditional music and dance in Ghana, supported the construction of a guest house in Mesomagor to provide accommodation for tourists who visit the orchestra and the tree platform. The guest house has four bed rooms, each with two beds. Other facilities in the guest house include two washrooms – toilet and bath – and a parking area.

Discussion with the Mesomagor residents revealed that the traditional bamboo orchestra is highly valued by the community because of the perception that it unites residents of the community.
As illustrated in Figure 5.12, the community ecotourism attractions are concentrated in the southern part of the KCA, where Abrafo and Mesomagor are located. Community interviews, supported by agency interview data, indicate that the relatively distant geographical location of Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities from the canopy walkway coupled with poor road conditions are among the causes of the lack of ecotourism attractions in these communities.

5.7.4.3 Undeveloped ecotourism attractions

It is true that, in a variety of contexts, the KCA region is endowed with diverse ecotourism attractions. However, agency interviews show that numerous untapped ecotourism resources exist outside the KCA. Making reference to a study conducted in 2006, the THLDDA official asserted that these ecotourism resources have not been developed due to a lack of tourism administrative structures at the district level, limited capacity of the local residents, and an apathetic attitude of park officials (see Box 5.2).
5.7.5 Travel Pattern and Trend of Tourist Visitation to the KCA

The KCA is an important ecotourism destination in Ghana because of its proximity to the Central Regional capital, Cape Coast and Ghana’s national capital, Accra as well as its all year visitation. Agency interviews and field observations show that there are two entry points to the KCA with regard to ecotourism activities. They are the south western point, where Abrafo is located, which provides entry to the canopy walkway, and the eastern point, where Mesomagor is located which provides entry to the tree platform (see Figure 5.12).

Discussions with park officials (GWD and GHCT) also revealed that it is difficult for tourists to visit both the canopy walkway and the tree platform on the same day due to the poor road network around the park. As shown in Figure 5.7, tourists who visit the south western part of KCA (canopy walkway) have to return to Cape Coast, the regional capital before they can access the eastern part of the

---

**Box 5.2 Undeveloped Ecotourism Attractions around the KCA**

“Everyone knows tourism in Ghana is an old industry which continues to contribute significantly towards the growth and development of Ghana. But we can’t say because it’s an old industry it should remain at where it is. Do you know that when you talk about tourism in Ghana, it is only at the national and the regional levels? Many tourism resources remain under-developed at the district level ... In this our district [THLDD], there are many attractions including Kakum, the most visited national park in Ghana.

Being aware of all these tourism potentials in the district, the district assembly [THLDDA] in 2006 put up a team to identify and write a report on all the potential tourist sites, so that with the support of other institutions develop them. The team did a good job of identifying close to 20 potential sites. Some of the sites identified were Jukwa Cultural Village in Twifo Hemang, Mbem Waterfall, the Ancestral Cave in Jukwa, spring water in Mfoum and so many others. Even in your case study areas, we identified Buomu in Nuamakrom and a bird sanctuary in Abrafo. The Buomu is a special rock having a cave with several apartments and it is believed to be a dwelling place for the god of the area. So the traditional people go there occasionally to pour libation.

The bird sanctuary in Abrafo for example is located very close to the entrance of the park [KCA] where we have a lot of bamboo growing there. There are so many bird species there with different nests. It is a potential site for bird watching and even educational tours. But ask me what has been done about all these sites? As I’m speaking with you, not even a single site has been developed into an ecotourism destination. Those in Kakum [park officials] are only concerned about the canopy walkway …” [THLDDA, May 2012].
park where the tree platform is located. There is no direct access from the south western part to the eastern part of the KCA. As a consequence, agency interviews show that tourists who visit the canopy walkway do not often visit the tree platform. That notwithstanding, while there is reasonable access to the canopy walkway because it is located on the major road linking the regional capital to the THLDD capital (Twifo Praso), accessibility to the tree platform is poor, which has affected tourist visitation to the tree platform.

In terms of tourist visitation, agency interviews reveal that tourist numbers to the canopy walkway in the KCA have been increasing over the years. The GHCT official explained that:

... Kakum, over the years, has witnessed increasing numbers of tourist visitation to its canopy walkway ... We believe strongly that the services that we provide the tourists are of high quality. We also have effective management team which has made most tourists prefer Kakum to other sites in Ghana ... GHCT, May 2012.

Given that the canopy walkway is the major source of attraction and has reasonable access, agency interviews show that it is the first point of visit by most tourists to the KCA (see Section 5.7.4.1). As a result, the GHCT only keeps records on tourist visitation to the canopy walkway, while it collaborates with the Mesomagor community to keep records on visitation to the tree platform (see Section 5.7.5.2). Between 2000 and 2012, the number of tourist visits to the canopy walkway in the KCA more than tripled (see Figure 5.13).

![Figure 5.13 Tourist Visitation to the Canopy Walkway in the KCA (2000-2012)](image)

Source: Based on Ecotourism Records from GHCT, Feb 2014.
As illustrated in Figure 5.13, domestic tourist numbers have increased over the past years while international tourist numbers have varied. However, analysis of tourist visitation records shows a decline in tourist numbers in 2003. According to the GHCT official, this was as a result of low domestic patronage, but indicated the reasons accounting for such fluctuation in domestic patronage are difficult to establish. Boakye and Owusu-Mintah (2008) agree that the reasons are difficult to ascertain, but identify financial constraints, in terms of low disposable income of many Ghanaians, as a key factor. Nonetheless, interviews with the GHCT official indicate that, with the organisation and promotion of group visitations (e.g., school and church groups) in Ghana, coupled with the training of tour guides in interpretation and human relations, and the establishment of a visitor information centre, there has been an increase in tourist visitation to the KCA over the past decade.

With the rapid growth in domestic visitation since 2005 (see Figure 5.13), the relative proportion of domestic visitors versus internationals has greatly changed, with visitation now strongly dominated by domestic tourists. The GHCT official explained further:

... Because the foreigners are often more interested in learning about the environment and our culture, we spend more time with them explaining these issues to them and try to provide them high quality services (e.g., security) ... But because our people (Ghanaians) form the majority of our visitors, we have introduced environmental education as part of our plan to keep encouraging them to visit ... GHCT, May 2012.

The above quote suggests that there is a strong focus on the domestic market, with the tourism products in the KCA being developed to suit the domestic market, although the focus on growing the market for international tourists, in terms of marketing and improved service delivery, remains paramount.

5.7.5.1 Categorisation of tourists in the KCA canopy walkway

Since the introduction of ecotourism into the KCA in the mid 1990s (see Section 5.7.2), analysis of the GHCT ecotourism records shows that tourists are composed of four main groups: Ghanaian adults, Ghanaian students/children (domestic), Non-Ghanaian adults and Non-Ghanaian students/children (international) as shown in Table 5.3.
Table 5.3 Tourist Composition in the KCA Canopy Walkway (2000-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ghanaian Adult</th>
<th>Ghanaian Student/Children</th>
<th>Non Ghanaian Adult</th>
<th>Non Ghanaian Student/Children</th>
<th>Total Visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19,809</td>
<td>14,541</td>
<td>10,121</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>49,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8,699</td>
<td>27,126</td>
<td>10,238</td>
<td>8,963</td>
<td>55,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9,707</td>
<td>44,491</td>
<td>8,945</td>
<td>7,972</td>
<td>71,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>28,681</td>
<td>8,395</td>
<td>8,202</td>
<td>53,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9,146</td>
<td>35,816</td>
<td>9,095</td>
<td>8,771</td>
<td>62,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>35,112</td>
<td>10,014</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>63,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17,290</td>
<td>50,659</td>
<td>15,169</td>
<td>25,216</td>
<td>108,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17,089</td>
<td>63,682</td>
<td>15,244</td>
<td>16,294</td>
<td>112,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19,526</td>
<td>67,892</td>
<td>17,964</td>
<td>16,337</td>
<td>121,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23,725</td>
<td>93,961</td>
<td>17,045</td>
<td>16,153</td>
<td>150,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15,954</td>
<td>102,431</td>
<td>16,030</td>
<td>20,722</td>
<td>155,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11,121</td>
<td>118,626</td>
<td>10,027</td>
<td>18,982</td>
<td>157,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13,387</td>
<td>128,090</td>
<td>11,125</td>
<td>18,531</td>
<td>171,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the GHCT official, categorisation of tourists is important to determine the major groups that patronise ecotourism attractions in the KCA:

... Because most of the tourists who visit Kakum are students, we decided to separate the students and children from the other visitors, which we refer to them as adults. If you analyse tourists’ arrivals figures at the KCA carefully, you will notice that generally students and children constitute about 50 percent of the total visitation which help us to know the type of services to provide ... **GHCT, May 2012**.

As illustrated in Figure 5.14, the growth in total tourist visitation to the KCA canopy walkway has been entirely driven by an increase in Ghanaian student/children tourists.

![Figure 5.14 Proportion of Tourist Composition in the KCA Canopy Walkway](image)

Source: Based on GHCT Records, Feb 2014.
The proportion of Ghanaian student/children tourists has grown from about 20 percent in 2000 to about 75 percent in 2012. While Ghanaian adults showed a progressive growth from 2002 to a strong base in 2009, the numbers have since dropped dramatically, the reasons, according to the park officials, are difficult to establish. In addition, the proportion of international tourists has been decreasing, to below 20 percent in most recent years. Despite the declining number of international tourists, interviews with some agencies (e.g., DHTM, GTA and GHCT) revealed that the KCA’s potential to attract international support, in the form of financial aid and technical assistance, has contributed to making the KCA the most visited ecotourism destination in Ghana.

5.7.6 Tourist Visitation to the Community Ecotourism Attractions outside the KCA

Although there has been an increase in visitation to the canopy walkway over the past decade, community interviews show the situation is different in the community ecotourism activities. While Mesomagor residents, in collaboration with the park officials, keep records on tourist visitation to the tree platform and the bamboo orchestra, those in Abrafo do not keep any records on tourist visits to the craft village. Considering that tourists who visit the tree platform also visit the bamboo orchestra, Table 5.4 presents total tourist visitation to the Mesomagor community.

Table 5.4 Tourist Visitation to the Mesomagor Community (2000-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Records of the Traditional Bamboo Orchestra, Feb 2014.
As presented in Table 5.4, while tourist visitation to the tree platform and the bamboo orchestra has been variable from 2000 to a strong base in 2010, the numbers have declined considerably. The leader of the bamboo orchestra explained the reasons for this trend in tourist visitation:

... We don’t receive many tourists here ... most of them [tourists] are from Belgium, Germany and USA ... we only receive more than 100 visitors when we have a good number of Ghanaians visiting ... Those who come here complained about the poor road conditions, but we try to compensate them through our music performances ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

Although Higham (2007) argued that undisturbed natural resources and supportive infrastructure are key to sustainable development of ecotourism, the above quote demonstrates that poor infrastructure, in terms of poor accessibility, is a barrier to ecotourism development in Mesomagor. However, the findings from the Mesomagor community meeting in 2014 suggest that the issue of poor access may be a blessing in disguise, as the residents indicated that this is part of the reason that all people who visit the tree platform also visit the bamboo orchestra:

... By the time they [tourists] arrive here, they are already tired because of the bad roads ... so most of them end up spending a night here ... Mesomagor community meeting, Feb 2014.

Unlike Abrafo, where ready access to Cape Coast has encouraged tour operators to provide ‘day trips’ to the canopy walkway, which does not encourage tourists to stay overnight in the community, those who visit Mesomagor often have to stay more than one day. As a consequence, the findings from the community meetings appear to suggest that there is an opportunity for additional experiences in Mesomagor, compared to Abrafo, despite the limited numbers of tourists in the former village:

... Because most of the tourists don’t know that there is a craft village here, very few of them come here after visiting the park. It [visitation] is not regular too ... they [tourists] come from Cape Coast and return after going to the canopy walkway ... Abrafo community meeting, Feb 2014.

Given the increasing tourist visitation to the canopy walkway in the KCA, in contrast to the low patronage of community ecotourism attractions outside the KCA, it is important to examine the revenue generated from tourist visitation and how it is managed. Agency and community interview results show that KCA
ecotourism (canopy walkway) revenue is generated from entry fees to the canopy walkway, while community ecotourism revenue is generated from the sale of artefacts, traditional music performances and visit to the tree platform. These are presented in the next section.

5.7.7 Ecotourism Revenue: Generation and Distribution

5.7.7.1 Ecotourism revenue generation in the KCA and the local community

Analysis of GHCT ecotourism documents reveals that the growing number of tourist visitations to the canopy walkway has been accompanied by an increase in revenue from walkway entry fees over the past decade (see Table 5.5), despite the fall in tourist visitations in 2003. Given that the canopy walkway is the major ecotourism attraction in the south western part of the KCA, the GHCT official explained that entry fees are charged to visit the canopy walkway. This entry fee includes access to the canopy walkway, information centre and walking trails located in the KCA (see Section 5.7.4.1).

Table 5.5 Entry Fee Revenue from Canopy Walkway (KCA) (2000-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ghanaian Adult (GH¢)</th>
<th>Ghanaian Student/ Children (GH¢)</th>
<th>Non Ghanaian Adult (GH¢)</th>
<th>Non Ghanaian Student/Children (GH¢)</th>
<th>Total Revenue (GH¢)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>54,413.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>70,404.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>77,409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>94,647.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>22,865.00</td>
<td>10,525.20</td>
<td>81,855.00</td>
<td>42,405.00</td>
<td>157,650.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32,570.00</td>
<td>40,820.40</td>
<td>100,845.00</td>
<td>49,266.00</td>
<td>223,501.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,412.50</td>
<td>60,682.80</td>
<td>136,521.00</td>
<td>126,080.00</td>
<td>327,696.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>42,722.50</td>
<td>76,418.40</td>
<td>137,196.00</td>
<td>77,734.00</td>
<td>334,070.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48,815.00</td>
<td>81,470.40</td>
<td>161,676.00</td>
<td>77,455.00</td>
<td>369,416.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>59,312.50</td>
<td>112,753.20</td>
<td>153,405.00</td>
<td>75,517.00</td>
<td>400,987.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>39,885.00</td>
<td>122,917.20</td>
<td>135,270.00</td>
<td>238,303.00</td>
<td>536,375.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>55,785.00</td>
<td>119,256.00</td>
<td>150,405.00</td>
<td>124,852.00</td>
<td>449,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>66,935.00</td>
<td>128,090.00</td>
<td>166,875.00</td>
<td>129,717.00</td>
<td>491,617.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Despite the dominance of domestic tourist visitation to the canopy walkway, data from the GHCT records (2014; Table 5.5) indicate that their contribution to total revenue in the KCA has been minimal compared with international tourists. As illustrated in Figure 5.15, regardless of the progressive growth of domestic tourism since 2004, the domestic contribution remains below 45 percent of the total entry fee generated. This situation is linked to a price discrimination policy.
implemented in the KCA and other ecotourism destinations in Ghana. For example, the entry fees for 2012 were GH¢ 5.00 (US$ 1.90, June 2014 rate) and GH¢ 1.00 (US$ 0.40) for Ghanaian adult and students/children respectively, while the rate for non-Ghanaian adult and students/children was GH¢ 15.00 (US$ 5.60) and GH¢ 7.00 (US$ 2.60) respectively. As explained by the GHCT official, this is a nationwide approach directed towards developing tourism destinations in Ghana:

... It is true that Ghanaians form the majority of the tourists who come here [KCA] but the international tourists contribute to the total revenue generated ... This is because Ghanaians are made to pay less fee than international tourists. This is an attempt to encourage more Ghanaians to visit Kakum and also make the facility accessible to all irrespective of one’s socio-economic status ... If you visit all the ecotourism destinations in Ghana, you will realise that Ghanaians are made to pay less than international tourists ... GHCT, May 2012.

![Figure 5.15 Proportion of Tourist Contribution to Entry Fee Revenue from the KCA Canopy Walkway](image)

Source: Based on GHCT Records, Feb 2014.

Given the contribution of international tourists to revenue generation in the KCA, despite their relatively low patronage, agency interviews suggest that there has been an awakening commitment on the part of park officials to develop strategies to attract and increase the number of international tourists. According to the GHCT official, this is reflected in the improvement in ecotourism services (e.g., usage and directional signs) and the development of human resource competence (e.g., tour guiding interpretation):
... You see, Kakum has gained international recognition and we continue to receive international tourists. We are always making efforts to improve the services that we provide and also develop our staff through refresher courses ... GHCT, May 2012.

Interviews with community residents show that, while the Mesomagor community, with the support of the park officials, has made attempts to keep revenue records, there are no available records on revenues generated from the sale of crafts in Abrafo. Abrafo residents identified low tourist visitation, as the reason for poor record keeping. Table 5.6 presents the revenue generated from tourist visitation to the Mesomagor community.

Table 5.6 Ecotourism Revenue in Mesomagor (2000-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tree Platform Fee (GHe)</th>
<th>Bamboo Orchestra Fee (GHe)</th>
<th>Total Revenue (GHe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>241.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>241.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>443.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>490.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>388.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>388.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>346.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>346.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>558.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>606.00</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>6,380.00</td>
<td>6,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>642.00</td>
<td>4,054.00</td>
<td>4,696.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>456.00</td>
<td>1,980.00</td>
<td>2,436.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,548.00</td>
<td>7,388.00</td>
<td>8,936.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,362.00</td>
<td>6,513.00</td>
<td>7,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>825.00</td>
<td>7,083.00</td>
<td>7,908.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Traditional Bamboo Orchestra Records, Feb 2014. nd= no data

Although tourist visitation to the Mesomagor community has decreased since 2011, the residents, especially the members of the bamboo orchestra group, are happy with the increasing revenue. Discussions with the Mesomagor residents revealed that the increasing revenue is a result of high fees for traditional bamboo performances paid by international tourists, who are the majority of tourists. For example, in 2012, international tourists were charged GHe350.00 (US$ 129.63, June 2014 rate) per performance. The leader of the bamboo orchestra said:

... Revenue from our performances has been increasing over the years, and we want it to continue in the future ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

Whilst poor infrastructure and marketing have affected tourist numbers to community ecotourism attractions outside the KCA (see Section 5.7.6), and resulted in contrasting practices of record keeping on ecotourism revenue, the key
concern expressed by local people across the four case study communities relate to the use of the ecotourism revenue. The next section presents the findings on how ecotourism revenue is distributed in and around the KCA.

5.7.7.2 Ecotourism revenue distribution in and around the KCA

According to the GHCT official, ecotourism revenue from the canopy walkway entry fees, which is the main source of ecotourism revenue, is shared between the GoG (51%) and the GHCT (49%), with no direct economic benefit to the local communities around the KCA. The park officials explained that the government revenue from ecotourism goes into consolidated funds for the development and benefit of the entire country, while the remaining 49 percent contributes to the management and maintenance of the canopy walkway and other facilities such as the visitor information centre in the KCA. The GHCT official explained further:

... The percentage of the revenue that we receive, we pay our workers, buy materials and other logistics that we will need to operate. Again, we used the same money to carry out our regular maintenance on the canopy walkway and other facilities in the park ... GHCT, May 2012.

While some agency officials (e.g., GHCT, CEDECOM, GTA) justified the existing revenue distribution system, arguing that the GoG and the CI are the ‘masterminds’ of ecotourism in the KCA, others (e.g., World Vision and THLDDA) were unhappy with the situation, and maintained that the GHCT in consultation with the government should consider involving the local communities in the revenue distribution. During the confirmatory research phase, the THLDDA official proposed a strategy for involving the local communities:

... It is not just enough to say that we give this amount of revenue [51%] to the government. What about the local communities? If they [park officials] think about the communities, they will set up a development fund of about 5 percent of the revenue from the park to support the communities around the park by providing them with quality health care and educational facilities which will equip future generation with the necessary skills to work in the various tourism activities in the park ... THLDDA, Feb 2014.

In the context of on-going mixed reactions from the agencies regarding the ecotourism revenue distribution system, the local residents strongly expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of local benefits from KCA ecotourism revenue. Residents in Abrafo (8 out of 10) and Mesomagor (10 out of 10) further challenged the government and the park officials to capitalise on the ecotourism potential in the KCA region, by embarking on projects that deliver sustainable
tourism livelihood outcomes and hence empower the communities. Some community residents said that:

... We are not saying they [park officials] should give us all the ecotourism revenue from the park, but we want to see development in our community. A lot of tourists come here [KCA], can’t they introduce more tourism activities like the craft village here for us to get jobs and learn creative skills? *Abrafo 7, April 2012.*

... The canopy walkway generates a lot of revenue, but ask me whether communities around it [KCA] know how the money is spent ... the government takes all the money. They [government officials] come here promising us that they will provide us with electricity, improve our road conditions ... but nothing has been happening over the years. The poor road conditions have affected the number of tourists who come here. If they [government officials] really think about us, then they should improve our road so that more tourists will visit our bamboo orchestra .... *Mesomagor 6, June 2012.*

In congruence, those in Adadientem and Nuamakrom indicated that efforts should be made by the government to use ecotourism revenue from the canopy walkway to develop infrastructure in their communities. However, they did not wish the government to give ecotourism revenue directly to the communities. In particular the traditional leaders suggested that this may exacerbate the existing political tensions between the traditional leaders (see Section 6.2.2). One Adadientem interviewee explained:

... We want the government to spend some of the money to construct our road and provide us with electricity, we will be better off because we can easily move around and this will open up our community to people in other parts of the region ... it will be a bad idea for the park officials to give money to the chiefs in the communities around the park. Already, there is tension because of the creation of the park, so if that should happen, some chiefs will demand more money than others which will create enmity among the communities. Some of the chiefs will also keep the money for their own use without any benefit to the community ... *Adadientem 9, July 2012*

On the other hand, at the community level, the leader of the bamboo orchestra in Mesomagor explained how the revenue generated is used:

... We spend 60 percent of the money from the bamboo orchestra performances to pay our members and the remaining on our activities ... the community also gets 12 percent of the revenue from the tree platform for development project while the park officials keep 64 percent, with the local tour guide and the reception manager sharing the remaining 24 percent ... *Mesomagor 2, June 2012.*
In addition, discussions with some workers of the Abrafo craft village identified irregular inflow of revenue from their activities. One worker commented that:

... What we do here [craft village] is not well marketed, so we don’t make enough money. We end up using the small revenue as wages ... Abrafo 6, April 2012.

The above discussions suggest that in the KCA, a key factor in the distribution of ecotourism revenue is the poor structure which excludes benefits to local community, while poor infrastructure and low marketing of community ecotourism attractions constitute the challenging factors in local communities, especially Abrafo. However, across the four case study communities, the views expressed by the residents in terms of improvement in infrastructure such as roads, and the creation of ecotourism-related jobs with part of the entry fee revenue, are indications that the local people recognise the importance of ecotourism to improving their socio-economic wellbeing. The next section examines the socio-economic characteristics of the case study communities.

5.8 Characteristics of communities around the KCA

Based on an early socio-economic survey (GWD, 1996) and the 2010 national population and housing census, about a quarter of the total population of the THLDD and Assin South District live in the communities bordering the KCA (Akyeampong, 2011; GSS, 2012). These two districts are predominantly rural, with THLDD having 75 percent and Assin South District 100 percent rural population (GSS, 2012). Agriculture is the dominant economic activity, employing over 70 percent of the total population in both districts (GSS, 2012). In the communities bordering the KCA however, over 90 percent are engaged in small scale agriculture (Monney et al., 2010).

5.8.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of the Case Study Communities

As presented in Table 5.7, human population in the case study communities has been increasing over the past four decades which has put pressure on the available resources (e.g., land), given that these communities are predominantly agrarian. This section examines the socio-economic characteristics of the case study communities, such as household size, education, occupation, and income and expenditure patterns. These factors can influence the outcomes of ecotourism on
poverty reduction, in terms of community benefits, and local support for the conservation of the KCA.

Table 5.7 Human Population in the Case Study Communities (1970-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>2,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Household size of respondents

As presented in Table 5.8, the household survey results show that over 50 percent of households across the four case study communities have more than five members, which is higher than the district and national averages of 4.5 and 4.4 persons per household respectively (GSS, 2012). The situation is more pronounced in the Mesomagor and Adadientem communities, where over 60 percent of households have more than five members compared to Abrafo and Nuamakrom.

Table 5.8 Household Size of Respondents (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>1-2 Household Size (%)</th>
<th>3-5 Household Size (%)</th>
<th>Over 5 Household Size (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey April-July 2012.

Discussions with respondents revealed that local communities regard large household size as a source of security, especially for parents in old age, in terms of receiving support from their children. However, a review of the THLDD and Assin South District development plans shows that other factors such as illiteracy, poverty, the lack of family planning programmes and facilities, and traditional norms and culture have influenced household size in the communities around the KCA.
**Educational background of respondents**

Findings from the household survey indicate that a majority (35%) of respondents across the four case study communities have never had any formal education. About 33 percent of households have received primary education, while only 13 percent have received technical training or secondary education (see Table 5.9).

**Table 5.9 Educational Characteristics of Household Respondents (n=310)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Senior High/Technical (%)</th>
<th>Junior High (%)</th>
<th>Primary (%)</th>
<th>Never (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadianem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey April-July 2012.

In all four case study communities, during the household surveys, respondents mentioned the lack of educational opportunities in their communities as a cause of high illiteracy. The THLDD development plan (2010-2013) also identified inadequate educational infrastructure such as school buildings, and lack of trained teachers in these communities as factors contributing to illiteracy.

**Occupational characteristics of respondents**

Households in the case study communities have different occupations or sources of income including agriculture, ecotourism and self-owned businesses. The household survey results show that farming remains the main occupation for the households across the four case study communities. As presented in Table 5.10, over 65 percent of respondents across the case study communities are involved in agriculture.

**Table 5.10 Occupational Categories of Household Respondents (n=310)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>KCA (%)</th>
<th>Community Ecotourism (%)</th>
<th>Agriculture (%)</th>
<th>Self-Owned Business (%)</th>
<th>Unemployed (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadianem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey April-July 2012.
Discussions with the household respondents revealed that the case study communities largely depend on farming for their sustenance. The major crops grown are maize, cassava, plantain, yam, and vegetables such as tomato. Some local people grow cash crops such as cocoa and oil palm. Apart from agriculture, self-owned businesses (e.g., corner shops, transport operators), and community ecotourism are the major sources of livelihood for the households in the case study communities. About 14 and 7 percent of respondents earn their income from self-operated businesses and community ecotourism respectively. Only 3 percent of households across the four case study communities depend on the KCA as a source of income, while 8 percent are unemployed. Unemployment is however higher in the Abrafo community (14%) compared to the other case study communities (see Table 5.10).

Given the large number of households involved in small scale agriculture, coupled with the unemployment situation, the household survey results further show low incomes of households in the case study communities, compared to the national daily minimum wage (GH¢ 5.24, April 2013 rate). As presented in Table 5.11, the average monthly income across the four case study communities is below GH¢ 100.00 (US$ 37.04, June 2014 rate). This shows that, on average, the local people earn less than US$ 1.25 a day (US$ 1.24) highlighting the scale of poverty in the case study communities.

Table 5.11 Monthly Income Patterns of Household Respondents (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Monthly Income (GH¢)</th>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Overall (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 200</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Monthly Income</td>
<td>GH¢126</td>
<td>GH¢62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The household survey results show that less that 20 percent of respondents across the four case study communities earn incomes above GH¢100.00. As presented in Table 5.11, across the case study communities 79.5 percent of the respondents are living below the poverty line. Discussions with the respondents identified
subsistence farming practices, limited ecotourism opportunities, and lack of access to resources in the KCA following its gazetted as reasons for low income. The complexities of these issues are explored in Chapter 6.

5.9 Chapter summary

Findings presented in this chapter answer a sub-question: ‘What is the state of poverty and ecotourism in Ghana’ of Research Question One. This chapter has presented the physical, social and economic characteristics of Ghana in general, and the KCA region in particular. This chapter has provided a background to tourism development in Ghana and further discussed ecotourism development, within the tourism development agenda of Ghana.

Over the past decade, there have been increasing tourist numbers to the canopy walkway in the KCA. While domestic tourists, heavily dominated by Ghanaian students/children, form the majority of total tourist visitations to the canopy walkway, GHCT ecotourism records show that the less than 20 percent international tourists who do come contribute over 60 percent of the total revenue generated. This situation is attributed to a subsidised entry rate for domestic tourists as a form of promotion. In contrast, community interview data reveal that irregular visitation by tourist, poor infrastructure facilities and poor marketing have affected the community ecotourism activities in the case study communities, despite Mesomagor community recording an increase in tourism revenue.

The contribution of international tourists to ecotourism revenue, despite their small numbers, presents an opportunity for promoting local development. Developing an integrated tourist package that links ecotourism attractions in the KCA to the communities, and is alluring to international tourists, has the potential to increase visitation to the local communities, and deliver widespread benefits to local residents. In essence, increasing the participation of private tourism operators is necessary for the promotion of local development through ecotourism.

Despite the prospects of ecotourism in the KCA, interview data suggest that communities bordering the KCA are experiencing severe poverty. The next chapter presents findings on local perceptions, interpretations, and experiences of poverty in the case study communities.
Chapter Six  
The nature and dynamics of poverty in the case study communities

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings from the semi-structured and in-depth interviews with selected agencies and community households, as well as participant observation, are presented. As the focus of this research is on the role of ecotourism in reducing poverty, it is important to describe the nature and dynamics of poverty in the case study communities, in order to address a sub question of Research Question One: “What are the dynamics of poverty in the case study communities” (see Section 1.4).

Although the focus of this research is not on protected areas, both agency and community interview results reveal that the creation of the KCA, a protected area, and the introduction of ecotourism are amongst the major factors contributing to poverty in the case study communities. According to Stone and Wall (2004), recognition of the connections between people, parks and tourism has led to the promotion of ecotourism as a strategy for funding conservation initiatives and stimulating socio-economic development in local communities. In the case study communities, ecotourism and the KCA are inseparable, as major ecotourism activities are based in the KCA, while ecotourism has contributed to the effective management of the KCA (see Section 5.7.3). Moreover, literature has shown that ecotourism in developing countries occurs largely in protected areas (see Section 3.5). As a result, the dynamics of poverty in the case study communities are examined within the context of ecotourism in the KCA.

This chapter has two sections: the first section examines the local understanding and interpretation of poverty, and second section examines the manifestation of poverty in the local communities. The objective of the first section is to find out how local communities understand and explain the poverty situation in their respective communities, and how these local perspectives of poverty relate to the multidimensional nature of poverty as discussed in Section 2.3. Community interviewees were asked to explain the term poverty based on their understanding, living conditions and the prevailing situation in the case study communities.
Based on the different interpretations, poverty conditions in the case study communities have been classified into four categories, to allow for detailed analysis and understanding of the dynamics of poverty (see Section 6.2). Follow-up questions were used to identify and describe how the poverty situation is reflected in the lives of the local people, and these are presented in the second section of the chapter.

6.2 Local understanding and interpretation of poverty

As discussed in Section 5.7, the KCA is located in two of the poorest districts of Ghana’s Central Region. Analysis of community interviews reveals that poverty in the case study communities is explained in relation to loss of access to resources in the KCA, increased occurrence of wildlife invasion, influence of national and local politics and influence of socio-cultural practices. The following sections examine the various aspects of poverty by the relative importance given to them by the community interviewees, based on the number of times mentioned and consistently emphasised during the interviews.

6.2.1 Loss of Access to Resources

The contemporary reality in Ghana is that livelihoods of households are contingent on the availability of resources and employment opportunities, both of which are under threat, with about one-third of Ghana’s population living under the poverty line (US$ 1.25 a day) (see Section 5.2.5). Within the four case study communities, loss of access to resources within the KCA appears to be a key poverty issue, as most community interviewees (39 out of 40) consistently mentioned and extensively discussed it. One community interviewee said:

... The forest [KCA] was everything to us... since ecotourism was introduced into the forest; it has really affected us because we can’t have access to all the resources [e.g., non timber forest products] that we used to get from the forest again ... Aabrafo 10, April 2012.

As Townsend (1979) asserts, communities are said to be poor when they do not have the resources necessary to obtain the type of diet, participate in activities and enjoy the living conditions which are customary (see Section 2.3). In the case study communities, loss of access to resources was explained by the community residents in three ways: loss of conventional off-farm activities, unemployment, and the failure of the social responsibility agreement between the national
government and the communities in relation to ecotourism in the KCA. These are summarised in Figure 6.1 and explained in the following sections.

Figure 6.1  Loss of Access to Resources in the Case Study Communities

6.2.1.1 Loss of conventional off-farm activities

Loss of conventional off-farm activities relates to the inability of households to undertake their routine income generating activities, and to meet their health and other basic needs (e.g., food, medicines) due to a ban on entry into the KCA because of ecotourism activities. Discussions with the community residents show that the complexion of the ‘loss of conventional off-farm activities’ has undergone considerable changes since the 1990s when the KCA was gazetted as a protected area, and ecotourism introduced. Interviews with residents revealed that although the KCA was established in the 1950s and resource extraction was illegal, the communities were not denied access, due to lack of control and enforcement of management rules (see Section 5.7.2). However, when the KCA was gazetted in 1992, a total ban on entry was imposed by the GWD. Residents recalled that ecotourism was introduced in 1995 at about the same time that the KCA was gazetted, and they attributed the ban on entry to the introduction of ecotourism,
rather than to the gazettal of the Conservation Area. This, according to the community interviewees, has denied households the opportunity to engage in traditional off-farm activities and to have access to medicinal plants. One Mesomagor interviewee commented that:

... Poverty here is denial of my ability to work and take care of my family... Before this park officials [GWD and GHCT] came here, we used to go to the park [KCA] without any challenges. But since the 1990s [when ecotourism was introduced], we have been banned from any form of entry into the park. We can’t do what we used to do anymore ...

Mesomagor 4, June, 2012.

Communities around the KCA are agrarian in nature and practise subsistence farming (see Section 5.8). Community interviews reveal that their farming activities are seasonal. Typically, the farming season is between March and November, during the rainy season. Prior to the gazettal of the KCA, these communities had engaged in traditional off-farm seasonal extractive activities in the KCA – such as gathering of snails, mushrooms, firewood, raffia palm for roofing, pestle and mortar for making local food (fufu), chewing sticks for cleaning teeth, canes used for basket weaving – as income generating activities and to support their subsistence living (Baidu-Ntiamoa, 2002; KCA, 1997). In addition, interview findings show the case study communities depended on plant/herbal medicine mainly from the KCA, and sometimes from the farms around it, due to inadequate health facilities. The GWD official said that:

... Before this place [KCA] was declared a protected area [gazetted], the communities depended greatly on the forest for their livelihood needs ... they treated common sicknesses with herbs and plants which were obtained from the forest and the surrounding farms because there were no health facilities, and the ones that existed too, lacked the necessary personnel and logistics. They either travelled to Praso [district capital] or even Cape Coast [regional capital] to receive medical care ... Now all these plants are being protected for conservation and ecotourism purposes ...

GWD, April 2012.

As explained by the community residents, the loss of off-farm activities, coupled with the seasonality of their agricultural activity, has caused households to be economically inactive during most of the off-farm season (November to February). Some community residents asserted that:

... At first [before ecotourism was introduced], we used to be busy throughout the year. We usually go to collect snails, mushrooms, firewood and other products from the forest ...

Abrasof 4, April 2012.
... In the rainy season [farming season] everyone in this community becomes busy with farm work ... but when the rain stops, life here becomes boring because there is not much to do apart from drying our cocoa beans and preparing our land for the next farming season ...

 Mesomagor 6, June 2012.

Although the impact of the loss of conventional off-farm activities is experienced across all the four case study communities, interview results show that it is mostly felt in the Abrafo and Mesomagor communities because all the interviewees from these communities consistently mentioned and extensively discussed these issues. However, only about half of the interviewees from the Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities highlighted the situation. A review of the community interviews shows that the soil type influences the type of crops cultivated in the case study communities. The less fertile agricultural land, south of the KCA, is more amenable to the growing of annual crops (e.g., cassava), whereas the northern communities are able to cultivate perennial crops (e.g., cocoa). An interviewee from Abrafo commented that:

... Many people in this community cultivate plantain, cassava, vegetables ... that is what the soil support. About 30 people cultivate crops like cocoa and oil palm. The off-farm season was an opportunity for us to make more money from the sale of snails, mushrooms ...

 Abrafo 1, April 2012

However, these annual crops generate less income to households compared with perennial crops; a situation which had previously resulted in more off-farm seasonal activities in Abrafo and Mesomagor than in Adadientem and Nuamakrom. Discussions with the THLDDA official confirmed the geographical disparities in terms of soil type and crop cultivation:

... A poverty profile mapping study that we carried out a decade ago showed that communities north of the park [KCA] have more fertile land and tend to cultivate crops like cocoa and oil palm [perennial] ... the less fertile land in the southern part of the park has made farmers to cultivate plantain and cassava [annual] with just less than 5 percent of them cultivating cash crops like cocoa ...

 THLDDA, May 2012.

Given that in the memory of the community residents there is no distinction between the gazetted of the KCA and ecotourism, households (27 out of 40) across the case study communities, particularly Abrafo (8 out of 10) and Mesomagor (9 out of 10), related their loss of access to resources to the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA. One Abrafo interviewee explained that:
... It is because tourists come there [KCA] that’s why they [park officials] don’t allow us to go into the park ... they keep on telling us that the animals and plants are being protected for tourism ... Had it not been the tourists who come there [KCA], I think they will allow us to go into the park to collect snails, mushrooms ... because we used to go to the park before the tourists started coming there ... Abrafo 10, April 2012.

In summary, the interview data show that community residents perceive that ecotourism in the KCA has prevented them from accessing plant medicine and engaging in their traditional income generating activities inside the reserve. Although the KCA was established to protect biodiversity, and ecotourism was introduced to provide alternative livelihoods and to reduce the impact of the creation of the park on local communities, community residents view ecotourism as the cause of loss of conventional off-farm activities.

6.2.1.2 Unemployment

Unemployment is an important dimension of poverty resulting from loss of access to resources in the KCA. Employment, as in many parts of Ghana, is a prerequisite for determining the quality of life and social class of households in the case study communities. Responses to interview questions for determining households’ welfare show that some people in the case study communities are unemployed because of two main reasons: first, loss of jobs (e.g., logging) resulting from the ban on entry into the KCA which is attributed to ecotourism by the local residents; and second, lack of job opportunities due to lack of employable skills and unattractive agricultural activity. The majority of community interviewees across the four case study communities expressed their dissatisfaction with the unemployment situation. One Mesomagor resident said:

... In this community poverty is so glaring that even a blind man can see it. A number of people who depended on logging and hunting lost their jobs since we were told not to go into the park [KCA] again by the park officials ... Young men and women in this community do not have any jobs to do apart from farming and we don’t also get good prices for our agricultural produce ... what else can I say, we have to live like this ...
Mesomagor 3, June 2012.

Given that unemployment is at variance with ecotourism’s principle of delivering economic benefits (see Section 3.6), residents were asked to explain how the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA has influenced the unemployment situation. Some community interviewees (26 out of 40), mainly from Abrafo (7 out of 10) and Mesomagor (8 out of 10), noted that some local people lost their
livelihoods (e.g., hunting, logging) when ecotourism was introduced, given their previously high dependence on the KCA. They asserted that some households in the communities have not fully recovered from the shock of losing their jobs since the creation of the KCA 25 years ago, as they continue to adjust and adapt to other non-forest based livelihoods (e.g., bead making). One Abrafo interviewee who used to be a hunter commented that:

… Some of us lost our jobs about 20 years ago because of the park [KCA]. I was only 23 years old when we were told not to hunt in the park again. Since that time, I have found it difficult to get a good job. I only support my wife with her farm work … we can’t even get chewing stick from the park, all in the name of conservation and tourists coming there to visit … Abrafo 1, April 2012.

Although community interviews show that ecotourism opportunities in terms of job creation are limited when compared to the communities’ previous dependence on resources within the KCA, the illiteracy rate in the communities around the KCA (Monney et al., 2010) has further limited the number of people that can be employed in ecotourism-related jobs (e.g., tour guide). Interviews with community residents indicate that key factors contributing to illiteracy include inadequate educational facilities, school dropout and lack of trained teachers. Monney et al. (2010) also identify lack of school facilities and trained teachers as factors causing high illiteracy in the communities around the KCA. As a result, majority of the youth lack the necessary skills and knowledge required to work in the ecotourism industry and other related sectors in the KCA region. An Abrafo interviewee commented that:

… Many of the young people who don’t have any work to do here either didn’t pass their exams, dropped out from school or didn’t go to school at all because there were no trained teachers around … They can’t also work in the park [KCA] because they didn’t pass their exams and they can’t speak English to the tourists … Abrafo 5, April 2012.

Another factor, which does not relate to ecotourism in the KCA, mentioned by the community residents as influencing the unemployment situation, especially among young people, is the unattractive agricultural activity in the case study communities. Traditionally, unemployed young people are expected by the communities to engage in agricultural activity, as this is the dominant economic activity, employing over 90 percent of people in the communities around the KCA (see Section 5.8). However, residents indicate that agriculture has become an
unattractive economic activity for young people due to its subsistence nature and the activities of middlemen (traders in the cities who move to the rural communities to buy agricultural produce at a lower price to sell at a higher price in the cities), although 11 of the 19 younger interviewees (26-39 years) were already working in agriculture. The majority of community interviewees (37 out of 40), across all four case study communities, commented that their poverty situation has given middlemen the opportunity to dictate prices for their farm produce. This illustrates Haughton and Khandker’s (2009) explanation of poverty as powerlessness, where poor people do not have the voice to influence decisions that affect them. Older community interviewees, mainly over 40 years, bemoaned the problem of unemployment and the unattractive nature of agricultural activity in the communities. One Adadientem interviewee asserted that:

... Everyone knows that our community is a farming community but you can’t advise any young person to do farming although many of them are without jobs ... they [the youth] see farming as an unrewarding activity where you will toil for the whole year and get nothing to even save because of low prices ... we’ve worked for decades but because we don’t have the power to decide on the prices, they are still very low. People from the cities [middlemen] come and buy our produce at a low price and sell them at high prices in the cities ...  

Adadientem 5, July 2012.

Analysis of the community interviews shows that the prevailing unemployment conditions in the case study communities have encouraged the young people to seek ‘greener pastures’ outside their communities, preferentially in the cities. According to some of the younger (26-39 years) community interviewees (19 out of 40), it is better for them to find jobs in the cities than to waste their time on agriculture, although the interview results suggest that the youth lack the necessary employable skills. One of the Abrafo interviewees maintained that:

... Personally, I will not advise any young person to go into agriculture ... most farmers in this community produce on subsistence basis, so how can you do this type of work and think of a better future? It’s better for us to go and work in the city and bring our parents money. We can get good job in Cape Coast and Accra [cities] ... 

Abrafo 3, April 2012

It is interesting to note that the problem of unemployment in the case study communities has caught the attention of the government agencies and NGOs operating in the KCA region. Interviews with the selected agencies show they are aware of and are concerned about the unemployment situation in the communities
around the KCA. As explained by some agency officials (e.g., GHCT and THLDDA), efforts are consciously being made to address the situation:

… We know many of the people are unemployed and most of them too are subsistence farmers ... We receive a lot of applications for employment almost every working day ... **GHCT, May 2012.**

... We are working very hard to address the unemployment situation in the communities around Kakum [KCA] ... There are some sponsorship programmes, micro-credit facilities and general infrastructure improvement by the government and our development partners ... **THLDDA, May 2012.**

Despite the efforts made by the agencies to reduce unemployment following the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, findings from the community meetings during the confirmatory research phase show that the situation has not improved:

... The government claims to be supporting us, but many of the people here are still unemployed, so where is the support? **Adadientem community meeting, Feb 2014.**

In summary, the interview findings show that all four case study communities have similar experiences with unemployment. Interviews with local residents have revealed that the unattractive agricultural activity has made community residents powerless, as middlemen dictate the prices of their farm produce, and has encouraged rural-urban migration among young people in the local communities.

### 6.2.1.3 Communities’ social responsibility

Interviews with community residents reveal that the government engaged with both communities around the KCA and environmental-related agencies (e.g., CI) prior to the establishment of the KCA, and the introduction of ecotourism. Although there was no formal written agreement between the government and the local people, the government’s attempt to sell the idea of creating the conservation area and introducing ecotourism to the local people resulted in them developing an understanding that the government would support them if they supported conservation of the park. Local residents believe this engagement has contributed to poverty conditions in the case study communities. As earlier mentioned, the communities had previously depended heavily on the forest for their basic needs (e.g., food). However, they had to forgo their livelihood activities, land and customary user rights in the name of ‘community’s social responsibility’ to support ecotourism in the KCA. According to the residents, discussions involved
a commitment to support both ecotourism in the KCA and the development of the communities. However, residents do not feel that the government has supported the communities, despite their commitment to the agreement. Some community interviewees commented that:

... Everyone in this community knows that our living conditions are not good and poverty is everywhere in this community, so if the park officials make a lot of money from the park and they will not support us, that’s up to them ... People think we don’t go to the park because of the park officials, no; it’s because we are committed to protecting the park and we also respect the tourists who come there. If we hadn’t agreed at the early stages, the park wouldn’t have been there ... so it’s not because they’ve [park officials] failed to fulfil their social responsibility to our community that will make us not to protect the park ... 

Abrafo 4, April 2012.

... We know we are supposed to support the protection of the forest [KCA] and the tourists who come there, and the whole community is playing a watch-dog role [partners in protecting the KCA] ... but we can’t hide behind protecting the forest when our living conditions are deteriorating while the government makes a lot of money from the tourists who visit the park ... 

Mesomagor 3, June 2012.

Despite the perception of government not fulfilling its side of the agreement to support the communities, interviews show that the communities are still committed to supporting the conservation of, and ecotourism in the KCA. Discussions with residents reveal that the communities’ support of ecotourism in the KCA is as a result of their international recognition because of ecotourism, the gradual adaptation of the communities to non-forest based activities, and the perception of the KCA as inducing rainfall for the agricultural activity of the communities, as well as serving as watersheds for rivers/streams used as sources of water in the local communities. Some community interviewees said that:

... Because of the park and the tourists who come here, we have a website and the name of this community is on the internet ... 

Mesomagor 8, June 2012.

... Since we were told by the government not to go into the park, we’ve become used to that and find it difficult to go into the park ... 

Abrafo 1, April 2012.

... It [KCA] is very important to us because the stream from which we fetch water takes its source from the park ... 

Adadientem 9, July 2012.

... At first [before the introduction of ecotourism], the park was not properly managed at all ... people were hunting and logging in it. But all these bad practices stopped when tourists started visiting the park ... Now, nobody is allowed to go in there again ... You know this is a farming
Across the case study communities, the effects of the ‘social responsibility promise’ appear to be more pronounced in Abrafo and Mesomagor communities, because interview results suggest they were guaranteed more benefits by the government, given their geographical locations as the major entry points into the KCA. The GHCT official explained that:

... Communities like Abrafo, Mesomagor, Mfuom and other immediate communities were given some priorities like involving them in tourism and also to continually support them in the form of social services provision because they serve as more or less the major entry points into the reserve [KCA] where tourists usually visit ... This was to help them develop positive relations with tourists ... GHCT, May 2012.

6.2.2 Increased Occurrence of Wildlife Invasion in the Case Study Communities

In recent years, environmental conservation has dominated global discussions on poverty particularly in developing countries. As Redford et al. (2013) claim poverty reduction and environmental conservation remain the greatest challenges confronting the world. However, environmental conservation strategies have the tendency to either contribute to poverty reduction (Leisher et al., 2010) or aggravate poverty conditions (McShane, 2003).

Interviews with residents from all four case study communities showed that government efforts to conserve the KCA have contributed to the poverty situation in these communities. Community interviews revealed that the case study communities are particularly vulnerable to the increased occurrence of farm raids by wildlife following the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, which is believed to have resulted from a ban on hunting in the KCA. According to residents, the increase in farm raids has caused loss of crops and resulted in household stress. Moreover, interview findings suggest no attempt has been made over the years to compensate households whose farms have been raided by wildlife from the KCA. Local residents asserted that this situation has worsened the poverty conditions in the communities. These issues are summarised in Figure 6.2 and discussed in detail in the subsequent sections.
6.2.2.1 Loss of crops

Interviews with the local community revealed that the ban on hunting in the KCA, with the objective of conserving the KCA and promoting ecotourism, has caused an increase in the wildlife population, resulting in regular farm raids and associated crop loss. An interviewee from Abrafo commented that:

… Every year, someone in this community complains about elephants’ attack on the farm ... We used to control the population of the animals in the farm when hunting was allowed ... Since we were banned from going to the park, the animals have multiplied and are causing us problems ... I have lived here all my life time, we never had very damaging impacts of farm raids by wildlife until the park officials asked us not to poach in the park because they want tourists from abroad and other parts of Ghana to come and see them [wildlife] ... Abrafo 10, April 2012.

Discussions with the local community show that the effects of farm raids are experienced by both affected (those whose farms have been raided) and unaffected (those who have not experienced farm raids) households. Some community interviewees (23 out of 40) explained that the regular occurrence of farm raids has burdened unaffected households, who have been providing both financial and material support to the affected households. One interviewee from Mesomagor, who has never experienced a farm raid before, explained that:
... We try to support those whose farms have been destroyed by the wildlife by giving them money and sometimes farm produce to feed on ... Wildlife raid in our farms is very unpredictable that you will never know who will be the next victim, so I support those whose farms are destroyed so that when it happens to me, people can support me too ... it [farm raid]puts pressure on my resources because I have to share with other people aside my family ... Mesomagor 7, June, 2012.

Of the four case study communities, farm raids appear to occur most frequently in Abrafo and Mesomagor. Residents in these communities reported that the cultivation of annual crops has increased the impacts of farm raids, as these crops are commonly raided by wildlife. Most interviewees (18 out of 20) from these communities expressed concerns about the frequent occurrence of farm raids and their associated damaging impacts on crops, in contrast to interviewees from Adadientem and Nuamakrom (8 out of 20). One of the Mesomagor interviewees expressed his ordeal:

... If you should visit my farm now, you will see the footprints of the elephants ... all my plantain farm is gone [destroyed]... Mesomagor 8, June 2012.

Community interviews indicate that agricultural farm lands located close to the KCA have been most severely affected by farm raids, especially in Abrafo and Mesomagor. An interviewee from Mesomagor said that:

... May be because my farm is just about 100 metres from the park that’s why it is always attacked by elephants. My plantain farm is raided by elephants almost every year... Mesomagor 3, June 2012.

These findings support the work of Monney et al. (2010) on the ‘Assessment of crop raiding by elephants in farms around the KCA’. Monney et al.’s (2010) findings show that the number of raids increased with the size of the farm and with proximity to the KCA boundary. In addition, Barnes et al. (2003) observe that wildlife raid large farms because of a wider variety of food crops, and that the most commonly raided crops are cassava, maize, cocoyam and plantain which are mostly grown in Abrafo and Mesomagor. Barnes et al. (2003) explain that about 300 households living around the KCA lose 60 percent of their crops annually due to farm raiding by wildlife from the KCA.

Discussions with the GWD official during the confirmatory research phase revealed that there are other factors besides the geographical proximity of farmlands to the KCA that relate to farm raids. According to the GWD official,
many of the wildlife live in the southern part of the KCA, and this was the reason
for the location of the canopy walkway (a major ecotourism attraction point). This
situation, according to the GWD official, is the main reason why there are more
farm raids by wildlife in Mesomagor and Abrafo compared to the Adadientem and
Nuamakrom communities:

... Kakum (KCA) is not as rich in wildlife like Mole and some other
national parks ... we’ve been receiving several complaints about farm
raiding ... I think the problem with Abrafo, Mfuom, Mesomagor, Kruwa
and other communities around the southern part of Kakum is that many of
the animals [wildlife] are in the southern part where we have major
tourism activity ... During the breeding period and sometimes off-breeding
period, the animals go beyond the boundary [KCA] into the nearby farms
... that’s where we have the problem because it’s difficult to control their
[wildlife] movement ... GWD, Feb 2014.

In summary, the interviews show that the ban on hunting because of the
introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, the perceived concentration of wildlife in
the southern part of the KCA, and the close location of farmlands to the KCA
boundary have made the case study communities vulnerable to regular farm raids
by wildlife from the KCA. This has led to crop damage and household stress
particularly in Abrafo and Mesomagor. In addition, community interviews
indicate that the effects of crop loss are experienced by both affected and
unaffected households.

6.2.2.2 Lack of compensation payments

Given that frequent farm raids have resulted in crop loss, the case study
communities expected the ecotourism agencies in the KCA (GWD and GHCT),
locally referred to as ‘park officials’, to compensate them for the lost crops.
However, a review of community and agency interviews and secondary
documents from the GHCT and GWD reveals that no effort has been made over
the years to provide compensation payments to affected people. One of the
community interviewees shared her experience regarding lack of compensation:

... We think the park officials will try and give us something [money] but
as of today, we’ve not received anything, not even a pesewa [local
currency] from them. They only pick your details when you report farm
raids to them ... Mesomagor 6, June 2012.

The agencies recognise that regular crop raiding has been occurring in the farms
around the KCA, and state that a number of strategies, including provision of
social services and alternative livelihood support systems, are available to help reduce the impact of these raids. Some agencies officials explained further:

... Government has over the years made efforts to provide the people around Kakum [KCA] with alternative livelihoods like the craft village in Abrafo to help reduce their over dependence on the forest and to reduce the shock of animal attack especially on their farm lands .... CEDECOM, July 2012.

... We try to compensate the communities especially Abrafo and Mesomagor by providing them with some social facilities and other support services like ICT centre and supply them with teaching and learning materials ... GHCT, May 2012.

The above quotes suggest that the agencies’ efforts are not geared towards controlling and managing farm raids, but rather to abating the effects of farm raids. In addition, the agencies have failed to recognise the connection between biodiversity conservation and provision of alternative livelihoods. As a consequence, the community interviews show that local people whose farms have been raided by wildlife have developed an antagonistic attitude towards ecotourism in the KCA, given the general perception that ecotourism has caused loss of access to the KCA, which has led to an increase in wildlife population. An interviewee from Nuamakrom said that, in his view, it is irrational for those whose farms are raided by the wildlife to support ecotourism in the KCA:

... The amount of money and time that I’ve spent on my farm only for the animals [wildlife] to come and destroy it ... I think it will be unreasonable for anyone to tell me not to poach just because tourists come and look at them [wildlife], knowing very well that the animals [wildlife] are the cause of my misery. I will not go to the park to poach [wildlife] but if I see any of the animals in my farm, I will kill it ... Nuamakrom 4, May 2012.

Despite the mounting complexities regarding farm raids, research recommendations made by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) (2003) and Monney et al. (2010) to control the phenomenon, such as planting of trees that are undesirable to elephants at the boundary of the KCA, have not been fully implemented. Findings from the confirmatory research phase indicate a lack of commitment by park officials and limited community knowledge, in terms of applying these recommendations. As a result, the local communities continue to use scarecrows, which are a poor deterrent to elephants. This suggests that farm raids will persist unless efforts are made by the park officials and the communities to implement the research recommendations.
6.2.3 Influence of National and Local Politics

As discussed in Section 2.3, poor governance is a key dimension of poverty in developing countries. Adejumobi (2006) indicates that governance has become central to poverty discussions, as issues relating to voice, vulnerability and power are contingent on governance decisions. Within the four case study communities, national and local political decisions are another influence on poverty conditions. As a key social element, political decisions are central to local development and ecotourism benefit distribution in the case study communities. Political decisions also play an important role in determining the ‘how’ and ‘extent’ of local communities’ participation in, and the ‘type’ of, development which should be pursued at the local level.

Given the relevance of political decisions in local development and poverty reduction interventions, the majority of community and agency interviewees widely discussed how both national and local political decisions have influenced poverty conditions in the case study communities. Based on the interview data, the influence of national and local political decisions has been categorised into: lack of government’s commitment to improve the living conditions of the communities, and disputes between traditional leaders in the communities around the KCA, as summarised in Figure 6.3 and explained in the following sections.
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6.2.3.1 Lack of government’s commitment to improve the living conditions of the communities

According to community residents (26 out of 40), a lack of government commitment to improving the living conditions of the communities is seen in the unfulfilled political promises and the perceived discrimination in development projects. However, these views were expressed differently across the four case study communities.

Discussions with the Abrafo and Adadientem residents reveal that these communities have been subjected to cynical acts (abuse of trust) by political parties. These parties have consistently capitalised on the poverty conditions in these communities to solicit electoral votes in exchange for supposed improvements to living conditions, after which no efforts are made to improve conditions. An interviewee from Adadientem commented on the poverty situation in the communities around the KCA:

... To me, poverty in this community is a platform for people to achieve their political ambitions ... because you are poor, they will come and convince you to vote for them so that they will improve your living conditions, when they get the power, you are erased from their plans. Several youth in this community have been used for political campaigns yet they are still without jobs ... **Adadientem 8, July 2012.**

With the KCA’s rich tourism potential, residents of Abrafo (7 out of 10) and Adadientem (5 out of 10) communities expected the government to ‘open-up’ the local communities by introducing tourism-related activities (e.g., hospitality services) that would engage the local people, especially those whose livelihoods and user rights have been lost as a result of the gazettal of the KCA, and introduction of ecotourism. As reported by one of the Abrafo interviewees, the communities around the KCA have undeveloped cultural attractions, such as festivals, which the government could capitalise on to enhance the living conditions of the residents:

... Government consulted us before Kakum [KCA] was created and tourists started coming here, why is government not involving us in the ecotourism management in Kakum ... the government could have at least put up a hotel or a guest house here. It will create employment for people and give the community the opportunity to interact more with the tourists and also sell some of our farm produce to them ... Communities around Kakum including Abrafo have unique local cultures and traditional
festivals that the government can help develop them into ecotourism attractions ... Abrafo 2, April 2012.

In the Mesomagor community, the residents (9 out of 10) are disappointed with the state of infrastructure and facilities (e.g., roads). According to them, since the KCA was gazetted and ecotourism introduced, the government’s effort to improve the living conditions of the community has been inadequate, despite the political promises, and this is reflected in the state of infrastructure in the community. An interviewee from Mesomagor explained the vulnerability of the community in relation to unfulfilled political promises:

... After several unfulfilled promises of government upon government, we have come to accept that poverty is part of our life, and there is nothing that we can do to change it. Government will continue making money from the park without supporting us. We don’t have a clinic, and our road is not good ... Mesomagor, June, 2012.

Analysis of the Mesomagor interviews show that the residents, based on political promises and the community social responsibility promise (see Section 6.2.1.3), expected the government to improve the condition of their road, provide electricity and establish a health facility, given that the community serves as the eastern entry into the KCA. This, according to the residents, would facilitate tourism activities in the community. The World Vision official also shared the concerns of the communities:

... Every Ghanaian deserves a fair share of the national cake [resources] but when politicians come and make all sorts of unrealistic promises, it only adds to the misery of the people ... WV, June 2012.

Other key concerns regarding the lack of the government’s commitment to improve living conditions in the communities were expressed by Nuamakrom residents over perceived discrimination in the distribution of development projects. They explained they are voiceless in influencing political decisions that affect their wellbeing. They further considered some actions taken by the government to have influenced the poverty situation in the community. One Nuamakrom interviewee explained the situation:

... Our politicians want families in this community to be poor. Because we are poor, we have no power to influence government’s decision, so the government does what it wants without considering our needs ... sometimes if the political party we voted for didn’t win power, the party in power will not do anything [development project] for us because we didn’t vote for it ... Nuamakrom 8, May 2012.
Despite the disappointment of communities and the World Vision representative in relation to unfulfilled political promises, interviews with the CEDECOM official indicate that the political promises made by the government have been met. The CEDECOM official explained that over the past years the government has been committed to meeting its promises of improving the living conditions of the communities around the KCA, and other communities in the region in which the KCA is located:

... If you visit the communities around Kakum [KCA], you will see that government has done a lot especially in the areas of education, health and water. Since the forest was gazetted as a national park and a resource reserve, communities like Abrafo, Nuamakrom ... have benefitted from water facilities, classroom infrastructure and health centres ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

Other agency interviewees (e.g., THLDDA, GHCT) maintained there is no discrimination against any community with regard to development projects. According to the THLDDA official, development projects in the districts in which KCA is located are prioritised according to the needs of the various communities:

... We’ve prioritised areas for development intervention in the communities in the district. We don’t provide all communities with the same development projects because they have different needs. The fact that we’ve provided community ‘A’ with potable water doesn’t mean we should provide community ‘B’ with potable water at the same period ... may be community ‘B’ is in need of a health facility, so that is what we will provide them ... THLDDA, May 2012.

In addition, the THLDD medium term development plan (2010-2013), which documents how specific development projects for the district are designed and implemented, indicates that projects in the district should be based on the development needs of the various communities.

The agency interview findings indicate that the differences in the agencies’ responses regarding unfulfilled political promises reflect the roles of these agencies in the case study communities. For instance, CEDECOM, as a government agency, is responsible for the socio-economic development of the Central Region (see Section 4.4.2.1), therefore the official only highlighted the efforts made by government to improve the living conditions of the communities. In contrast, the World Vision official, as representative of an NGO, studied the
existing situation of the local community and supported the community interviewees’ descriptions.

In summary, it would appear from the interview data that local poverty conditions have become bait for political parties to raise the expectations of the local people, by making unrealistic political promises for political gain. As a result, when political promises are compared to the government’s commitment or achievements in relation to improving the living conditions of the local communities, the local residents are disillusioned.

**6.2.3.2 Disputes/litigations between traditional leaders**

Although there seems to be an apparent lack of government commitment to improve the living conditions of the communities around the KCA, interview results show that poor communication between government officials and traditional leaders has played a part in preventing the implementation of some governmental development projects. As established in Section 5.2.4, traditional leaders are central to local development. Discussions with Adadientem residents show that the traditional leader has purposely terminated the government’s effort to provide potable water to the community, without involving the residents. The traditional leader of Adadientem revealed the reason for such an action:

> ... I had to instruct my people to fell a tree across the road in order to prevent the MP [Member of Parliament] from constructing a borehole in this community because he [MP] didn’t contact me first. I'm the leader of this community and I should know everything that concerns my people. Nobody can come into this community and do whatever he/she wants without my approval ... Adadientem 9, July 2012.

Considering the nature and impact of such anti-development behaviour on the community, the majority of Adadientem interviewees (9 out of 10) strongly expressed their displeasure with the situation, and indicated that this type of action perpetuates poverty conditions in the community. However, given the cultural reverence of traditional leaders in Ghana (see Section 5.2.4), the local people are unable to openly express their dissatisfaction to their traditional leader. An interviewee from Adadientem commented that:

> ... Our leader [traditional leader] is also not helping us at all. All that he is interested in is litigation ... the development of the community is least of his priorities. But because he is our leader, we have to show him respect; you can’t go against his rulings ... Adadientem 5, July 2012.
However, some community interviewees (23 out of 40) across the four case study communities, including Adadientem, revealed that their traditional leaders have been instrumental in some development projects in the local community:

... Although not everybody in this community like the chief [traditional leader] because of some of his actions, he has been very influential in the development of this community since he became the chief. He usually goes to the district assembly to meet with the government officials and discusses the things that the community needs with them. It is through his effort that we have a school here ... *Adadientem 10, July 2012*

... Because our traditional leader is powerful, he worked with the government officials to provide a clinic here ... *Nuamakrom 3, May 2012*.

... This school you see here was built by the World Vision, but under the supervision of our chief ... *Mesomagor 7, June 2012*

The above quotes emphasise the importance of traditional leaders in local level decision making and poverty reduction interventions in the communities around the KCA. Their actions and inactions can influence poverty reduction or otherwise.

Other attempts to understand and describe the nature of litigations/disputes between traditional leaders across the four case study communities have been linked to the creation and gazettal of the KCA. According to the community interviewees (36 out of 40), disputes between traditional leaders have emerged following the declaration of the KCA as a national protected area, and the introduction of ecotourism. In Ghana, the dominance and power of traditional leaders are contingent on the size of their territorial jurisdiction. As a consequence, the creation of the KCA resulted in a scramble for land by traditional leaders to make up for the land excised into the KCA. An interviewee from Abrafo said:

... Because the chief lost part of the community’s land to the forest [KCA], he has to look for land elsewhere. This situation has resulted in conflicts and has also generated unnecessary tension between some traditional leaders in the communities around the park ... *Abrafo 5, April 2012*.

The agency interviews reveal that this issue of conflict between the traditional leaders has served as a barrier to the efforts of the ecotourism and poverty reduction related agencies in bringing development to the communities. Some of the agencies explained how litigation between the traditional leaders has been preventing poverty reduction interventions in the case study communities:
... Some of the chiefs [traditional leaders] are too troublesome to the extent that they fail to attend meetings because their rival [other traditional leader] is around ... This situation sometimes makes it difficult for us to understand and assess the development needs of the communities; anyway we are doing our best ... WV, June 2012.

... Everyone knows that all the communities around Kakum [KCA] lost considerable amount of land to make Kakum what it is today. But sometimes we find it difficult to understand why some of the traditional leaders are not in talking terms ... This situation doesn’t only create tension between the communities but retards the overall development of the region because they are always divided on issues regarding their own development ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

6.2.4 Influence of Socio-cultural Practices

Socio-cultural practices – customs and traditions in the local community that inform and dictate the way of life of local people and their interactions with the environment – can aggravate the poverty conditions of a community. In Ghana, rural communities are mostly predisposed to the influence of socio-cultural practices, because of the relatively high illiteracy rate and households’ difficulty to meet their basic needs. Almost three quarters of the community interviewees (29 out of 40) mentioned and described the influence of socio-cultural practices on poverty, based on inter-generational factors such as situation in the family or community at birth.

As reported by the community interviewees (24 out of 40), the inter-generational situation is a major dimension of poverty in the case study communities, as it makes it difficult for people who are born into poor families and communities to have a better life. Bradshaw (2006) refers to this type of poverty as ‘culture of poverty’, where individuals become victims to the environment in which they are born (Section 2.4). Interviews with community residents show that the inter-generational situation is partly due to the persistent nature of poverty in the communities over the past years, which has made some residents come to accept poverty as the norm. Some community residents commented that:

... The poverty condition that I’m experiencing is due to the conditions in the community I was born into. If you have rich parents there is no way you will be poor ... Being born into a poor family or community is like being thrown into a ditch, how will you climb out and start living like the well-to-do people when there is no support ... Adadientem 5, July 2012.
... Don’t think poverty in this community is a temporary condition; it even became worse after the creation of the park ... We know its real and part of our life, and we have come to embrace it ... Mesomagor 9, June 2012.

Additionally, intergenerational conditions are used by traditional leaders and elders across the four case study communities as a means of avoiding possible conflicts, and for controlling the displeasure of young people towards the KCA and government officials. Discussions with community residents reveal that the young people are unhappy with the government’s and park officials’ commitment towards improving their living conditions following the gazettal of the KCA and subsequent introduction of ecotourism in the 1990s. As discussed in Section 6.2.1.3, the government made a commitment to support development of the communities prior to the establishment of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism, which the residents consider has been inadequate to date. Interviewees, mainly elders and traditional leaders, use adages such as ‘all fingers are not the same’, ‘God created us differently’ and ‘there is time for everything’ to pacify the behaviour of young ones and to ensure peace in the communities. Some community interviewees said:

... Our young people like asking questions about why this people have this [certain facilities] and we don’t have ... so the only way we convince them is to make them understand that this is the situation they were born into ... we sometimes tell them that all fingers are not the same and that God created us differently just for them to appreciate what they have and not to develop hatred against the government officials who are supposed to support us to develop our community. It also helps us to keep the peace we have... Adadientem 9, July 2012.

... No parents want to see the children engaging in social vices ... we’ve been telling them [children] over the years that our poverty condition is real and will not change overnight, because nobody cares about us ... I sometimes tell my children that some people are naturally meant to be poor and that they should accept whatever that comes their way ... Mesomagor 10, June 2012.

Although the youth in the case study communities consider this action by their leaders and elders to have contributed to government apathy in supporting them, interview results show that the use of intergenerational conditions to pacify the youth has been successful in ensuring peace in these communities, as the youth have come to accept poverty as the norm.
Summary of local understanding of poverty

The first finding relates to the cause of the gazettal of the KCA. Across the four case study communities, there is a general perception among residents that ecotourism is responsible for the gazettal of the KCA, because they were introduced around the same period. Given that the establishment of the KCA in the 1950s was characterised by poor management which did not ban community access to resources, the communities strongly believe the entry ban imposed on the KCA following its gazettal is a result of ecotourism.

Other findings include the perceived disparity between the strong commitment of communities towards ecotourism in the KCA and the inadequate commitment of the government to support them as part of the social responsibility agreement. Interview findings show that the residents’ commitment is due to the recognition of their communities in the global world because of ecotourism, the gradual adaptation to non-forest based activities, as well as the perception of KCA’s role in inducing rainfall for agricultural activity and as watersheds for sources of water for the surrounding communities. As a result, despite their poverty conditions, there appears to be a strong commitment on the part of the communities to supporting ecotourism in the KCA.

The prevailing community support for ecotourism and conservation presents an opportunity for advancing conservation and ecotourism related activities (e.g., development of community level attractions) in the KCA region. However, the nature of poverty (e.g., loss of income generating activities, unemployment) in the case study communities threatens ecotourism development and environmental conservation, because they directly affect the livelihoods of the people in these communities. Agency and community interviews show that, following the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, the poverty situation in the local communities has not improved, as regular farm raids by wildlife from the KCA has resulted in crop damage. This has led to stress for both affected and unaffected households, with affected households finding it difficult to cope with the impacts of the farm raids, while unaffected households are burdened by providing support for affected households.
Interviews further indicated that there have been no compensation payments made to local farmers experiencing such losses. This problem is compounded by the perceived lack of government commitment to improve the living conditions of the communities following the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA. Concomitantly, lack of communication between government officials and traditional leaders, and the scrambling for land by traditional leaders have contributed to poverty in the communities. Thus, with the constant threat from wildlife and the loss of crops, coupled with the inadequate commitment of government to improving living conditions in the communities, some local people expressed an antagonistic attitude towards ecotourism and the conservation of the KCA.

In essence, a modest commitment by the government towards improving the living conditions of the local people by fulfilling the ‘social responsibility’ agreement has the potential to create renewed optimism in local communities, in relation to ecotourism activities and poverty reduction. In the absence of such a commitment from government, the ongoing robustness of community support for ecotourism and conservation of the KCA, in the face of a continuing lack of benefits and increasing poverty, is unknown.

Although the above discussion has revealed the complexity of poverty in the communities, it does not provide details on how the local understanding of poverty is reflected in the way of life of the local people. The next section discusses the manifestation of poverty in the case study communities.

6.3 Manifestation of poverty in the local communities

Given the multidimensional nature of poverty in the case study communities, the community and agency interviewees were asked to explain how the different perspectives of poverty are manifested in the communities. This section is a follow-up to the discussion of the nature of poverty in the local communities, and provides further understanding of the indicators and consequences of poverty in the communities.

In this section, the manifestation of poverty is explained in social, economic and environmental contexts, based on agency and community interview data. As presented in Table 6.1, the manifestations of poverty in all four case study
communities are mostly based on the availability and quality of, and the level of access to basic amenities or facilities. Based on community interview findings and field observations, the legend below Table 6.1 provides descriptions of the quality and access to basic facilities included in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Availability of and Access to Basic Community and Social Facilities in the Case Study Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Facilities</th>
<th>Abrafo</th>
<th>Mesomagor</th>
<th>Adadientem</th>
<th>Nuamakrom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health centre</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>No health centre</td>
<td>Bad condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professional available</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of qualified health personnel</td>
<td>Health professional available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate teachers</td>
<td>Inadequate teachers</td>
<td>Inadequate teachers</td>
<td>Inadequate teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School (JHS)</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>No JHS</td>
<td>No JHS</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School (SHS)</td>
<td>No SHS</td>
<td>No SHS</td>
<td>No SHS</td>
<td>No SHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Centre</td>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>No ICT centre</td>
<td>No ICT centre</td>
<td>No ICT centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potable water sources</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural water sources</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Stream, well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>Good sanitation</td>
<td>Poor sanitation</td>
<td>Poor sanitation</td>
<td>Good sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Tarred/Sealed</td>
<td>Untarred/Dirt</td>
<td>Untarred/Dirt</td>
<td>Untarred/Dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No potholes</td>
<td>bumpy and dusty</td>
<td>bumpy and dusty</td>
<td>bumpy and dusty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Electricity available</td>
<td>No electricity</td>
<td>No electricity</td>
<td>Electricity available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Field Survey, April-July 2012.

Legend for Table 6.1

1. Good condition (no leaking roof; quality building structure; availability of working materials/equipment);
2. Bad condition (leaking roof; dilapidated structure; lack of materials/equipment);
3. Adequate teachers (availability of required numbers of trained teachers);
4. Inadequate teachers (low numbers of trained teachers; availability of untrained teachers, locally referred to as pupils’ teachers);
5. Good sanitation (availability of public and private toilet facilities; well-maintained); and
6. Bad sanitation (one public toilet facility for the whole community; unkempt; indiscriminate defecation).

6.3.1 Social Manifestation of Poverty in the Local Communities

Within the four case study communities, interviews and field observations show that poverty conditions are mainly manifested socially, in the form of poor quality of education, and substitution of education with child labour. Other social manifestations relate to poor health, poor housing conditions and inadequate sources of domestic potable water. The following sections further explore these social issues.

6.3.1.1 Poor quality of education, and child labour

As discussed in Section 5.3, poor quality education is a major challenge, and a cause of illiteracy in Ghana. In the case study communities, poor quality of education is manifested in the form of poor academic performance and the substitution of education with child labour. Causes of poor quality of education include lack of/inadequate trained teachers, teaching and learning materials, and senior high schools. Most community interviewees (34 out of 40) expressed concerns about the poor academic performance of the local schools. One Abrafo resident said that:

... Two of my children have failed their exams [Basic Education Certificate Exams] so they can't continue to the senior high school ... the eldest failed last three years and only last year, the younger one also failed ... Abrafo 7, April 2012.

Discussions with community residents reveal that poor academic performance of pupils in the local schools has resulted in child labour, especially in Adadientem and Nuamakrom. However, agency interviews show that the relationship between poor academic performance and child labour is reciprocal. On the one hand, poor academic performance resulting from school-aged children having to support their families as the only option because of a lack of school infrastructure and trained teachers, has contributed to child labour. On the other hand, child labour, resulting from the pressure of poverty and families needing labour, has also contributed to low school attendance and poor academic performance. Analysis of the interviews reveals that the majority of agency officials (5 out of 8) believe that the case study communities have a culture of using children to supplement farm labour whereas the community residents attributed the substitution of education with
child labour to poor academic performance. To illustrate this, community interviews show that poor educational infrastructure in the communities, and lack of teaching and learning materials, have resulted in poor academic performance. Parents therefore prefer using their children on their farms to sending them to school. An interviewee from Adadientem commented that:

... Our children really help us with our farm work. One person cannot manage 3-6 hectares of cocoa farm ... it is not that we don’t want our children to be in school, no; it’s because many of them [children] end up failing their exams ..., it’s better they [children] help us on the farm ...

Adadientem 1, July 2012.

Other interviewees from Adadientem and Mesomagor (13 out of 20) linked poor academic performance to the lack of trained teachers in these communities, and maintained that this is the cause of child labour. Some residents explained how the lack of trained teachers has contributed to child labour:

... My only son had to join me to farm because he failed his exams [Basic Education Certificate Exams]. They [students] will go to school and the teachers will not come ... what else do you expect than failure?

Adadientem 7, July 2012.

... We don’t have good [trained] teachers here ... the ones who come too have stopped. They [teachers] always complain about the poor conditions of our road and the lack of electricity here ...

Mesomagor 5, June 2012.

In relation to the substitution of education with child labour, the World Vision official noted that the communities around the KCA, especially at the northern part, place a higher value on their agricultural activities than their children’s education. As a result, they use their children to supplement their farm labour. This situation has contributed to falling academic performance in the case study communities, as children are prevented from going to school:

... Because agriculture is the major economic activity in those communities, children are made to support their parents’ farm work. There is nothing wrong with children supporting their parents on the farm especially after school hours. But once the children are exposed to activities involving money, they tend to be more interested in money making than going to school ...

WV, June 2012.

Although most agency interviewees (5 out of 8) mentioned households’ desire of substituting education with child labour, the other three agency interviewees believed that poor academic performance is promoting the substitution of education with child labour. They confirmed that the communities around the
KCA are challenged with low standards of education due to the difficulty in attracting and retaining trained teachers, a situation which has left households in those communities with no other choice than to engage their children in farming activities. The THLDDA official said:

... The assembly is aware that the quality of education in those communities is not the best ... We [THLDDA] have a problem attracting and retaining teachers in those communities because of their remoteness and poor conditions of their infrastructure ... THLDDA, May 2012.

However, in Abrafo and Nuamakrom, interviews with the residents show that child labour as a consequence of poor academic performance is not due to a lack of trained teachers, but rather to inadequate teaching and learning materials. According to them, issues of poor quality of education have resulted in increasing school dropout especially among female students. Some interviewees explained:

... Many of the children who go the school don’t have books and pencils, how can they concentrate in the classroom? Abrafo 9, April 2012.

... In this community, students especially the female dropout because of poor quality of education and also the parents cannot support them ... Some parents sometimes force their girl child into early marriage so that they can get some money ... Nuamakrom 4, May 2012.

The above quotes suggest that the problem of school dropout in these communities has cultural connections, and it has also been highlighted as being a major problem in the THLDD medium term development plan (2010-2013). The problem of school dropout, according to this plan, is a result of the early betrothal of the female child and use of the male child on the farm. Analysis of community interviews shows that the generally low education of residents in the case study communities, coupled with limited economic opportunities particularly following the gazettal of the KCA, has compelled parents to betroth their female children at an early age (before 18 years), while the male children are expected to work on the farm because of poor academic performance. Community interviews reveal that these betrothed females usually end up supporting their husbands/partners on their farms. This situation is considered very common in the communities around the KCA by the residents. One Adadientem interviewee commented that:

... We [parents] become less burdened and also get money when they [female children] get married early ... Adadientem 1, July 2012.
Despite the availability of basic schools, academic performance of pupils is poor across the four case study communities. In summary, whereas community residents related the substitution of education with child labour to poor academic performance due to lack/inadequate number of trained teachers and teaching and learning materials, some agency officials linked the poor academic performance to the communities’ preference of using children to supplement farm labour rather than sending them to school. However, analysis of the interviews shows that the cultural practice of early betrothal of the female child and engagement of male children in farming activities have also contributed to poor academic performance. Figure 6.4 summarises the relationships between poor education and child labour.
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**Figure 6.4** Relationships between Poor Quality of Education and Child Labour in the Case Study Communities

### 6.3.1.2 Poor health characteristics

Community interviews reveal poor health characteristics of people in the case study communities, with a focus on lack of health facilities, poor conditions of health facilities and inadequate numbers of health professionals. However, health characteristics manifest differently in each of the four case study communities. In the Mesomagor community, the absence of a health facility (see Table 6.1) has negatively affected the health condition of the people. One interviewee stated that:

... *In this our community, we don’t have any health facility, we have to walk for about one and half hours to access healthcare in Amoabeng [a nearby community]... We used to have a health facility but it’s not working again because health professionals failed to come and work here...* Mesomagor 4, June 2012.
The DHTM official mentioned factors such as the lack of electricity, the difficulty in attracting and retaining health personnel in Mesomagor due to its remoteness, and poor road conditions as responsible for the lack of a health facility in the community:

... The communities around Kakum lack facilities like health, education, water and so on because some of those communities are inaccessible by car ... The health centre in Mesomagor had to be closed down partly because there were no health personnel and electricity in the community. In Ghana today, you can’t get a trained medical doctor to live in a community where there is no electricity ... DHTM, June 2012.

In the Adadientem community, it would appear from the interviews that the key health challenge is the poor condition of the available health facility. Adadientem residents (8 out of 10) expressed their unhappiness with the poor conditions of, and the inadequate medical supplies in the health facility (see Figure 6.5). One interviewee commented that:

... In this community, if you visit the health facility, you will see that one medicine is giving to different people with different sicknesses because we don’t have adequate medical supplies ... Adadientem 7, July 2012.

![Figure 6.5 State of Health Facility in the Adadientem Community](image)

Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

The DHTM official indicated that poor conditions of health facilities and health care services are widespread across Ghana, and are not limited to the communities around the KCA:

... The issue of poor health facilities and health care services are very common in rural areas of Ghana ... they will either have the facility without a health personnel or there is no facility at all. Even in cases where there are health facilities, they are usually in deplorable conditions ... DHTM, June 2012.
Key health challenges for the Abrafo and Nuamakrom communities included inadequate numbers of qualified health personnel and local logistics problems. Community interviewees (17 out of 20) pointed out that patients sometimes had to wait for hours to access healthcare, while others travelled to neighbouring communities. One Abrafo resident commented that:

…”In this house everyone goes to the hospital when sick ... but sometimes you have to wait for about one hour before it gets to your turn. So I usually go to Jukwa [a nearby community] when sick ... they have more than one health professional and their health facility is better than ours here. I don’t spend much time there ... Abrafo 3, April 2012"

As presented in Table 6.1, Abrafo and Nuamakrom have relatively good health facilities and healthcare systems compared to Adadientem and Mesomagor. Community interviews show that, as a consequence, there is a growing incidence of self medication in the latter communities compared with the former. Discussions with community residents reveal that the poor quality of healthcare and poor state of health facilities, coupled with the availability of some medicinal plants from the farms, have made households in these communities reluctant to access healthcare from the health facilities. An interviewee from Mesomagor said that:

…”Because there is no health facility in this community, we help ourselves by treating sicknesses with plants and herbs ... our elders have very good knowledge about the types of plants and the sicknesses they are used to treat. They really help us to treat our sicknesses without having to travel to Amoabeng [a nearby community] for treatment ... Mesomagor 8, June 2012."

Given the growing incidence of self medication, interviews with residents in Mesomagor and Adadientem show they are unhappy with the restricted access into the KCA, which has limited them from accessing important medicinal plants (see Section 6.2.1.1). However, residents of Abrafo and Nuamakrom appear to be less concerned with the lack of access to medicinal plants in the KCA, because of the relatively good condition of their health facilities.

6.3.1.3 Poor housing conditions

In Ghana, households consider housing conditions to be an important manifestation of poverty, especially in rural areas where housing quality is poor. Interviews with the local community revealed that the situation in the communities around the KCA is similar to that in rural Ghana. Across the four
case study communities, local residents identified factors such as unemployment, loss of access to the KCA and low prices of agricultural produce (see Section 6.2.1) as reasons for the poor housing conditions. Figure 6.6 shows the housing condition in Mesomagor.
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**Figure 6.6** Housing Condition in the Mesomagor Community  
Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

Although poor housing conditions are considered to be an important social manifestation of poverty in all four case study communities, the issue was strongly identified in the Mesomagor and Adadientem communities, where all the interviewees emphasised this issue, compared to Abrafo and Nuamakrom where only about two thirds of the interviewees (16 out of 20) mentioned it. The differences in housing conditions across the case study communities are apparently related to the influence of infrastructure facilities, and proximity to the district capital. For instance, interviews with the Abrafo residents identified the good condition of roads linking to the district and the regional capitals, and the availability of ecotourism activities, as factors influencing the relatively good housing conditions in the community. One interviewee explained that:

> ... This community is expanding because of the ecotourism in the park ... Because we have good roads, electricity and water, some of the workers in the park live here. Some of them have built good houses here. We also have some people from this community who work in other communities. They easily commute to and from work because of easy access ... **Abrafo 10, April 2012**.

In addition, discussions with the Nuamakrom interviewees reveal that the relatively close location of the community to the district capital (Twifo Praso), and the availability of relatively cheap land have positively affected housing conditions, as these factors have attracted some people from the district capital to
live in the community. An interviewee from Nuamakrom explained how the availability of cheap land has contributed to good housing conditions:

... From here [Nuamakrom] to Twifo Praso [district capital] is not very far, as a result we have some people who have moved from Twifo Praso to settle here because of cheap land but still work in Twifo Praso. And these people have put up good and beautiful houses in the community. We also have some of our own people who have built very good houses here because they are engaged in good jobs in Twifo-Praso and earn a lot of money ... Nuamakrom 1, May 2012.

In summary, poor housing conditions characterise all four case study communities, but seem to be more evident in Mesomagor and Adadientem due to their relative remoteness from main roads and district capitals. From the interviews it appears that other key factors contributing to poor housing conditions include unemployment, loss of access to the KCA, the subsistence nature of agricultural activities and low prices of agricultural produce (see Section 6.2.1).

6.3.1.4 Inadequate sources of domestic potable water

Globally, access to domestic water supply remains a key factor in addressing poverty, particularly in developing countries. This is reflected in its inclusion as the seventh goal of the MDGs (Section 2.5.1). As Verhagen et al. (2004) note, availability of, and easy access to domestic potable water supply improves household welfare and public health, and delivers economic benefits. Nonetheless, interviews with community residents in this research reveal that all four case study communities lack piped water and depend on boreholes which are inadequate for the population they serve. However, each of the four case study communities has a different experience with access, availability and quality of potable water. In the Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities, all interviewees expressed concerns with the inadequate number of potable water supply facilities (e.g., borehole). Some residents commented that:

... We have only one borehole in this community which is functioning, in fact it is not enough because people who live far away have to walk for long distance before they get water ... Nuamakrom 1, May 2012

... When you go and fetch water from the borehole especially in the mornings and evenings [before the residents go to their farms and when they return from the farms], you will meet people in queue to get water ... One borehole is not enough. At least if we have two, those living in the
northern part of the community will have one while those of us living here in the south will also have one … Adadientem 8, July 2012.

In Mesomagor where there are two borehole facilities, the majority of interviewees (8 out of 10) emphasised the poor conditions of their boreholes, and in particular the poor conditions of the pumps. They pointed out that the frequent breakdown of the borehole pumps has denied households access to potable water. The remaining two Mesomagor interviewees live very close to the boreholes and are satisfied with the source of water. One interviewee said that:

... You will plan on going to fetch water only to know that the pump is not working ... There is always something wrong with one of the boreholes in this community... Mesomagor 10, June 2012.

Inadequate potable water supply facilities, coupled with frequent breakdown of the pumps in the Adadientem, Nuamakrom and Mesomagor communities, has compelled some households to use natural sources of water such as streams and wells, which are untreated and unhygienic. Community interviews suggest that households in these communities have resorted to accessing water from natural sources, which are close and always available, rather than walking long distances to access water from the boreholes:

... I used water from the stream to do everything [household chores] except drinking, but sometimes I drink water from the stream too... Adadientem 3, July 2012.

... Water from the stream is very useful because it saves us a lot of time that you have to walk to the borehole ... Sometimes you will get to the borehole only to realise that it is not working ... Nuamakrom 7, May 2012.

Analysis of the interviews shows that the inadequate numbers and poor conditions of boreholes have affected households, particularly women, as some interviewees, mostly women, asserted they spend more time and energy in collecting water from the boreholes compared to the streams. However, these natural sources of water are not potable. One female interviewee from Adadientem commented that:

... We’ve been told by health professionals that water from the streams is not good for drinking. But many of us use it because it’s always available ... we don’t have to walk and sometimes go and queue before getting water as it is in the case of the boreholes ... Adadientem 6, July 2012.

Discussions with Abrafo interviewees show that the community depends less on natural sources of water because of the availability of a number of boreholes (4),
although one interviewee indicated they are still inadequate. The majority of Abrafo interviewees (9 out of 10) indicated that most households depend only on boreholes as their sources of water.

In summary, there is an inadequate supply of potable water in some of the case study communities, especially in Adadientem, Nuamakrom and Mesomagor. Community interviews indicate that the lack of government commitment to improve the living conditions of the communities, and the anti-development stance taken by some of the traditional leaders in the case study communities (see Section 6.2.3.2), have contributed to the inadequate potable water supply facilities.

6.3.2 Economic Manifestation of Poverty in the Case Study Communities

The economic manifestation of poverty in the case study communities was explained by the local community as: poor road conditions in the communities, and unemployment. Unlike the social manifestations of poverty, community interviews show these economic manifestations of poverty are common issues across all four case study communities. An interviewee from Adadientem mentioned that:

... If you talk about the poor conditions of our roads and people not having jobs to do, all the government agencies [in the district] know them, even a one year old child in this community knows about them ...

Adadientem1, July 2012.

Data from the community interviews reveal that roads connecting the case study communities are in a poor state, except in Abrafo which is located along the main road that links Cape Coast (regional capital) and Twifo Praso (district capital) (see Table 6.1). Even in Abrafo, some local residents (3 out of 10) reported that the road network within the community is in poor condition. This, according to the residents, has affected the overall socio-economic development of the case study communities, since residents’ travel patterns, businesses and social interactions with the other communities have become seasonal, and mainly on market days. One Mesomagor resident said that:

... Drivers who ply the road have been complaining about the poor conditions. Because of that, you can only get a car to the other communities during market days [Tuesdays and Fridays]. Apart from that
you have to walk to Amoabeng [a nearby community] before you get a car ... Mesomagor 7, June 2012.

As a result of the poor condition of the roads, the residents in some of the communities, such as Nuamakrom, have to pay extra money to drivers to get their farm produce transported to the market centre. This is because drivers do not want to ply the roads for the fear of damaging their vehicles, and are also spending more time driving due to the poor road conditions. An interviewee from Nuamakrom commented that:

... Because our road is not good, the drivers charge extra money before you can transport your goods to Twifo Praso [market centre]. They [drivers] will tell you the road will damage their cars and also they have to drive slowly which will take their time, so we have to pay extra for any damage and delay that will be caused ... Nuamakrom 5, May 2012.

Moreover, some local residents in Adadientem (2 out of 10) and Nuamakrom (3 out of 10) bemoaned the impact of the poor condition of the road on their health conditions (e.g., asthmatic residents). One Adadientem interviewee remarked that:

... Our road is so dusty that people including myself often get health problems, because I am asthmatic... Adadientem 3, July 2012.

As discussed in Section 6.2.1.2, unemployment, especially among young people, remains a major concern for the case study communities, due to inadequate income generating activities. As a result, some Abrafo residents indicated they have been compelled to move into subsistence farming, while those in Adadientem, Nuamakrom and Mesomagor have sent their children to the cities in search of a better quality of life (see Section 6.2.1.2).

6.3.3 Environmental Manifestation of Poverty in the Case Study Communities

The environmental manifestation of poverty in the case study communities mainly relates to poor environmental sanitation. In Ghana and other developing countries, environmental sanitation has been a major challenge for governments over the years (UN, 2013). It is in recognition of its growing manifestation of poverty in the developing countries that the seventh goal of the MDGs aims to halve the number of people living without environmental sanitation services by 2015.

Environmental sanitation, in the form of human waste management, was of concern to all the case study communities, with as many as 20 out of 40 interviewees discussing this topic. However, such challenges appear to be more
evident in the Mesomagor and Adadientem communities, where there is only one public toilet facility serving the residents. In Mesomagor, the public toilet facility serves about 500 residents, while in Adadientem the facility serves about 460 residents. This has resulted in unkempt toilet facilities, and indiscriminate defecation in the surrounding bushes. One interviewee from Mesomagor remarked that:

... *In this community, we have only one public toilet for all the people, everyone goes there. It’s not good but that’s what we have for now .... Some people go to the bush to defecate because of the bad condition of the public toilet ...* Mesomagor 3, June 2012.

The Mesomagor and Adadientem communities have similar experiences in relation to human waste management due to limited public toilet facilities. Analysis of community interviews reveals that the unemployment situation, coupled with lack of access to the KCA (see Sections 6.2.1.1 & 6.2.1.2), has prevented residents from constructing toilet facilities at the household level, because of perceived lack of money and construction materials. As a consequence, the practice of indiscriminate defecation has been occurring in these communities. However, in Abrafo and Nuamakrom, discussions with the residents show there are a number of household toilet facilities in addition to public toilet facilities. This situation has contributed to better sanitation in Abrafo and Nuamakrom when compared to Adadientem and Mesomagor.

6.4 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented findings that address a sub question; ‘What are the dynamics of poverty in the case study communities?’ under Research Question One. Findings were obtained from semi-structured and follow-up interviews with selected agencies and case study communities respectively, as well as the researcher’s observation. Given that ecotourism was introduced in the KCA during the same period it was gazetted (1990s), community residents believe that the former, rather than the latter, has worsened poverty conditions. Thus, the interviews reveal that although poverty in the local community is influenced by the conservation of the KCA, the local people consider ecotourism as the driver of their poverty.

Based on the interview data, the dynamics of poverty in the local community can be divided into four broad categories: loss of access to resources, increased
occurrence of wildlife invasion, influence of national and local politics, and influence of socio-cultural practices. Loss of access to resources relates to factors such as loss of conventional off-farm activities, and unemployment, which have followed the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, as well as the social responsibility of the communities to support ecotourism in the KCA. In relation to farm raids by wildlife, community interviews show that the close location of farmlands to the KCA boundary, the ban on hunting because of ecotourism, and the cultivation of annual crops have contributed to regular farm raids by wildlife, which has resulted in crop damage and household stress for both affected and unaffected residents. In addition, those whose farms are affected have not received any compensation payment from the park officials, and have developed a hostile attitude towards ecotourism in the KCA.

The influence of national and local politics relates to a lack of government commitment to support the communities despite political promises, which has resulted in an abuse of trust by politicians. Other political influences include the anti-development stance of some traditional leaders because of lack of communication, and disputes between traditional leaders due to the scramble for land to make up for land excised into the KCA. The interview findings suggest that traditional leaders are very influential in the development of local communities, as their actions and inactions can determine whether or not development occurs.

The influence of socio-cultural practices explains the poverty conditions at the community and the family levels that have become a barrier to improving the living conditions of households. These factors reflect the multidimensional nature of poverty (see Section 2.3) with social, economic and environmental manifestations of poverty all evident in the case study communities. Social manifestations of poverty cover issues of poor quality of education and child labour, poor health characteristics, inadequate water supply and poor housing conditions. Economic manifestations include poor road conditions and unemployment. Environmental manifestations include poor environmental sanitation, especially in Adadientem and Mesomagor.

Across the four case study communities, based on interviewees responses on the availability and quality of, and access to social services, poverty conditions in
Mesomagor seem to be more pronounced compared to the other three communities. Abrafo appears to be relatively more developed in terms of availability of, quality of and access to basic services.

However, community interview results have shown that, generally, all four communities are very supportive of ecotourism in the KCA, despite inadequate government support and worsening poverty conditions. This support is based on a number of factors, including recognition of the communities at the international level because of ecotourism, KCA serving as watersheds for rivers/streams that serve as sources of water, and the perception that the KCA induces rainfall for agricultural activities in the communities. Thus, a modest commitment on the part of the government towards fulfilling its side of the ‘social responsibility’ agreement, made prior to the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, has the potential to renew communities’ commitment to the protection of the KCA, while supporting ecotourism activities.

The next chapter presents findings addressing Research Question Two: ‘How is the concept of ecotourism applied in and around the KCA?’
Chapter Seven
Tourism policy and ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter national tourism policies, and ecotourism implementation and management in and around the KCA are examined. Data sources used include semi-structured interviews with selected agencies, and follow-up in-depth interviews and household surveys with community respondents. Direct observation and secondary sources of data were also used. The results presented in this chapter address the Second Research Question: ‘How is the concept of ecotourism applied in and around the KCA?’ Analyses of responses are categorised into two broad sections focusing on national tourism policies/plans, and ecotourism implementation in the case study communities.

The first section describes national tourism policies/plans, focusing on past and current tourism plans and policies, their effectiveness and challenges in managing ecotourism activities in and around the KCA. The second section, ecotourism implementation, examines institutional level understanding of the concept of ecotourism, and presents findings on the administrative framework for ecotourism, and the characteristics of those involved in ecotourism. Case study communities’ experiences of ecotourism implementation and the relationship between park officials and local people are further examined in the second section.

7.2 Tourism policies in Ghana: Focus and challenges

A review of available tourism policies/plans in Ghana reveals that park officials (GWD and GHCT) do not have any ‘specific’ policies or plans for guiding and managing ecotourism in and around the KCA, or in Ghana in general. Tourism in Ghana has developed in an ad hoc basis, as tourism demand built. According to the GTA official, ecotourism in the KCA and other parts of Ghana is managed within the framework of the national tourism policies and plans:

... We don’t have any specific policy for ecotourism, but we have broad tourism policies for tourism development in Ghana ... Tourism in Ghana is a big industry that has been developing gradually over the years. We
Given the lack of ecotourism policy in Ghana, the purpose of this section is to understand how ecotourism has been integrated into the broad national tourism policies and plans, as well into poverty reduction targets. This section further examines the successes and challenges of these plans and policies, with specific reference to ecotourism in the KCA.

Tourism feasibility studies were conducted in Ghana in the 1970s (see Section 5.5.1), and emerging from those studies was the Ghana Tourist Control Authority Act 1973. This legislative instrument provides a broad legal framework for supporting tourism planning, development and management in Ghana. A review of tourism documents from Ghana’s Ministry of Tourism and the GTA shows that five main tourism development policies/plans have been prepared and implemented since the 1970s, including:

1. The 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan (1975-1990);
2. Medium-Term National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1993-1995);
3. National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1996-2010);
4. Strategic Tourism Action Plan (2003-2007); and
5. The National Tourism Policy, 2006.

These plans/policies have been reviewed and are discussed in the following sections, focusing on the background, ecotourism focus, poverty reduction targets, successes and challenges in terms of implementation, as well as the linkages between them.

7.2.1 The 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan (1975-1990)

The National Tourism Development Plan (1975-1990) was the first to be prepared in Ghana, with financial and technical support from the Danish Government (Hoff & Overgaard Planning Consult, 1974). It was developed to guide tourism planning during the early stages of tourism resource exploration in Ghana, with the GoG being the implementing body. Based on a targeted annual growth rate of 12.5 percent, the plan intended to achieve the following objectives:

1. To increase international tourist arrivals from 64,000 in 1975 to 357,000 per annum by 1990;
2. To increase the average length of stay of tourists from 4 to 9.4 days by 1990;
3. To increase the number of hotels from 900 in 1975 to more than 13,000 in 1990;
4. To create 36,000 new direct and indirect jobs annually through hotel development and hospitality services; and
5. To increase foreign exchange earnings at a rate of US$ 58 million per annum.

This was the first national tourism plan, and analysis of the plan’s objectives reveals that it was designed to make tourism attractive to both international and domestic tourists. Its focus was on developing local tourism resources, rather than on reducing poverty in local communities. Although the plan had a job creation objective, it only focused on generating employment through the development of hotels and guest houses which were concentrated in the urban areas such as the capital, Accra. According to the DHTM official, the plan was developed to provide a basis for tourism development:

... *You see, this plan was the first attempt as a country to really understand the tourism resources that we [Ghana] have and to put up a comprehensive effort in developing them. So we didn’t expect it to solve all our poverty problems or focus on one sector of the tourism industry, no; it was to give us an understanding of how we can manage our tourism resources.* ... *DHTM, June 2012.*

Thus, this plan was intended to provide a common platform for tourism development in Ghana. However in analysing the plan’s objectives, it was observed that the plan was not comprehensive in terms of developing niche tourism such as ecotourism, and in involving other development partners, such as the private sector, in tourism activities. Agency interviews suggested that the plan had little direct impact on ecotourism activities, as there was no objective to develop ecotourism resources, although some agency officials (e.g., GTA, GHCT) asserted that it provided the basis for recognising Ghana as a tourism destination. The official from the GTA noted that:

... *The impact of this plan on the development of Kakum was not direct and much ...; But the local and international status that Kakum has assumed today can be partly linked to this plan because it was the first plan that made attempts to market tourism resources in Ghana to both domestic and international tourists. In so doing, it attracted the attention of government and other development partners to the tourism resources that we have as a country.* ... *GTA, June 2012.*
Despite the plan’s focus on national level tourism development, discussions with the agencies in the KCA (e.g., GTA, DHTM) showed that the plan did not achieve even five percent of its targets and objectives – determined based on the number of objectives implemented – because of political instability and the economic crisis in Ghana during the 1980s (see Section 5.2.4). The economic and political crises are considered by the agency officials to have served as a disincentive to capital investment in tourism, and the development of internal tourist attractions.

As indicated by the DHTM official during the confirmatory research phase, the objectives of the plan were later integrated into a new tourism development plan (Medium-Term National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana) in 1993:

"... The late 1970s and the 1980s, as you may know, were terrible times in the history of Ghana. Every sector of the economy was affected including tourism. Although we had the plan in place, there was no way it could have been implemented due to the political and other crises that engulfed the country... It's always not easy when we put so much effort into a plan and it ends up not fully implemented. But most of the objectives of the plan were merged into the 1993 tourism plan [medium term-national tourism plan 1993-1995] when Ghana decided to adopt a democratic governance system in the 1990s ... DHTM, Feb 2014."

In summary, the National Tourism Plan (1975-1990), despite its national orientation in relation to tourism development, was not implemented, because of the political and economic crises that characterised Ghana during the period. Nonetheless, the agency interviews suggest the plan set the tone and pathway for subsequent tourism plans/policies in Ghana.

7.2.2 Medium-Term National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1993-1995)

This plan was prepared by a Tourism Task Force (a local group made up of tourism-related professionals and practitioners) set up by the government to provide guidelines and directions for the development of Ghana’s tourism industry over a three year period, with the government as the implementing body. The plan developed from the previous ‘foundational plan’ (National Tourism Plan, 1975-1990), with the purpose of making the tourism sector in Ghana internationally competitive, while maximising economic benefits to the country. Figure 7.1 summarises the plan’s main themes.
As illustrated in Figure 7.1, central to the plan was the establishment of a formidable foundation for tourism development, development of integrated niche tourism products (e.g., ecotourism, heritage tourism) and the creation of a positive image of Ghana as a tourist destination. In addition, the plan sought to enhance visitor satisfaction, and increase Ghana’s share of the tourism market at both international and sub-regional levels. Specifically, the plan sought to promote leisure travel as a major form of recreation, especially among segments of the Ghanaian populace, and to maximise the contribution of the tourism sector to Ghana’s economy, through job creation and an increase in net foreign exchange returns. As explained by the GTA official, the plan sought to provide a comprehensive perspective to developing tourism resources in Ghana:

... The 1993 medium term plan was very broad and touched on all sectors of the tourism industry. It particularly made provisions for developing attractions such as natural and cultural resources especially in the rural communities ... GTA, June 2012.

This quote indicates the plan recognised the various sectors of the tourism industry and their attractions. Review of the plan’s objectives shows it focused on developing tourism products based on heritage tourism, ecotourism, ethno-tourism, conference tourism and recreational tourism. Unlike the 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan (1975-1990), this plan seemed to have achieved some successes. Agency interviews reveal the plan recognised the possible negative impact of intensive tourism development on the environment and culture, and put
in place mechanisms (e.g., environmental education) to conserve and protect historic sites, natural environment and cultural traditions. The GWD official noted that:

... The plan [1993 Medium term plan] was very useful. Because every tourism activity has both positive and negative impacts, the plan didn’t focus only on positive aspects of tourism but also had a section on minimising the negative impacts on the environment. To us, this was mostly done through environmental awareness campaigns given our role as protectors of Ghana’s natural environment ... GWD, April 2012.

Other successes identified by some agency interviewees (e.g., GHCT, CI, DHTM) included the implementation of a number of ecotourism-related projects, with the support of international organisations such as CI. These projects included the building of conservation and visitor facilities at the forts and castles at Elmina and Cape Coast, and the development of the Kakum National Park (KNP) in the KCA, all in the Central Region of Ghana.

However, interviews with agency representatives show the plan was not fully implemented due to financial constraints, inadequate involvement of the private sector, and inadequate government commitment to investment in human resources and infrastructure development such as roads. Despite these challenges, the GTA and GHCT officials believe the plan contributed to poverty reduction by promoting tourism as a viable option for rural development and national integration. They further argued that the plan emphasised tourism as a vehicle for accelerating sub-regional development and achieving economic cooperation. Moreover, the plan was successful in establishing Ghana’s Ministry of Tourism and in developing top class hotels. The GTA official remarked that:

... Being the first plan adopted in Ghana under our democratic dispensation, it provided a number of opportunities such as the construction of hotels and guest houses particularly in Accra [national capital] and the construction of conservation facility [canopy walkway] in Kakum and visitor facilities in Cape Coast and Elmina [tourists’ destinations in Central Region]. Some Ghanaians were employed through such projects ... GTA, June 2012.

In summary, analysis of the plan and agency interviews showed that the plan was useful in developing niche tourism. In addition, the plan contributed, to a limited extent, to poverty reduction (e.g., job creation), although its implementation was marred with challenges such as financial constraints. Although agency
interviewees indicated that less than 30 percent of the plan’s objectives were achieved, they believe the plan could have contributed to poverty reduction, if all the objectives had been achieved. In relation to the KCA, the plan supported development of the ecotourism attraction (e.g., canopy walkway) in the KNP, which further opened up the rural communities around the KCA (e.g., Abrafo) to tourism activities (e.g., craft village). The gains of this medium term plan were further consolidated into another 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan (1996-2010).

7.2.3 The 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1996-2010)

An examination of the plan shows that it was intended to transform Ghana into a major tourism destination in the West Africa sub-region, Africa and the world. The plan was prepared by the government through the Tourism Ministry, with financial and technical support from UNWTO and UNDP (as part of the Integrated Tourism Development Programme, see Section 5.5.1). The plan had the following broad objectives:

1. To expand international tourism by exposing Ghana’s unique cultural and environmental heritage to the world, and by strengthening rural and urban economies, while stimulating socio-economic growth through income generation, employment creation, foreign exchange earnings and government revenue;

2. To promote regional African tourism through regional cooperation and the development of multi-destination products for travel to countries in West Africa and beyond, with the aim of offering international tourists diverse tourism products;

3. To enhance the planning and control of both international and domestic tourism, to maximise benefits while minimising environmental problems and social distortions;

4. To ensure a prioritised, staged and integrated regional development approach to tourism by focusing on accessibility, availability of attractions, facilities, services and infrastructure;

5. To provide acceptable standards of tourist facilities, with careful consideration of safety, sanitation, comfort and the environment;

6. To strengthen cross-sectoral linkages between tourism and other economic activities such as agriculture, to help integrate tourism into the economic fabric of Ghana; and
7. To emphasise the implementation of tourism plans with adequate regulatory, financial and organisational support, in order to ensure effective management and continuous monitoring of tourism impacts.

Analysis of the plan’s objectives reveals a strong emphasis on protecting the natural environment, minimising negative environmental impacts associated with tourism, and reducing poverty at the local level. As a strategy to reduce poverty and stimulate socio-economic development, the plan sought to develop two main tourism products – ecotourism, and heritage/ethnic tourism – in response to the country’s diverse natural resources and cultural attractions. The plan adopted the World Wide Fund’s definition of ecotourism:

“… nature travel that advances conservation and sustainable development. Ecotourism must involve the local communities located near the protected areas and make certain that they participate in and receive benefits from tourism development” (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996, p. 82)

The following were the plan’s strategies that focused mainly on ecotourism and poverty reduction at the local level (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/UNWTO, 1996):

1. Encouraging domestic tourism as a strategy to educate Ghanaians to appreciate their historical, cultural and environmental heritage through leisure and recreation, while distributing socio-economic benefits across the country;

2. Encouraging sustainable tourism development by continuously managing and maintaining tourism resources to serve present and future needs, while distributing economic, environmental and socio-cultural benefits to the local communities;

3. Promoting quality tourism development through the development of natural, historic and cultural tourism resources;

4. Developing and managing tourism activities for the purpose of bringing socio-economic benefits directly to local communities and the national economy, through community-based projects and community involvement in tourism; and

5. Providing man-power training and education to workers in both private and public tourism sectors.

The plan thus appears to be focused on developing ecotourism resources and delivering benefits to local communities. In relation to the KCA, the DHTM and GHCT officials explained that the plan was prepared to stimulate local
development, using ecotourism as a development tool. The DHTM official explained the situation in relation to the KCA:

... If you compare the two plans [the 15 year national tourism development plan (1975-1990) and the medium-term national tourism development plan (1993-1995)] before this plan, you could see that this plan intended to develop rural communities through tourism ... If you take Kakum for instance, the Abrafo craft village and the Mesomagor bamboo orchestra [ecotourism attractions] started functioning following the introduction of this plan in 1996 ... DHTM, June 2012.

Despite this focus of the plan, agency interviews show that tourism in Ghana today has not achieved many of the plan’s objectives, with the plan now outliving its life span. Some agency officials (e.g., DHTM, GHCT) believe tourism activities in Ghana still lack community participation and an impact distribution mechanism. The confirmatory research phase identified key factors that have limited the successful implementation of the plan, which include mistrust between the major tourism stakeholders, poor tourism management structure and lack of tourism development agencies at the local or district level. Some agency officials commented:

... I think over the years, the tourism sector has been characterised by mistrust among the major stakeholders, so policy makers and the industry tend to view the academics with a jaundiced eye, and vice versa ... The industry and policy makers see the academics as having book knowledge and sometimes tend to ignore very useful suggestions ... DHTM, Feb 2014.

... The whole central region is under one tourism inspectorate at Cape Coast. The question is can the one inspectorate unit go to every tourism site and hotel in every nook and cranny of the central region? No, it just can’t ... GHCT, Feb 2014.

In relation to poor tourism management structure, the findings from the confirmatory research phase show that some of the objectives of the plan (e.g., providing human resource training and education) do not have departments at the local level to implement and bring them to fruition, while there is inadequate communication between the stakeholders (e.g., between THLDDA and GHCT).

In summary, it would appear that the poor tourism management structure, lack of tourism development departments at the local level and mistrust among stakeholders have limited the plan’s implementation. Although the plan’s implementation period (1996-2010) has elapsed, it is interesting to note that less
than 40 percent of the objectives have been achieved. Findings from the confirmatory research phase suggest that it is still being used to regulate tourism activities in Ghana amidst these challenges. However in the KCA, the GHCT official believes the plan has been useful in developing local ecotourism attractions (e.g., Abrafo bee keeping centre). Some agency officials (e.g., DHTM, GTA) noted that a new tourism plan is currently being prepared – Ghana Tourism Development Plan (2013-2027).

7.2.4 Strategic Tourism Action Plan (2003-2007), Ghana

As part of ‘Ghana’s Vision 2015 development agenda’ adopted under a new government in 2000 (see Section 5.4), the Tourism Ministry prepared a 5-year Strategic Tourism Action Plan (2003-2007). A review of the plan shows that it was prepared with the objective of generating growth through tourism development. The plan estimated an annual tourism sector growth rate of 20 percent by the end of the plan period (2007). The focus of the plan was to position Ghana within the framework of a competitive and quality tourism destination. The following were the specific objectives of the plan:

1. To increase tourism arrivals to one million;
2. To make tourism an employment generating sector. The plan focused on making tourism in Ghana the third largest employer after agriculture and retailing. Within the formal sector, the plan centred on making tourism the largest employer, creating about 300,000 jobs within the plan period;
3. To increase tourism foreign exchange earnings. The plan sought to increase foreign exchange from tourism, from US$ 500 million in 2003 to US$ 1.5 billion by the end of 2007; and
4. To boost domestic tourism and make it attractive, through the development of tourism infrastructure and education.

Regarding poverty reduction and ecotourism, analysis of the plan’s objectives and agency interviews show that it had a disparate focus; the plan sought to address poverty by creating jobs through hotel and hospitality development, but did not support ecotourism development. The agencies (e.g., DHTM, GHCT) reported that several rural ecotourism resources were undeveloped and rural communities were marginalised from tourism activities. The DHTM official explained further:

... The only poverty reduction section in the plan [Strategic Tourism Action Plan] was about creating jobs. These jobs were indicated to be
created through the expansion of the number of hotels and other hospitality services which were concentrated in the urban areas. So ask yourself, what about the communities that had tourism attractions but did not have hotels like those communities around the KCA, how were they going to get the jobs that the plan was talking about? DHTM, June 2012.

Agency interviews show that several factors limited the implementation of the plan, including: lack of political will to invest in tourism infrastructure (e.g., roads, guest houses) especially at the local level, untrained and inadequate human resources (e.g., tour guides and professional hotel operators), and poor marketing. Moreover, the plan failed to integrate major issues discussed in the 15 year national tourism development plan (1996-2010), and did not focus on exploring and developing ecotourism resources in the KCA and Ghana in general. The GTA official commented that:

... If you examine that plan [Strategic Tourism Action Plan] very well, you will see that it was prepared because there was a new government but not that there was a need for it. It failed to consider some of the issues the 15 years national tourism plan raised because it was prepared under different political regime... Numerous ecotourism and community based resources were not considered, and even the existing ones like those we have around the Kakum lacked the needed infrastructure and the personnel to manage them ... GTA, June 2012.

The above quote indicates that the introduction of this plan was influenced mainly by political factors. Agency interviews reveal that it failed to consider key tourism attractions in the country, especially at the rural level and achieved less than 20 percent of its objectives, especially those relating to ecotourism development.

7.2.5 National Tourism Policy (2006)

Like the 15 year national tourism development plan (1996-2010), this policy was prepared with the assistance of SNV/Netherland Development Organisation. It focused on “the creation of appropriate environment for a private sector-led tourism development” (Ministry of Tourism & Diasporan Relations, 2006, p. 9). Considering that the implementation of previous tourism plans was characterised by financial constraints and inadequate private sector involvement, this policy identified the private sector as a major stakeholder in implementing and stimulating tourism activities. The policy focused on ensuring public-private sector partnerships with government, in order to provide a conducive and stable macroeconomic, socio-political, and ecological environment to attract further input from the private sector. Key themes of the policy include:
1. Development of Ghana’s inherent attractions, and the promotion of specific niche tourism markets. This theme focused on exploring Ghana’s numerous natural, cultural and historical resources;

2. Creation of opportunities for the involvement in, and benefit from, tourism by local entrepreneurs and communities in terms of employment, income generation, training and awareness, and access to social infrastructure;

3. Improvement in customer satisfaction by connecting tourists to attraction sites that will deliver a complete and satisfying experience. The policy intended to provide improved tourism facilities and deliver quality services at all the tourism destinations in Ghana;

4. Provision of high quality facilities and services by professionalising the tourism industry. This theme intended to develop the capacity of human resource, and to build quality assurance for the development of tourism;

5. To ensure effective and efficient management of the tourism industry especially in the area of finance; and

6. To provide adequate support for tourism services, basic infrastructure, product development, marketing, training and investment.

It would appear from the above themes that the policy placed importance on ecotourism, as three of them reflect ideal ecotourism development, while the remaining three influence the delivery of ecotourism, as summarised in Figure 7.2.

![Figure 7.2 Major Themes of the National Tourism Policy (2006)](image)

According to the GTA official, this policy is largely based on the 15 year national tourism development plan (1996-2010) which focused on the development of ecotourism resources at the local level. An examination of the policy shows that it reflects ecotourism’s key principles such as environmental conservation,
community participation, and economic benefits (see Section 3.6). The policy explains ecotourism as:

“… environmentally and socially responsible travel to natural or near natural areas that promotes preservation and conservation of cultural and natural resources, has low visitor impact, and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local people …” (Ministry of Tourism & Diasporan Relations, 2006, p.7).

Analysis of agency interviews showed that the policy created awareness amongst tourism practitioners and academics of the role of tourism in reducing poverty and empowering local communities. Currently, the policy remains useful in ensuring effective management of tourism resources, as well as involving local communities in tourism management. The GTA official explained the current relevance of the policy with reference to poverty reduction:

... The whole purpose of this policy is to ensure that tourism in Ghana develops and yields benefits to the local people. If you compare tourism figures after the introduction of this policy, you will realise that tourism in Ghana has grown phenomenally over this short period [2006-2012] after the policy was introduced ... Now, local communities are becoming more involved in tourism activities through employment and income generation ... GTA, June 2012.

According to DHTM and GTA officials, the policy has supported all aspects of tourism activities; planning, development and management in both urban and rural communities. In relation to ecotourism in the KCA, the GHCT official said that the involvement of the private sector in ecotourism activities (e.g., bee keeping centre in Abrafo) has complemented the government’s efforts in providing jobs for some local people, while serving as alternative tourism destinations for tourists who visit the canopy walkway in the KCA:

... This policy encourages the private investors to get involved in ecotourism and tourism activities in general. Around the KCA, the private sector has participated in ecotourism projects like the monkey sanctuary and the bee keeping centre. It’s good for the local communities because some people work there and tourists go there too ... GHCT, May 2012.

Despite the policy’s influence since its introduction and promulgation, its implementation in Ghana has been faced with challenges. Agency interviews identified key challenges, such as over-reliance on the private sector and lack of tourism development structures at the local level. The DHTM official noted that several tourism attractions remain undeveloped, majority of local communities
remain marginalised from tourism management, and there is poor quality of tourism services and facilities:

... The whole idea of tourism being a private sector-led activity is ill-thought ... government over-anticipated the private sector’s role in tourism meanwhile the basic infrastructures [e.g., road] to attract the private sector are in poor conditions. Also, the local communities don’t even know the resources that they have, and the government has made very little effort to involve them ... DHTM, June 2012.

Although the policy is perceived by GHCT and GWD officials to have been useful in developing (eco) tourism resources in the rural communities, the DHTM official, making reference to the KCA, claimed it has not achieved the themes of local level empowerment due to inadequate community involvement:

... Ecotourism in Kakum is an important project and everyone knows that, but what’s the significance of a project when the local people don’t even know how it is managed? ... DHTM, Feb 2014.

Despite these challenges, agency interviewees maintained that the policy remains useful in current tourism development in Ghana.

**Summary of tourism policies in Ghana**

Despite research on tourism dating back to the 1970s, implementation of tourism plans and policies has been characterised by a number of challenges, as illustrated in Figure 7.3. Agency interviews suggest that less than 50 percent of the objectives of national tourism plans/policies are implemented, due to many challenges (see Figure 7.3). Analysis of tourism policies/plans has shown that the Medium Term National Tourism Development Plan for Ghana (1993-1995) was the first to focus on poverty reduction at the local level and ecotourism development in the KCA, and further served as the basis for the inclusion of ecotourism objectives and poverty reduction targets in subsequent plans/policies. Figure 7.3 summarises the national tourism plans and policies from the 1970s to 2000s.
Tourism Policies/Plans and Challenges in Ghana (1970s-2000s)

Figure 7.3  Tourism Policies/Plans and Challenges in Ghana (1970s-2000s)
7.3 The concept of ecotourism: Institutional perspectives

As discussed in Section 3.6, the prevailing ecotourism mantra, espousing sustainable development over the traditional concentration on revenue generation in tourism activities, has resulted in the recognition of ecotourism as a ‘change driver’, due to its foundational principles. This characteristic of ecotourism is based on five principles; its potential to: stimulate environmental conservation, encourage community participation (working in cooperation with local people), empower vulnerable groups (e.g., women), deliver economic benefits (e.g., jobs), and preserve local culture. These five principles are based on the key principles of ecotourism identified by ecotourism researchers and international organisations (see Section 3.6), and reflect the conceptual understanding of ecotourism as a sustainable development strategy.

Using the above five principles as a framework for understanding ecotourism in the KCA, there appears to be a poor understanding of ecotourism by the agencies. The DHTM official remarked that:

... The problem we have in Ghana is about a lack of a precise definition of ecotourism? I’ve always engaged with people, I think we don’t understand ecotourism even from the definitional stage ... DHTM, June 2012.

In order to accurately reflect the agencies’ perspective on ecotourism, interviewees were asked to explain the meaning of ecotourism, based on the agencies’ understanding of the concept. Although the interviews suggested a lack of clarity regarding the meaning of ecotourism, all officials consistently mentioned environmental conservation as an overarching objective of ecotourism. Some of the officials explained that:

... Keeping the forest in its natural state for people to come around, learn and enjoy nature is what ecotourism is ... GWD, April 2012.

... Ecotourism in the KCA is all about protecting the rainforest by minimising the impacts tourists have on the environment to ensure that future generation see what a virgin forest is ... CI, May 2012.

Other interviewees mentioned economic gains for the local communities. As pointed out by the CEDECOM official, the government introduced ecotourism into the KCA with the intent to protect the rainforest and the wildlife, as well as to support and engage the communities around it in income generating activities:
Although the number one aim for introducing ecotourism into Kakum was to protect the forest and the wildlife; government has over the years made conscious efforts to integrate some income generation activities [e.g., sale of crafts] into the whole concept of ecotourism. To us, ecotourism is not only creating a natural protected area for tourists to enjoy, but also generating income for the local communities from tourists’ visitation ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

Other attempts to understand and describe ecotourism relate to employment creation and revenue generation. Agency interviews show that ecotourism involves generating economic benefits for both the local communities and the government. DHTM and GHCT officials explained that ecotourism contributes to government revenue, and has become a key local development intervention:

... It’s good that you are putting a Ghanaian dimension to the concept of ecotourism. I will say community-based tourism where efforts are made by the central government authorities or communities themselves to make financial gains out of the facilities in their midst, and that facility could be a monkey sanctuary, it could be a waterfall, it could be a national park as in the case of Kakum ... DHTM, June 2012.

... Ecotourism focuses on protecting the environment and generating revenue for the government for development and conservation purposes while creating opportunities like jobs for people who are either from the local communities or outside ... GHCT, May 2012.

Analysis of the agency interviews shows that only two of the five key principles of ecotourism (environmental conservation and economic benefits) were evident in the interviewees’ interpretation of ecotourism (see Figure 7.4). Although some agency officials (CEDECOM, DHTM and GHCT) are aware of, and recognised the need for participation in ecotourism (benefits sharing and decision making), their interpretations of ecotourism do not emphasise community participation.
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Although the interpretations of ecotourism based on the five principles outlined above appear to be central to the 15 Year National Tourism Development Plan (1996-2010) and the Ghana Tourism Policy 2006 (see Sections 7.2.3 & 7.2.5), discussions with the agencies in the KCA show they have a limited understanding of the concept. As a consequence, the DHTM official interviewed during the confirmatory research phase indicated that tourism activities in Ghana branded as ecotourism are not ecotourism, because they do not accurately reflect the basic principles of ecotourism. He explained the situation in relation to the KCA:

... We [Ghanaians] have over the years and even now just merged every kind of tourism. As we all know Kakum [KCA] is an ecotourism site but as to whether it has been operated as an ecotourism site as you and I know is another issue because there is no community involvement, no strategy to manage the negative impacts ... DHTM, Feb 2014.

Examination of tourism policies/plans reveals that the various sustainable development components of ecotourism highlighted in those documents appear to have been influenced by the involvement of international agencies (e.g., SNV, UNWTO, UNDP) in the preparation of those plans/policies (see Section 7.2), rather than by a locally driven understanding of ecotourism. It appears there is a disconnect between ecotourism strategies and objectives proposed in the development plans/policies, and what is applied in reality. In addition, implementation of the tourism plans/policies discussed in Section 7.2 has been marred with challenges, possibly because international agencies were involved in their preparation whereas local agencies with limited understanding have implemented the plans/policies. This underlies the distinct lack of use of ecotourism in Ghanaian tourism planning.

Thus, it is important to understand whether the implementation of ecotourism in and around the KCA conforms to its basic principles as a change driver or otherwise. This is presented in the next section.

7.4 Ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA

Given the local agencies’ limited understanding of ecotourism, both community and agency interviewees were asked to describe the implementation of ecotourism in the area. First, agency interviewees were asked to explain the management framework for ecotourism in the KCA. Second, agency and community interviewees were asked to outline the procedure for involving local communities
in ecotourism. Third, community interviewees were asked to share their experiences of ecotourism implementation. Fourth, community interviewees were further asked to explain how their experiences with ecotourism implementation have influenced their relationship with the park officials. These perspectives on ecotourism implementation were evaluated using the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (Ross & Wall, 1999a). A summary of the issues discussed in the following sections is presented in Figure 7.5.

![Ecotourism management framework](image)

**Figure 7.5 Focus of Ecotourism Implementation Section Analysis**

### 7.5 Ecotourism implementation in the KCA: The management framework

A review of Ghana Wildlife Division (GWD) and Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (GHCT) ecotourism management documents reveals a clearly defined operational and management framework for the ecotourism activities occurring in the KCA. When commenting on the ecotourism framework, the Conservation International (CI) official explained that the Government of Ghana (GoG) and the CI are the ‘masterminds’ behind the introduction of ecotourism to the KCA, and its management:

... *Following the gazettal of Kakum as a national protected area, the CI [an American NGO], in consultation with the government thought it wise to introduce ecotourism into the park ... The canopy walkway was even constructed by us with assistance of the GoG ... CI, May 2012.*

While the GoG and the CI remain the ‘architects’, agency interviews show they are not directly involved in day-to-day ecotourism activities in the KCA. The GWD and the GHCT, adopt this role. The ecotourism management framework mandates the GHCT to manage ecotourism in the KCA, whereas the GWD manages the entire KCA. Analysis of agency interviews shows both the GWD and the GHCT are accountable to the GoG, while the GHCT further reports to the CI. The GHCT official explained further:

... *When it comes to ecotourism in Kakum, we are in charge of tourists’ activities ... We consult GWD regularly, since they are responsible for managing the conservation area about environmental and other issues.*
Also, because our activities are to support the management of the KCA in terms of revenue generation, the GWD and our organisation are accountable to the government. Our organisation again sends reports to CI … GHCT, May 2012.

The marketing section of the ecotourism management framework is managed by the Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA). A review of GHCT and GTA tourism documents (e.g., development plans) indicates that ecotourism marketing forms part of the role of the GTA under Ghana’s Ministry of Tourism, but does not have a local office. As a consequence, although ecotourism attractions in the KCA are marketed to both domestic and international tourists by the GTA, the agency is not directly involved in the daily management of ecotourism. The GTA official explained:

... We promote it [ecotourism], you see Kakum is a national park, and under the laws of this country, national parks are managed by GWD of the Forestry Commission but because that national park has been developed into a tourist product, that is where our [GTA] interest is, so we promote it as a tourist product just like any tourism attraction in Ghana on behalf of the Ministry of Tourism. But we don’t have any role in how ecotourism is managed in the KCA … GTA, June 2012.

This quote reflects the traditional hierarchical tourism structure in Ghana, where the GTA markets all tourism products on behalf of the Ministry of Tourism. This also illustrates the central dominance and control of tourism activities by the Ministry of Tourism, without any decentralised structures at the local/district level (see Sections 7.2.3 & 7.2.5). Although the Ministry of Tourism is responsible for the overarching ecotourism policy for protected areas in Ghana, and the development of community tourism attractions, agency interviews show that there is a lack of a cohesive plan to ensure that the attraction of Kakum is linked to community opportunities. There appears to be separation of responsibilities, with no agency taking the responsibility for ecotourism development as a whole. For example, since ecotourism occurs in the KCA, it is recognised by the agency interviewees as the responsibility of GWD. Yet, the GWD does not have tourism as a core business.

Additionally, agency interviews show that the existing management framework has marginalised local communities, and failed to recognise the importance of community involvement in ecotourism. The exclusion of the local communities may be linked to the limited local understanding of the concept, as discussed in
Section 7.3, where agencies only recognised environmental conservation and economic benefits as the basic principles of ecotourism. It could also be linked to the misconception of ecotourism as only occurring in the KCA, and thus the responsibility of GWD, with no agency taking responsibility for ecotourism development outside the KCA.

However, a study by Segbafia (2008) reveals that for ecotourism, and all other forms of tourism in Ghana, to be meaningful, it should involve the local communities, and provide a platform for tourists to engage more with them and experience their culture. This has the capacity to deliver benefits to the local communities, ensure inter-cultural experiences and stimulate local support toward conservation. Expressing disillusionment with the situation, the THLDDA official concluded that the management framework apparently shows that ecotourism in the KCA serves only as a source of revenue generation for the government, and has no interest in or focus on engaging local community:

... Kakum is a revenue generation jackpot for the government; government gets a lot of revenue from the tourists who visit the facility. But I don’t know why the government doesn’t want to involve the surrounding communities in the management of ecotourism in the KCA ... From every indication, the local people are not involved in the management because that will mean that government’s revenue from ecotourism in the KCA has to be reduced so that the local communities will also enjoy some direct benefits. And this is something that the government and the park officials are not willing to do ... THLDDA, May 2012.

Despite calls by the international community, such as the UN, that tourism development, particularly in developing countries, cannot be detached from the environment and the local communities and their cultural experiences (UN, 2003), the apparent responsibility vacuum in the KCA has resulted in a lack of local/district planning process to link the attractions in the KCA to the community cultural attractions at the perimeter of the Conservation Area. In addition, discussions with the agency interviewees showed that the lack of involvement of local communities in the ecotourism management framework has been linked to a common perception and recognition of the KCA as a national facility rather than a locally managed facility. The DHTM official explained:

... Kakum is not a community driven facility like some community based projects. Kakum is a national facility because of the international recognition and national government support ... so in that instance it
becomes very difficult for local communities to be directly involved in its management apart from the local employees ... DHTM, June 2012.

Other challenges of the ecotourism management framework relate to the location of the agencies (GTA, GHCT and GWD) involved in the framework, under different government ministries with different interests. The DHTM official explained further during the confirmatory research phase:

... All tourism sites in Ghana have different management structures with different roles and under different ministries, which is wrong. There are vested interests and those vested interests have mother responsibilities, which the agencies are keen in achieving ... Given that some of the agencies don’t have tourism as a core function [e.g., GWD], for them tourism is not a priority ... DHTM, Feb 2014.

Despite these challenges, interview results suggest that some local people are employed in ecotourism activities in and around the KCA. The next section examines the characteristics of those involved in ecotourism.

7.6 Ecotourism implementation: Local community involvement

Within the case study communities, community interview results show that an individual’s involvement in ecotourism largely determines his/her attitude towards, perception of, and the benefits derived from ecotourism in the KCA. As a result, job opportunities appear to be one of the most important economic benefits of ecotourism in the case study communities. Thus, community and agency interviewees were asked to outline and explain the conditions or requirements for involving/employing people in the KCA and community ecotourism activities.

Community and agency interviews reveal that the requirements for working in ecotourism activities in the KCA and at the community level are different. The GHCT official explained that the minimum condition for working in the KCA, where the two major ecotourism attractions are located, is a basic school certificate, although some workers (e.g., cleaners) are employed without any qualification:

... We don’t have any rigid conditions for recruiting workers ... but those employed must be able to communicate very well with tourists and understand what we do as an organisation. So at least you must have a minimum of basic school certificate [Junior High School] ... they
employees are further given in-service-training to enlighten them more about our activities ... GHCT, May 2012.

However, as discussed in Section 6.2, the majority of the local people in these communities are illiterate and do not have this level of education. As a result, although ecotourism in the KCA requires only a limited number of employees (40), those employed are not only from the local communities but from other parts of the Central Region. Moreover, the lack of qualifications among residents in the communities around the KCA has become an impediment to assuming supervisory positions for the local people employed. The park officials explained:

... As you may know Kakum is a national project, so all those employed cannot come from the communities around it. Also, some of our staff are transferred from other national parks to this place ... So, it’s only those local people who have the qualification that can sometimes be employed ... GWD, April 2012.

... We have some of our workers from Cape Coast and other places ... the problem with the communities around the park is that many of those who come seeking for jobs, have never been to school. And you know what we do here it’s all about interacting with tourists, how can such people be able to communicate or explain things to tourists? GHCT, May 2012.

Whilst the park officials explained the conditions, and the difficulty in engaging more local people in KCA ecotourism, findings from the community meetings during the confirmatory research phase revealed that the residents are unhappy with the situation, especially with the small numbers of local people employed:

... Just consider the number of communities around the park, so if you employ 20 people, what have you done? Abrafo community meeting, Feb 2014.

In contrast, although there appear to be no specific conditions required for working in community ecotourism activities, community interview results show that participation is mainly dependent on an individual’s interest and commitment. For example, Mesomagor residents explained that the only requirement for joining the traditional bamboo orchestra is an interest in the orchestra, and a personal commitment to the group. Nonetheless, given the traditional bamboo orchestra’s community identity and ownership, community interviews show that only indigenes of Mesomagor are involved, and are mainly youth (20-49 years). The leader of the orchestra commented that:
... It is true that this group is made up of about 25 local people, but that doesn’t mean it belongs to the members or the leader. This cultural group is for the community ... those who are willing to join especially the young ones are always welcome ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

In the Abrafo community, discussions with the residents show there are no specific conditions for engaging people in community ecotourism activities. However, agency interviews reveal that attempts have been made by the GoG and other development partners to target the people who lost their livelihoods as a result of the gazetral of the KCA. The CEDECOM official asserted that:

... If you take the craft village in Abrafo, the purpose was to engage community people who are jobless partly because of the park ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

Agency and community interviews identify no specific political, social or economic factors characterising those involved in ecotourism, both in the KCA and at the community level. As discussed earlier in this section, involvement of people in ecotourism activities is based on individuals’ education and willingness. The GHCT official said that:

... If it’s about job, there is nothing like your political affiliation or your status in your community, if you qualify and there is room, we will employ you ... GHCT, May 2012.

In summary, analysis of community and agency interviews shows that, basing involvement in community ecotourism on interest and commitment, rather than educational qualifications, seems to have encouraged the participation of more local people, particularly in Mesomagor. In contrast, the illiteracy rate in the local communities, coupled with the small numbers of employees required in ecotourism activities, appear to be limiting more local people from being employed in KCA ecotourism. With different requirements regarding ecotourism employment in the KCA and at the community level, it is important to understand the local communities’ experiences with the implementation of ecotourism. These are presented in the next section.

7.7 Ecotourism implementation: Experiences of the case study communities

Ecotourism, by its nature and principles, has the potential to generate benefits in the host regions, and to minimise negative impacts of tourist visitation.
Community interviewees were asked to share their experiences of ecotourism in their communities.

In relation to the canopy walkway, community interviews show that out of the four case study communities, only Abrafo has some connection with this major ecotourism attraction in the KCA. Discussions with Abrafo residents show that some local people have been employed, and also that the community has been engaging with some of the tourists who visit the facility. Some residents said that:

... The canopy walkway is located in the southern part of the park and we [Nuamakrom] are at the northern part, we don’t have any connection to it and it doesn’t provide income to us ... Nuamakrom 7, May 2012.

... Although we [Abrafo] are happy having the canopy walkway close to our community, we don’t have strong connection to it because all the revenue generated goes to the GoG and the park officials ... But, some of our people work there and also some of the tourists visit our community so we get the opportunity to interact with them and sell some of our farm produce to them ... Abrafo 2, April 2012.

Although the communities have a weak connection to the canopy walkway, interview results indicate that the situation is different with the community ecotourism attractions. As discussed in Section 5.7.4, there are a number of other ecotourism attractions concentrated in the Abrafo and Mesomagor communities. The following sections examine the communities’ experiences with these ecotourism attractions.

7.7.1 Abrafo Community’s Experience with Ecotourism Implementation

Interviews with Abrafo residents identified the craft village, the bee keeping centre and the Frami monkey sanctuary as attractions in the Abrafo vicinity. Residents indicated that the craft village has provided jobs for some local people, who have received training in creative skills (e.g., bead making). One Abrafo interviewee commented that:

... In this community, one of the job opportunities you can talk about is the craft village. It is at this place that you will see men and women who are skilled in craft work. They are involved in all sorts of products which provide them with income. It is not vibrant but it’s important to us... Abrafo 3, April 2012.
However, discussions with some craft village workers show that low patronage, and limited sales of craft products appear to be the major challenges for the craft village. One worker explained that:

... Less than 5 percent of the tourists who visit Kakum come here, we don’t have a good market. We produced assorted products here but not all are sold out because of low patronage. This is really affecting our activities and we want government to support us ... Abrafo 9, April 2012.

The above quote suggests that the craft village workers expect the government to help them improve the sale of their products. However, agency interviews show that the low patronage is a result of the weak relationship between the park officials and the craft village. The CEDECOM official attributed this to poor organisation of the craft village workers:

... When you have strong associations, it becomes easy to secure financial support from financial institutions and NGOs; you can effectively market your products and have a common voice in deciding prices ... We’re still supporting the craft village in a number of ways such as organising regular training for them. But it’s also important for them [workers] to form associations which will even make it easier to establish stronger relationship with the park officials ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

Analysis of the Abrafo interviews shows that despite the opportunities the craft village provides, regarding jobs and training of local people in creative skills, residents expressed mixed reactions regarding their experience with the facility because of the low patronage.

In contrast to the experiences with the craft village, interviews with Abrafo residents identified strong community connection to the bee keeping centre. Abrafo interviewees (7 out of 10) claimed that this is because of its dual role: supporting the development of the local community and sustaining environmental conservation. One Abrafo resident noted that:

... We have some people from this community who work there ... Also, the activities of the bee centre don’t disturb us and the environment in any way ... Abrafo 7, April 2012.

This perspective was reinforced by the majority of agency representatives (6 out of 8), who identified a number of training programmes (e.g., farm management practices) organised by the bee keeping centre for the local farmers and
agricultural extension officers, to improve their agricultural productivity, while conserving the environment. The CEDECOM official explained that:

... Last year [2011], the director of the centre indicated that the centre has been keeping stingless bees for biodiversity conservation and had also trained about 150 rural farmers including bee keepers and agric extension officers on how stingless bees could be used to facilitate increased food production in the country ... CEDECOM, July 2012.

It would appear that Abrafo residents have developed a strong connection to the facility, despite its international research focus and the small number of tourists it attracts (see Section 5.7.4.2), maybe because of the ecotourism-related benefits (e.g., training) the facility provides to the local community.

Interviews with the local community revealed that the residents have no connection with the Frami monkey sanctuary because of foreign (European) ownership and management, as well as the employment of some residents. Some Abrafo interviewees (4 out of 10) were unhappy with the European dishes (e.g., sandwiches) which are served at the restaurant instead of local food. As explained by an Abrafo interviewee, in his view, this situation does not promote local culture and development:

... Because they [European owners] are here to make profit from their investment, they do what will benefit them not the local people ... Can you imagine that the foods that are served at the restaurant are European? You will go there and they will serve you sandwiches and other food from Holland. How do you expect the local farmers to benefit from such a facility? Abrafo 4, April 2012.

However, further clarification from the agencies (e.g., GHCT, DHTM) reveals that the activities of the monkey sanctuary are mainly influenced by the operational capacity of the facility and the demand by tourists. The GHCT official said that:

... If the community complain about the number of people being employed there [Frami monkey sanctuary], we understand, even ecotourism in Kakum employs just 40 people ... But that’s the number of people the facility can employ at a time, if there is a possibility of future expansion, they will employ more local people. The fact that it is owned by foreigners doesn’t mean they will intentionally employ few local people when their capacity to operate requires more ... We should also understand that the facility serves tourists with different tastes and preferences ... so they will serve food or drinks that the tourists want ... GHCT, May 2012.
7.7.2 Mesomagor Community’s Experience with Ecotourism Implementation

In the Mesomagor community, interview data identify the tree platform in the KCA and the traditional bamboo orchestra as the major ecotourism attractions. As explained in Box 5.1, the tree platform was established in 2000 by the GWD, and has since developed as an important destination for tourists in the Kakum region, especially at the eastern part of the KCA. Describing the relevance of the tree platform to the Mesomagor community, local residents (6 out of 10) said that it has become a symbol that reminds the community of its commitment to support the conservation of the KCA:

... For us in this community, the tree platform always makes us renew our commitment to protect the park because it supports the development of our traditional bamboo orchestra and provides jobs for some of our people ... Mesomagor 5, June 2012.

... The tree platform has been very useful to our community. It’s not because people in this community get a lot of money from it, no ... but our bamboo orchestra is what it is today because the tourists who visit the tree platform also visit our bamboo orchestra ... At least now a lot of people know this community because of the tourists who come here, it makes us happy ... Mesomagor 6, June 2012.

The above quotes suggest a strong community connection to this ecotourism experience. Other attempts to understand the importance to the Mesomagor residents of the tree platform as an ecotourism destination revealed that a tour to the tree platform is regarded by them as an educational and enjoyable expedition. Some residents (4 out of 10) indicated that local tour guides teach tourists about the variety of plant species, their uses and relevance in traditional medicine, as well as tracking wildlife in the KCA (see Box 5.1). As a result, there is a strong local connection to the tree platform in Mesomagor, as it reinforces their cultural values and knowledge.

Mesomagor residents indicated that the traditional bamboo orchestra entertains tourists who visit the tree platform with traditional music, ensuring they enjoy their stay, while they learn about the traditions of the community. One interviewee commented that:

... Our cultural group makes tourists who visit here happy and create a platform for us to teach the tourists about our traditions ... Mesomagor 1, June 2012.
The DHTM official also emphasised the significance of the traditional bamboo orchestra, and the strong community connection to it, and further described it as a perfect model of community-based ecotourism:

... Mesomagor is the only success story of a community-based ecotourism ... Their bamboo orchestra serves as an important attraction for tourists who visit the tree platform ... Every community member, whether directly involved or not, is proud of the group. It’s a legacy that binds the community together ... Should you visit there now, everyone will be talking about the bamboo orchestra ... that’s the kind of love the community has developed towards the bamboo orchestra. Because of that all the benefits also stay in the community ... DHTM, June 2012.

Given the community ownership of the traditional bamboo orchestra, and the cooperation between park officials and local tour guides in managing tourist visitation to the tree platform (see Section 5.7.4.2), Mesomagor interview results indicate there is a strong community connection to this ecotourism experience, as it unites the community, provides jobs for some community youth, as well as enhancing the image of the community by the interaction of residents with tourists.

7.7.3 Comparing Ecotourism Experiences in Abrafo and Mesomagor

Analysis of the community interviews shows that only Abrafo has some connection to the canopy walkway in the KCA. This situation appears to be a result of the limited engagement of, and lack of employment opportunities for the other local communities, the ecotourism responsibility vacuum in the Kakum region, as well as the recognition of the canopy walkway as a national rather than a local facility by the agencies and the local communities.

There seem to be stark differences between Abrafo and Mesomagor residents’ views regarding their connection to community ecotourism attractions. The above findings show that all community ecotourism attractions within the Abrafo community were either introduced by the GoG (e.g., craft village) or private investors (e.g., monkey sanctuary). The residents appear to lack confidence in initiating, planning and developing local ecotourism attractions. For instance, despite the existence of local cultural attractions such as festivals in the Abrafo community, they have not been developed into ecotourism attractions.
Abrafo residents have a strong connection to and positive experience with the beekeeping centre, because the facility employs local people and provides support and opportunities to the community. However, they expressed mixed reactions regarding their experience with the craft village, possibly because it is locally owned and they lack the confidence to take planning and management decisions, as they expect the government to be supporting them.

Abrafo residents may lack this confidence, but the confirmatory research phase also indicates that collaboration remains a key challenge to ecotourism development in Abrafo. Findings from Abrafo community meetings and agency presentations show that the lack of coordination between the park officials, craft village workers and the beekeeping centre has resulted in low tourist visitation to the community ecotourism attractions, despite increasing tourist numbers to the canopy walkway. Thus, although the Abrafo community remains a major point of entry into the KCA, residents expressed mixed reactions regarding their experience with ecotourism, due to the limited economic benefit to the community.

On the other hand, Mesomagor residents have capitalised on the presence of tourist visits to the tree platform in the KCA by developing the traditional bamboo orchestra without any government support. An examination of the Mesomagor interviews shows that key factors underlying the success of ecotourism have been the availability of a guest house constructed with the support of an NGO, and committed and supportive community residents. Although the Mesomagor community is one of the communities experiencing frequent farm raids by wildlife (see Section 6.2.2) and has fewer ecotourism attractions compared to Abrafo, as well as low numbers of tourist visitation because of poor accessibility and remoteness, residents have a strong connection to, and greater experience with ecotourism. This could possibly be due to the recognition of the traditional bamboo orchestra as a symbol of unity, the employment and income opportunities, the collaboration between the park officials and community in managing the tree platform, and the community pride derived from delivering these ecotourism products, as a result of their interactions with tourists. Thus, ecotourism, particularly the traditional bamboo orchestra, is highly valued by Mesomagor residents, compared to the situation in Abrafo.
In essence, the experience of the Mesomagor community in relation to ecotourism implementation has shown that ecotourism in itself does not necessarily deliver widespread benefits, but requires careful planning, management and collaboration. The communities around the KCA can take advantage of opportunities available to them to develop ecotourism attractions without necessarily depending on the government. The success of ecotourism in Mesomagor is mainly contingent on the community’s initiative and commitment, strong leadership of the bamboo orchestra and collaboration with the park officials. The Mesomagor experience provides some lessons that can be applied in the other case study communities, given the availability of untapped attractions as pointed out by the THLDDA official (see Box 5.2).

Considering the communities’ different experiences with ecotourism, the next section presents how the case study communities relate to the park officials.

7.8 Ecotourism implementation: Relationship between park officials and the case study communities

As reported in Section 7.4, the GHCT and the GWD are the agencies charged with the responsibility of managing ecotourism in the KCA, and are locally referred to as park officials. Interview results indicate that park officials are perceived by the local communities as government employees who manage ecotourism in the KCA, and enforce management rules for the Conservation Area. These officials are indigenes of the local communities, and city dwellers living locally, although some of them commute from the city (Cape Coast) to the KCA. Considering that the local community’s attitude towards ecotourism in the KCA is reflected in their relationship with the park officials, community interviewees were asked to describe these relationships. This section analyses responses.

Based on community interviews, the type of relationship between park officials and case study communities has been categorised into three: positive relationship, where communities freely interact and discuss development and management issues with park officials; neutral relationship, where there is no relationship between communities and park officials and both operate as independent entities; and negative relationship, where communities are opposed to the activities of park officials.
Relationships differed in the four case study communities. In the Abrafo community, most interviewees (8 out of 10) indicated a neutral relationship with park officials with two emphasising a positive relationship. An interviewee from Abrafo explained that:

... Kakum is Kakum and Abrafo is Abrafo, I don’t think we have anything in common when it comes to the way we live ... they are interested in making money from the park and we are also interesting in making money from our farm work ... Abrafo 10, April 2012.

This quote suggests there is no mutual relationship between Abrafo residents and park officials, despite the community serving as the major entry point to the KCA. From the interview data, it appears that the neutral relationship is due to limited community experience with the canopy walkway, in terms of job opportunities. The two residents who indicated positive relations were noted to be employees of KCA ecotourism (e.g., tour guides). One of them said:

... We are lucky to have such a resource here, at least it provides job for some of us ... Abrafo 2, April 2012.

In Mesomagor, the majority of interviewees (8 out of 10) indicated a positive relationship. Although the community appears to have no connection to the canopy walkway (see Section 7.6), residents maintained that it is through the activities of the park officials that tourists are attracted to the community, which has consequently supported the activities of their traditional bamboo orchestra. One of the interviewee noted that:

... The park officials have really supported us ... Those who visit the tree platform also visit our cultural group ... Sometimes they give us information prior to the arrival of the tourists, and this makes us prepare very well for them [tourists] ... Mesomagor 6, June 2012.

However, two Mesomagor residents were strongly against the activities of the park officials, as they attributed the regular farm raiding by wildlife from the KCA to the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA (see Section 6.2.1).

In the Adadientem community, most interviewees (9 out of 10) were unhappy with the activities of the park officials, and indicated a negative relationship. Discussions with the residents revealed that the community’s resentment is due to the illegal logging activities which have been occurring in the KCA, and in which they believe some of the park officials are involved. However, one resident
thought there is a neutral relationship between the community and the park officials. One Adadientem interviewee commented that:

... Some of the activities of the park officials are very bad, they connive with illegal operators to fell the trees in the park, but if they catch us in the park then they take us to court ... Adadientem 1, July 2012.

The community residents believe that park officials are engaging in corrupt activities to gain personal benefit from the resources in the KCA, while local people are locked out. They believe the remote location of Adadientem, compared to the major ecotourism centres (e.g., Abrafo), has facilitated the corrupt activities of the park officials, since it is difficult to track these illegal activities. This perception was widely expressed in the Adadientem community, because the residents consider illegal logging to be widespread in the KCA.

Further clarification from the GWD official during the confirmatory research phase reveals that illegal logging practices have been occurring, and efforts have been made to track down the perpetrators. The GWD official maintained that no park official has been involved in illegal logging:

... Some group of individuals have been doing this [illegal logging] in the name of GWD. Some of the community members think that we are responsible for the illegal logging ... We’ve made efforts to put our personnel at vantage points in the KCA to monitor and track any illegal activity in the KCA. We’ve also continued to educate community members through their leaders about our role and their role as well in managing the KCA ... GWD, Feb 2014.

Unlike the situation in the Adadientem community, there is a neutral relationship between the Nuamakrom residents and the park officials. Community interviews reveal Nuamakrom residents are more interested in their agricultural activities than ecotourism in the KCA, emphasising the community’s lack of connection to ecotourism in the KCA. However they strongly support protection of the KCA, because they believe it induces rainfall for their agricultural activities. An interviewee from Nuamakrom commented that:

... This community doesn’t interact with the park officials. They don’t come here so we don’t even know them ... but we don’t have any problem with them managing the park ... Nuamakrom 5, May 2012.
Analysis of the household surveys confirms that about 90 percent of respondents from the case study communities have developed either negative or neutral relationships with the park officials (see Figure 7.6).
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**Figure 7.6  Relationship between Case Study Communities and Park Officials**

Source: Based on Field Survey, April-July 2012.

This situation is more pronounced in Adadientem and Nuamakrom, where community interview results show that there are no community ecotourism activities, and the residents have no experience with ecotourism. As illustrated in Figure 7.6, there is little positive relationship between case study communities and park officials, except in the Mesomagor community where 74 percent of respondents indicated a positive relationship. This could be due to the community’s strong connection to the ecotourism experience, particularly the traditional bamboo orchestra, which seems to have fostered a positive relationship between the Mesomagor community and park officials. It could also be linked to park officials’ active commitment to directing tourists to the tree platform, and thus towards the bamboo orchestra experience. As a result, while the Mesomagor community sees park officials engaging with its attempts to develop a tourism product, the other communities do not see such support.
7.9 Ecotourism implementation in the local community: Applying the ecotourism evaluation framework

As discussed in previous sections, ecotourism in the KCA region has a problematic management framework, employs a limited number of local residents, and has generated different experiences in the case study communities. Ross and Wall (1999b) assert that successful implementation of ecotourism requires building harmonious and synergistic relationships between biological diversity and local communities, tourism and local communities, and tourism and biological diversity, as well as understanding the role of management.

This section thus evaluates the status of ecotourism in the case study communities, and examines the relationships between the three links using the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (see Section 3.8.1). Figure 7.7 presents how the Framework has been used in this research.
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Figure 7.7 How the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework has been applied in this Research

Source: Adapted from Ross and Wall (1999a, 1999b).

In Figure 7.7, these symbols → and ——→ indicating evidence of strong and weak relationship respectively have been used to explain management’s relationship with the three links (tourism, local communities and
biological diversity). For example, the relationship between management and biological diversity is described using this symbol \( \rightarrow \) when there is evidence of either monitoring/research programmes or enforcement of restrictions, but this symbol \( \rightarrow \) is used when both monitoring/research programmes and enforcement of restrictions are occurring.

These symbols \( \rightarrow \) and \( \leftrightarrow \) are used to describe the relationships between the three links. For instance, the relationship between local communities and tourism is described as ‘evidence of one way relationship’ using this symbol \( \rightarrow \) when there is evidence of either inter-cultural appreciation or socio-economic benefits occurring, while this symbol \( \leftrightarrow \) indicating ‘evidence of a strong two way relationship’ is used when both inter-cultural appreciation and socio-economic benefits are occurring.

### 7.9.1 Relationship between Local Communities and Biological Diversity

As illustrated in Figure 7.8, there appear to be positive relationships between all four case study communities and the KCA, although the relationship is ‘one way’ in terms of environmental advocacy. In relation to integrated resource use, there is no relationship, because interview findings reveal that local communities are banned from all forms of resource use in the KCA (see Section 6.2.1). However, community interviews suggest the ‘communities’ social responsibility agreement’ has contributed to strong community support for environmental conservation (see Section 6.2.1).

The majority of residents in the four case study communities identified the protection of watersheds of rivers, and the perception of the KCA inducing rainfall for agricultural activities as reasons underlying their commitment towards the conservation of the KCA (see Section 6.2.1). Interviews with agencies confirmed the communities’ support:

... Following the engagement of the communities around the KCA prior to its gazettal and the regular environmental education campaigns we undertake, the communities have demonstrated positive attitudes towards the conservation of the KCA, such as positive relationships with our staff, very low dependence on the resources in the KCA ... GWD, April 2012.

This quote suggests that the positive relationships between park officials and local communities, and low dependence on resources in the KCA are regarded by the
agencies (e.g., GWD) as evidence demonstrating local support for the conservation of the KCA. However, as discussed in Section 7.8, residents in the Adadientem community have developed negative relationships with the park officials, because of their perception of the park officials’ involvement in illegal logging. As a consequence, Figure 7.8 shows that residents of Adadientem believe there is a weak relationship between park officials and the KCA, in terms of enforcement of restrictions.
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**Figure 7.8  Status of Ecotourism Development in the Case Study Communities**

The Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework suggests that a symbiotic relationship between local communities and protected areas results when local people enjoy sustainable resource use, and act as stewards of protected areas (see Section 3.8.1). Interview results show there is no form of resource extraction from the KCA by the local community, although the resources are used for ecotourism purposes by the government. Thus, Figure 7.8 shows a one way relationship associated with advocacy, not a symbiotic relationship, as there is no benefit to the local community from resource use.
7.9.2 Relationship between Local Communities and Tourism

As Ross and Wall (1999b) claim, successful ecotourism ventures create a platform for the local communities to enjoy both direct and indirect economic benefits from ecotourism, while the experience of tourists is enhanced through intercultural interactions. In the case study communities, interview findings show that only Abrafo and Mesomagor are engaged in ecotourism activities (see Section 5.7.4.2). The lack of engagement in ecotourism activities by Adadientem and Nuamakrom residents is due to their relative remoteness from the major tourist entry points, and the concentration of ecotourism activities in the southern part of the KCA. As a result, there seems to be no relationship between ecotourism and the Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities (see Figure 7.8).

There is a strong two-way relationship between ecotourism and the Mesomagor community, while there is evidence of one-way relationship in Abrafo (see Figure 7.8). As discussed in Section 7.7.2, ecotourism has delivered socio-economic benefits to the Mesomagor community, while the community residents have developed their culture into an ecotourism attraction, providing tourists with cultural experiences. In Abrafo, community interviews revealed that ecotourism has delivered socio-economic benefits to some residents, but the community does not provide any cultural experience to tourists.

Moreover, Figure 7.8 shows there is evidence of a weak relationship between park officials and ecotourism activities located in Abrafo and Mesomagor, while there is no relationship between park officials and ecotourism in Adadientem and Nuamakrom, in terms of managing tourism impact. As discussed in Section 6.2.2, local residents in the case study communities expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of efforts to control the frequent farm raids which, they believe, are a result of ecotourism. The community perception that ecotourism contributes to farm raids, coupled with the lack of ecotourism benefits in some of the case study communities (e.g., Adadientem), has the potential to undermine the local communities’ support for ecotourism and even conservation (Lindberg & Enriquez, 1994). Lack of involvement of case study communities in KCA ecotourism management (see Section 7.5) has the potential to hinder positive links between local communities and ecotourism, given that local communities’ involvement in and sense of ownership over planning and development of
ecotourism are key to ensuring its successful operation, and to environmental conservation (see Brandon, 1993).

It would appear from the interviews that there are paradoxical relationships between local communities and ecotourism. On the one hand, there seem to be positive relationships and experiences between the Abrafo and Mesomagor communities and ecotourism, as ecotourism provides these communities with the opportunities to interact and share their culture with tourists, while they receive some socio-economic benefits. On the other hand, there appear to be negative relationships between Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities and ecotourism, as these communities do not receive any benefit from ecotourism. Thus, the positive synergistic relationship between local communities and ecotourism in the case study communities appears weak.

7.9.3 Relationship between Biological Diversity and Tourism

Interview findings demonstrate harmonious and symbiotic relationships between ecotourism and the KCA in all case study communities (see Figure 7.8), including those without ecotourism attractions. The findings show that the symbiotic relationship is influenced by the common perception among the residents that ecotourism is the cause of the gazettal of the KCA (see Section 6.2.1). Discussions with residents reveal that the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA has generated revenue for its conservation and resulted in improved management (see Section 7.7), and has further attracted international financial and technical support for ecotourism and environmental conservation research (see Section 5.7).

However, the interview findings indicate that the lack of ecotourism policy for developing and managing ecotourism activities in the KCA region and Ghana in general (see Section 7.2) is a major challenge to ecotourism implementation. According to community residents, there is a lack of commitment to development and management of ecotourism in the case study communities (see Section 5.7.4.3), as all ecotourism decisions in the KCA are made and implemented by park officials. This supports Bediako’s (2000) observation that ecotourism activities in Ghana are given a low priority in the national development framework, especially by the GWD (see Section 5.6). Although there is evidence of a positive relationship between the KCA and ecotourism, the park officials
should work to improve the relationship between conservation of the KCA and ecotourism in the local communities.

In summary, the relationships between the three key links of ecotourism implementation – tourism, local communities and biological diversity – are not symbiotic in the case study communities. The above discussions suggest there are limited benefits from ecotourism in the case study communities, particularly in Adadientem and Nuamakrom. In addition, interview results show that ecotourism development in the KCA is occurring without adequate consideration for the local communities, especially those in the northern part of the KCA, despite the general commitment of the communities towards the protection of the KCA.

As illustrated in Figure 7.8, Mesomagor appears to be more successful in ecotourism implementation than the other communities. This is because there is evidence of a strong two way relationship between ecotourism and the community, and ecotourism and the KCA, as well as evidence of one way relationship between the community and the KCA. On the other hand, ecotourism implementation in Adadientem seems to be the most ineffective, as there is no relationship between the community and ecotourism, while park officials’ relationship with the KCA is weak.

Ross and Wall’s (1999a) framework has proved useful in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of ecotourism implementation in the case study communities. For example, it is evident from Figure 7.8 that across the case study communities, areas requiring immediate attention, in terms of ecotourism implementation, are the interactions between ecotourism and local communities regarding socio-economic benefits and inter-cultural appreciation, as well as park officials’ connection with ecotourism in terms of tourism impact management and maintenance and provision of services.

**Summary of ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA**

The interview findings show that the KCA has a poor ecotourism management framework, which has been criticised by both the community and some agency interviewees for a number of reasons, of which a primary concern is the exclusion of the local communities. Additionally, the implementation of ecotourism that excludes local involvement has made some agency interviewees conclude that the
KCA is a revenue generation project for the government, not a resource for local development.

Interview results show that the conditions for working in the KCA and community level ecotourism activities are a minimum of basic school certificate and willingness of individuals respectively. Moreover, there appear to be no social, economic or political discrimination applied to those involved in ecotourism activities in and around the KCA.

Interviews indicated that all four case study communities have limited connection to the canopy walkway facility, as only few Abrafo residents are employed in the facility and engaged with tourists who visit the facility. However, community interviews showed that Abrafo has limited experience with community ecotourism resources compared to Mesomagor, where there seem to be strong community support and commitment, as well as strong collaboration with the park officials, in delivering these ecotourism products.

Across the four case study communities, Mesomagor appears to be more successful in terms of ecotourism implementation, while Adadientem and Nuamakrom have not developed any ecotourism attractions (see Figure 7.12).

7.10 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented the findings for answering Research Question Two. The results presented in this chapter were gathered from semi-structured interviews, follow-up in-depth interviews, secondary data analysis, household survey and direct observation. Data from these sources have proved useful in understanding ecotourism policy, development, and implementation in the KCA.

First, the chapter revealed that there are no ecotourism policies and plans in Ghana. It highlighted the major tourism policies, their focus and challenges, as well as their ecotourism and poverty reduction objectives. Second, there is limited institutional understanding of the concept of ecotourism, which is linked to the lack of ecotourism policy in Ghana by the agency representatives.

Third, the chapter analysed the management framework for implementing ecotourism in the KCA. Fourth, the chapter examined the conditions and characteristics of those involved in ecotourism in the KCA and the case study
communities. The findings have shown that the condition for involving people in ecotourism in the KCA is a minimum of a basic school education, while community ecotourism requires individual willingness. However, interview data suggest there is no discrimination when involving people in ecotourism activities.

Fifth, the chapter identified different ecotourism experiences across the four case study communities, with Mesomagor having a very strong connection to ecotourism, possibly because of strong community support and less reliance on the government. Interviewees from Abrafo seemed to have some expectation that the government would provide ecotourism opportunities for them. Interview findings have shown that communities such as Adadientem and Nuamakrom have no connection to ecotourism, due to lack of community ecotourism attractions.

The sixth issue relates to the type of relationship (positive, neutral or negative) between local communities and park officials. Interview results have revealed that Mesomagor residents have a positive relationship with park officials compared to the three other case study communities, possibly due to the community’s involvement in the management of the tree platform and the traditional bamboo orchestra. In addition, the application of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework to assess the status of ecotourism across the four case study communities reveals that Mesomagor is more successful in implementing ecotourism compared to the other three communities.

The findings in this chapter have provided an understanding and a framework for assessing the outcomes of ecotourism on the livelihoods of the communities around the KCA. The next chapter presents findings to answer Research Question Three.
Chapter Eight
The outcomes of ecotourism on poverty reduction in the case study communities

8.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses Research Question Three: ‘What are the outcomes of ecotourism activities in and around the KCA on poverty reduction in the case study communities?’ Data sources used to answer this research question were semi-structured interviews with selected agencies, in-depth follow-up interviews and surveys with household respondents, direct observation, as well as secondary data analysis. Based on interview data and household survey results, this chapter is divided into two broad sections: (1) dynamics of ecotourism outcomes in the local community; and (2) ecotourism’s impact on poverty reduction.

The objective of the first section is to understand the dynamics of ecotourism outcomes in the case study communities by examining community perspectives of the positive and negative outcomes of ecotourism as well as the distribution and management of these outcomes from an agency perspective. The second section looks at ecotourism’s contribution to poverty reduction in the case study communities, using the MDGs as the framework.

8.2 Dynamics of ecotourism outcomes in the case study communities

This section focuses mainly on community interviewees’ perspectives of the positive and negative outcomes of ecotourism, as well as agency perspectives of the management of these outcomes. Community interviewees were asked to identify and explain the effects of ecotourism on their communities. As presented in Table 8.1, the effects of ecotourism in the local community go beyond environmental conservation to encompass socio-economic and cultural benefits and challenges.

Although ecotourism has been operating in the KCA since 1995, community interviews suggest that local residents believe that not all their expectations have been met (see Table 8.1). Sections 8.3 and 8.4 present findings on the positive and negative outcomes of ecotourism.
Table 8.1  Actual and Expected, Direct and Indirect Outcomes of Ecotourism in the Case Study Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study communities</th>
<th>Type of outcome</th>
<th>Positive outcomes</th>
<th>Negative outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Abrafo                 | Direct          | 1. Job Opportunities:  
- Bee keeping; 
- Craft village; 
- Tour guides in the KCA  
2. Development of tourists accommodation (e.g., hotels)  
3. Benefits from ecotourism revenue (entry fee)  
1. Jobs in the KCA as tour guides and security personnel | 1. Lack of involvement in the KCA ecotourism management  
2. Lack of KCA ecotourism revenue benefits.  
2. Conflicts over ownership of land between traditional leaders | 1. Loss of jobs:  
- No hunting;  
2. Loss of access to resources:  
- No non-timber forest products [NTFPs] (e.g., snails raffia palm, plant/herbal medicine)  
3. Other:  
- Farm raid by wildlife | 1. Loss of jobs:  
- No hunting;  
2. Loss of access to resources:  
- No NTFPs;  
3. Other:  
- Farm raid by wildlife |
|                        | Indirect        | 1. Social Service/Infrastructure:  
- ICT centre;  
- Market;  
- Road;  
- Library;  
- Electricity;  
- Health facility  
2. Other  
- Scholarship programme  
- Training of farmers  
- Supply of teaching and learning materials  
- Environmental conservation | 1. Loss of jobs:  
- No hunting;  
2. Loss of access to resources:  
- No non-timber forest products [NTFPs] (e.g., snails raffia palm, plant/herbal medicine)  
3. Other:  
- Farm raid by wildlife | 1. Loss of jobs:  
- No hunting;  
2. Loss of access to resources:  
- No NTFPs;  
3. Other:  
- Farm raid by wildlife |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study communities</th>
<th>Type of outcome</th>
<th>Positive outcomes</th>
<th>Negative outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1. Social Service Provision: - Construction of a school building 2. Other: - Global recognition of the community; - Scholarship programme - Environmental conservation</td>
<td>1. Loss of jobs: - No hunting; - No logging 2. Loss of access to resources: - No NTFPs; 3. Other: - Farm raid by wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study communities</td>
<td>Type of outcome</td>
<td>Positive outcomes</td>
<td>Negative outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Environmental conservation:</td>
<td>1. Lack of involvement in the KCA ecotourism management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Protecting watersheds for rivers</td>
<td>2. Lack of KCA ecotourism revenue benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inducing rainfall for agriculture</td>
<td>3. Fear of demonstration effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Environmental conservation:</td>
<td>1. Farm raid by wildlife from the KCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Protection of rivers watersheds</td>
<td>2. Loss of access to resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inducing rainfall for agriculture</td>
<td>4. Conflicts between traditional leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Community Interviews - Field Survey, April- July 2012.
8.3 Positive outcomes of ecotourism in the case study communities

Community interviews show that the form and nature of the positive ecotourism outcomes vary from one case study community to another. To illustrate this, one Abrafo interviewee commented that:

... It will be wrong for anybody in this community to say that we’ve not benefitted from the park and the tourists who come here ... although it may not be money [direct benefit] but almost every community around the park has benefited in one way or the other... Abrafo 8, April 2012.

These differences are examined based on the situation in each community.

8.3.1 Positive Outcomes of Ecotourism in the Abrafo Community

According to the Abrafo residents, ecotourism benefits include job opportunities, social service and infrastructure provision, and scholarship and training programmes (see Table 8.1). One Abrafo resident summarised the benefits of ecotourism in the following statement:

... This community has benefited from employment opportunities like working in the park as a tour guide ... Also, we’ve some people who work at the craft village and the bee keeping centre ... The whole community has also benefited from the construction of an ICT centre by the GHCT ... Abrafo 4, April 2012.

Benefits have been categorised as direct or indirect outcomes based on the Abrafo interviews. Regarding direct outcomes, Abrafo residents identified job openings as the major benefits, with most interviewees (9 out of 10) widely discussing it. They indicated that the canopy walkway has provided jobs for about 20 local people. Two residents who are ecotourism workers in the KCA explained this direct benefit in relation to their personal experiences:

... Taking care of my family was a big challenge for me until I was employed as a tour guide in the park about 4 years ago ... Now, all my three children are in school and I can provide my family needs too ... Abrafo 2, April 2012.

... I have been with the GHCT for 8 years now as one of their security personnel. I get a good pay [salary], and some of the tourists also give you money if you are kind to them. Because of this work, I have been able to build my own house ... Abrafo 7, April 2012.

Other job opportunities, from community ecotourism activities, mentioned by Abrafo residents, include the employment of about 25 local people in the craft
village and about 5 local people in the bee keeping centre. They explained that a number of local people depend on these ecotourism activities as their primary source of livelihood. One worker of the craft village commented that:

... I have worked here as an artisan for close to 7 years now ... I used to be a hunter and a farmer before we were told not to go into the park again ... I received some training in basket weaving and its now my main job although I also farm ... Abrafo 9, April 2012.

Discussions with Abrafo residents reveal a number of indirect ecotourism benefits, primary among them the provision of social services and infrastructure. They mentioned a group of student tourists from Miami University (USA) who have been supporting the community with development projects (e.g., market, library). The activities of this group are hailed by residents as contributing to poverty reduction in the community. One interviewee explained further:

... There was no market, lorry station, library, electricity and health facility here in this community, but now we have them as result of ecotourism ... There is this group of students from Miami University in the USA who visited us about 5 years ago (2006)... They have been supporting us every year. The bus stop, the library, market and even the play field were constructed with their support ... Abrafo 1, April 2012.

Other indirect benefits of ecotourism mentioned relate to the training programmes on management practices organised by the bee keeping centre for farmers and extension officers, scholarship programmes for children in the local school, and supply of teaching and learning materials to the local school. Some residents explained that the Abrafo community’s strategic location maximised ecotourism benefits:

... I work with the GHCT and I know that the location of Abrafo at the entrance of the park has resulted in it receiving special attention from the GHCT and other organisations to help avoid possible conflict between the community and the tourists ... For instance, the GHCT provided us with an ICT centre and about 150 farmers and agricultural extension officers from Abrafo and its surrounding communities have also been trained in farm management practices as part of the activities of the bee keeping centre ... Abrafo 7, April 2012.

... They [the student tourists from Miami University] teach in our school when they visit, they supply the school with some teaching and learning materials. They have a scholarship and excursion packages for students especially those in Junior High Schools ... The GHCT from time to time supply the school with teaching materials too ... Abrafo 2, April 2012.
Although the expectations of most Abrafo residents, particularly infrastructure provision and jobs, have been met (see Table 8.1), interview data reveal that they are unhappy with the lack of ecotourism revenue benefit from the KCA, and the lack of a post office and police station in the community. They believe the location of Abrafo as the major entry point to the KCA should influence the government and park officials to provide the community with the necessary facilities. One interviewee said:

... it’s been over 15 years since tourists started coming here, and we still don’t have a police station, post office ... the park officials should support us to get these facilities because we are aware they make a lot of money from tourist visitation ... Abrafo 10, April 2012.

In summary, ecotourism benefits mentioned by Abrafo interviewees include job opportunities, and the provision of social services and infrastructure facilities, as well as scholarship and farm management training programmes. The interview findings show that a total of about 50 local people are believed to be directly engaged in ecotourism activities, while the entire community have benefited from the establishment of a library, ICT centre and lorry station, as well as scholarship programmes, which are indirectly linked to ecotourism. Although most of the community’s expectations regarding ecotourism have been met, some residents expected park officials to provide the community with additional social facilities.

It would appear from analysis of the Abrafo interviews that the residents only serve as recipients of ecotourism benefits because of the community’s location as the major entry to the KCA. The interviews suggest they lack the confidence to initiate and engage in ecotourism without either government support or being employed by private investors. As a consequence, Abrafo residents have a weak connection to ecotourism (see Section 7.7.3), despite these positive outcomes. A modest commitment on the part of Abrafo residents to engage more in ecotourism, without necessarily depending on the government, thus has the potential to deliver more ecotourism benefits, while establishing strong community connection to the ecotourism experience.

8.3.2 Positive Outcomes of Ecotourism in the Mesomagor Community

Direct ecotourism benefits mentioned by Mesomagor residents include job opportunities, empowerment of vulnerable groups (e.g., women) and cultural preservation. Indirect benefits include social services provision, scholarship
programmes and community pride resulting from global recognition of local ecotourism. All Mesomagor interviewees mentioned that the traditional bamboo orchestra has provided jobs for about 25 young men and women in the community. The leader of the traditional bamboo orchestra explained that:

... Although the main objective of this group is to protect and market our culture and traditions to people in Ghana and Abroad, it has also provided jobs for those involved. Currently we have 25 people from this village who are working for this group ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

Mesomagor residents indicated that about 4 local people have also been trained by the GWD in tour guiding and interpretation. These people act as local tour guides, who accompany park officials and tourists to the tree platform (see Box 5.1). One resident explained how the training of local tour guides has contributed to effective management of the bamboo orchestra:

... We’ve about 4 local guides here who have been trained in tour guiding and interpretation. Because of that they interact very well with the tourists and the park officials ... The training has helped us as a community to be able to receive and make tourists welcome ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

Interviews with the local community also identified the empowerment of women as a benefit resulting from ecotourism development. Mesomagor interviewees, mainly women (4 out of 10), explained that because of tourist visitation to the tree platform and to their community to see the bamboo orchestra, some local women have been trained as cooks, and now provide local food for tourists. Some expressed the view that the orchestra not only provides income to households, but has also contributed to women’s involvement in community level decision making, and that together, these contribute to a low incidence of gender discrimination, enhanced respect and improved well-being for women in the community. One woman who is part of the group that cooks for tourists said that:

... We have a women’s group here which provide local food for the tourists. I’m part of the group and we cook indigenous foods such as plantain, yam, fufu and sometimes rice ... We are five women and we feel happy doing that because it is refreshing cooking for a whiteman ... it’s not because we get money from that to support our families but the community leaders also involve us in taking decisions about the community’s development ... Mesomagor 1, June 2012

Preservation of community culture appears to be another benefit of ecotourism in Mesomagor. In the memory of Mesomagor residents, the introduction of the tree platform resulted in the revival of their traditional bamboo orchestra after it
collapsed following the gazettal of the KCA. The orchestra is now regarded by the community and park officials as one of the key ecotourism attractions at the eastern entry to the KCA (see Section 5.7.4.2). The leader commented that:

... I don’t think we would have had this group [bamboo orchestra] here had it not been ecotourism. The tree platform has been a key to the success of our group ... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

In relation to indirect ecotourism benefits, Mesomagor residents mentioned the construction of a school building and a sponsorship programme provided by the World Vision. They linked the construction of a new classroom block, and sponsorship support offered by the World Vision for the assistance of high achieving children in the community, to ecotourism, and described it as a source of relief for poor families. One resident explained the situation:

... Because tourists come here to see the tree platform and our bamboo orchestra, the World Vision is constructing our school block for us. Some children from this community have also been given scholarship by World Vision which has reduced the burden on their families ... Mesomagor 1, June 2012.

In contrast, the World Vision official explained that the construction of schools and scholarship programmes in the communities around the KCA are not linked to ecotourism. Rather, the objective of the NGO has been to lessen the poverty burden of the communities, particularly in the areas of health, education, water and sanitation. Nevertheless, Mesomagor residents attributed the World Vision’s interventions to ecotourism, maintaining that it is ecotourism that has attracted development projects into the community.

Additionally, the people of Mesomagor believe the recognition of their community at the global level is a result of ecotourism. The residents are proud of the international recognition of Mesomagor, and boast that although the community is small in terms of population and development, it has a website, and has become known to both domestic and international tourists because of ecotourism (see Section 6.2.1.3). They indicated that this makes the community happy in delivering ecotourism services to tourists.

However, interviews with the local community show that most of the residents’ expectations from ecotourism have not been met, especially those relating to infrastructure development such as health facilities and improved road conditions.
(see Table 8.1). Nonetheless, discussions with the residents show that they are still confident that continual improvement and management of their traditional bamboo orchestra will attract more tourists to the community, which will further compel the government to provide them with the needed infrastructure. One interviewee explained that:

...We didn’t have much expectations when we were told that the park is going to be used for tourism activities because our community has only about 500 people... But when the tree platform was established close to this community, we have been able to develop our bamboo orchestra which has attracted World Vision’s attention to construct our classroom block for us... We are hopeful that as more people become aware of our cultural group and start visiting this community, the government and the park officials will help us get electricity and good roads... Mesomagor 2, June 2012.

In summary, interviews with Mesomagor residents identified ecotourism benefits to include job opportunities, as a total of about 34 local people are employed in ecotourism-related activities, including the bamboo orchestra, local tour guiding, and as cooks. In addition, the residents believe ecotourism has contributed to empowerment of women. Indirect benefits include the construction of a school building, scholarships for high achieving children and community pride derived from global recognition of the community as a result of ecotourism.

Unlike Abrafo, the Mesomagor residents introduced the traditional bamboo orchestra without government support, following the establishment of the tree platform in the KCA. Residents appear to be happy delivering these ecotourism products, although their expectations from ecotourism with regard to infrastructure provision have not been met.

8.3.3 Positive Outcomes of Ecotourism in Adadientem and Nuamakrom Communities

As discussed in Section 7.9, the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework revealed that there is no symbiotic relationship between ecotourism and the Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities, due to a lack of community ecotourism attractions, and lack of involvement in the management of ecotourism in the KCA. However, interviews with local residents identified some indirect benefits of ecotourism. The residents of these communities strongly believe that ecotourism is the cause of effective management of the KCA, which has resulted
in regular and increased rainfall for their agricultural activities. Appiah-Opoku (2011) asserts that past management of the KCA was poor, due to a lack of enforcement of management rules, which resulted in illegal logging activities and hunting in the KCA. As discussed in Section 6.2.1.1, this situation improved after the KCA was gazetted in the early 1990s, and ecotourism introduced in the mid 1990s. In the memory of the residents, ecotourism is the cause of the effective management of the KCA. Some community interviewees explained:

... At first [before the introduction of ecotourism], the park was not properly managed at all ... people were hunting and logging in it. But all these bad practices stopped when tourists started visiting the park ... Now, nobody is allowed to go in there again ... You know this is a farming community and there is no irrigation facility here, but the park provides rain for us ... Adadientem 10, July 2012.

... We believe that it is because of the tourists who visit the park that’s why the park has received government attention ... For us in this community, it gives us rainfall for our farm work ... Nuamakrom 1, May 2012.

The Adadientem and Nuamakrom residents further attributed the protection of watersheds of rivers in the KCA (which serve as sources of water for some people in these communities) to ecotourism. One Nuamakrom resident commented that:

... It was only after the government decided to use the park for tourism activities that logging and hunting that occurred in the park ceased ... The major stream that a lot of people in this community use flows from the park. And because it [stream] is important to us, we don’t go the park to fell trees that will cause the stream to dry up ... Nuamakrom 3, May 2012.

Moreover, ecotourism was indirectly linked to the construction of a new health facility in Nuamakrom. The residents believe that the government constructed the health facility in recognition of the community’s support of conservation and ecotourism in the KCA. One Nuamakrom resident noted that:

... It’s been over 10 years since tourists started visiting the park, we now have a new health centre here. It means the government has recognised our support for the protection of the park ... Nuamakrom 5, May 2012.

As presented in Table 8.1, Adadientem and Nuamakrom residents did not expect any benefits from ecotourism. Making reference to their geographical locations in relation to the canopy walkway and the tree platform in the KCA, as well as the poor road conditions, the residents of these communities were aware that it would be difficult to engage with tourists. Some interviewees said that:
When we were told by the park officials that the canopy walkway was to be located in the southern part of the park, we didn’t expect to engage with tourists or receive any benefits from the tourists who visit the facility because moving from the park to this community will take you almost a whole day due to poor road network ... 

Adadientem 9, July 2012.

The canopy walkway was to be located in the southern part of the park. Because of that we didn’t have any plans to meet with tourists ... we couldn’t have had expectations for a facility which is located far from us ... 

Nuamakrom 10, May 2012.

In summary, community interviews show that there has not been any direct benefit of ecotourism in Adadientem and Nuamakrom. Major indirect benefits identified by the residents include the influence of ecotourism on the protection and management of the KCA, with benefits involving protection of watersheds and increased rainfall. Despite the benefits of ecotourism in the local communities, interview results show that ecotourism also has negative outcomes, as presented in the next section.

8.4 Negative outcomes of ecotourism in the case study communities

Unlike the positive outcomes of ecotourism, community interviews show a commonality in both the direct and indirect negative ecotourism outcomes across the four case study communities. As such, discussions are based on the identified direct themes: lack of involvement in KCA ecotourism management, lack of KCA ecotourism revenue benefits, conflicts between traditional leaders over ownership of land, and demonstration effect. The indirect themes include loss of jobs, loss of access to resources, farm raid by wildlife, and lack of compensation (see Table 8.1), and are discussed in the following sections.

8.4.1 Lack of Community Involvement in KCA Ecotourism Management

Across the four case study communities, the majority of interviewees (38 out of 40) consistently expressed their dissatisfaction with their exclusion from KCA ecotourism management. Community interviews show that some local people in Abrafo are employed in KCA ecotourism, but only as tour guides and cleaners. Local residents argue that the KCA ecotourism management framework (see Section 7.5) does not allow local people to be employed in supervisory and management positions, despite interview results showing that the local people do not have the necessary employable skills (see Section 6.2.1.2).
8.4.2  Lack of KCA Ecotourism Revenue Benefit

Another negative view of ecotourism strongly expressed by local residents is the lack of community benefit from canopy walkway revenue. While seeing increasing numbers of tourists visit the canopy walkway, residents of communities around the KCA assert that they are excluded from the benefits of increasing revenues, as these are shared between the government and the GHCT (see Section 5.7.7.2). They believe that they should receive a share of ecotourism revenue, but a number of factors are limiting this. For example, there is no existing policy for ecotourism development and management in the KCA, and Ghana in general (see Section 7.2), while there is a responsibility vacuum in ecotourism management, and exclusion of local communities from KCA ecotourism administration (see Section 7.5).

8.4.3  Conflict over Ownership of Land between Traditional Leaders

As presented in Table 8.1, conflict between traditional leaders over the ownership of land was identified by the community residents as another negative outcome of ecotourism. Since the gazettal of the KCA, there have been mounting tensions between traditional leaders in the surrounding communities over the acquisition of land to make up for the land excised into the KCA (see Section 6.2.3.2). Although Table 8.1 suggests that all four case study communities expected the conflict over ownership of land to occur, community residents explained that the situation has been more severe than first thought, given that these communities previously had access to resources in the KCA. In the minds of local residents, ecotourism was introduced around the same time that the KCA was gazetted, and they attributed the cause of conflict between the traditional leaders to the introduction of ecotourism, rather than the gazettal of the KCA (see Section 6.2).

8.4.4  Fear of Demonstration Effect

Although community interview data identified similar negative ecotourism outcomes in the four case study communities, fear of and concerns regarding the possibility of demonstration effect was more deeply felt and expressed by residents in the Mesomagor and Nuamakrom communities. Mesomagor people strongly expressed their dissatisfaction with the indecent dressing of some tourists who visit the community. Although the findings from the Mesomagor community meeting showed that the local people are happy to receive tourists, they were
particularly unhappy with the manner in which some tourists dressed, describing it as indecent and culturally immoral:

... Sometimes you see the whole community going to shake hands to welcome the tourists. It really shows that we want them [tourists] to be here at all times. But we are very worried about the way some of them dressed especially those from other countries [international tourists]... They expose some parts of their body which should be covered, and you know this is not accepted in our community. It sometimes makes us feel that the young ones in the community will learn from them, and we’re very concerned about that ... Mesomagor community meeting, Feb 2014.

While the Mesomagor community is faced with a cultural conflict, and expressed fear about the possibility of demonstration effect resulting from tourist visitation and behaviour, Nuamakrom residents also expressed concerns about the likelihood of young people in the community emulating the lifestyle of the tourists. Although the Nuamakrom community has not been receiving and engaging with tourists because of its remote location from the major entry points to the KCA, poor road network, and the lack of community ecotourism activities, findings from the Nuamakrom community meeting show that there are concerns among the community residents, especially the elders, that the local culture could be adulterated with the increasing arrival of tourists to the KCA:

... For us in this community, we don’t interact with the tourists, but we are only concerned with the manner in which some of them dress. We just hope and pray that our young people don’t copy from them ... Nuamakrom community meeting, Feb 2014.

8.4.5 Loss of Jobs and Access to Forest Resources

Negative views of ecotourism were also expressed in terms of loss of jobs, and loss of access to basic forest based resources. As discussed in Section 6.2.1.1, community residents explained that loss of jobs and access to non-timber forest products such as building materials and plant/herbal medicine occurred when the KCA was gazetted. They explained the gazettal of the KCA has removed the opportunity for income generation, their supply of forest goods to supplement food supplies as well as other needs such as medicines and construction materials (see Section 6.2.1.1). However given that there is no distinction between ecotourism and conservation in the communities, residents believe that the introduction of ecotourism is the cause of loss of jobs and access to resources.
8.4.6 Farm Raids by Wildlife from the KCA

Another negative outcome of ecotourism reported by community interviewees is frequent farm raids by wildlife. As discussed in Section 6.2.2, the case study communities, especially Abrafo and Mesomagor, believe that the ban on hunting in the KCA has not only removed an important supplementary food source and source of income, but has resulted in an increase in the wildlife population and an increased occurrence of farm raids in the surrounding communities, resulting in loss of crops (see Section 6.2.2.1). They expressed the view that ecotourism and conservation have compounded the poverty situation of households in communities surrounding the KCA. Interviews also indicated there have been no compensation payments made to local farmers experiencing such losses.

Given that ecotourism has both positive and negative outcomes, it is important to ascertain how these outcomes are distributed and managed in the case study communities. This is presented in the next section.

8.5 Distribution and management of ecotourism outcomes: Available mechanisms

In this section, agency perspectives on how ecotourism outcomes, both positive and negative, are distributed and managed in the communities around the KCA are presented. Agency interview results suggest there are no existing strategies or programmes for distributing and managing ecotourism outcomes in the case study communities. According to the DHTM official, this results from the lack of a national ecotourism policy framework:

... There is no single concerted approach available to ensure that the positive and negative effects of ecotourism are well managed ... The park officials can’t tell me that constructing an ICT centre or supplying teaching materials are enough to ensure that the outcomes of ecotourism are well distributed, No... the whole ecotourism sector of the tourism industry doesn’t have any policy or plan, so how do you expect the park officials to have an impact distribution plan? DHTM, June 2012.

However, some individual agencies (e.g., GHCT, CEDECOM) have developed strategies to manage the outcomes of ecotourism in the communities around the KCA, including the support of community ecotourism attractions in Abrafo and Mesomagor, and the provision of social services as discussed in Sections 8.3.1 and 8.3.2. The GHCT official said that:
... Over the past years, we’ve tried to support groups like the orchestra with tourists arrival dates and other relevant information that help the community prepare for tourists and also help tourists to enjoy their stay in Mesomagor. We know it’s not enough but the most important thing is that the community people appreciate our small efforts ... GHCT, May 2012.

Other strategies used by the agencies (e.g., GWD, CI) are environmental educational campaigns and provision of livelihood support services (e.g., craft village). The GWD official explained further:

... Because of the international status that Kakum has assumed, we don’t want to do anything that will soil its image. To ensure positive relationship with the local communities, we from time to time educate them about the importance of the KCA and the benefits the country [Ghana] derives from ecotourism ... GWD, April 2012.

However, it appears from the above discussions that the agencies strategies are not directed towards equitable distribution. This is because those strategies are only a ‘medium’ to advance the agencies’ activities, by establishing positive relations with the local communities, rather than ensuring equity in ecotourism outcomes. The World Vision official expressed his disappointment about the situation, and maintained that the strategies advance the agenda of park officials:

... All the campaigns that the park officials have done were about why the communities shouldn’t go into the park or kill the animals; they’ve never discussed how they’re going to compensate the communities for the regular farm destruction by wildlife... They are only interested in protecting the park and making money from it ... WV, June 2012.

In addition, the benefits of ecotourism are concentrated in some communities while the negative outcomes are experienced across all the case study communities (see Sections 8.3 & 8.4).

8.6 Ecotourism’s contribution to poverty reduction in the local community: Applying the MDGs’ framework

Ecotourism literature suggests that ecotourism has the potential to deliver poverty reduction benefits by generating economic benefits, conserving the environment and empowering the local community (see Section 3.6). However, this understanding is not accurately reflected in the agencies’ interpretation of ecotourism in the KCA (see Section 7.3). The above discussions (see sections 8.3 & 8.4) have revealed that ecotourism’s contribution in the case study communities has been a paradox. On the one hand, ecotourism has contributed to a limited
extent to employment creation and income generation, women’s empowerment, and environmental conservation; yet, it has also compounded poverty in the case study communities through limited sharing of ecotourism revenue, increased occurrence of farm raids, and loss of access to NTFPs.

Using the MDGs and Ecotourism Framework (see Figure 3.6), household respondents were asked to indicate the strength of the impacts of ecotourism on: employment and income generation, quality of education, women’s empowerment and participation, improved health and environmental conservation, while the agency officials explained ecotourism’s contribution to promoting international partnerships. Based on household survey results, Figure 8.1 shows local people’s perceptions of the strength of the impacts of ecotourism on each MDG, across the four case study communities. The household survey has been used as representative of the population in the case study communities, which has enabled statistical analysis and interpretation across the four case study communities.

**Figure 8.1 Household and Agency Respondents’ Perceptions of Ecotourism’s Contribution to the MDGs in the Case Study Communities**

Source: Based on Field Survey, April-July 2012.
8.6.1 MDG 1- Ecotourism’s Contribution to Employment and Income Generation: Household Respondents’ Perceptions

Household survey results show that 38 percent of respondents across the case study communities believe that ecotourism has contributed to employment and household income by generating direct and indirect opportunities, such as jobs and sales of farm produce. As presented in Table 8.2, more than 60 percent of household respondents in both Mesomagor and Abrafo reported that ecotourism has not only enabled some households to earn an income, but has also served as primary and secondary sources of livelihoods for some residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Very Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Neutral Impact (%)</th>
<th>Negative Impact (%)</th>
<th>Very Negative Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

However, more than 60 percent of respondents across all the case study communities indicated ecotourism has had a neutral or negative impact on employment and income generation. The ban on hunting and logging, and loss of access to resources in the KCA, leading to loss of jobs and income were mentioned by all household respondents from Adadientem and Nuamakrom, and some households in Abrafo (39%) and Mesomagor (31%). They perceive these losses as a result of ecotourism. These respondents argued that ecotourism had not been beneficial in terms of generating employment and income opportunities, especially for those who lost their livelihood and customary user rights following the gazettal of the KCA.

Observed neutral and negative responses cannot be attributed simply to the loss of jobs and income as a result of the gazettal of the KCA. As discussed in Section 7.8, this may have also been a result of the lack of confidence of communities (e.g., Adadientem) to initiate and develop local attractions, and the over-reliance of some communities, such as Abrafo, on the government to provide tourism-related employment opportunities.
8.6.2 MDG 2 – Ecotourism’s Contribution to Improved Education: Household Respondents’ Perceptions

As discussed in Section 6.3.1.1, community interviews show that the case study communities are characterised by poor quality education. This is because of inadequate supplies of teaching and learning materials, and increasing child labour. However, household respondents (56%) believe that the quality of education has been enhanced through ecotourism activities (see Table 8.3).

Table 8.3 Ecotourism’s Contribution to Education by Household Respondents (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Very Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative Impact (%)</th>
<th>Very Negative Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

More respondents from Mesomagor (75%) and Abrafo (74%) expressed positive views on the impact of ecotourism on the quality of education. They argued that the local schools in these communities have benefited from ecotourism in the form of construction of classroom blocks, supply of teaching and learning materials and scholarship programmes (see Sections 8.3.1 & 8.3.2). They further indicated that ecotourism has provided a platform for local residents to be trained in environmental interpretation and general hospitality, especially in Mesomagor.

The remaining 44 percent of respondents held neutral and negative views, particularly in Adadientem and Nuamakrom. Respondents in Adadientem (44%) and Nuamakrom (30%) believe the remoteness of their communities from the major ecotourism activities has denied them the opportunity to engage with tourists. They further argued that no revenue generated from tourist visitation to the canopy walkway has been invested in education in their communities.

Those who held neutral views (Adadientem 21% and Nuamakrom 48%) explained that the lack of ecotourism attractions in their communities (see Section 5.7.4.2) makes it difficult for them to identify any relationship between ecotourism and education. However, those who held positive views in Adadientem (35%) and
Nuamakrom (22%) are hopeful that given the support Abrafo and Mesomagor communities receive from tourists, their communities may experience similar benefits in the future should they engage in ecotourism.

Although the majority of household respondents in Abrafo and Mesomagor expressed positive views, others held negative and neutral opinions (see Table 8.3). In Abrafo, respondents mentioned lack of government commitment to use canopy walkway revenue to construct a senior high school facility in the community, arguing that their community is the entry point to the KCA and the most populated community in the vicinity of the KCA. Those in Mesomagor believe that trained teachers do not stay in their community because of the poor road conditions, which they attribute to lack of revenue from the canopy walkway.

8.6.3 MDG 3 - Ecotourism’s Contribution to Women’s Participation and Empowerment: Household Respondents’ Perceptions

As presented in Table 8.4, less than 50 percent of household respondents across the four communities claimed that ecotourism has contributed to women’s empowerment. However, the majority of household respondents in Mesomagor (73%) and Abrafo (60%) explained that ecotourism activities had provided opportunities for some women to engage with tourists, and generate income to support their households. Examples given were the women’s group in Mesomagor which cooks for tourists, the sale of farm produce to tourists by women in Abrafo and Mesomagor, and women’s involvement at both household and community level decision making (see Section 8.3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Very Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative Impact (%)</th>
<th>Very Negative Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

In addition, the respondents in Adadientem (23%) and Nuamakrom (7%) who held positive views explained that, although their communities do not interact
with tourists, some of their young women have expressed interest in working in ecotourism in the future when it is introduced in their communities, or may even travel to Abrafo should ecotourism activities in the KCA expand. Being aware of women’s involvement in ecotourism in Abrafo and Mesomagor, these respondents believe ecotourism presents an opportunity to empower women, who they indicated form the majority of the population of their communities.

About 39 percent of all respondents reported that ecotourism had a neutral impact on women’s empowerment, while 16 percent expressed negative views. The majority of respondents in Adadientem (61%) and Nuamakrom (68%) who held neutral views questioned how an activity located far from them could have an impact on their women. Those who expressed negative views in Adadientem (16%) and Nuamakrom (25%) admitted their communities do not engage in ecotourism, but strongly felt the lack of community involvement in KCA ecotourism management was a factor contributing to the lack of women’s involvement.

The major concerns expressed by respondents who expressed negative and neutral views in Abrafo (40%) and Mesomagor (26%) relate to the intermittent tourist visitation and poor marketing of community ecotourism attractions, and the limited employment opportunities in KCA ecotourism. The respondents believe that a limited number of women are involved in community ecotourism because of uncertainty due to low visitation. Also, Abrafo respondents were concerned with the limited number of local people employed in the KCA (see Section 8.3.1), and asserted that this situation does not encourage women’s involvement in ecotourism.

8.6.4 MDGs 4, 5 and 6 – Ecotourism’s Contribution to Improved Health: Household Respondents’ Perceptions

Household survey results revealed that all respondents in Adadientem and the majority of respondents in Mesomagor (96%) reported that overall, ecotourism has not contributed to improved health conditions, but rather has worsened the health situation in these communities (see Table 8.5). As discussed in Section 6.3.1.2, the Mesomagor community does not have a health facility, while the health facility in Adadientem is in a deplorable condition, resulting in a high incidence of self medication. The residents of these communities believe their
plight has been worsened with the introduction of ecotourism, as a result of restricted access to medicinal plants in the KCA, while the government has failed to use ecotourism revenue to improve their health infrastructure.

Table 8.5  Ecotourism’s Contribution to Improved Health by Household Respondents (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Very Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative Impact (%)</th>
<th>Very Negative Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, April-July 2012.

This contrasts with the situation in Abrafo and Nuamakrom communities where only 20 percent and 32 percent of respondents respectively, expressed negative views of ecotourism on the health of people. These respondents were those who depended on plant medicine. Thus, the lack of access to medicinal plants appears to be a widespread concern in the case study communities, as 36 percent of respondents expressed this view, while 43 percent reported a neutral relationship.

Although all communities around the KCA lost access to medicinal plants following the gazettal of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism, respondents in Abrafo (40%) and Nuamakrom (23%) reported that the availability of health facilities in their communities has reduced their dependence on plant medicine. While respondents in Abrafo believe ecotourism provides income for them, making the health facility in their community economically accessible, those in Nuamakrom (23%) consider the construction of their health facility as recognition by government of their support for the protection of the KCA (see Section 8.3.3).

However, only four percent of Mesomagor respondents indicated that revenue from ecotourism has made healthcare affordable. The majority of Mesomagor respondents who held negative (59%) and neutral (37%) views argued that, although ecotourism provides some local people with income, there is no health facility in the community, and residents had to travel long distances to access healthcare (see Section 6.3.1.2).
8.6.5 MDG 7 – Ecotourism’s Contribution to Environmental Conservation: Household Respondents’ Perceptions

All household respondents across the four case study communities reported that ecotourism has contributed to environmental conservation (see Table 8.6). Although the local communities have lost access to resources as a result of the gazettal of the KCA, and have accused park officials of engaging in illegal logging activities in the KCA, the respondents believe, overall, that ecotourism’s contribution to environmental conservation has been positive.

Table 8.6 Ecotourism’s Contribution to Environmental Conservation by Household Respondents (n=310)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Communities</th>
<th>Very Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Positive Impact (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Negative Impact (%)</th>
<th>Very Negative Impact (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abrafo</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesomagor</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adadientem</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuamakrom</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey April-July 2012.

Respondents explained that the introduction of ecotourism has contributed to the effective management of the KCA, which they believe protects the headwaters of major rivers/streams used as water sources in their communities. Other reasons accounting for the high positive responses include the common perception among the residents that the KCA induces rainfall (see Section 8.3.3).

8.6.6 MDG 8 – Ecotourism’s Contribution to International Partnerships: Agency Officials’ Perspective

Ecotourism’s contribution to international partnerships was discussed with the agency interviewees. Although some local communities responded positively to the MDG 8, in terms of the global recognition or reputation of their community, the agencies’ perspectives were sought on this MDG, because they are responsible for policy, planning, and management of both ecotourism and the KCA. They were asked to explain how the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA has attracted international support and fostered international cooperation.

Agency interviewees revealed that ecotourism in the KCA has contributed to international partnerships in two ways: financial support and technical assistance.
Regarding financial support, all officials asserted that ecotourism was introduced in the KCA with financial support from CI, which was used to construct the canopy walkway. The DHTM official suggested that, following the establishment of the walkway, international institutions such as USAID have provided financial assistance for the management of the KCA. In addition, NGOs have been involved in ecotourism-related activities.

Agency officials expressed positive views on the technical assistance received, in the form of continual international research in the KCA, following the introduction of ecotourism. Making reference to the bee keeping centre in Abrafo, which was introduced for international research purposes (see Section 5.7.4.2), the GHCT official explained that both national and international institutions (e.g., Danish International Development Agency) have been undertaking research in the KCA since the 1990s to support ecotourism and conservation:

... We believe that the studies being undertaking in Kakum is a result of its international recognition because of ecotourism. Over the past years, international institutions like CI, USAID... have conducted research in Kakum and continue to provide us with technical assistance on the management of the KCA ... GHCT, May 2012.

According to agency interviewees, the technical and financial support the KCA receives is due to its international recognition as a result of ecotourism. They believe the continuous support received from international institutions demonstrates ecotourism’s contribution to international partnerships in the KCA.

8.7 Chapter summary

This chapter has presented the findings to answer Research Question Three. The interviews reveal several positive direct and indirect outcomes of ecotourism, which are concentrated in the southern part of the KCA. Major ecotourism benefits identified include employment opportunities, social services and infrastructure provision. On the other hand, negative outcomes were experienced across all the communities around the KCA, and included lack of community involvement in revenue management and farm raids by wildlife. However, there are no strategies or programmes for distributing and managing ecotourism outcomes. As a result, some agencies have provided social services, and embarked on environmental education campaigns as strategies to manage the outcomes.
However, these mechanisms only focus on the needs of KCA ecotourism, while local goals are ignored.

Using the MDGs and Ecotourism Framework the household survey and agency interview findings reveal that across the case study communities, ecotourism has contributed to environmental conservation and international partnerships. Yet, ecotourism’s contribution to health, employment and income generation, and the empowerment of women remains limited (see Figure 8.1).

The final chapter discusses the three results chapters within the framework of the key findings from the literature review. The chapter presents recommendations and conclusions of the research, and identifies avenues for future research.
Chapter Nine
Discussion and conclusion

9.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the major themes arising from this research in the context of the literature, and provides recommendations. The research findings contribute both theoretically and practically to understanding the role of ecotourism in addressing poverty at the host community level in developing countries. This chapter discusses the following three major themes as they relate to the research questions, in the context of the literature:

- Theme One: Poverty in developing countries is multidimensional, and its dynamics are complex in rural Ghana;
- Theme Two: Ecotourism is a sustainable development concept, but implementation remains a challenge in developing countries; and
- Theme Three: Ecotourism does not always deliver poverty reduction outcomes.

On the basis of the key themes, the chapter presents recommendations for the improvement and implementation of ecotourism as a poverty reduction strategy in developing countries.

9.2 Theme One: Poverty in developing countries is multidimensional, and its dynamics are complex in rural Ghana

The first theme arising from this research relates to a local understanding of the complexity and multidimensional nature of poverty in ecotourism destinations. This finding indicates that the establishment of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism and issues of power and powerlessness appear to have compounded poverty in the communities around the KCA. Interviews with the local community appear to suggest that the establishment of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism, coupled with the abuse of power by traditional leaders and politicians underlie the increasing farm raids by wildlife, illiteracy, unemployment, and lack of access to resources in the KCA. This finding confirms a growing consensus in the literature regarding the global recognition of the multidimensionality of
poverty (e.g., Noble et al., 2004; Nyasula, 2010; Pillari & Newsome, 1998; Sen, 2000; Townsend, 1979; UN, 1995). This is also an important finding given that the meaning of poverty has been characterised by inconsistencies across different regions of the world, despite the adoption of universal poverty reduction approaches or programmes such as the MDGs. The following sections discuss how the aforementioned factors have defined and compounded poverty in the communities around the KCA.

9.2.1 Ecotourism in Protected Areas can Impoverish Local Communities

Despite global commitment and recognition of environmental conservation as a key poverty reduction intervention strategy, especially in developing countries (see Chapter 2), both environmental conservation and poverty reduction remain the most persistent global challenges (Redford et al., 2013). The literature has revealed that ecotourism has the potential to connect environmental conservation and poverty reduction, through improved livelihoods (Kiss, 2004; Spenceley & Snyman, 2012). Today, ecotourism is globally recognised as a strategy for environmental conservation and promoting development in poor countries, as well as for enhancing ecological and cultural sensitivity (Baral, 2013; Honey, 2008; Stone & Wall, 2004).

However, other researchers have argued that attempts to conserve the environment through interventions like ecotourism can either contribute to poverty reduction (Leisher et al., 2010) or exacerbate poverty conditions (McShane, 2003). Ecotourism in many developing countries occurs in protected areas (Charnley, 2005; Gurung & Seeland, 2009; Ross & Wall, 1999b), as in this research. This research shows that attempts to conserve the natural environment by the Ghanaian government, through the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, have generated both positive and negative outcomes for poverty reduction in the communities around the KCA. While the positive outcomes of ecotourism seem to have contributed to poverty reduction (see Chapter 8), the negative outcomes appear to have compounded poverty in some of the local communities. This section focuses on, and discusses how the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA has impoverished the local people, and influenced the multidimensionality of poverty in the local community.
As discussed in Chapter 6, the findings indicate that prior to the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, communities in the vicinity of the reserve engaged in off-farm seasonal activities such as hunting and gathering of snails, mushrooms, raffia palm for roofing, and plant medicine. These forest-based activities not only supported the communities’ subsistence needs, but also provided some income outside their small scale farming. With the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA following the reserve’s gazettal in the 1990s, these forest-based activities ceased, removing opportunities for seasonal income generation, and supply of forest goods to supplement food supplies as well as other needs such as medicines and construction materials (see Chapter 6).

Given that ecotourism was introduced around the same time the KCA was gazetted (see Chapter 5), residents in the local community attribute the ban on hunting wildlife in the forest to the introduction of ecotourism, rather than to the establishment of the Conservation Area. They consider that the ban has not only removed an important supplementary food source and source of income, but has resulted in an increase in the wildlife population, with an increased occurrence of farm raids by wildlife in the surrounding communities (see Chapter 6). Community residents expressed the view that the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA had resulted in an increased occurrence of farm raids and compounded the poverty situation in the communities. This finding supports Barnes et al. (2003), who claim that about 300 households living around the KCA lose 60 percent of their crops annually to farm raids by wildlife. This finding is also consistent with those of other scholars and international organisations (Redford et al., 2013; UNDP & UNEP, 2009), namely that poor communities depend on the natural environment, and any attempts to deny them access to natural resources without the provision of appropriate alternatives, will lead to increased poverty.

Despite the damaging impact of farm raids, the findings indicate there have been no compensation payments made to local farmers experiencing such losses. Thus, these communities are bearing the cost of ecotourism in the KCA. With the constant threat from wildlife, the loss of crops and the loss of access to forest products, some local people expressed an antagonistic attitude towards ecotourism in the KCA. This is consistent with the findings of other researchers (Hernandez et al., 2005; Kent, 2003), who argue that ecotourism can generate local level
conflicts, as benefits such as income, and costs such as lack of access to resources, are often inequitably distributed (UNWTO, 2002).

Therefore, in the absence of clear development programmes from government, it appears ecotourism has not delivered widespread benefits in relation to poverty reduction. Although ecotourism has provided some positive outcomes in the local community (see Chapter 8), which supports the theory that ecotourism can contribute to poverty reduction, it has also compounded poverty in the host communities. Hence, one of the contributions of this research is that: ecotourism theory does not necessarily lead to poverty reduction, without appropriate planning and implementation with the goal of poverty reduction.

9.2.2 The Influence of Power and Powerlessness on Poverty in the Local Community

Previous research describing poverty in developing countries has emphasised the importance and influence of ‘power’ and ‘powerlessness’ as a cause and manifestation of poverty (Haughton & Khandker, 2009; Turner & Lehning, 2006; UN, 1995). These studies show that issues of power and powerlessness manifest in diverse ways, including lack of participation in decision making and resource distribution, and economic deprivation. Consistent with those studies, this research shows that powerlessness among local residents, and the abuse of power by traditional leaders and government officials, are perceived to have contributed to poverty in the case study communities (see Chapter 6). The following sections discuss these issues further.

9.2.2.1 The contribution of ‘power-struggle’ to poverty in the case study communities

As discussed in Chapter 6, the ‘power-struggle’ in local level governance has contributed to poverty in the communities around the KCA. In principle, traditional leaders in Ghana should demonstrate commitment to good local governance and local level development, and act as channels for government’s development interventions at the local level (see Chapter 5). Studies have emphasised the indispensability of traditional leaders in the development process in Ghana, especially in rural communities (Arthur, 2007; Ayee, 2003; Donkoh, 2005). Given the political neutrality of traditional leaders in Ghana, they exercise a great deal of power and control over the collection, refinement, codification and
unification of customary laws, and the adjudication of disputes (see Chapter 5). However, the findings show that, besides mobilising local people for development projects and settling disputes, some traditional leaders in the communities around the KCA are also engaged in a ‘power-struggle battle’, which appears to have contributed to poverty.

This research shows that, although there is a general lack of Ghanaian government commitment to improving living conditions in these communities, following unmet political promises, the actions and inactions of some traditional leaders (especially following the gazettal of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism) have generated both positive and negative experiences in relation to poverty reduction (see Chapter 6). As Donkoh (2005) asserts, traditional leaders are expected to act as mediums between local communities and development partners including government. In the context of the case study communities, interview results show that some traditional leaders have used their ‘powers’ to spearhead development in their communities. For example, the traditional leader in Mesomagor has worked cooperatively with the World Vision to construct a primary school facility, while the leader in Nuamakrom has supported government officials in the provision of a new health facility.

However, the findings have revealed that this is not always the case, as some government development projects have been terminated by traditional leaders, owing to the lack of communication between them and government officials. For example, residents of Adadientem community believe that the action taken by their traditional leader to halt provision of potable water by the government has compelled them to use natural but non-potable water sources for drinking (see Chapter 6). Verhagen et al. (2004) assert that access to available potable water sources improves household wellbeing and health, thus the anti-development stance taken by some of the traditional leaders appears to have denied local residents access these benefits.

Although residents of the local community were unhappy with the actions of their traditional leaders, they could not express their disappointment because of the reverence they hold for their leaders (see Chapter 6). This is consistent with the findings of other researchers in Ghana (Arthur, 2007; Ayee, 2003; Donkoh, 2005), who argue that traditional leaders are revered and held in awe because the local
community believes they are an embodiment of the spirit of the ancestors, and influential agents of social cohesion and harmony. With their powerful influence on local development, the findings show that important development decisions are principally taken by the traditional leaders, on behalf of their communities, without necessarily consulting the local residents. This relates to Lott (2002) and Turner and Lehning’s (2006) findings on classism as both a cause and effect of poverty, especially in developing countries. Turner and Lehning (2006) argue that the upper class purposely subdue the lower class in order to maintain power, and prevent the involvement of the lower class in development opportunities and resources distribution (see Chapter 2).

The inability of local residents to influence their development also supports Haughton and Khandker’s (2009) explanation of poverty as powerlessness, where the poor lack power to influence decisions affecting their development. Adejumobi (2006) associates powerlessness with poor governance, arguing that bad governance aggravates poverty conditions in local communities, because issues relating to the voice of the poor in decision making are often neglected, despite remaining central to the fight against poverty, particularly in developing countries.

As discussed in Chapter 6, disputes between traditional leaders, following the gazetted of the KCA and introduction of ecotourism have also compounded poverty conditions, as they scramble for land to make up for land excised into the KCA. This research shows that disputes between the leaders have not only served as a barrier to development interventions by ecotourism and poverty reduction-related agencies (e.g., World Vision, CEDECOM), but have also prevented locally driven concerted efforts to facilitate the development of the communities around the KCA. Consistent with CIKOD’s (2010) analysis of the influence of traditional leaders in local development in Ghana, this research has found that fear of conflicting power relations, and mistrust between traditional leaders and government officials have limited poverty reduction efforts in communities around the KCA.

This research supports the theory that the use of ‘power’ can either compound poverty or contribute to poverty reduction. For example, the inability of local people to influence development decisions has deprived them of access to potable
water, while the use of power by traditional leaders has both halted and attracted some development projects to the local community. Therefore, addressing issues of power remains central to ensuring effective local level governance. Another contribution from this research is that: in the absence of effective local governance which centres on the use of power, poverty reduction programmes including ecotourism may not deliver widespread benefits in relation to improving the living conditions of the local people. While effective local governance may be interpreted differently in different parts of Ghana and other developing countries, for the local people in the communities around the KCA, effective traditional governance means there is community involvement in decision making on local development, including ecotourism activities. Also, the local people consider collaboration between traditional leaders, in relation to pursuing integrated local development and establishing healthy relationships with the government to help improve their living conditions, as important aspects of effective traditional governance.

9.2.2.2 Influence of local culture and illiteracy on poverty in the communities around the KCA

Another finding which relates to power and powerlessness is the influence of local culture and illiteracy on poverty conditions in the local community. As discussed in Chapter 6, the local culture and illiteracy in the communities in the vicinity of the Conservation Area have compounded the poverty situation, and limited interventions to reduce poverty. The findings indicate that residents in the communities believe poverty is entrenched in their families and communities, and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to reduce it (see Chapter 6). Although this cultural attitude can be partly attributed to the persistent poverty conditions in these communities, the general perception that poverty is an entrenched phenomenon, coupled with a lack of will-power and self-confidence to reduce it, has made residents come to accept poverty as the norm.

This finding is supported by international organisations (UNDP, 2005; UNESCO, 2005) and other scholars (Ali et al., 2002; Bradshaw, 2006; Lehning, 2006), who claim that poverty has cultural connections. These researchers and international organisations have identified some factors that cause and compound poverty in developing countries, principal among them being negative cultural practices (see Chapter 2). In explaining the culture of poverty, Bradshaw (2006) indicates that
poverty is caused and perpetuated by the transmission of a set of beliefs and values from one generation to another, and that individuals are not to blame, because they are victims of a destructive culture. According to Lehning (2006), the culture of poverty kills the self-confidence and limits the ability of individuals to engage in political and economic enterprises that promote economic development. Moreover, previous studies on poverty (Ali et al., 2002; UNDP, 2005; UNESCO, 2005) have revealed that the acceptance of inexcusable cultural practices that disempower people and prevent local development, remains a major cause of poverty in developing countries.

Another factor contributing to powerlessness in the local community is illiteracy (see Chapter 6). The poor quality of education, and associated poor academic performance of students, has resulted in increased child labour, school dropout and early marriage for female children. Although local residents provided reasons for these factors, including lack of trained teachers and learning materials, this research shows there are other reasons (see Chapter 6). For example, some households in the communities deliberately prevent their children from going to school, with the belief that the children will be more productive on the farm, while others betroth their female children at an early age to reduce the burden of providing for them. These actions by some households do not only increase the incidence of illiteracy, but also render the youth powerless in terms of understanding and influencing development decisions, and further compound poverty.

This research finding supports those of other scholars (Ali et al., 2002; Haughton & Khandker, 2009; Sumner, 2007), who argue that many regions of the world are trapped in perpetual poverty due to deprivations such as lack of education and high illiteracy. These scholars assert that the prevailing high illiteracy rates in developing countries result in people lacking key capabilities (e.g., ability to influence decisions) to develop and reduce poverty. An analysis by the UN in 2000, of the influence of illiteracy on poverty, identified illiteracy and lack of education as important poverty reduction challenges, and further emphasised them in the MDGs. According to the UN (2000), the ability to address illiteracy is imperative for effective poverty reduction in developing countries.
This research supports the theory that illiteracy and harmful cultural practices can be causes of powerlessness, which is a characteristic of poverty, especially in the rural areas of developing countries. Therefore, one contribution from this research is that: without a clear commitment by both the government to develop programmes to improve the quality of education in rural areas, and the local residents to reform harmful existing cultural attitudes and educate their children, harmful cultural practices and illiteracy may continue to render local communities powerless, and hence perpetuate poverty in the communities around the KCA.

9.2.2.3 Unemployment: A cause of powerlessness in the local community

The research findings indicate that unemployment remains a major driver of poverty in the communities (see Chapter 6). Unemployment has been widely reported in the literature as a major indicator of poverty and development (Cobbinah et al., 2011, 2013; Harris, 2000; Herath, 2009; Seers, 1969; World Bank, 2000). This research shows that the unemployment situation in the local community is complex. With over 90 percent of the community members in the study area engaged in agriculture (see Chapter 5), the findings show that unattractive agriculture activity and the loss of jobs following the gazettal of the KCA have influenced the unemployment situation in these communities.

As discussed in Chapter 6, some households still lack the self-confidence to engage in other economic activities, as they continue to recover from losing their jobs following the gazettal of the KCA and the introduction of ecotourism. Moreover, the perception of agriculture as an unattractive livelihood activity has contributed to unemployment among younger people. The young people believe there is little future in agriculture, since it provides little opportunity to raise livelihoods above subsistence, or to earn enough income for education and improvement in living conditions. Interview results show that some young people wish to be farmers, but have decided they need to engage in other economic activities if they are to raise their standard of living (see Chapter 6). Therefore, it appears that the young people feel ‘trapped’ by this cycle of deprivation and subsistence agriculture. Although ecotourism and poverty reduction agencies operating in the KCA region are aware of, and concerned about the unemployment situation, this research indicates that efforts mainly focus on sponsorship programmes for high achieving children and provision of micro-
credit facilities. These types of strategies are not necessarily building the capacity of the local people in ecotourism and non-forest based activities, nor addressing the widespread unemployment challenges (see Chapter 6).

Hills and Stewart (2005) have found that creating and sustaining employment opportunities for the poor is important in reducing poverty and empowering the poor. In addition, Cobbinah et al. (2013a) argue that poverty will remain persistent in developing countries unless the governments are committed to providing employment and other social opportunities for their people. According to Cobbinah et al. (2013a), empowerment of people through education, employment and health will provide an avenue for sustainable income generation to meet their basic needs such as food, and to ensure they have the power to influence their development. However, the research findings indicate that the lack of a regulatory framework for managing the activities of the middlemen, coupled with the small scale farming activities, has rendered the farmers powerless to determine the prices of their farm produce, and contributed to the unattractive nature of agriculture activity in the communities (see Chapter 6).

Employment is a basic need and a necessity for achieving a basic standard of living (Seers, 1969), and this research shows that the prevailing unemployment situation in the communities has encouraged rural-urban migration. Interview results indicate that local residents, especially the youth, are travelling to the cities in search of a better life. According to the local people, it is easier and better to secure jobs in the cities than engaging in unattractive agricultural activities. This finding is consistent with those of Bradshaw (2006), who asserts that geographical disparities influence the dynamics and causes of poverty. Bradshaw (2006) believes that rural poverty, and other forms of spatial characterisations of poverty, occurs when local people lack the necessary resources to generate wellbeing and income, as well as the power to claim (re) distribution of resources. These factors compound poverty in developing countries, especially in rural communities, creating a geographical disparity between urban and rural areas, and further encouraging rural-urban migration (Bradshaw, 2006).

However, as discussed in Chapter 6, the majority of the local people in the communities around the KCA are illiterate and without employable skills. As a consequence, they lack the necessary skills which may make them employable in
the cities. The same factors have limited the number of local people who can be employed in ecotourism-related jobs in the KCA. As Blank (2003) claims, one of the fundamental causes of poverty, in both developed and developing countries, is the absence of skilled labour. Blank (2003) argues that lack of skills resulting from lack of opportunities and preparedness of individuals to engage in the workforce, is driving poverty, particularly in developing countries.

Thus, this research not only contributes to the theory of unemployment as a cause of poverty, but also to the role of powerlessness in the poverty discourse. The findings indicate that powerlessness underlies unemployment, and includes absence of jobs, lack of skills and the lack of a regulatory framework to ensure that the prevailing working environment is favourable. The absence or inadequacy of the abovementioned factors renders local people powerless in terms of influencing development decisions, providing basic needs for their households, and enjoying a decent standard of living. Thus, it seems that efforts to address unemployment should be holistic, and include issues of illiteracy, rural-urban migration and a regulatory framework to improve farming activities in the local community, in order to ensure that poverty reduction efforts empower the local people and deliver positive outcomes.

**Summary of theme one**

The above discussion has highlighted the complex and multidimensional nature of poverty in rural ecotourism destinations. Although the creation of the KCA has compounded poverty in the form of unemployment, lack of income, and lack of access to NTFPs, medicinal plants, and building materials, the local people have confused the creation of the protected area with the establishment of ecotourism, and have attributed poverty conditions to ecotourism. Despite this misunderstanding, it appears no efforts have been made over the years by park officials to educate the local community on the differences between ecotourism and protected areas. Thus, there is no distinction in the minds of the local people between protected areas and ecotourism. With the majority of ecotourism activities occurring in protected areas globally, it is imperative for local communities and ecotourism and protected area agencies to understand the purpose of protected areas, and why ecotourism is introduced in such areas. This approach may help reform local understanding of the purpose of ecotourism, and
encourage support for ecotourism so that it is able to deliver poverty reduction outcomes.

In addition, issues of powerlessness in the local community greatly influence local poverty conditions. The abuse of power by traditional and political leaders, which is partly related to the establishment of the KCA and the introduction of ecotourism, has rendered the local residents voiceless in development decision making. The issue of powerlessness in ecotourism destinations around the KCA has negatively impacted on the subsistence livelihood of the local people. As discussed above, the local people do not have a voice to influence development projects, prices of their agricultural produce, or decisions on the management of ecotourism in the KCA. However, considering that the livelihood of rural dwellers in developing countries revolves around natural resources and small scale agriculture, empowering local communities through capacity building in ecotourism and non-forest based activities, and involvement in development decision making, can help reduce poverty in these rural communities.

9.3 Theme Two: Ecotourism can be a sustainable development tool but implementation remains a challenge in developing countries

Previous research has recognised ecotourism as a sustainable development strategy, particularly for conserving the environment and stimulating development in the host communities (Blamey, 2001; Drumm & Moore, 2002; Fennell, 2003, Honey, 1999, 2008; Lash, 2003; Ross & Wall, 1999b). However, there is little evidence to suggest that sustainable implementation of ecotourism is occurring in host communities and countries (Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Ross & Wall, 1999b). Ross and Wall (1999a) assert that recognition of the gap between the theory and practice of ecotourism is important in understanding the ideals of ecotourism prescriptions and ground level application. Therefore, this research used the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (Ross & Wall, 1999a) to: 1) assess the implementation of ecotourism; and, 2) compare the effectiveness of ecotourism implementation across the case study communities.

This research found that the theory and application of ecotourism in the KCA has been characterised by a great deal of confusion among park officials and agencies concerned with ecotourism in the park (see Chapter 7). This is reflected in an
inadequate theoretical understanding of the concept, and the planning, implementation and management of ecotourism. The conceptual basis of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of ecotourism as a concept, from the perspective of local understanding, planning and implementation, as well as the outcomes on poverty reduction. The following sections discuss how ecotourism planning and implementation engages with the political process of delivering sustainable development outcomes.

9.3.1 Understanding Ecotourism Implementation as a Political Process of Negotiation

The findings indicate that ecotourism implementation requires negotiations between different stakeholders with different agendas. However, there is lack of recognition of the importance of this political process of stakeholder negotiation in the implementation of ecotourism, among the agencies operating in the region of the KCA (see Chapter 7). Although nearly three decades have passed since the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, and its promulgation at the local and international levels, there is no clear understanding of the meaning of ecotourism amongst agencies involved in ecotourism (see Chapter 7). This finding reflects those of other researchers (Courvisanos & Jain, 2006; Wall, 1996; Weaver, 2001), who have argued that the concept of ecotourism lacks a universal understanding. Those researchers believe that the mushrooming of definitions of ecotourism, since its popularity in the 1980s, is due to a lack of clarity on the meaning of ecotourism, and the ever broadening dimensions of the concept.

However, despite this lack of clarity, there is a broad set of ecotourism principles that are clear and widely promoted, including environmental conservation and education, cultural preservation and experience, and economic benefits (Baral, 2013; Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Donohoe & Needham, 2006). This research shows that the lack of commitment towards understanding and implementing these widely promoted principles of ecotourism remains a fundamental gap in ecotourism implementation in and around the KCA. As discussed in Chapter 7, ecotourism implementation in the KCA is more about the belief that there are financial benefits through the adoption of the term, and the politics of use of the term, due to its nominal connection to ‘sustainability’. Interviews with park officials and the CI seem to suggest that it is easy to use the term ecotourism, but harder to implement the sustainability aspects of the concept, which requires input
from the various stakeholders, and adequate consideration for the environment, society and economic development.

This finding also indicates that park officials and NGOs operating in the region of the KCA are adopting the term ecotourism as a means to achieve their own interests, but under the banner of promoting ecotourism as a sustainable local development strategy (see Chapter 7). It would seem from the interview results that while the majority of these agencies (e.g., CI, GWD) have the agenda of conservation at heart, the government also has a revenue generation agenda. For example, CI and GWD are recognised globally and nationally respectively as conservation-driven agencies, and are therefore pursuing ecotourism because it can deliver environmental conservation benefits. As a result, they do not necessarily recognise and pursue the agenda of ecotourism as a sustainable model of economic development and poverty reduction. This finding supports Bediako’s (2000) claim that ecotourism in Ghana is accorded low priority by the GWD, possibly because ecotourism is not a primary interest of the agency.

While the foundational principles of ecotourism focus on achieving sustainable development and poverty reduction (see Chapter 3), this research shows that ecotourism principles that focus on achieving social goals in the local community are poorly implemented (see Chapter 7). The lack of understanding of ecotourism implementation as a political process of negotiating different agendas has resulted in the exclusion of some key foundational principles, such as local community involvement. For example, the communities around the KCA are the ‘owners’ of ecotourism-related problems such as farm raids, but the majority of them have no ownership of the solution, which is captured by certain interest groups (see Chapter 8). The process of negotiating agendas, strategies and outcomes to deliver multiple goals, including goals that achieve the needs of the community rather than conservation agencies and government, is lacking in ecotourism implementation in the KCA. However, to ensure that ecotourism delivers multiple goals, all stakeholders must engage in this political process of negotiation.

Previous research (Drumm & Moore, 2002; Goodwin et al., 1998; Mader, 2011; Petrovska et al., 2009; Sautter & Leisen, 1999) has emphasised the importance of stakeholder engagement in ecotourism activities. For example, Drumm and Moore (2002) argued that a key to the success of ecotourism planning and
implementation is the establishment of strong relationships amongst stakeholders, to ensure that multiple goals relating to environmental conservation and local development are met. This research shows that the politics of bringing together different bodies with varying agendas to achieve multiple goals through collaboration and coordination is imperative in implementing the foundational principles of ecotourism. However, this understanding does not appear to exist in the KCA, as community engagement and empowerment, and local culture are not recognised by the government and park officials as relevant to ecotourism implementation.

Thus, one of the key contributions of this research is that: ecotourism implementation should be regarded as a political process, which responds to the motivations and priorities of different stakeholders. Without clarity in the understanding of the ecotourism planning and implementation process, ecotourism may not deliver sustainable development outcomes. Ecotourism implementation cannot be regarded as a homogenous process but rather, as a complex political process of negotiations between different interest groups seeking to influence the outcome to achieve their agendas. Thus, implementation of ecotourism cannot be considered as an objective or altruistic enterprise.

9.3.2 The Challenge of Ecotourism Policy and Planning

Although tourism studies in Ghana date back to the 1970s, there is no specific policy for planning and managing ecotourism activities in Ghana. The findings demonstrate that ecotourism activities in the KCA and other parts of Ghana are planned and managed using broad national tourism policies. This lack of a regulatory framework does not support sustainable implementation of ecotourism. The findings support those of Charnley (2005), who argues that lack of ecotourism policy direction is preventing successful ecotourism implementation in countries in Africa, such as Tanzania. This research also shows that ecotourism objectives outlined in the national tourism plans have not been adequately implemented for a number of reasons, including limited commitment on the part of government to invest in the development of ecotourism resources. Some researchers (Asiedu, 2002; Bediako, 2000) maintain that ecotourism in Ghana has been accorded a low priority in the national development framework by the government. This research also shows that another key factor limiting the
implementation of ecotourism objectives in the national tourism plans is the central role played by international organisations (e.g., UNWTO) in the development of these plans. However, local tourism agencies, with a limited understanding of the concept of ecotourism resulting from their inadequate involvement in the plan development, are tasked with implementing these plans (see Chapter 7).

This research indicates that the lack of ecotourism policies, coupled with limited implementation of ecotourism objectives in the national tourism plans of Ghana, since the 1970s, has negatively influenced ecotourism implementation in the KCA, and Ghana as a whole. The ecotourism management framework in the KCA appears problematic, because it fails to recognise ecotourism implementation as a political process that centres on the participation of the various stakeholders. As a result, the ecotourism management framework does not recognise the importance of community engagement and participation in ecotourism. This may be due to a general perception amongst park officials, government agencies, NGOs and the local community that ecotourism in the KCA benefits the government, and also because of a lack of commitment to implementing the principles of ecotourism by park officials. However, Scheyvens (1999) notes, for ecotourism ventures to be considered successful, local communities should be involved in the planning, and also have some measure of control over the ecotourism activities. It is in recognition of the relevance of local community involvement that the UN (2003) indicated that the planning and implementation of ecotourism, and all other forms of tourism development, cannot be separated from the host communities and their cultural experiences.

The findings indicate that the lack of understanding of ecotourism implementation as a process of negotiation founded on strong administrative structures and engagement with multiple stakeholders, has led to confusion between the objective of ecotourism to deliver sustainable outcomes and the reality. Despite the practice of decentralisation, and the rapid growth of the tourism sector in Ghana (see Chapter 5), the findings indicate that there are no development programmes from, or efforts by, the government to decentralise tourism administrative structures at the district/local level, to ensure that ecotourism engages with the local community, and delivers poverty reduction outcomes. This is despite previous research (Ross & Wall, 1999a, 1999b) which suggests that
ecotourism should promote interactions between the local community, natural environment and tourists, with the aim of achieving sustainable development.

The findings indicate that the lack of ecotourism policies, coupled with poor administrative structures and lack of stakeholder engagement in the implementation and management of ecotourism in the KCA, has negatively affected the relationships between local residents and park officials. As discussed in Chapter 7, about 90 percent of residents across the case study communities have poor or negative relationships with park officials, because of their lack of involvement in KCA ecotourism management, and perceived conflict over resources in the KCA. This research supports the theory that poor implementation of ecotourism can generate negative experiences, which may discourage community participation in ecotourism, in the form of ownership and management of local resources, and further prevent local cohesion (Stronza & Gordillo, 2008). Despite community discouragement resulting from the lack of participation in ecotourism, this research indicates there has not been a proactive approach from the government to the local community, in terms of ecotourism policy formulation and implementation, supporting Charnley’s (2005) claim that lack of policy direction has negatively affected ecotourism implementation in developing countries.

9.3.3 Sustainability of Ecotourism Attractions: Local Community’s Experiences

Previous research indicates that an activity is said to be sustainable when the economic, environmental and social needs of the current generation are met, without compromising the needs of future generations (Diesendorf, 2000; Newman & Rowe, 2003; OECD, 2001; WCED, 1987). Thus, a sustainable development activity should be perpetual, with its benefits – economic, social and environmental – maintained indefinitely (Munro, 1995). The findings from this research indicate that not all the ecotourism attractions in the KCA and the case study communities can be considered sustainable. This is due to lack of community involvement in management, inadequate employment opportunities for local communities, poor condition of infrastructure, and low and intermittent tourist visitation.
As discussed in Chapter 2, sustainable development relies on local contexts, needs and priorities (UNESCO, 2005), and includes components such as opportunities for learning, cooperative small-group interaction, and creative behaviour, and an environment and lifestyle which do not promote a sense of alienation, deprivation or chronic frustration (Boyden & Dovers, 1997). Research findings show that ecotourism attractions in the KCA cannot be regarded as being sustainable, as local communities are disappointed and frustrated with their exclusion from the management of ecotourism in the KCA, and their inadequate livelihood opportunities. Using Ross and Wall’s (1999a) ‘Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework’, results show that small numbers of residents from Abrafo community are involved as tour guides, cleaners and security personnel, while the majority of communities around the KCA do not have any connection to KCA ecotourism. Moreover, this research indicates there are limited local socio-economic benefits from ecotourism in the KCA, especially in the communities north of the Conservation Area (see Chapter 8), a finding which mirrors those of other developing country based studies (e.g., Charnley, 2005; Stone & Wall, 2004). In an assessment of ecotourism as a sustainable community development tool in Ngorongoro Conservation Area in Tanzania, Charnley (2005) found that the local Maasai people are excluded from participating in the management of ecotourism, a situation which has resulted in limited economic benefits to the local community.

Despite its limited socio-economic benefits to the local community, the findings from the interviews and the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework analysis show that ecotourism in the KCA has promoted environmental conservation (see Chapters 7 & 8). This supports the ecotourism literature which indicates that environmental conservation underlies the promotion of ecotourism in developing countries, and is the fulcrum around which ecotourism activities revolve. In this regard, ecotourism may be regarded as being successful in host regions.

In relation to the community ecotourism attractions, the findings reveal that only the traditional bamboo orchestra in Mesomagor and the bee keeping centre in Abrafo are sustainable, in terms of delivering environmental, economic and social benefits to the local community. This is consistent with the findings of other researchers (Baral, 2013; Hillel, 2002), who claim that ecotourism is designed to
integrate the environmental, social and economic pillars of sustainable development, by contributing to conservation through financial and political support, and ensuring active participation from, and economic benefits to local communities and indigenous people.

The findings show that the activities of the other community ecotourism attractions, such as the Abrafo craft village and the Frami monkey sanctuary, have been characterised by a number of challenges. Whilst these attractions have supported the conservation of the KCA, community residents believe that the socio-economic outcomes of these ecotourism attractions have been unfavourable. Local residents identified key challenges to include foreign ownership, inadequate government support, limited employment opportunities, and low numbers of tourist visitation. There is therefore weak community connection to these ecotourism attractions, compared to the strong community connection to the traditional bamboo orchestra (see Chapter 7).

Assessing the sustainability of ecotourism in the case study communities using Ross and Wall’s (1999a) Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework, the findings indicate that ecotourism activity in Mesomagor could be regarded as being more sustainable – in terms of strong and positive relationships between conservation (KCA), tourism (ecotourism) and people (local community) – than the Abrafo, Adadientem and Nuamakrom communities. According to Ross and Wall (1999a), the relationships between these three links (conservation, local community and tourism) should be symbiotic, to guarantee successful ecotourism operation. These symbiotic relationships were observed to be occurring in Mesomagor, where ecotourism is community-based, and delivers benefits to the community, especially for women. The success in the Mesomagor community is driven by strong community support for the bamboo orchestra, and the tree platform in the KCA; community ownership of, and pride in delivering ecotourism products; and less dependence on the government to provide ecotourism-related opportunities.

Thus, the experience of the Mesomagor community, in relation to sustainable implementation of ecotourism focusing on the local community, could perhaps be replicated in the other communities around the KCA, given that many ecotourism attractions in the KCA region remain undeveloped.


Summary of theme two

The foundational principles of ecotourism present an opportunity to achieve sustainable development outcomes, especially in developing countries. However, the above discussion has revealed that ecotourism implementation in protected areas such as the KCA is not based on the principles that relate to achieving social goals. The lack of understanding of ecotourism implementation as a political process of stakeholder negotiation, where different bodies have competing agendas, has resulted in a strong focus on revenue generation and environmental conservation, with no consideration of social goals. As a consequence, park officials, government agencies and NGOs are supporting ecotourism as a means to advance their own agendas, rather than as a collective approach to achieving sustainable local development.

A major contribution of this research is that: recognising and understanding ecotourism implementation as a political process of negotiation, which engages with stakeholders with different interests and roles, has the potential to ensure successful ecotourism activities in protected areas in developing countries.

9.4 Theme three: Ecotourism does not always deliver poverty reduction outcomes

The conceptual basis for this research provides a framework for examining the concept of ecotourism with the ultimate objective of assessing its contribution to poverty reduction. Previous studies (Fennell, 2008; Honey, 1999; Pradhan, 2001; UNEP, 2001) have focused on the role of ecotourism in reducing poverty and facilitating local development, especially in poor regions of the world. Using the ‘MDGs and Ecotourism Framework’, the purpose of this section is to discuss the contribution of ecotourism in achieving the MDGs, and how the integration of social and cultural goals into ecotourism can contribute to widespread poverty reduction outcomes.

9.4.1 Promises and Pitfalls of Ecotourism to Achieving the MDGs in the Case Study Communities

Since the introduction of ecotourism into the KCA nearly three decades ago, it has evolved, grown and spread into the communities in the vicinity of the Conservation Area, and has become a tool for local development. Notzke (1999)
has argued that one of the potential benefits of ecotourism lies in its ability to diversify and complement both the local and national economies. This section discusses the contribution of ecotourism to achieving each of the MDGs in the case study communities.

9.4.1.1 MDG 1 – Ecotourism and employment and income generation

There is evidence from this research that ecotourism activities in the KCA and the case study communities, particularly in Abrafo and Mesomagor, have provided jobs and income to the local residents, as well as generating revenue for the Ghanaian government (see Chapter 8). This finding supports those of other researchers and international organisations (Coria & Calfucura, 2012; Fennell, 2008; Spenceley & Snyman, 2012; UNEP, 2001; Weiler & Ham, 2002), who claim that ecotourism generates economic benefits in the form of direct employment for both skilled and unskilled labour, in addition to providing income for host communities.

However, local residents in the Nuamakrom and Adadientem communities expressed disappointment with the lack of employment and income generation opportunities, which they believe has contributed to poverty, due to the poor infrastructure and lack of social services in their communities (see Chapter 6). Whilst local people living in communities away from the major tourist entries to the KCA are disappointed with the lack of ecotourism induced employment and development projects, those living at the major entry points are also unhappy with the limited role ecotourism plays in job creation and income generation (see Chapter 8). As a result, when local residents compare their previous dependence on the KCA with the economic benefits accruing from ecotourism, they find that ecotourism has not met its potential, in terms of delivering employment and generating income to the communities. Thus, economic benefits of ecotourism may not be enough to compensate for the costs of introducing ecotourism, which supports the theory that ecotourism can result in more costs than benefits if not properly planned (UNWTO, 2002).

Given that international tourists contribute over 70 percent of ecotourism revenue from the KCA region, collaboration and coordination between the local community and park officials, to develop strategies and programmes, is necessary. Providing an integrated ecotourism experience that is attractive to international
tourists, and requires them to visit ecotourism attractions in the KCA and the local community, has the potential to create more opportunities in terms of jobs and income in the local community.

9.4.1.2 MDG 2 – Ecotourism and improved local community education

There are indications from this research that ecotourism has contributed to improved local community education, through the provision of infrastructural facilities and services, especially in Abrafo (see Chapter 8). These infrastructural development facilities are regarded by the local people as facilitating local development and contributing to poverty reduction. In congruence with some authors (Barnes et al., 1999; Gurung, 1995), revenue from ecotourism activities may be used by both national and local governments to improve local livelihoods, through the provision of infrastructure and basic services such as schools, as well as to increase local confidence.

Despite the contributions of ecotourism to improved local education, the findings indicate that educational benefits and other ecotourism induced development projects are inequitably distributed across the communities surrounding the KCA. Local people, particularly those living away from the major tourist entry points, such as those in Nuamakrom and Adadientem, have experienced no benefits from ecotourism in relation to education. While being aware of increasing numbers of tourists to the KCA, residents of these two communities assert that they are excluded from ecotourism development projects. They believe that these projects, including education, should be fairly distributed amongst the communities around the KCA, rather than being concentrated in the communities at the major tourist entry points (see Chapter 8).

9.4.1.3 MDG 3 - Empowering women through ecotourism

Previous studies have demonstrated the role ecotourism plays in empowering women (Chhetri & Lama, 2012; Gauthier, 1993; Pradhan, 2001). Pradhan’s (2001) study found that Annapurna Conservation Area in Nepal is a good example of women’s involvement and participation in ecotourism activities. Pradhan (2001) argues that the level of engagement of women in ecotourism-related activities has become a source of inspiration for villages across Nepal. As discussed in Chapter 2, gender discrimination plays a key role in poverty conditions in developing countries (Schriver, 2004). Empowering women through
ecotourism activities could contribute to achieving poverty reduction in host communities.

In relation to the KCA, there are indications that ecotourism contributes to empowering women. Ecotourism has empowered local women in the Mesomagor community through the creation of employment opportunities, and involvement in community level development decision making. Local women in this community believe that ecotourism is the reason for their involvement in decision making. They consider their involvement in ecotourism to have contributed to a low incidence of gender discrimination, and enhanced respect and improved wellbeing of women in the community. Also in Abrafo, a number of women indicated that ecotourism has empowered them economically through the sale of their farm produce to tourists. This supports the findings of other researchers (Chhetri & Lama, 2012; Honey, 1999; Pradhan, 2001), who assert that ecotourism creates opportunities for women to be empowered socio-economically, in terms of employment, income generation and participation.

However, of the four case study communities, evidence of empowerment of women has occurred mainly in the Mesomagor community, because of strong community support for, and ownership of ecotourism. Local women in the remaining three communities had little experience of ecotourism-induced empowerment, and expressed their disappointment about this (see Chapter 8). This emphasises Landell-Mills and Porras’s (2002) claim that benefits of ecotourism activities, especially in developing countries, are skewed and only enjoyed by some communities.

This finding may be linked to the lack of commitment of park officials and the government to engage the local community in implementation of the foundational principles of ecotourism, which centre on empowering women and delivering multiple outcomes across a wider landscape. Perhaps the potential of ecotourism to empower women could be improved by incorporating and implementing pro-poor tourism objectives in ecotourism, which the literature indicates has the potential to deliver more gender concerned jobs (Ashley et al., 2001a; Gerosa, 2003).
9.4.1.4 MDGs 4, 5 and 6 – Improving local health through ecotourism

Previous research (Gurung, 1995; Scheyvens, 1999) has indicated that ecotourism revenue can support the provision of basic facilities and services, including health facilities in local communities. However, the findings from this research show that ecotourism’s contribution to improved health, according to the local community, is limited. As discussed in Chapter 8, the local residents expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of access to medicinal plants in the KCA, without the provision of an affordable alternative, especially in Mesomagor and Adadientem. Despite the limited contribution of ecotourism to improved health, some Abrafo residents consider revenue from ecotourism as important in accessing healthcare (see Chapter 8).

This finding supports the theory that ecotourism can contribute to the provision and improvement of basic services. Therefore, it would appear that ecotourism’s contribution to improved health is occurring gradually, although the local community believe it is limited and insufficient. The limited contribution of ecotourism to improved health could be linked to the issues of the competing agendas of different groups in ecotourism implementation which has resulted in the lack of commitment to community engagement and poverty reduction outcomes.

9.4.1.5 MDG 7 – Ecotourism and environmental conservation

This research indicates that ecotourism has contributed to environmental conservation. The local community considers ecotourism as an effective tool for conserving the environment, because it protects biodiversity, and according to the local people, induces rainfall for their agricultural activities and serves as a watershed for streams used as water sources. In addition, the findings show that both the park officials and the local community attribute the protection of the KCA to the introduction of ecotourism, arguing that the KCA is the only remaining tropical evergreen forest located in a semi-deciduous forest zone in Ghana.

This finding supports those of other writers (Blamey, 2001; Dumm & Moore, 2002; Fennell, 2003; Gossling, 2002; Honey, 1999; Hvenegaard, 1994; Stone & Wall, 2004), who argue that the fundamental objective of ecotourism has been to conserve the environment. These researchers have reported that the purpose of
introducing ecotourism to protected areas, particularly in developing countries, has been to generate funds to support conservation, which agency interviews have revealed is the case in the KCA.

9.4.1.6 MDG 8- Promoting international partnership through ecotourism

The findings indicate that ecotourism in the KCA has promoted international partnerships between government, NGOs and other international organisations. This research shows that several international organisations, including UNWTO, CI and USAID, have partnered with the Ghanaian government to develop ecotourism, in areas including the KCA. As discussed in Chapter 7, these international agencies supported the formulation of tourism policies.

However, this research suggests that the majority of international agencies are promoting ecotourism as a means to achieve conservation goals, rather than as a strategy to facilitate sustainable local development. For example, the ecotourism management framework in the KCA established by the CI and the Ghanaian government is flawed, because the CI has failed in its effort to establish ecotourism as a sustainable local development strategy, as its real agenda is achieving conservation. This supports Courvisanos and Jain’s (2006) concerns about the lip service being paid to ecotourism by academics, government and NGOs, as ecotourism principles remain a distant reality in ecotourism implementation in many destinations. Therefore, although ecotourism has promoted some international partnerships, it has not adequately engaged with the political process of delivering widespread sustainable development outcomes at the local level.

9.4.2 Improving ecotourism’s contribution to poverty reduction through the Integration of Social Goals

As discussed in Section 9.3.1, ecotourism implementation in the KCA is characterised by an overconcentration on revenue generation and environmental conservation, without adequate consideration of social goals. Yet, in theory, ecotourism should incorporate social goals, such as engaging with and delivering benefits to the local community (Page & Dowling, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004; TIES, 2013). The social goal of ecotourism ensures that ecotourism engages and works cooperatively with the local community. Furthermore, integrating social
goals into ecotourism contributes to satisfying and meeting the needs of tourists, which ensures continuity of ecotourism activities (Page & Dowling, 2002; Stone & Wall, 2004). Findings of this research report there have been some indications that local communities within the vicinity of the Conservation Area have recognised the role of ecotourism in meeting social goals.

Prior to the introduction of ecotourism in the KCA, the findings indicate that local communities were engaged by the Ghanaian government regarding their role in making ecotourism and the conservation of the KCA successful, as well as addressing their needs. Although local communities are not directly involved in the management of ecotourism in the KCA, there is evidence of community engagement and involvement in ecotourism, particularly in the Mesomagor and Abrafo communities. In Mesomagor, the local people expressed their satisfaction with their involvement in the operations of the tree platform and the traditional bamboo orchestra. They attribute the community’s involvement in the management process to their strong relationship with the park officials, strong support for conservation and their sense of connection to these ecotourism attractions. Also, Abrafo residents indicated that decisions regarding the management of the craft village largely rest with the local community, although they receive technical advice and support from the government, through CEDECOM.

This result is in congruence with the findings of other researchers (Gurung & Seeland, 2008, 2009; Lai & Nepal, 2006; Page & Dowling 2002), who also found that ecotourism has encouraged the integration of social goals, particularly community involvement and participation, in developing countries. For example, in a case study of community participation in ecotourism development in Tawushan Nature Reserve in Taiwan, Lai and Nepal (2006) reported that ecotourism has improved community involvement, in terms of participation in ecotourism planning, engagement with local government, and increasing ecotourism-related employment opportunities for local people. In relation to poverty reduction, some authors (Jacobs & Skocpol, 2005; Townsend, 1979; UN, 1995) have argued that the lack of consideration of social goals at the local community level, including participation in decision making and political process, is a fundamental cause of poverty in these countries. Thus, promotion and integration of social goals, such as community engagement in ecotourism
activities, can contribute to poverty reduction, and deliver sustainable development outcomes.

However, this research indicates that the potential of ecotourism to engage with local community has not been experienced in the communities located far from the major tourist entry points, because of the unavailability of ecotourism attractions (see Chapters 7 & 8). Therefore, residents in Adadientem and Nuamakrom indicate that they have not experienced any social benefits from ecotourism, given that there has been no attempt by the government and the local people to establish ecotourism in those communities.

Considering the untapped ecotourism resources around the KCA, the experience of ecotourism implementation in the Mesomagor community can be replicated in the communities having these undeveloped resources. This may provide further opportunities for residents in the communities around the KCA to engage and partake in ecotourism activities. However, the integration of social goals in ecotourism may only be achieved and promoted when attractions are developed and managed based on the foundational principles of ecotourism.

9.4.3 The Place of Culture in Poverty Reduction: The Role of Ecotourism

The findings indicate that ecotourism activities have led to the revival, development, and preservation of local culture in the local community, especially in Mesomagor. The local culture in Mesomagor was revived through ecotourism after it had collapsed following the gazettal of the KCA. Thus, ecotourism in this community can be regarded as a major tool for preserving local culture. This finding reflects those of other authors and international organisations, who argue that ecotourism in developing countries may create a platform for tourists to enjoy local cultures (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1991), protect local traditions (Fennell, 2003; Slinger, 2000), foster respect for different cultures (ESP, 2002; Honey, 1999), and create cultural awareness amongst host communities and tourists (TIES, 2013).

Researchers have argued that local culture can contribute to, as well as aggravate poverty conditions in developing countries (Ali et al., 2002; Bradshaw, 2006; UNDP, 2005; UNESCO, 2005). Nonetheless, the findings indicate that the development of Mesomagor community’s culture through ecotourism has contributed to poverty reduction, through employment creation, income
generation, community participation in decision making, and cultural preservation in the local community. The latter benefit is however mainly limited to the Mesomagor community. The findings indicate that the other case study communities, particularly Adadientem and Nuamakrom, have not yet recognised the potential of ecotourism to preserve local culture while contributing to poverty reduction. The Mesomagor community’s cultural preservation through ecotourism could perhaps be an example for the other communities in the vicinity of the Conservation Area, to learn and develop their local cultures, especially festivals.

Analysis of the field data indicates that, although ecotourism has contributed to cultural preservation in the Mesomagor community, there are concerns amongst this community and others about the possible reality of the demonstration effect. Mesomagor residents expressed concerns about the adulteration of their local culture by tourists, while those in Nuamakrom expressed fears of a possible demonstration effect in the community, given the increasing tourist visitation to the KCA. This finding is consistent with the findings of other researchers (Clifton & Benson, 2006; Farrell & Marion, 2002; Ormsby & Mannie, 2006), who have reported that ecotourism has led to adulteration of local culture and invasion of foreign cultures into the local community. However, the positive experience of Mesomagor regarding cultural preservation, presents an opportunity to promote cultural preservation and experiences in ecotourism activities, while minimising the negative impacts, through interventions such as tourist education on the importance and sensitivity of local culture.

**Summary of theme three**

Although ecotourism has the potential to deliver poverty reduction outcomes, this research shows that local people’s expectations have not been met. Despite increasing tourist numbers to the KCA, the findings indicate that the benefits of ecotourism to achieving the MDGs in the local community are limited and inequitably distributed, while the costs are experienced by all case study communities. Thus, the understanding of ecotourism as a local development tool that integrates economic, environmental and social goals appears to be a distant reality in the local community, and has left scars of disappointment among the residents.
9.5 Understanding the relationship between ecotourism and poverty reduction

A major contribution from this research relates to the twofold relationship between ecotourism and poverty reduction. While on the one hand ecotourism has contributed to poverty reduction, on the other hand it has compounded poverty. The relationship is influenced by many factors. This research demonstrates that the uncertainty surrounding the understanding of ecotourism is not only a challenge among researchers and international organisations, but also an issue for the host community. Although the principles of ecotourism highlight the importance of sustainable development and poverty reduction in ecotourism implementation, the findings indicate that some sustainability principles of ecotourism are missing in ecotourism implementation in the KCA, owing to a limited understanding of the concept by park officials, government agencies and NGOs, and a lack of recognition of ecotourism implementation as a political process of negotiation of outcomes.

Interview results also indicate that the limited understanding of ecotourism may reflect the lack of any attempt to interpret ecotourism in Ghana, in terms of developing a local strategy or policy. Thus, in addition to the absence of an ecotourism policy, this research shows that the ecotourism objectives stated in the national tourism plans have not been implemented. Interviews with agency officials suggest that international organisations with a deeper understanding of ecotourism are involved in the preparation of the national tourism plans, while local agencies with a limited understanding implement these plans. This may have accounted for the poor implementation of ecotourism objectives in the plans. As a result, the findings show that ecotourism in the KCA appears to be operated as a commercial activity, focusing largely on revenue generation and environmental conservation, without adequate consideration for social goals such as local engagement and development.

Although ecotourism has actually contributed in a limited way to poverty reduction in the communities surrounding the KCA, through employment and income opportunities, the interview results indicate that it has certainly not met local people’s expectations for employment, income generation, cultural preservation and local community engagement. In fact, the loss of access to forest
resources, and increased crop and property damage from wildlife incursions onto farms, following the gazetted of the KCA, has actually compounded poverty issues. Further, the limited opportunity to engage with tourists, lack of a share in direct revenue from entry fees despite increases in tourist visitation, and the perception that ecotourism in the KCA is a government project that excludes local involvement and opportunity, all point towards a failure of ecotourism implementation to meet the poverty reduction expectations of empowering local communities, stimulating local development and creating opportunities for the local people.

Although support for ecotourism in the KCA was often expressed by the local community, the frustration and antagonism expressed by some local residents towards ecotourism may, in the future, spill over into negative attitudes towards conservation, and potentially result in activities that are contrary to the principles of ecotourism. This situation has the potential to threaten the sustainability of ecotourism attractions, given that the livelihoods of the communities surrounding the KCA are based on small scale agriculture and previously on forest resources.

Despite the limited contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction, interview results indicate that the Mesomagor residents have had a different experience to the other three communities that depend on the government to provide ecotourism opportunities. The former, recognising the tourism potential of the KCA, have developed their culture as an ecotourism attraction. The commitment of the bamboo orchestra leader, the support of the Mesomagor residents, and the pride they derive from delivering this tourist experience, underlie the success of ecotourism implementation in this community. Using the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework, the Mesomagor community appears to be the most successful ecotourism destination around the KCA, and has delivered benefits in terms of income, employment, high self-esteem among women, community unity, and cultural preservation, despite challenges such as poor road conditions and increased farm raids.

Although ecotourism may not deliver widespread benefits in terms of poverty reduction in the absence of a clear government development programme, residents of host communities may identify, initiate and develop ecotourism resources within their communities. According to South Africa’s Department of
Environmental Affairs and Tourism (1996), the ability of local residents to oppose development that is harmful to the environment, develop ecotourism resources, handle impacts and make available information on ecotourism resources to other stakeholders, without necessarily depending on the government, is imperative to ensuring sustainability in ecotourism activities. Thus, the Mesomagor community’s experience strongly supports the theory that ecotourism can contribute to poverty reduction. Their experience also supports the theory that ecotourism can encourage interactions between tourists and local people and afford deeper inter-cultural experience. Therefore, the experience of the Mesomagor community, in terms of engaging with the political process of delivering widespread ecotourism outcomes, could be replicated in the other communities around the Conservation Area, so that ecotourism may deliver maximum benefits, in relation to poverty reduction, to the local people.

However, the role of government, in terms of planning and policy, remains central to augmenting the potential of ecotourism in poverty reduction. Thus, both government commitment to the development and implementation of ecotourism policy, and local community commitment to engaging with tourists through the development of their ecotourism attractions, are imperative to improving the living conditions of the poor, and achieving poverty reduction goals in ecotourism destinations.

This research reveals there are both benefits and costs associated with ecotourism activities. However, like the Mesomagor community’s experience, ecotourism is more likely to deliver benefits and minimise costs when the local community realises its role, and participates in ecotourism. This can lead to community empowerment in, and stewardship of ecotourism activities. The recognition of ecotourism as an opportunity for local community engagement with tourists rather than a government activity, and the realisation that there will be winners and losers, are necessary to improving the understanding of ecotourism. However, for ecotourism to deliver sustainable poverty reduction outcomes in the local community, there should be a focus on the pro-poor aspects, to ensure that the implementation of ecotourism is focused on the ‘social’ agenda. The focus on social agenda will ensure that the process of negotiating competing agendas or outcomes delivers benefits for the community, not just the government and conservation agencies.
This research shows that the foundational principles of ecotourism are important in achieving sustainable development and poverty reduction in the local community, but the implementation remains a challenge. In KCA ecotourism, the ‘minimalist’ implementation of the social principles, such as community participation, empowerment of vulnerable groups such as women, and inclusion of local culture has limited the realisation of poverty reduction outcomes. Thus, a commitment by the government, park officials and NGOs to carefully implement the foundational principles of ecotourism, especially those which focus on achieving social goals, through the political process of negotiations of competing agendas is necessary if ecotourism is to contribute to poverty reduction. Thus, this research has contributed to theory, and indicated that ecotourism has the potential to be an important socio-economic development driver, as a part of a wider poverty reduction package.

9.6 Recommendations for strengthening ecotourism planning and implementation

9.6.1 The Need for Ecotourism Policy and Plan Development

This research indicates that ecotourism has the potential to contribute to poverty reduction and sustainable development in host communities. However, those potential contributions are often limited by lack of policy direction, and unfavourable local conditions in host communities. This is because ecotourism development cannot deliver sustainable outcomes when it does not operate within an effective policy or administrative framework (Charnley, 2005), and does not involve the host communities on whose resources it is based (UN, 2003).

Given the widespread occurrence of farm raids by wildlife in communities around the KCA, lack of community involvement with tourism, weak distribution of economic benefits and higher levels of international tourism, a reassessment of current park management policy towards an improved programme that involves local communities to deal with these issues is tenable. Previous research (Stronza & Godillo, 2008) indicates that the level of host community participation in, and control over ecotourism resources is largely contingent on ecotourism policies and plans at national, local and park level that create an institutional environment for participation, and consider local factors such as commitment, understanding, willingness and capacity. Moreover, the perceptions and understanding of local
people in the host communities regarding ecotourism development may constantly change. To ensure host communities’ continual support for, and benefit from ecotourism activities, the ecotourism policy development process should be flexible to incorporate new concerns of the local community and tourists, and also address issues relating to changes in local livelihoods. Thus, regular consultation between host communities and other stakeholders, such as government, tourists and academics, in the ecotourism policy development process in developing countries may be necessary, to ensure that the needs of the various stakeholders are addressed.

9.6.2 Integrating a Pro-Poor Tourism Approach into Ecotourism Policy

The literature on pro-poor tourism indicates that unlocking socio-economic opportunities for the poor is fundamental to poverty reduction efforts ensuing from any form of tourism implementation (Ashley et al., 2001; Cattarinch, 2001; Goodwin, 2009). Ecotourism may deliver socio-economic outcomes and environmental benefits, including sustainable conservation of natural environment, community empowerment, and improved living conditions (Honey, 2008; Gurung & Seeland, 2008; Scheyvens, 1999). However, the development of ecotourism policy that incorporates the principles of pro-poor tourism, and encourages local community engagement, can be attractive to tourism operators, especially at the local level, and lure them to participate in ecotourism activities. This may ensure that ecotourism delivers benefits to the local community, and the poor receive an equitable share.

The findings from this research further indicate that host communities in developing countries have limited knowledge of ecotourism planning and implementation, as well as their role in ecotourism. Thus, ecotourism policies and plans should focus on empowering host communities through capacity building, especially the disadvantaged and poor people, and improving the skills and capacity of local people to implement a benefit sharing policy. Promoting the participation of the poor in decision making, so that their priorities are reflected in ecotourism development, is a key policy strategy of pro-poor tourism (Ashley et al., 2001). Moreover, as displayed by the leader of the bamboo orchestra, a collaborative process between the host communities and the government, to encourage a more independent entrepreneurial spirit among local residents, should
be promoted. This will ensure that local people take some responsibility for, and participate in ecotourism activities, and do not just expect the government to provide for them.

9.6.3 Exploring the Potential of Local Cultures in Ecotourism Development

Ecotourism activities are largely based on environmental assets, and focus on experiencing nature. However, the global experience suggests that successful ecotourism products integrate these environmental assets with cultural attractions, and recognise the interest and demand from tourists visiting sites to engage with local people. This makes local cultures an important component of the ecotourism experience. Considering that in developing countries, ecotourism occurs in protected areas surrounded by communities with diverse cultural experiences (Charnley, 2005; Gurung & Seeland, 2009; Lash, 2003; Ross & Wall, 1999b), local cultures present an opportunity to enrich ecotourism products. Although there is a general preoccupation with protected areas and conservation in ecotourism activities, there is also the reality of providing an attractive tourist package, which in a cultural environment often includes a cultural component. Besides, much interpretation of ecotourism provides meaning to the natural environment through its relationship with human culture. Thus, a shared focus on both environmental and cultural experiences in ecotourism development and implementation has the potential to deliver social outcomes.

Cultural education of host communities, regarding ecotourism development and implementation, needs to be considered. Education is needed to ensure communities are prepared for the changes and challenges that tourism brings, and to ensure that they can make informed decisions about their culture, regarding what to protect, what to share, and what aspects of culture they will allow to disappear. It is important to realise that tourism is only one of many influences on culture. However, an informed local community that is capable of making its own decisions about what is important in relation to culture, and with the power to control the development of ecotourism, is far preferable to the situation where external individuals or organisations such as governments or well-meaning academics enforce rules, making decisions on what is good and bad on their behalf. Having informed host communities, will among other things generate socio-economic benefits, in terms of income and protection of their culture and
traditions. This may contribute to poverty reduction, and also stimulate local support towards the conservation of the environmental assets upon which many ecotourism attractions are based.

9.7 Conclusion

This research has evaluated the concept of ecotourism from a theoretical viewpoint, including the planning, development and implementation phases, as well as its outcomes in relation to reducing poverty in developing countries. Guided by three broad research questions, a comprehensive review of ecotourism and poverty reduction-related literature was undertaken, in addition to analysis of empirical data based on two frameworks, the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework, and the Ecotourism and MDGs Framework.

This research shows that, due to a limited understanding of ecotourism, park officials, government agencies and NGOs have not engaged adequately with the process of negotiating competing goals and outcomes for different stakeholders, necessary for the successful implementation of ecotourism. The agencies are only committed to achieving their institutional goals, rather than to promoting sustainable local development through ecotourism. A manifestation of this is the overconcentration on revenue generation and environmental conservation by park officials, government agencies and NGOs. Social goals, including community engagement and cultural preservation, are not integrated into ecotourism implementation, which has resulted in confusion and disappointment for the local community. As an illustration of this point, there is no distinction made by the local communities between the gazettal of the KCA and ecotourism. In addition, the communities are excluded from KCA ecotourism management. Indeed, no efforts have been made by the park officials and the government to formulate ecotourism policies and plans, with less than 50 percent of the objectives of all national tourism plans and policies in Ghana implemented. This research has demonstrated that the administrative framework to implement ecotourism in Ghana is flawed, and has left considerable disappointment among the local community.

The key findings from this research are that ecotourism implementation is not an act of altruism, but a political process of negotiation that responds to the motivations and priorities of stakeholders. The lack of understanding of this
process in the implementation of ecotourism in the KCA has resulted in limited poverty reduction outcomes in the local community, despite a substantial improvement in conservation of the rainforest in the KCA. Thus, both local community support and local involvement with government creating the enabling environment, in terms of policy and administration, are central to ecotourism implementation. Although the benefits regarding poverty reduction are limited, ecotourism remains a viable option for stimulating local development, reducing poverty, and conserving the environment in developing countries, particularly Ghana. Other key findings arising from this research include:

- Given that poverty in developing countries is multidimensional, its dynamics in the case study communities are complex. Key issues relate to the poor traditional system of governance, farm raids by wildlife following the introduction of ecotourism, loss of access to resources because of ecotourism, and illiteracy. As a result, the living conditions of the poor in communities located around ecotourism resources in the KCA remain uncertain and difficult.
- Ecotourism is a useful strategy for poverty reduction and sustainable local development. However, the preoccupation with environmental conservation and economic returns to management in ecotourism activities in the KCA, with little consideration for social goals, remains a limiting factor in the role of ecotourism in reducing poverty. While the government and some local people receive the economic benefits of ecotourism, the cost of ecotourism is experienced across the communities around the Conservation Area. Therefore, improvement in the living conditions of the poor in communities around ecotourism resources may not occur unless there is evidence of equitable distribution of economic benefits from ecotourism.
- An increase in tourist visitation does not necessarily lead to an improvement in local living conditions, regarding a flow of income into the local community. Although, the KCA remains the most visited ecotourism site in Ghana, local communities around it are in persistent poverty. This is because the local people are marginalised from the management of, and do not receive direct benefits from, ecotourism in the KCA.
The potential of ecotourism in developing countries cannot be realised without considering social goals. In the case of Ghana, locating and adapting ecotourism in the local community is necessary for ecotourism to reach its full potential, in relation to poverty reduction and sustainable development. The prevailing traditional governance system, coupled with the power struggle between traditional leaders and government officials in the case study communities, remains an impediment to poverty reduction. In such an environment, it becomes difficult for the local people to build their confidence and participate in issues concerning their development, including ecotourism. Thus, ecotourism development should draw on the strengths of the local communities, and embrace them as partners in ecotourism ventures by inculcating the spirit of entrepreneurship, so that local people can exercise some level of control over ecotourism decisions. To date, ecotourism in the KCA and other parts of Ghana has achieved little in the way of local ownership and participation. Until local communities recognise their role in ecotourism, the potential of ecotourism to reduce poverty at the local level may not be achieved.

In contrast, this research suggests that ecotourism implementation in the Mesomagor community has involved local people in decision making, empowered vulnerable groups and established strong relationships between park officials and the local community. This has created employment and generated income for some local people, contributed to infrastructure provision, and led to strong community support for environmental conservation. Therefore, the contribution of ecotourism to poverty reduction in the Mesomagor community may be occurring gradually.

Nonetheless, to ensure ecotourism is successful in the KCA, and in Ghana as a whole, two conditions should be met. First, the existing ecotourism management framework in the KCA, and the implementation approach, should be reformed, through policy based on the foundational principles of the ecotourism concept. Second, the integration of social goals focusing on community participation, equity in benefit sharing, management of negative outcomes, training of local people as ecotourism workers, and effective collaboration between local community and park officials should be given priority in ecotourism implementation.
9.8 Recommendations for further research

This research has described and explained the ecotourism concept, its planning, development and implementation and the outcomes on poverty reduction in developing countries, particularly Ghana. However, in order for ecotourism to be recognised as a major poverty reduction strategy, there are a number of areas that will require further research. Future research may focus on the following:

1. Evaluation of a pro-poor tourism approach in ecotourism implementation

As ecotourism is increasingly recognised and used as a poverty reduction strategy in developing countries, with associated environmental conservation benefits, rigorous research on evaluating the possibility and effectiveness of a pro-poor tourism approach to ecotourism implementation is required. Evaluation studies should assess how the theoretical principles of both ecotourism and pro-poor tourism can be integrated and implemented in ecotourism destinations. Research needs to address the strengths and weaknesses of both pro-poor tourism and ecotourism, and how these two concepts complement each other in relation to delivering poverty reduction outcomes in the host communities.

2. An assessment of the long-term impact of trust in improving relationship between stakeholders in ecotourism implementation

Ecotourism implementation depends on a wide range of stakeholders; key amongst them is the local community. The success of ecotourism, to a large extent, depends on the relationship and roles of the various stakeholders. Central to these relationships and roles is the issue of trust. This research has shown that, even in local communities where there is evidence of ecotourism benefits, mistrust between the park officials and local people remains a major impediment to ecotourism implementation and poverty reduction. Future research could focus on how improving communication and relationships between ecotourism stakeholders could affect the implementation of ecotourism in the long-term, and would add to the body of knowledge of the complexity inherent in the potential of ecotourism to reduce poverty.
3. Assessing the cultural trade-off in ecotourism development and implementation

The role of ecotourism in preserving and protecting the cultures of host communities has been analysed, especially in developing countries (Clifton & Benson, 2006; Farrell & Marion, 2002; Ormsby & Mannie, 2006). However, these studies have largely focused on either the benefits or costs of ecotourism to the local culture. The trade-off of local culture, in relation to its preservation and adulteration, has been given insufficient consideration in the literature. The impact of ecotourism activities on local cultures of the host communities could be better understood when analysed from the perspective of costs such as the demonstration effect, and benefits like preservation of the local culture.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: The Concept of Poverty: The North-South Divide

Globally, there is no generally acceptable benchmark for classifying countries according to their level of development. Although the differences, in relation to the standard of living enjoyed by citizens of different countries, and the flow of resources from the ‘rich’ to the ‘poor’ countries, have made the classification of countries into either developed or developing important; where exactly to draw the line between developed and developing countries remains unclear (Nielson, 2011). As a result, there has been a mushrooming of terminologies in literature used in classifying countries, including third world/first world, developing/industrialised, backward/advanced, north/south, and developing/developed, among others (Nielson, 2011). In this chapter, the explanation of the term poverty, in the context of the developed and the developing countries, is based on the widespread usage and recognition of ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ concepts as a measure of standard of living, and the relationship between the rich and poor countries.

Developed Countries’ Perspectives on Poverty

According to Morazes and Pintak (2006), discussions on poverty in the developed countries have focused less on poverty as a condition characterised by severe deprivation of basic human needs. Rather, they have emphasised the complexities of poverty in contemporary post-industrial societies, including welfare provisions, benefits from the state, tax systems, social security transfers, social exclusion, social capital, feminisation of poverty and inequality (Morazes & Pintak, 2006).

In 1990, Esping-Andersen described poverty in relation to social welfare policy formation, and laid a foundation for appreciating current trends of poverty in the developed world. He differentiated the degree to which social rights and responsibilities are balanced, with regard to liberal (laissez-faire), corporatist and social democratic welfare approaches. Esping-Andersen (1990) categorises countries like the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States of America and Canada as market-oriented liberal states with less generous benefits, with Sweden, Denmark and Norway as more generous social democratic states. Esping-Andersen’s (1990) categorisation reflects societal views about the roots of poverty in the developed world, as social democrats view welfare assistance as a right of citizenship, and see poverty as a systemic concern and normal result of a market-economy. Market-oriented states tend to connect poverty with individual deficiencies (Morazes & Pintak, 2006). Research by Rank et al. (2003) revealed that individual characteristics, including lack of industrious work ethic or virtuous morality, low levels of education or low competitive market skills, define poverty in the developed world.

Other researchers (e.g., Hills & Stewart, 2005; Western et al., 2005) focus on social exclusion in their description of poverty, by regarding poverty as non-
participation in consumption, production, political engagement and social interaction (Marazes & Pintak 2006). Hills and Stewart (2005) interpret social exclusion as being more than the lack of material resources, and tend to focus on education, health, employment and social participation in their explanation of poverty as social exclusion. Another important part of the discourse on social exclusion relates to the increasing inequality in the developed world (increasing disparities in wealth and income among individuals and groups in society). In the developed countries, inequality is not confined to income alone (Marazes & Pintak, 2006), but is interpreted as limited opportunities for the poor, and concerns redistribution of resources in society (Hills & Stewart, 2005).

Sen (1997) indicates that creating opportunities by examining the capabilities of the poor in a given environment, relative to possibilities for others, is fundamental in poverty discourse in developed countries. Several factors, including income, availability of items for purchase and resources needed to meet basic needs (e.g., food, health and housing), are identified as opportunities to close the widening inequality gap (Marazes & Pintak, 2006). According to Western et al. (2005) social exclusion results when there are disparities, in terms of access to scarce and valued resources by certain individuals and groups, on the grounds of structural factors (e.g., class, ethnicity, gender, age, rural-urban differences) beyond their control. Marazes and Pintak (2006) further indicate that social exclusion has become central to the poverty discourse in developed countries.

Developing Countries’ Perspectives on Poverty

Literature on poverty in the developing countries provides a stark contrast with that of the developed countries, as issues of deprivation in terms of income, capability, and basic services dominate the poverty discourse. Although there have been consistent descriptions of poverty in developing countries, such as the use of the World Bank’s US$ 1.25 a day for absolute poverty, and US$ 2 a day for relative poverty, Marazes and Pintak (2006) indicate that these descriptions are often debatable. In Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, Hope (2004) asserts that about 45-50 percent of the people live below the poverty line (US$ 1.25 a day). On the other hand, Ayittey (2005), after examining how poor people in Africa perceive and describe poverty, concludes that poverty in Africa is not necessarily about lowness of income but is related to international or foreign influence and domination which threatens Africa’s future development, and that economic liberation is essential to poverty alleviation.

Accordingly, Ayittey (2005, p.15) asserts that “famine, civil wars, devastated agriculture, collapsed infrastructure, and political repression as well as HIV/AIDS have sapped African vitality ... to near stone-aged existence” and that it is time for Africans to control issues of governance and production. Moreover, poverty in the developing countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, is characterised by the lowest social indicators in the world, including high infant mortality (157 children out of 1000 die before the age of 5, and 90 out of 1000 die before the age of one),
low life expectancy, and low school enrolments (Adejumobi, 2006). This situation is exacerbated in developing countries ravaged by war, such as South Sudan and Somalia, because the majority of the population depend on food aid to survive (Adejumobi, 2006).

The incidence of poverty in developing countries is also described in terms of spatial and gender dimensions (Adejumobi, 2006). In relation to gender dimension, studies (e.g., Adejumobi, 2006; Bradshaw, 2006) have shown that women are often socially deprived, in terms of access to basic services (e.g., education), and livelihoods (e.g., land). Spatial dimensions of poverty deal with the rural-urban divide, as poverty is predominantly a rural phenomenon in developing countries (e.g., Boateng et al., 2000; Oksanen et al., 2003) despite recent studies suggesting acuteness of poverty in urban areas (e.g., Garland et al., 2007; Motšoene, 2014). The UNDP and UNEP (2009) have also described poverty focusing on the degradation of the environment, owing to over reliance of the poor on natural resources and the environment for their livelihood. According to WCED (1987), this has resulted in environmental impoverishment in many developing countries.

Nonetheless, a study by Sachs (2005) describes ‘differential diagnosis in clinical economics’ as an approach for addressing the root causes of poverty. The application of the differential diagnosis presents an innovative way of understanding poverty in developing countries, by emphasising the following elements: the poverty trap (self-perpetuating conditions which cause poverty), fiscal trap (staggering deficits resulting from huge borrowing), economic policy framework (government actions involving setting interest rates, budgets, labour market and national asset ownership), fiscal framework (structure for sustainable finances), physical geography (location and resources therein), governance patterns and failures (institutions and enforcement of law), cultural barriers (outmoded practices and beliefs), and geopolitics (the use of political power over a given territory). Sachs (2005) refers to this approach as ‘new enlightenment’ to globalisation, and claims it is necessary for overcoming the root causes of poverty in developing countries.

Another description of poverty in developing countries relates to the neoclassical approach to poverty (Bhalla, 2002). Bhalla (2002) views poverty globally in an econometric lens, and indicates that income is the best proxy for human welfare, despite its weaknesses. According to Bhalla (2002), income empowers the poor, in relation to purchasing power, and provides access to resources otherwise unavailable to the poor, as well as enabling them to enjoy public goods. Although Bhalla (2002) gives primary consideration to income, his assessment of poverty is context specific (as it pertains to particular people, groups and regions) and challenges the World Bank’s universal indicators.

Politically, Bhalla (2002) adopts a conservative approach, and states that the world has witnessed over twenty years of economic development directed at
improving the lives of the poor. Sachs (2005) disagrees pointing out that some of the world’s powerful nations, including the United States of America, have instigated and masterminded wars in some developing countries, and this has dented their credibility in achieving economic stability and growth, social justice, global peace and environmental protection in developing countries.

In summary, while the poverty literature in developed countries describes structural poverty and focuses on social exclusion, literature on the developing countries primarily focuses on issues of deprivation, powerlessness and access to basic services.

Bradshaw’s theory of the five causes of poverty includes the following:

1. **Poverty caused by individual deficiencies:** This cause focuses on the individual as being responsible for his/her poverty situation. Bradshaw (2006) indicates that politically conservative theoreticians blame individuals in poverty for creating their own problems, and argue that with hard work and better choices the poor could avoid their problems. Other variations of the individual theory of poverty ascribe poverty to genetic qualities, including lack of intelligence;

2. **Poverty caused by cultural belief systems that support sub-cultures of poverty:** The second theory of poverty roots its cause in the “Culture of Poverty”. It suggests that poverty is created by the transmission over generations of a set of beliefs, values, and skills that are socially generated, but individually held. Individuals are not necessarily to blame, because they are victims of their dysfunctional subculture or culture;

3. **Poverty caused by economic, political, and social distortions or discrimination:** Whereas the first ‘individualistic’ cause of poverty is advocated by conservative thinkers and the second is a culturally liberal approach, the third is a progressive social theory. Theorists in this tradition look not to the individual as a source of poverty, but to the economic, political, and social system which causes people to have limited opportunities and resources with which to achieve income and wellbeing.

4. **Poverty caused by geographical disparities:** Rural poverty, ghetto poverty, urban disinvestment, developing country poverty, and other framings of the problem represent a spatial characterisation of poverty that exists separate from other theories. This cause of poverty calls attention to the fact that people, institutions, and cultures in certain areas lack the objective resources needed to generate wellbeing and income, and that they lack the power to claim redistribution; and

5. **Poverty caused by cumulative and cyclical interdependencies:** The final cause of poverty is the most complex, and builds on components of each of the other causes in that it looks at the individuals and their community as caught in a spiral of opportunity and problems. Once problems dominate, they close other opportunities, and create a cumulative set of problems that make any effective response nearly impossible. This cyclical explanation explicitly looks at individual situations and community resources as mutually dependent, with a faltering economy, for example, creating individuals who lack resources to participate in the economy.
Appendix 3: Background and History of the Sustainable Development Concept

The concept of sustainable development dates back to the earliest examples of city planning and traditional agricultural systems, but became popular over the past three decades. It embraces issues of the environment, people and economic systems (Swarbrooke, 1998). According to Cobb (1992), discourse on sustainable development was rejuvenated by the World Council of Churches during its 1975 Assembly in Nairobi, Kenya, which was concerned with justice in the distribution and use of resources (Todorov & Marinova, 2009). However, the concept was first defined by the Brundtland Commission as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (WCED, 1987, p.43). WCED (1987) indicates that the definition contains, within it, two key concepts: (a) the concept of 'needs', in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and (b) the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organisation on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.

The concept had among its objectives: ensuring the availability of adequate resources for the population, equitable distribution of resources, economic development, as well as environmental protection for the benefit of both present and future generations (Malcom, 1994). The above definition of sustainable development was endorsed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development at Rio de Janeiro in 1992, but the root of the Brundtland Commission’s definition is linked to the 1972 UN Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, where the conflicts between the environment and development were first acknowledged, and in the 1980 World Conservation Strategy of the IUCN, which argued for conservation as a means to assist development and specifically for the sustainable development of species, ecosystems and resources (Kates et al., 2005).

The early 1990s was characterised by ‘The Earth Charter Initiative’, which was based on the Brundtland Commission’s definition of sustainable development (The Earth Charter International Secretariat, 1992). The Earth Charter was described as a “declaration of fundamental principles for building a just, sustainable, and peaceful global society in the 21st century” (The Earth Charter International Secretariat, 1992). This initiative, according to WCED (1987, p.332), was developed to create a universal declaration to “consolidate and extend relevant legal principles, needed to maintain livelihoods and life on our shared planet”. The initiative also presented a new sense of global interdependence and shared responsibility for the wellbeing of humanity, community life, and future generations.

Exploring the ‘The Earth Charter Initiative’, the U.S Board on Sustainable Development conducted a study in the 1990s, which conceptualised sustainable development from two perspectives: ‘what is to be sustained’ and ‘what should be
developed’ (US National Research Council, 1999). Under ‘what is to be sustained’, the Board identified three issues: nature, life support systems (environment) and the community. The Board noted that greater emphasis was placed on life support systems, which “defined nature or environment as a source of services for the utilitarian life support of humankind” (Kates et al., 2005, p.11). Kates et al. (2005) further indicate that this definition was strengthened by the study of ecosystem services, thus creating a sharp contrast between the intrinsic value of nature conservation and the utility of nature for human wellbeing. In relation to ‘what should be developed’, the Board noted three factors: people, economy, and society, emphasising economic development and wealth creation, and further indicated that sustainable development embodies human development factors, including increased life expectancy, education, equity, and opportunity (Kates et al., 2005).

The debate on sustainable development was intensified in 2000, through the adoption of the MDGs by the United Nations’ General Assembly (UN, 2000). Subsequently, the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 further expanded the standard definition (Brundtland Commission’s definition) with the widely used three pillars of sustainable development: economic development, social development, and environmental protection (Kates et al., 2005). The World Summit tackled the limitations regarding socio-economic development and environmental framework within which the concept operates, and further created a common platform for developing and strengthening the pillars (triple bottom line) of sustainable development, so as to make them mutually reinforcing at the local, national, regional and global levels.

Consequently, the concept of sustainable development has been used in several fields, including business (e.g., Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002), finance (e.g., Leader & Ong, 2011) and agriculture (e.g., Wilson & Tyrchniewicz, 1995), to describe activities and processes including eco-efficiency (the economic value added by a firm in relation to its aggregated ecological impact), socio-efficiency (value added and its social impact) sustainable finances, sustainable business activities, sustainable agriculture and sustainable land management (Todorov & Marinova, 2009). Although the three underpinning concepts (economic, social, and environmental) of sustainable development are interrelated (Malcom, 1994; WCED, 1987), corporate businesses, the financial sector and the agriculture sector are primarily concerned with increasing economic and social benefits (e.g., Leader & Ong, 2011; Wilson & Tyrchniewicz, 1995). However, these factors alone are not sufficient to achieve sustainable development (Dyllick & Hockerts, 2002).
Appendix 4: The Sustainable Livelihood Approach

Scoones (1998) identifies the sustainable livelihood approach as a tool for understanding the diversity of livelihoods available to people especially, the poor, and how the poor survive through several activities rather than a single job. This approach organises the factors that hinder or enhance livelihood opportunities, and establishes the relationships between these factors (Serrat, 2008). It facilitates the identification of practical priorities for actions that are based on the views and interests of those involved (Serrat, 2008). The sustainable livelihood approach, according to Chambers and Conway (1992), focuses on the development of both short-term coping strategies and long-term adaptive mechanisms that improve individuals and communities’ capacity to manage shifting circumstances.

The sustainable livelihood approach is underpinned by two fundamental ideologies: adaptive strategies (changes in people’s livelihood systems in response to difficult circumstances), and participation and empowerment (Helmore & Singh 2001; Tao & Wall 2009). The approach enhances the formulation of development activities that are people-centred, responsive and participatory, multilevel, conducted in partnership with the public and private sectors, dynamic, and sustainable (Serrat, 2008). Figure 1 shows the sustainable livelihood framework.

![Figure 1 Sustainable Livelihood Framework](image)

Source: DFID (2002).

According to DFID (1999), the sustainable livelihoods framework is not intended to suggest that the starting point for all livelihoods (or livelihood analysis) is the vulnerability context which through a series of permutations yields livelihoods
outcomes, but rather livelihoods are shaped by a multitude of different forces and factors that are themselves constantly changing. Thus, this framework is a development tool for improving the understanding of livelihoods, particularly the livelihoods of the poor (Tao & Wall, 2009).

Prior to any development activity, the sustainable livelihood framework can serve as an analytical tool for the identification of development priorities and new activities, in order to understand the way a socially constructed environment works, and to find potential beneficiaries or partners in practice (Kollmair & Gamper, 2002). A study by Ellis (2000) in three Tanzanian villages stresses the importance of a detailed livelihood analysis for successful development cooperation. In a region famous for its coffee production, a detailed livelihood analysis was successful in demonstrating that coffee production contributed to the household income by 1% - a striking fact that might have been overlooked without a detailed livelihood analysis (Kollmair & Gamper, 2002). The sustainable livelihood framework can be applied in the form of a livelihood analysis to assess how development activities ‘fit’ with the livelihoods of the poor, and was used as a checklist or means of structuring ideas in Namibia and Kenya (Ashley, 2000). Ashley (2000) explored how rural livelihoods affect and are affected by natural resource management initiatives, and what this implies for these programmes (Kollmair & Gamper, 2002).

Krantz (2001, p.4) summarises the strengths and weaknesses of the sustainable livelihood approach as follows: it provides a more holistic view of the resources, or combination of resources, which are important to the poor, including not only physical and natural resources, but also social and human capital. Further, the approach facilitates an understanding of the underlying causes of poverty, by focusing on the variety of factors, at different levels, that directly or indirectly determine or constrain poor people’s access to resources/assets of different kinds. The sustainable livelihood approach provides a more realistic framework for assessing the direct and indirect effects on people’s living conditions than, for instance, one dimensional productivity or income criteria.

However, the basic idea of the sustainable livelihood approach is to start with a broad and open-ended analysis, but this requires a highly flexible planning situation which rarely exists. The best hope is to ensure that already identified/decided sector development initiatives fit with people’s livelihood strategies, and make them better at responding to the constraints and opportunities affecting the poor. Shen et al. (2008) further argue that while the sustainable livelihood approach sheds light on the local poor and advocates for participatory analysis in practice, there is little evidence to show local people’s motivation for participation in decision-making processes and political governance (Ashley, 2000b).
Appendix 5: The Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool

The idea of the Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT) was conceived in 2007 and developed in Asia by IFAD, to address several challenges of the available poverty assessment frameworks which inhibit holistic analysis of the fundamental dimensions of poverty, especially at the rural level. MPAT has been identified as a multi-purpose tool for supporting poverty alleviation in rural areas, especially in developing countries, and presents comprehensive assessment modalities for defining rural poverty, by focusing on fundamental and universal dimensions relevant to rural poverty reduction (Cohen, 2009). Additionally, MPAT assesses the core dimensions of rural poverty, and further addresses the universal human needs and other important spheres relevant to poverty reduction (Cohen, 2010). Figure 2 shows the components and the sub components of the MPAT framework.

![Figure 2 Components and Sub-components of MPAT](source: IFAD (2009))

According to Cohen (2009), MPAT is based on the philosophy that all people, rich or poor, have the same basic needs, irrespective of their geographical locations or cultural inclinations. People are likely to neglect the other domains of their lives until these fundamental needs are met. MPAT has the primary purpose of providing an assessment of the key dimensions relevant to humans’ needs. Highlighting its global usefulness, MPAT is designed and intended for use by people concerned with rural poverty reduction, including project managers, donor agencies, government institutions, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organisations, practitioners and academics (IFAD, 2009).
Prior to the implementation of MPAT, the framework was tested and revised extensively in various parts of rural China and India (Cohen, 2009; IFAD, 2009). Additionally, MPAT was piloted in Asia to test its potential to generate valid and reliable data devoid of biases (Cohen, 2009). According to IFAD (2009) a large-scale pilot of MPAT was conducted in China and India in early 2009. Given the successes of MPAT following its application in a number of field-tests and pilot studies, there is a growing consensus among academics, practitioners and international organisations of the great potential of MPAT to support poverty alleviation initiatives in rural communities in the world (Cohen, 2009; IFAD, 2009). The MPAT is robust with respect to accurately capturing information for each of its main components, and has added value in its triangulation of data, imperative to providing a reliable evaluation (Cohen, 2009).

However, the MPAT is a new framework that is evolving with new inputs based on its application, which makes it inappropriate for this research. Also, the MPAT framework has largely been applied across large geographical regions such as a cross country studies (Cohen, 1999), with limited rural community level application. Besides, the MPAT framework does not cover all indicators or factors considered in this research, such as environmental conservation and household incomes.
Appendix 6: The Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework (Ross and Wall, 1999a)

**Origin of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework**

The idea of the ‘Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework’ was conceived and developed by Ross and Wall (1999a) in response to the widening gap between ecotourism philosophy and its application, which has inhibited holistic understanding of the ‘actual meaning’ of ecotourism in the host regions. As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5, the burgeoning interest in ecotourism over the past three decades has led to different interpretations, even among academics, which in Wall’s (1997) view has the potential to discredit the concept. Despite the growing interpretation of ecotourism, Ross and Wall (1999a) observe that there is very limited evidence to suggest that the application of the concept meets the objectives associated with ecotourism.

Literature indicates that ecotourism has the potential to stimulate environmental conservation while delivering sustainable development outcomes in the host regions (see Chapter 3, Section 3.5). Although the concept has been advocated in both environmental and tourism research, Ross and Wall (1999a) argue that the practical conditions required for the promotion, management and evaluation of ecotourism in the host regions are non-existent. As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.10, there are a number of case studies highlighting the failure of ecotourism to achieve its objectives, regardless of the mounting literature emphasising ecotourism’s potential to deliver sustainable benefits. As a result, Ross and Wall (1999) maintain that the philosophy of ecotourism has not been successfully implemented, despite practical guidelines proposed by Lindberg and Hawkins (1993) in their book ‘Ecotourism: A guide for planners and managers’. Thus, a standardised method for evaluating the progress of ecotourism destinations is imperative to understanding ecotourism challenges, and in developing the right approaches to achieving the ideals of ecotourism in the host destinations (Ross & Wall, 1999a).

**Conceptual Basis of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework**

Ecotourism interpretations over the past three decades have been broadened from descriptive elements of locations and activities, to include various normative outcomes addressing conservation and local development objectives, and engaging with a wide range of stakeholders with diverse functions. However, Ross and Wall (1999a) observe the lack of consensus regarding the uniqueness of ecotourism, and the extent to which it differs from other forms of tourism, has resulted in a lack of ecotourism application on the ground. They further attribute the controversies surrounding the appropriate use of the concept, and the inconsistency in its application, as the challenges of ecotourism implementation in the host regions. As discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.5, there is no internationally agreed definition of ecotourism, a situation which Ross and Wall (1999a) believe
has resulted in inadequate, if not lack of, evidence of ecotourism operationalisation based on its objectives in host regions.

The challenge of ecotourism operationalisation lies in the development of an appropriate method or framework for evaluating its implementation. Although evaluation frameworks (e.g., Courvisanos & Jain’s [2006] sustainable ecotourism framework; Scheyvens’ [1999] ecotourism empowerment framework) have been used to assess the impacts of tourism activities, Ross and Wall (1999a) explain that the development of a standardised framework has the potential to improve the dynamics of ecotourism, and contribute to ecotourism planning and management. They state that a standardised framework for evaluating ecotourism implementation should endeavour to incorporate all the principles discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.6, to ensure that ecotourism activities protect the natural areas, generate funds for conservation purposes, contribute to local community development and encourage education and advocacy in terms of environmental conservation and development. They describe an ideal ecotourism situation as the one where local residents, protected resources, and tourism benefit each other in an interrelated and symbiotic fashion.

**Composition of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework**

The Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework consists of three key parts: local communities, biological diversity and tourism. The framework suggests that the sustainability of tourism activities should be considered in the contexts of both the natural environment and the aspirations of local communities (Ross & Wall, 1999a).

![Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework](image)

**Figure 3 Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework: Relationship between the Three Links**

Source: Ross and Wall (1999, p. 126)
The framework is premised on the philosophy that fostering positive links between people, natural resources and tourism is significant in realising the functions of ecotourism, as the strength or weakness of one link has implications for the other links. In the context of ecotourism functions, Ross and Wall (1999a) indicate that the qualities that emerge from applying this framework, such as community involvement and cultural preservation, make the ecotourism concept whole, and that the relationships between these three links are critical in evaluating ecotourism implementation.

Explaining these relationships, Ross and Wall (1999a) assert that local communities act as stewards of natural resources, and benefit from them through sustainable harvesting, integrated and multiple use zones and by the protection of important resources such as watersheds of rivers. However, protection of natural resources through protected area regulations has the potential to result in antagonistic attitudes in local communities in developing countries, given their high dependence on natural resources for their livelihood in terms of resource extraction. Ross and Wall (1999a) believe that, if local people were involved in planning and management processes, they would have some control over the resources, and possibly support tourism, as it is often seen as one of the limited development options in developing countries.

In addition to the benefits accruing from protection of resources, Ross and Wall (1999a) note that local communities, by virtue of their status as ecotourism host communities, may receive different benefits including social, infrastructural and economic benefits, while their interactions with tourists may enhance tourist experience. With community participation as one of the key principles of ecotourism (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6), Ross and Wall (1999a) argue that local input into ecotourism destination development is critical for a number of reasons, including addressing local needs and concerns, avoiding decisions which may impact negatively on local residents, empowering local people to exercise some control over decision-making that affects them, and strengthening links between conservation and development goals. Thus, efforts to strengthen the relationships between the three links (local community, natural resources and tourism) should not be underestimated, as ecotourism contributions to biodiversity and the integrity of natural areas are equally important as potential benefits to adjacent communities (Ross & Wall, 1999a).

However, Ross and Wall (1999a) believe that Figure 3 will yield limited outcomes without effective management, which Boo (1993) argues is critical for the successful operationalisation of ecotourism. Thus, the development of positive synergistic relationships between the three links is unlikely to occur without the implementation of policies and management strategies, as well as engagement with different organisational stakeholders, including NGOs and development assistance agencies. As a result, Ross and Wall (1999a) introduced a management option into the framework. The management options are proposed to ensure monitoring and research programmes, as well as enforcement of restrictions in the
protected areas, while they provide tourism services and tourist impact management. In addition, the management options seek to carry out outreach programmes, and to enforce use zones in the local communities.

Figure 4
Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework: The Relationships between the Three Links and Management Agencies

Source: Ross and Wall (1999a, p. 130)

In summary then, the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework proposes that the success of ecotourism in protected areas is contingent on positive and harmonious relationships between natural resources and local communities, between local communities and tourism, and between tourism and protected areas facilitated by appropriate management (Ross & Wall, 1999a; 1999b).

Application of the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework

Ross and Wall (1999b) and Stone and Wall (2004) used the Ecotourism Development and Evaluation Framework to analyse the status of ecotourism development in three different protected areas in North Sulawesi, Indonesia, and two ecotourism locations in Hainan, China. They used the framework to first examine the relationship between the local people and the protected areas, which they found to not be harmonious because of the high dependence of the communities on the protected areas for their livelihood. Also, the framework was useful in establishing the relationship between local communities and tourism, which was found to be a paradox; on the one hand tourism has fostered positive links with the local communities through infrastructure development, but on the other hand, it has not encouraged positive attitudes towards conservation and cultural interactions. The last relationship, between tourism and protected areas,
Ross and Wall (1999b) found to be weak, due to factors such as inconsistency of enforcement of protected area regulations and management plans.

Ross and Wall (1999b) conclude that the relationships between natural areas, tourism and local communities in the North Sulawesi are not symbiotic because of limited tourism benefits to host communities, and ineffective management of protected areas as well as top-down unsupportive policies for successful ecotourism implementation. The framework was useful in identifying areas where efforts and strengths have been focused or lacking, in terms of ecotourism implementation, at different destinations. It enabled a holistic evaluation of ecotourism.

Although Ross and Wall (1999b) admit that the framework does not encompass all aspects of ecotourism, and does not address all issues concerning management, they suggest that “it directs attention to aspects of tourism, environment and society, which are often regarded as antagonistic, in a way which can encourage positive outcomes through facilitation of synergistic linkages rather than the initiation and perpetuation of conflicts” (p. 682).
Appendix 7: Social Science Research Paradigms

Positivist Research Paradigm

According to Blaikie (1991) positivism entails ontology of events with reality being viewed as atomistic, discrete and observable events. With its fundamental objective of providing explanations to reality and discovering fundamental laws of human behaviour (May, 2001; Neuman, 2003), human activities are interpreted as an observable pattern of behaviour in observable material circumstances, with social reality being a complex causal relation between events, based on an emerging patchwork of relations between the variables (Blaikie, 1991; Neuman, 2003). The cause of human behaviour is perceived to be external to the individual (Blaikie 1991; Johnson et al. 1984), and ensures objectivity in social reality (Neuman, 2003).

With regard to the epistemology of events, knowledge can be derived from experience by means of experimental or comparative analysis, and concepts and generalisations pertaining to particular observations (Blaikie, 1991; Johnson et al., 1984). Validity (see section 4.5) is ensured in positivism, through experiences and observations, although this may have to be subjected to statistical manipulations or experiments (Blaikie, 1991). The positivist paradigm employs quantitative and experimental approaches in testing hypothetical-deductive generalisations (Amaratunga et al., 2002).

Many scholars argue that the positivist paradigm reduces the complex into simple elements to enhance analysis, in addition to searching for causal explanations and fundamental laws (Amaratunga et al., 2002; Remenyi et al., 1998). This paradigm encourages independence of the researcher from the phenomenon being investigated and the need to formulate hypotheses for further verification (Amaratunga et al., 2002; May, 2001; Neuman, 2003).

Interpretivist Research Paradigm

With its opposition to the positivist research paradigm (Neuman, 2003), Blaikie (1991, p.120) states that “interpretivism entails ontology in which social reality is regarded as the product of processes by which social actors negotiate the meanings for actions and situations”. In its epistemology, knowledge results from everyday interpretations and meanings of events, with the integrity of the phenomena being retained (Blaikie, 1991). The interpretive research paradigm uses “qualitative and naturalistic approaches to inductively and holistically understand human experience in context-specific settings” (Amaratunga et al., 2002).

Amaratunga et al. (2002) further suggest this approach creates an avenue for understanding and explaining a phenomenon, rather than searching for external causes or fundamental laws (Remenyi et al., 1998). This approach, according to Amaratunga et al.(2002), rejects the use of regularities to ground generalisations.
and causations (what an object is likely to do and what it can do), and embraces the notion of deductivism (the claim that generalisations can be made from a finite set of events in the past to predict future events). Logic in this research paradigm is based on everyday activities, in which individuals make sense of their own social world (Blaikie, 1991). Although its critics argue that it lacks scientific rigour, interpretivism has been particularly used for exploratory research (Neuman, 2003).

**Critical Realism Research Paradigm**

Critical paradigm and realist philosophy have been integrated due to their common ontological and epistemological basis, and they have been referred to as critical realism research paradigm (May, 2003). The ontology in critical realism embraces the ultimate objects of scientific inquiry which exist, act and operate independently of scientists and their activities, and encourages the combined use of nomothetic and ideographic approaches to scientific social research (Blaikie, 1991; Neuman, 2003). Blaikie (1991) explains that the critical realism creates a distinction between the domains of the empirical (experiences of events through observations), the actual (observed and unobserved events) and the real (the processes that generate events).

The purpose of the realist paradigm is to explain observable phenomena with reference to the underlying structures and mechanisms of reality, and it is epistemologically based on the building of models of such mechanisms (Blaikie, 1991; May, 2001; Neuman, 2003). Validity is based on “the criterion that if it works it must be true” (Blaikie, 1991, p. 122). According to Neuman (2003), this paradigm is rarely used in social research, but is very useful among social organisations and movements, given its emphasis on societal transformation.
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INFORMATION SHEET
Research Project: Reducing Poverty in Developing Countries through Ecotourism: A Case Study of the Kakum Conservation Area, Ghana

Research Background
The primary objective of this research is to understand ecotourism activities in reducing poverty and develop a framework for managing ecotourism activities while improving the living conditions of the poor around the Kakum Conservation Area, Ghana. Four communities around the Kakum Conservation Area in Ghana have been purposively sampled for this study due to their constant interactions with tourists and relatively high poverty levels. There will be two field data collection visits for the study. The first in April-July 2012 seeks to gather a broad range of data needed in answering the research questions. The second visit in February-March 2014 will be a follow up visit which intends validating data and addressing all gaps and inconsistencies that might have occurred in the data analysis.

The data collection will involve four research techniques: semi-structured interviews with officials of the relevant organisations; household survey in the communities; in-depth interviews with households and organisations; and participant observation, in addition to secondary data. Interviews with organisations and households will last for approximately one hour. You are invited to participate in this research. I will be asking you questions on ecotourism activities in the Kakum Conservation Area, ecotourism policies in Ghana and the poverty conditions of the people living around the Conservation Area. This interview will take place in a place of your choice, hopefully in your house/office. Interviews will be recorded in written and/or audio form using audio recorder as part of this project. You are free to choose to be involved, or not to be involved, in this research at any time. Additionally, you can withdraw your participation at anytime, without being subjected to any penalty or discriminatory treatment. Maintaining confidentiality is important in this research. No names will be put on any publications. Data from the project will remain confidential.

You may withdraw from this research project at any time.

You are also welcome to contact the researchers involved in this research at any time

Contact details:
Principal Researcher
Patrick Brandful Cobbinah
PhD Student
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789, Albury, NSW, 2640, Australia.
Tel. +61 26051 9727; mobile: +61 412740660
Email: pcoobbinah@csu.edu.au

Principal Supervisor
Dr Rosemary Black
PhD
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789, Albury, NSW 2640, Australia.
Tel. +61 260510983; mobile: +61 415438825
Email: rblack@csu.edu.au

Note: Charles Sturt University’s Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this project. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this project, you may contact the Committee through the Executive Officer:
The Executive Officer
Ethics in Human Research Committee
Academic Secretariat
Charles Sturt University
Private Mail Bag 29, Bathurst, NSW, 2795, Australia.
Tel. +61-2-63384628; Fax. +61-2-63384194

Any issue you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully and you will be informed of the outcome.
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Research Project: Reducing Poverty in Developing Countries through Ecotourism: A Case Study of
the Kakum Conservation Area, Ghana

To be read or given to the interviewee at the start of the research:
Thank you for agreeing to take part in this research. I am a researcher from Charles Sturt University
working on the above mentioned project. Please sign below indicating that:

“I understand that I am free to choose to be involved, or not involved, in this research at any time. It is also clear to
me that if I withdraw my participation, I will not be subjected to any penalty or discriminatory treatment.
The purpose of the research has been explained to me and I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about
the research and received satisfactory answers.
I understand that this interview will be recorded in written and/or audio form as part of this project.
I understand that any information or personal details gathered during this research about me are confidential and
that neither my name nor any other identifying information such as positions in government or institution will be
used or published without my written permission.
To participants who can neither read nor understand English, I understand that my willingness to participate in this
research is an indication of my informed consent.
I understand that Charles Sturt University’s Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this study, and I
understand that if I have any complaints or concerns about this research I can contact the Committee*: Interviewee’s statement
I understand the information I have been given and agree to be interviewed.

Signature ........................................ Date ............

Interviewer’s Statement:
I confirm that I have carefully explained the nature, demands and foreseeable risks of the proposed study to the volunteer.
Signature ........................................ Date ............

Charles Sturt University’s Ethics in Human Research Committee has approved this study.
I understand that if I have any complaints or concerns about this research I can contact:

Executive Officer
Ethics in Human Research Committee
Academic Secretariat
Charles Sturt University
Private Mail Bag 29
Bathurst NSW 2795
Ph: +61 2 6338 4628
Fax: +61 2 6338 4194

Contact details:
Principal Researcher
Patrick Brandyfe Cobbina
PhD Student
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University
PO Box 789, Albury, NSW, 2640, Australia.
Tel. +61 26051 9727; mobile: +61 412749960
Email: pccobbina@csu.edu.au

Principal Supervisor
Dr Rosemary Black
PhD
School of Environmental Sciences
Charles Sturt University,
PO Box 789, Albury, NSW 2640, Australia.
Tel. +61 260519683; mobile: +61 415436823
Email: rblack@csu.edu.au
Appendix 10: Household Survey Questionnaire

Background Information

Name of Interviewer………………………Time ……………….. Date: ……………

Name of Respondent ……………………Name of Community………HH code……

Introduction

Hello my name is Patrick Cobbinah. I am a research student of Charles Sturt University, Australia undertaking a study on the potential of ecotourism in reducing poverty around the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA), Ghana. You happen to be one of the selected participants for this research. Would you be willing to spend 30 minutes now in answering a few questions relating to ecotourism and poverty reduction?

YES! Good thank you. Be reminded that participation in the survey is voluntary and you are free to stop the interview at any time if you feel the questions are too intrusive and demanding. Your responses will be handled with complete confidentiality. The results of the survey can be made available to you if interested.

NO! Is there another more convenient time when I could meet you? ……………........

Thank you for consenting to participate in this research. As I said, my research seeks to collect information on poverty reduction and ecotourism activities around the KCA, Ghana.

Household Characteristics

First, I’d like to ask you some questions about yourself, is that OK? Thank you.

1. Please, complete the table below by ticking or giving the appropriate response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1. Age of respondent…..</th>
<th>1.2. Gender of respondent:</th>
<th>1.3. Residency Status:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Male [ ]</td>
<td>1. Native resident [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female [ ]</td>
<td>2. Non-native [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. What is the size of this household?</td>
<td>1.5. Marital Status:</td>
<td>1.6. Educational status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.  1 [ ]</td>
<td>1. Married [ ]</td>
<td>1. Tertiary [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  2 [ ]</td>
<td>2. Single [ ]</td>
<td>2. Secondary /technical [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  3 [ ]</td>
<td>3. Widow [ ]</td>
<td>3. Junior High [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.  4 [ ]</td>
<td>4. Widower [ ]</td>
<td>4. Primary [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.  5 [ ]</td>
<td>5. Divorced [ ]</td>
<td>5. Never [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Over 5 [ ]</td>
<td>Other(s) specify</td>
<td>6. Other (s) specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. Ethnicity:</td>
<td>1.8. Religion:</td>
<td>1.9. Occupation Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.Akan [ ]</td>
<td>1. Christianity [ ]</td>
<td>1. Employed [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tribes of Northern origin [ ]</td>
<td>2. Islam [ ]</td>
<td>2. Unemployed [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ga [ ]</td>
<td>3. Traditional [ ]</td>
<td>Other(s) specify [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ewe [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nzema [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other(s) specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 10 Employed in:</td>
<td>1.11. Household expenditure:</td>
<td>1.12. Household income:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. KCA [ ]</td>
<td>A. Daily [ ]</td>
<td>A. Daily [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ecotourism activities [ ]</td>
<td>B. Weekly [ ]</td>
<td>B. Weekly [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Non ecotourism activities e.g. Agric [ ]</td>
<td>C. Monthly [ ]</td>
<td>C. Monthly [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>self owned business [ ]</td>
<td>D. Annually [ ] (specify).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Annually [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for answering all the questions. I really appreciate your help.

**Household Poverty Characteristics**

*Please, I’d like to ask you some questions about your living conditions and the community. Is that OK? Thank you.*

1. Do you think you and your household are poor? A. Yes [ ] B. No [ ]

2. Please explain your answer in Q2……

3. Are there other households in this community who are not poor? A. Yes [ ] B. No [ ]

4. Please explain your answer in Q4……

5. Please, indicate the availability and condition of the following social services, by completing the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Service /Facilities</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Health centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Junior high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4. Borehole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5. Piped water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6. Natural water sources (e.g., stream)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7. Sanitation facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.8. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9. Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.10. Electricity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding of Ecotourism**

*Now I want to talk to you about “tourism that brings visitors to your community to experience the national park and the local culture”.*

6. Is this type of tourism occurring in your community in and around the KCA? A. Yes [ ] B. No [ ]

7. On a scale of 2 to -2, how much do you support or oppose this type of tourism in your community.
   A. Strongly opposed (-2) [ ] B. Somewhat oppose (-1) [ ] C. Neutral (0) [ ] D. Somewhat support (1) [ ] E. Strongly support (2) [ ] F. No opinion [ ]

8. Please tell me why you feel that way…………………………………………

9. In your opinion, do you want this type of tourism in and around the KCA to increase or decrease? A. Large decrease [ ] B. Small decrease [ ] C. Stay the same [ ] D. Small increase [ ] E. Large increase [ ] F. Do not care [ ]

10. Please can you explain why? …………………………………………

11. Who is responsible for managing this type of tourism in your community?
   A. GTB [ ] B. GHCT [ ] C. District Assembly [ ]
   D. Community [ ] E. Others (specify).........
12. What is your relationship with the institution(s) that manage(s) ecotourism in the KCA?  
A. Positive  [ ]  
B. Neutral  [ ]  
C. Negative  [ ]

13. Explain your answer in Q 13. ........

14. Are there any groups in the community which are excluded or not engaged in this type of tourism?  
A. Yes  [ ]  
B. No  [ ]

15. If yes, which group is excluded from in this type of tourism? .........

16. Why do you think they are excluded? ........

Outcomes of Ecotourism on poverty reduction

Now, I’d like to know if you think this type of tourism is contributing to reducing the poverty among the people in this community or worsening their situation. Understanding the impacts of this type of tourism on individuals in this community is important in guiding future policies to be responsive and sensitive to local needs. I’d appreciate it if you can tell me some of the impacts of this type tourism on your lives and the community as a whole, by responding to the following questions.

17. Do you think this type of tourism has any impacts on your household? (a) Yes  [ ]  (b) No  [ ]

18. If yes, what are the impacts? (Use the following scale: Very positive impact 2, Positive impact 1, Neutral- 0, Negative impact -1, Very negative impact -2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>In what form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Environmental conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Employment and income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Women empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Cultural preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other(s) specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. If no why don’t you think there are any impacts? ..................

20. Do you think other households have similar impacts?  
A. Yes  [ ]  B. No  [ ]

21. Explain your answer in Q 21. ........

22. In what ways do you think your community will benefit if this type tourism increases in the future? [Interviewer to tick boxes, Allow for multiple responses]

A. All benefit will go to the local community  [ ]  
B. All the benefits will go to the management of the national park and the government  [ ]  
C. Benefits will equally be shared between governments and local community  [ ]  
D. Most of the benefits will go to the powerful elites in the community  [ ]  
E. Others (specify)..........

23. Before we finish, what do you think ecotourism of activities in your community?

24. Is there anything else you would like to add about ecotourism and poverty situation in this community?

Thank you very much for your time and for responding to the questions! Have a good day
Appendix 11: In-depth Interview Guide

Background Information

Name of Interviewer…………………………Time ……………….. Date: ……

Name of Respondent ……………………………………………HH Code…………..

Introduction

Hello my name is Patrick Cobbinah. I am a research student of Charles Sturt University, Australia undertaking a study on the potential of ecotourism in reducing poverty around the Kakum Conservation Area (KCA), Ghana. You have been selected as one of the participants for this research. Would you be willing to spend 60 minutes now in answering a few questions relating to ecotourism and poverty reduction?

YES! Good thank you. Be reminded that participation in the survey is voluntary and you are free to stop the interview at any time if you feel the questions are too intrusive and demanding. Your responses will be handled with complete confidentiality. The results of the survey can be made available to you if interested.

NO! Is there another more convenient time when I could contact you? .....................

Thank you for consenting to participate in this research

The interview is divided into three broad categories: Your understanding of poverty at the community level; your perspective on ecotourism activities in and around the Conservation Area; and the outcomes of ecotourism on the lives of people in this community. These areas will provide a deeper insight into how ecotourism is helping to reduce poverty in this region. To ensure all data is captured, the interview will be tape recorded, is that OK with you?

1. Can you (household) explain to me what poverty is? (The purpose of this question is to explore local communities’ understanding of poverty and how it relates to the theory of poverty, as reported in literature, as well as to gain insight into the role ecotourism in the Conservation Area has played in the poverty dynamics in the local community).

   • How do household perceive poverty?
   • What are the indicators of poverty to households?
   • Is poverty in this community linked to ecotourism in the KCA?
   • How has ecotourism in the KCA influenced the poverty condition in this community?
   • How is poverty manifested in this community?

2. What is the evidence that ecotourism is occurring in and around the Conservation Area? (This topic aims to ascertain local communities’ experiences with ecotourism, in terms of their participation in the implementation and management process [Note: Although the local residents did not understand the theory of ecotourism, they were able to describe it based on their observation and experience])
• What are the ecotourism resources that attract tourists to the KCA and this community?
• What are requirements for working in ecotourism in the KCA and the community?
• What are the characteristics of those involved in ecotourism in the KCA and the community?
• How is the community involved in ecotourism activities?
• To what extent are people in this community involved in the management of ecotourism in the KCA and the community?
• Are there any groups that are excluded from engaging in ecotourism activities? If yes, why?
• What has been your experience with ecotourism implementation in the KCA and the community?
• How has your experience with ecotourism implementation influenced your relationship with the institution(s) responsible for managing the KCA?

3. What are the effects of ecotourism on this community? (The purpose of this question is to assess the outcomes of ecotourism to know whether it is either contributing to poverty reduction or compounding poverty situation in the local community)

• Do you receive many tourists in this community?
• How are ecotourism revenue distributed?
• What are the positive effects of ecotourism in this community?
• What are the negative effects of ecotourism in this community?
• What are your expectations from ecotourism in this community?
• Have your expectations of ecotourism been met? If yes, how? If no, why?

Thank You. That’s the end of the interview today. Thank you very much for your time and for responding to the questions! Have a good day.
Appendix 12: Semi-structured Interviews Guide

Background Information

Name of Interviewer………………………………Time ………………… Date: ………

Name of Respondent ………………………Name of Institution……….Inst. code……

Introduction

The interview is divided into three broad categories: Your organisation’s understanding of ecotourism; the application of ecotourism policy; and outcomes of ecotourism on the lives of the people in the community. These areas will provide a deeper insight into how ecotourism is helping to reduce poverty in this region. To ensure all data is captured, the interview will be tape recorded, is that OK with you?

1. Can you explain to me ecotourism activities in the KCA and how your institution has been involved?

   First, I would like to talk to you about the activities of your organization and how they are linked to the interpretation and the implementation of ecotourism in and around the KCA. (the purpose of this topic area is to give the institutions the platform to explain what ecotourism is to them, how long they’ve been involved in ecotourism activities, background of ecotourism activities in the park and to identify whether their interpretations conform to the fundamental principles of ecotourism theory).

   • Generally, what are the roles of your organisation? Does your organisation have any role in ecotourism in the KCA? How long has your organisation been involved in ecotourism in the KCA?

   • When was ecotourism introduced in the KCA? What are the ecotourism attractions? Why was ecotourism introduced in the KCA?

   • What is your organisation’s understanding of ecotourism? What types of ecotourism is being practiced?

   • Do you think that ecotourism is connected to poverty in any way in the KCA? How do you think ecotourism is connected to poverty? In your opinion, what are the indicators of poverty in the KCA region? Why do you think these are the poverty indicators?

   Thank you, now I would like to ask you questions on legal/policy framework within which ecotourism is implemented and managed

2. Are ecotourism activities regulated by any legislation/policy/programme/plan?

   (The purpose of this topic is to find out the organisation’s knowledge on the availability of ecotourism policies, plans and programmes in guiding ecotourism activities in Ghana and in particular the KCA. This is important as it will reveal whether ecotourism activities in the study area are being implemented within a policy/legal framework. This topic asks questions on available policies, legislations, programmes of ecotourism. It is also important in determining the outcome of
ecotourism activities on the host communities. Additionally this is important in providing valuable feedback to the Ghana Tourist Authority and the Ministry of Tourism in the future formulation and implementation of ecotourism policies.)

- Does your organisation know of any ecotourism/tourism policy in Ghana? What are the available policies for managing ecotourism/tourism? What is the purpose/focus of these policies?
- Which of these policies are applicable to the KCA? Why these policies? Structure (national, regional and local), Coordination (conformity with local policies/plans)
- Do you think these policies are linked to poverty reduction? How do you think poverty is addressed in these policies?
- What are the challenges in implementing these policies? What efforts are being made to improve the situation?

Thank you, now I want to talk about the implementation and management of ecotourism activities around the KCA.

3. How is ecotourism implemented and managed around the KCA, and which organisations are responsible?

(This topic builds on the previous topic and establishes how the understanding of ecotourism has influenced its application. It attempts to ascertain whether ecotourism activities in the KCA are driven by the understanding of local organisations or by the theoretical interpretation of the concept. This topic asks questions on the various stakeholders and their role in implementing ecotourism in the region)

- Who are the major stakeholders in ecotourism activities in the KCA? What are their roles?
- Is your organisation involved? How is your organisation involved in the implementation of ecotourism in the KCA? What challenges does your organisation face in the implementation of ecotourism?
- What criteria are required in working in ecotourism related activities? What are the characteristics of those involved and why? Which groups are excluded?
- Are there any specific ecotourism strategies to improve the conditions of the poor around the KCA? What are they? Why these strategies?
- What are the challenges limiting ecotourism development in and around the KCA? What efforts are being made to overcome these challenges?

Thank you. After discussing ecotourism and how it is implemented, I would appreciate it if you can answer the following questions on the impacts of ecotourism on your organisation’s activities and the host communities.
4. Does ecotourism have any impacts?

(This topic seeks to understand the extent to which ecotourism is contributing to poverty reduction in the Kakum region or worsening poverty situation. Questions on both the positive and negative impacts of ecotourism as well as how these impacts are distributed are asked. Moreover, this topic explores deeper understanding the impacts of ecotourism activities on the host communities which is important in guiding future ecotourism policies to be responsive and sensitive to local needs).

- How many people are employed in ecotourism in the Conservation Area? How many of them are women? What is the tourist turnout (numbers)? What is the revenue and expenditure of ecotourism in the Conservation Area?

- What are the positive impacts of ecotourism on the host communities around the KCA? What are the negative impacts of ecotourism?

- How are the impacts distributed across the communities? How do the communities respond to ecotourism impacts?

- Do you think government has been responding to ecotourism? What are the responses of government?

- Overall, what do you think about ecotourism activities in the community? Overall is the impact good or bad? Do you think ecotourism should grow or decrease in the future?

- Before we finish, would like to make any comment about the role of ecotourism in reducing poverty in these communities?

Thank You. That’s the end of the interview today. Thank you very much for your time.