



## TOURISM AS A DRIVER OF RURAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: THE CASE OF BOABENG-FIEMA MONKEY SANCTUARY

 **Richard Baah-Mintah**<sup>1\*</sup>

 **Ellen Owusu-Adjei**<sup>2</sup>

**Stephen E. Hiamey**<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Development and Management, Anglican University College, Ghana.

<sup>1</sup>Email: [rb.mintah@angutech.edu.gh](mailto:rb.mintah@angutech.edu.gh) Tel: +233-243-512764

<sup>2</sup>Email: [ellen.owusuadjei@gmail.com](mailto:ellen.owusuadjei@gmail.com) Tel: +233-244-040929

<sup>3</sup>Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

<sup>3</sup>Email: [sehiamey@gmail.com](mailto:sehiamey@gmail.com) Tel: +233-244-974152



(+ Corresponding author)

### ABSTRACT

#### Article History

Received: 15 October 2021

Revised: 28 March 2022

Accepted: 12 April 2022

Published: 22 April 2022

#### Keywords

Tourism

Rural

Socio-economic

Development

Boabeng-Fiema

Monkey sanctuary.

Many countries especially developing ones like Ghana see tourism as a conduit for socio-economic development. This paper aims to examine stakeholders' perceptions of the socio-economic effect of the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary. To achieve this aim, research was carried out into the role of tourism (a Monkey Sanctuary) in promoting rural socio-economic development in Ghana. The systematic sampling and purposive sampling methods were used to select 265 household heads and 11 key informants respectively from the Boabeng and Fiema communities. The questionnaire, interview guide, and observation were mainly used to collect data from respondents. The main finding reveals a community's acceptance of tourism as having the potential to promote rural socio-economic development. However, this potential is challenged by the activities of the monkeys, destroying farm crops and properties coupled with an infrastructural deficit in the area. Implications are outlined for policymakers and the management of the wildlife sanctuary.

**Contribution/Originality:** The Monkey Sanctuary is great potential for the Boabeng and Fiema communities and the Nkoranza North District in general. The study, has, however, shown that a lot needs to be done by the key stakeholders in terms of infrastructural development and publicity to realize its full potential.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Developing rural communities has been a global issue. Globally, various governments, international organizations, donor agencies, non-governmental organizations, and other bodies, are initiating numerous programs and projects designed to facilitate rural-community development. This is particularly the case especially in developing countries in Africa, Asia, and South America. This is largely because a greater proportion of the world's population resides in rural areas. A generalization that is true about rural areas globally is that they are the homes of the highest population of the poor, who are desperately seeking ways to improve their living conditions and income (Todaro & Smith, 2015). Their major economic activity is agriculture.

To develop the rural communities, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, the role of the tourism industry, specifically rural tourism is very crucial (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), 2017). According to Samimi, Sadeghi, and Sadeghi (2011) and Scheyvens (2002) tourism is an attractive and vital tool for rural development, most especially among countries found in the Global South. Over the last few decades, studies have shown that the tourism industry is one of the fastest-growing industries globally. The United Nations

World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) reports that the industry contributed 9.8 per cent of the global GDP in 2016 (Peng, 2017). Developing the tourism potential of rural communities is considered a means of achieving economic and social development and regeneration; bringing overall development to rural areas (Saarinen & Rogerson, 2014). Rural tourism is a major breakthrough and a tool for rural revitalization that enhanced rural development and reduced rural poverty. This is the position of the endogenous development theorists who stress development emanating from the local initiative, local values, institutions, and the use of local resources (Hountondji, 1998; Millar, 2014). In this study, external resources are relied upon only if their benefits have relevance to, and can help augment and enforce, local initiatives (Millar, Apusigah, & Boonzaaijer, 2008).

In countries like Japan, rural tourism has improved the living standards of rural folks. The rural area with its serene and quiet environment appears to be a preferred destination for tourists. Tourism in rural communities provides a viable option for dealing with the unemployment challenge which is often found in the rural areas and preserving the environment and the cultural values of people (Viljoen & Tlabela, 2007). Developing the tourism potential of the rural areas will reduce the rural-urban migration and its concomitant adverse effects both in the rural areas and the urban centers. Tourism is seen by many countries, especially in Europe, as a way of diversifying the rural economy (Brandth & Haugen, 2011; Giannakis, 2014). This is because of the relationship it has with the other sectors of the rural economy such as agriculture, transportation, construction, food processing, and the various services sector in rural areas. Developing rural tourism in Ghana will serve two major purposes. Firstly, it will enhance the entire tourism industry, and secondly open rural communities (Asiedu, 2002). In another breadth, rural tourism could serve as an alternative to efforts toward rural development in Ghana.

As a country, Ghana is blessed with a plethora of excellent natural, cultural and heritage resources which, when harnessed and developed, can contribute to the development of the rural communities in Ghana. One of these resources is the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary (BFMS), a tourist destination located in the Nkoranza North District (NND) of the Bono East Region. The sanctuary has been in existence since 1927. Despite its presence, little or no empirical studies have been undertaken to find out how the existence of the sanctuary has helped in developing the rural communities within which it is located. Again, most studies in Ghana focus on mass tourism but not rural tourism. It is therefore deemed worthwhile for systematic research such as this to be carried out to find out how the existence of the sanctuary has helped in the socio-economic development of the surrounding rural communities in the Nkoranza North District. The rest of the paper is organized around the following areas:

- Conceptual issues on tourism and rural socio-economic development.
- Study setting and methodology.
- Results, and discussion.
- Conclusion and policy implications.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. *Tourism and Rural Socio-Economic Development*

As defined by the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (as cited in Nilanjan (2015); Manca (2016)), tourism is a social, cultural, and economic phenomenon that entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes. Globally, tourism has over the years emerged as one of the promising sectors when it comes to economic growth and development among countries (United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2014). Governments, international organizations, development agencies, and other scholars have all recognized the backward and forward linkages the tourism sector has with other sectors of an economy (Ekanayake & Long, 2012). Several studies have also shown a positive correlation between tourism development and economic growth and development.

In Ghana, like other developing countries, the tourism sector has been identified as a major engine of growth and development. This realization dates back to the 1970s when the government set up a committee to identify and

assess the tourism resource potentials of the country. The tourism sector is a major source of foreign exchange for economic growth and development as can be seen in Table 1 (Government of Ghana, 2012). The conducive climatic and natural endowment of Ghana has put the country in a better position to attract and reap the benefits associated with tourism. The major tourist scenery in Ghana includes ancient cultures, festivals and traditions of the people, diversity in color and pageantry, forts and castles, coconut-fringed and sandy tropical beaches, virgin tropical rainforest covers; waterfalls, monkey sanctuaries, crocodile ponds, and other natural resources (Asiedu, 1997).

**Table 1. Tourists' arrivals in Ghana (2004-2014).**

Year	Arrivals	Receipts (\$ Million)
2004	582.108	487.0
2005	392.454	627.1
2006	508.199	740.1
2007	580.895	879.0
2008	672.434	1.052.3
2009	667.275	1.211.4
2010	746.527	1.406.3
2011	827.501	1.634.3
2012	903.300	1.704.7
2013	993.600	1.876.9
2014	1.093.000	2.066.5

Source: Republic of Ghana, (2012); World Travel and Tourism Council (WT&TC) (2017).

Tourism development provides an important avenue for rural communities to see some level of development. Overall, tourism has the potency to improve the livelihoods of local communities through the creation of employment opportunities, generation of income, and poverty reduction (Simpson, 2009). In Ghana, almost every rural community to a very large extent is endowed with some tourism potential. For example, the much-touted potentials in Ghana such as the Kakum National Park, the Nzulezu settlement, Boabeng-Fiema Monkey sanctuary *inter alia* are in relatively small towns. The natural environment in rural communities provides a serene atmosphere for tourism to thrive. Tourism has a lot of synergies with the various sectors of the rural economy which makes it an important option for the rural development agenda. A critical analysis of these synergies requires a rigorous effort to assess the effect of tourism on each of these sectors of the rural economy. Tourism, if well-developed in rural communities, will provide opportunities for expanding rural economic activities, generate an influx of money from the urban areas, conserve environmental and cultural resources, and create local incomes and employment (Acheampong & Asiedu, 2008; Bojnec, 2010). According to United Nations, World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2006) tourism can contribute to development in developing countries in several ways. These ways can be grouped into three namely: Economic, Socio-cultural, and Environmental Impacts.

## 2.2. Economic Impact

The tourism sector has demonstrated its economic strength and potential all over the world. Many countries and governments globally recognize tourism as one of the rapidly growing economic sectors that when given the desired attention, can spur economic growth and reduce poverty (Ekanayake & Long, 2012; Yakubu, Yahaya, & Abu-Jajah, 2017). In Ghana, the tourism sector plays a significant role in the Ghana government's efforts to achieve economic growth and create new jobs (direct, indirect, and induced jobs). At the macroeconomic level, tourism is a major foreign exchange earner as it is the fourth contributor to Ghana's gross domestic income after gold, cocoa, and foreign remittances. International tourist arrivals for Ghana rose from 746,527 in 2010 to 1,093,000 in 2014 with corresponding receipts from US\$ 1,406.3 million to US\$ 2,066.5 million respectively as can be seen in Table 1 (Republic of Ghana, 2012; World Travel and Tourism Council (WT&TC), 2017). Other economic benefits of tourism include the generation of revenue (taxation), diversification of the rural economy, and improvement in the living standards of people (Croes, 2014a; Hawkins & Mann, 2007; Wylie, 2000).

### 2.3. Socio-Cultural Impact

The socio-cultural effect of tourism bothers on improving the quality of life of people in the destination. Developing rural tourism means devoting resources to providing basic infrastructure in rural communities to attract tourists. One major feature of the rural areas is their lack of infrastructural facilities. To this end, basic infrastructures such as potable drinking water, health facilities, better accommodation, schools, communication, transportation, electricity supply, and security need to be present in the destinations (rural communities) (Cook, Yale, & Marqua, 2006; Wyllie, 2000). This will provide livelihood benefits to the rural communities and also ensure that rural communities get their fair share of development in the country. In addition, developing tourism in the rural areas will reduce rural-urban migration and its attendant effects both in the rural and urban communities. Culturally, tourism development serves as an avenue to preserve the cultural heritage of communities (Weaver & Lawton, 2010). In another instance, both the locals and the tourists learn certain cultural values such as food, language, dance, dressing, and architecture from each other (exchange of culture). Tourism further creates additional value for historic buildings, heritage sites, and the fine and performing arts (Robinson & Picard, 2006).

### 2.4. Environmental Impact

Tourism acts as a tool to protect the environment (Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Tourism in general, and ecotourism in particular, has proven to be an effective way of conserving the environment. Ecotourism has the potential of providing an economic incentive for protecting natural and cultural diversity as well as providing revenue for economies. It further ensures proper land management and also improves the health and sanitation of communities. The rural people learn about the importance of preserving their natural resources as well as the need to keep their environment clean. Notwithstanding these benefits, skeptics argue that developing rural tourism has its challenges for the people, society, the rural economy, and the national economy at large. The tourism industry comes along with some socio-cultural, political, and economic ills, which, when not addressed, will go a long way to running down the benefits that come with the sector. Such relevant ills identified include prostitution; increased crime levels; corrupt local cultures; hikes in local price levels for food, land; exchange rate deterioration, environmental threat; deterioration of natural political unrest, displacement, cultural and social assets of the destinations (Aboagye, Frempong, & Eshun, 2013; Honey, Vargas, & Durham, 2010; Reisinger, 2009; Walker & Page, 2007). Given the above discussion, it can be concluded that the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary with its beautiful environment and rich cultural heritage as well as the serene and peaceful atmosphere has the potential of turning around the economic, social-cultural, and environmental fortunes of the people in the surrounding communities. The sanctuary can act as a catalyst in achieving rural development due to its diversification attribute and the linkages it has with other sectors of the rural economy. Consequently, the onus lies on stakeholders (government, chiefs, local people, private agencies, and other organizations) to organize and embark on proper programs to harness the tourism potential in these rural communities. However, measures should be put in place to reduce to the barest minimum the dangers associated with tourism in the communities.

## 3. STUDY SETTING AND METHODOLOGY

The Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary is located in the Nkoranza North District in the Bono East Region, Ghana. The Sanctuary is one of the prominent and renowned tourist sites in Ghana. It occupies a land size of 1.9km<sup>2</sup>. The sanctuary was established in 1927 and is the home of over 1,012 monkeys mainly of the Colobus (*Colobus Vellerosus*) and Mona (*Cercopithecus Campbellei Lowei*) species (Republic of Ghana, 2016). Between 2002 and 2004, under the initiative of the Nature Conservation Research Centre funded by the USAID, the sanctuary was selected as part of the Community-Based Ecotourism projects in Ghana. The sanctuary is mainly located in the Boabeng and Fiema communities. However, towns like Akrudwa, Bonte, Bomini, Busunya, and Kokompe share boundaries with the sanctuary.

#### 4. RESEARCH DESIGN

A mixed-method, single-unit embedded descriptive case study design was adopted for this study. The design focused on a single unit, the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary. However, to properly cross-examine the issue of tourism as a conduit for economic development in the community, data was collected from multiple units that were stakeholders. These include household heads, chiefs, and assemblymen. The descriptive case study design was considered since a holistic and in-depth investigation of how the BFMS has helped in the socio-economic development of people in the communities was the aim of the study (Yin, 2014).

##### 4.1. Target Population and Sample Size

The target population for the study was the residents (specifically household heads), opinion leaders (Chiefs and Assembly members) in the Boabeng and Fiema communities, and staff of the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary. There were 517 and 248 households in the Boabeng and Fiema communities respectively (Ghana Statistical Service, 2014). The purposive sampling method was used to sample the eight opinion leaders made of Chiefs, Assembly members, and Unit Committee members from the two communities and three members of staff from the BFMS. This was appropriate because these categories of respondents were knowledgeable in the operations of the sanctuary.

The total population of household heads in the two communities was 765. According to Krejcie and Morgan (1970) a required sample size of a population of 765 is 265, assuming a 5 percent margin of error and 95 percent confidence in the results. The study used a multi-stage sampling technique to select the respondents. Firstly, a list of households was compiled for both communities and used as a sampling frame. Each household was then given an identification number. Secondly, to ensure fairness in representation, there was a proportional distribution of respondents among the communities. The sample size for the Fiema community was 179 while that of Boabeng was 86 as shown in Table 2. Lastly, a sample of 265 household heads was drawn from both communities using the simple random method. A backup list was prepared from which absentee households were replaced accordingly.

**Table 2.** Distribution of respondents by communities.

Respondents	Houses	Households	Sample size
Fiema	471	571	179
Boabeng	232	248	86
Total	703	819	265

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

##### 4.2. Research Instrument

Data were collected using a questionnaire, structured interview, interviews, and observation. The questionnaire was administered face-to-face to the household heads. It had both open-ended and close-ended questions and was designed to identify ways by which the presence of the BFMS had helped in the socio-economic development of the rural communities and the challenges they faced with the presence of the sanctuary. Also, challenges faced by the BFMS were elicited by the questionnaire. Respondents who could read and write in the English language were given the questionnaire to complete in a survey format, while for those who could not read and write the questionnaire was translated into the local language and their responses were transcribed and translated back into the English language. In the case of the opinion leaders and staff of the BFMS (key informants), in-depth interviews were conducted.

##### 4.3. Pre-Test

To test the validity and reliability of the data collection instruments, as well as data processing and analysis procedures, a pre-test was conducted at Boyem, a Bat Sanctuary in the Techiman North Municipality. Boyem Bat

sanctuary was selected because it shares similar characteristics with the Boabeng-Fiema communities. The pre-test led to the early detection of errors or distortions and also helped in reshaping ambiguous questions.

#### 4.4. Data Processing and Analysis

Data collected from the field were edited, coded, and processed using the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS version 21) and Microsoft Excel (2017). Data obtained from the interviews were analyzed thematically. Common themes were put together. Data obtained from the study were presented using charts and tables that showed frequencies and percentage distribution.

## 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 5.1. Profile of Respondents

The background characteristics of respondents that were examined were the sex, age, educational level, years of stay in the communities and source of income, and household size of respondents. With regards to the sex distribution, out of the 256 respondents, 61.9 percent were males and the remaining (38.1%) were females. The dominance of males was observed in both communities as males constituted 60 percent and 66.3 percent in the Fiema and Boabeng communities respectively. This domination is largely so because of the recognition given to males as heads of families. Details of the distribution of sex of respondents by communities are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of sex of respondents.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	164	61.9
Female	101	38.1
Total	265	100
Age group		
15-30	61	23.0
31-45	112	42.4
45-60	55	20.7
60 and above	37	13.9
Total	265	100
Educational level		
No formal education	63	23.8
Basic education	156	58.8
SHS/Voc./Tech.	21	7.9
Tertiary	25	9.5
Total	265	100
Occupation		
Farming (Crop and animal)	171	64.5
Commercial drivers	18	6.8
Artisans	36	13.6
Small-scale business	27	10.2
Civil servants	13	4.9
Total	265	100
Years of stay in the community		
3-10	49	18.5
10-15	71	26.8
16-20	84	31.7
21 and above	61	23.0
Total	265	100

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

In terms of age, a greater proportion of the respondents were within the age group of 31-45 while 13.9 percents were 60 years and above. Concerning the level of education of respondents, 58.8 percent (156) had Basic education with 23.8 percent having no formal education. About 10 percent had tertiary education while 7.9 percent had

secondary, vocational, or technical education. This corroborates the findings by the Ghana Statistical Service (2014) that there is a low level of education in rural communities.

Occupation-wise, it was evident from the study that a greater proportion of the respondents, 64.5 percent, were farmers (crops and animals), and 10.2 percent were small-scale business owners. Artisans were 13.6 percent while 6.8 percent and 4.9 were commercial drivers and civil servants respectively. This supports the findings of Todaro and Smith (2015) that rural dwellers are predominately farmers. In connection with the number of years respondents had stayed in the Boabeng and Fiema communities, it was revealed that 31.7 percent had stayed in the community for between 16-20 years, 26.8 percent had stayed in the communities for between 10-15 years, while 23.0 percent had stayed in the communities for 21 years and above.

### 5.2. Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary and Rural Socio-Economic Development

The study further examined the perception of respondents on the socio-economic effect of the sanctuary of their lives and their communities. Out of the 265 respondents, 96.2 percent indicated that they perceived the presence of the sanctuary as an opportunity for their development and expressed pride in the sanctuary. They indicated that the sanctuary has made their communities popular both in Ghana and globally. However, 3.8 percent held a contrary view. This shows that the local people were positive when it comes to the BFMS and its effect on the development of their rural communities. To elicit the perception of respondents on the socio-economic effect of the BFMS on the local people and the surrounding communities, several statements were generated as captured in the literature review. The respondents were asked to indicate in order of preference how the presence of the sanctuary has benefitted them and their communities. The result is presented in Table 4.

From Table 4, it is seen that 86.3 percent of the respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the BFMS had helped in the protection and conservation of wildlife and other natural resources and helped in maintaining the aesthetic value of the environment. This confirms the findings of Wall and Mathieson (2006). Respondents added that the forest supports farming activities as the forest helps in bringing rains. Furthermore, it was revealed that the forest served as a windbreak that protected properties and farms from destruction. A respondent remarked that:

*The forest, as well as the animals in it, are protected as it is forbidden for people to farm or go hunting in the forest.*

It was further revealed from the study that about 79 percent of the respondents thought that the presence of the BFMS has preserved and promoted the cultural values of the people. Respondents saw the development of the BFMS as a means of promoting the cultural heritage of the people to the outside world. Respondents indicated that during their Yam Festivals, tourists come around to join them in the celebration as they also celebrate the monkeys during the festival. By these, cultural values are revived and promoted. This supports the findings of Weaver and Lawton (2010) and Robinson and Picard (2006). A 51-year old man from Fiema had this to say:

*The monkeys were regarded as children of local gods and consequently, they are revered and treated as human beings. When a monkey dies, funeral rites are performed just as in the case of a human being. Also, anyone who kills a monkey deliberately brings curse/calamity on himself and his descendants.*

The cemetery for the monkeys is presented in Figure 1. As can be seen, there is an inscription of the type of monkey and the date they died.

From Table 4, it is discernible that 74.3 percent of the respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the presence of the sanctuary had created job opportunities for people within the catchment area whereas 24.8 percent disagreed/strongly disagreed with this statement. According to the key informants, all the staff of the sanctuary i.e. managers, tour guides, guesthouse keepers, and revenue collectors, were indigenes from the surrounding communities. Aside from those directly employed in the sanctuary, others who were into petty trading, commercial drivers, woodcarvers, and other artisans indicated that their activities were boosted by the presence of visitors. Figure 2 is a picture of a craft shop at the Monkey sanctuary. This finding is similar to that of Wall and Mathieson (2006) that tourism creates both direct and indirect jobs in the destination's economy.



Figure 1. Cemetery of monkeys.

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.



Figure 2. Craft shop at BFMS.

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

Table 4. Boabeng-Fiema monkey sanctuary and rural socio-economic development.

Statement	N	SA/A (%)	U (%)	D/SD (%)
Conservation of biodiversity	265	86.3	0.7	12.7
Preservation of local culture	265	79.2	1.8	18.8
Job creation	265	74.3	0.7	24.8
Economic growth & diversification of the local economy	265	71.6	1.8	26.3
Poverty reduction	265	56.1	1.1	42.5
Empowerment of women, the young people, and the marginalized in rural	265	53.5	2.2	44
Infrastructural development	265	15.0	3.0	81.8

Note: SA/A= Strongly Agree/Agree; U= Uncertain; D/SD= Disagree/Strongly Disagree.

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

Furthermore, it can be observed from Table 4 that 71.6 percent of the respondents held the view that the presence of the BFMS has helped in the diversification of the local economy and ensured some economic growth. However, about 26.3 percent of respondents strongly disagreed/disagreed with this statement. This supports the findings of Croes (2014a); Hawkins and Mann (2007) and Wyllie (2000). In this regard, respondents indicated that



their output, as well as their sales levels, had increased following tourists' visits to the BFMS. Respondents revealed that tourism has provided an additional income source for their households as they no longer solely depended on agriculture as their only source of income but on other businesses such as petty trading, sewing, soap making, selling handicrafts, which provided them with an additional income to augment their meager household income levels. From Table 4, it is discernible that about 56.1 percent of the respondents strongly agreed/agreed that the existence of the BFMS had helped in reducing the incidence of poverty in the surrounding communities. However, 43.9 percent held a contrary view. Respondents who were of the view that BFMS had helped in reducing poverty in the area indicated an increase in their outputs following the visit of patrons of the sanctuary. The increase in output, they indicated, increased their income and saving levels. With the increase in their output and income levels, they were in a position to cater to their basic needs as the following excerpts illustrate:

*When tourists visit the sanctuary, they buy my farm produce. With this, I can get money to take care of my family in terms of providing meals, paying school fees, and medical bills, and acquiring properties [Adult Male].*

In terms of empowerment, there was a mixed reaction among respondents. As can be seen from the table, a sizable proportion of the respondents, 44 percent, strongly disagreed/disagreed that there had been an attempt to empower women and the marginalized in the communities. On the other hand, 53.5 percent strongly agreed/agreed and cited instances where the District Assembly organized training programs for such groups in areas such as soap making, bead making, batik tie-and-dye, and snail rearing. These, they argued were means for such groups to benefit from the BFMS as visitors often buy such products.

Concerning infrastructural development, 81.8 percent strongly disagreed/disagreed with the statement that there has been infrastructural development owing to the BFMS. This finding is contrary to the view by Cook et al. (2006) that tourism provides an incentive for infrastructural development. One of the workers at the sanctuary bemoaned the poor nature of the roads and telecommunication networks and remarked during an interview that:

*The bad nature of the road leading to the sanctuary is one of the major reasons people do not patronize the sanctuary, especially during the rainy season. Apart from the road networks, none of the telecommunication networks in Ghana has coverage here. One is unable to make calls or access the internet at the sanctuary.*

**Table 5.** Entrance and lodging fees-2018.

Categories	Amount (Gh¢)
Adults	20.00
Tertiary students	10.00
Senior High School students	5.00
Junior High School students	3.00
Primary school pupils	2.00
All Non-Ghanaian	50.00
Student Volunteer (In Ghana)	35.00
Accommodation	50.00

Source: Fieldwork, 2018 (The exchange rate is Gh¢4.80= US\$1).

### 5.3. Revenue Generation and Distribution at the Sanctuary

The study went further to look at the revenue generated from the sanctuary and also how the generated revenue is distributed among identifiable groups in the surrounding communities. It was revealed from the study that the sanctuary had three major sources of revenue namely: entrance fees by patrons, revenue from the guesthouse, and revenue from researchers. This supports the findings of Eshun and Tonto (2014). The key informants indicated that monies generated at the sanctuary are divided into two and shared among the communities and other stakeholders. While 40 percent of the revenue is shared among recognized people and groups, specific chiefs in the Boabeng and Fiema communities, landowners, and fetish priests in the communities. The remaining 60 percent is shared among the relevant stakeholders (District Assembly, Traditional Council, Wildlife division, etc.). The entrance fees are presented in Table 5.

#### 5.4. Challenges Facing Residents in the Catchment Area of BFMS

In furtherance of the discussion on the nexus between the sanctuary and rural development, the study found out from respondents whether they had negatively been affected by the presence of the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary. It was revealed that even though respondents were happy with the existence of the BFMS, there were some relevant challenges they faced as residents. The challenges revealed by the study are presented in Table 6. From the table, it is observed that 30.2 percent of the respondents identified the destruction of their farms by the monkeys as the major challenge that they faced while 25.0 percent mentioned the destruction of other properties as the challenge that they faced with the presence of the BFMS. The other properties the respondents indicated included electrical appliances, items in their shops, and the roofing of their buildings. Increases in the price of goods and services (17.1%) and social vices (12.6%) were the next challenges respondents identified. These negative effects identified by the study are similar to those identified by previous studies (Aboagye et al., 2013; Reisinger, 2009; Walker & Page, 2007). Negative influence on the local culture and pollution were the least identified challenges faced by the residents. It can, therefore, be seen that the destruction of the farms of the residents was the major challenge residents faced, followed by the destruction of other properties. The destruction of their farms stems from the fact that the animals fed on their farm produce especially crops like maize, groundnut, banana, and other vegetables. In the case of their properties, a young male had this to say:

*A monkey entered my bedroom and smashed my flat-screen 32-inch television. I complained to the Management Committee of the sanctuary, but they never replaced the television set. Again, because of the monkeys, certain food crops such as maize, groundnut, and banana cannot be cultivated in the community. We have to travel farther away from this community to grow these crops else they will destroy the crops.*

It was also revealed that the monkeys often come to the villages to steal food from the residents. This is mainly because the monkeys co-exist with people in the communities.

**Table 6.** Challenges facing residents in the catchment area of BFMS.

Challenges	Frequency	Percentage
Destruction of farms by monkeys	173	30.2
Destruction of other properties by monkeys	143	25.0
Increase in the price of goods and services	98	17.1
Social vices	72	12.6
Influence on the local culture	51	8.9
Pollution	34	5.9
Total	571*	100

Note: \*n is bigger than the number of respondents due to multiple responses.

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

In terms of the influence on the local culture, the key informants indicated that most of the people in the communities especially the youth try to copy the way of life of the tourists (taking liquor, sexual promiscuity, indecent dressing, and hairstyle), particularly the foreign ones. Such a lifestyle is against the cultural values of the surrounding communities.

Key informants further indicated that the leaders and the people in the communities were often left out when it came to decision-making and the management of the sanctuary. Again, they indicated that there was a lack of transparency in the sharing of the benefits accruing from the sanctuary. The following is an excerpt of the concerns the community had on the distribution of revenue from the sanctuary:

*There is no openness at all when it comes to the sharing of the revenue from the sanctuary. Owing to this, some communities are harboring the idea of establishing their sanctuaries in their respective communities [Adult Male].*

Despite this, it was revealed from the study that sometimes the management committee of the sanctuary came in to help especially when the community borehole broke down, and also assisted parents in paying the school fees of their children. This supports findings by Eshun and Tonto (2014).

### 5.5. Challenges Facing the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary

The study further examined challenges facing the BFMS which hindered its smooth operation. It was evident from the study that several challenges were facing the BFMS. These challenges were identified and ranked by the staff of the BFMS. The challenges were as follows:

- Poor road network.
- Lack of telecommunication network.
- Lack of commitment on the part of the central government and the district assembly in developing the sanctuary.
- Lack of trained personnel to manage the sanctuary, and lastly.
- Encroachment on the lands of the sanctuary by the local people.

Figure 3 shows the nature of the road leading to the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary. The key informants indicated that because of the poor nature of the road, the transport cost to the sanctuary was very high. This consequently increases the cost tourists had to bear before they could visit the site. This position was reiterated by the District Assembly (Republic of Ghana, 2016). Telecommunication is also an important factor that tourists consider in visiting a tourism destination in this technological era. The key informants and personal observation by the researcher revealed that none of the telecommunication networks in Ghana reaches the sanctuary and the surrounding communities. This, according to the key informants, serves as a disincentive for tourists to patronize their guesthouse at the sanctuary. However, they preferred lodging at Nkoranza and Busunya.



Figure 3. Nature of road at the Boabeng-Fiema monkey sanctuary.

Source: Fieldwork, 2018.

An adult male, for example, recounted how they had been promised by several personalities to help face-lift and develop the sanctuary but these promises were yet to be fulfilled:

*A lot of people including tourism ministers, regional ministers, district chief executives have been here and promised us that they were going to help develop the sanctuary for us by constructing good roads, extend the telecommunication network to the area but none of them has honored, such promises they made to us when they visited.*

This according to them shows that the government, in general, and the local administration, in particular, were not committed to the course of the sanctuary which could generate huge sums of revenue for the government for her developmental activities. Again, the workers managing the sanctuary were not trained in the tourism business as such lacked the requisite skills needed to man the site. With regards to the encroachment, the key informants indicated that the surrounding communities were all claiming ownership of the sanctuary and this had generated huge dispute among the communities. Consequently, people were encroaching on the lands belonging to the sanctuary mainly for farming.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The study sought to examine the contribution of tourism to rural socio-economic development, using the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary as a case study. The study revealed that the residents of the Boabeng and Fiema communities perceived the development of the Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary as an opportunity for the development of their areas. They perceived the sanctuary as an avenue for job creation for the people in surrounding communities, economic growth, diversification of the local economy, and the preservation and conservation of local culture and the environment. However, challenges such as destruction of farms and properties by monkeys, hikes in prices of goods and services and increase in social vices, poor road and telecommunication networks, and encroachment were identified. To benefit largely from the richness of the sanctuary both in natural and cultural resources, the research suggests that stakeholders, particularly the local communities, private investors, District Assembly, Ghana Tourism Authority, the Ministry of Tourism, and the Central Government should devote resources towards the development of the sanctuary. Particularly since infrastructure plays a crucial role in tourism development, stakeholders should collaborate to develop infrastructures such as good roads, telecommunication networks, electricity, medical services, security, and safety as well as information centers. The sanctuary should be given a facelift in terms of providing an enabling environment that will maximize tourist arrivals.

**Funding:** This study received no specific financial support.

**Competing Interests:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

**Authors' Contributions:** All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

## REFERENCES

- Aboagye, D., Frempong, F., & Eshun, G. (2013). The cultural and political ecology of rural tourism development in Ghana. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(3), 163-170.
- Acheampong, O., & Asiedu, A. B. (2008). *Tourism in Ghana: A modern synthesis*. Accra: Assemblies of God Literature Centre.
- Asiedu, A. B. (1997). Prospects for the emerging tourism industry in Ghana. *Research Review*, 13(1), 11-26.
- Asiedu, A. B. (2002). Making ecotourism more supportive of rural development in Ghana. *West African Journal of Applied Ecology*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Bojnec, Š. (2010). Rural tourism, rural economy diversification, and sustainable development. *Academica Turistica*, 3(1/2), 7-15.
- Brandth, B., & Haugen, M. S. (2011). Farm diversification into tourism—implications for social identity? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(1), 35-44. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2010.09.002>.
- Cook, R. A., Yale, L. J., & Marqua, J. J. (2006). *Tourism: The business of travel* (4th ed.). New Jersey, UA: Pearson Education.
- Croes, R. (2014a). The role of tourism in poverty reduction: An empirical assessment. *Tourism Economics*, 20(2), 207-226.
- Ekanayake, E. M., & Long, A. E. (2012). Tourism development and economic growth in developing countries. *International Journal of Business & Finance Research*, 6(1), 51-63.
- Eshun, G., & Tonto, J. N. P. (2014). Community-based ecotourism: Its socio-economic impacts at Boabeng-Fiema Monkey Sanctuary, Ghana. In C. M. Rogerson & D. Szymanska (Eds.), *Bulletin of Geography (Socio-economic Series, No. 26)* (pp. 67-81). Toruń: Nicolaus Copernicus University.
- Ghana Statistical Service. (2014). *2010 population and housing census: District analytic report Nkoranz North District*. Accra: Ghana Statistical Service.
- Giannakis, E. (2014). The role of rural tourism on the development of rural areas: The case of Cyprus. *Romanian Journal of Regional Science*, 8(1), 38-53.
- Government of Ghana. (2012). *National tourism development plan (2013-2027)*. Accra: Government of Ghana.
- Hawkins, D. E., & Mann, S. (2007). The World Bank's role in tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(2), 348-363. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2006.10.004>.

- Honey, M., Vargas, E., & Durham, W. H. (2010). *Impact of tourism-related development on the pacific coast of Costa Rica*. Washington, D.C: Center for Responsible Travel.
- Hountondji, P. J. (1998). *Endogenous knowledge*. Dakar: Research Trails.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607-610. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>.
- Manca, E. (2016). *Persuasion in tourism discourse: Methodologies and models*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Millar, D. (2014). Endogenous development: Some issues of concern. *Development in Practice, 24*(5-6), 637-647. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2014.938615>.
- Millar., D., Apusigah, A., & Boonzaaijer, C. (2008). *Endogenous development in Africa towards a systematization of experiences*. Barneveld, The Netherlands: BDU.
- Nilanjan, R. (2015). *Emerging innovative marketing strategies in the tourism industry*. Hershey, PA: Business Science Reference.
- Peng, O. H. (2017). *Sustainable tourism for development*. Paper presented at the 11th UNWTO Asia/Pacific Executive Training Program on Tourism Policy and Strategy, Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea.
- Reisinger, Y. (2009). *International tourism: Cultures and behavior*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- The Republic of Ghana. (2012). *National tourism development plan (2013-2027)*. Accra: Government of Ghana.
- The Republic of Ghana. (2016). *Composite budget of the Nkoranza North district assembly for the 2016 fiscal year*. Accra: Government of Ghana.
- Robinson, M., & Picard, D. (2006). *Tourism, culture, and sustainable development*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Saarinen, J., & Rogerson, C. M. (2014). Tourism and the millennium development goals: Perspectives beyond 2015. *Tourism Geographies, 16*(1), 23-30.
- Samimi, A. J., Sadeghi, S., & Sadeghi, S. (2011). Tourism and economic growth in developing countries: P-VAR approach. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 10*(1), 28-32.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Simpson, M. C. (2009). An integrated approach to assess the impacts of tourism on community development and sustainable livelihoods. *Community Development Journal, 44*(2), 186-208. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsm048>.
- Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2015). *Economic development* (12th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). (2017). *Economic development in Africa: Tourism for transformative and inclusive growth*. New York: United Nations Publication.
- United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). (2006). *Poverty alleviation through tourism: A compilation of good practices*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO). (2014). *Annual report 2014*. Madrid: UNWTO.
- Viljoen, J., & Tlabela, K. (2007). *Rural tourism development in South Africa*. Pretoria: HSRC Press.
- Walker, L., & Page, S. J. (2007). The visitor experience of crime: The case of central Scotland. *Current Issues in Tourism, 10*(6), 505-542. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2167/cit333.0>.
- Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism: Change, impacts, and opportunities*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Weaver, D., & Lawton, L. (2010). *Tourism management* (4th ed.). Milton, Australia: John Wiley & Sons Australia.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (WT&TC). (2017). *Travel & tourism economic impact 2017-Ghana*. London: WT&TC.
- Wyllie, R. W. (2000). *Tourism and Society: A guide to problems and issues*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Yakubu, L., Yahaya, A., & Abu-Jajah, A. (2017). The impact of pro-poor tourism strategies on the poor: The case of Mognori Community on the fringe of the Mole National Park in Northern Ghana. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Design, 6*(8), 89-106. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2017/v6/i8/aug17024>.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s). Journal of Tourism Management Research shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.*