

# Community Capacity Building, Local Community Involvement in Tourism Activities and Community Welfare in Uganda

KESANDE PROVIA

Lead author

Faculty of Marketing and Hospitality Management, Makerere University Business School  
P.O.Box 1337, Uganda, Kampala

KALULU RONALD

Co-author

University of Tourism, Technology and Business, P.O. Box 350, Kigali - Rwanda

KICONCO MICHELLE

Co-author

Faculty of Marketing and Hospitality Management, Makerere University Business School  
P.O.Box 1337, Uganda, Kampala

## Abstract

This study sought to examine the relationship between capacity building, community involvement in tourism activities and community welfare among the local communities living around protected areas in Uganda. The design of the study was cross sectional in that both quantitative and qualitative techniques were used in the analysis of the findings. A significant positive relationship existed between capacity building, community involvement and community welfare respectively. A strong positive relationship existed between community involvement and community welfare. Where community involvement existed, community welfare improved and vice versa. Among all the factors, community welfare significantly depended on community involvement in tourism activities. The study recommended tourism stakeholders and policy makers to encourage local communities living around protected areas to engage in tourism activities as a way of improving their welfare.

**Keywords:** Community capacity building, Community involvement, Tourism, Community welfare, Local communities

## 1. Background

An increasing demand for countryside as a result of the pressures of urban life has created the demand for rural tourism. Rural tourism is an important means of addressing the socio-economic challenges of the rural communities (Bosworth & Farrell 2014). Rural tourism is often seen as a means of helping local communities develop socially, economically and culturally (Tchetchik, Fleischer et al., 2006) and thus improve people's welfare as well as protecting the environment. These benefits include local employment, strengthening local identity, foreign exchange earnings, market for local produce, international exposure of communities, poverty eradication, and contribution to GDP among others.

However, given the various benefits that tourism brings to the economy, majority local communities especially those living where tourism takes place in this case Uganda still struggle with increasing unemployment, low incomes, poor infrastructural development, poor housing conditions, illiteracy levels, diminishing services, experience low standards of living and live below the poverty line (UBOS,2012) and (Thomson & Pepperdine, 2003). This could be attributed to limited involvement in tourism activities which deprive local people of training, skills development, social networks, community external support (UCOTA, 2012). For instance the UBOS, 2012, report findings indicate that poverty remains acute in the North and Eastern parts of Uganda even when these areas have outstanding tourist attractions which bring a lot of revenue to the area and such attractions include; the source of the Nile, Mt Elgon National park among others. The proportion of the poor is standing at 49 per cent and 27.7 per cent respectively, compared to 9.2 per cent in the west and 5.2 per cent the central region.

In areas where communities try to participate in tourism, there is an institutionalized tourism enclave for example the sale of handicraft, local food stuffs and bandas that would have enhanced local communities in Bigodi has been and is still controlled by associations like KAFRED and Bigodi Women Group which opposes any competition in Bigodi in western Uganda. This does not only restrict many people from participating, it also hinders tourists from going deeper into the villages to interact with the local people (Ahebwa, 2012).

Therefore, if communities are to improve their welfare and develop, there is need for participation and involvement in various tourism activities around them like it is elsewhere in the world like Philippines, South Africa and the Americas (Aref & Redzuan 2009; Craig 2009; Press 2009). It is believed that community involvement is strengthened by Community capacity building (CCB) in that it enables communities to mobilize,

identify and solve problems by themselves and hence communities will be seen to afford good health, happiness, prosperity, social control, good housing and the absence of undesirable conditions such as illness, poverty, crime, child neglect and unemployment (ITC, 2011). This means availability of basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, clothing and acceptable levels of health and education (World Development Report, 2000/2001).

It is against this background that the study focused on finding how community welfare can improve by involving local communities in tourism activities which is a result of community empowerment. Therefore, the study was guided by three objectives including (i) to establish the relationship between capacity building and local community involvement in tourism activities in Uganda; (ii) to examine the relationship between capacity building and community welfare in Uganda and lastly (iii) to establish the relationship between involvement of local communities in tourism activities and community welfare in Uganda.

## **1.1 Context /review of literature**

### **Capacity building**

Community capacity building (CCB) is a comprehensive process that involves all dimensions of community life. It is identified as one of the ways that community development can occur since it empowers communities to gain a social welfare, education, environment, local government, social and urban planning and health that can enable it to mobilize, identify and solve problems (Hounslow, 2002; Fiona, 2007). Community capacities are understood as the “qualities of a capable community” (Laverack, 2006). The dimensions of community capacity which are most important for achieving systematic change in local communities are; participation, and leadership, community resources, social network and community power. Collectively, these four dimensions of community capacity represent a community’s social capital. Even though (Thomson & Pepperdine, 2003; Bopp & Bopp, 2004) identifies seven dimensions of community capacity which include; shared vision, sense of community, external support, community leadership, resources, skill and knowledge, communication and ongoing training.

### **Community Involvement in tourism activities**

The involvement of communities occur in the activities that result in the supply of intermediate goods and services, such as the supply of fresh produce to tourism camps (Andriotis, 2000; Goodwin, 2002). In the context of this study, community involvement in the tourism activities can range from the supply of final goods and services to tourists, owning to co-owning accommodation facilities, allowing their natural resource base to be used, to the merely opportunistic selling of curios along the road (Lankford & Howard, 1994).

### **Community Welfare**

DFID defines livelihood as the combination of “the capabilities, assets and activities required for a means of living”. Livelihood takes the form of natural capital, financial, human, physical and social capital. Community welfare means the availability of basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, clothing and acceptable levels of health and education (World Development Report, 2000/2001). Wang, Yang et al., (2010) describes lack of assets, good health, skills necessary for employment, land/housing, and access to basic infrastructure, savings or access to credit, social assets such as network of contacts and reciprocal obligations, as a state of poor welfare. On the other hand, according to (Norton, Burdine et al., 2002) welfare is the economic well-being of an individual, group, or economy.

### **Capacity building and local community involvement in tourism activities**

Local communities are regarded as important asset in tourism development as it is within their premises that these activities take place. Local communities are also regarded as legitimate and moral stakeholders in tourism development (Haukeland, 2009) because their interests affects and are affected by decisions of key tourism policy makers (McCool, 2009). The level of community involvement in tourism development varies with regard to the community’s capacity and the level of information available to them as well as the opportunity, education, training and location availed to them (Spenceley, 2001; Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). One way to accomplish this is to increase public awareness of tourism through education campaigns and train local communities for employment in the industry. While increased public awareness creates a more hospitable environment for tourists and improves the image of the destination, providing entrepreneurial training empowers local communities and ultimately increases their capacity to receive significant benefits from tourism (Timothy, 1999). Capacity building in form of training, skills and knowledge creation, social capital, external support and community power enhances the community to expand local enterprise opportunities including those that provide services to tourism operations (e.g. food suppliers, guides and those that sell to tourists such as craft producers and sellers (Meyer & Stensaker, 2006; Meyer, 2007). Involving the local communities in tourism development within and around protected areas enhances the use of the resources in an “effective environmental stewardship that builds on indigenous, local and scientific knowledge, economic development, social empowerment, the protection of cultural heritage and the creation of interpretive and nature-based experiences for tourist learning and cross-cultural appreciation” at a tourist destination (Jamal & Stronza, 2009). According to (McIntyre, Jenkins et al., 2001; Muhanna, 2007; Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan et al., 2010); to achieve sustainable tourism development, local communities need to participate in decision- making process. Local communities can take

part in identifying and promoting tourist resources and attractions that form the basis of community tourism development.

### **Community Capacity Building and Community Welfare**

Community capacity is able to demonstrate a sense of shared responsibility and demonstrate a collective competence for addressing community needs and confronting situations that threaten the safety and well-being of community members. The dimensions of community capacity which are most important for achieving systematic change in local communities are; participation, and leadership, community resources, social network and community power. Collectively, these four dimensions of community capacity represent a community's social capital (Thomson & Pepperdine, 2003; Press, 2009) Whereas (Labonte & Laverack, 2001; Laverack, 2003) outlines nine dimensions of community capacity including; participation, problem assessment capacities, equitable relationship with external agents, organizational stature, resource mobilization, links to other resources and people, leadership, asking why, and control over program management. Therefore the success of local community depends on the quality, creativity and commitment of its leadership in maintaining its daily affairs in form of helping local groups, businesses, and non-profit organizations to work together (Kumar, 2005).

### **Involvement of local communities in tourism activities and community welfare**

Community involvement via employment opportunities, as workers or as small business operators, can be a catalyst to the development of tourism products and services, arts, crafts and cultural values, especially through taking advantage of abundant natural and cultural assets available in communities in developing countries. Also, since tourism offers better labour-intensive and small scale opportunities (Chok, Macbeth et al., 2007; Scheyvens, 2007) and since it happens in the community, community involvement through working in the tourism industry has been recognized to help local communities not only to support development of the industry but also to receive more than economic benefits (Johannesen & Skonhott, 2005; Li, 2006; Scheyvens, 2007). Encouraging local people to invest and operate small scale businesses, and work for the tourism industry is a suitable means for community involvement. This is in line with (Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Tosun, 2006; Ertuna, 2012) who underlined that in many developing countries community involvement through employment as workers in the industry or through encouraging them to operate small scale business, "has been recognized to help local communities get more economic benefits rather than creating opportunities for them to have a say in decision making process of tourism development". Zhao and Ritchie, (2007) added that communities, as a way of involvement and as the input of the local workforce, may pursue tourism-related economic activities as paid or self-employed workers. While involvement through employment has more direct impacts on the lives of local community households, it is arguably a useful way to curb poverty at the household level since it diverts economic benefits tourism brings directly to the family level (Zhao & Ritchie, 2007; Jamaluddin et al., 2012).

Increasing public tourism awareness through education and entrepreneurial local training is directly linked to community welfare because of its contribution to the economic development of the destinations where tourism is taking place as tourists may raise local production of additional goods and services such as agricultural products (fruits and vegetables), livestock (beef, lamb), poultry (chicken and eggs), fisheries (fish and seafood), manufacturing (equipment and furniture), non-perishable foods and dry goods (flour, rice, sugar etc), ground transport (tour operator transfers and packages, and local taxis), dairy and handicrafts (Mthembu, 2000; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Kalemo, 2011). The obvious outcomes from such activities are income and employment opportunities for enhancement of community welfare, particularly income among locals.

### **Conclusion**

The literature has revealed that community capacity building; local community involvement, community welfare in tourism has become a key element in development of local communities as well as their welfare. Tourism has been revealed as a key driver of community welfare especially when local people have control of the tourism resources in their area and when they can fully involve themselves such as in selling fruits, as tour guides, provision of homestays among others. However, this cannot come to reality if local people are not empowered. Therefore, community capacity building helps bridge the gap by training people, providing skills and knowledge, social capital and giving external support.

#### **1.1.1 Methodology**

The study was conducted among community members registered under the Umbrella of Uganda Community Tourism association with a grand total of 2901 members (UCOTA membership list 2012). All questionnaires were self-administered and consisted of closed ended questions and a few open –ended questions for purposes of clarity. The study used a cross sectional survey approach with the aim of establishing the relationship between community capacity building, local community involvement in tourism activities and community welfare in Uganda. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in data collection and analysis for purposes of drawing valid conclusions. A sample size of 341 community members who deal in crafts and other products, crafts only and no crafts at all were studied adopted from (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The sampling frame was UCOTA- membership list which contained all the names of local community tourism associations in Uganda. The study concentrated on local communities who were registered with UCOTA. The names of the associations



were subjected to systematic random sampling in order to obtain respondents. The study used both primary and secondary sources of data. Primary data. Secondary data was obtained from the review of literature in journals and books obtained from the internet as well as libraries. A 5-point Likert Scale was used to assess the adequacy of community capacity building, local community involvement in tourism activities and community welfare in Uganda. Community capacity building (independent variable) was measured in form of social capital, skills and knowledge, training and external support(Gannon, 1994; Thomson & Pepperdine, 2003). Local community involvement in tourism activities (mediating factor) was measured in form of employment, provision of homestays and supply of goods and services (UCOTA , 2012); While community welfare was measured in form of infrastructure development, access to utilities and food and improved income earnings (UNCTAD, 2010). Likert scales ranging from 1-strongly disagree (SA) to 5-strongly disagree (SD) were used (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006).Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was used to measure the consistency of the items and reliability of the instruments. According to (Kamukama and Natamba 2005), an alpha of 0.5 or higher is sufficient to show reliability. The closer the alpha is to one, the higher the internal consistency reliability; (NEWMAN 1978; Dhillon 1980).

The reliability was calculated for the measurement sets which assess the importance of community welfare activities associated with community capacity building and local community involvement in tourism. The reliability statistics for the measurement sets are presented in Table 4. It is evident from the above Table that Cronbach’s alpha for all measurement sets is above the acceptable limit of 0.70. The measurement set were found to be reliable (NEWMAN 1978; Kamukama and Natamba 2005).

**Table 1: Validity and Reliability of the instruments**

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
Capacity building	.724	9
Community involvement	.704	5
Community welfare	.707	5

**Source: Primary data**

Cronbach’s Alpha test for reliability of the research questionnaire was done and according to the results in table 1 above, only three items under Capacity building guaranteed reliability, seven under community involvement and nine under community welfare.

Before analysis of collected data began, data had to be prepared depending on the outline laid down at the time of developing the research plan. This ensured that the researcher had cleaned up all relevant data for making contemplated analysis (Basheka 2009). In data analysis, order, structure and meaning to the mass information collected was done. Quantitative data was got through data coding in order to get numbers. Coded data was then analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) to establish the correlation among the variables. A factor analysis (FA) was conducted to assess the validity of each construct in the model while the reliability of the variable was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha, Cross tabulations which describe the sample characteristics and Analysis of Variable (ANOVA) Tests was carried out to determine the differences in perception about the variables. Regression was used to determine the strength of the relationship between variables. Pearson regression analysis was used to find out how the dependent variable depends on the two independent variables.

**1.1.2 The results**

Table 2, revealed that 50.6% of the respondents were female while the rest were male. This means that majority of the respondents were females compared to males. These results confirmed the fact that most males are leave all responsibilities to their wives ranging from work and look after the home and children. Majority of the females reported that their husbands are always in the bar drinking, others go to towns to look for greener pastures and only come back home Christmas. The age distribution indicates that, the 20 - 30 year age group dominated (42.2%) followed by the 31 - 40 year (31.2%), 41 – 50 year, (18.8%) and those aged above 50years constituted the least, (7.8 %). This implies that the respondents who participated in the study were young people and this can be understood that the youths are the ones that contribute the largest labour force in the hospitality and tourism industry in Uganda. The marital status was such that; majority (39.0%) were married, followed by single people (29.2%), widowed (14.3%), those who had separated from their spouses (10.4%) and the least percentage (7.1%) were divorced. This means that the majority of the respondents was married and had family responsibilities to care for besides their daily tourism activities and they are the ones who had strong feelings about the fact that tourism contributed to the improvement of the standard of living in the community with regard to job opportunities and improvement of roads. The highest education level of the respondents was such that; most of the respondents had no education (42.2%), followed by (41.6%) who had attained a certificate, 11.7% a diploma and 3.9% had a degree and the rest (.6%) had a masters. This means that most of the tourism activities around the destination areas are carried out by uneducated people an indication that lack of education affects their capacity to fully involve in tourism activities and as a result their welfare gets affected. This indicates that the majority of the respondents did not understand how the existence of the tourism in their area meant to the

community as far as benefit through the improvement of general infrastructure and job opportunities are concerned.

#### **Descriptive statistics of capacity building**

Table 3 above presents the descriptive statistics of capacity building; minimum, maximum and mean values were computed from data coded as follows: “1” Strongly disagree, “2” disagree, “3” neither agree nor disagree “4” Agree “5” Strongly agree. The mean scores from 3.5 and above indicates agreement while mean scores below 3.5 indicate disagreement as discussed below;

#### **Skills and knowledge**

From table 3 above, respondents were not sure whether “training is a source of tourism development in their area”, (Mean=3.33, SD=1.42), and whether local people participated in tourism activities because they had hands on skills (Mean=3.44, SD=1.06). However, respondents’ opinion varied widely concerning the two issues given that the standard deviation for both of them was above one. The results therefore indicate that they were not sure whether providing entrepreneurial training empowers local communities and ultimately increase their capacity to receive significant benefits from tourism. This finding means that local people do not take training as useful resource which can impact on their businesses. The researcher also interacted with some craft shop owners and they revealed that it is a common practice for community members to operate small businesses without considering training as prior aspect of their businesses.

On the contrary, respondents agreed to the fact that local people had practical skills and experience to run the tourism businesses (Mean=3.67, SD=.69) and also that people who go for training in tourism are more successful than those who do not (Mean= 4.3, 0.75). More importantly, the deviation of the individual respondents’ opinion was not far from the common one, which implies that the local people actually had practical skills and experience which enabled them to run tourism businesses. In addition, it implies that those who go for training in tourism using local skills, attend workshops and seminars succeed in their business compared to those who do not. This means that; for communities to build their capacity, they need practical skills like local skills, entrepreneurial training and getting involved in workshops and seminars regularly.

#### **Social capital**

On social capital, the respondents agreed to the issues that; some community members were connected to some individual tourists who supported them in their businesses (Mean=3.6, SD=.54) and that local people directly interact with tourists (Mean=3.9, SD=.66). On the other hand, they disagreed to the fact that tourism officials normally had meetings with village members to get their ideas (Mean=1.8, SD=.88). The fact that the standard deviation for the three items above was low (below one) indicates that the individual respondents’ perception about the above issues on social capital was concerted. This indicates that some community members interact freely with tourists and are able to share with them their challenges and in the end they get support from them in form of funds which they use to start or expand their businesses. Thus, this means that for local communities to build their capacity, they need that free interaction with the visitors/ tourists. However, they disagreed on the issue of tourism officials meeting with them to get their ideas an indication that tourism officials are not helping them on how they can address challenges and promote local strengths. This means that local people rarely see tourism officials in their area helping the locals in as far community development are concerned.

#### **External support**

Regarding External support in table 3 above, respondents agreed that there were some NGOs which helped local people to begin their businesses (Mean=4.1, SD=.45) and that Government supports local communities in development projects (Mean=3.5, SD=.97). However, they could not say whether Community members could easily access resources from outside their area (Mean=3.4, SD=1.19). Apart from the uncertainty of respondents on access of local resources outside their area, the low values of the standard deviations on support from NGOs and the Government are indicative of consensus regarding the individual respondents’ opinion on them. This state of affairs shows that the government and related agencies had done enough work in as far as empowering the people to be employers rather than being employees. This also indicates that the Government of Uganda and NGOs support and contribute to empowering local community organizations to take full advantage of opportunities around them. Therefore this finding means that, for local communities living around destination areas to get empowered, the Government and other NGOs need to support them by providing entrepreneurial training, rehabilitating the existing facilities like roads, health facilities, extend financial facilities which offer loans at low interest rates among others.

**Table 4: Descriptive statistics of community involvement**

Variable/Item (N=154)	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
<b>Community involvement in tourism activities (N=154)</b>			<b>3.42</b>	<b>1.09</b>
<i><b>Employment</b></i>			<b>3.63</b>	<b>0.95</b>
Tourism creates local jobs	2	5	3.77	0.94
Local people invest and operate small scale businesses	1	5	3.33	1.27
Tourism offers labour and small scale opportunities compared to other non-agricultural activities	1	5	3.8	0.64
<i><b>Supply of goods and services</b></i>			<b>3.53</b>	<b>1.13</b>
Crafts shops in this area are owned by locals	2	5	3.8	1.0
Local people are given a priority to supply raw materials to tourism establishments in this area	1	5	3.53	1.28
Community members sell food stuffs to the hotels	1	5	3.53	0.97
<i><b>Provision of home-stays</b></i>			<b>3.10</b>	<b>1.19</b>
Local people provide accommodation to tourists	1	5	3.07	1.17
Locals own majority of the campsites	1	5	3.13	1.2

**Source: Primary data**

#### **4.2.2 Descriptive statistics of community involvement in tourism activities**

Table 4 above presents the descriptive statistics of community involvement where ; minimum, maximum and mean values were computed from data coded as follows: "1" Strongly disagree, "2" disagree, "3" neither agree nor disagree "4" Agree "5" Strongly agree. The mean scores from 3.5 and above indicates agreement while mean scores below 3.5 indicate disagreement as discussed below;

#### **Employment**

Of the three constructs that make up community involvement, respondents agreed that tourism provides worthwhile employment that create local jobs (Mean=3.77, SD=.94) and also that tourism offers labor and small scale opportunities compared to other non -agricultural activities (Mean=3.8), SD=.64). The respondents were at par on these two issues as seen from their low standard deviation. This indicates that local communities are involved in tourism activities and that tourism offer jobs as compared to agriculture. This means that for local communities to get involved tourism, they need to be employed directly as managers, waiters and waitresses, tour guides, cleaners, porters, drivers and interpreters.

On the other hand, the respondents on average were not sure whether local people invested and operated small scale businesses (Mean=3.33, SD=1.27), which perception could not be taken as conclusive since the standard deviation was high, an indication of substantial difference of the individual responses from the general perception. This means that some small scale tourism businesses could be owned by outsiders and locals are not encouraged to invest and operate small scale businesses.

#### **Supply of goods and services**

On the issue of supply of goods and services by the local people, respondents agreed that crafts shops in their area are owned by locals (Mean=3.8, SD=1.0) and that local people were given priority to supply raw materials to tourism establishments in the area (Mean=3.53, SD=1.28) and also to sell food stuffs to the hotels (Mean=3.8), SD=.97). This revelation can however be contestable because the standard deviation for all the three issues was considerably high (over one), an indication that a sizeable number of respondents could either have disagreed or even said that they are not sure. Therefore this finding means that some local people are the owners of small souvenir shops where they sell art pieces, beads, and flower ports among others. The results also mean that community members sell food stuffs to hospitality facilities like matoke, cabbages, carrots and other materials like charcoal.

#### **Provision of home stays**

Regarding provision of home-stays, the respondents could neither agree nor disagree about local people providing accommodation to tourists (Mean=3.07, SD=1.17) and whether the local people owned campsites (Mean=3.13, SD=1.2). However, just like the case was with supply of goods and services, the standard deviation here was substantially high which is indicative of a varied opinion regarding home stays. This means that majority of the locals do not provide home stays in form of accommodation, bandas and campsites an indication that accommodation is majorly provided by outsiders and few by locals like Mabira eco tourist site, volcanoes tourist inn, Buhoma community rest camp, Ruhanga community camp, Bushara island camp which account for about 28% compared to other products which take up to 72%.

**Table 5: Descriptive statistics of community welfare**

<b>Variable/Item (N=154)</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Community welfare</b>			<b>3.67</b>	<b>1.02</b>
<b>Income levels</b>			<b>3.78</b>	<b>1.03</b>
Locals get money from the direct sale of crafts	2	5	4.47	0.53
Local people earn from linking agriculture to tourism	1	5	4.17	0.71
Education in this area has improved because of tourism	1	5	2.7	1.34
<b>Infrastructure development</b>			<b>4.01</b>	<b>1.06</b>
There better road networks in this area	1	5	3.37	1.27
There is good water supply in the area	1	5	4.37	0.96
Schools in this area have all the facilities	1	5	4.3	0.95
<b>Access to utilities</b>			<b>3.23</b>	<b>0.98</b>
House hold individuals access any source of power easily	1	4	2.34	1.18
People have access to health facilities	1	5	4.11	0.78

**Source: Primary data**

Table 5 above presents the descriptive statistics of community welfare where; minimum, maximum and mean values were computed from data coded as follows: “1” Strongly disagree, “2” disagree, “3” neither agree nor disagree “4” Agree “5” Strongly agree. The mean scores from 3.5 and above indicates agreement while mean scores below 3.5 indicate disagreement as discussed below;

**Income levels**

Regarding income levels, respondents agreed that the local people got money from the direct sale of crafts (Mean=4.47, SD=.53) and that local people earn from linking agriculture to tourism (Mean=4.17, SD=.71). And since the standard deviation for the two issues were low, then the general opinion could not be doubted. This indicates that local people get income through the direct sale of crafts to tourists which mean that for local people to increase their incomes they need to involve in direct sale of crafts.

The respondents could neither agree or disagree on whether education in their area had improved because of tourism (Mean=2.7, SD=1.34), however the high standard deviation creates suspicion regarding the individual responses on this matter meaning that there could be a sizeable number of respondents who could have either have agreed or disagreed to education in the area having improved because of tourism. This is an indication that locals were not sure whether education had improved because of tourism as it was manifested in table 2 with the highest education level being a certificate and majority being without any education.

**Infrastructure development**

Concerning infrastructure development, the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed to whether road networks in their area had improved (Mean=3.37, SD=1.27), with considerable variation of opinion due to the high standard deviation. This means that local were not sure whether road networks had improved or not because of tourism. This also means any community development in their area is not communicated properly to the locals.

On the other hand, respondents agreed quite unanimously that there was good water supply in their area (Mean=4.37, SD=.96) and that some schools in their area had all the facilities (Mean=4.3, SD=.95). This is an agreement that local communities get external support from the Government and NGOs. The locals also agreed that atleast in each village, there is a well, water pump and that atleast three homes out of ten have water harvesting facilities like water tanks, big water clay reservoirs, drums and underground water reservoirs.

**Access to utilities**

And lastly on the issue of access to utilities, respondents disagreed that house hold individuals had access to any source of power easily (Mean=2.34, SD=1.18), however with much deviation from the common opinion. This means that local people still use traditional methods of power like small lamps among others.

On the other hand, respondents on average unanimously agreed that local people had access to health facilities (Mean=4.11, SD=.78). This is also in line with the external support from the Government and NGOs. For instance the researcher interacted with some respondents around Bwindi National Park, a community member needs only a book and 2000shs to access health facilities/ services in Buhoma community health center. This means that on average, even the poorest person can access health services.

**4.3 Correlation analysis**

Correlation analysis was employed to establish if there exists a relationship between pairs of the variables being studied.

**Table 6: Correlation analysis**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<b>Capacity building (1)</b>	1								
Skills and knowledge (2)	1.000**	1							
Social capital (3)	.398**	.404**	1						
External support (4)	.241	.375	.325**	1					
<b>Community Involvement (5)</b>	<b>.197*</b>	<b>.230*</b>	<b>.244**</b>	<b>.187*</b>	1				
Employment (6)	.049	.087	.135	.041	.623**	1			
Supply of commodities (7)	.186*	.271*	.222**	.241**	.840**	.535**	1		
Provision of Home stays (8)	.244**	.289**	.269**	.190*	.643**	.076	.337**	1	
<b>Community welfare (9)</b>	<b>.205*</b>	<b>.194*</b>	<b>.262**</b>	<b>.186*</b>	<b>.783**</b>	<b>.782**</b>	<b>.825**</b>	<b>.612**</b>	<b>1</b>

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

#### Source: Primary data

#### 4.3.1 Objective 1: The Relationship between Capacity Building and Community Involvement

The first objective of the study was to establish the relationship between capacity building and community involvement in tourism activities. According to the findings in table 6 above, it showed that there was a significant positive relationship between Capacity building and Community Involvement ( $r = .197^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This statistic implies that the level of Capacity building was directly associated with the level of the Community Involvement. This means that for community members to get involved in tourism activities, they need appropriate skills like craftsman's, cultural skills, communication, and customer care and management skills.

The above statement is in accordance with skills and knowledge ( $r = 1.000^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ), social capital ( $r = .398^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ) which had a strong positive relationship. Ideally, these findings imply that when local communities are supported with appropriate training to prepare them for a wide range of jobs in the tourism industry, interact and network freely with tourists, they can always get ideas and this would enable them to get involved in tourism activities. On the contrary, external support had relationship with community involvement but with no significant correlation, an indication that without the external support, they can use the internal resources like cultural and locally owned resources, they can still get involved.

#### 4.3.2 Objective 2: To determine the relationship between Capacity building and Community welfare

The second objective of the study was to examine the relationship between capacity building and Community welfare. As seen in table 6 above, there was a significant positive relationship between Capacity building and Community welfare ( $r = .205^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This implies that the more the communities get empowered through capacity building, the better their welfare would become. The results in table 6 above further revealed that Community welfare had a significant positive relationship with all of the components of Capacity building; that is with; Skills and knowledge ( $r = .194^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ), Social capital ( $r = .262^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ) and External support ( $r = .186^*$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This implies that the more skills and knowledge the community has, the more social capital and external support one they receive, the better their welfare. The community needs someone who can make them realize the value of their cultural skills and local resources and use them to make a living.

#### 4.3.3 Objective 3: To determine the relationship between Community Involvement and Community welfare

The third objective of the study was to establish the relationship between Community Involvement and Community welfare. Results in table 6 revealed that there was a significant positive relationship between Community Involvement in tourism activities and Community welfare ( $r = .783^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ), implying that the more the community engaged in tourism activities, the better their welfare became.

This revelation was further supported by the fact that Community welfare also had a strong positive relationship with the individual facets of Community Involvement in tourism activities, that is; employment ( $r = .782^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ), supply of goods and services ( $r = .825^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ) and home stays ( $r = .612^{**}$ ,  $p > .01$ ). This indicates that when people in the community are employed, engage in the supply of goods and services and provide home stays to tourists then their welfare would be improved.

#### 4.4 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was run to examine the explanatory power of Capacity building and Community Involvement on Community welfare.



**Table 7: Regression model of Community welfare**

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	.099	.086		1.511	.133
Capacity building	.037	.015	.026	1.174	.242
Community Involvement	1.023	.0204	.918	50.147	.000
<b>Dependent Variable: Community welfare</b>					
<i>R Square</i>	.433		<i>F Statistic</i>	978.43	
<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	.407		<i>Sig.</i>	.000	

**Source: Primary data**

#### 4.4.1 The model

The results in table 7 above, show that capacity building and community involvement were good predictors of community welfare (F-statistic = 978.43,  $p < .000$ ). These two factors accounted for about 40.7% of the observed variation in community welfare. The findings further showed that the relationship between capacity involvement and community welfare was statistically significant (Beta=.918,  $p < .01$ ) and that the relationship between capacity building and community welfare was not significant because of the mediating effect of community involvement (Beta=.026,  $p > .05$ ) as seen in table 7.

#### 4.5 Mediating effect of Community involvement on the effect of Capacity building on Community welfare

**Table 8: Test for mediating effect of Community involvement on the effect of Capacity building on Community welfare**

Regression	Coeff.	SE	t	Sig.
b(YX)	.192	.098	1.959	.052
b(MX)	.197	.048	2.48	.014
b(YM.X)	1.023	.204	50.147	.000
b(YX.M)	.037	.015	1.167	.245
<b>Sobel</b>	<b>2.564</b>	<b>.049</b>		<b>0.00</b>

**Y= Community welfare, X= Capacity building, M= Community involvement**

**Indirect effect = .192, Direct effect = -.022, Total effect = .170**

**Source: Primary data.**

Baron and Kenny's path analysis as shown in table 8 indicated that Capacity building had a significant positive effect on Community welfare (beta = .192,  $p < .05$ ) and the effect became statistically non-significant on controlling for Community involvement (beta = .037,  $p > .05$ ). Further still, the Sobel test for the mediation of Community involvement on the influence of Capacity building on community welfare indicated that the mediation effect was significant ( $Z = 2.564$ ,  $p < .05$ ). This implies that when the people are empowered through availing them with capacity building opportunities like equipping them with skills and knowledge, letting them interact and network with tourists and giving them access to external support their welfare is bound to improve. However, if the empowered local people do not put their skills for instance to use by engaging (involvement) in tourism activities, then their welfare would not be improved. This explains why the effect of community capacity building on community welfare would not be significant when community involvement is in the picture.

#### Conclusion

Developing communities around tourism destinations require constant training of locals through capacity building workshops and seminars at local levels which will arouse local involvement in form of direct sale of fruits, enterprise development, art crafts, provision of local guiding services and pottering among others.

#### 1.1.3 Recommendation to the Study

If communities living around tourism destinations are to develop and improve their welfare, the policy makers should try to put policies regarding tourism training centers around destination area and encourage local communities living around these areas to take part. This would help them to get the necessary skills which would in turn help them to run and manage their businesses. In addition, the Government give external help in form of infrastructure development like roads, clean water and health facilities to local communities living around destination areas to enable local people have direct involvement in tourism hence tap its benefits like those mentioned above. Community involvement in tourism should be emphasized as it helps local community members to earn a living which in form of provision of local supplies to hotels, story- telling, tour guiding, security guard, cleaners, and porters, among others. Encouragement of local communities in form of incentives, workshops and community meetings which should aim at providing support to those community members who want to start tourism businesses and lastly, all tourism jobs in those tourism areas should be given to the local youth, women and men especially those living around tourism resources.

## References

- Adebisi, A. (2012). "16. January to 18. January Green Week (GFFA)."
- Ahebwa, W. M. (2012). Tourism, livelihoods and biodiversity conservation: an assessment of tourism related policy interventions at Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP), Uganda, Wageningen University The Netherlands.
- Allen, L. R., P. T. Long, et al. (1988). "The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life." *Journal of Travel Research* 27(1): 16-21.
- Andriotis, K. (2000). Local community perceptions of tourism as a development tool: The island of Crete, Bournemouth University.
- Aref, A. "Community participation for educational planning and development." *Nat Sci* 8(9): 1-4.
- Aref, F. and M. r. Redzuan (2009). "Community Leadersa Characteristic and their Effort in Building Capacity for Tourism Development in Local Communities." *International Journal of Business and Management* 4(10): P187.
- Aref, F. and M. r. Redzuan (2009). "Community Leadersâ€™ Characteristic and their Effort in Building Capacity for Tourism Development in Local Communities." *International Journal of Business and Management* 4(10): P187.
- Aref, F., M. r. Redzuan, et al. (2009). "Assessing community leadership factor in community capacity building in tourism development: A case study of Shiraz, Iran." *Journal of Human Ecology* 28(3): 171-176.
- Bopp, M. and J. Bopp (2004). "Welcome to the swamp: Addressing community capacity in ecohealth research and intervention." *EcoHealth* 1(2): SU24-SU34.
- Bosworth, G. and H. Farrell (2014). "Tourism entrepreneurs in Northumberland." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38(4): 1474-1494.
- Bowen, G. L., J. A. Martin, et al. (2000). "Community capacity: Antecedents and consequences." *Journal of Community Practice* 8(2): 1-21.
- Boyd, S. W. and S. Singh (2003). "Destination communities: Structures, resources and types." *Tourism in destination communities*: 19-33.
- Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Building community capacity, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Chaskin, R. J. (2006). "Family support as community-based practice: Considering a community capacity framework for family support provision." *Family support as a reflective practice*.
- Choi, H. C. and E. Sirakaya (2006). "Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism." *Tourism Management* 27(6): 1274-1289.
- Chok, S., J. Macbeth, et al. (2007). "Tourism as a tool for poverty alleviation: a critical analysis of â€˜pro-poor tourismâ€™ and implications for sustainability." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(2-3): 144-165.
- Cole, B. (1992). "Building Sustainable Communities."
- Cole, D. and E. Ostrom (2010). "The variety of property systems and rights in natural resources."
- Craig, G. (2009). "Community capacity building and social policy: Health, housing and community regeneration." *Community Capacity Building. Creating a better future together*: 37-85.
- Czernek, K. (2013). "DETERMINANTS OF COOPERATION IN A TOURIST REGION." *Annals of Tourism Research* 40: 83-104.
- Eja, E., J. Otu, et al. (2013). "Community Leadership and Attitude to Impact of Ecotourism Development in Cross River State." *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences* 3(2).
- Ertuna, B. (2012). "Local community involvement in rural tourism development: The case of Kastamonu, Turkey." *COMITÄ‰ EDITORIAL* 10(2): 17.
- Fiallo, E. A. and S. K. Jacobson (1995). "Local communities and protected areas: attitudes of rural residents towards conservation and Machalilla National Park, Ecuador." *Environmental Conservation* 22(03): 241-249.
- Fiona, V. (2007). Community Capacity Building A review of the literature.
- Forstner, K. (2004) Community Ventures and Access to Markets: The role of Intermediaries in Marketing Rural Tourism Products. *Development policy Review* 22 (5): pp, 497-514
- Frank, F. and A. Smith (1999). The community development handbook: A tool to build community capacity, Human Resources Development Canada Ottawa, ON.
- Gannon, A. (1994). "Rural tourism as a factor in rural community economic development for economies in transition." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 2(1-2): 51-60.
- Giampiccoli, A. and J. H. Kalis (2012). "Tourism, Food, and Culture: Communityâ€™ Based Tourism, Local Food, and Community Development in Mpondoland." *Culture, Agriculture, Food and Environment* 34(2): 101-123.
- Gibbon, M., R. Labonte, et al. (2002). "Evaluating community capacity." *Health & social care in the community* 10(6): 485-491.
- Goodman, R., M. Speers, et al. (1998). "Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to

- provide a basis for measurement."
- Goodwin, H. (2002). "Local community involvement in tourism around national parks: opportunities and constraints." *Current Issues in Tourism* 5(3-4): 338-360.
- Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism planning: Policies, processes and relationships*, Prentice Hall.
- Hall, C. M. and D. K. MÅller (2004). *Tourism, mobility, and second homes: Between elite landscape and common ground*, Channel View Publications.
- Hanafiah, M. H., M. R. Jamaluddin, et al. (2012). "Local Community Attitude and Support towards Tourism Development in Tioman Island, Malaysia." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 105: 792-800.
- Haukeland, J. V. (2009). "Tourism stakeholders' perceptions of national park management in Norway." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 19(2): 133-153.
- Hounslow, B. (2002). "Community capacity building explained." *Stronger Families Learning Exchange Bulletin* 1(1): 20-22.
- Jamal, T. and A. Stronza (2009). "Collaboration theory and tourism practice in protected areas: stakeholders, structuring and sustainability." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 17(2): 169-189.
- Jamieson, D. (2008). *Ethics and the environment: An introduction*, Cambridge University Press.
- Johannesen, A. B. and A. Skonhøft (2005). "Tourism, poaching and wildlife conservation: what can integrated conservation and development projects accomplish?" *Resource and Energy Economics* 27(3): 208-226.
- Kalemo, Z. R. (2011). "Understanding the role of tourism in poverty reduction, the case of communities adjacent to Mikumi National Park in Tanzania."
- Krejcie, R. V. and D. W. Morgan (1970). "Determining sample size for research activities." *Educ Psychol Meas.*
- Kumar, C. (2005). "Revisiting 'community' in community-based natural resource management." *Community Development Journal* 40(3): 275-285.
- Lã¡tkovã¡j, P. and C. A. Vogt (2012). "Residents attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities." *Journal of Travel Research* 51(1): 50-67.
- Labonte, R. and G. Laverack (2001). "Capacity building in health promotion, Part 1: for whom? And for what purpose?" *Critical Public Health* 11(2): 111-127.
- Lankford, S. V. and D. R. Howard (1994). "Developing a tourism impact attitude scale." *Annals of Tourism Research* 21(1): 121-139.
- Lasker, R. D. and E. S. Weiss (2003). "Creating partnership synergy: the critical role of community stakeholders." *Journal of health and human services administration*: 119-139.
- Laverack, G. (2003). "Building capable communities: experiences in a rural Fijian context." *Health Promotion International* 18(2): 99-106.
- Laverack, G. (2006). "Evaluating community capacity: Visual representation and interpretation." *Community Development Journal* 41(3): 266-276.
- Li, W. (2006). "Community decisionmaking participation in development." *Annals of tourism research* 33(1): 132-143.
- Mansfeld, Y. and A. Jonas (2006). "EVALUATING THE SOCIO CULTURAL CARRYING CAPACITY OF RURAL TOURISM COMMUNITIES: A VALUE STRETCH APPROACH." *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 97(5): 583-601.
- Manyara, G. and E. Jones (2007). "Best practice model for community capacity-building: A case study of community-based tourism enterprises in Kenya." *Turizam: znanstveno-struã ni Å asopis* 55(4): 403-415.
- Mason, P. and J. Cheyne (2000). "Residents attitudes to proposed tourism development." *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2): 391-411.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D., M. A. Brennan, et al. (2010). "Community agency and sustainable tourism development: The case of La Fortuna, Costa Rica." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 18(6): 735-756.
- McCool, S. F. (2009). "Constructing partnerships for protected area tourism planning in an era of change and messiness." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 17(2): 133-148.
- McIntyre, N., J. Jenkins, et al. (2001). "Global influences on access: the changing face of access to public conservation lands in New Zealand." *Journal of sustainable tourism* 9(5): 434-450.
- Meyer, C. B. and I. G. Stensaker (2006). "Developing capacity for change." *Journal of Change Management* 6(2): 217-231.
- Meyer, D. (2007). "Pro-poor tourism: From leakages to linkages. A conceptual framework for creating linkages between the accommodation sector and 'poor' neighbouring communities." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(6): 558-583.
- Miranda, E. M. (2007). *Gang injunctions and community participation*, ProQuest.
- Moscardo, G. (2008). "Community capacity building: An emerging challenge for tourism development." *Building community capacity for tourism development*: 1-15.
- Moscardo, G. (2008). "Sustainable tourism innovation: Challenging basic assumptions." *Tourism and Hospitality*

- Research 8(1): 4-13.
- Mthembu, M. B. J. (2000). "Rural tourism development: a viable formula for poverty alleviation in Bergville." *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* 4(1): 63-74.
- Muganda, M., M. Sahli, et al. (2012). "Tourism's contribution to poverty alleviation: A community perspective from Tanzania." *Development Southern Africa* 27(5): 629-646.
- Muganda, M., A. Sirima, et al. (2012). "Sharing Tourism Benefits with the Local Community: A Business Perspective from the Grassroots in Tanzania." *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies and Management* 5(3): 239-251.
- Muhanna, E. (2007). "The contribution of sustainable tourism development in poverty alleviation of local communities in South Africa." *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism* 6(1): 37-67.
- Niezgoda, A. and K. Czernek (2009). "Development of cooperation between residents and local authority in tourism destination." *Turizam: znanstveno-stručni časopis* 56(4): 385-398.
- Norton, A., J. Burdine, et al. (2002). "Community capacity." *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research: Strategies for improving public health* 15: 194.
- Nunkoo, R. and D. Gursoy (2012). "Residents support for tourism: An identity perspective." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39(1): 243-268.
- Nyakana, J.B (2008) Sustainable wetlands resource utilization of Sango Bay through Eco-tourism development. *African Journal of Environmental Science and Technology Vol. 2 (10) pp 326-335.*
- OLAJIDE, O. (2012). "INFLUENCE OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION ON TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN OSUN STATE, NIGERIA." *JEDA-Volume 20, Number 1.-March, 2012. TABLE OF CONTENT: 527.*
- Pongponrat, K. (2011). "Participatory management process in local tourism development: A case study on fisherman village on Samui Island, Thailand." *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 16(1): 57-73.
- Press, M. (2009). "Dimensions of community capacity building: A review of its implications in tourism development." *Journal of American Science* 5(8).
- Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*, Simon & Schuster.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). "E pluribus unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century the 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture." *Scandinavian political studies* 30(2): 137-174.
- Reid, M. and K. Gibb (2004). *Capacity Building™ in the third sector and the use of independent consultants: Evidence from Scotland.* The ISTR 6th International Conference, Toronto.
- Rimington, M. and C. Cooper (2011). *Tourism and Entrepreneurship*, Goodfellow Publishers.
- Sanoff, H. (2000). *Community participation methods in design and planning*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Saxena, G. (2005), —Relationships, Networks and the Learning Regions: Case Evidence from the Peak District National Park, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, 277–289.
- Saxena, G. (2006), —Beyond Mistrust and Competition—The Role of Social and Personal Bonding Processes in Sustaining Livelihoods of Rural Tourism Businesses: A Case of the Peak District National Park, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 8, 263–277.
- Scheyvens, R. (2007). "Exploring the tourism-poverty nexus." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(2-3): 231-254.
- Shaw, G. and A. M. Williams (1998). "Entrepreneurship, small business culture and tourism development." *The economic geography of the tourism industry: 235-55.*
- Smith, N., L. B. Littlejohns, et al. (2003). *Measuring community capacity: State of the field review and recommendations for future research*, Citeseer.
- Smith, N., L. B. Littlejohns, et al. (2001). "Shaking out the cobwebs: insights into community capacity and its relation to health outcomes." *Community Development Journal* 36(1): 30-41.
- Snyman, S. L. (2012). "The role of tourism employment in poverty reduction and community perceptions of conservation and tourism in southern Africa." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 20(3): 395-416.
- Songorwa, A. N. (1999). "Community-based wildlife management (CWM) in Tanzania: Are the communities interested?" *World development* 27(12): 2061-2079.
- Spenceley, A. (2001). "Local community benefit systems at two nature-based tourism operations in South Africa." *Industry and Environment* 24(3): 50-53.
- Spenceley, A. and D. Meyer (2012). "Tourism and poverty reduction: Theory and practice in less economically developed countries." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 20(3): 297-317.
- Tchetchik, A., A. Fleischer, et al. (2006). "Rural Tourism: Development, Public Intervention And Lessons from the Israeli Experience." *Review Literature And Arts Of The Americas.*
- Thomson, D. and S. Pepperdine (2003). *Assessing community capacity for riparian restoration*, Citeseer.
- Timothy, D. J. (1999). "Participatory planning A view of tourism in Indonesia." *Annals of tourism research* 26(2): 371-391.
- Tosun, C. (2000). "Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries." *Tourism Management* 21(6): 613-633.

Tosun, C. (2006). "Expected nature of community participation in tourism development." *Tourism Management* 27(3): 493-504.

Tosun, C. and D. Timothy (2003). "Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process." *Journal of Tourism Studies* 14(2): 2-15.

Vafadari, K. (2012). "Tourism and the Revival of Rural Japan: The Case of Satoyama Development in Ishikawa Prefecture, Japan." *Asia Pacific World* 4(2): 103-121.

Vail, S. E. (2007). "Community development and sport participation." *Journal of Sport Management* 21(4): 571.

Vincent, K., B. Harris, et al. (2007). "Managed moves: schools collaborating for collective gain." *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties* 12(4): 283-298.

Wang, H., Z. Yang, et al. (2010). "Minority community participation in tourism: A case of Kanas Tuva villages in Xinjiang, China." *Tourism Management* 31(6): 759-764.

Wang, Y. and G. Wall (2005). "Resorts and residents: stress and conservatism in a displaced community." *Tourism Analysis* 10(1): 37-53.

Wilcox, S., M. Bopp, et al. (2003). "Psychosocial and perceived environmental correlates of physical activity in rural and older African American and white women." *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 58(6): P329-P337.

Wilson, R. K. (2006). "Collaboration in context: rural change and community forestry in the Four Corners." *Society and natural resources* 19(1): 53-70.

Wituk, S., S. Ealey, et al. (2005). "Community development through community leadership programs: Insights from a statewide community leadership initiative." *Community Development* 36(2): 89-101.

Wright, R. W., L. Hanson, et al. "Building Community Capacity through "Sport for Development"™." *SPORT, PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT*: 319.

Zhao, W. and J. B. Ritchie (2007). "Tourism and poverty alleviation: An integrative research framework." *Current Issues in Tourism* 10(2-3): 119-143.

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent,

We are a team of researchers from Makerere University Business School and Rwanda Tourism University College, conducting an academic research entitled "COMMUNITY CAPACITY BUILDING, LOCAL COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN TOURISM AND COMMUNITY WELFARE IN UGANDA" as a way of contributing and inducing local people to participate in tourism activities around them. You have been identified as a resourceful person for this study and hereby requested to spare your resourceful time and fill in this questionnaire. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and only aggregate figures will be reported. It will be greatly appreciated if you would complete the questionnaire, as your opinion can help improve the welfare of Ugandan local communities. Please return the completed questionnaire to the deliverer. Thank you for your time and effort.

SECTION A: BIO DATA

(Please tick the most appropriate option)

a. What is your age group?

Age (years)	20-30	31-40	41-50	51 and above

b. What is your gender?

Male	Female	Others

c. What is your marital status?

Single	Married	Divorced	Widowed	Separated

d. What is your highest education level?

None	Certificate	Diploma	Degree	Masters

**SECTION B: STUDY VARIABLES**

**PART A: Community Capacity Building**

Please rate the expectation of each community capacity building dimension and the actual perception (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree).

<b>Please select only one option that best suits your level of agreement or disagreement</b>	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Skills and knowledge</b>					
Skill and knowledge is a source of tourism development in this area	1	2	3	4	5
Local people have practical skills and experience to run tourism businesses	1	2	3	4	5
People who go for training in tourism are more successful than those who do not	1	2	3	4	5
People participate in tourism activities because they have hands on skills	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Social capital</b>					
Tourism officials normally have meetings with village members to get their ideas	1	2	3	4	5
Some community members are connected to some individual tourists who support them in their businesses					
Local people directly interact with tourists	1	2	3	4	5
<b>External support</b>					
There are some NGOs which help local people to begin their businesses	1	2	3	4	5
Government supports local communities in development projects	1	2	3	4	5
Community members can easily access resources from outside this area	1	2	3	4	5
<b>PART B. Community involvement in tourism activities</b>					
Please rate the expectation of each community involvement in tourism activities dimension (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree).					
<b>Employment</b>					
Tourism creates local jobs	1	2	3	4	5
Local people invest and operate small scale businesses	1	2	3	4	5
Tourism offers labour and small scale opportunities compared to other non-agricultural activities	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Supply of goods and services</b>					
Crafts shops in this area are owned by locals	1	2	3	4	5
Local people are given a priority to supply raw materials to tourism establishments in this area	1	2	3	4	5
Community members sell food stuffs to the hotels	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Provision of home-stays</b>					
Local people provide accommodation to tourists	1	2	3	4	5
Locals own majority of the campsites	1	2	3	4	5
<b>PART C: Community welfare</b>					
Please rate the expectation of each community welfare dimension and the actual perception (1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree).					
<b>Income levels</b>					
Locals get money from the direct sale of crafts	1	2	3	4	5
Local people earn from linking agriculture to tourism	1	2	3	4	5
Education in this area has improved because of tourism	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Infrastructure development</b>					
There better road networks in this area	1	2	3	4	5
There is good water supply in the area	1	2	3	4	5
Schools in this area have all the facilities	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Access to utilities</b>					
House hold individuals access any source of power easily					
People have access to health facilities	1	2	3	4	5

*Thank you very much!*

Yours faithfully,

1. Ms. Kesande Provia  
**Lead Researcher/Lecturer**  
**Makerere University Business School**  
**P.O.Box, 1337,**  
**Kampala-Uganda.**

2.Mr.Kalulu Ronald  
**Associate Researcher/Lecturer**  
**Rwanda Tourism University College**  
**P.O.Box, 350,**  
**Kigali Rwanda**

3.Ms. KICONCO MICHELLE  
**Associate Researcher/Lecturer**  
**Makerere University Business School**  
**P.O.Box, 1337,**  
**Kampala-Uganda.**