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ABSTRACT

Protected Areas are increasingly becoming significant due to their double potential as tourism and biodiversity conservation areas. This has led to an increasing desire by governments to convert a lot of forests into Protected Areas. However, these conversions are sometimes met with strict opposition from members of fringe communities. This is sometimes attributed to the destruction of livelihood sources of community members and thus affects the smooth management of protected areas. The objective of this study therefore was to examine the perception and attitudes of residents towards the effective management of the Kyabobo National Park in the Nkwanta North District of Ghana. Using a mixed method approach, 200 questionnaires were administered to respondents in five fringe communities. Focus Group Discussions and interviews were also used to collect field data and information. The study revealed that majority of community members do not receive any form of social, economic or cultural benefits from the KNP but they were however supportive of the establishment of conservation area where biodiversity can be preserved. The study also revealed that the perception and attitude of respondents are not influenced by their demographic variables such as age, level of education and occupation. Respondents however had negative attitudes towards the park because promises made by park authorities before the conversion of the place to a park had not been kept. The negative attitudes therefore affect the effective management of the park. It is recommended that government and management of the park fulfill their promises to residents. Also, alternative livelihood options should be provided for residents to avoid illegal entry into the park. The planning of sensitization programs should involve all residents and not target only certain demographic categories as there is no relationship between demographic characteristics of respondents and their perception and attitude towards protected areas.
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<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPCU</td>
<td>District Planning Coordinating Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSGDA</td>
<td>Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Ghana Statistical Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>Ghana Tourism Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTDC</td>
<td>Ghana Tourism Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOTCATT</td>
<td>Hotel and Catering Tourism Training Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWC</td>
<td>human-wildlife conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for Conservation Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNP</td>
<td>Kyabobo National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMDAs</td>
<td>Metropolitan, Municipal, and District Assemblies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Food and Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAs</td>
<td>Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDGs</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWTO</td>
<td>United Nations World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPA</td>
<td>World Commission on Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCU</td>
<td>World Conservation Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>Wildlife Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPAs</td>
<td>Wildlife Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTTC</td>
<td>World Travel and Tourism Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Protected Areas (PAs) are generally regarded as warehouses of biodiversity globally (Dudley, 2008). Their role as the protection of the extinction of natural flora, ecosystem, and fauna of the earth for the benefits of man cannot be overestimated (Dudley, 2008). According to The World Conservation Union (WCU), PA is defined as, “clearly defined geographical space that is recognised, dedicated and managed through the legal and other effective means to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values (Dudley, 2008).” PAs serve as tools for preserving threatened ecosystems and mitigation strategies for climate change (Dudley, 2008; Getzneret et al., 2012). Managements of PAs also provide alternative livelihood and income generation projects for fringe communities (Dudley, 2008; Getzneret et al., 2012). This makes most protected areas increasingly significant in recent times due to their role in tourism growth and development of destination areas (Akyeampong&Asiedu, 2008; Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). Thus, in as much as there is a global concern about the nexus between tourism and protected areas, we cannot also do away with issues of perceptions and attitudes of local communities towards PAs which determine the long-term existence of protected ecological zones (Dewu & Røskaft, 2017).

In recent times, the world has experienced increase in the numbers of nationally designated PAs. They comprise of 157,897 PAs which cover over 24 million square kilometers of land and sea (WDPA, 2012). The level of protections among nations varies (WDPA, 2012), for instance according to WDPA (2012), in a study conducted in 236 countries, 45% of the countries
had more than 10% of their terrestrial area protected, and with only 14% of the countries had more than 10% of their marine area protected.

In Ghana, according to UICN/PACO (2010), twenty-one (21) Wildlife Protected Areas (WPAs) occupy a total of 1,347,600 hectares of the country’s land. Among these, PAs network constitutes seven (7) National Parks, six (6) Resource Reserves, two (2) Wildlife Sanctuaries, one (1) Strict Nature Reserve and five (5) Coastal Wetlands (UICN/PACO, 2010). In recent times, in spite of the fact that some areas have been designated as priority areas for conservation purposes, which is viewed as one of the very useful strategies in safeguarding the earth’s declining biological diversity (Geldmann et al., 2013), their establishment and maintenance is not completely devoid of controversies (Geldmann et al., 2013). It is also noticed that despite the implementation of several conservation approaches, many protected areas across the globe still experience biodiversity loss due to negative perceptions and attitudes held by locals towards most of the parks (Muhumuza & Balkwill, 2013). These PAs are viewed differently by many people, as many observe them as a perfect conservation strategy; it is however perceived differently by others as a threat to their source of livelihoods (Brockington & Wilkie, 2015).

The management of such areas over the years, especially in Africa, has followed the top-down approach giving little or no attention to the needs and aspirations of locals in the fringe communities (King, 2010). Ironically, the idea of sustainability championed by advocates for protected areas is usually not compatible with the resource use and needs of local communities (Cobbinah, 2015). Residents in fringe communities usually hold the view that it is their right to make unregulated use of the resources in protected areas (Amoah & Wiafe, 2012). Such notion is detrimental to the idea of conservation and thus Congo a long way to affect the overall success of implemented efforts in future.
Ayivor et al., (2013) and Cobbinah et al., (2015) maintained that the establishment and maintenance of protected areas most often involve evictions, restriction of access to essential resources, and the loss of traditional land use rights. The unfortunate issue, especially in most of the developing world is that, most of the areas demarcated for protection are usually occupied by people who are generally impoverished and who depend largely on the resources in the protected areas as source of livelihood (King, 2010). When areas are converted into national parks, the resident population is completely restricted from the use of resources in the areas making it difficult for them to meet their livelihood needs (Amoah & Wiafe, 2012; Cobbinah et al., 2015). King (2010) intimates that protecting areas foster resentment and apathy when locals are restricted from using resources in protected areas. Securing livelihoods and assuring a feeling of ownership is a key to garnering support for conservation (King, 2010).

Apart from excluding local people from resource acquisition which is always accompanied by untold hardship (Mfunda, 2010; Masud et al., 2014), local communities are also compelled to endure this great losses such as raided crops, depredated livestock and damage to other properties emanating from the establishment of these areas (King, 2010, Karanth & Nepal, 2011; Vedeld et al., 2012; Cobbinah, 2015). Almost invariably, these losses are accompanied by lack of compensation which often breeds negative perception and attitude towards such projects (King, 2010). According to King (2010) and Wanget et al (2006), all these losses associated with the establishment of PAs coupled with other factors often lead to negative perceptions and attitudes of the locals towards PA.

Amoah and Wiafe (2012) also added that the exclusion of the local people from parks management is the main source of conflict in most PAs. In this regard, communities who are excluded from the management but at the same time incur the costs of conservation are not
expected to support conservation of PAs (Gillingham & Lee, 2003). On the other hand, communities who are involved in the management process are expected to support and show positive perceptions and attitudes towards the conservation process (Infield & Namara, 2001). Since perceptions and attitudes by the locals are necessary determinants of conservation successes, positive perceptions and attitudes toward protected areas by fringe communities will positively relate to the long-term success and existence of PAs (Struhsaker et al., 2005, Dewu & Røskaft, 2017).

Conservation processes that exclude the needs and acceptance of local communities is difficult to manage (Allendorf et al., 2006). As a result, there is the need for a change from the top-down to bottom-up approach in park management to meet the needs of the locals (Wells & McShane, 2004; King, 2010). This approach will ensure a balance in the cost of conservation where alternative livelihood and economic development will be enjoyed by locals in protected areas (Wells and McShane, 2004; King, 2010). In order to meet the needs and development of fringe communities (Sluis et al, 2007) have called for the nexus between sustainable tourism and protected areas. In recent times tourism sector remains an important driver of economic revitalization and as a driving force in addressing spatio-temporal inequities in development (Asiedu, 2012). This is manifested in job creation, poverty alleviation, and environmental protection (UNWTO, 2015). The use of these conserved areas for tourism development is therefore deemed to be an appropriate way for sustaining and enhancing the livelihoods of residents in such communities. In addition to the above, protected area is one of the approaches to natural resource management and within this domain the question of community participation is not sufficiently addressed both at policy and implementation level.
Since local’s perceptions and attitudes toward protected areas is considered as an important part of conservation process, this study seeks to investigate the perception and attitudes of residents in fringe communities on PAs and its implications on effective park management and engagement local residents livelihood enhancement.

1.2 Problem statement

The recent advocacy by conservation organizations such as African Wildlife Foundation, Conservation International, IUCN, The Nature Conservancy, and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), among others, led to the increase in sizes and numbers of PAs in the world (Videld et al., 2012). These advocacies made the potentials of protected a prominent tool for tourism growth and development of destination areas to become increasingly significant (Akyeampong and Asiedu, 2008; Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996). According to Chevalier and Milburn (2015), PAs are able to function as profitable establishments which provide both monetarist and non-monetarist benefits to boost development if managed effectively. Managements of PAs also provide alternative livelihood and income generation projects for fringe communities (Dudley, 2008; Getzner et al., 2012).

In spite of the benefits offered by PAs, its adverse effects on the fringe communities cannot be disputed. According to Weladji and Tchamba (2003), a greater proportion of these PAs in Ghana were created by colonial masters without taking care of the needs of local communities. The colonial authorities never considered the views and the needs of the local people. Moreover, some locals were displaced and deprived of their resources of livelihood. These made some locals lose their livelihood and became vulnerable to poverty. According to Oxford dictionary, perception is defined as the ability to see, hear or understand things. Understanding community
perceptions and attitudes towards protected areas is of great importance because these attitudes are one way or the other, inherently linked to the long-term existence and effectiveness of protected areas (Dewu & Røskaft, 2017). Additionally, a greater understanding of these can help avoid tension and improve successful management (Maya & Metzger, 2017). Maya and Metzger (2017) further noted that understanding attitudes of fringe communities in newly created parks provide valuable information for the design of education and engagement programmes, while creating a benchmark to compare changes over time. Furthermore, understanding local resident’s perception and attitude of PAs makes it possible to create strategic place-based management strategies that build on people’s positive perceptions and attitudes and mitigate the negative ones (Allendorf et al, 2006).

Several studies have been done on perception and attitude of locals toward PAs in Ghana. A study by Amuquandoh (2010) on perception on the environmental impact of tourism in the Lake Bosomtwe Basin revealed that residents expected both positive and negative effects of protected area development, but were more inclined to the positive side. Akyeampong (2011) also examined the expectation, experience and perception of residents on pro-poor tourism and established that while some expectations were too much, others had been met.

The Kyabobo Range National Park (KNP) which was formerly established in 1993 is one of the many and newest national Parks in Ghana (Sluis et al., 2007). The Park is unique and is situated right on the boundary between the savannah and forest zones in Ghana, where a mosaic of woodland and various forest types (mainly semi-evergreen) intermingle at the western edge of the Dahomey Gap which made it very significant for biological preservation and nature-based tourism (IUCN, 2010). Kyabobo National Park similar to any other park in Ghana faces challenges such as poaching, conflicts, loss of flora and fauna among others as a result of
negative perception and attitude from locals. These negative attitudes militate against the sustainability of the park. Notwithstanding this, most of the studies on KNP have rather skewed toward other issues to the neglect of the perceptions and attitudes of the local residents toward KNP. Bowes-Lyon, (1998) for instance noted that the decision making regarding the KNP is quite complicated with many different people trying to influence outcomes. Sluis et al., (2007) and Bouma (2007) also explored into the potential of tourism in KNP and established that the park offers a high prospect for tourism development. Larsen (2006a) further delved into butterfly population and composition of the KNP and found that it contains almost 80% of the entire butterfly population in the Volta Region of Ghana. Leache (2005) conducted a herpetological survey of the KNP and found a high amphibian population around the Shiare area of the park while Bruku (2016) looked at the economic effects of the park, perceived risk in the area and needed alternative livelihood interventions for the park resident population.

With the above background, it is vividly clear that much of the research on perception and attitudes of locals toward KNP (Amuquandoh, 2010; Akyeapong, 2011) and (Sluis et al., 2007; Bouma, 2007; Larsen, 2006; Leache, 2005 Bowes-Lyon, 1998; Bruku, 2016) did not look at perceptions and attitudes of locals towards KNP and this poses a serious challenge to economic and social-cultural activities in the fringe communities. The focus has been on perceived risk in the area (Bruku, 2016). It can be justified from the above that much has not been done on perceptions and attitudes of fringe communities toward the KNP. But as pointed out earlier on, the KNP faces a wide array of challenges that need a more comprehensive examination. This study therefore sought to understand the perceptions and attitudes of fringe communities towards KNP, specifically focusing on how age, level of education and occupation
affect the local people’s perceptions and attitudes. It also looked at the impacts of these perceptions and attitudes towards KNP and its sustainable development.

1.3 Research questions

1. What are local people’s perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park?

2. What are the factors that influence local people’s perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park?

3. How are the impacts of the local peoples’ perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park?

1.4 Research objectives

1. To examine the perceptions and attitudes of locals towards KNP.

2. To analyze factors affecting the local people’s perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park.

3. To assess the impacts of local peoples’ perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park.
1.5 Hypotheses

Ha: the type of occupation, level of education and age of individuals has a significant relationship with economic, social and cultural benefits from Kyabobo National Park.

Ho: the type of occupation, level of education and age of individuals has no relationship with economic, social and cultural benefits from Kyabobo National Park.

1.6 Significance of the study

There has been a lot of research conducted on protected areas in Ghana. However, many of these researches pay attention to issues such as tourism potentials of protected areas, aspect of risk, and livelihood threats. Taking the study area into consideration, very little is known perceptions and attitudes of the locals toward effective management of the protected area.

Therefore, this study sought to fill this gap in knowledge by identifying perceptions and attitudes of residents of fringe communities towards protected areas and factors affecting these perceptions and attitudes. Furthermore, the study provides useful information which will serve as data base for further research, policy makers at local and national level in addressing issues of perception and attitudes of locals for effective management of protected areas.

1.7 Organization of the study

The study is structured into five chapters. Chapter one provides the introductory aspects study. This entails background, problem statement, objectives, significance, research questions, scope, limitations and the organization of the study. The second chapter looks at the related literature. In this section, the necessary books, articles, and other works, which have been written by other researchers on the subject, were reviewed. The third chapter is on the study area and
methodology. This involves sampling technique, sources of data, data collection methods and instruments, sample size and sampling technique, and methods for data analysis. Chapter four provides a comprehensive analysis and discussions of the data on each objective. Here statistical tables, cross-tabulations and other analytical tools are used to draw meanings from data into information to aid discussions. Finally, the fifth chapter presents the summary of key findings, conclusion and recommendations.

1.8 Chapter summary

This chapter provided an overview of the research by giving an introduction to the study where basic concepts were discussed. The problem statement of the study was also looked at as well as the study objectives, research questions and hypothesis. Another component of this chapter is the limitation of the study, its significance and its organization.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter delves into various literary sources and also presents the review of related literature concerning ecotourism, how it influences rural livelihood enhancement in fringe communities and the conceptual framework of the study. It begins by introducing the main concepts of the study that is sustainability and sustainable development, sustainable tourism, ecotourism, the relationship between ecotourism and poverty alleviation, the impacts of protected areas on the locals, the overview of protected areas at the global level, antecedent of protected areas in Ghana, the linkage between protected areas and tourism, park-people relationship, national parks as important protected areas, historical overview of Kyabobo National Park, overview of tourism sector in Ghana, the perception and attitude of local towards protected areas, factors that affect the perception and attitude of the locals towards the protected areas, the impact of the perception and attitude of locals on protected areas, the study’s conceptual frameworks.

2.2 Exploring the overview of protected areas at the world level

Protected Areas (PAs) across the globe served as the home of extinction bio-diversity globally (Kamal, 2014). The designation of PAs is aimed at protecting and sustaining the extinction biodiversity on the earth for human sustenance (Kamal, 2014). According to The World Conservation Union (IUCN), PAs are defined as, “clearly defined geographical space that is recognized, dedicated and managed through the legal and other effective means to achieve the
long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values (Dudley, 2008).” A protected area is a demarcated area that is managed through laws or customs to conserve or protect biodiversity. The World Parks Congress that was organized in 1992 in Venezuela adopted the definition of protected area as “an area of land or sea especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity, and of natural and associated cultural resources, and managed through legal or other effective means.”

PAs across the world can manifest in different ways including national parks, community conservation areas, wilderness areas, natural, and private reserves (IUCN, 2014; Bruku, 2016). Furthermore, the number of PAs across the globe has received a tremendous increase as a result of calls by numerous conservation stakeholders such as African Wildlife Foundation for their increment (Vedeld et al., 2012). Notwithstanding this, most of these PAs are conflicts laden with the fringe communities (Kamal, 2014). This happens especially when people in the fringe communities begin to show negative attitudes towards the PAs on the basis that they have lost their livelihoods and properties to the establishment of the parks. (Kamal, 2014). The creation of most PAs in Africa were done by our colonial administrators without paying attention to the needs of the locals, the locals lost their livelihoods which is the bane of negative perception and attitude shown by most fringe communities towards Pas (Weladji and Tchamba, 2003).

Over the past century, the world has seen a tremendous increase the number of PAs (Kamal, 2014). There are over 157, 897 PAs which occupy a total land area of more than 24 million square kilometers (Kamal, 2014). The level of protection varies from nation to nation (WDPA, 2012). Out of 236 countries, only 45% countries had their terrestrial area protected, also, out of the 236 nations, 14% had more than 10% of their marine area protected (WDPA, 2012).
The main functions of PAS are not only the preservation of the threatening ecosystems and bio-diversity but the focus is broadened to include measures to mitigate the adverse effects of climate change on the earth and its content (Dudley, 2008; Getzner et al., 2012; Kamal, 2014). Moreover, PAs provides livelihood and income for the people in the fringe communities of the protected areas, provides different form of ecosystem services (Kamal, 2014; Bruku, 2016). The Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CDB) (2008) posited that PAs also convey remarkable environmental, divine, cultural and scientific gains to society. Based on these, Getzner et al. (2012) acknowledged that the management PAs should not be narrowed down to only biodiversity conservation but also to include solutions to humanity problems.

2.3 Paradigmatic evolution of protected areas models

Protected areas as a concept has a long term history, it existence could be traced back for at least several thousand years in South Asia, Pacific and Africa in several forms such as individually owned and community owned forest reserves and spiritual areas. For example, sacred groves, royal decrees, and controlled “taboo” areas, (Colchester, 1994; Dudley et al, 2005, Yannick, 2010). A lot of protected areas came into existence in the middle of the 19th century (Colchester, 1994; Dudley et al, 2005; Yannick, 2010). Since then, the concept has spread and developed significantly, taken into consideration principles, standards and attitudes of each passing era (Colchester, 1994; Dudley et al, 2005; Yannick, 2010). However, over the past 150 years, there was a change in societal views toward protected areas identified by three different models. These include the classic, the modern and post-2010 models.
2.3.1 Classical model

The idea of classical model stipulates that, protected areas in the past were generally viewed as independent entities from their surrounding fringe communities (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). PAs were not incorporated into an integrated land-use plan, instead; protected areas were often isolated from land-use plan (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). They were developed in a way that did not in consider economic and social value of local communities (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). Prior to the 1970s, the objectives of PAs were not compatible with its benefits and attempts made to re-direct protected areas toward achieving social and economic benefits were regarded as being detrimental to biodiversity conservation objectives. Protected areas were basically government owned enterprise (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010).

2.3.2 Modern model

In the 1970s, the emergence of modern models of protected areas began. It was characterized by major innovations such as management effectiveness, protected area network design, governance and sustainable finance (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). This model reflected the needs of fringe communities (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). This is the time planners began to recognize the importance of local communities, recognize state models as community integrated, and used protected area networks to address the need of fringe communities (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). Protected areas are now viewed as more community owned enterprises and managed in partnership with the locals to reflect the needs of the locals. Many partners such as non-governmental organizations, and community-based conservation areas emerged and were viewed as financiers of most PAs (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). Increased scientific innovation and understanding, public awareness of human rights including Declaration on the
Rights of Indigenous Peoples and technological advances such as geographical information systems (GIS), remotely sensed data, and spatial modeling tools were recognized as the drivers of change behind the modern model (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010).

2.3.3 Emerging or post-2010 model

These drivers of change in the modern model led to the transformation of the concept of Pas which led to post-2010 model (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). In the emerging model, Pas are recognized as important part of livelihood enhancement projects that contributes more to ecological, social and economic needs of the locals (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). Protected areas are recognized as not only providing environmental needs but also creating an enabling environment for humans, flora and fauna to adapt to climate change effects (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). This model does not only provide sustainable alternative livelihood opportunities for the locals, but also the attainment of Millennium Development Goals (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010). Another social function of emerging model is that it buffers humanity from the adverse effects of climate change. In economic wise, the model generates revenue for its own operation and the development of local and national economies through tourism (Phillips, 2003; Yannick, 2010).

2.4 Evolution of protected area approaches

The current approach to the management of protected areas has undergone through five main changes. According to Phillips (2000a), the five approaches include the following.
2.4.1 It has moved from being an island to a network of activities

It is well established that, a great number of the various categories of PAs have been integrated into national land-use planning. This is aimed at addressing issues concerning sustainable use of resources to achieve conservation objectives (Phillips, 2000a; Bovamick, 2010). This has changed the planning and management strategies of PA (Phillips, 2000a; Bovamick, 2010). Planning is now done at bioregional scale to reflect the Convention on Biological Diversity objectives (CBD) and making the effects of conservation being felt beyond strictly protected core zones. Due to that, PAs are being incorporated into larger sectors (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010).

2.4.2 The objectives of protected areas is no more focused on conservation only but also included social and economic objectives.

PAs do not only aimed at achieving conservation objective but also integrated into economies, which will contribute to sustainable livelihoods activities in the fringe communities (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010). More intervention strategies have been put in place to neutralize the adverse effects of PAs and makes the local to depend on them as alternative livelihoods (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010). Management of PAs is being decentralized to include the local levels of government, NGOs, communities and private individuals or corporations (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010).
2.4.3 The locals are now part of management and also feel a sense of ownership of protected areas

The nexus between PAs and the fringe communities has seen a paradigm shift (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010). The issue of the relationship between PAs and fringe communities first became an international issue in 1982 World Parks Congress in Bali, Indonesia (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010) This approach has seen the management of PAs being managed with and for the people rather than against them. The co-management of PAs has brought new insights into sustainable conservation practices and changes to the legal frameworks for PAs (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010).

2.4.4 Emphasis is now more on quality instead of quantity

The old idea of rapidly increase in Pas has given way to the need to maintaining effectiveness and quality work at existing PAs. This led to the change of management strategy to deal with threats that are degrading and destroying PAs (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010). Emphasis is now on quality as against quantity: this will empower PAs to achieve their basic objectives such as ecological, economic and social objectives (Bovamick, 2010).

2.4.5 The idea of protected area is now an international concern instead of national concern

The in-situ conservation championed by PAs was formally recognised through the landmark of 1992 CBD (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010). The convention outlined a number of strategies aimed at empowering the effective management of PAs (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick,
2010). It also established the Global Environment Facility (GEF) as a sustainable funding mechanism finance PA conservation and management (Phillips, 2000a, Bovamick, 2010).

2.5 Categories of protected areas according to IUCN 1994

I. Strict nature reserve area. These include land and/or sea possessing exceptional ecosystems, geological or physiological features which are basically for scientific research and/or environmental monitoring.

II. National parks. They protected areas managed mainly for ecosystem conservation and recreation. Natural areas of land and/or sea, designated to protect the ecological integrity of ecosystems for sustainable development and at the same time exclude activities that are detrimental to the basic objectives of conserving nature. This approach also provides spiritual, scientific, educational, and recreational benefits for visitor which must be compatible to the environment and the culture of the locals.

III. Natural monument. These also include areas that are conserved and managed essentially for specific features. These areas possessed natural characteristics that are unique from other areas because of the rarity of its features.

IV. Habitat/species management area. They are protected areas managed mainly for conservation motives. Through Management Intervention are put in place in habitat areas to ensure the maintenance of habitats meet the requirements of specific species.

V. Protected landscape/seascape: protected areas managed mainly for landscape/seascape conservation and recreation. Areas of land, with coast and sea as appropriate, where the
interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant aesthetic, cultural and/or ecological value, and often with high biological diversity.

VI. Managed resource protected area: protected areas managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems. Areas containing predominantly unmodified natural systems managed to ensure long-term protection and maintenance of biological diversity, while at the same time providing a sustainable flow of natural products and services to meet community needs.

2.6 Intervention policy environment for sustaining livelihoods in protected areas

Protected areas serve as important tools or drivers for poverty alleviation and livelihood sustainability by providing supportive and enabling policy environment (Andam et al, 2010; Yannick, 2010). If protected area stakeholders are to utterly consider poverty alleviation and livelihood sustainability by protected areas, they will need to develop and improve on the following policy packages (Dudley, 2008; Andam et al, 2010, Yannick, 2010).

2.6.1 Policies for sustainable resource use

Natural resources usage in many protected areas around the globe is allowed, but the issue is there are no policies safeguarding the sustainable use of these resources.

PAs development planners made some progress in the development of standards and criteria for the use of resources (Finger-Stich, 2002; Yannick, 2010). This criteria regarding resource use in PAs was significant to planners and policy makers as they struggling with how to develop policies and guidelines for the use of natural resources. At times, protected area managers rely on the use of independent third-party certification bodies within their protected
areas to make sure that the laid down criteria and guidelines are followed (Finger-Stich, 2002; Yannick, 2010). Another important tool regarding the sustainable use of resources in and around PAs is certification, which is a significant option in community-based protected areas such as the Maya Biosphere Reserve in Guatemala, where management authority is difficult than in government-run protected areas (Finger-Stich, 2002; Yannick, 2010).

2.6.2 Development of tourism guidelines for protected areas development

Tourism is one of the most globally acknowledged economic drivers in PAs; tourism development in most PAs creates jobs and sustainable livelihood for the locals around protected areas. However, policies with clear standards and best practices are required to balance conservation objectives and tourism and its associated livelihoods (Drumm, 2002; Eagles, 2002, Yannick, 2010). These practices and guidelines should be adopted by planners to guarantee the long-standing sustainability of tourism operations and to ensure that benefits emanating from tourism are equitably enjoyed by the fringe communities (Drumm, 2002; Eagles, 2002, Yannick, 2010).

2.6.3 Development of safeguards and thresholds

Development of safeguard and thresholds is one of the steps in the right direction for the development of alternatives for sustainable livelihoods that balances conservation objectives and economic development of PAs. The basic practice for conservation and financial planning is the development of thresholds and safeguards (Knight et al., 2007; Drumm, 2009; Bovamick, 2010, Yannick, 2010).
Thresholds are tools that help to delineate the point where any used resource begin to degrade and safeguards are mechanisms that are put in place to ensure that these levels are not passed (Knight, et al., 2007; Drumm, 2009; Bovamick, 2010, Yannick, 2010). Proper safeguards and thresholds can help minimize misunderstanding over the use protected areas resources. Besides, the existing guidelines for developing safeguards and identifying thresholds of sustainability within certain sectors, such as tourism, protected area planners should be well developed and applied in other sectors (Knight, et al., 2007; Drumm, 2009; Bovamick, 2010; Yannick, 2010). Moreover, it is also very important to embed guidelines, thresholds and safeguards within protected area policies and annual plans safeguards (Knight, et al., 2007; Drumm, 2009; Bovamick, 2010, Yannick, 2010).

2.6.4 Polices for equitable sharing of benefits of livelihood related resources

Equitable sharing of the benefits emanating from protected areas is the fundamental principle of the Programme of Work of Pas. Planners should consider the mode of sharing benefits of PAs alongside with increasing sustainable livelihoods (Yannick, 2010). In many protected areas, the level at which fringe communities benefit from PAs vary and usually the laid down policies for sharing the benefits do not favor poor communities. Therefore, it is very imperative on the part of planners to develop policies that will ensure access protected areas resources by all the fringe communities to sustain livelihoods and poverty alleviation (Yannick, 2010).

2.6.5 Policies for integrating protected areas into sectorial plans and strategies

There was also a call for integration of protected areas into broader sectors (Yannick, 2010). A wide range of sectors such as land-use planning, transportation, energy, tourism, wildlife,
agriculture, grazing, forestry, fisheries, freshwater, waste, invasive species, and climate change need to be integrated into protected areas development (Yannick, 2010).

2.7 Antecedent of protected areas in Ghana

According to UICN/PACO (2010) Ghana is well endowed with diverse ecosystems and high levels of diversity of flora and fauna species. The idea of demarcation of forest areas for protection existed in the olden days even before the arrival of the white man. Traditional councils in the olden days do set aside forests as sacred grooves which are protected by strict traditional customs (Bruku, 2016). According to Teye (2013), successive governments since colonial and post independent have embraced the need to protect the forest areas of Ghana and have thus enacted important legislations and policies to achieve this objective. The idea of policy formulations and implementation of policies on environment in Ghana became popular after the 1992 summit in Rio (Ayivor, 2013). This led to the establishment of forest related institutions such as Ghana Forest Commission and Ghana Wildlife Division, regulations on PAs were also reinforced (Jachmann, 2008). According to UICN/PACO (2010), Ghana is endowed with twenty-one (21) Wildlife Protected Areas (WPAs) representing a total of 1,347,600ha of the country’s land. These PAs include 7 National Parks, 6 Resource Reserves, 2 Wildlife Sanctuaries, 1 Strict Nature Reserve and 5 Coastal Wetlands with some of them serving as cultural, spiritual entities, sanctuaries and sacred grooves (UICN/PACO, 2010). Some also contain aesthetic attractions with notable examples being the Bamboo Cathedral and Rapids in Ankasa; Waterfalls and Caves in Bomfobiri (Bruku, 2016). UICN/PACO (2010) explains that WPAs in Ghana are subject to threats such as poaching, bushfires and land conversion caused by
agricultural activities within and around PA boundaries due to the perception and attitude of local from the fringe communities.

2.7.1 Exploring the linkage between protected area and tourism

The idea changing role of protected areas is being surrounded by more than enough controversies (PAs) and why the massive call for the integration of tourism in most protected areas (Bruku, 2016). The use of parks as PAs is regarded as an important societal activity in countries such as USA and Canada (Bruku, 2016).

Most tourism destinations are underdeveloped due to the fact that successive government have turned blind eye to the provision of resources for the development of most of destinations regions and to add to this, tourism development has not taken the central position of most governments budgets (Moore et al., 2009). Encouraging tourism development in most of the protected areas will give the way for private sector and local community’s involvement in protected areas management (Moore et al., 2009). More researchers in recent days are calling for partnerships between tourism and PAs as a result of the potential contribution sustainable tourism has d areas (Moore et al., 2009). For instance, Sustainable Tourism Cooperative Research Centre (2001) looked at the potential contribution of tourism to protected areas and established some guiding principles and guidelines for tourism and protected area partnership (Moore et al., 2009).

Moreover, Moore et al (2009) supported that the Department of Industry, Tourism and Resources (2003) published a report that also looked at the common goals that exist between tourism and protected areas (Moore et al., 2009). Tourism-PAs Partnership is regarded essential for its contribution to sustainable protected area tourism; this also gives way for increase
participation and ownership of protected areas by the private individual, local communities and others stakeholders in protected areas management (Moore et al., 2009;). De Lacy et al. (2002) acknowledged that partnerships tourism and PAs agencies can serve as a driving force for the mobilization of resources and expertise for the development of most protected areas. Furthermore, the linkage between tourism industry and PAs can bring about ne innovations and power sharing in the management of protected areas (Leach & Pelkey, 2001). It also imbibed into the locals the spirit of conservation initiative, enhances collaborative decision-making and conflict resolution (Davidson & Lockwood, 2008).

Notwithstanding its conservational significance, tourism in PAs can also be exclusionary when threatened by destructive, natural, and socioeconomic circumstances (Davidson & Lockwood 2008).

2.7.2 Park-people relationship

Literature argued that the relationship between protected areas and the local people be fully understood by long-term interdisciplinary approaches (Allendorlf et al, 2012). “The issue underground is that, decisions regarding the management of most PAs are exclusively in the hands of the staff external to other stakeholders which might also contribute meaningfully to the development of PAs (Allendorlf et al, 2012).”

The role of protected areas as effective means of in-situ conservation makes it the milestone for conservation of biodiversity (Kamal, 2014). Though, establishment of PAs have played significant role in biodiversity conservation but their adverse effects such as hardship and loss of livelihoods have instilled bad perceptions and negative attitudes into resident of fringe communities (Kamal, 2014). The locals who are also the partners in the development of
conservation ideas rather have their livelihoods threatened when their chance of gaining benefits from the park is limited (Vedeld et al., 2012; Kamal, 2014).

Moreover, the locals also experience some economic losses as most of their crops are damaged and other associated losses posed by the establishment of PAs (Kamal, 2014). In addition, extant literature suggests that locals’ attitudes towards the staff managing the PA and the perceptions of management practices are also influential factors to overall attitudes towards protected area (Biljana, 2010). For example, fear of resettlements and lack of job provisions (Allendorf, 2007) lead to negative perception and attitudes.

Besides the adverse effects incurred by the locals as a result of the establishment of PAs that raises negative perception and attitude between the locals and the park authorities, PAs still offers several benefits the locals (Kamal, 2014). In the first place, firewood from PAs serves as the major source of fuel for domestic energy needs for most people living in rural areas (Kamal, 2014). For instance, local inhabitants around BNP and Shukla Wildlife Reserve (SWR) benefited several ways from the PAs (Kamal, 2014).

According to Biljana (2010) access to the resources by locals is very important for the positive attitudes of local communities. Locals from the fringe communities turn to have more positive attitude towards conservation of PAs due to their access to resources, lower population densities and socio-economic intervention (Kamal, 2014). One key area for management to consider is to understand the perceptions and attitudes of the locals towards PAs to in order to fully enhance the relationship between management of parks and the locals (Allendorf et al, 2012; Kamal, 2014). Locals perceptions and attitudes towards protected areas remain an integral part so far as park-people relationships is concerned (Kamal, 2014), it also determines the success of most (Kamal, 2014). Notwithstanding this, in order to fully develop good policies and
guidelines for proper management of PAs, we need to lay emphasis on a good relationship between par management and the locals (Allendorf et al, 2012; Kamal, 2014). Moreover, it also forms a baseline for assessing success of management activities (Allendorf et al, 2012; Kamal, 2014).

Based on this, it can be concluded that positive relationship between management and the locals leads to positive perceptions and attitude of locals towards pars management (Allendorf et al, 2012). Positive interactions between management and residents can increase local acceptance of protected areas (Allendorf et al, 2012), while residents’ will develop negative perceptions and attitudes towards PAs when they distrust management. (Allendorf et al, 2012).

2.7.3 The impacts of protected areas on the livelihood of fringe communities

Livelihood is a broad concept that needs to be critically looked at in trying to analyze the impact of PAs on the lives of the locals because livelihood entails the capabilities, assets, activities and access needed by individual for a living (Jessica & Calfucura, 2011). The core to this definition is livelihood assets which comprises all forms of capital such as physical, natural, socio-cultural, financial and human.

Physical capital: they are roads, hospitals, water and sanitation, schools, goods, equipment, livestock.

Natural capital: his includes all natural resources such as land, oil, water, forest.

Socio-cultural capita: these include all the social opportunities at the disposal of an individual such as being part of a family.
Financial capital: it includes all financial resources at the disposal of an individual such as savings, credit and income from employment, trade and remittances.

Human capital: they also include the skills, knowledge, health and ability to work (UNDP, 2010).

Chambers & Conway (1991) also supported that people’s livelihood are their capabilities, assets (material and social resources) and activities needed their living. The livelihoods of communities are considered sustainable if it can recover from shocks and maintain its capabilities and assets for now and in the future, but not undermining the natural resource base (Temu, 2013). In the case of indigenous communities, livelihood is correlated to poverty through the lack of access to employment, income, human capital, as well as with the lack of income diversification (Lepper & Schroenn, 2010). Besides the environmental, economic and socio-cultural benefits, PAs in host communities is aimed at improving the livelihood of the members of the host communities (Jessica & Calfucura, 2011).

Extant literature shows that benefits from PAs have the potentials to diversify income generation in local communities (Jessica & Calfucura, 2011). This is demonstrated by an empirical studies conducted by Mbaiwa and Stronza (2010) in the Okavango region of Botswana asserted that PAs has become the major provider of livelihood activity among the fringe communities replacing most of the traditional livelihood activities.

To add to the above, they also argue that PAs have positive effects on the value for land, thus they argued that more value is placed on the land designated for PAs activities than when used for traditional activities (Mbaiwa & Stronza, 2010). Lastly, in case of any unforeseen or unfortunate circumstances, benefits derived from PAs are used to offset (Lepper & Schroenn,
2010). On the other hand, the fact that PAs can impact negatively on the livelihood activities of fringe communities (Wapalila, 2008). As well noted by Wapalila (2008), there are numerous instances of conflicts between wildlife guards and residence of host communities’ in and around national parks in developing countries with its adverse effects on people’s livelihoods, this imposes livelihood cost which can contribute to food insecurity (Salerno et al, 2015). The livelihood opportunities in host communities get limited and further strained by population due to loss of land and limited access to resources by households as a result of the restriction on resource use and mobility imposed by authorities (Salerno et al, 2015). Residents in host communalities, their livestock and visitor are frequently attacked by predators as well as crop depredation (Salerno et al, 2015).

2.7.4 National parks as important protected areas

Muhumuza and Balkwill, (2013) posited that national parks are the most common types of PAs with a global total land percentage value of 23% being occupied by PAs. According to IUNC, National parks fall within category II PAs. The establishment of National parks according to Muhumuza and Balkwill (2013) is based on the following objectives: safeguard the biological integrity of bionetworks for present and posterity; eliminate misuse that is detrimental to proper demarcation of PAs; and offers the bases for spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational, and tourism prospects which protect biodiversity and also meet the needs of the locals.

The value attached to parks stem from the environment, community, health and economic benefits (Parks Forum, 2008). The approaches to the management of parks are categorized into two; we have protection approach, which looks at the exclusion of activities from National parks
except for tourism, and the community-based conservation approach which targets addressing the challenges associated with eliminating human activities from the frontiers of parks (Muhumuza & Balkwill, 2013).

2.7.5 Historical overview of kyabobo national park (KNP)

The Kyabobo National Park is among the numerous newly created parks in Ghana. Little information has been provided in literature with regard to the historical overview of the park, even though some studies have been carried out on the park. Despite these challenges, this aspect of the review depended on the scanty existing literature in providing information on the historical overview of Kyabobo National Park.

The fact that the establishment of national parks and conservation in general in Ghana has a long history cannot be disputed. However, efforts towards biological conservation became prominent in March, 1988 when the government at the time led the crusade to conserve biodiversity. In 1993, Ghana became significant to the convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) which called for the use of both in-situ (sacred-groves and protected areas) and ex-situ (gene banks, zoological and botanical gardens) methods in promoting conservation across the country (Bruku, 2016).

According to Sluis et al, (2007), a preliminary survey was conducted in the area by Ankudey for the Wildlife Division (WD) in 1989 before the park was established. This preliminary survey was part of a ten-year development to define the appropriateness of the area for demarcation as a national park (Larsen, 2006a). Finally in 1993, an executive instrument (E.I. 20 of 16/09/1993) was passed and this legalized the area as a national park (Sluis et al, 2007).
The boundary of the Kyabobo National Park has experienced two re-demarcation exercises in 1995 and 1999 due to increasing outcry and agitation from local people concerning the loss of farmlands. Even though, there is still nonconforming views especially from the Shiare community concerning the boundary of the park which they argue is disadvantageous to them. However, since the last re-demarcation exercise in 1999, the issue of boundary re-demarcation has stabilized and there hasn’t been any further boundary alterations.

It was also noted by Larsen (2006a) that the Kyabobo National Park adjoins the Fazao-Malkafassa National Park in Togo, and is close to the German colonial station of Bismarckburg. As a result of the park’s linkages with German researches in Bismarckburg, this has given the Kyabobo National Park a strong historical link with Germany which had driven visitation to the park by many German tourists in the past.

Bowes-Lyon (1998) argued in one of his studies that there is a strong spiritual attachment to Kyabobo National Park through Shiare Village. Shiare which is one the fringe communities continues to be controlled by a powerful and influential cult, with pilgrims from across West Africa coming to consult “Brukung”, the traditional god (Bowes-Lyon, 1998). Bowes-Lyon (1998) further argued that Kyabobo National Park until recently was noted for meat trading with truckloads of bush meat such as bushbuck, duiker and bush pig. Thus, current threat of poaching can be traced to this historical background of hunting for bush meat in the area.

It cannot also be disputed that Kyabobo National Park area is challenged with frustrations and tensions between government and local people (Bowes-Lyon, 1998). According to Ayivor et al, (2013), two park guards of the Kyabobo National Park were killed by assailants over a boundary dispute in 2006. Even though, the issue of tensions has reduced, such assassinations
and agitations show that issues concerning the management of the park are far from a consensus. Nonetheless, the Wildlife Division (WD) works informally with the fringe communities with the Senior Wildlife Officer in charge of maintaining effective communication between local participants and park management.

Taking the management of the park into consideration, Bowes-Lyon (1998) noted that decision making regarding the Kyabobo National Park is quite complicated with many different people trying to influence outcomes. As a result of potential government control of local natural resources (Land and Wildlife), the communities viewed the park as a threat to both their culture and future income-generating possibilities.

2.7.6 Importance of local communities' perception and attitudes towards protected areas

There are more than 100,000 protected areas (PAs) covering 12% of the land size of the world (World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 2004). Establishment of PAs is a key strategy to conserving the world biodiversity (Ochieng, 2015). There has been several researches done on perceptions and attitudes of locals towards protected areas (PAs), especially in the third world countries, but the analysis of perception and attitudes towards categories of protection is scanty (Biljana, 2010).

The importance of researching into perceptions and attitude of locals towards protected areas cannot be overemphasized, such studies make it known to the world awareness regarding conservation efforts and existing perceptions and attitudes towards conservation (Andrea, 2012). Understanding the locals’ perceptions and attitudes toward the protected area and their inclusion
the management of PAs could bring better innovations for effective management of parks (Andrea, 2012).

Despite this, the perceptions and attitudes of locals towards PAs in most developing countries can be contentious, as the conservation of PAs often leads to the deprivation of local people sources of livelihoods (Ochieng, 2015). It has always been viewed as impossible establishing protected areas near local communities as a result of conflict of interest between management and locals within the fringe communities (Bartlett et al., 2010). Most at times, the locals in the fringe communities are not included in the planning processes resulting in conflicts between expectations of the locals and conservation goals (Dimitrakopoulos et al, 2010). It has become very imperative to investigate these incompatibilities to gain a better understanding between these two entities to avoid conflicting expectation (Andrea, 2012).

Andrea (2012) posited that most conflicts between park guards and local peoples are as a result of constraints imposed the by management on locals regarding land use and natural resource extraction. Local people restriction regarding access to the protected area, agricultural activities, timber extraction or other such activities, are just some of the most frequent sources of conflict between local communities and park guards (Andrea, 2012). Hulme and Murphree (2001) supported that restriction imposed on the local is the bane of negative perceptions and attitudes of locals towards most protected area. Therefore, it is very prudent integrating into management strategies the concerns of the locals for a balance between conservation goals and sustainable development of the fringe communities (Struhsaker et al. 2005;). So, investigating perceptions and attitudes held by the locals with regard to conservation will equip the locals the fundamentals of successful conservation management (Andrea, 2012).
2.7.7 Factors that affect local people’s perception and attitude towards protected areas.

According to Ochieng (2015), there are various factors that can affect perceptions and attitudes of people and these are classified into four broad categories namely:

Socio-cultural factors: taboos and belief, cultural practices, gender issues dietary habits/food preference and tastes.

Environmental factors: the need of wilderness experience can enhance initiatives to conserve nature and its resource from recreation, aesthetic or spiritual values gives people motives to conserve the areas.

Economic factors: it’s mainly for monetary gains from the sale of wildlife and wildlife products;

Political factors: politicized conservation or nature either enhances negative or positive perceptions and attitudes to people.

It is argued that successful conservation initiatives require the active participation of local communities in decision-making processes as well as changes in perceptions in order to integrate local development with environmental conservation (Panayiotis et al., 2014). Literature shows that other determinants of local’s perceptions and attitudes towards conservation include the level of trust showed by the management of parks, restriction on the locals, the level of awareness among citizens and personal attributes of individuals (Panayiotis et al., 2014).

Furthermore, from the literature point of view on local residents’ perception towards PAs, we know that perception can be partly determined by individual, household, and community socio-economic characteristics (Biljana, 2010).

Ochieng (2015) further argued that people’s perception can also be influenced by some specific factors which include: social, economic and demographic characteristics of people like age which influence the way people think; ethnicity; location of fringe communities in relation to
protected areas; duration/period or length of residency; membership in conservation organizations; participation in conservation activities; type of training for example is it natural resources based or wildlife based; past experience with for example human-wildlife conflict (HWC), relocation, denial of access to traditional resources locked in PA or denial of ownership right; access to benefit and location of communities.

The degree to which neighboring communities award their support to protected areas determines its successful management (Ochieng, 2015). Therefore, successful conservation initiatives require the active participation of local communities in decision-making processes as well as positive perceptions and attitudes of locals towards conservation initiatives (Panayiotis et al., 2014).

Fringe communities will make protection impossible when they realized protected areas have become a burden. In contrast, when the conservation initiative is seen as a positive benefit, the local people themselves will support the management to protect the threatening species. Predictors of people’s perceptions and attitudes can be explored by correlating perceptions and attitudes with socio-economic variables to understand who likes or dislikes a PA.

In conclusion, it can be inferred that factors that determine local communities’ perception and attitudes towards protected areas are those that either benefit them or do not benefit them.

2.7.8 Impacts of local community attitudes and perceptions towards parks and their wildlife

Accordingly, to uncheck population growth of locals in most fringe communities, resources found in the surrounding protected area are depleted because the locals revert to poaching which lead to antagonism between the local communities and park authorities (Ochieng, 2015). For example, the local communities inside Queen Elizabeth National Park in
Uganda turned to poaching after the Labe fish was overfished due to an increase in the population of the locals, this resulted in several conflicts between the locals and park guards (Ochieng, 2015). Literature further revealed that residents of fringe communities revert to damaging perceptions such as encroachment, poaching, and excessive harvesting of indigenous wildlife that undermine the objective of management of protected areas if the locals do not get benefit from the wildlife (Ochieng, 2015).

In addition, the locals show negative perceptions and attitudes due to restriction imposed on them which denied them of their source of livelihood (Biljana, 2010). This causes conflict between the local and forest managers (Biljana, 2010). Moreover, the damaging effects of local population are exacerbated by the poorest section in the local communities who believed that the natural resources are free for everybody to use (Andrea, 2012).

According to Kamal (2014), the sense of mutual understanding that supposes to exist between park staffs and the locals is missing leading to negative perceptions and attitudes held by the locals, this idea of negative perceptions and attitudes is very detrimental to biodiversity conservation and source of livelihood.

On the other hand, previous research has also revealed that people with positive perception thus if they see the benefits from management scheme and surrounding ecosystem are more likely to appreciate conservation of protected areas (Biljana, 2010). From the above discussion, it is evident that the impacts of local communities on protected areas will vary with the attitudes and perceptions they have towards these areas as well as the benefits they accrue from them. Those with a positive attitude will impact positively on them while those with negative attitudes will impact negatively to them.
2.8 Overview of tourism sector in Ghana

The current tourism industry in Ghana had its roots far back in the colonial period (Longmatey, Amoako-Atta & Prah, 2001). The rich cultural heritage and the hospitality of the people make Ghana a favorable and attractive destination for international travels and tourism (Longmatey, Amoako-Atta & Prah, 2001). Ghana has a good number of heritage sites both natural and cultural which include castles and forts, sandy beaches, nature parks and gardens, craft villages, cultural monuments, unique arts, vibrant lifestyle and cultural traditions, and other attractive sceneries that attracts potential tourists (Longmatey, Amoako-Atta & Prah, 2001). With a growth rate of 12% per annually, tourism is regarded as one of the fastest growing sectors in Ghana’s economy, which contributes greatly to the country’s gross domestic product after cocoa, gold, and remittances from abroad (Adu-Ampong, 2017).

Under the vision 2020 agenda for Ghana, the National Tourism Development Plan (1996-2010) was carved as a 15-year policy outlook to propel tourism development in Ghana. The Medium-Term National Development Plan (1997-2000), a subsidiary of 1996-2010 plans aimed among other things to create enabling environment, ensure human development, rural development, infrastructure development, urban development, and others for tourism industry to thrive in Ghana. Similarly, tourism industry was given utmost priority in Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy (2003-2005) and Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda (GSGDA, 2010-2013). These two policy documents purported to diversify and expand the tourism industry for revenue generation, provide domestic tourism to foster national cohesion as well as redistribution of income, promote sustainable and responsible tourism in such a way to preserve historical, cultural and natural heritage, and the development of other subsidiary sectors of the tourism industry (GSGDA, 2010-2013). The National Tourism Development Plan (1996-2010)
was ambitious but could not achieve much due to lack of political commitment at the highest level of government, changes of government and frequent changes of leadership at tourism institutions, low levels of funding allocated to development and marketing, unreliable data on the performance and contribution of the sector, among others (2013-2027 Plan, p. 8).

Notwithstanding, the resilience of tourism sector cannot be overemphasized and this is reflected in its significant contribution to the national economy. The expiration of 1996-2010 plan and the subsequent promulgation of Tourism Act in 2011 gave birth to National Tourism Development Plan (2013-2027), thus, a 15-year policy outlook that seeks to ensure that tourism in Ghana is developed in a sustainable and responsible manner so that it contributes to the country’s GDP, reduces poverty, in such a way that its operation does not prevents the locals from achieving their needs (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027).

The multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral nature of tourism sector demands a collaborative effort from several stakeholder institutions. The institutional framework for the tourism sector in Ghana harnesses the collaborative effort of public sector tourism institutions and associations, the inter-ministerial committees, and public-private partnership (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027). The key institutional frameworks involved in tourism administration are: “Ministry of Tourism (MOT), the Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA), Ghana Tourism Development Corporation (GTDC) and all other hospitality institutions (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027).” It also includes Metropolitan, Municipal, and District Assemblies (MMDAs). The ministry of tourism is headed by the Minister, who is assisted by the Deputy Minister, with the Chief Director who performs the overall administrative responsibility (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027). The tourism ministry has the responsibility to formulate implement tourism-related that will realise the sector’s vision of being the larger contributor to
Ghana’s economic growth, poverty alleviation, environmental conservation, as well as national cohesion (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027).

Ghana Tourism Authority (GTA) is the policy implementation authority of Ministry of Tourism (MOT) and was created in 2011 under the Tourism Act 817 to replace the then Ghana Tourism Board. GTA has been empowered under Tourism Act 817 to regulate tourism enterprises such as accommodation, catering, travel and charter operations through registration, inspection, licensing, and other regulatory activities related to the tourism sector. GTDC aims at promoting sustainable tourism by fostering close ties between the main stakeholders to attract both local and foreign investors. Another institution of the sector, Hotel and Catering Tourism Training Institute (HOTCATT) exists to develop and enhance human resources for tourism industry in Ghana (The National Tourism Policy, 2013-2027).

Under the decentralization policy in Ghana, ‘schedule two’ sectors which encompass the tourism sector work in collaboration with MMDAs report directly to the ministry (2013-2027 plan). This suggests that the local governments’ set-up in Ghana have some level of control over tourism activities at the local level. What happens is that the tourism units at the local level only negotiate with the MMDAs to have their budget included in MMDAs medium-term development plans. This suggest that most of tourism-related decisions emanate from the Ghana Tourism Authority under the Ministry of Tourism, and are viewed to be top down and may not meet the priority of destination communities.
2.9 The concept of tourism

Tourism is an activity which cut across conventional sectors in the economy. In defining tourism, there is always a challenge and as a result most academicians tend to craft their definitions of tourism to suit their specific purpose (Leonard & Carson, 2016).

One of the earliest definitions of tourism was provided by the Austrian economist Herman Von Schullard (1910), he defined tourism as “sum total of operators, mainly of economic nature, which directly relate to the entry, stay and movement of foreigners inside and outside a certain country, city or a region”.

United Nations World Tourism organizations (2015) defines tourism as “the activities of people travelling to places outside the normal home for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the places visited.”

According to Education Bureau (2013), tourism means the temporary movement of people to destination outside the places where they normally live and work, including the activities of the people during their stay at the various destinations.

2.10 Sustainability and sustainable development

The terms sustainable development and sustainability have attracted the attention of many scholars and researchers over the world (Bai et al, 2014; Stuart et al, 2013; Juan et al, 2015). The term (sustainable development) have become important strategic objective for tourism destinations worldwide after it was used by Brundtland Commission in its report “Our Common Future” (Bai et al, 2014; Stuart et al, 2013; Juan et al, 2015). It is most often difficult
to give one interpretation to sustainable development; literature indicates that the term itself comprises two contradictory parts: while the first part speaks of conservation, the latter speaks of growth (Juan et al, 2015).

It is a guiding principle of economic, social and environmental development that tries to ensure equitable sharing of environmental cost and economic benefits between and within nations (United Nations, 1987; WCED, 1987, Ralph Hansmann, 2012).

According to the Brundtland Commission Report (United Nations, 1987; WCED, 1987, Ralph Hansmann, 2012), “Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” This definition was further expanded during the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in Brazil, creating the principles for sustainable development (Conttrel et al, 2004; Stuart et al, 2013). In addition to the above, sustainability can also be defined as a long-term enhancement and conservation of cultural and natural resources (Brendan, 2016).

The fundamental and basic concern of sustainability is the continue increase in human impact on human survival and the ecosystem on which they depend (Persha et al, 2011; Buckley, 2012). These human impacts continue to grow due to continues growth in humans which is propelled by biological pressure to increase human reproduction and competitive consumption (Buckley, 2012). Since then economic, social and environmental sustainability has been the sphere of sustainable development.

According to Peeters and Weaver (2012), sustainable development in recent times has been a well-structured and established term, but the current problem that militates against the achievement of the goals of sustainable development is unsuccessfulness of its implementation.
and this can be explained by the uncertainties that remain about the meaning of the concept.

Several scholars have asserted that there have been a lot of uncertainties when trying to define and measure sustainable development (Turcu, 2013). Since 1980, it has not only become contentious but an issue that has captured the attention of both academics and politicians when trying to measure sustainability Catalina (Turcu, 2013). Buckley (2012) also argued that there has not been any consensus yet on the conceptualization and measurement of sustainability. Due to that, indicators of sustainable development are developed to suit specific geographical areas (Cernat & Gourdon, 2012). This has called for several defections and myriad indicators been used to define and measure sustainability. Some researchers apply multidimensional approaches to sustainability by considering a mixture of dimensions such as economic, social, and environmental (Martínez & Rodríguez Del Bosque, 2014). Cottrell, Vaske, & Roemer, (2004) also used four indicator such as economic, socio-cultural, environmental, and institutional as a measurement of sustainability. In addition to the above, more recently, the concept of sustainable development has evolved and extended into definition and of three pillars (environmental, economic and social) among which economic sustainability was newly defined as a result of financial and economic crises hampering the word’s development which include equitable development (Bai and Sharkis, 2014).

Similarly, sustainability is also regarded as an integrative concept that considers social, environmental and economic aspects as it three basic dimensions which is collectively termed the pillars of sustainability. It is argued that any responsible development should consider natural, human and economic capital (Schoolman et al, 2012; Ralph Hansmann, 2012). The three pillars have been criticized by researchers for having different types of morals that are not positively commensurable relatively to each other (Mieg, 2010, Hansmann, 2012). In
furtherance, there is always conflict of interest among different stakeholders within a single pillar of sustainability and balancing their interest regarding one pillar is often difficult (Kyburz-Graber et al, 2006, Hansmann, 2012).

Breddrich et al in 2012 and Bai and Sharkis, (2014) went further to categorize sustainability according to the following:

Economic Sustainability: this is based on economic progress which takes into consideration fully addressing economic variables and issues such as employment, income, on their own merits. The economic sustainability also focuses on sustenance of variety of “capital” such as man-made, natural, human, and social. Economic sustainability could also include any resource use today that does not reduce the income in future (Bredrich, 2012; Bai and Sharkis, 2014).

Social Sustainability: the dimension of socio-cultural sustainability is very diverse; understandably, it often makes it difficult to a uniform definition for socio-cultural sustainability due to its diversity (Bredrich, 2012; Bai & Sharkis, 2014).

Environmental Sustainability: Historically, the idea of environmental sustainability was initially coined by scientists at the World Bank. The original term that was used was “environmentally responsible development” and it eventually led to “environmentally sustainable development” (Serageldin and Streeter, 1993). And lastly, environmental sustainability theory was developed (Goodland, 1995). It is defined by concentrating on biogeophysical aspects of the earth that enables the earth to sustain the biosphere by providing options for the achievement of both social and economic sustainability (Bredrich, 2012; Bai & Sharkis, 2014).

According to P. Sutton (Commissioner for environmental sustainability of the Australian State of Victoria), maintaining the valued qualities of the environment underpins environmental
sustainability (Sutton, 2004). Some scholars also argued that all the three-dimensions of sustainability such as environmental aspect, the economy, and societal issues, there should interplay to ensure that the air is clean, clean water and productive land for socio-economic development (Morelli, & John, 2011). In a quest to promote a coordinated development between the society, the environment and the economy, a series of sustainability oriented policies must be implemented (Bai et al, 2015).

Various stakeholders such as international organizations (United Nations, 2012; UNWTO, 2011), define sustainable development on the basis of its constitutional components and argue that the definition dwelled on three core aspects: environmental, socio-cultural, and economic (Farsari, 2012).

2.11 Sustainable tourism

“Sustainable tourism” is the newest and powerful paradigm shift for regulating the use of protected areas by visitor (Daniel, 2015). The idea of sustainable tourism which focuses on the economic, environmental and socio-cultural impact and benefits of tourism was brought to light during the publication of Brundtland Commission in 1987 (Sorensson and Friedrichs, 2013).

In the first place, the environmental dimension which includes natural capital and renewable and non-renewable resources, this aspect was the main focus of sustainable tourism (Angeles et al, 2016). Additionally, the socio-cultural dimension hinges on how human interact with the environment and how socio-cultural resources in the fringe communities can be protected (Angeles et al, 2016). The idea of cultural interaction and the activities necessary to promote a cultural exchange between the visitors and the locals is also regarded as very
important (Angeles et al, 2016). Finally, the economic dimension of sustainable tourism is about meeting the economic requirements of the locals, thus achieving higher output within a limited amount of capital (Angeles et al, 2016).

In recent times, many scholars and developmental organizations around the world have adopted sustainability approach to development and its application to rural tourism development since tourism and recreation industry is increasingly becoming an important development promoter of rural communities and rural sustainability (Reza & Saeed, 2013). In addition to the above, Reza & Saeed, (2013) posited that the idea of sustainable tourism is an integrated and a holistic strategy adopted in replacement of conventional mass tourism. Since the concept of sustainability can be applied to all categories of tourism (Saarinen, 2006), the biggest challenge of the application of sustainability to tourism is how to use it in a more practical and useful manner (Sharpley, 2003).

Moreover, sustainable tourism must be maintained in terms of environment, socio-culture and economy where the environment is recognized as a fundamental tourism resource in terms of quality and variety so that the current resources can be enjoyed by the future generation (Sher, 2015). Similarly, sustainable tourism was described based on the principles of sustainability which covers the economic, environmental and socio-cultural aspects of tourism development and to ensure long-term sustainability tourism development at protected areas (UNWTO, 2004; Day & Cai, 2012). This called for a suitable balance between the three dimensions of sustainable tourism (UNWTO, 2004; Day & Cai, 2012).

According to Day and Cai (2012) and UNWTO (2004), sustainable tourism ought to ensure that, environmental resources are put to optimal use, maximum respect is given to socio-cultural authenticity of the locals and to ensure viable and long-term operation of the economy.
Buckley (2012) advanced that since sustainability and sustainable tourism are real-world phenomena, the basic principles of sustainable tourism are spelled out by the fundamental of sustainability, outside to the literature that originally focused on tourism.

Despite the extant literature on sustainable tourism and the importance of sustainability in tourism, its definition is still not flexible enough to allow multiple approaches and interpretations of the concept (Cernat & Gourdon, 2012). Sustainable tourism is based on the premises that host communities and other stakeholders need to participate in decision making on a relatively level playing ground but rather inequality is the order of the day so far as tourism implementation and planning is concern (Hall and Jenkins, 2004). However, the achievement of sustainable tourism implementation depends much on the management’s ability to efficiently combine and coordinate all stakeholders (Hall and Jenkins, 2004).

Researchers should use appropriate measurement tools to quantify the level of tourism sustainability and to grade their evolution over time to ensure the success of sustainable tourism in fringe communities (Blancas, 2016). Practically, sustainable tourism indicators are regarded as the major instrument used to measure the achievement of host communities from economic, social and environmental point of views (Blancas, 2016). Though idea of sustainability is considered as very new in tourism sector, numerous literatures describe it as a policy failure (Hall, 2011; Fodness, 2016).

Extant literature and personal experience of researchers identify challenges affecting the implementation sustainable tourism policies. In the first place, the term “sustainability” posed as a difficult challenge that hinders sustainable tourism implementation since its meaning has been contested by different school of thoughts (Kaewta & McKercher, 2015). Notwithstanding these, studies shows that the implementation of sustainable tourism failed based on the premises
that dominance economic powers direct tourism development (Scott, and Ruhanen, 2012). Moreover, scholars outlined political misdirection, conflict and volatility as some of the inhibiting factors sustainable tourism implementation (Novelli et al 2012; Ruhanen, 2013).

“Sustainable tourism can be defined as tourism development that takes into consideration the principles of sustainable development such economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism development and also meeting the needs of the locals (Victoria et al, 2013).” This broader definition recognizes the three pillars on which sustainable development rest on, acknowledges the need to act according to the indicator stipulated in the 1987 Brumdtland report and identified stakeholders as critical in sustainable tourism development (Victoria et al, 2013).

According to Buckley (2012), tourism sector is nowhere yet near sustainability in spite of the fact that the idea of social and environmental sustainability of tourism was first identified almost 40 years ago.

However, despite the involvement and importance of stakeholders in sustainable tourism development by enhancing the understanding of sustainable tourism, the process has been rendered complicated as a result of heterogeneity and multiplicity of tourism stakeholders (Victoria et al, 2013). Moreover, the attention of stakeholders should be drawn to maintaining tourism sustainability so that present resources can be enjoyed by the future generation and this goal tourism sustainability can be achieved if government met out proper regulation, obedience from host communities and unity (Sher, 2015).

2.12 Ecotourism

Ecotourism as a concept which is related to other concepts such as sustainable tourism and alternative tourism gained currency in the mid-1980s as part of several responses to the
adverse effects posed by the conventional mass tourism, these effects could be environmental, economic and socio-cultural (Jafari, 2001; Fennell & Weaver, 2005). It is widely advocated that ecotourism should be managed in such a way that it will be conducive to sustainability (Fennell & Weaver, 2005). Literature suggests that, by 1983 a Mexican environmentalist by name Hctor Ceballos Lascurain came out with the term ecotourism and this concept was initially used to describe travelling to natural areas especially to places that have comparatively not experienced any disturbance emphasizing on education.

Hector Ceballos-Lascurian and further defined ecotourism which was officially adopted by International Union for Conservation as environmentally responsible travel and visitation to relatively undisturbed natural areas, in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features both past and present) that promotes conservation, has low visitor impact, and provides for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local populations (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1996).

Within tourism sector, any nature-based activity is labeled as ecotourism for marketing purposes and this is always confusing (Pawar et al, 2009). Visiting ‘green’ destinations is not all about ecotourism; it has gone beyond the level of ‘green’ behaviour in reaching and exploring such destinations (Pawar et al, 2009). Similarly, the concept dwells on three core criteria which include tourists visiting nature-based destination to appreciate nature or to be in nature, learning about nature and the development of environmental consciousness (Butzmann & Hubert, 2016). Though ecotourism is a form of: alternative tourism which is geared toward achieving social, economic and environmental goals of sustainable tourism, it also serve as a tool which reconciles both conservation goals and the losses incurred by the local by creating alternative livelihood activities to support them (Ekanayaka and Aloka, 2013).
Ecotourism has gone beyond just tourism to natural areas; however, there is no any consensus agreement among scholars on the widely accepted definition of ecotourism due to myriad of ideas about its distinctiveness and the level to which it differs from other forms of tourism (Ross and Wall, 1999).

According to Mete & Gumus (2016), ecotourism is defined as a type of tourism in which the environment, the welfare of the locals is under the communities’ protection. International Nature Protection Union further argued that ecotourism has potentials of protecting nature and cultural resources, with emphasizes on less impacts on the resources (Mete & Gumus, 2016). The International Ecotourism Society define ecotourism as a responsible travels that which ensures the conservation of the environment and improvement in the welfare of local residents that also interprets and educates participants (TIES, 2015). The logo of ecotourism is shows that it all about how to unite conservation, fringe local communities and sustainable for a common goal (TIES, 2015). The following values of ecotourism stipulated by the IES must be adhered to by all stakeholders.

1. Reduction in impacts that is psychological, behavioral, social and physical.

2. Build respect and awareness on the environment and culture.

3. Provision of experience for both hosts and visitors.

4. Provide direct financial benefits for conservation.

5. Generate financial benefits for both local people and private industry.

6. Provide unforgettable insights to visitors that help raise sensitivity to host countries’ social climates.

8. Recognize the cultural values of native people in your community and work in collaboration with them to create empowerment (TIES, 2015).

Mihai and Andres (2016) also posited that ecotourism sustains and support the locals for livelihood instead of overexploiting and denying them of resources. Honey (1999) defines ecotourism as small travelling to fragile, pristine and protected areas with the fundamental objective of educating travelers, providing funds for conservation, yielding direct benefits for the economic development and political empowerment of local community as well as fostering respects for different cultures and human rights. In explaining this definition, Honey (1999) emphasizes on low impacts on host communities and environment as well as empowerment of the local communities through equitable distribution of tourism benefits. Funnel (2001), analyzed various definitions of ecotourism and realized that the natural environment, education, protection or conservation of resources preservation of culture and community benefits as variables common to all the definitions.

The general accepted definition of ecotourism is produced by World Conservation Union (IUCN) which define ecotourism as “Environmentally responsible travel to natural areas, in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and accompanying cultural features, both past and present) that promote conservation, have a low visitor impact and provide for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local peoples” (www.nature.org).

In recent times, there are most tourism destinations that are not classified as ecotourism and to add to that not sustainable (Patterson, 2002). Ecotourism focuses on how to conserve, educate, traveler responsibility and community involvement (Patterson, 2002). The following are
the characteristics that differentiate ecotourism from other forms of tourism: Conscientious, impact visitor behavior, sensitivity towards and appreciation of local cultures and biodiversity, support for local conservation effort, sustainable benefits to local communities, local participation in decision-making, educational components for both the travelers and local communities and ensures that wildlife is not harassed (Patterson, 2002). Ecotourism focuses basically on experiencing and learning about nature, also components such as landscape, flora, and fauna and their habitats, as well as cultural artifacts within the locality is also of importance (Kiper, 2013).

2.13 Ecotourism versus poverty alleviation

The relationship between tourism and poverty alleviation cannot be overestimated since poverty alleviation through tourism is termed as not only generating economic benefits to the poor but also generating environmental and socio-cultural benefits to the marginalized and the poor in host communities (Manu et al, 2012). This has necessitated many countries in the world to adopt ecotourism as a strategy to for poverty alleviation in most fringe communities (Manu et al, 2012). Having the potentials to reduce poverty in local communities, ecotourism has made tremendous benefits to the locals (Porter et al, 2015)

According to Porter et al (2015), ecotourism has enhanced the living standard of some island and coastal regions and reduce pressure on fishing resources in China. Manu et al (2012) supported that ecotourism is one of the pro-poor strategies adopted at most PAs to sustain the livelihood of the local communities impact due to its economic multiplier effects. For example, in residents of Sirigu adopted tourism development as a strategy to enhance their livelihood as a result of low yields from the overused farmlands over the years. Another instance is in Kenya,
11N’gwesi Community-Based Ecotourism Site, due to its tremendous impacts on the lives of the locals made it received the Equator Initiative Award at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa, in 2002. Again, in South Africa, another community-based ecotourism site that has made a lot of economic impact on the lives of the locals is Buffalo Ridge Thakadu River Safari Camp within Madikwe Game Reserve (www.africacomunity-based ecotourism.com).

2.14 Conceptual framework

A conceptual framework, according to Jabareen (2009), is defined as a network of interlinked concepts that together offer an inclusive understanding of a phenomenon or phenomena. Issues regarding the management of natural resources (protected areas resources) have to be looked at within the context of human endeavor. The idea from theory of reasoned action revealed that people’s intentions determine their behavior which in turn leads to their perceptions and attitudes (Ajzen, 1988). Therefore, the idea of the locals regarding forest resources varies from community to community (Ajzen, 1988). These variations could be communities need, perceptions and attitudes of local to conservation initiatives (Ajzen, 1988). Several studies also revealed that demographic factors determine the perceptions and attitudes of local regarding natural resource management (Pomeroy et al., 1996; Wright and Shindler, 2001). Other empirical studies acknowledged that benefits and cost of fringe communities also determine their support for natural resource management (Allendorf, 1999).

This study employed demographic characteristics of locals, cost and benefit from the park, awareness creation, location of fringe communities among others to unearth the variations in perceptions and attitudes of locals regarding conservation of resources in PAS.
Policies regarding the provision of alternative livelihood in fringe communities should be implemented in order to promote the use of PAs as a conservation initiative. (Biljana, 2010). For instance, it can be concluded that conservation initiatives will be appreciated by locals who expect some positive benefits from the establishment of park (Biljana, 2010). Against this background, it is expected that residents from the fringe communities who expect positive benefits from parks will support conservation initiatives than those who not expect any positive benefits (Biljana, 2010).

On the other hand, Mehta and Kellert (1998) argued the establishment of PAs as a way of conserving biodiversity also put some limitation on locals at the fringe communities. Most of resources with the fringe communities are captured in within the boundaries of protection (Mehta and Kellert, 1998). In addition, certain rules and regulations stipulated to regulate the use of resources in and around the park awareness determines the perceptions and attitudes of locals towards establishment of PAs.

Taking of Kyabobo National Park into consideration, educating the locals regarding issues surrounding the establishment of PAs will affect their perceptions and attitudes towards protected areas. Communities who have knowledge about rules and regulations with regard to the use of protected areas resources will hold positives perceptions and attitudes towards PAs establishment than locals without such knowledge. Moreover, a PAs that has its objectives well spelt out to the locals will also gain the support of conservation of resources in the park.

Socio-economic and demographic variables such as age, level of education among others also affect perceptions and attitudes of locals toward conservation (Heinen, 1993). Educational level of households also influences locals’ perception and attitude towards PAs.
The wealth level of households also influences conservation attitudes (Infield, 1988; Hackel, 1999). Research has also proved that wealthier locals will support conservation initiatives more than poorer locals (Infield, 1988; Hackel, 1999).

On one hand, communities whose source of livelihood entirely depends on the forest resources will be more concerned with conservation initiatives than those with alternative sources of livelihood (Infield, 1988; Hackel, 1999).

The Figure below is used to illustrate the factors that determine locals’ perceptions and attitudes towards conservation and possible outcomes.
The outcome of the management option and sustainability of protected area resources

Attitude toward conservation option

Other factors: location and resource trend

Cost from PAs: denied access to the important livelihood source, revenue is not to compensate the losers and no participation of communities

Benefits from PAs: increase of resources in the future, employment creation through tourism and biodiversity protection

Socio-economic and demographic variables: household age education and livelihood sources

Regulation and resources: informal rule, formal rule and enforcement

Other factors: location and resource trend
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Figure 2.1  Conceptual Framework

Source: Conceptual relationships among factors that shape the perception and attitude of locals towards protected areas (developed based on Mehta (2001); Buer (2003) and Holmes (2003).

2.15 Chapter summary

This chapter delved into relevant literature and conceptual frameworks necessary for the study. This chapter focused on specific issues such as the concept of tourism and Overview of Tourism sector in Ghana. The chapter also explored the overview of Protected Areas at the global level, Antecedent of Protected Areas in Ghana and the relationship between protected areas and tourism. Supportive environment to sustain livelihood and categories of PAs was also looked at. The chapter also looked at models and evolution of PAs. Further, the chapter provided an overview Park-People Relationship and discussed the historical background of the Kyabobo National Park.

In addition, the next section of the literature review provided a discussion on the perceptions and attitudes held by the locals towards park management. Furthermore, issue such as factors influencing the perceptions and attitudes of the locals has also been discussed. The chapter concluded with a discussion on the linkages between the conceptual framework and the issue of perception and attitude of locals in the Kyabobo National Park.
CHAPTER THREE

STUDY AREA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Chapter three is dedicated to presentation of the background on the geography of the study area and the procedures that was used to achieve the objectives of the study. The chapter covers a discussion of: the location and physical features of the study area, the relief and drainage, vegetation and climate, the study population, socio-economic and demographic characteristics and methodology of the study.

3.2 The study area

3.2.1 Location KNP

Kyabobo National Park (pronounced Chyabobo) which was established in 1996 is one of the national parks added to the numbers of Protected Areas in Ghana (Larsen, 2006a). According to (Sluis et al, 2007), the park is located in Nkwanta South District the north of the Volta Region and lie between the coordinates 8°17¹ and 8°31¹N, and 0°31¹ and 0°44¹E, sharing border with the Republic of Togo. Moreover, with an area of 340 sq. km, the Nkwanta South District Assembly (2013) estimates that the park is the second highest national park in the country. Sluiset al, (2007) argued that KNP shares international border with the much larger Fazao-Malfacassa National Park of Republic of Togo covering 1,920 km². The map of the study area is shown in Figure 3.1
3.2.2 Relief

The nature of land (topography) of the Kyabobo National Park according to Sluis et al, (2007) is undulating, with a series of steep hills running north-south throughout the park). Most of the hills are over 800 meters high. The park forms extensive catchment areas for Lake Volta, via the Kpassa, Bonakye and Chai rivers (Sluis et al, 2007). The geological characteristics of the area comprises of quartzite, sandstone, shale, phyllite, schist and silicified limestone (Sluis et al., 2007).

3.2.3 Drainage KNP

Kyabobo National Park is endowed with a lot of rivers and streams (Graphic Showbiz, 2007). According to Ministry of Food and Agriculture (2015), the Nkwanta South District is drained by rivers and streams such as Bonakye, Sabon, Kabiti, Kue, and Chai with rivers like the Kue and Bonakye flowing through the park. With the Togo-Buem ranges on the eastern boarder of the district as the source of the rivers, the rivers flow south-westerly direction into the Oti river which covers about 1% of the surface of the district (MOFA, 2015). Most of the rivers and their tributaries in the district serve as the main source of drinking and no-drinking water (GSS, 2014). With most of the streams serving as source of water to the fringe communities flow through the park and served as conduit by which the locals interacted with park before its protection (MOFA, 2015). It can be concluded that the relief and drainage features of the study area provides a suitable atmosphere for tourism activities like hiking and swimming.
Figure 3.1. Study Area Map

Source: Bruku, 2016.
3.2.4 Vegetation

One most important attraction the National Park offers for naturalists and scientists is that Kyabobo is situated on the boundary between the savannah and forest zones in Ghana, where a mixture of woodland and various forest types (mainly semi-evergreen) blend together extensively, at the western edge of the Dahomey Gap (Sluis et al., 2007). The park is generally densely wooded with few ridge tops almost bare of trees (Sluis et al, 2007). Furthermore, the area characterized by tall evergreen rain forest and semi-evergreen rainforest, as well as dry anogeissus forest and riparian forest (Sluis et al, 2007).

Larsen (2006a) acknowledged that the park encompasses typical Guinea Savannah at the foot of the main ridge of mountains, succeeded by dense Guinea Savannah Woodland, characterized by a tree cover of 40-60%.

In the lower parts of the mountains is a Savannah-Forest Transition zone and then stretches of Drier Forest in suitable areas (Larsen, 2006a). The final vegetation is tropical high forest of the Semi-Deciduous Forest type (Larsen, 2006a). The abundance of savannah vegetation and grass promotes the growth of wildlife in the area.

3.2.5 Climate

The mean annual rainfall at Nkwanta over the last 6 years is 1226mm, most of which falls in June to September. The dry season which is characterized by the hot dry dusty harmattan winds from the Sahara occurs between October and May (Sluis et al., 2007). Larsen (2006 a ) further added that the mountains in and around the park, have to some extent created their own local climatic conditions, which have increased relief rainfall which favored
the growth of the forest in spite of the long spells of very dry conditions during the late Miocene till the late Pleistocene.

It can be concluded that the vegetation and climatic characteristic of the study area allows the thriving agricultural activities. The residents in the fringe communities engage in farming and livestock rearing as a significant source of their livelihoods.

3.2.6 The study population

Akyodes are the indigenous people who own most of the land in the park by customary rights (Sluis et al., 2007). Shiare, Chillinga, Kromase, Nyanbong, Gekorong, Abrewanko, Keri and Pawa are the Akyode towns which form the fringe communities of the Park (Sluis et al., 2007). The other tribes within the study area are the Konkomba, Adele, Ewe, and Kotokoli (Sluis et al., 2007). According to 2010 population census, the District has a population of 117,878; with 58,482 representing 49.6% are males while females form 50.4% (GSS, 2012). According to Ghana Statistical Service, (2014), the District occupied a total land area of 2,733 square kilometers and a population density of 43.13 persons per square kilometer in the year 2010.

3.2.7 Socio-economic and demographic characteristics

Nkwanta South District has 18,114 total stocks of houses, representing 4.5% of the total houses in the Volta Region and 0.5% of the national housing stock (GSS, 2014). The main construction material used for the outer walls in the District is mud brick with roofing material is metal sheets. Notwithstanding this, thatch/palm leaf or raffia also form the materials used for roofing in the District (GSS, 2014). Moreover, the main source of lighting in the district is
electricity (37.3%), kerosene lamp (7.5%), and flashlight (25.1%). Fuel wood is the main source of fuel for cooking (GSS, 2014).

The district is endowed with 69 pre-schools, 87 primary schools, 37 Junior High Schools, and 2 Second Cycle Institutions (GSS, 2014). There are two hospitals in the District and other health facilities in various communities. Most of the roads in the districts are not tarred apart from Nkwanta township roads resulting in difficulties in vehicular movement especially in the rainy season and dusty in the long dry season (GSS, 2014).

Agriculture and forestry activities form the backbone of the economy in the Nkwanta South District with little manufacturing and service (GSS, 2014). The major economic activities include agriculture and its related activities. As a result of high returns derived from yam production in particular, most of the economically active population is engaged in farming. Due to that Nkwanta South District is classified among the principal producers of yam in Ghana (GSS, 2014). They also cultivate crops such as cassava, maize, groundnut, cowpea, rice and sorghum. Yam buying also offers a greater source of employment for middlemen in the district as result of abundant yams in the district.

Moreover, most of the people are also engaged in agro-processing industries such as gari processing (GSS, 2014). Livestock are also reared for both domestic and commercial purposes. Communities along rivers in the district especially Kabiti also engage in some fishing activities to complement their farming activities.
3.3 Philosophical worldview of the research

Although philosophical ideas remain largely hidden in research, they still influence the practice of research and need to be recognized (Creswell, 2009). It is very significant that individuals undertaking research come out explicitly on the philosophical pathway the research is following (Creswell, 2009). The philosophical worldview of a research provides explanation to how people perceive, think and know about reality (Bruku, 2016). Thus individuals’ perceptions about the world provide a baseline that guides enquiries into any problem identified by a researcher (Bruku, 2016). There are four philosophical worldviews of research: the postpositive, social construction, advocacy/participatory and pragmatic worldviews (Creswell, 2009). This study adopted pragmatic worldview to explore the perception and attitude of locals toward Kyabobo National Park. “Pragmatism is derived from the work of Peirce, James, Mead and Dewey (Creswell, 2009).” According to Creswell (2009), other writers who also applied the ideas of pragmatism include Rorty (1990), Murphy (1990), Patton (1990) and Cherryholmes (1992). Pragmatic worldview arises out of actions, situations, and consequences rather than antecedent conditions (Creswell, 2009). Kalolo (2015) further acknowledged that the etymological meaning of pragmatism is identified as finding a practical approach to finding solutions for existing problems. The idea of pragmatism provides the researcher the opportunity to choose the methods, techniques and procedures of research that best meet the objectives of their study (Creswell, 2009). Thus, for the mixed method researchers, pragmatism opens the door to multiple research methods, different worldviews, different assumptions, as well as different forms of data collection and analysis rather than subscribing to one way (Creswell, 2009).

This study explored the perception and attitude of the locals towards protected areas. A mixed method approach underpinned by pragmatic philosophy was adopted in this study to offer
detailed explanations to the issues of perception and attitude of locals towards Kyabobo National Park. The importance of pragmatism for this study is that it allows for the gathering of various viewpoints through the use of various methods. Using this method therefore, the researcher was able to investigate the perception and attitude of locals and the factors influencing their attitude towards Kyabobo National Park.

3.4 Research design

This study adopted a case study approach where five fringe communities of the KNP were targeted. Case studies are considered useful in research as they enable researchers to examine data at the micro level and also offer a practical solution to researchers dealing with big sample population (Zainal, 2007). The design is also useful in studying phenomenon whose boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Zainal, 2007). Adopting a case study approach in exploring the attitudes and perception of fringe communities towards the KNP will therefore be necessary in obtaining information exclusive to each community thus help in establishing variations in perception and attitudes among the communities if any. The study also adopts a cross sectional data collection approach since the interest is not in investigating any phenomena over time.

3.5 Research strategy

The researcher employed mixed method strategy in the conduct of this study. According to Creswell (2009) a mixed method approach has the advantage of incorporating both qualitative and quantitative research methods hence it is able to fill the shortfalls in each of the two
methods. Also, according to Teye (2012) employing both quantitative and qualitative strategies in research studies promotes cross-validation of each strategy around a common reference. The quantitative data gave reasonable grounds to perform statistical analysis such as chi-square test which aided in making generalizations. The qualitative data on the other hand served as a tool that provided in-depth insight into the problems that were investigated. With regard to this study, the quantitative data helped in establishing patterns in terms of linking variables with respect to responses. The qualitative data on the other hand provided more insight as to why people make certain choices.

3.6 Data sources

This study collected data from two main sources. These were the primary and secondary data sources. Primary data was obtained through the administration of questionnaires, in-depth interviews, participant observation and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). The primary data probed into the perceptions of residents of fringe communities towards KNP, factors affecting the local people’s perceptions and attitudes towards Kyabobo National Park and the impacts of locals’ perceptions and attitudes on the Park.

Secondary data on the other hand was obtained from websites, reports, books, journals and articles, newspapers, brochures, magazines and any other relevant sources. A district shape file of Nkwanta South was obtained from the GIS unit at the Department of Geography and Resource Development, Legon.
3.7 Data collection methods

3.7.1 Quantitative data

The fringe communities include Keri, Chilinga, Kue, Pawa, Gekorong, Odomi, Nyambong, Abrewanko and Shaire out of which five were purposively sampled. These were Keri, Kue, Odomi, Nyambong and Shaire.

These communities were selected because through engagements in the area they were found to be more dependent on the KNP for livelihood activities and also close to the KNP.

The quantitative data for the study was obtained using semi-structured questionnaires. The questionnaire was used to solicit data from households in the fringe communities. The questionnaires were organised around four main areas by taking the objectives of the study into consideration. The thematic areas were the demographic and socio-economic profile of respondents, local people’s perceptions towards KNP, factors affecting local’s perceptions and attitudes and the impacts of their perceptions and attitudes on KNP.

3.7.2 Qualitative data

The qualitative data for this study was also obtained using in-depth interviews and FGDs. The in-depth interviews focused on management of KNP, Wildlife Division, Nkwanta District Assembly and opinion leaders at the community level. The discussion was focused on factors affecting locals’ perceptions and attitudes toward the park. The FGDs focused on selected community members at Kue, Odomi, Nyambong and Shaire. In all four FGDs were organized. Three kinds of FGDs were undertaken. These included: adult male only, adult female only and
youth groups only. The FGDs delved into whether community members have positive or negative perceptions towards KNP. Moreover, factors affecting the perception of the locals towards KNP and some of the key effects of the local communities’ perceptions towards the KNP that emerged from the survey were discussed.

3.8 Sampling technique

The multi-staged sampling technique was used in selecting respondents for the questionnaire survey. Multi-stage sampling technique helped the researcher to break down the target population into groups and sub-groups that aids in getting fair perspectives from each group (Verial, 2014). Also, it is distinguished as most appropriate technique for selecting sample sizes from heterogeneous populations (Verial, 2014). Considering the heterogeneous nature of the people with respect to culture and ethnic backgrounds, the mixed method approach was very appropriate in the selection of respondents.

The first stage involved the division of each community into four main clusters based on the major roads in each community. Equal proportion of the questionnaires was administered in each cluster. However, in each cluster the systematic sampling method was used where the first household was selected and then afterwards every second house targeted for the questionnaire administration. In each household, household heads were targeted but in cases where the household heads were not available their qualified representatives in terms of age (20 years and above) and duration (10 years and above) of stay in the community were considered for selection. Also, purposive sampling was used to select committee members in each community.
3.9 Sample size for quantitative data

The sum of 150 questionnaires was administered in the five fringe communities of KNP. The study used 2015 projected population of these communities obtained from the District Planning Coordinating Unit (DPCU). Based on the projected population, sample sizes were proportionally allocated to each of the five fringe communities. The sample size for the study was determined from the total population using the Yamane formula which is stated below:

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \quad \text{Yamane (1967:886)}.
\]

\(n\) = sample size, \(N\) = total study population, \(1\) = constant, \(e\) = confidential level (%).

Based on proportional allocation, the sample size for each community was calculated using the formula below.

\[S = \frac{(CP)}{(TP)} \times n\]

where \(S\) = sample size, \(CP\) = population of the community, \(TP\) = total population and \(n\) = sample size.

Table 3.1 below summarizes the various population and sample size of the communities that were visited.

Table 3.1: Communities, population and sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population above 20years</th>
<th>Calculated sample size</th>
<th>Used sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keri</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kue</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odomi</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyanbong</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Sample size for qualitative data

A total of six (6) stakeholders were selected and interviewed during the field work. The stakeholders included Kyabobo National Park Manager, the personnel from Wild Life Division-Nkwanta, District Director of Forest Services Commission, and the Assembly members for Shiare-Kromase, Keri, and Odomi electoral area. Interviews does not necessarily require a large sample size, rather, emphasis is placed on the process and meaning, and in-depth knowledge on the topic (Teye, 2012; Bruku, 2016). There was also a focus group discussion with five committee members each in the various communities for more information.

3.11 Ethical considerations

The role of ethical consideration in research cannot be underestimated. It ensures credibility, validity and integrity of research. Therefore, the ethical concerns of the respondents were duly observed during this study. In the first place, respondents were informed that their consent was needed and that participation was voluntary during administration of questionnaire and other field activities that involved the respondents. The objectives of the study were spelt out to the participants and that no monetary or material benefit is to be expected from the researcher. Moreover, as a way of ensuring and protecting the anonymity of key informants, pseudonyms were used to represent the identities. Permission was sought from participants for their pictures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaire</th>
<th>798</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4922</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to be used in the thesis. Finally, participants were assured that their responses to questions will be kept confidential.

### 3.11 Data analysis

The quantitative data was coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 software. Tables and graphs were generated to aid in data analysis. This helped to identify quantitatively the perceptions of respondents concerning KNP as the study hoped to find out in objective 1. Also, statistical analysis such as Chi-Square was ran to identify the factors that have relationship with respondents’ perception towards the Park as the study sought to find out in the second objective. Geographic Information System (GIS) software, ArcMap 10.4.1 was used to create a map to show the relationship between proximity to the KNP and level of benefits (economic, social and cultural) respondents derive from KNP. A buffer analysis was performed using ArcMap 10.4.1 to assess the proximity between fringe communities and Kyabobo National Park (KNP). The rationale behind this spatial analysis was to examine how distance between respondents’ place of residence affects their perception and attitude toward the KNP.

The qualitative data from the interviews and FGDs were recorded and transcribed into word documents and then later uploaded into the Envivo software to generate themes. The themes together with thorough readings of the transcripts supplement the quantitative data in terms of identifying the reasons why people make certain choices and perception with regards to the park. The third objective was largely explored with the help of information from interviews.
with stakeholders in the management of the park. The hypothesis was tested using the Chi-Square in the SPSS.

3.12 Limitations of the Study

The researcher encountered some challenges in the process of this study. These included time limitation, material, movement and finance which did not allow the researcher to cover more fringe communities of the KNP. Another challenge was the difficulty in acquiring data from the relevant institutions. Some officials in the targeted institutions were not willing to release some relevant data on certain key issue about the park. Some of the respondents were reluctant to disclose certain information due to fear of being arrested.

3.13 Chapter summary

Chapter three of this study focused on the characteristics of the study area and the methodology adopted for the study. The discussion on the study area looked at the location, physical and socio-economic characteristics of the fringe communities of the KNP. The methodological issues of the study were also discussed under this chapter. Key areas discussed included the research design and strategy, sources of data and the modus operandi adopted in data collection, sampling techniques, sample sizes and the means of data analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the discussion of the results of study. The first section of the chapter specifically discusses the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Among the demographic variables discussed include sex, level of education, age and religion. Others are marital status, occupation and level of education. The subsequent sections present results and discussion on the study’s objectives set in chapter one. Discussions are made based on results generated on perceptions and attitudes of locals towards KNP; factors affecting local people’s perceptions and attitudes; and the impacts of perceptions and attitudes towards KNP. The chapter concludes with a chapter summary.

4.2 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

Some studies have shown that there is a relationship between people’s demographic characteristics and their attitudes and perceptions towards certain phenomena (see Cantiello et al, 2015). In this vein some demographic characteristics that are perceived to have relationship with people’s perception and attitudes were considered for the study. These include sex, age, level of education, income, marital status and religion.

The data revealed that majority of the respondents were males with 68% representation whilst 32% were females (Table 4.1). This higher representation of men cut across all the five communities. This distribution can however be explained by the fact that the study targeted household heads for the data collection and because of the cultural believes of the people males
are considered household heads thus their higher representation. In some instances however, females were the heads or the male heads were absent thus the engagement of women in the survey. With respect to age, the studies found out that the highest proportion of respondents were within 30 to 39 age range forming 30.7% of the total respondents. This is followed by those above 60 years with 24% whilst those in the 50-59 range are made up 19.3%. Those within the 20-29 and 40-49 age range made up 14 and 12% respectively. This is displayed in Table 4.1. At the community level Shiare had no respondents who were within the 20-29 and 30-39 age groups. This can be explained by the fact that there is a lot of youth migration in Shiare and only a few of the youth in the town remain in the town when they are of age. The rest migrate to the big towns and cities in search of better livelihoods.

Majority of the respondents are married. For instance, whilst 84.7% of the respondents are married, 11.3% are single with 1.3% each either cohabiting or widowed. On the other hand 0.7% each are either divorced or separated. At the community level however, only Nyambong had respondents who are divorced or separated. All the other four communities had no respondent who is either married or separated. In Odomi, all the respondents (100%) were married whilst Shiare had as high as 96% of the respondents married. This high percentage of the married population can be as a result of the fact that the tradition of the people encourages early marriage. Girls for instance are perceived as managers of homes thus the people do not encourage education to higher levels for the girl child.

With respect to level of education the educational level of the people are relatively low. The highest proportion of the respondents (40.7%) has had no formal education. This is followed by 27.3% who have had education up to the JHS/Middle School level. The proportion of respondents who have had education up to the post-secondary/tertiary level form 12% whilst the
remaining 12 and 8% have had education up to the primary and SHS/Vocational/Technical levels. The distribution of educational levels of the respondents is however not homogenous among all the communities. For instance, in Kue none of the respondents have had education up to the SHS level whilst in Odomi as low as 5% of the respondents have had education up to the tertiary/post-secondary level (Table 4.1).

When it comes to religion, majority of the respondents (62.7%) are Christians followed by the African Traditional Religion with 26% representation. Muslims on the other hand made up 11.3% of the respondents which is the least proportion. This distribution is somehow odd given the fact that Islam is the second largest religion after Christianity. This could be that Islam has not spread much to that part of the country or the people hail African Traditional Religion. Specifically at Nyambong and Shiare, none of the respondents were Muslims. However, a whopping 97.1% of the respondents at Nyambong are Christians (Table 4.1).

Majority of the respondents are farmers with 69.3% representation. This is followed by 17.1% of the respondents who fell in the professionals/technicians/managers category. Artisans made up 10.7% of the respondents with pensioners forming the least proportion with a representation of 0.7% (Table 4.1). This distribution however does not cut across all the communities. For instance, it is only Nyambong that had respondents who were pensioners and unemployed. None of the respondents in the other four communities were pensioners or unemployed. The high percentage representation in farming coincides with the national and district data where majority of the labour force are engaged in agriculture. Again, all the communities are rural and agriculture is found to be the major occupation of most rural folks in Ghana.
Table 4.1: Demographic characteristics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nyambong freq</th>
<th>Nyambong %</th>
<th>Shiare freq</th>
<th>Shiare %</th>
<th>Kue freq</th>
<th>Kue %</th>
<th>Odomi freq</th>
<th>Odomi %</th>
<th>Keri freq</th>
<th>Keri %</th>
<th>Total freq</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensual/cohabitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None(no formal education)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS/SHS/middle school</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS/SHS/Voc/Tech</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary/Tertiary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Traditional Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/managerial/tech.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-250</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 1000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Last but not least, another demographic characteristic that was considered is level of income. Majority of the respondents (69.8%) fell within 1-250 Ghana cedis as average monthly income. This is followed by those who earn between 251 and 500 Ghana cedis that is made up 16.8% whilst 10.8% and 2.7% earn above 1000 Ghana cedis 501-1000 Ghana cedis respectively. This distribution shows that the income level of the respondents is relatively low.
4.3 Economic, social and cultural benefits of KNP

To enable the researcher identify the perceptions and attitudes of fringe communities towards national parks, series of questions were posed to respondents in the questionnaire that was administered and interviews and focus group discussions conducted with selected respondents. Respondents were first asked whether they receive any direct or indirect benefits from KNP in terms of economic, social and cultural benefits.

In terms of economic benefits (see Figure 4.1), Nyambong respondents recorded 5.7% while Kue respondents recorded 10%. Respondents in Keri recorded 2%. Odomi respondents recorded the highest (30%) result for obtaining economic benefit from Kyabobo National Park. No respondent in Shiare indicated that they receive any kind of economic benefits from the national park. This result is a potential recipe to create negative attitude and perception for residents in Shiare towards the national park. Among those who said they gain economic benefits from the park during the focus group discussions mentioned benefits such as them being employed as committee members to manage the park. Others also said they were trained in bee keeping thus they have been keeping bees for some time as a form of alternative employment. However, those who were employed to be part of the committee complained they were later laid off. The remaining respondents in the study communities claimed they receive no economic benefits from the natural park.
With respect to social benefits a majority (5%) of the respondents in Odomi community said that they receive social benefits from the KNP whilst only 2% of respondents in Keri said they receive social benefits from the park. Figure 4.2 shows the level of social benefits received from each community. Respondents in Nyambong recorded 2.9% for social benefit they receive as the result of establishment of the park. Interestingly, respondents in Shiare and Kue indicated that they receive no social benefit from the park. Result from qualitative data supported that among the social benefits they receive include boreholes drilled for them by the park.

Source: Field Data, 2017.
management. Others also said that the mere presence of the KNP has opened the community up to the world since tourists visit the community frequently.

**Figure 4.2. Level of social benefits derived from the study communities.**

The researcher probed further to know whether residents derive cultural benefits from the park. Majority (5%) of respondents who claimed they receive cultural benefit from the park were in Odomi (see Figure 4.3). Respondents in Keri recorded 4% for cultural benefit while respondents in Nyambong recorded 2.9%. The remaining communities (Shiare and Kue) indicated that they receive no cultural benefits from the national park. However, those who agreed to receiving benefits mentioned the presence of some animals of cultural value in the park.

**Source: Field Data, 2017.**
and the support of festivities by the park management as some of the cultural benefits they benefit from being close to the KNP.

Generally, it could be deduced from this section that, residents living around KNP do not really enjoy any significant benefit from the park since its establishment in 1993 either direct or indirect. A careful observation in the communities shows that the expectation of residents living near KNP to have an improved standard of living is yet to be met. It could be deduced that, the farther a community is from the national park, the less benefit (economic, social and cultural) a community derives from the park. Thus, there is an association between proximity to the national park and level of benefit available for a community.

**Figure 4. 3. Level of cultural benefits derived in the study communities**

![Figure 4. 3. Level of cultural benefits derived in the study communities](http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh)

**Source:** Field Data.
4.4 Perceptions and attitudes of respondents toward KNP

Further towards understanding the perception of respondents on whether the presence of the KNP contributes negatively or positively to life in fringe communities with respect to the social, economic and cultural aspects of the people, respondents were asked to state their level of agreement with some statements. This is displayed in Table 4.2. It can be observed from the table that 71.3% of the respondents agreed that the social benefits they derive from KNP is negative followed by 24% who were neutral. This runs through the economic and cultural benefits with respondents giving similar responses. For instance, 69.3% said the economic benefits derived from the KNP are negative. This means that if the forest was not a national park, there would have been a lot of economic benefits derived from the park by the people. Among some of the economic benefits the people talked of include burning of charcoal, hunting, fetching firewood and other leaves of medicinal and commercial importance. Similarly, 70.5% of the respondents agreed that there have been negative returns in terms of the cultural aspects of life in the community. The study therefore sought to find out why respondents had this view. It was therefore revealed through interviews and focus group discussion that certain cultural practices of the people prior to the use of the park as a conservation area for tourism purposes no longer exist.

According to the management of the park, the perception and attitudes of the locals vary from community to community. The locals from Shiare indicated more negative perceptions and attitude towards the park than the other fringe communities. These bad perceptions and attitudes include poaching, hunting for the forest resources, tying red-band on route signifying warning to forest guards and park managers who try to stop residents, conflict and killing of the guards. This is attributed to the fact that, the Shiare are the custodians of the lands in all the Akyode
communities and it is their duty to fight for traditional lands seized from them. Additionally, they own much of the land lost to establishment of the park. Moreover, ninety nine percent (99%) of the people in Shiare are Akyodes unlike in other communities like Kue and others who are made up of a mixture of different tribes who do not own much of the land lost to the establishment of the park. Due to that, the perceptions and attitudes toward the park’s establishment by locals from these communities were somehow better.

A middle age man, who was one of the participants in the FGD in Shiare, expressed his sentiment that:

“.. We were thinking we were going to get employment from the park. To our dismay however, our land was rather seized without any compensation. Our livelihood has been taken away from us. This made some people to illegally hunt in the park for livelihood. For fear of being arrested, those hunters who had problems with the guards have migrated to Togo to hide there. The communities are doing their best to support conservation but the management of the park are not up and doing in terms of helping the locals.”(Response from a 45-year-old community activist in Shiare on the 27/09/2017).

Although the respondents seem to express their resentment on how the KNP is affecting their lives negatively they seemed to back any plan that supports the conservation of the park and were repulsive towards life threatening activities done within it. For instance, 81.1% of the respondents agreed that setting aside the KNP for conservation purposes is positive whilst 9.3% said it is negative. Similarly, a large majority of 85.3%, 84.0% and 76.7% respectively positively agreed to statements such as the need for setting aside a place for plants and animals to live without interference; conserving forests so that future generations may know and make use of;
and reserving the forest for tourism purposes. This goes to suggest that majority of respondents have a positive perception towards the use of the park for conservation and tourism purposes. This point is underscored by majority of the respondents who agreed that it is negative to use the KNP for livelihood activities in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Perceptions of respondents toward KNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The social benefits derived from the KNP is…</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The economic benefits derived from the KNP is…</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cultural benefits derived from the KNP is…</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting aside the KNP for conservation is…</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting aside a place for plants and animals to lie without interference is…</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving forests so that future generations may know and use is…</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating KNP land for farming and other personal use is…</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting in the KNP is…</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing for the cutting of timber in the KNP is…</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserving the forest for tourism purposes is…</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Fieldwork, 2017**

This is evident in the responses given by respondents when asked about their perception on the use of the park for livelihood purposes. The analysis revealed 72% of the respondents agreeing that allocating KNP land for farming and other personal use is negative. Also, 81.3% of the respondents agreed that hunting in the KNP is negative. Similarly, 88% and 91.3% agreed that allowing for the cutting of timber in the KNP and burning the KNP is negative respectively.

### 4.5 Factors affecting perception and attitude of fringe communities towards parks.

Results from the interviews and FGD’s revealed that respondents in communities such as Shiare, Kue and Odomi were not in good terms with operators of the national park. The main
reason behind this state of affairs was that, government officials failed to compensate them when a large section of their land was converted into the national park. However, residents in the other fringe communities like Keri and Nyambong expressed good remarks about the national park. Based on the foregoing, the researcher performed a spatial analysis on the communities to find their proximity to the national park and how that may affect their perception and attitudes. This was mainly done on the assumption that those closer to the park may be comparatively more affected than those that are a far away. A buffer (see Figure 4.1) was created around the communities to assess the areas that were closer to the park. Results from the buffer indicated that, the shortest distance between Shiare and the park was 3km, Odomi was 2km, Keri was 3km, Kue was 1km and Nyambong was 7km. Out of the five (5) fringe communities, Kue and Odomi were the closest because they covered 1 km and 2km distance between them and the national park respectively. Shiare and Keri both recorded 3km distance between them and the national park. Nyambong was the farthest of the communities from the national park as it is located 7km away from it.

The buffer results validate the comments from the respondents because the communities which were closest to the park had their lands taken away from them. Thus, the closer a community is to the national park, the likelihood that a portion of their land has been converted into the forest reserve, and since they were not compensated, such residents will develop an indifferent attitude and perception towards the park. On the other hand, distant communities who were less affected in terms of land reclamation will develop a positive perception and attitude towards the Kyabobo National Park.
Figure 4.4: A map showing proximity of communities to the KNP

Source: Author’s construct.

In order to prove this assertion statistically the communities were categorized into short distance (0-0.25km), medium distance (2.5-5km) and far distance (5-7.5km). A crosstab was then run between distance away from the park and the economic, social and cultural benefits derived from the KNP. The results showed that there is a significant relationship between distance and economic benefits derived from the park whilst no significant relationship was established between distance and social and cultural benefits (Table 4.3).
Table 4.3: Crosstabulation between distance and benefits derived from the KNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age categories</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Social benefits</th>
<th>Cultural benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short [0-2.5km] (Odomi and Kue)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium [2.5-5km] (Shiare and Keri)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
<td>(98.7%)</td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far [5-7.5km] (Nyambong)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
<td>(94.3%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.3%)</td>
<td>(92.7%)</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square test value</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2017

The study further sought to find out why respondents hold those perceptions and attitudes towards the park. In this respect the study first of all run some cross-tabulations to find out if there is any relationship between some demographic characteristic of respondents and their perception or attitudes towards the KNP. The data revealed that none of the respondents within the ages of 20-29 said they gain any economic benefits from the KNP whilst 21 of them said no.
With those in the 30-39 age category 7(15.2%) of them said yes whilst 39(84.8%) said no. Two (2) of the respondents in the 40-49 age category on the other hand claimed that they receive economic benefits whilst 16 of them said no. One person each in the 50-59 and 60 and above age categories said they receive economic benefits from the KNP whilst 28 and 35 respectively answered no to whether or not they receive economic benefits from the KNP. This is displayed in Table 4.4.

In trying to find out whether there is any relationship between the age categories and benefits derived from the KNP, a chi-square test of independence was run between age, level of education and occupational 95% level of significance. With respect to the relationship between age and the various benefits – economic, social and cultural – the Pearson chi-square test value obtained (0.92) is greater than the significant value of 0.05 which indicates that there is no significant correlation between age and economic benefits (Table 4.4). This goes to suggest that the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between age and whether respondents receive benefits from KNP is accepted.

Also, the study also tried to find out if age has any relationship with social benefits derived from the KNP. In this regard a cross tabulation was run between age and whether respondents received any social benefits. The data revealed that none of the respondents in the 20-29; 50-59 and 60 and above age categories responded yes to gaining any social benefits from the KNP. However, majority of the respondents in the various age categories said that they do not receive any social benefits from the KNP. Following this trend, the study tried to find out if there is any relationship between a particular age category and the receipt of social benefits. A Pearson’s chi-square test of independence was therefore run between age and whether respondents receive social benefits. The Pearson chi-square test value obtained (0.378) is higher
than significant value (0.05) which means that there is no significant relationship between age and whether respondents receive social benefits or not from the KNP (Table 4.4). This means that the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between age and whether respondents receive benefits is accepted.

The study further looked if there is any relationship between age and cultural benefits derived from the KNP. As shown in Table 4.4, the outcome of the Pearson’s chi-square test showed that there is no relationship between age and whether respondents received cultural benefits. The chi-square test value obtained is 0.653 which is greater than the significant value of 0.05. Looking at the statistics it shows clearly that majority of the respondents responded no to receiving any cultural benefits from the KNP. Based on these findings it can be concluded that age has no relationship with whether people receive benefits from the KNP or not.
Table 4.4. Cross Tabulation between ages and whether KNP provides benefits

| Age categories | Economic benefits | | Social benefits | | Cultural benefits |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|
|                | Yes (%)           | No (%)         | Yes (%)        | No (%)           | Yes (%)           | No (%)          |
| 20-29          | 0 (0.0%)          | 21 (100%)      | 0 (0%)         | 21 (100%)        | 0 (0%)           | 21 (100%)       |
| 30-39          | 7 (15.2%)         | 39 (84.8%)     | 2 (4.3%)       | 44 (95.7%)       | 2 (4.3%)         | 44 (95.7%)      |
| 40-49          | 2 (11.1%)         | 16 (88.9%)     | 1 (5.6%)       | 17 (94.4%)       | 1 (5.6%)         | 17 (94.4%)      |
| 50-59          | 1 (3.4%)          | 28 (96.6%)     | 0 (0%)         | 29 (100%)        | 0 (0%)           | 29 (100%)       |
| 60 and above   | 1 (2.8%)          | 35 (97.2%)     | 0 (0%)         | 36 (100%)        | 1 (2.8%)         | 35 (97.2%)      |
| Total          | 11 (7.3%)         | 139 (92.7%)    | 3 (2%)         | 147 (98%)        | 4 (2.7%)         | 146 (97.3%)     |
| Pearson chi-square test value | 0.92 | 0.378 | 0.653 |

Another demographic characteristic that was considered in this regard is the level of education of respondents. A cross-tabulation was run between level of education and whether respondents obtained benefits from KNP. The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between level of education and whether respondents get any benefits from KNP. As shown in Table 4.5 the Pearson chi-square test obtained between level of education and economic benefits is 0.045 which is lower than the significant value of 0.05. This means that there is a relationship between level of education and whether respondents receive any economic benefits from the KNP. Similarly, the test results showed that there is a relationship between level of education and whether respondents received social benefits (Table 4.5). However, the test proved no relationship between level of education and cultural benefits derived from the KNP. From Table 4.5 the Pearson chi-square value between level of education and whether respondents obtain social benefits is 0.081 which is greater than the significant value of 0.05. It can be concluded therefore that there is no relationship between level of education and whether respondents obtain cultural benefits from KNP.
Table 4.5. Cross tabulation between level of education and benefits obtained from KNP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Social benefits</th>
<th>Cultural benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>58 (95.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS/Middle School</td>
<td>2 (4.9%)</td>
<td>39 (95.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS/SHS/Technical/vocational</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Secondary/Tertiary</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>14 (77.8%)</td>
<td>2 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11 (7.3%)</td>
<td>139 (92.7%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square test value</td>
<td>0.045*</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated from SPSS
The last demographic characteristic that was considered is the occupation of the respondents. In trying to find out if there is any relationship between occupation and the benefits generated from the KNP, a Pearson chi-square test of independence was run between the type of occupation and whether respondents obtained benefits. When it comes to the relationship between the type of occupation and economic benefits the Pearson chi-square test obtained is 0.239 which is greater than the significant value of 0.05. This means that there is no relationship between occupation and whether respondents enjoy economic benefits or not. Taking the relationship between occupation and whether respondents receive social benefits or not into consideration, the Pearson chi-square test value obtained is 0.044 which is less than the significant value of 0.05 meaning there is a relationship between them. Similarly, with respect to significant relationship between the type of occupation and cultural benefits obtained from the KNP, the Pearson chi-square test obtained is 0.251 which is greater than the significant value of 0.05. This means that there is no significant relationship between the type of occupations and cultural benefits from the KNP (Table 4.6).
Table 4.6. Cross tabulation between occupation and benefits obtained from KNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>Social benefits</th>
<th>Cultural benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes(%)</td>
<td>No (%)</td>
<td>Yes (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>6 (6.2%)</td>
<td>91 (93.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical/managerial</td>
<td>3(12.5%)</td>
<td>21(87.5%)</td>
<td>2(8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1(33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10(7.1%)</td>
<td>130 (92.9%)</td>
<td>2 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson chi-square test value</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Generated from SPSS

More elaboration from FGD shows that there is spatial variation among the fringe communities in terms of their perceptions and attitudes towards KNP. The observed variation is attributed to location and distance of the fringe communities from the park. According to information gathered, communities located closer to the park such as Kue, Shiare and Odomi had much of resources lost to the establishment of the park. Locals from these communities are much affected negatively by the establishment of the park, these compelled residents from these communities to have negative perceptions and attitudes towards the park. On the other hand, a
community like Nyanbong which is located far from the park than the rest of the fringe communities is not much negatively affected by the establishment of the park. According to the unit community leader in this community, none of their resources especially land is taken away from them. The people did not express much negative perceptions and attitudes toward the park because of their distance away from the park. A member from the FGD at Nyambong said that:

“Because we are located far away from the park than the other communities, none of our resources have been affected as a result of the establishment of the park and because of that we don’t have much negative perceptions and attitudes toward the park.” (Response from a male respondent on the 29/09/2017 at 5:13 pm)

In another instance, another old man from Kue also expresses his sentiment that:

“Our farmlands have been confiscated and we don’t have land to farm on again. This led to land fragmentation. Our livelihoods have been taken from us making life unbearable for us. That made most of our people in our communities harbor negative perception about the park leading to negative attitudes.” (Response from an opinion leader in Kue on the 9/10/2017 at 1:53 pm).

It can now be established that the location and distance of the fringe communities also determine the perceptions and attitudes of the locals towards the park.

4.6 Impacts of local peoples’ perceptions and attitudes on park.

The previous section has largely shown that there is a negative perception that the presence of KNP affects livelihoods of the local people negatively. Notwithstanding this,
majority of the respondents support the conservation of the KNP as a conservation site. This is quite surprising as one would have thought that once KNP affects their livelihood they would be against it being used as a conservation site. Given this revelation, the study was also interested in finding out the impact of these perceptions and attitudes on the park. In this regard respondents were first asked whether they thought they themselves or any of their relatives are engaged in any activity that is detrimental to the management of the KNP. The data revealed that all the respondents answered no suggesting that none of the respondents or any of their relatives is engaged in any activity that is detrimental to the park. This is shown in Figure 4.5. From Figure 4.5, it can be observed that 100% of the respondents said they or members of their household do not engage in any activity that is detrimental to effective management of the park.

**Figure 4.5. Activities engaged by respondents that are detrimental to KNP.**

![Bar chart showing 100% no and 0% yes](Source: Fieldwork, 2017.)
This is surprising given that during the FGDs and interviews with the park management it was revealed that some people enter the forest illegally to engage in practices such as poaching, cutting of trees among others that affect biodiversity conservation in the park. According the park manager, the locals were told that the main objective of establishing the park was to conserve biodiversity for future generation and also to develop the area as a tourism destination so that the locals could benefit from it. But the negatives attitudes of the locals such as poaching, cutting of trees, conflicts have really affected the usefulness of the park. Normal patrol by the guards was affected; some of the satellite camps that served as abodes for the guards were destroyed, not forgetting the resignation of some of the workers as a result of conflicts between the locals and the guards. As a result of these, the area has not been developed as a tourism destination. But he went further to admit that of late they have seen some improvements in the perception and attitude of the locals for the better.

Another question that was asked during the questionnaire survey was whether respondents thought some members still enter the park to engage in illegal activities. It was revealed however that this time around it was no longer 100% of the respondents who responded No but a majority of 62.3% agreed that members of the community outside their households enter the forest illegally to engage in unapproved activities. This is shown Figure 4.6 below.
According to the respondents, before the establishment of the KNP, individuals or residents were made aware that the government was going to give them alternative livelihoods since they could no longer engage in livelihood activities that are related to the park. They were promised jobs such as labourers at the park, management committee members, and also the giving of loans to residents to establish small businesses. However, all these things have not happened after the establishment of the park and the people are left with no jobs. People therefore flout the laws on preventing them from visiting the park. For instance, in FGD held at Nyambong, a middle aged man had this to say.

“…We did not know they were coming to protect the forest so that nobody goes there again. Our thinking was that they are coming to protect the land so that a lot of animals will come into the forest so that even when you are in your farm the animal will come to

you. But when that did not happen the hunters had reacted negatively towards the KNP. They have not stopped going there. And people are also cutting trees in the forest. If not for the intervention of the immigration service and the national security, by now you would not see a single tree when you get there ... people have the opinion that it is their land and if that has been taken then they should be compensated... since they did not get any compensation then they will also go there and take their property” (Response by a youth activist in Nyambong community on 29/09/2017 at 4:33 pm)

The study further found out from the respondents that the level of impact of these activities on management of the park. Respondents were therefore asked to choose from a likert scale between very negative and very positive. It was revealed (see Figure 4.7) however that majority of the respondents (52.3%) agreed that the impact of the activities engaged in by community members on the park is negative whilst 26.7% agreed that the impact is very negative. Whilst 1% of the respondents said the activities have positive impacts on the management of the park, none of the respondents agreed that the impacts are very positive with 20% remaining indifferent. This means that the park is under threat from these illegal and negative attitudes from the respondents. The 1% who indicated that their activities have positive impact on the park said that they no longer go into the park to draw resources to support their livelihoods. This they say can ensure the conservation of certain plant and animal species.
Figure 4.7. The level of impacts of respondents’ activities on the park


It can be said that people are afraid of prosecution or any punishment when they admit that they use the forest for their livelihood activities although it is not allowed. This may be the reason why they said their households do not engage in any activity that could be detrimental to the effective management of the park.

4.6 Chapter summary

This chapter focused on the discussion of the results of the study. The first section of the chapter discussed the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Discussions were also made on perception of residents in fringe communities towards the KNP, factors that affect these perceptions and attitudes and its implications on effective management of the KNP.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

Chapter five which is the final chapter of the study talked about three main issues which are the summary, conclusions and recommendations. The summary discusses briefly the research design and the major outcomes produced. Conclusions are drawn based on the study findings before finally recommendations for policy and future research are provided.

5.2 Summary of key findings

With a detailed questionnaire administration, interviews and Focus Group Discussions, the study was able to achieve its set objectives in Chapter One. In all, 200 questionnaires were administered in the five communities bordering the KNP, together with interviews and FGDs. Majority of the respondents were males and a significant percentage had no formal education. Farming formed the major occupation of the respondents as indicated in Ghana Statistical Service report.

The first objective was to identify the perceptions and attitudes of fringe communities towards the KNP. The study found that majority of the respondents does not receive social, economic or cultural benefits from the KNP and this is similar to finding from Manu et al (2012) study at Sirigu. They intimated that the presence of the KNP has worsened their plight as they do not enjoy the benefits they used to enjoy before the conversion of the forest into a national park. Although respondents expressed worry about the disadvantages created by the park they however
supported the idea of conserving the forest and using it as a national park. Also, majority of the respondents abhorred actions that will degrade flora and fauna the forest.

The second objective was to look at the factors that affect local peoples’ perception and attitudes towards the KNP. The analysis of the data revealed that demographic characteristics such as level of education has no relationship with social, economic and cultural benefits derived from the KNP. However, the study showed that age has a relationship with social and economic benefits derived from the KNP. The study shows that there is a significant relationship between distance and the level of economic benefits derived from the KNP. However, there was no relationship between distance and socio-cultural benefits derived from the KNP by fringe communities. In addition to the above, type of occupation of the respondents has a relationship with social benefits derived from the KNP. The study also revealed that some residents in fringe communities hold negative perception and attitudes towards the KNP. This negativity is mainly due to failed promises such as non-payment of compensation by the government before the forest was converted into a national park. The loss incurred by the locals such as loss of farm lands to the creation of the park also instilled negative perception and attitude in the respondents.

The last objective was to look at the impacts of the perceptions and attitudes of fringe communities on the effective management of the park. It came out that 100% of the respondents said that none of them or members of their families engage in activities that affect the effective management of the KNP. However, majority of the respondents said that other members of the community flout laws protecting the park and enter the park to do all sort of illegal activities. The study makes the point that it is the fear of arrest that is why respondents actually said they do not engage in any illegal activity around the forest.
5.3 Conclusions

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions can be made. First of all, it can be concluded that fringe communities perceive national parks to be of more harm than good and that the presence of parks in communities deprive the community of the social, economic and cultural benefits they get from the parks. Also, it can be concluded that communities welcome the idea of reserving the forest for future use and protection of some plant and animal species.

Furthermore, the study concludes that peoples’ perception and attitudes about conservation of the park have no relationship with their demographic characteristics such as age, level of education or occupation. People’s perceptions are rather influenced by the losses suffered and unfulfilled promises associated with the creation of the park. Moreover, it can be concluded that the loss of livelihood of the local people is the main cause of the negative perception and attitudes among the locals towards the park.

Also, the study concludes that the attitudes and perception of community members have negative consequences on the smooth management of national parks. Community members tend to flout rules protecting conservation sites and conflicts sometimes erupt between community members and park managers. Lastly, there is much to be done on educating the locals on the future benefits of the park to gain their support for effective conservation.

5.4 Recommendations

The study has helped to reveal that the conversion of forests into reserves or national parks poses negative challenges to members in fringe communities and community members
tend to react by infringing on the provisions made to protect these forests. It is therefore recommended that when the government and management of the park promise to provide alternate livelihood sources for residents they should fulfill those promises and also help to sustain projects. This will help curb the negative perceptions and attitudes held by members of fringe communities that affect the efficient and effective management of parks.

Also, this study has revealed that demographic characteristics such as age, occupation and level of education to some extent have little bearing on people’s perception and attitudes when it comes to conservation sites. It is therefore recommended that efforts by governments and other agencies to curb negative perceptions should not be planned towards demographic variables. This can lead to waste of resources and misdirection. Instead, more studies are recommended to help isolate other variables that may assist to develop measures towards positively influencing people’s attitudes and perception to future park development initiatives either in the locality or elsewhere.

The study also found that peoples’ livelihoods which are actually depended on the forest are lost as a result of the conversion of the forest into a conservation site. This is actually the cause of the negative perceptions and attitudes among the locals towards the park. It is therefore recommended that portions of forest reserves are given to community members so that they can continue to enjoy their livelihoods. Also, sustainable alternative livelihood activities should be provided. These will help in fulfilling some of the outstanding promises that remain unfulfilled. People go back to break the laws that protected these areas because of the violation of these promises by the state.
5.5 Implications for future research

The study revealed that people do not benefit from the establishment of protected areas but they however approve the establishment of such areas. It is therefore recommended that future studies should look at the reasons behind this revelation. This will be very positive for planning purposes for future development of national parks. Also, the study revealed that the locals, especially the youth and the uneducated people, were not properly educated on the main objectives of establishing the park. So, future studies should look at how to educate the locals about the rationale for establishing the park.
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APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
UNIVERSITY OF GHANA, LEGON
This study is aimed at examining the perception and attitudes of fringe communities towards the protection and conservation of the Kyabobo National Park and its implications on effective park management the study is being carried out by an MPhil candidate of the Department of Geography and Resource Development towards the award of an MPhil degree.

All responses provided to the questions will be treated strictly as confidential and used solely for academic purposes. No direct references will be made to the respondents in the writing of the final report. It will be very much appreciated if you could spend a few minutes of your time to help in this course.

Community/Area: ...........................................  Enumerator ID: .................
House number: .............................................  Questionnaire No.: ..............
## SECTION A – DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** | **Sex** | I. Male  
|     |     | II. Female  
| **2** | **Age** |   |
| **3** | **Marital status** | I. Single (never married)  
|     |     | II. Consensual/cohabitation  
|     |     | III. Married  
|     |     | IV. Divorced  
|     |     | V. Separated  
|     |     | VI. Widowed  
| **4** | **Highest level of education attained** | I. None (no formal education)  
|     |     | II. Primary  
|     |     | III. JSS/SHS/Middle School  
|     |     | IV. SSS/SHS/Vocational/Technical  
|     |     | V. Post Secondary/Tertiary  
|     |     | VI. Other (please specify): ………………………………  
| **5** | **Religion** | I. Christian  
|     |     | II. Muslim  
|     |     | III. African Traditional Religion  
|     |     | IV. Other (please specify)  
|     |     | ……………………………………………………  
| **6** | **Occupation** | I. Farmer  
|     |     | II. Professional/technical/managerial  
|     |     | III. Artisan  
|     |     | IV. Pensioner  
|     |     | V. Unemployed  
|     |     | VI. Other (please specify): ………………………………  
| **7** | **Ethnicity** |   |
| **8** | **Household size** |   |
| **9** | **What is your average monthly income?** | I. 1 – 250  
|     |     | II. 251 – 500  
|     |     | III. 501 – 1000  
|     |     | IV. 1001- 1500  
|     |     | V. Above 1500  
| **1** | **How long have you lived in this community?** |   |
### SECTION B – BENEFITS DERIVED FROM KNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you earn any economic benefits from the KNP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes what are some of these economic benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you derive any social benefits from the KNP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes please state some of these social benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this community derive any cultural benefits from the KNP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes please state some of these cultural benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Derived from KNP</th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION C - PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF KNP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting aside the KNP for conservation purposes is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting aside a place for plants and animals to live without human interference is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conserving forests so that future generations may know and use them is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating KNP land for people to farm and other personal use is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting in the KNP is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing for the cutting of timber in the KNP is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning the KNP is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserving the KNP for only tourism purposes is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACTS OF ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS ON KNP MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you or any member of your household is engaged in any activity that is...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities Engaged in the KNP</th>
<th>Very Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Very Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting timber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserving the KNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX II: INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. Benefits derived from the KNP (Social, economic and cultural).

2. Challenges faced by residents as a result of the use of the KNP as a forest reserve.

3. Perception and attitude towards the use of the KNP as a forest reserve (whether good or bad).

4. Reasons for perceptions of residents.

5. How attitudes are affecting effective park management?

6. What can be done to ensure effective park management?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you think members of this community are engaged in any activity that is detrimental to the effective management of the KNP?</td>
<td>I. Yes</td>
<td>II. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How will you describe the level of impact of these activities on the management of the KNP?</td>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In your own opinion how do you think the KNP can be effectively managed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>