

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RWANDA DEVELOPMENT BOARD TOURISM
REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM TOWARDS LOCAL COMMUNITY SOCIO-
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF NYUNGWE NATIONAL PARK**

Phiona K. Kamuzinzi¹, Jaya Shukla², Eugene Ndabaga³

, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.

, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.

, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kigali, Rwanda.

ABSTRACT: *Development agencies and policymakers are increasingly advocating tourism revenue sharing as an effective way to increasing local development around protected areas. In Rwanda, through its outreach programme, the Tourism Revenue-Sharing (TRS) programs, Rwanda Development Board (RDB) usually remits 5 per cent of the park entry fees every year to fund various community projects where given tourist attraction is found. The study was guided by the following key objectives; to examine the social economic impact of tourism revenue sharing program towards the development on local communities, and analyse the challenges faced by local administration and beneficiaries in management of these revenue sharing. To archive the set objectives, a cross sectional research design was used, combined with qualitative and quantitative approach. Primary data was collected from community members living adjacent to Nyungwe national park, community leaders and RDB staff through questionnaires and interviews. The study adopted descriptive and statistical approaches in processing data and Special Program for Social Scientist (SPSS) computer program was employed in data analysis. The survey findings indicated that the revenue sharing program had contributed to social-economic development as it had facilitated the construction of 6 health centers and 10 schools, ensured communities access to safe water supplies and improved housing condition. Several agricultural projects were supported directly through the revenue sharing scheme; it had created employment, promoted local enterprises and sustainable use of natural resources in Nyungwe national park. However, the study revealed some challenges in management of revenue sharing and among those were; inadequate funds, corruption, inadequate skilled manpower, poor communication and elite capture.*

KEYWORDS: Revenue Sharing, Tourism, Local Community

BACKGROUND OF STUDY

The tourism industry has thrived, emerging from an unrecognized economic sector to become one of the world's greatest export industries. Having capitalized on advancements in communication, transportation and a liberalized global market environment, tourism has shown consistent growth, reporting an average annual growth rate of 7% per year (UNWTO, 2012).

Globally, tourism plays a vital role in the social and economic development of many countries, (Binn&Nel, 2002). From the social perspective, tourism promotes the respect and preservation of

the communities' cultures around the world (Global education center, 2005) and promotes social exchange (Simpson, 2008). For the environmental perspective, tourism has the ability to recover the degraded areas, as with examples of Sydney Harbour Rocks areas (Ryan, et al, 2009).

Tourism revenue sharing in Rwanda can be traced back to the 1950s when the Belgian colonialists used it as a tool to elicit cooperation from native Rwandans settled in areas adjacent to the country's game reserves. At that time the monetary benefits were delivered to the local communities while the local communities received the direct share of meat from the crop raiding animals that were short by the game departments (Naughton- Treves, 1999). Since 1996 Rwanda has been stable in terms of political conditions and biodiversity conservation policies have been pursued in consistent and determined manner.

Economically, tourism creates employment opportunities (Lee & Chang, 2008). The United Nations world Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) estimates that tourism contributes more than 75 million direct jobs worldwide. Apart from direct jobs, tourism creates indirect and induces employment opportunities to communities. With these types of employment opportunities (that is, direct, indirect and induced), tourism offers women and youth fast entry into the workforce (UNWTO, 2012).

Apart from the employment opportunities, the tourism industry contributes significantly to the foreign exchange of many nations (Lee & Chang, 2008). On the global scale, tourism generated revenue equivalent to US\$944 billion (UNWTO, 2013). It is not surprising that the tourism industry is considered a lead export sector that accounts for 30% of the total export service worldwide and nearly 45% in developing countries (UNWTO, 2010). For example, in one of the developing countries, Rwanda where this study is undertaken tourism has been growing in terms of tourists' arrivals and revenue since 1998.

Over the last ten years, tourism in Rwanda has recorded significant growth potential, with the industry's contribution to the country's GDP growing at a steady rate (Mwandosya, 2007). Resulting from the joint efforts by the government and the private sector in promoting the tourism industry as one of the country's key drivers of economy and marketing the country as the quality nature destination, the industry's contribution to national output (GDP) has shown a steady increase from 0.5% in 1995 to 17.2% in 2010 (RDB, 2012). Tourism industry has proved to be an important export industry representing some 47% of total foreign exchange from the export of goods and services compared with 2% in 1995 (Rwanda Tourism Master Plan, 2009). According to recently released figures, the industry today is the number one foreign exchange earner for Rwanda, overtaking agriculture, formerly the country's leading export sector (RDB, 2012). Such figures show that export earnings from tourism have exceeded those of gold and have nearly tripled the amount the agriculture industry has contributed to Rwanda's economy (UNCTAD, 2013). Recent statistics, released in June 2013 by the government about the economic survey of the country, indicate that in 2012 the industry has employed 250,000 people as compared with 132,000 recorded ten years earlier (NISR, 2013).

Despite the positive contribution of the tourism industry to socio-economic development, the industry has many problems hindering local communities' socio-economic development. For example, some scholars argue that the development of tourism results in restricted access to natural resources among some local communities. For instance in china the 1994 regulations on nature reserves banned local residents from quarrying, hunting, mining, and logging in protected areas (Ma, et al, 2009).

In communities other than those in china such as Rwanda, local residents experience restricted access to resources which were once accessible without any restrictions, especially before the advocacy nature resource protection for sustainable development for the next generation (Roe, 2004). Although restricted access to natural resources is an important mechanism for ensuring that resources are not over used and also fragile resources are not disturbed, most local residents do not appreciate this fact. It should be noted that although some of them may respect restricted access, poverty forces them to demand access to protected resources. In abide to ensure that local communities fully appreciate and understand the issue of restricted access to protected areas, revenue from the protected areas is shared with the community surrounding the protected areas (Roe, 2004).

There are several programs in various protected areas in Africa that aim to benefit local people through development projects. Many of these programs have a well stipulated tourism benefit-sharing mechanism with 'poor' neighboring communities. As from 2002 for example, 29 % of tourist revenue at Jozani National Park in Zanzibar goes to community development projects such as schools, health services, safe water supply and many others (Makame and Boon, 2008).

In Rwanda, through its outreach programme, the Tourism Revenue-Sharing (TRS) programs, Rwanda Development Board (RDB) usually donates a portion of revenue accrued from wildlife-based tourism to assist local communities living adjacent to national parks in the construction of schools, dispensaries, and water supply among others (Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001). Essentially, tourism revenue sharing (TRS) programs promote tourism development and ensure that local communities enjoy tangible benefits from the industry while participating in wildlife conservation (Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001).

In 2004, Nyungwe forest reserve was elevated to national park status. The local communities around living adjacent to Nyungwe constitute some of the most densely populated areas in Rwanda (RDB, 2002). Historically these communities have used Nyungwe as a source of wild meat, timber, mining (especially for, gold), honey and land for cultivation and non-timber forest products such as medical plants and materials for subsequent crafts. The upgrading of the forest reserve into national park in 2004 increased the restrictions on access to these natural resources leading to substantial loss of income to communities (Namara, 2005).

While the government of Rwanda views tourism revenue sharing programs as a significant approach to rural development industry in terms of poverty alleviation, health promotion and education enhancement among other things little is known about the effectiveness of the revenue sharing programs towards local communities, therefore this fact sets the basis for this study.

Statement of Problem

As mentioned earlier, tourism is one of the major sectors in many countries, including Rwanda, with the highest growth potential, it is the world's largest employer and one among the major sources of substantial foreign exchange earnings (Richards, 2003). It is through this observation that many people believe that the industry is well placed as one of the major means through which development of local communities can be achieved (Beeton, 2006). One approach to enhance this development through tourism is to share revenues with local communities and ensure that their potential role is tapped and maintained through active participation in the industry (Beeton, 2006). It is imperative to note that revenue sharing with these communities is central to the sustainable development of the industry not only because tourism has had a close connection with the local communities, particularly as hosts and guides but also because "the destinations of tourists are communities and it is in the community that tourism happens" (Scheyvens, 2002).

To avoid dissatisfaction and conflict with local communities, RDB remits 5 per cent of the park entry fees every year to fund various community projects. Every parish that is adjacent to the boundaries of a protected area such as Nyungwe has a secretary for the environment and natural resources who is designated as a representative on the board that manages tourism revenue. Therefore this study sought to assess the effectiveness of tourism revenue sharing programs towards Nyungwe National Park local communities' socio-economic development.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to assess the effectiveness of tourism revenue sharing programs towards the socio-economic development of Nyungwe National Park local communities.

Specific objectives of the Study

The specific objectives underlying this study were;

- i) To examine the social impact of tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of local communities.
- ii) To examine the economic impact of tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of local communities.
- iii) To analyse the challenges faced by local administration and beneficiaries in management of revenue sharing.

Research questions

The study was set to answer the following research questions;

- i) Is there any social impact accruing from tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of local communities?
- ii) Is there any economic impact accruing from tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of Nyungwe local communities?
- iii) What are the possible challenges that local administration and beneficiaries may be facing in management of revenue sharing?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used both qualitative and quantitative approach because it required both an in depth, intensive approach that seeks an understanding of socio-economic reality and also based on statistical descriptions. Literature was reviewed from scientific books, journal articles, and through project documents.

Target population

The target population considered was identified and divided into two categories in line with the confines of this study. Therefore a total of 2563 respondents, disaggregated into 2527 community members, 11 cell officials and 25 RDB employees constituted the total population for the purposes of this study.

Sampling size and procedure

Sample size

The population researched upon was quite small (2563 respondents); hence scientific sampling was implied to each member of the population since the number of population was attainable for sampling. To justify the point, the use of Sloven's Formula was utilized.

Sampling Procedure

The study adopted simple random sampling to get the sample for quantitative data and Purposive sampling was adopted in the case of getting the qualitative data.

Data Collection Instruments

Data was collected using different instruments. Hence the use of:-

Interviews

The interviews helped the researcher to take account of nonverbal communications for instance attitude and behavior of interviewees. The face-to-face interview guide contained a basic checklist for relevant topics covered.

Questionnaires distribution/ Collection

Questionnaire method was mainly employed in collecting data from selected RDB employees and Cell officials. The questionnaire was semi-structured and had open ended and closed questions. To ease the processing of data, options for answers were provided where applicable.

Data Management and Analysis

Qualitative analysis

Qualitative analysis refers to describing, summarizing and interpreting the data obtained for each study unit (or for each group of study units) (Struwig, 2001). Qualitative data was edited and analysed using themes derived from the objectives of the study.

Quantitative analysis

Quantitative analysis is usually a description of the data for each variable for all the study units included in the sample (Struwig, 2001). Data collected from the primary survey was compiled, sorted, edited, cleaned, tabulated and weighted and analysed using descriptive statistics (frequencies).

RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

The interpretation, discussion and assessment of the data were carried out in relation to the objectives of the study and in comparison with the cited literature review.

The social impact of tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of local communities**Improved the health facilities**

The health of community members is clearly and directly impacted by improved health facilities. Whether RDB revenue sharing program had improved the health facilities was asked.

Table 1: Improved the health facilities

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	26	27.1
Agree	51	53.1
Disagree	19	19.8
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

From table 5 above, the survey findings show the highest number of respondents 53.1 % agreed that RDB revenue sharing program had improved on the health facilities for the communities nearby Nyungwe national park. Only 19.8 % of the respondents disagreed to the statement. The respondents reported that, the revenue sharing program had facilitated the construction of 6 health centers which had increased the overall wellbeing of the villagers.

Promoted the education services

Education is a key component in any development endeavor as it is believed to be the surest way of raising literacy. Respondents were asked on whether RDB revenue sharing program supports education services in the communities.

Table 2: Promoted the education services

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	12	12.5
Agree	80	83.3
Disagree	4	4.2
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

Findings of the study show that RDB revenue sharing program had helped communities nearby Nyungwe NP to improve education services. This is evidenced by the higher response rate of 83.3 % and 12.5 % who either strongly agreed or agreed as shown in table 6 above. The findings indicated that the revenue sharing program had transformed the lives of children in the area by enabling easy access to education facilities.

Improved water accessibility

Lack of adequate, good-quality water is a significant obstacle to development. Information on whether RDB revenue sharing program had increased community access to water was sought.

Table 3: Improved water accessibility

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	72	75.0
Agree	21	21.9
Disagree	3	3.1
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

According to the results in table 3 above, the majority of respondents 75.0 % strongly agreed that the revenue sharing program had improved water accessibility in the community. The respondents reported that, revenue sharing program had ensured communities access to safe and adequate water supplies through simple technologies such as rain water collection and storage.

Transport infrastructure improved

Improving the road network in rural areas does a vital role in increasing movement of people and goods in a community. Whether RDB revenue sharing program had helped to improve on the transport infrastructure was asked.

Table 4: Transport infrastructure improved

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Agree	5	5.2
Disagree	34	35.4
Strongly disagree	57	59.4
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

Study findings as presented in table 4 above show that 59.4 % of the respondents strongly disagreed that the revenue sharing scheme had improved the transport infrastructure. However, some respondents 5.2 % agreed that, there was a road connecting Kanyinya (Karengera sector) to Rwabidege (Ruharambuga Sector) that was under repair by communities themselves and RDB supported with the construction of 5 bridges.

Improved the housing condition

Many of the rural people in Rwanda live in insecure houses. Whether the revenue sharing program had improved the housing condition in communities nearby Nyungwe national park was asked.

Table 5: Improved the housing condition

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	21	21.8
Agree	75	78.2
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

The study found that respondents were aware that revenue sharing had improved the housing condition, as survey results in the table 9 above shows, 78.2 % agreed and 21.8 % strongly agreed on this statement. The respondents noted that, The Revenue Sharing program had supported local administration to eradicate herb roofed houses (Nyakatsi).

The economic impact of tourism revenue sharing program towards the development of local communities**Improved the agriculture activities**

Agriculture is the main source of income to the majority of Rwandans who reside in rural communities such as those nearby Nyungwe national parks. Whether the RDB revenue sharing scheme had improved the agricultural activities in the communities was inquired.

Table 6: Improved the agriculture activities

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	17	17.7
Agree	79	82.3
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

In table 6 above, the highest number of respondents 82.3 % agreed and 17.7 % strongly agreed to the statement that RDB revenue sharing program had improved the agricultural activities. The respondents reported that, several agricultural projects spread in 5 districts had been supported directly through the revenue sharing scheme.

Increased local employment opportunities

One of the indicators of economic development of any community is high employment rate. The respondents were asked to reveal whether the revenue sharing scheme had increased local employment opportunities.

Table 7: Increased local employment opportunities

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	27	28.1
Agree	66	68.8
Disagree	3	3.1
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

From table 7, the results indicate that the majority of respondents 68.8 % agreed while only 3.1 % of the respondents disagreed. The respondents reported that, the revenue sharing program had provided direct self-employment through agricultural and nonagricultural projects such as, Community tourism.

Promoted local enterprises

Small enterprises all over the world are emerging today as an avenue for gainful employment, a means of helping people to assert themselves in the world of work, and a way of improving both their economic and social status. Thus, respondents were asked whether revenue sharing had promoted local enterprise.

Table 8: Promoted local enterprises

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	82	85.4
Agree	14	14.6
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

To the inquiry whether revenue sharing program had promoted local enterprises, the majority of respondents 85.4 % strongly agreed and none of the respondents disagrees. The respondents reported that the revenue sharing program had assisted people in groups to start and grow enterprises which can sustain them and the economy.

Sustainable use of natural resources

Over the last two decades tourism has been fronted as a rationale or instrument for maintaining protected areas and thus respondents were asked about sharing revenue with communities had secured their allegiance to conservation.

Table 9: Sustainable use of natural resources

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	64	66.7
Agree	32	33.3
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

From table 9 above, the majority of respondents 66.7 % strongly agreed that the revenue sharing program had promoted sustainable use of natural resources in Nyungwe national park. The respondents reported that, the revenue sharing program had increasingly fostered 'hybrid environmental governance' in which the responsibility of and the right to manage Nyungwe biodiversity assets is shared between the government, NGOs and the surrounding communities.

Improved market infrastructures

Market infrastructures above all play a crucial role, particularly for the poorer sections of the community. Markets are low entry cost vehicles for business growth and the encouragement of start-ups and the potential for developing local enterprises. Thus respondents were asked whether revenue sharing had improved market infrastructure.

Table 10: Improved market infrastructures

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Agree	0	0.0
Disagree	24	35.8
Strongly disagree	43	64.2
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

The findings show that 64.2 % strongly disagreed and none of the respondent agreed with the statement that revenue sharing had improved market infrastructures. The respondents reported that, the revenue sharing had not yet managed to secure funds to construct modern market in any of the communities around Nyungwe national park.

The challenges faced by local administration and beneficiaries in management of revenue sharing

Inadequate funding

Having inadequate funding negatively affects a community's ability to effectively influence and manage development initiatives. The respondents were asked about whether inadequate funding was a challenge in management of revenue sharing program.

Table 11: Inadequate funding

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	57	59.4
Agree	39	40.6
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

From table 11 above, the highest number of respondents 59.4 % strongly agreed to the statement that local administration and beneficiaries of revenue sharing were faced with the problem of inadequate funding and none of the respondents disagreed. During this study, Local people, park level authorities, and national level RDB staff members, all expressed concern that funds for revenue-sharing were inadequate.

Corruption

There are potential problems with corruption at both the local and national levels in Rwanda. Whether local administration and beneficiaries were faced with lack of transparency and accountability in management of revenue sharing was asked.

Table 12: Corruption

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	0	0.0
Agree	16	16.7
Disagree	59	61.5
Strongly disagree	21	21.9
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

According to the survey results in table 12 above, the biggest number of respondents 61.5 % disagreed that there were problems of corruption in management of tourism sharing. However, 16.7 % of respondents noted cases of corruption in revenue sharing. The respondents reported that, the communities had not encountered any incidence of misappropriation or embezzlement of revenue sharing funds.

Inadequate skilled human resource

The study sought information about whether local administration and beneficiaries suffers from lack of management experience due to the nature of its members being not highly qualified as noted from the profile of respondents.

Table 13: Inadequate skilled human resource

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	83	86.5
Agree	13	13.5
Disagree	0	0.0
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

Information in table 13 above shows 86.5 % of the respondents strongly agreed that there was inadequate skilled human resource to manage revenue sharing. The respondents reported that, there was inadequate skilled manpower in target communities, as many beneficiaries do not have professional skills to design, plan and write good project proposals.

Poor communication

The more people who are involved deeply in any initiative do not get information, the more likely it does not get community support and, therefore, the more likely it is not successful. Thus the respondents were asked to give an account on whether local administration and beneficiaries were faced with poor communication in the management of revenue sharing.

Table 14: Poor communication

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	60	62.5
Agree	32	33.3
Disagree	4	4.2
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

In table 14 above, the majority of respondents 62.5 % strongly agreed to the statement that there was poor communication in management of revenue sharing. The respondents reported a lack of face-to-face contact, both with high ranking authorities (RDB) and their own representatives at the local council committee that controls revenue sharing.

Elite capture

Today, many projects have failed to benefit the target communities because leaders who are in charge of distribution or management of these projects use them for their own political benefits. Therefore, respondents were asked about whether there were problems of elite capture in the management of revenue sharing.

Table 15: Elite capture

Comment	Frequency	%age (%)
Strongly Agree	33	32.7
Agree	55	54.5
Disagree	13	12.9
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Total	96	100.0

Source: (Fieldwork, April, 2015)

According to the findings in table 15 above, the highest number of respondents 54.5 % agreed to the statement that the revenue sharing program was faced with the problem of elite capture. The respondents reported that the ordinary people were too frequently left out and that the local representatives tend to give the revenue shares to their immediate villages and people who had voted them.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

From the results of the study, the findings suggest that the revenue sharing program had improved on the quality of life of people living nearby Nyungwe national park. In particular, there was improvement on the income levels of residents as a result of various projects established and supported through revenue share. Therefore, if properly managed the revenue sharing program is capable of scaling social-economic in communities around national parks.

Recommendations

The researcher would like to put forward the following recommendations in view of the study;

- Rwanda Development Board should ensure that there is a well-planned body to do the monitoring and evaluation of the revenue sharing program so as to handle the different corruption malpractices that have infested the program.
- RDB should find a way to increase on amount of funds disbursed: revenue sharing fund allocation ceilings should be significantly increased. In most instances, the amount of funds allocated to communities fall far below the actual financial needs of the project.
- RDB should try to improve on project monitoring. Closely related to the need for improved staffing at the field level is the urgency to design an effective project monitoring and evaluation program. This will increase the likelihood that beneficiaries will receive timely interventions to enable their projects continue on a growth and innovation path.
- Priority in terms of funding and support should be given to construction of modern market infrastructures. Given adequate resources, there is huge potential for thousands of families to generate viable income from trading. Round table talks involving RDB and communities should be set up to come up with a plan to construct a modern market.
- RDB should organize training camps and seminars for selected community representatives on various topics such as, how to design and write good project proposals.

- The study recommends RDB to increase access or sharing of information with beneficiaries (community). Various methods of information sharing such as public hearings, public meetings, general public information meetings, informal small group meetings, public displays, field trips, site visits, letter requests for comments, material for mass media, and response to public inquiries should be adopted.

REFERENCES

- Amin, A. A., (2000): *Equity, microeconomic and efficiency effects of revenue policy in Africa*. Paper presented at the Fourth AERC Senior Policy Seminar. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Archabald, K., & Naughton-Treves, L. (2001): Tourism revenue-sharing around national parks in Rwanda: early efforts to identify and reward local communities, *Environmental Conservation*, 28 (2) 135-149.
- Bailey, K. D., (4th Edition) (1994): *Methods of Social Research*: The Free Press, A Division of MacMillan, Inc., New York.
- Beeton, S., (2006): *Community development through tourism*: Land link Press, Australia.
- Bin, T, & Nel, E., (2002): Tourism as a local development strategy in South Africa: *The geographical journal*, 168(3)235-247.
- Blair, R., & Reed, B., (1995): *Applying Strategic Planning to Rural Development: Rural Development Strategies*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Booth, J. & Briggs, P, (2nd Ed) (2004): *Rwanda: The Bradt Travel Guide*: Chalfont St Peter, UK.
- Brohman, J., (2006): New directions in tourism for Third World development: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, (1), p. 48-70.
- Cano, H., (4th Ed). (2000): *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Christie, I. and Crompton, E., (2012): Tourism in Africa, *Africa Region Working Paper Series*, No. 12 World Bank Group.
- Corlien, V., & Ann, B., (1991): *Multiple Case Narrative: A qualitative approach to studying multiple populations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Daft, R. L. (2006): *The New Era of Management*. Mason, Ohio: Thomson South-Western.
- De Vos, & Strydom, H., (2005): *Research at grass roots for the social sciences and human services professions*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Dieke, P., (2000): *The political economy of tourism development in Africa*: Cognizant Communications Corporation: New York.
- Finlay, H., Fitzpatrick, M. and Ray, N. (2000): *Lonely Planet*. Footscry: Lonely Planet Publications Pty Ltd.
- Global education center, (2005): Tourism fact sheet: Chicago, Globaled.
- Goodwin, H (2006): Pro-poor tourism; opportunities for sustainable local development: *tourism management* 28(3)736-740.
- Green, G., & Haines, A. (2002): *Asset Building and Community Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Grinell, E., & William, P., (1990): *Key issues in Research Design*. New York: Routledge.

- Hamm, G. F., (2010): *Community Visioning Programs: Processes and Outcomes*: University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI
- Hall, M (2007): *Tourism planning, policies, processes, and relationships*. Essex: Prentice Hall.
- Heidarabadi, S.M. (2008): *Strategies for planning domestic and international tourism development of Qom Province with emphasis on religious Tourism*: Unpublished Master Thesis. Lulea, Sweden: Lulea University of Technology.
- Honeck, D. (2008): *LDC poverty alleviation and the Doha development agenda: is tourism being neglected?* World Trade Organization, Manuscript.
- Hulme, D., &Murphree, M. W., (2002): *African Wildlife and African Livelihoods: The Promise and Performance of Community Conservation*. Oxford: James Curry.
- Kayihura, J., (2005): Tourism, Economic Development and the Global-Local Nexus: Theory Embracing Complexity, *Tourism Geographies*, 3(4), 369-393.
- Kirsten, M., &Rogerson, C. M. (2002): Tourism, business linkages and small enterprise development in South Africa: *Development Southern Africa*, 19, (1), p.29-39.
- Lee, C. C., & Chang, P., (2008): Tourism development and economic growth: A closer look at panels: *Tourism management* 29(1)180-192.
- Li, W. (2005): Community decision-making: participation in development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (1) 132-143.
- Liu, J. C., &Var, T., (2004): Resident attitudes towards tourism's impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of tourism research*, 13(2), 193-214.
- Lucas, R. (2008): "On the mechanics of economic development," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 12(50) 214-221
- Ma, A, Si, L., & Zhang, H., (2009): The evolution of culture tourism: *Tourism in china: Destination, culture and communities: New York, Routledges*.
- Makame, M. K., &Boon, E. K., (2008): Sustainable tourism and benefit-sharing in Zanzibar: the case of Kiwengwa-Pongwe Forest Reserve, *Journal of Human Ecology*, 24 (2) 93-109.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2003): *Tourism and sustainability: Development and new tourism in the Third World*. 2nd ed. Routledge: New York.
- Mwandosya, M. J. (2007): *Tourism, human welfare and climate concerns*: The case of East Africa: Presented to the international conference on secure and sustainable living: social and economic benefit of weather, climate change and water services: Madrid, Spain.
- Namara, A., (2005): From paternalism to real partnership with local communities? *Africa development* 31(2):39-68.
- Naughton- Treves, L., (1999): Whose animals? A history of property right to wildlife in Akagera: *Land degradation and development*, 10(4):311-328.
- New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), (2004): *Infrastructure Short Term Action Plan (STAP)*: Johannesburg, South Africa.
- NISR, (2013): Census 2012 in belief. *Report No. 03-02-03 (2012)*: Kigali Rwanda.
- Nowak, J.J. Sahli, M. &Sgro, P.M. (2003): Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare: *Pacific Economic Review*. (8)3: 245-258.
- ORTPN, (2005): Rwanda Tourism Roadmap, document for Rwanda National Innovation and Competitiveness (RNIC) Project for Government of Rwanda, OTF Group.
- Rao, N. and Suresh, K.T. (2001): Domestic tourism in India. In K. Ghimire (Eds.) *The Native Tourist: Mass Tourism within Developing Countries* (pp.198-228), London: Earthscan.

- Richards, G., (2003): Tourism and labour mobility in the European Union: *Tourism Recreational Research*, 28 (1) 77-86.
- Rutagarama, E., & Martin, A., (2003): The development dimension of tourism foreign direct investment in Rwanda: *A report for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development* (UNCTAD), Geneva.
- Roe, D., (2004): Poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation: *Rebuilding the bridges; Oryx* 38(2) 137-139.
- Rwanda Development Board, (RDB) (2012): *From exclusion to participation: Turning Rwanda's tourism policy around?* Kigali, Rwanda, RDB.
- Rwanda Development Board, (RDB) (2012): *Tourism expected to blossom next year-tourism annual report*: RDB: Kigali Rwanda.
- Ryan, C., & Gu, H., (2009): *The growth and context of tourism in china*: New York, Routledges.
- Sandbrook, C. G., (2006): *Tourism, conservation and livelihood: The impact of gorilla tracking at Bwindi impenetrable national park, Uganda*. Ph. D. Thesis, University College London: London UK.
- Scheyvens, R., (2002): *Tourism for development: Empowering communities*: Prentice Hall, England.
- Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D., (2002): *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues*. Channel View Publications: North York.
- Simpson, M. C., (2008): Community benefit tourism initiatives: A conceptual oxymoron? *Tourism management*; 29(1)1-18.
- Spenceley, A. (2008): Responsible tourism in Southern Africa. In A. Spenceley (ed) *Responsible tourism: critical issues for conservation and development*, Earthscan UK & USA.
- Songorwa, A. N. (1999): Community-based wildlife management (CWM) in Tanzania: communities interested? *World Development*, 27 (12) 2061-2079.
- Struwig, F.W., (2001): *Planning, designing and reporting research*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman (Pty) Ltd.
- Timothy, D. J. (1999): Participatory planning: a view of tourism in Indonesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (2) 371-391.
- Tosun, C. (2000): Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries: *Tourism Management*, vol. 21, 613-633.
- Tourism Master Plan (2009): *Strategy and actions*: Ministry of Commerce: Kigali, Rwanda.
- UNCTAD (2013): *FDI in tourism: The development dimension*: UNCTAD current studies on FDI and development No.4, New York and Geneva, United Nations.
- United Nations Development Programme (2012): *Human Development Report*: Oxford University Press: New York.
- United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2013): *World Tourism Barometer 2013*: Madrid, Spain, UNWTO.
- United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2012): *Roadmap for recovery: Tourism and Travel a primary vehicle for job creation and economic recovery*: Madrid, Spain, UNWTO.
- United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2011): UNWTO World Tourism Barometer: *Vol. 6, nr. 3 Madrid: UNWTO*.

- United Nations World Tourism Organization (2006b): *Tourism and least developed countries: A sustainable opportunity to reduce poverty*: Madrid, Spain.
- United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) (2005): *Tourism highlights (2005)*:Madrid, Spain.
- Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006): *Tourism: Changes, impacts and opportunities*. Pearson Education Limited: England.
- Wilkerson, M. L. (2006): Information for developers: developing a rural tourism plan, *Economic Development Review*, 14 (2) 79.
- World Bank (2008): *Benefit sharing in protected area management: The case of Volcano National Park, Rwanda*: Washington, World Bank.
- World Travel and Tourism Council, (2005): Sowing the Seeds of Growth: *The 2005 Travel and Tourism Economic Research*, Tourism Satellite Accounting Research.
- World Bank, (2001): *World development report 2000: Attacking poverty*. New York: Oxford University.