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Over the past few decades, tourism has developed into a global economic force that few countries or communities remain untouched by its activities. Local communities in the developing world that were once viewed as tourism commodities, have today recognised the potential economic gains that can be realised from tourism. Many communities are now actively engaged in tourism enterprises either as individuals or as groups to tap into that potential. This study took a partial knowledge-based approach to tourism in exploring how members of a remote rural community in Bigodi Parish, in western Uganda overcame the problems of ‘exclusion’ to engage in social enterprises within the context of Community Based tourism and associated developments. In the early 1990s the Ugandan government introduced new conservation reforms that led to 6 forest reserves converted to national parks, but at a significant social cost and conflict as many people living near the new Forest National Parks were displaced. Bigodi is one of the village adjacent to Kibale National Park where in 1992, more than 30,000 residents were evicted from their homes to make way for the national park.

The research highlights some of the strategies the residents that stayed in the area adopted to be able sustain their livelihood through community-based tourism Projects under the umbrella of Kibale Association for Rural and Environmental Development (KAFRED) a community organisation managed by the local people. The primary data analysed in this study was collected from different stakeholders in Bigodi using an ethnographic approach. The results indicate that when the right tools are provided to the local people, they are empowered and are able manage their own development. Community Based tourism in Bigodi was initiated and managed by the local people who are sensitive to the cultures of the community they live within. As such there are currently more positive changes emerging from tourism than negative ones. Tourism has not only changed the community; it has begun to lift
Bigodi from obscurity to new levels as a global example of a locally owned tourism business for the local people. Nevertheless, the creation of Kibale National Park, and community based tourism within it, led to lasting negative social impacts that affected many families in the area.
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Introduction
The post-world war era has witnessed an enormous and limitless spread of tourism that prompted most of the analyses of the concept to refer it to globalisation (Scheyvens 2002; Mowforth and Munt 2008). In most of the developing countries tourism is now seen as a viable tool for economic development and social change. Moufakkir and Burns (2012) confirms this view, arguing that tourism is an agent of change, a global phenomenon which plays a significant role in the socio-cultural evolution. This evolution is sometimes seen as asymmetrical in terms of power relations where the affluent countries of the west are the generators of tourism and the less affluent countries are at the receiving end (Britton 1982). However, what is to note here is that many people including those in rural areas see tourism as an economic and socio-cultural process for all those who participates in its activities.

A key aspect to be considered here is how the processes of tourism’s global expansions have played themselves within the developing world at the national, regional and local levels (Scott, 2011). Generally, governments in the developing countries have employed a top down type of tourism planning model where all decisions of developing and promoting tourism are carried out by the central government leaving the local community destinations with little or no input is the activities that affect their livelihoods. This has led to some commentators (see Richards and Hall, 2003) arguing that the forces of modernisation have turned the local communities into products sold to tourists and consumed as commodities. And
these communities are expected to conform to the tourists’ expectations of backward
neighbourhood, which has not been tainted by modernisation and expected to
impinge on its rustic rural tranquility.

However, according to Sharpley (1999) tourism is a socio-cultural event for both
travellers and people living in destinations. It is an event that, in the context of both
domestic and international tourism brings together people and material objects,
dreams, imaginings and expectations from different regions, countries and cultures
in various forms of socio-cultural interactions but in ways that differ for both tourists
and diverse local populations (Robinson and Smith, 2006; Robinson and Picard,
2006). The resulting tourism - local relationships may impact on both local
destination neighbourhoods and visitors in a wide variety of ways depending on the
location, type of tourism developed, degree of similarities and differences between
tourists and local people, length of time and place of interactions, amongst many
argued that communities today can no longer be seen as commodities packaged
and sold to the tourist, as many local communities have realised the potential
economic gains that can be made from tourism. Many communities are now actively
engaged in tourism enterprises either as individuals or as groups to tap into that
potential (Salazar, 2012).

Scholars have raised various perspectives on the role of the community in tourism
development. For instance, Mowforth and Munt (2008) argued that community in the
tourism context could be considered as simply the space where activities occur. And
for others a community may be the stumbling block that stands in the way of
potential tourism development (Sharpley and Tefler, 2008).
This paper takes a different view, it explores a rural community in Bigodi Parish, in western Uganda that did not hinder tourism but instead had to overcome the problems of ‘exclusion’ to take an active role and engage in social enterprises within the context of Community Based tourism and associated developments. Sharpley and Tefler (2008) noted that local communities are now engaged in social enterprises through tourism and this raises more question of who actually controls the tourism and who benefits from these tourism activities. This study was also interested identifying who is in control of tourism activities in the community as well as finding out who benefits

Social Entrepreneurship

One of the biggest challenges of the 21st century global economy is the alleviation of poverty, and eventually the ultimate elimination of this social evil. Factors such as lack of access to economic opportunities, unemployment and the failure to meet the basic needs may lead to frustration and inducing undesirable and destructive behaviour at both the individual and community level. The emergence of alternative development theory recognises the role of social entrepreneurship and microbusinesses at the community level in helping to fight poverty by creating the badly needed jobs as well as increasing incomes. In order to fight poverty in the rural communities, tourism has been promoted as an economic activity that has the ability to combine traditional business concepts with social venturing (IFAD, 2010).

It is generally accepted by entrepreneurship scholars that there is no definitive research agenda for social entrepreneurship, as such there is no conclusive agreement on the meaning of the concept (Perrini, 2006; Nicholls, 2009). In the UK, the Department of Industry and trade (DTI, 2001) defines a social enterprise as an
organisation acting independently to achieve social and economic goals; that is an organisation that aims at achieving financial sustainability as well as serving a social purpose. Though definitions will defer from one country to another, this study adopts the DTI definition. Social entrepreneurship is viewed by many as a western concept, however, what is ignored is that social enterprises existed in many developing economies as cooperatives formed to meet a social need. For instance in rural Uganda, family based cultural development, customs and many other practices have for a very long time depended on the strong ethos of working together as a community cooperative rather than on the spirit of competition.

Steyart and Katz (2004) argued that entrepreneurship is a socially situated concept that arises in places and involves innovative methods of recombining resources but extends beyond economic realm. This means that whereas, entrepreneurship is embedded in the traditional realm of economics that is often profit oriented, there is now a growing body of scholarship that regard entrepreneurship as social process (Hindle, 2010), and others view entrepreneurship as a collaborative social endeavour (Downing, 2005). Within tourism, entrepreneurship could be seen from the perspective of embeddedness; that is how the community as well as context may constrain entrepreneurship, though on the other hand they can be instrumental in creating opportunities that could be aligned to the needs as well as the capabilities of the community (Peredo and Chrisman, 2006). In this case change is not driven solely by economic motives and the irrationality of individuals, but also by the social values and norm of the community thus creating an interdependence of both the social and economic spheres. This perspective is emphasised by Fligstein (2001) who argues that social actors are important entrepreneurship, though the actual
performance of the enterprise will depend on the forward thinking and skilled performances of key dominant actors within the community.

McKeever et al (2014) argued that entrepreneurship becomes more meaningful if the people in charge are committed to their community. This way, the resulting developments will address the needs as well as the capabilities of the community, particularly in deprived societies where the majority of the residents are defined in terms of their social and economic status. Therefore, it could be argued that entrepreneurship in these impoverished communities provides an important route for the residents to improve their socio-economic vitality (Korsching and allen, 2004). This view fits well with most of community based tourism enterprise as most them aim at infusing financial sustainability with well-being of the local residents by aligning the needs and capabilities of the community.

**Community Based Tourism**

In the past three decades community based tourism has emerged as alternative approach tourism development in many parts of the developing world (Cobbinah et al, 2013). Hall (1997) noted that the emergence of communities as social forces has given hitherto invisible groups a voice to speak for themselves. From Hall’s perspectives the emergence of these new communities and the voices of the hitherto excluded from the mainstream development can be regarded as a democratic trend against the hegemonic central governments. As such community approaches (bottom up) to tourism development have been accepted by many governments because they realise the importance of the community in the development of successful sustainable tourism products (Theerapappisit, 2012).
Community based Tourism (CBT) is defined by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) as “a form of tourism in which a significant number of local people has substantial control over, and involvement in the community’s tourism development and management. The major proportion of the benefits remains within the local economy” (WWF, 2001:1). It is argued that even those community members who are not indirectly involved in tourism enterprises, should gain some form of benefit as well (Sproule 1996, Roe et al, 2004). The rationale for engaging in community based tourism business is built on the notion that benefits from Community-based community based tourism will result in conservation of the natural resources in question whilst also leading to increased benefits for local communities who may have forgone more environmentally damaging development activities (Wunder 2000; Naidoo & Adamowicz, 2005; Pegas and Stronza, 2010), by linking conservation and livelihoods (Scheyvens 1999, Salafsky & Wollenberg, 2000; Lew, 2014; Mann, 2014, Nthiga et al 2015). It is argued that tourism at the community level, may lead to reduction in poverty (Goodwin 1998; Scheyvens 2002; Hall, 2007; Koens and Thomas, 2015), empowerment of the local people (Scheyvens 1999, Park and Kim, 2014) and rural development through the creation of employment and a share in the benefits accrued from tourism activities in the area.

In contrast critics argue that often community-based community based tourism is not the universal cure for the future of rural development in impoverished communities in developing countries (Zeppel, 2006, Goodwin, 2009). Developments within community based tourism have only rarely benefited the local people, even though one of the main goals of CBT clearly cites this as a key factor (Horwich & Lyon, 1999). The income generated from community based tourism activities is very small when divided amongst households and it is doubtful this income has much impact on
poverty reduction or improved natural resource management (Bond 2001; Turner 2004a; Kiss, 2004; Zoomers, 2014). Others like Akama (1996), Belsky (1999), Campbell (1999), Duffy (2002), Turner (2004b) and Kiss (2004) argue that the most cash benefits from community-based tourism are often captured by government agencies, foreign tourism companies, urban enterprises and a relatively small proportion of the community elite leaving the majority of the rural poor toiling with the costs of tourism and enjoying minimum benefits. It is often argued that the ability of the local community to control the development is sometimes severely weakened by the power of the tourism industry (Swarbrooke 1999; Hana and Dana, 2014). Competition around the resources within the local community, within different local communities and between local communities and external tourist groups, organisations and national governments have been verified and conflicts tend to intensify as pressures put on tourism resources grows (Wearing & Neil, 2009).

Kiss (2004) observes that tourism is not the best choice as an entry level business for rural communities that lack previous business and management experience, because tourism is competitive, very demanding and sometimes takes many years to produce tangible benefits. Furthermore, governments sometimes impose tourism development strategies upon the community, which are not compatible with livelihoods and interests of the local community. Manyara and Jones (2007) went further by arguing that development of CBT is an extension of neo-colonialism because many of the CBT projects have developed a tendency of dependency on donor funding from the western countries. While we agree that some local communities have started CBT enterprises that failed, some community tourism enterprises have persisted and with the right combination of circumstances and luck
have succeeded where others failed (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014; Mearns and Lukhele, 2015).

Study area and Methodology

The focal location of the research on which this paper is based is Bigodi, one of the parishes adjacent to Kibale National Park (KNP) in western Uganda. Kibale National Park is one of the most popular destinations for primate tourism in eastern Africa. Kibale, gazetted as a National Park in 1993 is bordered by 27 parishes scattered in four districts including Kabarole, Kyenjojo, Kamwenge and Kasese in the former Toro Kingdom. Agriculture is the main source of livelihood in Bigodi, outside of National Park boundaries. Agriculturalists in the area belong to two dominant ethnic groups: the indigenous Batooro (Naughton-Treves, 1998) and the Bakiga, who came to the Kibale region from south western Uganda, from the 1950s and 1960s onwards. High population densities and land shortage in their home area in Kigezi led some of the Bakiga to migrate in search of free land (Archabald and Naughton-Treves, 2001 ;).
Each group has its own cultivation and land use traditions and techniques, though the boundaries between the two groups are becoming increasingly indistinct. The inception of Kibale National Park in western Uganda together with intermarriages between the two groups has affected and been affected by the landscapes and livelihoods of neighbouring communities. In addition to agriculture some members of this diverse community also undertake other non-farm activities such as petty trade, handicraft making, teaching, guides and charcoal burning.

Smith (2001) argued that the use of qualitative methods in collecting data provides a voice to the ordinary people, particularly those in deprived communities to air their views and perspectives which becomes the basis for knowledge production. Indeed one of the main basis for a qualitative research is to bring the often neglected experiences and knowledge of the non-dominant groups to the academic research agenda. Qualitative approach also allows the researcher to keep on collecting these experiences over a long period of time because it recognises that as human being, people are different and have unique experiences which are enriched or change over time. For this study, the primary data analysed these unique experiences of different stakeholders in Bigodi using ethnographic research methods. Regarding entering the field, there are several activities that must be addressed. These include choosing a site, gaining permission, selecting key informants, and familiarising oneself with the setting or culture (Bernard 2006). In this process, one must choose a site that will facilitate easy access to the data. The objective is to collect data that will help answer the research questions. Fieldwork for this study started in June 2004 when I arrived in Uganda on an exploratory survey searching for the most suitable space for research. Bigodi parish on the borders of Kibale National Park provided the most
practical solution; however, I did not enter Bigodi until the last week of August of the same year.

Patton (2015) noted that researchers particularly those conducting in-depth studies often spend a great deal of time negotiating their access to the research field. Whilst Stake (1994:242) stresses the importance of researcher needing to spend long periods time in study sites 'personally in contact with activities and operations of the case reflecting and revising meaning of what is going on'. I found it a crucially important factor in this study to spend some time in Bigodi negotiating and gaining access to the local people, utilising diplomacy and sensitivity before starting to collect data. I spent three weeks in Bigodi getting to know the local people before actually starting to collect data. This phase involved meeting and introducing myself to individual village council chairpersons, the local gatekeepers.

In ethnographic studies the researcher usually takes the role of the observer and inquirer, but at the same time becoming part of the phenomenon being studied. That is the researcher to be able to understand the meaning and experiences of the research participants he has to be involved with the lives of the people being studied. Data on individual and household characteristics, livelihoods, local people’s participation and perceptions of community based tourism enterprise was collected through in-depth group and village discussions, individual interviews, key informants, and participatory observation over a period of 12 months. The data collection process started in 2005 and culminated into the production of PhD thesis. However, the interest in the case study continued and that data has been updated periodically, the last time being December 2014, and most of the new data has been included in this study.
As a means to interpret the data, I used Miles and Huberman’s (1994) data analysis approach. In this approach, analysis consisted of three concurrent flows of activity, which started with data reduction, followed by data display and the drawing up of conclusions or verification. These streams of activity, as Miles and Huberman (1994) point out, form an interactive model in which the activities are ‘interwoven before, during and after data collection in parallel form, to make up the general domain called analysis’ (p. 12).

Data reduction - which was a continuous process from the beginning of the research right up to the writing up phase of the report – included the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data in written-up field notes or memos (Maxwell, 2004). According to Miles and Huberman (1994), codes are efficient data-labelling and data-retrieval devices that empower and speed up analysis. I started by creating a list of categories for each of the data sources that were used in the study. Categorisation helped me to tie the research questions directly to the data. In this selective process of handling all this information from interviews, documents and field journals, which came in the form of words, some words and phrases had to be ‘hung on to throughout data analysis’ (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p. 56) because they rendered more meaning to given situations and contexts.

The next stage was identification of the themes emerging from the raw data, a process sometimes referred to as ‘coding’ (Strauss and Corbin, 2008). In inductive approaches to analysis, data are generally coded at two levels ‘open’ and ‘axial’ (Bryman and Burgess, 1994; Neuman, 1997; Strauss and Corbin, 2008). The open coding stage of data analysis helped me to unpack the data through a process of breaking the data down into discreet parts or categories. The goal was to create
descriptive, multi-dimensional categories, which formed a preliminary framework for analysis. The categories then became building blocks for developing theory (Strauss and Corbin, 2008). Data analysis was largely done manually, and with partial aid from a word processor. I used notebooks and file folders to systematically store the coded field data for easy retrieval during analysis.

Community Based Tourism in Bigodi

As of 1991, Bigodi was, like many other remote rural areas of Uganda, fairly unknown to the wider region and world, and its main activities were to a great extent (but by no means only) limited within the parish and the surrounding communities. However, three key events took place between 1991 and 1993 that changed the contemporary spaces of Bigodi and made deep impacts on the livelihoods local residents. Firstly, was the forced eviction of people from their in the process of converting the area into a national park, which traumatised this community. Secondly, the creation of Kibale National Park which (as has often been the case with African National Park designation) severely limited people’s access to the resources in both the Kibale forest and Kibale game corridor. Lastly, came the introduction of tourism in Kibale National Park. Whereas all three events affected local people in different ways, the introduction of tourism in the park at Kanyanchu a few kilometres away from Bigodi marked a new beginning for the local people in the area. The coming of volunteers from Britain (The Frontiers) and America (the US Peace Corps) to assist in establishing tourism facilities at Kanyanchu opened Bigodi to foreign visitors who in their bid to win over the support of local people interacted with them freely and introduced the community to the benefits they could derive from tourism. Martin and Osberg (2009) argued that it usually take an individual to have a vision and insight to see the opportunities that no one else had seen. In Bigodi, that
vision was realised by Mark Noonan, one of the US Peace Corp Volunteer who was assigned the task of extending the benefits of the park to the community of Bigodi realised the tourism potential of Magombe Swamp. He recognised the swamp as an attraction that could bring tourists out of the park and into the community of Bigodi. But as Martin and Osberg (2009) noted that social entrepreneurship’s focus is not only the power of the brilliant individual, instead it is about the power of the collective and strategic partnerships. Mark Noonan did not work alone instead he mobilised the local people into social entrepreneurship groups based on tourism related activities and taught them to manage their own natural resources through income generating activities.

The initiation of a social enterprise also requires institutions to turn the transformative ideas to translate into real change. In Bigodi, Kibale Association for Rural and Environmental Development (KAFRED) emerged as the lead Community Based enterprise to bring about changes in the area. KAFRED runs and manages the community based tourism resource and controls the CBT initiative. KAFRED was established in 1992 through the efforts the US Peace Corp who mobilised a few individuals in the community and sold them the idea of taking advantage of the tourism activity initiated in the neighbouring national park, by starting a community tourism enterprise in the nearby swamp. The association is a self-run Community organisation managing a wetland through a tourism based enterprise in Western Uganda. KAFRED differ in many ways from other Community-based enterprises established in Uganda and are engaged in tourism, regarding operation area, formation, generation of benefits and linkages to the tourism market. The operation area for the tourism activities (the Bigodi Bird Sanctuary) is not located within a protected area dedicated for conservation or tourism purposes, but is within a
multipurpose area used for crop cultivation, livestock rearing and residential functions as well.

Instead of competing with the Kibale National Park, Bigodi’s swamp walk compliments and extends the tourism experience of the park visitors. For instance the forest canopy in the National Park does not provide good opportunities for birders; however, the swamp on the edge of the park provides birders with an opportunity of watching both forest and water birds. Therefore, whereas the park provides a good experience for tracking primates, particularly the chimpanzees, and the swamp is a haven for birders and for those who seek to see something of the lives of local peoples.

It has been argued that a major source of the common benefits and costs of tourism development is economic impacts Ashley et al 2007. Local communities are greatly influenced by their economies (see Murphy, 1985; Nitsch and Straaten, 1995; Ashley et al, 2007). Tourists to Bigodi have grown from the 500 visitors received in 1994 to over 4000 visitors in 2010, but tourism remain small-scale and perhaps necessarily so, since it is based on viewing wildlife on a fragile environment. The swamp walk remains the main source of revenue for KAFRED. According to KAFRED financial books revenue collected from the swamp walk has multiplied from £1360 in 1995 to £50000 per annum by 2011. KAFRED which initially depended on donors to supplement their income, has now graduated into a self-sufficient social entrepreneurship. For instance in 2011, 90% of the funding for the association’s activities came from the revenue collected from the guided swamp walk. The biggest part of this money is injected into the local economy as wages to KAFRED employees, supplement teacher salaries at Bigodi Secondary School and purchase supplies from farmers.
Goodwin et al (2014) argued that community based tourism should provide collective benefits as well as creating opportunities for individuals to gain employment as well as enabling those who are able to start microbusinesses. Despite substantial reforms in the education sector in Uganda that led to the introduction of universal primary and secondary education policy, rural education still lags behind urban regions in Uganda. Rural Uganda lacks resources such as school structures and teachers therefore making the new reforms more rhetoric than reality. In Bigodi the introduction of tourism served to help fill the gap in secondary education in the area.

In 1994, KAFRED’s first task, using the initial revenues from the swamp walk, was to establish a secondary school in the area. Before 1994, it was nearly impossible for poorer families in Bigodi to educate their children beyond primary level. Though Bigodi had primary schools, all located within easy reach for children, the nearest secondary school was nine miles away. Children had to walk or ride bicycles to access secondary education in distant villages. Alternatively, when children finished primary level, they had two options, stay in the community, help on the family farm, and thus quit school, or move to Kamwenge or Fort Portal (26 and 40 kilometres away from Bigodi) and continue studying. Parents used to prefer the second option for boys, while girls were made to quit school and most probably get married. The introduction of a secondary school in the area helped ease the problem particularly for girls and there are now fewer excuses to keep girls at home after primary education.

The school has remained the most significant community project that KAFRED has developed since 1994. Until recently KAFRED was responsible for all the financial obligations of running the school including paying teachers’ wages and subsidising school fees, however, the school has now been recognised by the Ugandan
government and is now included in the Universal secondary project, though the responsibility of managing it still lies with KAFRED.

**Women's empowerment - revenue from sale of handicrafts**

Many local people in Bigodi seem to have adapted well to tourism. Tourism, as a new activity for local people in the community, was perceived as a chance for additional economic activity to be combined with existing livelihoods and not to be a substitute for these. The ways that Community based Tourism can complement existing livelihood activities emerged as a key theme in conversations with local residents of Bigodi in this research. Handicraft production for the tourist market emerged as one of the main activities undertaken by local people - especially women - to supplement their household incomes. The production and sale of handicraft in Bigodi is mobilised through Bigodi Women’s Group (BWG), another social enterprise managed by women in the area. The main handicrafts made include baskets and mats. It is no surprise that women are the main group engaged in handcraft making. Weaving baskets and making mats is a long-standing cultural practice for women in Uganda. Traditionally, women made handicrafts for their homes such as mats for visitors and baskets for storing food. What has changed today is that the handicrafts are now a supplementary source of income for many poor households in Bigodi. Selling of handicrafts is one of the few means where local women in Bigodi can earn an income to improve their livelihoods. Handicrafts are particularly beneficial, as they can be produced episodically, easily allowing women to work part-time and to be based at home with their families (Lash, *et. al.* 1999;; Hengky, 2014). The major
source of raw material for handicrafts in Bigodi was found to be the Magombe swamp area and some are located within the National Park. Local people in Bigodi also use millet straws to weave baskets. The latter is a product from millet - one of the foods eaten in the area. It used to be thrown away as a waste but today it is a source of money.

However, the packaging of art and culture for souvenir trade as well as music and dance for tourism amusement in exchange for money by local communities has been criticised as a ‘commoditisation of culture’ (Nash, 1996; MacLeod, 2005; Kashaga, 2014). It is argued that the handicraft produced - because it is meant for tourists - cannot be authentic having lost its original purpose and significance therefore this demeans the maker because expression of artistic creativity has been commoditised and modernised. Such approaches tend to ignore that ‘commerce may also be another form of meaningful interaction’ (Meethan 2003: 15) and the fact that tourism cannot be isolated from other many aspects of culture. Therefore, commentators treating tourism as an exogenous force run the risk of ignoring how tourism may be adapted to become part of the local realities and a continuation of cultural forms of production (Hitchcock, King and Pamwell 1993). The critics also ignore the fact that handicraft production for tourism is a way for many impoverished women to improve their existing livelihoods rather than working directly (and only) for tourism, and so incorporate it into their social spaces (Butcher, 2005). In Bigodi, the selling of handicraft has empowered some of the women to earn an income of their own - the little income that is generated from their household gardens tends to be controlled by their husbands who in many cases spend it on alcohol and sometimes use the money to buy a second wife. Women getting an income of their own has not seemingly affected the social setting of the community, instead the men talked to
were happy with the arrangement, because it meant they can spend their money with no worries about home obligations as these have been taken care of by their wives using the income generated through handicraft production. Therefore the selling of handicraft in Bigodi does not seem to be leading to a commoditising of cultural practices, it instead appears to be an adaptation of existing practices to tourism and provides revenue to neighbourhoods with very few livelihood options and allows the women who participate in it to earn income of their own.

**Community pride**

Values about belonging in the parish of Bigodi have seemingly changed much in the past decade. More than just bringing a promise of economic gains, tourism has seemed to bring new pride and recognition of the place – at least for some. Bigodi has emerged from obscurity to national and international recognition. For instance, KAFRED was a finalist project in the UNDP Equator initiatives in 2004 and eventual winners in 2010. KAFRED was also recognised by United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) as a responsible ecotourism project and appeared as a case study in their guidebook on *Indicators of Sustainable Development for Tourism Destinations* (2004). At the national level, Bigodi Bird Sanctuary, the ecotourism project in Bigodi, has been used by the Ugandan government as a showcase model of community tourism. In 2012 KAFRED efforts were fully recognised by the Ugandan government earning the association a visit to the parliament to demonstrate the importance of community based tourism enterprises improving rural livelihoods. This has not gone unnoticed, many of the local people are proud of the interest their community has generated through tourism. During the numerous conversations undertaken with people in Bigodi none talked negatively about their community being noticed in these ways; instead they talked about their community
seemingly becoming important both at the national and international level. For the peoples of a remote area of Uganda this seemed to be a significant factor emerging in the development of CBE.

Conclusion

By identifying positive impacts of community based tourism enterprise, I do not deny that negative impacts occur because of tourism activities. According to Wall and Mathieson (2006), social cultural impacts usually occur slowly over time and tend to be less than visible and intangible – at least to those looking from outside these lived spaces. Swanbrooke (1999) also notes that the impacts of tourism are usually permanent and impossible to reverse. The Bigodi neighbourhoods have their own share of negative impacts - though they may not easily be noticeable. Inflation in land prices, particularly in Bigodi and Nkingo villages, a change that has been caused by the presence of tourism, is one problem. Other problems include inequality in participation and access to benefits and costs among and within villages. Local elites who are educated, or economically and politically well placed, are in far better positions to participate in in tourism and to take a bigger share of economic benefits. However, this does not mean that the poorer totally lose out - they have also benefited though not in the magnitudes that elites have.

When discussing Community based tourism enterprise the question of success becomes controversial as some measure success based on economic performance based on revenue gained, the extent and number of people lifted from poverty; in this case few community based tourism enterprise could considered successful. When other factors are considered such as the net gains in terms of community
benefits, the ability for the community to make their own decisions and manage the resource in addition to the other enabling factors such people’s ability to sell their products direct to the tourists without the interference of middlemen, then CBTE are a success in many communities. There is need to abandon the Eurocentric view that regard communities from the western perspectives. Most of the communities in the rural areas of the developing countries are surrounded by poverty, therefore any activity that can generate employment or bring in revenue is important regardless of the quantity of the contribution.

Prahalad (2005) argued that if the poor are not viewed as victims but instead recognised as creative entrepreneurs, provide training to allow them to use their innate entrepreneurial abilities they will be able to pull themselves out of poverty. The experiences of Bigodi suggest that local people are not simply having tourism put on them. And they are not just victims. Some people in Bigodi see an opportunity and are negotiating with tourism and tourists, though others did not see this opportunity at the beginning and may eventually be excluded from these opportunities tourism creates. Those that are seeing opportunities see what is expected or desired in the ways they, and the place they live in, is being viewed, and are re-making themselves and their cultures in ways they feel work for them and for tourism – without becoming reliant on tourism. Bigodi has experienced significant socio-cultural, economic changes that started in the early 1990s with the advent of tourism in the area. These changes in local people’s livelihoods and Bigodi in general are equated with development. Change, better described as development, is now a feature of life in Bigodi.
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