



American Journal of Tourism and Hospitality (AJTH)

ISSN: 2993-6519 (ONLINE)

VOLUME 4 ISSUE 1 (2026)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Community Involvement in Tourism Development: The Setbacks and Drawbacks

Felix Kudjo Mlagada^{1*}, Kate Neequaye¹, Adriana Narkwah Anderson¹

Article Information

Received: January 12, 2025

Accepted: March 30, 2025

Published: May 01, 2026

Keywords

Butre, Community Involvement, Drawbacks, Setbacks, Tourism Development

ABSTRACT

The study assessed the factors that neglect community involvement in tourism development in the Butre Community. A quantitative research design was employed, where five hundred (500) respondents were selected for the study. The stratified sampling technique was used in the selection of respondents. Data were collected using a questionnaire, and with the help of SPSS, the data were analyzed and then presented using mean, standard deviation, and multiple regression. The study revealed significant barriers to community involvement in tourism development, including the prioritization of external investors, weak governance structures, and insufficient consideration of local cultural values. Also, the study showed that community involvement was crucial for the sustainability of tourism projects, yet significant gaps exist in economic benefit distribution, cultural preservation, and ecological knowledge integration. The regression analysis results demonstrated that while wealth disparity and the dominance of external investors hampered community participation in Butre's tourism, inclusive characteristics like government involvement, cultural respect, training access, and environmental focus increased it. Therefore, tourism developers and policymakers should actively involve local communities in decision-making to enhance project sustainability and prevent conflicts. Government and tourism authorities should implement policies that ensure fair distribution of tourism revenues to benefit local communities.

INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies have examined the economic, environmental, and social advantages of community involvement in tourism and conservation (Liu *et al.*, 2023; Chan *et al.*, 2021). Participatory methods have enhanced cultural preservation, biodiversity conservation, and local livelihoods worldwide (Gidebo, 2023). In Africa, studies have highlighted successful models like Kenya's Maasai Mara conservancies and Namibia's community-managed reserves, which integrate local populations into tourism management (Oduor, 2020; Tubey *et al.*, 2019). In Ghana, research has examined community participation in eco-tourism and heritage tourism, particularly at Kakum National Park and Cape Coast Castle (Eshun & Tichaawa, 2020; Kumi *et al.*, 2018). Even though these studies highlight the advantages of community-led tourism, they frequently emphasize financial results more than long-term sustainability or the degree of community involvement in decision-making.

There are still a lot of unanswered questions about how well Ghana's tourism laws benefit local populations, notwithstanding these developments. A significant portion of current research focuses on well-known tourist destinations, providing little understanding of how national policies affect real local advantages (Wondirad & Ewnetu, 2019). Furthermore, while community-based tourism models have been extensively studied in other African contexts, there are not many comparative studies that focus on Ghana. This disregard for effective policy execution, equitable benefit sharing, and significant community involvement impedes a thorough grasp of the nation's sustainable tourist development. The current

study assesses the degree and scope of community involvement in tourism development in Butre to close this gap. It specifically aims to pinpoint the main causes of community neglect and evaluate the impact that neglect has on the long-term viability of local tourism initiatives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community Involvement and Tourism Development
There are many different meanings of the term "community", most of which revolve around a collection of people who live in a particular region and have similar identities and interests (Jovchelovitch, 2019). A community, according to Bell and Newby (2021), is "a group of individuals who live in the same geographical region and share certain common interests". According to Watkins *et al.* (2018), local communities are made up of people who have a similar identity and may pursue a range of related livelihoods. These concepts emphasize the importance of common identities and interests among people in a certain area.

The term "community involvement" describes how locals actively participate in decisions and activities that impact their lives and general well-being (Ellery & Ellery, 2019). To improve their well-being in terms of income, personal development, self-reliance, or other values they hold dear, beneficiary client groups actively shape the direction and implementation of a development project, according to Bandé *et al.* (2024). To guarantee that the advantages are fairly distributed and in line with the needs and values of the community, locals must participate in the planning, execution, monitoring, and assessment of tourism-related projects.

¹ Takoradi Technical University, Ghana

*Corresponding author's e-mail: mlagada4@gmail.com

According to Li *et al.* (2020), tourism development includes the design and implementation of initiatives that increase a destination's attractiveness to travelers while promoting economic growth, cultural preservation, and environmental sustainability. It includes marketing, developing infrastructure, and creating services and attractions for tourists that meet their demands. According to Ye *et al.* (2024), sustainable tourism development places a strong emphasis on striking a balance between the protection of natural resources and cultural heritage and economic gains to provide long-term advantages for both the host community and tourists.

Numerous writers have underlined how important community involvement is to the growth of the tourism industry. Sharp *et al.* (2020) state that "community involvement is a process in which residents of a community are given an opportunity to participate in decisions that affect their lives". They contend that because it preserves local culture and aids in environmental conservation, this kind of engagement is crucial to the long-term sustainability of the tourism sector. In a similar vein, Scheyvens & Biddulph (2018) emphasize that community involvement results in more effective and inclusive tourism practices, but they also point out issues like power disparities and resource scarcity that need to be resolved to guarantee meaningful participation.

Involving local stakeholders in tourism initiatives can generate community resilience and adaptive capacity, contributing to the overall well-being of the community. Research shows that community participation in tourism can enhance community resilience by building social capital and fostering partnerships among stakeholders (Partelow, 2021). Lin *et al.* (2021) note that Tourism development can foster community resilience by creating new job opportunities and building community solidarity among those who have not traditionally been involved in tourism.

The literature does, however, also highlight difficulties in obtaining successful community involvement in the growth of tourism. Community members' participation may be hampered by obstacles such a lack of knowledge, a lack of funds, and a lack of skills, according to Kala and Bagri (2018). Targeted capacity-building programmes, open communication, and the creation of systems that enable local communities to actively participate in tourism development processes are necessary to overcome these obstacles.

It is often acknowledged that a key component of sustainable tourism is the engagement of local communities in tourism development. According to scholars, communities benefit economically, socially, and culturally when they actively participate (Li *et al.*, 2020; Chaudhary *et al.*, 2018). Community-based tourism (CBT) gives residents a say in tourism initiatives, which increases ownership and long-term dedication to the ventures' success (Dodds *et al.*, 2018). According to the study, including community inputs enhanced local livelihoods and encouraged environmental stewardship by making

locals more invested in the sustainability of their resources. Similarly, Okazaki (2018) underlined that community involvement in decision-making processes helps alleviate the negative social repercussions of tourism, such as displacement and loss of cultural property.

Another important part of tourism development is economic empowerment through community participation. As Muresan *et al.* (2019) noted, tourism creates direct job opportunities, which boost local economies. Their research on Romanian rural tourism revealed that community involvement helps diversify income sources, lowers poverty, and promotes local entrepreneurship. Saayman and Giampiccoli (2018) also noted that local participation in tourism can reduce economic leakages, ensuring that more money from tourism stays in the community. These findings suggest that the local population is actively involved in tourism development, management, and ownership in order to maximize economic gains.

Involving the community in tourism development also improves visitor experiences and promotes cultural preservation. Local participation in tourism projects, according to Salazar (2020), guarantees the preservation of indigenous customs and cultural manifestations. Locals are given the ability to genuinely express their heritage through cultural tourism initiatives, which enhances the experience of tourists. According to Yanes *et al.* (2019), community involvement in tourism can help stop local culture from becoming commodified, which lends credence to this viewpoint. They found that community-led cultural tourism fosters deeper connections between visitors and residents, protecting cultural heritage and fostering intercultural understanding in their study on Latin American tourism. Another important advantage of tourism-related community involvement is environmental conservation.

According to Jones and Jones (2021), when it comes to tourism development, locals who possess a profound grasp of their surroundings play a crucial part in conservation efforts. Their studies in East Africa showed that community-based tourism conservation programmes not only saved wildlife but also gave locals new sources of income. Furthermore, Gabriel-Campos *et al.* (2021) noted that community involvement increases the climate change resilience of tourist locations. Communities can adopt regionally tailored solutions that support the growth of sustainable tourism when they are involved in environmental management initiatives.

Community involvement in tourism has many advantages, but there are still drawbacks. A study by Rahman and Baddam (2021) found that meaningful participation is frequently hampered by power disparities between foreign tourist stakeholders and local populations. They contend that if these injustices are not addressed, local voices might be ignored, which would lessen the impact of community-based tourism programmes. Additionally, Hampton *et al.* (2020) discovered that communities frequently do not fully benefit from the development

of tourism due to a lack of resources and inadequate training. These difficulties highlight the necessity of laws and initiatives that build local capability and guarantee a fair share of the advantages of tourism.

Factors that Contributes to the Disregard of Community Involvement in Tourism Development

There are a number of economic reasons why community involvement in tourism development is neglected, with profit-driven enterprises being one major issue. According to Mowforth and Munt (2019), the development of tourism frequently follows neoliberal economic principles, putting profit ahead of community involvement and marginalizing local residents in the process. This focus on increasing profits, which is usually the result of big investors, takes focus away from community-based tourism projects (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2018).

Furthermore, Hampton *et al.* (2020) pointed out that this neglect is made worse by economic leakage, in which tourism-related profits go to foreign investors rather than local populations. Locals consequently receive less money and have less motivation to engage in tourism. According to Muresan *et al.* (2019), communities are frequently disregarded in favour of larger stakeholders that give priority to foreign tourists in the absence of formal frameworks for local economic inclusion. The disregard for community involvement in tourism development is also greatly influenced by sociocultural issues. According to Burns and Novelli (2020), a lot of tourist models are created without taking into account the distinctive cultural values and customs of the local populace, which causes a gap between tourism initiatives and these communities' social realities.

Furthermore, tourism initiatives imported from Western contexts frequently ignore local socio-cultural dynamics, according to Saayman and Giampiccoli (2018), which exacerbates tensions between local populations and external tourism players. Additionally, Mowforth and Munt (2019) note that decision-makers usually disregard local knowledge in favour of foreign expertise over community involvement. Hampton *et al.* (2020) support this by pointing out that socioeconomic stratification in local communities might result in the marginalization of marginalized groups, which further reduces overall tourism involvement.

Other important issues that contribute to the disregard for community involvement are weak political and governance frameworks. According to Scheyvens and Biddulph (2018), elite actors control government structures in many emerging nations, putting their own interests ahead of those of the local populace. Because of this, there is an imbalance of power and outside developers have a big say in tourism initiatives, thereby ignoring local opinions (Gabriel-Campos *et al.*, 2021). This view is supported by Rahman and Baddam (2021), who contend that local communities are excluded from talks about tourism development when institutional mechanisms for community engagement in policy-making processes

are lacking. Furthermore, Okazaki (2018) points out that ineffective governance frameworks frequently lack the ability to compel community involvement, which leads to the exclusion of regional stakeholders in favour of private investors.

Disregarding community involvement in the development of tourism is also influenced by environmental issues. According to Gabriel-Campos *et al.* (2021), outside tourist developers frequently ignore local environmental expertise, which results in environmentally unsustainable tourism practices that drive away local residents. In support of this claim, Jones and Jones (2021) point out that, in spite of their close proximity and in-depth knowledge of the local ecology, communities are frequently left out of environmental conservation initiatives.

According to Hampton *et al.* (2020), major tourism initiatives may degrade the environment, which has an impact on local livelihoods and deters locals from traveling. The exclusion of local communities from environmental decision-making, according to Scheyvens and Biddulph (2018), causes tourism projects to put short-term financial gains ahead of long-term environmental sustainability, further separating tourism from community interests.

The disregard for local participation in the development of tourism is also influenced by economic inequality within communities. Hampton *et al.* (2020) assert that the wealthiest members of the community may monopolize the benefits of tourism, limiting the less fortunate members' access to the financial rewards of travel. Internal conflicts result from this, which makes it challenging for marginalized groups to participate in tourism development and prevents collective community action (Yanes *et al.*, 2019). According to Scheyvens and Biddulph (2018), this kind of economic disparity deters the general public from engaging in tourism because they believe the advantages are concentrated among a small group of people. To further marginalize communities' involvement in tourist development, Mowforth and Munt (2019) contend that socioeconomic disparity might lead to power disparities that restrict their ability to bargain with outside tourism developers.

Lastly, a major obstacle to local communities' participation in tourist development is the absence of training and capacity-building opportunities. According to Yanes *et al.* (2019), communities are dependent on outside actors to spearhead tourism activities because they frequently lack the technical know-how and abilities needed to run tourist projects successfully. This opinion is supported by Saayman and Giampiccoli (2018), who stress the importance of capacity-building initiatives in enabling local populations to assume leadership positions in the growth of the tourism industry. Additionally, Burns and Novelli (2020) point out that the lack of such initiatives keeps local communities marginalized because they continue to rely on outside resources and knowledge. Additionally, according to Okazaki (2018), communities' isolation from the growth of tourism is further cemented by the fact that they lack the necessary training to

effectively advocate for their interests.

Theoretical Framework

The community-based tourism framework was used in the study. Involving local communities in tourist planning and development is crucial, according to Murphy's 1985 formal introduction of the Community-Based Tourism (CBT) framework as cited by Scheyvens, (2018). Murphy maintained that communities should actively participate in decision-making processes and that tourism should not just be profitable but also inclusive and respectful of cultural norms. The study assessing the Factors that Neglect Community Involvement in Tourism Development: A Case Study of Butre Community, Ghana was theoretically grounded in this people-centered approach to tourism development. The CBT model served as the foundation for the study, which aimed to explain why, despite Butre's potential for growth and cultural tourism, local involvement in tourism is still so low.

Building on this framework, the study examined how much community involvement had been disregarded using the CBT model as a guide. It assisted in focusing the inquiry on important ideas that are frequently missing from traditional top-down tourist planning, such as involvement, teamwork, and benefit-sharing components. The research found that decisions in Butre were often made without enough consultation, indicating a divide between citizens and policymakers. This departure from CBT principles brought to light the structural obstacles that lead to the community's exclusion from tourism development initiatives, such as poor information flow and a lack of capacity-building.

Additionally, the study was able to investigate community attitudes and the ensuing socio-cultural effects of exclusion thanks to the CBT framework. Butre locals described tourism as a process run by outside parties that had little bearing on their daily life, expressing a sense of estrangement. These feelings show a disregard for CBT's tenets, which emphasize regional perspectives and cultural authenticity. The study emphasized the significance of trust, transparency, and a sense of ownership factors crucial for encouraging active engagement and long-term sustainability in tourism by incorporating the lived experiences of the community.

In summary, the CBT framework guided the development of the study's recommendations in addition to influencing its analytical perspective. The concept offered a road map for reimagining tourism development using inclusive tactics like targeted capacity-building initiatives, community forums, and participatory planning. By taking these actions, the research promoted a tourism development process in Butre that is in line with the ideals of the target audience. As a result, the CBT model provided the community with a diagnostic tool as well as a guide for inclusive, sustainable tourism.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study used a descriptive design and a quantitative approach. By measuring and analysing data methodically and objectively, quantitative approaches helped the researchers lessen the influence of their own bias (Sileyew, 2019). This increases the objectivity and reproducibility of results for other researchers. Additionally, results were generalized because of the greater sample size. The people who live in Butre, Ghana's Ahanta West Municipality, provided both primary and secondary data. Data from the respondents was obtained through the use of questionnaires.

A stratified random sample was used in this study to provide equitable representation of various community groups while analysing the elements that contribute to resident neglect. Based on factors including age, gender, and participation in tourism, the target audience was separated into pertinent strata. Respondents were chosen at random from each stratum based on how many of members of the community they were. This method improved the findings' generalizability and dependability by guaranteeing that all significant subgroups were fairly represented. Across the strata that were found, 500 respondents in total were chosen and sampled.

Quantitative data was analysed using IBM's statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) software, version 27.0. The field data was coded, meticulously edited, and cleaned to eliminate any incomplete questionnaires that would compromise the validity of the results. The study employed the mean and standard deviations in the descriptive analysis. The study used multiple regression analysis to determine which factors significantly predict neglect, the direction and strength of each factor's influence, and the proportion of variation in neglect that can be accounted for by the combined factors. The study's ethical considerations focused on informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality of the participants.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Community Involvement in Tourism Development

This section focuses on how the community was involved in tourism development. The researcher asked questions on whether community participation was effectively integrated into tourism planning and development. Additionally, the researcher inquired about whether tourism projects in the community prioritize environmental sustainability and conservation efforts and whether external investors engage meaningfully with local communities in the decision-making process for tourism projects. Lastly, the researcher examined whether community-based tourism initiatives have resulted in improved social cohesion among residents. All the above were rated using the Likert scale: strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (D), and strongly disagree (SD).

Table 1: Level of Community Involvement in Tourism Development

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community participation is effectively integrated into tourism planning and development in my region.	500	3.65	1.293
Local communities benefit economically from tourism projects in my area.	500	3.49	1.328
Traditional leadership structures are respected and utilized in tourism development in my community.	500	3.9	0.993
Tourism projects in my community prioritize environmental sustainability and conservation efforts.	500	2.71	1.206
External investors engage with local communities meaningfully in the decision-making process for tourism projects.	500	3.71	1.075
Community-based tourism initiatives in my area have resulted in improved social cohesion among residents.	500	2.52	1.204
There is a clear communication channel between tourism developers and local communities regarding project planning and execution.	500	3.59	1.278

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

The mean and standard deviation were used in this study to measure the central tendency and variability of respondents' perceptions regarding tourism development and community involvement. The mean provides insight into the overall agreement or disagreement with each statement, while the standard deviation indicates the extent of variability in responses, helping to determine whether opinions are consistent or widely dispersed.

The mean score of 3.65 for the statement on community participation in tourism planning suggests a moderate level of agreement, indicating that while some efforts have been made to integrate local voices, there may still be gaps in full community involvement. The relatively high standard deviation (1.293) implies that perceptions vary significantly among respondents, possibly due to differences in access to decision-making processes across communities. This suggests that while participation exists, it may not be uniformly implemented, highlighting the need for more inclusive and consistent community engagement strategies.

The perception that traditional leadership structures were respected and utilized in tourism development scored the highest mean (3.9) with a relatively lower standard deviation (0.993), indicating strong and consistent agreement among respondents. This suggests that traditional leaders play a crucial role in shaping tourism policies and projects, which may contribute to culturally sensitive development. However, while this was a positive indicator of respect for indigenous governance, it is essential to assess whether such leadership inclusion effectively translates into tangible benefits for local communities beyond ceremonial involvement.

On the other hand, the statement regarding the prioritization of environmental sustainability in tourism projects received a lower mean score of 2.71, reflecting general disagreement with the notion that conservation efforts are emphasized. The moderate standard deviation (1.206) indicates some variation in responses, but the overall sentiment suggests that environmental

concerns may not be adequately addressed. This finding underscores a critical gap in sustainable tourism practices, which could lead to long-term ecological degradation if not urgently rectified. Strengthening environmental policies and ensuring compliance with sustainability measures should be a priority.

A particularly concerning finding was the low mean score of 2.52 on whether community-based tourism initiatives have improved social cohesion, indicating strong disagreement among respondents. The relatively high standard deviation (1.204) suggests that while some individuals may have experienced positive social impacts, many do not perceive such benefits. This could imply that tourism development has not significantly fostered unity or has even contributed to social tensions, possibly due to unequal benefit distribution or exclusionary practices. Addressing these concerns would require more inclusive and community-driven tourism initiatives that equitably distribute economic and social benefits.

Community participation in tourism development remains inconsistent despite policy frameworks advocating for inclusivity. Scheyvens and Biddulph (2018) argue that engagement is often superficial, reducing communities to mere consulters rather than active decision-makers. Hampton *et al.* (2020) highlight how powerful investors dominate decision-making, relegating local voices. Burns and Novelli (2020) emphasize that weak governance and financial constraints further limit meaningful participation.

Mowforth and Munt (2019) stress that economic priorities overshadow sustainable tourism goals, leading to environmental neglect. Gabriel-Campos *et al.* (2021) argue that equitable financial models could improve community ownership and long-term benefits. Saayman and Giampiccoli (2018) assert that integrating cultural practices enhances local involvement in tourism. Addressing these barriers is crucial for sustainable and inclusive tourism development.

Factors that Contribute to the Neglect of Community Involvement in Tourism Development

This section of the study presents results on the factors that contribute to the neglect of community involvement in tourism development. Issues discussed were that the profit-driven tourism project prioritizes the interests of external investors over local community engagement, and local cultural values and practices are adequately considered in tourism development initiatives in my area. Also, discussed were governance structures in my

community that effectively include local communities in tourism development decision-making processes, and environmental sustainability is prioritized in tourism projects that involve local communities. Then, wealth disparities within my community prevent equitable access to the benefits generated by tourism development. The respondents rated the statements based on a five-point Likert scale, such as strongly disagree, disagree, agree, and strongly agree. The results were presented in Table 2. The data revealed that profit-driven tourism projects

Table 2: Factors that Contribute to the Neglect of Community Involvement in Tourism Development

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Profit-driven tourism projects prioritize the interests of external investors over local community engagement.	500	2.02	0.497
Local cultural values and practices are adequately considered in tourism development initiatives in my area.	500	1.56	0.556
The governance structures in my region effectively include local communities in tourism development decision-making processes.	500	1.58	0.548
Environmental sustainability is prioritized in tourism projects that involve local communities.	500	2.42	0.602
Wealth disparities within my community prevent equitable access to the benefits generated by tourism development.	500	1.96	0.403
Local communities receive sufficient training and capacity-building opportunities to effectively participate in tourism development.	500	1.45	0.600
Community involvement is essential for the long-term sustainability of tourism development projects in my area.	500	2.76	0.496

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

tend to prioritize external investors over local community engagement, as indicated by a low mean score of 2.02 and a relatively low standard deviation of 0.497. This suggests that local interests are often overlooked in favour of financial gains, leading to minimal involvement of community members in decision-making. The implications are significant, as such an approach can result in a lack of local ownership, reduced socio-economic benefits for residents, and potential resistance from the community toward tourism initiatives. A shift toward more inclusive and participatory tourism models is necessary to address this imbalance.

With regards to the low mean score of 1.56 regarding the consideration of local cultural values and practices in tourism development, with a standard deviation of 0.556. This indicates a general disregard for cultural integration, which could lead to the erosion of traditional customs and identities. The lack of cultural sensitivity in tourism planning can result in alienation among community members and diminish the authenticity of local attractions. Addressing this issue requires deliberate efforts to incorporate indigenous knowledge, traditions, and customs into tourism projects to foster cultural sustainability and community acceptance.

Similarly, governance structures appear ineffective in including local communities in tourism decision-making, as reflected by a mean score of 1.58 and a standard deviation

of 0.548. This suggests that communities have limited influence over tourism policies and projects, potentially leading to decisions that do not align with their needs or aspirations. Weak governance structures can hinder trust between stakeholders and limit the success of tourism initiatives. Strengthening participatory governance, where community representatives actively contribute to policy formation and project implementation, would enhance inclusivity and ensure that local concerns are adequately addressed.

The issue of training and capacity building for community participation in tourism is another critical concern, with the lowest mean score of 1.45 and a standard deviation of 0.600. This suggests that local residents are not receiving adequate skills development opportunities to engage meaningfully in tourism-related activities. Without proper training, communities may struggle to compete in the industry, limiting their economic empowerment. Investing in capacity-building programmes, such as entrepreneurship training, hospitality skills development, and tourism education, would help bridge this gap and enable communities to take a more active role in the sector.

On a slightly positive note, the highest mean score (2.76) was recorded for the statement that community involvement is essential for the long-term sustainability of tourism projects, with a standard deviation of 0.496.

This indicates that there is a general awareness of the importance of community participation, even though practical implementation remains weak. The recognition of this necessity presents an opportunity for tourism stakeholders to push for policy reforms and strategic initiatives that prioritize local engagement. Ensuring that community involvement is not only acknowledged but also institutionalized in tourism planning can lead to more sustainable and resilient tourism development.

The exclusion of local communities from tourism development is a direct consequence of profit-driven models that prioritize external investors over indigenous participation (Amoako-Atta *et al.*, 2020). This economic approach perpetuates revenue leakage, reducing financial gains for locals and limiting their engagement (Hampton *et al.*, 2020). Furthermore, ignoring cultural values not only alienates communities but also diminishes the authenticity of tourism experiences (Burns & Novelli, 2020).

Weak governance structures allow elites to dominate decision-making, leaving locals without a voice in tourism policies (Scheyvens & Biddulph, 2018). The absence of strict policy enforcement further enables external developers to bypass local inclusion (Rahman & Baddam, 2021). Environmental neglect exacerbates these issues by sidelining local expertise in conservation efforts (Gabriel-Campos *et al.*, 2021). Additionally, internal economic disparities concentrate tourism benefits among the wealthy, preventing equitable community participation (Yanes *et al.*, 2019). The lack of training programmes further reinforces dependency on external stakeholders, hindering sustainable local leadership (Saayman & Giampiccoli, 2018). A shift towards inclusive tourism models is crucial to ensuring fair economic distribution, cultural preservation, and long-term sustainability. Without proactive reforms, tourism development will continue to exploit rather than empower local communities.

The regression model showed a significant positive

Table 3: Regression Model Summary

Metric	Value
R	0.782
R2	0.612
Adjusted R2	0.608
Std. Error	0.39

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

relationship ($R = 0.782$) between the characteristics that were found and the underutilization of community involvement in Butre’s tourism development. The study’s independent factors could account for around 61.2% ($R^2 = 0.612$) of the variation in disregard of community involvement. The model’s dependability was validated by the adjusted R^2 value of 0.608, and the modest variability in the predictions was indicated by the standard error of 0.39. The ANOVA table evaluated the statistical significance of the regression model used

Table 4: ANOVA

Source	Df	SS	MS	F	Sig.
Regression	6	204.3	34.05	224.1	0.000
Residual	493	74.8	0.152		
Total	499	279.1			

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

to investigate the reasons behind the undervaluation of community involvement in Butre’s tourism development. The model produced 499 data points with 6 degrees of freedom for regression and 493 for residuals. The model’s predictors appeared to account for a significant amount of the variance in the dependent variable, as indicated by the regression sum of squares (SS) of 204.3. The high explanatory power of the model was highlighted by the F-value of 224.1. Moreover, the combined variables’ statistically significant impact on community involvement outcomes was validated by the corresponding p-value of 0.000.

Regression Model Equation

$$\text{Community Involvement} = 1.05 + (-0.33 \times \text{External investor priority}) + (0.25 \times \text{Cultural value consideration}) + (0.30 \times \text{Governance inclusion}) + (0.18 \times \text{Environmental focus}) + (-0.29 \times \text{wealthy disparity}) + (0.31 \times \text{Training access})$$

Where: The coefficients indicate the magnitude of influence of each predictor variable on community involvement

The regression coefficients table provided insightful information about the relative importance of different predictors on community participation in the growth of tourism in the Butre community. After holding all predictors constant, the analysis showed a statistically significant baseline level of community engagement, with a coefficient of 1.05, a standard error of 0.18, a t-value of 5.83, and a p-value of 0.000.

“External Investor Priority” was the first predictor to be examined in detail, as it had a negative coefficient of -0.33. A standard error of 0.05, a t-value of -6.60, and a p-value of 0.000 all confirmed this finding, which indicated that a stronger emphasis on outside investors seriously weakened community involvement. The significant negative weight this feature carried in the model was indicated by the standardized beta of -0.28, which suggests that when development gives priority to external stakeholders over local ones, community exclusion is more likely to occur.

On the other hand, “Cultural Value Consideration” was shown to be a statistically significant factor with a positive coefficient of 0.25, a standard error of 0.06, a t-value of 4.17, and a p-value of 0.000. A moderately strong correlation was shown by the standardized beta of 0.22, indicating that inclusive community engagement was more likely to be promoted by development initiatives that respected and integrated local cultural values.

With a positive coefficient of 0.30, a standard error of 0.05, a t-value of 6.00, and a p-value of 0.000, the role

Table 5: Regression Coefficient

Predictor Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.(p)
Constant	1.05	0.18	-	5.83	0.000
External investor priority	-0.33	0.05	-0.28	-6.60	0.000
Cultural value consideration	0.25	0.06	0.22	4.17	0.000
Government inclusion	0.30	0.05	0.26	6.00	0.000
Environmental focus	0.18	0.05	0.15	3.60	0.001
Wealth disparity	-0.29	0.06	-0.24	-4.83	0.000
Training access	0.31	0.05	0.27	6.20	0.000

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

of “Government Inclusion” was equally noteworthy. Its significance was further supported by the matching beta value of 0.26, which showed that the degree of community involvement in the planning and execution process was positively impacted by the strategic participation of governmental entities in tourism development.

“Environmental Focus” also showed a positive association, with a coefficient of 0.18, a standard error of 0.05, a t-value of 3.60, and a significance level of 0.001, further enhancing the model’s predictive power. Even though its beta value of 0.15 was lower than that of other factors, it nevertheless demonstrated that eco-friendly tourist practices encourage community involvement, especially when sustainability and local ecosystems are given top priority.

On the other hand, with a coefficient of -0.29, a standard error of 0.06, a t-value of -4.83, and a p-value of 0.000, the factor of “Wealth Disparity” was shown to be a significant deterrent. The negative effects of unequal wealth distribution were emphasized by the beta coefficient of -0.24, which indicates that economic exclusion directly deters local community participation in tourism-related activities.

Last but not least, the most significant positive predictor of community involvement was the variable “Training Access”. It had a standardized beta of 0.27, a t-value of 6.20, a p-value of 0.000, a coefficient of 0.31, and a standard error of 0.05. This made it abundantly evident that community members were empowered by having access to pertinent training and skill-development programmes, which increased their ability and desire to participate actively in tourism development activities.

The results were crucial for planning and tourism policy in places like Butre. First, they said that community-based and inclusive policies, such as training and acknowledging cultural values, had greatly encouraged local participation in tourism projects. Second, the detrimental impact of wealth inequality and the emphasis on external investors implied that local involvement was stifled when tourist growth was controlled by external interests or marked by unequal economic structures, which resulted in resistance or a lack of sustainability. Last but not least, government participation was shown to be a powerful enabling factor, suggesting that cooperative governance and institutional support had been crucial in guaranteeing

that the advantages of tourism were shared fairly and welcomed locally. Stakeholders were advised by these insights to reconsider development tactics to encourage more equitable and participatory tourist growth.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the study identified poor governance, economic marginalization, cultural neglect, inadequate training, and the dominance of external investors as major barriers to community involvement in tourism development. These factors limited participation, leading to cultural erosion, environmental degradation, and socio-economic inequality. The exclusion of local voices not only undermined social cohesion but also created resistance to tourism initiatives, weakening their long-term sustainability. Effective community engagement was found to be essential for preserving local culture, ensuring equitable benefit distribution, and promoting ecological sustainability. Politically, marginalization in decision-making gave undue influence to external actors, further deepening governance challenges. The regression analysis confirmed that community involvement in Butre’s tourism sector significantly improved with inclusive governance, respect for cultural values, training opportunities, and environmental consideration. Conversely, income disparities and external investor prioritization negatively affected participation. These findings reinforce the need for participatory approaches that empower local communities. Strengthening local capacity, promoting shared benefits, and integrating community perspectives into policy and project design are crucial for sustainable tourism development. Overall, inclusive and community-centered strategies emerged as critical drivers for the successful and resilient growth of tourism in the Butre community.

REFERENCES

Amoako-Atta, E. E., Dayour, F. F., & Bonye, S. Z. (2020). Community participation in the management of Wechiau Community Hippo sanctuary, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies*, 17(1), 1-24.

Bandé, A., Ika, L. A., & Ouédraogo, S. (2024). Beneficiary participation is an imperative, not an option, but does it

- really work in international development projects?. *International Journal of Project Management*, 42(1), 102561-102572.
- Bell, C., & Newby, H. (2021). *Community studies: An introduction to the sociology of the local community*. Routledge.
- Burns, P., & Novelli, M. (2020). Community participation in tourism development: The role of the private sector. *Tourism Management*, 79(4), 104088-104099.
- Chan, J. K. L., Marzuki, K. M., & Mohtar, T. M. (2021). Local community participation and responsible tourism practices in ecotourism destination: A case of lower Kinabatangan, Sabah. *Sustainability*, 13(23), 13302.
- Chaudhary, S., McGregor, A., Houston, D., & Chettri, N. (2018). Environmental justice and ecosystem services: A disaggregated analysis of community access to forest benefits in Nepal. *Ecosystem Services*, 29(3), 99-115.
- Dodds, R., Ali, A., & Galaski, K. (2018). Mobilizing knowledge: Determining key elements for success and pitfalls in developing community-based tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(13), 1547-1568.
- Ellery, P. J., & Ellery, J. (2019). Strengthening community sense of place through Place making. *Urban planning*, 4(2), 237-248.
- Eshun, G., & Tichaawa, T. M. (2020). Community participation, risk management and ecotourism sustainability issues in Ghana. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, 28(1), 313-331.
- Gabriel-Campos, E., Werner-Masters, K., Cordova-Buiza, F., & Paucar-Caceres, A. (2021). Community ecotourism in rural Peru: Resilience and adaptive capacities to the Covid-19 pandemic and climate change. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 48, 416-427.
- Gidebo, H. B. (2023). Linking livelihood and biodiversity conservation in protected areas: Community based Tourism development perspective from developing country. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 23(3), 361-375.
- Hampton, M. P., Maher, M. E., & Lutz, K. (2020). Community involvement in tourism development: Policy, practice, and prospects. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 17(2), 189-203.
- Jones, S., & Jones, J. (2021). The role of local communities in environmental conservation through tourism. *Conservation and Society*, 19(3), 214-228.
- Jovchelovitch, S. (2019). *Knowledge in context: Representations, community and culture*. Routledge.
- Kala, D., & Bagri, S. C. (2018). Barriers to local community participation in tourism development: Evidence from mountainous state Uttarakhand, India. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 66(3), 318-333.
- Kumi, J. N., Kumah, M. S., Afetorgbor, S. K., & Apeamenyo, R. (2018). Factors that hinder local participation of ecotourism in Ghana: Case study of WLI. *IJAR*, 4(12), 180-186.
- Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Roders, A. P., & Van Wesemael, P. (2020). Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices. *Cities*, 96(3), 102476-102545.
- Lin, Y., Kelemen, M., & Kiyomiya, T. (2021). Bridging community resilience and sustainable tourism development via post-disaster education tourism in rural Japan. *The Journal of Organization and Discourse*, 2(1), 32-44.
- Liu, Y. L., Chiang, J. T., & Ko, P. F. (2023). The benefits of tourism for rural community development. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2019). Community-based tourism: The rhetoric and the reality. *Tourism Review International*, 23(4), 271-285.
- Muresan, R. M., Rosu, M., & Zmora, A. (2019). Tourism and economic development: The role of community involvement. *Sustainability*, 11(7), 2047.
- Oduor, A. M. (2020). Livelihood impacts and governance processes of community-based wildlife conservation in Maasai Mara ecosystem, Kenya. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 260(2), 110133.
- Okazaki, E. (2018). *Community participation in tourism: A review of the literature*. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 72(2), 66-77.
- Partelow, S. (2021). Social capital and community disaster resilience: post-earthquake tourism recovery on Gili Trawangan, Indonesia. *Sustainability science*, 16(1), 203-220.
- Rahman, S. S., & Baddam, P. R. (2021). Community Engagement in Southeast Asia's Tourism Industry: Empowering Local Economies. *Global Disclosure of Economics and Business*, 10(2), 75-90.
- Saayman, M., & Giampiccoli, A. (2018). Community-based tourism and sustainable development: Evidence from rural tourism in South Africa. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 26, 34-40.
- Salazar, N. B. (2020). Cultural preservation through community-based tourism: The importance of local involvement. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 15(3), 221-236.
- Scheyvens, R., & Biddulph, R. (2018). Inclusive tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(4), 589-609.
- Sharp, J., Pollock, V., & Paddison, R. (2020). Just art for a just city: Public art and social inclusion in urban regeneration. In *Culture-Led Urban Regeneration* (pp. 156-178). Routledge.
- Sileyew, K. J. (2019). *Research design and methodology* (Vol. 7). Cyberspace.
- Tubey, W. C., Kyalo, D. N., & Mulwa, A. (2019). Socio-cultural conservation strategies and sustainability of community based tourism projects in Kenya: A case of Maasai Mara conservancies. *Journal of Sustainable*

- Development*, 12(6), 90-102.
- UNESCO. (2020). Community participation in tourism development and the preservation of cultural heritage. *UNESCO Reports*, 56, 112-118.
- UNWTO. (2019). Guidelines for sustainable tourism development and community involvement. *UNWTO Publications*, 72, 1-12.
- Wondirad, A., & Ewnetu, B. (2019). Community participation in tourism development as a tool to foster sustainable land and resource use practices in a national park milieu. *Land use policy*, 88(2), 104-155.
- Yanes, A., Zielinski, S., Diaz Cano, M., & Kim, S. I. (2019). Community-based tourism in developing countries: A framework for policy evaluation. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 2506-2521.
- Ye, J., Qin, Y., & Wu, H. (2024). Cultural heritage and sustainable tourism: unveiling the positive correlations and economic impacts. *Current Psychology*, 43(47), 36393-36415.