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OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Attraction: An attraction involves a destination of interest for visitors to tour and it has traditional value, historical importance, and natural or man-made beauty, providing leisure, exploration and amusement for relaxation or self-gains.

Awareness: It is understandable Information or insight of a condition or fact

Collaboration: This is a cooperative engagement that engages several parties with or without past experiences to work together for a particular goal.

Local Community: A community is a setup of people who are socially mutually dependent, and who share certain practices within them and are nurtured by them.

Community Based Organization: It is an organized nonprofit group working at a local level to benefit and improve local people livelihood.

Community Participation: This is health involvement and engagement of a group of people in promotional practices of activities relating to people.

Community Based Tourism: It is a type of tourism that local people in an attraction invite, host, and guide tourists in local destinations for economic, environmental and social benefit.

Culture: Culture involves patterns, implicit and explicit behavior acquired and transferred by symbols relating to distinct group of human achievement that involve artifacts, and values of a culture.
Heritage: Heritage is a broad concept of natural and cultural environment that compose of landscapes, historic places, sites, biodiversity collections, past, present and continuing cultural practices.

Interpretation: Interpretation is a communication process that involves visitors by making them understand heritage values and culture using different techniques that enrich the visitor experience, understand the site, and enjoy the experience.

Marketing: Marketing involves activities and processes for producing, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have significance for customers, partners, clients, and the extensive society.

Mount Kenya Region: It is a highland area hosting the world heritage site the Mount Kenya National Park. It includes areas neighboring Mt. Kenya Heritage Site such as Nyeri, Kirinyaga, Embu, Tharaka-Nithi, and Meru Counties.

Participation: The capability to hear, see, or know a particular thing via the senses of association or the action of engaging in an ongoing happening.

Partnership: Participation is close involvement of people in the economic, social, political, and cultural activities that relate to their lives. This involves involvement in particular programs and projects.

Role: Role include the activities and duties that people engage, participate, and perform at a particular affair that could be daily or over a period of time. For example, tour guiding is a role performed by tour guides to promote tourism and earn a living.

Stakeholder: It is an individual, group or union that is involved has concern in an association.
Stakeholder collaboration: It is a process that different groups with different or similar perspective can share and exchange viewpoints then explore solutions beyond personal vision.

Stakeholders Partnership: It is a legal organization of people, organizations or institutions united to solve a particular common problem.

Sustainable Tourism: This involves the process of promoting a destination society economically, socially, and environmentally through positive impacts of tourism.

Sustainable community based heritage tourism development: This is a form of responsible that continuously promotes local people and destination economically, socially, and through environmental conservation.

Tourism: Tourism involves the act of people traveling to and residing in places away from their typical environment in less than one consecutive year for vacation, business and other engagements.

Tourist: A tourists is an individual that voluntarily goes for a tour to place outside her or his normal environment, for one a period of less than one year, for any main purpose (business, holiday or other personal engagement) apart from being employed by a local entity.

World Heritage Site: This is a man-made or natural location known as being of outstanding value of historical significance and thus as deserving exceptional protection. These locations are designated and managed by local authorities and UNESCO.
ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS

CBT: Community Based Tourism

CPMHF: Community Peace Museums Heritage Foundation

ICOMOS: International Council on Monuments and Sites

KECOBAT: Kenya Community Based Tourism Network

KNBS: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics

KWS: Kenya Wildlife Service

MDG’s: Millennium Development Goals

MKE: Mount Kenya

MNP: Mount Kenya National Park

NMK: National Museums of Kenya

NP: National Park

PR: Public Relation

ST: Sustainable Tourism

UNDP: United Nation Development Program

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNWTO: United Nations World Tourism Organization

WCCD: World Commission on Culture and Development
WHS: World Heritage Sites

WTO: World Tourism Organization

WTTC: World Travel and Tourism Council
ABSTRACT
In the recent past, sustainable tourism is a developing alternative type of tourism; this has led sustainable tourism to gain recognition by tourism developers and stakeholders. Nonetheless, tourism encounters various challenges such as people displacement, commercialization of culture, organic dilapidation, and economic dependency through social economic development. However, sustainable tourism has gained recognition through providing alternative tourism development that is economically friendly, socially acceptable, and environmentally conducive. Sustainable tourism has led to better policing of eco-friendly practices. In Kenya, unsustainable practices such as mass tourism and stakeholders disagreements has for a long period challenged the economic, environmental and cultural development. However, Kenya has started to embraced sustainable goals in tourism development by realizing unsustainable practices negatively impact environmental and social economic development. Therefore, there is need to obtain a sustainable balance in development of social cultural practices in tourism development. These practices include stakeholders’ participation, collaboration, and local community heritage interpretation on community sustainable tourism. Sustainable community heritage tourism involves people and place that is shared for decades hence the reason to sustainably protect the values for tourists experiences and the coming generations. Sustainable community challenges can be solved by understanding research objectives and gaps that focus on aspects that influence community based heritage tourism. Such gaps and objectives in this study include identifying the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region. The main objectives include identifying community interpretation of heritage, examining the role of stakeholders’ participation, identifying stakeholders’ collaborations and the impacts on sustainable community based heritage tourism. The study area covered Mt. Kenya region counties targeting the local communities and the park management. The targeted Mount Kenya region counties include Kirinyaga, Nyeri, Meru, Tharaka Nithi, and Embu. The research applied descriptive survey research design to allow comparison of findings of different respondents in different counties. Research questions and interview were used to collect the data which resulted to 85% questionnaire and 100% interview response rate of the total targeted 384 sample size. Demographics such as gender, age, marital status, and level of education were evident as key determining factors that influence local community roles in enhancing sustainability of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region. Male gender dominate in participating in sustainability of community based heritage tourism while age and marital status influence people availability based on commitments to family chores, roles and educational engagement of the young people. Similarly, level of education is a significant factor that determines knowledge of promoting sustainable practices in the region. The respondents indicated to have knowledge on heritage, value Mt. Kenya as a natural heritage site and can interpret heritage based on the availability of community forums and CBO in the region. The respondents indicated to be moderately involve in participating in CBT but highly indicated the desire to be included in Mt. Kenya heritage decision making and the need to have more stakeholders. The respondents indicated availability of local and international stakeholders’ collaborations that promote sustainable tourism. Collaboration are importance in the region as a key factor in promoting sustainable inclusion of various stakeholders to promote sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region. In recommendation, communities should be appropriately engaged without undermining their roles to enhance local people interpretation, create awareness, make informed decisions, and sustainability promote heritage. Moreover, policy makers should develop stakeholders’ partnerships and collaborations policies for engagement.
1.0 CHAPTER ONE:

1.0 Introduction

The chapter introduces the study on the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya Region from the background, illustrated problem statement and a discussed purpose of the study. Similarly, the chapter highlights analyzed study objectives, the significance of the study, delimitations, limitations, and assumptions of the study. The chapter finally highlights a conceptual framework that guided the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

Internationally, the local community role is particularly imperative in the growth of sustainable tourism as an alternative tourism planned to assist the local people to respect their authentic culture, promote heritage, and teach local people and holiday makers in all values around local destinations (Aleksandra, 2014). Local people association and involvement shows that practices and accomplishments of the sustainable heritage tourism are linked with the aspects of planning an indigenous community economically, ecologically, and socially. Consequently, the local community people in the local host destinations should benefit and their potential should not be marginalized (Aleksandra, 2014).

In Africa, heritage is affiliated to an attraction that may be considered as representational of historic human experience and equally of displaying current effects on people experiences and insights of the world. Heritage insights make people to have historical identity and since the history attached belong to particular people in the society including stakeholders around such as local communities (Han-yin Huang, 2011). The main roles of local people involvement in world
heritage sites and culture include heritage conservation, maintenance, preservation, sustainability, reconstruction and restoration.

In Kenya, Cultural Heritage Department is among the well-established research section of the Kenya national museums. This research department was known as Ethnography, and it came into existence in 1970 under the stewardship of an Anthropologist Jean Brown. The department has a lot of museum collection at the time Jean Brown was the head. Nevertheless, the research section was involved in protection of cultural materials (National Museums of Kenya, 2016). Similarly, the national museums partners with various stakeholders such as the local people to conserve cultural heritage around the attractions.

Kenya has exceptional cultural and natural heritage resources that have significant value to be recognized both locally and internationally. There are six UNESCO heritage sites in Kenya that compose of three natural and three cultural heritage sites. The UNESCO sites include the natural Mount Kenya National Park; the old town of Lamu; Mijienda Kaya Forest; Lake Turkana National Parks; the Fort Jesus; and the Great Rift Valley Lake system that consist of Nakuru Elementaita and Bogoria Lakes. Moreover, Kenya has eighteen sites shortlisted in the Tentative List of UNESCO.

The valuable heritage sites contribute highly on the diversity of Kenya national heritage; Kenya heritage value attract significant tourists in the country hence require sustainable conservation from the local people international stakeholders (UNESCO, 2015).

Kenya world heritage sites forms a comprehensive source of Kenyan cultural history hence require expansive policing, protection and promotion to efficiently and sustainably give back to the tourism sector. There are various development projects in the country that are directly
threatening the existence of heritage sites in the Kenya because heritage policies are weak hence displaying gaps in sustainable development and policing. For example; the development of Lamu Port South Sudan Ethiopia project LAPSSET has affected Lamu old town heritage site; the high court magistrate of Malindi Land and Environment stopped the construction for threatening the heritage site (National Museums of Kenya, 2015).

In the development of LAPSSET project, the local communities were poorly involved as local heritage stakeholders. However; the Kenya National Museums intervened through heritage experts that recommended the project to enhance stakeholders’ cooperation in the region (National Museums of Kenya, 2015).

Based on the example above; Kenya heritage performance is based on stakeholders’ partnerships, collaborations, management and promotion. Kenya LAPSSET project development report development by the National Museums highlights stakeholders’ partnership importance in saving the national heritage. The national museum plays a vital role in uniting stakeholders and policy experts in enhancing heritage conservation and protection. The national museum provides support such as expert transport to Lamu and expertise for decision making. Similarly stakeholders’ collaboration is important as part of decision making and stakeholders’ partnership which is highly needed in the development of tourism (National Museums of Kenya, 2015).

Similarly, the development taking place in Mt. Kenya between the Aberdares and Mt. Kenya National Park is a key threat to sustainability of heritage owing to weak development policies. The development in Mt. Kenya region directly affect wildlife corridor hence posing threat to the existence of wildlife freedom in the region. Moreover, the development along Aberdares and Mt. Kenya National Park wildlife corridor display lack of proper stakeholders’ consultation,
community engagement in plan development, and international stakeholders’ collaborations relating to heritage such as UNESCO.

Kenya cultural heritage and wildlife conservation has for a long time been ignored therefore losing their distinct value and potential hence becoming homogenized landscapes (Mugwima, 2016). Natural and cultural heritage sites in Kenya require the valuable and active participation of individuals and communities in the industry of conservation (Mugwima, 2016). The benefit of heritage and cultural lies within the Kenyan cultural alliances to address the existing disconnect in conservation and community participation.

According to Mugwima (2016), conservation in cultural and heritage management is directly linked to local ethics by local management systems and international systems of values. However, knowledge regarding natural heritage sites such as Mount Kenya among other cultural heritage has raised with the increasing awareness of the sustainable development goals. The increase in heritage conservation has been occasioned by public access to conservation areas and conservation practices.

The Kenya Constitution in chapter two recognizes the Kenya culture and heritage as the nation foundation by affirming that the State is responsible for recognizing and promoting cultural expressions and heritage (Aleksandra, 2014). The promotion of culture and heritage is through community empowerment and involvement in conservation practices. The National Museums and Heritage Act (2006), further provide a guideline on natural and cultural heritage areas of conservation. Therefore, promoting community access to the world heritage sites such as Mt. Kenya offers more competitive avenues to promote conservation and create awareness.
In Kenya, the International Council on Monuments and Sites facilitate in creating stakeholders’ partnership and collaborations that aid in managing and conserving heritage sites in the country. Creation of awareness regarding conservation of Mount Kenya as a world heritage site has improved with the increased tourists’ visitation. The tourists include both domestic and international tourists.

The visitation has encouraged conservationists to develop competitive strategies to engage tourist in the promotion of conservation all over the world and communicate the significance of heritage conservation (Mugwima, 2016). Moreover, heritage sites managers have created engaging platforms to have tourists as key stakeholders and collaborate in creating awareness and conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites.

There are various underlying factors that pose threats in Kenya to culture and heritage sites such as traditional structure and natural heritage encroachment. An example is a human encroachment around Mount Kenya world heritage site. The encroachment has been brought by the rising population and poor farming techniques that make the local people go after the farms in and around Mt. Kenya heritage sites. The encroachment of Mt. Kenya heritage site has caused a negative impact on the existing wildlife hence degrading the value and potential of Mount Kenya as a world heritage site.

1.2 Problem Statement

Kenya as a heritage destination and the local people contain memories from the diverse heritage sites. The place that tourists tour, the local residence express heritage message hence contrasting tourists experience, explanations from local community workspace activists justifies the contrast. This controversy expresses the need to incorporate local community in heritage interpretation for
the tourists to comprehensively understand the indigenous context. However, there is relationship tension between academic historians and interpretation of heritage by the local people (Han-yin Huang, 2011).

Heritage physical state directly relate to the participation of local community; a heritage site respected, managed, and used by the local community has higher chances to be protected and restored, findings indicate that heritage sustainability cannot be achieved without local community involvement (Emerton, 2000). Therefore, sustainable local community well-being is grossly undermined, hence requiring a different approach towards the Community based tourism development process (Terzic, 2014).

The local community should be involved in the development process to receive sustainable support and promote community heritage tourism. During the development of sustainable tourism projects, key stakeholders need to be mapped, identified, and be analyzed to understand stakeholders interest and importance in the development process. Stakeholders’ analysis should be identified early to develop a good communication plan, determine engagement level, and identify each stakeholder’s role for sustainable development.

However, the non-inclusion of relevant stakeholders in community based heritage tourism constitutes a major challenge in sustainable heritage site (National Museums of Kenya, 2015). According to Terzic (2014), citizen participation is usually not considered as a vital part in democratic process of development since 3% of the total population in the local government is influential in the process of decision making hence result to unsustainable social, cultural tourism practices.
The development of Mt. Kenya wildlife corridor development and LAPSSET in Kenya heritage sites are key examples of heritage development that occurred to justify failure to clearly engage stakeholders’ participation, community involvement, and poor heritage development policies (National Museums of Kenya, 2015). Consequently, current socio-economic development and weak heritage policies directly affects heritage sites in Kenya.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

To solve the existing problems of the study, the researcher purposed to study the role of local communities’ in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region of Kenya. Therefore, the research sort to study interpretation of heritage, community as stakeholders ‘participation and stakeholders’ collaboration on sustainability of community based heritage tourism in the Mt. Kenya region and bridge the existing gaps.

Establishing of local community interpretation of heritage is important for the conservation of Mount Kenya national heritage. Moreover, community interpretation displays knowledge required to conserve the heritage site and delivery of necessary information to the tourists. Local community participation in heritage conservation is necessary for creating awareness and understanding the heritage site (ICOMOS, 2011).

Community participation in Mt. Kenya further gives the local people a sense of heritage ownership as enshrined in the Kenyan constitution. Participation in decision making provides local opportunities in making the decision that contributes to the conservation of the world heritage site. It is evident that local communities during the research indicated that they are not highly engaged in the decision-making process regarding the conservation and management of Mount Kenya as a world heritage site.
The local communities around Mt. Kenya region lack knowledge of heritage interpretation hence posing conservation threat to the world heritage site. By addressing the existing stakeholders collaboration challenges on community-based heritage tourism, local communities and heritage management bodies should create a sustainable conservation plan to protect Mount Kenya national heritage.

Moreover, community collaborations with other stakeholders provide avenues to promote community-based tourism, solve community exclusion problem, create awareness, and promote sustainable tourism. Therefore, addressing heritage interpretation, stakeholders’ participation and collaboration problem, Kenya heritage and community-based heritage tourism will be well conserved.

There will be good community-oriented policies to promote sustainable conservation of heritage in Mount Kenya region among world heritage sites in Kenya. The study will further benefit the local community in Mount Kenya region by developing a sense of heritage ownership. Ownership comes through identification, understanding, and contribution to the development of a destination (Andrew, 2016).

When the local communities around the Mount Kenya region can interpret Mount Kenya as heritage, and they understand the value of existence, they will easily protect and promote it. Finally, the engagement of different stakeholders will result in better collaboration strategies that engage the communities in decision making hence appreciating the value of Mount Kenya as a world heritage site.

1.4.0 Objectives

This section covers the general and specific objectives of the study.
1.4.1 General Objective

The main objective of this study was to examine the role of local community participation and stakeholders’ collaboration on the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism, in Mt. Kenya Region, Kenya. Local community participation in heritage conservation is influenced by the local understanding of sustainable conservation practices and heritage around them. Local community understanding of heritage determines heritage interpretation of Mt. Kenya national heritage.

Therefore, interpretation is essential in providing avenues for local community participation, collaboration, and conservation of community-based heritage tourism. Local community interpretation, participation and collaboration impact positively on sustainability of community heritage tourism in Mount Kenya heritage site.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To determine the local community interpretation of Heritage and its Influence on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism
2. To examine the role of stakeholder participation and its influence on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism
3. To identify stakeholder Collaborations towards Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism

1.5 Research Questions

1. How does the local community interpret heritage and sustainability based on heritage tourism?
2. What are the roles played by stakeholders’ participation in the sustainability of community based heritage tourism?

3. Does stakeholders’ collaboration contribute to sustainability of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region?

1.6 Significance of the study

According to KWS (2010), Kenyan natural heritage faces unique dangers that negatively affect the essential ecological attractions. These threats include the exclusion of local communities in decision making regarding heritage conservation, poor interpretation of heritage by local people, lack of stakeholders’ participation in community-based heritage tourism, and weak heritage policies on stakeholders’ collaboration. Other threats facing World Heritage Sites in Kenya include human encroachment, burning of Mt. Kenya forest, poaching of wildlife, pollution, and lack of heritage awareness among tourism stakeholders. These threats facing World Heritage Sites in Kenya form the basis of this research.

The Mount Kenya national heritage and ecosystem need modern policies to control development and tourism within the UNESCO world heritage site. Hence the development of this study aim to guide policy frameworks on sustainable development of heritage through positive community based heritage tourism; stakeholder partnership; and collaborations. This study helps understand the local community tourism context because there is disconnect in academician and heritage interpretation, understand the community role as stakeholders, influence of participation, and policy guide on these factors affecting Mt. Kenya region tourism. Therefore the policies will focus on empowering local communities as main stakeholders among other stakeholders.

The study similarly benefit tourism stakeholders from the community and in heritage to counter the challenges experienced in local community involvement in tourism development and
sustainability of community based tourism. The study focuses on this area because sustainable tourism development, heritage sustainability cannot be entirely realized without local community involvement since the community depend on local community heritage tourism.

Moreover, local community participation in heritage tourism from Bolivia La Yunga indicates the success of community based heritage tourism (Santilli, 2009). Santilli (2009) further argues that heritage that is appreciated, used, conserved, respected and managed by the local people has higher chances of being interpreted and appreciated by tourists among other stakeholders.

Similarly, profiling of community based heritage will assist in understanding stakeholders’ level of involvement and highlight stakeholders role in the process of promoting communities through inclusion in decision making. External collaboration with local stakeholders will facilitate in promoting the management of heritage through enhancing sustainable tourism development, provide more decision making platforms and improve local community performance in sustainability of heritage tourism. Further, local communities within the Mount Kenya heritage site will appreciate their local culture and protect the local heritage through the understanding of the authentic values of each heritage in Kenya.

### 1.6.1 Research output

The findings of this study are important in understanding the rate of community interpretation of heritage, stakeholders participation and collaboration performance. Moreover, the research is more important since it explore further problems facing Mount Kenya heritage tourism, identify interpretation challenges, and promote heritage engagement of local stakeholders such as the local community and county government to enhance sustainable tourism. Finally, a conceptual framework on impacts of sustainable community based heritage tourism.
1.7 Delimitations

Through identifying local people participation, roles, and external collaborations on community heritage tourism sustainability, the study delimits itself through the methodology that the research applied for this study. The researcher has applied appropriate research methods throughout the study to achieve reliable results in this study. Moreover, the researcher has used research assistance to ensure the study is carried out in the right time and professionally across the study area and in scientific analysis of this study. Similarly, the geographic area of this study covers appropriate areas to achieve the desired results of this study based on WHS and sustainability of community based heritage tourism.

1.8 Limitation

The study limitations were:-

I. Language barrier was a main challenge. The respondents’ language and mother tongue influenced their ability to give well composed answers to the questionnaires as expected. The researcher addressed this problem by using research assistant that were eloquent in the respondents’ native language and could meticulously get the best response to fill questionnaires. The researcher overcame the language barrier challenge also by engaging the respondents in the language the respondents feel comfortable to use while collecting the data.

II. There might be dishonesty in the process of data collection from the respondents which might affect the credibility and accuracy of data and results. The researcher addressed this problem by requesting the respondents to give true information of what they know in the research instrument used. Moreover, the researcher and the research assistants
engaged with the respondents freely in their local dialect that created confidence to give honest response during the data collection process.

III. Accessibility and transport to the interior villages was a challenge that would affect collection of data from the interior targeted respondents in the counties of the study region and area. The researcher addressed this problem by accessing the most populated centers that are active in community based heritage tourism such as Narumoru tourist and guides villages, towns, and tourism stakeholders’ centers that are easily accessible. The researcher further hired research assistants from different areas in Mt. Kenya region that know the cheapest way to access interior areas of the research area.

1.9 Assumptions of the study

The study was founded on the following basic assumptions:-

I. The respondents would not be influenced by the local language in answering the questionnaires and they would give answers in good English to the research as expected. This assumption was important since the researcher was able to engage research assistants and use respondents native language, this made the responses given on the research instruments be in good English and understandable.

II. The respondents would give reliable and honest data through the instruments of data collection that will assist in solving the existing gap. This assumption was important since the respondents were free with the researcher and the research assistants to give true responses. Moreover, the researcher and the research assistants were able to create confidence in the respondents by freely engaging in the respondents’ local dialect that made the respondent give honest and reliable responses.
III. The researcher would be able to access most villages in the region in different counties to get comprehensive results. This assumption was important since the researcher was creative enough to identify through consultants and research assistants the most populated areas in Mount Kenya region to get the required information. Additionally, the researcher used local research assistants that know Mount Kenya region well to access the area in an easy and in a cheap way. The researcher was able to access most of the villages in the research region and collected the data efficiently.

1.10 Conceptual framework

**Independent variables**

- Local interpretation of Heritage
  - CBT knowledge, Heritage value, Community forums, CBT profile

**Intervening variables**

- Stakeholder participation in heritage sustainability (Community)
  - Stakeholders’ importance, roles & level of involvement

- Stakeholder Collaboration in sustainability of heritage (Local & International)
  - Identification & importance

**Dependent variable**

- Sustainability indicators of community-based heritage tourism

- Government support and or Policy makers (NMK)
Figure 1.1: Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework indicates study variables that are independent variables of local community heritage interpretation; examine communities’ roles as key stakeholders, and availability of influential stakeholders’ collaborations. Community heritage interpretation is an independent variable that influences sustainability through creation of awareness, knowledge and existence of CBO profile that attract stakeholders. Examining community Stakeholders’ participation variable sought to identify stakeholders’ importance, roles & level of involvement that influence sustainability of local CBHT around Mount Kenya.

Moreover, Stakeholders collaborations variable sought to identify both local and international stakeholder’s collaborations and evaluate their importance in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism.

The independent variables affect the sustainability of Mt. Kenya CBHT and the intervening variables such as the national museums of Kenya and policymakers that intervene in ensuring sustainable practices are developed and implemented. Finally the dependent variable that are sustainable indicators, highlight the resulting benefits of having proper independent and intervening variables of sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region.
2.0 CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The chapter two covers the existing literature of this study on heritage interpretation, community based heritage profiling, community participation as stakeholders, international and local collaborations, and tourism sustainability. The literature review further covers stakeholders’ concepts on participation, sustainable concepts on heritage tourism, and stakeholders’ concepts on collaborations. The literature review has a theoretical framework that enabled the researcher cover literature of heritage sites around the world. The chapter further discusses the current and previous research relating to the study by bringing out related knowledge gaps involving study objectives.

2.1 Local Interpretation of Heritage and sustainable tourism

This section discuss the existing and current literature on interpretation of heritage that is determined by community knowledge on community based heritage tourism, value of heritage to the local community, community forums, and the profiles of community based tourism. The concept of local interpretation of heritage assists in determining the effect of heritage interpretation on sustainability of heritage. The section further addresses empirical research related to local interpretation of heritage and the influence and impact on sustainable heritage tourism.

2.1.1 The Concept and Gap on interpretation of heritage

The concept of heritage Interpretation involves an activity that aims to give relational meaning on a particular heritage attraction and the affiliated aspects that contribute to authentic
understanding through descriptive media that connect the reality of the heritage (Sarm, 2013). Interpretation process makes local people to understand heritage and appreciate heritage value. According to Sarm (2013), interpretation is an informal education process that engages tourists by giving reliable heritage information to inform impact on visitors experience and promote heritage conservation. Heritage interpretation through the local communities enables to promote positive practices by reducing adverse impacts on heritage from the tourist and the host community.

Local community perception on heritage and local attractions affect interpretation and behavior on sustainable conservation. Heritage perception further facilitate in understating heritage value and implication of heritage (Han-yin Huang, 2011). This perception and value further assists in heritage reconstruction and give a sense of place that also assist in comprehending heritage meaning to reflect past human and historical representation and world insight. Therefore, heritage attraction gives a representation and sense of belonging of a group of people and their historical origin.

In the United States of America, interpretation of art is used to describe natural heritage and cultural heritage. Moreover, the general public understands heritage through heritage interpretation using organized forums, tour events, and campaigns relating to heritage (Shalaginova, 2012). ICOMOS has internationally appreciated the importance of heritage interpretation in educating, creating and promoting awareness to the people hence encouraging quality heritage interpretation at heritage sites across the world. Interpretation of heritage theory aims to understand people beliefs, desires, and cultural artifacts meanings and also their practices towards the handling of heritage.
The interpretation theme outlines the participants in heritage interpretation. The theme is created by the relationship of understanding each sector in the theme whereby the phenomenon is the uniting factor for interpretation. The interpreter and the participants are drawn to the heritage site with the aim to gain or add value to the heritage that needs to be sustainable for heritage conservation.

Figure 2.1: Heritage Interpretation Theme
Source: (Biesen, 2016)

According to Shalaginova (2012), interpretation occurs between three elements that include self-knowledge regarding the heritage, park or heritage visitors, and the heritage in context of interpretation. The interpreter should have the ability and the motivation factor that will inspire the visitor to understand the heritage. For qualitative interpretation, the interpreter requires to know the visitor motivation in visiting the particular heritage. Further, to make the visitor understand heritage the interpreter should learn the best way to communicate to the visitor depending on how the interpreter understands the visitor’s motivation, basic interests, and the visitor’s cultural origin (Shalaginova, 2012). Figure 2.2 further describes the three principles in interpretation circuit, the interpreter, the visitor, and the park as discussed.
Communication is an important approach in understanding interpretation of cultural heritage; communication approach brings understanding as a psychological process. The understanding theory is based on the complex social and cognitive entity that allow the desired thinking and behavior to understand the communication made and as a result to help interpret the situation. Visitors and people experiencing a heritage site understand the site depending on the gained information and experiences encountered in the destination (Shalaginova, 2012). Therefore, for the visitor to gain maximum information on the heritage and be able to interpret the destination as required, there are different levels of communication required to achieve proper interpretation. In figure 2.2 is an interpretation model outlining the affective, cognitive and behavioral responses of the visitors:

Figure 2.2: Interpretation Model
Source: (Shalaginova, 2012)
The interpretation model in figure 2.3 demonstrates the quality interpretation of heritage site. Quality interpretive programs make the visitor connect emotionally from the heritage interpreter. The emotional connection of the heritage site makes the visitor explore more meaning of the heritage and find deep meaning for themselves (Shalaginova, 2012). The found meaning regarding the heritage site creates more imagination and creates more emotional connection and attachment with the heritage site. Positive feeling and emotions as a result of heritage connection from the interpretation are important in having tourists cognitive and behavior relating to the situation.

Culture over the years has facilitated in understanding heritage sites and cultural heritage sites relating to particular cultures. Guides need to understand culture to aid in interpretation of a cultural site to a visitor. The World Commission on Culture and Development (WCCD) was commissioned by the UNESCO to recognize cultures as important elements that aid in
understanding and interpretation of cultural concepts (Shalaginova, 2012). Moreover, the understanding culture creates a connection with the cultural heritage site hence give more meaning to the cultural site existence and in heritage interpretation.

In Kenya, heritage sites such as Mount Kenya not only provide content for heritage interpretation but also carriers of collective knowledge and cultural memory that can be easily shared, interpreted and understood by tourists.

Tour guides and local communities play an important duty in interpreting heritage sites to the tourists. Therefore, the tourist hosting guide serves the tourist with the initial understanding of the heritage site and describes the heritage value to the environment and the society. The concept of sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Kenya is based on reducing the negative impacts and on the contrary, provides a positive contribution to the hosting community as well give a quality experience to the tourists. Therefore, the communication is significant in interpreting sustainability of heritage tourism.

2.1.2 Local Interpretation of heritage and its aim on sustainable tourism

ICOMOS (2011) observes that interpretation include range of potential heritage activities that promote awareness and knowledge that facilitate in understanding cultural heritage. Sustainable heritage interpretation can be promoted through destination tour, publication, educational activities, community programs, research, and training.

Heritage interpretation at the attraction influence people participation and engagement in the management process at the site. Moreover, interpretation influence tour guiding process, and decision making hence influence local people contribution to heritage sustainable process (ICOMOS, 2011). Local communities are vital participants in sustainability of world heritage
site such as Mt. Kenya. The concern to the communities include to sustainably earn a decent livelihood for the local communities, engage tourists through the process promoting the destination, and share long term benefits of heritage profits. Sustainability carried by locals challenge the stakeholders to participate in conserving local heritage, promote heritage accessibility and improve tourism amenities in the local heritage destinations.

Sustainability using local communities allow participation and local involvement in decision making process and give community opportunities to sustainably own the destination that give satisfaction in engaging in planning and management of heritage (Simeunovic N., 2014). Moreover sustainable tourism requires optimizing local destination value, enhancing local well-being, conserving the resources, and improving tourism social performance. However, heritage and cultural tourism has development steadily because of maintaining history through the local people, visitors, and industrial stakeholders.

2.1.3 Empirical findings on local interpretation of Heritage and sustainable tourism

A study carried out in Tisban, a minor village located in Nangan Island central division of the Matsu archipelago. Local people in the village of Tisban in Matsu experience social change that rise from the process of developing the village to attract tourists, engage stakeholders, and sustainably conserve their natural and cultural attraction. The ICOMOS definition of heritage development is based on a broad sustainable concept of engaging people to conserve cultural and natural heritage (ICOMOS, 2011). Cultural and natural heritage include built environments, biodiversity, historical attractions, collections, cultural experiences, and landscapes. A field research was conducted in the village of Tisban by the local people to locally understand heritage; the study was done by collecting data from local people, listening to local people views, and through planned interviews (Han-yin Huang, 2011).
According to the research done in that village the place the local people belong hold memories that local people own and to the visitors, the local destinations offer experience and knowledge form the local people that contrast their understanding. The research applies to the historical conservation of Mt. Kenya local people interpretation and the empirical signifies sense of place that is felt in Situ.

An empirical study carried out by Biesen (2016) on the success of interpretation of heritage is based on the value of the heritage site. Heritage sites that are well conserved and managed seem to have great value to the local communities around them, and the heritage management bodies appreciate the value. However, the tour guides and local communities can communicate using both verbal and non-verbal techniques such as body language to the tourists (Biesen, 2016).

Research carried out on Management of heritage Interpretation at Angkor Wat Temple, Cambodia World Heritage Site indicate that interpretation provide a significant role in the heritage site sustainability. Sarm (2013) further argues that effective heritage interpretation contribute to conservation and sustainable tourism and encourage local activities such as tour guiding, heritage protection and cultural conservation. Effective heritage activities such as guiding and learning motivate tourists to sustainably visit heritage and promote sustainable community heritage tourism (Sarm, 2013).

Sarm (2013) further explains that with visitors guided by the locals and offer repeated visit to improve and understand the heritage well and control adverse impacts on the heritage sites. Heritage is well protected when the local people and the tourists understand the value of the heritage site. Sarm (2013) argues that informed tourists become heritage stakeholders through contribution to conservation since they understand the value of protecting the sites. Tourism sustainability influence local tourism development that include the local people and eradicate
poverty. Nevertheless, sustainability cannot be achieved without direct participation of the local people. Heritage is connected with people inclusion in promoting conservation and respecting the sites for better chances of protection (Terzic, 2014). Thus, the elaborate empirical study and findings above justify the gaps that connect local heritage interpretation; further research is required to improve community heritage sustainability.

2.2 Profile of community-based heritage tourism practices

This section describes and discusses the concept of profile of community based heritage tourism and influence on sustainable community tourism. The profile of community based heritage tourism has different types of community based organizations and different goals that influence the impact of heritage sustainability. The section further discusses empirical studies done on profile of community based heritage tourism and the sustainable tourism practices in the community based tourism. The profile of community based tourism influence heritage interpretation, stakeholders’ participation, and stakeholder’s collaboration that contribute to promotion of sustainable tourism.

2.2.1 Concept and Gap on the profile of community based heritage tourism practices

Community based tourism refer to people possessing a shared mandate, and the capability to make informed decisions through representative organizations (Isakson, 2016). For example settlers make an earning as land managers, service and produce providers, entrepreneurs, and workers (Isakson, 2016). As a result of people’s ability, profiling of local Community-Based Sites activities is influenced. Profiling entails listing the community-based tourism CBT practices and understanding their importance for sustainability and conservation. Importantly to note, some the tourism income is usually set aside for projects that entirely benefit the community and its natural assets. Community-based tourism allows both the local and
international tourists to explore and give back to the locals, appreciate Kenyan’s culture and wildlife. Since tourism enable the local inhabitants to benefit from the coming of tourists, the locals become more conscious and concerned of their environment. The benefit obtained from community heritage encourages the local communities to practice conservation of these resources hence the locals should be involved in the tourism development decision making (Travel Guide Report, 2016).

Several organizations are involved in community based organization, such as Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation (COMPACT), a United Nation Development Program joint. Community management of protected areas conservation COMPACT is an example of community organization of UNDP joint initiative that facilitates on global environmental program and grant programs through United Nation Foundation. The United Nations Foundation developed initiatives to incorporate locals in the running and governing of the global sites of heritage. The United Nations Foundation, with an attempt to empower biodiversity, preservation and local inhabitants in a particular environment, offers an amount of over $10 million in GEF small portions to non-governmental organizations and localized organizations (Foundation, 2012). In Kenya, Kenya Community Based Tourism (KECOBAT) was established in August, the year 2003. The launched network in 2003 acted as an organization to deal with matters concerning local tourism in Kenya.

Community-based heritage tourism was originally introduced in the tourism industry to control mass tourism and give back to the local communities (Jamal, 2016). Community-based tourism focuses on maximizing benefits to the host community and creates awareness regarding the values of sustainability and conservation. Jamal (2016) further argues that sustainability through community-based tourism use good practices such as supporting local communities, waste
management, reducing overconsumption, maintaining biodiversity, and sustainable use of resources.

According to Woodley (2003), there is needed to have clear policies that guide community-based heritage in Mount Kenya region particularly on the jurisdiction between the Kenya wildlife service, forest department and the private sector. There is lack of clear guide on operations of local community projects and utilization of park products that the local community should use (Woodley, 2003). Moreover, the community-based tourism practices are destructed by the human settlement and the Mount Kenya ecosystem migration routes are cut off by uncontrolled community-based practices.

2.2.2 Empirical findings of community based heritage tourism practices

In Kenya, local inhabitants are directly incorporated in promoting local tourism through creation of Community-Based Tourism events by people residing near major game parks. In return, the community events help in the utilization of game reserves, and improve economic and living standards (KECOBAT, 2016). Ranch owners are encouraged to allow for wildlife habitation. An organization ranch in Loitoktok, for example, has entered into an agreement with tourism stakeholders and developers and agreed to reserve its ranch for wildlife inhabitation.

The local communities not only earn from rented land, but also from social projects such as access of roads, education and other avenues that contribute to opportunities of employment for the local inhabitants, therefore refining the people’s quality life (KECOBAT, 2016). This process of locals benefiting from the environment differently from the usual pastoralism helps boost wildlife and environmental preservation. Community tourism therefore exist with the aim of offering aid to groups of local inhabitants possessing income generating ways that
complement keeping of livestock. As a result, the local women are happy since their children and husbands are working and earning an income which helps curb adversaries impacted by drought.

A major advantage of Community –Based Tourism on wildlife is that the wildlife is no longer under siege by poachers since the local inhabitants conserve the environment, thus boosting Kenya’s heritage (KECOBAT, 2016). Similarly; other heritage destinations across the country such as Naro, Samburu and Tsavo should embrace community based tourism by engaging stakeholders (KECOBAT, 2016), a factor displaying a CBT gap in these heritage regions.

A study on community-based tourism conducted by Paolo (2016), in Philippines department of tourism, indicate that local cultural practices are promoted by tourism businesses such as restaurants, foreign tourists in conjunction with the local communities. The local government units in the Philippines with tourism board members explore heritage tourism to establish challenging areas facing the local communities that promote community-based tourism. The exploration promotes best practices in the local destinations to ensure the community-based tourism has a great opportunity to maximize benefits to the tourism industry in the Philippines and for sustainability.

An example of community-based heritage tourism that has been promoted by local government units in the Philippines includes southern Cebu Heritage Trail. Southern Cebu Heritage Trail is sponsored by the Ramon Aboitiz foundation that represents the community heritage tourism practices for twenty-one years and promotes cultural heritage in Cebu for sustainability (Paolo, 2016). Through the support of community-based tourism in the Philippines, local communities have developed more sustainable practices that attract tourists. Other community-based tourism practices the Philippines have developed include Bohol heritage tourism, Kawit community base
heritage tourism program, Taal heritage program, and Santa Ana heritage community tourism projects (Paolo, 2016). These community tourism practices aim to preserve Philippines cultural heritage, promote sustainable tourism, and encourage economic tourism activities through community projects that benefit different communities and cultural organizations.

2.3 Stakeholder Participation and Sustainability of Heritage Tourism

This section tackles the concept of stakeholders participation that determine the level of stakeholders engagement, stakeholders involvement in decision making, and stakeholders importance in community based heritage tourism. The section further addresses empirical studies done on stakeholders’ participation and the impact on sustainability of heritage tourism.

2.3.1 Concept and Gap on Stakeholders participation and sustainability of Heritage Tourism

In the attempt to boost tourism, it is vital to comprehend the interdependence between tourism and heritage to enable the legitimization of stakeholders in the sustainability process of tourism. Generally, the structure of the management stakeholder consists of three major sectors such as the public sector, private sector and the international communities. The sectors have individual responsibilities that are geared towards heritage management and sustainability (Sarm, 2013).

According to Breugel (2013), sustainable community-based tourism success depends on cooperation of the locals and goodwill since they are on the ground to improve the tourism sector. Breugel (2013) further highlights that any development in tourism that is not in line with the local’s aspirations and abilities, can damage the potential of the tourism industry in general. There are several ways that the local settlers, who are significant stakeholders, can be involved in tourism development. Therefore, it is of significance to involve the locals in growth of the
tourism sector since involvement of local communities is considered an important idea towards the success of any development projects in a country. Moreover, involvement of local stakeholders in project development is now evident in most governments and non-governmental organizations’ policies (Breugel, 2013).

Many organizations plan to have local people to participate in their programs, which make those projects good on paper. However, when there is no local stakeholders’ participation, the project may be inappropriately used leading to poor sustainability. Breugel (2013) further indicates that credulous way participation of stakeholders is viewed and practiced, that creates demand for a rampant change in the tourism sector.

Relating to (Sarm, 2013) theory on partnership among stakeholders on heritage sustainability, the figure 2.4 outlines their category and relationship on partnership. The theory encourages heritage sustainability from various stakeholders, where local groups and international bodies collaborate in the tourism ministry to boost heritage interpretation and maintenance.

---

Figure 2.4: Management Stakeholder Structure
Source: (Sarm, 2013)
The concept on conservation and stakeholders’ participation is based on the benefit that ensures there are socio-economic gain both to local people and the environment (Rukwaro, 2016). Therefore there is need to integrate both the social, economic, and environmental benefits to have a successful stakeholder’s partnership. Rukwaro (2016) posit that, local involvement in stakeholders’ partnership shape people’s destiny, maintain the local culture and traditions create employment, and appreciate people’s lifestyle.

Figure 2.5: System of Sustainable cultural tourism
Source: (Rukwaro, 2016)

Economically, stakeholders’ partnerships are sustainable through sustainable employment, sustainable businesses, and successful investment on the local people. Socially, stakeholders’ participation enhances local social activities such as cultural events that promote sustainable heritage tourism. Stakeholders’ participation further promotes environmental benefits through conservation of heritage environment such as forestation and controlling environmental degradation.
2.3.2 Empirical findings on stakeholders’ participation and sustainable heritage tourism

According to Bott (2012), after conducting an empirical study on the aspect of participation of stakeholders, the community involvement ought to be highly considered. Bott (2012) further states “CBT ventures are those in which members of local communities have a degree of control over the activities taking place, and a significant proportion of the economic benefits accrue to them”. It is expected that several community-based tourism projects would equal self-mobilization as defined, to promote collaboration and maintenance of heritage.

Local community participation in heritage tourism is necessary in achieving faster and better results in tourism development, therefore, negative participation has facilitated in negative heritage conservation. However, there are different types and levels of engaging participating stakeholders. High level of stakeholder participation leads to better results. An empirical study done in Thailand, level of stakeholders participation reduce local community participation constrains in tourism development. Moreover, involvement of external stakeholders and local people in different levels that lead to more successful tourism development projects (Breugel, 2013).
According to figure 2.6 on stakeholders’ participation, community participation is a centre stage of uniting other stakeholders to participate in community-based tourism CBT. The local communities around a heritage site or practicing community-based heritage tourism are required to benefit from external partnerships coming to the unit in promoting heritage sustainability. Therefore, external stakeholders come to promote participation in community activities and values that the local people will benefit from. There are various levels of participation that stakeholders engage in while entering into sustainable participation.

Passive stakeholders’ participation is where a stakeholder enters a partnership and provides ideas or resources upon request without taking the lead in the stakeholders’ partnership. Passive stakeholders partner with the community and engage with the community in the time of need. Participation by information giving is where stakeholders’ main role is to provide the required information to promote the core business of the partnership. The information is providing stakeholders carryout research regarding the reason for partnership and give progressive
information that the partnership can use to strengthen the stakeholders' partnership. In Kenya, KECOBAT and the national museums of Kenya provide information that community-based heritage tourism requires promoting sustainable heritage tourism in the Mount Kenya region and the surrounding community-based heritage by the communities in the region.

Community-based projects in Mount Kenya region such as the United Narumoru Association have drawn different stakeholders in the tourism industry to partner in the promotion of stakeholders’ participation and sustainable heritage tourism. The association invites organizations and people to partner in promoting community tourism by participating in community programs such as mountain climbing and conserving Mount Kenya national heritage.

An empirical study done on the Agikuyu shrine Mukurwe Wa Nyagathanga justifies the need for stakeholders partnership through the communities around the shrine in the Mount Kenya region. Mukurwe Wa Nyagathanga is the origin of the Agikuyu community, the biggest community in Kenya (Rukwaro, 2016). The shrine is where the first Agikuyu woman and man came from, the man was Gikuyu, and the woman was Mumbi. Moreover, the shrine had a Mugumo tree at the centre of the shrine that perceived as an immemorial object of worshipping their god. The Mukurwe shrine is a great national pillar on the heritage and sustainability of cultural tourism in Kenya since the shrine was established during the British leadership before independence and has vital Agikuyu cultural history.
According to Rukwaro (2016), Mount Kenya region heritage has faced conservation threats since independence. Figure 2.7. Above indicate Mukurwe Wa Nyagathanga shrine that is one of the heritage sites that has faced land grabbing, cultural erosion, and stakeholders participation challenges in Mount Kenya region. After independence Mukurwe Wa Nyagathanga was restored by the main conservation stakeholders partners, the Greenbelt movement and the local community from land grabbers (Rukwaro, 2016). Moreover, there was lack of stakeholders’ collaboration and coordination in protecting the heritage site hence low level of cultural conservation. The local community elders pushed hard to create stakeholders’ participation active to air their views on the shrine cultural values and the need to protect the shrine. According to Rukwaro (2016), community conservation initiative to unite stakeholders was a vital in restoring the history and community based heritage tourism.
2.4 Stakeholder Collaborations and Sustainability of Heritage Tourism

This section discusses the concept of stakeholders’ collaboration that determines the availability of stakeholders’ collaboration and importance of stakeholder’s collaboration in promoting sustainable community based tourism. The section further discusses empirical studies done on stakeholders’ collaboration and the impact in the development of sustainable tourism.

2.4.1 Concept and Gap on stakeholders’ collaborations towards sustainability of heritage tourism

Collaboration goes beyond partnership of people that are either active or passive by sharing deeper responsibility, authority, and accountability to achieve the aim of the collaboration. Collaboration among different stakeholders unites local stakeholders and international bodies to tackle a common goal (Cooper, 2012). Different stakeholders control their resources that facilitate in achieving the common goal through collaboration; these resources include expertise, money, and technology. However, it is difficult to effectively achieve sustainable heritage tourism without stakeholder’s collaboration because of resource limitation factor (Cooper, 2012). Stakeholders collaboration facilitate in problem solving through members participation.

Stakeholders’ identification and legitimization is the first stage in the process of collaboration for tourism development. During the tourism development process, tourism stakeholders should be legitimized and identified early to develop a common goal (Simeunovic, 2014). Early stage of stakeholders collaboration facilitate in controlling the collaboration influence and each partner’s interest in the process. Moreover, the identification and legitimization process outline the stakeholder role and the communication plan in each collaboration level (Simeunovic, 2014).

In relation to Bott (2012) theory, shareholder theory of partnership in secured areas, the relationship between the private and public sector is to be integrated. Moreover, the integration
relationships should be mapped to natural area destination and those who inhabit it, as well as others people who have a “stake” in it.

Stakeholder’s collaborations are developed from existing list of stakeholders with a common goal. However, stakeholder’s involvement involves some legitimacy that determines the level of engagement in the stakeholders’ collaboration (Stronza, 2016). There are stakeholders that may not be willing to participate with others in the collaborative process for different reasons. The level of engagement in the collaboration is determined by the influence of stakeholder’s power in the collaboration, legitimacy of the stakeholder in the relationship, and the urgency of stakeholders wish in the organization. Stakeholder’s power in the collaboration is not enough without legitimacy to execute a certain mandate. Stakeholders may have the influential power and the legitimacy but choose not to be active in participation in the collaboration. However, with a legitimate power and urgency towards the goal of the stakeholders’ collaboration, the collaboration works in unison.

Collaboration strength is determined by the power of each stakeholder in the collaboration. Therefore, power distribution in the collaboration is essential to influence the required direction in the collaboration. In heritage tourism, collaboration strength is therefore sustained by stakeholder’s power, legitimacy, and urgency of the desire to contribute to the development of the heritage tourism. Collaboration development is based on the form and structure of the collaboration (Stronza, 2016). The collaboration structure and form focus on requirements to join the collaboration and the entrance level of each stakeholder in accordance with each stakeholder’s intention, perception and goal.

Heritage tourism collaborations focus on uniting the power to identify, understand and promote heritage in protected areas through nature representation. Heritage collaborations also aim to
include local communities in promoting heritage since people and nature of a particular region share culture and historic values. Collaborations engaging the local communities in an established process have found more power among collaboration stakeholders, and these collaborations last for a long time.

![Collaboration Process Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.8: Collaboration Process**  
Source: (Larson, 2013)

Collaboration involves a process that has different stages to be different from a stakeholder’s partnership in heritage sustainability (Larson, 2013). Stakeholder’s analysis is the first stage that analyzes the stakeholder aim and their motive. The process is followed by process design, development of shared agenda, constituency building, and implementation. The design process provides a road map for use by different stakeholders that highlights the areas to observe the development of shared agendas in the collaboration to ensure there is an effective collaborative process.
2.4.2 Empirical findings on stakeholders’ collaboration towards sustainability of heritage and tourism

A research in Cambodia involving stakeholders collaboration among 3000 local tour guides and international tourism partners have enhanced sustainability through training to work in the Siem Reap province of Angkor Wat. The collaboration focused on knowledge sharing, social skill development, and legal understanding (Sarm, 2013). The training enhanced heritage interpretation through the tour guides for capacity building and promote sustainable heritage tourism.

According the study in Cambodia, understanding each stakeholder perception is necessary in controlling collaboration complications. Perception concept facilitate in understanding each member view on conservation and promotion as key determinants in effective collaboration. The perception concept bridges the gap between large, small, local, and international stakeholders to facilitate in proper sustainable practices. Grabowski (2011) further acknowledges there needs to be an inclusion of those displaced and disempowered.

Without these important stakeholders’ partnership and collaboration, the site becomes void of the heritage itself, the heritage that is being preserved in particular. The study demonstrates the linkage between heritage and tourism development through stakeholder collaboration. Grabowski (2011) argues that, conflict arises in stakeholders’ collaboration that complicates the effectiveness of each member if no proper identification and planning is done. The study further found that international, local, private, and public stakeholders’ collaborations have different working relationships that can cause failure in the development plan, success of sustainable heritage tourism development and stakeholder’s collaboration communication (Grabowski, 2011).
Research done by Aas (2015) in Rio Grande watershed between United States and Mexico basin indicate the power of building strong collaboration for sustainability. The watershed in the Rio Grande provide more water for the cities in Mexico and the United States, but the water has reduced in the basin as a result of pollution and destruction of wildlife habitats (Aas, 2015). However, different stakeholders that include non-governmental organizations, organizations and communities have struggled to preserve the watershed for sustainable provision of water. According to Aas (2015), the struggle has been in existence for lack of stakeholders’ collaboration.

A study from a retreat held in Rio in the refuge of the watershed indicates that a theme was to develop a strong collaborative initiative to conserve the Rio. The preparation began by inviting all stakeholders starting with the local communities with a common goal of creating awareness on conservation regarding the basin cultural heritage and natural resources (Simeunovic N., 2014). According to Aas (2015) the leading stakeholders include the government, associated governments agencies, conservation groups, business people and the local communities.

The research further indicated that the retreat was developed by understanding each stakeholder’s role and duty in the collaboration to ensure there is a maximum protection of the Rio watershed. Each stakeholder further gave opinions on how to sustainably conserve the watershed for their main goal was to promote conservation sustainably. Policies were developed to guide the collaboration that saw sustainable conservation practices develop.

2.5 Theoretical frameworks

This section highlights and discusses theories related to the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism.
2.5.1 Heritage Sustainable Theory

According to Dangi (2016) research on long term sustainable tourism, the literature on community based tourism looks towards local level responsibility, tourism development practices, and management. Sustainable practices and development in progress towards long term sustainable goals has difficulties with indicators in the principles of stakeholders’ collaboration. The theory involves critical analysis of the relationship between communities based tourism (CBT) and sustainable tourism (ST).

The Heritage and Sustainable Theory argue that a joint approach is needed in advancing and management conservation of the previous confusion in tourism research relation to heritage tourism and community. The joint integration aids in addressing heritage management, decision making, collaboration, participation, and distribution of resources. The integrated approach would further promote heritage and communities to realize the desirable sustainable goals relating to sustainability of heritage and community tourism according to both sustainable theories and community based tourism theories (Dangi, 2016). However, the theory further applied approaches that added a new category that sort to further ascertain the relationships between Sustainable Tourism and CBT which was highly adopted for this study, as well as to further explore dimensions of governance, justice and ethics. The study further used involvement and interpretation as theoretical approaches to understand Mt. Kenya heritage sustainability through communities as key sustainable development stakeholders.

2.5.2 Partnership and collaboration structure Theory

The theory suggests that in centralized structure of management of tourism, the locals face critical problems in tourism planning and actions in their respective communities. Secondly, there may lack restrictions for the local communities to be involved, but coordination remains a
problem. The theory also outlines limitations on the structure of management. The policymakers’ negative attitude towards the local inhabitants neglect the community’s ability to be involved in the decision making process on tourism matters. The structural gap therefore blocks the locals’ ability to participate and be involved in tourism management.

This study checks into this aspects and use it to bring out the relationships between all stakeholders and collaborators (Lalayan, 2014). Lalayan (2014) further highlights that CBT greatly rely on administrative management, businesses, and institutions around the community heritage sites. However, economic and administrative regulations, institutional frame work lower action and strength of teamwork. The theory reinstates that well designed business models and good projects are likely to fail, when there is poor partnership and not collaborations. There is regulation of revenue distribution when there is clear relation between stakeholders and community participation in the process of project funding, tenure, and ownership in order to have harmony in national and CBT framework.

The study used the theory to bring out Mount Kenya stakeholders participation, the effectiveness of the existing partnerships, and their success on heritage sustainability. The study further sought to understand the existing stakeholders’ collaboration in sustainability of heritage. Collaborations according to the partnership structure help in having united partnerships from different stakeholders; stakeholders enter into collaborations for long term sustainable development.

2.5.3 Stakeholders Collaboration Theory

Stakeholders’ collaboration theory aims to integrate the relationship between the privates and public sector organizations, the protected area biophysics, and the people who inhabit the area (Stronza, 2016). Moreover, the collaboration theory further targets to benefit people and organizations that have a stake in the destination. The theory state that environmental
stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations are vital stakeholders since they see the broad value of environment without focusing on the minor and immediate benefit that may lead to biodiversity exploitation. Non-governmental organizations aim to optimize biodiversity conservation through stakeholder’s collaboration theory by employing resourceful stakeholders such as scientists that are capable of providing knowledge to benefit nature and all parties associated to nature.

Stakeholder’s collaboration theory opens more opportunities to engage other stakeholders to form collaborative alliances that are active to solve society problems. Open engagements to include other stakeholders allow local communities that are important ensuring the collaboration is community oriented and acceptable in promoting culture and indigenous knowledge (Stronza, 2016). Heritage collaborations further appreciate the role each stakeholder play since heritage has for a long period left for the government.

The interest of each stakeholder in collaborative stakeholder’s theory is cut out to avoid stepping on different stakeholder’s interest. Stakeholder’s interest is cut out by understanding what role each stakeholder plays in collaborative initiatives such as what NGOs require in a collaborative stakeholders partnership (Stronza, 2016). The collaboration works through participatory dialogue to enable tabling of all the existing differences, goals, and mission for each stakeholder in the collaboration.

The research employed stakeholders’ collaboration theory in studying objective two that aims at examining the roles of stakeholder participation and its impact on sustainability of community based heritage tourism. The theory helped to study partnership roles as the theory aims to integrate private and public stakeholders and establish their roles. The theory helped to focus
beyond the immediate benefits of each stakeholder promoting heritage in Mount Kenya region and also the broad interest in partnering with local communities for future heritage development.

2.5.4 **Heritage interpretation Theory**

Heritage interpretation theory indicates that interpretation has contributed to restoration of declined understanding of both urban and rural areas through tourism conservation (Uzzell, 2015). The heritage interpretation has therefore led to people understanding and creating awareness on appreciation of place and time. Interpretation challenges all tourism stakeholders through the disconnection that exist between the academicians, tourists, and the hosting community. The visitors are left without clear understanding of the destinations they visit if the host communities do not interpret heritage as required (Uzzell, 2015). The academicians and historians according to heritage interpretation theory should take the lead in contributing to making the general public understand the heritage, moral and ethical issues that regard sustainable heritage.

The origin of interpretation depends on the conservation movement. Lack of proper interpretation pose a huge treat to conservation and in long term sustainability of heritage. Heritage interpretation theory indicate that human beings are destroying wildlife that include both flora and fauna because they do not understand their real meaning and value (Uzzell, 2015). Therefore, interpretation of heritage will be of significant impact in our society when the practice of community based tourism will be well interpreted and articulated by theories that guide stakeholders to promote sustainable practices.

Heritage interpretation theory is further embedded within the Tilden dictum that dictates that, through interpretation, there is understanding; through understanding of heritage, there is heritage appreciation; and through heritage appreciation, there is protection (Uzzell, 2015). The
Tilden dictum shows there will be achievement in the desired effect of interpretation through public sharing of information, and education through public campaigns and advertisements. The knowledge of interpretation ultimately changes the attitude that contributes to poor sustainable practices.

The study used Heritage interpretation theory to study heritage interpretation and understanding of Mount Kenya heritage by the local communities and stakeholders in the region. Heritage interpretation guided the study using the Tilden dictum to gauge the level of heritage understanding that brings about interpretation and appreciation that indicate whether heritage around Mount Kenya is protected or not.

The research theories facilitated the researcher to understand the role of local communities in interpreting heritage for sustainable tourism. Similarly, the local community interpretation theories indicate the level of community integration in heritage sustainability, heritage integration theory indicate the need to engage local community in decision making and promote the heritage protection. Moreover, the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage has been enhanced by partnership and collaboration structural theory that indicate the necessity to partner key stakeholders and local communities for sustainable development. Heritage partnerships have been proven to promote heritage interpretation, create awareness, define collaboration role for conservation and promote community based heritage sustainability.
3.0 CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter checks on the research design, describe the design and show the study area and target population used in data collection. The chapter further shows the target population, sampling techniques and sample size used for the research.

3.1 Research Design
The study employed Descriptive Survey Design. Descriptive Survey Design observes the features and results of the same respondent. According to Kothari (2004), Survey Research Design explains certain research phenomenon in true natural occurrence and vital determinants relating to natural phenomenon in discovering inferences and causal relationships. Descriptive survey research design allows a researcher to relate, quantify, and justify great number attitudes from the respondents in a quantitative research. The researcher selected this design to allow findings comparison and apply constructive schools of thought for the study. This gave relevant data that facilitated in examining the role of local community participation and stakeholders collaborations on sustainable heritage tourism the study area.

3.2 Study Area
Mt. Kenya NP region is the area under study focus since UNESCO has listed Mt Kenya as a natural site of the World Heritage site within the Mount Kenya tourism circuit and a significant factor in promoting national and regional heritage tourism through the second highest mountain in Africa. The heritage site is surrounded by different communities in Mount Kenya region that influence the region sustainable tourism development.
Mount Kenya region is a highland area hosting the world heritage site, the Mount Kenya National Park. According to KECOBAT (2016), the Mount Kenya region is a heritage area that hosts many different communities coexisting together in different counties of the region. Mount Kenya region further hosts various community-based tourism organizations that contribute to the development of heritage tourism in Kenya (Mount Kenya Environmental Conservation, 2016). Moreover, the community-based tourism in Mount Kenya region is connected by the values Mt. Kenya has towards the tourism sector in Kenya and the benefits the natural heritage offer to the surrounding environment in the region.

Mount Kenya heritage hosts a natural forest that covers two percent of the country size and makes the mountain a water tower among the five water towers in Kenya. The forest provides seventy-five percent of Kenya renewable surface water, and the region soil is the cotton type that is good for agricultural farming. However, Mount Kenya had lost thirty percent of the forest cover since 1997 when the mountain was gazette as a site under UNESCO World Heritage (Mount Kenya Environmental Conservation, 2016). The loss of the forest has been associated with poor illegal activities such as deforestation, poor farming techniques, and unsustainable tourism practices.

Lack of heritage awareness and unsustainable tourism practices have been associated with heritage degradation in the region. However, Mount Kenya environmental conservationists encourage communities to promote community-based heritage tourism to improve community cultural tourism that supports heritage tourism (Mount Kenya Environmental Conservation, 2016). Moreover, the conservationists provide education to the communities on heritage sustainability, proper farming techniques, and forestation to control inhabitation of the natural forest in the protected national park.
The survival conditions of different communities in Mount Kenya require improvement by providing education for all on the importance of community-based tourism, heritage, partnership and sustainability. Tourism stakeholders should strengthen community self-help groups, schools, park management, and empower county governments in the countries around the Mount Kenya region to promote sustainable tourism practices.

Figure 3.1: Mt. Kenya NP Region (Study Area)
Source (Steinicke, 2012)

3.3 Target Population

The target population of the study comprised of two different groups in Mt. Kenya NP region. The first target group is the local communities as key stakeholders of Mt. Kenya NP. This is because the local community helped in giving information on how heritage is defined and understood to be, description of community based heritage practices, indicate the role of stakeholders’ participation, and stakeholders’ collaboration on sustainable tourism.
The researcher also targeted park management that includes Mt. Kenya National Park senior warden and the deputy senior warden. The two managers assisted to respond on interview questions on community interpretation of heritage, participation and agreement of stakeholders, and ways of heritage sustainability.

Table 3.1: Counties population in Mt. Kenya Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties of Mt. Kenya Region</th>
<th>Population of communities</th>
<th>p- value</th>
<th>Sample Frame</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nyeri</td>
<td>693,558</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Embu</td>
<td>516,212</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Meru</td>
<td>1,356,301</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kirinyaga</td>
<td>596,268</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 TharakaNithi</td>
<td>365,330</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,527,669</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source (Statoids Kenya, 2015)

3.4 Sampling Techniques

The researcher used simple random sampling technique for the study and cluster method for respondents’ distribution in the study area counties. All the units inside the clusters were selected to partake in responding the questionnaires, that involved splitting the population into different clusters and selecting a proportion of these clusters to form a sampling frame. The researcher further used simple random selection of people with the formed clusters of the targeted key sites to participate in responding to the questionnaires. The main reason in applying sample random sampling technique is to generate precise and accurate information since the method reduces biasness (Maingi, 2014). Moreover, a repetitive of the entire population characteristic was studied to give information regarding the entire population.
3.5 Sample Size

A total of three million five hundred and twenty seven thousand six hundred and sixty nine people reside around the study area of Mount Kenya National Park as of 2009 census (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2010). Similarly, Mount Kenya National Park receives 25,600 tourists annually which indicate Mt. Kenya National Park as the less visited park in Kenya with one percent of park annual visitation (Martina Neuburger, 2012). The researcher used fischer research method to determine the sample size in the study area. Using the fischer research method the sample was determined from three million five hundred and twenty seven thousand six hundred and sixty nine residents around Mount Kenya to that gave a sample size of 384 respondents around the heritage site. This sample size was considered sufficient for the purposes of generalization of the study findings as it is consistent with the sample size required for normal distribution possibility.

\[
N_0 = \frac{Z^2 * p * q}{e^2} \quad \text{Equation [1]}
\]

\[
= \frac{1.96^2 * 0.5 * 0.5}{0.05^2} = 384.16
\]

\(N_0\) is the sample size,

\(Z^2\) is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area \(\alpha\) at the tails (1 - \(\alpha\) equals the desired confidence level, e.g., 95\%) \(^1\),

\(e\) is the desired level of precision,

\(p\) is the estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population,

\(q\) is 1-\(p\). (95% confidence level and ±5% precision.)
3.6 Research Instruments

The researcher used both questionnaires and an interview as instruments of data collection. The research used both primary and secondary source for data. For primary data, the researcher used questionnaires targeting the local community and local tourists as stakeholders since detailed information was needed on community heritage tourism and sustainability, community participation, and collaboration. The questionnaires were both open ended and closed ended questions to ensure there is maximum information collected and quality response.

An interview was conducted with Mt. Kenya NP management, Mt. Kenya National Park Senior Warden and the previous acting senior warden. The previous acting senior warden is part of Mount Kenya management team. The researcher later went for an observation walk to observe and see sustainable measure in place to promote Mount Kenya world heritage site. The researcher further applied direct observation on sustainable practices around Mt. Kenya NP. Every instrument was checked on its validity to ascertain they are flawless for the study. Moreover, several ideals were deliberated in the design before the questionnaires were developed. These factors went in line with the recommendations of Manion, Morrison and Cohen (Morrison, 2004).

3.7 Pre-Test

A pre-test was carried out in the Mount Kenya regional key towns of Mt. Kenya that included Nyeri, Chuka, and Embu region. The pre-test was carried out in June the year two thousand and seventeen with the aim of confirming the validity of the instruments to be used, and the quality of questions to be used in the field research.

The pre-test was conducted by distributing sample questionnaires to different local communities in Nyeri, Chuka, and Embu. Embu was the first town the pre-test was carried out in the first
week of June; twelve questionnaires were distributed in Embu town. Nyeri town was the second pre-test area that happened in the second week of June the year two thousand and seventeen and distributed fourteen questionnaires. Finally, Chuka town was the last pre-test area the researcher carried out the pre-test by distributing eleven questionnaires. The total pre-test sample size was thirty seven (37). The researcher found the questionnaires were friendly to the local communities and the respondents. Eighty percent (80%) of the questions in the questionnaires were answered without researcher assistance in all the three pre-test areas. However, the remaining twenty percent (20%) of the questions in the questionnaires that researcher assisted the respondents' challenge was based on language density, which gave the researcher an opportunity to use simpler words and language in the making the final revised questionnaires for data collection. Nevertheless, the pre-test responses on the questionnaires were never used in the main study.

The pre-test confirmed the questionnaires offered valid and friendly questions to the local people on heritage interpretation, community participation, and collaboration in heritage sustainability. Kikuyus, Merus, and Embus were the dominant communities that participated in responding to the questionnaires due to regional cultural distribution. According to the pre-test findings, the respondent understood the questions during the pre-test with ease, this proved the questionnaire quality was good, and the language used in the questionnaires is comfortable with the respondents. These findings gave the researcher the confidence to carry on to the actual data collection. However, the few challenges encountered such as lack of cooperation between the respondents and the researcher were vital lessons to guide the researcher on the best areas of the research zones to collect actual data for a smooth research process.
3.8 Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

Validity, a vital criterion, shows the extent to which an instrument is to measure something, therefore a construct’s content validity is viewed when subject and semantic meaning of the construct are seen (Maingi, 2014). The accuracy of the questionnaires was enabled through judgment from experts such as the research supervisor, among others in the field of study. The validity and Reliability were carried out in June twenty sixteen using the researcher readers and supervisors. It was conducted by professionally reviewing all the questions in all the sections of the questionnaires and ensuring all the questions are accurately responding to the research problem.

The reliability test was used by subjecting the instrument to crombach alpha test, to ensure that only consistent results are observed. Results were positive although the researcher supervisors guided the researcher to rectify a few questions that were academically difficult to the local communities of different academic levels. Before the study, the instrument was used regularly to enable the reliability of the measuring tool and ensure that the objectives of the research are achieved. Interview questions were developed professionally in relation to the population under target and research objectives for valid and dependable responses.

3.9 Data Collection

Data collection questionnaires were used to collect data from the respondents in Mount Kenya region. The questionnaires were both open-ended and closed-ended questions. Closed-ended questions offered the respondent an opportunity to answer the questions in precise and in a short time while the open-ended questions offered the respondent an opportunity to discuss their response without researcher limitation. The questionnaires were distributed to the targeted local communities to fill, and researcher with the aid of the researcher assistant collected the
questionnaires back after they were comprehensively filled. The data was collected in three weeks.

The researcher also used interview questions for data collection. The interview was targeting the Mount Kenya heritage managers such as Mount Kenya National Park senior warden. For the interview technique questions were developed by the researcher for use during the interview. The interview was conducted one on one and quality responses were achieved regarding the research.

The researcher was luckily taken for a casual walk in the heritage site of Mount Kenya National Park to see the sustainable practices implemented by the management team. However, the observations were not part of research data collection techniques though the researcher saw some physical sustainable practices on heritage. Moreover, the researcher observation walk indicated the existing physical research problem in the Mount Kenya region, and community-based heritage tourism that promotes sustainable stakeholders partnership and collaboration. The researcher and Mt. Kenya management former acting Senior Warden visited the park to show sustainable practices in place to promote sustainability of heritage. The former acting Senior Warden further referred the researcher to community organizations in Narumoru and Aberdares for more data collection on community-based tourism practices, interpretation, and collaborations.
3.10 Data Analysis and Presentation

This research applied both qualitative and quantitative methods in analyzing the data.

Table 3.2: Summary of Data Analysis Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objectives</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Data Collection Techniques</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine local community interpretation of Heritage and its Impact on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Local Community Questionnaires</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To examine the role of stakeholder participation and its Impact on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism</td>
<td>Questionnaire Interview Qualitative and Quantitative</td>
<td>Community Questionnaires and Mt. Kenya N.P Management Interview</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics Table and Graphical presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To identify stakeholder Collaborations and Its Impact on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism</td>
<td>Questionnaire Interview Qualitative and Quantitative</td>
<td>Community Questionnaires and Mt. Kenya N.P Management Interview</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics Table and Graphs presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source; Researcher; 2016

3.11 Logistical and Ethical Consideration

Permission was sought from the director general of National Commission for Science, Innovation, and Technology to carry out the research. The respondents were informed on the purpose of study to ensure confidentiality; the respondents were not required to indicate their names on the questionnaires. The collected information was confidential and used for the purpose of the research only.
4.0 CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

The purpose of the research was to study the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region. To achieve this purpose, the study was guided by guiding objectives and a conceptual framework. This chapter presents data analysis, the interpretation of the results and discussion of the findings. This includes descriptive analysis and regression analysis of the data; it was analyzed using statistical software SPSS version 24. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the data while regression analysis was done to determine the relationship between the study variables.

4.1 Response Rate

In Table 4.1 is the questionnaire response rate and interview response rate in Table 4.4. The response rate is used to discuss further findings of this study.

4.1.1: Questionnaire Response Rate

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Community</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sampled 384 respondents; however, 317 questionnaires were well answered and returned which is 85.5% response rate that is a good representation for the study. Gay (1995) asserts that a response rate 50% is adequate and therefore the response rate for this study was
adequate for the analysis and interpretation of data. The response came through the questionnaires that the researcher used to obtain primary data from the local community members and key stakeholders in the community programs around Mount Kenya region.

4.1.2: Interview Response Rate

Table 4.2: Interview Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher conducted an interview with Mount Kenya National Park management that includes the senior warden and the former acting senior. The senior warden and the former acting senior warden responded on the interview guide that covered local interpretation on heritage, role of stakeholders’ participation in sustainable tourism, stakeholder’s collaboration, and sustainability of community based heritage tourism. The interviewee comprehensively responded to all the questions and guided the researcher in making physical observation on sustainable practices in place to promote Mt. Kenya heritage.

4.2 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

This section explain demographic information of the respondents of the research, the section discusses the following: gender distribution, age, marital status, level of education, and the respondent county. The demographic information help to understand the background of the respondents and the effect of this information facilitate in understanding the role of local
communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region.

4.2.1 Gender Distribution of the Respondents

The researcher sought to establish the gender distribution of the respondents. Based on the data presented on Figure 4.1 below, 214 male responded to the questionnaires appropriately that represents 67.6% of all the respondents and 103 females responded to the questionnaires representing 32.4% of the total respondents. This implies gender representation in the study.

![Figure 4.1: Gender Distribution](image)

The male gender dominated in promoting community based tourism in the Mount Kenya region, 67.6% of the respondents is above average in conducting tourism activities that are sustainable. According to Andrew (2016) most of the local community based tourism activities require muscles and male strength hence most of the respondents are of male gender. These activities include climbing the mountain through community organizations, community conservation that involve going to Mount Kenya National Park to put off the fire in the forest. Moreover, some of the community tourism programs such as community tour guiding in climbing the mountain happens for a long time and at night such that the female gender may fail to engage for family care purpose.
The implication of these findings is that more male responding to the questionnaire indicates the male gender dominance in community based heritage tourism compared to the female gender. The implication may lead to more success of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region if male gender will maintain their participation numbers since community based heritage tourism require more strength (Andrew, 2016).

4.2.2 Gender Distribution per County

In figure 4.2 is gender distribution per county. Five counties were cover in the study; these include Nyeri, Meru, Embu, Tharaka Nithi, and Kirinyaga.

![Gender Distribution per County](image)

Figure 4.2: Gender Distribution per County

The result in Figure 4.2 indicates gender distribution per county in the study area. Nyeri leads with 63% of male respondents followed by Tharaka Nithi with 62%, Kirinyaga 58%, Embu 54% and Meru 52%. The findings indicate that the male gender continue to dominate at the county level in study. The gender influence on community based tourism participation correlates with a
study done on determinants of household decisions in Meru Ontukigo and Ngare Ndare of Timau region in Meru (Musyoki, 2012). There is high significant relation between male gender roles in the family and their availability to participate in conservation and gender since male and female experience different situations in family roles, females are confined in family constrains that limit their participation conservation in Mount Kenya region (Musyoki, 2012). Musyoki (2012) further argues that women are disadvantaged because of their home chore such as child bearing, water fetching and cooking. Moreover, the male gender is advantaged by associations related to their duties such as cattle keeping in the forest and outdoor meetings in community groups.

The implication of the study findings revealed that Nyeri County with more males participating in community based tourism holds a higher potential to lead in sustainable community based tourism in Mt. Kenya region. Moreover, the findings indicate that Meru County has the lowest number of male participating in community based tourism that may lead to low sustainability of community based tourism in Mt. Kenya region.
4.2.3 Respondents’ Age Distribution

In Table 4.3 is respondents’ age distribution in the study area that comprises five counties that include Nyeri, Meru, Kirinyaga, Embu, and Tharaka-Nithi.

Table 4.3: Respondents’ Age Distribution in the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25 Years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 Years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 Years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 Years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65 Years</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 66 Years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 4.3 presents the age distribution of all the respondents in the study area. Based on the findings, the researcher obtained accurate data for the study since the majority of the respondents were aged above 26 years. From the data, a greater proportion of 88 (27.8%) respondents were aged between 36-45 years, 79 respondents representing 24.9% were aged between 26-35 years, 62 respondents representing 19.5% were aged between 46-55 years, 30 respondents representing 9.5% were aged between 56-65 years while only 10 respondents representing 3.1% were aged above 66 years. The youngest responded between the ages of 16-25 years were 48 respondents representing 15.2% and were able to understand what sustainable community-based heritage tourism entails. The findings further indicate that the people between the ages of 36 to 45 years are highly engaged in community-based tourism with the male gender
taking the lead according to figure 4.1 on gender distribution. Age distribution directly relate to
the community role in sustainable tourism through the level of understanding the importance of
having sustainable heritage. The level of understanding the importance of heritage is determined
by age and level of education. Therefore correlating to Mensah (2016) findings that indicate
most people engaging in community-based heritage tourism are farmers, bringing up families at
the ages of 30-50 years, or engaged in community programs.

The findings on age distribution imply that the number of people participating in community-
based heritage tourism reduces with age. The number reduces from the age of forty-five (45)
years as old age capture. The reduction could be attributed to the old age and reduction in energy
to be engaged in community-based heritage tourism.

Table 4.4: Respondents’ Age Distribution per County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years /Counties</th>
<th>Nyeri</th>
<th>Meru</th>
<th>Kirinyaga</th>
<th>Embu</th>
<th>Tharaka Nithi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 66</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 4.4 presents the age distribution of the respondents. Based on the
data, the data were analyzed according to the county. In Nyeri County, a greater proportion of
the respondents (28%) were aged between 36-45 years, 21.4% were aged between 46-55 years,
and 19.5% were aged between 26-35 years while only 6.5% were aged above 66 years. The age
distribution in Nyeri indicates that the highest number of respondents involved in community-
based tourism is age 36 to 45 years. This can be attributed to heritage tourism perception by the young people between 16 years to 25 years that took an average of 14.5%. Moreover, some of the age group of the young people between 16 to 25 years is school students that have not prioritized to promote community-based tourism in Nyeri County. According to Mensah (2016), community participation in community-based heritage tourism attracts more people in the community locality that engage in farming, local works or community programs. These group of people working as farmers, local workers and raising families are between the ages of thirty to fifty years.

In Meru County, the biggest age group is between the ages 36-45 years representing 25.8% of the respondents, 23.5% were aged between 26-35 years while 7.0% were aged above 66 years. This indicates the same scenario in Nyeri whereby the highest age group of respondents involved in community-based tourism is between the 36 years to 45 years. However, Meru County has the highest number of respondents between the ages of 26 to 35 years in the Mount Kenya region. This can be attributed to the engagement of local people that have finished college between the ages of 26 to 35 years in agricultural tourism that goes hand in hand with community-based tourism. Meru County is known for Miraa farming; Miraa product is farmed for export to earn an income similar to community tourism in Meru that benefits the community from Mount Kenya through tour guiding among other community-based organizations such as Ngare Ndare.

In Kirinyaga County, a greater proportion of (26.5%) was aged between 36-45 years while 6.4% were aged above 66 years. In Embu County, 5.5% of the respondents are above 66 years, and the highest numbers of respondents are between the ages of 36 and 45 years with 24.8%. Moreover, Embu provided the highest percentage of respondents between the ages of 56 to 65 and 46 to 55 years with 13.7% and 22.0% percentages respectively. However, Embu County recorded the
lowest percentage of respondents between the ages of 36 years to 45 years and provided the least percentage number of (10.3%) of the young respondents between the ages of 16-25 years participating in community-based tourism in the Mount Kenya region. This could be attributed to low cultural activities related to heritage in Embu compared to other counties in Mount Kenya region.

In Tharaka Nithi County, 26.5% of respondents were aged between 26-35 years, 25% were aged between 36-45 years while only 4.5% were aged above 66 years. This means Tharaka Nithi has the lowest number of respondents above the age of 66 years participating in community-based tourism in Mount Kenya region.

The implication of the results indicate that sustainable community-based tourism is best promoted by people between the age of 36 to 45 years and sustainability has remained stable since this age group has finished school and fully engage in sustainability. However, for long-term sustainability, the youth below 35 years should engage more in community-based tourism since they have an education that can contribute to long-term tourism practices. The old age group above 66 years should engage more on heritage advisory to maintain authentic cultural practices in the region.

### 4.2.4 Respondents’ Level of Education

Figure 4.3 presents data on the highest level of education attained by the respondents, based on the data, one hundred and fifty two (152) respondents reported having attained undergraduate degrees representing 48%, seventy three (73) respondents had Diplomas representing 23%, sixty (60) respondents had masters degrees representing 19% while thirty two (32) respondents had high school education representing 10%. However, the findings further from the study area
indicate a surprising zero percent (0%) of respondent do not have a PhD level of education. The findings imply that the researcher obtained accurate information since 90% of the respondents reported to have attained post-secondary qualifications and therefore they understood issues relating to sustainable community based heritage tourism well. The findings correlate with a study done in Ghana on effect of socio-demographic characteristics and tourism benefits on community participation since most participants in community based tourism are educated and understand the value of sustainability and heritage. Education increases the ability of a local community to participate in sustainable tourism (Mensah, 2016).
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Figure 4.3: Highest Level of Education Attained by Respondents

The findings further agree with heritage interpretation theory that relates with people understanding sustainable tourism through education and creation of awareness. Most people with middle level of education participate in conservation of heritage and sustainable tourism (Mensah, 2016). Heritage interpretation theory challenges tourism stakeholders in community
based tourism to have higher level of education as evident in the respondent’s findings in order to understand and interpret heritage and promote sustainable conservation.

### 4.2.5 Marital Status

Figure 4.4 presents data on the marital status of the respondents, based on the data, one hundred and seventy eight (178) respondents reported that they were married representing 56%, one hundred and thirty three (133) respondents were single representing 42%, while only six (6) respondents reported that they were divorcees representing 2%. This implied that majority of the respondents understood the social-cultural implications community based tourism since they were in families.
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Figure 4.4: Marital Status

Figure 4.5 below indicates marital status distribution per county in the area of study. Kirinyaga leads in having the highest married respondents with sixty four percent (64%), followed by Embu at sixty one percent (61%), Tharaka Nithi at fifty nine percent 59%, Meru at fifty six percent (56%) and Nyeri at forty nine percent (49%). The findings are not consistent with Okavango Delta research on marital status effect on participation in community based tourism.
According to Mbaiwa (2012), most people from community stakeholders are in a relationship but not married. However, most married people fall under 50% of the participants because of family responsibilities (Mbaiwa, 2012).

![Figure 4.5: Marital Status per County](image)

The unmarried respondents come second with Nyeri having the highest single respondents with forty three percent (43%) and Kirinyaga comes last with few single respondents at thirty percent respondent. Moreover, figure 1.14 continues to indicate that the divorced respondents are few among all respondents. However, Nyeri leads with the highest number of divorced persons in the study with eight percent (8%). This could be attributed to alcoholic effect on family set up that promote irresponsible behaviors that lead to high divorce rate in Nyeri. Alcohol has become a threat in Nyeri County and the Mt. Kenya region and has affected both male and female with a major impact on the male gender hence attributing to high divorce rate, high unproductive levels, and poverty in Nyeri county (Kobia, 2011).
4.2.6 County of Residence

Figure 4.6 presents data on the respondents’ counties of residence, based on the data, One hundred and fourteen (114) respondents reported were from Meru County representing 36% of the total respondents. Sixty seven (67) respondents were from Nyeri County representing 21% of the total respondents. Fifty seven (57) respondents were from Embu County representing 18% of all the respondents. Fifty four (54) respondents were from Kirinyaga County representing 17% of all the respondents. While only twenty five (25) respondents were from Tharaka Nithi County representing 8% of the total respondents. The findings implied good regional representation of the respondents. The higher the percentage per county indicates a higher number of respondents from certain county volunteered to answer the questionnaires and not necessarily responded from their home county.
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Figure 4.6: Respondents County of Residence

4.3 Objective One - Local Community Interpretation of Heritage

The first objective of the study sought to determine the local community interpretation of Heritage and its Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. In finding solution to the research question on how the local community interpret heritage to match tourism sustainability based on heritage tourism, the study used knowledge of CBT, value of Mt. Kenya
Heritage, and Community forum to determine local community interpretation of heritage and sustainability. The researcher further used the profile of community based tourism through checking the availability of community based organizations, CBO goals, and the types of community based organization around the study area that would assist in determining heritage interpretation in the study area.

4.3.1: Knowledge of Community Based Tourism

In Table 4.5 represent the result of knowledge of community based tourism that help in determining the understanding of community based tourism for the locals sustainably conserve and promotes CBT.

Table 4.5: Knowledge on Community Based Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledgeable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher sought to establish if the respondents had good knowledge about community based heritage tourism, based on the data presented on Table 4.5, Two hundred and sixty six (266) respondents representing 84% of the total respondents reported having knowledge on community based tourism. While fifty one (51) respondents representing 15% of all the respondents reported not to have good knowledge regarding community based heritage tourism. The respondents who indicated being knowledgeable about community based tourism reported they were able to accurately define community based heritage tourism to prove their
understanding. The findings imply that the researcher obtained accurate information since a greater proportion was aware of what community based heritage tourism is. According to Sarm (2013), heritage interpretation by the local communities enables local communities to understand and appreciate their cultural and heritage destination. Sarm (2013) asserts that people that have knowledge on heritage increase tourists experience and promote conservation practices.

The findings imply that the Mt. Kenya heritage has a good opportunity to be promoted and be promoted by the local communities since the local people have knowledge about heritage and hence can sustainably conserve the heritage. Other implications include promotion of community based heritage tourism since the local people understand heritage to sustainably protect CBT.

4.3.2: Value of Mt. Kenya Heritage

In Table 4.6 is the result of value of Mt. Kenya heritage that help to display how the local community value the world heritage site for interpretation and sustainability of the site. Table 1.8 indicates the frequency of respondents giving actual number representing value measure and the corresponding percentage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It matters and should be protected</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has no value to you and future generations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has lost its value so it should not be protected</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a bother since it does not help you</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t Know anything about it</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 4.6 on the values of Mt. Kenya Heritage, one hundred and eighty-six (186) respondents representing 58.7% reported that the mountain has great cultural value and therefore it should be protected. Sixty-nine (69) respondents representing 21.8% of the total respondents reported that Mt. Kenya heritage has lost its value and it should be protected. Twenty-two (22) respondents representing 6.9% of the total respondents reported that Mt. Kenya is a bother to the local community since it does not help them directly.

Twenty respondents (20) representing 6.3% of the respondents reported that Mt. Kenya heritage has no value to them and future generation, this segment equals the group that reported they do not know anything about the value of Mt. Kenya heritage by having twenty respondents (20) representing 6.3% of the total respondents. The two groups with twenty (20) respondents reporting that Mt. Kenya has no value to them and does not help them could be basing their reasons on lack of interest in touring the heritage, attending or joining a CBT forum and some of these people this segment could be new to the area. Local communities that value heritage and understand its impact tend to promote and conserve their heritage (Shalaginova, 2012). The findings indicate to attract community protection since a big number of local communities, and people see Mount Kenya heritage value.

The findings indicate that a large percentage of the community members value Mt. Kenya national heritage and it should be protected. The implication of the findings shows that Mt. Kenya is in a position to secure community protection, promotion, and conservation. Therefore, the intervening factors to the heritage such as the national and county governments should encourage these motives from the local community. The implications would lead to the evidence of sustainable tourism practices in Mt. Kenya national heritage as a dependent variable.
4.3.3 Community Forums

Figure 4.7 indicates the result of community forum that unite locals and contribute to the understanding of community based heritage that influence heritage interpretation and sustainability of CBT.
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Figure 4.7: Community Forums

The researcher soughs to establish the availability of community forums that help residents understand community heritage tourism and Mt. Kenya as a world heritage site. One hundred and forty-six 146 respondents representing 46% of the total respondents reported that there were no community forums in their area. One hundred and seventy-one 171 respondents representing 54% of the respondents agreed that there were forums in their communities. These community forums include planned community programs to bring local community members together to discuss community agendas such as sustainability of culture, heritage and protection of wildlife around the park. According to Jamal (2016), community forums that unite people to promote cultural values have a strong culture that appreciates the value and importance of cultures and
heritage around them. Community forums lead to development of community base organizations that sustainably conserve culture (Jamal, 2016)

The findings imply that the community forums exists but not empowered to a sustainable level considering that the respondents were people from regions that run community-based heritage tourism, hotels, and tour guides associations. The implication encourages protection of heritage and hopes to create more awareness regarding heritage. The intervening variable should join in as factors to promote community forums. Intervening variables such as the county and national government should intervene and promote community forums on heritage. The intervening variable efforts from the governments would result in a positive outcome through dependent variable indicators such as sustainable heritage benefits.

4.3.4 Relationship between community forums and the Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism

The respondents who confirmed to be involved in community forums indicated that the community forums provided education about the importance of community-based tourism. The respondents through community forums further learnt how to conserve natural resources as well as protection strategies for heritage sites such as Mt. Kenya to ensure sustainable tourism in the region. Therefore, there is a direct relationship between the existence of community forums and the desire to promote sustainable community-based heritage tourism. The relationship proves positive through the fifty-four percent (54%) of respondents that engage in community forums and the forums main purpose to promote heritage, culture, and protection of wildlife around Mount Kenya National park.
The existence of conservation community programs such as conservation in Mount Kenya brought through community forums, and conservation partnerships are evidence of positive impacts in Mount Kenya heritage. However, the existing 46% of the respondents that indicated not to have knowledge of or engaged in community forums is a huge percentage that poses a threat to the conservation of heritage around Mount Kenya. Both public and private institutions that promote culture and heritage should create awareness through encouraging people to partner in community forums that should choose leaders that need to be included in the management of national heritage for proper decision making (Woodley, 2003). Therefore, the local people need to join the 54% number of people that know the availability of community forums in order to promote sustainable heritage and cultural values through community forums.

4.3.5 Interview Report on Local community interpretation of Heritage

The park management reported that the management of Mt. Kenya N.P mind how the local community understands and interpret heritage. The management affirmed this result by indicating that the management evaluates how the local tour guides interpret heritage to tourists while in and around the park. The results indicate the park management ensure the local communities and guides can properly interpret heritage to avoid the misconception that would not promote heritage tourism.

The park management further indicated that they engage themselves in community forums to promote heritage. Mt. Kenya N.P management engages in community forums to create heritage and park awareness and encourage communities to promote sustainable practices. The interview response correlates with local community responses on knowledge of heritage, community forums, and value of Mt. Kenya national heritage.
The management further responded that local communities contribute and participate in the sustainability of sustainable heritage tourism in the park. The management confirmed that the communities engage in sustainability through community associations such as the guide cleaning program, putting off the fire in the forest, assist in human-wildlife conflict, deforestation and control pouching. These are sustainable practices that come from park and community partnership. The findings and responses correlate with Huang (2011) that sustainable heritage development occurs through heritage management and local community involvement.

The implication of the findings indicates that the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage in Mt. Kenya is in progress through park and community partnership. The intervening variables groups such as the national museum, the Kenya Wildlife Service, and the Kenya Forest Service should encourage more partnerships from community stakeholders to enhance the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage tourism.

4.3.6 Descriptive relationship between local community interpretation of Heritage and its Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism

The study findings indicated that eighty-four percent 84% of respondents know community-based tourism. Similarly, this number of respondents indicated they could interpret heritage and impact positively on the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. The respondents further proved they could comfortably interpret heritage since eighty-four percent of the respondents have knowledge on community-based tourism. According to Biesen (2016), communities that have knowledge about heritage and can interpret heritage can sustainably promote community-based heritage tourism.
The findings further indicate that most respondents in the Mount Kenya region value heritage and therefore the heritage site should be protected. This implies that Mt. Kenya is still regarded as a world heritage site even though it has faced some degradation resulting from high population growth in the region among other factors. While some of the respondents believed that Mt. Kenya does not contribute to the local community in relation to economic development and inter-cultural exchange a greater proportion of those interviewed believed that Mt. Kenya had some contribution to the community. And they reported with great confidence that Mt. Kenya has a definite contribution to the local community (mostly government and institutional representatives, owners of accommodation facilities, restaurants, shops, etc.). The value of Mt. Kenya as indicated signifies the need to have a quality interpretation in order to appreciate the heritage value.

The respondents further indicated that they would let the tourists know the importance of Mt. Kenya as this educates tourists as stakeholders of heritage and cultural significance in the region. Therefore, local communities should understand heritage more to ensure more sustainable practices are promoted by the local communities and provide quality interpretation of heritage and sustainability (Biesen, 2016). The values of Mount Kenya can be promoted through quality interpretation of Mount Kenya as a heritage that provides more community-based heritage understanding to respond positively to sustainable tourism.
4.3.7 Profile of Community Based Organizations in Promoting Sustainable Tourism

The researcher sought to establish whether there are community based organizations involved in promoting sustainable tourism around Mt. Kenya. Table 4.7 indicates community based organizations that promote sustainable CBT.

Table 4.7: Community Based Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the information presented in Table 4.7, Two hundred and twenty-seven (227) respondents representing 47% of the respondents agreed that there was community-based organization involved tourism in their communities and the organizations included cultural conservation areas, CBOs, NGOs, tourism associations among others. An example of these organizations and associations include community conservation initiatives of women who carry out cleanup initiatives.

The most active community organization is the Mount Kenya guide association in Chuka Meru, the guide association promotes park sustainability daily by taking tourists up the mountain after creating awareness on the threats facing Mount Kenya national heritage. The awareness is based on required sustainability and conservation practices such as to control pollution during the adventurous mountain climbing. Moreover, the tourism association carries out conservation program that collects non-biodegradable foreign materials dropped in the park and enlighten visitors on conservation practices. However, One hundred and fifty (150) respondents
representing 41% reported that there were no community-based organizations in their communities. The existence of community-based organizations forms the basis of management of community tourism (Breugel, 2013). According to Breugel (2013), community-based organizations involve local people that promote their cultural products and heritage that benefits and promote them.

The implication of these findings indicates that most respondents know more community organizations that will encourage the development of community-based heritage tourism. Community-based organizations maximize benefits to the local people and promote local community culture for future generations. The intervening variable that includes the government and the national museums of Kenya should intervene and encourage the formation of CBO. The resultant development of more CBO would result in more sustainable practices of heritage as dependent factors.

4.3.8 Goals of Community Based Organizations

Table 4.8 indicates the goals of the existing community based organizations to enable understand if the organizations create heritage awareness that improve heritage interpretation and for encouraging sustainable practices.
Table 4.8: Goals of the Community Based Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Culture</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Mobilization</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Awareness/Training</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate Income</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Sustainable Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 4.8 above, one hundred and thirty-eight (138) respondents representing 43.5% of the respondents agreed that there were community-based organizations engaged in tourism in their respective communities with the objective to support culture. Seventy-eight (78) respondents representing 24.7% of the respondents reported that CBO focus on social mobilization as the objectives of the organizations. Seventy-one (71) of the respondents representing 22.4% of the respondent reported creation of awareness/training is a mission for CBO. Nineteen (19) respondents representing 5.9% of the total respondents reported income generation as the objectives of the organizations. Finally, eleven (11) of the respondents representing 3.4% the smallest group respondents reported that the CBO objective is to promote sustainable development of heritage. The findings imply that a greater percentage of the community-based organizations involved in tourism in Mt. Kenya region are in existence to enhance the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism in the region through cultural support.

Creating awareness comes third with 22.4% that would be associated with the fact that most people know about their culture but desire to know more and learn what they do not know. The community-based organization in the study area is rated at 5.9% to generate income; this implies
the organizations do not highly focus on generating income. However, the study further indicates the community-based organizations do not focus on promoting sustainable development since the respondents rated the CBO at 3.4% in promoting sustainable development. According to Rukwaro (2016), Mount Kenya communities oppose modern development that faces cultural destinations such as Mukurwe Wa Nyagathanga with the purpose to conserve and maintain cultural purity. Rukwaro (2016) argues that cultural contamination come through development that cannot be quantified to be sustainable or cultural development.

The findings further imply that culture and heritage are highly integrated into Mount Kenya since the respondents indicate to support a culture that is part of the region heritage. Social mobilization comes second through the unity that community-based organization brings from different people of different cultures in the region. The social mobilization indicates to have a great share of the unity that the culture has created through social groups such as women groups and men Chama that form the community-based organizations.

The intervening variable such as the county and national government and the NMK should intervene through community forums and CBO to ensure that the local is highly aware of heritage sustainability. Moreover, the resultant factors such as sustainable practices in CBO and creating awareness would be dependent factors at the national level hence promote sustainable tourism.
4.4.9 Types of Community Based Tourism Organizations

The Figure 4.8 show the existing community based tourism organizations that the local communities are involved in, this help in understanding where most community members are engaged since the engagement influence their level heritage interpretation and sustainability of CBT.

![Figure 4.8: Type of Community Based Tourism Organizations](image)

The researcher sought to establish the type of community-based tourism that the respondents were involved in. Based on the data presented in figure 4.8, One hundred and twelve (112) respondents representing 35.35% of the respondents were engaged in community conservancies. The community conservancies included the Young Green, Community Conservation Initiative, Save Mount Kenya Group, Tupande Pamoja Group among others. The groups carry sustainable conservation practices for Mt. Kenya tourism heritage.
The findings further indicate that Ninety-seven (97) respondents representing 30.59% of the respondent were engaged into tour guiding, that includes the Mt. Kenya guiding association and other private tour planners, the guiding association was the most active group in promoting community-based tourism practices among the entire respondent. The Mt. Kenya tour guiding association promotes tourism sustainability through heritage interpretation to the visitors, promote environmental conservation through cleaning programs and earn revenue through tour guiding packages that visitors to the heritage sites use.

Figure 4.8 further indicate that eighty-nine (89) respondents representing 28.07% of the respondents were involved in lodges that host community programs, tourists, and accommodation to tourism stakeholders around Mount Kenya heritage site. The lodging community is not directly involved sustainability of Mt. Kenya heritage site, but they also inform tourists on Mt. Kenya heritage as well as donate to heritage conservation. The remaining nineteen (19) respondents representing 5.99% of the respondents reported that they were involved in other activities that do not relate to a community-based organization in Mt. Kenya region. Community-based organizations play a vital role in heritage interpretation and creating awareness around heritage site (Terzic, 2014). According to Uzzell (2015) on heritage interpretation theory, the type of community-based organization and stakeholder motivation determine the influence of heritage sustainability thereby having a high percentage of community conservancies determined to promote cultural tourism.

**4.3.10 Relationship between the Community Based Tourism, Interpretation of Heritage and Participation**

The findings on the profile of community-based tourism imply that most communities in Mt. Kenya region value community-based heritage tourism practices and therefore they are working
closely with community-based organizations as well as park management. Moreover, the communities are working with other institutions to ensure sustainability of tourism, heritage, and long-term benefits to the local communities. Community-based organizations encourage sustainable practices such as conservation and protection that promote sustainable tourism (Paolo, 2016). The findings affirm that Mount Kenya heritage is based promoting sustainability of community-based heritage tourism.

The availability of community-based organizations in the study area impacts tourism sustainability through heritage interpretation. The heritage interpretation theory and the findings correlate with the Tilden dictum since the community-based organizations main objective according to the findings on table 4.3 is to support culture. The Tilden Dictum through heritage interpretation theory dictates that there is need to understand the culture to interpret, appreciate and protect (Uzzell, 2015).

According to Rukwaro (2016), local communities around the study area understand their heritage and seek to protect it by having the findings indicating to reject developments that would promote cultural degradation. Stakeholders’ participation is further evident in with the availability community conservancies that directly relate to heritage interpretation and conservation of Mount Kenya national park as a world heritage site.

**4.4 Objective Two-Role of Stakeholder Participation**

The second objective of this study sought to examine the role of stakeholder participation and its Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. To find solution to the research question on what are the roles played by stakeholders’ participation in sustainability of community based heritage tourism, the study used level of participation in CBT, involvement in
Mt. Kenya N.P decision making, and the scale of Stakeholders Importance in Sustainability of CBT to examine the roles of stakeholder in sustainability of community based heritage tourism.

4.4.1 Level of Participation in community based Tourism

Figure 4.9 indicates the level of local communities’ participation in community based heritage tourism as vital stakeholders. The level of participation helps indicate if the communities are involved in sustainability of CBT or not. Moreover, the level of participation influences local community roles in sustainability of CBT.

Figure 4.9: Level of Participation in Community Based Tourism

Figure 4.9 above indicate the level of respondents’ participation in community-based tourism, a greater proportion of One hundred and eighty-four (184) respondents representing (58%) of the respondents reported that they were moderately involved in community-based tourism. Forty seven (47) respondents representing 15% of the total respondents reported very low involvement. Thirty-eight (38) respondents representing 12% of the respondents reported high level of
involvement; thirty-two (32) respondents representing 10% of all the respondents reported a low level of involvement. Finally, only sixteen (16) respondents representing 5% of the total respondents reported a very high level of involvement promotion of community-based tourism, these include CBO leaders, lead tour guides, and event organizers in community lodges. The findings indicate that most people in the study area are involved in community-based tourism with a low percentage being very active in promoting community-based tourism. The success of community-based heritage tourism is embedded on the level of local people participation in community-based tourism activities (Breugel, 2013). Therefore, community-based heritage tourism around Mount Kenya region has a good potential to succeed in the promotion of sustainable community-based heritage tourism through local communities involvement and participation.

The respondents further indicated that stakeholders are important assets in the promotion, conservation and sustainability of Mt. Kenya heritage site. The local people too indicated to be promoting Mt. Kenya heritage by telling friends, relatives, colleagues and peers from other regions of the world to visit Mt. Kenya and the tourist sites.

The implication of the result is that there will be slow involvement of people in community-based tourism if the most active and involved group is at 5%. This would require the intervention of National Museums and the county government as intervening variable indicates to ensure more people are engaged in CBO.

4.4.2 Local involvement in Mt. Kenya WHS Decision Making

Figure 4.10 indicates the desire by the local communities as stakeholders to be involved in making decisions regarding sustainability of Mt. Kenya as World Heritage Site. Local involvement of local communities in Mt. Kenya World Heritage Site decision making indicates the local role in contribution to sustainability of Mt. Kenya heritage.
Figure 4.10: Desire to be involved in Mt. Kenya N.P Decision Making

The findings indicate in Figure 4.10 that, majority of the respondents of two hundred and forty seven (247) representing (78%) of all the respondents indicate they would like to be involved in Mt. Kenya National Park heritage decision making in order to protect and promote it at the community level. Seventy (70) respondents responded representing twenty two (22%) of the respondents’ also indicated they would not want to be included in Mt. Kenya N.P decision making, this could be associated with their heritage perception or engagement in other activities. Active involvement of local communities in decision making in a destination ensure there is local ownership and protection (Bott, 2012). The local communities consider themselves as legitimate and moral stakeholders in tourism development in the region since Mt. Kenya as a heritage influences their socio-cultural interests as well as economic status.

The intervening variables such as the national museums and heritage management should create more opportunities to engage the local community in Mt. Kenya heritage decision making. More involvement means the local community would feel there is local heritage ownership so as to sustainably conserve and protect the heritage.
4.4.3 Scale of Stakeholders Importance in Sustainability of CBT

Figure 4.11 indicates the measure of stakeholders’ importance in promoting sustainability of community based tourism by the local community. The scale of importance indicates how local communities perceive the need to have other stakeholders in facilitating the sustainability of community based heritage tourism.

The findings in figure 4.11 indicates that two hundred and sixteen (2016) representing sixty-eight (68%) of the respondents consider stakeholders as a significant part in promoting community-based tourism in Mt. Kenya region. Forty-one (41) respondents representing thirteen percent (13%) of the respondents indicate that stakeholders are important. Thirty-five (35) respondents representing 11% of the respondents indicated stakeholders are moderately important, and only twenty-five (25) respondents representing 8% of the total respondents considered stakeholders less important in promoting sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. However, none of the respondents considered stakeholders are not at all important in promoting sustainability of CBHT. The findings indicate stakeholders assist the local communities in promoting sustainable tourism; the respondents indicated that stakeholders assist them in funding community-based
organizations, serve as guests in cultural events, and promote sustainable conservation of CBO. KECOBAT (2016), states that stakeholders such as the government, tourists, and non-governmental organizations are vital and important in promoting sustainability of community-based organizations.

The intervening moderators such as the national museums should encourage and attract more stakeholders to partner in Mt. Kenya CBO and heritage conservation. More stakeholders’ engagements mean there would be more promotion of Mt. Kenya region heritage and benefits to the local communities. Moreover, the evidence of more sustainable practices would be implemented as dependent factors to promote sustainable benefits of sustainable tourism.

4.4.4 Interview Response on the Role of Stakeholders Participation

The interview carried out by the researcher with Mt. Kenya N.P management included the senior warden and the former acting Senior Warden indicated that the Mt. Kenya National Park has stakeholders. The interviewee stated that county governments around the park, donors, NGOs, and the local communities around the park are the main stakeholders. The interviewee highlighted that the stakeholders’ main objectives are to promote Mt. Kenya National Park conservation, funding conservation practices, and supporting community tourism activities.

The interviewee however stated that Mt. Kenya N.P as a world heritage site faces various challenges such as population pressure from the increasing number of local community, deforestation of the park forest, and uncooperative stakeholders in promoting conservation. The interviewee recommended that stakeholder’s roles should be adhered to and ensures there is teamwork and honesty in stakeholder’s partnership. The interviewee further suggested that there should be more awareness and education to the local communities since they are part of the
major stakeholders, infrastructure development towards and inside the heritage by the county governments as stakeholders.

4.4.5 Relationship between Stakeholders partnership and its impact on Sustainability of CBT in Mt. Kenya N.P

The respondents reported that the local communities usually take part in promoting Mt. Kenya as a world heritage site as well as other tourist resources and attractions in the locality that forms the basis of community-based heritage tourism development. To enhance sustainability in community-based heritage tourism, the community members engage in activities that promote domestic tourism as active participants rather than passive observers. The findings indicate that local communities’ main roles in participating in Mt. Kenya include conserving heritage and wildlife, earning from tourists and their support systems, benefiting from park products, and promoting cultural values. Heritage Integrated Sustainable Theory correlates with the findings in that, sustainability of natural heritage sites depend on the support of local communities that benefit from the heritage site (Dangi, 2016).

Direct participation of community members as stakeholders enables policymakers such as the national museums of Kenya to interact with the community members and identify the necessary steps required to achieve sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region (National Museums of Kenya, 2015). As major stakeholders in community heritage tourism, the respondents also reported their duty include decision-making, for example requesting the government to allocate some money raised from local tourist sites for community development as well the protection of the tourism resource base. This is consistent with that of Sanoff (2013) who maintains that the main purpose of community participation is to involve people in the design and the decision making processes.
The respondents finally suggested that community participation in decision making should be encouraged to enhance community-based heritage tourism as this increases people’s trust and confidence with the tourism industry. It also provides the local community with a voice in design and decision-making in order to improve plans, service delivery and promotes a sense of community by bringing together people who share a common culture (Sanoff, 2013). Local involvement of Mt. Kenya in decision making and participation in conservation has promoted sustainability of community-based heritage tourism.

4.5 Objective Three-Stakeholder Collaborations

The third objective of the study sought to identify stakeholder collaborations towards sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. In providing solutions to the research question on if stakeholders’ collaboration contribute to sustainability of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region, the study checked the availability of stakeholders’ collaboration, type of collaborations, and the importance of these stakeholder collaborations to promote sustainability of community based heritage tourism.

4.5.1 Availability of Stakeholders Collaborations

The Figure 4.22 indicates the availability of stakeholders’ collaborations in the study area. These stakeholders’ collaboration helps to identify the importance of collaborations that lie between local community tour guides and park management; and CBO and NGOs. The availability of stakeholders’ collaborations indicate how the collaborations contribute to sustainability of community based tourism in the study area.
The findings according to figure 4.22 above indicate that two hundred and forty-four (244) respondents representing 77% of the respondents indicated that there are collaborations between local organizations and international organizations such as the park and UNESCO. Some of the community organizations include tour guides and park management, CBOs, hotels and local NGOs. Community programs such as involvement of the local community members in community meetings to ownership, tour guides, management of the heritage sites are the avenues that attract stakeholders’ collaborations.

The findings further indicate there are seventy-three (73) respondents representing 23% of the respondents that do not know if there are any stakeholders’ collaborations in Mt. Kenya region. The 23% of the respondents included junior employees of organizations around the study area, some residents in the towns in the study area, and people that do not know about heritage around the study area. The findings in the 23% case imply that not all respondents know about community-based heritage around Mount Kenya region. Stronza (2016) posits that not all
stakeholders as part of community members that are willing to be involved and participate in collaborative processes for personal purpose.

The intervening factors that include the national museums and the government should ensure that there are more community collaborations to enhance the role of local communities in promoting sustainable CBO. More stakeholders’ collaborations mean more strength in enhancing CBO that will result in dependent indicators of sustainable community-based heritage tourism.

**4.5.2 Importance of Stakeholders collaboration in promoting sustainable Tourism**

Figure 4.13 indicates stakeholders’ collaboration importance that helps in promoting sustainable community based tourism.

![Figure 4.13: Stakeholders’ Collaboration Importance in Promoting Sustainable CBT](image)

According to the findings in figure 4.13 above, one hundred and forty-six (146) respondents representing 46% of the respondents indicated that stakeholder’s collaborations are very important. Eighty-nine (89) respondents representing 28% of the respondents consider stakeholder collaboration important. Fifty-seven (57) of the respondents representing 18% fairly
considered stakeholders’ collaboration important in promoting CBT. Sixteen (16) respondents representing 5% of the respondents considered stakeholders’ collaboration less important while only nine (9) respondents representing 3% of all the respondents considered stakeholders’ collaboration not important toward sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. The importance of the stakeholder’s collaborations as reported by the respondents included promote conserving the park, rehabilitation of the park (both internal and external part of the park), promotion of the park through trade fair and conservation campaign, promoting local community welfare, and funding. According to Larson (2013), most stakeholders engage in stakeholder collaborations for personal purpose and the stakeholder’s level of engagement influence and determine stakeholders’ collaboration power.

The implication of the findings suggests that most people appreciate and would want there be more stakeholders’ collaborations to enhance the role of local communities as stakeholders in promoting heritage tourism. The implications of having more stakeholders collaborations as most respondents indicate result to strong CBO, the creation of awareness regarding heritage, conservation of heritage, involvement in decision making, and proper sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. The intervening variables should ensure more collaborations as a set and engage the local communities in enhancing their roles in sustainable community-based heritage tourism.

4.5.3 Interview Response on Stakeholders’ Collaboration

The management of Mt. Kenya N.P interviewees indicated that there are stakeholder collaborations that partner from the local community side, nationally and internationally with the park for various reasons. The interviewees indicated that collaborations help in influencing the sustainability of heritage tourism by encouraging and ensuring that stakeholders promote
conservation, enhancing the livelihoods of communities as stakeholders, reducing poaching and deforestation, promoting rehabilitation of the park and the forest and controlling fires, and attract tourists that promote sustainability.

The implication of having agencies governing the intervening variables such as the national museums of Kenya, national and county governments in stakeholders’ collaboration is that the collaborations will be based on good policies. Moreover, the existence of the policy makers as intervening agencies will provide sustainable support such as finance community heritage projects that promote sustainability of heritage in Mt. Kenya region. Finally, the dependent variables indicators after having strong and collaborating intervening bodies will be evident by seeing stakeholder benefits from the collaboration, successful sustainable practices, and improved performance of heritage around Mt. Kenya region.

4.5.4 Relationship of Stakeholder Collaborations and its Impact on Sustainability of CBT in Mt. Kenya Region

The respondents indicated that collaborations such as national and international collaborations had provided community members with the capacity to be directly involved in sustaining heritage tourism around Mount Kenya. Identification and employment of locals as tour guides and involvement of local community in park conservation activities was noted as forms of collaborations that contribute to the promotion of sustainability of community-based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region.

The respondents emphasized that there should be collaborations with the government to ensure that professionals and experts that design and formulate good policies for the community heritage tourism engage local community collaborations to create community collaboration
oriented policies. The policies would effectively engage local communities who know little as far as community collaboration in heritage tourism is concerned to support the management and conservation of tourism sites through community collaboration. The respondents further noted that stakeholder collaborations also enhance formulation and implementation of the policies that strengthen and promote community heritage tourism.

Respondents noted that stakeholder collaborations are likely to speed up the development of community heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region since local people as well as organizations will know better the importance of tourism and how to conserve the heritage sites. They further underscored that having collaboration with major stakeholders could help to protect the community interests, and increase transparency and accountability. Moreover, community collaboration with major stakeholders would help to wipe out embezzlements of funds raised through community heritage tourism which are rampant acts amongst key decision-makers.

The local communities indicated that the current level of collaborations is lower than it could be if local people had a voice in tourism development issues. This situation, according to them, is as a result of leaders’ reluctance to involve the rest of the community in tourism decision-making process resulting in inadequate information among community members. There is need to identify, map, and analyse each stakeholder objective before developing a stakeholder collaboration (Simeunovic, 2014). Therefore, the findings according to the respondents indicate that there is no proper identification and analysing before the formulation of stakeholder collaborations in Mt. Kenya region.

The results also show that local people acknowledge the need to be engaged in decision making process without limitation by their level of education. Similarly, local community acknowledge the requirement to join external collaborations in making policies with formal organizations that
consist of people with wide knowledge and expertise. Before making such policies, the respondents reported that the local people need to be consulted so that the outcome of tourism policies meets community stakeholders’ needs and addresses their concerns of the local community.

They also want to have a voice and become ‘watchdogs’ in tourism development issues to enable them to protect community interests. Although the respondents noted that local communities wish to play an active role in tourism development, there is a need to educate them on the importance of community heritage tourism further. According to Cooper (2012), stakeholders need to possess necessary knowledge regarding all the stakeholders and be educated on the objectives of the collaboration.

Finally, the interviewees stated that in order to develop effective collaborations and local stakeholders effective in the region as a world heritage site, the existing challenges should be solved. The interviewee noted challenges that include teamwork and cooperation, creation of awareness and education to the communities as key stakeholders, infrastructure development as well as tackling real conservation issues rather than personal issues.

**4.6 Sustainability of community based heritage tourism**

The respondents indicated that community-based programs help in supporting sustainable community heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya. These community programs that promote sustainable heritage tourism include community forums as highlighted in figure 4.7, community-based tourism participation as highlighted in figure 4.8, and through community stakeholders’ collaborations in figure 4.12. The findings indicate that community programs main purpose is to benefit the local community economically, culturally and environmentally conserve heritage. This correlates with Lalayan (2014) theory of partnership and collaboration structure that the
success of sustainable community heritage is based on the existence of local community programs and engagement regulations.

Mobilization of local authorities and communities to increase efforts in conservation was also noted by the respondents as a way of sustaining community-based tourism. A greater proportion of the respondents (65%) reported that community-based heritage tourism is sustainably promoted. However, they noted that the low level of awareness and lack of proper community education on the importance community-based heritage tourism makes it difficult for everybody to understand the value of community-based heritage tourism.

The other challenges noted by the respondents included lack of clear policies by the devolved governments as an intervening variable that enhances the sustainability of the community-based heritage tourism as well as increased levels of population that results to encroachment into lands that have been traditionally considered as heritage sites. It was further reported that sustainable community-based heritage tourism is supported by creating programmes that seek to teach the local community about the significance of tourism.

The respondents recommended that the government should work hand in hand with local organizations, business communalities as well as community members to widen the efforts of both stakeholders and the community. The respondents emphasized the need for more transparency among the institutions and community based organizations mandated with the management of community heritage sites. They also recommended there be excellent communications systems between the institutions and local communities as well as developing long-term strategies that would promote cultural/heritage tourism in the communities around Mt. Kenya. Finally, they recommended that the local community members should be educated on
tourism sustainability to enable them to understand the benefits of conserving community heritage sites.

Therefore, to promote the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region, the local communities should be engaged in all aspects as discussed with the intervention of intervening institutions. These interventions include the national heritage management body NMK, heritage and park management, and both the county and national government to enhance local community ability and strength independent factors of sustainable community heritage tourism.
5.0 CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The study sets out to study the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region. The research objectives were to determine the local community interpretation of Heritage and its Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism, to examine the role of stakeholder participation and its Impacts on Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism, and to identify stakeholder Collaborations towards Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism. Therefore, this chapter presents the summary of the findings of the study based on the objectives, makes conclusions and presents the recommendations for further research.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The summary of the findings in this chapter gives a review of the demographic characteristics of the respondents that included local communities and stakeholders around the study area in Mount Kenya. The findings summary further covers a review of each objective of this study that include Local interpretation of Heritage and sustainability, Stakeholder participation and heritage sustainability, and Stakeholder Collaboration and sustainability of heritage.

5.1.1 Summary findings on Demographic characteristics

The demographic characteristics of the study included gender distribution, age, marital status, level of education, and the respondent county that assist in understanding the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region. According to the findings on gender, the results indicate that the most male (67.6%)
participate in promoting community heritage tourism based on their strength, family chores, and time consumed in the involvement of participation in community-based heritage tourism. The effect of having more male than female in all counties participating in community-based heritage tourism in the study area indicate the effectiveness of sustainable tourism positively.

Most people participating in community-based heritage tourism are between the ages of 26 to 35 years followed by 36 to 45 years, the results are attributed to these two age groups being married and engaged in employment and farming around their established homes. The youth below 25 years are not actively participating in CBT because of educational engagement, and the old above the age of 55 years do not have much strength to participate in the demanding CBT. Most participants in CBT have an undergraduate degree and diploma implying that the participants understand the heritage and can promote sustainable heritage tourism.

According to the findings, most participants in community-based heritage tourism are married followed by single people in all the included counties in the study area. This is attributed to the married people having established homes and commitments in the community work, the single group involved are either people who dropped school, finished high school and college education and are yet to be married. Meru County leads with having the most participants (36%) in CBT, followed by Nyeri County 21%, Embu and Kirinyaga are closely tied with 18% and 17% respectively. The impact of the number of participant in each county indicates the level of sustainable practices in each county.

### 5.1.2 Summary findings on Local interpretation of Heritage and sustainability

Regarding the interpretation of heritage, most respondents have knowledge regarding community-based heritage tourism hence the community can interpret heritage and promote
heritage tourism. On the values of Mt. Kenya Heritage, the study revealed that Mt. Kenya is still regarded as a valuable heritage site by the local communities even though it has faced degradation resulting from high population growth in the region and demand of resources among the rising population. While some of the community members believed that Mt. Kenya does not contribute to the local community, more than half of the respondents believed that Mt. Kenya had some contribution to the community. They reported with great confidence that Mt. Kenya has a definite contribution to the local community such as the county government and institutional representatives, owners of accommodation facilities, restaurants, shops and many more. The respondents further indicated that they would let both international and domestic tourists know the importance of Mt. Kenya to the community around it as well as educate them of its cultural significance in the region.

It was further established that there are community forums that help residents understand community heritage tourism and Mt. Kenya as a world heritage site. The community forums provided education about the importance of community-based tourism and how to conserve natural resources as well as protection strategies for heritage sites such as Mt. Kenya to ensure sustainable tourism in the region. The availability of community forums ensures the local community understands the community stand on sustainability of heritage in the Mt. Kenya region. Moreover, the interview responses affirmed that the management responsible in protection of Mt Kenya National Park aids in creating awareness regarding heritage that impact positively on heritage interpretation. According to Woodley (2003), proper interpretation of heritage by the stakeholders promotes heritage sustainability.
5.1.3. Summary findings on Profile of Community Based Tourism in Heritage Tourism

The residents of Mt. Kenya region indicated presence of community-based organizations that exist out of community knowledge on the importance of heritage and sustainability. The community-based organizations were observational evidence of sustainable practices existing in Mt. Kenya region to promote sustainable heritage tourism. The respondents further demonstrated excellent knowledge about the goals, roles and mandates of community organizations; these roles are the practice strategies used by the participants in CBO to promote sustainable tourism through organized CBO.

The local communities further demonstrated the ability to define community-based heritage tourism and proved their understanding of sustainable heritage through CBO and national park collaboration. The study established the existence of community-based organization which involved tourism to promote heritage sustainability in Mt. Kenya region. The organizations have been working closely with local community members as well as government institutions and agencies to ensure sustainability and long-term benefits of community-based heritage tourism. The goals of the community-based organizations in partnership with the community included supporting culture, social mobilization and creation of awareness. It was also established that a greater percentage of different community-based organizations involved in tourism in Mt. Kenya region were in existence to enhance the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism in the region.

5.1.4. Summary findings on the Roles Stakeholder participation and heritage sustainability

The study revealed that communities usually take part in promoting Mt. Kenya as a world heritage site as well as other tourist resources and attractions in the locality that forms the basis of community tourism development. To enhance sustainability in community-based heritage
tourism, the community members engage in activities that promote domestic tourism as active participants rather than passive observers. Similarly, more than half of the respondents indicate that their level of participation is above average in promoting heritage sustainability hence revealing a positive indication of the community role in stakeholders’ partnership to promote heritage around Mt. Kenya.

Direct participation of community members as stakeholders enables policy makers such as the tourism board to interact with the community members and identify the necessary steps required to achieve sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region. As major stakeholders in community heritage tourism, the respondents reported their duty include decision-making, for example requesting the government to allocate some money raised from local tourist sites for community development as well the protection of the tourism resource base.

Most communities as stakeholder indicated the need to be involved in making heritage sustainable decision making to avoid sustainable conflict that comes through human-wildlife conflict. The scale of involvement of stakeholder shows the need to have more partners that can bring more resources and strategies to promote sustainability of community-based heritage around Mt. Kenya. The stakeholder's partnership ensures each party with interest in promoting sustainable heritage tourism understand their role and can promote community-based heritage by appreciating and involving them in promoting heritage sustainability. The interviewee further affirmed that stakeholder partnerships are vital and their identified roles in the partnership important in promoting sustainability of the world heritage site.
5.1.4 Summary findings on Identification of Stakeholder Collaboration and sustainability of heritage

Collaborations between different local and international organizations such as tour guides and park management, CBOs, NGOs, and UNESCO was established to be undertaken in Mt. Kenya region for the benefit of sustainable CBHT. The availability of stakeholders collaboration in the study area indicate the strength in promoting sustainable heritage tourism by different organizations coming together to solve a communal challenge. Community programs such as involvement of the local community members in community meetings, leadership of CBO, tour guides as well as management of the heritage sites and parks respond to the research question that stakeholders’ collaboration contribute to the sustainability of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region.

The objectives of the stakeholders’ collaborations as reported by the respondents included cleaning and conserving the parks, rehabilitation of the park (both internal and external), promotion of the park through trade fair and conservation campaign and funding. Therefore correlating with most respondents that stakeholders’ collaborations are very important in promoting sustainable community based tourism.

Collaborations with the government has ensured the support of professionals and experts who can design and formulate good policies for the community heritage tourism and effectively engage local communities who definitely know little as far as community heritage tourism is concerned to support the management and conservation of tourism sites. Finally, the interviewee felt that stakeholder collaborations also enhance the formulation and implementation of the policies that promotes community heritage tourism and sustainable conservation of Mt. Kenya as a World Heritage Site.
5.1.5 Sustainability of community based heritage tourism

On sustainability of community based heritage tourism, the findings revealed that community based heritage tourism are sustainably promoted in the region. However, the respondents noted that the low level of awareness and lack of proper community education on the importance of community based heritage tourism makes it difficult for everybody to understand the value of community based heritage tourism. The other challenges noted included lack of clear policies by the devolved governments that enhance the sustainability of the community based heritage tourism as well as increased levels of population that results to encroachment into lands that have been traditionally considered as heritage sites. It was further reported that sustainable community based heritage tourism is supported by creating programs that seek to educate the local community on the importance of tourism.

The respondents further emphasized on the need for more transparency among the institutions and community based organizations mandated with the management of community heritage sites, ensuring the excellent communications systems between the institutions and local communities as well as developing long term strategies that would promote cultural and heritage tourism in the communities around Mt. Kenya.

5.2 Conclusions

The attractions in Mt. Kenya region and the sensitivity of the natural and cultural resources, as well as social-demographic aspects of the region require fast change in the regional management. There is a need to change policies towards more responsibility and actions in order to achieve maximum sustainable development of community based heritage tourism. The attractiveness of Mt. Kenya as a world heritage site, the hospitality of community members in the region and the well-preserved natural and cultural heritage has led to the increase of tourism attractiveness of
the area but require more promotion. Destinations and attractions used and respected by both residents and tourists have resulted to sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region.

5.2.1. Conclusion on Local Community Interpretation of Heritage and heritage sustainability

Based on the findings and summary of the findings on local interpretation of heritage, the local communities around Mt. Kenya understand heritage and can interpret heritage appropriately. However, the interpretation of heritage by the local community does not fully contribute to maximum sustainability of community based heritage tourism in the region based on low level of engagement in decision making and exclusion as key stakeholders. The potential of having proper interpretation is not properly used to promote sustainability of heritage based on different aspect facing the communities in the region.

The communities in Mt. Kenya region are aware of the problems faced in the efforts to protect cultural heritage and the potentials for the sustainable community heritage tourism development, but such awareness is not sufficient to make the community members strive to ensure sustainability. The main issue therefore is the possibility of participation of members of the local communities in decision making processes related to cultural heritage and cultural tourism since the communities understand and can interpret heritage. The opinion of the local community members is very important for the functioning of regional heritage in promoting sustainable interpretation to gain physical outcome of the unexploited potential of sustainable heritage tourism in the region.
5.2.2. Conclusion on the Stakeholder participation Roles and heritage sustainability

Different stakeholders have different roles according to the study; therefore stakeholders’ roles determine the influence and performance of stakeholders’ partnership in promoting sustainable heritage tourism. However, there seem to be underutilized roles by different stakeholders in order to have proper performing stakeholders in Mt. Kenya region. Based on respondents’ responses, the local community appreciate the role stakeholders’ play but more local stakeholders should be engaged in decision making as a vital role that local community deserve to gain in order to have higher control, develop a sense of heritage ownership and benefit from Mt. Kenya heritage.

Community members’ participation need to include several phases such as informing, consulting, suggesting and decision making in order to have community roles established as well as other stakeholders roles. This phase would demand each stakeholder to perform on their duties and roles to effectively promote sustainable heritage tourism. Partnerships, collaborations and rational planning of community based heritage tourism development in Mt. Kenya region is based on the effectiveness of the role each stakeholder plays.

5.2.3. Conclusion on Stakeholder Collaborations

The availability of stakeholders’ collaborations is an indication of united stakeholders’ in Mt. Kenya region to promote sustainable heritage tourism. Stakeholders’ collaboration is important in networking and cooperation between stakeholders in different levels such as national and county governmental institutions, community leaders, tourism businesses and local community members. The stakeholders network need to focus on ultimate sustainable goal that would uplift the performance of the world heritage site from being the least visited park to a more productive heritage site that encourage community based heritage tourism.
The lack of inter-sector cooperation and distance from responsibility of different subjects in processes of government were identified as direct consequence of ambiguity and inconsistency among normative, legislative and regulatory frameworks. Therefore, deficiencies in the area of cultural heritage preservation and problems in the creation of the platform for sustainable tourism development are present.

The research findings showed the local institutions and county governments have initiative of educating the community members on the importance of sustainable community based heritage in Mt. Kenya region. The attention has not been directed to communication strategies between the authorities and the local community members. It is the first step for the community members to participate in decision making processes referring to the cultural heritage management in order to provide the basis for sustainable community based heritage tourism.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made: The devolved governments should put in place mechanisms that encourage local ownership and management of small and medium scale tourism enterprises by community members in order to generate direct economic benefits to the local. With tourism SMEs such as accommodation facilities, restaurants, snack bars, tour and travel services, retail shops and craft production, the local community members can realize huge economic empowerment, and this will prompt them to conserve community heritage sites, and this will promote the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism.

The long-term competitiveness and sustainability of community-based heritage tourism should be enhanced through legislative measures and strengthened by multi-level cooperation, ensuring local and regional benefit brought along with new investments in Mt. Kenya region. The key
institutions charged with the regulations and management of the tourism sector such as Kenya Wildlife Service should work closely with the devolved governments to ensure that community members accrue benefits from the community-based heritage tourism. This can be achieved through the development of community-based tourism and other programmes to bring the benefits of tourism to local communities. The benefits can relate to job creation and direct income to local communities that raise the living standards and quality of life of community members while at the same time benefiting the national and county governments.

Both the national and county governments should encourage community participation in heritage tourism which can take various forms depending on the local types of tourism resources and social circumstances. The types of community participation that should be focused on can include: Village tourism, with tourists visiting villages on day tours or staying overnight in local accommodation facilities, eating local cuisine and experiencing village life and cultural traditions. The other one can be ecotourism, where local communities exist in the ecotourism area, with these communities providing businesses and employees related to the ecotourism activities. Ecotourism and village tourism can be combined with the tourists experiencing both the natural environment and local cultural patterns of the communities.

Participation of local community members in development, management and operation of nearby major heritage sites as well as attraction features such as national parks in a manner that both generate economic benefits to the communities should be highly encouraged in order to enhance their support for conservation of the natural or cultural resources that form major components of community based heritage tourism. This will promote the sustainability of community-based heritage tourism in the long run.
Policy makers and authorities in the tourism industry should carefully monitor and streamline community-based heritage tourism in order to ensure that equitable benefits accrue to the community members and tourism does not result in environmental or social problems. An approach to establishing a community-based tourism programme for day visits by tourists in a traditional area commencing to develop tourism involves the following types of actions, which can be adapted to local circumstances need to be taken into consideration. The communities can have traditional layouts and building styles and materials and engage in some form of craft production, traditional dance and music performances and traditional agricultural or fishing techniques to make visits more interesting to both domestic and international tourists.

Both the national and county governments need to come up with mechanisms that strengthen community-based heritage tourism offerings for the benefit of Kenya’s entire tourism sector.

Finally, community education programmes on heritage tourism should be conducted to inform community members about the importance of tourism and current policies and strategies for developing community-based heritage tourism. These programmes should include conservation of tourism sites and resources.

5.5 Suggestion for Further Research

This study determined the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community-based heritage in Mt. Kenya region. There is a need for further studies to carry out similar tests on a longitudinal design in other heritage sites in the country. In addition, more variables depicting sustainable community-based tourism should be adopted to uphold the findings that indeed local communities influence sustainable community-based heritage tourism. The same study should be carried out using focused group discussions in order to achieve more detailed responses which can give better analysis results.
As a result of the government’s increased efforts to improve the tourism sector as well as encourage sustainable community-based heritage tourism, further studies should explore the impact of the roll-out of infrastructure by the government countrywide to support community-based heritage tourism. Further, there is a need for a study to be conducted on the effect of insecurity on sustainable community-based heritage tourism in the interior parts of the country.

The findings of this study indicate a consistent involvement of more males in all the counties in the study area. Therefore, there is need to conduct further research on the influence of male gender on the sustainability of community-based tourism. Moreover, there should be a study on the role of the youth between the age of eighteen years and thirty-five years in promoting sustainable community-based heritage tourism in Mount Kenya region. Finally, a further study is necessary to investigate the factors affecting implementation of policies aimed at improving sustainable community-based heritage tourism by both the national and county governments.
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Appendix 2: Questionnaires to the Communities

This study seeks to study the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya Region. The information collected will be used for academic purpose only and the researcher will keep such information strictly confidential. Thank you for participating in this survey.

Instructions to respondents:

- Please indicate your responses to the questions in the spaces provided where appropriate
- Kindly tick and describe where appropriate
- The information collected will be used for academic purpose only and the researcher will keep such information strictly confidential and does not intend to judge the respondent in anyway.

Section A: Background information

1. Your gender
   ( ) Male  ( ) Female

2. What is your age bracket?
   □ 16-25 years □ 26-35 year □ 36-45 years □ 46-55 years
   □ 56-65 year □ 66 and above

3. What is your highest level of education?
   ( ) High school  ( ) Diploma  ( ) Undergraduate Degree
   ( ) Masters  ( ) PhD

4. Your Marital status
   ( ) Married  ( ) Single  ( ) Divorced  ( ) Other
5. Which County do you come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Tick your county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyeri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirinyaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TharakaNithi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section B: Profile of community based tourism in heritage tourism

6. Do you have community based organizations tourism around Mt. Kenya? These include cultural conservation areas, CBO, Associations or any other.

( ) Yes  ( ) No

7. If yes, how many do you know?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. What are their main objectives of those community based organizations?

Support culture ( )  Social Mobilization ( )  Create Awareness/Training ( )
Generate income ( )  Promote sustainable development ( )
Other
________________________________________________________________________

9. What type of community based tourism are you more frequently involved in?

( ) Lodge  ( ) Tour Guide  ( ) community conservancies
( ) Other ______________________ ( ) None

Section C: Local community interpretation of Heritage

10. Do you know what community based heritage tourism is?

( ) Yes  ( ) No
11. If yes, briefly discuss.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

12. Do you think Mt. Kenya Heritage has values for the current generation/future generation or it’s just a mount that is a bother to you since it does not benefit you?
   It matters and should be protected (   )
   It has no value to you and future generation (   )
   It has lost its value so it should not be protected (   )
   It is a bother since it does not help you (   )
   I don’t know anything about it (   )

13. What are the key details that you give to tourists for them to understand Mt. Kenya as World heritage? Briefly discuss.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

14. Do you have community forums to help or involve you understand community heritage tourism and Mt. Kenya a world heritage site?
   (   ) Yes.   (   ) No.

15. If yes, briefly discuss.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Section D: Role of stakeholder participation

16. As a residence of Mt. Kenya region, are you a major stakeholder in sustainability of it as World Heritage Site?
   (   ) Yes: How: ___________________________________________________________
   (   ) No: Why: ___________________________________________________________
17. Are you in any way involved in promotion, conservation and sustainability of Mt. Kenya as a world heritage?
   ( ) Yes        ( ) No

18. If yes, briefly discuss.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

19. If not, why aren’t you?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

20. To what level of participation are you involved in Community based tourism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

21. Would like to be involved in Mt. Kenya National Park heritage decision making?
   ( ) Yes. How: ________________________________________________________________
   ( ) No.

22. Do community programs have stakeholders in their operations and management?
   ( ) Yes        ( ) No

23. If yes, who are they?
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

24. Briefly describe the major duties of stakeholders in community heritage tourism
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
25. To what extent do the stakeholders help in sustainability of community heritage tourism?

Tick Appropriately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Moderate Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tick Appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. What else you recommend to be done to enhance community based heritage tourism?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Section E: Stakeholder Collaborations

27. Are there stakeholders’ collaboration around Mt. Kenya in community heritage tourism?

These included collaboration between different organizations i.e. tour guides and park management, CBO and park management or local organizations and guides toward the park.

( ) Yes   ( ) No

28. If yes, what collaborations are they?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

29. How do those collaborations contribute to promotion of sustainability of community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya region?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

30. In a scale, what rate do these collaborations help in promoting sustainability of community heritage tourism and Mt. Kenya NP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate of Effectiveness</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Moderate Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tick Appropriately</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section F: Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism


________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

32. Are the community based heritage program sustainably conserved? (Economically, socially or environmentally)
   ( ) Yes     ( ) No

33. What are the main challenges involved in promoting sustainability of community based heritage tourism?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

34. How do they support sustainability of community based heritage tourism?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

35. How would you want to see community heritage around Mt. Kenya improved to enhance heritage tourism sustainability? Discuss please

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you.
Appendix 3: Interview Schedule for Park Management

This study seeks to study the role of local communities in enhancing sustainable community based heritage tourism in Mt. Kenya Region. The information collected will be used for academic purpose only and the researcher will keep such information strictly confidential. Thank you for participating in this survey.

Interview Section A: Local community interpretation of Heritage

1. Does the park management mind how the local communities interpret heritage around Mt Kenya region?
2. Does the park management evaluate the local tourist guide understanding on how they interpret heritage to tourists?
3. Does the park management engage in community forums to promote heritage and sustainable measures awareness?
4. How do communities around Mt. Kenya NP contribute in sustainability?

Interview Section B: Role of stakeholder participation

5. Does the park have stakeholders?
6. What are their objectives that contribute in promotion of sustainability of Mt Kenya NP as a WHS?
7. What challenges does the management encounter in dealing with the stakeholders?
8. What measure would you recommend to make stakeholders partnerships and collaboration effective to promote sustainability of Mt. Kenya NP as a WHS?

Interview Section C: Identify stakeholder Collaborations

9. Does the management has internal or external collaborations?
10. What are their main objectives?
11. How does these collaborations help in influencing sustainability of heritage tourism?
12. What are the challenges encountered in stakeholders collaboration?
13. What measure would you recommend to make stakeholders collaboration effective to enhance sustainability of Mt. Kenya NP and CBT?
Interview Section D: Sustainability of community-based heritage tourism

14. How economic, social cultural and environmentally sustainable is Mt. Kenya NP as a world heritage site?

15. What sustainable programs do the park management have to promote efficient sustainability of the park?

16. Does the park management have community representatives to contribute in sustainable and operational decision making?

17. How do you rate the performance of sustainability of CBT and Heritage between management and the community around?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. What would you recommend to improve sustainability of community based heritage tourism sustainability?
## Appendix 4: Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TIME TO TAKEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2015/2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oct/15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept submission and Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Preparation, submission and presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACOSTI Application &amp; Pre-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report submission and supervisors Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation, Correction, thesis submission and presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: General Information of Mt. Kenya Region

Appendix four gives an overview of the study area that include the five counties that touch Mt. Kenya World Heritage Site.

Appendix 5.1. Nyeri County

Nyeri County is located in Mt. Kenya region; it has a population of approximately 693,558 people and covers an area of 3,356 km². Nyeri County is divided into five divisions that include Kieni east, Kieni west, Mathira-ini, and Nyeri municipality. The major communities in Nyeri County include Kikuyu, Meru, Embu, Kirinyanga among other.
Appendix 5.2. Kirinyaga County

Kirinyaga County is in Mount Kenya region former central province. Kirinyaga headquarters is in Kirugoya/Kutus with Wanguru as the largest town. Kirinyaga County covers an area of 1,205.4 km² and has a population of 596,268 people. The county has four divisions that include Central, Gichugu, Mwea, and Ndia that are represented by Kerugoya, Kianyaga, Wanguru, and Baricho towns respectively. The dominant communities in Kirinyagacounty include Kirinyaga, Mbeere, Kikuyu, Embu, and Meru among others.
Appendix 5.3. Embu County

Embu County is in the Mount Kenya and the former headquarters for Eastern province. The county covers an area of 2,818 km² and has a population of 516,212 people. The county is divided into Manyatta, Mbeere North, Mbeere South, and Runyenjes constituencies. The dominant communities include Embu, Kikuyu, Meru, and Kirinyaga among others.
Appendix 5.4. Tharaka Nithi County

Tharaka Nithi County is in Mount Kenya region former Eastern province. The county has a population of approximately 365,330 people and covers an area of 2609 km². Tharaka Nithi headquarters is in Kathwana that intersect Maara, Tharaka, and Chuka/Igembengombe constituencies. The dominant local communities include Meru, Mbeere, Kikuyu, and Embu among others.
Appendix 5.5. Meru County

Meru County is located in Mount Kenya region in the former eastern province. Meru County is the most populated county in the research area of Mt. Kenya region with a population of 1,356,301; the county covers an area of 6,930.1 Km². The major local communities around Meru County include, Ngaa (Meru), kikuyu, embu, kamba among others.
Appendix 6. Muranga, Laikipia, and Nyandarua Counties

These are three counties that lies within the extended boarders of Mount Kenya region but do not touch Mount Kenya National Park World Heritage Site.
Appendix 7: Map of Mount Kenya

This is a map of Kenya with all the forty seven counties of Kenya.