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ABSTRACT

This study was on the impact of tourism on the conservation of the cultural heritage in the Kenyan coast. It examined the social, economic and physical impacts of tourism on the immovable and movable cultural heritage in the coastal part of the country. It captures the benefits, damages and challenges of tourism to heritage conservation, using illustrations from four coastal sites: Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba la Mtwana and Kaya Kinondo. It is based on the premise that tourism significantly affects people, their cultural heritage and the environment.

The study had three objectives: to explore the direct and indirect socio-cultural impacts of tourism; assess the physical damage occasioned by tourism on Kenya’s sites and monuments; and evaluate the economic effects of tourism on Kenya’s heritage. It was conducted at the Kenya Coast between May and September 2007 and was guided by Mathieson and Wall’s analytical framework. Data were obtained from documentary sources, key informant interviews, direct observation and photography. They were analysed using both qualitative and quantitative approaches and the information presented in plates, verbatim quotes, and tables of frequencies and percentages.

The study established that tourism indeed supports cultural heritage conservation, although it also has destructive effects which need to be dealt with in order to safeguard the heritage for posterity. Tourism’s influence on out-of-school education and the safeguarding of the world’s cultural and natural treasures are vital windows through which anthropologists can appreciate leisure, human behaviour and cultural dynamics as well as the material implications shaping human behaviour in the contemporary world. The conservation and use of the historically and artistically valuable heritage are crucial aspects in the quest for societal development in the face of global influence and challenges. The study recommends that apart from educating the public on respectful use of the heritage, and creating a tourism-supported national heritage conservation fund, closer collaboration of the site managers with the community members be enforced to check visitor threats.
Chapter One: Background to the Study

1.1 Introduction

Tourism continues to have significant impact in the contemporary world, including developing countries such as Kenya, recognised as one of the most developed tourist destinations in sub-Saharan Africa (Sindiga 1999: 59; Weaver 1999: 801). Covering a territorial area of 582,646 square kilometres (Maxon & Ofcansky 2000: 1; Sindiga 1999: 35), Kenya has a varied landscape of bewildering ecological variety and great beauty, and is inhabited by diverse ethnic communities with a rich heritage. Heritage is any tangible (physical) or intangible (non-physical), natural or cultural resource passed on in society from one generation to another. Kenya’s heritage has accumulated over millions of years. As the cradle of humanity, Africa possesses some of the earliest settlements of human occupation, producing the earliest evidence of hominids and tools (Abungu 2005), which are integral antecedents capturing humanity’s adaptive technology. Among the natural heritage are physical features such as mountains, oceans, lakes, rivers, sandy beaches, biodiversity (fauna and flora), climate and other gifts of nature. Cultural heritage resources, on the other hand, include historical sites and monuments, ethnographic resources, arts and crafts, religious centres, traditions, and festivals (Okpoko 1990: 130; Seba 1997: 144). Kenya’s movable and immovable resources serve as a central base for development initiatives and a source of tourism attraction to the country. Indeed, heritage has been deemed the lifeblood of much of the tourism industry (Boniface & Fowler 1993: xi; Johnson 1992: 2) and to appreciate and utilise the cultural resources, a tourist has to possess cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984; Richards 1996).

Due to its significance in steering development initiatives, heritage has been the target of conservation since time immemorial. Conservation is the preservation, protection, treatment and maintenance of heritage resources in order to elongate their lifespan for continued beneficial use by the society (Linstrum 1978: 15; Nyamanga 2003: 15). The primary aim of conservation is to reduce the rate of decay to which objects are inevitably exposed (Fitch 1982; Price 1990: 284). The preservation, protection, and promotion of our cultural heritage not only help to intensify national and community identity but also serve educational, research and development purposes. Tourism and heritage conservation as global
necessities, are closely yet paradoxically linked, in that while they are considered crucial for the economic success of nations, both are at the same time in some degree of conflict (Ashworth 1999: 21; McKercher & du Cross 2002: 12): tourism has exploitative and corruptive effects (Hazlewood 1979: 107).

This study captures the mutual but, sometimes, antagonistic relationship between cultural heritage conservation and tourism. In particular, it determines and analyses the impact of tourism on Kenya’s cultural heritage resources, in line with the country’s fundamental policy of maximising net economic benefits from tourists subject to social, cultural and political constraints. The immovable heritage consists of fixed assets that are culturally, historically, and educationally important such as sites and monuments, and buildings, which cannot be moved from one place to another. Tourists have continued coming to Africa from other parts of the world to see the natural and cultural patrimony in its unadulterated context. Kenya’s foreign tourists are largely interested in its biodiversity, climate, scenic beauty, history and cultural development to satisfy their leisure, educational and inspirational needs.

Tourism is the short-term purposeful leisure travel made by people, singly or in groups, from their permanent residence to other destinations within or outside their country (Burns 1999; Nash 1981; Okpoko 1990; Pearce 1989). Domestic and international tourism focus on the natural and cultural dimensions of the destinations, resulting in heritage tourism with two broad forms: nature tourism and cultural tourism. With the incorporation of conservation concerns there is now ecotourism as a third form of tourism. The tourism industry has become very important in the modern world, largely for its economic, physical, environmental and socio-cultural benefits. A number of authorities, including Mathieson and Wall (1982, 1992), have provided a broad analysis of the economic, physical and social impacts of tourism. Economically, tourism and travelling account for more than 10% of the world’s total Gross Domestic Product (Waithaka 2004: 105) and is the largest source of employment in the world (Kenya Tourist Board 2003: 10); tourism accounted for about 12.6% of the average GDP for African countries and employed 13 million in 1997 (Fay, 1999: 1857). Based on these statistics, tourism has been considered by the World Bank as an important vehicle for realizing development in developing countries and steering the economies of the developed world.
Tourism is known to create a wide range of service roles in society (Nash 1981: 466), having provided 470,000 such jobs in Kenya in 2002 (KTB 2003: 18), up from 11,000 by 1967 (Hazlewood 1979: 107). The tourism sector employs, formally and informally, numerous people in various cadres as managers, and subordinate staff in hotels, restaurants, motels, lodges, airlines and parks and other businesses such as curio-selling, shop-keeping, transport, banking, entertainment and tour guiding. By providing employment for men and women in such sectors as hotels, lodges, tour companies and national parks, tourism allows citizens to participate in the cash economy, thereby raising their standards of living (Muthee 1991: 3). Moreover, the revenue raised from tourists through entrance fees promotes the conservation of the natural and cultural endowments (Haulot 1976, 1985; Muthee 1991: 4; Nyeki 1993). The unique spiral relationship between cultural heritage and tourism has been recognised by UNESCO in its cultural policy, premised on the fact that monuments attract tourists, who bring money that naturally serves to maintain, restore and display monuments thus attracting more tourists (UNESCO 1970: 61). UNESCO trusts that when monuments are commissioned to promote tourism, they will be more easily preserved, better known and appreciated globally (UNESCO 1970: 62). This study sought to determine the impact of tourism on the conservation of Kenya's immovable cultural heritage and associated movable objects by addressing the question, 'What are the salient impacts of tourism on heritage conservation in Kenya?'

1.2 Problem Statement

Despite tourism's economic benefits and its promotion of culture and modern values (Irandu 2004; Lea 1988; Liu 2003; Makopondo 1994; Mathieson and Wall 1992; Ouma 1970; UNESCO 1970), the industry threatens the life of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage in many ways. The first threat of tourism to the immovable cultural heritage is that it contributes to the plunder and damage of both the immovable and movable heritage, through theft of and illicit trade in cultural objects and the scribbling of graffiti on monuments. The theft and illicit trade in cultural pieces, such as the Mijikenda vigango (specially carved memorial grave posts) has lead to the desecration of the traditional burial sites and shrines (the makaya) and virtual loss of these treasures. However, except for the highlights by Bwana (1995) and
Maikweki (1995), the extent to which theft and illicit trade have affected the cultural heritage in Kenya has received little attention. On the other hand, graffiti making continues at many Kenyan sites and monuments (Abdalla et al., 2003; Kessy et al., 2003; Nyamanga 2005). Although capturing a historically valuable artwork, graffito (singular of graffiti) is destructive as it interferes with the aesthetic value of and messages in the heritage and creates avenues for other decay and deterioration agents to undermine the heritage’s fabric. In addition, there is increased danger of fire, light and smoke resulting from a variety of indirect tourist activities in a destination such as cafeteria, sound and light shows (Buhalis & Fletcher 1995: 6).

Tourism and archaeological explorations have been accused of the plunder of much of our treasures as evidenced by the coastal monuments that have been robbed of their ceramic inlays and shipwreck contents (Kusimba 1996; Maikweki 1995; Ndeti 1975: 49; Wilson & Omar 1996). Global tourism together with new ways of selling stolen materials have encouraged looting and illicit trade in objects (Pye 2001: 18, 19). Tourism has also been a serious source of conflict between proprietors and the local community over communal resources (Kusimba 1996; Migot-Adholla et al. 1982; Nyeki 1993), a key indicator of tourism’s insensitivity to local community needs and concerns. This neglect of local community interests makes tourism unpopular and exploitative and could be among the reasons behind the country’s low levels of domestic tourism. Furthermore, many observers wonder whether the revenue generated by tourists is sufficient for the care of the cultural heritage resources in Kenya, each of which requires at least a million Kenya shillings to develop and open to the public (Sparacino 2005: 75).

Tourists themselves are also a bother to site maintenance through the litter they often throw anyhow on the sites, their weight and the abrasion of their feet often causing damage to the cultural heritage. Since all tourists are engrossed with curiosity, their constant touch and scratching of Swahili doors could lead to irreparable damage of the fragile carving patterns (Athman 2003: 129). Ashley (2000: 22) holds the view that tourism focussed on local culture can help strengthen pride and traditions, but risk devaluing culture by commodifying it. Some tourists’ activities and their sheer numbers may jeopardise the continued survival of the treasured cultural and natural heritage. Citing Hunter and Green (1995), Ashworth (1999: 17) underscores the heritage-tourism conflicts saying that Stonehenge cannot withstand the visitors’ feet, the caves of Lascaux their breath, Tutankamon’s tomb their sweat and the art of the Louvre their
digestive systems, adding that such cities as Venice, Oxford and Canterbury view tourism as a problem and not an opportunity. Based on this broad overview, the study sought answers to the following questions:

- What social and cultural impacts does tourism have on heritage conservation in Kenya?
- Does tourism cause any physical damage to the Kenyan sites and monuments?
- Does tourism economically benefit Kenya's heritage conservation?

1.3 Study Objectives

1.3.1 General Objective

In general, this study explores and documents the impact of tourism on the conservation of Kenya's cultural heritage.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

- To determine the direct and indirect socio-cultural impacts of tourism on the cultural heritage in Kenya.
- To examine the physical damage tourism causes to Kenya's historical sites and monuments.
- To evaluate the extent to which tourism benefits Kenya's heritage conservation.

1.4 Rationale of the Study

Tourism cannot be detached from heritage, be it natural or cultural (Nash 1981: 464; Johnson 1992: 2). Heritage is conserved to meet the vital needs of the community such as development, learning, leisure and recreation. As a source of inspiration in society, heritage conservation has been promoted over the years, yet it still experiences numerous challenges. Exposure of heritage resources to tourist use predisposes them to varying degrees of damage. Although cultural loss and damage have been noted as enhanced by increased mass tourism, the gravity of this matter is not adequately captured in the available few Kenyan studies (Sindiga 1999: 189; Irandu 2004: 134). More specific attention is therefore needed especially to unravel the mysteries behind conflicts in heritage conservation and use. There is indeed a vital need for consideration of socio-cultural dimensions of tourism alongside the economic and environmental ones. Since the economic and socio-cultural impacts of tourism depend upon the type of tourism and the type of society (de Kadt 1979: 4), heritage conservation demands that we understand the user needs, their behaviour and effects on the resources to ensure appropriate management and sustainable use.
This study, by seeking to understand the interaction between cultural tourism and heritage conservation and promotion, should be valuable to institutions charged with the use, management and conservation of our treasured heritage and as an inspiration to further concrete studies. These institutions include: the National Museums of Kenya, the Kenya Tourist Development Authority, the Ministry of Heritage, the Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife, the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Gender, educational and research institutions such as Universities, Utalii College, Travel and Tour Organisations, Tour Guides, Community Development Bodies, NGOs and local councils which receive much revenue from tourism.

1.5 Scope and Limitations

The main concern of this study was an analytical description and assessment of the impact of tourism on the cultural facets of our heritage. The study was conducted at the Kenya Coast and primarily focused on the analysis of the economic, socio-cultural and structural effects on selected sites and monuments resulting from tourism activities. Due to lack of baseline studies on the subject and lack of necessary equipment and time, the magnitude and rate of structural damage were not addressed. Neither did this study deal with the impact control measures, although it highlights suggestions for such control.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature on heritage resources, as well as the conservation initiatives and challenges relating to tourism. It provides the theoretical framework as well as hypotheses and concepts integral to the study. The literature discussing cultural attractions (tourism pull factors), tourist behaviour, cultural heritage conservation and promotion, is reviewed. Although often considered parasitical, the relationship between heritage and tourism could be symbiotic: how is this beneficial relationship harnessed in Kenya? Mathieson and Wall’s (1992) conceptual framework that considers the economic, physical and socio-cultural impacts of tourism guided this study.

2.2 Tourism, Cultural Heritage and Conservation

2.2.1 Tourist Cultural Attractions

A tourist attraction is anything or feature that draws tourists to a destination (Makopondo 1994: 24). Studies show that cultural resources are vital attractions upon which tourism thrives. Mathieson and Wall (1982), for instance, indicate three major forms of culture that attract visitors: inanimate, routine and animate. Inanimate attractions are forms of culture which indirectly involve human activity, such as unique architecture and art, historical buildings and monuments, and traditional arts and crafts. The second form consists of those forms of culture reflected in the normal daily life of a destination. Here, visiting foreign peoples observe their normal social, economic and leisure activities in an attempt to understand their lifestyles, ideologies and customs as a common tourist motivation. Finally, are the animated forms of culture, which may involve special events or depict historic or famous occurrences, for example, musical festivals, carnivals, festivals reflecting old traditions and behaviour, re-enactments of battles and displays of old machinery. These are pointers to the centrality of the cultural heritage in tourism promotion and through which tourism makes significant impact.

Kenya’s rich and varied heritage is highly treasured by the nation, its forty-two plus ethnic communities and the world community including foreign settlers and visitors, especially people from Germany, Britain, Italy, France, U.S.A, and Japan, who are the major visitors (Dieke 1991; Ouma 1970;
While wildlife is the outstanding attraction in Kenya, tourists also come to Kenya largely to enjoy the magnificent scenery, to see the people and their diverse cultural heritage, for sports (athletics, motor rally, horse racing, soccer, bull fighting) and other activities including business, conference and education as well as sex (Omondi 2003). Of the 240 gazetted historical sites and monuments, only 17 are open to the public (Sparacino 2003: 75) as regional and site museums, namely: Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba la Mtwana, Mnarani, Takwa, Lamu (Old Town, Fort, Swahili House, Post Office), Rabai, Olorgesailie, Kariandusi, Hyrax Hill, Fort Ternan, Songhor, Kenyatta Houses in Lodwar and Maralal, Thimlich Ohinga, Koobi Fora, Njuuri Ncheke Building (Meru), and Kaya Kinondo. The unique wildlife, natural scenery, the climate, good beaches, historical sites and monuments, and people are therefore among Kenya’s valuable treasures upon which the tourist industry relies (Dieke 1991; Kisongo et al. 1969; Kamau 1999; Makopondo 1994; Nyeki 1993; Popovic 1972; Saleh 1981). Table 2.1 captures the visiting trends to museums and sites from 1996 to 2006 indicating that the cultural heritage is increasingly becoming a vital component of tourism in Kenya; receiving over six hundred and thirty-eight thousand visitors annually.

Table 2.1: Visitors to Kenyan Museums, Snake Park and Sites (in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td>218.0</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>175.4</td>
<td>196.4</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td>275.4</td>
<td>223.9</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>218.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Park</td>
<td>170.6</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>166.2</td>
<td>105.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Jesus</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>140.3</td>
<td>140.7</td>
<td>122.4</td>
<td>126.2</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>127.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisumu</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitale</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gede</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamu</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumba</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olorgesailie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kariandusi</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrax Hill</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Blixen</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mnarani</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabarnet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapenguria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malindi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabai</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinondo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narok</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>758.8</td>
<td>588.1</td>
<td>494.2</td>
<td>573.1</td>
<td>585.1</td>
<td>675.8</td>
<td>603.1</td>
<td>686.3</td>
<td>677.4</td>
<td>772.8</td>
<td>603.6</td>
<td>638.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 General Impacts of Tourism on Heritage

In this context, impact refers to the effects or net changes tourism has on the people, the heritage and the environment. Impact assessment is based on quantity (number or weight of people or things involved), time (how long or how frequently visited), quality (behavioural dispensation of actors, intensity and price-strength) and direction (negative or positive). Tourism has both direct and indirect negative and positive effects of diverse magnitude. Although it is deemed to undermine social norms (through negative behaviour change) and contributes to environmental pollution as well as damage to monuments, tourism also has many benefits to a nation.

Economically, tourism generates revenue and foreign exchange and creates job opportunities for people in various cadres in the industry. Tourism also promotes the preservation of the cultural and natural heritage for tourists’ consumption, and contributes to increased global understanding by allowing people to meet and share experiences and other things integral to life. Through tourism, such development initiatives as new infrastructure facilities like roads, water, and electricity for community use are often extended even to remote areas (Akama 1997; Lea 1993: 7; Senior 1982). It therefore promotes the welfare and progress of members of the society, by earning them livelihoods and has been considered an important vehicle for development. However, the participation of the local communities in the tourism industry is negligible since much of the central businesses are owned and controlled by foreign investors (Irlandu 2004: 134; Jommo 1987; Sinclair et al. 1995), and so that welfare has not been realised. Nevertheless, since tourism has been said to contribute to the restoration and preservation of historical buildings and sites, largely through the entrance fees, souvenir sales and donations, it has stimulated the restoration and preservation of Kenya’s historical sites and monuments such as Fort Jesus, Mombasa Old Town, Gede ruins, and Lamu Old Town (Irlandu 2004: 142).

Although Kenyan scholars (Irlandu 2004; Sindiga 1999) have decried the paucity of information on tourism’s impact on the cultural heritage, there has been a growing concern over the impacts of tourism as a respectable subject of inquiry. For example, Mathieson and Wall (1982) observe that anthropological and sociological analyses of the impacts of tourism have increased since the first anthropological symposium on tourism held in Mexico City in 1974. A number of texts and academic articles in many journals have
been devoted to tourism’s anthropological aspects, especially concentrating on two particular themes: 1) tourism and processes of cultural change: acculturation and cultural drift; and 2) intercultural communication and the commoditization of culture. These are highlighted below, showing how they obtain in Kenya.

2.2.3 Tourism and Culture Change

Culture change can be internally induced through discovery and invention or externally induced as a product of contact. Contact situations are rather complex and tourism represents only one form of exposure of hosts to foreign cultural elements and traits. Culture change resulting from contact depends largely on the nature of the contact, the socio-economic profiles of interacting individuals or groups, and the numerical differences in the populations. Although tourism could conceivably influence all facets of culture, the analyst of culture change must find ways of overcoming the severe difficulties of separating the effects of tourism on host cultures from those changes induced by other causes such as the international media, improved communications technology and globalisation.

Nunez Jr. (1963), McKean (1976), and Greewood (1989) are noted for their concern with the unique ways in which tourism influences communities. Documenting the interaction between Mexican villagers and urban tourists, Nunez Jr. (1963) noted the rapid and dramatic changes in economic and political structures, land use patterns and value systems. McKean (1976: 238) described similar results in a study undertaken among the Taos Pueblo Indians. McKean notes that the Indians ‘have come to be allied in a “culture symbiosis” with the Anglo motel and shop operators recognising the importance of the Indians in attracting the tourists and the Indians knowing that the whites operate necessary tourist services that enable them to profit.’ Greenwood (1989), on the other hand, discusses the death of a Spanish city ritual, the Alarde of Fuenterrabia, under the influence of tourism. Such cultural changes induced or accelerated by tourism, as noted above and elsewhere, could well obtain in Kenya, especially in areas where tourism has gained major ground.

The Maasai of Kenya and Tanzania have been a major component of tourism promotion and their culture seems to be experiencing extensive commodification: the people pose for photographs, dance and sing, and sell curios (Loefler 1993, cited in Othoche 1999: 213; Sindiga 1999: 60, 115). Although they are
largely dependent on livestock, many Maasai people have embraced tourism as a major source of their livelihood in the recent decades and may be a major force in the transformation of their stable culture (Kareithi 2003; Olindo 1991, cited in Ceballos- Lascurain 1996: 81; Spear 1993: 1). Castigating the equation of the Maasai with wildlife and curios, Wahome Mutahi (Daily Nation, August 5, 1991, p. 6) observes that the commercialisation of a people sacrifices culture on the altar of the dollar and the Deutschemark. While money seems to have overtaken human dignity today, this absurd trend can be reversed through policy for which community involvement and government support are vital. To a marginalised people in need of empowerment through education, resource distribution, employment and protection against wildlife threats, tourism is considered as some sort of blessing however degrading.

Culture change resulting from another culture’s influence is called acculturation, a common theoretical framework in anthropological studies. Those who use the framework argue that when contact takes place between a strong and a weaker culture, it is usually the strong culture which influences the weaker one. The two underlying assumptions of these scholars are that cultural changes: 1) occur primarily to the indigenous society’s traditions, customs, and values rather than to the visiting group; and 2) lead to a gradual homogenisation of cultures in which the local identity is being assigned into the stronger, visiting culture (Petit-Skinner 1977, cited in Mathieson & Wall 1982, 1992).

Acculturation theory asserts that when two cultures come into contact for any duration, each becomes somewhat like the other through a process of borrowing (Nunez Jr. 1977: 207). Borrowing is by no means symmetrical and is largely influenced by the nature of contact situation, the socio-economic profiles of interacting individuals or groups, and the numerical differences in the populations. As many destinations of cultural tourism are developing countries, tourists, who are generally western and wealthier, are less likely to borrow from their hosts than their hosts are from them. As host societies adapt to tourism and attempt to satisfy the needs of tourists, they will inevitably succumb to the tourists’ attitudes and values and become more like the culture of their visitors. Most studies have therefore noted a gradual weakening of traditional culture and what has been termed the development of a coca-cola society within indigenous lifestyles (Shivji 1973: 10). In African countries like Togo, Mauritius, the Seychelles, The Gambia and Kenya whose beaches are popular winter vacation spots for Europeans, the resulting “beach culture”
(nudeness, scanty dressing, prostitution, drug addiction) causes a lot of cultural tensions between the Europeans and acculturated Africans, on the one hand, and the conservative Africans, on the other (Fay 1999: 1858). These are among the dysfunctional aspects of tourism that Macharia (1977) and Migot-Adholla et al. (1982), among other observers, only briefly touch on.

Observing that tourism represents one means by which acculturation can be studied, since almost all communities had been exposed to outside contact before the recent upsurge in tourism, Mathieson and Wall (1982) have identified increases in mobility, the process of urbanisation, and contact of natives with explorers and missionaries as the factors contributing to the breakdown of cultural barriers, adding that it is difficult to separate the changes induced by tourism from those resulting from other processes of modernisation. They argue that many souvenir art forms (arts of acculturation or tourist art) may result from gradual modification (p.161). The degree to which tourism contributes to the acculturation process, the nature and direction of effects emanating from the process and the factors manipulated to minimise the role of tourism in acculturation are unexplored and un-answered topics in the literature. Of course, scholars have identified the revival of traditional arts and crafts as being among the major positive impacts of tourism. How has tourism contributed to the resurgence of traditional art production in Kenya? Irandu (2004: 141), for instance, argues that with the development of international tourism in Kenya since the late 1970s there has been a revival of traditional arts and crafts, but the extent to which this revival has occurred is lacking in the literature. It is evident, however, that shops selling traditional arts and crafts as souvenirs to tourists have proliferated across the country and are run by both men and women, who have made it a source of their livelihood.

2.2.4  Intercultural Communication and Commoditization of Culture

In their broad scrutiny of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on culture, Mathieson and Wall (1982: 162), observe that the dominant perspective regarding debate over the nature and direction of the consequences of tourism is that it is harmful (see also Lea 1988, 1993). For them, the harmful theme is exemplified by Turner and Ash (1975) in their assertion that the tourists' superior economic wealth rapidly erodes the sensuous and aesthetic wealth of cultures that have developed in isolation from the Western world; tourism orchestrates the obliteration of other cultures in contact with the European culture. For
Dower (in Mathieson and Wall 1992), however, tourism and conservation can be brought to work together for mutual benefit as both are interdependent and stand to gain from close and effective collaboration.

Mathieson and Wall (1992) explore in detail intercultural communication and cultural commodification that Lea (1988, 1993) summarises rather succinctly. They consider cross-cultural contact arising from tourism as a function of three factors: the type of tourist, type of place and brokers or intermediaries. First, they hold that the different categories of tourists in the Developing World interact differently with the local people. Secondly, they consider the context in which contact takes place including the length of stay, the environment under which contact occurs and the language ability as factors helping in determining the depth of communication that takes place. Lastly, they consider cultural intermediaries such as interpreters and tour guides as conduits through which much of the contact occurs, determining the degree and pace of such communication (Lea 1988: 71).

Lea states that one of the most obvious signs of cultural reawakening or deterioration in the developing society is found in the state of traditional art forms and that the growth of a tourist handicrafts market stimulates local production both positively and negatively. While, the positive influences relate to the financial success of traditional art and artefact production in many places, the sheer pressure caused by a ready market for handicrafts has also led to a fall in the quality of workmanship and the manufacture of cheap imitations (Lea 1988: 71). Although some observers claim that traditional designs are degraded in this way and old skills lost leading to the existence of fake art on sale (Lea 1993; see Cohen 1989, 1993 for details regarding art change), Sindiga (1999) found no evidence of declining skills in the artefact production in Kenya. Finally, is the aspect of commodification - the ability of modern tourism to market its products as a commodity, part of which consists of promoting the cultural attractions of holidaying in an exotic environment. The dark (negative) and bright (positive) sides of commodification are captured in the literature. Although criticised for cheapening cultural events as religious ceremonies and death of cultural rituals such as the Alarde of Fuenterrabia in Spain (Greenwood 1989), commodification is also responsible for the flow of funds into many local activities (Lea 1988: 72).

Even though the Kenya government continues with rigorous campaigns for expansion of tourism within the country and across the globe, setting aside 970 million shillings for marketing in the 2006-2007
fiscal year (Otieno J. in Daily Nation. 30 August. 2006. p. 28). the worrisome conflicting returns of the tourism industry need crucial attention. On the positive side, the industry strengthens pride in traditional languages, performing arts, and production and conservation of a country’s material culture. This is evidenced at various points of the tourist circuits such as Bomas of Kenya in Nairobi, Bombolulu Cultural Centre in Mombasa, Ngomongo Village in Shanzu near Mtwapa and elsewhere (see Kamau 1999: 132) where some of the local Kenyan cultures have been replicated to allow tourists an opportunity to view and appreciate collections of indigenous homesteads, and dance performance by traditional dance troupes. Kenya has gained pride because of its cultural and natural heritage in a serene and accommodating environment, becoming the first African country to be honoured with the Swedish Grand Travel Award in 1993 (GoK 1994: 129). However, tourism is blamed for promoting class distinctions in society since its growth in Kenya has led to increase in land prices, land alienation, blocked access to public resources and beachfronts (Saleh 1981) as well as commodifying culture and affecting the country’s consumption patterns (Gembe 1982). Finally, by promoting the learning and daily use of foreign languages, tourism continues the erosion of many local languages, a process initially instigated by colonialism.

Thus, although it promotes education, intercultural understanding and global peace (UNESCO 1970), the commercialisation of culture, considered an un-avoidable worst effect of cultural tourism (Richards 1996: 65), tourism raises serious concerns about delinquent behaviour such as immorality, drug abuse and crime. For example, sex tourism puts the health of those involved at the risk of contracting sexually transmitted infections (today called reproductive tract infections including HIV/AIDS), drug use, trafficking and abuse as well as other vices such as gambling and crime, including terrorism. In a broad overview of sex tourism (prostitution), Omondi (2003) discusses the gender and political economy of sex tourism in Kenya, its health and socio-economic impacts, and government policy on sex tourism, advocating for an investigation of its root cause, subjection of perpetrators to international criminal laws, and rehabilitation of victims including offering them alternative means of earning a living.

Gembe (1982), in his critique of tourism, observed that traditional dances hitherto performed for meaningful purposes are now items for sale to the tourists. On the other hand, Ceesay and Ceesay (2005: 52) observe that the opening of sacred grounds to tourists or people with no feel for their religious essence
reduces the religious essence to a spectacle; the sacredness and value of these sites gradually diminishes, eroding the basis and communal life held together by the sites. The opening up of sacred sites such as Katchikally Crocodile Pool in the Gambia, and the *makaya* on the Kenyan coast to tourists may be aspects of transgression and cultural commoditization raising many ethical queries that heritage managers, tourism promoters and the relevant governments must resolve.

### 2.2.5 Conservation Approaches to Tourism Induced Impacts on the Cultural Heritage

This section explores why conservation is needed and what it entails in the context of cultural heritage tourism. Heritage conservation remains a primary concern in many nations of the world today because of its historical, economic, environmental and cultural importance. Conservation arises, as Watson (1978: 28) says, from a high sense of national and civic pride and a desire by all levels of society to meet the challenge of deciding the future of their heritage. Needed for survival and development purposes, heritage treasures are a source of inspiration and any threat to their existence requires realistic attention and immediate remedy, especially restraining the deterioration process by maintaining a nearly inert and controlled environment. With buildings, however, these conditions are impossible without excluding the public from the premises. While the cessation of deterioration is impossible, high quality control will retard it, so that the public can see, feel, pass through and experience our historic heritage (Chambers 1976, cited in Fitch 1982: 326).

The conservation of heritage resources depends on many integral factors including the level of technology, the degree of management and the policies of a nation (Fitch 1982). The national laws, in particular, specify the nature of conservation while conservators rely on the advice given by heritage managers, architects, designers, economic planners, and other local and international experts. The interests and values of the heritage conservation stakeholders should tally with those of heritage users to ensure cooperation and minimise conflict (McKercher & Du Cross 2002).

The conservation literature shows that numerous factors continue to unduly threaten the heritage, making protection a mandatory requirement if they are to continue existing to serve research and tourist needs as well as concrete pillars of societal pride and inspiration. The five main forms of attrition to which artefacts are exposed are weathering, abrasion, vandalism, theft and fire (Fitch 1982).
Abrasion is the most active form of attrition resulting from merely exposing an artefact to public access. Modern cultural tourism creates a situation where large crowds walk around, through and over monuments and sites, which were never designed to support such traffic. Fitch observes that some monuments are too fragile to permit public exposure at all as in the case of the Tombs of Thracian Horsemen at Kanzaluk in southern Bulgaria, whose microclimate must be kept by completely barring human visitors. Even specialists wearing protective attire are admitted for only limited periods and their presence monitored by deliberate instruments; a full hand pointed replica of this monument has been installed in the National Museum in Sofia for public access (Fitch 1982: 327). Kenyan museums such as Fort Jesus, Malindi and Lamu, which have historic storey houses, could be affected by the tourist traffic and clearly deserve some attention.

Human visitors may be a serious danger to the heritage. This is because they bring increased temperature, increased humidity and carbon dioxide (CO₂), dust, germs and spores attached to their clothing to the heritage surrounding all of which are injurious to the visited heritage (Fitch 1982; see also Brown 1998: 178-183). Secondly, trooping to the site and buildings makes the heritage suffer under the visitors’ weight, especially old buildings with fragile fabrics. Fitch gives examples where such traffic had to be dealt with, including Monticello, which in 1976 received several hundred thousand people trooping through Jefferson’s house and gardens. The abrasion of their shoe leather and the sheer weight of their bodies took a measurable toll on the fragile old fabric. In Washington’s Mount Vermont, the load was more severe as the two million people passing through the mansion in 1976, necessitated the replacement of the protective floor covering every three months with additional measures taken to strengthen the old wooden structure. A seriously reported case is Stonehenge in Wiltshire, England, where continued visitor pressure (the people received rose from 3770 in 1901 to 680,000 by the end of the 1980s) made it necessary to restrict access by erection of barriers (Breeze 1994: 237; Mathieson and Wall 1992: 24; Walsh 1997: 134). Similar barriers have been erected around Kenyan rock art sites on Rusinga and at Kakapel (Okumu 2006, personal communication; Ngalla 2006) largely to protect the fragile heritage from abrasion caused by people.
The behaviour of tourists contributes to the vandalism of the heritage resources to which they are attracted. For Fitch (1982: 327), much of the physical damage to the fabric of artefacts owing to overcrowding at the height of the tourist season are not vandalism, except the wily trace of fingerprints on building stairways and the beaten down verges of the gravel paths. He adds that the crowding and the overflowing trash baskets are due to saturation, which unless corrected, eventually lead to vandalism. Fitch reminds us that the behaviour of the public in a public space is affected by the level of housekeeping in that space as evidenced by the Trivoli Gardens in Copenhagen and Disneyland in California, both of which, though the most intensely used, remain the tidiest and the most continuously house kept public spaces.

Fitch says that there is a decline in public manners today and that the abuse of parks and landscapes, more visible today, may be attributed to a basic shift in public attitudes towards the public domain. Although tourists may not have been tidier previously, clearly the nature of their debris has changed today. Fitch observes that a picnic which only a century ago left only a few chicken bones and some crusts of bread today produces a bewildering waste of plastic containers and wrappings, aluminium cans, used photo bulbs, and non-degradable glass bottles. There is little information on how these behavioural problems are evident in Kenya.

Vandalism, theft and the risk of fire are also critical and are to some degree associated with tourism. Vandalism is a deliberate or malicious abuse of the artefact, and is age-old as shown by the curved initials and graffiti along the streets of Pompeii, Egyptian sites and Roman Catacombs and elsewhere that no doubt today constitutes a real and rising threat to the existence of all artefacts exposed to the public. Graffiti making has been noted on a number of Kenyan monuments, including Fort Jesus in Mombasa (Nyanganga 2005), and Shimoni caves in Kwale District (Abdalla et al. 2003: 16; Kessy et al. 2003: 6, 12). Vandalism is due to neglect, for as Fitch (1982: 328) observes, ‘the first graffiti seems to encourage newer and more outrageous levels’. Theft is another severe form of attrition, while fire is considered the ultimate attrition. On sites, fire could be started by a careless smoker throwing away smouldering buts anyhow or accidentally from the electric systems or site cafeterias and kitchens (Fitch 1982: 332). Both visitors and the heritage sites they visit require constant security. The site guards control vehicle movements, direct the visitors and safeguards against vandalism. As there is little data on Kenya’s
response to the challenge of vandalism, theft and fire on its sites and monuments, this study addresses them.

2.2.6 Theories of Heritage Tourism

A number of theories and models can be used to analyse heritage tourism. Among the theories are systems theory, conflict theory, dependency theory (also globalisation, delocalisation and social exchange), functionalism, phenomenology, acculturation (structuration) and irritation index (see Chen 2001; Lea 1988, 1993; Lewis 1972; Mathieson & Wall 1982, 1992; Nash 1981). Underlying all these is the aspect of transaction, bidirectional exchange involving tourists and their countries on the one hand and the hosts and their products on the other with positive and negative economic, physical and socio-economic effects. While development theorists consider the potential economic returns, other scholars focus on the damage and change resulting from tourism and therefore explore its conflicting relationship, especially its influence on culture change. According to Ashworth (1999: 21), ‘the symbiosis between heritage resource and the heritage tourist is complex and not automatically beneficial to both’; ‘the relationship is in many respects partial, frequently one-sided in its dependency, inequitable in its distribution of costs and benefits, almost inevitably the cause of some frictions between users and occasionally the cause of serious conflict.’ By paying to see the conserved heritage, visitors generate the necessary resources needed for continued maintenance and promotion of the heritage. But tourism may have a conflicting relation with heritage as a consequence of use and abuse, thereby threatening the existence of the treasured heritage resources.

2.3 Conceptual Framework

This study was guided by Mathieson and Wall’s (1992) conceptual framework (Figure 2.1). The framework identifies the various kinds of tourism-related impacts linking them together to a control segment. Tourism has both direct and indirect economic, physical and social impacts, which are either positive or negative subject to tourist destination and tourist characteristics. Since the study focuses primarily on the consequential component of tourism, the model which captures the linkage of the various impacts was considered quite relevant to the study, helping to simplify and integrate the specific areas of the study, which none of the theories was deemed able to achieve alone.
The framework has the following basic assumptions. First, it recognises sets of variables and their inter-relationships and ways in which they influence the nature, direction and magnitude of tourist impacts. Second, it points out that impacts linger and interact with each other. Third, it argues that impacts operate continuously but can change through time with changing demands of the tourist population and with structural changes in the tourist industry.

**Fig. 2.1: Conceptual Framework (Source: Adapted from Mathieson & Wall 1982: 15)**

The framework shows that the various tourism impacts are interlinked and require a system of control for managing them. Since the study was concerned with analysing tourism's benefits and damages, this framework seemed satisfactory in analysing its consequences. Tourism's benefits, threats, damages and challenges to heritage conservation could be economic, physical or social in nature. Economic impacts encompass the monetary costs and benefits resulting from tourism which, as Mitchell (1971: 13) argues, could be explained using rudimentary economic theories (centring on production, employment, revenue, consumption, tastes and prices). Physical impacts include alterations in the natural environment and the built heritage such as pollution, abrasion, vandalism and structural improvement, which have relations to visitor numbers, type and behaviour, activities and time taken as well as the levels of housekeeping and surveillance. Finally, socio-cultural impacts relate to the effects of tourism on the social and cultural facets of the destination areas. For instance, tourist lifestyles may change residents' tastes through demonstration effects (Mitchell 1971: 16). Tourism is unique in that tourists are physically present in the exporting
country and its appreciation rests on a clear understanding of these benefits, damages and challenges as they affect heritage conservation and use. Thus, although a tourist activity may be economically desirable, it could be socially and environmentally damaging, yet the generated revenue could be used to ameliorate pollution (Mathieson & Wall 1992: 24).

2.4 Study Hypotheses

❖ More of Kenya’s cultural heritage is being conserved due to the socio-economic benefits derived from tourism such as generated revenue, promotion of cultural knowledge, education and jobs in heritage conservation and management and revival of traditions and crafts.

❖ Tourism poses a serious threat to cultural heritage conservation owing to certain negative socio-economic and physical impacts such as vandalism, pollution, desecration and commercialisation.

❖ Tourism’s revenue generated as entrance fees and other purchases are used to conserve the sites and monuments as well as remedy its threats to heritage conservation.

2.5 Conceptualisation of Key Variables

Conservation is a very broad term referring to the preservation, protection, treatment and maintenance of objects against agents of deterioration or decay in a bid to elongate their lifespan. Conservation is achieved through preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, consolidation, reconstitution, adaptive use, reconstruction and replication. Conservation was measured by the site’s legal protection, maintenance, cleaning and security.

Cultural heritage encompasses all those cultural facets inherited by generations of any given human society or nation for posterity. The cultural heritage includes tangible immovable objects such as monuments, sites or movable artefacts such as pots, beds, bags, quivers, slings, calabashes, clothing as well as intangible aspects such as language, performing arts (dance, music, drama), culinary practices, body decoration and religion.
Tourism has been defined as an activity, industry, transaction or system of relationships and phenomena arising from the journeys and temporary stays of people not only travelling primarily for leisure or recreational purposes but also for business, health or educational reasons outside their residence or workplace (Boniface & Cooper 1987; Burns 1999; Mathieson & Wall 1982; Newsome et al. 2002; Pearce 1989). As used in this study, the term refers to all formal and informal activities and services centring on all voluntary and purposive short-term travels undertaken by domestic and foreign cultural tourists. Tourism is measured by the presence of tourists, leisure, travel, and attractions.

Cultural tourism is a form of heritage tourism focusing on people and cultural aspects of a destination as the central motivating or determining factors. McKercher and Du Cross (2002: 5) see cultural tourism as an umbrella term for an unlimited range of activities including historical tourism, ethnic tourism, arts tourism, museum tourism and others, conceptualised to involve four elements: tourism, the tourist, the use of cultural heritage assets, and the consumption of experiences and products.

Tourist attractions are the natural or man-made factors or elements in a destination that draw, pull or influence tourists to that place. They include scenic beauty, beaches, climate, people, art, buildings, hotels and others.

Threats are potential harmful effects such as vandalism, theft, pollution, desecration and the like that affect the existence of movable and immovable heritage objects. Threats were measured by the presence of graffiti and litter (garbage), erosion of building walls and grounds, visitor traffic and loss of objects.
Chapter Three: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research strategies that were used in the study. It describes the research site, study population, sampling procedures, methods of data collection and analysis, ethical issues and the difficulties that the research faced. Carried out at four coastal sites between May and September 2007, the study adhered to social science ethics and used various secondary sources of data, observation, key informant interviews and photography in obtaining data as detailed below.

3.2 Research Site

3.2.1 Location

This study was conducted at Fort Jesus (Mombasa), Jumba (Mtwapa), Gede (Malindi) and Kinondo (Ukunda) in the Coast Province of Kenya. Coast Province is located within latitudes 0° - 4°50'S and longitudes 37°30'E - 41°40'E (Kamau 1999: 43) and is one of the eight Provinces of Kenya. The Province covers a total area of 83,603 square kilometres (Ndeti 1975: 10) and comprises seven districts: Mombasa, Kilifi, Kwale, Malindi, Taita-Taveta, Tana River and Lamu. The population of the entire Coast Province by now exceeds 2,487,264 (GoK 2001), up from 1,720,331 (Kamau 1999: 53), with an annual growth rate of 3.5%. Fort Jesus is located on Mombasa Island in Mombasa District. Jumba la Mtwana is located near Mtwapa in Kilifi District. Gede is in Malindi District and Ukunda is in Kwale District. While Fig. 3.1 shows the location of Kenyan museums and sites, Fig. 3.2 is a section of the coast capturing some makaya and infrastructure.

3.2.2 Topography and Drainage

Coast Province has a topography rising from sea level to 900m in the eastern boundaries divided into six distinct relief regions: the coastal plain, the foot plateau, the coastal range, the Nyika plateau, the Tana River basin and lowlands and the residual hills (see, Kamau 1999; Foeken & Hoorweg 1988: 36, 37, for details). The drainage system of the coast consists of the Indian Ocean, two permanent rivers (Tana and Athi), and seasonal rivers such as Dodori, Rare, Kombeni, Mwachu, Ramisi, Cha Simba and Koroni.
draining into the Indian Ocean. Inland drainage consists of small lakes and manmade dams. These supply the water and food resources needed by the inhabitants and visitors to the region. Fringed by coral reefs, the coast is lined with a thick mangrove forest, which has for centuries supplied timber for building and export (Saleh 1981: 63).

3.2.3 Climate and Economy

The Kenyan coast has a warm and humid climate with a precipitation ranging from 900mm to 1100mm and temperatures of 22.7°C to 33.1°C capable of supporting agriculture and forestry. The abundant ocean waters support diverse sea fish (GoK 1997: 5). The coastal climate, its beautiful beaches, cultural resources, many splendid hotels and infrastructure including good roads, seaports, and an international airport in Mombasa as well as local airports in Malindi and Lamu and airstrips in Diani, Mnarani Club, Kiswani Farm, Kilifi township and Galana Game Ranch and hospitable population, make the region rather attractive to tourism, trade and industry. In fact, tourism is a vital part of the coastal

Fig. 3.1: Map of Regional and Site Museums in Kenya (Source: NMK 2005).
3.2.4 Cultural Heritage

The Kenyan coast is endowed with a magnificent cultural heritage, which is largely a product of contact with the external world, especially Arabia, Asia and Europe. It has diverse tangible and intangible cultural heritage belonging to its multiethnic, multiracial and multi-religious (Muslims, Christians, Hindus and Traditionalists) population. The abundant tangible indigenous cultural heritage includes the makaya (plural for kaya) some of which are gazetted as national monuments. There are also close to 200 sites and monuments lying on the Kenya coast, some of which are open to the public. These include: Fort Jesus, Jumba la Mtwana, Gede, Mnarani, Vasco da Gama Pillar (Padrao) in Malindi, Shaka Mwana, Ungwana, Lamu, Pate, Siyu Fort and others (see, Bvvana 1978; Ghaidan 1976; Kirkman 1964; Wilson 1978, 1980, 1982). The conservation of the built heritage along the coast began with gazettement and consolidation activities, which saw Gede, for example, gazetted in 1927, and some consolidation work carried out since 1939. These sites attract visitors and students from all over the world. Of the sites and monuments open to the public, Fort Jesus receives the highest number of both local and international visitors (Table 2.1) and is among the chief sources of revenue for the NMK.

Makaya are small relict patches of forest that once sheltered the fortified villages of the Mijikenda people of coastal Kenya and which, due to their spiritual and ceremonial significance, are customarily protected by a council of elders (Bennun & Njoroge 1999: 97). There are 60 makaya in Kwale, Kilifi and Malindi districts, 39 of which have been gazetted as monuments (NMK 1998; Githitho 200) and following NMK’s request, UNESCO enlisted them in the World Heritage List in 2008, a move that could make them a major tourist attraction (UNESCO 1999: 1). Some of the makaya in Kwale District are Kaya Kinondo (Kaya Digo), Kaya Mwelc, Kaya Bombo, Kaya Luguna for the Adigo and Kaya Duruma (Kaya Mtswakara) for the Aduruma. Save for Kaya Digo, other makaya are not open to the public (Jimbi 2006, personal communication). Located in Mswambweni Division off Diani Beach, Kwale District, Kaya
Kinondo has an ecotourism project manned by the Kaya Kinondo Conservation Group (KKCG). The KKCG’s Ecotourism project offers tours in the *kaya* as part of its income generating activities (Kepher-Gona & Mrithi 2005: 2). The generated revenues support the communities around Kaya Kinondo, especially in earning a living, producing handicrafts for sale to tourists and learning banking skills through the community bank (Kamweru n.d). All the *makaya* are under the care of the Coast Forest Conservation Unit (CFCU), an NMK conservation department based at Ukunda in Kwale District and Kilifi.

### 3.2.5 Infrastructure

The Kenyan coast has a good infrastructure with the transport network consisting of roads, railway, water, air and pipeline. There are five all-weather roads, three of which are trunk roads radiating from Mombasa: one north to Malindi, the other south to Lunga-Lunga (with a branch to Kwale town) and, lastly, westwards to Nairobi (with a branch to Kaloleni) (Foeken & Hoorweg 1988: 29; see also UNEP 1998: 49 for details).

The Mombasa-Nairobi railway line transports goods and passengers and has stations in Mazeras and Mariakani. The railway line branches at Voi to connect with Taveta Township. There is considerable use of boats and canoes by local fishermen and dhows and large boats carry many goods from Lamu to various points along the coast including Malindi, Kilifi and Mombasa. The ferry at Likoni plays a significant role in connecting Mombasa Island with the south coast mainland. Moi international airport in Mombasa, the main coastal airport is served by Kenya Airways as well as a number of international airlines since it can handle all types of passenger airlines (UNEP 1998: 50).

Fig. 3.2: A section of the Coast showing some makaya, reserves, drainage & transport system (Source: Bennun & Njoroge 1999:117).
The second level airports at Malindi and Lamu are served by local airlines and so are the third level airstrips at Kilifi and Mnarani Club in Kilifi District, Kiunga, Mokowe, Manda and Witu in Lamu District, Mackinnon Road, Ramisi, Diani, Shimba Hills Game Reserve and Wasini Island in Kwale District, Taita, Mwatate, Voi, Mtito Andei, Kilaguni and Aruba in Taita-Taveta and Garissa, Galole and Garsen in Tana River District. Investments in infrastructure such as Moi International Airport and several improvements in airports in Malindi and Lamu (as well as airstrips in Diani and elsewhere), railway and road networks, have greatly improved the comfort and speed of travel. However, heavy rains and flooding during the April-June wet season normally affect the road networks, cutting off transport and communication in the region.

3.3 Study Design

This was a small-scale descriptive cross-sectional study aimed at generating qualitative and quantitative data on the impact and relationship between tourism and heritage conservation. Information was obtained directly from the site through observation and interview with some stakeholders (site managers, education officers, tour guides, tourism officials), using an interview guide and a camera, and analysed manually and by a computer.

3.4 Study Population and Unit of Analysis

The Kenya coast has more than 89 sites and monuments (Bwana 1978; Wilson 1978, 1980, 1982). In this study all the heritage sites at the coast constituted the population while the unit of analysis was the individual site.

3.5 Sample Population and Sampling Procedure

The study focused on four heritage sites, Fort Jesus, Jumba la Mtwana, Gede and Kaya Kinondo. These were selected purposively on the basis of their prominence as tourist attractions: Fort Jesus for its popularity, Gede for its long history of conservation, Jumba for its picnic site and Kaya Kinondo for being the only kaya open to the public.
3.6 Data Collection Methods

This study used secondary and primary sources of information to answer the research questions and satisfy the research objectives.

3.6.1 Secondary Data

Secondary data are those data generated by other people meeting their research objectives, but which have some relevance to the current problem. Secondary data (from print and electronic sources such as books, journals, theses, newspapers, unpublished manuscripts, private and institutional reports, government documents, etc.) were used in preparing the research proposal and throughout the study. Background information on tourism, conservation, their relations and effects, the visitation trends and management are among the data provided by this source.

3.6.2 Key Informant Interviews

Face-to-face interviews were used to gather information from members of the public, heritage employees and government officials. The instrument used was an interview guide consisting of open-ended questions (Appendix A). Open-ended questions are those questions requiring the informant’s free response, providing answers in his or her own words. Information on the various effects of tourism and conservation practices was gathered through such interviews.

Key informants are those individuals who have more than ordinary knowledge on a subject. Site managers and community members constituted this team. They provided relevant information on the various effects of tourism and how they could be managed (boosted or deterred).

3.6.3 Direct Observation

Direct observation was carried out to capture the structural damage, graffiti, litter and other tourist behaviour on the sites visited by them. The information generated from direct observation was captured photographically by a manual and a digital camera and noted in a field notebook. Photographs from the manual camera were sorted scanned and together with those downloaded from the digital camera, are presented as plates.
3.7 Data Analysis

Data analysis is 'the search for patterns in data and for ideas that help to explain the experience of those patterns' (Bernard 1994: 360). Done manually or using a computer, data analysis involves strategy, reflection and interpretation including tabulation, calculation and presentation. Quantitative data were not analysed using the SPSS computer software but manually and the results presented in tables of frequencies and percentages, and in averages (mean and range). Data from key informant interviews were sorted out, as relevant calculations were carried out thematically and interpreted in line with the research objectives. The information has been reported verbatim, in paraphrases and in percentages and tables of frequencies where possible.

3.8 Challenges Faced in the Field and their Solutions

One immediate difficulty that led to delay in the commencement of the fieldwork was lack of funds. I had hoped that the NMK would grant me financial support for my research, but this was not forthcoming and the money I received from the British Institute was only a fifth of the budget. This made me scale down the period of research and the number of targeted informants. The second problem was with the informants, some of whom were hard to find, making it expensive tracing them. I would book an appointment only to find on arrival that the informant was nowhere and had to substitute them where possible. Moreover, some informants would not divulge essential information, especially the financial records. Although I turned to the museum headquarters for such information there was minimal success. I was therefore forced to make calculations using the available visitor statistics to estimate the revenue for the sites under study. The April-June long rains drastically affected the road network in the Coast and floods interfered with my travels. Both the Mombasa-Malindi and Mombasa-Vanga roads were temporarily impassable during the month of May. To overcome language barrier for non-English speaking local people, Swahili was used and there was no need for the services of an interpreter.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

This study adhered to appropriate research procedures and acknowledges all sources of information as far as possible. No harm was done to any of the respondents or institutions. Where any informant felt his or her identity was best kept secret, this has been upheld, and consent was sought as necessary. Neither did the study infringe on the privacy of any informant. A research permit was obtained from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and as required by this permit, it was presented to the District Education Officers in Mombasa, Kwale and Malindi, who then allowed me to carry on with the research.
Chapter Four: Tourism and Cultural Heritage Conservation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the findings of the research. As stated earlier, direct observation, personal face-to-face interviews and secondary data were used to gather information, which has been coded, tabulated and analysed. The chapter reviews the coastal attractions, coastal communities, and tourism’s impacts on the built heritage, tourism and the Mijikenda heritage, conservation challenges induced by tourism, graffiti and others, incorporating the various viewpoints provided by my informants. Beginning with a look at the informants’ characteristics, the chapter ends with effects of tourism on heritage conservation.

4.2 Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Informants

The socio-demographic characteristics of the informants are summarised in Tables 4.1a, b and c. A total of thirty-five informants were involved in this study, eight of whom were site managers. The informants were drawn from diverse educational, ethnic and religious backgrounds, and were aged between 21 and 75 years, giving an age range of 54 years and a mean age of 43 years. Most of the respondents were Muslims and Christians and the majority were men. Only one of the informants said he adhered to Traditional African Religion. Female informants were about a quarter (26%). Most of the informants (80%) were fifty years and below (Table 4.1a) and a majority were first degree graduates (Table 4.1b). One informant had no formal education at all, two (aged 71 and 75 years) had Kenya African Preliminary Examination certificates, six had secondary education, and nine had certificate and diploma, while five had postgraduate diploma or masters. Finally, one was a PhD student. The informants were drawn from coastal communities, especially the Mijikenda and Swahili (Table 4.1c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (Years)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1a Informant Characteristics
Table 4.1b: Informants’ Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Primary (up to Std 8)</th>
<th>Secondary (up to Form 4)</th>
<th>Advanced Level (Form 6), Diploma</th>
<th>First Degree Graduates</th>
<th>PGD, Masters</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1c: Informants’ Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Mijikenda</th>
<th>Swahili (including Bajun)</th>
<th>Abaluya</th>
<th>Akamba</th>
<th>Ameru</th>
<th>Abagusii</th>
<th>Luo</th>
<th>Adauida</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Tourism and the Kenyan Coastal Heritage

4.3.1 Tourists, Coastal Attractions and Tourist Facilities

Catering for some 66% of the country’s tourism activities (Omondi 2003) and revenue (Kamau 1999: 98), 52% of accommodation facilities and 44% of the tour operators nationally (Sindiga 2000: 223, 224), the Kenya coast is reputed for its tourist infrastructure. It has a large number of accommodation facilities such as hotels, guesthouses, apartments, villas, cottages and private houses and good transport and communication facilities available in Mombasa, Malindi, Lamu, Kilifi, Watamu and Kwale (Dieke 1991; Ndege 1992; Sindiga 1999, 2000). Tourist establishments in Lamu, for instance, have increased from 8 hotels with a bed occupancy of 186 in 1975 to 19 lodges, several hotels and over 30 private houses, all providing 500 beds by 2003 (Athman 2003: 107). This section provides information on two central questions, that is: ‘Who is a tourist?’ and ‘What attracts tourists to the Kenyan coast?’

My informants had a variety of opinions in answer to the question, ‘Who is a tourist?’, but these opinions could be grouped into three broad statements (Table 4.2), which appear to echo Smith’s (1981: 475) perspective of tourism as a social practice involving the co-occurrence of temporary leisure, disposable income and travel ethic (Burns 1999: 26) as well as those of Okpoko (1990). For these informants, a tourist is:

- A any person temporarily visiting another place/locality for some specific reason(s).
- Anyone willing to spend money and time in places of interest and curiosities; and
An local or foreign traveller searching for a different experience or renewed experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Tourist</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any individual temporarily visiting another locality for specific reasons</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone willing to spend money and time in places of interest and curiosities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any local or foreign traveller searching for a different experience or renewed experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above views, a tourist may be envisaged as any local or foreign individual who has resources (money and time) and opportunities for travelling to and temporarily visiting places of interest. It approximates wa Kinyatti’s (2006: 230) definition of a tourist as ‘one who visits a place other than his normal place of residence for leisure, or even business for a few days or longer and pays for his livelihood there during this period of time.’

Tourists visit the Kenya coast for a number of reasons, chief among them being to enjoy the available natural and cultural attractions. Among the natural attractions are the warm climate, the sandy beaches, the ocean, the wildlife and game/marine parks. The coastal people and their customs and lifestyles - dance, drama, food, dress, language, religion, homesteads and artefacts - are major cultural attractions, besides the ruined settlements and other monuments. Some tourists also come here for sexual enjoyment making prostitution a thriving business (Omondi 2003; Sindiga 1999) and the country has been deemed a tourist paradise for Western sex hunters according to Ngugi wa Thiong’o (Sindiga 2000: 232).

The informants considered the priority attractions to include the diverse heritage (Table 4.3). On average 50% reported cultural attractions while 74% reported natural ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractions</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People &amp; their Lifestyle</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Swahili, Mijikenda, Pokomo, Taita, Sanye, Aweera/Boni.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Heritage: Monuments</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba, Mnarani, Vasco da Gama Pillar (Padrao).</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Villages</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Ngorongo Village in Taita, Bombolulu Cultural Centre, Akamba Crafts Centre in Changamwe.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Fort Jesus, Lamu, Gede, Jumba, Malindi, Krapf Memorial (Rabar).</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports &amp; Games</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Athletics, Golf, Safari Rally, Camel Riding, Swimming and other water sports.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality &amp; Sex</td>
<td>Socio-Cultural</td>
<td>Private Home Accommodation (Home Stays). Prostitution</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Centres; Shrines &amp; Activities</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Mosques, Maulidi, Makaya, Temples and Churches.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Climate</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Ocean</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>The Indian Ocean and other water masses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Beaches</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Diani, Mombasa, Girama, Kilkambala, Watamu</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests, Natural Parks &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Forests such as Arabuko Sokoke, Mwaluganji and Diani; Marine Parks such as Malindi, Watamu and Mombasa; National Parks and Game Reserves such as Tsavo, Shrimba Hills and Others including Bamban, Mamba</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Beauty</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>General landscape, Marafa Knar (Devil’s Kitchen)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Coastal Communities and Tourism

The East African coast has generally been considered a very hospitable region due to the friendliness of its inhabitants. Because of the inhabitants' diversity and their rich cultural heritage and practices, the Kenyan coastal region has seen many holidaymakers, researchers and sportsmen come to experience diversified and rewarding experiences. Friendship, intermarriages and other social activities have resulted from such contacts. How do the local people perceive tourism? How has the local community participated in the tourism industry?

The participation of the coastal communities in the tourism industry has been highlighted by some scholars (Beckerleg 1995; Migot-Adholla et al. 1982; Peake 1982, 1989; Kusimba 1996; Joosten & Marwijk 2003; and Sindiga 1996, 2000) that my informants seemed to echo. Though the region accounts for about 70% of the national tourism industry (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 48), the indigenous coastal peoples maintain a hands-off attitude to the ownership and employment in the industry. Sindiga (2000: 230) argues that except for some young men with secondary education who take up salaried clerical jobs in the tourism industry, the Waswahili avoid subordinate positions (such as cleaners, waiters) in hotels partly because of their religious prohibitions (regarding alcohol and pork, see Kusimba 1999: 218), their low level of education and association of tourism with immorality (Beckerleg 1995; Sindiga 1996), preferring to work in dhow sailing, fishing, mangrove harvesting and sand mining. The Swahili, however, only control sea-tourism business where they operate glass-bottomed boats, used by tourists to view underwater marine life. My informants argued that religion and education placed certain constraints on the local community participation in tourism.

In their study in the early 1980s, Migot-Adholla and colleagues (1982) reported that up to 60% of hotel workers came from outside the coast. 66% of my informants tended to concur with these sentiments, observing that tourism focuses largely on non-coastal communities in employment, ownership and artefact trade. Nevertheless, the Swahili culture has been a significant contributor to the expansion of tourism as many of the visitors come to study and experience the Swahili heritage: learn their language, see their towns, and witness their religious activities and other ceremonies. Swahili culture has been a profitable field of inquiry for western archaeologists, historians, anthropologists and language students (Fuglesang 32
1994: 25). With the increasing value of home-stays, particularly favoured by students, the major beneficiaries are likely to be members of the Swahili community.

Most studies on tourism at the coast have focused on Lamu (Athman 2003, Fuglesang 1994: Irandu 2004, and Saleh 1981), Malindi (Martin 1973; Omondi 2003; Joosten & Marwijk 2003) and elsewhere. Their views on tourist behaviour and tourism impacts, could be representative of the entire Swahili coast experience and involvement in tourism, even though other scholars, such as Eastman (1994), and Migot-Adholla et al. (1982) have chided the exclusion of the Swahili and local communities from tourism. Lamu, an ancient Swahili town in the Lamu archipelago dating from the 14th century AD (Hodd 1996: 173), has been thought of being under threat from tourism which is gradually destroying its cultural and physical fabric (Crowther & Finlay 1991: 190). A dominant cultural centre reputed for its long history and undisturbed socio-cultural traditions, Lamu’s people, museums and old town make it useful for Islamic and Swahili cultural studies. Lamu receives about 17,000 visitors annually, 5,117 of whom are Kenyans, 2,877 Britons and 2,138 Americans (Athman 2003: 107, 109). Lamu visitors usually begin their tour with the Lamu Museum located on the seafront, where they can see displayed reconstructions of the stone house interiors such as kitchens, bathrooms, decorated bedrooms, models of various local vessels and magical beliefs connected with traditional ship building as well as musical instruments and beautifully ornamented jewellery. The coastal towns, settlements and their inhabitants are an endless exhibition, attractive to the tourists’ curiosity and gaze (Fuglesang 1994: 23).

The coastal visitors are classified by their mission as pilgrims and holidaymakers (Fuglesang 1994) or by their class as high, middle and low (Saleh 1981), each affecting the coast in different ways. The pilgrim tourists, largely from East Africa, congregate here annually for the Maulidi festival to celebrate the birthday of the Prophet Mohammed at the renowned Riyadha Mosque, during the Islamic month of Rabin Awal (Athman 2003: 111; Fuglesang 1994: 23). Twenty thousand such religious tourists flock Lamu and are normally entertained by Swahili dances from Pate, Siu, Ndau, Faza and Matondoni as well as by a series of cultural competitions like dhow and donkey races, bao game, henna painting and calligraphy organised by Lamu Museum. My informants noted that the pilgrim tourists are cultural tourists who affect the religious and social life of the local community, strengthening their beliefs, education and marital life.
The holidaymakers are not only a source of income and reproduction to the local people, but also the cause of conflict and tension, as do researchers, who are usually linked with the disappearance of documents. While the high-class tourists visit museums, stay in high-class hotels and do not do a lot of purchases, the middle class do a lot of sight seeing and make a lot of purchases, supporting Lamu’s craft industry. Worst of all are the low class tourists who stay mostly in lodges, sleep on beaches and pay pittance for their accommodation many of them in private single rooms (Saleh 1981: 143, 144). The low class tourists buy nothing and have been accused of encouraging drug taking, liquor drinking and sexual promiscuity among the local youth against the established Lamu people’s values (Saleh 1981: 145). Saleh therefore proposed encouragement of high class and middle class tourists and deterrence of low class tourists in Lamu and, among other things, an introduction of notices at all entry points telling tourists on the code of conduct and dressing while in Lamu. Furthermore, while Fuglesang believes tourists play a major role in the everyday life of the Lamu community and elsewhere in the coast depending on the length of their stay, Saleh considers it parasitic and seasonal. Moreover, local people are excluded from the tourist hotels whose proprietors have not only constructed buildings that do not conform to the surrounding landscape (my informants called these strange or funny houses), but have also blocked local residents’ access to the sea for recreation or fishing (Saleh 1981: 58), excluding the fishers and sailors from cleaning and repairing their boats and canoes (Kusimba 1996: 218). My informants shared the same sentiments, decrying the blockage of communal utilities by tourist facilities and urging that only beneficial tourists be permitted into the country.

While the coastal people understand that tourists come for holidays, to lie on the beaches, to go sailing between the islands, to spend their money on local souvenirs, or engage in cultural tourism (Fuglesang 1994: 23), their activities and needs should be beneficial and respectful to the local people. In their curiosity, the visitors are often in search of authentic cultural experiences of the local people, as they also seek authentic objects to acquire and take back home from their overseas excursions. The tourists’ desire for authenticity is hardly seen as a genuine endeavour towards an appreciation of the local culture, other than a way of ascertaining its inferiority. My informants considered most tourists as leisure seekers, less genuinely concerned with local cultures, save for a few who have made permanent attachments
through property purchase (land and houses including movable artefacts), marriage and religion. Coastal tourism has also promoted the art of body decoration, henna painting, especially on the arms and legs. Female visitors often seek contacts with the local women to have the customary henna designs painted on their hands. Besides the women and girls, one can also notice a number of young male visitors with henna decorations and other designs on their legs, arms, backs and chests. Echoing Young (1992: 18), my informants said that henna for tourists is of a different variety, since the decorative art is traditionally associated with marriage and weddings.

The importance of beach boys and girls as a link for tourists with the local culture cannot be overlooked. Usually stationed at the seafront to get the newly arrived tourist, these young men and women who come from various ethnic and educational backgrounds, offer their services as tour guides, translators and companions. By arranging lodgings, boat trips, sightseeing, and contacts with travel agencies, besides providing sexual services in exchange for payment, the beach boys have been instrumental in the coastal tourism, allowing foreign visitors to sample and enjoy Swahili and other local cuisine as well as attend and experience important public celebrations like the Maulidi and weddings. The beach boys and girls are sometimes a nuisance to both the visitors and the local people, due to some of their indecent behaviour, which my informants cited as begging, crowding, rowdiness, pick pocketing, dirt, and immorality. The informants suggested that coastal tourism should rely more on trained and uniformed tour guides as an effective link with the local community and to deter indecency.

Tourists are both loved and hated for their money, their curiosity and their effects on local people and their heritage, as evident from the literature and echoed by most of my informants. While their money and other gifts are welcome, the visitors are hated not only for their endless photography and their skimpy attire, but also their association with the theft of local documents, their promotion of immorality and drug abuse and their unpalatable publications. The local people consider appearance on photos is an exposure to the evil eye (Fuglesang 1994: 24) but also a source of exploitation and disrespect. Thus, my informants said that the local people strongly oppose photography by tourists, and their leisured lifestyle: 'the shameless walk through the coastal streets by half-naked female visitors showing their legs, bare shoulders and bellies in disregard to our dressing code is annoying because our children are tempted to do the same'. By failing
to honour official notices encouraging respect for the dressing norms, the coastal visitors are not only despised, but also accused of moral inferiority and arrogance. Tourists are also accused of promoting beach boys, and consumption of drugs and alcohol by the local youth. The moral decay among the youth who increasingly engage in homosexuality and unbalanced heterosexual relations with visitors, and their neglect of school and family attachments is a major worry to the community and their leaders. Nevertheless, tourism revenue is vital to the local people for sustaining their own livelihood, for their schools as well as for preservation and restoration of the monuments and cleanup of their towns (Crowther & Finlay 1991: 190).

While most of the coastal visitors go away in a matter of days, others who stay longer establish long-term relationships with the coast through property ownership, religious conversion and marriage. It is through such relationships that visitors have purchased and now own 50% of the houses in Shela (Fuglesang 1994: 25) and some of them have converted to Islam, married locals and raised families. The informants agreed that tourism continues to promote the age-old mixed marriages and is popular, especially among the younger generation. They also held that tourism has promoted both local and foreign language use and acquisition against Eastman’s (1994: 174) contention that the growth of tourism in Kenya has had little emphasis on the role of Swahili or on using the language: ‘Tourists often try to speak in Swahili and buy dictionaries and storybooks’. These tourism-related tensions affect the intergenerational relationship in the coast and my informants argued like Saleh (1981) that the un-productive and destructive class of tourists need to be hindered from visiting the coast. The foregoing issues affect heritage conservation.

4.4 Tourism and the Conservation of Coastal Cultural Heritage

4.4.1 Tourism and the Built Heritage

Although the majority of the coastal tourists have generally focused on the beach, a good number of them also have interest in the built heritage such as Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba la Mtwana, Old Towns of Mombasa and Lamu, the museums and other such sites and places as would give them a glimpse of the coastal traditional and modern architecture, unique urban lifestyle and history. Gede, Jumba la Mtwana, Mnarani, Malindi, Mambrui, and Lamu are ruined Swahili sites normally visited by tourists. Fort Jesus, Gede and Jumba are gazetted national monuments, and have remained open to the public since 1960.
and 1972, respectively. Lamu has four museums (Lamu Museum, Swahili House Museum, Lamu Fort Environment Museum and the German Post Office Museum). The first museum in Lamu was opened in 1971 (Wilson 1982: 17). During the 1990s, Lamu museums received 7,623 visitors annually. The gazettlement of Lamu Old Town as a monument in 1986 and its proclamation as a World Heritage site in 2001 (Ashman 2003: 109) has boosted the significance of the region making it known and appreciated globally. Malindi Museum was also recently established to capture and present the region’s culture to the public.

Fort Jesus is the most significant attraction at the coast, receiving over 120 thousand visitors and about 11 million Kenya shillings in revenue annually (Tables 2.1 and 5.2). Built by the Portuguese in 1593, Fort Jesus captures the unique history of contact and conflict between the Africans, Arabs, Swahili and the Europeans. Its unique military architecture, its age and history all give Fort Jesus a magnetic attraction to coastal visitors, making it one of the major granaries of the NMK in terms of revenue generation.

Gede, located approximately 16 kilometres south of Malindi town, is famous for its cultural heritage and biodiversity, receiving about 20 thousand visitors and 4.5 million shillings annually (Tables 2.1 and 5.3). Founded in the 13th century AD, Gede was a large and prosperous town, which flourished until its abandonment in the 17th century (Kirkman 1964; Abungu 1986; Wilson 1980). Lying in a primeval forest, Gede ruins, the best preserved of the early coastal towns (Chittick 1977: 126), reflect the unique architectural style and wealth of many Swahili towns and was the first site to be gazetted as a national monument. The surrounding indigenous forest is home to numerous species of flora and fauna, which can be enjoyed on a tour of this ancient town. Guided tours provide a unique insight into the history of the area. Gede also has a tree nursery aimed at promoting indigenous coastal trees and shrubs, and an NMK/community based butterfly farm, Kipepeo. aimed at conserving the forest by diversifying and improving the local economic base.

A charming site, Jumba la Mtwana (Swahili meaning the large house of the slave) is located some 19 km north of Mombasa. James Kirkman excavated Jumba la Mtwana in 1972 and dated its occupation from 1350 to 1450 AD (Kirkman 1974; Sasoon 1980; Wilson 1980). Jumba receives slightly over five thousand visitors annually (Table 2.1) and was selected for this study because of its picnic banda, where
visitors can dine as they view the sea, ruins or swim in the ocean. The other site with a picnic banda is Takwa, on Manda Island in the Lamu archipelago. Since my research was conducted during the low tourism season, corresponding with the cold season unfavourable for swimming and picnicking, no picnic activities were observed. Besides, the picnic banda was being renovated. Jumba la Mtwana and other coastal sites have attracted many different kinds of visitors, whose resources have helped in their maintenance. There is daily clean-up and regular maintenance and repair supervised by the respective curators and the authorisation of funds for such activities comes from the NMK Director General.

Plate 4.1: Vehicles Bringing Tourists to Sites/Monuments. Notice the Askari (pointed at with arrow directing their movements at Fort Jesus.)

The three sites are accessible to tourists who largely come by a wide range of vehicles including cars, lorries, buses, vans, bicycles and tuktuks. Plate 4.1 captures some of these vehicles and how their movement is controlled at Fort Jesus. Visitors to museums, sites and monuments are charged some fees, which as the Takwa brochure states, ‘finances the maintenance of the ruins’ (NMK 2004). Plate 4.2 captures the revised entry charges to the various museums, sites and monuments across Kenya. Prior to December 2005 the charges for local residents were 50 shillings for adults, 20 shillings for under 16s, and 20 shillings for school groups, while for foreigners the charges were 200 shillings for adults and 100 for under 16s. For organised educational groups, primary and secondary schools paid 10 shillings per student/teacher (now 20/-) while college students and lecturers paid 20 shillings (now 50/-) with prior booking. The upward revision of the charges in 2005 (effected in 2006), has affected differently the visitor numbers to each site (Tables 2.1, 5.2 - 5.4); the revenue more than doubled (Table 5.6a).

Plate 4.2. Revised Visitor Entry Fees to Museums, Sites and Monuments.
The three monuments face many problems associated with tourism, including dust, litter, and graffiti (Table 4.4). I observed at Jumba Ruins some refuse including soda straws, polythene bags, bottle tops, and used milk packs, but there was no litter container or instruction regarding the disposal of litter. It is only at Fort Jesus where there is a litter container at the entrance (Plate 4.3). All the studied sites suffer from the graffiti problem, but Fort Jesus suffers most (Plate 4.4). The graffiti occur on the walls, trees and other surfaces and, according to my informants, they are mainly drawn or written by school and college students (see Plate 4.7 on p. 44). More discussions on graffiti appear in section 4.6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Rating by Site</th>
<th>Researcher’s Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>Not serious at all three sites.</td>
<td>Much of the vandalism occurs at Gede and Jumba but are not tourist related - dead tree trunks fall on and break ruined walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>Not serious at all three sites.</td>
<td>I observed no large accumulations of litter at any of the sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Serious at Fort Jesus, not serious at Gede and Jumba.</td>
<td>Made especially by school children and vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td>Serious at all three sites.</td>
<td>A severe problem especially during dry season, affecting the museum galleries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>Very serious at Fort Jesus, not serious at Gede and Jumba.</td>
<td>Affects all three. Most of the graffiti at Gede and Jumba are found on trees due to lack of suitable writing surfaces here, but the rough ruin walls have also attracted some writings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>Not serious at all three sites.</td>
<td>The security apparatus was reported to be adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td>Very serious at Jumba</td>
<td>Jumba is unfenced, over-exposed and understaffed. The curator fears the site’s safety owing to inadequate staffing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Tourism and the Mijikenda Heritage

The Mijikenda are a coastal Bantu people closely related to the Pokomo, Segeju, Adawida and Swahili. They consist of nine closely related ethnic groups (the Giriama, Rabai, Chonyi, Kauma, Kambe, Jibana, Ribe, Digo and Duruma), and are distributed over a wide territory of approximately 65 km broad stretching about 150 km from slightly north of latitude 3° South in Jilore region to latitude 4°30'South on the Kenya-Tanzania border (Mutoro 1994:132). The Mijikenda have held to their traditions associated with the kaya, a sacred site that was the centre for political, magico-religious and ceremonial functions (Spear 1978, 39
The Mijikenda community and their culture are slowly picking up as a tourist attraction in the coastal region, promising to alleviate the community's poverty. Visitors to the *kaya* and the villages have spurred growth in handicraft making and sales, and other small business ventures. Apart from Kaya Kinondo Ecotourism Project in Kwale District, there is another proposed project involving Kaya Fungo in Kilifi District, called Mijikenda Ecotourism Venture, whose circuit comprises five packages: Dr Krapf Memorial Museum (Rabai); blacksmithing in Kaloleni; cultural village in Kaya Fungo; Bamba open air market and Nyari depression in Sokoke.

Krapf Memorial Museum in Rabai is a community museum founded in 1994 for the conservation of the Christian as well as the host Mijikenda cultural heritage. As the cradle of Christianity in East Africa, Rabai's rich heritage would attract any visitor willing to see and experience the old church and its environs, the museum, the old church and the village being the popular areas in Rabai. As the curator observed, 'the visitors normally tour the site, museum gallery, the church building as well as read and take photographs, eat the coconut fruit, drink its juice (*madaju*) and taste the palm wine (*mnazi*).'

The curators and the elders underscored the essential need for tourists in the *kaya* to observe certain rules. The visitors are required to take off their shoes, hats or any head covering while in the *kaya* but must drape in black/dark or grey clothing (*kaniki*) that is easily recognised by the ancestors, whose wrath nobody would be willing to provoke. Of course, black for the Adigo symbolises purity and spiritual rectitude. In addition, no menstruating woman is permitted into the *kaya* and no *kaya* visitor must wander off the trail alone. Photography is allowed elsewhere within the *kaya* except around the sacred burial and ceremonial places. Finally, littering, hunting and collecting of any items within the *kaya* are prohibited (Kamweru, n.d. p. 2). These requirements must be met before any visitor is allowed to participate in a guided tour through the meandering routes in the dense Kinondo forest. All the informants held that no visitor should be allowed into the sacred space, mainly where initiation ceremonies and religious functions such as the exorcism of evil spirits from sick people were performed (Mutoro 1994: 136, 138).

A visit to Kaloleni and Kaya Fungo cultural village exposes the tourist to the Mijikenda cultural roots and socio-economic activities. Tourists are also privileged to see and listen to dances and rhythmic
melodies of the coastal people, purchase handicrafts, behold kaya display as well as watch and talk to the Mijikenda fortune-tellers and magicians.

The only ecotourism and conservation project running is that of Kaya Kinondo, one of the thirty-nine gazetted makaya. These forest-home establishments (the makaya) have become a focus of conservation and Kaya Kinondo as a typical Mijikenda forest habitat has been opened to tourism. Based on the 2006 records, Kaya Kinondo receives, on average, 63 visitors and 18,000 Kenya shillings revenue monthly (see Table 5.5). Still retaining the sanctity observed during the early days of the Mijikenda as they spread along the coast from Shungwaya in the 16th century (Mwangudza 1983), Kaya Kinondo continues to be used by elders for their worship and ritual activities. The makaya gazetted as monuments are protected grounds for conserving the rich biodiversity-medicinal herbs and culturally important flora and fauna, however, the local community members still retreat in these abodes for prayers, rituals and sacrifices. Mutoro (1994: 137), for instance, observes that the Mijikenda elders not only still wish to be buried in the kaya, but also continue to retreat there for several weeks at a time to perform rites and make offerings to their ancestors as they pray for rain or give thanks for a good harvest. The Adigo still use their makaya for such prayers and rituals in which black animals (a bull, goat and chicken) are slaughtered and forbid taking or consuming the ritual meat outside the kaya. Thus, though largely professing the Islamic faith (and some Christianity), the Mijikenda still revere ancestral spirits, which they believe influence the activities of the living (Udvardy et al. 2003).

One of the central questions in this research was to know whether the opening up of the makaya to tourists is a good idea or not. The findings (summarised in Table 4.5) clearly show that a greater majority of the study population support the opening up of the makaya to tourism. Most of the respondents felt that it was a wonderful idea that would help in the conservation of the dying cultural spaces and practices. They also noted that this way some community members would be allowed opportunities to earn their living through employment as managers, curators and conservation staff, tour guides, guards, traders in handicraft business and so forth. Tourism has enabled the Mijikenda community to display and sell locally made handicrafts such as fans, mats, and baskets. They cautioned, however, that there are certain areas within the makaya (e.g., the ritual area holding the fingo) that no foreigner should be permitted into as a safeguard.
against their desecration and that the community members should be the principal managers of the eco-
tourism ventures. For these reasons appropriate education is needed to prepare the tourists and the local
community on how to relate and deal with one another. One informant, who was noncommittal, said it was
not a question of support or opposition but the community prerogative: ‘Whether the community feels it is
all right or not is up to them.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes (Positive)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Negative)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither (Neutral)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proponents argued that because churches and religious shrines are also visited, it is all right
for visitors to be allowed into the Mijikenda makaya. It was their general contention that opening the
makaya to tourism would: 1) allow tourists a chance of appreciating Mijikenda history and cultural values;
2) enable community members to benefit from managing the tourist activities; 3) provide them with jobs
and other financial gains for uplifting community members’ lifestyles; 4) help market the local cultural
resources globally, develop infrastructure and improve the local economy; and 5) enable people to value
conservation and expand the scope of cultural options available to tourists. Those in opposition maintained
that no outsider should be allowed into the sacred place and that it was very wrong to expose societal
secrets to non-members. They argued that opening the makaya to tourism would: 1) unduly expose the
Mijikenda traditional practices; 2) deny self-preservation and break central Mijikenda cultural rules,
thereby desecrating the makaya; and 3) destroy the sites by encouraging theft of vigango, cutting down of
trees, etc.

The question of destruction seemed rather strong and on further probe, one informant indicated that
tourism pollutes the environment by accumulation of litter such as dumping of waste in Kaya Chale by the
nearby hotel. Another said that the makaya and other coastal cultural heritage sites are destroyed largely by
people in high offices and not by the coastal Swahili and Mijikenda people: ‘It is the non-coastal Africans
who sell land to the Italians and people in high offices who bribe the Giriama to sell vigango’. These claims
echo Kusimba’s (1996) observations that proprietors in the tourism industry dispossessed the helpless
locals, creating squatters and landlessness in the coastal region and destroying the heritage.
4.4.3 Tourism and the Movable Cultural Items

Tourism has been considered a promoter of movable cultural items especially souvenirs that are purchased and taken home as mementos from the visited foreign lands. The literature and my informants indicated that the tourists who visit the Kenya coast buy the following cultural items: Akamba woodcarvings, Gusii soapstone carvings, paintings, baskets (kiondos), mats (mikeka), miniature boats (dhow/jehazi), hand-fans (pepeo), ornaments (beads, earrings, bangles, necklaces, decorated shells), vigango, garments/textiles/attire (such as t-shirts, Swahili kikoi, hats, lesso/kanga and Maasai shukas), musical instruments and accompaniments (drums, horns, kayambas, whistles, flywhisks), mouse traps, baobab drums, flower vases, pots, coffee/teapots, shredders (vifumbi/mbuzi), ncem (mwarubanne) soap. Some tourists take photographs, buy postcards and accept henna painting on their bodies, arms and legs as a sign that they were here. My own observation captured some of the items sold to tourists and the promotional objects (Plates 4.5a and 4.5b).

These items are obtained from the tourist shops, cafes, hotels, supermarkets, kiosks, workshops and boutiques in Mombasa, Malindi and elsewhere. They are also sold directly by local community hawkers, individuals, beach boys and museum gift-shops in Fort Jesus, Kaya Kinondo, Jumba la Mtwana, Malindi, Gede, and Lamu as well as the numerous cultural villages and craft centres (e.g., Ngomongo and Bombolulu). In fact, there are curio-shops in nearly all the tourist establishments in Kenya.

Although some informants noted that many of the souvenirs (art and craft items) do not reflect the local coastal cultures, a number of the local community groups have been established which tend to promote traditional weaving skills in mat making, basketry and thatch (makuti) production (Plate 4.6).
Sadly, as one informant noted, most of the shops are run by people who are not interested in the promotion of culture and who have no entrepreneurial skills. While some scholars (Awuondo and Nthuku 1992: 102; Lea 1988; Mitchell 1968: 11; Rajotte 1980: 13; Young 1992: 18) have pointed out that tourism could lead to the manufacture of unauthentic and bizarre cultural items, Sindiga (2000: 230) found no evidence to that effect.

For Sindiga, mass production and modification of artefacts are merely factors of tourism demands. Mass tourism is believed to have greatly revived the manufacture of such Kenyan artefacts, leading to certain modifications aimed at making them suitable for customer demands and desires. Tourism contributes to the promotion of handicraft production in Kenya by creating jobs to art sellers and dealers and reviving community organisations such as women groups that manufacture these items. Thus, the making and selling of arts and crafts such as Akamba woodcarvings, Gusii soapstone-carvings, Gikuyu, Kamba and Taita baskets (kiondo), Maasai and Ogiek beads, necklaces and Pokomo mats and handicrafts, has become a major tourism associated economic activity.

Plate 4.6: Sample of Coastal Economic Activities: Growing of Cassava, Cocoanuta, Bananas, Sisal, Thatch Making and Weaving

The local artefact producers are usually, however, exploited by middlemen who reap a greater proportion of the benefits. The middlemen usually buy the handicrafts cheaply and subsequently sell them at exorbitant prices to the tourists locally and abroad. Apart from the low prices fetched by the local producer, the handicraft industry has also suffered from lack of credit facilities.

Conservators, scholars and my informants continue to blame tourism and archaeological research for exposing cultural heritage items such as vigango to theft and vandalism for a quick buck. Since there is
money, desperate local people steal even ritual items and sneak them into the black market associated with tourism and research. Young (1992) found that henna for tourists was a cheap imitation of the real henna painting.

4.5 The Physical and Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism

Tourism has many key positive and negative economic, physical and socio-cultural impacts that not only encourage heritage conservation but also severely challenge it, making visitors a worrying threat to the existence of the heritage upon which tourism is so dependent. This section and chapter five capture the various impacts and challenges as experienced in the Kenyan coastal sites and monuments open to the public, together with suggestions on how to overcome them (Tables 4.6, 4.7 and 5.1). It is a close reflection of my informants’ views regarding the interaction between tourism and conservation of the cultural heritage. The economic effects are dealt with in chapter five. This section reviews the salient economic, physical and socio-cultural impacts of tourism integrating my own findings see (Table 4.6. and the sub-sections below) with the relevant literature (see, for example, Joosten & Marwijk 2003; Kreag 2000; Mathieson and Wall 1982, 1992).

First are the economic benefits and challenges. The positive economic benefits of tourism include: increased employment opportunities; improvement of infrastructure; contribution to income, standard of living and widespread economic impact in the community; increase in tax revenues; improvement of investment and development infrastructure spending; and creation of new business opportunities. The negative economic effects, on the other hand, include: increase in prices of commodities (goods, services, land, housing) and cost of living; exportation of profits by non-local owners of tourist enterprises; low wage jobs, importation of labour and under/unemployment occasioned by seasonality; additional cost for infrastructure development; reduction of local business chances as a result of all-inclusive packages; and economic over-dependence on tourism by the local community resulting in risks of food insecurity (see chapter five for details).

Secondly are the positive and negative physical impacts. The positive physical effects of tourism include such benefits as increased natural environment protection and raising environmental awareness, preservation of historic buildings, and improvement of the visual and aesthetic value of the sites. The
negative physical effects are pollution, loss of natural landscape, agricultural land and open spaces, destruction of flora and fauna as well as disruption of wildlife breeding cycles and behaviour, degradation of landscape and historic sites, water shortages, and introduction of new building styles that fail to fit community expectations.

Finally, the socio-cultural benefits and challenges of tourism include improvement of quality of life, promotion of cultural exchange, greater tolerance of social differences and positive changes in local values and customs, preserving cultural identity of host populations and improvement of understanding of different communities, increases in availability of recreation facilities, improvement of standards of services by shops and restaurants as well as quality of fire and police protection, heightening of national pride and greater appreciation of local resources, and creation of a more interesting and exciting place to live in. The negative socio-cultural effects are excessive drinking, gambling, crime, drugs, prostitution, increased smuggling, language and cultural effects, negative changes in values and customs, modification of the social structure by new cliques, negative non-tourist recreation facilities, shortage of goods and services, increased pressure on infrastructure, heightened community divisiveness, increased hectic community and personal life, residents’ feeling sense of exclusion and alienation over planning and development concerns, feeling of loss of control over community future, child labour and abuse (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 54).

Table 4.6: Salient Physical and Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism (N= 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Physical Impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Negative Physical Impact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Infrastructure development</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1. Loss of property rights and denial of public access to communal places like beaches</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Site rehabilitation and protection</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2. Environmental pollution</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education and visitor centres</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3. Destruction of infrastructure</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Donation of conservation materials</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4. Degradation (abrasion &amp; litter)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site cleaning and landscaping</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5. Vandalism and theft</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Deforestation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7. Graffiti</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Socio-Cultural Impact</th>
<th>Negative Socio-Cultural Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Creates contact and promotes intercultural understanding</td>
<td>1. Cultural loss and decay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhances education and language learning</td>
<td>2. Prostitution and Moral decay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Revives cultural activities</td>
<td>3. Family break-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotes gift exchange and marriage</td>
<td>4. School drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotes recreation and health</td>
<td>5. Drug abuse and insanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community support and cooperation</td>
<td>6. Loss of labour (diseases, death)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Security</td>
<td>7. Disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Insecurity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1. Cultural loss and decay</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2. Prostitution and Moral decay</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3. Family break-ups</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4. School drop-outs</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5. Drug abuse and insanity</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6. Loss of labour (diseases, death)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7. Disturbance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.5.1 Major Physical Impacts of Tourism in Kenya

4.5.1.1 Positive Physical Impacts

The informants also catalogued a number of physical effects or benefits of tourism (Table 4.6 above), including:

- Infrastructure development (construction of hotels, guest-houses and cottages, air strips/airports, ports, roads, water and electricity supply systems, health, communications, recreation facilities and security);
- Revenue and donations generated by tourism through entrance fees, purchases of guidebooks, etc., are used for rehabilitation, protection and improvement of sites;
- Development and promotion of education facilities and visitor information centres;
- Provision of material items such as vehicles, television sets and computers used in conservation initiatives; and
- Keeping sites and monuments clean with improved presentation and landscaping.

4.5.1.2 Negative Physical Impacts

Tourism is also known to have a number of negative physical impacts, which my informants identified to include (Table 4.6 above):

- Loss of property rights. ‘Foreigners usually buy houses and alter them to suit their tastes as happened in Lamu where funny houses have come up at Shella’ as other private developers in the tourism industry close roads and paths leading to the rivers, ocean, beaches and fishing grounds;
- Advancements in tourism have led to non-traditional structures such as flash toilets and modes of transport (use of speedboats) contributing to environmental pollution (through waste disposal and oil leakages), hence affecting marine life and ecosystem;
- Destruction of infrastructure (roads, buildings, water and sewage systems) due to overuse:
Degradation of sites through abrasion and accumulation of non-biodegradable items like used bottles and plastics, besides injury to archaeological values through heritage commercialisation activities like the Sound and Light Shows in Fort Jesus;

- Vandalism of monuments, graffiti making (see Plates 4.4, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.12-4.18) and theft of movable artefacts; and
- Cutting down of trees to facilitate construction of hotels and other tourist structures and to create access routes in the kaya.

4.5.2 Major Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism

The various communities and their cultures are affected differently by tourism and the mass media. Apparently there are true and false forms of a culture. The true culture of a society, according to Sharpley (1994) refers to its values, norms and ways of life (see also, Brunt & Courtney 1999: 508). False forms are imitations of the true culture. Socio-cultural impacts of tourism are those positive and negative effects tourism has on people, their quality of life and their values, customs and beliefs (Brown 1998: 66; Fox 1977). My informants pointed out a wide range of such effects as captured in the subsections below.
4.5.2.1 Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism

The informants held that tourism has the following beneficial social and cultural effects:

- It provides opportunities for people to meet, socialise and develop friendship and closer understanding, locally and globally. As some intermarriages are contracted through tourism, greater cultural blending occurs, leading to breakdown of prejudice and barriers, and appreciation of other cultural values;
- It encourages education in modern skills and languages that are vital for improvements in social services and productivity;
- It revives cultural activities and skills such as dances, ritual dramatisation, weaving, sculpture, plating, beadwork and decoration (henna painting) and sharing of heritage responsibilities;
- Tourists' social contacts help market heritage sites and their preservation through gift exchange and donations such as the Kaya Kinondo conservation project van, computers;
- Promotes recreation, picnics and sports for healthy living and revenue generation;
- Supports the community in education and training through establishment of schools, churches and colleges;
- Improves security such as the establishment of the tourist police unit; and
- Strengthens local cooperation through community groups.

4.5.2.2 Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism

Finally, the informants cited a number of negative social and cultural effects of tourism. It was noted that aping of foreign customs and mannerisms is one of tourism's key influences at the Kenyan coast. Usually, the local people (especially the youth) are prone to taking up customs and traditions of the tourists, often adopting bad habits of dressing and sexuality (prostitution, homosexuality), largely conditioned by monetary desires. The way and mode of dressing and lifestyle of tourists, most of whom go nearly nude, are often in conflict with the local Islamic expectations of decent dress and public appearance.

Some local male youth are seen to pierce their ears, noses and lapels. They also braid their hair. Male and female ras are on the increase. Tourists who smoke cigarettes and hard drugs and drink alcohol,
often influence the local youth in the habits that are contradictory to Christian and Islamic virtues. The following are among the socio-cultural damages of tourism identified by my informants:

- Alienation of local culture by aping foreign habits and mannerisms-scanty dressing, piercing of body, foreign speech accents, and moral decay and sexual exploitation through prostitution, homosexuality, child-sex and pornographic productions as well as family break-ups and weakening of kinship and marital bonds;
- School drop outs, leading to increased illiteracy in the coast as youngsters opt to entertain, guide and even marry tourists;
- Increased drug use and abuse resulting in loose morals, dementia, cancer, spread of sexually transmitted infections including HIV/AIDS and loss of productive labour;
- Disrespect for cultural sites and dwellings, like makaya from where vigango are stolen, conversion of residential houses into lodges and hotels and disturbances by noisy discotheques; and
- Increased insecurity and loss of life owing to murder and physical abuse occasioned by tourists including bomb threats by illegal visitors with ulterior motives.

Plate 4.9a: Official Graffiti – Fort Jesus: Portuguese Wall Paintings (see also Kirkman 1974b Plates 15-18); text see p. 47.

These factors tie up with Sindiga’s (1999) observations that the development of mass tourism at the Kenya coast created profound socio-economic changes, especially in Mombasa and Malindi, characterised by a myriad of social problems including high drop out rate in schools by male children, drug peddling, petty crimes, family disputes and prostitution.

Data expressing the magnitude of such occurrences are, however, lacking in the literature. Much of the blame on the negative effects has been put on package tours as captured in one of the reports:

Plate 4.9b: Official Graffiti: Gede Dhow Graffiti; (see 4.6.2 on p. 47)

‘Package tourists who generally spend very little money during their stay in Kenya create congestion in the parks and also in certain cases offend against cultural and moral values are not the most desirable visitors’ (GoK 1991: 201).
4.6 Tourism, Graffiti and Conservation

4.6.1 Meaning and Importance of Graffiti

Considered the most common form of vandalism, graffiti are sketchy drawings and writings made on walls, trees and other surfaces at places visited or used by people. Taking many different forms, graffiti usually consist of names and dates, social wish expressions such as love, sports, religious and political dreams.

Most graffiti seem to seek identification with a particular place, organisation or desire as a sample of graffiti captured from Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba la Mtwana, Vasco da Gama Pillar (Padrao) in Malindi attest to. Most of my informants indicated that it is the student groups, especially primary, secondary and college students, who usually make graffiti (see also Plate 4.6 on p. 44). This appears to corroborate Wall and Praddle’s (1979 in Brown 1998: 165) contention that young people constitute the majority of vandals and their attitude range from boredom to the intention of striking back at the establishment. No sarcastic forms of graffiti were spotted, save for their concentration, magnitude and increasing tendency as can be captured from the sampled plates.

Plate 4.10: Site Boards - Kaya Kinondo (left) and Jumba la Mtwana (right)

4.6.2 Graffiti and Conservation

Heritage managers have faced some dilemma regarding graffiti (Brown 1998: 166). While some graffiti have been considered abuse to conservation others have been treasured and presented as part of the associated cultural heritage or site. The hated graffiti are those that are very recent and which seem to represent some degree of vandalism. Vandalism, according Christen and Davis (in Brown 1998), is any behaviour that depreciates the physical and aesthetic qualities of the environment and recreational experience in recreation settings, such as littering, graffiti, souveniring (collecting objects for souvenirs), tree carving, cutting of trees, and noise pollution (Brown 1998: 165).
Some graffiti though have been granted official recognition, especially the very old and perhaps meaningful ones which are subsequently preserved for people who visit these places to see. Two examples of official graffiti are the Portuguese Wall Paintings in Fort Jesus (Plate 4.9a above) and the dhow etched on the walls of the House of the Dhow in Gede (Plate 4.9b). While the Portuguese wall paintings were removed from their original location and preserved in a housed environment, the house of the dhow graffiti remains in the open. At some time the dhow drawing was covered with a glass panel, but this has ceased to exist and the drawing is left to the mercy of nature. This and the fading rusty Jumba site-board (Plate 4.10) are a clear mockery of the country’s conservation processes and mechanisms. Vasco da Gama Pillar (padrao) in Malindi also remains perpetually threatened by ocean scoring waves and people who write graffiti on it and on the information glass panels that are also breaking.

Plate 4.11: Fort Jesus Notices Against Graffiti: Placed at Main Entrance (left), on the Walls by the entrances to the Omani House and Gunpowder Store (right)- areas of high graffiti concentration.

Made using many different tools including pens, paint, and sharp-edged materials like stones, sticks and nails (Plates 4.4, 4.7, 4.12 – 4.18), the biggest challenge graffiti pose to conservation is that they damage the walls, trees and mar other surfaces such as glass panels in exhibitions. As was observed earlier (see p. 3), graffiti not only interfere with the aesthetic value and messages in the heritage but also create avenues for other agents of decay to attack and destroy the heritage’s fabric. The grooves formed by the shape taken by the graffiti as traced by the sharp objects usually provide avenues for other agents of deterioration to affect the monument surfaces. Most of the graffiti forms are a serious abuse to the monuments and are an eyesore to behold. In Fort Jesus, for instance, the administration has not only taken the initiative of cleaning the graffiti but also ask visitors not to write graffiti, owing to their damaging effect (Plate 4.11). Despite such cleaning measures and polite requests, which are also a form of visual pollution (Brown 1998: 181), graffiti continue to be made as shown by the very recent dates.
4.7 Effects of Tourism on Heritage Conservation

4.7.1 Tourism's Contribution to Conservation

Does tourism contribute to cultural heritage conservation in Kenya? Most of the informants (30/35 or 86%) agreed that tourism contributes to cultural heritage conservation. They said so, especially because of the resultant financial/material and structural benefits accruing from the tourist activities including entry charges, entertainment, purchase of gift-shop items and advice regarding conservation matters and better presentation of the cultural heritage to the public. One informant remarked that tourism contributes directly through funds and publicity:

When a tourist writes about his/her experience at a given site/monument or museum, the information provided will obviously influence the readers who might be moved to visit and have the same experiences or attract donor attention to support conservation and maintenance work for continued benefit to humanity. Students, tourists and researchers have, in this way, influenced the financial support granted by the international community for the conservation of the Old towns of Mombasa and Lamu.

The rest (14%) did not think tourism contributes to conservation, arguing that only a few of the protected sites/monuments were open to visitation, adding that tourists also destroy the heritage by abrasion, vandalism and graffiti. Moreover, they said that tourism has little direct benefits since most of the conservation work is project funded and the community is usually excluded. They cited massive destruction of old buildings in Mombasa and Lamu in the 1980s that gave way to modern tourist facilities like hotels. To enhance tourism's contributions to cultural heritage conservation, the informants made a number of suggestions that would help boost the positive effects and also deter the negative ones as captured below.
4.7.2 Responding to the Impacts: Boosting Tourism’s Positive Returns

The informants made a number of significant suggestions on how to encourage the positive and deter negative impacts of tourism (Table 4.7). For the encouragement of the benefits, they suggested that:

❖ Mechanisms and measures be put in place to ensure money generated by the visitation of the cultural attractions are largely directed towards their maintenance, improvement and conservation;
❖ Proper planning for better site interpretation, presentation and management of the cultural attractions be ensured and marketed adequately to ensure continued flow of visitors and revenue;
❖ Proper and respectful use of the heritage by visitors be enforced;
❖ Local community members be involved in the use and conservation activities of the attraction;
❖ Communities within the heritage sites should be allowed to earn socio-economic benefits to enable them appreciate their significance and need for continued preservation;
❖ The infrastructure (roads, communications, security, etc.) be improved on to encourage access; and
❖ The Government creates a conservation fund by taxing all tourism activities and scrap packaged tours as they affect the free movement of tourists.

Table 4.7: Dealing with the Impacts of Tourism (N= 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encouraging Benefits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Discouraging Damages &amp; Threats</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use revenue for conservation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1. Create awareness on tourism threats</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve interpretation, presentation and management</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2. Strengthen cultural aspects</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourage respectful use by visitors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3. Develop protection policies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve attractions by marketing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4. Develop rules and protocols on site access and visitor behaviour</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Involve community</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5. Enlighten visitors on the dos and don’ts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Allow community to benefit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6. Legally deal with breaches</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Improve access</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7. Enlighten community on the laws and policies on heritage use and conservation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Create conservation fund by 10% tax</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8. Improve security</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Regulate visitor numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7.3 Responding to the Impacts: Deterring Tourism’s Negative Effects

Finally, regarding the deterrence of tourism damages or negative effects, the informants suggested that measures be undertaken to:

❖ Create greater awareness regarding tourist induced problems:
❖ Strengthen the cultural aspects so that people get to know and appreciate the heritage;
❖ Develop and implement cultural heritage protection policies;
- Develop stringent rules and protocols that visitors must adhere to regarding entry in and tour of the sites;
- Enlighten the visitors on the dos and don’ts to be observed while at the cultural heritage grounds;
- Have appropriate legal machinery and mechanism for dealing with any breaches;
- Make community members aware of the legal machineries and policies regarding heritage use and conservation;
- Regulate visitor numbers; and
- Provide adequate surveillance and improved security at the heritage attractions.

Plate 4.13: Tree Graffiti at Jumba (left) and Gede (right), see 4.6.2

Plate 4.14: Linear Scratched Graffiti (Made with sharp object, a stone or nail), see 4.6.2

Plate 4.15: Heavily Scurried Walls Within Fort Jesus, see 4.6.2. Plate 4.16: Charcoal Drawn Squares and Letters, Fort Jesus, see 4.6.2

Plate 4.17: Graffiti near Fort Jesus Flag Post, see 4.6.2 Plate 4.18: Dhow Design, Fort Jesus, see 4.6.2
Chapter Five: Economic Impact of Tourism in Coastal Kenya

5.1. Introduction

The wide range of salient economic, physical and socio-cultural benefits and defects accruing from tourism has already been captured in the preceding chapter. This chapter reviews the economic costs and benefits of tourism in the light of development and heritage conservation in Kenya. Tourism's economic costs and benefits have been highlighted in appreciable detail in the literature (Akama 1997; de Kadt 1979; Irandu 1995; Joosten & Marwijk 2003; Kamau 1999; Lea 1988, 1992; Mathieson & Wall 1992; Othoche 1999; Ouma 1970; Sharpley 2000; Sindiga 1999, 2000; Summary 1987; UNESCO 1970; Ward et al. 1994). This chapter concentrates on the economic importance in answer to one of the key objectives of this research: to evaluate the economic impact of tourism in the light of cultural heritage conservation.

Considered as having the largest and longest established tourism industry in sub-Saharan Africa (Weaver 1999: 801), Kenya's prominence has been attributed to the abundance of natural and cultural attractions as well as a developed infrastructure (now being revived after a long period of dereliction). Moreover, it is largely due to its positive economic effects that tourism has been accepted in many regions of the world as an engine and vehicle of growth and development, despite its seasonality and tendency to entrench dependency. While capturing the economic importance of tourism, the following questions will also be addressed: Is Kenya realising the economic growth and development? Who actually benefits from tourism? Are the economic benefits being channelled to the general public and conservation initiatives?

5.2 General Economic Effects of Tourism

Tourism has a wide range of economic benefits, key among them being a vehicle to economic development through its potential to generate revenue, providing employment and expanding infrastructure as well as influencing growth in other sectors of economy such as agriculture and services such as banking, transport, communication, health, and education. Tourism's potential of stimulating other areas of the local or national economy happens by a process known as income multiplier, usually called the multiplier effect. The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) has aptly noted that tourism and travel have the capacity of creating jobs more rapidly than most other industries, stimulating infrastructure growth and expansion.
agricultural development, growth in the manufacturing industry, high technology and communications, proliferation of small and medium sized enterprises, which in turn help to generate service and entrepreneurial skills. The KTB Managing Director, Dr Ongong’a Achieng’, also considers Kenya’s tourism sector as playing a vital role in the country’s economic development through its contribution to the GDP, foreign exchange earnings, employment and poverty reduction (Achieng’ 2007: 3).

In their review of the economic benefits and costs of tourism, Ward et al. (1994) and Worrall (1985), among others, have made useful comments regarding the economic benefits of tourism. They cite foreign exchange and increased employment as the two of tourism’s evident gains. However, they also caution that not all the revenue derived from the sector benefits the local community due to outflows or leakages that are determined by ownership. Although tourism has a significant influence in the balance of payments, the sinister cheating in the foreign exchange, for instance, saw Kenya earning a gross revenue of K£116 million from tourism in 1982 but had only K£89 million remaining in the country (Worrall 1985: 167). Twenty-three per cent of the tourism income (K£27 million) had leaked out of the country that year alone and there is probably much leakage today since there are no foreign exchange controls (Globe Africa 2007). Thus, although the official statistics and revenue data provided for 2006 show 1.6 million tourist arrivals and 56.2 billion Kenya Shillings in revenue (GoK 2007), it is likely that a substantial part leaked out, owing to the fact that much of the sector is owned by foreign entrepreneurs.

The number of international tourist arrivals in Kenya has expanded from 110,000 in 1963 (Dieke 1991) to 1,600,600 and the revenue has risen from 48.9 billion Shillings in 2005 to 56.2 billion Shillings in 2006 (GoK 2007). Employment creation abilities and infrastructure expansion are other economic gains although there are no records (see, de Kadt 1979; Elkan 1975; Hazlewood 1979; GoK 2003; Mitchell 1971; Sindiga 1999; Summary 1987; Visser and Koyo 1992, for some highlights). While the statistics depict a positive trend in the Kenyan tourism sector, there is little evidence for a robust growth in Kenya’s economy as these are smothered by its morass costs such as provision of infrastructure in the form of roads, sewage systems, telecommunications links, and water and power supplies. Ward et al. (1994) observed that the presence of greater numbers of tourists brings labour costs, principally in areas like cleaning and policing. More cleaning activities are required to deal with the waste and garbage generated by the visitors. Also
many more security personnel are required to guide and safeguard the attractions and accommodation
premises. Price inflation is another negative economic result of tourism. Although local communities might
be less affected if the inflation were restricted to luxury goods and items like souvenirs, increased demand
for food, land and property puts essential purchases out of their (local people's) reach, thus offsetting the
advantage of increasing employment opportunities by reducing the value of their earnings. Furthermore,
greater involvement in the tourism sector by the local community might put other important traditional
sectors such as agriculture and fishing at risk of low productivity. Prices of essential products are likely to
shoot up when few food products are available to the community.

Seasonality is another major setback of tourism in Kenya. Tourism has high and low seasons
reflecting their associated characteristic range of benefits and harm. Kenya's high tourism season runs from
September to March, at which time there is boom, while the low season runs from April to June and
coincides with the long rains, which, as Dieck (1991: 279) says, curtails tourism. While the key economic
impacts of tourism in the eyes of my informants are captured below, it should be noted that sometimes what
is regarded as negative to the general public could, in fact, be positive to the entrepreneurs. For instance,
the rising prices of commodities may express boom for the business people, but harmful to the general
populace. Again the decline in value of the local currency would mean low actual receipts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Impacts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Negative Impacts</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Foreign exchange and revenue</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1. Exploitation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employment</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2. Land grabbing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monetary circulation in community</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4. Neglect of education, marriage etc</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resource development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5. Neglect of agriculture</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Promotion of agriculture &amp; fishing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6. Inflation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Donations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7. Illicit cultural trade</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.1 Major Positive Economic Effects of Tourism in Kenya

My informants perceived the positive economic effects of tourism in many ways (see Table 5.1 above).
First, they saw tourism as bringing in foreign exchange and revenue (money in the form of taxes, permits,
etc.), which contribute to economic growth and development. Secondly, they held that tourism provides
people with employment in hotels and other service areas like transport, banking, insurance, kiosks, tour
guiding, gift-shops, cafeteria, entertainment, exhibitions and museums, sites and monuments thereby
increasing their earnings and purchasing power and boosting their livelihood. However, the employment areas in which the local people have been absorbed are usually low paying leading to little improvement in livelihood. Thirdly, to them, tourism promotes art production by providing a ready market for such traditional crafts as carvings, baskets, paintings, and garments which these visitors buy to take home as gifts. However, the trade is not only exploitative but also dominated by non-locals. Fourthly, tourism facilitates greater monetary circulation in the society through sale of drinks including local ones such as madafu (un-ripened coconut fruit and its water), food, entertainment and home-stay, leading to economic development and social welfare. However, it was observed that since few tourists consume these resources the little returns deny any meaningful growth.

Fifth, for them, tourism provides opportunities for resource development, for instance, their realisation that cultural heritage has monetary value and is useful for alleviating poverty. Sixth, the capability of tourism to promote agriculture and fishing through provision of markets for such produce as meat, eggs, vegetables, fruits, fish, milk, could lead to increased productivity and hopefully, eventually alleviate poverty. Other studies show, however, that the linkages are less marked (Sindiga 1999). Seventh, by providing sponsorships and scholarships to local students, tourists give them hope and opportunities for acquiring education, knowledge and skills for survival. Eighth, tourists avail other donations in the form of food, books, medicine, clothes that meet the local needs. Finally, by promoting photography, filmmaking and postcard production, which are less physically damaging to our tangible and intangible heritage, tourism helps market the heritage vastly to other people across the universe.

5.2.2 Negative Economic Effects in Kenya

Finally, regarding the negative economic effects of tourism the informants' held, first, that tourism perpetuates the exploitation of the nation and local people, especially where the tourists pay everything abroad and come here without hard currency or where the business intermediaries (middlemen) reap most of the benefits. Secondly, tourism has led to land grabbing and overstretching of the local resources so that the community loses essential spaces such as playgrounds, routes to beaches and fishing-grounds. Thirdly, the industry has influenced the commercialisation of culture such that traditional customs are now performed for cash or in the case of Fort Jesus where the sound and light shows are increasingly held to
raise money neglecting their potential harm to the site through emitted smoke, increased lighting and traffic. Fourth, tourism has led the youth to greater prioritisation of money thus denying them chances of studying, marrying and building of homes. Fifth, tourism's magnetic quick monetary gains have led to the neglect of traditional economies such as agriculture. This over-reliance on tourism has many negative consequences including, inducing food scarcity, creating unemployment during low season and leading to general poverty.

Sixth, the informants regarded tourism as one of the international trade and exchange factors influencing the devaluation of the local currency, which induces inflationary trends, thus lowering domestic consumption. Seventh, tourism could influence the proliferation of illicit businesses such as drug trafficking, theft of artefacts, piracy and black-markets leading to stifling competition to legalised entrepreneurs and loss of copyrights. Eighth, tourism brings in unaccountable money, often leading to misuse of revenue (funds and donations) and greater portions of its benefits (funds) are repatriated (leaked or siphoned). Ninth, the diversion of nearly all services to tourism denies local people access to essential goods and services. Tenth, tourism also induces laziness and un-productivity especially where people are largely dependent on handouts/donations, leading to greater entrenchment of poverty. Lastly, tourism’s monetary attractions promote commercial sex that undermines the female gender and minors predisposing them to exploitation, physical abuse, sexually transmitted infections (including HIV/AIDS) and premature death through murder. These observations underscore tourism’s exploitative tendencies.

5.3 Tourism and Development: Factors Influencing Tourism’s Net Economic Impact

The main economic concern with any venture is to have net beneficial returns that would shape the economy for growth and development. As briefly mentioned on p. 51, the ability of the sector’s benefits to infiltrate the community in the form of employment, increased incomes, infrastructure growth, spurring agriculture and industry as well as service sectors (banking, communications, health insurance, etc.) is what is called multiplier effect or linkages. Through linkages with other sectors of the economy, tourism has the potential of engineering growth and development as most governments, UNESCO, economists and other scholars have shown. The Kenya government, as Ndege (1992: 339) observes, backs tourism’s entrenchment largely because of its place in the economy, especially its effects on employment, industries.
indigenous crafts and agriculture and also because it promotes cultural understanding, and contributes substantially to government revenues (taxes, import duties, licences and fees). Tourism is thus promoted as the main foreign exchange earner, employer and source of general development (Omondi 2003).

Tourism’s capability of leading to the growth and expansion of infrastructure and the improvement of people’s living standards by influencing the improved provision of roads, housing, electricity, water, banking, communications (telephone and internet services), slaughter houses, shops, and hospitals, has had a major bearing for its support in many world economies. Nevertheless, the industry is also blamed for creating enclaves, where certain areas experience growth and better facilities while others have few or none at all. At the Kenya Coast, for instance, it is noticeable that the infrastructure is restricted within one kilometre ocean-shoreline, where good access roads, electricity, water and other basic services lie away from the centres of local population (Sindiga 2000: 230). Such facilities are concentrated in Mombasa and the adjoining areas of Watamu, Malindi and Lamu. Roads and other infrastructure are badly lacking in the rural localities, making it difficult for people to transport commodities to markets and agriculture to grow (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 57). Capturing the condition in Malindi, Joosten and Marwijk blame government policy for allowing the local government to concentrate on the urban areas and not others. such that local people living behind Malindi Airport, for instance, lack access to such services as clean water, electricity and telephone.

Tourism’s tendency of isolating the local communities is absurd and regrettable. We saw earlier that the Coast has more than half the tourist accommodation facilities. These and associated services are largely owned by foreigners (Jommo 1987; Sindiga 2000: 229; wa Kinyatti 2006) who have concentrated on commercial gains at the expense of the local people whose access to beaches and fishing grounds have been curtailed (Kusimba 1996; Saleh 1981). Sindiga (2000: 230) contends that the location of the Mombasa-Malindi and Likoni-Lunga Lunga highways within 3km of the beach was intended to halt hotel development [otherwise beyond this line local areas and communities would have benefited].

Studies show that the making and selling of arts and crafts as among the major economic activities associated with tourism, thought to be revived by mass tourism, leading to some beneficial degrees of modifications to suit customer demands and desires. However, it is noted that the local producer of these
Artefacts face a number of challenges, including exploitation by middlemen who reap a greater proportion of the benefits by buying them cheaply and selling at exorbitant prices to the tourists locally and abroad. Moreover, the handicraft industry has not only suffered from lack of credit facilities, it has also created friction and tension among the proprietors themselves and the communities (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 68). Bachman (1988, cited in Sindiga 2000: 231) notes that although certain aspects of Kenyan arts and crafts and dances have been encouraged owing to tourism, tourism promoters have ignored other artistic forms such as music and theatre. Sourveniring or the hunting for, sale and curation of African art objects and other heritage treasures outside the continent has raised many eyebrows in the wake of increasing theft and plunder of such objects (see, for example, Brown 1998, Udvardy et al. 2003).

Tourism’s linkages with other economic sectors in Kenya receives mixed responses. While some people feel tourism has positive links with industrial and agricultural growth, others feel that it robs these economic sectors of their vitality and development. The ambivalence is reflected in the responses given by my informants (Table 5.1). Although 19 of them said that tourism promotes agriculture and fishing since these products have high demand by the tourist hotels, others noted that it leads to neglect of these extraction activities basically because it provides better incomes in the short-term. Tourism has been considered a vehicle for the growth of other industries (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 55). Joosten and Marwijk report that with the opening of Malindi as a tourist destination other industries such as fishing, agriculture, handicraft making (wood-carving and furniture making), transport and other services (taxis, bicycles, safari companies, boat businesses, driving schools, miraa sales and curio shops) picked up. Tour operation services are also seen as key indicators of tourism. The Kenya Coast boasts of 44% of all tour operators in the country (Sindiga 2000: 224) and evidently tour guiding, taxi services and associated activities thrive at the tourist attraction sites. Sadly, instead of leaving such small services to the local people, the foreign owned hotels even provide shops, taxi-drivers and tour guides: some keep poultry, have hair salons and construction firms (Joosten & Marwijk 2003: 69). The informants noted that the local people employed in these industries have certain connections with influential government officers.

Tourism’s linkage with the agricultural sector has been subject to natural factors and coastal community’s predisposition of the to manual labour. The fruits, vegetables and flowers used by the tourism
industry in this region come from the coast itself and elsewhere in the country. Agriculture depends on tourism as mangoes, pineapples and oranges grown locally and vegetables and potatoes from upcountry are sold to the available tourist market at the coast. Kamau's (1999: 195) study on the role of tourism on regional development (using village tourist centres) noted that most farmers at the Coast sold their produce to the nearest markets like Kongowea, Ukunda and Marafa where hoteliers made purchases. Noting that there is no region-specific data on the subject, Sindiga (2000) observes that Kenya saves much foreign exchange because food and beer consumed by tourists are locally produced (not imported). Unfortunately, the Coast does not produce sufficient food to meet the local population and tourist demands; most of these items are brought from upcountry, where favourable environmental conditions of rainfall and good soils lead to their mass production. Since vegetables, fruits, milk and other agricultural products are brought in from the Kenya highlands to meet tourist demand, Sindiga concludes that there appears to be poor linkages between tourism and agriculture.

What factors then lead to tourism's net gains in an economy? Ward and colleagues (1994) have hinted at a number of factors. They observed that the net economic value of leisure and tourism to a region or country depends on the following seven factors: (a) whether it derives income from other industrial sources; (b) whether demand for specific attractions and facilities it offers is constant; (c) whether the majority of leisure and tourism facilities and developments are locally owned; (d) the systems of taxation and public spending operation; (e) in the case of international tourism, the strength of the local economy and its currency compared with those overseas; (f) the ability of the standards found in developments and infrastructure to keep pace with the growing demands and sophistication of the market; and (g) the ability to persuade local residents not to counteract increasing earnings by going out of the region or country to spend them.

Most of my informants tended to agree with these factors, noting that Kenya depends on oil from the Middle East countries and manufactured goods from the developed world, which are not only a big drain to its resources but also the cause of environmental pollution in the country. Furthermore, apart from the tourism industry being subject to seasonal fluctuations, most of the country's tourism enterprises are co-owned with foreigners as principal shareholders, making local community benefits minimal. While most of
the local beneficiaries of the tourism industry spend locally at the coast and elsewhere in Kenya, others also travel abroad. In addition, the country has been blamed for its harsh taxation regime, a fluidy currency and a dilapidated infrastructure, all of which curtail investment expansion and income. The Kenyan currency, although quite stable now, is subject to drastic fluctuations against foreign currencies and the infrastructure, while being fixed, remains affected by heavy vehicles, the rain and neglect. Finally, the country, in pursuance of the mixed capitalist economy, has endeavoured to keep pace with international levels-having many high-class star hotels and facilities for accommodation, conferences, and sports. These are generally out of reach for the majority of the Kenyan people, but are enjoyed largely by foreigners and a few rich Kenyans and senior civil servants. These factors clearly indicate that the net economic effects of tourism are rather minimal.

Many of Kenyan sites and monuments have benefited from tourism and government policy on heritage conservation beginning from the colonial period. Although specific statistical data are lacking, most of the sites and monuments open to tourism, have little net gains from tourism, as the recurrent expenditures and overheads could outstrip the generated revenue (see, NMK 1972: 54, 55). How then do we justify tourism's contribution to heritage conservation? Although this question was partly answered in section 4.7, it is highlighted here using the visitation records and revenue and will be pursued further in the next chapter.

Tables 5.2-5.5 highlight the visitor numbers and revenue from the studied sites while Table 5.6 shows how much of the revenue is used on conservation initiatives. Whereas Fort Jesus received at least Ksh 131 million in eleven years, giving a mean annual earning of Ksh 11 million (Table 5.2), Gede received at least Ksh 35 million in eleven years with a mean annual earning of Ksh 3 million (Table 5.3). Though its records are scanty Jumba la Mtwana receives about 5,000 visitors and a revenue slightly exceeding 440,000 shillings annually (Table 5.4). From the available 2006 records, Kaya Kinondo (Tables 5.5, 5.6a and 5.6b), received 63 persons and 18,000 shillings in revenue monthly (besides 6,000 shillings from its Transport and Biashara Accounts). Save for Kaya Kinondo, no expenditure records were availed to me for Fort Jesus, Gede and Jumba, making it impossible for me to show how much of the handsome income was spent on conservation activities (Table 5.5). Kaya Kinondo's average monthly expenditure is
(1.572 shillings and its average net monthly income is 12. 120 shillings (Table 5.5). The conservation expenses incurred by Kaya Kinondo in 2006 was 64, 780 shillings, constituting 50% of all its identified expenses (Table 5.6a), of which 42% went to site interpretation, presentation, security and maintenance (i.e., expenses to the guards, guides, forest inspection, garment cleaning, dancers, banda, sign boards and toilet), 38% to committee activities and 20% towards salaries (Table 5.6b). While the manager’s salary was Sh. 9,000 (14%) and that of the Artist, Sh. 4, 200 (7%), the committee expenses took a great toll of the resources. Moreover, another half of the recurrent expenditure deals with purchase of drinks (water, soda), craft making items and other business items, which though peripheral, supplement the economic value of the site.

### Table 5.2: Fort Jesus Visitors and Revenue, 1996-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non Resident Adult</th>
<th>Non Resident Child</th>
<th>E African Adult</th>
<th>E African Child</th>
<th>Resident Adult</th>
<th>Resident Child</th>
<th>Educational Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>82,885</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,029</td>
<td>11,114</td>
<td>13,148</td>
<td>168,263</td>
<td>14,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63,997</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,591</td>
<td>9,143</td>
<td>13,727</td>
<td>129,908</td>
<td>10,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35,486</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,394</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>13,987</td>
<td>97,141</td>
<td>8,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>43,413</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39,741</td>
<td>9,359</td>
<td>15,912</td>
<td>110,247</td>
<td>9,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48,359</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,103</td>
<td>8,644</td>
<td>10,637</td>
<td>115,823</td>
<td>9,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31,052</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,952±</td>
<td>3,312±</td>
<td>61,247±</td>
<td>61,400±</td>
<td>11,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>49,663</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,716</td>
<td>11,071</td>
<td>24,153</td>
<td>138,164</td>
<td>11,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34,455</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,666</td>
<td>12,478</td>
<td>27,866</td>
<td>132,967</td>
<td>11,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>45,897</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,138</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>28,213</td>
<td>151,095</td>
<td>12,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>53,680</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60,495</td>
<td>11,058</td>
<td>39,559</td>
<td>167,303</td>
<td>14,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>37,942±</td>
<td>1,932±</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>11±</td>
<td>46,996</td>
<td>11,798</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>139,971±</td>
<td>11,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>50,206</td>
<td>1,221±</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>44±</td>
<td>57,732</td>
<td>3,577±</td>
<td>14,563±</td>
<td>63,049±</td>
<td>9,007±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518,072</td>
<td>23,561</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>459,788</td>
<td>110,166</td>
<td>210,161</td>
<td>1,552,402</td>
<td>129,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47,098</td>
<td>2,142±</td>
<td>536±</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41,799</td>
<td>10,017±</td>
<td>19,106</td>
<td>129,869</td>
<td>11,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>99,613,500±</td>
<td>3,426,350±</td>
<td>642,800±</td>
<td>42,800±</td>
<td>20,475,800±</td>
<td>3,664,570±</td>
<td>4,721,994±</td>
<td>130,991,175±</td>
<td>10,915,931±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Researcher’s Estimates Using Museum Records. Res. = Resident; E. Africa = East Africa. * Subject to the new rates! Includes 9 Non Resident School Groups from within East Africa; + should be more since only January to July figures were used.)

### Table 5.3: Gede Visitors and Revenue, 1996-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non Resident Adult</th>
<th>Non Resident Child</th>
<th>E African Adult</th>
<th>E African Child</th>
<th>Resident Adult</th>
<th>Resident Child</th>
<th>Educational Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>16,997</td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>4,029</td>
<td>29,771</td>
<td>2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12,429</td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,893</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>21,082</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6,617</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>4,897</td>
<td>14,822</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>20,759</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8,927</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>6,774</td>
<td>21,975</td>
<td>1,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,334</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>10,252</td>
<td>26,379</td>
<td>2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9,768</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,345</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>11,205</td>
<td>27,779</td>
<td>2,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8,452</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>11,755</td>
<td>25,598</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10,072</td>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,713</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>14,047</td>
<td>30,637</td>
<td>2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11,874</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,385</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td>16,035</td>
<td>35,514</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>16,689</td>
<td>37,342</td>
<td>3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117,200</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39,341</td>
<td>20,618</td>
<td>104,751</td>
<td>236,289</td>
<td>19,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10,655</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>17±</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,576</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>9,323</td>
<td>9,969</td>
<td>9,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>27,590,800</td>
<td>730,450</td>
<td>76,400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,177,850</td>
<td>1,107,700</td>
<td>2,595,690</td>
<td>34,984,690</td>
<td>5,803,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average revenue</td>
<td>2,598,235</td>
<td>68,223</td>
<td>6,945</td>
<td>10±</td>
<td>197,986</td>
<td>190,700</td>
<td>235,972</td>
<td>3,180,426</td>
<td>4,505,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Calculated using museum records. Revenue in Kenya Shillings; E. Africa = East African. * Subject to the Revised Rates)
### Table 5.4: Jumba Monthly Visitor Statistics and Revenue, 2005-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>22,574/-</td>
<td>29,690/-</td>
<td>50,565/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>30,590/-</td>
<td>37,029/-</td>
<td>52,020/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>32,260/-</td>
<td>35,015/-</td>
<td>51,440/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>12,934/-</td>
<td>52,230/-</td>
<td>44,880/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6,370/-</td>
<td>18,740/-</td>
<td>39,152/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>16,400/-</td>
<td>28,135/-</td>
<td>33,386/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>16,765/-</td>
<td>31,910/-</td>
<td>35,710/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>27,340/-</td>
<td>47,360/-</td>
<td>70,915/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>30,590/-</td>
<td>37,029/-</td>
<td>52,020/-</td>
<td>70,070/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>32,260/-</td>
<td>35,015/-</td>
<td>51,440/-</td>
<td>57,050/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>6,370/-</td>
<td>18,740/-</td>
<td>39,152/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>304,472/-</td>
<td>462,260/-</td>
<td>554,328/-</td>
<td>79,440/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>25,372.70</td>
<td>42,023.60</td>
<td>50,393.50</td>
<td>50,393.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Curator’s Comparative Report 2007. The site receives 5.065 visitors and 140.333 shillings annually)

### Table 5.5: Kava Kinondo Visitor Statistics & Net Revenue, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>No of Visitors</th>
<th>Visitor Revenue</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20,100/-</td>
<td>22.870/-</td>
<td>14.940/-</td>
<td>028.030/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16.200/-</td>
<td>18.725/-</td>
<td>11.605/-</td>
<td>023.320/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13.050/-</td>
<td>10.735/-</td>
<td>13.300/-</td>
<td>010.485/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>33.000/-</td>
<td>03.345/-</td>
<td>17.300/-</td>
<td>019.045/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.300/-</td>
<td>01.740/-</td>
<td>02.700/-</td>
<td>005.340/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.150/-</td>
<td>00.310/-</td>
<td>03.800/-</td>
<td>008.660/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.250/-</td>
<td>02.105/-</td>
<td>06.765/-</td>
<td>012.590/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24.350/-</td>
<td>02.280/-</td>
<td>22.460/-</td>
<td>004.170/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18.750/-</td>
<td>00.900/-</td>
<td>16.160/-</td>
<td>003.490/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.350/-</td>
<td>01.220/-</td>
<td>12.220/-</td>
<td>007.350/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.250/-</td>
<td>01.620/-</td>
<td>06.040/-</td>
<td>010.830/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>194.750/-</td>
<td>65.850/-</td>
<td>127.290/-</td>
<td>133.310/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average*</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.704/-</td>
<td>5.986/-</td>
<td>11.572/-</td>
<td>12.119/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Kava Kinondo Records at CFU Ukunda: - Data not available. * The averages consider only 11 months as data were unavailable for December; with 12 months the figures would be adjusted to 58 people, 16,229 shillings, 5,188 shillings, 10,608 shillings, and 11,109 shillings respectively.)

### Table 5.6a: Studied Sites’ Conservation Expenditure, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum/Site/Monument</th>
<th>Revenue (Ksh)</th>
<th>Conservation Expenditure (Ksh)</th>
<th>Conservation Expenditure (Percentage)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For! Jesus</td>
<td>25,220,760</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The revenue is 2.4 times the old rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gede</td>
<td>8,044,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Same as for Fort Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumba la Mtswana*</td>
<td>28,135</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Data incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kava Kinondo</td>
<td>260,600*</td>
<td>64,780</td>
<td>50% of all site expenditure</td>
<td>The rest of revenue goes to peripheral expenses e.g. purchase of drinks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33,554,125*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: NMK File Records at the Headquarters. * = no complete records; + = Likely to Exceed. - No data provided)

### Table 5.6b: Kava Kinondo Conservation Expenses, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payments Towards</th>
<th>Guiding</th>
<th>Guarding</th>
<th>Banda and Signboard Erection</th>
<th>Forest Inspection and Site Garment (Anuki) Cleaning</th>
<th>Manager's and Artist’s Salaries</th>
<th>Toilet Maintenance and Tissue</th>
<th>Traditional Dancers</th>
<th>Elders' Council &amp; Committee Meetings, Allowances and Transport</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount (Sh)</td>
<td>11,230</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>2,150</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>13,200*</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>64,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Kava Kinondo Records at CFU Ukunda. * = There were no records of payments for some months)
This chapter focused primarily on the economic effects of tourism, underscoring the various positive and negative economic impacts and their relevance to the cultural heritage conservation in Kenya. As a key sector of the Kenyan economy promising to change the people’s lifestyles and boost their welfare, tourism remains a serious threat since most of the players in the sector are non-locals. Moreover, most of the returns do not reach the local community members on a significant scale and the infrastructure and social amenities spurred by tourism remain concentrated in a few areas, especially urban and townships. Due to high leakage, beach tourism is subsidised by other sectors, making it impossible for it to spur growth in other sectors and general development (Sindiga 2000: 228). Furthermore, though promising and offering employment opportunities, tourism is considered a low paying job to a large majority of less educated local people who work under deplorable and dehumanising conditions (wa Kinyatti 2006). Mama wa Kinyatti believes that the industry does not and will hardly ever benefit the average Kenyan, rather than further economic and cultural imperialism (ibid. 240). It is not in the hotels alone where staff wages are low: the guards taking care of the makaya earn as little as one thousand Kenya shillings a month (Kiriama 2005). These and other socio-cultural as well as negative environmental effects tend to undermine the supposed attractive revenues earned by the tourism sector. Some scholars observe that tourism only generates development indirectly (Andah 1990: 119) and that its success in achieving development has been queried since it is not a typical strategy for achieving equity and has never been a redeemer of global poverty (Bell 2004: 93, 95). Moreover, tourism has an eroding effect on the heritage upon which it is highly dependent.
6.1 Introduction

Tourism significantly affects the natural and cultural heritage upon which it is dependent. The study has captured its salient socio-cultural, physical and economic impacts on the immovable cultural heritage, and its conservation and management. This chapter discusses the findings of the study. It also provides conclusions as well as some recommendations for implementation by policy makers, heritage managers and other interested parties.

6.2 Summary

The overall objective of this study was to explore and document the impacts of tourism on the conservation of Kenya’s immovable cultural heritage. The findings show that cultural heritage, as an integral tourist attraction, is substantially affected by tourism, both positively and negatively. The nature and magnitude of these impacts are subject to season, number, type and behaviour of visitors, political conditions, entry charges and length of stay at the attraction. The damages are either deliberate or unintentional and, as Brown (1998: 178) argues, result from mass visitation, lack of knowledge and carelessness. The benefits, threats and challenges that the continuous use of the cultural heritage by tourism brings with it, must be understood and resolved by policy makers and heritage managers to insure the continued existence of these vital resources. This discussion focuses on each of the effects, in line with the specific objectives of the study. It begins with the socio-cultural effects, moves on to physical ones and ends with the economic effects.

6.2.1 Direct and Indirect Socio-Cultural Impacts

The first specific objective of the study was to determine the direct and indirect socio-cultural impacts of tourism on the cultural heritage conservation. To this end the study established that such impacts include creation of contacts and intercultural understanding (94%), promotion of recreation and health (91%), revival of cultural activities (86%), promotion of gift exchange and education (86%) (see. Table 4.6). On the other hand, the industry was accused of being responsible for the general promotion of moral decay (97%), substance abuse [leading to insanity] (91%), cultural loss as well as loss of labour (86%), and
desecration and disturbance (80%). Nevertheless, it would appear that the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts.

### 6.2.2 Physical Damages of Tourism

The second objective was to examine the physical damages tourism causes to historical sites and monuments. It was found that tourism destroys the roads leading to these attractions as well as those within them as a result of overuse especially during the high seasons. Tourists also affect the monuments through abrasion, vandalism, theft and graffiti. The beneficial physical effects of tourism included site rehabilitation and protection (97%), infrastructure development (91%), and site cleaning and landscaping (91%). The negative effects, on the other hand, were: infrastructure destruction (97%), abrasion, vandalism and theft (91%) and graffiti (91%). These physical damages support the hypothesis that tourism poses a serious threat to heritage conservation. Graffiti remains a major concern.

### 6.2.3 Economic Impacts

The final specific objective of the study was to evaluate the economic effects of tourism on the country’s cultural heritage. Of the major economic benefits revenue (94%), employment (91%) and marketing (83%) were the highest ranked by the informants, yet these benefits were largely offset by inflation (91%), neglect of traditional economics (91%), exploitation (86%), illicit cultural trade and land grabbing (80%). Tourism’s economic effects are compounded by the fact that the finances could be channelled to peripheral activities such as purchase of drinks, *makuti* and other things (Tables 5.6a and b). However, due to lack of data on the expenditures from Fort Jesus, Gede and Jumba, it cannot be fully shown that the financial returns from tourism go largely to conservation.

The study underscores the need for a holistic view of the relationship between cultural heritage and tourism. It raises the need for knowing and addressing the impediments and challenges to heritage conservation wrought by tourism. Overall, the key economic effects of tourism seem to reinforce the socioeconomic and physical benefits as well as aid the remedy of the negative physical consequences on the heritage and the community in general. Without understanding tourism’s potential harms to heritage in general, its great benefits remain a mere mirage.
The continued existence of the immovable cultural heritage remains an enormous task for the managers. It has therefore become essential that a clearer understanding be reached regarding the spiral relationship between tourism and the cultural heritage. Already a unique interdependence has been recognized that policy makers seek to harness for their conservation as a tool for the realization of development. Sites and monuments are among the main tourist attractions. As generators of revenue, employment providers, learning and leisure resources, their conservation remains paramount. The resources accruing from tourism (finances and other donations) are, therefore, largely expected to go towards the maintenance, restoration and improved display of these treasures to ensure their continued public use for enjoyment, education and inspiration. Although it is held that when monuments are commissioned to promote tourism, they will be more easily preserved, better known and appreciated (Unesco 1970: 61), much of the returns from tourism does not go towards conservation activities, but channelled to other peripheral activities and expenses and a vast majority of the Kenyan cultural sites remain little known to the public.

By directly and indirectly financing the restoration, preservation and presentation of monuments and sites of historical, artistic, architectural and cultural value, tourism safeguards the world's cultural heritage. Eighty-six percent of my informants felt that tourism does support heritage conservation, while fourteen percent were doubtful. The latter were particular concerned with the destructive impacts of tourism, including being the cause of global cultural monotony and decay through its homogenising and destructive effects on the world's unique heritage as an agent of change (see p. 48). Nevertheless, tourism remains esteemed as a promoter of education, culture and international understanding as they put monuments to wider cultural use both locally and globally, and provide positive ingredients for the promotion of cultural heritage conservation, and enhancement of national economic development (growth and prosperity) as well as world peace for mutual coexistence of human groups.

Revenue has been a major strength in the link between tourism and heritage use and conservation. This study shows that in total the four study sites generate, on average, some 16 million shillings annually (11 million, 4.5 million, 440 thousand, and 18 thousand by Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba and Kaya Kinondo, respectively). This is a substantial income, besides the job opportunities provided to the community.
members as attendants, curators, photographers, security personnel and curio sellers. It is not surprising, therefore, that my informants rated revenue and employment among the most significant economic effects of tourism as they directly and indirectly contribute to heritage conservation. However, the money generated by the visited attractions as well as those granted by other agencies to support conservation activities is not only dictated by the seasonality of the industry but also prone to misuse. Moreover, the visitors, their weight and behaviour (such as graffiti making and carefree waste disposal) remain serious challenges to heritage conservation. It was the informants’ opinion that the heritage and community concerns should be prioritised whenever they conflicted with the visitors’. They underscored the need for closer collaboration between the heritage managers and the community, especially in the selection, interpretation and presentation to the public to meet local community needs as well as those of the tourists, as resources for leisure and instruments for development.

The heritage use and conservation conflicts are practical as well as policy issues. While having valued local, regional and national images deserving protection from any destructive forces, the heritage suffers from conflicts resulting from use that the management must grappled with, including the critical ethical queries relating to the opening up of sacred sites (the makaya) to tourism. The visitor curiosity remains a noteworthy challenge to conservation. Although the Mijikenda community, the kaya core is forbidden to all except the initiated community members, the tourist who requires to maximise his or her experience of the sacred place puts the site at risks of desecration.

6.3 Conclusion

This study explored the impacts of tourism on cultural heritage conservation and draws the following conclusions in line with its objectives. First, tourism has the potential to support cultural heritage conservation in Kenya, especially through the positive economic returns such as revenue and the increasing opening up of the sites largely for visitation, education and cultural promotion. My informants observed that had the monuments not been conserved for tourist use, none of them would be existent today. Before Fort Jesus, Gede, Jumba and other coastal sites were rehabilitated and opened to the public, they were bushy, people robbed their building materials and beatification inlays and the makaya were faced with
deforestation and grabbing. Thus, the maintenance of the cultural heritage for visitor access for education and enjoyment have been of paramount importance in ensuring their continued existence.

However, tourism enhances the decay of the treasured heritage through abrasion, graffiti making, noise, light and theft. Since the negative physical and socio-economic effects are a challenge to heritage conservation, tourism’s heritage support to conservation is highly questionable. Thirdly, although considered to have greater economic benefits that spread out into the society through eco-tourism initiatives and groups (such as the Kaya Kinondo community group) and potentially spurring economic growth and development, tourism continues to be castigated for creating dependency, exploitation and general socio-cultural abuses, including cultural decay making it unpopular. Cultural decay in non-tourist areas is associated with internal dynamics and media influences.

Fourth, the study noted a number of ways for dealing with the tourist-induced problems and challenges. The site administration has put up notices against graffiti and litter dumping and provides guidelines for respectful tour of the sites. Besides these notices and guidelines, and the suggestions provided by my informants (see, 4.7.2 and 4.7.3 on p. 49) as well as those highlighted under the literature review, it is noteworthy that the socio-cultural impacts induced by tourism could be managed by controlling the number and type of visitors, as well as the locations and types of their activities, which, significantly rely on the stakeholder collaboration.

Finally, education and leisure seem to be the core motives of tourism and heritage conservation. The Kenyan sites are opened to the public for personal enjoyment of these endowments, for inspiration and pride in the cultural heritage and to promote out-of-school learning— the economic gains from tourism are essentially for the sustenance of this link. Kenyan sites and monuments are increasingly being opened to the public as moral obligation to community for education, enlightenment and development. This necessitates provision of viable conditions for ensuring responsible use and enjoyment of the country’s heritage. Hence, while enhancing the revenue generated from the visitors, effort should also be made to obtain ideas of how best the heritage should be presented to the public and how visitor threats could be minimised.
6.4 Recommendations

In view of the discussions and conclusions, the study recommends to the policy-makers and implementers (especially heritage managers and interest groups such as NGOs, students and scholars) to:

- The government and heritage managers should institute appropriate conservation and management measures to improve public education and ensure respectful use of Kenya's heritage. This could be achieved by appropriate marketing strategies including printing out pamphlets and guidebooks with essential notes on site regulations to be issued to every visitor and posted on the internet.

- In liaison with research institutions, the heritage managers should periodically conduct research on and minor visitor impacts, for instance, to establish the magnitude and rate of damage occasioned by tourists on the old storey buildings, which appear to show cracks and sags as Fort Jesus entrance, Arab House and Possibly Malindi Museum.

- The government should set aside a special conservation fund from all cultural tourism activities in the country to support the country’s heritage conservation.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Guides

Appendix A1: Interview Guide for Caretakers

A. Introduction

I am a second year postgraduate student from the Institute of African studies, University of Nairobi. I am carrying out a research for my thesis on the impact of tourism on cultural heritage conservation in Kenya, with particular emphasis on coastal sites and monuments. I, therefore, kindly ask you to spare some time and answer a few questions that will enable me generate data that will meet my study objectives. All the information you provide will be useful and will be treated with strict confidence.

This study seeks to understand the site conservation practices in Kenya and how tourism affects them. As a sign that you have willingly accepted to participate in this research, please, sign in the space provided.

I voluntarily accept to be interviewed by the researcher __________ (respondent’s signature), date __________

B. Respondent’s Background

a. Name of respondent ____________________________  b. Gender ____________________________

c. Age ____________________________  d. Highest level of education ____________________________

e. Duration of employment ____________________________

C. Site/Monument, Visitors and their Impacts

1. Site Name (Fort Jesus, Jumba la Mtwana, Gede, Kaya Kinondo) ____________________________

b. How long have you worked at this site? ____________________________

c. Is the entrance charge reviewed from time to time? ____________________________

d. When was the entry charge last reviewed? ____________________________

e. What has been the effect on visitation since review of the entry fees? (Tick the appropriate answer)

1) More visitors have been received than before.

2) Fewer visitors have been received than before.

3) There has been no change in the number of visitors received at the site.
2. a. Do you receive more local visitors than foreign ones?
   b. Why is this so?
   c. How many receipts do you sell? Daily________ Monthly________ and Yearly________
   d. What is the money received from visitors to this monument used for?
   e. Who authorises how this money is used?
   f. Who supervises how this money is used?
   g. What else do you sell to the tourists who visit this site?

3. a. How is the site maintained?
   b. What problems do you experience at the site/monument? (Tick appropriate answers)

   Theft
   Vandalism
   Litter
   Noise
   Dust
   Graffiti
   Other
   (Specify)

   c. How serious are the identified problems? (Please tick the appropriate option)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Very serious</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Not serious</th>
<th>No idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. a. Are there any artistic, names or other forms of writings scribbled on the walls and other surfaces within the site?
   Yes __________________________ No __________________________ Don’t Know __________________________
   b. What are the common forms of such graffiti?
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c. Who do you think writes or draws graffiti? (Tick appropriate options)

Any Tourist______ School Groups (Primary School Children ______ Secondary School Students ______ )

College Students ______ Male Adult Tourists ______ Female Adult Tourists ______

Local Tourists Only _________ Foreign Tourists Only ______

d. How do you deal with the graffiti problem?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

5. a. What benefits do you think tourists bring to the site?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

b. Are there harmful things that tourists do or bring to the site that is likely to affect the monuments?

Yes __________________________ No ______________________ No Idea _____________

d. If your answer to c above is yes, what are they?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

e. What measures do you take to discourage the harmful effects?

__________________________________________________________

g. What is your overall impression about tourism; is it good or bad?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

6. a. Do vehicles come to the site? Yes ________________________ No ____________

b. If yes, how many vehicles enter?

Daily _________ Weekly _________ Monthly _________ Yearly _________

c. What kinds of vehicles? (Tick relevant options) Cars _______ Lorries _______ Buses _______ Vans ______

d. Do you have a parking lot for vehicles bringing visitors here? Yes _____________________ No ____________

e. What damage or interference do the vehicles cause to the site?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

7. a. What is the site/monument famous for?

__________________________________________________________

b. Which place(s) within the site/monument is (are) always visited by the tourists?
c. What activities are your visitors engaged in while on the site?


d. Are there any rules or guidelines to be followed by people visiting the site/monument? Yes ______ No _____


e. If your answer to b above is yes, what are these rules or guidelines your visitors have to abide by?


8. Are there any useful further observations you have regarding the effects tourist have on the site/monument?


Thank you for sparing your time.

D. NOTES (FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY)
Date _____________________
Qualities of the respondent _____________________
Are the questions well addressed?


Is there need for further follow up?
Appendix A2: Interview Guide for the Key Informants

Instructions: This interview guide consists of four major questions broken into two parts with a number of sections. Part A deals with the respondent's background, whereas Part B captures the community members' perceptions regarding the impacts of tourism on their cultural heritage. Please, fill in the questions appropriately by writing in full or ticking the suitable alternatives to the answers provided. Should you need more space, kindly use the underside of the paper, remembering to clearly mark the number and subsection of the question being addressed.

A. Interviewee Background Data

1. a. Name (Optional) ____________________________________ b. Sex __________________ c. Age __________
   d. Occupation ________________________________________
   e. Highest level of education _____________________________
   f. Religion ____________________________________________
   g. Nationality/Community ________________________________

B. Tourism Impacts

2. a. Who is a tourist?

   _____________________________________________________

b. Which heritage resources at the coast attract tourists?

   _____________________________________________________

c. What are the most important positive impacts tourists have on the visited places?
   c.i. Economic Benefits

   _____________________________________________________

c.ii. Physical Benefits

   _____________________________________________________

c.iii. Social and Cultural Benefits

   _____________________________________________________

d. What are the most important negative impacts tourists have on the visited places?
   d.i. Economic Damages

   _____________________________________________________
d.ii. Physical Damages


d.iii. Social and Cultural Damages


3. a. Does tourism contribute to the conservation of the cultural heritage sites at the coast?

   Yes ____________________  No ____________________  No idea ______________

   b. Please, briefly explain your answer to 3.a above.


   c. What should be done to improve tourism’s benefits towards cultural heritage conservation in Kenya?


   d. What should be done to deter tourism’s damages to cultural heritage conservation in Kenya?


4. a. What cultural items do tourists buy to take home for memories and gifts from the coast?


   b. Where do they get them from? ____________________________________________

   c. The makava are being open to tourists. do you support or oppose this development in Kenya?


   d. What further observations do you have regarding the effects tourists have in Kenya in general and on cultural heritage conservation in particular?


   Thank you for sparing your time.