

# *Community Participation in Cultural Tourism: An Empirical Perspective*

Patrick Kwoba Olubulyera

School of Business and Human Resource Development,  
Rongo University,  
P.O. Box 103-40404, Rongo, Kenya  
pkwoba@rongovarsity.ac.ke



**Abstract** – The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between selected demographics and community participation in cultural tourism development. This study which was conducted in Kogelo area in Kenya. A study sample of 137 respondents was randomly selected from among the residents. Descriptive statistics was used to determine the link between the demographic factors and the participation of the local community in cultural tourism development, while linear regression and the F distribution test were used to test the research hypotheses. Results revealed that 58.4% of the respondents participated in cultural tourism development while 41.6% did not. The first hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between gender and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected since it had an F value of 4.773 and p value of 0.031. The second hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between age and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was accepted since it had an F value of 0.001 and p value of 0.980. The third hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between marital status and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected since it had an F value of 4.308 and p value of 0.040. The fourth hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between level of education and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected since it had an F value of 2.742 and p value of 0.100. This implied that the selected demographic factors influenced community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo.

**Keywords** – Cultural tourism; Development, Community; Participation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Traditions, heritage, culture and nature are the reasons why tourists visit an area and cultural tourism depends on these cultural and natural resources ([1],[2]). Culture, like God and politics is everywhere [3]. In order to ensure community participation, Smith [1] suggested that there should be a sense of local ownership, leadership and empowerment, development opportunities for local control and management, creation opportunities for group and community-based projects, respect local heritage, traditions and cultural values and facilitation host–guest interaction.

Cultural tourism is a type of tourism that has two definitional perspectives. Firstly, the conceptual definition of

cultural tourism which is people moving to cultural attractions that are away from their usual residence, with the purpose to collecting novel information and experiences to gratify the cultural needs ([4],[5]). Secondly, the technical definition of cultural tourism which is all movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama outside their normal place of residency ([4],[6],[7]).

In essence, cultural tourism is one of the oldest types of tourism and still remains to be a backbone of the tourism industry in most parts of the world [6]. In 2007, 40% of all international tourism (360 million arrivals) was as a result of cultural tourism [8].

This percentage rose to 50% of all international tourism (467 million arrivals) in 2010 [9]. From the preceding statistics, it can be understood that cultural tourism is of foremost significance and therefore there is need to evaluate how the selected demographic factors affect community participation in this type of tourism.

On the other hand, community participation is the involvement of a group of people residing in a specific geographic area and conditioned by the sub-cultural or life processes of cooperation, assimilation, competition and conflict in a particular project or endeavor [10]. It is an active process by which beneficiary client groups influence the direction and execution of a development project with a view to enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish [11]. The study sought to test the following research hypotheses regarding the selected demographic factors of gender, age, marital status and level of education influenced community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo. The research hypotheses were:

Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant relationship between gender and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo.

Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant relationship between age and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo.

Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant relationship between marital status and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo.

Ho<sub>4</sub>: There is no significant relationship between level of education and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed quantitative approach where the data collected is structured and subjected to a formal statistical and numerical analysis and are used to describe and understand behavior ([12],[13],[14],[15],[16],[17]). The study used descriptive survey research design which describes the state of affairs as it exists and the researchers use to administer a survey questionnaire to a smaller group of people in order to identify trends in attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of a larger group of people ([18],[19],[20],[21]). Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents for the questionnaires.

According to this sampling technique, all members of the population under study have the same known and equal chance of selection ([22],[23],[24],[25]). The study used

questionnaires which consists of a number of questions printed or typed in a definite order on a form or set of forms to solicit information appropriate for analysis and in a predetermined order ([26],[27],[28],[29]). The research instrument used was the questionnaire which is a fundamental in collecting information for descriptive survey ([30],[31],[32]). In data analysis, the researcher used descriptive statistics which are statistical computations describing either the characteristics of a sample or the relationship among variables in a sample ([33],[34]).

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study analyzed the demographics of the local community at Kogelo on four variables namely gender, age, marital status and level of education. On gender as shown on Table 1, 59.9% of the respondents were male while 40.1% were female, with a mean of 1.40 and standard deviation of 0.492. This clearly implied that the male respondent were more than the female ones. Concerning age, 45.3% of respondents were aged between 18-30 years, 32.1% were between 31-40 years, 12.4% were between 41 – 50 years and 5.1% each were aged between 51- 60 years and over 60 years respectively, with a mean of 1.93 and standard deviation of 1.116. This meant that a majority of the respondents were between the ages of 18 – 30 years, which form the majority of the youth in Kenya according to the 2009 census [35]. A majority of respondents (108) were below 40 years. This implied that most of the locals were of younger generation and it can be inferred that cultural tourism initiatives in the area can be sustained because a majority of the locals were in their prime ages.

On the issue of marital status, results also revealed that 38% of the respondents were single, 41.6% were married, 9.5% were separated, 5.8% were divorced and 5.1% were widowed, with a mean of 1.99 and standard deviation of 1.085. The study also revealed that a slight majority of the respondents were married, owing to the fact that the area has a rural setting and marriage is sometimes preferred due to numerous responsibilities. With regard to highest level of education, 5.8% respondents had attained primary level of education, 48.9% had secondary education, 28.5% had attained tertiary education and 16.8% had no formal education, with a mean of 2.56 and standard deviation of 0.839. From this result, it is clear that a majority of respondents had secondary education as their highest level of education. Consequently, the respondents were inquired whether they participated in cultural tourism or not. 58.4% of the respondents mentioned that they participated in this type of tourism, while 41.6% revealed that they did not.

On the cross-tabulation of gender and community participation in cultural tourism development, 67.5% of the males and 32.5% of the females reiterated that they participated in this type of tourism (Table 1). On the other hand, 49.1% of the males and 50.9% of the females admitted that they did not participate in cultural tourism development. This result depicts explicitly that the male

respondents had more inclination to participate in cultural tourism development, compared to their female counterparts. The Chi-square results of gender and participation were  $X = 4.678$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p = 0.031$  and revealed that gender as a variable significantly affected the participation of the respondents in cultural tourism development.

Table 1 : Gender By Community Participation In Cultural Tourism Crosstab And Chi-Square Test

			Community participation in cultural tourism		Total
			Yes	No	
Gender of respondents	Male	Count	54	28	82
		% within participation in cultural tourism	67.5%	49.1%	59.9%
	Female	Count	26	29	55
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	32.5%	50.9%	40.1%
Total		Count	80	57	137
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Chi-Square = 4.678, df=1, p = 0.031					

Concerning the cross-tabulation of age and community participation in cultural tourism development, the respondents between ages 18 – 30 years had 56.5% who participated in cultural tourism development and 43.5% of those who did not. Those between the ages of 31 - 40 years of had 59.1% who participated in cultural tourism development and 40.9% of those who did not. Those between the ages of 41 - 50 years of had 64.7% who participated in cultural tourism development and 35.3% of those who did not. Those between the ages of 51 - 60 years

had 85.7% who participated in cultural tourism development and 14.3% of those who did not as shown in Table 2.

The respondents whose ages were over 60 years had 28.6% who participated in cultural tourism development and 71.4% of those who did not. The Chi-square results of age and participation were  $X = 5.097$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p = 0.278$  and revealed that age as a variable significantly affected the participation of the local community in cultural tourism development.

Table 2 : Age Of Respondents By Community Participation In Cultural Tourism Cross-Tabulation And Chi-Square Test

			Participation in cultural tourism		Total	
			Yes	No		
Age of respondents	18 - 30 years	Count	35	27	62	
		% within Age of respondents	56.5%	43.5%	100.0%	
	31 - 40 years	Count	26	18	44	
		% within Age of respondents	59.1%	40.9%	100.0%	
	41 - 50 years	Count	11	6	17	
		% within Age of respondents	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%	
	51 - 60 years	Count	6	1	7	
		% within Age of respondents	85.7%	14.3%	100.0%	
	Over 60 years	Count	2	5	7	
		% within Age of respondents	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	80	57	137
			% within Age of respondents	58.4%	41.6%	100.0%
Chi-Square = 5.097, df=4, p = 0.278						

Concerning the cross tabulation between marital status and community participation in cultural tourism development, the respondents who were single had 63.5% who participated and 36.5% did not. On those respondents who were married, 61.4% did participated and 38.6% who did not. Those who are separated in their marital status had 53.8% who participated and 46.2% who did not.

On those who are divorced, 37.5% participated and 62.5% did not. Last but not least, those who were widowed

had 28.6% of them reveal that they participate in cultural tourism development and 71.4% reiterated that they did not (Table 3). This meant that community participation was slightly more among the single respondents compared to the other marital statuses. Furthermore, the chi-square results of marital status and community participation were  $X = 4.873$ ,  $df=4$ ,  $p = 0.301$  and this depict that marital status significantly affected the community participation in cultural tourism development.

Table 3 : Marital Status By Community Participation In Cultural Tourism Cross-Tabulation And Chi-Square Test

		Community participation in cultural tourism		Total		
		Yes	No			
Marital status	Single	Count	33	19	52	
		% within Marital status	63.5%	36.5%	100.0%	
	Married	Count	35	22	57	
		% within Marital status	61.4%	38.6%	100.0%	
	Separated	Count	7	6	13	
		% within Marital status	53.8%	46.2%	100.0%	
	Divorced	Count	3	5	8	
		% within Marital status	37.5%	62.5%	100.0%	
	Widowed	Count	2	5	7	
		% within Marital status	28.6%	71.4%	100.0%	
	Total		Count	80	57	137
			% within Marital status	58.4%	41.6%	100.0%

Chi-Square = 4.873, df=4, p = 0.301

Cross tabulation between the level of education and community participation in tourism was performed in the study. From the findings, it was revealed that among those who participated in cultural tourism, 8.8% had a primary level of education, 50% had secondary, 27.5% had tertiary and 13.8% had none. Consequently, it was also realized that from those who did not participate, 1.8% had a primary level of education, 47.4% had secondary, 29.8% had tertiary and 21.1% had none as depicted in Table 4. The trend of the results reveals that most participants of cultural tourism development had a secondary level of education. In addition, the chi-square results of level of education and community participation were  $X = 3.957$ ,  $df=3$ ,  $p = 0.266$  and this depict that level of education significantly affected the community participation in cultural tourism development.

As depicted in Table 5, the study tested the first research hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between gender and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo’. From the findings, F-distribution

test as a result of linear regression revealed an F value of 4.773 and p value of 0.031. This meant that the first hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between gender and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected.

The research also tested the second research hypothesis ‘there is no significant relationship between age and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo’. The finding showed that F-distribution test had F value of 0.001 and p value of 0.980. This meant that the study failed to reject the second hypothesis that stated that ‘there is no significant relationship between age and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo’.

Additionally, the study also tested the third hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between marital status and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo’. From the F-distribution test, it had an F value of 4.308 and p value of 0.040. This meant that the

third hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between marital status and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected’.

Last but not least, the research tested the fourth hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between level of education and community participation in cultural

tourism development at Kogelo’. From the test, F had a value of 2.742 and there was a p value of 0.100. This meant that the fourth hypothesis that ‘there is no significant relationship between level of education and community participation in cultural tourism development at Kogelo was rejected’.

Table 4 : Level Of Education And Community Participation In Tourism Crosstab And Chi-Square Test

			Community participation in cultural tourism		Total
			Yes	No	
Level of education	Primary	Count	7	1	8
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	8.8%	1.8%	5.8%
	Secondary	Count	40	27	67
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	50.0%	47.4%	48.9%
	Tertiary	Count	22	17	39
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	27.5%	29.8%	28.5%
	None	Count	11	12	23
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	13.8%	21.1%	16.8%
Total		Count	80	57	137
		% within Participation in cultural tourism	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square = 3.957, df=3, p = 0.266

Table 5 : Anova Of Demographic Factors And Participation In Cultural Tourism

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
1	Regression	1.137	1	1.137	4.773	0.031 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	32.148	135	0.238		
	Total	33.285	136			
2	Regression	0.000	1	0.000	0.001	0.980 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	33.285	135	0.247		
	Total	33.285	136			
3	Regression	1.029	1	1.029	4.308	0.040 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	32.255	135	0.239		
	Total	33.285	136			
4	Regression	0.663	1	0.663	2.742	0.100 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	32.622	135	0.242		
	Total	33.285	136			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Gender						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Age of respondents						
c. Predictors: (Constant), Marital status						
d. Predictors: (Constant), Level of education						
e. Dependent Variable: Participation in Cultural Tourism						

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In conclusion, the demographic factors or variables of gender, age, marital status and level of education affected community participation in tourism in one way or the other. It was explicit that these factors cannot be ignored. The sustainability of tourism is dependent on the level of community participation. The study recommended that contemporary and innovative ways should be utilized to ensure that community participation in cultural tourism development is enhanced.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Smith, M. K., 2003. *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. London: Routledge.
- [2] Fernandes, C., 2013. *The Impact of Cultural Tourism on Host Communities*. In: R. Raj, K. Griffin & N. Morpeth, eds. *Cultural Tourism*. Boston MA: CAB International, pp. 26 - 38.
- [3] Adair, G., 1982. *The Postmodernist Always Rings Twice: Reflections on Culture in the 90s*. London: Fourth Estate.
- [4] Richards, G., 1996. *Cultural Tourism in Europe*. CABI: Wallingford.
- [5] McDonnell, I. & Burton, C., 2005. *The marketing of Australian cultural tourist attractions: A case study from Sydney*. In: M. Sigala & D. Leslie, eds. *International Cultural Tourism : Management, implications and cases*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 16 - 25.
- [6] Richards, G. & Munsters, W., 2010. *Developments and Perspectives in Cultural Tourism Research*. In: G. Richards & W. Munsters, eds. *Cultural Tourism Research Methods*. Cambridge, MA: CAB International, pp. 1 - 12.
- [7] McGettigan, F. & Rozenkiewicz, A., 2013. *Archaeotourism : The Past is Our Future?*. In: R. Raj, K. Griffin & N. Morpeth, eds. *Cultural Tourism*. Boston, MA: CAB International, pp. 118 - 128.
- [8] Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009. *Impact of culture on tourism*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- [9] Goeldner, C. & Ritchie, B., 2012. *Tourism: Practices, Principles, Philosophies*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- [10] Pender, L., 2006. *Managing the Tourism System*. In: *The Management of Tourism*. London: Sage Publications.
- [11] Page, S., 2007. *Tourism Management : Managing for Change*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Butterworth Heinemann.
- [12] Matthews, B. & Ross, L., 2010. *Research Methods : A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- [13] Stangor, C., 2011. *Research Methods for the Behavioral Science*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- [14] Bryman, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. New York, NY: Oxford University Press Inc.
- [15] Passer, M. W., 2014. *Research Methods : Concepts and Connections*. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- [16] Salkind, N. J., 2017. *Exploring Research*. 9th ed. New York, NY: Pearson.
- [17] Devlin, A. S., 2018. *The Research Experience : Planning, Conducting, and Reporting Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [18] Kothari, C. R., 2004. *Research Methodology : Methods and Techniques*. 2nd ed. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.
- [19] Kombo, D. L. & Tromp, L. A., 2006. *Proposal and Thesis Writing: An Introduction*. Nairobi: Pauline Publications.
- [20] Clark, V. L. & Creswell, J. W., 2015. *Understanding Research : A Consumer's Guide*. 2nd ed. London, UK: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [21] Besen-Cassino, Y. & Cassino, D., 2018. *Social Research Methods by Example : Applications in the Modern World*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [22] Altinay, L., Paraskevas, A. & Jang, S., 2015. *Planning for Research in Hospitality and Tourism*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Butterworth Heinemann.
- [23] Mitchell, M. L. & Jolley, J. M., 2010. *Research Design Explained*. 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- [24] Cooper, D. R. & Schindler, P. S., 2014. *Business Research Methods*. 12th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- [25] Gliner, J. A., Morgan, G. A. & Leech, N. L., 2017. *Research Methods in Applied Settings : An Integrated Approach to Design and Analysis*. 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [26] Babbie, E., 2008. *The Basic of Social Research*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- [27] Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A., 2007. *Research Methods for Business for Students*. 4th ed. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- [28] Spickard, J. V., 2017. *Research Basics*. London, UK: SAGE Publications, Inc.

[29] Patten, M. L. & Newhart, M., 2018. Understanding research methods : An overview of the essentials. 10th ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

[30] Orodho, A. S., 2003. Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and reports. Nairobi: Meselo Publishers.

[31] Sreejesh, S., Mohapatra, S. & Anusree, M. R., 2014. Business Research Methods : An Applied Orientation. New York: Springer International Publishing.

[32] Bordens, K. S. & Abbott, B. B., 2017. Research Design and Methods : A process approach. 10th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

[33] Bowers, D., 2008. Medical Statistics from Scratch : An Introduction for Health Professionals. 2nd ed. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

[34] Babbie, E., 2010. The Practice of Social Research. 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

[35] Kenya National Bureau of Statistics , 2010. National Population and Housing Census. Nairobi: KNBS.