

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Respondent's demographics

The total number of study respondents who successfully participated in the study was 281 consisting of 177 KWS registered porters and guides and 104 visitors. The demographic analysis of the guides and porters indicated that out of the 177 porters, 60.7% were tour guides while 39.3% were porters. On the gender participation of the guides and porters 83.8% were males with only 16.2% females indicating that more males took the guides and porters roles as compared to women. On the education levels of the porters and guides, 48.7% had obtained relevant diploma and certificates, 28.2% of the respondents had completed their secondary education 16.2% had attained education up to primary level and 6.8% were below primary school level. The study sought the period of operation of the porters and guides in Mount Kenya World Heritage Site and the findings demonstrated that 70.1% of the respondents had operated in the heritage site for more than three years, with 20.5% between 1-2 years and 9.4% below one year.

Policy implementation barriers in Mount Kenya World Heritage Site

The study sought to identify existing policy implementation barriers in Mount Kenya World Heritage Site. As indicated in table 3.1, 89.8% of the guides and porters agreed that there was lack of effective communication. In view of lack of stakeholder support, majority of the respondents 58.1% were not sure about it while 33.3% agreed. On the same breath, most of the guides and porters (94%) agreed that there was absence of holistic integration of policy issues, 99.1% agreed that there was an issue with economic prioritization of tourism resources while 98.3% agreed to the existence of financial resources constraints.

The study findings were enriched by the interview findings with the KWS officer stating some of the policy implementation barriers in MKWHS;

Some of the policy implementation barriers in the Mount Kenya World Heritage site include; human and financial resource constraints, lack of a solid and effective policy communication strategy, sectoral interests as the heritage site is gazetted as a duo-management ecosystem and political interference especially during election period.'

In addition, the Forester KFS highlighted;

In Mount Kenya ecosystem, the most common policy implementation barriers are; conflicts of management, lack of a clear chain of command and reporting, conflicting policies in terms of similar policies but differing Acts, Lack of an effective joint management plan, conflict of interest, lack of precision of existing policies as well as inadequate human and financial resources to manage the ecosystem.'

According the study findings, communication of policies in Mount Kenya World Heritage Site is ineffective thus inadequate to create awareness among all the relevant stakeholders .This creates a great hindrance for the policy implementations the policy implementers are not fully aware of their responsibilities .Moreover, while stakeholders involvement and inclusivity is key in enhancing successful policy implementation, stakeholders in the heritage site were not involved fully in matters tourism policies. The study also reveals that the policies that have been established for Mount Kenya World Heritage Site are not comprehensive and consistent and they

fail to fully consider the management of cross cutting issues in policy making. While the respondents agreed that there were challenges with financial constraints to aid in the implementation of the policies it is worth noting that there is the issue of the economic prioritization of tourism resources in Mount Kenya World Heritage Site making the policy implementation efforts to be inclined on the possibility of making more profit from tourism activities.

Mount Kenya World Heritage Site is a unique ecosystem and being a dual-management ecosystem, the policy makers participating in the in-depth interviews pointed out Mount Kenya specific policy implementation barriers which include: sectoral conflict of interest between the managing bodies, conflicting policies, politics as well as lack of a clear chain of command and reporting. Besides the government officials pointed out that lack of a harmonized management plan has been a major impediment to effective policy formulation.

The findings corroborated with those of (Elliot, 1997). stating that political environment of a country influences the process of policy implementation. Additionally the study lend credence to the assertions of (Dodd’s & Butler, 2009) suggesting that policy implementation barriers hindering destination implementation of policies include; lack of stakeholder support, insufficient resources to support policy implementation, a lack of communication among relevant authorities, a lack of holistic integration and coordination among tourism stakeholders, a lack of knowledge and awareness about policies, the ambiguity of existing policies, and the prioritization of the economic value of tourism side-effects.

Furthermore, the study findings corroborate with the assertions of (DeGroff & Cargo, 2009) that policy implementation approaches should not be based on the assumption that resources would be abundant since policy results are influenced by available capital, institutional structure, and access to the implementation arena. Subsequently, policy implementation approaches must be versatile and creative, while still paying close attention to the environment. From the study, it is evident that successful tourism policy implementation is dependent on availability of resource both human and financial resources, disposition of policy implementers with capacity to implement policies, stakeholder attitudes and involvement and inclusivity as well as effective institutional arrangements as pointed out by (Viriani, 2009) (Table1).

Table 1: Policy implementation barriers (N=117).

Policy implementation barriers	SD	D	SD+D	NS	A	SA	SA+A
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Lack of effective communication	0	0	0	10.3	43.6	46.2	89.8
Lack of stakeholder support	0	7.7	7.7	58.1	23.9	9.4	33.3
Absence of holistic integration of policy issues	0	0.9	0.9	5.1	68.4	25.6	94
Ambiguity of policies	0	0	0	0.9	70.1	29.1	99.2
Economic prioritization of tourism resources	0	0	0	0.9	48.7	50.4	99.1
Financial resources constraints	0	0	0	1.7	47.9	50.4	98.3

Key: sd: Strongly disagree D: Disagree NS: Not Sure A: Agree SA: Strongly agree

CONCLUSION

As stated by the Kenya Wildlife Service officer ‘having policies that are not effectively enforced and implemented is as good as not having them’. The management of Mount Kenya World Heritage site should consider the existing policy implementation barriers and develop a long-term strategy for bridging the barriers. Stakeholders’ involvement and inclusivity in policy formulation and implementation should not be overlooked since it plays a critical role in informing roles and responsibilities, influencing their attitude and thus enhancing successful policy implementation.

There is need for the management of the heritage site to develop a harmonized joint management plan that can be used as a common reference point by all the management bodies in order to mitigate the issues on sectoral conflict of interest and have a clear chain of command. Additionally, the policy makers should make provision for financial resources in order to facilitate the policy implementation plans and on the other hand, build human capacity to implement the policies. Policies should be frequently reviewed to identify any existing gaps and policy communication awareness campaigns should be established.

REFERENCES

- Airey, D., & Chong, K. (2010). National policy makers for tourism in China. *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(2), 295-314.
- Amat Montesinos, X. (2017). Landscape and heritage of the transhumance in Spain. Challenges for a sustainable and responsible tourism.
- Cousquer, G.O. (2018). Knowing the mule Faring well in Moroccan mountain tourism PhD Thesis. University of Edinburgh.
- Debarbieux, B., Oiry Varacca, M., Rudaz, G., Maselli, D., & Kohler, T., et.,al. (2014). Tourism in mountain regions hopes fears and realities. Department of Geography and Environment University of Geneva Centre for Development and Environment University of Bern.
- DeGross, A., & Cargo, M. (2009). Policy implementation Implications for evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation* 124, 47-60.
- Dodds, R. (2007). Maltese tourism policy Standing still or advancing towards sustainability *Island Studies Journal* 2(1), 47-66.
- Dodds, R., & Butler, R. (2009). Barriers to implementing sustainable tourism policy in mass tourism destinations.
- Euromontana. (2017). Mountain tourism: Do you know these good practices Euromontana. Available online at: <https://www.euromontana.org/en/tourism-in-mountain-do-you-know-these-good-practices/>
- Hair, J.F., Money, A.H., Samouel, P. & Page, M. (2007), Research Methods for Business Education Training, 49(4), 336-337.
- Krutwaysho, O., & Bramwell, B. (2010). Tourism policy implementation and society. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 670-691
- Markovic, J. J., & Petrovic, M. D. (2013). Sport and recreation influence upon mountain area and sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Environmental and Tourism Analyses* 1(1), 80.
- Mthethwa, R.M. (2012). Critical dimensions for policy implementation.
- Mugenda, O., Kimani, E., Maina, L., & Wainaina, M. (2010). Female Representation at Various Levels of Education in Kenya. Identifying Opportunities for Policy Action and Linkages. *Nairobi: Longhorn Publishers*.
- OECD. (2018). Policy statement tourism policies for sustainable and inclusive growth. In OECD, *OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 11-14* Available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1787/tour-2018-2-en>
- O’Toole Jr, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation Assessment and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 10(2), 263-288.
- Paül, V., Trillo-Santamaría, J.M., & Haslam-Mckenzie, F. (2019). The invention of a mountain tourism destination: An exploration of Trevinca A Veiga Galicia, Spain. *Tourist Studies* 19(3), 313-335.

- UNWTO (2014). AM reports, volume ten global benchmarking for city tourism measurement World Tourism Organisation Madrid.
- UNWTO. (2018) United Nations World Tourism organization. Available online at: <http://www2.unwto.org/en>
- Upadhayaya, P.K. (2018). Sustainable Management of Trekking Trails for the Adventure Tourism in Mountains A Study of Nepal s Great Himalaya Trails. *Journal of Tourism & Adventure* 1(1), 1-31.
- Virani, A., Wellstead, A.M., & Howlett, M. (2020). Where is the policy A bibliometric analysis of the state of policy research on medical tourism? *Global health research and policy* 5(1), 1-16.
- Von Schomberg, R., & Hankins, J. (2019). International handbook on responsible innovation A global resource. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Wang, D., & Ap, J. (2013). Factors affecting tourism policy implementation A conceptual Framework and a case study in China. *Tourism Management* 36, 221-233.
- Zhang, Q.H., Chong, K., & Jenkins, C.L. (2002). Tourism policy implementation in mainland China: an enterprise perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.