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Abstract

This paper examines community capacity building as a strategy for tourism development at Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village (SZCV) in Eshowe, KwaZulu Natal Province, South Africa. The paper evaluated the concepts that are considered to be influential in community capacity building in tourism. Community capacity building is an essential condition for tourism development thereby enhancing its benefits for local communities. It plays a significant role in identifying priorities and opportunities for development particularly in the tourism field. The adequacy of communal capacity building has largely been attributed to Shakaland Zulu’s Cultural Village inability to unleash its full potential. Thus, this paper aims to examine community capacity building as a stratagem for tourism development. The paper is mostly theoretical and propositive in its intentions. Some insight on SZCV serves to put forward various recommendations. A case study method is utilized to gather relevant information on capacity building opportunities (the training offered to SZCV employees). Semi-structured interviews were used as a method to collect required data. Recommendations on how to improve the current status are presented as an important part of this article.
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Introduction

Tourism is often proposed as a developmental strategy for rural regions, based on assumptions made about the ability of tourism to generate employment and income for local residents and businesses (Aref, 2011:347; Moscardo, 2014:354). However, it is not always clear whether tourism creates a significant positive contribution to local destination communities, as in many cases the benefits from tourism have been slow to emerge, modest at best and usually restricted to certain groups within the community (Moscardo, 2014:354). Moreover, the majority of tourism projects cited as successes provided only a modest supplement to local the livelihood which remains dependent on external support for long periods (Harun et al., 2012:2). Therefore, it is fundamental for local communities to attain the
necessary capacity for tourism development, which must be developed before any community initiative begins as their level of involvement in tourism development highly depends on the capability that they have acquired (Harun et al., 2012:3). Additionally, common barriers to effective tourism development for local communities include the inability of the local community to be involved in tourism due to constraints of knowledge of tourism; necessary skills and resources; local leadership; organisation structure as well as networking (Aref, 2011:349; Harun et al., 2012:3). The lack of capacitation has often been the main reason for community members being excluded or not being able to benefit significantly from tourism gains, or being unable to attain senior managerial positions within the tourism industry (Khosravi, Mohamed & Nair, 2015:236).

Community capacity building is an essential condition for tourism development and enhancing its benefits for local communities (Aref, Redzuwan & Gill, 2010:172; Aref, 2011:347). It plays a significant role in identifying priorities and opportunities for development (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:12). Consequently, understanding how community capacity building could develop tourism in local communities is essential for the continued success of tourism development projects (Aref et al., 2010:82). Furthermore, capacity building is necessary for community development and participatory processes at the community level (Aref et al., 2010:172). It is the process of community development that leads to social capital which in turn results in effective community development (Phillips & Pittman, 2014:17).

In tourism development, the process of community capacity building can be seen as the capacity of the people in communities to participate in tourism activities, whereby tourism developers often have the tendency to invest in community training as a means of contributing to long-term development (Aref et al., 2010:82). Comparable to community development, community capacity building defines a process that increases the assets and attributes that a community is able to draw upon in order to improve their living conditions (Aref et al., 2010:82; Khosravi et al., 2015:236). Therefore, the process of capacity building concerns the development of skills, opportunities and abilities that will enable local people to make decisions and take actions for tourism development while protecting their desired community attributes; hence, it is widely acknowledged (Khosravi et al., 2015:236). Such decisions and actions of the community are based on the desire to develop their community for tourism (Aref et al., 2010:82; Khosravi et al., 2015:236).

Although the concept capacity building is cited as essential for tourism development, limited attention has been given to it in tourism studies compared to other fields of development; particularly health, education and agriculture (Hamzah & Khalifah 2012:12; Harun et al., 2012:3). This gap has caused some difficulties in local communities, particularly in remote or developing areas due to the ever-evolving nature of the tourism sector (Khosravi et al., 2015:236). Therefore, the aim of this paper is to discuss the importance of capacity building as a strategy for effective community development in Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village (SZCV). The paper is mostly theoretical and propositive in its intention. Some insight at SZCV serve to put forwards various recommendations.

The SZCV is located 160km away from the city of Durban (South Africa) in the heart of Eshowe, within the municipality of uMlalazi. This tourism destination was originally built for the filming of the highly commended international television series, Shaka Zulu, between 1984 - 1985 (Shakaland, 2015). This film showcased the life of the ruler of the Zulu empire, King Shaka Zulu. The SZCV was later used for the filming of other television programmes, namely “John Ross” which was filmed in 1986 and “Ipi Ntombi” in 1990 (Shakaland, 2015).

Based on the above, this paper intends to contribute to the existing body of research on community capacity building as a strategy for tourism development. The paper identifies tourism capacity building opportunities offered to SZCV employees. It argues that capacity building has been given limited attention in tourism studies compared to other fields of development, despite tourism being often proposed as a development strategy.
Methodology

This paper is a desktop research. Thus, the paper is mostly theoretical work based on literature review with the final intention to express various recommendations. Some references to SZCV serve to put forwards various recommendations. The case study of SZCV is based on fieldwork of the first author of the paper and it employs data gathered using semi-structured interviews to obtain relevant information from the 84 employees of SZCV, who are the respondents of the paper. These participants comprised senior staff members and general employees of SZCV. The paper adopted a qualitative approach within the interpretive paradigm, which is essential for qualitative research. The paper also used a quantitative approach.

Literature Review

Community is a very elusive term. However, for the purpose of this study, it refers to a group of people sharing a geographic location or sharing common interests, concerns, culture, values and working together to achieve common goals (Aref, Gill & Aref, 2010:156; Iorio & Wall, 2012:1440; Mbagwu, Bessong & Anozie, 2016:122). This means that people in groups need to engage and participate in common practices and be committed to making decisions in co-operation with each other (Schulenkorf, 2012:3). The term can also be used to describe a mutually-supportive, geographically-specific, social unit, such as a village or tribe whereby people identify themselves as community members with shared values and where there exists a sense of communal decision-making (Salazar, 2012:10; Tolkach, King & Pearlman, 2013:320).

Communities play an essential part in the tourism product. The hospitality that such communities provide directly affects tourists’ satisfaction, expenditure levels, and tendencies for repeat visits. On the contrary, a poor reception by the community may also minimize the possibility of tourists recommending the destination to others (Zamani-Farahani & Musa 2012:802; Spencer &Nsiah 2013:221). Therefore, the co-operation of the local community is essential for the success and sustainability of any tourism development project (Stylidis et al., 2014:261). Similarly, the success of tourism development in a destination is linked to how local community members perceive and support tourism. If local community members perceive or experience the impact and benefits of tourism positively, it is more likely that they will be more supportive of its development (Adongo, Choe & Han, 2017:86). Additionally, several studies (see Adongo et al., 2017:87) have alleged that the manner in which local community members are attached to their communities influences their support for tourism development.

For tourism purposes, local community members must organize themselves to play a more effective role in development, as well as interact with government and role players at all levels. They must also be able to identify and manage potential tourism resources and attractions within their communities in order to support and promote responsible tourism and community development (Aref et al., 2010:155; Sutawa, 2012:415; Saufi, O’Brien & Wilkins, 2014:802). Additionally, they should be enthusiastic participants in tourism decision-making with regard to tourism development and further apply their knowledge, capabilities, and insight and control the tourism development process (Hamilton & Alexander, 2013:170; Saufi et al., 2014:802). In this instance, it is crucial for the local community residing near SZCV to support tourism development in the cultural establishment and to become active participants in tourism decision-making with regard to tourism development in the area.

This can convince the community of the need to integrate tourism into the local economy and thus provide better opportunities for the host community to benefit from the development of tourism taking place in their locality while keeping tourism sustainable (Sebele, 2010:136; Eshiliki & Kaboudi, 2012:334; Lee, 2013:39). Furthermore, participation in decision-making enables community members to rule and control tourism development while controlling,
checking and balancing the participation process in order to achieve the goal of sustainability (Sutawa, 2012:415). Participation also enables communities to control and protect their interests and their community (Bittar Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017: 3). It helps to avoid the negative socio-cultural impact resulting from tourism development and can maximize social and economic benefits, because both the benefits and costs are fairly redistributed (Idziak, Majewski & Zmysłony, 2015:1343). Additionally, participation in tourism decision making can have a positive impact on a community’s attitude towards tourists; strengthening local identity, motivating communities to raise concerns about maintaining their resources, stimulating local entrepreneurship, strengthening collaboration and building partnerships, minimizing internal conflict and establishing relationships between a community and external agencies (Idziak et al., 2015:1343).

Participation in tourism decision making also allows for the creation of mutual understanding and appreciation amongst community members, thus enabling the tourists visiting the destination to receive a more authentic cultural experience (Schulenkorf, 2012: 3; Hugo & Nyaupane, 2016:1). Consequently, if local community members do not fully participate in the decision-making of tourism development, it will adversely impact on their communal goals, values and perhaps result in unsustainable tourism outcomes (Sebele, 2010:137; Ebrahim & Khalifah, 2014:30; Hussin & Kunjuraman 2014:42). In addition, a lack of community participation in decision-making of tourism development means that the local community have not made the tourism development project their own by design (Gascón, 2013:720). The decision making process for the community includes deciding the appropriate approaches for the development and promotion of tourism, as well as choosing the appropriate integrated and collaborative approaches for tourism planning and for community development (Sutawa, 2012:415). Local community members also need to work in unity with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) to educate other community members about matters concerning tourism development projects (Aref et al., 2010:155).

Community capacity building is a complex term to define. However, a widely acknowledged definition of community capacity building is “the interaction of human capital, organizational resources and social capital existing within a community that can be used to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the wellbeing of that community” (Chaskin, 2001:318 in Traverso-Yepez et al., 2012:2). Within the context of this paper, ‘community capacity building’ refers to the extent to which community members can work together effectively to develop and sustain strong relationships; make collective decisions; and collaborate effectively to develop community plans, establish goals and get things done (Phillips & Pittman, 2014:8). Such strong relations should be based on values of equity and respect, as well as facilitate participation, leadership, organizational structures, resource mobilization and critical assessment (Traverso-Yepez et al., 2012:2). Furthermore, these relationships should be ongoing and influential to improve development processes (Khosravi et al., 2015:245).

The concept ‘capacity building’ was first introduced during the late 1980’s. It can be traced back to the work of Paulo Freire who gained international recognition for his experiences in literacy training in North-eastern Brazil (Giampiccoli, Jugmohan & Mapuri, 2014:658; University of Miami, 2016). Freire’s most renowned work is “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” (1970), where he argued for a system of education that emphasizes learning as an act of culture and freedom (University of Miami, 2016). Capacity building later became popular in developing countries when the bottom-up approach of community-based tourism was seen as a catalyst for community development, assisting in minimizing the dependency on government in the provisioning of employment and business opportunities (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:14). It has also developed into a major focal point for donor funding organizations, particularly as a strategy for poverty reduction amongst rural communities (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:12).

A number of different concepts have been used in different studies (Bennett et al., 2012:6; Chaskin, 2001) to evaluate the capacity of communities and have been suggested as fundamentals for building local capacity. These include positive attitudes; knowledge and skills
Evidence from Chaskin (2001:318) emphasizes that community capacity building must focus on three components:

- **At the individual level** - it is important to develop human resource and community leadership;
- **At the organizational level** - efforts could be made to develop the ability of community organizations to serve in community development; and
- **At the community level** - it seeks to focus on associations and relations between community residents, local groups and local community organizations to build up community development.

Following Chaskin’s components of community capacity building, Aref and Gill (2011:95) and Pat-Mbano and Ezirim (2015: 399) also identify more elaborate but similar components of community capacity building. They categorize these into individual level, organisational level and community level:

- **Individual level** - capacity building refers to the ability of individuals to set and achieve objectives through knowledge and skills enhancement;
- **Organisational level** - it refers to anything that influences an organisation’s performance, leadership, structure of the organisation, resource mobilisation, physical and intellectual resources; which also includes organisation strategy, management, business approaches, and organisation linkages, such as networks and partnerships and organisation systems; and
- **Community level** - it includes informal and formal linkages between organisations and individuals and organisations within the community; infrastructure within the community; networks and resources from external support to the community and focuses on social capital developments; which include networks, relationships between people in a community and levels of trust and co-operation that exist within a community. All such orchestrated activities enable the community to address problems whilst improving their communities.

This proposed community level is relevant to this paper as it allows the community to use any form of linkages, whether formal or informal, as an agendum to facilitating developmental concerns of any kind within the community, thereby allowing communal problems to be addressed effectively.

**Community capacity building through tourism**

In a tourism sense, building community capacity includes strengthening human resources; organizational and individual capacity; developing appropriate facilities and training on tourism; and also assessing tourism’s impact (Aref, 2011:347). This further assists the community to improve their ability to participate in the tourism decision-making process, increasing the qualities and assets that a community is able to draw upon in order to improve their lives (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:12; Khosravi et al., 2015:236). Hence, when communities have essential tourism skills and access to resources, they have the opportunity to become active participants in tourism development. As such, community members are likely to be involved in tourism planning and managerial processes (Bittar Rodrigues & Prideaux, 2017:3). Therefore, with the necessary training on tourism, as well as accessibility to tourism resources, community members of Eshowe may possibly become more active participants of tourism.
activities at the SZCV. This ‘non-active involvement’ has often been one of the reasons that Eshowe community members have been excluded from tourism planning and managerial processes at the SZCV.

Community capacity building in tourism also involves facilitating communities to take advantage of the opportunities provided by tourism development (Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:12; Khosravi et al., 2015:245). Additionally, it refers to a process whereby individuals, communities, organisations and countries develop their abilities individually and collectively in order to perform functions, solve problems, achieve objectives and maintain changes (Koutra & Edwards 2012:779). Therefore, the process of community capacity building in tourism requires individuals who are skilled in collecting, analyzing and reporting data on needs, opportunities, barriers and resources; planning and evaluating community initiatives; mobilizing resources; facilitating group processes; solving problems and resolving conflicts amongst participants and opposing groups (Ghaderi, Abooali & Henderson, 2017:3). Without the involvement of these skilled individuals, it becomes easier for external parties to set the agenda and direct tourism development. The process also encourages local participation in policy-making and in decision-making about how resources are managed. Thus, this enables community members to substantial control over how local issues are handled (Ghaderi et al., 2017:1).

Community capacity building in tourism also entails business planning and management; operational skills in tourism businesses; training of local community members involved in tourism, in areas of customer service, operational excellence and product excellence (Ezeuduji, 2015:73). However, in most cases, many local communities particularly in developing countries do not have these capacities and often do not have the infrastructural facilities such as tarred road, transportation, sewerage, electricity and telecommunication systems that are able to attract tourists to their communities (Saito, 2017:4). Furthermore, local people often do not have sufficient business managerial skills, while their economy relies on foreign investment (Saito, 2017:4). To address these concerns, the involvement of stakeholders such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s), government organizations and the private sector are imperative as an agenda to facilitating capacity developmental initiatives amongst community members (Saito, 2017:4). Community capacity building in tourism is also problem-based, participatory, prolonged and supportive, comprising more than just training (Stewart, 2015:549). As a result, community capacity building includes aspects of not only training, but expands to organizational and personal development and resource building (Pat-Mbano & Ezirim, 2015:399). The process is organised and planned in a manner that reflects the principles of empowerment and equality (Pat-Mbano & Ezirim, 2015:399).

Community capacity building promotes social and economic change. Hence, it is significant to undertake long-term investment in people and their organizations and improve processes through which they can better build the forces that affect their lives (Motsoene, 2014:109). This concept is supported by scholars such as Denizci and Tasci, (2010) who acknowledged that community capacity building occurs within a tourism knowledge economy framework whereby capacity is usually expanded through investment in human capital and in professional development (Stolk, Lyons & Young 2017:153). Undeniably, Melubo and Buzinde (2016: 506) supported this concept by emphasizing that investing in professional development generates skillful, hardworking and proficient tourism employees who are likely to obtain higher profits and greater skills as compared to those who do not possess such levels of human capacity. Moreover, community capacity building is an essential concern for both policymakers and community residents and is an essential condition for the implementation and maintenance of effective community development (Aref, Montgomery & Ma'rof, 2013:58). In this instance, local communities and their leaders need to be adequately informed and empowered so that they are able to make informed decisions to secure appropriate capacity building in order to enhance skills, knowledge and promote transparency (Manyara & Jones, 2007:641; Aref et al., 2010:82). Consequently, the lack of community capacity and limited understanding of tourism impacts are barriers to effective tourism development, since the basis for sustainable
community development lies in developing community capacity (Aref, 2011:347; Hamzah & Khalifah, 2012:11). Moreover, such limited understanding about tourism and its impact can result in the risk of over-reliance on non-local capability (Ghaderi et al., 2017:3).

Building community capacity can be challenging, especially when it is limited by poverty; poor communication and knowledge; low levels of institutional capacity and a lack of support from government or tourism authorities, as might be the case in a rural area such as Eshowe (Rahmawati, DeLacy & Jiang, 2016:248). Furthermore, community capacity building can also be challenged by inadequate educational and development policies, a lack of infrastructure or difficulty of access, and the lack of skilled employees caused by migration (Bouchon & Rawat 2016:46). As a consequence, community capacity building initiatives have been questioned and criticized, in that they may act as a means to enhance the reputations of politicians and government officials, playing upon the well-intentioned implications that surround the concepts of community, community capacity and social capital (Traverso-Yepez et al., 2012:2). This distracts attention from the larger causes of socio-economic inequalities to the responsibility of the individuals living in lower income communities, thereby placing blame on the victim and focusing on unreliable populations (Traverso-Yepez et al., 2012:2). However, Edwards (2015:7) highlighted that in order for community development initiatives to be successfully implemented and sustained, community members must develop the capability for collective action, the internal resources to support the process and the necessary skills and knowledge to successfully identify local problems and solutions to such problems. Consequently, as communities become more unified, they have a greater potential to be mobilized, as well as to be able to identify collective problems and undertake more effective and sustainable solutions (Edwards, 2015: 8).

Additionally, a study conducted by Lucchetti and Font (2013: 5) indicates that it is crucial that there exists accessibility of tourism resources at a community’s geographic location, which is a key component to capacity building, since attractive and unique tourism assets offer enhanced chances for the development of successful tourism products. It is important to consider that the main resources of deprived communities are usually their natural and cultural heritage and that tourism, for instance, can generate income through the interpretation of such resources to visitors (Lucchetti & Font, 2013:6). It is also important that community members show a willingness to engage in tourism. This goes hand-in-hand with levels of trust in the activity and in the stakeholders involved in tourism. The existence of more established alternative livelihoods in the community may also affect its willingness to engage in tourism. Moreover, understanding the existing skills within the community is also crucial for community capacity building and to identify capacity-building requirements. Therefore, priority should be given to developing tourism products and services that build on existing capabilities (Lucchetti & Font, 2013:6).

**Cultural Villages**

Cultural villages are a new industry after the 1994 period, while also serving as a foundation to heritage tourism in South Africa (Bovana, 2010:32). Such villages are one of the main types of cultural tourism products in South Africa and employ a number of people who are knowledgeable about cultural activities and are able to ratify them to visitors (Mearns, 2007:38). They are interpreted as purpose-built structures for the intention of tourist visitation and represent the way of life of a cultural group that existed or still exists (Conradie, 2012:3; Ndlovu, 2013:52). Furthermore, cultural villages also represent the way of life of local people, allowing visitors to learn about the culture of the people, their past and present ways of living (Moswete, Saarinen & Monare 2015:281). The activities and attractions linked to cultural villages include guided tours, cultural exhibitions and craft workshops, where local people can be employed as tour guides and demonstrators. They usually consist of a homestead to display the living arrangements, an arena for dance, music and other live cultural displays (Mearns, 2007:38). Furthermore, cultural villages are usually linked to craft shops, traditional
food outlets, as well as accommodation facilities, which offer traditional dance performances and cultural displays (Bovana, 2010:38).

Many deprived communities in South Africa have ventured into the cultural village market, using their culture, both past and present, as a source of hope and employment (Mearns, 2007:38). South African cultural villages allow tourists to experience how local inhabitants of a land once lived and are mainly found in the eastern part of South Africa (South African Tourism, 2015). The villages celebrate the ethnic diversity of the country or focus on one ethnic group, while enriching the tourist experience through broadening their knowledge and understanding of cultural villages (South African Tourism, 2015). Such cultural villages include - Shangana Cultural Village, Basotho Cultural Village and Matsamo Cultural Village. The Shangana Cultural Village is located outside Hazyview in Mpumalanga and promotes the Shangaan culture. The Basotho Cultural Village on the other hand, is found in the Free State Province, and enables visitors to experience authentic hospitality and learn about traditional arts, crafts and ways of life of the Basotho people. In addition, the Matsamo Cultural Village promotes the Swazi culture. The Matsamo Cultural Village is located near Swaziland and provides visitors an authentic Swazi cultural experience, which is well preserved in the area (South African Tourism, 2016). Furthermore, cultural villages form part of a cultural representation with the history of the village normally being traced back to the colonial and apartheid period, and have become popular attractions amongst tourists (Ndlovu, 2013:52). The activities narrated above are synonymous to that of the SZCV. This is further discussed in the next section.

The case of community capacity building in Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village

Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village offers visitors from all over the world a unique Zulu cultural experience. This cultural experience also dwells on a better understanding of the Zulu people and their customs (Shakaland, 2015). Owned by Tourvest in Zululand, the cultural village includes a cattle pen and is divided into 55 rooms which are in the form of traditional Zulu architectural beehive huts that include authentic African decor complete with wooden interiors, thatched roofs and an earthy, warm atmosphere (Tourvest, 2012; Shakaland, 2015). The Shisa Nyama restaurant, with its authentic setting and traditional Zulu style, offers guests an opportunity to enjoy ethnic dishes (Aha, 2016). The arts and crafts on display are nothing short of impressive in their diversity and colourful loveliness (Aha, 2016). The surroundings of the village are peaceful, with the hills in the east offering a splendid view of the Mhlatuze Valley where Shaka's military stronghold - Kwa Bulawayo - once stood (Aha, 2016). Activities in Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village include the Nandi experience. This includes a three-hour daytime adventure named in honour of Shaka's mother, Nandi, team building activities, school/educational programmes, as well as a guided cultural tour.

The Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village has implemented community capacity building as a strategy for tourism development through the training it provides to employees of the cultural village. The training is provided in categories such as cultural dance performance, bar attendance, delivering superior customer service, front desk training, tour guiding, arts and crafts production and sales and housekeeping. However, training in management or levels of training that can provide opportunities to move into the management level is non-existent. Most training has been linked to the low-level positions and is directly related to the employees' current positions. Moreover, training mainly focuses on the enhancement of service delivery and may not necessarily assist in promotions or in salary increases. However, it is evident that these forms of training were expedient as respondents did indicate that their skills were sharpened by the highly skilled personnel who trained them. It is also evident that employees are adapting quite well to the different forms of training that they have undergone. This is showcased by the cultural dance performers' ability to adopt ancient Zulu dance styles within a short space of time, while preparing for the Heritage Day festival. On the contrary, logistics and finance have been two main issues undermining the frequency of training at the SZCV.
To address concerns, it may be necessary to appoint staff whose duty will mainly focus on capacity building amongst employees of the SZCV, whilst also sourcing funds for such capacity building initiatives.

Although the employees of SZCV indicated that they were involved in the tourism decision making process, their involvement was required for superficial activities only, while they were excluded from key decision-making issues. The employees of the SZCV were only involved in tourism decision-making pertaining activities such as arts and craft work that were needed to attract more tourists. The involvement of housekeeping staff was also required for concerns related to the purchase of additional cleaning equipment. However, this is directly related to their present jobs and is linked to improvements in what they do and is not at a strategic level. This means that the general staff suggestions or advice do not influence the SZCV’s decision, neither do the employees’ suggestions influence management decisions in the planning process of this tourism establishment. Moreover, the cultural establishment needs to consider community views and incorporate such input when constructing the tourism planning process. In consonance with this concern, it is suggested that the management of SZCV should empower general staff to be on the board of SZVC and influence management decisions. Thus, it becomes necessary to involve general staff members in the tourism-planning process, particularly the experienced or those who have worked at the tourism establishment for several years. Although they may not have high education levels, their experience at the cultural village may contribute to positive outcomes.

**Recommendations**

This paper proposes the following measures to enhance capacity building while minimising inadequacy in capacity development:

**Skill acquisition**

Every employee of the cultural establishment needs to be trained to obtain professional expertise. Such training should be conducted regardless of whether the SZCV employee is a full-time, or part-time employee; or is familiar with the Zulu customs. Hence, it is recommended that the SZCV appoint a registered Skills Development Facilitator (SDF) to undertake a skills audit and assist in the development of a Workplace Skills Plan (WSP) within the cultural establishment. This will assist the SZCV to identify needed skills and describe the range of skills development interventions that will be used to address these needs, whilst increasing the possibility of promotions and improving salary scales in the SZCV. Furthermore, the WSP will facilitate access to a required grant for skills training within the SETAs (Sector Education and Training Authorities). In the case of the SZCV, a relevant SETA would be the CATHSSETA (Culture, Art, Tourism, Hospitality and Sport Sector Education and Training Authority), which is one of 21 SETAs established under the Skills Development Act of 1998.

Employees also need to be rewarded with training certificates after they have undergone training. This will boost their morale and keep such employees motivated. As an addendum to sustaining quality services to tourists, such training should be conducted quarterly amongst reservationists and cultural dancers who engage mostly with the tourists; while annual training should be conducted amongst employees such as room attendants, porters and drivers.

**Internship**

The SZCV should invest in staff training and collaborate with local authorities and institutions to develop suitable and effective training programmes and promote recruitment. This can be conducted by providing placements or internships for local university students who are studying towards tourism qualifications. Such internship programmes will orchestrate a further deepened relationship with community members, which will in turn offer ownership and more involvement amongst the locals. Such interns could be absorbed into the cultural village at a later stage.
Involvement in the tourism planning process through interactive participation

The cultural establishment should also include interactive participation in the tourism planning process. Such interactive participation should entail a collective reasoning or brainstorming by core stakeholders to solve certain issues affecting the concerned group of individuals. The management of the SZCV can use this approach to communicate with individuals from the community. This could also be extended to tourists through re-evaluation exercises, analyses and access activities and services. This interactive participation can be carried out on a quarterly basis. Such an initiative can result in the innovation of new tourism ideas and sustainability and development of the SZCV.

The tourism planning process of SZCV, when re-evaluated and re-designed, should include community and tourists’ views, as this may result in the gradual realization of SZVC’s full potential. Furthermore, this avails the opportunity for community members to identify and highlight concerns that are most imperative. Community involvement can also result in creativity which will enhance the Zulu cultural experience amongst tourists. Additionally, this will ensure community support for the cultural tourism establishment.

Conclusion

This paper examined community capacity building as a stratagem for tourism development through the training it provides to employees of a cultural village in South Africa. The findings indicated that the Shakaland Zulu Cultural Village has implemented community capacity building as a strategy for tourism development through the training it provides to employees in cultural dance performance, bar tending, delivering superior customer service, front-desk training, tour guiding, arts and craft and housekeeping. Consequently, setbacks such as minimal employee training, not recognising high performing employees, as well as not involving general staff members in the tourism planning process in SZCV have had adverse impacts and undermined the growth and development of the SZCV. The cultural establishment should therefore consider re-evaluating the training process and tourism planning process. The SZCV should further implement more strategies for achieving impactful community capacity building and not only focus on training but also look into organisational and personal development and resource building, in order to enable the community of Eshowe to work mutually to perform functions, solve problems, achieve objectives and maintain changes. The establishment should also seek ways to reward high performing employees and develop more community development programmes for the community of Eshowe.
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