Heritage Tourism as a Strategy for the Local Economic Development in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Thembinkosi Keith Gumede
Department of Recreation and Tourism,
University of Zululand, South Africa
P.O. Box 59062, University of Zululand,
Private Bag X1001, KwaDlangezwa, 3886
Email address: tkgumede8@gmail.com
tkgumede8@gmail.com

Abstract

This study was conducted at KwaBulawayo (eShowe) and Ondini (Ulundi) Cultural Centres, which are located in the north coast of KwaZulu-Natal Province, South Africa. The study was conducted to explore the heritage tourism economic potential of these sites. This study theorised heritage tourism within the shift from an industrial to a post-industrial mode of production and consumption research framework. A descriptive design was used in the study, and a qualitative mode of enquiry was adopted during the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. The population of the study comprised of the municipal officials, cultural centres' personnel, community leaders, and households of the nearer communities. The municipal officials and cultural centres' personnel were sampled through a purposive sampling technique, while community leaders and households were sampled through a convenience sampling technique. Survey questionnaires were used to collect data from a sample of 36 respondents through face-to-face interviews. The data were analysed through content analysis. The findings showed that the communities of the study areas, generally, understood heritage tourism within the context of use value, that is, as containers of cultural, historical, and traditional knowledge, rather than exchange value, as market commodities. This study further found that the branding of the sites revolved around the Zulu Kings, Shaka and Cetshwayo, which seemed not to draw tourists except for those fond of history. Hence, the study recommended that the sites be marketed and rebranded to enhance their full tourism potentials. As heritage tourism has become a major attraction the world over, this study further recommended that communities needed to be conscientised about the development value of heritage tourism and ideally participate therein. Related further research would focus on mechanisms to enhance community participation in tourism development, especially in such rural settings.

Keywords: heritage tourism, local economic development, cultural centres, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Introduction

Heritage tourism as one of the sub-sectors of the tourism industry has played a central economic role as one sector of tourism that has become a major foreign currency earner, especially in developing countries (Saarinen and Manwa, 2008; Kruger and Douglas, 2015). Heritage tourism, particularly in the developing countries, has demonstrated a great deal of potential for alleviating challenges of unemployment and income inequality (Binns and Nel, 2002; Manyara and Jones, 2007; Kausar and Nishikawa, 2010; Scholtz and Slabbert, 2015). This happens through multiplier effect since tourism is labour intensive (Kausar and Nishikawa, 2010). Developing countries that are rich in heritage resources, such as South Africa, could use them for revenue generation by staging and/or selling heritage attributes, such as traditional artefacts, architecture, gastronomy, and language (Binns and Nel, 2002; Snowball and Courtney, 2010; Madden and Shipley, 2012). Much has been indicated by the literature on the effects of heritage tourism on local economic development (Richards, 2005; Yilmaz and Bititci, 2006; Nyaupane, 2009; Secondi et al., 2011; Department of Travel and Tourism, 2013; Ghanem and Saad, 2015; Chung-Ki, Tack-Seon and Sangmee, 2016). However, literature does not state vividly how heritage tourism can be used to stimulate local economies, especially those of rural communities. Thus, the study explored the potential of heritage

tourism to stimulate the economies of KwaBulawayo (eShowe) and Ondini (Ulundi) Cultural Centres and their surroundings in KwaZulu Natal province in South Africa. The next part of this paper discusses the literature review of the study.

Literature review

Heritage and tourism have developed a connection as they complement each other (Madden and Shipley, 2012). Secondi *et al.* (2011) maintain that heritage has been used in tourism as a strategy to promote positive images of a specific destination. This symbiosis has influenced the practice of heritage tourism (Gilbert, 2006). Literature (Li and Lo, 2005; Ray, McCain and Melin, 2006; Fonseca and Ramos, 2012; Baltescu and Boscor, 2013; Demonja and Gredičak, 2014; Surugiu and Surugiu, 2015; Delconte, Kline and Scavo, 2015) defined heritage tourism as travelling to the authentic destinations inspired by the visitors' interests to explore the past and/or the environment of the host destination without degrading the environment of the surrounding communities. During these visits, tourists satisfy their touring desires by experiencing the unknown (new experiences), participate in cultural events and rituals, interact with local community members, and experience culture in its authentic or inauthentic form. For instance, the Slave Cave in Kenya has been attracting thousands of the visitors interested in heritage resources. As a result, this site has been considered as part of a strategy of poverty alleviation. Some initiatives that have been developed through this site have involved awarding of bursaries to school pupils (Wynne-Jones and Walsh, 2010). This has been echoed by Secondi *et al.* (2011) when affirming that by sustaining heritage attributes, communities adjacent to the heritage sites stand higher chances of breaking the chains of poverty by using those sites as mechanism for tourism development. Since the inception of democracy, heritage tourism has been considered by the government of South Africa as a market niche that offers unexploited potential both for local and regional tourism development (Van der Merwe, 2018).

Industrial to post-industrial society and heritage tourism

This study understood heritage tourism to be predicated upon the theory of a shift from industrial to post-industrial mode of consumption (Booyens, 2010). In a broader context, tourism development has been influenced by a need to switch from basic economic industries, such as commodities and manufacturing to the more vibrant and diversified service industries (Goulding, 2000; Vogt *et al.*, 2004; Mason, Duquette and Scherer, 2005). As a consequence, heritage tourism has emerged as a potential mechanism through which economic crisis stifling the traditional industrial society could be curbed. This switch requires that those who are responsible for tourism planning and decision-making are to demonstrate creativity in as in creative destruction, to borrow from Joseph Schumpeter, an Austrian political economist. In the South African context, a typical example of how a shift from industrial to post-industrial society has influenced heritage tourism development is the case of Soweto Township which was the primary setting of the 1976 riots which were carried out on June 16. The uprising that began in Soweto and spread countrywide changed the socio-political landscape in South Africa and was a pivotal point in the country's shift to a democratic dispensation.

Historically, the township was established to accommodate Black African labourers who were employed by the traditional industrial sectors, such as mining and manufacturing in the vicinity of Johannesburg. However, due to its political and its rich heritage background, Soweto is considered to be one of the South Africa's top 20 heritage tourism sites (Booyens, 2010). The visits to the township have increased and Soweto has been referred to as a sought-after cultural heritage experience by the inbound tourists resulting from the diverse cultural heritage background and remarkable political history. Areas adjoining Vilakazi Street, Pela Street, and Hector Pieterson Museum have been declared by the Johannesburg City's Development Agency as the essential centres for heritage tourism (Booyens, 2010).

Drivers of heritage tourism

The increasing interest in visits to heritage destinations has been attributed to a variety of heritage offerings, such as, authenticity, arts, rituals, history, culture, architecture, competition, festivals, religion, gastronomy, folklore, nature, pilgrimage, and nostalgia (Hubbard and Lilley, 2000; Vong and Ung, 2012). In other words, the uniqueness of each destination is what draws the tourists' interest (Van der Merwe and Rogerson, 2013). For instance, in Cordoba, Spain, gastronomic tourism is reported to have been increasing over the years and is considered as one of the heritage tourism components that have been progressing in the country (Sanchez-Canizares and Lopez-Guzman, 2012). In a similar perspective, Bessiere (2013:275) posits:

> If food is considered to be at the centre of cross-cultural reconciliation, food, therefore, would qualify as one of the essential development strategies.

Architecture is another driver of heritage tourism which is receiving considerable attention. In essence, whenever people travel into a particular destination, they tend to gaze at its surroundings, and architectural structures are no exception. Destinations with distinct landscapes and townscapes are likely to attract more visitors as opposed to those with common building structures (Shehata, Monstafa and Sherif, 2015). As a result, Willson and McIntosh (2007) caution that visitors' emotions pertaining to a particular destination's architecture need to be understood in order to develop, enhance, and sustain tourism potential of its favoured buildings and future architecture. Linked to these, is the concept of nostalgia. Various authors (Fairweather, 2003; Marschall, 2012; Alexandra and Paul-Emmanuel, 2014) view nostalgia as a distinct feeling generated by yearning to experience the past or an emotional longing for the past experience, product, and/or service. Kim, Kim and Park (2013) uphold this view by maintaining that heritage tourism is mostly driven by the past nostalgia and tourists' desire to experience different forms of cultures. Marschall (2012) confirms that tourists are highly keen to visit sites of memory, *viz*. museums, monuments and memorials.

Participants in heritage tourism

Different stakeholders and authorities are involved in heritage tourism in a variety of capacities (Bott, Grabowski and Wearing, 2011). There are three key stakeholders that are involved in sustainable heritage tourism development and they are public sector, private sector, and local residents (Timur and Getz, 2008). Although local residents were previously excluded from participating in tourism activities, the changing nature of heritage management has lead into their inclusion in heritage tourism (Scheyvens, 2002). Perhaps, their inclusion is premised on their responsibility to ensure the protection of the heritage sites against any harmful activity, e.g. marauding, vandalism, etc.

Thus, it is essential to maintain their sense of ownership; hence, their close connection with the heritage sites could be critical for sustainable preservation of heritage, good branding of the heritage sites, and sustainable local-tourists relationship (Ramshaw, 2014; Ghanem and Saad, 2015).

For instance, in Mali in north west Africa, the locals are fully engaged in heritage tourism activities such that they participate in decision making pertaining to the operation of the heritage sites. Importantly, they participate in heritage tourism-related local economic development initiatives by, among other things, preparing indigenous food for the visitors and exposing them to the architectural buildings. As a consequence, the number of tourists visiting the heritage sites in this region has significantly increased (Farid, 2015).

Heritage tourism and local economic development

Heritage tourism has become the most popular form of tourism in terms of attractions and visitor spending. It attracts millions of tourists yearly. Statistics show that 40 percent of international visits is attributed to heritage tourism. The demand for heritage tourism has been found to be increasing by 15 percent each year (Nguyen and Cheung, 2014). Heritage sites have become significant sources of revenue for local economies. The linkage between heritage and economy forms the basis for addressing critical social issues, such as inadequate human and infrastructural capital, inadequate access to credit, and dominance of urban players (Kausar and Nishikawa, 2010). This linkage has also been resourceful in addressing income inequalities and unemployment crisis mostly prevalent in the developing countries (Kausar and Nishikawa, 2010). Hence, local economic development is regarded as a viable strategy with which poverty, unemployment and inequality can be alleviated in developing countries, such as South Africa (Rogerson, 2006). Despite the fact that heritage sites are incapable of eradicating poverty, they can be used as a strategy for accumulating economic benefits.

In the African context, heritage tourism has been effectively used as a strategy for the local economic development. Mali is one of the Africa's developing countries that have been using heritage resources as a mechanism for local economic development. Numerous visitors have been attracted to Mali because of its indigenous culinary and architectural buildings. The revenue generated from these visits has positively contributed towards the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country and resulted in creation of new job opportunities. For instance, approximately 73 000 jobs were created from heritage tourism in the country during 2014 and were expected to increase significantly during 2015 (Farid, 2015).

The Slave Cave in the south coast of Kenya has been considered to be the most popular heritage sites in the country that attracts thousands of visitors who are interested in slave heritage tourism. This attraction has been resourceful to the adjoining communities by generating employment and providing financial muscle to fund educational programmes undertaken within its proximity (Wynne-Jones and Walsh, 2010). The Midlands Meander in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, exemplifies the earliest heritage tourism route in the country with its focus on local arts and crafts. Approximately 56 percent of its revenue is attributed to accommodation and indigenous food. The attraction's turn-over is estimated at R359 million per annum which resulted in approximately 2100 job opportunities created for local people (Snowball and Courtney, 2010). Against this background, perhaps it could be said that the developing countries that feature heritage resources, such as museums, pilgrimages, and architecture have a great opportunity to attract both domestic and international tourists who are interested in heritage exploration. Due to tourists' stay and the money spent during their stay, host destinations have opportunities to accumulate revenue which could enhance economic opportunities (Gomes de Menezes and Moniz, 2011).

Study areas and their historical background

The study was conducted at KwaBulawayo (eShowe) and Ondini (Ulundi) Cultural Centres and their surroundings. These cultural centres are located on the north coast of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. These case studies were chosen on the basis of the richness of their historical background. KwaBulawayo, which was later named KwaBulawayo Cultural Centre. The site is known to have been the headquarters of King Shaka, the prominent King of the Zulu Nation (Zululand, 2014). This was thus the Zulu capital, which included the royal residence, and it was in the 1830s one of the biggest urban areas in Africa, containing close to 1 500 huts and a large central parade ground enclosed in an enclosure with a perimeter of several kilometres, overseeing the attractive Mhlathuze Valley.

Historically, the King's homestead was named KwaBulawayo (the place of killings) resulting from the attack against the King by his enemies who were suspected of wanting to assassinate him, after which he fled to KwaDukuza across uThukela River where he built his new homestead (Cele, 2001). In a nutshell, King Shaka is the founder of KwaBulawayo and it is where he established the Zulu Kingdom military camp (Ritter, 1978). The site is located in the south the uMhlathuze Local Municipality to the right of the Eshowe-Empangeni main road (Zululand, 2014). The King built the capital in a circular formation made up of about 1500 dwelling huts which encompassed the upper segment of the circle designated for the private quarters of the King and many of his serving guests (Ritter, 1978). Figure 1 shows the historical site of the headquarters of King Shaka (the KwaBulawayo Cultural Centre).

Figure 1: Historical site of the headquarters of King Shaka (*Source*: *Researcher's photograph*).

The capital was known as a place where old men were kept to advise young men on necessary fighting skills and behavioural patterns *viz*, sexual abstinence when one was a warrior. As a consequence, the other name for the capital was also KwaGibixhegu because of the old men who stayed there (Ritter, 1955). Moreover, the capital served as the King's court of justice where the culprits were officially prosecuted. This court proceedings were undertaken under the fig tree, approximately in the five-acre yard, just in front of the King's Great Council hut (Ritter, 1955).

One of the important historical highlights, is that after each battle or expedition, the results were reported to the King in order to deliver the spoils of the battle or be assigned further orders (Becker, 1964). On this occasion, all those who were injured during the battle were provided with medical treatment by the traditional herbalists, while those who had killed their foes were fortified against dark evil which was believed to have been sent by the evil spirits to torture their minds.

The heroes who won distinctions during the battle were rewarded, while those who surrendered were removed to the outskirts of Bulawayo into the Cowards Bush to be slayed (Becker, 1964). The Centre was proclaimed on the 15th of December 2011 under the auspices of King Goodwill Zwelithini Zulu and its objectives revolve around ensuring the preservation of local customs and traditions for future generations, educating tourists and others on the significance of the site to the Zulu people and providing tourists with a truly authentic and unforgettable African experience (ISSUU, 2015). On the other hand, King Cetshwayo Cultural Centre is located in Ward 22 of the Ulundi Local Municipality, under the Zululand District Municipality, 9km outside the Ulundi Town along the road to Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Park (ISSUU, 2015). Figure 2 shows the statue of King Cetshwayo located at the King Cetshwayo Cultural Centre.

Figure 2: Statue of King Cetshwayo located at the King Cetshwayo Cultural Centre (*Source: Researcher's photograph).*

The Centre was named after King Cetshwayo, the famous King of the Zulu Nation who was born in 1826 at his father's (Mpande's) kraal called Mlambongwenya, near eShowe (SAHO, 2009). The King had his headquarters and residence at Ondini popularly known as Ulundi (Zululand, 2014). He was a nephew to King Shaka and had a great determination to maintain the sovereignty of his nation against the British imperial supremacy and their intentions to ruin the nation's cultural heritage (Ballard, 1983). Noticeably, the King managed to resist the spiritual, political, and economic pressures imposed by the British before his imprisonment and exile in the Cape around 1878 (Ballard, 1983; SAHO, 2009). Although the King was labelled by the British, such as the then British High Commissioner in South Africa (Sir Bartle Frere) and the then Secretary for Native Affairs in neighbouring British Colony of Natal (Theophilus Shepstone) as an aggressive, bloodthirsty and cruel character, he managed to transform his Kingdom monarchy from being a violent lawless tyranny under his predecessors, Shaka and Dingane, into a constitutional monarchy and equitable rule of law (Laband, 1986; Cope, 1995). The King ruled over 300 000 people in the vicinity of uThukela River, UMzinyathi River, and uPhongolo valley at the age of 40. The King died near Eshowe in February 1884 from what has been alleged to be an unknown cause (Ballard, 1983). The Centre was proclaimed on the 20th of August 1983 under the auspices of King Zwelithini Goodwill Zulu, the current king of the Zulus who belongs to the same monarchy and royal family as King Cetshwayo. In this sense, he would refer to King Cetshwayo as his forefather, ancestor, and predecessor. The items featured on the Centre include the famous collection of beadwork, authentic items that can be accessed at the Museum (Zululand, 2014).

Methodology

After necessary ethical considerations, such as receipt of permission to conduct research from community leaders, municipal officials, and tourism destinations' management were taken into account and met, the University of Zululand's Research Ethics Committee (UZREC) issued an ethical clearance certificate which endorsed the eligibility of the researcher to conduct the research within the study areas. The study adopted a descriptive design on the basis of the primary research question, which reads: 'How can heritage tourism be used as a strategy for the local economic development in the study areas'? Since this question required the respondents to express their views on the chosen topic, the study used qualitative mode of enquiry during collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. The municipal officials, heritage tourism destinations personnel, community leaders, business people, and households were

the target population of the study. They were used as relevant informants from whom reliable data were obtained. In this sense, population can be interpreted as a pool of cases or elements from which a sample is drawn (Neumann, 2003). The combined population size of the municipalities (UMlalazi Local Municipality, 213 601 and Ulundi Local Municipalities, 188 317) under which the study was conducted was 401 918.

Municipal officials and cultural centres' personnel were sampled through purposive sampling on the basis that the study targeted sampling units with specific information pertaining to the chosen topic (Singh, 2007; Robinson, 2014). Community leaders and households were sampled through convenience sampling on the basis that the study targeted those respondents who reside in the proximity of the study area, available and willing to participate in the study (Maree and Pietersen, 2016). Having realised the impossibility of including the entire population in the study coupled with other critical considerations, such as financial constraints and timelines, a sample of 36 respondents was drawn to represent the entire population. In other words, a sample of 18 respondents was drawn in each study area. In this study, the criteria for arriving at an appropriate sample size were informed by three determinants as proposed by Finn, Elliot-White and Walton (2000), namely: (1) level of the available resources, (2) purpose of collecting the data, and (3) size of the population.

Survey questionnaires comprised of unstructured and semi-structured questions were used to collect primary data from the relevant respondents, while discussion and policy documents, scholarly journals, theses and internet sources were used to collect secondary data. The typology of questions contained in survey questionnaires enabled respondents to provide responses and further expatiate on their responses by stating why things are as they said. In other words, it provided the respondents with an opportunity to forthrightly express their concerns pertaining to their own circumstances. The data were analysed by means of content analysis. This was done by sifting the implicit meanings embedded in the responses in order to establish the respondents' in-depth and own understanding and interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation.

The successive parts of the data were classified in accordance with their categories in order to generate themes and/or sub-themes for the purpose of interpreting the results against the primary research question. Content analysis was chosen on the basis that it is a systematic method which is flexible to minimise large quantities of data and suitably analyse qualitative responses to unstructured open-ended interview questions. During the interpretation of data, the study focused on fundamental areas that determined the formulation of the questions and objectives of the study. This was done to generate meanings from the qualitative results. The study compared the results with the reviewed literature to determine whether the latter corroborates or refutes the former. Thereafter, inferences were drawn against the research question. In this manner, the interpretation of data served as an important aspect in drawing inferences from the findings of the study (Verma and Verma, 2006).

Aim and objectives

The study sought to explore how heritage tourism can be used as a stimulus for local economic development. In other words, the study explores how heritage attractions found in the study areas can be used to catalyse the local economy. In line with the aim of the study, the specific objectives of the study were as follows:

(a) To discover how the shift from industrial to post-industrial mode of production and consumption accounts for heritage tourism.
(b) To identify the key role players in heritage tourism within the two identified heritage attractions (i.e. KwaBulawayo and Ondini Cultural Centres).
(c) To determine how heritage tourism is understood in the areas of study.
(d) To ascertain the economic potential of heritage tourism in the vicinity of the study area.

(e) To identify factors in favour of and/or against heritage tourism in the study area.

Results and discussion

The following results were discussed against the objectives of the study. Thus, the first theme focused on how the shift from industrial to post-industrial society accounts for heritage tourism. The findings indicate that heritage tourism is deeply embedded and can be explained within a shift from industrial to post-industrial mode of production and consumption, where aspects of society, such as heritage and culture are packed for tourism consumption. This shift took place in the late 1970s when global economic system which was predicated on industrialisation and manufacturing experienced problems which were recessionary (Vogt *et al.*, 2004; Booyens, 2010). Out of the recessionary problems, a new system of production called post-industrialisation or post-Fordism or post-modernity emerged. This system came with new processes of production and consumption where consumerism became a feature of new economy (Jackson, 2006). Consumerism meant that aspects of the society, such as heritage and culture had to be packaged for the tourist consumption and revenue generation. The study found that there are different stakeholders who play different important roles in heritage tourism of the study areas. Thus, most of the respondents identified the Amafa AkwaZulu, Site Managers, District and Local Municipalities, local business people, community leaders, and general public as the main people who participate in heritage tourism. However, the majority of the respondents revealed that community members are the most important stakeholders in heritage tourism.

Regarding the understanding of heritage tourism by the respondents, it was understood as visits to destinations that are characterised by rich historical, cultural, and traditional background; however, a few respondents expressed their lack of understanding and certainty about the concept. Based on these results, it could be said that heritage tourism is understood in terms of culture, history, and tradition. Based on the researcher's observation, those who did not understand the meaning of heritage tourism could somehow stifle the development of heritage tourism in their communities; hence, they might not know the core business and/or value of these heritage sites. As a result, it may be difficult for them to promote and/or protect these attractions. In view of this, Abuamoud *et al.* (2014) confirm that community inclination and commitment to fully participate in tourism development initiatives stimulate tourists' demand for tourism attractions. Resulting from the social corporate responsibility (SCR) and other related initiatives, it has been considered as a norm that attractions, such as heritage tourism destinations, need to assist in enhancing the socio-economies of the adjoining communities in a form of job creation, skills development, etc. In a similar perspective, Goodall (1997) posits that developing countries that are characterised by rich heritage resources need not rely on governments for their local economic development. Instead, they can stimulate the regional and local economies by developing sustainable heritage tourism. With this in mind, the respondents were canvassed for their views on the economic potential of heritage tourism. When responding, one of the officials said:

> The Ondini Cultural Centre has been able to provide full-time employment for the local people. Apart from that, I think from my side it's nothing, but giving people a platform to exhibit their crafts and artistic work in the museum which increases their chances for the business exposure. In short, the centre is the economic opportunity (Tourism Officer of the Zululand District Municipality: July 2016).

In view of the respondent's assertion, the study found that heritage tourism is considered to be contributing towards the local economic development of the study area. This finding aligns with the assertion made by Chung-Ki, Tack-Seon and Sangmee (2016) that heritage related tourism has been considered as a rapidly growing element of tourism and a local economic development strategy resulting from its ability to enhance the economy, community livelihoods,

create job opportunities and improve local infrastructure. This finding was also confirmed by the Chief of KwaBulawayo Cultural Centre when he stated:

> The KwaBulawayo Cultural Centre plays an important role in terms of the local economic development, hence it has created full-time and part-time jobs for the local people.

However, the views of the community members on this matter differ from those raised by the above respondents. From the community members' perspective, the two cultural centres do not present an economic opportunity to the local communities. Emphasis was put on the tendency of the centres to employ local people in trivial positions, whereas top positions are occupied by the people from outside the adjacent communities. The nature of the findings depicts mixed feelings between the officials and general public in this regard. The researcher's observations reveal that most of the negative responses that came from the general public were not genuine; they were considered to be based on emotions rather than on hard facts. To justify this inference, most respondents from the community lack necessary skills for tourism development. As a consequence, they were not employable in this field. Based on what the study observed, those who had few tourism-related skills, such as curatorship, tour-guiding, security-guiding, computer literacy, etc. were employed by the heritage sites.

Against this understanding, it could be said that heritage tourism has demonstrated potential for enhancing local economic development of the study areas. This is a favourable finding both for the heritage tourism and the enhancement of the socio-economies of the study areas. Another essential objective this study sought to achieve was to identify factors in favour of and/or against heritage tourism in the study areas. Thus, the respondents were asked to identify the stimuli and/or hindrances to heritage tourism in the case studies to which respondents identified marketing strategies, proper infrastructure, offerings, branding, and facilities. With respect to marketing strategies, a significant proportion (33 percent) of the respondents emphasised that internet plays an important role in attracting potential tourists towards the heritage destinations, hence it the mostly used and prevalent marketing medium during the 21st century and aligns with the so-called 'post industrial revolution regime'. To support this view, (Lai and Shafer, 2005) concur that more than 63 percent of modern day tourists use internet when planning their tours. As a result, it provides access to the public world over. Other respondents (24 percent) believed that tourism towards the study areas is attributed to proper roads towards the heritage attractions.

A moderate proportion (17 percent) of the respondents were convinced that offerings, such as artefacts, gastronomy, etc. attract visitors who want to learn about and/or experience traditional means of living. It was interesting for the study to find that there were respondents (13 percent) who firmly asserted that tourists are attracted by none other than the branding and history attached to the heritage attractions. They emphasised that both Kings (Cetshwayo and Shaka) after whom the heritage attractions were named, are internationally renowned for their bravery and contribution in building the Zulu Kingdom. A proportion of 10 percent of the respondents declared that facilities, such as museums; architecture, etc. motivate tourists to visit heritage attractions. A least proportion (3 percent) of the respondents revealed that heritage tourism towards the study areas is due to all of the above attributes. The findings are supported by the assertion made by Vong and Ung (2012) and Hubbard and Lilley (2000) that the increased interests and visits in heritage tourism destinations are resulting from a variety of attributes, namely: history, artefacts, culture, architecture, infrastructure, etc.

With regards to the hindrances to heritage tourism, Ozturk, Ozar and Caliskan (2015) postulate that visitors' attitudes towards touring a particular destination are informed by a variety of factors, such as the dynamics of the society and others. By virtue of this empirical understanding, the question pertaining to the factors that may impede heritage tourism towards the study areas was of imperative importance. The findings indicate that unavailability

of facilities such as accommodation has impacted negatively towards tourists' turnout in the study areas. The respondents highlighted that the heritage attractions do not accommodate tourists who intend to stay more than a day because the accommodation facilities are neither available within the attractions nor in the adjacent communities.

Conclusion

The findings of the study demonstrated that heritage tourism is understood as a process of visiting a particular destination motivated by cultural, historical, and traditional attributes found in the destination. The study established that community members are the most important participants and that their influence is viewed to be significant towards heritage tourism development of the study areas. It was found that heritage tourism towards the study areas is mostly driven by the marketing strategies. Importantly, the findings indicated that heritage tourism of the study areas is perceived as an economic opportunity. In view of these findings, the study arrived at a conclusion that heritage tourism contributes towards the local economic development of the study areas. The study made an inference based on the findings that heritage sites have not been doing well in terms of the availability of facilities.

References

Abuamoud, I., Libbin, J., Green, J. & AlRousan, R. (2014). Factors affecting the willingness of tourists to visit cultural heritage sites in Jordan, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(2), 148-165.

Alexandra, V. & Paul-Emmanuel, P. (2014). A taste of nostalgia: Qualitative Market Research, *An International Journal*, 17(3), 225-238.

Alonso, A. (2013). Tannat: the positioning of a wine grape as symbol and 'referent' of a nation's gastronomic heritage, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 8(2-3), 105-119.

Ballard, C. (1983). The Historical Image of King Cetshwayo of Zululand: A Centennial Comment, King Cetshwayo of Zululand, pp. 29-32.

Baltescu, C. & Boscor, D. (2013). An Analysis of the Cultural Tourism Development in Romania, *Bulletin of the Transilvania*, 6(55) No.2, Series V.

Becker, P. (1964). Rule of Fear, The Life and Times of Dingane King of the Zulu, Longmans, pp. 11- 12.

Bessiere, J. (2013). Heritagisation, a challenge for tourism promotion and regional development: an example of food heritage, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 8(4), pp. 275-291.

Binns, T. & Nel, E. (2002). Tourism as a Local Development Strategy in South Africa, *The Geographical Journal*, 168(3), 235-247.

Booyens, I. (2010). Rethinking township tourism: Towards responsible tourism development in South African townships, *Development Southern Africa*, 27(2), 273-287.

Bott, A.L., Grabowski, S. & Wearing, S. (2011). Stakeholder Collaboration in a Prospective World Heritage Area: The case of Kokoda and the Owen Stanley Ranges, *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies Journal*, 3(2), 35-54.

Cele, T. (2001). Qualities of King Shaka as portrayed in Zulu oral testimony and in izibongo, *South African Journal of African Languages*, 21(2), 118-132.

Chung-Ki, M., Tack-Seon, R. & Sangmee, B. (2016). Growth effects of leisure tourism and the level of economic development, *Applied Economics*, 48(1), 7-17.

Cope, R.L. (1995). Written in Characters of Blood? The Reign of King Cetshwayo KaMpande 1872-9, *The Journal of African History*, 36(2), 247-269.

De Carlo, M. & Dubini, P. (2010). Integrating Heritage Management and Tourism at Italian Cultural Destinations, *International Journal of Arts Management*, 12(2), 30-43.

Delconte, J., Kline, C. & Scavo, C. (2015). The impacts of local arts agencies on community placemaking and heritage tourism, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/1743873X.2015.1088019 [Accessed on 16 October 2015].

Demonja, D. & Gredičak, T. (2014). Exploring the 'Cultural Tourism-Sustainable Development' Nexus: The case of Croatia, *Scientific Annals of the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi Economic Sciences,* 61(2), 161-179.

Department of Travel & Tourism (2013). Annual Report 2012/2013, Vote 35, Statistical Release, Pretoria: Government Printer.

Donohoe, H. (2012). Sustainable heritage tourism marketing and Canada's Ridean Canal world heritage site, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 121-142.

Dueholm, J. & Smed, K. (2014). Heritage authenticities-a case study of authenticity perceptions at Danish heritage site, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(4), 285-298.

Fairweather, I. (2003). Showing Off: Nostalgia and Heritage in North-Central Namibia, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29(1), 279-296.

Farid, S. (2015). Tourism Management in World Heritage Sites and its Impact on Economic Development in Mali and Ethiopia, *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 595-604.

Finn, M., Elliot-White, M. and Walton, M. (2000). Tourism and Leisure Research Methods, London: Pearson Education.

Fonseca, F. & Ramos, R. (2012). Heritage Tourism in Peripheral Areas: Development Strategies and Constraints, *Tourism Geographies*, 14(30), 467-493.

Fu, Y., Kim, S. & Zhou, T. (2014). Staging the 'authenticity' of intangible heritage from the production perspective: the case of craftsmanship museum cluster in Hangzhou, China, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, DOI: 10. 108 /14766825. 2014. 983439 [Accessed on 24 November 2014].

Ghanem, M. & Saad, S. (2015). Enhancing sustainable heritage tourism in Egypt: challenges and framework of action, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10(4), 357-377.

Gilbert, S. (2006). Finding a balance: Heritage and tourism in Australian rural communities, *Rural Society*, 16(2), 186-198.

Gobo, G. (2015). The next challenge: from mixed to merged methods, *Qualitative Research in Organisations and Management, An International Journal*, 10(4), 329-331.

Gomes de Menezes, A. & Moniz, A. (2011). Determinants of length of stay: a parametric survival analysis, *Tourism Analysis,* 16(5), 509-524.

Goodall, B. (1997). The Future for Heritage Tourism: Environmental Transformations in Developing Countries, *The Geographical Journal*, 163(2), 243-244.

Goulding, C. (2000). The commodification of the past, postmodern pastiche, and the search for authentic experiences at contemporary heritage attractions, *European Journal of Marketing*, 34(7), 835-853.

Harrison, R. & Reilly, T. (2011). Mixed methods designs in marketing research: Qualitative Market Research, *An International Journal*, 14(1), 7-26.

Ho, P. & McKercher, B. (2004). Managing heritage resources as tourism products, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(3), 255-266.

Hubbard, P. & Lilley, K. (2000). Selling the Past: Heritage-tourism and Place Identity in Stratford-upon Avon, *Geography*, 85(3), 221-232.

Ihantola, E.M. & Kihn, L.A. (2011). Threats to validity and reliability in mixed methods accounting research, *Qualitative Research in Accounting and Management*, 8(1), 39-58.

ISSUU (2015). A complete guide to municipalities in South Africa, The Local Government Handbook South Africa, 5th ed. pp. 173-174.

Ivankova, N.; Creswell, J. & Clark, V. (2007). First steps in research, Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Jackson, W.A. (2006). Post-Fordism and Population Ageing, *International Review of Applied Economics*, 20(4), 449-467.

Kausar, D. & Nishikawa, Y. (2010). Heritage Tourism in Rural Areas: Challenges for Improving Socio-economic Impacts, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 195-213.

Kim, J., Kim, B. & Park, S. (2013). The Effects of Tourism Ritualization, Ritual Performance on Tourist Satisfaction, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 14(3), 245-263.

Kruger, E. & Douglas, A. (2015). Constraints to consumption of South Africa's national parks among the emerging domestic tourism market, Development Southern Africa, 32(3), 303-319.

Laband, J.P.C. (1986). HUMBUGGING THE GENERAL? King Cetshwayo's Peace Overtures During the Anglo-Zulu War, *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 67, 1-20.

Lai, P.H. and Shafer, S. (2005). Marketing Ecotourism through the Internet: An Evaluation of Selected Ecolodges in Latin America and the Caribbean, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 4(3), 143-160.

Li, Y. & Lo, L.B.R. (2005). Opportunities and constraints of heritage tourism in Hong Kong's changing cultural landscape, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 5(4), 322-345.

Lundi, T. (2012). Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches: Some Arguments for Mixed Methods Research, *Scandinavia Journal of Educational Research*, 56(2), 155-165.

Madden, M. & Shipley, R. (2012). An analysis of the literature at the nexus of heritage, tourism, and local economic development, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7(2), 103-112.

Manyama, G. & Jones, E. (2007). Best practice model for community capacity-building: a case study of community-based tourism enterprises in Kenya, *Tourism*, 55(4), 403-415.

Maree, K. & Pietersen, J. (2016). Sampling, First steps in research, Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Marschall, S. (2012). Personal memory tourism and a wider exploration of the tourism-memory nexus, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(4), 321-335.

Mason, D., Duquette, G. & Scherer, J. (2005). Heritage, sport tourism and Canadian junior, hockey: nostalgia for social experience or sport place? *Journal of Sport and Tourism*, 10(4), 253-271.

Neuman, W.L. (2003). Social research methods, qualitative and quantitative approaches, 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Nguyen, H. & Cheung, C. (2014). The classification of heritage tourists: a case of Hue City, Vietnam, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(1), 35-50.

Nyaupane, G. (2009). Heritage complexity and tourism: the case of Lumbini, Nepal, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 4(2), 157-172.

Ozturk, A., Ozar, O. & Caliskan, U. (2015). The relationship between local residents' perceptions of tourism and their happiness: a case of Kusadasi, Turkey, *Tourism Review*, 70(3), 232-242.

Ramshaw, G. (2014). A Canterbury tale: imaginative genealogies and existential heritage tourism at the St Lawrence Ground, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(3), 257-265.

Ray, N., McCain, G. & Melin, T. (2006). Lewis and Clark and the Corps of Discovery: Re-enactment Event Tourism as Authentic Heritage Travel, *Leisure Studies*, 25(4), 437-454.

Richards, G. (2005). Cultural Tourism in Europe, CAB International: Wallingford.

Ritter, E.A. (1955). Shaka Zulu, The rise of the Zulu Empire: Shaka's Court of Justice at the new Bulawayo, 235-236.

Ritter, E.A. (1978). Shaka Zulu, The Tembu War-The new Bulawayo-Shaka's testudo-Order restored in Natal-Mzilikazi, 238-239.

Robinson, O. (2014). Sampling in Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Theoretical and Practical Guide, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 11(1), 25-41.

Rogerson, C. (2006). Tourism and local development in South Africa: Challenging local government, School of Tourism and Hospitality, *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJHERD)*, 2, 9-23.

Saarinen, J. & Manwa, H. (2008). Tourism as Socio-Cultural Encounter: Host-Guest Relations in Tourism Development in Botswana, Botswana Notes and Records, 39, 43-53.

SAHO (South African History Online), (2009). Biography of Cetshwayo KaMpande, the last king of an independent Zulu nation (1872-1879). *Africanhistory.about.com* [Accessed on 7 January 2009].

Sanchez-Canizares, S. & Lopez-Guzman, T. (2012). Gastronomy as a tourism resource, *Current issues in Tourism*, 15(3), 229-245.

Scheyvens, R. (2002). Tourism for development: Empowering communities, Pearson Education: Essex.

Scholtz, M. & Slabbert, E. (2015). The relevance of the tangible and intangible social impacts of social tourism on selected South African communities, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 3(5).

Secondi, L., Mesegner-Santamaria, M., Mondejar-Jimenez, J., & Vergas-Vergas, M. (2011). Influence of Tourist Sector Structure on Motivations of Heritage Tourists, *The Service Industries Journal*, 31(10), 1659-1668.

Shehata, W., Monstafa, Y. & Sherif, L. (2015). Towards the comprehensive and systematic assessment of the adaptive reuse of Islamic architectural heritage in Cairo, *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 5(1), 14-29.

Singh, K. (2007). Quantitative Social Research Methods, New Delhi: Sage Publishers.

Snowball, J. & Courtney, S. (2010). Cultural heritage routes in South Africa: Effective tools for heritage conservation and local economic development? *Development Southern Africa*, 27(4), 563-576.

Surugiu, M. & Surugiu, C. (2015). Heritage tourism entrepreneurship and social media: opportunities and challenges, *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 188, 74-81.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, in Jogulu, U.D. and Pansiri, J. (2011). Mixed methods: a research design for management doctoral dissertations, *Management Research Review*, 34(6), 687-701.

Timur, S. & Getz, D. (2008). A network perspective on managing stakeholders for sustainable urban tourism, *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 445-461.

Van der Merwe, C. & Rogerson, C. (2013). Industrial heritage tourism at the 'Big Hole', Kimberly, South Africa, *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJPHERD)*, 2, 155-171.

Van der Merwe, C. (2018). The Geography of Heritage in South Africa, World Regional Geography Book Series, Springer: Cham.

Verma, R. & Verma, G. (2006). Research Methodology, New Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers.

Vogt, C., Kah, A., Huh, C. & Leornard, S. (2004). Sharing the heritage of Kodiak Island with tourists: Views from the hoists, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(3), 239-254.

Vong, L. & Ung, A. (2012). Exploring Critical Factors of Macau's Heritage Tourism: What Heritage Tourists are Looking for when Visiting the City's Iconic Heritage Sites, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 231-245.

Willson, G. & McIntosh, A. (2007). Heritage Buildings and Tourism, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2 (2), 75-93.

Wynne-Jones, S. & Walsh, M. (2010). Heritage, Tourism, and Slavery at Shimoni: Narrative and Metanarrative on the East African Coast, *History in Africa*, 37, 247-273.

Yilmaz, Y. & Bititci, U. (2006). Performance measurement in the value chain: manufacturing vs tourism, *International Journal of Productivity and performance Management*, 55(5), 371-389.

Zululand District Municipality (2014). Zululand Integrated Development Plan Final Review 2014/2015.