Local Community Participation in Tourism Development: The Case of Katse Villages in Lesotho
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One of the central elements of tourism development is to encourage local communities’ participation as it is the core to the sustainability of tourism industry. While the literature suggests a number of roles local communities could take in tourism development, little emphasis has so far been given to how local communities should participate in tourism development. The aim of this paper is to contribute to the understanding of community roles in tourism development by examining the views of the community at Katse area in Lesotho. A combination of stratified and convenience sampling approaches was used for sample selection of 500 households. The initial step involved stratified random sampling; accordingly, the population of Katse was first subdivided into four villages. Convenience sampling was then applied through the selection of each household in the four villages. The findings revealed that local communities want to be involved when tourism policies are being made to enable policymakers to prepare a policy that meets stakeholders’ needs and addresses their concerns. They also want to be part of tourism development decisions to ensure their needs are incorporated.

Keywords: Tourism, Tourism Development, Community Participation.

Introduction

Tourism development renders various economic, socio-cultural and environmental changes on the host community’s life, some more beneficial than others (Stylidis et al. 2014). Thus, the participation of local residents is imperative for the sustainability of the tourism industry at any destination (Gursoy et al. 2010). Understanding the residents’ perspective can facilitate policies which minimize the potential negative impacts of tourism development and maximize its benefits, leading to community development and greater support for tourism particularly, in developing countries, whereby tourism is still at an infant stage of development.

In the effort to promote development within a country, tourism development has become one of the key growth mechanisms for many developing countries. Within the process of development, it is often the economic indicators that draw the most attention and tourism is seen as attractive because it generates foreign exchange, increases employment and income for the local population, attracts development capital and promotes economic independence (Weaver and Oppermann 2000). As such, it can be argued that tourism promotes a level of economic growth conducive to increasing social well-being and stability of the local communities.
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Local participation has been regarded as a positive force for change and authorization to country’s development. This, however according to Nsizwazikhona and Nduduzo (2017) represents an over-simplistic conclusion. The principle behind local participation may be easy to promote, however the practice is far more complex. Generally, it is often assumed that residents are willing and able to participate equally (Hanafiah et al. 2013). This has been a continuing debate and issue within tourism development studies. Participation of local people is a criterion often agreed on as an essential condition for development and sustainability of any form of tourism (Lekaota 2015). Yet, it is the combination of the two words local and participation that is paradoxically implying local residents being so often left outside of the management, decision-making and managing of tourist development (Stone and Stone 2011). Clearly, the ideal would be for communities to decide the form and function of tourism developments and have full control over any tourism schemes in their location. In most cases, local residents often lack the experience, resources and hence even interest, needed to establish successful tourism ventures (Rogersson and Letsie 2013).

There is unclear description of local communities’ roles and how their views are incorporated in the whole tourism planning and development process. While the tourism literature suggests a number of roles local communities could take in tourism development, little emphasis has so far been given as to how the local communities themselves feel about these imposed roles. This creates a gap between what communities viewed as their roles in tourism development and as opposed to what the literature suggests.

Therefore, the aim of this study is to determine how the local communities in Lesotho participate in tourism development, with a view to advice tourism managers, planners and other local destinations within the country on how the local community should be involved and participate tourism development. Specifically, the study responds to the question: What are the views of local people towards participation in tourism development? This paper will firstly, provide a brief profile of Lesotho, including the Katse area, literature review on community participation in tourism development, the methodology adopted in carrying out this study, the results of the study, conclusions and recommendations.

Case Study Area Profile

Lesotho is a small land-locked country, completely surrounded by its neighbor South Africa, on which it must depend for access to the outside world (Appendix 1). It has a population of about two million and a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita of $1,020 (Lesotho Economic Review Outlook, 2017). It is classified as a low-income country. Its territory is mostly highland with its lowest point sitting at 1,400m above sea level (making it the highest base altitude in the world) (Lesotho Economic Review Outlook 2017). It is divided into ten districts, and its Capital town is Maseru. The national and official language of Lesotho is Sesotho. Following the Lesotho’s independence in 1966, Sesotho was
chosen and officially recognized as the national and official language of the country.

Katse area is located in the Leribe district, the Southern part of the country. It is now a home to the Highest Dam Wall in Africa, Katse Dam, one of the main attractions in Katse area. The congenial Katse Village, developed in the early 1990s is located in this area and provides a spectacular view of the Katse reservoir as well as the country’s rugged mountain scenery (Shano 2014). At 2,000 metres above sea level, Katse Dam is described as a striking piece of modern engineering (Lesotho Tourism Development Corporations Statistics 2017). The Dam is one of less than 30 double curvature concrete arch dams in the world; one of the world’s 10 largest concrete arch dams in terms of its volume; and the highest dam in Africa. The Dam has since its construction in 1991 been attracting thousands of people who come to see this engineering creation (LTDC 2017). The Katse Dam is situated on the Malibamatso River in Lesotho. It is by far the most efficient storage dam in Africa due to its great depth and relatively small surface area, which reduces evaporation.

The tourism sector in Lesotho is considered to have great potential for attracting foreign exchange and creating employment in the country (Lesotho Government Reviews 2016). However, the sector is small in absolute size. According to the World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC), in its 2017 Travel & Tourism Economic Impact Report, tourism sector in Lesotho appears at 169 out of 185 countries. The WTTC 2017 report further estimates that the direct contribution of travel and tourism to Lesotho’s GDP was M1 520.5 million (US$103.4 million) in 2017, which translates to 5.3 percent of total GDP. According to the Lesotho Central Bank Economic Quarterly Review of 2017, the sector currently supported approximately 35 000 jobs in 2017, translating to 5.9 percent to total employment in that year, with this figure expected to rise by 5.4 percent in 2018. The main attractions in Lesotho are the unique natural environment, including mountains scenery, scenic routes, topology, the snow in winter, waterfalls, rich culture and man-made attractions, such as the Katse dam (Shano 2014).

This sector is a very labour-intensive industry that has the potential to generate more jobs particularly in the highlands region like Katse where poverty is greatest. The development of tourism is created by the building of the Katse Dam by the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) coupled with improved roads into the Highlands that were built and upgraded as part of the project. A large number of tourists in 2017 mainly from South Africa (46.2% and rest of the World 56.6 %) visited Katse (Table1). Table 1 further depicts that Katse remained the second most popular tourism attraction in 2017 in Lesotho.
The main compelling reason for selecting the Katse area as the site for this study was its popularity as a tourist destination in Lesotho. It was named after a wealthy man called Katse who used to have a lot of livestock and provided agricultural produce to the local communities. The area is now a home to the Highest Dam Wall in Africa, Katse Dam which attract many tourists around the world. The gracious Katse Village, developed in the early 1990s is situated in this area and provides a beautiful view of the Katse reservoir as well as the country’s rugged mountain scenery engineering (Lesotho Tourism Development Corporations Statistics 2017).

This area has a number of attractions for tourists, such as, the Katse dam and the 1970-hectare Bokong Nature Reserve that lies at the head of the Mafika-Lisiu pass en route to Katse dam. Features of interest in Bokong include different types of birdlife, and tourists may be able to catch a glimpse of the rare and endangered bearded vulture as well as a number of other bird species endemic to the afro-alpine zone (Trans-Caledon Tunnel Authority (TCTA) 2003). Besides the tourist attractions, there are other several activities and facilities for tourists at Katse, such as 4X4 trekking, camping, fishing, pony trekking, hiking, biking and sightseeing and Basotho cultural performances (Khotle and Caswell 2006, Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA) 2003).

| Attraction Place Visited in Lesotho | South Africa % | Rest of World % | Total % |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|
| KATSE                              | 46.2           | 56.6            | 46.9    |
| AFri Ski                           | 13.0           | 6.5             | 12.6    |
| Sani                               | 10.8           | 4.4             | 10.4    |
| Thaban Ntlenyana                   | 9.4            | 8.0             | 9.3     |
| Oxbow                              | 4.0            | 6.1             | 4.1     |
| Thaba - Bosiu                      | 2.6            | 2.2             | 2.6     |
| Morija                             | 2.2            | 4.3             | 2.3     |
| Mohale dam                         | 2.2            | 0.0             | 2.0     |
| Dinosaur Footprints                | 1.5            | 0.7             | 1.5     |
| Handicrafts Centre                 | 1.3            | 2.8             | 1.4     |
| Liphofung                          | 1.1            | 2.2             | 1.2     |
| Semonkong                          | 1.1            | 0.7             | 1.1     |
| Ts'ehlanyane National Park         | 0.9            | 2.1             | 0.9     |
| Bokong                             | 0.9            | 0.7             | 0.9     |
| Bushmen Paintings                  | 0.6            | 0.7             | 0.6     |
| Roma (National University of Lesotho)| 0.6            | 0.0             | 0.6     |
| Roma (non-university visit)        | 0.6            | 0.0             | 0.6     |
| Kome Caves                         | 0.6            | 0.0             | 0.5     |
| Malealea                           | 0.2            | 2.2             | 0.3     |
| Maletsunyane Falls                 | 0.2            | 0.0             | 0.2     |
| **Total**                          | **100**        | **100**         | **100** |

Source: Lesotho Development Tourism Statistics, 2017.
Katse holds first position (Table 1) on the list of the most popular attractions in Lesotho and is one of only eighteen top attractions areas that have drawn an increased number of tourists over the past two years (Lesotho Tourism Development Corporations Statistics 2017). For instance, thus, because of what Katse offers, the researcher considered that findings and conclusions reached from this study could be applicable to other rural areas that offer similar tourist attractions to Katse. Besides Katse being one of the most popular attractions in Lesotho, Katse was selected on the basis that the community at Katse might be aware of and have information about the tourists because they are in contact with them on a daily basis as the tourists are travelling to Katse Dam. The Katse residents might also be aware of some developments brought by tourism at Katse.

Literature Review

There has been a relatively slow realization of the importance of community participation in tourism development (Fariborz 2011). This might be the reason why in many developing countries, Lesotho included, tourism has been developed and controlled by large multinational companies that have little regard for local social and economic conditions. These large multinational companies would make decisions to be implemented by the local community and yet the local communities were not involved in the initial planning of the project. Richards and Hall (2000) argue that if the local community was not involved from the initial planning stage of tourism it becomes much harder to bring them on board at a later stage. The local community might have some resentment at not having been part of the process from the start.

Sharpley and Telfer (2002) argue that many decisions governing domestic matters are made elsewhere by foreign tour companies and service providers, which often do not have the destination community’s best interest in mind. Thus, Mitchell and Reid (2001) suggest that local people and their communities have become the objects of development but not the subject. However, it is believed that only when local communities are involved in tourism management their benefits can be ensured and their traditional lifestyles and values respected (Mitchell and Reid 2001, Sheldon and Abenoja 2001).

Fariborz (2011) also argues that the community must be involved as active participants in all tourism related activities. It is good management practice to obtain the views of a community before development takes place (Li 2006). This will provide tourism planners with information about the likely acceptability of any proposed development, what views are held by the local community and whether or not any fears can be allayed by the development of an appropriate management strategy (Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002). This will also not only provide happy and healthier residents but will encourage greater participation in civic matters in general, thus, creating more active and concerned citizens (Wilson 2003: 1465-1470).

Moscardo (2015) argues that the absence of local participation in tourism projects and the exclusion of the resident population from tourism planning is a
dilemma that needs attention. This exclusion of residents from tourism development may be traced to the external nature of funding and implementation of projects, especially in developing countries (Teye et al. 2002). Therefore, Cattarinnich (2001) suggests that the community must participate in tourism decisions if their livelihood priorities are to be reflected in the way tourism is developed.

Community participation in decision-making has been widely promoted and debated for several reasons (Mearns 2012). Local community involvement in tourism development is likely to assist the formulation of more appropriate decisions and to generate an increase in local motivation (Li 2006). The host community should have an active say in the kind of tourism appropriate to their lifestyle, culture and natural resources, and to be free to reject tourism as an economic option if other options are available (Richards and Hall 2000).

Page (2007) argues that tourist satisfaction is likely to be greater where hosts support and take pride in tourism because they have an understanding of how the destination adapts to change. It can, therefore, be seen that local community participation is very important for sustainable tourism. It will likely decrease hostility between tourism developers, tourists and the community, for actions taken and their resultant impacts become the responsibility of the local population (Nyaupane et al. 2006).

Garrod (2003) contends that involving a community in tourism planning (through such means as consultation, focus groups and committees) may assist in overcoming resistance or opposition, and avoid decisions that may otherwise cause conflict. Small and Edwards (2005) share similar views with Garrod (2003) that the long-term sustainability of tourism can be jeopardised if communities are not involved in the planning and management of tourism.

Teye et al. (2002) suggest that it is critical to involve the community in the planning and development of the industry and more studies of residents’ attitudes toward tourism in developing countries should be undertaken. Wilson et al. (2001), share similar views with Teye et al. (2002) and further suggest that tourism development and management should not remain in the realm of the government, as happens in many developing countries, but that the community should be fully involved in tourism development projects and decision-making, as suggested by many past studies (Fariborz and Ma’rof 2008, Andriotis 2002, Sheldon and Abenoja 2001, Botes and Van Rensburg 2000, Watt et al 2000, Hanafiah et al. 2013).

Garrod (2003) and Lekaota (2015) notes that the basic requirement for the community approach to tourism development is that all members of communities in tourist destination areas, rather than just those directly involved in the tourism industry, should be involved in the management and planning of tourism. Although community participation may seem to contribute positively towards tourism development, it should be realized that it is only one of many ways to ensure that local people benefit from tourism (Li 2006). Rather, the modes of participation are related to the institutional arrangements and the different stages of tourism development in a community as a result there is no universal mode applicable everywhere (Gopaul 2009).
Lekaota (2015) reports that resident participation ranges from a passive position at one end of the spectrum to one of self-mobilization that is characterized by independent initiatives where local people are strengthened socially and economically by their involvement. Hall (2000), Kim (2013) argue that, if sustainable tourism is to be achieved, functional participation must include the forming of groups by the local community to meet predetermined objectives related to the development projects. Incorporating the community and monitoring their attitudes should be a priority for sustainable tourism.

Methodology and Process

A combination of stratified and convenience sampling approaches was used for sample selection of 500 households. The initial step involved stratified random sampling; accordingly the population of Katse area which is composed of Katse community was first subdivided into four groups (villages), namely, Ha-Lejone, Ha-Poli, Ha-Mikia and Mphorosane. The roles of the local community in tourism development were measured with seven (7) variables measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, with a score 1 representing ‘strongly agree’ and a score 5 representing ‘strongly disagree’, with a series of seven statements adapted and used by Tosun 2002. Therefore, the measuring instrument was regarded as valid and reliable. Each question followed by an open ended question probing for more information why the respondent held such view. The follow up questions provided a wider picture of respondents’s views regarding their participation in tourism development in the study area and allowed for the emergence of issues not originally included in the questionnaire.

Convenience sampling was then applied through the selection of each household in the four villages. This was done due to the structure of the villages in Lesotho which are scattered and far from each other. Due to lack of statistical information on the number of households per village in Lesotho, an estimation of 190 residents per village was recommended by the Lesotho Bureau of Statistics Report 2015. Therefore, the total population for all the 4 villages was 760. Within each of the four villages approximately 125 households were conveniently selected to participate in the study, making the total population of 500, which according to Sekaran and Bougie (2013) is a well represented sample. However, 446 responded to the question resulting into 89 percent response rate. Head per dwelling was asked to participate in the face-to-face interview based on the questionnaire. Checks with the chiefs of the four identified villages confirmed that respondent was a resident member of the local community.

Household self-administered surveys were carried out over a period of eight weeks whereby the respondents answered questions posed orally by the interviewers in Sesotho (local language) due to low knowledge of the English language. For the total number of 20 questions, including the demographic questions and questions related to the appropriate role of the community in tourism development, the interview took approximately 15-20 minutes per respondent. At the end of every day, completed Sesotho questionnaires were translated into
English by the researcher with the help of the research assistants for easy of analysis. For the purpose of analysing data SPSS was used to produce mean scores and standard deviations (SDs). The responses were coded into a set of categories developed from identified commonalities in line with the seven statement. The approach focused on meaning drawn from content of the data and considered in a particular context (Sekaran and Bougie (2013)).

Results and Discussion

Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 2 illustrates an equal distribution in terms of gender, where 52% males and 48% females participated in the study. It is also clear that 49% of the respondents have visited Katse for recreational purposes while 48% have not. This is an indication that some residents are aware of tourism while some are not. The majority of the respondents (91%) indicated that they do not work in any tourism related jobs nor do their family members and relatives (90%). Respondents working in tourism related jobs are 9%. This is consistent with the researcher’s observation that, although Lesotho has tourism potential, it has not been optimally developed.

Forty-two percent of the respondents were unemployed while 19% were employed. This reflects the current status concerning unemployment in Lesotho. The Lesotho Central Bank Economic Quarterly Review of 2017 reports that unemployment in Lesotho is between 45 and 52%. This might be the reason why unemployed respondents account for a higher percentage. On the other hand, people staying at home will have more contact with tourists as these tourists visit their communities. Apart from the unemployed, 12% and 6% were students and pensioners respectively.

A large percentage of respondents (34%) were between the ages of 20 and 30, followed by respondents between the ages of 40 and 50 (22%). Only 6% of the respondents were between 50 and 60 while 10% were above 60. It is interesting to realize that this age group between the ages of 20 and 30 should be driving the economy but it is currently unemployed in Lesotho. If tourism can be developed, this age group can be employed in the tourism industry, and take active role in the development of tourism in Lesotho. The number of respondents in each village ranged from 120 (25) in Ha-Lejone, Ha Poli Mphorsane, 118(24%), Ha-Mikia 110 (22%) and lastly, Mphorasane 98(20%).
Table 2. Profiles of Survey Respondents

| Variables            | Category          | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender               | Males             | 52        | 52         |
|                      | Females           | 48        | 48         |
| Age                  | <20               | 62        | 12         |
|                      | 20-30             | 173       | 34         |
|                      | 30-40             | 110       | 22         |
|                      | 40-50             | 73        | 14         |
|                      | 50-60             | 30        | 6          |
|                      | >60               | 50        | 10         |
|                      | Missing data      | 1         | 2          |
| Employment status    | Employed          | 95        | 19         |
|                      | Unemployed        | 208       | 42         |
|                      | Self-employed     | 94        | 19         |
|                      | Student           | 61        | 12         |
|                      | Pensioner         | 29        | 6          |
|                      | Missing data      | 13        | 2          |
| Visited Katse for    | Yes               | 240       | 49         |
| recreational purpose | NO                | 244       | 48         |
|                      | Missing data      | 16        | 3          |
| Work in tourism      | Yes               | 32        | 6          |
| industry             | NO                | 460       | 92         |
|                      | Missing data      | 8         | 2          |
| Family members       | Yes               | 44        | 9          |
| working in tourism   | No                | 453       | 91         |
| industry             | Missing data      | 16        | 3          |
| Villages             | Ha-Lejone         | 120       | 24         |
|                      | Ha-Poli           | 118       | 24         |
|                      | Ha-Mikia          | 110       | 22         |
|                      | Mphorosane        | 98        | 19         |
|                      | Missing data      | 54        | 11         |

The Role of the Local Communities in Tourism Development

The mean scores for statements 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are above 3, suggesting strong agreement with the statement (Table 3). The fact that the local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made had the highest mean score of 4.67, SD 0.92, followed by the view that local people should have a voice in the decision-making process with Mean 3.94 and SD1.08 (Table 3). Consequent, to the two views, is the perception that local people should be consulted but the final decision on tourism development should be made by formal bodies, in the case of Lesotho these formal bodies are Lesotho Ministry of Tourism and Lesotho Tourism Development Corporation (LTDC). The three views are tremendously related and they suggest that the local community strongly perceive that they must be fully involved and participate in tourism developments in their respective areas. These outcomes, support suggestions by Scherl and Edwards (2007), Muganda et al. (2013) and Tosun (2006) with regard to the role of the local communities in tourism development. On the other hand, local communities overall rejected the
statement that the “local people should not participate in tourism development by any means” (mean 1.28, SD 0.82). The same results were found by Tosun (2002) in his study regarding expected nature of community participation in tourism development in Turkey, Marzuki and Hay (2012) and Lekota (2015). Lastly, there was a statement which was phrased positively “local people should take the leading role as workers at all levels” (mean 2.90, SD1.30). Respondents disagreed with the statement in contrast with what Tosun (2006) observed in Turkey.

Regarding the question why the respondents have strong feeling that they should be consulted when tourism policies are being made, they argue that if they are consulted, this will ensure that the policy makers get different views from all the stakeholders so that they can be able to draft tourism policies incorporating the views of the community. As such, the community will own and protect tourism developments in their respective areas. Nsizwazikhona and Nduduzo (2017) also found the same results in his study regarding the challenges to active community involvement in tourism development at Didima Resort. Furthermore, one of the respondents supported her views that they should be considered in tourism policy-making by saying that; “If we are part of the decision making, we will be able to look after the tourism developments made in our villages”. This view was supported by one of the respondents who argued that if they are allowed to voice their views in tourism developmental issues, this could assist to protect their interests, and increase transparency and accountability amongst the decision-makers, who are mainly, the Lesotho Government officials.

The respondents were of the view that the current infant stage of Lesotho tourism could develop if ever the local community had a voice in developmental issues. One respondent had this to say: “Our government officials ignore the fact that the tourism attractions are in our areas, as such, they affect us, therefore, we have to be involved from the initial stages of formulating the tourism policies.” This will grant the local community opportunities to have voice in the decision-making process of projects in their areas. These views are supported by Curry (2000), who argues that the communities are the owners of tourism attractions, therefore, they must be involved in decisions regarding their resources. These views are supported by Andriotis (2001), Tosun (2002), Walpole and Goodwin (2000) and Garrod (2003), who proposed that for the sustainability of tourism development, the management should consider the inclusion of local people in all tourism related decision-making processes. This may encourage greater participation and involvement and create more active and concerned residents (Wilson 2003). However, Li (2006) found that tourism in the Jiuzhaigou Biosphere Reserve in China was successful despite apparently weak local participation in the decision-making process. This is contrary to the interviewees’ opinions and also to current academic understanding of community participation, which has suggested that if local residents are to benefit from tourism they must be integrated into decision-making process.

On the issue of the idea of the local people being financially supported to invest in tourism development, respondents were of the view that more jobs will be created in the country. As observed earlier, Lesotho, is one of the developing countries whose unemployment rate is approximately between 45 and 52%.
Remarkably, there are very few people working in tourism related jobs (approximately 5.9%). This is a clear indication that the tourism sector in Lesotho is at an infant stage and not well developed. Therefore, the respondent’s argument was that people should be encouraged and supported financially in order for them to invest in tourism sector. One of the respondent had this to say “There are many tourists, going to the Katse Dam almost every day, but there are no facilities, such as, filling stations, washing rooms, restaurants, and accommodation between Ha Lejone and Katse, if we can get support, we can build Bed & Breakfast (B&B), filling stations and bath rooms on the way to Katse” Furthermore, respondents argued that they like tourists, they like to invest in tourism, the only constraint is lack of capital to invest in tourism.

The respondents who rejected the idea expressed their fears about investing in tourism because tourism is not for Basotho people. One respondent said “We don’t know this tourism thing, this is not our culture to go around places like the white people, instead these people come to our country and they leave nothing for us, they come to our country with their cars, their food and tents”. As a result, the respondents felt that tourism business is not yet profitable in Lesotho, and the local community do not understand it fully.

**Table 3. Local Community Participation in Tourism Development (N=500)**

| Statements # | Question: In your view, what should be an appropriate role of the community in tourism development? | Mean | SD |
|--------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----|
| 1            | Local people should not participate in by any means                                             | 1.28 | 0.82 |
| 2            | Local people should be financially supported to invest in tourism development                   | 3.80 | 1.25 |
| 3            | Local people should take the leading role as entrepreneurs                                      | 3.79 | 1.08 |
| 4            | Local people should be consulted when tourism policies are being made                            | 4.67 | 0.92 |
| 5            | Local people should be consulted but the final decision on tourism development should be made by formal bodies | 3.30 | 1.28 |
| 6            | Local people should have a voice in the decision-making process                                 | 3.94 | 0.89 |
| 7            | Local people should take a leading role as workers at all levels                                | 2.90 | 1.30 |

*Source: Field survey, January – March 2017. *the higher the mean score, the stronger is the agreement.

Lastly, on the view that people should take a leading role as workers, those who supported the idea believe that if they take a leading role, they would take care of tourism products in their communities. They further supported their views by indicating that probably, that could increase local access and participation in tourism development. It may also increase employment opportunities and improve the livelihood of the communities with in the Katse area. They also believe that this may reduce conflicts between tourism authorities and the communities, whereby they complain that better jobs are given to expatriate while the local
communities are left with only blue color jobs. The respondents who rejected this idea indicated that it would deny local people an opportunity to participate in tourism development, and therefore, it would be difficult for the Lesotho Ministry of Tourism to achieve the tourism national goals, as implementation of tourism activities is mainly done by the locals. As a result, tourism development would decline mainly due to lack of local support.

Conclusions

The study investigated how the Katse community should participate in tourism development in their respective areas. The findings indicate that it is necessary that the community have a representative voice in all tourism structures at National, district and local level. In order to maximize the leadership potential and achieve local community participation, the local community should elect its own leaders who will be able to represent the community interests in tourism development structures in the country. In addition, the local leaders should be educated on tourism development and participation so that they will able to transfer acquired knowledge to the communities. They need to remove the existing perception that tourism is for wealthy and white people as was said by one of the respondents. For effective organization of tourism, it is important for the community to organize themselves through their local leaders and form groups for the purpose of sharing information and possible experiences. This should be facilitated through local government structures, which may also possibly make financial provisions for the organization of communities. However, the local community concedes that there is a need to involve tourism experts when formulating tourism policies because they have wide knowledge and expertise in tourism developmental issues and policy formulations. Consultation is one area whereby the local community emphasized that they need to have voice in issues related to tourism development. Generally, the findings from this case study of Katse villages in Lesotho confirm Tosun (2002), Marzuki and Hay (2012) and Lekaota (2015) suggestion that community participation process in developing countries still face operational problems which result in limited participation for the local community.

Recommendations

It is therefore, recommended that the Katse community should actively participate in tourism development by seeking partnership opportunities with the established tourism private sector, and perform the four management functions namely; planning, organizing, leading and controlling in their respective villages. The residents must be included in key project planning and decision-making activities through the organization of public meetings of local residents, the utilization of the local press as a communication tool and surveys of different businesses and be empowered to decide what forms of tourism they want to
develop in their respective communities, and how the tourism costs and benefits are to be shared among different stakeholders. Education and awareness programs should include the local community, aiming to help them become more involved in tourism development as both entrepreneurs and employees, but also as those who have the right to live in a high quality and safe environment. A mechanism for financial assistance needs to be considered by the authorities in order to encourage local communities to invest in tourism industry. As a result, this would create employment opportunities to local communities, reduce unemployment and improve living standards and make them much more supportive for tourism development.

The communities should also be encouraged to form tourism related associations that will represent them in the National Community Council (NCC) for effective management of tourism in Lesotho. Some interviewees also observed that the communities do not have enough information about the benefits of tourism in Lesotho. As a result, the education and awareness campaign should not only be done by LTDC. It should involve all the tourism institutional structures in Lesotho, including the local community leaders. The local community leaders should play a major role in educating and creating awareness of tourism benefits in their respective villages through public gatherings, workshops and meetings. In addition, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s) should also play a major role in educating the locals about importance of tourism development in their respective areas. The communities in which tourism projects are available should be given priority when the developments are made in their areas so that they can take part in tourism management in their communities. These views are supported by Curry (2000), who argues that the communities are the owners of tourism attractions, therefore, they must be involved in decisions regarding their resources. This may encourage greater participation in tourism development.
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| NUL          | National University of Lesotho |
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| TCTA         | Trans-Caledon Tunnel Authority |
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