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Abstract
In terms of cultural heritage, Southern Africa is arguably one of the richest regions. This region has potential for a vibrant cultural heritage tourism sector. Against the background that cultural heritage tourism is a major source of revenue to this region and the need to educate the public on the importance of cultural heritage, we assess the region’s online promotion strategies to the public. We employed qualitative and quantitative analysis of data obtained from cultural heritage organizations of six countries, namely Botswana, Zimbabwe, Lesotho, Namibia, South Africa and Zambia. We assessed the websites of these organizations on the premise of the Information, Communication, Transaction, Relationship and Technical model (ICTRT); social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, LinkedIn and Instagram were also analysed. Our results show that except for South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), South Africa, and National Heritage Council of Namibia, most Southern African cultural heritage institutions are struggling to promote cultural heritage online. Given the increased online activities as a result of the global COVID-19 pandemic, we also show that for most Southern African cultural heritage bodies, this has not yet positively affected their online marketing activities. Based on these results, we recommend that concerned organizations should increase online visibility geared towards aggressive marketing approaches.
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Introduction

Heritage loosely defined describes those aspects inherited from the past. However, the implication and application of that definition seem not to be easy. Ashworth (2011, p. 2) defined heritage as ‘a process whereby objects, events, sites, performances and personalities, derived from the past, are transformed into experiences in and for the present’. This definition emphasizes the aspect of selecting what to inherit as cemented by Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996, p. 6) as ‘what contemporary society chooses to inherit and pass on’. In these definitions, there are certain principles that are recurrent and worth accentuating, which are the notion of the past, value by contemporary societies and the need for sustainability.

Although the focus of this article is on cultural heritage, it should be stressed that heritage comes broadly in three groups, that is, cultural, natural and mixed. Cultural heritage is an expression of the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation, including customs, practices, places, objects, artistic expressions and values. Cultural heritage is often expressed as either intangible or tangible (ICOMOS, 2002). What makes cultural heritage quite remarkable is the role of humanity in the creation of culture, whether tangible or intangible. UNESCO (1972) defined natural heritage as natural features, geological and physiographical formations, and delineated areas that constitute the habitat of threatened species of animals and plants and natural sites of value from the point of view of science, conservation or natural beauty. It includes nature parks and reserves, zoos, aquaria and botanical gardens. On the other hand, mixed heritage is a combination of cultural and natural values, which are inseparable. Particularly in Southern Africa, it is critical to note that in most instances, the divide between cultural and natural heritage is not always clear, especially at places that have natural values and evidence of cultural occupations.

Hassan (2014, p. 7213) defines tangible heritage as ‘all the material traces such as archaeological sites, historical monuments, artifacts, and objects that are significant to a community, a nation, or/and humanity’. This implies that the physical artefacts that societies produce are passed from generation to generation. Although this refers to the physical components, some can be moved while others cannot be moved or transported. Movable cultural heritage is most observable in museums. Immovable cultural heritage refers to tangible cultural heritage that cannot be transported or moved unless completely damaged such as archaeological sites or historic buildings.

Intangible cultural heritage is a recent recognition within the heritage sector that has been quite important in understanding and appreciating communities with living traditions. In March 2001, UNESCO held a round table to draw a working definition for intangible heritage. The definition used here is from that meeting and is cited as Francioni (2001) who defined it as ‘any non-corporeal manifestation of tradition-based creativity, spontaneously originated and developed within a cultural community by which it is perceived to be an important component or reflection of the community’s social or cultural identity’. This includes cultural processes that are revered, passed from ‘generation to generation, by oral transmission, by imitation or by other means of learning’ such as traditional ceremonies, dramas and beliefs. Hence, there is a connection between tangible and intangible heritage since intangible aspects are expressed through and in tangible heritage (Francioni, 2001; Hassan, 2014; Munjeri, 2004). In 2003, at the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage held in Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe, the recognition, promotion and protection of intangible heritage made great strides.

Cultural heritage is finite, it is non-renewable. For this reason, cultural heritage resources need to be conserved for posterity. Managing cultural heritage should be inspired by considering future generations. The finite nature of cultural heritage, which if inappropriately managed, has the risks of depriving knowledge to future generations about their culture causing identity crisis and ultimately erase memories
and valuable pasts. The onus of passing heritage to future generations is not only on governments, and other organizations interested in heritage, rather it starts from the individual level. It is our collective duty to preserve, conserve, protect and sustain cultural heritage resources for future generations.

**Southern African Cultural Heritage: An Overview**

Southern Africa is a region found in the southernmost of the African continent. This region consists of 10 countries, namely Angola, Zambia, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Malawi, Botswana, South Africa, Eswatini and Lesotho (Figure 1). In this study, we tried to cover most heritage institutions within these countries. However, due to language differences, we exclude Angola and Mozambique because at the time of writing, none of us understood Portuguese, which is the language used by these countries.

Southern Africa is one of the regions that has numerous and beautiful cultural heritage sites with evidence of long human occupation (Table 1). However, this region has relied on and promoted natural heritage more than cultural heritage (Manwa, 2007). Southern Africa is endowed with enormous cultural heritage resources spanning from the onset of human evolution to the recent past. Evidence of human evolution in Southern Africa is dated around 2.5 mya (Thackeray, 2016). There are few hominin remains that have been found in Southern Africa, however, these few remains have been crucial to the understanding of the peopling of Africa. Some of the remains recovered include the ‘Kabwe Man’, from Zambia, whose age is still unknown was assigned to H. *rhodesiensis* while others ascribe it to H. *helmei* or H. *hiedelbergensis* (McBreay & Brooks, 2000), Homo *naledi* dated between 236 and 335 kya (Berger et al., 2010, 2017; Dirks et al., 2017), at Florisbad, a cranium of Homo genus was dated by ESR to 250 and 300 kya (Grün et al., 1996) and other places such as Sterkfontein, Kromdraai, Taung fossil skull site, Malapa (Berger et al., 2010, 2017; Thackeray, 2016; Val, 2013).

![Figure 1. Map Showing Modern Political Boundaries of Southern Africa](source: © Peter Morrissey)
The Stone Age of this region spans from 1.7 mya (Klein, 2000a), and this is further subdivided into the Early Stone Age (ESA), Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Later Stone Age (LSA). The ESA is dated to about 1.7 mya, while the MSA is dated from about 300 kya (Lombard et al., 2012; Wadley, 2015; Wurz, 2014), the LSA is dated from about 20 kya. The ESA of Southern Africa remains one of the poorly understood periods of the Stone Age. This might be because of lack of standardised stone tool implements. The MSA is well known, especially in South Africa, and this phase presents evidence of the emergence of modern human behaviour through symbolic expression (Klein, 1994, 2000b; Henshilwood et al., 2004; McBrearty & Brooks, 2000; Wurz, 2008, 2014) and complexity in animal exploitation (Clark, 2011; Marean, 1998; Milo, 1998; Val, 2016; Val et al., 2016). The LSA of Southern Africa is more characterized by rock art sites with more than 3,000 in Zimbabwe (Taruvinga, 2005; Walker, 1995) and many in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia (Deacon, 2005).

Notably, Southern Africa has greatly contributed to global knowledge on human evolution. This is because the region has the earliest evidence of modern human behaviour (Henshilwood, 2007; Henshilwood & Marean, 2003; McBrearty & Brooks, 2000; McBrearty & Stringer, 2007; Wurz, 2008). The emergence of modern human behaviour is an aspect that has been debated as to what really constitute modern human behaviour (Klein, 1994, 1995, 2000b, 2001; Henshilwood, 2007; Henshilwood & Marean, 2003; Henshilwood et al., 2001; McBrearty & Brooks, 2000; Wurz, 1999, 2008). Traditionally, the emergence of modern human behaviour was argued to be from Europe around 40 kya, and this has been termed the Upper Paleolithic Revolution. However, recent research has questioned this origin, thus suggesting this development to be from Southern Africa, e.g., Henshilwood et al., 2004. In fact, McBrearty and Brooks (2000) argue that the Upper Paleolithic Revolution was ‘the revolution that wasn’t’, because of evidence from Southern Africa that predates 40 kya.

Towards the end of the 1st millennium AD, Southern Africa experienced social, economic and political transformations. This period ushered in what became known as the Iron Age (Chirikure & Pikirayi, 2008; Chirikure et al., 2013; Huffman, 2007; Pikirayi, 2001, 2017). This period is believed to be a result of the development of agriculture from the north as part of the Bantu migration package (Pikirayi, 2014) that led to sedentarism and the rise of socio-complexity whose annex in the region is characterized by the Zimbabwe Culture (Chirikure et al., 2013; Huffman, 2007; Pikirayi, 2001, 2006). The Iron Age of Southern Africa has documented evidence of long-distance trade links between Southern Africa and other continents, especially Asia and later Europe (Chirikure, 2014; Chirikure et al., 2017; Moffett &

---

**Table 1.** World Heritage Sites from Southern African Countries Considered in This Article

| Country   | World Heritage Sites | Cultural World Heritage Sites | Natural World Heritage Sites | Mixed World Heritage Sites | National monuments/sites |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Zimbabwe  | 5*                   | 3                             | 2                            | 0                         | 168 (http://www.nmmz.co.zw/national-monuments-zimbabwe) |
| South Africa | 10#                  | 5                             | 4                            | 1                         | 3,759 (https://sahris.sahra.org.za/declaredsites) |
| Lesotho    | 1#                   | 0                             | 0                            | 1                         | Unavailable             |
| Botswana   | 2                    | 1                             | 1                            | 0                         | Unavailable             |
| Zambia     | 1*                   | 0                             | 1                            | 0                         | 90 (http://nhcc.org.zm/) |
| Namibia    | 2                    | 1                             | 1                            | 0                         | 132 (https://www.nhc-nam.org/nahris/declaredsites) |

**Source:** UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

**Note:** *shares Victoria Falls World Heritage Site; #shares Maloti-Drakensberg Park World Heritage Site.
Chirikure, 2016; Mudenge, 1974; 1988; Pwiti, 1991, 2005). In Southern Africa, sites such as Great Zimbabwe, Mapungubwe, Thulamela, Manyikeni, Domboshava, Ingombe Illede, Rooiberg, Phalaborwa and Khami attest to the manifestation of the Iron Age occupation within the region.

Given the vast cultural heritage vestiges of Southern Africa, these resources can be conserved, marketed and promoted to the public through online platforms. Information dissemination to the public ensures that the people have a sense of identity, sense of ownership and act as an educational tool for history. Because cultural heritage sector is one of the less funded sectors in most developing countries, the management of such resources is challenging. Most developing countries cannot effectively fund this sector as priority is placed on other sectors deemed as ‘developmental’. After presenting an overview of Southern Africa’s cultural heritage resources, we now turn to the cultural heritage organizations responsible for this sector and their respective countries.

**Zimbabwe**

The National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ) is a statutory body that became operational through the National Museums and Monuments of Rhodesia Act 313 17/1972. After the independence of Zimbabwe, the Act did not change save the name Zimbabwe replaced Rhodesia and the Act was called the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe Act 313 subsequently Chapter 25.11 (Chipunza, 2005; Chiwaura, 2005). Chapter 25.11 was set to establish a board of trustees to administer museums and monuments in Zimbabwe and to provide for the establishment and administration of museums, preservation of ancient, historical and natural monuments, relics and other objects of historical or scientific value or interest. In Zimbabwe, the regulating body of cultural heritage is different from that of natural heritage as there is a separate body and Act that governs natural heritage (Parks and Wildlife Act of 1975, that established Parks and Wildlife Management Authority).

**South Africa**

The management of the country’s heritage is legislated by the National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999. The Act established South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) for the management, conservation, promotion, protection and management of heritage in all its various forms. The Act also aims to ‘empower civil society to nurture and conserve their heritage resources so that they may be bequeathed to future generations’ (South African Government, 1999). One of the major emphasis of the Act is to provide education to the public by raising awareness about the importance of South African heritage.

**Namibia**

The National Heritage Council (NHC) of Namibia is a statutory organization of the government of Namibia established under the National Heritage Act No 27 of 2004. This Act aims at providing for the protection and conservation of places and objects of heritage significance and the registration of such places and objects to establish a National Heritage Council and a National Heritage Register. It is the national administrative body that is responsible for the protection of Namibia’s natural and cultural heritage (https://www.nhc-nam.org/about). This body came into existence in 2005 after replacing the National Monuments Council. Inspired by its mission of identifying, protecting and managing Namibia’s heritage, its vision is to reconcile cultures and share the benefits of the nation’s heritage in diverse cultural identities (https://www.nhc-nam.org/about).
Zambia

The current legislation that governs heritage in Zambia is called the National Heritage Conservation Commission Act 23 of 1989. This Act replaced the Natural and Historical Monuments and Relics Act and then established the National Heritage Conservation Commission (NHCC). It is the prerogative of the Commission to oversee the conservation practices, protection and promotion of cultural and natural heritage.

Botswana

The Monuments and Relics Act of 2001 is the current legislative framework that regulates cultural heritage in Botswana. The National Museum and Art Gallery Board was established under the National Museum and Art Gallery Act of 1967 to oversee the conservation of cultural heritage.

Lesotho

The Historical, Monuments, Relics, Fauna and Flora Act of 1967 resulted in the establishment of the Commission for preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques and the protection of Fauna and Flora. The Commission is responsible for the conservation, protection and promulgation of cultural and natural heritage.

Marketing cultural heritage resources requires the governing bodies to first view these resources as a brand. This means that sometimes, aggressive marketing approaches are required as a way of public awareness or education. Marketing strategies, whether online or not, should be contemporary, engaging and accessible. For these reasons, we analysed online marketing strategies as they best fit these descriptions. The objectives of this article are to identify and compare the online marketing strategies that are used by cultural heritage organizations in Southern Africa, and to assess the effectiveness of these strategies in information dissemination and public awareness.

In a world that has been characterized by a surge in computers, Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), we assess how Southern African cultural heritage agencies are using technology to their advantage as a method of education and information dissemination through the various online platforms. Admittedly, a number of research exist on the role of cultural heritage tourism to different national economies (Keitumetse, 2014; Manwa, 2007; McGregor & Schumaker, 2006; Nkwanyana et al., 2016; Nyawo & Mashau, 2019; Saarinen & Rogerson, 2015; Venske, 2008), however, there is lacuna in the use and role of online marketing strategies for purposes of education and information dissemination at a regional scale, hence, the focus of this article.

Analysis and Results

This study employed a qualitative and quantitative research to understand the online marketing strategies that are being implemented to market and promote Southern African cultural heritage resources. The study evaluated websites using the Information, Communication, Transaction, Relationship and Technical (ICTRT) model as proposed by Li and Wang (2010) and social media platforms.

An analysis of the online marketing strategies employed by the different governmental bodies responsible for cultural heritage in Southern Africa shows that most of them have websites, Facebook
pages, while others use social media platforms such as LinkedIn and Twitter. Only SAHRA has a YouTube channel and uses Instagram as marketing platforms. The Commission for preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques and the protection of Fauna and Flora (Lesotho) and the National Museum and Art Gallery Board (Botswana) do not use any online platform, that is, website or social media (Figure 2).

**Analysis of Websites**

Analysis of websites was more qualitative in nature. Aspects that pertain to the website information, communication, transaction (online payments), technical aspects such as redundancy, consumer facilities and ease of accessing services were analysed. Percentage redundancy was calculated as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{Number of links leading to nothing}}{\text{Total number of links available on website}} \times 100.
\]

The results from the analysis of websites showed that most of these government bodies have information that is not regularly updated, as the information was last updated in 2018 with the exception of SAHRA. The websites do not offer ease services to the public as there are no frequently asked questions (FAQs), automatic response platform, multiple languages, virtual tours, online payment options and online reservations. All websites require one to call or send an email if they want to book a reservation rather than having a straight option of reservation on the websites. Although this research was primarily to assess online strategies in information dissemination, information about tourism facilities is not presented on most websites. Nonetheless, these websites show relatively low redundancies and have contact information feedback forms and links to social media (Table 2).

![Figure 2. An Assessment of Online Marketing Strategies by Different Southern African Countries](image)

**Source:** The authors.

**Note:** Key—0 = absence; 1 = presence.
Table 2. Analysis of Websites of Southern African Cultural Heritage Bodies

| Attribute                          | Zimbabwe                  | South Africa              | Namibia                    | Zambia                     |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Website                            | http://www.nmmz.co.zw/    | https://www.sahra.org.za/ | https://www.nhc-nam.org/   | http://nhcc.org.zm/        |
| % redundancy                       | (8 ÷ 113) = 7.3%          | (0 ÷ 203) = 0%            | (0 ÷ 32) = 0%              | (1 ÷ 31) = 3.2%            |
| Updated Info                       | 2018                      | 2020                      | 2018                       | 2018                       |
| Links to tourism facilities        | ✓                         |                          |                            |                            |
| Online payments                    | X                         |                          | X                          | X                          |
| Virtual tours                      | X                         | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| List of national monuments or sites| ✓                         | ✓                         |                            |                            |
| E-mail                             | ✓                         | ✓                         |                            |                            |
| Phone number                       | ✓                         | ✓                         |                            |                            |
| Address                            | ✓                         | ✓                         |                            |                            |
| Photo gallery                      |                          | X                         | X                          |                            |
| Online reservations                |                          | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| Calendar of events                 |                          | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| FAQs                               |                          | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| Brochure                           | X                         |                          |                            |                            |
| Links to social media              | ✓                         | ✓                         | ✓                          | ✓                          |
| Multiple languages                 |                          | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| Search option                      | ✓                         | ✓                         |                            |                            |
| Interactive                        |                          | X                         | X                          | X                          |
| Feedback form                      | ✓                         | ✓                         | X                          | X                          |

Source: The authors.

The NHC website provides links which should appear with images, but most of these images do not appear. This was not considered as redundancy since the text was showing without accompanying photographs. The NHC website, though it has little information, provides a link to the Namibia Heritage Resources Information System (NAHRIS). The NAHRIS website provides information such as the number of national sites, search facilities of the sites and FAQs; this website is remarkably interactive. It has research permits that gives details of the researcher, nature of permit, date of effect and expiry. The SAHRA website provides a link to one of its departments, the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) from which other SAHRA information such as annual reports can be obtained.

Analysis of Facebook

We analysed this social media platform in two sections: the first being the period prior and just after the introduction of lockdown measures as a result of COVID-19 pandemic. This section was up to 30 June 2020, a period we deemed all Southern African countries had started to deal with the effects of COVID-19 pandemic. The second section is the period from 1 July 2020 to 30 October 2021, since we also aimed at understanding if cultural heritage promotional activities were affected by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The analysis of the use of Facebook employed a quantitative approach because we evaluated the effectiveness of this platform in online marketing and promotion strategies. Variables such as number of
page followers, number of page likes, number of posts, number of photographs and number of videos were assessed. The assessment of Facebook was to understand the effectiveness of such a platform in cultural heritage education dissemination. Admittedly, the analysis of Facebook was affected by the date the page was created; however, the period analysed was from 1 January 2015 to 30 October 2021. The total number of posts recorded are posts within the period in study only; this number includes photographs uploaded, posts shared, posts created, videos uploaded and shared. The number of photographs and videos was not restricted to the period 1 January 2015 to 30 October 2021, because quantification (for the avoidance of error) in relation to this period proved to be a challenge. For the NHCC, the average posts were based on the date of creation of the page since it was created in 2018.

Most Southern African cultural heritage bodies use Facebook as an online marketing strategy and most of these pages were created relatively early and when most people in Africa were aware about this social media platform. However, the number of Facebook posts in relation to the date they were created shows that few cultural heritage bodies really use Facebook as a means of information dissemination. The number of people following and liking the Facebook pages of these bodies is also quite low and possibly a precursor as to why few cultural heritage bodies do not really use Facebook. Nonetheless, SAHRA regardless of the low numbers of people liking it and following it, it is interacting way much more than some bodies with higher following and likes such as NMMZ (Table 3). In 2015 alone, SAHRA’s Facebook page had 234 posts, shares and updates which marked the highest yearly updates from the same page during the period analysed.

The NMMZ website has a link to a Facebook page, but that page seems to be no longer in use. The Facebook page analysed here was created before the one that is linked on NMMZ website. The Facebook page linked on NMMZ website has 112 likes and followers; this page was created on 6 March 2018 and posts were made from 6 to 7 March 2018. For this reason, we decided to analyse the one created in 2013, although it is not officially linked on the NMMZ website, however, we believe that it is authentic.

The results from Facebook analysis of the period linked to COVID-19 pandemic shows a negative trend in the use of this platform by the relevant cultural heritage bodies (Table 4). Given that this period was characterized by numerous online events, it is expected to see more online visibility. However, within the period analysed related to COVID-19 pandemic, Southern Africa’s online outreach remained low. Nonetheless, this trend varies from one cultural heritage body to another. For example, SAHRA and NHC have greatly utilized Facebook as a marketing tool regardless of the pandemic.

**Analysis of YouTube and LinkedIn**

Of the six Southern African prime heritage organizations analysed, only SAHRA has a YouTube channel. The channel’s name is ‘South African Heritage Resources Agency SAHRA’ (https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC19pgFMLy9KeM9bvCXosI_Q). The channel is quite recent as it was created on 6 July 2020. We hope that this channel will be quite useful in information dissemination as it is promising to be a major vehicle towards the marketing of South Africa’s heritage resources. During the time of this analysis, 33 videos were uploaded and the channel had 118 subscribers. The channel has social media links to the agency’s website and Facebook page.

In a review of online marketing strategies by Zimbabwean museums, Mawere and Tevera (2015, pp. 261–262) gave two examples of videos on YouTube. The focus of the videos (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZhuH8yY9JJY and https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JiugVgPxx6Q) is on cultural heritage. However, these videos are found on YouTube channels that are not related to NMMZ or any museum in Zimbabwe. For this reason, we did not include them as videos from NMMZ.
| Attribute          | Zimbabwe                                                                 | South Africa                                           | Namibia                                               | Zambia                                               |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Page name          | National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe                                 | South African Heritage Resources Agency                | National Heritage Council of Namibia                 | National Heritage Conservation Commission             |
|                    | ![Link](https://www.facebook.com/National-Museums-and-Monuments-of-Zimbabwe-467739700011274) | ![Link](https://www.facebook.com/SAHeritageResourcesAgency) | ![Link](https://www.facebook.com/NHCNAMIBIA)         | ![Link](https://www.facebook.com/zambiaheritageconservation/) |
| Date created       | 21 October 2013                                                          | 1 November 2012                                        | 6 June 2011                                           | 15 May 2018                                          |
| Updated            | 2020                                                                     | 2020                                                   | 2020                                                  | 2020                                                 |
| Total posts        | 8                                                                        | 980                                                    | 394                                                   | 24                                                   |
| Average posts/year | 1.5                                                                      | 178.2                                                  | 71.6                                                  | 12                                                   |
| Likes              | 1,897 (112)                                                              | 1,892                                                  | –                                                     | 1,341                                                |
| Followers          | 1,917 (112)                                                              | 1,987                                                  | 2,471                                                 | 1,354                                                |
| Total number       | 26                                                                       | 1,068                                                  | 362                                                   | 34                                                   |
| of photos          |                                                                          |                                                        |                                                       |                                                       |
| Total number       | 0                                                                        | 42                                                     | 23                                                    | 4                                                    |
| of videos          |                                                                          |                                                        |                                                       |                                                       |

Source: The authors.

Note: The data is from 1 January 2015 to 30 June 2020.
| Attribute         | Zimbabwe                                      | South Africa                  | Namibia                        | Zambia                           |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Page name         | National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe    | South African Heritage Resources Agency | National Heritage Council of Namibia | National Heritage Conservation Commission |
|                   | [https://www.facebook.com/National-Museums-and-Monuments-of-Zimbabwe-467739700011274](https://www.facebook.com/National-Museums-and-Monuments-of-Zimbabwe-467739700011274) | [https://www.facebook.com/SAHeritageResourcesAgency](https://www.facebook.com/SAHeritageResourcesAgency) | [https://www.facebook.com/NHCNAMIBIA](https://www.facebook.com/NHCNAMIBIA) | [https://www.facebook.com/zambiaheritageconservation/](https://www.facebook.com/zambiaheritageconservation/) |
| Date created      | 21 October 2013                                | 1 November 2012               | 6 June 2011                     | 15 May 2018                      |
| Posts             | 1                                              | 416                           | 68                             | 0                                |
| Average posts/month | 0.06                                        | 27.7                          | 4.5                            | 0                                |
| Likes             | 105                                            | 352                           | –                              | 780                              |
| Followers         | 111                                            | 351                           | 588                            | 839                              |
| Number of photos  | 0                                              | 201                           | 106                            | 0                                |
| Number of videos  | 0                                              | 15                            | 11                             | 0                                |

**Source:** The authors.

**Note:** The data is from 1 July 2020 to 30 October 2021.
The analysis of LinkedIn consisted only of an upper date limit of 30 October 2021 regardless of when the pages were created. This is because the LinkedIn pages of the institutions analysed were all recently created. SAHRA has two pages, and the other page is called ‘South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)’ (https://www.linkedin.com/company/south-african-heritage-resources-agency-rsa/) that had 362 followers, however, with no post as of 30 June 2020. For that reason, the other page with some posts was analysed as detailed in Table 5. Although SAHRA uses LinkedIn, this platform seems not to be frequently used probably because of a relatively recent creation of the page by the institution. On the other hand, the NHC of Namibia’s LinkedIn page looks to have been abandoned especially when one compares this to the Facebook page of the same institution.

### Table 5. Showing Analysis of LinkedIn Pages

| Name | Website | Page created | Followers | No. of posts | No. of videos |
|------|---------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| SAHRA | https://www.linkedin.com/company/south-african-heritage-resources-agency-rsa/ | November 2019 | 205 | 249 | 8 |
| NHC | https://www.linkedin.com/company/national-heritage-council-of-namibia/ | * | 61 | 0 | 0 |

**Source:** The authors.

**Note:** *Could not be established as the date of the earliest post (which is not there) might save as an indicator of when the page was created.

### Table 6. SAHRA’s Analysis of Twitter Handle

| SAHRA | @SAHRAonline (https://twitter.com/SAHRAonline) |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Followers | 444 |
| Following | 309 |
| Date joined | April 2014 |
| Link to other platforms | ✓ (only website) |
| Tweets | 1,186 |
| Last updated | 22 May 2019 |

**Source:** The authors.

The analysis of LinkedIn consisted only of an upper date limit of 30 October 2021 regardless of when the pages were created. This is because the LinkedIn pages of the institutions analysed were all recently created. SAHRA has two pages, and the other page is called ‘South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)’ (https://www.linkedin.com/company/south-african-heritage-resources-agency-sahra/) that had 362 followers, however, with no post as of 30 June 2020. For that reason, the other page with some posts was analysed as detailed in Table 5. Although SAHRA uses LinkedIn, this platform seems not to be frequently used probably because of a relatively recent creation of the page by the institution. On the other hand, the NHC of Namibia’s LinkedIn page looks to have been abandoned especially when one compares this to the Facebook page of the same institution.

### Analysis of Instagram and Twitter

Only SAHRA is present on Instagram and the account was created more recently in September 2020 (https://www.instagram.com/sa_heritageresourcesagency/). The Instagram page has 30 posts and 33 followers. It could not be established why the other heritage organizations are not present on Instagram. Rather we speculate that their absence might be a result of lack of vibrant marketing teams and strategies or apathy. Only SAHRA uses Twitter as one of its online platforms (Table 6). Nonetheless, SAHRA’s Twitter handle is not up to date in comparison to its other platforms such as Facebook.

### Discussion

Of the six government heritage institutions analysed, four use online marketing strategies while the Commission for preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques and the
protection of Fauna and Flora of Lesotho and the National Museum and Art Gallery Board of Botswana are virtually ‘non-existent’. This study has shown that most Southern African countries are reluctant to use online marketing strategies in cultural heritage sector. We explain the possible reasons of reluctancy as ranging from lack of equipment, or a general dislike of online platforms or lack of staff that can assist with online marketing.

Given the exponential growth of computers worldwide, technological developments and the increase in online skills, we were tempted to assume that a dislike of online platforms might be the plausible explanation. Firstly, some of these national heritage institutions lack staff that is capable of developing online marketing approaches (see Mawere & Tevera, 2015). While marketing departments are in place at most of these institutions, an assessment of their online visibility suggests otherwise. Secondly, these institutions are reluctant to incorporate digital platforms with ‘traditional’ marketing strategies. Here, we use ‘traditional’ to refer to marketing strategies such as the use of printed formats such as guidebooks, maps, pamphlets or school invitations. For an improved marketing opportunity of Southern Africa’s heritage resources, we suggest a more vibrant online presence of the cultural heritage institutions concerned.

In Southern Africa, there is cultural heritage marketing potential that is by hampered by technological challenges. The subject of this article does not require a lot of resources as there is evidence that most cultural heritage governing bodies in Southern Africa have resources needed for online marketing. Hence, these marketing departments need to be technologically strengthened.

One of the major thrusts of cultural heritage organizations is to offer education to the public. In normal circumstances, these services are offered at heritage places or even online. In the wake of the recent novel COVID-19, most heritage places were temporarily closed due to different national lockdowns causing physical visitation to heritage places more difficult compared to online platforms. However, our study has shown that none of the cultural heritage organizations analysed have virtual tours. In assessing the effects of COVID-19, UNESCO (2020) noted that in Africa and the Small Island Developing States, only 5% of museums managed to offer online content to the public. Thus, one major lesson from the COVID-19 pandemic in Southern Africa to the cultural heritage sector is the need for these organizations to fully embrace online platforms. Online marketing strategies are essentially targeted at the youths and the working class. The different online platforms assessed here are populated and frequently accessed by these demographic groups.

However, online platforms certainly pose challenges such as technical barriers. These challenges are inevitable if vibrant online marketing strategies are envisaged. To overcome such barriers, the institutions concerned can involve various technocrats, especially telecommunication specialists. This can also include young science communicators who are comfortable with social media. Hence, while cultural heritage institutions are primarily focused on heritage preservation, a multidisciplinary approach can be helpful in advancing online marketing of Southern African heritage resources.

Without doubt, the general public in Southern Africa seem to be ready for online marketing of heritage. In Zimbabwe for example, the Postal & Telecommunications Regulatory Authority of Zimbabwe (POTRAZ, 2020) reported that for the first quarter of 2020, there was a growth in Internet and data usage resulting from the adoption of e-learning, telecommunication and e-conferencing. However, heritage institutions in Southern Africa are lagging despite the massive public investment in online digital platforms owing much to the COVID-19 outbreak that has restricted physical interaction. In other Southern African countries such as Botswana, South Africa and Namibia, data subscription tariffs are fairly low, which enhances the viability of public outreach through online marketing.

What might be of great advantage to all cultural heritage organizations analysed is to have online payment features. The NHCC website (Zambia) has a cart, but this does not allow one to add any product in it. The websites of the heritage organizations analysed do not have FAQs, online reservations and
multiple languages. The availability of online reservations will ensure ease of service to the public, and this will avoid queues when the public need to purchase tickets. One of the major topical issues in cultural heritage is inclusiveness in heritage dissemination and appreciation. However, in the absence of multiple languages, some members of the public may feel segregated. Ultimately, this can be associated with the need to decolonize the sector by offering multiple languages preferably local ones.

We sought to also determine the effectiveness of the websites analysed. For this analysis, the ICTRT model (Li & Wang, 2010) was used. From the analysis, the SAHRA website has most of these features, and this implies that the website is effective. On the other hand, other cultural heritage organizations analysed have fewer of these features which means that their websites are less effective.

The Facebook pages of the organizations analysed show that this platform generally attracts fewer people. This is observed by the number of people who like and are following the different pages. Despite the relatively lower numbers of likes and followers, SAHRA is greatly utilizing this platform to reach a wider audience than any other cultural heritage organization in the countries analysed. Although NMMZ has a relatively greater number of likes and followers, its Facebook page shows that more can be done (Mawere & Tevera, 2015), as we cemented their argument through quantification of Facebook posts. We speculate that NMMZ Facebook page was created and seem to be in an abandoned state. This is supported by an average annual post of 1.5 for the five-and half-year period analysed, and this means that the Facebook page goes for several months without any post from NMMZ. Particularly for NMMZ, we concur with Mawere and Tevera (2015) that if this organization needs to realize its full potential and be relevant, it should be active, up to date and use online platforms.

The British Council (2016), in a report published on museums and cultural heritage in Zimbabwe, noted that marketing, digital technologies, business and finance were the top three missing transversal skills within the cultural sector. These three are closely interlinked as the lack of business and finance strategies will result in lack of digital technologies; hence, online marketing cannot be fully achieved. The British Council (2016) indicated that there is need for the cultural sector in Zimbabwe to employ recent graduates, as most staff members currently employed at these institutions lack required skills in digital technologies. Appointment of qualified personnel is also a key area with specific reference to the marketing department, which is ad hoc, not well-structured nor well-coordinated, and hence, lack required professional skills in marketing (Mugunzva, 2016). The administration of cultural institutions in Southern Africa should, therefore, strive to employ the qualified personnel to realize their full potential concerning digital marketing of heritage resources. In this line of argument, it is, therefore, important to merge marketing skills with digital skills to enhance the cultural sectors’ use of modern technologies.

What this study has shown is that some cultural heritage organizations are very centralized. This is particularly for NMMZ and NHCC. The NMMZ has five administrative regions, but on its website, contact details of various regions are that of the headquarters. This is the same for the NHC that has four regions. The effect of this is that the public cannot make direct enquiries to a particular regional office, this may result in pressure on the headquarters’ office to effectively manage. Therefore, we recommend a decentralized approach in the management of these organizations so that each region might increase its audience resulting in better cultural heritage dissemination programmes.

Comparatively, SAHRA has better online marketing strategies. Most of its online platforms are evenly managed as they do not show an over-emphasis on one platform. One of the most commendable features is that only SAHRA’s annual reports are accessible to the public, while those of other organizations in the region are not available online (see Mugayi, 2014). Based on the observation that South Africa has better marketing strategies in the region, we suggest regional cooperation. At present, we are not aware of any regional initiatives towards vibrant online marketing strategies between cultural heritage institutions of these countries. We propose that regional co-operation might be imperative in this endeavour, with South Africa as a resource of experience. This co-operation should not only focus on
marketing cultural heritage through online platforms but on marketing strategies in general. Even with ‘traditional’ marketing strategies, their efficiency in Southern Africa is yet to be demonstrated.

Conclusions

One the objectives of this study was to identify online marketing strategies used in the promotion of cultural heritage of Southern Africa. The analysis shows that four of the six organizations analysed, namely NMMZ, SAHRA, NHC and NHCC use multiple online strategies, while the other two do not. The online marketing strategies include websites, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and LinkedIn. SAHRA uses a plethora of online platforms than any other heritage organization. Of all online platforms, Facebook seems to be the most preferred platform by Southern African cultural heritage institutions here analysed. This is because most Facebook pages contain current information that is otherwise absent on other online platforms including institutions’ websites.

This study analysed the commitment to online cultural heritage promotion by six governments in Southern Africa as these institutions were legislated by their respective parliaments. For that reason and for the purpose of consistency, only legislated and prime governmental bodies responsible for cultural heritage were analysed. With this in mind, we recommend respective Southern African governments to invest in cultural heritage through ICT infrastructures. The development of ICTs has led to the availability of relatively cheaper resources for online strategies. Online marketing strategies have been growing due to the exponential growth of computers and ICTs. An investment in ICT development will also ensure that these organization’s websites are up to date, have much lower levels of redundancy and the public is kept abreast. Ultimately, this means that more opportunities can be realized on both ends that is the public and the cultural heritage organizations. At the end, we ask whether Southern Africa is ready to market its cultural heritage resources using online platforms?
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