



Tourism Governance in Transition Period: Restructuring Kenya's Tourism Administration from Centralized to Devolved System

Rayviscic Mutinda. Ndivo & Roselyne N. Okech

To cite this article: Rayviscic Mutinda. Ndivo & Roselyne N. Okech (2019): Tourism Governance in Transition Period: Restructuring Kenya's Tourism Administration from Centralized to Devolved System, *Tourism Planning & Development*, DOI: [10.1080/21568316.2019.1580210](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1580210)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1580210>



Published online: 01 Mar 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 94



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Tourism Governance in Transition Period: Restructuring Kenya's Tourism Administration from Centralized to Devolved System

Rayviscic Mutinda. Ndivo^a and Roselyne N. Okech^b

^aSchool of Hospitality, Travel and Tourism Management, Mount Kenya University, Thika, Kenya; ^bTourism Studies Program, Grenfell Campus – Memorial University of Newfoundland, Corner Brook, Canada

ABSTRACT

This study sought to examine the efficacy of tourism administration within Kenya's devolved system of government. The study was based on content analysis of official documents and websites from the national and county governments in Kenya. Nine counties out of the 47 were further purposively selected for analysis of the tourism functionalities undertaken by the county governments. Data were analysed using thematic data analysis based on predetermined research questions. The study found out that whereas the role of both levels of government in Kenya's tourism development is clearly identified, gaps exist that would hamper coordinated development of a competitive tourism industry in the country. This study thus identifies a number of lessons for tourism administration restructuring for destinations transiting from centralized to decentralized government system including the need for a clear delineation of tourism development functions between national and devolved government units, institutional and functional alignment between national and devolved government levels, a clear coordination mechanism between the tourism development mandates of the two levels of government, need to standardize tourism administration and development institutional framework and functions across the devolved units, and the need for capacity building of the devolved units during the transition point.

KEYWORDS

Tourism administration; centralized vs decentralized administration; regulatory theory; destinations in transition; tourism in Kenya

Introduction

Effective governance is key to creating and maintaining an enabling environment, essential to the achievement of social and economic objectives in any country. This involves the establishment of institutions that are designed to provide the structural framework necessary to guarantee long-term stability of economic exchanges and social economic processes (Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000). Such institutions therefore represent a vital input for economic growth and indeed explains the development gaps between economies. In the tourism sector, institutional configurations have been identified as being responsible for the sector's structural and spatial characteristics (Britton, 1991).

CONTACT Rayviscic Mutinda. Ndivo  raymutinda@yahoo.com  School of Hospitality, Travel and Tourism Management, Mount Kenya University, P.O. Box 342, Thika, Kenya

© 2019 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

In Kenya, the tourism industry occupies a central role in the country's socio-economic development agenda. The industry is currently the country's third leading export sector, making a significant contribution to such important economic indicators as the country's Balance of Payment, the GDP, and employment creation. For instance, in 2013, the travel and tourism industry generated KES 462.8bn accounting for 12.1% of Kenya's GDP; recorded a total investment of KES 55.8bn, 7.6% of total investment in the country; and supported a total of 589,500 jobs representing 10.6% of the country's total employment (WTTC, 2014). Such significant contribution has accorded the sector prominence in virtually all the country's major socio-economic development frameworks including the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERSWEC) 2003–2007 (Government of Kenya [GoK], 2003) and the Vision 2030 (GoK, 2007).

In the year 2010, Kenya adopted a new Constitution that changed the country from a centralized system of government to a devolved one that features a central national government and 47 semi-autonomous counties. The constitution further delineated administrative functions between the national and the county governments (GoK, 2010). This paper therefore examines the institutionalization of the tourism sector within this devolved system of government with a view to examining any institutional gaps that may have a bearing on the country's tourism development. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What are the tourism development mandates of the national and county governments in Kenya?

RQ2: What is the nature of linkage between the county and national public tourism institutions?

RQ3: What are the perspectives of county governments of their constitutional tourism development mandate as demonstrated by their institutional structures and functionalities?

Study theoretical and empirical underpinning

Relevant to this study are two major theoretical foundations of public administration: the regulatory school of thought of political economy, and the centralized vs decentralized administration systems. These are expounded in sections below. In addition, a review of extant literature on the distribution of tourism functions within a decentralized system is also provided.

The regulatory theory of political economy

One of the key logic underpinning the theory of political economy is that the economy is embedded in historical, political, socio-cultural and geographical contexts. These contexts influence the structures that organize accumulation and distribution (Bramwell & Meyer, 2007; Coles & Church, 2007). In this sense, political economy focuses on analysing how public policy is created and implemented and by extension, recognizes that institutions are embedded in networks of social relations. The institutional approach to the political economy is thus concerned with the institutional regime of the economy. Such regime consists of the institutional environment (covering both informal structures, and officially formalized laws and regulations) and specific institutional arrangements

(i.e. the specific configuration of organizations that are involved in regulation) (Yüksel & Yüksel, 2000).

Changes in institutional arrangement between new and existing governance systems are embedded in the regulatory theory of the political economy. This approach to political economy originally focused on the emergence of new socio-economic institutional forms and the tensions between them and existing institutional arrangements (Cornelissen, 2005, 2011; Boyer & Saillard, 2002; Mosedale, 2011). The theory primarily examines the relationships between states, governance and society. Accordingly, it studies historical change of the political economy through two central concepts: the *regime of accumulation* (referring to the manner in which production, circulation, consumption, and distribution organize and expand capital in a way that stabilizes the economy over time); and the *mode of regulation* (the structures that sustain the survival of the *regime of accumulation* by regulating economic behaviour and for the resolution of conflict) (Cornelissen, 2005, 2011; Mosedale, 2011). Regulatory theory thus focuses on the transformation of social relations that create new forms of economic and non-economic structures and hence, regenerates the mode of reproduction (Boyer & Saillard, 2002).

Within tourism, the scope of regulatory attention is given to a number of themes including analysing the organization of institutions and the allocation of roles and responsibilities (Church, Ball, Bull, & Tyler, 2000; Dredge, 2006; Hall, 1997; Hall & Jenkins, 1995; Ruhanen, Scott, Ritchie, & Tkaczynski, 2010; UNWTO, 2007; Zhang & Zhu, 2014); tourism policy formulation including the process through which the policy agenda for tourism is shaped, the way in which tourism problems are defined and alternatives are considered, and how choices are made and decisions and actions taken (Hall & Jenkins, 1995, p. 19); policy coordination challenges associated with the spread of tourism across governmental structures and the consequences of splitting tourism development functions between different levels of government (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007; Hall, 2009, p. 2010); and restructuring of public administration with respect to tourism (Dredge, 2001; Dredge & Jenkins, 2003a, 2003b, 2007; Hall, 2010).

Centralized vs decentralized tourism administration systems

Policymaking has always adapted two opposing administrative frameworks, the centralized (top-down) and decentralized (bottom-up) administrative structures. Within the tourism sector, decentralized system has been majorly adapted by developed economies while developing countries have tended to lean towards the centralized structures. Such structures are characterized by national governments deciding on sector policies and providing much of the infrastructure and services. Accordingly, this results in the concentration of authority and decision-making within the central state and its bureaucracies (Oliveira, 2002; Rondinelli, McCullough, & Johnson, 1989; Yüksel, Bramwell, & Yüksel, 2005). As Wahab (1997) posits, the preference of the centralized tourism administration structures in developing economies is informed by the sector being consideration as an industry of national concern which should be centrally planned and controlled. This results in lack of a system that would allow decisions to be taken by the people most immediately affected by them.

The ability of centralized administration systems to achieve the desired tourism development outcomes is limited owing to the fact that decisions are usually taken at levels

distant from those who are most affected by them (Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000). As a result, such decisions in many occasions are out of touch with the needs of local stakeholders as they may not be based on detailed knowledge of the local environment. Further, such decisions generally overlook the knowledge, skills and goals of local tourism organizations, both public and private. Moreover, the physical distance can impact on the willingness of local stakeholders to participate in both the decision-making process and their implementation (Turner & Hulme, 1997; Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000).

The identified limitations of the centralized tourism administration have provided the basis for the decentralized approach; believed to offer improvements in the efficiency of service delivery, and to bring decision-making closer to those affected by it (Turner & Hulme, 1997). Decentralization involves the delegation of power to lower levels in territorial hierarchy and thus refers to territorial-based delegation not to purely functional-based delegation (Smith, 1985). It thus gives the local actors power to decide and plan their own development projects that results in better levels of development since local actors are more knowledgeable of their capacities and their needs. However, decentralization may fail where local decision- and policy-makers lack the necessary expertise (Lake & Rothchild, 2005). In addition, as Nasser and Donsimoni (2012) argue, political rather than economic reasons form the major driving force behind decentralization in most countries. In such cases, the latter is assigned peripheral consideration and may not receive the requisite policy and fiscal attention.

Decentralization however, does not imply that all authority should be delegated from the central government to the regional or local authorities. In most cases, arrangements exist where the central government retains a core of essential national functions and assumes a supervisory role over the local units. Accordingly, on the basis of how authority is transferred, decentralization could be classified into two categories: *territorial* and *functional* decentralization (Turner & Hulme, 1997). In territorial decentralization, authority is placed geographically closer to service providers and clients. On the other hand, functional decentralization involves authority being transferred to an agency that is functionally specialized. Based on these two forms, a number of versions of decentralization are possible. For instance, functional decentralization may occur in three different forms: delegation within formal political structures, (e.g. between central government and local government); transfer of power within public administrative or parastatal structures, (e.g. between the headquarters of a ministry and its district offices); and transfer of power from an institution of the state to a non-state agency (Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000). On its part, the territorial decentralization can be divided into two forms: deconcentration and devolution. Deconcentration involves extending the scope of functions by moving executive agencies from the centre down to lower territorial levels in the political system (Crook & Manor, 1994). While this version may result in greater effectiveness, it has been noted as lacking popular participation (Turner & Hulme, 1997). The devolution type on the other hand, involves transferring powers and functions from the central government to legally incorporated local governments that have their own legal personalities and separate from the central government, its central ministries, and local authorities (Alderfer, 1967, p. 53). This thus gives the devolved units full responsibility for policy determination in regard to specified locally-run subject areas.

While decentralization has been billed as a counter to the limitations of the centralized system, a number of limitations have also been noted as affecting the system. First,

countries switching from a centralized to a decentralized system are likely to encounter a number of problems during such transition mainly emanating from the reluctance of the national leadership to share their authority (Crook & Manor, 1994; Turner & Hulme, 1997; Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000). In addition, the transfer of responsibilities from the central to the decentralized units may not always be accompanied by corresponding transfer of financial resources. Moreover, lack of competencies at the local level may lead to excessive wastage of the devolved resources as their administration and deployment may be entrusted to inexperienced, ill-trained and underpaid staff (Yuksel & Yüksel, 2000). In view of such limitations, decentralization may be potentially difficult to implement and often may yield very limited or negative outcomes at a high cost (Smith, 1985; Turner & Hulme, 1997). However, if well embraced and strategically implemented, decentralization presents a more viable tourism administration pathway.

Distribution of tourism functions within a decentralized system

Depending on the usage, the concept of governance assumes diverse definitions. For example, the corporate dimension defines governance as “the system by which companies are directed and controlled” (Cadbury 1992, p. 15). On the other hand, the political science dimension as fronted by Rhodes (1997, p. 15) regards governance as “the self-organizing inter-organizational networks characterized by interdependence, resource exchange, rules of the game and autonomy from the state”. In the case of tourism sector governance, Ruhanen et al. (2010) argue that both political science and corporate approaches are applied as evident from the works of Nordin and Svensson (2007), Palmer (1998) and, Svensson, Nordin, and Flagestad (2006). This perspective is informed by the fact that governance in the tourism sector lies at the intersection of the public, private and community sectors (Ruhanen et al., 2010).

As to what constitutes the dimensions of governance, Ruhanen et al. (2010) in their ground breaking study involving a review of 53 published governance studies identified 40 separate dimensions of governance. The authors further found six dimensions of governance as being the most prominent, thus: accountability, transparency, involvement, structure, effectiveness and power. The current study focuses primarily on the structure and effectiveness dimensions of governance with respect to the restructuring of the public sector functions from a centralized to a decentralized system.

A number of studies have identified the presence of clear roles and responsibilities and clear operational structures and processes as being prominent characteristics of effective destination governance (Beaumont & Dredge, 2010; d’Angella, Carlo, & Sainaghi, 2010; Ruhanen et al., 2010; Zhang & Zhu, 2014). Subsequently, analysis has been undertaken on tourism structures in different countries and the roles of different levels of government (Costa, Panyik, & Buhalis, 2014; Lennon, Smith, Cockerell, & Trew, 2006; OECD, 2014).

Destinations have generally applied varied frameworks in the distribution of tourism functions between the national and devolved units. As a general practice however, the national level is responsible for the more strategic roles while the local level focuses on the more operational elements of tourism development (UNWTO, 2007). Specifically, national governments assume a leading role in: defining national tourism policy; establishing the regulatory framework that reflects the overall development goal of the country’s tourism industry; leads and coordinates international promotion; provides statistics,

research and analysis to support industry development, policy development and marketing for the overall tourism industry; establishes mechanisms and institutions to provide the human, financial and material resources necessary for quality tourism; promotes the national co-ordination of public and private initiatives in the field of tourism; and provides assistance to local and regional authorities in tourism development initiatives (Guerin, 2004; Ndivo, Waudo & Waswa, 2013; OECD, 2014; Ontario Ministry of Tourism, 2009).

The local or regional authorities on the other hand, undertake the role of developing tourism in their respective areas under the coordination of the national government including: setting objectives for regional tourism development; promoting the region as a tourism destination mainly within the domestic market (and sometimes at the international level in partnership with the national tourism organization or jointly with other regions); collecting, processing and disseminating data on regional tourism; and co-ordinating public and private sector tourism development initiatives within the region (Guerin, 2004; Ontario Ministry of Tourism, 2009). Within such frameworks, national tourism development is achieved in a coordinated and participatory manner featuring the contribution of both public and private sectors at national and regional levels. In addition, regions are also accorded space and support to develop the industry within their individual or clustered jurisdictions. This scenario is well demonstrated in the case of South Africa where the South African Tourism works with independent provincial tourism authorities and other stakeholders to roll out the insight, the global strategy and the specific expression for each province and product (Republic of South Africa, 2016). This allows smooth coordination and implementation of the country's tourism industry that has grown to become a top destination in Africa.

Nonetheless, regional examples exist where such coordination has not always been smooth. In the case of Ethiopia for instance, a situational analysis of the country's tourism provided in the Sustainable Tourism Master Plan 2015–2025 (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2015) indicates that its National Tourism Development Policy (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2009) lacks clear guidelines and a programme for implementation including a link between the Federal level of government and the regional states. In addition, regional tourism development instruments are not aligned to the broader national tourism development goals and thus notes the need to harmonize such instruments at both levels to ensure that tourism development and growth is conflict free. A further need is noted for a well-coordinated and managed approach to the various institutions and measures put in place to enhance the capacity of such institutions to deliver on their respective mandates (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2015).

In view of the foregoing, the current study focuses on the effectiveness of tourism administration under the devolution-type territorial decentralization just after changes in institutional arrangement between new and existing governance systems. It examines the extent of restructuring of public administration with respect to tourism and thus analyses the organization of institutions and the allocation of roles and responsibilities.

Study methods

The study analyses content of a number of official and legal documents and websites from national and county governments, and relevant tourism institutions in Kenya with a view to responding to the research questions identified above. Data were then analysed using

Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA). This approach allows subjective interpretation of text data content through identifying and coding categories or themes of similar meanings that respond to the research questions (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Moretti et al., 2011). In the current study, the deductive approach to QCA was used. This approach allows preconceived codes or categories derived from prior relevant theory, research or literature to be used in the analysis of data (Cavanagh, 1997; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Kondracki, Wellman, & Amundson, 2002; Mayring, 2000). Based on the literature on the distribution of tourism functions between the national and devolved units reviewed above (Guerin, 2004; Ndivo et al., 2013; OECD, 2014; Ontario Ministry of Tourism, 2009).

Under the National government functions, the following seven themes were predetermined: N1: Defining national tourism policy; N2: Establishing the regulatory framework that reflects the overall development goal of the country's tourism industry; N3: Leading and coordination of international promotion; N4: Providing statistics, research and analysis to support industry development, policy development and marketing for the overall tourism industry; N5: Establishing mechanisms and institutions to provide the human, financial and material resources necessary for quality tourism; N6: Promoting national co-ordination of public and private initiatives in the field of tourism; and N7: Providing assistance to local and regional authorities in tourism development initiatives.

On the other hand, under the Local or regional authorities functions, the following four themes were predetermined: LR1: Setting objectives for regional or local tourism development; LR2: Promoting the region as a tourism destination mainly within the domestic market (and sometimes at the international level in partnership with the national tourism organization or jointly with other regions); LR 3: Collecting, processing and disseminating data on regional tourism; and LR4: Co-ordinating public and private sector tourism development initiatives within the region. Data obtained from secondary sources were then coded according to these predetermined categories and the appropriate subcategories.

To respond to research questions RQ1 and RQ2, a content analysis of key legislations was undertaken including the Fourth Schedule of Kenya's Constitution (GoK, 2010), the Tourism Act of 2011 (GoK, 2011), and the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act of 2013 (GoK, 2013a). Further analysis involved that of Strategic Plans and official websites of different tourism institutions in Kenya including those established under the Tourism Act, 2011 (GoK, 2011) (thus: Kenya Utalii College, Kenya Tourism Board, Kenyatta International Convention Centre, Tourism Fund, and the Tourism Finance Corporation), and other relevant institutions not specifically provided under the Tourism Act, 2011 such as the Bomas of Kenya (BoK), National Museums of Kenya (NMK), and the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS).

To answer research question RQ3, the official websites of all the 47 county governments in Kenya and the report by the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution (CIC) on "Assessment of the implementation of the system of devolved government" (GoK, 2014a) were first analysed. This was done with a view to identify the county governments' tourism institutional framework. Further, nine counties were purposively selected for analysis of the tourism functionalities undertaken by the devolved governments in Kenya. These composed of those Counties with the highest tourist activity based on the presence of a leading tourist attraction and/or the share of national tourism arrivals (as indicated in Kenya's 2014 Economic Survey (GoK 2014b, pp. 211, 214)). Through this

approach, information-rich cases were identified and selected in line with the research objectives (Patton, 2002; Zhi, 2014). The ultimate goal was to identify what Counties perceived as being their tourism development mandate. Table 1 provides a summary of the selected counties and the rationale for their choice.

Under each research question, the emerging themes were then tabulated, analysed and conclusions drawn.

Results and discussions

Tourism development mandate of the national and county governments in Kenya

The distribution of functions between the national and county governments in Kenya is featured in the Fourth Schedule of Kenya's Constitution (GoK, 2010). Primarily, the national government is charged with overall responsibility over tourism policy and development while the county governments are responsible for local tourism as part of their general mandate on trade development and regulation (GoK, 2010, pp. 175, 177) (see Table 2).

(a) Role of national government in tourism development

From the findings of this study, the two levels of government in Kenya embraces the tourism development functions identified in the extant body of literature reviewed. Nonetheless, of importance to note is that whereas the Kenyan constitution only provides for a few functions as noted in Table 2 above, the national government has established a

Table 1. Profile of the counties selected for the study.

County	Rationale
1. Kwale	Home to the Southern Coastal beaches and the Mijikenda Kaya forests—a UNESCO World Heritage Site
2. Kilifi	Home to the North Coast beaches
3. Mombasa	A coastal county that is the leading leisure destination in Kenya, home to the Fort Jesus—a UNESCO World Heritage Site
4. Nairobi	Kenya's capital, home to the Nairobi national park, and the leading business tourism destination in Kenya
5. Nakuru	home to Nakuru and Elementaita National parks, part of the Rift Valley Lake system, a UNESCO World Heritage Site
6. Narok	home to Masai Mara national reserve
7. Kajiado	Part of the greater Nairobi metropolis, home to the Amboseli national park, and a part of Nairobi and Chyulu national parks
8. Nyeri	The leading destination in the central region of the country and home to Aberdares national park, and part of Mount Kenya national park—a UNESCO World Heritage site
9. Machakos	Part of the greater Nairobi Metropolis, and the most popular domestic tourism destination

Table 2. Distribution of tourism administration functions between national and county governments.

National government	County governments
(i) Tourism policy and development.	(i) Trade development and regulation, including, among others, local tourism
(ii) National betting, casinos and other forms of gambling.	(ii) Licensing and control of undertakings that sell food to the public
(iii) Protection of the environment and natural resources, including protection of animals and wildlife, among others	(iii) County cultural activities, public entertainment and public amenities,
(iv) Ancient and historical monuments of national importance.	(iv) County planning and development, including among others, statistics
(v) Capacity building and technical assistance to the counties	

number of institutions and agencies to execute its functions. Table 3 summarizes tourism development functions performed at the national level.

(a) Responsibilities of county government in tourism development

From the provisions of the Constitution, the county governments have been given the relevant mandate to develop the tourism sector at the local level including the development of cultural, heritage, recreation, and beach products (where applicable); and promotion of tourism investment under the trade development function. Further, while the national government retains the function of protecting animals and wildlife, the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act of 2013 (GoK, 2013a) allows counties to develop the wildlife product by managing national reserves created by the national government Minister-in charge of wildlife (GoK, 2013a, section 35). In addition, the Act provides for the establishment of wildlife conservancies owned by either individual landowners, body corporates, group of owners, or a community (GoK, 2013a, section 39). Furthermore, it is important to note that the Constitution requires the national government to provide capacity building and technical assistance to the counties in the execution of its functions, tourism development included.

From the analysis of tourism development functions undertaken by the counties, this study establishes that though not at equal measures, the county governments in Kenya perform the requisite functions for devolved units of government as identified in the literature. First, the counties perform the function of setting objectives for regional or local tourism development. This involves two main categories: (a) *County tourism planning and management* including tourism policy management; formulation of tourism development strategic plans; establishment of legal and institutional framework on tourism management, (b) *Implementation of national policies and regulations*. This takes the form of implementation of national tourism policies, regulations, strategies and programmes; implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism; and domestication and implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism.

In addition, the function of tourism promotion is also undertaken at the county level. The main focus is mainly on promoting the counties as tourism destinations mainly within the domestic market. The aspect of promoting the counties at the international level in partnership with the national tourism organization or jointly with other regions is largely missing among all the counties examined. On the third function, of collecting, processing and disseminating data on regional tourism, the only evidence that county governments in Kenya perform this function is that of dissemination of tourism information with no indication of any efforts to collect and process the data before disseminating it. Lastly, the counties undertake the function of co-ordinating public and private sector tourism development initiatives within the region. This is undertaken in the form of *Standardization and control of the tourism industry that includes such functions as* Maintenance of standards in tourism products and facilities; Coordinate and facilitate the management and control of county specific tourism activities; Administration and regulation of betting; casinos and other forms of gambling levies; and Liquor licensing.

In addition to the functions identified in literature, counties in Kenya also perform two other functions. First, there is a focus on the development of the tourism sector. This involves diversification and development of tourism niche products; mapping out tourist attraction sites and conservancies; promotion of tourism investments; development of tourism

Table 3. Kenya: Tourism Development functions of National government.

Theme	Categories and sub-categories
N1: Defining national tourism policy	Tourism policy and development (Const.)
N2: Establishing the regulatory framework that reflects the overall development goal of the country's tourism industry	(i) Regulation National betting, casinos and other forms of gambling (Const. BCLB). (ii) Sustainable tourism development: • Regulate tourism activities and services countrywide (TRA), • Conservation, Protection and management of the environment and natural resources, including protection of animals and wildlife, among others (Const, KWS). • Establishment of county wildlife conservation committees (KWS) • Development of mechanisms for benefit sharing with communities living in wildlife areas (KWS) • Preservation of ancient and historical monuments of national importance (Const., BoK) • Promoting the conservation and sustainable utilization of national heritage (NMK)
N3: Leading and coordination of international promotion	(i) To develop, implement and co-ordinate a national tourism marketing strategy (KTB) (ii) Market Kenya at local, national, regional and international levels as a premier tourist destination (KTB) (iii) Identify tourism market needs and trends and advise tourism stakeholders accordingly (KTB) (iv) Developing and implementing the national strategy for meetings, incentives for conferences and exhibitions (KICC)
N4: Providing statistics, research and analysis to support industry development, policy development and marketing for the overall tourism industry	(i) Collect and analyse information, for the tourism sector and other clients in the private and public sectors (TRMI) (ii) Assess strategies and techniques for product development and marketing (TRMI) (iii) Determine, in consultation with lead agencies, the carrying capacities of the various tourism destinations and conservation needs and priorities (TRMI) (iv) Give information on early warning, disaster management, impacts and mitigation and adaptive strategies to climate change (TRMI) (v) Promote and undertake extension service programmes intended to enhance wildlife conservation, education and training (KWS)
N5: Establishing mechanisms and institutions to provide the human, financial and material resources necessary for quality tourism	(i) Capacity building for the tourism sector human resource (KUC) (ii) Specialized short-term courses on conservation and sustainable utilization of national (NMK) (iii) Finance the development of tourism products and services (TF, TFC) (iv) Mobilize resources to support tourism-related activities (TF) (v) Provide for investment opportunities in the tourism sector (TFC) (vi) Provide business advisory services to the tourism sector (TFC) (vii) Visitor safety (TPS)
N6: Promoting national co-ordination of public and private initiatives in the field of tourism	(i) Formulating guidelines and measures for sustainable tourism throughout the country (TRA) (ii) Monitor and assess tourist activities and services to enhance continuous improvement and adherence to sound principles and practices of sustainable tourism (TRA) (iii) Ensure the development and implementation of high quality tourism sector (TRA)

(Continued)

Table 3. Continued.

Theme	Categories and sub-categories
N7: Providing assistance to local and regional authorities in tourism development initiatives.	(i) Capacity building and technical assistance to the counties (Const.) (ii) Assist and advise in the preparation of management plans for community and private wildlife conservancies and sanctuaries (KWS)

Keys: TRA: Tourism Regulatory Authority; KUC: Kenya Utalii College; TPS: Tourism Protection Service; KTB: Kenya Tourism Board; KICC: Kenyatta International Convention Centre; TRMI: Tourism Research and Monitoring Institute; TF: Tourism Fund; TFC: Tourism Finance Corporation; BoK: Bomas of Kenya; NMK: National Museums of Kenya; KWS: Kenya Wildlife Service.

infrastructure and amenities; and development of partnerships for tourism development. Secondly, the counties focus on sustainable tourism development. This involves management and protection of cultural and natural heritage; facilitation of development funds for local tourism facilities; and promotion of community based tourism (Table 4).

Table 4. Kenya: Tourism development functions of County Governments.

Theme	Category and sub-categories
LR1: Setting objectives for regional or local tourism development	<i>County tourism planning and management</i> including • Tourism policy management; • Formulation of tourism development strategic plans; • Establishment of legal and institutional framework on tourism management <i>Implementation of national policies and regulations</i> including • Implementation of national tourism policies, regulations, strategies and programmes; • Implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism; and • Domestication and implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism
LR2: Promoting the region as a tourism destination mainly within the domestic market or at the international level in partnership with the national tourism organization or jointly with other regions	• <i>To promote tourism in the county</i> • <i>Support marketing of domestic tourism</i>
LR 3: Collecting, processing and disseminating data on regional tourism	<i>Dissemination of tourism information</i>
LR4: Co-ordinating public and private sector tourism development initiatives within the region	<i>Standardization and control of the tourism industry:</i> • Maintenance of standards in tourism products and facilities, • Coordination and facilitation of management and control of county specific tourism activities, • Administration and regulation of betting, casinos and other forms of gambling levies, and • Liquor licensing
Others	
LR 5: Development of the tourism sector	• Diversification and develop tourism niche products; Mapping out tourist attraction sites and conservancies; promotion of tourism investments; Development of tourism infrastructure and amenities; Development of partnerships for tourism development
LR 6: Sustainable tourism development.	• Management and protection of cultural and natural heritage; Facilitation of the provision of funds for development of local tourism facilities; and Promotion of Community based tourism

A further analysis was carried out on what the counties specifically perceived as being their tourism development mandate. A total of nine functional thematic areas were identified (Table 5). The most common functions performed by majority of the counties were related to tourism marketing and promotion (indicated by seven counties) followed by tourism development (indicated by six counties). Other major functional themes arising included the promotion of tourism investment and county tourism planning and management (both indicated by four counties each).

A number of important observations are worthy highlighting as pertains to functions indicated by individual counties. Narok County, for instance features in all the nine thematic areas while Nairobi City only featured in one, tourism planning and management. In the case of Narok (home to the world renown Masai Mara game reserve that generates billions of Kenya shillings per annum) the county lists 15 functions as being the mandate of its Directorate of Tourism and Wildlife. One of the key observations about the county is that it is the only one that indicates implementation of national tourism policies and regulations as one of its mandate. However, some of the functions under this theme appears to be outside the scope of the functions of the counties as assigned under the Constitution. Notable functions include “Implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism” and “Domestication and implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism as appropriate”. These functions are in the domain of the national government and thus an indication of lack of appreciation of the county’s mandate. It also raises pertinent questions on the level of attention to detail accorded to the county’s tourism development responsibilities and would therefore, be interesting to see how the county implements such mandates.

Nairobi, home to Kenya’s capital city and that receives the highest business tourist arrivals (GoK, 2014b), identifies its tourism mandate as being solely focused on “the policy formulation leadership in local tourism and wildlife management” with no mention of any other core tourism development functions. Further, Mombasa, the leading coastal destination for both domestic and international leisure tourists (GoK, 2014b) does not consider important functions as tourism marketing and promotion, and tourism development—including product innovation and development, as key to its mandate. These omissions by Nairobi and Mombasa counties should be of great concern to the country’s tourism industry in general. This is in taking note of the pivotal role played by both Nairobi (as the national capital and the hub for the country’s business tourism) and the Mombasa (Kenya’s leading leisure destination for domestic and international tourists). These two regions not only attract the highest visitors, they also host the highest share of the country’s tourist hotels and conference facilities (GoK, 2014b). Most importantly, they form key anchor destinations for the rest of the destinations in the country.

It is also informative to note that concerns have been raised about the quality and safety of the coastal product in Kenya (GoK, 2008; World Bank, 2010). In particular, the World Bank’s 2010 “Polishing the Jewel” report on Kenya’s tourism sector (World Bank, 2010), Mombasa, Kenya’s largest coastal resort, suffers from among others

... out-of-date and tired lodging options, which are not attractive to travellers able to select from numerous beach destinations; inadequate infrastructure (that is, poor roads, water shortages, expensive and limited utilities, and insufficient waste management); and a predictable product mix (that is, lack of innovative and exciting product offerings for travellers) ... (World Bank, 2010, p. 15)

Table 5. Tourism functions performed by selected counties in Kenya.

County function	Kajiado	Kilifi	Kwale	Machakos	Mombasa	Nairobi	Narok	Nyeri	Nakuru	No. of Counties
1. <i>Tourism marketing and promotion</i>										7
To promote tourism in the county	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Dissemination of tourism information			✓							
Support marketing of domestic tourism	✓	✓								
2. <i>Tourism development including(product innovation and development)</i>										6
To develop tourism in the county	✓		✓	✓			✓	✓		
Diversify and develop tourism niche products		✓	✓	✓						
Map out all the tourist attraction sites and conservancies	✓	✓	✓	✓						
3. <i>Promote tourism investment</i>										5
Promote tourism investment		✓		✓			✓		✓	
Development of tourism infrastructure and amenities					✓					
4. <i>County tourism planning and management</i>										5
County tourism policy management				✓		✓			✓	
Develop tourism development strategic plans							✓	✓		
Establish legal and institutional framework on tourism management								✓		
5. <i>Sustainable tourism development (including CBTS and conservation)</i>										4
Management and protection of cultural and natural heritage				✓	✓		✓			
Facilitate the provision of funds for development of local tourism facilities							✓			
Promote CBT			✓				✓			
6. <i>Standardization and control of the tourism industry</i>										4
Maintenance of standards in tourism products and facilities			✓				✓		✓	
Coordinate and facilitate the management and control of county specific tourism activities							✓			
Administration and regulation of betting, casinos and other forms of gambling levies					✓					
Liquor licensing					✓				✓	
7. <i>Development of partnerships for tourism development</i>	✓		✓				✓			3
8. <i>Collection and administration of tourism-related revenue</i>					✓		✓			2
9. <i>Implementation of national policies and regulations</i>										1
Implementation of national tourism policies, regulations, strategies and programmes;							✓			
Implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism'							✓			
Domestication and implementation of bilateral, regional and international agreements on tourism							✓			
Total themes in which a county featured	3	2	5	5	4	1	9	3	4	

It would therefore be expected that Mombasa County would be at the forefront in the efforts to build the image of the coastal resort.

Generally, the above scenario therefore depicts a situation whereby different counties have interpreted differently their tourism development mandate as identified by the Constitution with some outright cases of lack of appreciation of what such mandate is. This would in effect limit the development potential of the counties to not only position themselves as a tourist destination in their own rights, but most importantly, contribute to the overall national tourism development.

County governments' tourism administration structures

From the information available on the official websites of all the 47 county governments and the CIC's 2014 report, a number of important findings were noted on county government tourism administration structures in Kenya (Table 6). First, the study found out that a total of 43 counties had a department with a mandate over tourism development. However, four of them did not have any department with such a mandate. This forms a serious omission in view of the express constitutional provision that all counties should be involved in developing tourism at the local level.

The study further found out that in all the counties that had a department responsible for tourism development, the sector was found to be grouped with other functions. The most common cases involved tourism being grouped with other commercial sectors including trade, industrialization, cooperative development, and wildlife (13 counties); trade, industry, enterprise, investment (7 counties); and those grouping it with culture,

Table 6. Organizational structures in charge of tourism development in Kenya's counties.

	Responsible department – combinations	Counties	Total
1.	Tourism, Wildlife, Trade, Industrialization, and Cooperative Development	Nairobi, Nyandarua, Kilifi, Kirinyaga, Kiambu, Meru, Makueni, Wajir, Narok, Kericho, Nakuru, Kakamega, Busia	13
2.	Tourism, Trade, Industry, Enterprise, Investment, and industrialization	Turkana, Samburu, Embu, Baringo, Uasin Gishu, Laikipia, Vihiga	7
3.	Tourism, Culture, Social Services, and Sports	Nyeri, Marsabit, Mombasa, Machakos, Homa Bay, West Pokot, Nyamira	7
4.	Tourism, ICT, Trade, Industrialization, Wildlife and Cooperative Development	Mandera, Siaya, Kwale, Isiolo	4
5.	Tourism, Trade, Energy, and Industry	Kitui, Bomet	2
6.	Tourism, Education, and Information Technology	Murang'a	1
7.	Tourism, Culture and Co-operative Development	Nandi	1
8.	Tourism Environment and Natural Resources	Tharaka	1
9.	Tourism, Commerce, and Heritage	Kisumu	1
10.	Tourism, Trade, Investment, Local and International Funds/ Resource Mobilization, and Culture	Lamu	1
11.	Tourism, Energy, and Environment	Garissa	1
12.	Tourism Development, Trade, Cooperatives, and Energy	Elgeyo Marakwet	1
13.	Tourism and Natural Resources	Taita Taveta	1
14.	Tourism, Environment, Natural resources, and Water	Bungoma	1
15.	Tourism, Agriculture, and Livestock	Kajiado	1
	No mention of the sector in the County ministries/ departments	Tana River, Migori, Kisii, Trans Nzoia	4
		Total	47

Source: GoK (2014b); individual county government official websites.

social services and sports (7 counties). Others have merged the sector with quite distant sectors such as ICT, energy, agriculture and livestock, education, and regulation.

This level of disparity on the sectors with which tourism is combined raises concerns about the amount of attention given to the sector. Even more serious is the concern on what competencies should the County Executive Officer in-charge of such combination possesses in order to adequately administer such varied sectors, especially where tourism is combined with distant sectors like energy, education, water, agriculture, or livestock.

Linkage between counties and the national tourism institutions

Kenya's Constitution thus underlines a clear functional arrangement between the national government and the counties, able to ensure accelerated development of a competitive tourism sector that fully integrates the devolved units. However, for such results to be realized, an institutional framework and arrangement to facilitate a seamless functional linkage between the two levels of government would be an essential prerequisite.

At the national level, a number of public institutions exist with different mandates towards the development of the tourism sector. The primary line institutions have been established by the Tourism Act of 2011 (GoK, 2011), although a number of them have not yet been operationalized. Table 5 provides a summary of the mandates of the institutional bodies established under the Act (Table 7).

The above national bodies have a number of key mandates whose implementation would necessarily require a clearly indicated integration mechanism with the counties. However, analysis of the provisions of the entire Tourism Act indicates that it does not recognize the existence of the counties and makes no single mention of them. This omission is equally reflected in the focus of the bodies formed under the Act. It is informative to note that the Tourism Act of 2011 was enacted one year after the promulgation of Kenya's Constitution in 2010 that provided for a devolved system of governance including the devolved functions. It would therefore be expected that the Tourism Act would take cognizance of the counties and devise mechanisms of linking the national institutions with the devolved units. This would be essential for purposes of providing technical support (as part of the national government constitutional duty to the counties) and ensuring coordination of tourism development initiatives in the entire country, at the very minimum.

Moreover, out of the other three national bodies not established under the Tourism Act, i.e. the Bomas of Kenya (BoK), National Museums of Kenya (NMK), and the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS), only the latter has explicit initiatives focusing on the counties and the community. This is clearly articulated in the Wildlife Conservation and Management Act, 2013 (GoK, 2013b) that establishes KWS and assigns it key mandates towards the local communities and counties. The Act further provides for the establishment of national reserves by the Minister to be managed by the relevant county governments. In addition, the Act provides for the establishment of wildlife conservancies owned by individual landowners, body corporates, group of owners or a community but mandates KWS to coordinate and control all wildlife security issues in these protected areas. Within its mandate, as indicated on its official website, KWS declares a commitment to developing tourism within the counties through its Community Wildlife Program. Through this initiative, the KWS commits to help communities develop tourism and other related ventures. Moreover,

Table 7. Mandates of institutions established by the Tourism Act, 2011.

Institution	Key Mandates, Programmes and Units Relevant to counties	Reference to counties
<i>(a) Institutions established by the Tourism Act, 2011</i>		
1. The Tourism Regulatory Authority (not yet operational)	- Formulating guidelines and measures for sustainable tourism throughout the country - Regulate tourism activities and services countrywide - Ensure the development and implementation of high quality tourism sector; - Monitor and assess tourist activities and services to enhance continuous improvement and adherence to sound principles and practices of sustainable tourism	None
2. The Kenya Utalii College	Capacity building for the tourism sector	None
3. Tourism Protection Service	Visitor safety	None
4. Kenya Tourism Board	- To develop, implement and co-ordinate a national tourism marketing strategy; - Market Kenya at local, national, regional and international levels as a premier tourist destination; - Identify tourism market needs and trends and advise tourism stakeholders accordingly	None
5. Kenyatta International Convention Centre	Developing and implementing the national strategy for meetings, incentives for conferences and exhibitions	None
6. Tourism Research and Monitoring Institute (not yet operational)	- Collect and analyse information, for the tourism sector and other clients in the private and public sectors, - Assess strategies and techniques for product development and marketing; - Determine, in consultation with lead agencies, the carrying capacities of the various tourism destinations and conservation needs and priorities; - Give information on early warning, disaster management, impacts and mitigation and adaptive strategies to climate change	None
7. Tourism Fund	- Finance the development of tourism products and services - Mobilize resources to support tourism-related activities.	None
8. Tourism Finance Corporation (TFC)	- Provide financial assistance to investors or entrepreneurs in the tourism sector including small and medium and community based enterprises; - Provide for investment opportunities in the tourism sector; - Provide business advisory services to the tourism sector	None
<i>(b) Other relevant institutions</i>		
9. Bomas of Kenya (BoK)	Cultural heritage preservation and promotion as a tourist attraction.	None
10. National Museums of Kenya (NMK)	- To promote the conservation and sustainable utilization of national heritage - Directorate of Regional Museums, Sites and Monuments - Offers specialized short-term courses - The provisions of NMK Strategic Plan, 2009–2014	None
11. Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS)	- Conservation and management of wildlife in Kenya - Establishment of county wildlife conservation committees - Develop mechanisms for benefit sharing with communities living in wildlife areas; - Assist and advise in the preparation of management plans for community and private wildlife conservancies and sanctuaries; - Promote and undertake extension service programmes intended to enhance wildlife conservation, education and training	Yes
12. Department of Tourism	The National Tourism Organization (NTO) under the Ministry of East Africa, Trade, Tourism and Industrialization	Yes

KWS is involved in the development of domestic tourism and niche tourism products such as eco-tourism, cultural tourism, and bird tourism, among others (<http://www.kws.org/about/>).

On the part of BoK and NMK, it is important to note that Kenya's rich cultural and heritage diversity provides great potential through which a number of counties can develop their tourism industry. Being therefore the premier institutions vested with overall mandates over the preservation and management of the country's cultural and heritage resources respectively, it would be expected that the two institutions would be at the forefront in championing the participation of the counties in their individual mandates. For instance, BoK would be expected to closely liaise with the devolved governments in the development and promotion of cultural tourism in Kenya. However, going by the information availed in its official website, there is no indication of any role currently being played by BoK in conjunction with the counties (<http://www.museums.or.ke/content/view>).

Furthermore, despite the indication by a number of counties that they are developing heritage or museums as tourism attractions (Table 3), NMK's official website and the Strategic Plan 2009–2014 (NMK, 2009) makes no mention of any partnership with the county governments. In addition, NMK Strategic Plan 2009–2014 acknowledges the significance of heritage management to the development and promotion of cultural, heritage and domestic tourism in the country. As a result, the institution identifies tourism as one of the available and emerging opportunities and prospects for its functions. It would therefore be expected that with this recognition, efforts would be directed to lobby-in the counties into the development of heritage as a tourist attraction throughout the country. Further, it is important to note that NMK indicates that it organizes short-term courses related to the preservation and promotion of both cultural and natural heritage in various fields (<http://www.museums.or.ke/content/view>). These would be of interest to building the capacity of the counties in their endeavour to develop cultural and heritage tourism.

On the part of the Department of Tourism, its *National tourism strategy 2013–2018* only identifies the existence of national and county structures for tourism promotion and coordination as one of the country's strengths (GoK, 2013b, p. 32). The only other reference to the counties is on encouraging "the county governments to undertake their mandates on domestic tourism and invest in the sector in terms of infrastructure and advertisements ... " (GoK, 2013b, p. 37). However, despite this acknowledgement, the Strategic Plan does not provide any strategic measures directed at exploiting or developing the strategic advantages presented by the counties.

The above scenario demonstrates lack of a deliberate institutional linkage between the national and the county levels of governments necessary for successful tourism development in Kenya. This in effect deprives the counties of the institutional and technical support from the key national bodies essential for the development of tourism at the county level. On the other hand, this disconnect also limits the ability of the national institutions to effectively undertake their mandates within the devolved government arrangement.

Conclusion and discussion

From the analysis presented in this paper, a number of tourism institutional gaps exist in the devolved system of government in Kenya that would hamper efforts to develop a competitive tourism industry. It is important to note that the country's Constitution recognizes the significance of the counties in the country's tourism development and thus

assigns them clear mandates complete with a provision for technical and capacity support from the national government. However, this constitutional intention may be curtailed by the identified significant gaps in institutional frameworks and linkages. First, a number of counties seem not fully appreciate what their tourism development mandate entails, or how to articulate such mandate. It would thus be unexpected for such counties to undertake any meaningful tourism development initiatives. Further, while several national bodies have been legally established to undertake key functions relevant to the development of the tourism sector, majority of them lack a framework linking them with both the counties and any county-focused strategic initiatives. This not only deprives the counties of the all-important institutional and technical support, but also limits the ability of the national institutions to effectively undertake their mandates within the devolved government arrangement. Eventually, the ability of the country to competitively develop her tourism industry remains in jeopardy.

In view of the above institutional gaps, there is need to first and foremost review and harmonize the tourism structures and mandates of the counties in order to effectively develop the sector in a coordinated manner. This will call for standard mandates and institutional framework across the counties. While it is important to note that all counties in Kenya may not have equal tourism development potential, such standard mandates and structures should be adopted in those counties where it is considered such potential exists. This will be essential if the development of the sector is to be coordinated throughout the country. Further, the functional relationship between the national level and the devolved units is of paramount importance in developing tourism within a decentralized system. It is therefore important that national institutions pursue measures to ensure seamless coordination with the county structures. This would be essential for the translation of national policies, programmes and goals at the county level, and facilitation of a bottom-up integration of individual county tourism innovations and initiatives into the national tourism agenda.

The findings of this study reveal a number of observations concerning restructuring tourism administration framework for destinations transiting from centralized to decentralized government system. First, it is important that a clear delineation of tourism development functions between national and devolved government units be clearly articulated from the onset. In addition, institutional and functional alignment between national and devolved government levels is a key prerequisite. This is essential to guarantee seamless implementation of national tourism policy and development agenda in a coordinated manner. The success of such alignment would in essence require a clear coordination mechanism between the tourism development mandates of the two levels of government. Further, there is need to standardize tourism administration and development institutional framework and functions across the devolved units. This would ensure a common approach to tourism administration. Finally, this study notes the need for capacity building of the devolved units during the transition point on key areas essential for tourism development including institutional formulation and policy and functional alignments between the national level and devolved government level.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Alderfer, H. F. (1967). *Public administration in newer nations*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Beaumont, D., & Dredge, D. (2010). Local tourism governance: A comparison of three network approaches. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(1), 7–28.
- Boyer, R., & Saillard, Y. (Eds.). (2002). *Regulation theory: The state of the art*. London: Routledge.
- Bramwell, B., & Meyer, D. (2007). Power and tourism policy relations in transition. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 766–788.
- Britton, S. (1991). Tourism, capital, and place: Towards a critical geography of tourism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 9(4), 451–478. doi:10.1068/d090451
- Cadbury, C. (1992). *Report of the committee on the financial aspects of corporate governance*. London: Gee.
- Cavanagh, S. (1997). Content analysis: Concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher*, 4(3), 5–16.
- Church, A., Ball, B., Bull, C., & Tyler, D. (2000). Public policy engagement with British tourism: The national, local and the European union. *Tourism Geographies*, 2(3), 312–336. doi:10.1080/14616680050082544
- Coles, T., & Church, A. (2007). *Tourism, power and space*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cornelissen, S. (2005). *The global tourism system: Governance, development and lessons from South Africa*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Cornelissen, S. (2011). Regulation theory and its evolution and limitations in tourism studies. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism: A critical perspective* (pp. 39–54). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Costa, C., Panyik, E., & Buhalis, D. (Eds.). (2014). *European tourism planning and organisation systems*. Bristol: Channel View.
- Crook, R., & Manor, J. (1994). *Enhancing participation and institutional performance: democratic decentralisation in South Asia and West Africa*. A report to Escor, the Overseas Development Administration, on Phase Two of a two Phase Research Project. London: Economic and Social Committee on Overseas Research.
- d'Angella, F., Carlo, M. D., & Sainaghi, R. (2010). Archetypes of destination governance: A comparison of international destinations. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 61–73.
- Dredge, D. (2001). Local government tourism planning and policy-making in New South Wales: Institutional development and historical legacies. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 4(2–4), 355–380.
- Dredge, D. (2006). Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27, 269–280.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2003a). Destination place identity and regional tourism policy. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(4), 383–407.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2003b). Federal-state relations and tourism public policy, New South Wales. *Australia. Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(5), 415–443.
- Dredge, D., & Jenkins, J. (2007). *Tourism planning and policy*. Milton: Wiley.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115.
- Government of Kenya. (2007). *Kenya Vision 2030: A globally competitive and prosperous Kenya*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2008). *Ministry of tourism. Strategic plan 2008-2012*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2010). *Constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi: National Council for Law Reporting.
- Government of Kenya. (2011). *Laws of Kenya. Tourism Act No. 28 of 2011*. Nairobi: National Council for Law Reporting.
- Government of Kenya. (2013a). *The wildlife conservation and management Act, 2013*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2013b). *National tourism strategy 2013–2018*. Nairobi: Department of Tourism, Ministry of East Africa, Commerce and Tourism.
- Government of Kenya. (2014a). *Assessment of the implementation of the system of devolved government: From steps to strides*. Nairobi: Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution (CIC).

- Government of Kenya. (2014b). *Economic survey, 2014*. Nairobi: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- Government of Kenya. (2003). *The economic recovery strategy for wealth and employment creation (2003/2007)*. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Guerin, A. (2004). *The French initiative for innovation in tourism: how to rejuvenate supply and increase the productivity of the tourism sector?* Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/cfe/tourism/34267998.pdf>
- Hall, C. M. (1997). The institutional setting: Tourism and the state. In D. Ioannides & G. Keith (Eds.), *The economic geography of the tourist industry: A supply-side analysis* (pp. 199–219). London: Routledge.
- Hall, C. M. (2009). Innovation and tourism policy in Australia and New Zealand: Never the twain shall meet? *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 1(1), 2–18.
- Hall, C. M. (2010). Politics and tourism: Interdependency and implications in understanding change. In R. W. Butler & W. Suntikul (Eds.), *Tourism and political change* (pp. 7–18). Oxford: Goodfellow.
- Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. M. (1995). *Tourism and public policy*. London: Routledge.
- Hsieh, H.-F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277–1288.
- Kondracki, N. L., Wellman, N. S., & Amundson, D. R. (2002). Content analysis: Review of methods and their applications in nutrition education. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, 34(4), 224–230.
- Lake, D., & Rothchild, D. (2005). Territorial decentralization and civil war settlements. In P. Roeder & D. Rothchild (Eds.), *Sustainable peace: Power and democracy after Civil Wars* (pp. 109–132). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lennon, J., Smith, H., Cockerell, N., & Trew, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Benchmarking national tourism organisations and agencies: Understanding best practice*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 1(2). Retrieved from <http://217.160.35.246/fqstexte/2-00/2-00mayring-e.pdf>
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2009). *National tourism development policy*. Addis Ababa: Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2015). *Sustainable tourism master plan-2015–2025*. Addis Ababa: Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- Moretti, F., van Vliet, L., Bensing, J., Deledda, G., Mazzi, M., Rimondini, M., ... Fletcher, I. (2011). A standardized approach to qualitative content analysis of focus group discussions from different countries. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 82(3), 420–428.
- Mosedale, J. (2011). Re-introducing tourism to political economy. In J. Mosedale (Ed.), *Political economy of tourism: A critical perspective* (pp. 1–13). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Nasser, W., & Donsimoni, M. (2012). Local governance, decentralization and local economic development. *Middle Eastern Finance and Economics*, 125–135.
- National Museums of Kenya (NMK). (2009). *National museums of Kenya strategic plan 2009–2014*. Nairobi: National Museums of Kenya.
- Ndivo, R. M., Waudo, J., & Waswa, F. (2013). From national to regional tourism development focus in Kenya: Examining the challenges and opportunities. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 10(1), 99–109.
- Nordin, S., & Svensson, B. (2007). Innovative destination governance. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 8, 53–66.
- OECD. (2014). *OECD Tourism trends and policies 2014*. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/tour-2014-en>
- Oliveira, J. (2002). Implementing environmental policies in developing countries through decentralization: The case of protected areas in Bahia, Brazil. *World Development*, 30, 1713–1736.
- Ontario Ministry of Tourism. (2009). *Ontario tourism industry structure assessment research study*. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario. Retrieved from http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Ontario_Tourism_Industry_Structure_Assessment.pdf
- Palmer, A. (1998). Evaluating the governance style of marketing groups. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25, 185–201.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Republic of South Africa. (2016). *The National Tourism Sector Strategy (NTSS) 2016–2026*. <https://www.tourism.gov.za/>

- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding governance. Policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Rondinelli, D., McCullough, J., & Johnson, R. (1989). Analysing decentralization policies in developing countries: A political-economy framework. *Development and Change*, 20, 57–87.
- Ruhanen, L., Scott, N., Ritchie, B., & Tkaczynski, A. (2010). Governance: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 4–16.
- Smith, B. C. (1985). *Decentralisation: The territorial dimension of the state*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Svensson, B., Nordin, S., & Flagestad, A. (2006). Destination governance and contemporary development models. In L. Lazzeretti & C. S. Petrillo (Eds.), *Tourism local systems and networking* (pp. 83–95). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Turner, M., & Hulme, D. (1997). *Governance, administration and development*. London: Macmillan Press.
- United Nations World Tourism Organisation. (2007). *A practical guide to destination management*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Wahab, S. (1997). Sustainable tourism in the developing world. In S. Wahab & J. J. Piagam (Eds.), *Tourism, development and growth: The challenge of sustainability* (pp. 129–146). London: Routledge.
- World Bank. (2010). *Kenya's tourism: Polishing the jewel*. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/KENYAEXTN/Resources/Tourism_Report-ESW_Kenya_Final_May_2010.pdf
- WTTC. (2014). *Travel & tourism economic impact 2014: Kenya*. WTTC, UK.
- Yüksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yüksel, A. (2005). Centralized and decentralized tourism governance in Turkey. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 859–886.
- Yüksel, F., & Yüksel, A. (2000). *Decentralised tourism administration: Is it the way forward?* Paper presented at the First International Joint Symposium on Business Administration, Challenges for Business in the New Millennium, Karvina, Czech Republic. <http://www.opf.slu.cz/vvr/akce/turecko/pdf/YukselF.pdf>
- Zhang, H., & Zhu, M. (2014). Tourism destination governance: A review and research agenda. *International Journal of e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning*, 4(2), 125–128.
- Zhi, H. L. (2014). A comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *PubMed*, 61(3), 105–111.

Websites

- Nairobi City County: <http://www.nairobi.go.ke/home/about-the-county/#trade>
- Machakos County: <http://www.machakosgovernment.com/GovernmentDepartmentsMachakos.aspx?DptID=9>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Kilifi County: <http://www.kilifi.go.ke/departments.php?com=2&com2=14&com3=23&com4=#.VOXjZS7sd9w>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Kwale County: http://www.kwalecountygov.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=160&Itemid=785. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Kajiado County: <https://www.kajiado.go.ke/ministries/trade-tourism-and-industrialization/>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Narok County: <http://www.narok.go.ke/county-departments/departments-of-trade-industrialization-cooperative-development-tourism-wildlife/about-department>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Mombasa County: <http://www.mombasa.go.ke/departments-of-tourism-development/>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Nyeri County: <http://www.nyeri.go.ke/tourism>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Nakuru County: <http://www.nakuru.go.ke/ministry-of-trade-industrialization-tourism-and-wildlife-management/>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- Kenya Wildlife Services: <http://www.kws.org/about/>. Accessed on 15 February 2015
- National Museums of Kenya: <http://www.museums.or.ke/content/view/273/146/>
- Bomas of Kenya: <http://www.bomasofkenya.co.ke/>. Accessed on 10 February 2015