

# Effects of agritourism development on the local community in Kericho County, Kenya

Nicholas Kipkorir<sup>1</sup>, Nzomo S. Twili<sup>2</sup>, Adol Gogo<sup>3\*</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Chuka University, Kenya

<sup>3</sup>Doctoral School of Regional Science, Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Hungary

\*Corresponding author's email: [adolgogo@pm.me](mailto:adolgogo@pm.me)



**Journal of Tourism,  
Culinary, and  
Entrepreneurship**

**e-ISSN:  
2776-0928**

**Publisher:**  
School of Tourism,  
Universitas Ciputra Surabaya,  
Indonesia

**Keywords:**

*Agritourism  
Local Community  
Agritourism Policy  
Stakeholder Theory  
Destination Lifecycle Theory*

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines the effects of agritourism development on local communities in Kericho County, Kenya. Descriptive research design was used targeting agritourism stakeholders in Kericho with a sample size of 40 respondents. Questionnaires were used to collect primary data, with the findings indicating that the association between agritourism development and socio-cultural, environmental, and economic impacts was strong and positive. The study also revealed that agritourism had enhanced the local community's dignity and value, leading to new social recognition as a leading tea zone nationally and internationally. The study concludes that notable negative social impact is acquiring new destructive lifestyles such as drug abuse and sexual assaults as agritourists introduce new behaviors, tastes, and preferences. Environmentally, agritourism has aggravated human-wildlife conflicts by constructing tourist infrastructural facilities in the neighboring forest environment. Economically, agritourism has led to the reduction of poverty levels through the creation of employment. The study implies that local stakeholders ought to increase participation through education campaigns to minimize the tribulations associated with agritourism. These findings are invaluable to agritourism stakeholders in developing agritourism policy for Kericho County by incorporating a holistic approach that ensures sustainable agritourism growth.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

According to UNWTO (2013) World Tourism Barometer, it is estimated that international tourist arrivals grew by 5% in 2013, reaching a record of 1,087 million. Asia and the Pacific recorded the most substantial growth with a 7% increase in arrivals, followed by Africa 6% and America 5%. The sector is a major source of income developing countries, providing hope for the citizens (Christie & Crompton, 2010). In 2011, 4.5% of total tourism

revenue came from agritourism. Part of the revenue came from investments by individuals who depend on agritourists, while the other came from infrastructure development that benefits the residents, agritourists and the entire economy (Telfer, 2012). Agritourism involves utilizing agritourism farms for accommodation and meal provision in a picturesque cultural environment (Kigera, 2018).

The recognition of tourism as a beneficial sector requires equal attention to its impacts on the environment, taking cognizance that tourism and the environment rely on each other (UN, 2013). Tourism experts should reinforce the benefits of well-implemented sustainable tourism principles (Sharpley, 2013). Agritourism is often promoted as the best solution to sustainable development due to its reliance on natural usage of human activities and the natural environment (Aksu & Tarcın, 2016).

UNWTO (2013) submits that tourism is the total collection of processes amongst the government, local community, suppliers in tourism, tourists themselves and the immediate environment. Additionally, UNWTO elucidates that sustainable tourism development is one that provides the needs of the tourists in the destination, without hampering the ability of future tourists and generations in the regions visited to enjoy a similar experience. It is expected that resources will be managed properly while providing economic, social, and aesthetic values without negatively impacting on cultural integrity, biological, ecological, and essential life support systems (UN, 2012). Correspondingly, agritourism is ingenious and creative farming approach that incorporates leisure for tourists, intended to be either economic or non-economic for farmers and the local community (Chepkoech, 2019). Agritourism is practiced across the globe as a community based activity to fight poverty. Such community-based tourism projects are in the lead to enhance rural development in advanced countries like Ireland (Storey, 2014) and the developing world (Honey, 2013).

Across Europe, agritourism has become a priority for culture, environment, agriculture and the economy (Ciolac & Iancu, 2013). Dettori et al. (2004) indicate agritourism is also well developed in France. Viljoen & Tlabela (2017) examine that the favorite forms of agritourism accommodation in France are camping and caravans. Therefore, farmers have created and

invested in accommodation facilities for rent. Dettori et al. (2004) indicate that women farmers are the main players in agritourism in France. Agritourism is a significant part of the agriculture sector and the farmers have a register to ensure fair competition and consumer rights.

According to UNWTO (2017) report, Asia is the second-largest recipient of international agritourists after Europe, with 28% of the World's Agritourism has grown virtually uninterrupted over the past decades, becoming a leading economic sector in terms of not only size but also the rate of growth (UNWTO, 2017b). Agritourism has supported new directions in rural sustainable development in Malaysia, which has more than a hundred tourist destinations that offer agritourism activities (Lin & Huang, 2016). Correspondingly, Odege (2014) argues that tourists' dispersion to under-utilized areas and diversification of the product to include agritourism and nature tourism are some of the new trends utilized by African countries to sustain growth in the tourism industry.

Clearly, agritourism is important to the contribution of the main tourism product offering in many countries. In Kenya, for example, rural tourism is listed as one of the pull factors largely due to the large pool of agricultural diversity based on geographical locations and climate (Oketch, 2009). Despite its significance, agritourism is faced with many challenges, and the major ones include socio-cultural commoditization, ecological erosion, and economic slump. The objective of this research was to evaluate the impacts of agritourism on the host community. Kenya has had a long history of tourism leadership in East Africa as one of the largest cultural resource bases. However, economic mismanagement over the past decades has continuously eroded the tourism benefits received by the country.

Government of Kenya (GoK) (2003a) states that Kenya's tourism industry is a major industry that could enhance development and poverty reduction. Further, the industry has been identified as one of the sectors that will help Kenya achieve major global and national goals. Kenya's agritourism performance can be evaluated based on its ability to surviving the market, the market's valuation of securities as well as its reputation. Agritourism development in Kericho refers to how well this type of tourism achieves its objectives and its impact on the hosting community. Whereas studies on wildlife tourism impacts are available, there was a

scanty review of agritourism performance and impacts, requiring an investigation to supplement the existing literature. Moreover, Policymakers in agritourism should emphasize the benefits agritourism can bring to host economies, particularly in agritourism destination counties such as Kericho.

Agritourism comes with many effects on a destination. While it has been hailed for stimulating rural infrastructural development and general improvement in the host community's economic welfare, it is also a major agent of cultural erosion and environmental degradation. Policymakers, key support players such as the local community and community-based organizations in the dark on how best to implement the agritourism policies in Kericho County. This study sought to assess agritourism's effects on the local community at Kericho County concerning socio-cultural, economic, and environmental effects. More specifically, the objective was to examine the socio-cultural effects, economic, and environmental effects of agritourism on the local community in Kericho County. The study findings will offer insights to the Kericho County government and the National government on how to sustainably develop agritourism around local communities.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Conserving rural regions with everything significant around it is the new trend being utilized globally following sustainability principles. Countries worldwide consider developing rural areas as an opportunity to reduce levels of poverty, hence the concepts of rural tourism and agritourism. Bungau et al. (2015) stated that rural tourism encompasses all types of tourism practiced in the rural regions, while agritourism involves utilizing agritourism farms for accommodation and meal provision in the picturesque cultural environment.

It can be argued that agritourism is a subsidiary of rural tourism where farming and tourism exist, which ensures that elements of a tourism product are available; accommodation, food, and entertainment (Brezuleanu, & Brad, 2016). Agritourism development involves implementing a policy framework that makes agritourism more appealing to tourists to outdo

its rivals in the same environment. Several scholars have studied the concept of agritourism development and strategies adopted by organizations to position themselves in a competitive environment. A study by Hartl (2012) focused on developing marketing strategies for tourism destinations in peripheral areas of Europe, while Stark (2015) focused on rural tourism strategies in Australia. Muruga (2016) examined the Ministry of Tourism's competitive strategies to attract Tourists in Kenya. The studies concluded that much focus should be directed on communicating a positive image of destinations through the marketing mix. However, there is a scanty review on agritourism's impact on the hosting community, where much of the reviews have focused on its improvement. From this perspective, more effort needs to be focused on rural tourism and its impact on supplementing the existing reviews as none had scoped this crucial segment, which corresponds with the prevailing trend of sustainable tourism.

Agritourism and the local people have an inseparable relationship. With the local people as the custodians, Social-cultural, as a dimension of tourism, is discussed from the anthropological perspective. According to Keesing in George et al. (2009), social-culture refers to the totality of man's knowledge that is both learned and accumulated through experience. It consists of those socially transmitted and distinct patterns of behavioral characteristics belonging to a particular social group.

Moreover, George et al. (2009) argue that social-cultural is the foundation upon human beings and communities make sense of the world. Therefore, primacy to preserve such an important human construction should be ensured. While social-cultural is constantly transforming, it is important to allow it to naturally develop and grow without economic obligations and outside influences. Meethan (2001) viewing social-cultural in anthropological perspectives that is social-cultural comprises the sum of both material and symbolic production. Social-cultural is then conceptualized as a form of interaction, system of symbolism used to create and recreate common values, similar to that employed within cultural studies. Conversely, by developing cultural products, it helps to attract visitors to the community. Studies reveal that family values are affected or influenced by tourism (Knox, 1982), lead to

cultural commodification, high rates of crime and prevalence of prostitution, (Cohen, 1988; Pizam & Milman, 1986). Further, due to socio-cultural differences, tourism may also generate social conflicts in the destination.

Pizam & Milman (1986) reiterate that tourism can be a contributing factor to social tensions in the host society. It is frequently asserted that the host countries' traditions are weakened under the influence of tourism (Crick, 2017; Sharpley, 1994). Authenticity and the identity of the traditional social-cultural are lost due to the proclivity by the local community to emulate attractive civilization (Dogan, 1989). Cohen (1988) submits that commoditization is a process by which 'things' are perceived to be goods for sale based on evaluation of their exchange value. The main idea is that whatever 'thing' is being evaluated needs to have a well-communicated market price. This accords them an exchange value that was inherently not possessed. In the realm of tourism, this is manifested in cultural tourism packaging (Appadurai 1986; Swanson & Timothy 2012). Medina (2003) describes this as socio-cultural commoditization. There is plenty of tourism literature, dissecting this concept alongside authenticity, defined by Dolezal (2011) as the originality of culture. Martin (2010) states that culture's commodification leads to changes in the original culture, which affects the culture's authenticity.

It is for such reasons that some researchers postulated that it enhances and maintains equilibrium. They argue that agritourism enables families to work together to build a successful agritourism while also generating revenues through visitation. This helps in building schools, roads, provision of electricity, and several other social benefits. These positive long-term benefits are only possible with careful, sustainable tourism development that allows local communities to adjust (Aronsson, 2000).

Agritourism requires culturally sound actions without any damage to the social-cultural environment, which consists of not exploiting the local communities' culture, heritage, and economic potential (Pigram, 1992). The studies reveal that local households benefit from non-cash livelihood impacts, including developing projects financed from tourism income, including donations, and assistance from tourists, KWS, and local tour operators. They include schools,

health clinics, improved roads, water boreholes, and electricity, which hopefully provide future development grounds.

Tourism and environmental protection are two sides of the same coin. There is tourism pressure on culture, natural resources and the environment (Natrona et al., 2002). Eagles et al. (2002) opined that the "agritourism farms need tourism" and "tourism needs agritourism farms. Thus, to establish agritourism farms there must be tourism. The impacts of agritourism are on water, energy, pollution, wildlife and socio-culture behaviour. Other areas include waste pollution, noise pollution from transport, traditional settlement due to modern construction among others (Kumar & Ramaswamy, 2005).

The scale of damage is contingent on the level of tourism activities, tourism seasonality, and intensity of development (Ikiara & Okech, 2002). Agritourism development has not progressed without controversy. Agritourism offers accessibility for groups, quality services at affordable prices and a chance to participate in agritourism farms that makes it more appealing. Nature, beauty and serenity have become a priority for choosing tourism destinations, (UNEP, 2005). Past methods adopted by farmers for agritourism have resulted in problems disaffection and criticisms (Eagles et al., 2002). The criticisms have been harsh forgetting the merits of agritourism, stating that it has resulted in over-exploitation of natural resources. This diminishes the quality of tourism experience and the local community.

The laissez-fair tourism policies of the past especially in Kenya lead to haphazard construction of facilities. Consequently, there has been increased resource depreciation leading to a decline in agritourism product. For example, accommodation facilities are constructed in fragile areas, compromising ecological needs of the region (Irandu, 2016).

Davenport & Switalski (2005) contends that biggest problem in agritourism lies on the infrastructure development particularly in rural regions that have little or no control procedures. Kerley et al. (2003) argue that preference for mega-fauna reduces appreciations of biodiversity. Goodwin & Leader-Williams (2000) further state that relying on mega-fauna by tourism interferes with conservation objectives.

The main benefit comes from economic development, measured through foreign

exchange, taxation, foreign direct investment, and employment creation (Fleming & Toepper, 2010; Stynes, 2013). Agritourism brings lasting economic gains to a local community. Income generated is shared amongst family members leading to improved standards of living.

Mitchell & Ashley (2017) emphasized that between 50 to 90 percent are indirect impacts of tourism effects. Therefore, the implication is that the multiplier effect is between 2 to 10. The costs are for daily needs such as food by people working in tourism, and non-food expenses like religious contributions. Kaosa-ard (2016), Oula (2016), and Prachvuthy (2016) studied the revenue from Community Based Tourism (CBT), but the scope of their study excluded the indirect effect and the general equilibrium.

Bill et al. (2017) also investigated rural tourism's economic impact by classifying rural tourism. The first category was hard tourism, while the second was soft tourism. This category characterized Hard tourism as externally owned large-scale developments. On the other hand, Soft tourism was described as tourism activities that occurred within a local economy and engaged local community. The impacts were measured in three dimensions, namely direct, indirect, and induced impacts. When there is an impact of tourists spending on tourism businesses, this was categorized as direct impacts. When the impact is from successive rounds of local business transactions due to tourist spending, this is an indirect impact. When there is an impact on jobs and income generated the this is defined as induced impact. A total of 120 tourism related businesses, and 1,800 tourists were surveyed in Scotland. Their findings indicate that more money was generated from hard-tourism, while a greater multiplier was generated by soft tourism. Although the multiplier effect was small at 1.10 and 1.15, respectively.

Jones & Murphree (2001) state that there are various concepts in community conservation. One of them is economic and ensures the local community have increased self-interest in natural resources management. the community conservation concept has four main elements. Because of the structure in tourism sector, it does not need huge investment for it to generate significant multiplier effect. The World Tourism Organization (2002) reiterate that tourism is a very important sector for poverty alleviation.



There are always opportunities to sell and offer services that blend together with agricultural activities. Richards & Hall (2000) and Novelli & Gebhardt (2017) highlight that it is not a priori to promote tourism in marginalized regions of developing countries, it is contingent upon social, environmental, political and economic factors. For example, the Africa has had increased tourist visitation to major destinations, but it has not resulted in commensurate economic, social and environmental advantages (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2016). Tourism has been proselytized as a suitable strategy to enhance international trade, sustainability and reduction in poverty in developing countries, (Honeck, 2008; Scheyvens, 2017; UNCTAD, 2017; UNWTO, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2008, 2009, 2013). Tourism contributes to the economies of both developed and developing countries through employment creation, balance of payments, and attracting direct investment, (Hawkins & Mann, 2017; Rogerson, 2017).

As a result, many countries are participating directly in agritourism development within their villages. Although seasonality disrupts tourism businesses leading to loss of revenue, the money generated during high season provides profits, salaries and other multiplier effect in the local economy, (Sindiga, 2000;2002). Ashley et al. (2000); Halloway (2009) and Mowforth & Munt (2008) contend that if properly planned, tourism can provide a strong transformation for individual households and communities by offering access to food, reducing levels of poverty, provision of health services, education opportunities, infrastructure and economic stability.

Studies carried out in Kuta, Komodo and Sanur, Indonesia; Pokhara, Nepal; Mombasa, Amboseli, and Maasai Mara National Reserve in Kenya reveal that despite the seasonal nature of tourism sector, salary and status of tourism jobs pay slightly more than other sectors, (Kamau, 1999; Homewood & Thompson, 2002; Pagdin, 1995; Ondicho, 2010). A study by Thompson and Homewood (2002) indicates revenue generated at group ranches are spent on education bursaries for children who might have not afforded to pay for their own school fees. NGOs are also taking part in educating local community to pursue high school, college and University education.

## **Life-cycle Theory**

The theory of life-cycle posits that tourism progresses in stages over time. According to Butler (1980), the stages are exploration, followed by involvement, next is development, then consolidation, and finally stagnation. Depending on strategies that destination managers employ at stagnation stage, the region might again pick-up in a stage Butler described as rejuvenation. Hovinen's (2001) in studying mature tourist destinations, corroborated this theory by demonstrating that at the exploration stage, a small number of tourists offer irregular visitations with no facilities offering services. As a result, contact with residents is high, which may attract some visitors. There are no visible impacts of tourism on the physical fabric and social milieu of the destination, with tourism not forming part of the region's major economic sector. This theory's is suitable because agritourism in Kericho County is considered to be at exploration stage, with few facilities offering services and tourism not forming part of the region's main economic activity. However, it is expected that with continuous improvement of services, the number of arrivals is likely to increase, and the destination will be moving into the next stage of life-cycle.

## **Stakeholder Theory**

Freeman, in 1984 was the first articulate stakeholder theory which postulates that a phenomenon has various relationships amongst groups and individuals, who affect or are affected by activities. The theory describes a genuine stakeholder as someone who the ability and right to be part of the process. Capacity in this context refers to the requisite skills and resources to participate, while the right implies the freedom to moderate the impacts of the decisions resulting from the activity in question (Easterling, 2004). As key stakeholders in a tourism system, residents' needs must be identified, considered, and subsequently satisfied. As Bryson et al. (2002) stated, "Key stakeholders must be satisfied at least minimally. Otherwise, policies, organizations, communities, and even countries will fail."

Similarly, Buer (2002) stated that what is considered as return on investment (ROI)

within a tourism system is a function of stakeholder satisfaction. According to Buer, the stakeholder is the priority and not competition or customer focus. In this connection, for strategies to be successful, they must integrate all stakeholders' interests and not focus on one group for this balance to be achieved, (Freeman, 1984; Friedman & Miles, 2002; Phillips & Freeman, 2003). However, stakeholders consist of people in an environment that holds values (Rokeach, 1973), which influences their behavior as both individuals and organizations. Values or sets of values are different across groups, cultures, and individuals (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002). Bearing this in mind, the gist of stakeholder theory strives to unite all the divergent viewpoints and interests, into hopefully one melting pot that averts or minimizes conflicts during agritourism development.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

The study was conducted in Kericho County, covering Belgut and Bureti regions. The target population for this study was local agritourism stakeholders' representatives. The selection of this target population was justified because the people living in Belgut and Bureti sub-counties within Kericho County are the major stakeholders and beneficiaries of agritourism. The study utilized 30% of the target population to derive a sample size of 40 respondents, based on Mugenda (2003) formula. Primary data was collected from local agritourism farmers, hospitality representatives, agritourists, and Kericho County Government tourism management staff using questionnaires. Reliability was tested through a pilot study that was carried out before the second administration.

### **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The study examined the gender of the respondents, and it was established that 71% of the respondents were male, and 29% were female. 45% of those who provided data were between 31-40 years, followed by over 40 years (33%) and 21-30 years (22%). It was established that 39% of the respondents were other stakeholders, while 61% were locals.

**Table 1. Social-cultural Impacts of Agritourism**

S/N	Socio-Cultural Impacts	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Trivialization or revalidation of culture	17%	39%	4%	29%	11%
2.	Reduction of illiteracy level	47%	21%	10%	20%	2%
3.	Enhancement of community dignity and value	26%	56%	2%	12%	2%
4.	Acquisition of destructive lifestyles	20%	34%	2%	22%	22%

Source: Research data (2020)

**Table 2. Agritourism and Socio-cultural Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	.214	.729		.791	.003
	Socio-cultural	.107	1.290	-.393	-.853	.000

$$Y = 0.214 + 0.107X_1$$

Source: Research data (2020)

From the study findings on socio-cultural impacts in Table 1 above, 39% of the respondents agreed that agritourism destroys and preserves the beauty of the local community's culture. Apart from that, (47%) strongly agreed with the statement that agritourism has led to a reduction of the community's illiteracy level as the majority of the productive population has embraced education to work in available occupations such as tour guides. Other respondents also held that agritourism had enhanced the community's dignity and value, leading to new social recognition (56%). The study findings also indicate (34%) of the respondents agreed, that agritourism had contributed immensely to acquiring new destructive lifestyles such as drug abuse and prostitution. The regression equation revealed that holding socio-cultural aspects constant, the agritourism impacts would be 0.214. However, a unit increase in socio-cultural impacts would lead to an increase in agritourism.

**Table 3. Environmental Impacts of Agritourism**

S/N	Environmental Impacts	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Environmental degradation	21%	19%	17%	22%	21%
2.	Aggravation of human-wildlife conflicts	4%	61%	2%	20%	3%
3.	Natural environment conservation	13%	36%	1%	27%	23%
4.	Endangerment of flora and fauna through poaching	63%	11%	12%	16%	8%

Source: Research data, 2020

**Table 4. Agritourism and Environmental Impacts Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	.243	.193		.256	.000
	Environmental	.857	1.335	.775	.095	.048

$$Y = 0.243 + 0.857X_2$$

Source: Research data (2020)

Findings of the study in Table 3 on agritourism's environmental impacts indicate that the margin difference of association between agritourism and its impacts on the environment was almost neutral. However, (22%) of respondents agreed that agritourism has led to the introduction of negative environmental exposures such as pollution of water, air, and land. (61%) agreed that agritourism has aggravated human-wildlife conflicts by converting the natural environment to human use by constructing tourists' facilities. Apart from that, (36%) agreed with the opinion that agritourism has enhanced natural environment conservation through the preservation of sites that are considered to be of significance in enhancing agritourism. Respondents (63%) indicated that agritourism is a threat to endangered flora and fauna through poaching as poachers disguise themselves as agritourists hence gaining access to surrounding wildlife habitats

From the established regression equation in Table 4, it can be seen that holding environmental aspects constant; the agritourism impacts would be 0.243. However, a unit increase in environmental impacts would increase agritourism development impacts by a factor of 0.857 units.

**Table 5. Economic Impacts of Agritourism**

SN.	Economic Impacts	1	2	3	4	5
1.	Agent of social, economic development	22%	24%	7%	11%	36%
2.	Enhancement of household income level	3%	22%	3%	41%	31%
3.	Creation of affluent social class	13%	24%	23%	29%	11%
4.	Financial empowerment	21%	20%	15%	20%	22%

Source: Research data, 2020

**Table 6. Agritourism and Economic Impacts Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	Constant	.345	.242		1.426	.000
	Economic	.179	.763	.963	2.916	.021

$$Y = 0.345 + 0.179X_3$$

Source: Research data (2020)

The study revealed various economic aspects associated with the concept of agritourism to the hosting community, as reflected in Table 5 (36%) agreed with the opinion that agritourism is an agent of social, economic development. They also agree that the local community benefits from roads, water, and electricity through tourists' infrastructural development. Respondents (41%) indicated that agritourism had enhanced the household income level through entrepreneurial activities. The participants earn income, which improves their lives. One notable negative aspect of agritourism from an economic perspective is related to the high cost of living. Respondents (29%) argued that agritourism contributes to the high cost of living as the hosts have to bear the exorbitant prices of goods and services as tourism creates a new, affluent social class. It was revealed that the percentage of respondents agreeing that agritourism has led to reduction of poverty level consist of a good percentage of employment and other benefits such as health centers to the community. However, to increase agritourism, employment levels should be given the first refusal. This can be attained by ensuring the locals are empowered through education to act as interpreters and gain meaningful employment opportunities. The regression equation in Table 6 indicates that holding economic aspects constant, the agritourism impacts would be 0.345. However, a unit increase in economic impacts would increase agritourism development impacts by a factor of 0.179 units.

**Table 7. Correlation Analysis**

Study Variables		Agritourism	Socio-cultural	Environmental	Economic
Pearson Correlation	Agritourism	1.000	.956	.972	.959
	Sociocultural	.956	1.000	.985	.942
	Environmental	.972	.985	1.000	.931
	Economic	.959	.942	.931	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Agritourism	.	.000	.000	.000
	Socio-cultural	.000	.	.000	.000
	Environmental	.000	.000	.	.000
	Economic	.000	.000	.000	.
N	Agritourism	40	40	40	40
	Socio-cultural	40	40	40	40
	Environmental	40	40	40	40
	Economic	40	40	40	40

Source: Research data (2020)

The relationship between agritourism development and the socio-cultural impact was strong and positive (95.6%) at a 95% level of confidence. On the other hand, the relationship between agritourism development and environmental impact was found to be strong and positive (97.2%) at a 95% level of confidence, and the relationship between agritourism development and economic impact was found to be strong and positive (95.9%) at 95% level of confidence. Therefore, it is conclusive that there is a positive strong relationship between the independent variables (agritourism development) and hosting community general impacts (socio-cultural, environmental, and economic).

**Table 8. Coefficient of Determination**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.986 <sup>a</sup>	.972	.970	.164

Source: Research data (2020)

Findings shown in Table 8 above indicate a strong positive correlation between cultural impacts and agritourism development, as shown by 0.986 (98%). On the other hand, Adjusted R squared is the coefficient of determination, which shows the dependent variable's variation due to changes in independent variables. From the findings above, the value of adjusted R squared was 0.970; this means that 97% changes in hosting community general impacts could be accounted for by agritourism development.

**Table 9. Analysis of Variance**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.408	3	11.136	414.738	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	.967	36	.027		
	Total	34.375	39			

Source: Research data (2020).

Where the processed data (population parameters) have a significance level of less than 0.05, the data is deemed ideal. From the ANOVA statistics above, the significance value was 0.000, which is less than 0.05, indicating that the model was statistical significance. On the other hand, the calculated value shows the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, where if the calculated value is greater than the critical value (1.96), then the relationship is deemed significant. From the findings above, the calculated value was greater than the critical value ( $1.96 < 4.738$ ), an indication that agritourism development significantly impacted the hosting community socially, environmentally, and economically.

**Table 10. Regression Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.061	.061		-.995	.327
	Socio-cultural	-.483	.184	-.463	-2.629	.013
	Environmental	.994	.166	.971	5.980	.000
	Economic	.522	.089	.491	5.884	.000

Source: Research data (2020).

The regression coefficients above represent study variables associations where 'constant' represents the dependent variable while 'sociocultural-code, environmental code, and economic code' represent independent variables. From the findings in the Table 10 above, the established regression equation was:

$$Y = -0.61 - 0.483X_1 + 0.994X_2 + 0.522X_3$$

The above regression equation revealed that holding agritourism development to a constant zero, hosting community general impacts would be -0.61. A unit increase in agritourism development would lead to a decrease in socio-cultural impacts by a factor of 0.483, while a unit increase in agritourism development would lead to an increase in environmental impacts by a factor of 0.994. On the other hand, a unit increase in agritourism



development would increase economic impacts by a factor of 0.522.

The study sought to investigate whether there existed a relationship between agritourism development and hosting community existing impacts. The study utilized regression analysis to establish the relationship between dependent and independent variables where the equation  $Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon$  guided the study.

The findings revealed that the association between agritourism development and socio-cultural, environmental, and economic impacts was strong and positive on the correlation coefficient. This was based on correlation coefficient results of 95.6%, 97.2%, 95.9 respectively, meaning there was a strong positive relationship between agritourism development and the local community existing impacts. From the findings on the coefficient of determination, the adjusted R squared value was 0.972 and indicated a variation of 97.2% on impacts (socio-cultural, environmental, and economic) due to changes in agritourism development. From the analysis of variance findings, the significance value was 0.000, which is less than 0.05, indicating that the model was statistically significant. Thus, the influence of the independent variable over the dependent variable existed.

On the regression coefficient, the findings revealed that when the agritourism development is inexistent, the community impacts were minimal. The conclusion is based on the regression equation that was established. The regression equation established was;  $Y = -0.61 - 0.483X_1 + 0.994X_2 + 0.522X_3$ . This means, holding agritourism development to a constant zero, the impacts would be -0.61 (negative). A unit increase in agritourism development would lead to a decrease in socio-cultural impacts by a factor of 0.483, while a unit increase in agritourism development would lead to an increase in environmental impacts by a factor of 0.994. On the other hand, a unit increase in agritourism development would increase economic impacts by a factor of 0.522.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that agritourism like all the other forms of tourism, generates

positive and negative impacts at Kericho County. Therefore, policy framework and thorough implementation is vital in order to accentuate the positive out-comes, while ameliorating the negative results social-culturally, economically and environmentally. Generally, the merits far out-weigh the demerits, which calls for expert advice to collaborate with the communities around tea plantations. Through sustainable agritourism development, more opportunities will be available amongst the local community in terms of tour guiding, show casing tea farming and increased demand for local services. The local culture will be passed from one generation to the other, with the incentive of tourist showing interest to experience their traditions. Environment will also be protected when there is reduced pressure amongst the youths to clear surrounding forest and sell charcoal. At the international level, this will increase preference for Kenyan tea exports while also diversifying tourism products that Kenya is known for beyond beach and safari products.

## **Recommendations**

From the findings, the study recommends that; there is a need for increased funding for conservation purposes in order to improve problem animal control that frequently results in human-wildlife conflicts. There should be more frequent stakeholder needs assessment and engagement in conservation programs enactment and monitoring through policy creation. On socio-cultural impacts, the study recommends that local stakeholders' participation be enhanced through incentives and education campaigns to minimize the tribulations associated with agritourism and any other form that could emerge in the locality. Environmentally, the study recommends that KWS and other Conservationists should formulate policies to counter the negative impacts of agritourism development on ecology and the natural environment in general. Economically, the study recommends that County and National governments to undertake regular stakeholder needs assessment to evaluate agritourism products and services they can offer to generate more revenue. The locals should be legally empowered to ensure they gain from being involved in conservation programs by ensuring their financial

share is well captured on economic policy. Further studies should be performed on the influence of agritourism's service quality to ascertain the missing link between agritourists' expectations and the experience in Kericho County.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Adriana, B. (2009). Environmental supply chain management in tourism: The case of large tour operators. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 17, 1385–1392.
- Aitchison, C., MacLeod, N. E., & Shaw, S. J. (2004). The competitive destination: A sustainable tourism perspective. *Tourism Geographies: An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 6, 508–510.
- Alonso, A. D., & Ogle, A. (2010). Tourism and hospitality small and medium enterprises and environmental sustainability. *Management Research Review*, 33, 818–826.
- Altinay, M., & Hussain, K. (2005). Sustainable agritourism development: A case study of North Cyprus. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17, 272–280.
- Aminian, A. (2012). Environmental performance measurement of tourism accommodations in the pilgrimage urban areas: The case of the Holy City of Mashhad, Iran. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35, 514–522.
- Aminu, M., Muhamad Ludin, A. Z. B., Matori, A. N., Wan Yusof, K., Dano, L. W., & Chandio, I. A. (2013). A Spatial Decision Support System (SDSS) for sustainable rural tourism planning in Johor Ramsar sites, Malaysia. *Environmental Earth Science*, 70, 1113–1124. doi:10.1007/s12665-012-2198-6
- Antimova, R., Nawijn, J., & Peeters, P. (2012). The awareness/attitude-gap in sustainable tourism: A theoretical perspective. *Tourism Review*, 67, 7–16.
- Armitage, D., Berkes, F., & Doubleday, N. (2007). *Introduction: moving beyond co management*. In D. Armitage, F. Berkes, & N. Doubleday (Eds.), *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance* (pp. 1–19). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Ato Arthur, S. N., & Mensah, J. V. (2006). Urban management and heritage tourism for sustainable development: The case of Elmina cultural heritage and management programme in Ghana. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 17, 299–312.
- Austin, N. K. (2003). Entrepreneurship development and tourism in rural African communities. *Journal of African Business*, 4, 87–101.
- Ayala, H. (1995). Ecoresort: A 'Green' master plan for the international resort industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14, 351–374.
- Brown, K., Turner, R.K., Hameed, & H., Bateman, I. (1997). Environmental carrying capacity and tourism development in the Maldives and Nepal. *Environmental Conservation*, 24(4), 316–325.
- Beeton, S. (2006) *Community development, through rural tourism*. Landlink Press, Australia.
- Baker, J. E. (1997). Trophy hunting as a sustainable use of wildlife resources in Southern and Eastern Africa. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5, 304–321.
- Blancas, F. J., Gonzalez, M., Lozano-Oyola, M., & Perez, F. (2010). The assessment of sustainable tourism: Application to Spanish coastal destinations. *Ecological Indicators*, 10, 484–492.
- Gary, M., & Ray, N. M. (2003), Legacy tourism: the search for personal meaning in heritage travel. *Tourism Management*, 24(6), 713–717.
- Hill, J. & Gale, T., 2009. *Ecotourism and Environmental Sustainability: Principles and Practices*. Published by Ashgate p.261, Britain.
- Kenya, National Policy on Culture and Heritage (2009). *Ministry of Sports, Culture and the*

- Arts. Government Printer, Nairobi
- Manyara, G., & Jones, E. (2007). Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: an exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6), 628-644.
- Merceda, J.S. (2009). *Local participation as a tool for rural tourism development*. MA European Tourism Management; Bournemouth University
- Rooke M. K, (2007) Critical Success Factors for Cultural Heritage Tourism Operations: The University of Georgia.
- Rusten E. (2010). *A practical guide for schools: The computer system sustainability toolkit*.
- Scheyvens, R. (2002). *Rural tourism for development: empowering communities*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. Prentice-Hall, England
- Seattle, (2013). *Rural tourism development processes in Western North America: Washington tourism alliance*. Puget Sound Regional Council.
- Stem, C., Lassoie, J., Lee, D., & Deshler, D. (2003). Community participation in ecotourism benefits: The link to conservation practices and perspectives. *Society and Natural*. 16, 387-413.