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ABSTRACT

There are currently 962 geographic sites in the world that have been classified as World Heritage. World Heritage is a unique concept, privy to and defined by UNESCO-- the United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural organization, one of the specialized agencies and autonomous organizations established within the UN-United Nations system. World Heritage is governed by an international treaty called the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 1972 (The ‘Convention’). The inscription of a World Heritage Site or designation of World Heritage Status is highly coveted and considered in UNESCO parlance to be of “Outstanding Value to Humanity.” There are only 4 heritage property sites of English-speaking islands in the Caribbean basin, one of which is located on the island of St. Lucia called The Pitons Management Area (PMA). The PMA comprises 2902 hectares of protected marine and terrestrial property inscribed in 2004. In 2008, the island faced the threat of placement on UNESCO’s List of World Heritage in Danger (LWHD) for breaches of the Convention. The main purpose of this study was to evaluate the perceptions of World Heritage Status from three identified stakeholders: UNESCO, the St. Lucian national government and the local Soufrière township-home of the PMA. This was an exploratory attempt at gauging perceptions of local voices on World Heritage Status as it relates to the PMA and the island’s classification as a small-island developing state (SIDS). Using political ecology as a theoretical framework for analyzing the role of power relationships in this case study, this research revealed that there is an overall lack of communication between the Soufrière community and the national government regarding education and sensitizing about the
World Heritage program mandates and incorporating the local citizenry in the protection of their heritage. The majority of the local participants’ support for World Heritage Status on the island of St. Lucia was dependent on perceptions of increased income and employment opportunities associated with World Heritage as a global construct and narrative. This research also showed concerns of UNESCO and the St. Lucian national government to be at odds with the 1972 Convention. Results indicated that the varied perceptions of the three stakeholder groups are based on the prioritized interests of each and incommensurate with the aims of protecting the PMA’s heritage for posterity.
CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

“The Pitons, close up, were just as surprising as they had looked from the air: two lonely spikes jutting out of the coast of the island, each shaped like the Matterhorn, and one of them slightly taller than the other. Their perpendicular sides were coated with red, green and canary-yellow moss and creeper, and when from our little boat in the gulf that they enclosed, we clapped our hands, a host of birds took flight from their nests on invisible ledges and gyrated clamorously above our heads”

—From the Traveler’s Tree by Patrick Leigh Fermor (1950, p. 197)

Introduction

The Pitons Management Area (PMA), a unique, biodiverse area on the island of St. Lucia in the Western Caribbean is a 2004 UNESCO inscribed World Heritage Site. The site’s status was approved based on the unique beauty, biodiversity and geology, as identified by the 1972 UNESCO Convention’s “natural criteria” (UNESCO, 2008a, 2008b). This research project was conceptualized based on surfacing news about the integrity of the PMA’s protected Status, 5 years post-inscription. The government of St. Lucia was currently facing threats to de-list the PMA from UNESCO’s World Heritage List since a 2008 acknowledgement from the World Heritage Center revealed concerns about the integrity of the PMA’s status due to lack of oversight and management of activity in the protected area. Cited threats indicated development pressures linked to luxury development property for the tourism industry (IUCN, 2011; UNESCO, 2007). This project was attempted as an exploratory study aimed at gauging perceptions of World Heritage Status. Focus on 3 identified PMA stakeholders (UNESCO, the St. Lucian national government and the local Soufrière township) were used to identify gaps in
perceptions of World Heritage Status respective of each of the project’s stakeholder data samples.

Heritage as a concept in the academic literature is broad, purposefully ambiguous and malleable (Harvey, 2001). It is subjective and has been viewed in the literature to encompass individual identity, collective identity, as political, fake or genuine ‘performance,’ tangible or intangible (Lowenthal, 1998; Urry, 2005; Chambers, 2009; Smith & Akagawa, 2009; Smith & Waterton, 2009; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009; Williams, 2009). More common to the heritage debate is the task of its preservation and/or conservation. Treatment of the heritage in this project will consider Howard’s (2003) definition as “anything that someone wishes to conserve or to collect, and to pass on to future generations” (p. 6). It is viewed as a social process, where the current generation is constantly negotiating and defining what and how the past is honored. It is seen as important to identity at any level, be it individual, collective group, nation, or state. The idea of World Heritage is a fairly new phenomenon of the 20th century. It is a unique concept in which the responsibility for protection of natural and cultural heritage around the world is attempted.

The institutional home of World Heritage is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), one of the specialized agencies of the UN. This unique heritage program is governed by an international treaty called the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, adopted by UNESCO in 1972, also referenced as the ‘World Heritage Convention’ or ‘the Convention.’ These abbreviated forms shall be referenced interchangeably from this point forward. Under the Secretariat of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO “seeks to encourage the identification, protection and
preservation of cultural and natural heritage around the world, considered to be of “Outstanding Value to Humanity” (UNESCO, n.d, para. 3). With the exception of the United States, World Heritage Sites (WHS) are very popular places for wealthy tourists in the global North to visit (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). A significant decision of the 29th session of UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee in Durban, South Africa in 2005, determined that other parts of the world besides the dominant European and Judeo-Christian monuments and sites should be represented on UNESCO’s World Heritage Site List (UNESCO, 2009).

At the time of data collection, the heritage area of study, the Pitons Management Area (PMA), was the most recently inscribed of three World Heritage Sites in the Eastern Caribbean (Nicholas & Thapa, 2010). The area was granted World Heritage Status on June 30th, during the 28th Session of the World Heritage Center in Suzhou, China in 2004 (The National Review, 2010). The area comprises a total of 2,909 hectares which is being used for tourism, residential and fishing. The heritage property is located in the town of Soufrière on the central west coast of the Caribbean island of St. Lucia. Often called the ‘Helen of the West-Indies,’ St. Lucia is situated along the East Caribbean archipelago between the islands of Martinique and St. Vincent and 110 miles- North-West of the island of Barbados. The island’s approximate geographic location is Latitude 14° N and 61° W Longitude with an area of 617.5 km² and an estimated 43 kilometers long and twenty-two kilometers-wide. St. Lucia is volcanic in origin with a forested, hilly interior, intersected by fertile valleys (Momsen, 1996, xv; CIA, 2012).

The town of Soufrière is home to the most iconic twin peaks of the Caribbean landscape- The Pitons. They are “precipitous” volcanic plugs located within the PMA, just south of the town of
Soufrière. The largest peak is known as Gros Piton (pronounced Goh-Pee-Toh) at 786 meters and Petit Piton (pronounced: Pee-tee-Pee-Toh) at 738 meters. Soufrière has a rich historical and cultural heritage. It was an important area to pre-Columbian peoples known as the Amerindians who may have regarded the twin peaks as part of their spiritual/deific worship. The Amerindians were displaced by African populations enslaved in the 17th century by the French. Base camps, caves and ambush sites still exist from a history of slave rebellions in the Soufrière area. Plantation estates and sugar mills are also remnants of the area’s heritage (SRDF, 2010). Plantation agriculture included cultivation of tobacco, coffee, coconut and sugar cane crops.

The economy of St. Lucia consequently remained largely agriculturally-based, with the cultivation of coconut, citrus, vegetables, root crops and bananas. Bananas at last estimate represented about 40% of the island’s export commodities (ECLAC, 2011, Saint Lucia Economic & Social Review, 2002). International agreements over tariffs, import licenses and the continuing free trade debate during the banana wars in the early 1990’s (Anderson, Taylor & Josling, 2003; Myers, 2004; Timms, 2006) contextualized the island’s push to a service oriented economy with tourism being the main foreign-exchange earner. The tourism industry is the fastest growing on the island. The national government’s ability to balance imports and exports is a constant struggle that has sustained deficits rather than surpluses. GDP per capita, currently stands at $12,800 according to 2011 estimates (CIA, 2012). St. Lucia’s population is currently estimated at 162,000 with over 80% of the population of African descent. A unique Anglo-French culture speaks to two centuries of constant war between the English and French since the island’s colonial discovery in the 17th century (Momsen, 1996, xv; Saint Lucia National Trust, 2011; CIA, 2012).
St. Lucia has been touted, the only place in the world with a ‘drive-in’ volcano, which is accessed through a “break in the edge of a caldera, thought to have collapsed some 40,000 years ago” (Momsen, 1996, xv). This area is home to a perennially bubbling mineral-rich grey mud and active sulphur springs. The area has attracted considerable geothermal research since 1974 (Momsen, 1996, xv). The PMA property is mainly terrestrial but includes part of the Soufrière Marine Management Area (SMMA), which contains a diversity of marine features and life. This includes 60% coral reef cover and 168 finfish species. There is a total of 245 plant species on Gros and Petit Pitons [of which] 8 are rare species. There are 27 bird species, 5 of which are endemic (UNESCO, 2004). The site is divided into three management zones: “(1) Terrestrial Conservation Area (17% of total area); (2) Terrestrial Multiple Use Area (53%); and (3) Marine Management Area (30%). The majority of the Terrestrial Conservation Area is owned by the government, while 80% of the Multiple Use area is privately owned. The Marine Management Area is further segmented into five zones: a marine reserve, fishing priority area, yachting area, multi-purpose, and recreational area” (The National Review, 2010, p.1).

Tourism, particularly resort development is the dominant economic activity in the Multiple use area with two major resort hotels in operation therein (Nicholas & Thapa, 2010). Undoubtedly, the PMA is a major tourist attraction. The island receives over 250,000 visitors annually. According to the government of St. Lucia’s Central Statistics Office, the highest visitor peak exceeded 325,000 in 2005 (CSO St. Lucia, 2011).

The pursuit of World Heritage Status is voluntary and the process can be protracted and relatively expensive. It is considered a great feat to achieve placement on UNESCO’s coveted
World Heritage List (WHL). However, the inclusion of international agencies or collective political entities in the management of heritage resources around the world poses many questions, particularly that of the relationship between global-local interactions. World Heritage Sites are unique examples of global-local interaction where the stakeholders can serve to be selective in the choosing, designating, planning and managing processes of the heritage property (Wall & Black, 2004). World Heritage Status and its relationship to small island developing states (SIDS) with economies largely based on tourism as with many Caribbean islands is important to evaluate. SIDS are considered to be “highly vulnerable because of their exposure to hurricanes; limited land and natural resource base, fragile marine ecosystem and limited economic diversification with a high degree of openness to external economic influences and growing national debt” (Saint Lucia National Trust, 2011, para. 2).

Trade-offs, priorities, needs, rights and opportunities become the consequent issues of debate that pose World Heritage and the designation of World Heritage Status as inherently political. Local perceptions of World Heritage Status become an important perspective to consider. Perceptions thus, can be viewed as an integral part of the equation in leveraging sustainability and equity among stakeholders, particularly those most directly impacted by policies, be they internal or external. “Stakeholders are impacted by heritage designation in different ways. They ascribe different values to the sites and have different access to power over the management of the sites as well as over their own relationships to the sites” (Wall & Black, 2004, p. 436). Knowledge of these perspectives cannot be deferred if heritage protection is the goal. A review of the literature showed perceptions to be relevant in evaluating programs that are implemented in particularly third-world spaces (the global south) in reference to global issues
such as biodiversity, sustainability and protected areas where community based development (CBD) approaches have been implemented. However, limited evaluation of this unique program of UNESCO’s World Heritage can be found and even further limited in the Caribbean region (Nicholas, 2007; Nicholas, Thapa & Ko, 2009a). Perceptions of populations in the global north or the more affluent European communities (Driml & Common, 1996; Titchen, 1996; van der Aa, Groote & Huigen, 2004; Hommes, Vinke-de Kruijf, Otter & Bouma, 2009) on the protection and use of natural marine and terrestrial resources are more likely to be found and even in this category, arguably limited. Further, critique of global issues and their itinerant policies and programs have only recently become topics of concern (Smith & Akagawa, 2009; Keough, 2011; Titchen, 1996).

Political ecology literature has shown inconsistencies with the vision of sustainability that is built into most global programs and their accompanying policies in the investigation of global-local interactions. Yet, perspectives from the owners of heritage property are rarely inclusive of World Heritage as a concept and program outside of UNESCO’s publications and regional or international conventions. Reflection of UNESCO’s World Heritage Program and its applicability in the global south is necessary. The work of Nicholas et al. (2009a) stand as one of the rarer pieces of academic literature dedicated to the PMA regarding residents’ perspectives. Management of the site was found to be disjointed with little involvement of the local Soufrière community. Nicholas et al. (2009a) viewed local residents support for a World Heritage Site as fundamental to the sustainability and integrity of the site. There is room in the literature however, to consider what perceptions exist of World Heritage Status on more exploratory terms.
Problem Statement:

There is insufficient knowledge about UNESCO’s World Heritage Site program in the Pitons Management Area on the island of St. Lucia and the meanings which accompany World Heritage Site Status among the local population. Knowledge gaps exist between the identified stakeholders: UNESCO, the St. Lucian national government and the local Soufrière population. This research project will help provide a better basis to developing country governments and to add to the body of knowledge on World Heritage in a unique part of the world. The results of the study will address the following research questions:

The overarching question of this thesis is accompanied by particular research questions I have attempted to answer as well:

Overarching Question:
What are the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding World Heritage Site Status?

Sub Questions:

Q1: Which stakeholders were involved in World Heritage Site Inscription?

Q2: What are the local perceptions of World Heritage Status in a Small Island Developing State (SIDS)?

Q3: Are there power imbalances in decision-making processes for the Pitons Management Area, World Heritage Site?

The remainder of this thesis is organized into eight chapters: Chapter 2 gives a brief background on World Heritage Status as a concept of heritage and a review of perceptions as it relates to
global-local interaction in the literature; Chapter 3 examines the theoretical framework for this study; Chapter 4 describes the research design and methodology as employed to answer the project’s research questions; Chapter 5 provides a summation of the study area used for the field portion of the project; Chapter 6 presents the results of the applied methodology; Chapter 7 provides a discussion of the project’s research findings and the final chapter, Chapter 8, revisits the significance of the research in consideration of the project’s findings.
CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter provides a brief, but adequate background of World Heritage [Status] as a concept of heritage, a unique and inherently broad field of study in social science literature. A review of the existing body of knowledge on perception studies as it relates to global-local interactions will be covered in addition to an examination of the unique category of SIDS, representative of the project’s study area.

World Heritage

Heritage as a concept can mean different things to different people. In the academic literature, it has evolved mainly in the domains of anthropology, geography and heritage studies and its treatment is based primarily on heritage conservation and/or preservation. It is unanimous however, that anybody can define heritage. UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee endorses “the modern concept of ‘heritage’, from the Roman law definition of patrimonium as “inherited property that is transmitted from parents to children” (UNESCO, 2011c, p. 9). In more contemporary, applicable terms, heritage can be viewed as “the legacy of the past, the present, and that which we are morally obliged to give to future generations so that they can learn from, increase and enjoy it” (UNESCO, 2011c, p. 9). The literature’s treatment of the heritage concept as “modern” is based on the consensual notion of its advent as a 20th century phenomenon. It is
treated as a broad subject: purposefully vague and malleable (Harvey, 2001). Defining heritage in the scholarly literature illustrate various concepts, mainly heritage as individual identity, as collective identity, as inherently political, as ‘fake or genuine’ performance (Harrison, 2005). It can be considered both tangible and intangible (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). The breadth of the heritage concept, seemingly implies a subjective nature, and consequently, involves constant negotiations. Harrison (2005) asserts that “debates and conflicts over heritage take place in an ever-shifting scenario, where the ‘achievements’ of one class, one ethnic group, one nation state, one era are always negotiated and reassessed by the next” (p. 9). Therefore, sociopolitical attributes such as these are pervasive and crucial in how heritage is represented at any point in time. Germane to the topic of heritage as study then, is its link to power, particularly the power to oblige a worldview, especially of the past into the present. Harvey (2001) contributes to this understanding in a critical look at this modern perspective of the heritage concept. He considers a longer historical view of the heritage concept as a social process, least concerned about solving a composite of its immediate problems but rather, engaging the discussion of how identity, power and authority are produced in society. For purposes of brevity and simplicity, Peter Howard’s (2003) definition of heritage shall be used. Howard (2003) defines heritage as “anything that someone wishes to conserve or to collect, and to pass on to future generations” (p. 6). The highly subjective nature of heritage can be contentious discourse and more so problematic for the individual or group taking on the responsibility of protecting heritage. It is unanimous however, that heritage plays an important role in creating individual, community and national identity (Ashworth & Graham, 1997; McLean, 2006; Moore & Whelan, 2007; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Howard (2003) notes that heritage traverses several classifications that may not fall into discrete categories in terms of the kinds of things that are conserved or collected, e.g. landscape
or artifacts; the types of people who engage in conserving and collecting like academics or visitors and the levels of identity such as family heritage or regional heritage.

The scope of the literature however, is wanting in several fields on the topic. Material on conservation techniques for both tangible and intangible heritage is common. However, “material that examines the concept of heritage as a unity, which concentrates on questions of ownership of heritage and its purposes, is much more limited” (Howard, 2003, p. 9). Heritage scholars have recognized that the concept in all its forms cannot be compartmentalized easily for analysis as there will always be difficulties between the varied dimensions at which the subject can be addressed. Again, it is not necessarily discrete. The illustration of the ‘heritage cube’ is used to help conceptualize these varied dimensions and articulate the possibilities of stakeholders involved in the ‘heritage process.’ Howard (2003) states that in the ‘heritage process,’ “one can trace a process followed by items, entering the heritage chain. This moves through discovery or formation, inventory, designation, protection, renovation, commodification and, sometimes destruction” (Howard, 2003, p. 186). The author utilizes this cube for simplicity. The identified dimensions are always in flux. In reality, negotiating heritage is complex as these dimensions are ever shifting and sometimes rapidly.

World Heritage is demonstrated as one example in the ‘levels of identity’ dimension of ‘the heritage cube.’ World heritage in the literature is articulated as a unique concept, privy to and defined by the international, institutional body--UNESCO. In terms of formation- how things are chosen from the myriad possibilities to be identified as heritage, World Heritage is an arduous and very unique and selective process.
UNESCO articulated the concept of world heritage adopted by its general counsel at its seventeenth session in Paris, France on 16th November, 1972 through the ‘Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage’ (UNESCO, 1973). This instrument is also colloquially referred to as the World Heritage Convention or simply, the Convention. The World Heritage Convention is considered an international treaty and came into effect in 1977 after 20 countries ratified the treaty (Willems & Comer, 2011). The organization serves as one of the autonomous specialized agencies, under the economic and social council, a principal organ under the United Nations (UN) System (UN, 2011). The Convention acknowledged that there were increasing threats to cultural and natural heritage of the world brought about by natural causes and socio economic conditions. The following figure (Fig: 2), represents the articulation of the two criteria considered for World Heritage listing according to the 1972 Convention. The World Heritage Committee was established as described in Article 8 of The Convention, as an intergovernmental committee with the mandate to oversee the ‘Protection of the Cultural and
Figure 2: Criteria for World Heritage Listing: Article 1 (Cultural Heritage) and Article 2 (Natural Heritage) (UNESCO, 2005, p.10)

Natural Heritage of ‘Outstanding Universal Value.’ (UNESCO, 2005, p.12). The World Heritage Center, housing the Secretariat of the World Heritage Committee, is responsible primarily for the management of The Convention. The Committee itself however, does not make nominations on which sites should make the World Heritage list. These nominations come from nation states
that are party to the 1972 Convention. Representatives from each country that is party to the Convention meet annually for assessment of current sites, in addition to considering new nominations. A World Heritage Site then, is a geographic location ascribed or designated –World Heritage Status by UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee which is said to represent ‘Outstanding/Universal Value to humanity’ based on Articles 1 and 2 of the Convention. At the time of this writing, there were 890 World Heritage Sites under the Cultural (n = 689), Natural (n = 176), and Mixed site (n = 25) categories in 148 countries (UNESCO, 2010).

Given the annual growth of approved sites, the World Heritage brand has become significant and especially desired by developing countries for numerous perceived and actual benefits, notably increased tourism activity (Timothy & Boyd, 2006; Leask, 2006; Li, Wu & Cai, 2008; Smith & Duffy, 2003; Thapa, 2007). An application for World Heritage listing is a tedious and complex political process (Harrison, 2005). To maintain inscription on the World Heritage Site list, each government has to uphold the obligations as State Party to the 1972 Convention. Identification and conservation of sites are the most prominent task of the World Heritage Centre and its case-affiliated advisory bodies. These advisory bodies as described under Article 8 (3) of the Convention provide the scientific expertise for UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee. They are primarily represented by but not limited to the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). In meeting the cultural criteria for a world heritage site, ICOMOS insists on the site’s authenticity, while IUCN considers the natural sites based on comprehensiveness and integrity (Howard, 2003).

Considering the three dimensions of ‘the heritage cube’ (Figure 1): type, market and identity, a significant component of the literature and media coverage involves their varied levels and
categories. However, minimal literature covers the roles or perspectives of heritage ‘owners’ within the dimension of the heritage ‘market.’ Any discursive threads on heritage, involve primarily identifying categorical heritage areas and how best to manage them. Internal assessments such as UNESCO’s *World Heritage Papers* series and general body meeting reports reflect myriad heritage concerns particularly those of the cultural criteria. However, assessments of the accolade and perceptions of it by the host community are minimal in the body of scholarly literature. World heritage within the scope of this study considers the unique confluence of world heritage - natural heritage and the ‘owners’ of the heritage, with primacy on ‘owners’ perceptions of World Heritage Status. The literature which exists on the assessment of local populations’ perspective of World Heritage Status suggests that the least powerful voices in these populations have minimal participation in the heritage process (Chambers, 1997; Black & Wall, 2001; Hampton, 2005; De Cesari, 2010). “The meanings sites hold for these stakeholders may be quite different from these propounded by national tourism marketing agencies and UNESCO” (Harrison, 2005, p. 7).

The literature acknowledges World Heritage Status as a highly valued promotional tool for developing tourism for countries in the lesser developed world (Timothy & Boyd, 2006). World heritage sites (WHS) are very popular places to visit for affluent tourists from the global north (with the exception of the United States). These sites are frequented around the globe every year as new sites are being added to the list. With the increased visibility and popularity of these sites, there is greater focus on effective management that takes into account equity in the heritage resource (Knapman & Stoeckl, 1995; Nursey-Bray & Rist, 2009; Carter & Bramley, 2002). Yet, Howard (2003) notes that as valuable as heritage resources may be in their varied dimensions, they are not the most prioritized for public funding in any country, developed or developing. The
question of governance of the resources becomes critical. The political power and autonomy of international agencies and the predominant epistemic treatment of natural resource management is commonly applied without question. Finnemore (1993) made specific reference to the historic roots of this approach citing UNESCO on the position of the modern state’s stake and responsibility for scientific research: “Specifically, European states’ adoption of state bureaucracies designed to facilitate scientific research since World War I [via] the campaign-like strategies of UNESCO in purveying the idea of the control of science by the state as a “collective good” (Finnemore, 1993, p. 583). The author expressed these directives as a new way for international organizations to exert influence of their organizational outputs. States do not influence or partake of this scientific production and output. It is done at a systemic level as opposed to the national level of the states doing the adopting. It is an international organization that persuades the adoption of scientific norms. The control therefore, is from the outside. By virtue of the varied entities involved, heritage is inherently political with some entities having more power than others.

UNESCO’s political imperative is to expand representation on the World Heritage list. Prior to the last decade, Europe and Judea-Christian monuments and sites dominated the World Heritage list (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). The World Heritage Committee in the interest of implementing its ‘Global Strategy for a Balanced, Representative and Credible World Heritage List’ adopted in 1994, considered 38 underrepresented small island developing states (SIDS) for implementation of the World Heritage Program. The latter was established at the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee in Durban, South Africa, in 2005 (UNESCO, 2009). The World Heritage Center aimed to alleviate this disparity in the underrepresentation of SIDS on the WHS. As of July, 2011, there were 26 world heritage properties located in SIDS as shown in Figure 3.
World Heritage properties located in SIDS (as at July 2011)

1. Old Havana and its Fortifications, Cuba, (iv)(v), 1982
3. Aldabra Atoll, Seychelles, (vii)(ix)(x), 1982
5. Trinidad and the Valley de los Ingenios, Cuba, (iv)(v), 1988
7. San Pedro de la Roca Castle, Santiago de Cuba, Cuba, (iv)(v), 1997
9. East Rennell, Solomon Islands, (ix), 1998
11. Viñales Valley, Cuba, (iv), 1999
14. Alejandro de Humboldt National Park, Cuba, (ix)(x), 2001
15. Pitons Management Area, Saint Lucia, (vii)(viii), 2004
16. Qal’at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun, Bahrain, (ii)(iii)(iv), 2005
17. Urban Historic Centre of Cienfuegos, Cuba, (ii)(v), 2005
19. Historic Centre of Camagüey, Cuba, (iv)(v), 2008
20. Le Morne Cultural Landscape, Mauritius, (i)(vi), 2008
23. Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande, Cape Verde, (ii)(iii)(vi), 2009
25. Phoenix Islands Protected Area, Kiribati, (vii)(ix), 2010

Figure 3: List of World Heritage Properties located in SIDS as of July, 2011 (UNESCO, 2011b)

Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) are cited in the literature as the first to synthesize global and regional issues, challenges and practices related to cultural heritage and tourism, specifically in least developed countries (LDC’s). The authors’ review of the ‘trend’ of World Heritage in the LDC’s of the world, noted primarily the relative risks and opportunities associated with this unique designation of WHS. Lack of cooperation, political will and financial constraints are demonstrated challenges experienced in LDC’s. These realities produce inconsistencies and
inadequacies in management and planning leading to anthropogenic and natural pressures. These conditions consequently warrant placement on UNESCO’s List of World Heritage in Danger (WHD) (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). WHD/LWHD is articulated in the 1972 Convention under Article 11(4) as shown in Figure 4:

**Article 11(4) Excerpt**

“…a list of the major operations are necessary and for which assistance, has been requested under this Convention. This list shall contain an estimate of the cost of such operations. The list may include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use of ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves. The Committee may at any time, in case of urgent need, make a new entry in the List of World Heritage in Danger and publicize such entry immediately.”

Figure 4: Excerpt of Article 11(4) of UNESCO’s 1972 Convention articulates the conditions for placement on UNESCO’s List of World Heritage in Danger (LWHD) (UNESCO, 1973, p.139; 2011a)

The process from first application, to ratification of The Convention to World Heritage inscription can well exceed a decade. It is a voluntary motion for any state party to seek placement on UNESCO’s World Heritage Site List. World Heritage Status remains a coveted accolade despite the general assumptions found in the literature of: “global visibility, increased visitation, increased tourism earnings, possible acquisition of international assistance to conserve
and manage the site and as a tool for marketing and promotion” (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009, p. 11). However, the literature reveals these assumptions to be tacit, erroneous and unsubstantiated (Hall & Piggin, 2001; Hazen, 2008; Li, Bihu & Liping, 2008).

SIDS can also fall into the category of an LDC. SIDS characterize a specific political identity – The United Nations Department of Economics and Social Affairs, Division for Small Island Developing States (UNDESA), lists 52 SIDS divided into three geographical regions: the Caribbean (with 23 States); the Pacific (with 20 States); and Africa, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea, or AIMS region (with 9 States) (UNESCO, 2009). These self-governing islands are similar in terms of their economies, geography and politics. SIDS fundamentally suffers the vicissitudes of the global market. The financial resources of these states are highly dependent on external economics. UNESCO’s literature recognizes that SIDS share similar interests and concerns, such as “marine and coastal management, impacts of climate change [and] issues of sustainable development.” (UNESCO, 2009, p. 8). This UNESCO report from the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2009, entitled Report on the World Heritage Programme for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) concluded that all SIDS in the world heritage network need the means for improving communication with access to information.

Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) propose that UNESCO plays a pivotal role in preserving the cultural heritage of LDCs with limited financial and technical resources for conservation. So far, there is insufficient literature to suggest that there is proper evaluation of the World Heritage Status of heritage sites, particularly in the least developed world and of focus here, the small island developing states (SIDS). Of particular interest in the review of UNESCO World Heritage literature, is the limited funding available for the expense of preserving heritage in all
its recognized forms under the cultural and natural criteria. Article 15 of the Convention established the ‘World Heritage Fund,’ but little reference to this fund can be found in literature on the maintenance of WHS. International cooperation or assistance programs, extra-budgetary sources provided by European countries and independent charities are the major donors to the fund. Many of these donations are ‘at will’ or gained through solicitation (UNESCO, 2009, p. 6).

The agreement to include the underrepresented states on the World Heritage List was made in acknowledgement of the Convention’s mandate to preserve the world’s ‘cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding/Universal Value to humanity. Yet, primacy is seemingly placed on the quantitative achievements of the Convention rather than a qualitative perspective on the representation of these inscribed sites. Considerations of governance on the part of UNESCO, as perceived by the local population are poignant in assessing World Heritage Status in SIDS.

The concepts of sustainable development, sustainability, sustainable tourism and eco-tourism have not been given substantial attention in this work. It must be noted that acknowledgement of these concepts and their practical applicability is important in light of this project, the region and its overall necessity in heritage conservation/preservation. However, it is not the researcher’s intent to provide an in-depth review of these commonly juxtaposed concepts. World heritage transects various iterations of the maintenance of generational ownership and survival of heritage resources. The literature on the concepts of sustainability and sustainable development, sustainable tourism and eco-tourism in the scholarly literature is replete and has broad appeal with diverse paths and minimal specificity (Wall, 1997; Parris & Kates, 2003). These concepts are by definition contentious. Parris and Kates (2003) confer that sustainable development does not have any unanimous indicators supported by scientific process. However, Prugh, Costanza
and Daly (2000) provide that there are regionally focused understandings around these concepts being modeled.

The evaluation of UNESCO’s privileged designation - World Heritage Status and its relationship to sites on an international, state and local level reveals some geographic spatiality. The lesser developed world and by extension, SIDS are under-represented in world heritage literature.

The Caribbean Small Island Developing State (SIDS)
What is known of the islands of the Caribbean has been geographically and politically demarcated in many terms: the Caribbean, Caribbean Basin, West-Indies, Commonwealth Caribbean, British Caribbean, Eastern Caribbean, Antilles, Leeward Islands and Windward Islands. For purposes of this study, SIDS in the Caribbean basin that encompasses a common political definition of particular reference to the study’s inquiry shall be used. However, an authoritative definition of SIDS according to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development refers to currently 51:

“... low-lying coastal countries that share similar sustainable development challenges, including small population, limited resources, remoteness, susceptibility to natural disasters, vulnerability to external shocks, and excessive dependence on international trade...the countries are categorized by their three regions; the Caribbean, the Pacific, and the AIMS (Africa, Indian Ocean, Mediterranean and South China Sea)” (UN-DESA, 2007, para. 1).

The economies of the Caribbean Basin countries are generally small island economies that are heavily dependent on the United States, the EU, and increasingly, China and other Asian countries for trade, investment, and economic assistance. The regional population is estimated at 17 million inhabitants (Pollard, Christ, Dean, Linton, Thomas & Butcher, 2009).
The geographic locations of the Caribbean Basin countries offer the advantages of proximity to the large U.S. market, many shipping routes, tropical fruit production and access to sun, sea and sand in a growing year-round tourism industry (Pollard et al., 2009). In the region’s most recent history, small island state economies have been dependent on agricultural products, primarily sugar and bananas, manufacturing of apparel and small electronic goods, tourism and recently financial service to provide employment to their populations and to balance their budgets. SIDS have provided access to cheaper labor and favorable tariff programs offered by developed countries or economically powerful political entities as the United States, EU and Canada (Pantojas-García, 2001; Alexandraki & Lankes, 2004; Pollard et al., 2009). However, being that they are in recipient positions of these external implementations, it can be argued that small island developing states may only temporarily benefit from these arrangements, especially in cases where multinational corporations or foreign investors renege on agreements. To bolster their bargaining power for trade and development for their economy, the region has had to unite in several ‘configuration pacts’ within and outside the region. These include opportunities for loans and grants to help finance development projects, economic integration for lesser developed islands and means to facilitate free-trade agreements. Many of these agreements were implicitly borne for protection in the global markets in the sale of agricultural produce, primarily bananas. The weightier shift from agriculturally based economies to tourist-based economies for some SIDS like St. Lucia was a consequence of international and market vicissitudes which severed the region’s agricultural dependence (Conway, 1997; Armstrong & Read, 1998; Karagiannis & Witter, 2004). A look at the literature on tourism in the Caribbean basin reveals the contentious nature of its service based industry and its dependence on the volatility of its environment. Tourism is a major economic sector in SIDS and tourist arrivals in some cases substantially
exceed carrying capacity (Nurse & Seem, Year Unknown; McElroy & De Albuquerque, 1998; de Ferranti, Perry, Lederman & Maloney, 2002; Thomas, Pigozzi & Sambrook, 2005).

Further issues noted that the impact of tourism on the balance of payments of a country can be misleading. The industry adds substantially to gross revenues but the expenses from tourist-related imports can be exorbitant providing smaller net revenues (McKee & Tisdell, 1990; McElroy & De Albuquerque as cited in Gayle, 2002). It is implied and espoused therefore, that tourism can play a role in development of SIDS, but caution against heavy reliance on this industry for economic development is necessary. Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) sufficiently sum up the relative relationship of tourism to parts of the developing world like SIDS in our present time:

“There is recognition in tourism studies in general, and heritage tourism in particular, that tourism and its impacts, constraints, and management implications are different in the developing world from conditions in the developed world. These differences are underscored principally by differences in economics; politics, power and empowerment; colonialism; conservation/preservation practices; social mores; cultural vitality; gender and socio-economic disparities; urbanization; and legislative engagement, among others” (Timothy & Nyaupane, p. 3).

Community Perceptions

There is sparse literature on local perceptions in formerly colonized places regarding WHS (Aas, Ladkin & Fletcher, 2005; Yuksel, Bramwell & Yuksel, 1999). Extant literature focuses primarily on perceptions based on Community Based Management (CBM) practices. Inquiry into the perceptions, attitudes and/or awareness of local, resident stakeholder communities is lauded as necessary for biodiversity, conservation or preservation initiatives. Thus, analysis of awareness
for conservation of endangered species in Assam, India (Heinen & Shrivastava, 2009); assessment of attitudes of local people in relation to personal costs and benefits associated with various intervention programs, socioeconomic and demographic characteristics in protected parks in Nepal (Mehta & Heinen, 2001; Mehta & Kellert, 1998); local peoples’ knowledge, aptitude and perceptions of planning and management issues over conflict issues between locals and authorities in India (Rao, Nautiyal, Maikhuri & Saxena, 2003), urban and rural perceptions of protected areas in a wildlife sanctuary (Triguero-Mas, Olomí-Solà, Jha, Zorondo-Rodríguez & Reyes-García, 2009), all give credence to the importance of the local voice in natural [heritage] resource management. Recent work in tourism studies by Nicholas (2007), Nicholas et.al (2009a, 2009b) and Nicholas and Thapa (2010), the only major published literature on perceptions in our geographic area of study, have provided a considerable base to which further inquiry into perceptions of WHS can be made of St. Lucia’s PMA.

The authors’ state that the designation of the PMA as a World Heritage Site is indeed “a major feat for St. Lucia, as a small island developing state…[thus] the need to promote a sustainable development approach to site management is indisputable” (Nicholas et al., 2009a, p. 391). In Residents’ perspectives of a World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia, the authors’ examined the factors which influence local community residents’ support for the Pitons Management Area (PMA) as a World Heritage Site and their support for sustainable tourism development. Their work was premised on Wager’s (1995) and Thapa’s (2007) conclusive view that local residents support for a World Heritage Site is critical to the sustainability of the site in question. The authors employed stakeholder theory as the primary lens through which tourist related activities are assessed for sustainability measurements. Originally a business/corporate
sector concept, stakeholder theory “recognizes that plural interests [exist] and particular groups have varying degrees of involvement in tourism” (Le Pelley & Laws, 1998, p. 90). Stakeholders are therefore affected in different ways and by extension; the burdens are shouldered based on the resource capacities of the stakeholders in question. Simply, any party that has an interest (‘stake’) in a project is considered a stakeholder (Laplume, Sonpar & Litz, 2008). Governmental bodies, political groups, local communities and private or public businesses linked to the industry are viewed as the most identifiable stakeholders, relative to the small island tourism economy.

Mehta and Kellert (1998) in their assessment of CBC (Community-Based Conservation) and its ability to stem biodiversity loss in Nepal also utilized perception research as a means toward facilitating greater success in conservation of a natural domain. They affirmed the importance of local community views on implemented policies and programs regarding resource conservation. The heterogeneous nature of communities cited of Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Mason and Cheyne, 2000, also provide some credible bases for the importance of perception research. Bruyere, Beh and Lelengula (2009) in a recent assessment of protected area management in rural Kenya, espoused that contributions to a greater social capital need to be considered; particularly the inclusion of local community voices in decision-making and the realization of tourism benefits. The authors’ goal was to assess the extent to which community members and protected area staff agreed, on the sufficiency of communication and distribution of economic benefits within a protected area in Kenya. Liu, Sheldon and Var’s (1987) research explain residents' perception of tourism and tourists in Hawaii, North Wales, and Istanbul using explanatory economic, social, and environmental variables. Their results indicated that the impact of tourism
on the environment is shared by all the residents regardless of where they are geographically located or how young or old their tourism industry is. First world case studies applying community perceptions at UNESCO sites demonstrated its relevance in forming a conservation management strategy. The consultation of local communities in the trilateral nomination (Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands) in the case of the Wadden Sea Coastal Conservation Area, is a seminal study where UNESCO’s World Heritage program was suspended due to dissent from ‘critical stakeholders.’ It was cited that a “NIMBY- “Not in my backyard” approach was a conglomerate of many factors but primarily, the critical stakeholders perceived minimal benefit for the local population in pursuing the accolade (van der Aa, Groote & Huigen, 2004). However, the literature overall shows that World Heritage Status is generally accepted in favor of listing due to expected benefits to the host nation through the legal protections afforded for successful preservation efforts and the pride in global recognition.

Evidently, this is only a small subset of researchers utilizing perceptions to help articulate better policies and concepts in the management of common resources. Simultaneously, their research demonstrates the necessity and confidence in this kind of qualitative and quantitative research inquiry. Nicholas et.al’ (2009a, 2009b) and Nicholas and Thapa’s (2010) studies attenuated the paucity of empirical research on stakeholder perspectives in the context of a World Heritage Site in the Caribbean region. The author’s indicated that open-ended survey components provided more insightful perceptions. Nicholas et al.’ (2009a) seminal work infers that the PMA’s designation as a WHS is predicated on the use of the resource for economic benefits via tourism.
This research inquiry concerns the investigation of local community perceptions of World Heritage Status in light of UNESCO’s threat to remove the PMA from the WHL to the LWHD. The reality of international programs and/or projects can be considered far removed from the intent and expectations of countries and respective local stakeholders, albeit to varying degrees of affect. Perceptions of the local community allow for the identification and evaluation of gaps which may not be adequately considered in the implementation/adoption of externally influenced programs like World Heritage—essentially, an investigation of power relationships on varying levels of scale. Therefore, in this study, the researcher will extend Nicholas et al.’s. (2009a) work by investigating local community perceptions of the PMA’s World Heritage Status, alongside international and national textual data on St. Lucia’s PMA from UNESCO and the St. Lucian National Government in the identification of power relationships. A political ecology theoretical framework is useful in analysis.
CHAPTER 3:
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The review of literature has established that heritage is a contentious subject matter and that global and local interrelationships on the subject of natural resource heritage in particular, have not adequately accounted for local perspectives on heritage, its use and meaning. In this exploratory study, where the aim is to expand on a study area where minimal information on perspectives of World Heritage Status have been gauged; the established patterns in the literature require a more concrete lens for examination. A theoretical framework for this research was therefore established to gage this amorphous landscape between and among the identified stakeholders: UNESCO, the St. Lucian national government and the local Soufrière population. Political ecology as a field of study has examined global south geographies similar to the project’s study site. By applying the central theme of ‘power’ and how it is wielded in this phenomenon of World Heritage will allow the identification and construction of power relationships between and among the representative stakeholder samples. Thus, the theoretical framework will lay the foundation for examination of stakeholder perceptions through political ecology as a theoretical and applied scientific study.

Political Ecology

Political ecology as a field of study emerged as a response to central questions within social science disciplines that were inadequately addressed in the investigation of human-
environmental relationships. Political ecology developed from the separate theoretical fields of political economy and ecology. ‘Political economy’ on the most basic level and in its earlier iteration, dealt with the management of wants (goods), how these goods would be produced and how they would be distributed. This relationship involves the practices through which powers in their myriad forms are exercised (Caporaso & Levine, 1992; Usher, 2003; Paulson & Gezon, 2005). The latter ‘ecology’ focuses on the interrelationship between organisms and their environment (Begon, Townsend & Harper, 2006). For varied research interests, political ecology is used as a framework to help scientists understand complex, political, economic, and cultural processes that are at play at a particular geographic scale.

Scale is significant in the objective investigation of any geographic phenomenon. Political ecology as a study speaks to relationships of marginalization. However the varied levels of scale investigated can determine how much influence can be attributed to the phenomenon in question. The field is inherently interdisciplinary with many contributions made by specialists in agriculture, land tenure, health, development, international law, history and the physical sciences.

*The Political Economy of Soil Erosion in Developing Countries* (Blaikie, 1985) and *Land Degradation and Society* (Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987) were seminal publications that propelled the field’s expansion. Analysis of humans and the investigation of physical environmental problems did not account for political processes that were contributing to resource access or depletions. The earlier works in political ecology investigated associations with land tenure systems, marginalization of social groups and environmental changes such as land degradation
and deforestation with specific focus on the rural and developing world and how it is/has been shaped by wider, external political forces (Blaikie, 1985; Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987). As the field progressed, much research delved into social relations of production and investigation into resource access and control, to understand the varied action levels at which landscapes are negotiated to develop formidable ideas for conservation and sustainable environmental alternatives (Blaikie, 1995; Thrupp, 1993; Greenberg & Park, 1994; Escobar 2001; Brown, 1998). Rural and third world spaces, (contemporarily referred to as the global south) were the primary focus for empirical study. Bryant’s (1998), definition considers political ecology to examine “the political dynamics surrounding material and discursive struggles over the environment in the third world” (p. 79). The global South in political ecology therefore, is said to represent a ‘politicized environment’ and attendant to the commonalities of this political grouping is [found] the role of unequal power relations as a central theme (Bryant, 1998).

The field of political ecology was advanced through research and applied practice by varied contributing disciplines. In the 1990’s, there were theoretical shifts in the politics of environmental discourse as it related to global governance, deforestation and community environmental management and ethnic and gender relations (Peluso, 1992, Schroeder, 1999, Escobar, 1996, Neumann, 1992). The current literature demonstrates these varied discursive paths. These new scholarly considerations emerged in part due to major critique of early political ecology which did not resemble a more organized field of work. Paulson and Gezon (2005) asserted the field of study to be viewed outside the structure of conventional institutions of governance, including considerations of daily interactions on different levels of scale. This was a
unique characteristic as most levels of analysis in social science research were limited to considerations of singular aspects of a phenomenon for analysis.

Advancements in geospatial technology have sophisticated analyses in political ecology. Scale in this field of study relates to “social and biophysical processes that produce distinctive socio-spatial configurations of resources” (Zimmerer & Bassett, 2003, p. 290). These can examine movements of animal species over landscapes and its effect on human populations, for example as Zimmerer and Bassett (2003) did in studying overgrazing by considering carrying capacity and overstocking. External, non-localized influences affect smaller, local landscapes. Global and local concerns therefore, are not viewed as separate but interconnecting. Communities at any point in time therefore, can reflect policies and conditions that do not originate from their own communities or region. Today, political ecology literature covers urban/industrial political ecology (Pelling, 1999, 2003; Swyngedouw & Heynen, 2003; Heynen, Kaika & Swyngedouw 2006), ethics of political ecology (Turner, 2004; Peet, Robbins & Watts, 2011; Gleeson & Low, 2002), first world political ecology (McCarthy, 2002; Walker, 2003; Schroeder, 2005; Schroeder, Martin & Albert, 2006), critical political ecology (Forsyth, 2003, Robbins, 2004), political ecology of geospatial technologies (McCusker & Weiner, 2003), eco analysis/theory in resource management and conservation (Bakker, 2003; Zimmerer & Bassett, 2003; Turner, 2004).

A distinguishable part of the work of the political ecologist is the ‘participation’ as research scientists in bringing awareness to extant power relationships and its association with greater access to social and physical resources. The field calls for the need for practical engagement
with varied stakeholders in finding practical solutions to social-environmental problems. Paulson and Gezon (2005) assert the importance of a commitment to finding methods for evaluating current state and use of resources in locales being studied. Determining how larger economic and political systems affect the site in question and how the discourse on culture and the environment is constructed, becomes pivotal to the political ecologists’ aim to finding alternatives to existing, conventional development models that are marginalizing. Addressing political activity around environmental resources from the perspective of liberation or emancipation potential are also critical discourses in the field of political ecology (Watts & Peet, 2004).

Therefore, the role of political ecology in geographic research is quintessential and has become firmly established in human-environmental research in geography. Topics such as protected areas and nature management regimes which cover the study of non-profit or non-governmental organization (NGO’s) and the globalization of environmental change have gained some influence with increases in global environmental changes, environmentalism and conservation management areas springing up worldwide (Bryant & Bailey, 1997; Watts, 2000; Walker, 2005; Bebbington, 2004). Bebbington (2004) for instance examined the dynamics of NGOs and uneven development which expanded on ideas of varied meanings of development, what the researcher referred to as “resulting geographies of intervention” (p.726). This was based on Cowen and Shenton’s (1998) earlier work, distinguishing between “development as an immanent and unintentional process’ versus ‘development as an intentional activity” (p.50). The former refers to “the existence or development of structural, political processes such as the expansion of capitalist economy while the latter refers to the work of international agencies and other entities
engaged in forwarding projects, programs and policies with finite ends” (Bebbington, 2004, p. 726). A case is firmly made for the geographer’s critical look into flows of knowledge, resources, ideas, values and power that is part of producing and re-producing place and implicit of this, the livelihoods of those who reside in those places (Bebbington, 2004; Escobar, 2001).

**Conceptualizing Development Alternatives**

The different ways development is conceived or how stakeholders participate is inherent of political ecology’s concern with producing alternatives to development and thus management of human-environmental issues. The application of political ecology as a framework within the literature has helped assess how globalized forces can influence policies and practices of environmental protection outside their immediate realms of influence. Stonich (1998) applied a political ecology framework to examine relationships among tourism development and resource uses, in the Bay Islands of Honduras. The researcher concurred that the most impoverished immigrants and residents on these islands were found to be the most vulnerable to environmental health risks stemming from resulting destruction to the physical environment as a consequence of unequal power relationships. The author further articulated that unequal access to resource distributions among various stakeholders were raised by actions attributable to powerful national and international stakeholders in the Bay Islands. Escobar (1998), Bryant and Bailey (1997) and Bryant (1998, 2005) expound considerably on the global south in the context of power relationships and stakeholder involvement. A critical example would be in Escobar’s (1998) case study of the social movement of black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia, where a community based approach to addressing biodiversity/sustainability questions from the perspective of a shared cultural and political agenda, served effective in collective influence at
the state and global levels. Escobar (1998) posited his inquiry in terms of how these social movements created a space— an ‘alternative world’ within the ‘biodiversity network’ to leverage control over their livelihoods. Escobar (1998) demonstrated in his review that the construction of this ‘biodiversity network,’ is a constructed global narrative of risks and possible solutions that have been made simplistic and purveyed wholesale through a network of actors (NGO’s, universities, research institutes to name a few) that has been produced. Arguably, it could be stated that global narratives are still continually being produced by dominant international institutions in the foremost perspectives of science, capital and management.

The black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia collectively contributed within legal frameworks to a request for cultural and territorial rights that was approved by the Colombian government within a timeframe of 2 years. This law which was known as Ley 70 set rules for political and organizational principles which were fundamental in solidifying the social movement of these black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia. This was accomplished through the functional realities of daily life for the inhabitants of the rainforest which not only included the Pacific black communities but also indigenous communities with whom the black activists made alliances and additionally through “ideological and political reflection” by the black activists (Escobar 1998, p. 63). Thus, as a unified political grouping, the black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia were able to exert influence collectively in the government’s sanctioning of the law.

Escobar (1998) expounded that the movement’s success was predicated on an ethnocultural approach where the activists are united on a view of blackness as a collective identity, solidified in a shared cultural experience. Escobar (1998) also notes that similar reflections were made in
Hall’s (1990) reference of Caribbean and Afro-British identities that played a pivotal role in “anticolonial struggles” in mid-20th century. In Escobar’s (1998) case, there is a deliberate motive to create a conducive environment that meets the needs of the collective social group. The researcher acknowledged the activists particular stance on territory as one of their most critical struggles along with the alliances made with indigenous communities the territory also served. The activists articulated idea of territory was seen as a continuous, functional space where the ecosystem is utilized for the community’s needs and is part of the landscape to which social and cultural development is tied. The black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia

“...developed a political ecology framework that incorporates concepts of territory, biodiversity, life corridors, local economies and territorial governability, and alternative development. They were able to push their agenda forward with their consistent interactions with community, state, NGO, and academic sectors” (Escobar, 1998, p. 69).

Escobar’s (1998) research demonstrates a relative and concrete example of a development alternative influenced by the collective perceptions of a localized population who are also a colonized and currently marginalized people.

A more in-depth reflection by Ugglä (2010) considers the discourse on nature and culture as defined by the policies of two dominant international conventions: The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which demonstrate the theoretical and practical controversies that can result in analysis that does not consider the human-environmental relationship as espoused in a political ecology framework. The author investigated the conflicting views of these two international conventions with respect to interconnected environmental issues, climate change and biodiversity. They all showed
evidence of unequal power relations and a concealing of regional differences to dealing with climate change.

“For some time, biodiversity conservation has emphasized the creation of protected areas. This Western model of nature conservation-based on the fragmentation concept and the idea that nature is best preserved as wilderness or natural nature has been exported to the rest of the world. The idea of wilderness as a place devoid of human beings has resulted in removal of native peoples from their land (Colchester 2004; Schelhas 2001). ...this approach to conservation can be counterproductive, since the removal of people and dissolution of local communities breaks ties to the natural environment, which may reduce the interest in long-term stewardship and create conflicts between the indigenous people and park managers”.(Uggla, 2010, p. 86)

What is critical in Uggla’s (2010) work is the demonstrated influence that such international conventions do not speak to in practical and real terms on the ground (in-situ). Literature on CBM (Community-based Management) processes in some of these troubled domains of the global South has brought light to some of these contradictions. The cited motives, arguments and values as articulated by the conventions are agreed to in signatory participation. However, there is obscurity in the view of the relationship between humans and their environment and how such external policies are translated in situ.

Escobar (1998) and Uggla’s (2010) research provide a perspective on this global-local debate that is in keeping with a sustainability paradigm-- a means for local communities to strengthen their autonomy over their resources. Prugh, Costanza and Daily (2000) support that sustainability is not privy to global forces; communities are the primary source of responsibility for creating sustainability in the world.

Bryant (2002) examined a least common phenomenon of the NGO in a case study of biodiversity conservation and indigenous people’s ancestral domain in the Philippines, particularly how the Foucauldian concept of ‘govermentality’ -a concept which involves finding ways in which
‘subjects’ could be brought to internalize state control through self-regulation” resulted in an unconventional alliance. This alliance was participatory development between government and NGO. Bryant (2002) recognized that “this outcome is not necessarily consistent with the core objectives of many NGOs” (p. 269). The researcher shares that the core objective of ‘participatory development,’ widely used by NGO’s has the potential to facilitate unfair exercises of power. The discourses usually do not originate from the NGO or the communities being served. The furthering of projects committed to community participation and empowerment, become governed by power relationships and elites (Bryant, 2002).

Bryant (2002) demonstrated in his study that NGO’s contributed to formal political empowerment of the people; “educating peripheral groups [about] their rights as citizens” (p. 273-274) which furthered social prioritization of new issues such as the protection of the environment. NGO’s were able to secure legal bases for biodiversity conservation in the Philippines through donor-funded and external sources which led to a sanctioned partnership with the government. These new relationships allowed for successful attempts at incorporating/involving residents as participants in park management and other efforts at informing communities about the importance of biodiversity protection and sustainable resource management. They also worked to secure ancestral land through the indigenous peoples mapping of their own domain (their own knowledge bases.). Bryant’s (2002) research demonstrated an anomaly; a contribution to critical literature that challenged conventional notions about NGO’s, specifically in grassroots governance and empowerment. (Bryant (2002) demonstrated that there is room to improve strategies and probe systemic forms of governance in a manner that places the disenfranchised at the fore and in contributory, participatory roles that matter politically in the lives of the disenfranchised. Development alternatives are crucial to political ecology. In
general however, critique of international, transnational entities show inconsistencies in the implementation and impact of environmental governance and the exporting of scientific expertise (Forsyth, 2003; Finnemore, 1993; Mercer, 2002).

**Framework Summary**

Unequal power relationships among peoples, their resources and their use are of pivotal concern to political ecologists of varied disciplinary stripes. Continued work in this field can only serve to further articulate how these relationships are manifested across scales by investigation into how environments are conceived and perceived by the varied stakeholders involved. How these relationships play out in politicized environments is even more crucial. The research project’s attempt to focus on the concerns of stakeholders within this framework is to imply a foundational basis for policy formulation and an alternative to conventional development through the acknowledgement of what can be suggested of small nations, particularly SIDS, considering World Heritage. Beyond acknowledging the realities of capitalistic demands and resulting social systems within the framework of the current world economy, political ecology provides the challenge to work to advance the conditions of the marginalized that are politically, economically and ecologically disenfranchised and the opportunity to reflect on the role of the political ecologist in this regard.

The field of political ecology therefore, seeks to progress inquiry into “alternative and ethically based routes that do as much for improving material conditions as they do for transforming discourses about development” (Bryant & Goodman, 2008,p. 710). There is a need to elucidate on concrete and perhaps nuanced areas of local understandings within understudied, politicized
environments. Conceptualizing perceptions of World Heritage Status in this study, involve ideas of a politicized environment within the perceived and manifested expectations of World Heritage Status in SIDS.
CHAPTER 4:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the research methods used to evaluate perceptions of World Heritage Status by various stakeholders in the PMA as an exploratory study. “Exploratory research seeks to find out what meanings a party gives to their action in addition to the issues that concern them” (Schutt, 2011, p. 13). The research methodology consisted of a key informant survey involving semi-structured one-on-one interviews and content-analysis of web-based archival research. The qualitative procedures and analysis techniques used in the design of this study are described. Unless otherwise specified, ‘key informants’ in this chapter refer to respondents or participants who were identified through the snow-ball sampling procedure and partook in the semi-structured interview process. A three-step coding process and content analysis were employed in the project’s data analysis.

Sampling Design

A qualitative research strategy using a non-probability sampling procedure was employed for this project. This involved a mixed/combination method: purposive sampling strategy (of key informants) utilizing a snowball sampling approach. Semi-structured one-on-one interviews were used as the primary means of data collection because of the desire for in-depth information in addition to practical considerations for [varied] levels of literacy (Bruyere et al., 2009).
Interviews were conducted during a one-month span which commenced in January, 2011. A key informant survey was a necessary component of this research project, to aid the discussion of World Heritage Status from some level of expertise and/or familiarity in heritage management in general as well as the WHS program. It was expected that people in the Soufrière township would be more familiar with developments in the management of the PMA and uses of the natural heritage (general and/or specific) through the local media, direct/indirect connection to the site through employment and by way of local town-hall meetings or other government means of sensitizing the community.

The snow-ball sampling approach commenced with the current PMA manager at the time, who was previously contacted and verbally agreed to participate in the project. At the conclusion of each interview, the key informant and every consenting participant thereafter was asked to recommend names of other adult individuals in the population who would participate in the survey, as the sample ‘snowballed’ in size. Contact was made with the individuals referred by previous key informants. The contact information provided by key informants included land and/or cellular telephone numbers, the individual’s current place of work or residence, and if known, relative work shifts. Prospective participants were contacted within 1-6 hours of gaining the information needed to solicit participation in the research project. Based on distance and feasibility of transport to these prospective participants at the specific time of contact, the researcher was able to solidify participation. Each key informant was reminded as per Institutional Review Board (IRB) regulations that participation in the research project was voluntary; the one-on-one interview would be tape-recorded and their participation in the project or any references to their responses would remain anonymous. The referred individuals were allowed 24 hours to determine their interest in voluntarily participating in the research project.
The majority of the individuals, who were solicited, agreed to participate at initial approach. The remaining key informants made arrangements for future appointments to conduct the one-on-one interviews. The length of individual interviews ranged from between 15-60 minutes. Tests for completeness and saturation were considered based on recommendations by Rubin and Rubin (2005):

- **Completeness**: “What you hear provides an overall sense of the meaning of a concept, theme, or process” (p. 70).

- **Saturation**: “You gain confidence that you are learning little that is new from subsequent interviews[s]” (p. 67).

The key informants represented adult individuals (18 years or older) who currently live or previously lived in Soufrière and/or currently work or previously worked in Soufrière. As per the guidelines of the IRB, participants were reminded that there was minimal risk involved in participating in the study, that is, that any perceived risk during the interview process would be risks that any individual would normally be exposed to on an everyday basis.

All interviews were conducted in English. None of the participants from the interview schedule demonstrated predilection for the local island dialect- Patois/French Creole. Throughout the schedule, only customary phrases were referenced- ones that are commonly interjected in the island’s English parlance. If the case arose, that one of the respondents identified through the ‘snow-ball’ approach only spoke the island dialect or demonstrated preference for the dialect, a local translator had previously been identified and would have been made available. The researcher however was sufficiently versed in the local dialect on a basic-conversational level to
comprehend dialect phrases used to represent an idea/concept, commonly referenced even by individuals on the island who are not fluent in Patois/French-Creole. These references were demonstrated from only 2 out of the total sample population of 30 key informants during the entire interview schedule. Interview responses represented in the study are direct translations with some minor grammatical corrections.

Survey Development and Implementation

The semi-structured survey instrument was developed based on examination of both technical and non-technical literature on sustainability ideals and political ecology (e.g., sufficient opportunities for community-based input) and CBM peer-reviewed articles, objectives and obligations (as outlined in UNESCO’s 2008 World Heritage Information Kit and other related UNESCO documents), in addition to local press coverage surrounding the PMA. 15 main questions relating to World Heritage Status were designed to ask key informants. The questions asked during the one-on-one interview process however, were not limited to these 15 questions. Responses given from the questions designed, furthered the discussion during the interview process. This technique was utilized to gain in-depth insight to understandings and perceptions held of World Heritage Status on the island of St. Lucia.

Practical considerations of objectivity and sensitivity in the investigation of the research problem were employed. Maintaining a balance between objectivity and sensitivity was a conscientious effort as the researcher was considered expatriate to the island. Corbin and Strauss (2008) emphasize that objectivity is imperative to reaching an objective and accurate interpretation of events, while sensitivity is needed to perceive subtle nuances and meanings in data and
distinguish connections between concepts. Both open-ended and close-ended questions were part of the survey instrument. The one-on-one interview primarily included open-ended relatively unstructured questioning in which the interviewer sought in-depth information on the feelings, experiences and perceptions of the key informants (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). During the interview process, key informants were asked to assess World Heritage Status in relation to the PMA based on their own knowledge, understandings and perceptions via the unstructured survey questions. Respondents were also asked about their perceptions of responsible parties to the PMA as a World Heritage site. Evaluation of perceptions of involvement in World Heritage site inscription and management was measured in response to questions such as: Are you aware of any groups/agencies which inform the public about World Heritage Status on the island? And who do you perceive make decisions about the PMA and its World Heritage Status? Assessment of other issues that may be perceived additionally important to World Heritage Status was gauged through responses on general opinions and general expectations about World Heritage Status.

Qualitative Analysis

In this study, the analytic procedure—‘open, axial and selective code processing’ was used to assist in extracting themes from the sample of key informant data. The researcher solely conducted, recorded and transcribed a total of thirty semi-structured key informant interviews. Every interview was fully transcribed. A qualitative software analysis program –Nvivo –Version 9.4 was used to assist in the data analysis. The software allowed for keywords to be identified and themes to be ascribed to various sections or statements within the transcripts, known as ‘coding.’ The transcripts were read multiple times prior to commencement of analysis to gain an
overarching view of the content. The three-step coding process: open, axial and selective coding was employed in successive order.

Open coding refers to “the process of generating initial concepts from data” (Strauss & Corbin, 2008, p. 140). Thus, in open coding (step 1), the researcher referred to the interview questions and reviewed the data for phrases and concepts that appeared multiple times in response to those questions. Codes were then created and assigned (e.g., ‘national recognition, pride, and incentive’) to the phrases and concepts that emerged multiple times [or co-occurred] in the transcripts (Bruyere et al., 2009). Axial coding refers to “the development and linking of concepts into conceptual families- coding paradigm” (Strauss & Corbin, 2008, p. 125). Therefore, in axial coding (step 2), categories were created (e.g., ‘tourism benefits’) based on the codes in step 1, and then each code in step 1 was connected to categories in step 2. The number of times a code was referred to in the data was calculated for percentages to assess their salience. In the final step- selective coding (step 3), the data was reviewed to gain an idea of what relationships existed between the main categories identified in axial coding. These results served as the final themes representative of the perceptions of the study’s key informant sample.

**Content Analysis of Web-based Archival Research**

Content analysis “is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts or other meaningful matter to the contexts of their use. [It] provides new insights, increases a researcher’s understanding of particular phenomena or informs practical actions.” (Krippendorff, 2012, p. 24). These inferences are about the “sender(s) of the message, the message itself, or the audience of the message” (Weber, 1990, p. 9). To acquire a sample for UNESCO and the St.
Lucian government as PMA stakeholders, a sampling frame of non-technical literature was acquired to determine emphasis of the public statements and communication made by these identified stakeholder bodies for analysis. The sampling frame of this literature for content analysis was found through web-based archival research (digital documents and texts). Corman and Dooley’s (2006) Crawdad Text Analysis System (Crawdad) – Desktop version 2.0 was employed for computational analysis of sample documents from institutional stakeholder groups: UNESCO and the St. Lucian national government. Crawdad system software performs qualitative data analysis and text mining based on the patent-pending technology called Centering Resonance Analysis (CRA). According to the originators of Crawdad, Corman and Dooley (2006):

“Centering Resonance Analysis (CRA) represents a text [or population of text] as a network of interconnected words...Crawdad generates a CRA Network, which contains information about the contents of the text...then provides a variety of analytical and text mining functions so that you can explore the information and insight contained in the texts.” (Corman & Dooley, 2006, p. 5)

“The software is most suitable for analyzing grammatical English text written in full sentences” (Corman & Dooley, 2006, p. 5). The files to be analyzed were identified, extracted and the text pre-processed before computational analysis could be conducted. Krippendorff & Bock (2009) state that “useful claims in content analysis require contextual understanding, formal analytical constructs, appropriate sampling, and the possibility of testing validity” (p. 40). Pennebaker and Chung (2009) contend that with “recent advancements in technology, computational linguistics, and the psychology of language, computerized text analyses are increasingly efficient and reliable” (p. 390). The purpose of this methodology was to apply Crawdad’s method of network analysis to extract text and textual word pairs that demonstrate instrumentally, the focus of the identified stakeholders’ concerns. The basis for examination was descriptive and not meant to involve hypothesis testing or theory development.
Data Preparation

The textual samples were identified through web-based archival research of respective UNESCO websites and official St. Lucian government web directories and websites in addition to Google’s search engine. Search words or word strings – ‘World Heritage,’ ‘Pitons Management Area’ and its short form, ‘PMA,’ were filtered through UNESCO’s institutional websites, St. Lucia’s official government information websites or indirectly via Google search engine. The conglomerate of this output documents/text served as the sampling frame. The documents chosen were the ones which most directly communicated concerns about heritage in relation to the WHS program and/or SIDS for UNESCO stakeholder samples upon individual review. Similarly, documents/text communicating heritage and its relationship to the PMA as a WHS were chosen to represent the National Government sampling frame. All representative samples were non-technical literature in word processed, PDF or HTML formats. See Appendices D and E for the list of documents used.

Pre-processing

The Crawdad Text Analysis system requires input text to be in the form of plain ASCII text (.txt). Text in PDF and HTML versions which met the sampling frame as previously specified, were manually extracted and copied into a word processor program. The textual content for each stakeholder sampling frame (UNESCO and the St. Lucian National Government) was analyzed as complete and respective corpuses. Therefore, each stakeholder sampling frame had a respective digital folder. All documents and text retrieved were copied and placed into one file for UNESCO and the respective files retrieved from the St. Lucian national government into its own file, so that each contained all related text in aggregate. These plain text files were saved in
representative folders created for the 2 stakeholder groups, coded respectively as UNESCO_Corpus and Corpus_NG (National Government). The basis for aggregation serves to prevent text content from being too small for analysis, thus compromising validity. “Text lengths of at least one paragraph is recommended at minimum, but documents with at least 500 words are proven to yield best statistical representation” (Corman & Dooley, 2006, p. 7). Additionally, all items from the textual content that would affect the results based on the software’s analytic capabilities as recommended by the software originators were removed:

- Titles and subtitles
- Embedded tables and figures
- Page headers and footers
- Website address links
- Bullet points
- Numbered points

The word processed files were then saved in the delimited plain text format (.txt). The researcher used Crawdad’s Generator function to convert the .txt files to .cra files to build a CRA (Centering Resonance Analysis) network for each of the stakeholder sampling frames (respective text corpuses). “These CRA files describe CRA Networks, which represent words used in the original text and the intentional connections made between these words by the author” (Corman & Dooley, 2006, p. 7).

**Crawdad Analysis**

Crawdad software version 2.0 was used to analyze the text corpuses. The following illustrates the computational process:
Figure 5: Illustration of computational process for Corman and Dooley’s (2006) Crawdad Software version 2.0.

**Visualizer** analytical function: The visualization depicts a sub network, based on the most influential words in the document. Typically, nodes with influence values above 0.015 are shown. A tabular summary of high influence words and word pairs was also created. The ‘word pair’ influence results were chosen for each corpus as opposed to ‘word’ influences. Their comparative results showed the ‘word pair’ to have a relatively, more connective view of concerns or collective view of salience within the respective text corpuses. The “highlighted words display” option through the Visualizer Output screen allows the researcher to view the word pairs spatially in the text by highlighting the salient word pairs (influence cutoff at 0.015). The ‘word pairs’ within the context of the corpus allowed the researcher to view main conversation points within each respective sampling frame. Because the corpus is a
conglomerate of text, the researcher looked for consistency of each salient word pair throughout the entire corpus to determine the trending discussion or concerns for the representative stakeholder sampling frame. Consistently, any word pair with an influence score below 0.1 did not produce any trending or meaningful conversation in the text corpuses. The final, resultant ‘word pair(s)’ for each sampling frame all rated an influence score of 0.1 and above and represented relatively consistent word pair connectivity throughout. In the case of the text corpus representative of the national government (Corpus_NG), there were more than one salient word pairs. For instance the word pair “piton | area” proved to be more relevant than the word pair, “world | area” based on the context of what was being spoken of or revealed by the author in the use of the word “area” and its relationship to “piton” as opposed to what was being revealed in the use of the word “area” relative to the word “world.” The capitalized versions of all words in a pair group were not accounted for in determining relationships with the exception of “Piton” or “Pitons.” A conceptual model from the results of the two analytical approaches for the project methodology was created. [See Page 71].

Limitations
Deciding on a sample size for qualitative inquiry was important. The study sample included data from 30 semi-structured interviews from key informants in the township of Soufrière. The relatively similar qualitative study design by Bruyere et al. (2009) acknowledged “the sample size of 30 individuals [as] relatively low” (Bruyere et al., 2009, p. 53-54). However, the literature justifies the sample size within this qualitative context. Salant and Dillman (1994) state that qualitative research does not have clearly delineated rules. Qualitative research depends on the intent of the research inquiry, what associated risks are present, what will be useful, what will be
credible and what can be achieved given available time and resources. It was concurred, therefore, that the sample size of 30 key informants was viable for this study. Additionally, Schutt (2011) supports that, “samples of more homogenous populations can be smaller than samples of more diverse populations” (Schutt, 2011, p. 165).

Schutt (2011) also notes that purposive sampling “does not produce a sample that represents some larger population, but it can be exactly what is needed in a case study of an organization, community, or some other clearly defined and relatively limited group” (p. 157). Thus, inferential statistics, defined as a “mathematical tool for estimating how likely it is that a statistical result based on data from a random sample is representative of the population from which the sample is assumed to have been selected” (Schutt, 2011, 161), cannot be calculated due to non-generalized characteristics of the study sample and the choice of qualitative methods. The absence of random selection in a methodological approach to the research project, did not allow the study to be considered statistically representative of the population. This was an obvious and acknowledged limitation in the study’s research design.

Thus, the combination or mixed purposeful sampling- a non-probability sampling technique: namely, *purposive* and *snowball* sampling methods do not yield a representative sample. The issues that emerged might be referent to WHS’s identified under ‘natural criteria’ in other parts of the Caribbean basin or other SIDS; “how those issues are specifically defined and resolved must have a highly localized theme” (Bruyere et al. 2009, p. 54). External validity however, does exist where power relations are concerned.
It is important to emphasize Corbin and Strauss’ (2009) assertion that “all things gathered through research should be regarded as provisional, forms of concepts tend to vary with conditions” (p. 70). At the time of writing, the PMA and its World Heritage Status was a highly volatile topic on the island, pursuant to social and legal controversies and actions taken against varied stakeholders (some included key informants within this study). The confluence of time and the geographic space of inquiry, informed the problem as investigated then. The summation of categories thus, is context specific and may/may not be validated at a future time. By context, the researcher refers to:

“... the cultural, historical, political, and social ties that connect individuals, organizations or institutions. What individuals, groups, or organizations say, do, or believe can never be understood completely without understanding the social, political, cultural, environmental, economic kinship, and even personal matrices in which they are embedded.”(Schensul, Schensul & Le Compte, 1999, p. 9)

The local Saint Lucia National Commission for UNESCO housed under the central government’s Ministry of Education, Human Resource Development, Youth and Sports, declined any interview regarding the research project. This is an acknowledged and unfortunate limitation in the study as the opportunity could have provided a unique comparison of UNESCO representation at the local level of governance. Finally, it is imperative to note here that the town of Soufrière was the most devastated by Hurricane Tomas- a category 1 hurricane on October 30th, 2010-about two and half months prior to the research interview process.

With respect to the Web-based archival research, periodicals from the public press such as The Voice and Star Publishing newspapers including their online supplements which provided social commentary on WHS on the island were not used for purposes of objectivity and veracity. However, the non-technical literatures were essential points of reference for the exploratory
nature of this study. They were collectively used as a guide to understanding perspectives of the local Soufrière community relative to key informants’ semi-structured interview responses. It is beyond the scope of this work to provide further analysis beyond descriptive. In fact, a much larger body of text would be preferable for any further analysis to allow for a larger sampling frame and one that allows in addition, for time series or longitudinal research study.
CHAPTER 5:

STUDY AREA

Introduction

For determining areas of perception amongst the local Soufrière population, one-on-one key informant approach was adopted. The entire demarcated area of Soufrière was the study site used by the investigator in the field portion of the study to gain access to key informants/research participants.

St. Lucia

Often called the ‘Helen of the West-Indies,’ the island of St. Lucia is part of the Windward Islands. It is situated along the East Caribbean archipelago between the islands of Martinique and St. Vincent, 110 miles north-west of the island of Barbados. The island’s approximate geographic location is Latitude 14°N and 61°W Longitude with an area of 617.5 km² and estimated forty-three kilometers long and twenty-two kilometers-wide (Momsen, 1996, xv) with 158km of coastline (CIA, 2012). The capital of St. Lucia is Castries.

Soufrière

The town of Soufrière is located on the central west coast of the island of St. Lucia, 13°N Latitude and 51°W Longitude (SRDF, 2010). The town is home to the most iconic twin peaks of the Caribbean landscape known as ‘The Pitons,’ and covers an area of 23.33 square miles (CSO
St. Lucia, 2011). The Pitons are two volcanic spires that rise steeply side by side from the sea, just south of the town. The larger of the two peaks and second highest point on the island is known as Gros Piton (pronounced Goh-Pee-Toh) at 770 meters and Petit Piton (pronounced: Pee-tee-Pee-Toh) at 743 meters (SRDF, 2010).

The township of Soufrière has a rich historical and cultural heritage. It was an important area to pre-Columbian peoples known as the Amerindians who may have regarded the twin peaks as part of their spiritual/deific worship. Petroglyphs, middens and a megalith identify these Amerindian populations. The Amerindians were displaced by African populations enslaved in the 17th century by the French. In 1746, Soufrière was, officially recognized by France, as Saint Lucia’s first town (SRDF, 2010).

Base camps, caves and ambush sites still exist from a history of slave rebellions in the Soufrière area. Plantation estates and sugar mills are also remnants of the area’s heritage (SRDF, 2010). Plantation agriculture included cultivation of tobacco, coffee, coconut and sugar cane crops. Today, Soufrière is a world renowned tourist destination for land and cruise tourists from around the world, attracted to the area’s unique geological features.

**The Pitons Management Area (PMA)**

The Pitons Management Area (PMA) is located within the boundaries of the town of Soufrière. The demarcated area covers 2,909 hectares (11.23 square miles), just less than 5% of the island’s total landmass. The PMA was inscribed on the World Heritage Site List, June 30th, 2004 (The National Review, 2010, p.1). The property is mainly terrestrial but includes part of the Soufrière Marine Management Area (SMMA), which contains a diversity of marine features and life. This
includes 60% coral reef cover and 168 finfish species. There is a total of 245 plant species on Gros and Petit Pitons [of which] 8 are rare species. There are 27 bird species, 5 of which are endemic (UNESCO, 2004). The site is divided into three management zones: (1) Terrestrial Conservation Area (17% of total area); (2) Terrestrial Multiple Use Area (53%); and (3) Marine Management Area (30%). The majority of the Terrestrial Conservation Area is owned by the government, while 80% of the Multiple Use area is privately owned. The Marine Management Area is further segmented into five zones: a marine reserve, fishing priority area, yachting area, multi-purpose, and recreational area (The National Review, 2010, p.1). Tourism, particularly resort development is the dominant economic activity in the multiple use area. The PMA is a major tourist attraction in the town of Soufrière. The island receives over 250,000 visitors annually (CSO St. Lucia, 2011)

Population and Social Context

The island’s population is currently estimated at 162,000 with over 80% of the population of African descent. A unique Anglo-French culture speaks to two centuries of constant war and colonial disputes between the English and French (Momsen, 1996, xv; St. Lucia National Trust, 2011; CIA, 2012). The government’s most recent statistics show population density in the township at 366 per square mile area and last mid-year census estimate of with a population of 8550 (CSO St. Lucia, 2011).

Economy

The economy of St. Lucia has historically been largely agriculturally-based, with the cultivation of coconut, citrus, vegetables, root crops and bananas. Today, mostly bananas, mangos, and
avocados are grown for export. Bananas have been the largest export. At last estimate, bananas represented about 40% of the island’s export commodities (ECLAC, 2011, St. Lucia Economic & Social Review, 2002). The banana industry has been in decline since the 1990’s affected by severe competition from other banana producing countries particularly in Latin America. International agreements over tariffs, import licenses and the continuing free trade debate during the decade of the 90’s (Myers, 2004; Timms, 2006) moved the country further toward a service oriented economy in ‘sun, sand and sea’ tourism. Foreign investment in offshore banking has also been a major contender for foreign-exchange earnings. The island introduced a value added tax in 2012 of 15%, becoming the last country in the Eastern Caribbean to establish this tax (CIA, 2012)

**Tourism Economy**

Today, the tourism industry is the country’s greatest foreign-exchange earner. It is also the fastest growing industry on the island. Additionally, it is currently St. Lucia's primary source of employment and revenue. Revenue accounts for 65% of GDP. However, the national government still struggles with balancing imports and exports, sustaining deficits rather than surpluses. According to current estimates, the country’s GDP per capita, stands at US $7124.00 (UN, 2013). St. Lucia is vulnerable to a variety of external economic activity; including volatile tourism receipts, natural disasters, and dependence on foreign oil. The most recent record demonstrates the island’s high public debt, with balance of payment at US -$284 million dollars in 2011 (UN, 2013). These obligations continue to constrain growth and development on the island.
Land Use

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries notes that “land capability is mainly determined by soil; physical and chemical properties, climate and topography” These characteristics however, do not determine actual use of the land. Social, economic, legal and historical factors play a greater part in land use in St. Lucia (Government of St. Lucia, 2001, p. 23). At last estimate, (2011), St. Lucia’s land use showed arable land at 4.84%, permanent crops at 11.29% and other at 83.87% (CIA, 2013). The latter category covers settlements, rock and exposed soils and water, both marine and dam (Government of St. Lucia, 2001, p.24)

Geology

St. Lucia is volcanic in origin. It is mountainous with a forested interior, intersected by wide, fertile valleys (Momsen, 1996, xv; CIA, 2012). The highest elevation point from the Caribbean Sea (0 meters) is the peak of Mount Gimie, at 950 meters. The island has been touted, the only place in the world with a ‘drive-in’ volcano, which is accessed through a “break in the edge of a caldera, thought to have collapsed some 40,000 years ago” (Momsen, 1996, xv). This area is home to a perennially bubbling mineral-rich grey mud and active sulphur springs in which the water may reach temperatures of 121°C. These unique geological features have attracted tourists worldwide. The area has also attracted considerable geothermal research since 1974 (Momsen, 1996, xv). The island’s noted natural resources are: forests, sandy beaches, minerals (pumice), mineral springs and geothermal potential (CIA, 2012). St. Lucia is prone to natural hazards such as tropical storms and hurricanes and volcanic activity. Deforestation and soil erosion are the most pressing environmental issues.
Climate

The island’s climate is moderated by the northeast Trade Wind belt and is affected by a tropical maritime climate. The island also experiences two seasons annually: The rainy or wet season which begins in June and ends in December and the dry season which starts in February and end in May. January is considered a transition month that can be wet or dry. According to the island’s meteorological office, “total annual rainfall averages about 1700 millimeters with September being the rainiest month. The northernmost and southernmost areas of the island are the driest. Heaviest rainfall results from tropical cyclones, tropical waves, the Inter Tropical Convergence Zone and Upper Level troughs” (SLUMET, n.d.). These can result in major flooding in low lying areas, landslides, forest destruction, crop destruction, loss of life, infrastructural damage, losses in the agricultural sector and extensive soil erosion. Hurricane Tomas, a category 1 hurricane which battered the Eastern Caribbean in October, 2010, caused unprecedented damage to the island of St. Lucia with the heaviest infrastructural damage in the south of the island which included the Soufrière township (CDEMA, 2010). The volatility of climate conditions in the region is an overt threat to the island’s economy and the tourism industry in particular.
Figure 6: Location of St. Lucia in the Caribbean. The island’s approximate geographic location is Latitude 14°N and 61°W Longitude with an area of 617.5 km², 43km long, 22 km wide and 158 km of coastline (Momsen, 1996, xv; CIA, 2012).
Figure 7: Identification of the Soufrière township and demarcation of the Pitons Management Area (PMA) and its policy areas. (Government of St. Lucia, Survey and Mapping Section-Prepared by C. Williams, 2011)
Figure 8: The Pitons (twin volcanic peaks - Gros Piton and Petit Piton) (V. C Hippolyte, 2010)

Figure 9: Sulphur Springs Park (Source: Soufrière Foundation, n.d.)
Figure 10: The Diamond Falls (Botanical Garden) Soufrière, St. Lucia
(Source: DiscoverSoufrière.com, n.d.)
CHAPTER 6:

RESULTS

Introduction

The results have been divided into four main sections: 1) profile of respondents/key informants, 2) qualitative results derived from key informant interviews, 3) qualitative results from web-based archival research and 4) Comparison summary of qualitative results from the combined qualitative methodologies.

Profile of Respondents

Responses to the semi-structured interviews using a snow-ball sampling method were taken from 30 different key informants--adult individuals (18 years or older) who at the time of the interview or prior to the interview process, lived and/or worked in the town of Soufrière where the Pitons Management Area (PMA) is located.

The majority of the respondents in this study, approximately 63% (19), at the time of the interview schedule or prior to, lived and worked in Soufrière. 20% (6) at the time of the interview only previously worked in Soufrière and 17% (5) of the study respondents at the time, only previously lived in Soufrière.
**Education Levels:**

The majority of the key informants- 47% (14) were college educated. The college/university education category did not differentiate between partial or completed instruction at this respective education level. 33% (10) of the sample respondents had at minimum, secondary level schooling. The adult literacy rate for the entire population of St. Lucia according to the latest United Nations statistic (2000) was 90.1%. Adult literacy represents the ability to read and write at the specified age of 15 and above that is, the statistic represents the “total population of males and females on the island, age 15 and over that has ever attended school” CIA, 2010).
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Figure 11: Education level of sample key informants (n=30)

**Occupation:**

The snow-ball sampling approach yielded service industry; primarily tourism related employment; 33% (10) as the largest group by occupation and government/civil service as the second largest group 27% (8).
Gender:

The gender ratio of key informants within the snow-ball sample was approximately 47% (14) males to 53% (16) females.

Age:

The majority key informant group, represented the 20-29 year age range at 40% (12) of the sample.
Table 1: Proportion of key informant sample age distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Sample Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;60 years</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In answering the project’s overarching research question, the following schematic was created to express the results. To answer the research questions, I used the salient themes informed by the derived codes from key informant responses in the one-one-one interview process in addition to the resultant themes from the web-based archival analysis, addressed separately.
What are the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding World Heritage Status in the PMA (Pitons Management Area)?

Figure 15: Schematic demonstrates the salient concerns of three identified stakeholders in the Pitons Management Area (PMA): the local study population represented by key informants in the township of Soufrière, the St. Lucian National Government and UNESCO via its World Heritage Centre.

Key Informant Findings

This section represents the key findings from the analysis of key informant data. The study’s research questions compartmentalize this section. The results shown for each research question
represent the salient themes derived from patterns in key informant responses to the semi-structured interview questions. The percentage of respondents and the corresponding number from particular questions that matched a salient theme are presented. Some of the salient themes derived from this first methodology, the key informant interview provided results for more than one research question. For example research questions 2 and 3 were informed by key informant responses which provided the basis for the ‘Perceived government agenda’ theme. Throughout these sections, an exemplar/illustrative quote is used to express the manner in which the key informant discussed the material that corresponded to each pattern. Bracketed comments within these quotes are intentional, to prevent disclosure of any information that may identify the key informant.

Research Question 1: *Which stakeholders were involved in World Heritage Site Inscription?*

It was evident that the responses which informed the salient theme- ‘Communication’ provided some evidence to inform this query. Two out of the 30 key informants did not respond to this question during the interview process. Only 7%, two of the 28 key informants, revealed some concrete knowledge about how the idea of pursuing World Heritage Status came about. Approximately 32%, nine out of the 28 key informants who responded to the inquiry on the responsible stakeholders that pursued World Heritage Status, correctly mentioned “The National Trust.” 25%, seven out of the 28 key informants said they did not know who was responsible for pursuing site inscription; another 7%, two out of the 28 key informants mentioned the government; 4%, one key informant mentioned the “Soufrière Regional Development Foundation,” which was an entity that contributed at some later point to the pursuit of World
Heritage Status. 18%, five out of the 28 key informants who responded mentioned the PMA office. This office was not consolidated till the designation of Status in 2004. Another 4%, one key informant mentioned the St. Lucia “tourist board” and another mentioned the “World Heritage Committee.” 7%, two out of the 28 key informants who responded to the question, were unspecific about persons or entities responsible for World Heritage Site inscription in St. Lucia; one mentioning that “somebody realized the significance of the Pitons,” and the other that, “one or two agencies [exist].” The key informant was unable to reference these agencies by name.

![Sample distribution of the primary entity perceived to be responsible for pursuing site inscription.](chart)

Figure 16: Proportion of the sample showing the primary entity perceived to be responsible for pursuing site inscription of the PMA (n=28). The majority of the sample perceived the government primarily pursued the PMA’s site inscription.

It was evident from the semi-structured interview responses that key informants were indecisive about the entity/entities primarily responsible for seeking inscription, and in some cases,
expressed self-criticism of their ignorance on this question. Respondent interviewee 026 (Int_026) was a key personnel in this study. This respondent was born and raised in the community of Soufrière like many of the other respondents but was politically knowledgeable about the community from “coming of age during the 1960’s” (personal communication, Int-026). This respondent recollected pastimes in this area, particularly the familial use of the area beaches by Soufrière community residents in addition to trending community discussion about the vision for the area. This respondent was the only one to provide evidence of earlier considerations for the area’s acknowledgement as a protected site, the most thorough, first hand recollection/response yet of how this unique part of Soufrière, entertained the idea of World Heritage Status:

“...but it was Edward Innocent, he was a district representative for Soufrière... This gentleman, he began working with National Trust and he heard about this World Heritage Status and he was telling us “Don’t you think it would be a nice thing for us to have that” because you know I was telling you how sacred that area was to us as teenagers, going there, bathing and playing, you know finding the history and all of that, so he went up...and they originally sought that because, we felt that people needed to know about the Pitons. We wanted to advertise, to boast about it, we wanted to showcase to the world, but we were not even looking at the economics of it, we were just looking at the Status and that is how it started off and we were thinking that if we had that as a National Park and it had that Status, it would bring in tourism. But, unfortunately when we started looking at that, other people started coming in. Investors started coming in and saying “hey that’s paradise, I can make so much money off of it as a hotel” and we got ourselves in problems with the government and all of that.” (Int_026, personal communication, January 8, 2011)

Another important key informant working as an executive in the tourism heritage on the island corroborated this piece of knowledge.

“Essentially, it was the National Trust, through the late Edward Innocent. He was working in the National Trust. He was the pioneer in advancing the place and the National Trust picked it up and then they brought in some other local organizations and I think the Soufrière Foundation, assisted along the lines, but if you’re looking for one institution that did the groundwork and consulted and made the proposal, it’s the National Trust. The SMMA and the Fishermen’s’
“Pride” in the iconic and aesthetic value of the PMA was a recurring and dominant theme for the sample key informants in their assessment of Status designation on the island. Key informant evaluations of perceived expectations for World Heritage Status included overall consensus in the PMA’s preservation/conservation based on the uniqueness of the area. Some key informants were knowledgeable about the area’s history as sacred space to the indigenous Amerindian population in addition to the significance later on, in the inheritance of land by the enslaved African populations. It was unanimous among the key informant sample that sensitizing or educating the public is poorly addressed. Perspectives varied however. The key informants that were primarily working in government, civil service, management or administrative positions mentioned that educating was done on the part of the government, but admitted that it was not sustained. Some key informants spoke on behalf of the Soufrière population (that is exclusive of themselves); in expounding on general opinions and expectation of World Heritage Status, key informants referred to a general apathy of “people in Soufrière,” an overall “disinterest” in the local Soufrière community about the Pitons Management Area as a World Heritage site.

“There are a lot of mixed feelings. St. Lucians need to be educated a little more on the importance of having such designation, because for a country with 238 square miles, we look at the English-speaking Caribbean: Dominica, St. Kitts and St. Lucia are the only three with World Heritage Status and you have Barbados, Trinidad, Jamaica, all the other countries there that are fighting to get it and you’re not able to get it yet, so it goes to show that whatever product that we have is very unique, and so there must be a promotional drive, to get people sensitive about Status and what it means to us as a people.” (Int_001, personal communication, January 6, 2011)

“There should be more ...strategic programs in place to promote greater awareness as to what World Heritage Status is all about. Now it is all good and well to say that we should have greater awareness and I think that the PMA office, they have tried to a certain extent- they have attempted to call meetings and stuff like that and people do not come, they’re not very interested so I don’t think it’s a case where things are not being done, but stimulating people’s interest is
According to personal communication with the National Trust administration, it was the St. Lucia National Trust that forwarded efforts to achieve designation on the UNESCO World Heritage List. A collaborative report with the World Heritage Committee cited that the government’s “National Cabinet of Ministers established the Saint Lucia World Heritage Committee to undertake a planning and consultation process with the view to nominate the Pitons and surrounding resources as a World Heritage Site under the provisions of the World Heritage Convention. The process spanned over a six year period” (De Beauville-Scott, George, World Heritage Committee, 2003, p. 14)

It was evident throughout the interviewing process that the key informants expressed mixed responses about the entity/entities responsible for pursuit of World Heritage Status on the island of St. Lucia.

In terms of the sample’s awareness of the 1972 Convention, 57% (17) respondents indicated “yes” that they were aware of it while 43% (13) indicated “no” they had never heard of it. 65%, 11 out of the 17 key informants who said they were aware of the 1972 Convention were aware of it through their government, civil service or tourist related employment position. The majority of this group cited that they could not speak to “specific details” of what the Convention involved. It should be noted that two of the respondents who indicated “yes” expressed that the island is “unable to fulfill UNESCO’s mandates,” (personal communication, Int_026) while the other...
respondent shared that “every country must be looked at one a case by case basis” (Personal communication, Int_001).
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Figure 17: Proportion of key informants that indicated their awareness of the UNESCO 1972 Convention. The 1972 UNESCO Convention governs placement of heritage property identified as cultural and/or natural inscribed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List (n=30)

Research Question 2: **What are the local perceptions of World Heritage Status in a small island developing state (SIDS)?**

Most of the key informants, approximately 70% (21) viewed World Heritage Status as an incentive/benefit to people on the island when asked about their perception of World Heritage Site’s benefits to the island and in a separate question, any consequences they perceived of the designation. 14%, three of these key informants indicated more than one benefit. 13%, four pointed to perceptions of Status as generally detrimental. 7%, two key informants chose not to respond and another 7%, two indicated that they did not perceive of any benefits of World Heritage Status to the island. Only one out of the 30 key informants articulated both incentives and detriments to having World Heritage Status on the island. In general, the key informant
sample viewed World Heritage Status as a benefit to the island. When asked to express further thoughts, the most common responses from the key informant sample in order of the most common, went as follows:

- Increased tourist arrivals and marketing for the island
- National recognition
- Source of income/revenue
- No benefits

“…there are areas where we benefit in terms of promoting World Heritage Sites all over the world. When they promote St. Lucia as a World heritage destination, visitors will want to come and see. So it is a boost, it is a plus for us in terms of marketing St. Lucia touristically. That in a sense also helps us in marketing St. Lucia as a tourist destination—World Heritage Site.” (Int_023, personal communication, January 5, 2011)
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Figure 18: Proportion of key informants’ perception of World Heritage Status in terms of benefits and consequences of World Heritage Status in St. Lucia (n=30).

There were seemingly default expectations in the respondents’ perceptions of tourism-related projects, programs or ventures translating to increased revenues for the island. On this open-ended inquiry on thoughts/opinions of world heritage Status on the island, very few key
informants made a distinction or identified who or what areas in the Soufrière community, benefited. The exception of two respondents indicated increased revenues for individuals in Soufrière via “tour guides [and] taxis” (Personal communication, Int_006) and by “selling products and t-shirts with World Heritage Site [signage] and souvenirs. (Personal communication, Int_021.) Key informants’ understanding of increased tourism activity in the country meant increased U.S Dollar foreign exchange or otherwise currency circulation in general which was perceived to benefit the entire island and the local community. Whether the sample respondents had experienced increased benefits or improvements in their personal/respective livelihood since World Heritage Status was achieved was not mentioned.

The articulation of national and international recognition and personal pride for the unique and natural beauty of the PMA particularly the twin volcanic peaks- The Pitons, was a prevalent and consistent view. The following exemplars illustrate key informants’ perceptions of World Heritage Status on the island of St. Lucia, its association with tourist influx and the itinerant expectations for increased economic activity on the island.

“Just the matter of your having a World Heritage Site puts you on the world map, because once you see that a country is a world heritage site, it actually attracts people to come visit that site.” (Int_012, personal communication, January 5, 2011)

7%, two of the key informants did not perceive Status to have any benefit to the island:

“To tell you the truth, I don’t think we are gaining anything from the World Heritage Status, you know I have been personally asking persons, you know if we’ve been gaining from that Status, sometimes when we have visitors coming in, we’d ask them if they’ve heard about St. Lucia- The Pitons being a World Heritage Status and I think over 90% of them would tell you No! I don’t think we’re really gaining anything from it. I think it’s just the politicians who are really trying to use that, especially the Minister of Tourism, using it as a forum to promote the island.” (Int_010, personal communication, January 10, 2011)
“To tell you the truth I don’t know what benefit because I do not see anything they’re doing for the World Heritage because the Pitons are there and everybody keeps fighting for the Pitons but they’re not doing anything to protect it. So, there’s no benefit in there.” (Int_014, personal communication, January 9, 2011)

The majority of the key informants supported World Heritage Status in St. Lucia. The island’s SIDS attribute was not perceived as a deterrent, neither a benefit in the majority of key informants’ perceptions of World Heritage Status on the island. 13%, four out of the 30 key informants had no comment on the open-ended inquiry about St. Lucia’s ability as a SIDS to maintain Status. 92%, 24 out of the 26 key informants who responded to the open-ended inquiry supported the maintenance of World Heritage Status on the island. 50%, 12 of the 24 key informants who responded affirmatively indicated expectation of the central/national government to ensure maintenance of World Heritage Status. 25%, six were in agreement that St. Lucia had the capacity to maintain World Heritage Status with no attending difficulties. Insights from this group were viewed in terms of consolidating the local community to work together to maintain Status in conjunction with the political will and support of the national government. 13%, three of the affirmative key informants agreed to the island’s capacity to maintain Status but additionally acknowledged the existence of ‘challenges in the face of external pressures,’ and another 13%, three agreed additionally to the need for community involvement.

“This is a challenge for especially small countries to maintain certain developments. Usually, when we get assistance from outside, you’ll get the product. The product alone is not all. It’s like if somebody is buying you a car and they just hand you the car and that’s it, but you have to maintain the car, so that is the way I see St. Lucia and so you’re going to get a lot of support: technical support, as a heritage sites, a lot of people coming to look at it, tell us what to do, you know always be mindful of the criteria, the regulations and everything. As to whether we have the resources that mandates to keep it up there, I can see us having some problems but as it is happening with how the reports go [identifying what we have not done], it has to take a lot of dedication, conviction, commitment you know? And it has to involve all the people... I have confidence that with the organizations that we have, government understanding the nature of World Heritage and what it means to the country and what the country can achieve, let us go to the right channel and achieve all what we can from it, whilst it remains the property of our patrimony.” (Int_007, personal communication, January 11, 2011)
8%, two out of the 26 key informants who responded to the inquiry, said the island does not have the capacity to maintain status. This respondent expressed the following:

“...I believe we could afford to give up that Status and hold some of the aspects of it for our own country, our own benefit. What benefits us is important. I don’t think we should allow ourselves to be dictated by what other people think. If it doesn’t work for us, we should find something that is suited to us and work with that!” (Int_027, personal communication, January 4, 2011)

Research Question 3: Are there power imbalances in decision making processes for the PMA, World Heritage site.

Inquiry into key informant perceptions of governing power in the management of the PMA was nearly unanimous. More than half, 73%, 22 key informants conveyed that the St. Lucian central/national government was the primary decision makers in matters concerning the PMA. The majority of respondents mentioned the central government in general, while others mentioned actual ministerial branches for instance, the Ministry of Physical Planning and Development and the Ministry of Housing. 40%, twelve of the key informants gave their responses regarding decision-makers in the form of a hierarchy of responsible parties. The key informants, who indicated the PMA office as primary responsible party, believed that this office had some level of jurisdictional power in the PMA. It was understood in conducting this research that the PMA office has no powers over policy. The PMA office is housed under and is overseen by the Ministry of Physical Planning and Development, a department of the national government. 10%, three of the key informants indicated that UNESCO were the primary decision makers in the PMA’s maintenance, another 10%, three mentioned that they did not know. Only one key informant mentioned the National Trust and another one mentioned “the people of St. Lucia.”
Adequacy & Perception of Government’s Role was a clear concern among the key informants, inclusive of those who actually worked in government or civil service. The key informant’s expressed unsettling views about the government’s role in the maintenance of the PMA, primarily due to the reported uncontrolled development publicized by the mainstream media in addition to the general knowledge of the ownership and control of private or commercial property in the PMA by foreign nationals. The majority of the key informants are seemingly dissatisfied with the “reactive” attention that the PMA receives from national government as opposed to a more “proactive role,” which the key informants perceive, should be taken. Key informant responses focused on what the government should be doing or the preferable position to maintain the PMA’s World Heritage Status. Consequently, it was unanimous, 100%, all 30 sample respondents thought the national government did not play an efficient role in the management of the PMA and additionally in how the government dealt with the PMA’s struggles
in the media at the time of the island’s publicized threat of being de-listed from UNESCO’s World Heritage List. The majority of key informant perceptions could be illustrated in a summary of excerpted points:

- Government can do more
- Government wants to gain from economic development/ caught in between goals for preservation
- Government are the powerbrokers
- Government uses the area as a part of their political platform
- Government allows exploitation

It was evident that persons who held administrative or managerial roles in tourism related employment or who worked for the government or civil service were cognizant of the government’s concerns for economic development and the need to preserve/protect the PMA. These key informants perceived that the issue should be “put into perspective” as one key informant articulated “…to see where the island is losing and where it is gaining and [what is] to [the island’s] advantage” (Personal communication, Int_007). Some key informants from this group and the majority of respondents who are not in these occupational groups believe that the locals should be left to care for the Pitons Management Area (PMA). These key informants are against non-native peoples managing hotel entities or owning land in the PMA. One key informant articulated:

“They should try and protect [the PMA] more and that place should remain untouched. It should remain for us, the local people not outsiders. Outsiders shouldn’t have shares in that. I don’t mind if they come to visit, they go to parks, you know? People could come, walk through the area and what not, yes! That’s how it should remain but you cannot have people just coming in buying land and all these things.” (Int_016, personal communication, January 13, 2011)
The majority of the key informants perceived themselves as having a role to play in the PMA and its maintenance as a World Heritage Site. 70%, 21 out of 30 respondents agreed that they had a role to play in the PMA as a World Heritage Site, 17%, five did not perceive themselves as having a role to play in the PMA and 13%, four key informants perceived they had a right to play a role but were unsure of functional/productive avenues to do so. The chances to address concerns in a meaningful exchange between government representatives or site administration were seen to be out of reach. The majority, 70% of the respondents who perceived themselves as having a role to play, expressed their affirmation by default of their voluntary and/or involuntary employment/ job function or as a resident of Soufrière. Key informants, who responded affirmatively, also indicated that they played a role by being vigilant about preservation/conservation concerns in the PMA. It is important to note here that the empirical work undertaken by Nicholas (2007) and Nicholas et al. (2009a) on the PMA had not at the time of this writing been practically considered in any form by national authorities who were aware of the researchers’ work in this area. One key informant expressed her vigilance regarding construction that she saw was taking place at a specific area (Piton Mitran) in the PMA.

“... I live within the constituency in which the World Heritage site is located. You have to provide leadership and advocacy to either watch or monitor and speak out against whatever the situation is. And that is exactly what I did when I saw this thing [construction] going on over at Piton Mitran. I was the first person to speak out against it, to create national consciousness about it and thereby inciting the National Trust so that they took it up and spoke up about it.” (Int_008, personal communication, January 10, 2011)

Another key informant expressed:

*I was one of the fortunate ones who were able to go to Jalousie, see Jalousie and know Jalousie with the plantation and with the unique things there. Being a member of the National Trust when*
they got the remains of the cemetery and being there, being part of that, being part of all of those things….All of Soufrière is kind of really close to my heart and I was one of the very first persons, when they wanted to sell Jalousie for a hotel, we formed [a] group [and] we were fighting against [the politicians]. We were saying, ‘put this place as a National Park, it would bring in the same revenue.’” (Int_026, personal communication, January 13, 2011)

The key informant sample expressed varied concerns about their perception of World Heritage Status on the island relative to personal and collective concerns of residents of Soufrière. Many respondents spoke on behalf of neighbors or other residents they had heard about in the community who felt disenfranchised in the PMA. The totality of concerns spanned the following points:

- “There is no legal mandate within national law for “no-build zones, no legislation saying you cannot build”
- People are coerced to sell their land
- Gated communities and exclusivity are imminent
- General ignorance of PMA mandates
- No liberty to create livelihood off the land as desired
- Must be careful in leaving our resources for generations to come
- We are not enjoying the benefits (of jobs and increase in revenue)
- Benefits are limited to some people
- Benefits the foreigners
- Informal/self- employment is becoming marginalized
- Erosion and instability of the land through building construction within the site
Figure 20: Proportion of sample key informants on their perception of World Heritage Status’ affect in Soufrière (n=29)

There was an inaudible response to this question during the interview process due to an audio glitch, so the response had to be rejected. Therefore, 10%, three out of the remaining 29 key informants indicated that World Heritage Status affects local people positively in Soufrière; 38% (11) indicated that World Heritage Status affects local people negatively. Equally, another 38% (11) of the key informant sample indicated World Heritage Status to have both positive and negative effects on the local Soufrière population and 14%, four, indicated that World Heritage Status has no effect on the local Soufrière population. One key informant spoke of a neighboring family whose property accessed a fresh water source:

“..[The government] is still targeting them to gazette their land .The investor wants all that land area. I find that is unfair. Where will we St. Lucians go when we want to take a little shower, where are the beaches. We need our beaches for our own recreation, when we have our children. I have 5 grandchildren there already. When they want to go to the beach, where am I taking them? We cannot take them to the rivers because the rivers are polluted. You understand me? People cannot even go down to the Jalousie beach anymore and I find that to be ridiculous...You cannot have the people of St. Lucia with no access to beaches.” (Int_019, personal communication, January 10, 201
The concern for access to recreational areas that used to be easily accessible to residents on the island, prior to hotel construction in the area, resurfaced in the consciousness of the Soufrière community though the island’s struggles to remain on UNESCO’s World Heritage List.

**Web-based Archival Research Findings**

**Corpus Sample: National Government**

Table 2: Influence analysis results from the sample text corpus (Corpus\_NG) representative of the National Government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Pairs</th>
<th>Influence Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piton</td>
<td>area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piton</td>
<td>world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piton</td>
<td>site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word “Piton(s)” in the sample text corpus of the ‘national government’ are used interchangeably by the text authors. In context, “Piton” or “Pitons” refers either to the actual twin mountain peaks or the demarcated 2,902 hectare area representing the Pitons Management Area’s legal boundaries.

The use of the word “Piton” to the paired words: “area”, “world,” and “site,” exclusive of their reference to “World Heritage Site,” demonstrated the most connective relationships in relative consistence throughout the text corpus. The sample text shows persistent use of official terminology in speaking about the PMA, particularly in terms of its description as relayed by UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee in its formal UNESCO speak or parlance. The use of either of these relatable words to “Piton, from the titular, “Pitons Management Area” showed the following connections to their use in the representative national government text corpus:
Table 3: Influential word pair connectivity representation of the St. Lucia National Government. Demonstrates the connective relationship to the use of the word pairs “piton | area,” “piton | world,” and “piton | site” in the National Government’ text corpus (Corpus_NG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of the word “Pitons” and its connective relationship to:</th>
<th>…In the text corpus referenced:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“area”</td>
<td>● Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Natural (beauty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Surrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Soufière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Geographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Unspoiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Divided (policy areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Diverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Geologically(unique)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Appreciated (value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“world”</td>
<td>● Treasures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Pride (National)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“site”</td>
<td>● Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Universal value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Volcanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● “Must see”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Multiple-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Regimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influential word pairs referenced a consistent discussion on the natural and unique aspects of the Pitons and its surroundings (pre-inscription) and the PMA property (post-inscription). In addition, the expectation of benefits to the island by the consistent description of the PMA as a
place of “outstanding universal value” and its relationship to the island’s tourism market was prevalent. The incumbent Prime Minister noted of the PMA in a press release/speech on February 14, 2005 that:

“Through UNESCO, the United Nations body responsible for this designation, the rest of the world has placed on our shoulders the important task of preserving and protecting the Pitons for present and future generations.” (Anthony, 2005, para. 14)

The honor and responsibility of placement on UNESCO’s World Heritage listing is prevalent in government literature, evident in the sample corpus and from the non-technical literature sources on the island. In addition, the expectation of the PMA’s perceived benefits to the island in relationship to the island’s tourism market was consistent. There was little reference throughout the national government corpus outside of these two themes: outstanding value and economic benefit to the island. Articulated responsibilities on the part of the St. Lucian government and the public were not readily available. Reference to measures put in place for protection was evident in a government press release on October 30, 2003, prior to World Heritage site inscription, announcing the establishment of a Pitons Management Area Advisory Committee. The committee’s responsibility involved review of development, building and structural plans, implementation of a research and monitoring program in consult with stakeholders in making decisions for the PMA. The responsibility for putting a public education program in place was also mentioned as a responsibility of the PMA Advisory Committee (Government Information Service, 2003). The national government also proposed that the committee and its mandate be kept in place to ensure protections for the area regardless of the island achieving World Heritage Status. The committee was kept in place post-inscription. Personal communication with three key informants (Int_002, Int_007, Int_020, January 6-14, 2011) who mentioned being a member of this advisory committee could not recall when the committee last met.
Corpus Sample: UNESCO

Table 4: Influence analysis results from the sample text corpus representative of UNESCO (Corpus_UNESCO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word Pair(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heritage</td>
<td>property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word pair, “heritage | property” was the most consistently influential in the sample text corpus for UNESCO. The use of the word “property” in relation to “heritage’s” representation as world, cultural, tangible, intangible, threatening and movable, showed the following connections to its paired word “property”:

Table 5: Influential word pair connectivity- UNESCO Corpus. Demonstrates the connective relationship to the use of the word pair “heritage | property,” in the UNESCO text corpus (Corpus_UNESCO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of the word “heritage” and its connective relationship to:</th>
<th>…In the text corpus referenced:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“property”</td>
<td>• protect(ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• irreplaceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• right(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• safeguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• inscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• universal value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• land-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• marine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship of the word pair in the UNESCO text corpus places focus on the fragility of heritage property. This word pair connectivity also relays the multitude attributes of property that
UNESCO re-iterates as important to maintain protection and integrity, safeguard and most important, uphold the property’s “universal value”. The lower half of the word list in Table 6.5 was sourced primarily from a reply to the St. Lucian government from UNESCO’s World Heritage Committee’s 32nd meeting report, where consensus on the PMA stated:

“...that the level of development within the property [PMA] may set inappropriate precedents as to what should be expected of a property inscribed under criterion of the World Heritage Convention. It is also clear by the number of development applications under consideration in the short time since inscription that development pressures over time risk eroding its outstanding universal value unless a very clear and rigorous planning process is put into place immediately, strictly enforced and closely monitored.” (UNESCO, 2008c, p. 58).

The UNESCO text corpus is focused on the obligation of signatory state parties to the 1972 Convention in the use of all avenues available to maintain the integrity of the heritage property’s “outstanding universal value.” Recommendations made by the WHC to the St. Lucia government specifically involved:

- Improving the role of management for the property
- Improving engagement with the community and stakeholders
- Increase training for management personnel in participatory approaches and conflict management
- Find and build creative ways to fund the management of the PMA (with additional recommendations to take a UN sponsored online course to assist)
- Advocating for development outside the property
- Supporting local business enterprises and entrepreneurs outside the property
- Focus on sustainable tourism development with a suitable marketing plan
• Build capacity to manage PMA through establishing relationships with other UN
development agencies e.g. UNDP (United Nations Development Program)’s GEF Small
Grants Program and others as fit.

These were stringent recommendations expressed to the national government regarding the
PMA. The text corpus was consistent in articulating UNESCO’s aim to maintain all inscribed
properties onto its World Heritage List.
CHAPTER 7:

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The following discussion focuses on the perceptions of World Heritage Status in the PMA from three stakeholder groups: the local Soufrière population, the national government and UNESCO. Comparative analysis was undertaken by comparing the concerns of these stakeholder groups against a political ecology framework, thereby, evaluating the role of unequal power relations as a central theme. As mentioned before, in the field of political ecology, global and local concerns are not viewed as separate but rather as interconnecting. A review of the concerns of political ecology centers on the framework for the study of human-environmental relationships or nature management regimes, in rural, developing spaces. The field therefore, involves the following concerns:

- Resource control (political processes that contribute to resource access/depletions)
- Land tenure
- Marginalization of social groups
- Environmental changes (e.g. terrestrial changes)

Specific to human geography, reference to new concepts other than resources and power, particularly knowledge, ideas, and values were shown to be important considerations as well. In addition, ‘participation’ as research assistant is critically addressed. Both the content analysis of
web-based archival research, information from the one-on-one key informant interviews and participant observation were the methods of evaluation.

The Local Soufrière Population

It is evident from a political ecology perspective that World Heritage Status in the PMA constitutes a politicized environment as it relates to the relationships among people, resources and their use. There is evidence of an overall lack of communication between the Soufrière population and the national government. This is conclusive of ineffective political processes which create a divide between and among the people and their resources. This was seen not only through lack of access to the PMA’s resources for the Soufrière community but also limitations placed on construction activity to new or existing personal property in the PMA. Access to beaches has been a contention for residents in the area for quite some time. Furthermore, the increased interest in PMA real estate is perceived as a threat to resource access. This was shown to be a consequence of property appreciation due to World Heritage Status and the itinerant increases of foreign investment in land ownership within the PMA’s boundaries. Resource control, land tenure and environmental changes are evident concerns, with the latter being the least recognized by the local study sample. The local study populations’ mention of World Heritage Status in terms of expectations for revenue increase and more employment opportunities was prevalent, yet not reflected in concrete examples.

The lack of sustained communication between the national government and the people of Soufrière on the PMA has contributed to marginalization of the local populace and their ability to facilitate meaningful contributions to the maintenance of their heritage. Marginalization of
social groups is a critical vein in political ecology analysis, where environmental degradation entrenched in policies at varied levels of scale can lead to social friction and struggles (Blaikie & Jeanrenaud, 1997; MacSwain, 2009; Peet et al., 2011). Unanimous disagreement from the local study population on the national government’s inactive or ineffective role in the management of the PMA could be the evidence of a lack of political will. Some key informants were sympathetic to the national government’s challenge in meeting both economic and environmental goals in the protection of the PMA. However, none of the key informants exonerated the national government’s open acknowledgement of their responsibility to protect the PMA for “posterity.” In addition, the key informant sample did not perceive the island’s SIDS attribute as an obstacle to maintaining World Heritage Status. In spite of the threat of being placed on ‘UNESCO’s List of World Heritage in Danger, the majority key informant sample supported World Heritage Status on the island. Primary support for the accolade is tied to ideas of prestige and the perceived benefit of being accountable to an external governing body such as UNESCO. The predominance of this notion is a reflection on the St. Lucian national authorities’ negligence in the protection of the heritage property. However, the key informants simultaneously cited disapproval in the restrictions that were placed on residents living in the PMA. This was viewed primarily in terms of maintenance and construction needed or desired for upkeep or expansion by individuals who own property in the PMA and as mentioned previously, the community’s access to beaches. Confirmation of these restrictions was evident in Nicholas et als.’ (2009a) research where parts of the PMA with tourist establishments were found to be restricted from local population use. Through the interview responses and participant observation, there was vehement intolerance for further marginalization of residents’ access to public areas, speculation of heritage property and foreign interests in new tourist establishments
for the area. One key informant, who is a land-owner, expressed having to pursue the island’s legal system over accusations of construction not-in-keeping with the zoning rules for the property. This land owner (Int_018) interviewed on January 9th, 2011 expressed the experience of constant obstruction for over a year by ministerial authorities responsible for the management of the PMA. This land owner utilized the property for the family’s livelihood. According to the landowner, costs incurred for pursuing the legal system was perceived as an undue burden. The land owner incurred debt through the legal process which affected the ability to use the property and its resources for income during legal pursuit causing severe economic hardship. The key informant and land-owner thought that the infractions levied by the authorities were folly and that similar scrutiny is not made of foreign and wealthier local investors.

The predominant expressions of prestige and accountability to the international governing body-UNESCO, was concluded on the basis of the organization’s political power. It’s global presence and recognition was perceived as the better channel to protect the PMA for future generations and international posterity as opposed to the sole, governing responsibility of the St. Lucian national government. Simultaneously, the results show that key informants are unaware of UNESCO’s requirements to maintain the PMA on its World Heritage List. Out of the key informant sample, 57% are aware of the existence of a convention but are totally unaware of the agreement. The maintenance of the PMA is spoken of in abstraction. There is little to negligible reference to how individuals, community groups or the community as a collective are engaging in the protection of the heritage other than a relationship to the area by place, position of employment and/or residence within the heritage boundary. Practical engagement with the heritage is obscure. To say the least, the symbolism of heritage in UNESCO parlance is not
contested. Expressions such as ‘Outstanding Value to Humankind’ or other similar variations were very common among the interview sample. Yet, articulating expectations for management, maintenance or oversight of the heritage were not referenced in any concrete terms. The focus on improving residents’ livelihoods through increases in opportunities for income, employment or other small business ventures became a prioritized response for key informants. It is important to note that many of the residents did not anticipate possible consequences of the PMA’s increase in property value via World Heritage inscription. There was no evidence from the key informants interviewed, of interest in personal (self-acquired) and/or inherited property sales. The sample population however, was explicit about the need for equity in the ability to exploit opportunities they perceived World heritage Status would bring.

There were peculiar and adamant references to ‘slave/slavery mentality’ made by four out of the 30 key informants in their descriptions of ineffective governance at the national level. Three out of 30 key informants articulated the government’s knowledge and awareness of ‘bare minimum wage and maximum work’ that workers encounter in the tourist establishments in the area. One of them made mention of the government acquiring land and failing to pay the local people and even ‘selling out’ to other individuals with commercial interests. Though it was beyond intent, scope or time to analyze in depth, all responses provided through the interview process, these peculiar references to the area and the island’s colonial past were being used to describe present day experiences surrounding the heritage property. The reality of these inequities as experienced by the resident population over a prolonged period of time has seemingly been an ongoing struggle for the Soufrière community prior to inscription. Yet, recognition of these perceptions has come to the fore, exacerbated by the achievement of Status. As participant observer, there
were vehement articulations in retrospect. The analogous reference to conditions of a colonial past is contrary to the key informants’ expectations of increased revenue and employment opportunities. Home and land ownership on the island is an important part of the Soufrière population’s sense of place. Key informants’ expressed pride in their home and the area where they reside and work. The legacy of the former plantation slavery in Soufrière is not so easily forgotten. According to one respondent who has been an advocate for the area - “This place is their ‘navel string’ [the inheritance of their parents and grandparents]” (Int_026, personal communication, January 13, 2011).

Referent to Bryant’s (1998) political ecology, the role of unequal power relations is a central theme in the “material and discursive struggles” over the PMA in the small island developing state of St. Lucia. The negative consequences of World Heritage Status experienced by the key informants were seemingly viewed as a necessary compromise; further evidence of a relative non-issue in the grander economic contributions that World Heritage Status is perceived to contribute to the island. Yet, there are questions and concerns that are not being addressed by the community or on behalf of the community via the national government. Collectively, the majority of the representative sample perceives the national government to have, as one informant expressed, “little regard for the local Soufrière population trying to make a living” (Int_003, personal communication, January 6, 2011)

**Web-based Archival Sample**

In the global governance context, the content analysis of the UNESCO sample showed that the concern for “heritage property” is the primary focus in the international agency’s communication of World Heritage Status. To re-iterate, UNESCO, s mission is “to encourage the identification,
protection and preservation of cultural and national heritage around the world, considered to be of ‘Outstanding Universal Value’.” As previously mentioned, UNESCO’s WHC was aware of the presence of residential and commercial resort property within the PMA’s boundaries prior to inscription on UNESCO’s World Heritage List. However, the WHC’s response to the island’s national government left little ambiguity for what was at stake for the PMA under the Convention. The World Heritage Committee, in conjunction with the IUCN acknowledged in 2008, that the reality of construction activity in the PMA was not in keeping with the criterion for the World Heritage Convention. The committee acknowledged that developments overtime will eventually risk compromising the PMA’s outstanding universal value unless a strict planning process is put into place (UNESCO, 2008c). It would seem based on UNESCO’s recommendations prior to 2009 that the national government was unprepared for the contingencies that would be levied against it to save being placed on the LWHD. Simultaneously, it suggests that UNESCO initially compromised its own legal mandate by inscribing the World Heritage Site having previously acknowledged compromising commercial and residential development activity within the boundaries under consideration for Status designation. The WHC’s communication to the St. Lucian national government prior to the World Heritage’s 33rd session in 2009 referenced the need for an integrated development strategy report for the PMA; which would include firstly, a request, that UNESCO’s recommendations be adopted as a foundational planning framework for the PMA under the laws of the island’s legal system ; Secondly, a call for reflection on the part of the government that further anticipated development does not “prejudice the outstanding universal value “of the PMA and encouraged of the national government to develop local partnerships with other UN affiliate bodies (UNDP, IUCN) to name a few. These articulated recommendations by the WHC, hardly
reflects a collaborative relationship, akin to the importance placed on their role to include SIDS property onto the World Heritage List. These recommendations in accordance with the Convention, collectively allude to a level of control that could be argued as unanticipated by the local Soufrière population in particular. UNESCO’s capacity to govern in support of its Convention is critiqued for global north locations (Chown, 2001; Graeme, 2004; Giovine, 2009, Evans, 2002). As evidenced by this research project, communication between UNESCO via the WHC and the national government imply an ostensible disconnect with expectations for property listed on the WHL. Personal communication with government and heritage professionals confirmed that funding will not be given to the national government if initiatives on the part of the government are not put into place. It is suggestive that outside of political will, the objective reality of access to monetary and technical resources is important to helping sustain heritage property. In an assessment of threatened built heritage sites on the World Heritage List, Dijkgraaf (2003) affirmed that “methods of conservation, maintenance and management of sites in developing areas of the world …differ greatly from those employed in the developed world and insufficient funding can be a deterrent as well” (p. 32). Frey and Pamini (2009) however, support that to be placed on UNESCO’s WHL, does not lead to any significant support by UNESCO. A 2005 publication of the Convention’s operational guidelines reviewed that the World Heritage Fund provides a total amount each year of about US $4million to support requests for assistance by State Parties (UNESCO, 2005). This annual allocation is insignificant in comparison to existing needs of the List. “UNESCO provides expertise and scientific support. It does not provide any (or at best only minor) financial help” (Frey & Pamini, 2009, p. 3). The ability to have access to UNESCO funding for sites may be a great incentive but access to the funds and the structure for funding, may not coincide with perceptions on the ground. This
supports in some way, Harrison’s (2005) earlier statement that “meanings sites hold for stakeholders may be quite different from these propounded by national tourism marketing agencies and UNESCO” (p.7). Dijkgraaf (2003) extends that responsibility on the part of UNESCO to assist in soliciting and securing funding should be a priority.

The web-based archival results from the sample of national government and UNESCO text, demonstrate poor attempts in meeting the needs of the PMA in terms of its legal mandates under the Convention, and arguably the management of stakeholder relationships. Further, the idea of protected areas as perceived by the governing institution- UNESCO may not be in alignment with the realities of its Convention mandates given the island’s limited fiscal and technical resources and the national government’s challenges on economic growth and development. This particular critique –on the inherent fiscal limitations of UNESCO’s funding for the World Heritage program, the largely hands off approach taken in facilitating acquisition of funds for listed properties, suggests that is warranted. In lieu of the vast and blanket obligations to be met by state parties regardless of economic status, it is obvious that appropriate measures need to be taken to facilitate fiscal costs regarding listed sites.

A condition of inscription, as previously mentioned, requires a management plan carried out by the state party. The mandates of UNESCO are communicated at the international level to maintain the world heritage property within the guidelines of the Convention. The guidelines are expected to be upheld via the signatory state party’s legal system. Yet, in the case of the PMA, a St. Lucian government official confirmed that “there is no legal mandate within national law for ‘no-build zones’, and no legislation saying [individuals] cannot build.” There are policy areas
within the boundary that call for scrutiny on construction. The purveyed idea of ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ to mankind has been concretized in the national literature, is reflected in the rhetoric of the national government on the PMA heritage property and, by extension to the perceptions held by the local population. Evidence of prioritizing the protection of the heritage through commensurate legal frameworks or local agreements is negligible. UNESCO’s narrative of patrimonial heritage does not coincide with the treatment of the PMA in accordance with the national government’s responsibility as state party to the 1972 Convention. The web-based archival data shows the focus of World Heritage Status as primarily based on perceived economic benefits for the island.

A most recent publication by Frey, Pamini and Steiner (2011) investigated UNESCO’s WHL based on an analyses of varied economic metrics and found that economic and political factors unrelated to the heritage’s value, play a significant part in heritage placement; to include size of the tourist sector, importance of the media, total GDP and GDP per capita, to name a few. It is of no surprise then that Wall and Black’s (2004) examination of residents living in and around built heritage (monuments) that have been awarded World Heritage designation in two study sites in Indonesia, found that perspectives of the local people were not adequately represented or respected as stakeholders compared to those representative of international agencies, government officials and tourism developers. Primacy was placed on the values of these large institutional bodies than on the local people. Consequently, the local people were excluded in the planning and management of sites. The activities of the local population were disrupted, and exclusion from their heritage went into effect. This is a common thread in the extant literature, where the rights of the local population are being threatened or altogether denied as participants in
management of their heritage. Aplin’s (2004) investigation of the Kakadu National Park World Heritage site in Australia is a seminal example of a national government’s will to suppress the indigenous land rights of the residents—residents of the Kakadu National Park. The Australian authorities prioritized and supported a nuclear power generation and milling construction commencement within proximity to the boundaries of the park. This perspective reflected a conscious compromise of state responsibilities to the Convention. This example however, is characteristically different from motivations on the part of more powerful stakeholders in developing countries, where the larger economic obligations to keeping pace with debt obligations can tarnish the integrity to the heritage. Such actions on the part of powerful stakeholder forces in developing countries are no exoneration; the difference in global north/global south dilemmas in a post-modern globalized world begs to be factored.

Outside of the objective realities in the World Heritage program’s governance, on the national level, the lack of education and sensitizing about the World Heritage agreement—the 1972 Convention, as a point of reference for the public, can be suggestive of an unrealistic view of the PMA’s designation. The point of departure in communicating about the PMA is primarily based on the global narrative of UNESCO’s World Heritage brand. The National government Corpus demonstrated a paucity of relevant information on the PMA and its relationship to UNESCO and its WHL. The suggestion can be made that the obligations of the 1972 Convention is seemingly incommensurate with the perceptions of the local Soufrière community. Through participant observation, it was evident that hotel establishments and expatriate land owners were the primary recipients of benefits of World Heritage Status, particularly in their leverage of real estate in the PMA. The local Soufrière community is seemingly unaware of how the PMA resources are to be
used. They are uneducated about the World Heritage Agreement—the mandates of the 1972 Convention, in general, and lack an overall awareness of site activity which disadvantages the local population’s ability to contribute meaningfully to protecting their heritage. Dawson Munjeri in a report on the disappearing of “built” (monuments, structures) world heritage for a UNESCO funded convention/conference in 2003, stated:

“In the two capacity-building workshops in which I was directly and indirectly involved (Namibia, 2001 and Uganda, 2002), 30% of the participants (site managers and middle-level heritage managers) had never even seen a copy of the World Heritage Convention. And 40% had never seen the Operational Guidelines. An even higher percentage had no understanding of what the two documents mean in practice. (Munjeri, 2003, p. 75).

The discussion so far suggests that heritage is an area of inquiry highly dependent on Status and power wielded at any point in time and on whom amongst the stakeholders, identified or not, has the loudest voice and clout.

**A Discursive Re-examination**

Public awareness and perceptions of international entities’ relationship to state party responsibilities reflects a deficit. In fact, it would seem that in the blurring of communication boundaries, increasing transnational movement and such critical reflections on the global-local relationships in-situ may be seen as uninviting to the global institutions. If at all pursued, it is to levy some political correctness; such as funding conferences where papers are presented and discussed on issues regarding respective World Heritage properties with little to no further obligations on the part of the governing organization other than creating the fora for exchange. Yet, political parameters of varied economic, social and environmental stripes have some level of authoritative influence on the livelihoods and resources in far-flung geographies.
The local stakeholders in the case of the PMA are seemingly bystanders to varying degrees. The sample population expressed an inability to demonstrate influence in protecting the PMA. There is evidence of a lack of agency on the part of local stakeholders; as they are unaware of how to hold the PMA management accountable for the sustainability of their heritage in lieu of poor communication from the national government. The government and civil servants of Soufrière seem to be waiting on directives from national government as to what the plans are to bolster management capacity for the PMA, while the locally self-employed are expecting the local civil servants and PMA office to provide some direction and clarity on the heritage property’s management. Their employment and livelihoods are tied to the heritage property but as a social group they do not perceive to have control over the resources and activities taking place. Perceptions of locals show that some by default subscribe to what Uggla (2010) states as “allusions” to western romanticism regarding heritage. The local stakeholders seem to be in agreement with the stance of the St. Lucia National Trust whose role is to protect heritage on the island. Yet, the capacity of the St. Lucia National Trust as confirmed by an executive informant is limited by resources to engage the public as needed (Informal Communication, February, 2011). The global narrative purveyed by UNESCO of “Outstanding Universal Value” through World Heritage Status impacts the local Soufrière community. As supported by the salient theme ‘Communication’ in the key informant survey, responses indicated that expectations of the program on a local, community and national level were based on these terms of “Outstanding Universal Value,” and itinerant perceived economic benefits. Yet, the current position is that benefits are limited to some local persons who are formal business owners and the expatriate community. The majority of the local study population indicated that the people of Soufrière are not enjoying the benefits of jobs or increases in revenue. It was surprising that only two key
informants mentioned the threat of erosion in the area through building construction. This is
telling of how the respondents collectively prioritized perceptions of World Heritage Status to
coincide with the accolade’s narrative.

Governance is imperative. Recent developments into how protected areas are being governed
outside of the brand accolade of World Heritage in the Caribbean region provide some evidence
of the importance of local perceptions in their aim to involve participation of community
stakeholders. The research done by CANARI, an independent, regional, technical assistance
organization focused on conservation and sustainability support the premise that substantial
external involvement in the management of protected areas in the Caribbean has to be balanced
(CANARI, 1999, 2001; Clauzel, 2001). In a study of leisure perceptions, Parr and Lashua
(2010), aimed to determine if there is consensus among leisure services practitioners, meaning of
‘leisure’ and investigate how they describe themselves and the body of knowledge related to
leisure services. Parr and Lashua (2010) assessed in their literature review that a considerable
amount of research addressed the meaning of leisure in people’s lives but had not considered the
possibility that to the masses, perceptions of leisure are based on the cues of public relations and
advertising authorities. In other words, that the masses perception of leisure is likely to follow
the consensus of what leisure means based on external forces/sources of information rather than
on perceptions based of their own accord or experiences. This idea can arguably be made of the
impacts of this accolade- World Heritage Status based on the project’s local population sample
results. A lack of understanding of external programs and their objectives is likely to leave local
stakeholder populations disillusioned. A real understanding of what host communities perceive
of ‘Status’ and its meaning; expectations of it or how it translates in people’s lives is imperative.
Protecting the marginalized is important and indicative of protected area management, be it on the international or national level.

Preliminary reviews of technical and non-technical literature in addition to participant observation, showed criticisms directed to the national government via editorials, local airwaves and reports without a similar level of critique for the accolade’s designating entity-UNESCO. The key informants’ perceptions of “control” as a benefit, a detriment or both, is important to understand. There is unanimous understanding of UNESCO’s ability to affect the PMA’s placement on the World Heritage list and any repercussions that may ensue from determinations made by the organization. Increased tourism earnings, global visibility, increased visitation, possible acquisition of international aid to conserve, and management of the heritage site as a tool for marketing and promotion (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009) are articulations expressed in myriad ways by the local study population. Again, these assumptions of benefit to a host population, however, have shown to be unsubstantiated (Hall & Piggin, 2001). The key informants of this study were unable to articulate real/ experienced benefits of World Heritage Status outside of the perceptions of prestige. The fact that least developed countries on UNESCO’s List in Danger exceed developed nations’ could suggest evidence of LDC’s inability to avoid this position against UNESCO’s mandates and the minimalist intervention afforded to rectify breaches as witnessed in the case of the PMA. This situation is increasingly problematic for states like St. Lucia, primarily dependent on tourism to support their economy. McLean and Straede (2003) provide, that “compensatory actions need to be facilitated to avoid resource deprivation that would incur more costs than benefits” (p. 513). However, MacSwain (2009) warns against the polarization of the debate, which may serve unhelpful and/or unbalanced.
“Locals should not be portrayed as either completely at fault or as naïve ingénues at the mercy of international forces” (p. 2-3).

Thus, in navigating these differences in perception and the now recognized disparities in political power, whether direct or indirect, an investigation of society and social choices at the confluence of the natural environment and its use in the way of life of a people is required. Defining in what manner a natural environment will function to the society partaking of its use involves as Uggla (2010) supports, rules or policies that govern their interaction. The political ecologist stance in identifying unequal power relationships is forced to ask--What political environment serves most conducive to the society in question? Escobar’s (1998) investigation of global-local interactions referent to the global biodiversity debate can be used to explain the effect of global narratives on societies and social groups and help articulate alternatives to development. Escobar’s (1998) research on the black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of Colombia is viewed as a way of re-thinking versus re-conceptualizing global debates on biodiversity and sustainability. In this case, the researcher posits the idea of cultural autonomy as a social movement perspective and a formidable means of protecting environments against the ‘biodiversity narrative’ and its ‘network of actors,’ similar networks referenced earlier by Finnemore (1993) on the importance of state and international agencies and academic sectors of society responsible for purveying means to address the environment theoretically and technically. In the particular case of the biodiversity debate, constructed discourses are shortened to simplistic accounts of threats and potential solutions where a network of personnel and institutions participate in the provision of knowledge and materials (Escobar, 1998; Uggla, 2010, Finnemore, 1993; Forsyth, 2003). Escobar’s (1998) research into the black communities of the Pacific rainforest region of
Colombia show how the movement grew in conceptual and political sophistication against conventional articulations of biodiversity and sustainability questions.

Though, the social movements in Escobar’s (1998) study relate to explicit political moves toward the defense of territory, culture and identity as characteristic of a certain geographic space and cultural group. The case demonstrated a conscious move towards an alternative to conventional development. The autonomy over the governance and use of the communities’ resources weighed significantly, particularly where external policy meets formally colonized spaces and marginalized peoples. World Heritage and biodiversity narratives are different. Yet, the impacts of both narratives are similar, as heritage and biodiversity have become influential topics in global politics. The effect of global politics in far-flung, localized geographies can lead to irreparable consequences if proper frameworks are not put in place and obligations are incongruent with capacity on the ground.

**Discussion Summary**

Evidently, the results from the project’s three representative samples: the Soufrière key informants, the UNESCO corpus and the National Government corpus, showed disparities in the expectations of World Heritage Status. Each of the identified stakeholders demonstrates concrete interests, the latter for arguably ostensible reasons. Consequently, perceptions of the accolade affect how the heritage property is prioritized. Fundamental errors in the designation of World Heritage Status of the PMA are evident in the tacit approbation from the WHC in its review of the PMA as a possible threatened WHS. The national government’s inability to sustain and share communication at the national and local levels to the Soufrière community has repercussions. Though we are aware that actual designation on the WHL is attended by its own
political rhetoric and internal and external negotiations, the responsibilities of all stakeholders should be addressed in earnest. The governance of the heritage property should be shared with accountability and transparency to alleviate disillusionment and undue social liabilities.

The key informant survey demonstrated that the PMA is important to the livelihoods of the Soufrière community for economic, recreational and social reasons. However, the need to reflect on the contradictions of the collective perceptions of World Heritage Status versus the reality of limitations that affect collective control and in actuality, autonomy of the PMA warrants further, practical discussions. The prioritized concerns of the three stakeholder groups: the local population, the national government and UNESCO demonstrate that World Heritage Status supports relationships of unequal power relations that exist at the confluence of natural resource use. Fundamental errors on the part of the national government in terms of communication have led to further marginalization of the Soufrière resident population as it relates to environmental changes in rural and developing world areas concerned with economic development challenges. The local people are disadvantaged through lack of communication and governance of the heritage, while at the international level; UNESCO continues to maintain substantial governing leverage of the heritage property via the agreements articulated in the 1972 World Heritage Convention.

The application of political ecology as a framework helps articulate how larger economic and political systems affect the study area in question and how the discourse on culture (the way of life of a people) and the environment is constructed. It is a means to finding alternatives to existing, conventional development models that are marginalizing. There is a need to be versed
in the concerns of all stakeholders to achieve some level of pragmatism in implementing solutions to resource issues. The adoption wholesale of the mass narrative as party to the Convention does not serve the population as it stands. There is a relationship to the PMA that has been lost since the arguable commoditizing of the heritage property. World Heritage Site Status has allowed the character of the heritage as once seen by the community as a functional space for the freedom of communal use, to be re-organized/re-cast to serve Western-style conservation interests. These interests leverage the use of geographic resources contingent on international laws that do not have a real relationship to the local owners of the resource. Perspectives from the local population on these programs of global scale are rarely inclusive or genuinely considered. Furthermore, perspectives if identified are not understood on local terms. Economic, ecological and cultural differences cannot be removed from the debate in this heritage resource question.

It would be safe to argue then, that the local Soufrière community is rife for a re-visit to their past- a re-consideration of a community-led (controlled) paradigm. The local community is in need of creating an organized voice. There is undoubtedly a need to question! Of what purpose does the constructed narrative of World heritage serve the island of St. Lucia? How does the accolade affect the identity of place and people? This fundamental relationship will help to drive the importance of constructing development that is relatively congruent with the community in the present and where the articulation of local perceptions can lend to ideas of governance and distribution of resources that are not based predominantly on capitalist interests. The discussion has to serve the wider issue of sustaining resources, sustaining livelihoods, protecting heritage in the present, so that there will be heritage to speak of in the future. To overlook such is to essentially deny the importance of World heritage altogether.
CHAPTER 8:
CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

The overall goal of my study was to assess World Heritage Status in the Pitons Management Area, Soufrière St. Lucia, 5 years post ‘World Heritage’ inscription. I focused on the examination of three stakeholder groups: the local Soufrière community via a key informant survey, the international governing body UNESCO and the St. Lucian national government, both through content analysis of respective technical literature. I was interested in the perceptions of the local Soufrière population to determine their understanding of World Heritage inscription and its manifestations in the Soufrière community, in addition to perceptions of World Heritage from UNESCO and the St. Lucian National government. I addressed the research goal through 4 questions, using a political ecology framework to determine relationships of un-equal power. My research questions included one overarching question and three sub-questions which were:

**Overarching Research Question:**
What are the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding World Heritage Site Status?

**Sub Questions:**
Q1: Which stakeholders were involved in World Heritage Site Inscription?
Q2: What are the local perceptions of World Heritage Status in a small island developing State?
Q3: Are there power imbalances in decision-making processes for the Pitons?
My conceptual model of the major perspective of each of the 3 stakeholder groups showed varying and different concerns on the respective agendas. The local study population demonstrated focus on perceived economic benefits and pride for the accolade but was concerned about equity in distribution of perceived benefits. The St Lucian national government saw international significance for protection of the PMA as well as the importance it played in the island’s tourism market. UNESCO showed primary concern for its World Heritage List and articulating its mandates for maintaining World Heritage inscription. All three stakeholder groups demonstrated incongruence with the demands of the 1972 Convention. Findings show that there is a palpable lack of communication and education on World Heritage Status and its relationship to the governance of the PMA in the Soufrière community. Some of the members of the Soufrière community were responsible for pushing the idea for the PMA to become an internationally recognized national park. The St. Lucian National Trust was principally involved in the pursuit of the area’s World Heritage recognition. However, the study found that minimal public access records or local understanding of how the island of St. Lucia came to achieve World Heritage Status, exists.

In spite of the literature’s acknowledgement of the characteristic limitations of SIDS, the local study population showed deference to the island’s political category and its ability to maintain protection of the PMA. SIDS status is not viewed as a hindrance to protecting World Heritage Status on the island. The literature revealed that limited financial and technical capacity on the part of UNESCO is congruent with the implied provisions of its governing mandate for the World Heritage Program. Further, poor government will with little to no involvement of the Soufrière population in decision-making processes, ineffective and unsustainable communication
between and among the identified stakeholders is evidence of un-even power relationships being exercised and exploited.

The literature review supports that international agencies demonstrate little evidence of the ability to affect actions on the ground in keeping with their perceived global ideology and questions of equity. The theoretical framework further determined that without collective involvement from a cohesive, marginalized group, there is little evidence for equitable outcomes for a resource-rich area as the PMA. Oversight is lacking and communication on varied administrative levels is deficit. UNESCO’s view of World Heritage and its accompanying policies are not mutually exclusive. Applying such unifying paradigms without conscious reflection on its affect in developing geographies can lead to undue equity concerns for natural resource use and management. The applied political ecology framework revealed UNESCO’s World heritage program to exhibit unavoidable challenges through the commoditizing of the resource and incongruence with the livelihood of the community based on resource control, marginalization of social group and land tenure issues. A case for a self-governing, accountable body of all representative stakeholders on the site and in the community is necessary and should be prioritized.

**Limitations and Future Research**

Lesser constraints on time and resources did not allow for a larger interview sample. The opportunity to interview UNESCO’s local office on the island could have been a unique contribution to the project. It must be noted that there are many other stakeholders that could be identified in this project. The three most prominent were chosen based on a preliminary technical/non-technical literature review. A larger sample and a longitudinal study of the PMA
in its current political standing, moving forward and further investigation into roles of other stakeholders in the community would help determine how governance unfolds or could unfold in the area. A comparison of perspectives from the local Soufrière population against residents from the other districts of the island would also aid substantially in giving a more comprehensive view of how World Heritage Status is perceived on the island of St. Lucia.

Management Implications

The results of this study can be used by developing country governments to reflect on actual gains and minimizing negative outcomes where possible. The existence and accessibility to a participant, leading, governing body via the PMA Advisory Committee would be viewed as an important, integral and strategic role in overseeing the PMA and assisting to safeguard its Status. However, the unexplained absence of this Advisory body did not seem to be of issue as the majority of the key informants did not make reference to its existence or active presence in the community. Yet, active, participatory leadership from such a body would arguably be instrumental. In said cases where meetings were held in Soufrière, there was not a sustained contribution through these mediums of exchange that arguably could have played a vital role in management of the PMA. The call for workshops to be held in the region to assist in sharing management expertise by Caribbean regional governments can be fruitful and should be capitalized. However, understanding perceptions and knowledge of the respective host community is always pivotal in helping achieve heritage management goals when communicable avenues are sustained and direct involvement of the community as not merely receivers of information but participants in decision-making processes. That said and not-contingent on the part of the national government to re-orient its failed agenda, it is seemingly evident that the
local community can benefit from a community-controlled paradigm for heritage resource management; an independent, organized voice that is acknowledged as a legitimate political body. An intervention into the minimalist discussion on the PMA needs to be made. It would help in re-orienting ideas of heritage that is in keeping with the needs of the local Soufrière population and the island as a whole.

In keeping with the importance and theoretical underpinnings of political ecology, I as researcher will be sharing the results of my findings of this small project with the Soufrière community. Digital and hard copies will be provided to institutional stakeholders in the Soufrière community, most importantly the PMA office.
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Appendix A: List of acronyms used in this study

CANARI - Caribbean Natural Resources Institute
CBC - Community-Based Conservation
CBD - Community-Based Development
CBD - The Convention on Biological Diversity
CBM - Community-Based Management
CDEMA - Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency
CIA - Central Intelligence Agency
CRA - Centering Resonance Analysis
CSO - Central Statistics Office
ECLAC - Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
GDP - Gross Domestic Product
GEF - The Global Environment Facility
ICOMOS - International Commission on Monuments and Sites
IRB - Institutional Review Board
IUCN - International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
LDC - Least Developed Countries
LWHD - List of World Heritage in Danger
NGO - Non Governmental Organization
PMA - Pitons Management Area
SIDS - Small Island Developing States
SLUMET - St. Lucia Meteorological Service
SMMA - Soufrière Marine Management Association
SRDF - Soufrière Regional Development Foundation
UN - United Nations
UNDESA - United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WHC - World Heritage Centre
WHD - World Heritage in Danger
WHL - World Heritage List
WHS - World Heritage Site
### Appendix B: Summary of Salient themes and corresponding relationship to the study’s research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ #</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Salient Theme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ (Overarching) | *What are the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding World Heritage Status in the PMA (Pitons Management Area)*? | - Perceived Benefits of Tourism  
- Communication  
- Perceived Government Agenda  
- Individual/Collective Agency |
| RQ 1     | *Which stakeholders were involved in World heritage Site Inscription*              | - Communication                                      |
| RQ 2     | *What are the local perceptions of World Heritage Status in a small island developing state?* | - Perceived Benefits of Tourism  
- Perceived Government Agenda |
| RQ 3     | *Are there power imbalances in decision-making processes for the PMA, World Heritage site?* | - Communication  
- Perceived Government Agenda  
- Individual/Collective Agency |
Appendix C: Semi-structured survey used in this study

Interview Number: ____________

Introductory Statement:
Hello, my name is Vernice Camilla Hippolyte and I’m a graduate student in the Department of Geography at the University of South Florida in Tampa. I am conducting interviews to collect data for my Master’s Thesis. I would like to ask you some questions about your knowledge and experience with the Pitons Management Area. This study is not funded by any company or corporation, and I am not trying to sell you anything. This interview will take about 30-35 minutes of your time. The results could be published. Your answers will be kept completely confidential and identifying information will not be used for statistical purposes. The session will be audio-recorded for my personal reference in completing the study. All recordings will be kept confidential and destroyed within two years from initial field collection date. May I continue? Do you have any questions before we start?

If you have any more questions or would like more information, please contact my advisor, Dr. Fenda Akiwumi, at the University of South Florida at 813-974-6887. She can also be reached through e-mail at fakiwumi@usf.edu.

Overarching Research Question:
- What are the perceptions of the various stakeholders regarding World Heritage Site Status

The research sub-questions are:
Q1: Which stakeholders were involved in World Heritage Site Inscription?
Q2: What are the local perceptions of World Heritage Status in a small island developing State?
Q3: Are there power imbalances in decision-making processes for the Pitons Management Area, World Heritage Site?
Date:
Sex:

1. What is your age?
   __19 or less , __20 to 29, __30 to 39, __40 to 49, __50 to 59, __60 or over

2. What do you do for a living/work?

3. What is your highest level of formal education?
   __ Primary, __secondary, __college/university, __ tertiary/vocational

4. Do you personally consider the Pitons Management Area (PMA) to be heritage?
5. Do you believe the PMA should be protected?
6. What benefits do you perceive of World Heritage Status in St. Lucia?
7. Do you perceive of any risks to the PMA by having World Heritage Status? __Yes __No. If Yes, can you identify/explain?
8. Do you think the government adequately supports World Heritage Status on the island?
9. Are you aware of any groups/agencies which inform the public about World Heritage Status?
10. Are you aware of the PMA being protected prior to World Heritage Status?
11. Who do you perceive make decisions about the PMA and its World Heritage Status?
12. Do you perceive of any risks/consequences of St. Lucia having gained World Heritage Status in light of the Mignucci case (Italian couple).
13. Do you perceive yourself as having a role to play in the PMA as a World Heritage Site?
14. What in your understanding were the reasons for seeking World Heritage Status?
15. Do you think people are affected by World Heritage Status on the island?
16. What is your perception of any general expectations for World Heritage Status on the island?
17. Are you aware of the 1972 UNESCO Convention?
18. What are your thoughts in terms of St. Lucia as a Small Island Developing State (SIDS) and the ability to maintain World Heritage Status?
Appendix D: Bibliography of web-based archival documents used for content analysis (UNESCO/Corpus_UNESCO)


Appendix E: Bibliography of web-based archival documents used for content analysis (National Government/Corpus_NG)


