# SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT AT WORLD HERITAGE SITES IN SUKHOTHAI PROVINCE, THAILAND

Ranee Esichaikul[1*] and Rochaporn Chansawang[2]
[1, 2] Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University, Chaeng Wattana Road, Pakkred, Nonthaburi 11120, Thailand
*Corresponding author:  esichai@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the relationship between cultural heritage preservation and tourism management and to examine sustainable management practices at world heritage sites in Sukhothai Province. The qualitative research approaches were applied; in-depth interviews were conducted with twenty-seven key informants.  The results showed that sustainable heritage management has made a positive impact on the local economy and social and cultural conservation of the World Heritage. The Park Authority has developed and conserved archaeological sites with various stakeholder assistance, particularly for physical management, but it has not yet utilized archaeological heritage in the park for greater tourism development.  There is a gap between heritage and tourism in describing integration between what is protected in heritage and what is a sustainable use of heritage as a tourism resource. Local community had limited knowledge to participate in the decision-making process and did not have active role in development and management of the world heritage. Guidelines for sustainable integration of cultural heritage and tourism management are proposed.

**Keywords:** Sustainable Heritage, Tourism Management, World Heritage Sites, Sukhothai Province

## INTRODUCTION

Heritage is defined by UNESCO (2005) as "our legacy from the past, what we live with today, and what we pass on to future generations".  Heritage has been described broadly as urban centres, archaeological sites, industrial heritage, cultural landscapes and heritage routes (UNESCO, 2021).  Besides, the sustainable development goals (SDGs) recognize the relevance of heritage for sustainable development (SD). Particularly, World Heritage contributions to society and to local communities emphasize sustainable use and benefit-sharing. These living heritage sites are considered important not only for what they tell us about the past, but also as a testimony to the continuity of traditions in modern culture and by providing implicit evidence of their sustainability (ICOMOS, 2011).

Heritage includes both the tangible and intangible, which are found in both rural and urban settings that attract tourists. Some heritage sites are recognized as major tourist attractions of global significance, whereas others attract special interest groups, leading to the creation of

niche tourism products (Trauer, 2006; Corsale, 2017). Heritage tourism is defined as 'visits by persons from outside the host community motivated by interest in historical, artistic, scientific, lifestyle, or cultural offerings of a community, region, group, or institution' (Silberberg, 1995). Where conservation of buildings, sites and structure was centered in former times, nowadays it entails complex management to deal with change of uses, changes in the surroundings, wider stakeholders and competing demands of environmental, economic, social and cultural requirements (Pereira Roders, 2010; Li and Hunter, 2015). Heritage management practices has been progressing toward a more holistic approach, where cultural heritage has become a driver for development, which when properly managed can enhance the livability of their surrounding areas and sustain productivity in a changing global environment. The government should thus have clear strategies and effective methods for planning, designing, and managing heritages, where possible enhancing their cultural significance. However, there is still a gap between the practices and theory of cultural heritage management. There is a significant delay in shifting to a more holistic approach in world heritage city management practices. (Pereira Roders, 2011).

Furthermore, tourism can affect cultural heritages in various ways, whether positive or negative (Imon, 2017). While tourism may contribute in socio-economic, it can lead to irreversible damage and destruction of heritage resources, as well as negative impacts on the local community in terms of social disruption and increased cost of living (Jamhawi and Hajahjah (2017). The impacts of tourism are socio-cultural in nature and have been discussed by both heritage and tourism researchers (Schipani, 2008; Shepherd *et al.*, 2012; Deery *et al.*, 2012). Urban heritage areas are under significant pressure as a result of increasing populations and significant visitor growth (Waterton and Watson, 2011). Nevertheless, cultural heritage plays an important role in urban sustainable development (Nocca, 2017). Sustainability encapsulates economic, environmental and societal parameters which conforms the efficiency and increasingly importance of sustainable maintenance management for built heritages (Kayan, 2019). Sustainability of heritage and tourism has been identified as a compound value with multiple dimensions: physical, social, economic, culture and environment (Loulanski and Loulanski, 2011). It also needs to balance commercial exploitation and protection of historical and cultural heritage attractions with sensitivity and dignity (Fredholm, 2016). However, a relationship between the environment, people and economy of the tourism industry makes achieving sustainable development goals almost impractical unless there is a coordination and integration by all the parties involved especially in culturally and naturally sensitive areas such as world heritages. Moreover, the host community has been identified as a significant stakeholder for sustainable heritage tourism (Salazar, 2012; Boonmeerit, 2017), which efficient partnerships among stakeholders are the prerequisites for this (Damanik, 2016). Without active participation from local communities, it would be difficult for heritage managers to distribute costs and benefits among stakeholder groups in a fair manner (Chan, 2016). Hence, there is a gap between heritage and tourism in describing the link between what is protected in heritage and what is a sustainable use of heritage as a tourism resource.

World heritage sites are listed sites whose Outstanding Universal Value should be protected for all people, and ensuring their preservation through close cooperation among States Parties (WHC, 2022). Sukhothai Historical Park, recognized as a UNESCO World Heritage Park, is located in the centre of Sukhothai Province. The attractiveness of the park brings many visitors and challenges of urbanization. However, cultural heritage management in Sukhothai Historical Park (SHP) is government-led. Park preservation and management is under the jurisdiction of the Fine Arts Department (FAD) (Asian Legal Information Institute, 2021). Sukhothai heritage management is not apparent in terms of heritage planning, decision-making, implementation programmes, sharing of benefits, or evaluation programmes. Local communities have not been actively involved in tourism planning and

management because they lack prerequisite knowledge and tourism management skills. Therefore, this paper aims to investigate relationship between heritage preservation and tourism management by using Sukhothai Historical Park as a case study because of its value of being UNESCO World Heritage. This study will further examine sustainable tourism management practices at world heritage sites in Sukhothai Province. The results of the study may help to manage park heritage sustainably in developing and managing its cultural heritage, and benefit Sukhothai Province as a tourist destination.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Heritage management deals with the use of the past for contemporary purposes including conservation activities for heritage for the future, use of heritage for tourism purposes and the meaning of heritage for local communities. Conservation can be defined as careful planning and management of limited and selected resources to restrict changes to the minimum and to ensure the survival of heritage over a long time (Jimura, 2019). Sustainable heritage management is the process of achieving continuous improvement in the planning, preservation and conservation of heritage assets for the benefit of current and future generations (Nocca, 2017). This ensures that the facilitation of heritage assets will deliver well-organized and cost-effective services while conserving the assets significantly for present and future generations (Mensah, 2021). The relationship between heritage and tourism is dynamic and involves contradictory values, so it should be managed in a sustainable way for present and future generations (ICOMOS, 1999). The concept of sustainable tourism emerged from the theory of sustainable development (WCED, 1987). Most tourism scholars assess sustainable tourism using three core dimensions: economic, social and ethical, and environmental aspects (Howie, 2003; Gale, 2005; Mowforth and Munt, 2009; UNWTO, 2011). The sustainable management of heritage follows the 'triple-bottom-line' (3BL) theory of sustainable management, envisaging the complete integration of economic, sociocultural and environmental sustainability objectives in a strategic manner. Achieving sustainability in heritage involves compromises and balances between these objectives because of many challenges (Darlow *et al*., 2012). Rozemeijer (2001) defines sustainability in heritage tourism as a four-dimensional concept, composed of economic viability, cultural and ecological sustainability, institutional consolidation, and fair distribution of costs and benefits among all participants. Furthermore, Jamieson and Jamieson (2019) state that the set of over tourism competencies that are required by heritage management teams lie in the four key areas of community economic development, urban planning and design, urban heritage area planning, and tourism planning and management. A meta-analysis of sustainable integration of cultural heritage and tourism by Loulanski and Loulanski (2011) concluded many synthesized factors including local involvement, education and training, balance of authenticity and interpretation, shift toward sustainability-centered tourism management and practice, integrated planning and management, incorporation of cultural heritage and tourism in sustainable development framework, and integrated governance and stakeholder participation.

According to the survey conducted by Darlow *et al*. (2012) in Devon and Cornwall, the three aspects of sustainable management have different priority levels, but the respondents ranked sociocultural sustainability the highest. Furthermore, Omar *et al*. (2013) conducted a study in Penang, Malaysia, and concluded that the process of involving stakeholders in the planning stage of management programmes increases their perceptions regarding heritage sites and their willingness to participate in protecting the sites. Ngamsomsuke *et al*. (2011) applied Howie's concept to measure sustainable cultural heritage tourism in Thailand and identified four dimensions in heritage tourism destinations. Sangchumnong and Kosak (2017) synthesized sustainable cultural heritage tourism indicators into three major dimensions, suggesting that the social and ethical dimension of destinations have been overshadowed by the economic dimension, which may lead to a lack of sustainability.

Moreover, sustainable heritage management occurs when all the relevant stakeholders are involved in the management processes (Mensah, 2021). The most useful strategies for

preserving and conserving heritage sites, which also contribute to tourism sustainability, is stakeholder collaboration and involvement, stakeholder empowerment, and an adaptive reuse approach (Chong and Balasingam, 2019). Jamal and Getz (1995) define stakeholder collaboration as a process of joint decision-making between autonomous parties. UNESCO has emphasized the importance of the participation of a variety of stakeholders in heritage identification, protection, and preservation as a worldwide strategy policy (Bruku, 2015; UNESCO, 2021). Evidence from empirical studies by Hence, engaging all relevant stakeholders into the participation process remains as one of the main challenges in heritage tourism management (Jamhawi and Hajahjah: 2017).

In addition, community participation is known as a fundamental part of heritage management, and effective community participation is a process that is essential for enhancing long-term sustainable heritage management (Landorf, 2009; Taylor, 2016). Community participation occurs in the development of heritage policies to ensure that the needs and interests of local communities are reflected and linked to the safeguarding, management and use of the cultural heritage. Activities should engage communities in the management of heritage, physical conservation, proper rehabilitation and careful use of heritage (Gottler and Ripp, 2017). Community participation in heritage includes meaningful engagement in the generation of data, interpretation, conflict and contestation reduction, and shared responsibility for the management of heritage resources (Chirikure et al., 2011). The community will be more supportive of tourism development if they have an opportunity to participate in the planning and development process (Mak, 2012). Nevertheless, capacity building and participation awareness of the community should be taken into consideration.

The researchers thus synthesized cultural heritage and sustainable tourism management concepts from several sources and subsequently established seven dimensions for investigating cultural heritage and sustainable tourism management practices, including conservation and preservation of heritage, planning and management of heritage, economic sustainability, socio-cultural sustainability, ecological sustainability, collaboration network of stakeholders, and community participation.

**Description of the Study Area**

In this study, world heritage sites of Sukhothai Historical Park were selected as a world heritage case study. The park covers the ruins of Sukhothai, literally 'dawn of happiness', capital of the Sukhothai Kingdom in the 13th and 14th centuries, in Sukhothai Province in north central Thailand. Sukhothai Historical Park ruins are one of Thailand's most impressive World Heritage sites. The city's walls form a rectangle about 2 km (1.2 mi) east-west by 1.6 km (0.99 mi) north-south. There are 193 ruins on 70 km$^2$ (27 sq mi) of land. There is a gate in the centre of each wall. The park comprises the ruins of royal palaces, 26 Buddhist temples, the city gates, walls, moats and the water dyke control system of ancient Sukhothai, with an additional 70 sites within a 5km radius. The park is protected and managed by the Fine Arts Department, Ministry of Culture of Thailand. The protection of the area was first announced in the Royal Gazette on 6 June 1962. The enabling law is the Act on Ancient Monuments, Antiques, Objects of Art and National Museums, B.E. 2504 (1961) as amended by Act (No. 2), B.E. 2535 (1992). UNESCO has declared the Park a World Heritage Site in 1991. The park welcomes thousands of domestic and international visitors each year.

Figure 1:  World Heritage Sites of Sukhothai Historical Park, Sukothai Province, Thailand

## METHODOLOGY

A case-oriented understanding was applied in this study to investigate a phenomenon from the perspectives of the participants. This study used a semi-structured in-depth interview in order to investigate sustainable heritage tourism management dimensions, to analyze its success and obstacles, and to gain some insightful in-depth data of their practices of SHP in Sukhothai Province.  A detailed review of literature was initially carried out, focusing on concepts and theories of cultural heritage and sustainable tourism management.  Selected constructs frequently mentioned in the literature were incorporated in semi-structured in-depth interview instruments. For the qualitative research method, the participants for this study were the key informants of three stakeholder groups from the public sector, private tourism sector, and village committees. Twenty-seven were purposely selected based on their representativeness of their group.  The interviewees were able to provide detailed answers and insights into cultural heritage and sustainable heritage tourism management. (Veal, 2006).  The assumption with the three major groups of stakeholders was that each key informant brought various interpretations and values to the process as their profiles show in Table 1. The in-depth interviews divided into seven topics were used as an instrument to collect data.  Qualitative data obtained through interviews was analyzed manually through content analysis of coding, sorting, and looking for dominant themes. The present study conducted triangulation to enhance the accuracy and credibility of this research through methodological triangulation which requires three groups of interviewees (Denzin, 2009). The data gained from these three groups enabled the researchers to examine the integration of cultural heritage and sustainable tourism management practices expressed by the interviewees.

Table 1: Research informants

| Interviewee | Position | Organization |
|---|---|---|
| **Public sector** | | |
| G1 | Deputy Director-General | Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) |
| G2 | Director, Office of Community-based Tourism | Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration |
| G3 | Department Director | Tourism Authority of Thailand |
| G4 | Division Director | Department of Tourism, Ministry of Tourism and Sports |
| G5 | Archaeologist | Fine Arts Department |
| G6 | Archaeology Specialist | Fine Arts Department |
| G7 | Archaeology Specialist | Sixth Regional Office of Fine Arts, Sukhothai |
| G8 | Director | TAT, Sukhothai Office |
| G9 | Managing Director | Office of Designated Area 4, DASTA |

| Interviewee | Position | Organization |
|---|---|---|
| G10 | Archaeologist | SHP Authority |
| G11 | Archaeology Specialist | SHP Sukhothai Culture Office |
| G12 | Director | Sukhothai College of Dramatic Arts |
| G13 | Chief Cultural Officer | Sukhothai Culture Office |
| G14 | Chief Division | Sukhothai Office of Tourism and Sports |
| **Private tourism sector** | | |
| P1 | Managing Director | NS Travel Company Limited |
| P2 | Secretariat | Thai Ecotourism and Adventure Travel Association |
| P3 | Division Manager | Local Alike Company Limited |
| P4 | Managing Director | Sukhothai Treasure Resort and Spa |
| P5 | General Manager | Legenda Sukhothai Hotel |
| P6 | Co-founder and Project Manager | Sriwilai Sukhothai Resort and Spa |
| P7 | Owner | Suthep Sangkhalok, Sukhothai |
| P8 | Committee Member | Sukhothai Tourism Association |
| **Local community** | | |
| C1 | Village Headman, Mu 2 | Muang-Kao Sub-district, Muang District, Sukhothai Province |
| C2 | Village Headman, Mu 10 | Muang-Kao Subdistrict, Muang District |
| C3 | Chairman | Muang-Kao Community-based Tourism Club |
| C4 | Mayor | Muang-Kao Municipality Office |
| C5 | Chairman | Local Tourist Guide Club |

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results from interviews with three stakeholder groups of key informants on sustainable heritage tourism management of Sukhothai Historical Park (SHP) are analysed and presented in seven dimensions in Table 2. For conservation and management of the world heritage, the results showed that the Park Authority has responsibility to conserve and preserve archaeological sites of SHP and develops world heritage sites with local community assistances, particularly for physical management, orderliness and safety of the park surroundings. Major SHP plans included archaeological excavation and conservation cultural heritages for economic and social benefits, and development of the historical park landscape. However, after receiving UNESCO World Heritage status, the SHP Authority established more rules and regulations in accordance with UNESCO requirements, which affected local people ways of life and were partly understood and appreciated the need for the affects. The private sector recognized that the SHP Authority has developed and preserved the park up to an acceptable level; however, they articulated that the SHP Authority should plan tourism development to expand economic gains for the park and for local people. This is in line with Pereira Roders (2011) that there is a significant delay in shifting to a more holistic approach in world heritage management practices. Furthermore, there is a gap between heritage and tourism in describing integration between what is protected in heritage and what is a sustainable use of heritage as a tourism resource (Imon, 2017).

For economic viability, the private sector stated that SHP management has made positive impact upon local economy and contribution by generating additional revenues for local people in the community. SHP Authority has provided some service areas in the park for restaurants and OTOP souvenir shops managed by local people, and hired local people to repair, and maintain the physical conditions of the park. This is similar to the findings of Ongkhluap (2012) who found that tourism impacts on economic values at the Ayutthaya World Heritage Site were perceived as high positive, but lower sociocultural and environmental values. However, the private sector addressed that the park contains popular cultural attractions which create a positive impact on the urban economy. As a result, the

benefits of heritage tourism include high tourist arrivals and receipts, multiplier effects within the industry and creation of employment opportunities for the city (Chong and Balasingam, 2019).

For sociocultural and ecological sustainability, the public sector pointed out that SHP management had created a positive social and cultural impact upon the cultural conservation and restoration of the World Heritage site. The local community indicated that local people help the SHP to preserve local cultural heritage and protect archaeological sites in ecological ways. The SHP Authority, together with related agencies, organize a major festive event of the Loy Krathong Festival in November every year. However, the private sector suggested that creative cultural and traditional activities should be revived to attract a greater variety of tourists. This is similar to the Darlow *et al.* (2012) study in Devon and Cornwall; the results showed different priority levels for the three aspects of sustainable management, but the respondents ranked sociocultural sustainability the highest, while environmental sustainability was the lowest. This is somewhat corresponding to the findings by Sangchumnong and Kosak (2018) that there was potential for sustainable heritage tourism in the economic, social and ethical dimensions, but less potential in the environmental dimension. The social and ethical dimension in Ban Wangka Village, Thailand, has been overshadowed by the economic dimension, which may lead to a lack of sustainability.

With regard to collaboration network of stakeholders, the public sector (DASTA) encouraged community collaboration to set up the Muang-Kao Community-based Tourism Club (MCBT), Home Stay Club, and Local Tour Guide Club. The private sector stated that the Sukhothai Tourism Association and Tourism Council had been set up for tourism-related business owners and entrepreneurs in Sukhothai Province. This is in line with Chong and Balasingam (2019), who claimed that the most useful strategies for preserving and conserving heritage sites that contribute to tourism sustainability are stakeholders' collaboration and involvement and stakeholder empowerment; nevertheless, engaging all relevant stakeholders into the participation process remains as one of the main challenges in heritage tourism management (Jamhawi and Hajahjah: 2017).

As for community participation (CP), the interview results show that the Park Authority had informed local people about the significance of the heritage, and had given opportunities for local people to participate in major cultural events in the park, but it did not consult with local people on park development and management. This is related to findings by Li *et al.* (2020) that top-down processes were applied to cultural heritage management in China. In the study by Ponna and Prasiasa (2011) in Angkor, Cambodia, indicated that CP is not involved in sustainable tourism planning and management of Angkor. However, local residents around the SHP claimed that they had limited knowledge to participate in the decision-making process. This is similar to a study by Mak *et al.* (2017) in Hong Kong, where the local respondents did not show confidence in taking full responsibility for tourism development. They believed that decisions should be made by the government and relevant administrative units after taking their views and opinions into consideration. Moreover, the study conducted by Tosun (1999), showed that there are operational, structural and cultural limits to CP in the tourism development process in tourist destinations in many developing countries. Although these limitations may vary, the forms and scale of tourism development are beyond the control of local communities.

Here are some sample quotations from interviews with different groups of stakeholders:

*"SHP has developed zoning for bicycle route, tram services, electronic cars for commuting around the park. Cars and tour buses are not allowed to enter SHP for environmental protection. SHP has created interpretation signs, reconstructed model and QR Code for scanning, but we lack some budget for physical maintenance of the park. (G7)"*

*"The Fine Arts department focuses on conservation and preservation of Sukhothai Historical Park while DASTA has analysed the government policies and tourism strategies and help local people to develop community-based tourism in Muang-Kao Sub-district of Sukhothai. (G9)"*

*"The park receives government budget and plays a major role in conservation and preservation of the archaeological sites. The government sector should create value addition of the Sukhothai Heritage into low carbon tourism, slow tourism. (P3)"*

*"We create social business model of private sector and local community in developing tourist goods and services according to the potential level of community and we share benefits of 70 to community and 30 to us. (P2)"*

*"The Park Authority hires local people to work and repair the park and arranges the area in front of the park for local restaurants and souvenir shops. Local people help the park look after local culture and archaeological heritages. But when we want to build a new house in the park, we have to ask permission from both local authority and the park authority. (C3)"*

*"Muang-Kao Community-based Tourism Club attempts to create tourism awareness among local people by training them to understand community-based tourism, be good host, and learn how to be a local tour guide. (C5)."*

Table 2: Different perspectives of three stakeholder groups of informants towards sustainable tourism management of World Heritage Sites in Sukhothai Province

| Topic | Public sector | Private sector | Local community |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Conservation and preservation of heritage** | -Monuments in Sukhothai were officially protected in 1935 when they were registered and declared ancient monuments by the Fine Arts Department.<br>-The Thai government started restoration and development of ancient temples in Sukhothai in 1953.<br>-In 1976, the Fine Arts Department has started a master plan project and development of historical park at Sukhothai in the fourth National Economic and Social Development Plan (1976-1981). | -SHP Authority focused on conservation of physical aspects of cultural heritages and safety of the park areas, but service facilities should be improved.<br>-SHP Authority had succeeded in the development and preservation of the park up to an acceptable level. | -Park Authority faced land ownership and land title problems with local people who lived there before the government announced it was turning into the area within the park.<br>-Muang Kao Municipality has duties to look after community around SHP, conserve heritages, manage waste and environment, and improve road and landscape. |
| **Planning and management of heritage** | -H.R.M. Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn representing H.M. King Bhumibol Adulyadej has opened SHP on November 20, 1988.<br>-Major SHP plans included archaeological excavation and conservation cultural heritages for economic and social benefits, and development of the | -TAT and private sector asked for road improvement for better accessibility and night lightening to attract more tourists to take night photograph but limited budget cannot make it long duration.<br>-SHP mainly focused on development of the center areas (10 | -Local community did not have active role in development and management of the SHP.<br>- -Muang Kao Municipality works with Park Authority to organize tourism activities, such as Songkran Festival, Loy Kratong Festival. |

| Topic | Public sector | Private sector | Local community |
|---|---|---|---|
| | historical park landscape. | temples) of the park but there are other 200 temples in the park areas that can be developed into tourist routes. | |
| **Economic sustainability** | -SHP management has made positive impact upon local economy and contribution by generating additional revenue for local people in the community.<br>-SHP Authority hired local people to clean up, clear out weeds, collect garbage, wash moat, and repair heritages around the park.<br>-SHP Authority has provided some areas in the front of the park for restaurants and souvenir shops managed by local people.<br>-Local people have developed some home stays, resorts and guesthouses, restaurants, souvenir shops for tourists. | -Archaeological sites in SHP are major cultural attractions that tourists want to visit, which create a positive economic impact.<br>-These sites become tourism products that create positive impact on local economy.<br>- Local people have developed some home stays, resorts and guesthouses, restaurants, souvenir shops to satisfy tourist needs.<br>-Local people become local tour guides for some creative heritage routes in the park. Tourism Council of Sukhothai organizes local trade shows and food tours for travel agents to support local cuisine. | -SHP management has made positive impact upon local economy by generating extra income for local people.<br>-SHP Authority has provided some service areas in the park for restaurants and souvenir shops managed by local people.<br>-SHP Authority hires local people to clean, repair, and maintain the physical conditions of the park.<br>-Local people has developed some unseen local heritage routes for tourists with local tour guides. |
| **Socio-cultural sustainability** | -SHP management has created positive social and cultural impact upon cultural conservation and restoration of the world heritages, particularly on tangible aspects while provincial culture office is responsible for intangible aspects of heritages.<br>-SHP Authority together with other related agencies organize a major festive event every year for Loy Kratong Festival. | -SHP Authority together with other related agencies organize Loy Kratong Festival event for tourists in November every year but the event activities are the same every year.<br>-More cultural and traditional activities in the festival should be revived to attract various tourists.<br>-Sukhothai Provincial authority and TAT organize Mini Light and Sound to create | -Local people help SHP to conserve local cultural heritages, as well as to guard archaeological sites.<br>-Local people participate in Loy Kratong Festival by organizing a parade funded by village authority. |

| Topic | Public sector | Private sector | Local community |
|---|---|---|---|
|  | -Sukhothai Provincial authority and TAT organize Mini Light and Sound at the park on occasional basis. | more value adding for the park.<br>-TAT organize cultural conservation activities such as giving alms to monks early morning at a temple, and DIY activities of Sukhothai celadan/ceramic painting. |  |
| **Ecological sustainability** | -SHP arranges for environment management by setting up rules and regulations to manage waste and noise pollution. | Tour buses are not allowed to enter SHP for environmental protection.<br>The Park Authority should launch low carbon tourism. | -Local people and SHP set up rules and regulations for restaurants and souvenir shops to be environmentally friendly. |
| **Collaboration building among stakeholders to develop heritage tourism** | DASTA helps local people to set up Muang-kao Community Based-Tourism Club (MCBT), Home Stay Club, Local Tour Guide Club, to build community collaboration. | Sukhothai Tourism Association and Sukhothai Tourism Council have been set up among tourism-related business owners and entrepreneurs in Sukhothai Province.<br>-Local people have set up MCBT Club for tourism development. | -Local people have set up several tourism-related community clubs, such as MCBT, Home Stay Club, Local Tour Guide Club for community collaboration building.<br>-Local people have set up a small various groups, such as Non-toxic Vegan Group, Wood Carving Group, and Celadon Group. |
| **Community Participation** | The Park Authority had educated local people about the significance of the heritage, and had given them opportunities to participate in cultural events, but it did not consult with local people on heritage development and management. | The Park Authority has duties to conserve heritages in SHP, and provide information for the private sector and local community but allows the private sector and community to participate in management to some extent. | Local residents around the park admitted that they had limited knowledge to participate in the decision-making process. |
| **Success of Sustainable Heritage** | -SHP together with Si Satchanalai and Kamphaeng Phet Historial Parks were | -SHP Authority has succeeded in development and preservation of the | -SHP Authority has developed and conserved the historical park |

| Topic | Public sector | Private sector | Local community |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Tourism Management** | registered and proclaimed the 574Th World Heritage Site by UNESCO in 1991. -Value adding for heritage tourism products has been created by organizing some tourist activities of intangible products which are valuable and focus on local identity by participation of tourists. | park up to an acceptable level. -Other agencies are responsible for tourism promotion, such as Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), Designated Areas for Sustainable Tourism Administration (DASTA) by receiving some budget from the government. -However, SHP Authority should plan for tourism development in order to expand economic gain of the park to local people. | while the local people in the community helped protect and conserve the archaeological heritages with limited understanding of becoming UNESCO world heritage. -Community members may organize any activities inside SHP, such as a local festival, special dinner for special tourists, with permission from SHP. |
| **Obstacles of Sustainable Heritage Tourism Management** | -After receiving UNESCO World Heritage, SHP Authority has organized more rules and regulations to follow UNESCO requirements. Some issues affect local people ways of life which they partly understand and are aware of those requirements. -SHP Authority is preparing for new master plan for SHP development in 2018-2022 but encounters some problem that make it delay until 2019. -Fine Arts Department has not yet allocated any budget for project implementation. -Fine Arts Department has no specific policy on community involvement. The level of community involvement depends on the decision of the director of the SHP. | -SHP Authority has not yet utilized archaeological heritages in the park for more benefits of tourism development and promotion. -Interpretation signs and media should be more technological advances. -Mascot representing SHP should be created for animation and promotion. | -SHP Authority faces land ownership and land title problem with local people in the community who live there before the government announced the area as SHP. -According to the SHP conservation rules and regulations, any construction or modification of the existing houses inside SHP area is required to ask for SHP permission. Some residents are not very happy about the conditions which make it harder for their family to live together in the same area. |

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Heritages are discovered in both rural and urban settings that attract tourists, in particular world heritage sites are valued as major tourist attractions of global significance. World heritage contributions to society and local communities focus on sustainable use and benefit-sharing. The sustainable management of heritage follows three dimensions of sustainable management, envisaging the integration of economic, sociocultural and environmental sustainability in a strategic manner. Because of many challenges, achieving sustainability in heritage involves compromises and balances between these objectives (Darlow *et al*., 2012). Furthermore, although sustainable heritage management occurs when all the relevant stakeholders are involved in the management processes, engaging all relevant stakeholders into the participation process remains as one of the main challenges in heritage tourism management (Jamhawi and Hajahjah, 2017). The results of this study showed that sustainable heritage management has made a positive impact on the local economy and social and cultural conservation of Sukhothai World Heritage. The Park Authority has developed and conserved archaeological sites with various stakeholder assistance, but it has not yet utilized archaeological heritage in the park for greater tourism development. There is an imbalance between heritage and tourism in describing integration between what is protected and conserved in heritage and what is a sustainable use of heritage as tourism resources. Local community had limited knowledge to participate in the decision-making process and are not aware that their participation in decision-making processes is vital for the sustainable tourism development of their community. As a result, this study proposes some guidelines for developing sustainable tourism in cultural world heritage sites in Sukhothai Province that suitable mechanism should be facilitated for multisector communication and development among major stakeholders and education institutes to jointly face the challenges for more visitors and future impacts. A sincere relationship and share informative ideas for triple-bottom line theory of sustainable development for balanced management of tourism to generate more economic benefits to host communities in Sukhothai city is essential in the near future. Better coordination among relevant stakeholders and periodic monitoring of tourism impacts to achieve long-terms sustainability is required. Finally, a bottom-up approach for heritage tourism management in this city is advisable.

## REFERENCES

Aas, C., Ladkin, A. and Flecher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (1), 2-48.

Asian Legal Information Institute. (2021). *Act on Ancient Monuments, Antiques, Objects of Art and National Museums 1961*. Thai Legislation. Accessed 22 May 2021, http://www.asianlii.org/th/legis/consol_act/aoamaooaanm1961650/

Boonmeerit, W. (2017). Community participation for sustainable heritage tourism and development: The case of the Royal Thai Monastery Lumbini, Nepal. *Veridian E-Journal SU*, 10 (4), January-June, 335-347.

Bruku, S. (2015). Community engagement in historical site protection: Lessons from the Elmina Castle project in Ghana. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 17 (1), 67-76.

Chan, P. Y. (2016). *Community Participation in Heritage Management: A Case in Macau.* Unpublished thesis. Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, Columbia University, New York.

Chirikure, S., Manyanga, M., Ndoro, W., and Pwiti, G. (2011). Unfulfilled promise? Heritage management and community participation at some of Africa's cultural heritage sites. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *Heritage and Community Development: Collaboration or Contestation?* Oxford: Routledge.

Chong, K. Y., and Balasingam, A. S. (2019). Tourism sustainability: Economic benefits and strategies for preservation and conservation of heritage sites in Southeast Asia. *Tourism Review*, 74 (2), 268-279.

Corsale, A. (2017). Jewish heritage tourism in Bucharest: Reality and visions. *The Geographical Journal*, 183 (3), September, 261-271.

Damanik, J. (2016). Lack of stakeholder partnerships in destination management: Lessons learned from Labuan Bajo, Eastern Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Tourism Research*, 1 (2), 173-198.

Darlow, S., Essex, S., and Brayshay, M. (2012). Sustainable heritage management practices at visited heritage sites in Devon and Cornwall. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 7 (3), August 2012, 219-237.

Deery, M., Jago, L., and Fredine, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: a new research agenda, *Tourism Management*, 33 (1), 64-73.

Denzin, N. K. (2009). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (4th Edition). Transaction Publishers.

Fredholm, S. (2016). Assets in the age of tourism: The development of heritage planning in Ghanaian policy. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 34 (4), 498-518.

Gale, R. (2005). Sustainable tourism: The environmental dimensions of trade liberalisation in China. In D. Shrubsole and N. Watson (Eds.), *Sustaining our Futures: Perspectives on Environment*. Waterloo, Ontario: University of Waterloo.

Gottler and Ripp, (2017). *Community Involvement in Heritage Management Guidebook*. Organization of World Heritage Cities, Europe.

Howie, F. (2003). *Managing the Tourist Destination*. London: Thomson Learning.

ICOMOS. (1999). *International Cultural Tourism Charter: Managing Tourism at Places of Heritage Significance*. Retrieved from http://www.icomos.org.

ICOMOS. (2011). *17th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium: 'Heritage, Driver of Development'*, 27 November – 2 December 2011, in ICOMOS News, 18 (1), 9. Paris, ICOMOS.

Imon, S. S. (2017). Cultural heritage management under tourism pressure. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes,* 9 (3), 335-348.

Jamal, T., and Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22, 186–204.

Jamhawi, M. M., and Hajahjah, Z. A. (2017). A bottom-up approach for cultural tourism management in the old city of As-salt, Jordan, *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 7 (1), 91-106.

Jamieson, W., and Jamieson, M. (2019). Overtourism management competencies in Asia urban heritage areas. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*, 5 (4), 581-597.

Jimura, T. (2019). *World Heritage Sites: Tourism, Local Communities and Conservation Activities*. Oxford: CABI.

Kayan, B. A. (2019). Sustainable built heritage: maintenance management appraisal approach. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, (3), 2019, 266-281.

Landorf, C. (2009). A framework for sustainable heritage management: A study of UK industrial heritage sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15 (6), 494-510.

Loulanski and Loulanski, (2011). The sustainable integration of cultural heritage and tourism: a meta study. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19 (7), 837-862.

Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Roders, A. P., and Wesemael, P. V. (2020). Community participation in cultural heritage management: A systematic literature review comparing Chinese and international practices. *Cities,* 96, 1-9.

Li, Y., and Hunter, C. (2015). Community involvement for sustainable heritage tourism: A conceptual model. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 5 (3), 248-262.

Mak, K. L. (2012). *Community Participation in Tourism: A Case Study of Tai O.* University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

Mak, K. L., Cheung, L., and Hui, D. L. (2017). Community participation in the decision-making process for sustainable tourism development in the rural areas of Hong Kong, China. *Sustainability*, 9, 1-13.

Mensah, J. (2021). Community perception of heritage values regarding a global monument in Ghana: Implications for sustainable heritage management, *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences,* DOI 10.1108/JHASS-01 2021-0010.

Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (2009). *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, Globalisation and New Tourism in the Third World* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Ngamsomsuke, W., Hwang, T., and Huang, C. (2011). Sustainable cultural heritage tourism indicators. Paper presented at the 2011 International Conference on Social Science and Humanity, Singapore.

Nocca, F. (2017). The role of cultural heritage in sustainable development: multidimensional indicators as decision making tool. *Sustainability*, available at https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/9/10/1882

Omar, S. I., Muhibudin, M., Yussof, I., Sukiman, M. F., and Mohamed, B. (2013). George Town, Penang as a world heritage site: The stakeholders' perceptions. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 91, 88-96.

Ongkhluap, S. (2012). Tourism impacts on the Ayutthaya World Heritage Site: Measuring the perceptions of the host community. *Journal of International and Thai Tourism,* 8 (1), January-June 2012, 31-55.

Pereira Roders, A.R. (2010). *Revealing the World Heritage cities and their varied natures. Heritage and Sustainable Development*. Vol. 1, Greenlines Institute for the Sustainable Development, Barcelos, 245-53.

Pereira Roders, A.R. (2011). World Heritage cities management. *Facilities.* 29 (7/8), 2011, 276-285.

Ponna, P., and Prasiasa, D. P. O. (2011). Community participation for sustainable tourism in heritage site: A case of Angkor, Siem Reap province, Cambodia. *MUDRA Journal of Art and Culture*, 26 (3), 306-313.

Rozemeijer, N. (Ed.). (2001). *Community-based Tourism in Botswana: The SNV Experience in Three Community-tourism Projects*. Retrieved from https://bibalex.org/baifa/Attachment/Documents/116197.pdf

Salazar, N. B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: Issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (1), 9-22.

Sangchumnong, A., and Kosak, M. (2017). Sustainable cultural heritage tourism at Ban Wangka Village, Thailand. *Anatolia*: *An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 29 (2), 183-193.

Schipani, S. (2008). *IMPACT*: *The effects of tourism on culture and the environment in the Asia and the Pacific: alleviating poverty and protecting cultural and natural heritage thorough community-based ecotourism in Luang Namtha, Lao PDR*, UNESCO Bangkok, Bangkok.

Shepherd, R., Yu, L., and Huimin, G. (2012). Tourism, heritage and sacred space: Wutai Shan, China, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, & (2), 145.

Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 16 (5), 361-365.

Taylor, K. (2016). The historic urban landscape paradigm and cities as cultural landscapes. Challenging orthodoxy in urban conservation. *Landscape Research*, 41 (4), 471-480.

Tosun, C. (1999). Towards a Typology of Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process. *Anatolia*, 10 (2), 113-134.

Trauer, B. (2006). Conceptual special interest tourism frameworks for analysis. *Tourism Management*, 27 (2), 183-200.

UNESCO. (2005). *Vienna Memorandum on World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture-Managing the Historic Urban Landscape*, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, Paris.

UNESCO. (2013). *Managing Cultural World Heritage: World Heritage Resource Manual.* UNESCO/ICCROM/ICOMOS/IUCN: Paris.

UNESCO. (2021). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.* Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

UNWTO. (2011). *Sustainable Tourism for Development*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.

Veal, A. J. (2006). *Research Method for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*. Pearson, London.

Waterton, E., and Watson, S. (2011). Introduction: Heritage and community engagement. In E. Waterton and S. Watson (Eds.), *Heritage and Community Development: Collaboration or Contestation?* Routledge: London.

WCED. (1987). *Our Common Future.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

World Heritage Committee. (2022). The Criteria for Selection. Available at: https://whc.unesco.org/en/criteria/ (accessed 10 July 2022).