

Resident's Perceptions of the Impact of Cultural Tourism

Dr. Anumol K. A.

Assistant Professor, Department of Economics
Sree Sankara College, Kalady, Kerala, India
anusyam.syam@gmail.com

Abstract: *McCool and Martin (1994) indicated that the purpose of tourism development should be to increase the quality of life (QOL) for residents. The underlying premise is that tourism brings economic benefit to communities through job opportunities, tax revenue, investment, and the like. At the same time, it also produces a variety of negative impacts such as crowding, traffic congestion, pollution, and increased cost of living that may harm residents' quality of life. Researchers have identified a connection between residents' quality of life and tourism development and have identified several factors which influence residents' quality of life such as type and number of tourists, social exchange relation, type of tourism development, and more. Residents' quality of life and satisfaction are important not only for residents but also for tourism investors and stakeholders. The present study focused on the cultural impact of tourism. This information may be very useful to regional, local, tourism stakeholders, tourism planners, and policymakers.*

Keywords: Cultural Tourism, Quality of Life, Tourism Impacts

I. INTRODUCTION

Jurowski (1994) indicates that once a community becomes a tourist destination, the lives of residents in the community are affected by tourism, both positively and negatively. Residents in the community evaluate that tourism creates more negative impact than positive; it implies that they do not welcome the tourist. Hence, the tourists are inclined to neither take a revisit nor develop an intention to revisit. So the participation and acceptance of the local community are critical for the development of tourism. There is a need for evaluating its impacts because residents' support is essential for further tourism development in their area. Therefore, government planners and community developers should consider residents' standpoints when they frame tourism programmes and policies.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A rich body of literature investigates the relationships between residents' perceived impacts of tourism and their support for tourism development. Yet, most of these studies adopt a priori categorization of potential Impacts of tourism (into positive or negative economic, social-cultural and environmental impacts or simply costs and benefits), whereas limited attention is given to the residents' evaluation of the extent to which they perceive an impact as being positive or negative. The important studies related to Quality of life were that of Richard (1988) MaCool and Martin (1994) Roehl (2000) Kim K(2002) Charls and Duffy (2009)Aref (2011) Uysal Muzzafer(2010) Khizindar M Tariq (2012) This studies revealed that most residents of the perceive tourism impact to be largely positive in their community. Tourism impact has a strong potential to yield a better quality of life. Furthermore, this study validated SET as useful consideration in tourism planning and development. Dr. Manika Singla (2014): "a case Study on Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism in the city of Jaipur, Rajasthan: India" is a paper that focuses on the community perceptions of the socio-cultural impacts of culture and heritage tourism in particular and examines the extent to which they coincide with the tourism impact literature. This study not only deals with socio-cultural impacts perceived by residents as the impacts of tourism development but also identifies the effects of demographic variation on the residents' attitudes towards tourism. Pushpinder. S. Ghill(2005): In his book "Tourism economic and social development" brings to the four variables information regarding place of tourism development, the significance of tourism in India, socio-economic dimensions of tourism, tourism infrastructure, and the role of travel agencies. Richard sharply (2011): "The study of tourism: past trends and future directions" explored the development of tourism as an area of study, analyzing approaches taken from an international context. It critiques contemporary

epistemologies of tourism framed around the social science versus management dichotomy and offers alternative approaches to the study of tourism. Robert M (2010): "The economics of tourism destination" emphasized new aspects such as measurement of tourism, supply trends, competition models, macro evaluation of tourism projects and events, and the role of tourism in a developing stage.

III. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To analyze the direct effect of the cultural effects of tourism on the quality of life of residents in the community.
- To provide a suitable suggestion for sustainable tourism development based on the findings of the study.

IV. RESEARCH METHODS

The study was conducted by collecting primary as well as secondary data. For the collection of secondary data Tourism Statistics, published annually by the Department of Tourism, the Government of Kerala gives the official data regarding the flow of foreign tourists and domestic tourists to Kerala, Economic Review (State Planning Board, Kerala), published articles, journals, etc. are the main source of information regarding trends of tourist arrivals in Kerala. The primary data was collected from residents who reside in the selected tourism centers in the Ernakulum district, Kerala. For the collection of the primary survey, a self-administered questionnaire was used.

V. MAJOR FINDINGS

Hypothesis	statements
H01	Tourism has not increased residents' pride in the local culture.
H02	Tourism has increased residents' pride in the local culture.
H03	Tourism doesn't encourage a variety of cultural activities for residents
H04	Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities for residents.
H05	Tourism doesn't help keep culture alive and maintain the ethnic identity of the residents
H06	Tourism helps keep culture alive and maintain the ethnic identity of the residents
H07	Tourism doesn't encourage residents to imitate the behavior of the tourist.
H08	Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behavior of the tourist
H09	Tourism doesn't disrupt traditional cultural behavioral patterns in residents.
H10	Tourism disrupts traditional cultural behavioral patterns in residents.
H11	Meeting tourists from all over the world is not a life-enriching experience.
H12	Meeting tourists from all over the world is a life-enriching experience.
H13	Tourism doesn't give opportunities for cultural exchange between residents and tourists and it is pleasant for the residents.
H14	Tourism gives opportunities for cultural exchange between residents and tourists and it is pleasant for the residents.
H15	I would not like to meet tourists from many countries to learn about their cultures.
H16	I would like to meet tourists from many countries to learn about their cultures.

Table 1.1: Model fit Indices for CFA –Cultural impact of Tourism

	χ^2	DF	P	Normed χ^2	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	CFI	RMR	RMSEA
Cultural impact	18.511	13	.139	1.424	.990	.973	.972	.981	.991	.021	.031

(Note: χ^2 = Chi-square; df = degree of freedom; GFI = Goodness of fit index; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; NFI = Normated fit index; CFI = Comparative fit index; AGFI – Adjusted goodness of fit index, RMR=standardized root mean square residual, TLI= Tucker-Lewis Index)



All the attributes loaded significantly on the latent constructs. χ^2 (18.511) DF (13)P(.139) Normed χ^2 1.424) GFI (.990) AGFI (.973) NFI(.972) TLI(.981)CFI(.991)RMR (.021) RMSEA (.031) The value of the fit indices indicates a reasonable fit of the measurement model with data.

Table 1.2: The regression Coefficients – Cultural Impact of Tourism

Table with 5 columns: Path, Estimate, Critical Ratio (CR), P, Variance explained. Rows include paths like 'Tourism has increased residents' pride in the local culture' and 'Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities for residents'.

To measure the cultural impact of tourism the following constructs were tested and whose regression coefficient values are explained in the below table

Table 1.3: Regression Coefficient values of the cultural impact of tourism

Table with 2 columns: Path, Coefficient value. Rows list various tourism-related paths and their corresponding regression coefficients.

Two constructs whose value is less than 0.4(Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behaviour of the tourist, I would like to meet tourists from many countries to learn about their culture) have no significant influence on the cultural impacts of tourism.

From this we conclude that Residents those who had a job related to tourism anticipate the economic benefit of tourism more than others. From a carrying capacity perspective resident’s quality of life may be diminished when tourism increases beyond a limit.

VI. CONCLUSION

The findings contribute toward a deeper understanding of the “exchange” process specified by the Social Exchange Theory, by considering the effect of each perceived impact domain on residents’ quality of life and support.

and stages of tourism development. As evident in the study area, perceived cultural impacts is very less. This is not entirely surprising, since the potential economic benefits are both easy to observe and are often the most valued by local authorities and residents. The SET has considered residents' support as the result of a simple weighting of costs versus benefits. The current study suggests that residents engage in a more complex evaluation of the exchange they are about to enter. The results and suggestions will be of great use to policymakers in tourism and government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1]. Akmal,A & Manap. "The impact of tourism innovation on quality of life of residents in the community: a case study of Sungaimelaka" *International conference on management proceeding* (2011).
- [2]. Ajims P. M. & Jagathyraj V. P. "Challenges faced by Kerala tourism industry", Paper presented in the Conference on Tourism in India- Challenges Ahead". 15-17. (2008).
- [3]. Allen, L. R. et al. "The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life." *Journal of Travel Research*, 27, 16-21. (1988).
- [4]. Volkan,A. "The Relationship between Quality of Life and Tourism: The Case of Alanya Region." *International Journal of Economic Research*, ISSN: 0972-9380, Volume 14 Number 11.and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(3), 2-8 (2017).
- [5]. Andereck, K. L. "Environmental consequences of tourism: a review of recent research. In S. F. McCool, & A. E. Watson (Eds.) *Linking tourism, the environment, and sustainability – topical volume of compiled papers from a special session of the annual meeting of the National Recreation and Park Association*. Minneapolis, MN: Gen. Tech." (1995).
- [6]. Andereck, K. L., Vogt, C.A. "The Relationship between Residents 'Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options," *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 39, Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 27-36. (2000)
- [7]. George P. O. "Management of Tourism Industry in Kerala", Mahatma Gandhi University. (2008).
- [8]. Gondos ,B. "Relationship between tourism and quality of life-research esatlake Balaton". *International conference 25-27 june, Portoroz, Slovenia*. (2014).
- [9]. Government of Kerala, Department of Tourism, *Tourism Vision 2025*. (2002),
- [10]. Gregory, R. "A Study of Tourism Potentiality of Cochin, M.Phil. Dissertation, Department of Applied Economics," Cochin University. (1994)
- [11]. Gunn, C. A. "Tourism Planning (2nded.)" New York: Taylor and Francis. (1988).
- [12]. Gursoy, D., Chi, C.G., & Dyer, P. "Locals' attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia." *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 381-394. (2010).
- [13]. Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C. &Uysal, M. Resident attitudes: "A structural modeling approach." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79-105. (2002).
- [14]. Homans, G. "Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms." Revised Edition. (1967).
- [15]. Noppanon,H & Sompong, P."The Effects Of Residents' Image And Perceived Tourism Impact To Residence Satisfaction And Support: A Case Study Of Hua-Hin Prachubkirikhan," *The 2015 WEI International Academic Conference Proceedings Vienna, Austria*. (2015).
- [16]. Hooper, D, Coughlan, J and Mullen, M "Structural Equation modelling Guidelines for determining model fit" *Dublin institute of technology Arrow@ DIT*, article, school of management. (2008)
- [17]. Roehl, W.S., "Quality of Life Issues in a Casino Destination", *Journal of Business Research*. 44, 223-229. (2000)
- [18]. Rose F.G "Resident Perceptions of the Impact of Tourism on an Australian City". *Journal of Travel Research* 30(3):13-17 · (1992)
- [19]. Schalock, R.L. (ed.) "Quality of life: Conceptualization and Measurement" (Vol. 1).Washington, DC: American Association on Mental Retardation. (1996).
- [20]. Schroeder, T. "The Relationship of Residents' Image of their State as a Tourist Destination and their Support for Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 71-73. (1996).
- [21]. Sheldon, P. J. &Var, T. "Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales." *Tourism Management*, 5, 40-47. (1984).
- [22]. Sirgy, M. J. "Handbook of quality-of-life research: An ethical marketing perspective" *Social Indicators Research Series No. 8*. (2001).

- [23]. Smith, Michael D, Richard, S & Krannich. 1998. "Tourism dependence and resident attitudes." Annals of Tourism Research(4): 783-802
- [24]. Hyungyu Park , "Heritage Tourism: emotional journeys into nationhood" , 2010
- [25]. Dr. ManikaSingla , "ACase Study on Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism in the city of Jaipur, Rajasthan: India", 2014
- [26]. Richard sharply, "The study of tourism: past trends and future directions" 2011
- [27]. Robert M "The economics of tourism destination", 2010
- [28]. Kathleen L. Andereck and Christine A. Vogt, The study "The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism and Tourism Development Options