

Local Residents Perception and Attitude Towards Model Tourism Village Kumbalangy Kerala

*C. Pradeep Kumar **Dr. R. Sakthivel ***Dr. Hareesh N Ramanathan

ABSTRACT

The present study is being carried out to understand the local resident's perception and attitude towards model tourism village Kumbalangy. Kumbalany village was declared as model tourism village by Kerala Govt on 2003. The project was set in motion in 2003 to help the local people through tourism development. The aim of this study is to assess whether the efforts taken by govt agencies are supported by local residents which other wise needs for implementation of various awareness programme to reinforce perceived positive impacts and minimize negative impacts. The study was conducted through survey method and participation of all sections has been ensured.

The question on positive and negative impacts was put up to respondents. The response percentage considered satisfactory. The basis of the research was on social exchange theory. The collected data has undergone through various suitable statistical tests to establish internal consistency, significance etc. The results indicate that those who are benefited from tourism supports and those who are not benefited have got less interest in promoting tourism. Very few people have viewed tourism activity as detrimental to society.

Introduction

Kumbalangy is an island-village situated on the outskirts of Ernakulum district in the state of Kerala India. The area of the village is 16 km². The village is well connected with the main land by road. The approximate distance from Kochi international airport is 45 Km. Approximately there are 30,000 residents live in the village. Fishing is the main occupation though it is home for farmers, toddy tappers and coir spinners. There are over 100 Chinese nets in the backwaters which face the village has given a picturesque.

In 2003 The Kumbalangy village was selected by Government of Kerala .as model tourism village for Integrated Tourism Village project which meant to transform the tiny island into a model fishing village and tourism spot. The village council is implementing the project with the help of state govt financial assistance.

The village tourism promotion council wants to bring back the pokkali farming method of fishing which is considered as more ecologically balancing. Also, mangroves that were once in abundance in the region are being planted once

* Research Scholar, Bharathiyar University, Coimbatore

** Assistant Professor, Govt Arts College, Coimbatore

** Professor and Head, Department of Management Studies, Toc H Institute of Science and Technology, Kochi. Kerala

again. For ecology balancing so far, about 50,000 mangrove saplings have been planted in the area.

Presently, there are about 20 houses as home stay that offers rooms to visitors. The roads, canals and waste management system have been strengthened to attract tourists. New projects like goat, poultry and honey bee farming are also in progress with financial support for micro enterprises. Sixteen different government departments are involved in this agriculture village project, including Coconut Development Board, Department of Fisheries, and Horticultural Corporation. By roping in neighbouring coastal village of Chellanam as the Sustainable Agriculture Village project is going to add an additional variety of tourism in Kumbalany village where tourist can exploit the beach and other features at Chellanam, which were missing in Kumbalangi.

Present study has been conducted to assess the resident's perception and attitude whether they support these activities related to tourism. In fact resident's participation is a basic necessity for development and sustenance of any project. Some previous studies have aimed to identify residents perception on tourism activities. (Brunt and Courtney, 1999, Cheyne and Mason (2000), Gursoy *et al.* (2002) , Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), (Jurowski and Gursoy, 2004). Lindberg and Johnson (1997), Williams and Lawson (2001)

The tourism development is an effective and sustainable way for revitalize the economy of a destination place irrespective whether it is rural or urban area .The quality of life within a community will have a significant bearing on resident perception, a planning/management regime sensitive to community needs is an essential ingredient of sustainable tourism development. To analyze tourism impact on local

residents one has to understand perception of local population and perception developed by tourism. The attitude of the local residents also to be measured. Additional evaluative component with belief can give attitude of an individual.

Literature Review

Substantial amount of literature about local resident's perception and attitude on tourism development has been documented by various authors from time to time. Kerala Tourism Policy (2012) emphasis local community's participation and acceptance of tourism for its sustenance. For gaining support of destination of local community they should benefit on economic, social and environmental fronts. Jamal and Getz(1995) supported community based tourism planning –arguing host community involvement leads to the development of socially responsible tourism and acceptable social effect. Sharma and Dyer (2009) observed the policy should be made towards creating more jobs, attracting more investment etc can creating positive impact on cultural identity of community and maintaining high standard of roads and public facilities.

According to Gursoy, and Rutherford (2004) the host community backing for tourism development is affected directly and or indirectly by few determinants of resident support. Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal (2002) finding confirms the usefulness of social exchange theory principles in explaining resident's attitude towards tourism. Brinda , Osti and Faccioli (2011) has observed that the local people weigh the benefits of tourism before they enter into exchange process .Angeles and Garcia (2008) on his observation has mentioned that significant economic development of region contributed by the participation of local residents' for tourism promotion initiatives will be more successful .

Wang, Bickle and Harill (2009) has observed that added shopping amenities and economic benefits are enjoyed by local residents that accrued from tourism. Chuang (2011) observes restoration of historical building , the conservation of natural resources, preservation of the country land scope at high standard has increased environmental impacts on residents in rural area. Shakeela ,and Weaver(2012) noted that tourism itself serves as an agent of social and cultural malaise that invites resistance. Leonard A Jackson (2008) in his study about event tourism indicated need for assessment of residents perception for tourism planning and blamed tourism for inflated real estate prices and increases in the cost of some consumer items. Resident also indicates that they believe tourism can bring economic benefits foster cultural exchange and increase employment opportunities

Mason,and Cheyne (2000) observes though women were generally more opposed than men to the tourism development on the ground of perceived negative impacts has expressed positive impacts on provisions of a community facility and benefits of this developments to the region to a greater extent than men. Haralambopoulos, and Pizam(1996) study discovered that respondents had a mixed attitude towards tourism. It was also found that majority of respondents had very positive perception of the impacts of tourism towards role of women and young adults in the community's social and economic life . The study also indicates the perceived impacts of tourism are not universal but rather depends on variety of circumstances and characteristics associated with the nature of tourism activities.

Besculides, Elee ,and McCormick(2002) providing jobs for residents is obviously an important by product but residents also see tourist as a means of helping them learn about

share and preserve their culture. Brunt and Courtney (1999) observes that consequential effect on attitude of the residents of host community with tourism in the region has altered the physical structure. Dunn and Dunn (2002) identified that to build a stronger stake holder base for tourism to flourish improved communication strategies is a must activity.

Residents positive attitude can make lot of difference in tourism development. The attracting facial and bodily expressions of residents will not only influence the tourist to stay at destination also will make a positive feeling towards the place.

2 (i). Social Exchange Theory : Basis of present study has been social exchange theory. Social exchange theory explains social change and stability as a process of negotiated exchange between all stake holders and human relationship are formed by the use of a subjective cost- benefit analysis. Gursoy and Rutherford (2004) observes that the residents involvement in tourism will be increasing is they perceive potential benefits are greater than the cost.

Objectives of the Study

To find out the major factors contributing the perception of people in Kumbalangi , Kerala towards developing their village as a model tourism village

Research Methodology

According to official population reports, there are approximately 30,0000 residents in Kumbalangi model tourism village . The details about the population was taken from the gramapanchayath population record. Hence random sampling was executed from the list given by the Panchayath authorities. Sample size was calculated by

accommodating the mean and standard deviation of the key variables.

The questionnaire was made in bi-lingual ie English and Malayalam for accommodating all category of people. The data result obtained from Malayalam was letter translated in English for analysis.

The study used descriptive statistics to measure resident's attitude towards tourism development. The total evolution was comprised of extensive review of literature of previous studies, questionnaire development on perception and

attitude of residents. pilot test etc. The valuable result obtained from pilot test was used for finalizing the instrument. A 5 point likert scale was used to measure resident's perception. The reliability statistics was carried and the cronbach's alpha value was 0.956 which is considered satisfactory. The Kaiser – Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlette's test of sphericity (Table 1) was tested and found to be satisfactory. The value close to 1 indicates that patterns of correlations are relatively compact and so factor analysis should yield distinct and reliable factor.

Table 1 : KMO and Bartlett's Test

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .921 |
| | Approx. Chi-Square | 5468.894 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | df | 378 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

The communalities before and after extraction shows all the statements are having adequate loading

It can be found that the five components extracted from principle component analysis is capable of explaining 74.76 % of the variation and the first component alone could explain about 49.846 of the variation. (Annexure 1)

The researcher attempted identifying those variables by using a Rotated Component Matrix. The rotation method used was Varimax method with Kaiser Normalization Table variables having high loadings are indicated. These variables are collected and organized based on their loadings. (Annexure 2)

In this, components are identified based on the statements which are having high loadings. The researcher has named each and every component factor with a suitable name identified from the common behaviour shown by the statements.

| SI No | Factor One :-Increased cost |
|-------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | VAR 017 |
| 2 | VAR 019 |
| 3 | VAR 020 |

The first factor was identified and named to be **Increased cost** because the extracted statements say cost of living, price of goods and

services and tourism caused more public expenses which indicates rise in cost in all levels of livelihood.

| SI No | Factor Two :- Degradation of environment |
|-------|---|
| 1 | VAR 025 |
| 2 | VAR 026 |
| 3 | VAR 027 |

The Second factor was identified and named to be **degradation of environment** because the extracted statements says environment and eco system has been degraded.

| SI No | Factor Three:- Increased cultural performance |
|-------|--|
| 1 | VAR 010 |

The Third factor was identified and named to be **increased cultural performance** because the extracted statements says demand for cultural programmes has been increased..

| SI No | Factor Four:- Job creation |
|-------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | VAR 003 |

The Forth factor was identified and named to be **Job creation** because the extracted statements says tourism has created jobs.

| SI No | Factor Five :- Improved infrastructure |
|-------|---|
| 1 | VAR 014 |

The Five factor was identified and named to be **Improved infrastructure** because the extracted statements says demand for cultural programmes has been increased.

Residents of Kumbalangy model tourism village perceives that though they benefitted due to tourism development there are few negative factor which needs to be controlled for sustainable growth. (Annexure 3)

Findings

- Majority of residents feels that with increase of tourism the cost of living, cost of goods and services has increased.
- Tourism has caused increase in road accident and illegal activities.
- Few respondents feels ecosystem and environment damage has increased due to tourism.
- Local residents benefitted due to development of tourism.
- Cultural performances have been increased due to tourism development.
- Traffic is a cause of concern for residents of Kumbalangy.

Recommendations

- Tourism development authorities needs to put more effort to create awareness of benefit of tourism .
- The existing roads to be repaired and more new roads to be created to ease the traffic conjunction and improve the perception towards road safety.
- Number of Govt owned commodity shops to be increased and all essential commodity to be made available to common man.
- More effective measure to be carried out on waste management and eco system preservation .

- Tourism institute by Govt/reputed institute to be opened at local level so as to enroll more local students in the tourism related courses.
- 24X7 help services of police/fire to be made available.

References

- A shakeela and David W 2012 Resident reaction to a tourism incident Mapping a Maldivian emoscope *Annals of tourism research* 39 1337-1358.
- Besculides A, Lee M, McCormick P. 2002. Resident's perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29: 303–319.
- Brida, Osti L, Faccioli M (2011) Residents perception and attitude towards tourism impacts. A case study of the small rural community of Folgaria(Trentino-Italy) *Bench Marking .An International Journal* (18) No 3 359-385.
- Brunt P, Courtney P. 1999. Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 26(3): 493–515.
- Chen CF and Chen PC 2010 Resident attitudes toward heritage tourism development *Tourism geographies* (12) 525-545.
- Cheyne J, Mason P. 2000. Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2): 391-411.
- Chuang ST(2011) Resident's attitudes towards Rural Tourism in Taiwan A Comparative view point .*International journal of tourism research*
- Dunn H and Dunn L (2002) Tourism and popular perception Mapping Jamaican attitude. *Social and economic studies* 51 (1) 25-45.
- Fredline E, Faulkner B. 2000. Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(3): 763–784.
- Garcia A ,Verdugo M and Ruiz D 2008 Gaining residents support for tourism and planning .*International journal of tourism research* 10 95-109.
- Gursoy D, Jurowski C, Uysal M. 2002. Resident attitudes: a structural modelling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 79–105
- Greg Richards 1996 Production and consumption Of European cultural tourism *Annals Of Tourism Research*, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 261-283
- Gursoy D, Rutherford DG. 2004. Host attitudes toward tourism. An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(3): 495–516.
- Gursoy D, Jurowski C, Uysal M. 2002. Resident attitudes: a structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29: 79–105.
- Harvey MJ, Hunt J, Harris CC. 1995. Gender and community tourism dependence level. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22(2): 349–366.
- Hughes G. 2002. Environmental indicators. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(2): 457–477
- Israeli A ,Uriely N and Reichel A 2002 Attitudes of local residents Vs Residents

- of surrounding areas towards tourism development. *An International journal of tourism and hospitality research* 13 (2) 145-157.
- Jackson L (2008) Resident's perception of the impacts of special event tourism. *Journal of place management and development* (1) 240-255
 - Jacobsen SKJ2002 Anti-tourist attitudes. Mediterranean charter tourism. *Annals of tourism research* 27 (2) 284-300;.
 - Jamal T, Getz D. 1995. Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22: 186–204.
 - Jurowski C, Gursoy D. 2004. Distance effects on resident's attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(2): 296–312.
 - Kousis (2000) Tourism and environment A Social movement perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research* (27) (2) 468-489.
 - Lindberg K, Johnson R. 1997. Modelling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 24(2): 402–424
 - Mason P and Cheyne J 200 Resident's attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of tourism research* 27 (2) 391-411
 - Richards G 1996 Production and consumption of European culture tourism. *Annals of tourism* 23(2) 261-283
 - Ritchie BW and Inkari M 2006 Host community attitude towards tourism and cultural tourism development. The case of the Lewes District Southern England. *International journal of tourism research* 827-844.
 - Schofield P 2011 City residents attitudes to proposed tourism development and its impacts on the community. *International journal of tourism research* 13 218-233.
 - Sharma B and Dyer P (2009) Residents involvement in tourism and their perception of tourism impacts. *Bench marking An international Journal* (16) PP 351-371.
 - Smith M, Krannich R. 1998. Tourism dependence and resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(4): 783–802
 - Teye V, Sonmez SF, Sirakaya E. 2002. Residents' attitudes towards tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(3): 668–688
 - Wang S, Bickle M and Harrill R (2010) Resident's attitude towards tourism development in Shandong China. *International Journal of culture tourism and hospitality research*. (4) PP 327-339.
 - Weaver D, Lawton L. 2001. Resident perceptions in the urban–rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28: 439–458.
 - Williams J, Lawson R. 2001. Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(2): 269–290.
 - William G, Zikmund P. 2000. *Business Research Methods*, 7th edn. The Dryden Press: Chicago, USA

Annexure 1

Table 2 : Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigenvalues | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 13.957 | 49.846 | 49.846 | 13.957 | 49.846 | 49.846 | 6.589 | 23.533 | 23.533 |
| 2 | 3.029 | 10.818 | 60.665 | 3.029 | 10.818 | 60.665 | 4.177 | 14.917 | 38.449 |
| 3 | 1.712 | 6.116 | 66.781 | 1.712 | 6.116 | 66.781 | 4.010 | 14.320 | 52.770 |
| 4 | 1.147 | 4.096 | 70.877 | 1.147 | 4.096 | 70.877 | 3.883 | 13.867 | 66.637 |
| 5 | 1.090 | 3.893 | 74.769 | 1.090 | 3.893 | 74.769 | 2.277 | 8.133 | 74.769 |

Annexure 2

Table 3 : Rotated Component Matrix^a

| Statements | Component | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| VAR 001 | .293 | .149 | .011 | .695 | .149 |
| VAR002 | .503 | .177 | .080 | .538 | .330 |
| VAR 003 | .332 | .157 | .245 | .762 | .067 |
| VAR 004 | .443 | .186 | .237 | .590 | .127 |
| VAR 005 | .311 | .080 | .519 | .601 | .327 |
| VAR 006 | .213 | -.024 | .576 | .495 | .097 |
| VAR007 | .490 | .061 | .547 | .147 | .210 |
| VAR008 | .077 | .595 | .418 | .283 | .169 |
| VAR009 | .087 | .493 | .571 | .100 | .257 |
| VAR010 | .291 | .287 | .747 | .083 | .045 |
| VAR 011 | .311 | .342 | .590 | .145 | .176 |
| VAR 012 | .189 | .766 | .213 | -.171 | .209 |
| VAR 013 | .385 | .048 | .459 | .127 | .465 |
| VAR 014 | .273 | .143 | .187 | .200 | .741 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|------|------|-------|
| VAR 015 | .024 | .086 | .132 | .122 | .869 |
| VAR 016 | .716 | .084 | .382 | .243 | .225 |
| VAR 017 | .901 | .147 | .038 | .102 | .112 |
| VAR 018 | .727 | .226 | .301 | .423 | .093 |
| VAR 019 | .798 | .112 | .177 | .236 | .176 |
| VAR 020 | .765 | .214 | .295 | .352 | -.016 |
| VAR 021 | .462 | .078 | .506 | .504 | .115 |
| VAR 022 | .642 | .048 | .445 | .339 | .207 |
| VAR 023 | .651 | .072 | .419 | .322 | .267 |
| VAR 024 | .581 | .111 | .470 | .450 | .172 |
| VAR 025 | .092 | .923 | .058 | .139 | .058 |
| VAR 026 | .334 | .855 | .042 | .202 | -.012 |
| VAR 027 | .018 | .903 | .077 | .154 | -.020 |
| VAR 028 | .725 | .276 | .229 | .384 | -.094 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. | | | | | |
| a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations. | | | | | |

Annexure 3

| Question on survey instrument | N | Mean |
|--|-----|--------|
| Tourism has created jobs in the community | 200 | 4.6750 |
| Tourism has attracted investments to community | 200 | 4.6150 |
| Tourism leads to illegal activities | 200 | 4.5600 |
| Tourism has provided economic benefits for the local residents | 200 | 4.5250 |
| Tourism increases the price of goods and services | 200 | 4.5150 |
| Tourism increases the number of traffic accidents | 200 | 4.5100 |
| Tourism increases the cost of living | 200 | 4.4850 |
| Tourism damages the natural environment and landscape | 200 | 3.8850 |
| Tourism increases the demand for cultural performances | 200 | 3.8100 |
| Tourism destroys the local ecosystem | 200 | 3.7700 |
| Notes:- Questions are ranked by mean values .Scales ranges from 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly disagree. | | |