

*Contemporary Research in
Commerce and Management*

Dr. Noushad. P. M. & Dr. Vineeth. K. M.



Maharaja's
College
Ernakulam



A GOVERNMENT
AUTONOMOUS COLLEGE

Re-Accredited by NAAC with 'A Grade'
Affiliated to Mahatma Gandhi University
Centre of Excellence under Govt. of Kerala
Identified by UGC as College with Potential for Excellence

ISBN: 978-93-5300-817-8

Contemporary Research in Commerce and Management

Edited by

Dr. Noushad. P. M. M. Com., M. Phil., LLB, Ph. D.

Assistant Professor and Head

Post Graduate Department of Commerce

Maharaja's College, Ernakulam, Kerala, India - 682011

&

Dr. Vineeth. K. M. M. Com., M.B.A., Ph. D.

Assistant Professor

Post Graduate Department of Commerce

Maharaja's College, Ernakulam, Kerala, India - 682011

IMPACT ANALYSIS OF BEACH TOURISM –A STUDY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ERNAKULAM DISTRICT

Dr. Radhika. P. C.

Assistant Professor of Commerce, Sacred Heart College, Thevara

Dan Antony and Jithin Pandiath

Second B Com Travel and Tourism, Sacred Heart College, Thevara

ABSTRACT

Tourism is promoted by almost all countries because of its economic, socio-cultural and environmental benefits. The government of India is also promoting tourism in a big way. Among the different states in India, Kerala has reached a very good status in terms of tourist arrival and tourism revenues. According to Kerala tourism statistics (2016) "the Foreign Tourist arrival to Kerala during the year 2016 is 10,38,419 and it shows an increase of 6.23% over the previous year's figure of 9,77,479. The domestic Tourist arrival to Kerala during the year 2016 is 1,31,72,535 which shows an increase of 5.67 % over the previous year's figure 1,24,65,571. The Foreign exchange earnings for the year 2016 is Rs.7749.51 Crores which recorded an increase of 11.51 % over the previous year. Total Revenue (including direct- & indirect) from Tourism during 2016 is Rs.29658.56 Crores, showing an increase of 11.12% over the last year's figure." These were the result of promotional activities of Kerala government. But these promotional activities are usually unplanned and are focused on reaping economic benefits. As a result, these developments had created a lot of negative impacts at the destination. Usually these impacts were suffered by the resident community who are residing at the destination. So the present study is conducted to understand the different impacts of tourism in Kerala. The study is mainly concentrating on beach tourism. The study have got two objectives, first one is to understand the positive impacts of beach tourism in Kerala and second one is to understand the negative impacts of beach tourism. The study was based on the data collected from two beach tourism destinations in Ernakulam district namely Fort Kochi and Cherai. The result of the study will help to understand the impacts of beach tourism in resident's perspective.

Keywords: *Beach tourism, perceived impacts of tourism*

Introduction

Tourism industry is considered as the fastest growing industry in modern world. It provides direct economic impact to the host country and the industry has significant indirect and induced impacts. The government of Kerala is giving high priority in the development of tourism as it ensures economic development. The economic benefits of tourism include provision of employment opportunities, provision of foreign exchange earnings, GDP growth etc. The development of tourism not only provides economic benefits but also it provides socio-cultural and environmental benefits. But the uncontrolled development exerts a lot of negative problems in the host country's

environment. These include the destruction of the traditional landscape, congestion of the transport system, various forms of pollution, impacts on natural resources, impacts on consumption patterns, impacts on social systems etc. Thus the need for sustainable planning and management is imperative for the industry to survive as a whole. For proper management of the tourism industry it is necessary to understand the different impacts of tourism in resident's perspective. So the present study tries to understand the different impacts of tourism. This study mainly concentrates on beach tourism destination because it is one of the important type of tourism. Beach Tourism is seen as a combination of nature and culture which is a major factors attracting foreign tourists to India. As Kovalam was the first promoted destination in Kerala, it was established as a beach tourism destination among international tourists during 1980's. Kerala is blessed with vast coastline with a number of beautiful beaches and the government is promoting beach tourism in a big way. As the foreign tourists are attracted by the three 'S' (Sun, Sand and Surfing), the opportunities of beach tourism are unlimited. Kerala is named as one of the "ten paradises of the world" and "50 must-see destinations of a lifetime" by National Geographic's Traveller magazine. State government has utilised the possibilities of integrating tourism opportunities with other development activities and has also promoted the inclusion of host community in the industry for better growth and for the achievement of sustainability. This study focuses on the impacts of Beach tourism. The study have got two objectives, first one is to understand the positive impacts of beach tourism in Kerala and second one is to understand the negative impacts of beach tourism.

Objectives of the study

1. To understand the positive impacts of beach tourism in Kerala.
2. To understand the negative impacts of beach tourism in Kerala.

Methodology of the study

This study is based on both primary and secondary data. The secondary data is based on the literature review which includes major tourism journals, PhD thesis and important tourism websites.

Study location and sample: The study is based on the primary data collected from two beach tourism destinations in the Ernakulam district namely Fort Kochi and Cherai. Fort Kochi beach is situated in Old Kochi area towards the west of Ernakulam. Colonial style bungalows, Vasco da Gama square, the remains of Fort Emmanuel along the granite walkway and sea food stalls make the beach attractive. Cherai is an ideal beach towards the north end of Vypin Island, which encloses coconut grooves and paddy fields. The data was collected from the local resident community of Fort Kochi and Cherai using systematic sampling method. Data was collected from every 5th house in a street. A structured self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data from 100 households (50 from Fort Kochi and 50 from Cherai) in Nov 2017. All the items were measured on a 1-5 likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 2=Disagree,

3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=strongly agree). The data collection instruments were developed to systematize the collection of data and to ensure that all the respondents are asked the same questions and in the same order. The questionnaires were developed with open-ended and close-ended questions. The questionnaire was personally administered with the respondents.

Limitations of the Study

- The sample size may not be very large to generalize the results.
- It is limited to information provided both by primary and secondary data

Analyses Design:-The analyses were done using SPSS 21. Underlying constructs measuring resident's perception of positive and negative impacts were identified using an exploratory factor analysis. The perception of positive and negative impacts was examined by using Cronbach reliability. To detect scale dimensionality, an EFA with a principal component method with varimax rotation was conducted. The appropriateness of factor analysis was determined by examining the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. A value of 0.60 or above from the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy test indicates that the data were adequate for EFA (Tabachnick et al., 1989). A significant Bartlett's test of sphericity was also required. In order to ensure that each factor identified by EFA had only one dimension and each attribute loaded only on one factor, attributes that had factor loadings of lower than 0.40 and attributes loading on more than one factor with a loading score of equal to or greater than 0.40 on each factor were eliminated from the analysis (Hattie, 1985). Thus the factor analysis resulted in finding out the different factors under perceived impacts of tourism. The perception the resident community towards the tourism impacts are assessed by calculating the mean score of the variable.

Perceived Positive Impacts of Tourism

Most of the studies on residents support for tourism suggest that majority usually support tourism as an important economic development tool. Tourism increases the employment opportunities (Mason et al., 2000, Yoon et al 2001, Gursoy et al., 2002, Dogan et al., 2004, Dyer et al., 2007, Untong et al., 2010, Nunkoo et al. 2011, Nunkoo et al.2012). Tourism also helps to improve the local economy (Gursoy et al., 2004) and it provides revenue for the local government (Yoon et al., 2001, Ko et al., 2002, Dogan et al., 2002, Dogan et al., 2004, Dyer et al., 2007). The tourism industry attracts more investments (Yoon et al., 2001, Ko et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2004, Dyer et al (2007), Untong et al., 2010, Nunkoo et al., 2011, Nunkoo et al., 2012). Tourism helps in income generation and it also raises the standard of living of the resident community (Yoon et al., 2001, Ko et al., 2002, Nunkoo et al., 2011).The public facilities and the recreational facilities are improved because of tourism (Ko et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2002, Teye et al., 2002, Andereck, et al., 2005, Dyer et al., 2007,

Nunkoo et al., 2011). Tourism promotes cultural exchange and encourages variety of cultural activities (Yoon et al., 2001, Gursoy et al., 2002, Teye et al., 2002, Ko et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2004, Andereck, et al., 2005, Dyer et al., 2007, Nunkoo et al., 2012).

Perceived Negative Impacts of Tourism

Even though tourism provides a number of benefits for the community, there exists the negative side also. Tourism increases the cost of living, increases real estate cost and it also results in the increase of prices of goods and services (Ko et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2004, Dyer et al., 2007, Nunkoo et al., 2011, Látková et al., 2012). As a result of tourism the crime rate increases, creates congestion problems and the traffic accidents are also increases (Yoon et al., 2001, Ko et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2002, Gursoy et al., 2004, Andereck, et al., 2005, Nunkoo et al., 2011, Látková et al., 2012). The destinations become overcrowded and this creates problem for community (Yoon et al., 2001, Teye et al., 2002, Nunkoo et al., 2012, Látková et al., 2012). The tourism development also causes different types of pollutions (Yoon et al., 2001, Ko et al., 2002, Dyer et al., 2007, Untong et al., 2010, Nunkoo et al., 2011, Nunkoo et al., 2012). Cultural degradation is another problem created by the tourism industry (Yoon et al., 2001, Nunkoo et al., 2012). Alcoholism, Sexual permissiveness and prostitution are the other cite negative impacts (Ko et al., 2002, Teye et al., 2002, Andereck, et al., 2005, Nunkoo et al., 2011, Nunkoo et al., 2012).

The Result of the study

Fort Kochi: Fort Kochi beach is situated in Old Kochi area towards the west of Ernakulam. Colonial style bungalows, Vasco da Gama square, the remains of Fort Emmanuel along the granite walkway and sea food stalls make the beach attractive. Out of the 50 respondents, 70% of them were males and 30% were females. It was noted that 50% of the respondents were from the age group of 40-50, 30% falls in 50-60 and 20% in the 60 above category. It was noted that all the respondents were married. 20% of the respondents turned out to be post graduates, 50% were graduates, whereas the rest were 12th or below. All the respondents are living in the destination for more than 10 years. 90% of the respondents are natives of their destination whereas 10% of them were living in that destination for 31-40 years.

Cherai: Out of the 50 respondents, 60% of them were males and 40% were females. It was noted that 40% of the respondents were from the age group of 40-50 and 60% falls in 50-60. It was noted that all the respondents were married. 70% of the respondents were educated below 10th grade whereas 30% of the respondents has were educated till 12th grade. 90% of the respondents are living in the destination for more than 10 years whereas 10% of them are living for less than 10 years. 60% of the respondents are natives of the destination whereas 10% of them were living for 31-40 years, another 10% of the respondents had only lived for a maximum of 10 years whereas 20% of the respondents have been lived between 11-20 years.

Factor analysis result: The 100 samples collected from the two beaches are used for conducting factor analysis. The Factor Analysis derived the following latent factors for the dimension. The reliability coefficients for the all the latent constructs involved in this study were calculated. Cronbach's Alpha was found out for each construct. The factor analysis on perceived benefits of tourism resulted in two factors namely 'Economic and social Benefits' and 'Welfare Benefits'. The factor analysis on perceived cost of tourism resulted in three factors namely 'Socio-environment cost', 'Socio-cultural cost' and 'Socio-economic cost'. The following table1 gives the factors derived and the reliability values.

Table1: Reliability Coefficients for constructs used in the study

Sl.No.	Constructs	Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
I	Perceived Benefits of Tourism (PBT)		
1	Economic and social Benefits	7	0.9647
2	Welfare Benefits	4	0.8125
II	Perceived Cost of Tourism (PCT)		
3	Socio-environment cost	5	0.8457
4	Socio-cultural cost	5	0.7874
5	Socio-economic cost	4	0.8229

The perception the resident community towards the tourism impacts are assessed by calculating the mean score of the variable and the result is presented in the table2

Table2: Mean score values

Variables	Mean	Standard deviation	Description
Perceived Benefits of tourism			
Economic and social Benefits	3.39	1.180	Moderate
Welfare Benefits	3.89	0.43	High
Perceived costs of tourism			
Socio-environment cost	3.67	1.18	High
Socio-cultural cost	3.12	1.14	Moderate
Socio-economic cost	3.24	1.16	Moderate

Here the mean score value of below 2.5 is taken as low, between 2.5 to 3.5 is taken as moderate and above 3.5 is considered as high. The above table shows that Economic and social Benefits of tourism are moderate and the welfare benefits of tourism is perceived to be high.. Regarding the socio-cultural and socio-economic cost they perceived it as 'moderate'. The residents perceive the 'Socio-environment cost' as 'High'.

Discussion of the findings and Conclusion

The main objectives of the study were to understand the positive impacts of beach tourism in Kerala and to understand the negative impacts of beach tourism. The factor analysis on perceived benefits of tourism resulted in two factors namely 'Economic and social Benefits' and 'Welfare Benefits'. The factor analysis on perceived cost of

tourism resulted in three factors namely 'Socio-environment cost', 'Socio-cultural cost' and 'Socio-economic cost'. In order to understand the resident's perception towards these impacts, mean score was calculated. The result shows that the 'Economic and social Benefits' of tourism are moderate and the welfare benefits of tourism is perceived to be high. This is because even though the tourism development results in economic development, the benefits from tourism are reaped by some people other than the local residents. They are only getting some revenue from tourism and that is the reason why they perceived it as moderate. The community based tourism development programs has to be more strengthened and should ensure the resident's participation in the beach tourism developments. This will ensure the distribution of economic benefits to resident community. The community members are satisfied with the welfare benefits, because the tourism development ensures the development of transportation, communication, shopping and health care facilities.

Regarding the socio-cultural and socio-economic cost they perceived it as 'moderate'. The residents perceive the 'Socio-environment cost' as 'High'. The reason for this result is that the tourism development in beaches has been causing negative environment impacts. The condition of Fort Kochi beach is an excellent example for this. The waste management system in Fort Kochi is mismanaged. The beach is very much littered by the ice cream cups, sticks, plastic bottles, plastic covers etc. Proper waste management system is necessary to revive the conditions of beach. The tourists are coming to beaches for experiencing the exotic beach atmosphere. These negative environment impacts will result in dissatisfaction among tourists and in turn will affect the tourist's inflow. So it is high time to consider this issue by the tourism authorities. As the resident community is more interested in reaping the economic benefits of tourism, they are less concerned about the socio-cultural cost.

This study reaffirms the importance for researchers, scholars, and practitioners to understand the different impacts of tourism in resident's perspective. The study also explains the different factors under the perceived benefits of tourism and perceived cost of tourism. The study highlights the area which needs the consideration of tourism authorities to ensure community support and sustainability of the destination. If the negative impacts of tourism are minimized and positive impacts are enhanced, that will ensure the community satisfaction and in turn will result in full community support for tourism development.

References

- Allen, L., Hafer, H., Long, P., & Perdue, R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 2-33.
- Alfonso Vargas-Sanchez, Nurria Parras-Beuno, and Maria De Los Angeles Plaza-Mejia (2011), Explaining Residents Attitudes to tourism. Is a universal model possible?, *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol :38,no:2,pp-460-480.
- Akarapong Untong, Mingsarn Kaosa-ard, Vicente Ramos, Korawan Sangkakorn and Javier Rey-Maquieira (2010), Factors Influencing Local Resident Support for

- Tourism Development: A Structural Equation Model, Paper presented in The APTA Conference 2010 at Macau, China between 13-16 July 2010.
- Bouquet, M., and M. Winter 1987 Introduction: Tourism Politics and Practice. In *Who From Their Labours Rest: Conflict and Practice in Rural Tourism*, M. Bouquet and M. Winter, eds., pp. 1-8. Aldershot: Gower.
- Bramwell, B. (2011). Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: A political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4/5), 459-477.
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., & Dronberger, M. G. (2009), Comparison of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina, *Tourism Management*, 30, 693-703.
- Chun-Fang Chiang & Kuan-Chieh Huang (2012), "An Examination of Antecedent Factors in Residents' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts on a Recreational Fishing Port, Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 17:1, 81-99 Published online: 18 Nov 2011.
- Dong-Wan Ko and William P. Stewart (2002), A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development, *Tourism Management* 23, pp 521-530.
- Fotis Kilipirisa and Stella Zardava(2012), Developing sustainable tourism in a changing environment: issues for the tourism enterprises (travel agencies and hospitality enterprises)", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 44 (2012) 44 - 52 .
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010), Local's attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49, 381-394.
- Gursoy Dogan, Juroski Claudia and Uysal Muzaffer (2002) , Residents Attitudes A structural Modeling Approach, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), pp79-105.
- Gursoy Dogan and Rutherford Denney G (2004), Host Attitudes Toward Tourism An Improved Structural Model, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hattie, J. (1985), Methodology review: Assessing unidimensionality of tests and terms. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9(2), 139-164.
- Kathleen L. Andereck, Karin M. Valentine, Richard C. Knopf and Christine A. Vogt(2005), Residents' Perceptions Of Community Tourism Impacts, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 1056-1076, 2005.
- Kreg Lindberg and Rebecca L. Johnson(1997), Modeling Resident Attitudes Toward Tourism , *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp.4 02-424.
- L C Harrison and W.Husbands (1997), "Practising Responsible Tourism: International Case Studies in Tourism Planning, Policy and Development", *Tourism Management*, vol 18, no:5, pp 333-337.
- Lee, C., Kang, S. K., Long, P., & Reisinger, Y. (2010), Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: A comparative study. *Tourism Management*, 31, 189-201.
- Newman, P., & Clarke, J. (2009). *Publics, politics and power. Remaking the public in public services*. Sage: London.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Modeling community support for a proposed integrated resort project. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 257-277.

- Pam Dyer, Dogan Gursoy, Bishnu Sharma and Jennifer Carter(2007), Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia, *Tourism Management* 28 (2007) 409–422.
- Pavlna Látková and Christine A. Vogt(2012), Residents' Attitudes toward Existing and Future Tourism Development in Rural Communities, *Journal of Travel Research* 51(1) 50–67.
- Peter Mason and Joanne Chey ne(2000), Resident's Attitudes To Proposed Tourism Development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 391±411.
- Robin Nunkoo and Ramkissoon Haywantee(2011), Developing a community support model for tourism , *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol :38,no:3,pp-964-988.
- Robin Nunkoo and Dogan Gursoy(2012), Residents' Support For Tourism An Identity Perspective, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 243–268.
- Sevgin Akis, Nicos Peristianis and Jonathan Warner (1996), Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 17, No. 7, pp. 481-494.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidel, F. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Thibault Michot (march 2010), "Pro-poor Tourism in Kumarakom, Kerala, South India: Policy Implementation and Impacts ,working paper no7,published by the Guild of independent Scholars and the Journal of Alternatives in the Social Sciences.
- Victor Teye, Sevil F. Soñmez and Ercan Sirakaya(2002), Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism Development, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 668-688.
- Yooshik Yoon, Dogan Gursoy and Joseph S. Chen (2001), Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation Modeling, *Tourism Management* 22 (2001)363 -372.
- Yu, C., Chancellor, H. C., & Cole, S. T. (2011), Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: A re-examination of the sustainable tourism attitudes scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50, pp 57–63.
- Zhang, J., Inbakaran, R., & Jackson, M. (2006). Understanding community attitudes towards tourism and host–guest interaction in the urban-rural border region. *Tourism Geographies*, 88(2), 182–204.

Websites

<http://www.keralatourism.org/rt-impactsocial.php>
www.keralatourism.gov.in
www.keralatourism.org