Impact of the Tourism Development on the Quality of Life of the People: A Case in Jaffna Municipal Area
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Abstract

Purpose: The impact of tourism development on the quality of life (Veenhoven. R., 2007) of the people in the Jaffna municipal area is studied.

Design/Methodology/Approach: Closed-ended questionnaire/ Likert scale- for measuring the impact of the Tourism development as above. A questionnaire was distributed in the Jaffna municipal area. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed in this study.

Findings: Descriptive analysis showed that there is a positive relationship between tourism development and quality of life. Correlation analysis ascertained it. Correlation analysis established that a significant positive correlation is present between the two, which was very strong. The correlation of tourism development was significant with the three sub-variables, namely, households’ income, entrepreneurial & employment opportunities, and culture. Regression analysis confirmed that tourism development had a significantly positive relationship and predicted the model satisfactorily to explain the impact of tourism development on the quality of life of people of the Jaffna municipal area.

Practical implication: There is a great potential to enhance the quality of life through tourism development.

Originality/ value: Improving the Quality of Life of the people through Tourism Development is explored. The specific findings are valuable in policy-making and planning tourism development projects.
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Introduction

Tourism is one of the largest and fastest-growing industries globally (Larry Dwyer, Peter Forsyth &Wayne Dwyer, 2009). It is a substantial source of job creation worldwide. Developing countries embrace international tourism as a source of economic growth (Larry Dwyer, Peter Forsyth &Wayne Dwyer, 2009). In the increasingly globalised economic environment, a developing country such as Sri Lanka must explore ways to gain an advantage from the tourism industry. It is a challenge to effectively plan for tourism development within overall national economic development planning and policies.

For centuries, foreign travellers have been visiting Sri Lanka (Wikipedia, 2021), and Jaffna has many tourist attractions (Dilogini, K & Hensman, GH 2004.; (Mathivathani & Sasitharan 2010 in Shanmuganathan, K 2016). Tourism is growing fast in Sri Lanka. The Sri Lankan tourism sector plays a vital role in the economy.
It addresses various issues like employment, livelihood support and sustainable improvement of socio-economic conditions of the communities. Sri Lanka’s tourism sector was recognised as the number-one travel destination for 2019 (SLTDA 2019). Sri Lanka earned $4.4bn from tourism in 2018, with revenue up 12% on the $3.9bn of 2017, according to the SLTDA.

According to the Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority, tourist arrivals were above two million in the year 2018 and contribution to GDP increased from 6 % in 2000 to 12.6 % in 2019, growing at an average annual rate of 4.28% (SLTDA 2019).

Tourism growth trends in Sri Lanka is as follows:

| Year | Tourist Arrivals Growth Change |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 2001 | 50.0                          |
| 2002 | 40.0                          |
| 2003 | 67.1                          |
| 2004 | 57.7                          |
| 2005 | 60.3                          |
| 2006 | 13.0                          |
| 2007 | 27.3                          |
| 2008 | 26.7                          |
| 2009 | 19.8                          |
| 2010 | 17.8                          |
| 2011 | 13.1                          |
| 2012 | 14.0                          |
| 2013 | 10.3                          |
| 2014 | 2.3                           |
| 2015 | 3.2                           |
| 2016 | 4.9                           |
| 2017 | 5.1                           |
| 2018 | 1.8                           |

Source: Annual Statistical Report- 2018, Sri Lanka Tourism Development Authority

Sri Lanka can develop tourism despite missed opportunities on several occasions. Jaffa was seriously affected by the nearly three decades of war, which ended in May 2009. Immediately after the end of the war, tourism was expected to bounce back in the area.

The objectives of implementing various tourism development projects are to increase the total output of the people of the tourism area and improve the sustainable socio-economic conditions of the households. It is, therefore, clear that residents’ perceptions are important to strengthen economic growth from tourism development. It is necessary for projecting a good image of the tourism industry.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to analyse outcomes/impact of tourism through residents’ perceptions to incorporate lessons learned from it to implement future economic development programs effectively.

Research Questions

- Is there any significant relationship between tourism development and the quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area?
- To what extent does tourism development impact on quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area?

Objectives

- To identify the relationship between tourism development and the quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area.
- To find out the level of impact of tourism development on the quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area.

Review of Literature

Tourism

The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) explains tourism relates to travelling and
staying for leisure, business, and other purposes tour (UNWTO, 2008). UNWTO added that it is limited travel and stay within one at a time of a visitor. Tourism consists of a cluster of interrelated economic activities that encompasses various undertakings covering the agricultural, manufacturing, and service sectors. Tourism contributes to three high-priority goals of developing countries: the generation of income, employment, and foreign-exchange earnings (Larry Dwyer, Peter Forsyth & Wayne Dwyer, 2009).

Empirical Review

Tourism has evolved internationally in a big way. Globally, travel and tourism’s direct contribution to GDP was approximately 2.9 trillion U.S. dollars in 2019 (Statista, 2021). Tourism generates 12% of the global gross national product, and it employs around 200 million people worldwide.

Following the end of nearly three decades War in Sri Lanka in May 2009, Sri Lanka had a tourism boom (Fernando, 2015). The number of tourist arrivals to Sri Lanka sharply increased to a record high. The tourism sector has become a main driver of the Sri Lankan economy in terms of foreign exchange earnings, employment generation and attracting foreign direct investment (SLTDA, 2019). The tourism sector can immensely contribute to the economic development in Sri Lanka.

Economic Impacts of Tourism

Benefits of Tourism include foreign exchange earnings, revenues to the government, direct employment opportunities increasing living standards for the residents, infrastructure development and several other things (Mansour Esmaeil Zaei & Mahin Esmaeil Zaei, 2013).

Policymakers have considered the potential of tourism development significant (UNWTO, 2007). The tourism industry has labour intensive characteristics (O’Higgins, 1998). The tourism industry can generate enormous employment and income-earning opportunities. These are usually small and medium scale employments engaging many women, minorities and young people.

Moreover, the tourism sector can attract foreign direct investments. Furthermore, Kraph (1961) stated that tourism could generate, from limited investment in infrastructural facilities, a large sum of capital, which may be transferred to the other sectors of the economy. Such actions contribute to the growth and development of a country through the multiplier effect on employment generation, education enhancement, and an increase in Foreign Direct Investment, which ultimately boosts the foreign reserves.

Tourism can impact a country’s economy by driving the growth and development of various industries such as transportation, accommodation, arts, and entertainment. However, improvements in the standard of living of residents are not reported favourably in general. Further, inflation of the prices could also be observed in these areas.

Davison (1996) and Allen et al., (1988) suggest that tourism development in each community is different, and the tolerance of tourism activities are dependent on several encouragement factors together with the economic, socio-cultural, and environment of each community. Fariborz (2009) states that the tourism industry has human and environmental costs while benefitting the residents involved. Thus the local community is a necessary condition for improving the development process.

A study conducted by Kreg (2001) detailed positive and negative economic impacts. Residents of any host area may perceive tourism positively (Andriotis 2002a) or negatively (Allen 1990). Many scholars (Allen et al. 1988; Lankford and Howard 1994; Ritchie 1988 etc.) explained that residents’ perceptions of the costs and benefits of tourism influence visitor satisfaction. Residents’ subjective perceptions of tourism are important. Planners and developers can identify real concerns and issues from these perceptions to develop appropriate policies, optimising the benefits and minimising the problems (Andriotis K & . Vaughan, R. D, 2003).

Tourism Development in Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka has been a tourist destination for centuries (UNDP; WTO, 1993; SLTDA, 2011). Sri Lanka satisfies the criteria for tourism countries (Fernando S, 2017). Sri Lanka has the potential to become a popular tourist destination (SLTDA).
Research Gap

There is a lack of studies relating to the impact of the tourism development programme in the Jaffna municipal area. No study has come across the research on the impact of the tourism development program in the Jaffna municipal area, Jaffna district of Northern Province of Sri Lanka.

Therefore, it is proposed to conduct to fill up the research gap on the impact of the Tourism development program in the Jaffna Municipal area, which has enormous potential due to many factors such as its historical background, cultural uniqueness, attractive places in the vicinity, and surroundings, etc.

Hypotheses of the Study

H1: There is a significant relationship between tourism development and households’ income in the Jaffna municipal area.

H2: There is a significant relationship between tourism development and the environment in the Jaffna municipal area.

H3: There is a significant relationship between tourism development and entrepreneurial & employment opportunities in the Jaffna municipal area.

H4: There is a significant relationship between tourism development and the culture of the people in the Jaffna municipal area.

H5: There is a significant relationship between tourism development and the quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area.

H6: There is a significant impact of tourism development on the quality of life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area.

Scope of the Study

The scope is restricted to the people in Jaffna municipal area. This study especially looked at the level of Tourism Development and the level of Quality of Life. The study began in January 2020 and concluded in August 2021.

Materials and Methods

The aim is to identify the impact of Tourism Development on Quality of Life. A structured questionnaire is used to determine the relationship between the independent and the dependent variable with a quantitative approach.

An appropriate questionnaire was developed to capture the variables identified with a high degree of reliability and validity. Questions were formulated after rigorously going through questions in the questionnaires used in similar studies (Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R.D (2003); Lin Yan (2014); Azizan Marzuki, (2012)) that were reported to be having high reliability and validity. Finally, based on the review, the questionnaire was designed to suit the objectives and scope of this study. The questionnaire was developed to capture data of the variables identified with a high degree of reliability and validity. Responses were captured on a five-point Likert type summated rating scales of the questionnaire in a continuum from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Collected data were processed and analysed using SPSS version 20.

To profile the respondents following details were collected through the questionnaire: Gender, Age,
Income status, period of residence, and frequency of contact with tourists.

- Dependent Variable: Quality of life
- Independent Variable: Tourism development

Variables were assessed in the following manner as outlined in the conceptual model above:

Tourism development (independent variable) - six questions

Quality of Life, which is reported to be influenced by tourism development (dependent variable) (Pierre Benckendorff et al., 2009)

Under this dependent variable, four parameters (sub-variables) were identified after reviewing past research materials as mentioned above and included as follows:

- Household income development- four questions
- Environmental Development- six questions
- Entrepreneurial and Employment Development- five questions
- Cultural Development- eight questions

There were 34 questions. Twenty-nine questions were related to tourism development and dependent variables such as household income, environment, entrepreneurial employment opportunities, and culture, which connect to the Quality of Life. The other five questions are connected to residents’ details such as gender, age, period of residence, the extent of income earned by tourism-related activities, and the degree of interaction/contact with tourists. Questions numbering 16 to 30 with negative connotations had been transformed into reverse values by recoding using SPSS 20 software to make them positive in line with other questions.

**Research Sample and Data Collection**

The questionnaire was administered to 120 selected people who are medium and small income earners in the Jaffna municipal area (for this purpose, persons from families earning a monthly income of Lankan Rs. 50000 or below were taken into account as a thumb rule as 25% of the employees earn less than (approximately) Rs.50000 (Rs.51400) in 2021. (Salary explorer, 2021) and 107 out of 120 had responded and returned responses to the questionnaire. Questionnaires were personally delivered by hand.

**Basis of Sampling**

The research collected the data to study the impact of tourism development in the Jaffna municipal area. A sample of 120 households was selected from the area. Convenient Stratified sampling was used. Households were selected representing the wards as depicted below as far as possible. Questionnaires were personally delivered by hand within the municipal area. The details are as follows:

| Ward No | Ward Name                  | No of households | Members | Percentage of (% ) numbers | Numbers of selected households |
|---------|----------------------------|------------------|---------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 01      | Vannarpannai North         | 1400             | 4485    | 5                           | 7                             |
| 02      | Kantharamad North West     | 1645             | 5201    | 6                           | 8                             |
| 03      | Kantharamad North East     | 762              | 2055    | 2                           | 2                             |
| 04      | Nalluru Rajathani          | 1357             | 3802    | 5                           | 6                             |
| 05      | Sangiliyan Thoppu          | 1241             | 3501    | 4                           | 5                             |
| 06      | Ariyalai                   | 1208             | 3595    | 4                           | 5                             |
| 07      | Kalaigakal                 | 573              | 1693    | 2                           | 2                             |
| 08      | Kantharamad South          | 776              | 2157    | 3                           | 3                             |
| 09      | Iyanar Kovilady            | 915              | 3267    | 4                           | 4                             |
| 10      | New Moor Street            | 373              | 1320    | 2                           | 1                             |
| 11      | Navanthurai North          | 720              | 2620    | 3                           | 3                             |
| 12      | Navanthurai South          | 632              | 2195    | 3                           | 3                             |
| 13      | Old Moor Street            | 1407             | 5349    | 6                           | 7                             |
| 14      | Grant Bazaar               | 880              | 2782    | 3                           | 4                             |

http://www.shanlaxjournals.com
Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability is defined as the accuracy or precision of a measuring instrument. The research mainly depended on the measurement taken by the instrument. The questionnaire was the instrument that was pre-tested and found to be suitable under preliminary study.

| Reliability Statistics |
|------------------------|
| Cronbach’s Alpha       |
| No. of Items           |
| .741                   | 34                      |

According to Nunnally (1978), the alpha of a scale should be greater than 0.70 for the items to be used together as a scale. Cronbach’s alpha measure of 0.741 resulted from the analysis reveals that the instrument used for measurement (questionnaire) is highly reliable in applied settings.

Descriptive Analysis

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

|                          | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Tourism Development      | 107| 3.17    | 4.33    | 3.7508| .44059         |
| Household Income Development | 107| 2.00    | 4.00    | 2.9936| .60970         |
| Environmental Development | 107| 2.67    | 3.45    | 3.0804| .21385         |
| Entrepreneurial and Employment Development | 107| 2.60    | 4.20    | 3.5822| .50690         |
| Cultural Improvement     | 107| 2.50    | 3.75    | 3.0421| .45304         |
| Quality of Life          | 107| 2.78    | 3.75    | 3.1733| .31727         |
| Valid N (list wise)      |    |         |         |       |                |

Source: Jaffna Municipal Council, 2020

Results

The sample size is limited to 120 people (107 responded finally). According to table 1, Entrepreneurial and Employment Development has the highest significant mean value (3.5822) among Quality of Life factors. Entrepreneurial and Employment Development contributed most significantly to the Quality of Life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area. Conversely, the level of Household Income Development had the lowest significant mean value (2.9936). It shows that Household Income Development did not affect the Quality of Life of the people in the Jaffna municipal area. Other factors such as Environmental Development and Cultural Improvement also influenced the Quality of Life.
From the above, it can be observed that the perception of people in the area understudy towards tourism development was moderately positive as the mean is 3.75. However, households’ income was moderately low (mean=2.99) in the perception of the people of the area. The perception was neutral about environment (mean= 3.08) along with culture (mean= 3.04). However, it is noteworthy that the mean of perception of people is moderately positive for entrepreneurial and employment opportunities. Quality of life was perceived by people moderately positively as the mean is 3.17.

**Correlation Analysis**

According to Table 2, there is a significant association between Tourism Development and households’ income, entrepreneurial and employment opportunities, and culture, which indirectly confirms that the quality of life of people is closely correlated to tourism development. The relationship was positive and very high (as the coefficient of correlation is .748).

The relationship between Tourism Development and entrepreneurship and employment opportunities is positive and very high (at 1% significant level; coefficient of correlation is +0.797). The relationship between Tourism Development and Household Income Development is positive and high (at a 1% significant level; coefficient of correlation is +0.599). The relationship between Tourism Development and Cultural Improvement is positive and moderate (at a 1% significance level; the coefficient of correlation is 0.471). On the contrary, the relationship between Tourism Development and Environment is negative and weak (at a 1% significance level; coefficient of correlation is -0.153). Overall, quality of life has a significant positive relationship as the coefficient of correlation is 0.748 at a 1% confidence level.

**Table 4: Correlations**

|                          | Tourism Development | Households' Income | Environment | Entrepreneurial and Employment opportunities | Culture | Quality of Life |
|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Tourism Development      | Pearson Correlation | 1                  | -0.153      | .797**                                       | .471**  | .748**          |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000              | 0.117       | 0.000                                        | 0.000   | 0.000           |
|                         | N                   | 107                | 107         | 107                                          | 107     | 107             |
| Households' Income      | Pearson Correlation | .599**             | 1           | 0.165                                        | .610**  | .794**          |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000              | 0.069       | 0.090                                        | 0.000   | 0.000           |
|                         | N                   | 107                | 107         | 107                                          | 107     | 107             |
| Environment             | Pearson Correlation | -0.153             | 0.176       | -0.019                                       | .544**  | .441**          |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.117              | 0.069       | 0.849                                        | 0.000   | 0.000           |
|                         | N                   | 107                | 107         | 107                                          | 107     | 107             |
| Entrepreneurial and Employment opportunities | Pearson Correlation | .797**             | 0.165       | -0.019                                       | 1       | .300**          |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000              | 0.090       | 0.849                                        | 0.002   | 0.000           |
|                         | N                   | 107                | 107         | 107                                          | 107     | 107             |
| Culture                 | Pearson Correlation | .471**             | .610**      | .544**                                       | .300**  | .865**          |
|                         | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 0.000              | 0.000       | 0.000                                        | 0.002   | 0.000           |
|                         | N                   | 107                | 107         | 107                                          | 107     | 107             |
As such, in hypothesis H1, a significant relationship between tourism development and households’ income, is accepted. The hypothesis H2 is not acceptable as there is no significant relationship between tourism development and the environment and the correlation is negative but found to be not significant. Also, there is a significant relationship between tourism development and entrepreneurial & employment opportunities, and hypothesis H3 is accepted. The hypothesis H4 is accepted as a significant relationship exists between tourism development and culture. For the sub-variables, based on the above statistical inferences, H1, H3 & H4 are accepted, and H2 is not acceptable. The hypothesis H5 that there is a very high significant relationship between tourism development (independent variable) and quality of life (dependent variable) is accepted, as indicated above. This strong relationship suggests that the impact of the independent variable (tourism development) on the dependent variable (quality of life) should be tested for hypothesis H6.

**Regression Analysis**

The purpose of this analysis is to predict one (in this case, dependent) variable from another (independent) variable. Single regression analysis was carried out to find out the pattern of variation of the values of the dependent variables (sub-variables such as households’ income, environment, entrepreneurial and employment opportunities, culture, and main variable quality of life measured by them) concerning the values of the independent variable (Tourism Development).

The table 5 provides values R= 0.748 and R² =0.560. The R-value represents the simple correlation and is 0.748, which indicates a high degree of correlation. The R² value measures how much the independent variable (tourism development) predicts or explains the total variation in the dependent variable (quality of life). In this case, 56% can be explained, which is quite substantial to accept hypothesis H6. The hypothesis H6 is accepted.

**Table 5: Model Summary**

| Model | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| 1     | .748a | .560     | .555              | .21157                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Tourism Development

Table no. 6 (ANOVA table) below reports how well the regression equation fits the data (i.e., predicts the dependent variable): It indicates that, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable (i.e., it is a good fit for the data).

**Table 6: ANOVA**

| Model     | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|-----------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Regression| 5.970          | 1  | 5.970       | 133.366| .000b |
| Residual  | 4.700          | 105| .045        |       |       |
| Total     | 10.670         | 106|             |       |       |

Dependent Variable: Quality of Life

Table 7 (Coefficients table) provides details to predict the dependent variable (quality of life) from tourism development. The table shows that tourism development contributes statistically significantly to the quality of life under this study.
Table 7: Coefficients

|                         | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig.  |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|
|                         | B                           | Std.Error                 | Beta  |       |
| (Constant)              | 1.153                       | .176                      |       |       |
| Tourism_Development     | .539                        | .047                      | .748  | 11.548| .000  |

The above inferences indicate a significant impact of Tourism Development on Quality of Life (54% at the significant level of 0.01). The regression equation of impact of Tourism Development on Quality of Life of the people can be modelled as Y= 1.153 + 0.539X (where Y- dependent variable & X-independent variable). Thus, quality of life increased by 0.539 per additional unit of Tourism Development.

Limitations of the Study

Sample: There are 26900 households under the Jaffna municipal area, but for research purposes, only 120 households were selected.

Measurement: The relevant mode of analysis was determined through available data with convenient sampling in limited locations.

Time: Data was collected within the period set for the study. Research could be extended to other locations/ districts to verify the hypotheses broader and for comparative study.

Conclusion, Recommendations, and Policy Implications

A significant relationship exists between Tourism Development and Quality of Life. Also, the results revealed a positive impact of Tourism Development on the Quality of Life of people in the Jaffna municipal area, as perceived by the residents of the area.

The degree of relationship of tourism development with entrepreneurial & employment opportunities and households’ income were also very high and high, respectively. Therefore, it is recommended to take more focused action on these factors to influence the economic level of the people. Further studies in different districts and regions are suggested to confirm the results. It will further validate the conclusions and recommendations if the research is conducted in other areas and districts.

Additional investigation is recommended to examine more respondents in different areas that tend to follow different patterns of movement/models of tourism development.

This research is recommended to be extended to other areas of tourist importance, especially rural areas, to identify whether differences and similarities exist for possible suggestions related to policy implications.

Negative concerns were expressed on the environment related to tourism in the study. Attention should be given to those concerns and related social impacts of tourism. Residents’ acceptance of tourism development is important for the long-term success of tourism, as numerous studies already revealed, as explained elsewhere in this paper. Therefore, involvement and participation of the host community in the planning process and development projects are necessary.

Regular monitoring of community attitudes is necessary to obtain information on the needs, views, and desires of host communities. A system of collecting longitudinal data, or in other words, continuous gathering of information regularly for a long period, should be established to monitor any changes in the perceptions of residents and their support of tourism development (Allen et al., 1988). It will enable to take actions aimed at environmental conservation, increasing opportunities for public involvement for employment and entrepreneurship, and controlling the tourism industry.

The perceptions of residents of the Jaffna Municipal area towards tourism development was possibly and successfully reviewed and analysed even though extraneous factors such as COVID 19 limited the participation of residents of the area.
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