DOI: 10.18843/ijms/v6si2/14

DOI URL : http://dx.doi.org/10.18843/ijms/v6si2/14

Economic Impact of Tourism Development on Kerala Economy with Special Reference to Service Providers in Selected North Kerala Destinations

Dr. B. Kirubashini,

Ameen CP,

Associate Professor and Head of Department, Department of Commerce, PSG College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore. Ph. D Research Scholar (Full Time), Department of Commerce, PSG College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore.

ABSTRACT

Tourism sector of a nation and its economic development are closely related and interdependent. In this era of globalization, economic diversification and technological advancement have resulted in a congenial situation for tourism growth especially in developing nations like India. The present study focuses on evaluating the economic impacts of tourism development on service providers in the light of challenges faced by them in selected destinations in North Kerala. The study indicates that infrastructural facilities and development and presence of foreign tourists have positively influenced on service providers. The study suggests that adequate infrastructural facilities should be established and skilled and trained human resources should be appointed in various tourism destinations in North Kerala in order to achieve optimum tourism development and which leads to optimum economic development.

Keywords: Economic development, service providers, North Kerala, tourism industry, destinations and economic impact.

INTRODUCTION:

From the very beginning of the human history, the tendency of travelling is intrinsic in human minds. Later, as a result of human civilization, travelling has been transformed steadily into a pleasure pursuing activity. But after industrialization only, people began to move in numerous senses to spots away from their native places to pursuing leisure and enjoyment. Tourism sector is globally accepted as one of the briskly emerging industries with multi-dimensional activities of this new era. Both domestic and international tourism, nowadays have achieved substantial preferment since it creates socio-economic entitlements to the visitors, to the tourism centre economies and to the entire world in general. So, in short, tourism is economically, environmentally, culturally and socially an inevitable component to an economy.

Tourism industry of a country and its economic growth are interrelated. Economic development simply means a process through which people's standard of living gets improved in all sense in an economy. Tourism sector offers considerable economic benefits especially for developing countries like India. The sector influences many industries both directly and indirectly in a positive sense by creating demand and growth for them. So in short, tourism industry not creates economic activities only but it results in many other advantages also such as increased demand for tourism related products and services, country's growth as a whole, touching global standards, stimulation of more consumption, creation of job opportunities, infrastructural development and so on. In developing countries with abundant tourism attractions, like India, tourism sector is regarded as the backbone of their economic development. In India, Kerala is one of the prime tourism destinations well renowned throughout the world. Since the state Kerala is rich with several natural, cultural and historical attractions, economic development of the state is much dependent on both domestic and foreign tourists' arrival.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Dayananda K. C. (2016) tries to expose both positive and negative effects on economic, social and environmental aspects of Indian economy. The study discloses many positive impacts such as increased income and employment opportunities, channel of foreign exchange earnings, conservation of heritage and nature, better infrastructure facilities and fostering peace and stability and many negative impacts such as unhealthy social and cultural transformations, exploitation of natural resources, increased pollution etc. Researcher concludes that eco-tourism should be strengthened in India in order to conserve and maintain environmental and cultural diversities of the country.

Sandeep Kaur (2016) in his study made an endeavour to evaluate the influence of tourism industry on Indian economy and to predict the future potentialities of the sector on the basis of secondary data. The present study denotes that Indian tourism is viewed as a major tool of economic development and job creation especially in remote and backward areas. It is suggested that professional management and additional infrastructural facilities are required in order to enjoy natural and heritage resources to their maximum extent.

Lateef Ahmad Mir (2014) emphasized to analyse to what extent tourism sector influence on different economic dimensions of Indian economy and the significance of the sector for the entire development of the economy. Results of the study disclose that tourism sector creates job opportunities both directly and indirectly and results in improved standard of living of people since the sector has strong backward and forward linkages. The researcher suggests that tourism products and services should be consistently updated to fulfill the varying requirements of the tourism market.

Mehalia Jackman et al., (2012) aimed in his study to find out whether economic growth and tourism growth are interdependent in Barbados an eastern Caribbean island. This study discloses a long run association between economic growth and tourism growth, i.e. if there is 1.2% rise in tourists' arrival; it resulted in 1% increase in GDP. It is concluded that the approach executed by decision makers should spur growth in remaining sectors of the economy in such a way as to achieve more developments in the tourism industry.

E. M. Ekanayake et al., (2012) looked into the relationship between tourism growth and economic development in developing economies by applying a newly formed heterogeneous panel co-integration technique. The study reveals that tourism revenue offers a favourable contribution to the economic development especially in developing nations. The outputs of the present study indicate that government of developing nations should emphasise on economic policies to stimulate tourism industry as a prospective channel of economic development.

RESEARCH GAP:

Tourism sector plays a very vital role in the economic development of India. Among different Indian states, Kerala is described as one of the well-known tourism centre across the world. Therefore it is a constructive effort to analyse the economic impact of tourism on various tourism related service providers in different destinations in North Kerala districts so that various governments and other tourism promotion agencies can introduce innovative measures to promote tourism in those districts and in turn to foster them economically, socially and culturally.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

In Kerala, tourism sector has been proved as one of the major economic choices to strengthen the state economy since the sector has good prospects of creating income and job opportunities. Development of tourism sector depends not only on arrival of tourists but also on presence of many tourism allied service providers such as transportation services, hospitality and accommodation services, shopping facilities, tourism information services etc. These service providers contribute much more for the development of regional economies particularly and of the state government in general. The state Kerala can be categorized into three parts such as South Kerala, Central Kerala and North Kerala. South Kerala and Central Kerala districts are relatively more pioneered in respect of economic development and volume of tourists' arrivals. In such a context, it is productive to analyse the economic impacts of tourism development on Kerala economy on the basis of data collected from tourism related service providers in various tourism destinations in North Kerala districts.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- > To assess the socio-economic position of different service providers in North Kerala destinations.
- > To ascertain the economic impact of tourism development on service providers in North Kerala tourism destinations.

- To identify major obstacles faced by service providers for their development and tourism growth.
- > To offer suitable recommendations to promote positive economic impact on the basis of the findings of the study.

HYPOTHESIS:

 H_0 = There is no significant association between impact of tourism on employment generation and effect of tourism on the standard of living of the local people.

 H_1 = There is significant association between impact of tourism on employment generation and effect of tourism on the standard of living of the local people.

METHODOLOGY:

Area of the study:

This study encompasses four districts in the northern side of Kerala state namely Kozhikode, Wayanadu, Kannur and Kasaragodu.

Sample and Sampling Method:

Data have been gathered from 96 tourism related service providers including both owners and employees from various tourism destinations in North Kerala by applying purposive sampling technique. The total sample of service providers has been distributed equally among four districts. From each district, two major destinations have been selected for data collection. In Kozhikode district, Kozhikode Beach and Beypore Beach have been chosen. Pookode Lake and Karlad Adventure Camp have been decided from Wayanadu district. In Kannur district, Muzhappilangadu Beach and V-Pra Floating Park were selected. Bekal Fort and Ranipuram Hills were sampled from Kasaragodu district. From each of these destinations, 12 sample respondents were selected purposively.

Sources of Data:

Both primary and secondary data have been used in the present study. Primary data was gathered by dispensing well structured questionnaires amongst service providers (both owners and employees) in chosen tourism destinations and secondary data was collected by depending on journals, articles, magazines, books, newspapers and government reports.

Statistical Tools:

Gathered data was analysed by using percentage analysis, Chi-square analysis and Garret's ranking test.

LIMITATIONS:

- > Primary data have been collected from 96 respondents only.
- ➤ The study has been confined to North Kerala districts only.
- ➤ The study has been undertaken within a limited time period.

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION:

Table 1: Percentage Analysis

| Age | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Below 25 years | 18 | 18.75 |
| 25-40 years | 39 | 40.63 |
| 41-55 years | 30 | 31.25 |
| Above 55 years | 9 | 9.37 |
| Total | 96 | 100 |
| Sex | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Male | 73 | 76.04 |
| Female | 23 | 23.96 |
| Total | 96 | 100 |
| Educational Qualification | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| School Level | 44 | 45.83 |
| Graduation Level | 23 | 23.96 |

| Post Graduation Level 14 14.58 Professional 1.evel 7 7.29 7.29 7.29 7.29 7.29 100 | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|------------|
| Others Total 96 100 Over Occupational Status No. of Respondents Percentage Employee 62 64.58 Employee 70tal 96 100 Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 23 23.96 Rs. 15,000 - Rs. 30,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 - Rs. 45,000 25 26.04 Above Rs. 45000 10 100 No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3.13 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Below | Post Graduation Level | 14 | 14.58 |
| Occupational Status No. of Responders Percentage Owner 34 35.42 Employce 62 64.58 Total 96 100 Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 − Rs. 30,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 − Rs. 45,000 10 10.42 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.42 Motical (Large) 3 3.13 Hotels (Large) 3 3.13 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. | Professional Level | 7 | 7.29 |
| Owner 3.4 35.42 Employee 62 34.52 Employee 62 34.52 Employee 62 34.52 Employee 70tal 96 100 Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 30,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 45,000 10 10.42 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.42 Most Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3.13 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 7 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 17 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 1.0 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 1.0 Tourist Guides 10 9 9.37 | Others | 8 | 8.33 |
| Owner 34 35.42 Employee 62 64.58 Total 96 100 Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 30,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 45,000 25 26.04 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Nature of Busines No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3.313 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Apurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 | Total | 96 | 100 |
| Owner 34 35.42 Employee 62 64.58 Total 96 100 Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 30,000 38 39.58 Rs. 30001 – Rs. 45,000 25 26.04 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Nature of Busines No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3.313 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Apurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 | Occupational Status | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Total 96 100 | | | |
| Average Monthly Income No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 15,000 23 23,96 Rs. 15,000 — Rs. 30,000 38 39,58 Rs. 30001 — Rs. 45,000 25 26,04 Above Rs. 45000 10 10,42 Nature of Business No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3,13 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12,5 Spice Shops 14 14,58 Handicrafts 16 16,67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12,5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9,37 Travel Agents 10 10,42 Tourist Guides 12 12,5 Tourist Information Services 8 8,33 Tourist Information Services 8 8,33 Below Rs. 10,000 5 14,71 Rs. 10,000 — Rs. 20,000 16 47,06 Rs. 20001 — Rs. 30,000 16 47,06 Rs. 20001 — Rs. 30,000 11 33 34,37 </td <td>Employee</td> <td>62</td> <td>64.58</td> | Employee | 62 | 64.58 |
| Below Rs. 15,000 | Total | 96 | 100 |
| Below Rs. 15,000 | Average Monthly Income | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Rs. 30001 – Rs. 45,000 25 26,04 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.4 Total 96 100 Nature of Business No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Foor 70 10 10.0 Very | | | |
| Rs. 30001 – Rs. 45,000 25 26,04 Above Rs. 45000 10 10.4 Total 96 100 Nature of Business No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Foor 70 10 10.0 Very | Rs. 15,000 – Rs. 30,000 | 38 | 39.58 |
| Nature of Business No. of Respondents Percentage Hotels (Large) 3 3.13 Hotels (Small and Medium) 12 12.5 Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Travel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 10 | | 25 | 26.04 |
| Nature of Business | Above Rs. 45000 | 10 | 10.42 |
| Hotels (Large) | Total | 96 | |
| Hotels (Large) | Nature of Business | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Hotels (Small and Medium) | | | |
| Spice Shops 14 14.58 Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Tavel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 38 8.33 | | | |
| Handicrafts 16 16.67 Fancy and Stationary Shops 12 12.5 Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Travel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 34.37 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly | | | |
| Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Travel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 NB: Above question was asked to oversure sortly Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Usy Highly 38 39.58 Wery Highly 38 8.33 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 </td <td></td> <td>16</td> <td>16.67</td> | | 16 | 16.67 |
| Ayurvedic Centres 9 9.37 Travel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 - Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 NB: Above question was asked to oversure sortly Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Usy Highly 38 39.58 Wery Highly 38 8.33 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 </td <td>Fancy and Stationary Shops</td> <td>12</td> <td>12.5</td> | Fancy and Stationary Shops | 12 | 12.5 |
| Travel Agents 10 10.42 Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 - Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 34 100 Moderate 24 25 25 Poor 16 16.67 10.42 25 Poor 10 No. of Respondents <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | | |
| Tourist Guides 12 12.5 Tourist Information Services 8 8.33 Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.1 | | | |
| Tourist Information Services Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Wery Highly 38 39.58 Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 | | 12 | |
| Total 96 100 Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents< | | 8 | |
| Average Salary Given to Your Staff No. of Respondents Percentage Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Not at all 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Total | | | |
| Below Rs. 10,000 5 14.71 Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 38 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 | | No. of Respondents | |
| Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 20,000 16 47.06 Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 11 32.35 Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 No. at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 34 35.42 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately | | | |
| Above Rs. 30,000 2 5.88 Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 | | 16 | 47.06 |
| Total 34 100 NB: Above question was asked to owners only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 <t< td=""><td>Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000</td><td>11</td><td>32.35</td></t<> | Rs. 20001 – Rs. 30,000 | 11 | 32.35 |
| NB: Above question was asked to owers only Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Above Rs. 30,000 | 2 | 5.88 |
| Tourism Impact on Employment Generation in this Location No. of Respondents Percentage Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Total | 34 | 100 |
| Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | NB: Above question was asked to ow | ners only | |
| Excellent 13 13.54 Good 33 34.37 Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 100 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | | | Percentage |
| Moderate 24 25 Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total 96 No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | | _ | |
| Poor 16 16.67 Very Poor 10 10.42 Total Poelopment on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Good | 33 | 34.37 |
| Very Poor 10 10.42 Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Moderate | 24 | 25 |
| Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Poor | 16 | 16.67 |
| Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Very Poor | 10 | 10.42 |
| Very Highly 38 39.58 Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Total | 96 | 100 |
| Highly 33 34.38 Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Impact of Infrastructural Development on Your Income | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Moderately 14 14.58 Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Total 96 100 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Very Highly | 38 | 39.58 |
| Little 8 8.33 Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Highly | 33 | 34.38 |
| Not at all 3 3.13 Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Moderately | 14 | 14.58 |
| Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Little | 8 | 8.33 |
| Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People No. of Respondents Percentage Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Not at all | 3 | 3.13 |
| Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Total | 96 | |
| Very Highly 12 12.5 Highly 34 35.42 Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Tourism Effect on Standard of Living of the Local People | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
| Moderately 27 28.12 Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Very Highly | 12 | |
| Low 15 15.63 Very Low 8 8.33 | Highly | 34 | 35.42 |
| Very Low 8 8.33 | Moderately | 27 | 28.12 |
| , and the second | Low | 15 | 15.63 |
| Total 96 100 | Very Low | 8 | 8.33 |
| | Total | 96 | 100 |

| Does Recession in Foreign Countries Affect Your Income? | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|---|--------------------|------------|
| Yes | 58 | 60.42 |
| No | 38 | 39.58 |
| Total | 96 | 100 |

GARRET RANKING ANALYSIS:

Table 2: Ranking of Obstacles to the Economic Development of the Locality by Tourism

| CI No | Obstacles | Ranks Given by the Service Providers | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| Sl. No. | Obstacles | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | 5 th | 6 th | 7 th | 8 th | |
| 1 | Lack of Infrastructural Facilities | 24 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 4 | |
| 2 | Lack of Government and Other Supports | 15 | 16 | 10 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 12 | |
| 3 | Lack of Foreign Tourists | 9 | 8 | 12 | 18 | 22 | 5 | 9 | 13 | |
| 4 | Lack of Alternative Options During Offseason | 6 | 12 | 11 | 16 | 9 | 6 | 17 | 19 | |
| 5 | Shortage of Skilled Labour | 5 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 15 | 19 | 13 | 18 | |
| 6 | Shortage of Rooms and Guest Houses | 9 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 21 | 10 | |
| 7 | Misbehaviour of Local People | 11 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 17 | 18 | 14 | 9 | |
| 8 | Unfavourable Government Policies and Taxes | 17 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 17 | 9 | 11 | |

Table 3: Percent Position and Garret Value Percent Position = 100(Rij - 0.5)/Nj

| Sl. No. | 100(Rij - 0.5)/Nj | Calculated Value | Garret Value |
|---------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | 100 (1 – 0.5)/ 8 | 6.25 | 80 |
| 2 | 100(2-0.5)/8 | 18.75 | 67 |
| 3 | 100 (3 – 0.5)/ 8 | 31.25 | 60 |
| 4 | 100 (4 – 0.5)/ 8 | 43.75 | 53 |
| 5 | 100(5-0.5)/8 | 56.25 | 47 |
| 6 | 100 (6 – 0.5)/ 8 | 68.75 | 40 |
| 7 | 100 (7 – 0.5)/ 8 | 81.25 | 33 |
| 8 | 100 (8 – 0.5)/ 8 | 93.75 | 20 |

Table 4: Calculation of Garret Value and Ranking

| Sl. | Obstacles | Ran | ks Giv | ven b | y the | Servi | ce Pı | rovid | ers | Total | Average | Dank |
|-----|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|---------|------|
| No. | Obstacles | 1 st | 2 nd | 3 rd | 4 th | 5 th | 6 th | 7 th | 8 th | Total | Score | Rank |
| | Lack of Infrastructural Facilities | 1920 | 1206 | 900 | 795 | 423 | 320 | 99 | 80 | 5743 | 59.82 | 1 |
| 2 | Lack of Government and Other Supports | 1200 | 1072 | 600 | 477 | 658 | 400 | 330 | 240 | 4977 | 51.84 | 3 |
| 3 | Lack of Foreign Tourists | 720 | 536 | 720 | 954 | 1034 | 200 | 297 | 260 | 4721 | 49.18 | 4 |
| 4 | Lack of Alternative Options During Offseason | 480 | 804 | 660 | 848 | 423 | 240 | 561 | 380 | 4396 | 45.79 | 7 |
| 5 | Shortage of Skilled Labour | 400 | 536 | 420 | 583 | 705 | 760 | 429 | 360 | 4193 | 43.68 | 8 |
| 6 | Shortage of Rooms and Guest Houses | 720 | 938 | 900 | 477 | 235 | 520 | 693 | 200 | 4683 | 48.78 | 5 |
| 7 | Misbehaviour of Local People | 880 | 536 | 660 | 424 | 799 | 720 | 462 | 180 | 4661 | 48.55 | 6 |
| 8 | Unfavourable Government Policies and High Taxes | 1360 | 804 | 900 | 530 | 235 | 680 | 297 | 220 | 5026 | 52.35 | 2 |

Result of Garret Ranking Analysis:

For analysis of ranks given by the service providers for the obstacles faced by them on the basis of obstacles' seriousness, Garret Ranking Analysis was applied. On the basis of this analysis, lack of proper infrastructural facilities has been given highest average score of 59.82 and first rank which is followed by unfavourable government policies and high taxes, lack of government and other supports, lack o foreign tourists, shortage of rooms and guest houses, misbehaviour of local people, lack of alternative options during offseason and shortage of skilled labour respectively from 2nd to 8th ranks.

CHI-SQUARE TEST:

Chi-square Analysis between Impact of Tourism on Employment Generation and Effect of Tourism on the Standard of Living of the Local People:

Effect of Tourism on the Standard of **Impact of Tourism on Employment Generation** Good Moderate **Living of the Local People** Excellent Poor Very Poor Total Very Highly 4 2 0 12 Highly 5 10 11 2 34 6 Moderate 2 2 27 11 6 6 1 2 3 4 15 Low 5 2 Very Low 1 3 1 8 1 33 24 10 Total 13 16 96

Table 5: Observed Frequencies

Table 6: Calculation of Chi-square Value

| 0 | E | $(O-E)^2/E$ | О | E | $(O-E)^2/E$ | 0 | E | $(O-E)^2/E$ | 0 | E | $(O-E)^2/E$ | |
|----|-------|-------------|----|---------------------------|-------------|---|------|-------------|---|------|-------------|--|
| 4 | 1.63 | 3.4460 | 11 | 9.28 | 0.3188 | 2 | 3.75 | 0.8167 | 1 | 1.33 | 0.0819 | |
| 5 | 4.60 | 0.0348 | 5 | 5.15 | 0.0044 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 | 1.25 | 1.25 | |
| 2 | 3.66 | 0.7529 | 3 | 2.75 | 0.0227 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.54 | 0.6699 | |
| 1 | 2.03 | 0.5226 | 2 | 3 | 0.3333 | 6 | 5.67 | 0.0192 | 2 | 2.81 | 0.2335 | |
| 1 | 1.08 | 0.0059 | 11 | 8.5 | 0.7353 | 6 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 4 | 1.56 | 3.8164 | |
| 4 | 4.13 | 0.0041 | 6 | 6.75 | 0.0833 | 3 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 2 | 0.83 | 1.6493 | |
| 10 | 11.69 | 0.2443 | | $TOTAL(\Sigma) = 15.5737$ | | | | | | | | |

Level of Significance = 5% (0.05)

Degree of Freedom = (r-1)(c-1) = (5-1)(5-1) = 16

Critical Value = 26.30

Result of Chi-square Test:

Since the computed value is less than table value, null hypothesis is acceptable. In other words, from this result it is interpreted that there is no significant association between impact of tourism on employment generation and effect of tourism on the standard of living of the local people.

FINDINGS:

- ➤ It is showed that majority of the respondents (40.63%) have an age between 25-40 and which is followed by the age range of 41-55 with 31.25% of the service providers.
- ➤ It is noted that most of the service providers (76.04%) are male.
- ➤ It is accentuated that 45.83% of the respondents have school level educational status and 23.96% of the sample units are graduated.
- ➤ It is clear that among total respondents, majority (64.58%) is employees and remaining respondents are owners.
- ➤ It is reflected that 39.58% of the respondents are getting an average monthly income of an amount in between Rs. 15,000 Rs. 30,000 which is followed by the average income of an amount in between Rs. 30,001 45,000 with 26.04% of the respondents.
- ➤ It is illustrated that 16.67% of the respondents are engaged in handicrafts business, 14.58% are in spice shops and 12.5% are engaged in small and medium hotels, stationary business and tourist guidance.
- \triangleright It is stated that majority of the owners (47.06%) are offering a salary scale of Rs. 10,000 Rs. 20,000 for their employees and 32.35% of the owners offer a scale of Rs. 20,001 30,000.
- > It is pointed out that 34.37% of the service providers argue that tourism has influenced positively in employment generation in their locality in a good level.
- ➤ It is mentioned that majority of the respondents (39.58%) agree that infrastructural facilities have affected very highly in their income.
- ➤ It is proved that 35.42% of the respondents claim that tourism industry have highly influenced on the standard of living of the local people.

➤ It is disclosed that most of the service providers (60.42%) opined that recession in foreign countries affect their income.

SUGGESTIONS:

- ➤ Since many occupational sectors are showing decline tendencies, more people should give more attention towards profitable and convenient tourist allied businesses or services.
- Exclusive and separate master plans for individual tourism centers and a collective master plan for the entire state should be established for development of tourism centers and tourism industry.
- ➤ Infrastructural facilities should be improved in tourism destinations by ensuring the participation of both various governments and private agencies.
- > Tourism and infrastructural development should be undertaken by ensuring the preservation of abundant biodiversities in the destination.
- > Trained human resources should be admitted in tourism related businesses and services in order to fulfill the varying requirements of both domestic and foreign tourists.
- ➤ In order to ensure maximum development of tourism industry, the government should take suitable measures to ensure adequate salary for trained and skilled tourism employees.
- ➤ Government and other tourism promotion agencies should impart awareness to the people about the significance and potentials of tourism sector in the economic growth of the economy.
- The government should offer maximum supports to youth to start self employed entrepreneurships in tourism destinations.

CONCLUSION:

Nowadays, tourism development has been recognized throughout the world as a prime instrument of development of the entire economy. In the current situation, the only promising sector in Kerala is the promotion of tourism related businesses and services. From the present study, it is concluded that majority of the respondents opine that tourism industry has positive impacts on employment generation and standard of living of people in North Kerala. In order to ensure economic development of the state economy, government should focus on effective and feasible tourism development. The study suggests that various government and tourism related bodies should prepare exclusive plans for tourism development and economic growth in North Kerala districts by ensuring the involvement of both public and private authorities.

REFERENCES:

- Dayananda K. C. (2016). Tourism and Its Impact on Indian Economy, *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 2, Issue 6, PP 24-28.
- E. M. Ekanayake and Aubrey. E. Long (2012). Tourism Development and Economic Growth in Developing Countries, *The International Journal of Business and Finance Research*, Vol. 6, Issue 1, PP 51-63
- Lateef Ahmad Mir (2014). An Economic Evaluation of Indian Tourism Industry, *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, Vol. 4, Issue 12 PP 1-7.
- Mehalia Jackman and Troy Lorde (2012). Examination of Economic Growth and Tourism in Barbados: Testing the Supply Side Hypothesis, *TOURISMOS: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism,* Vol. 7, Issue 2, PP 203-215.
- Sandeep Kaur (2016). A Study on Contribution of Tourism Industry to Indian Economy, *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, Vol. 2, Issue 12, PP 1621-1625.
