

Influence of Tourism Development on Host Communities: A Study of Ohafia L.G.A. **¹Enemuo, O.B.; ²Eke, P.C. and ³Obinwanne, C.O.**

1, 2&3 Department of Home Science/Hospitality Management and Tourism, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike
Correspondence: enemuo.ogechi@gmail.com

Abstract

The study examined the influence of Tourism development on host communities in Ohafia L.G.A. The objectives of the study were to determine the various tourism resources in the selected sites; to identify the various types of tourism developments, to ascertain the role of the tourism development on the socio-cultural life of host communities, to determine the influence of tourism development on the sustainability of the tourism resources. Three hundred and ninety-seven questionnaires consisting of two sections were administered to the respondents. The data generated from the questionnaires were analyzed using mean, frequency and standard deviation. The study found that the various tourism resources in Ohafia were Nkpogolo forest reserve, Mmori River, Ufutiti water fall and Ezieofri cave, Achichi shrine in Elu community, ObuNkwa and Ugwuaaba in Asaga community. The role of tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host community was also identified, more so, the role of tourism development on socio-economic variables of the host community was identified and finally, the influence of the tourism development on sustainability of the host community was identified. In conclusion tourism development plays a vital role in the sustainability of our culture and norms as it has a way of preserving our natural and cultural heritage. The study therefore recommends that the government should partner with traditional rulers or indigenous bodies to help in the planning and development of the cultural tourism in the host communities. Policies and practices that ensure sustainability of natural and socio-cultural lives, socio economic variables and preservation of the natural heritage of the host communities should be developed. Host community should participate in the maintenance process of the natural or indigenous heritage of their land to give the host communities a sense of ownership and control over the national resources or heritage of the communities, government should ensure that tourism developers carry out environmental impact assessment (EIA) before commencing any development in the community for sustainable tourism

Keywords: Influence, Tourism, Development, Host Communities

Introduction

Preserving local tradition and the conservation of biodiversity can be seen as two of the more central objectives of the steadily growing ecotourism industry (Denman 2001, Honey 2008, Scheyvens 2009). Ecotourism projects involving local communities are often offered as opportunities to gain economic benefits while protecting the natural environment and cultural heritage of vulnerable areas (Cobbinah 2015). They are promoted as solutions to increase participation and more strongly integrate local people in development goals. When evaluating the obstacles, threats, failures and successes of these projects the attention is generally drawn to what the economic impact has been for the community and local people (Denman, 2001). However the economics is only one side of the story. As noble as the goals of ecotourism and

especially community-based ecotourism may be and despite its great potential as a sustainable and profitable business for the locals, the other possible profits and losses that it causes need to be critically evaluated as well.

Local communities are confronted with new worldviews and ideas about livelihood and interacting with their surroundings at the tourism- indigenous intersection. The communities often hold a vast storage of local and indigenous knowledge that is being dipped into by outsiders seeking to amplify their own experience and understanding of these cultures (Zeppel, 2006). And it is not only the tourist that brings in new influences to local communities. The other stakeholders such as national and local government, other businesses, other indigenous communities and different institutions and organizations involved in conservation and preservation contribute to mixing the new with the traditional and autochthonous in protected areas promoting ecotourism. The traces left behind by this interplay in tourism are not only monetary but also cultural and may challenge the very basis of what and how the indigenous people know about the world.

Conserving natural surroundings tends to be thought of as inherent to a traditional indigenous way of life (Heyd, 2005). This is usually due to the fact that in order to protect indigenous culture and knowledge you need to protect the location where it was born; without the land there is no culture. Therefore participation of indigenous communities in projects such as ecotourism, which aim to protect these cultures, is valuable and nowadays often also desired by the other parties involved (Cox 2009). Yet community-based ecotourism cannot be seen as a “one-size-fitsall” model. The particular context of each project and the willingness of the communities to open up their lifestyles need to be taken into consideration to ensure the integrity of the projects (Denman 2001). Many of the community-based ecotourism projects take place in remote, ecologically diverse and therefore highly vulnerable areas of the world (Zeppel 2006). They are often protected areas and the last places where a community's intangible cultural heritage is nurtured and passed on. How ecotourism can be truly sustainably introduced to an area like this and what the role of the indigenous peoples should be needs careful examination.

Sustainable tourism development meets the needs of present tourists and host regions while protecting and enhancing opportunity for the future. It is envisaged as leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic, social, and aesthetic needs can be fulfilled while maintaining cultural integrity, essential ecological processes, biological diversity, and life support system."(WTO, 2005).

In other words, sustainable tourism development is ecologically sustainable, economically viable as well as ethically and socially equitable. It respects the fragile environmental balance that characterizes many tourism destinations, particularly in environmentally sensitive areas; and it is based on a long term perspective. Tourism is said to be sustainably developed if it meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet up with their own needs. This is in line with the world tourism organization definition that sustainable tourism is a tourism development that “meets the needs of the present tourists and host region while protecting and leaving opportunities for the future, leading to management of all resources in such a way that economic social and material needs can be fulfilled while maintaining the cultural integrity essential ecological processes and all the life support systems (WTO, 2014). In other words, tourism development becomes sustainable if they are

environmentally compatible, socially acceptable and economically beneficial to the present and future stakeholders. Thus while the resources of the environment could be exploited to promote the living conditions of the present, they should not be done in such a way as to prevent the future generations from benefiting from it. That is to say that if tourism is sustainably developed, it will continue forever to provide all the essential life support to the host destination.

Globally, Indigenous tourism is commonly viewed as a means of facilitating socio-economic benefits to Indigenous individuals, communities and host regions. Like all forms of tourism, the development, stakeholders (Okolo, 2006). Sustainability theory attempts to prioritize and integrate social responses to environmental and cultural problems. The sustainability theory is set to help maintain ecological (environmental) integrity and diversity, meet basic human need, and keep options open for future generation. Sustainability theory will also support empowerment of individuals to be involved in the decision that influences the environment and quality of lives.

Kavita, Swartz & Green (2017) carried a research on “Sustainable cultural Tourism in Nigeria: Issues and challenge”. The study revealed the challenges and issues faced by the local communities through their participation in tourism and the nature of cultural heritage tourism and the challenges and benefits that cultural heritage tourism has on the host community as a tourism offering. Review of policies and framework for cultural heritage initiatives was used to analyse the data collected. The results of this study show that the development of cultural heritage tourism were encouraged by the tourist's demand for new travel destination and products, successful cultural heritage tourism will occur when tourism value chain is aligned with basic ideas of community-based tourism development. This study is related to the present study because it examines the sustainability of socio-cultural environment of the host community.

Nigeria is richly endowed with a wide range of indigenous, cultural and natural attractions which can form the basis of flourishing tourist market. Ironically most of these indigenous resources and other cultural and natural attractions have not been harnessed or even documented at a time most countries accept the need to increase competitiveness in the global tourism market as a means of sustaining growth and development (Whitney-Squire, 2016). The greater number of the population due partly to ignorance and lack of tourism awareness failed to see and understand that indigenous resources in the forms of shrines, monuments, caves, grooves and the endowed natural landscapes which are part and parcel of their daily lives are objects of beauty and tourism potentials with high economic values. This situation has led to mismanagement and loss of invaluable resources. The indigenous resource potential of Ohaofia and its environs have not been fully brought to the lime light so as to join other tourist attractions in the country for their sustainable development. It is in view of these stated problems and others that led this researcher to embark on the research of influence of indigenous tourism development in cultural sustainability of Ohaofia and its environs and how these resources can be used in sustainable tourism development.

Methodology

The main objective of the study is to evaluate the influence of Tourism Development on Host Communities: A study of Ohafia L.G.A. Specifically, the work

1. Examine the various tourism resources in Ohafia.
2. Identified the various types of tourism development on the tourism resources in the study area.
3. Ascertained the role of the tourism development on the socio- cultural life of the host communities in Ohafia.
4. Determined the influence of the tourism development on the sustainability of the host community.

Research Questions

1. What are the various tourism resources in Ohafia?.
2. What are the various types of tourism development on the tourism resources in the study area?
3. What are the roles of the tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host communities in the study area?
4. What are the influences of the tourism development on the sustainability of the host community?

Research Design: This study adopted the survey research design.

Areas of the study : The study areas was obu-Nkwa in Asaga, Ezie –Ofri Cave in Amekpu, Nkpogolo forest reserve in Ebem, Achichi square, Ifutiti water fall in Amaekpu, UgwuAaba in Asaga and Mmori river in Ebem all in Ohafia L.G.A. Ohafia is a Local Government Area in Abia State, in southeastern Nigeria.

Population for the Study

The population for the study includes the residents and residents of Asaga Ohafor, Amaekpu, Elu, and Ebem in Ohafia Local Government of Abia State. The total population for the study was 34392, with a breakdown of the various communities as:

Villages	Male	Female	Total
Asaga	3,949	4,861	8,810
Ebem	4,275	5,266	9,541
Amaekpu	4,271	5,041	9,312
Elu	3,201	3,528	6,729

Source: National Population Commission, 2006

Sample for the study: The sample size of 397 was determined from the population of one thousand three hundred and eighteen (10318) using Taro Yamane formula.

Sample and Sampling Techniques: The sampling technique used were proportionate

stratified random sampling and purposive sampling.. Proportionate stratified random sampling was used for this study to ensure greater representativeness of the sample in relation to the population and guarantee that the minority constituents of the population are represented in the sample. Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to select the areas where indigenous activities take place while purposive sampling was used to select the respondents who fit the purpose of the study.

Instrument for data collection: The instrument for data collection of this study was a twenty (20) items structured questionnaire.

Data collection technique: The researchers administered 397 copies of the questionnaire by hand to the respondents. The respondents were given some days to respond to the questions after which the copy of the questionnaire was collected from the respondents.

Data analysis technique: Simple descriptive statistics was used to analyze the information gotten from the data. Simple descriptive statistics, such as mean, percentages and frequency distribution were used to analyze the data generated.

Results and discussion

Research question 1: What are the various tourism resources in Ohafia?

Table 1: Tourism resources in Ohafia L.G.A

Communities	Tourism resources
Ebem	Nkpogolo Forest Reserve and Mmori river
Amaekpu	Ufutiti water fall and EzieOfri cave
Elu	Achichi square
Asaga	Obunkwa shrine and Ugwuaaba

Source: Researchers Field Survey, 2018

Table 1 showed the identified tourism resources in the study area as: Nkpogolo Forest Reserve
 Mmori River
 Ufutiti water fall
 EzieOfri cave
 Achichi square
 Obunkwa shrine
 Ugwuaaba
 Obunkwa shrine
 ugwuaaba

Research Question 2

1. What are the various types of tourism development in the selected sites in Ohafia L.G.A?

Table 2 Types of tourism development in the selected sites in Ohafia L.G.A

S/N	Types of tourism development in Ohafia L.G.A	Total score	Mean (X)	Standard deviation	Decision
1	Eco tourism	1620	4.65	.660	Accept
2	Religious tourism	1056	3.02	1.558	Accept
3	Sports tourism	934	2.69	1.060	Rejected
4	Recreational tourism	1578	4.51	.845	Accept
5	Cultural tourism	1550	4.43	.992	Accept
6	Political tourism	898	2.57	.960	Rejected
7	Shopping tourism	1605	4.59	.760	Accept
8	Social tourism	1625	4.64	.661	Accept
9	Pleasure tourism	1617	4.62	.682	Accept
10	Professional/business tourism	915	2.61	1.667	Rejected
11	Rural tourism	1434	4.10	1.407	Accept
	Total	14830	4.43		
	Grand mean		3.86		

Table 2 presents the mean response of various types of tourism developments. The tourism developments includes eco-tourism , religious tourism, sports tourism, recreational tourism, cultural tourism, political tourism, shopping tourism, social tourism, pleasure tourism, business tourism and rural tourism. The decision rule states that any mean below 3.0 is considered rejected while mean above 3.0 is accepted. Among the eleven item statement eight were accepted while three were rejected. The result above shows that eco tourism, social tourism, pleasure tourism, shopping tourism, recreational tourism, cultural tourism, rural tourism, and religious tourism were accepted with a mean score of 4.65, 4.64, 4.62, 4.59, 4.51, 4.43, 4.10 and 3.02 respectively while Sport tourism, political tourism and business tourism were rejected with mean score of 2.69, 2.57 and 2.61 respectively.

Research Question 3

1. What are the role of tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host community?

Table 3 Role of tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host community?

S/N	Role of tourism on socio-cultural life of the host community	Total score	Mean (X)	Standard deviation	Decision
1	Attitude	1516	4.33	1.070	Accept
2	Child rearing	1522	4.35	1.067	Accept
3	Cross cultural differences	1925	4.36	1.084	Accept
4	Cultural deprivation	1525	4.36	1.052	Accept
5	Cultural identity	1537	4.39	1.040	Accept
6	Cultural change	1532	4.39	1.040	Accept

7	Discrimination	1528	4.37	1.045	Accept
8	Ethnic identity	1534	4.38	1.039	Accept
9	Ethnic values	1508	4.31	1.085	Accept
10	Sociological concepts	1499	4.28	1.104	Accept
11	Family structure	1491	4.28	1.104	Accept
12	Power and politics	1502	4.26	1.125	Accept
13	Regional differences	1491	4.29	1.090	Accept
14	Religious belief	1502	4.31	1.088	Accept
15	Religious practice	1509	4.32	1.086	Accept
16	Social process	1511	4.30	1.091	Accept
17	Education	1508	4.30	1.091	Accept
18	Social organization	1505	4.31	1.085	Accept
19	Innovation	1508	4.26	1.144	Accept
20	Materialism	1490	4.26	1.144	Accept
21	Laws	1490	4.31	1.085	Accept
22	Religion	1508	4.32	1.086	Accept
23	Values	1505	4.30	1.091	Accept
24	Language	1511	4.32	1.086	Accept
	Total	33644	103.66		
	Grand Mean		4.32		

Table 3 above shows the role of tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host community. 24 items were stated and among the 24 item statements all the items were accepted by the respondents as the role of tourism development on the socio-cultural life of the host community. The items are Attitude, child bearing practices, cross cultural differences, cultural deprivation, cultural identity, cultural change, discrimination, ethnic identity, ethnic value, sociological concept, family structure, power and politics, regional differences, religious belief, religious practice, social

process, education, social organizations, innovation, materialism, laws, religion, values with mean 4.33, 4.35, 4.36, 4.36, 4.39, 4.39, 4.37, 4.38, 4.31, 4.28, 4.26, 4.29, 4.31, 4.32, 4.30, 4.30, 4.31, 4.26, 4.26, 4.31, and 32 respectively. The decision rule states that any mean from 3.0 and above is accepted while mean below 3.0 is rejected. This shows that tourism development has a big role to play on the socio-cultural life of the host community.

The role of tourism development on the Socio-economic variables of the host community

Table 3.1 Role of tourism development on the Socio-economic variables of the host community

S/ N	Socio economic variables	Total score	Mean (X)	Standard deviation	Decision
1	Economic growth and developments	1037	2.96	1.687	Reject
2	Source of income to the host community	1071	3.06	1.687	Accept
3	Infrastructural development to the host community	1073	3.07	1.689	Accept
4	Level of education	1480	3.03	1.654	Accept
5	Creating employment opportunity to the host community	1047	2.99	1.699	Reject
6	Income and assets	1093	3.12	1.681	Accept
7	Health and lifestyle	995	2.84	1.725	Reject
8	Quality of neighbourhoods	1088	3.14	1.725	Accept
9	Occupation	1053	3.01	1.727	Accept
10	Race and ethnicity	1096	3.13	2.776	Accept
	Total	11033	3.25		
	Grand Mean		3.43		

Table 3.1 above examined the role of tourism development on the socio economic variables socio economic variables of tourism. Among the ten items stated seven were accepted by the respondents while three items were rejected. The decision rule states that any variable less than 3.0 should be rejected while variables above 3.0 should be accepted. Variable with the highest mean is quality of neighbourhood with mean of 3.14 followed by race and ethnicity with a mean of 3.13, followed by income and assets with a mean of 3.12, followed by infrastructural development to the host community with a mean of 3.07, followed by source of income to the host community with a mean of 3.06, followed by occupation with a mean of 3.10 while creating employment opportunity to the host community, economic growth and development, health and lifestyle were rejected with a mean of 2.99, 2.97 and 2.84 respectively.

S/ N	variables	Total Score	Mean (X)	Standard deviation	Decision
1	Helps in preservation of the natural heritage	1100	3.14	1.526	Accept
2	Helps in preservation of invasive species	1104	3.15	1.540	Accept
3	Maintenance of healthy environments	1038	2.97	1.569	Reject
4	Norms and culture of the host community are	1087	3.11	1.523	Accept

	preserved for future generation				
5	Preservation of threatened species	1010	2.89	1.527	Reject
6	Conservation of lifestyle or individual culture of a community	1096	3.13	1.540	Accept
7	Conservation of natural eco system	1131	3.23	1.537	Accept
8	Lifestyle development of the host community	1136	3.25	1.513	Accept
	Total	8702	24.87		
	Grand mean		3.11		

host communities and helped in learning other people's culture, preserving the natural heritage for future generation.

Conclusion

This work has attempts to evaluate the influence of indigenous tourism development in cultural sustainability of selected sites in Ohafia. The various tourism sites in Ohafia were identified in this study, the types of tourism developments in the study area were also identified and they includes eco-tourism, recreational tourism, cultural tourism, pleasure tourism, rural tourism, social tourism, recreational tourism and so on. The role of tourism developments on the socio-cultural life of the host community was identified in this study including the socio economic variables which includes occupation, income and asset, creating employment opportunity, economic growth and development. Also influence of tourism development on the sustainability of the tourism resources was also examined and the result shows positive and negative influence in terms of preservation of natural heritage, preservation of invasive species, maintenance of healthy environment, conservation of lifestyle and conversation of threatened species.

Indigenous tourism contributes to the economic improvement of cultural tourism to the host communities for sustainable tourism through the provision of jobs, trades, preservation of natural heritage and structural development.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were drawn from the findings of the research work:

1. The government should partner with traditional rulers or indigenous bodies to help in the planning and development of the cultural tourism in the host communities.
2. Policies and practices that ensure sustainability of natural and socio-cultural lives, socio economic variables and preservation of the natural heritage of the host communities should be developed.
3. Host community should participate in the maintenance process of the natural or indigenous heritage of their land to give the host communities a sense of ownership and control over the national resources or heritage of the communities.
4. Government should ensure that indigenous stakeholders carry out environmental impact assessment (EIA) before commencing any building and development in

any community for sustainable

tourism environment.

5. Village heads should create awareness on indigenous practices to help in checking traditional fanaticism and give room for cultural tolerance in the host communities.
6. Proper health care should be built in the community so that the entire tourist will be properly examined before allowing into the community.

References

- Amoamo, K. L. & Thompson, E (2013). The Impacts of Tourism on Natural Resources. Parks and Recreation, 28 (6), 26-32.s. *Journal of Travel Research* 37 (2) 130-8.
- Denman (2011) History, Culture, and Tourism. A paper presented at the 7th Annual conference of the Archaeological Association of Nigeria University of Porthacourt Department of management. School of Arts and social studies. National Open University of Nigeria.
- Gedecho (2014). Challenges of cultural tourism development: case of Ogun state research report No 145.
- Hamans, G. (2001). Sociology, Themes and Perspectives, London University Tutorial Press pg 521. P.P.52
- Kavita, E., Swratz, J. & Green, I. (2017). Sustainable Cultural and Religious Tourism in Nigeria. In Nsukka *Journal of Humanities* No 12 Faculty of Arts University of Nigeria Nsukka.

- Okpoko, P.(2006). The Constraints and Prospects of Tourism Developments in Nigeria. The case of Bauchi and Ogun States
Ibadan: *Nisser. Olubiyi press* Ltd PP 46
- Okoli C (2001). Tourism Development and Management in Nigeria. Enugu Jee communication and in Public Relations Journal, A Biannual Journal of Nigeria Institute of Public Relations, Vol3, No. 2.
- Okonkwo, E. E. & Nzeh, C..A. (2009). Faith-Based Activities and their Tourism Potentials Enugu, Nigerian: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Scheyvens, G. A. (2009). Tourism: Change, Impact and Opportunities.
- English: publication Owerri.
- Richards, G. (2006). Cultural Tourism in Europe, the Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS).
- Ramchander (2004). Literature Review: perception of socio-cultural impacts and the Theoretical framework. Available on upetal upetal.up.ac.201./03 chapter3.pdf
- UNWTO, Madrid, WTTC, WTO, EC (2005) agenda 21 For the Travel and Tourism Industry. Towards Environmental Sustainable Development International Group. Hotels Group Limited London, United kingdom.
- World Tourism Organization: (2014) Guide for Local Authorities on Developing Sustainable Tourism. Maldrid, World Tourism Organization
- Wall, G. (2002) Tourism Development Growth: The Challenge of Sustainability London; Routledge Washington: Island Press.
- Wall G. and Mattheison A. (2006). Tourism: Change, Impacts and Opportunities. England: Prentice hall.
- Wilson, D. S. (2013). The relationship between host community and guest tourism essay.Essays,UK. (November,2013). The relationship between host community and guest tourism essay. Retrieved from <http://www.ukessays.com/essays/tourism/the-relationship-between-host-community-and-guest-tourism>.
- Zeppel, H. (2006) Come share our culture: Marketing Aboriginal tourism in Australia. Pacific Tourism Review 2 (1), 67-82.

