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About the Chapter:

This chapter studies the local community perception about various tourism impacts in Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una district of Himachal Pradesh. The responses various attitudinal statements related with various tourism impacts are divided into various sections that correspond to social, economic, environmental, and overall impacts of tourism. Overall, local people of Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una districts expressed favorable opinions on the positive impacts of tourism, mainly in the economy, society, and culture categories, yet they have shown some concerns for some negative impacts of tourism specifically about the impacts of tourism on the environment. Local people show strong opinion for the statement that tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population. The relationship between different independent variable as age, gender, education, income reliance, district of local community and various statements is identified by ANOVA and t-tests. There was not much statistical difference were evident as residents displayed quite a high degree of similarity in their choices. The interrelationship among the variables is discovered and analysis of residents' perceptions is undertaken using factor analysis.

5.1 LOCAL COMMUNITY SURVEY

Tourism is widely perceived as a potential economic base, providing elements that may improve quality of life such as employment opportunities, tax revenues, economic diversity, festivals, restaurants, natural and cultural attractions, and outdoor recreation opportunities. There are concerns, however, that tourism can have negative impacts on quality of life. These can be in the form of crowding, traffic and parking problems, increased crime, increased cost of living, friction between tourists and residents, and changes in hosts' way of life. In order to sustain any form of tourism development, residents should be the focal point in the development.
However, hosts, particularly in developing countries, are frequently excluded from decision-making and management of projects based on community power relations case studies regarding community input into environmental decisions. As the range of types of tourism increases, consideration of socio-cultural influences in addition to economic and environmental impacts on and of tourism is imperative. Considering a lack of understanding about socio-cultural impacts of tourism in the developed world, comparative studies of different communities could further contribute to theoretical development about relationships between tourism impacts and community support for tourism development. In this chapter, the exploratory study is to examine perceptions of local residents' of Lahul-Spiti and Kullu districts on tourism impacts, tourism development and related issues and how those perceptions influence their support/opposition for tourism development.

**General Profile of the Respondents**

Table 5.1 and graph 5.1 presents the categorization of local people on the basis of districts. In the survey 400 respondents were covered. In Lahul-Spiti district 17(4.25%) respondents were surveyed, in Kullu district 175(43.75%) respondents were surveyed while in 208(52%) respondents were surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahul-Spiti</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kullu</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Una</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

Table 5.2 and graph 5.2 classifies respondents on the basis of gender. It is evident from the table and graph that out of total 400 respondents surveyed in 276(69%) were male while 124(31%) were female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH 5.2
GENDER
Age of Respondents

Table 5.3 and graph 5.3 categorizes local people on the basis of age. There were 168 (42%) respondents lying between the age group of 18-30 (young) years. The number of respondents who were in the age group of 31-44 (middle aged) were 144 (35%) and the least number of respondents were having the age above 45 years (old).

### TABLE 5.3
AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of Respondent</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30 years (young)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44 years (middle aged)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45 years (older)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAPH 5.3
AGE
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- 18-30 years (young): 42%
- 31-44 years (middle aged): 35%
- Above 45 years (older): 23%
Education

The respondents are also categorized on the basis of their education. It is evident from the table 5.4 and graph 5.4 that there were 128(32%) respondents whose education level was up to matric. The number of respondents whose education level lied between matric and graduation was 208(52%) and there percentage was high in the all categories. The respondents whose education level was post graduation and above was 64(16%) and it was the lowest number in the total sample.

TABLE 5.4
EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto Matric</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matric to graduation</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduation and above</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAPH 5.4
EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS
Employment reliance on Tourism

The respondents are also categorized on the basis of employment reliance on tourism. It is evident from the table 5.5 and graph 5.5 out of total 400 respondents 84(21%) respondents were non-reliant on tourism while 316(79%) were reliant on tourism.

### TABLE 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment reliance on Tourism</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-reliant</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAPH 5.5

**Employment Reliance on tourism**

- Non-reliant: 21%
- Reliant: 79%
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Annual Personal Income

Table 5.6 and graph 5.6 categorizes the respondents on the basis of annual personal income. It is evident from the table that 222 (55.5%) respondents have their personal income up to 2 lakhs rupees which is the highest income group in the sample. The number of respondents lying between income 2 to 4 lakhs rupees were 108 (27%) and the number of respondents having income level of 4 lakhs rupees were 70 (17.5%).

**TABLE 5.6**

ANNUAL PERSONAL INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual income</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upto 2 lakhs (Low Income)</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2 lakhs (High income group)</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAPH 5.6**
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- Upto 2 lakhs (Low Income): 72.5%
- Above 2 lakhs (High income group): 27.5%
5.2 COMMUNITY ABOUT TOURISM IMPACTS

Tourism has been seen as a positive agent of change for many communities because of its potential for job creation, income generation, and enhanced community infrastructure. However, while tourism development is usually justified on the basis of these positive benefits, it is often challenged on the grounds of socio-cultural and environmental devastation. Thus local community perceptions of the conditions and changes that may exist in host communities. As the support of host communities is a precondition for a sustainable industry, regional social impact studies are a crucial input to tourism planning and decision making. Effective implementation of sustainability-based tourism strategies requires an understanding of the social, environmental and economic implications of the industry. Systematic analyses of tourism impacts can help planners, decision makers and tourism promoters identify issues and develop appropriate policy and management. The environmental and economic effects of tourism have been the focus of numerous studies while there have been several assessments of social impacts, both conceptual and empirical the social costs and benefits of tourism remain under researched.

In this regard in the three selected districts namely Lahaul-Spiti, Kullu and Una the survey of local community is done. The respondents were asked to rank their perception about various tourism impacts in their community such as social, economic, environmental, and overall impacts of tourism. For various statements were situated on a five-point scale with 1 representing a response of "strongly agree" and 5 representing "strongly disagree. The responses of local community about various statements are as per the table 5.7.
### Table 5.7
COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ABOUT PHYSICAL AND SOCIAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical and Social Impacts of Tourism</th>
<th>Extent of Awareness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>C.V</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population (e.g. crafts, arts, music)</td>
<td>88 (22)</td>
<td>248 (62)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.79111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourism has led to an increase in infrastructure for local people</td>
<td>92 (23)</td>
<td>268 (67)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.61134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The money that tourism brings in is of benefit to the whole community</td>
<td>40 (10)</td>
<td>228 (57)</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
<td>96 (24)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.96875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tourism Impacts are good to our family</td>
<td>44 (11)</td>
<td>140 (35)</td>
<td>204 (51)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.73057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tourism Impacts are good to our social life.</td>
<td>56 (14)</td>
<td>192 (48)</td>
<td>52 (13)</td>
<td>80 (20)</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.11392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Our household’s standard of living is higher because of the money that tourists spend here</td>
<td>64 (16)</td>
<td>152 (38)</td>
<td>72 (18)</td>
<td>80 (20)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.19949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tourism benefits a small group of people in the region</td>
<td>56 (14)</td>
<td>228 (57)</td>
<td>48 (12)</td>
<td>56 (14)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.98857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data collected through questionnaire, S.D Standard Deviation, C.V - Coefficient of Variation, Values in brackets show percentages
5.3 COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ABOUT SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM

Tourism and Cultural Activities

Local people in Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una districts were asked about whether tourism is encouraging cultural activities in your local area. 62% people were strongly agree (Graph 5.7) with the statement, 22% of the respondents agreed with the statement while 8% of the respondents disagreed and rest of 8% of respondents completely disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the sample as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.02 which come to agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.79111) and coefficient of variation (39.16386). Furthermore the value of skewness has turned out to be affirmative indicating that variation has been towards the lower side. The positive value of skewness (0.693) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (78.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree that tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population.

GRAPH 5.7
Tourism and Infrastructure Development

Tourism promotes infrastructure like roads, telecommunication, hospitals, banks, security facilities in a destination which benefits local people. While local people were asked about it 67% respondents strongly agreed with the statement and 23% agreed with the statement (Graph 5.8) that tourism has led to increase in infrastructure development in their area. There were 8% of respondents who were neutral for the statement and only 2% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 6.9 have worked out to be 1.09, which comes between strongly agree and near to agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.61134) and coefficient of variation (32.17579). Furthermore the value of skewness has turned out to be affirmative indicating that variation has been towards the lower side. The positive value of skewness (0.595) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (107.04) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree that tourism leads to the infrastructure development in the region.

GRAPH 5.8
The money that tourism brings in is of benefit to the whole community

Tourism has multiplier impact and the money spent by the tourists circulates in different sections of the society directly or indirectly. Why asked about the statement that the money that tourism brings is benefitted to the whole community, 10% of the respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.9) with the statement and 57% of the respondents agreed to it. There were 9% of the respondents who were neutral for the statement while 24% of respondents disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.47, which comes close to neutral level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.96875) and coefficient of variation (39.22065). Furthermore the value of skewness has turned out to be affirmative indicating that variation has been towards the lower side. The positive value of skewness (0.562) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (60.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people are not sure enough that money that tourism brings in benefits the local community.

GRAPH 5.9

Tourism brings monetary benefit to the community
Tourism Impacts Are Good to Our Family

Tourism not only creates social, economic and environmental impacts upon a destination but individual are also affected. It provides direct or indirect employment, quality of life of the local people and many more benefits. When asked about the impacts of tourism on the family, 11% of respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.10) with the statement while 35% of respondents agreed with the statement. There were more than half of respondents who had shown neutral opinion while 3% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.46, which comes close to neutral level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.73057) and coefficient of variation (29.69797). The negative value of skewness (-0.493) denotes that the disparity in the responses have been inclined to fall above mean. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (58.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people believe that tourism impacts are good to their family.
Tourism Impacts Are Good to Our Social Life

Tourism creates socio-cultural impact upon society. On the one side it leads to better cultural understanding between guests and hosts and on the other side it promotes peace and harmony. There also cases when negative socio-cultural impacts are noticed such as demonstration effect in which destinations loses their cultural identity. While asking about the statement that that tourism impacts are good for their social life, 14% of the sample population have strongly agreed (Graph 5.11) with the statement and 48% of sample population had agreed to the statement. There were 13% respondents who had shown a neutral opinion about the statement. There were also respondents who disagreed (14%) to the statement while the respondents who strongly disagreed to the statement were 5% of total sample population. The mean score of the as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.54, which comes above to neutral level towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.11392) and coefficient of variation (43.85512). The positive value of skewness (0.591) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (54.7) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people are not agreed tourism impacts are good for socio-cultural arena of the area.

GRAPH 5.11

Tourism Impacts are good to our social life
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**Our Household’s Standard Of Living Is Higher Because of the Money That Tourists Spend Here**

While asking about the rise in standard of living because of tourists spending in the local area 16% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement while 38% of respondents agreed (Graph 5.12) with the statement. There were 18% of respondents who had shown neutral attitude while 20% of respondents disagreed with it and 8% of respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.66, which comes above to neutral level towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.19949) and coefficient of variation (45.09361). The positive value of skewness (0.401) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (24.7) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that their standard of living is high because of tourism

**Graph 5.12**

![Graph showing the distribution of responses](image)
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Tourism Benefits a Small Section of the People in the Region

It is also blamed that only few sections of the society avail the benefits of tourism. While asking about it 14% of respondents strongly agreed with the statement and 57% of respondents were agreed to the statement. There were 12% of respondents who had shown neutral attitude for it while 14% respondents disagreed (Graph 5.13) with the statement and 14% respondents completely disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.7 have worked out to be 2.35, which comes above to neutral level towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.98857) and coefficient of variation (42.06681). The positive value of skewness (0.908) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (89.7) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that their standard of living is high because of tourism.

GRAPH 5.13

Tourism benefits a small group of people in the region
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### TABLE 5.8
COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ABOUT ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impacts of Tourism</th>
<th>Extent of Awareness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>C.V</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tourism Impacts are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantageous to the economy</td>
<td>220 172 8 0 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.54039</td>
<td>54.03505</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>46.34</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the local area</td>
<td>(55) (43) (2) (0) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tourism Impacts are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantageous to the economy</td>
<td>228 168 4 0 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.51874</td>
<td>51.85642</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>50.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Himachal Pradesh</td>
<td>(57) (42) (1) (0) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tourism Impacts are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantageous to employment in</td>
<td>208 184 4 4 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.5096</td>
<td>51.02041</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>169.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local area?</td>
<td>(52) (46) (1) (1) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tourism Impacts are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantageous to national</td>
<td>212 168 12 8 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.65782</td>
<td>65.82348</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>83.44</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economy?</td>
<td>(53) (42) (3) (2) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tourism attracts more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spending in the region</td>
<td>180 204 12 0 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.55377</td>
<td>55.43818</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>42.14</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45) (52) (3) (0) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tourism attracts more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment in the region</td>
<td>48 192 96 64 0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.90252</td>
<td>90.30271</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12) (48) (24) (16) (0) (100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. There should be government incentives for tourism development</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.55922</td>
<td>55.97082</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Prices of many goods and services in the region have increased because of tourism</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.52136</td>
<td>52.17124</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Non-residents should be allowed to develop tourism attractions in this area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.07961</td>
<td>108.002</td>
<td>-1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Non Himachali owned businesses are beneficial for the region’s tourism industry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.91143</td>
<td>91.17541</td>
<td>-0.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There should be a specific tax on tourists</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.05117</td>
<td>105.121</td>
<td>-0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Tourism creates more jobs for outsiders than for local people in the region</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.99575</td>
<td>99.6234</td>
<td>1.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data collected through questionnaire, S.D Standard Deviation, C.V. - Coefficient of Variation, Values in bracket show percentages
5.4 COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ABOUT ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM

Tourism Impacts Are Advantageous to the Economy of the Local Area

Tourism creates economic impacts in any destination. While responding to the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to the economy of the local area 55% of the respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.11) with the statement and 43% of respondents agreed to the statement. This indicates that local people have a very strong faith upon the tourism industry for the economic development. There were only 2% of the respondents who had shown a neutral attitude about the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.47, which lies between agreed level and strongly agree level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.54039) and coefficient of variation (54.03505). The positive value of skewness (0.513) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (46.34) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to local area.

GRAPH 5.14
Tourism Impacts Are Advantageous to the Economy of the Himachal Pradesh

While responding to the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to the economy of the Himachal Pradesh as whole 57% of the respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.15) with the statement and 42% respondents agreed with the statement. This reflects that people have a very faith of tourism industry for the economic development of the state. There were only 1% respondents who had shown a neutral approach for the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.44, which lies between agreed level and strongly agree level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.51874) and coefficient of variation (51.85642). The positive value of skewness (0.466) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (50.42) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to the economy of Himachal Pradesh.

Graph 5.15

Tourism Impacts are advantageous to economy of Himachal Pradesh
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Community Perception about Tourism: An Empirical Analysis

Tourism Impacts Are Advantageous To Employment in Local Area

Tourism provides variety of employment opportunities in a destination. While assessing opinion of the local people about the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to the employment in local area there was a favorable opinion about it by the sample population. More than half of the respondents (52%) strongly agreed with the statement and 46% of respondents agreed (Graph 5.16) to the statement. While there were only 1% of population who show neutral reaction and 1% of population disagreed to the statement.

The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.23, which lies very close to strongly agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.5096) and coefficient of variation (51.02041). The positive value of skewness (2.651) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (169.04) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people very strongly agree with the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to employment in local area.

GRAPH 5.16
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Tourism Impacts are Advantageous to National Economy

Tourism creates a very significant impact in national economy as a whole. While asking opinion of sample population in this regard more than half of respondents have strongly agreed to the statement and 42% of sample population has agreed to it. While there were only 3% of respondents who have shown neutral attitude (Graph 5.17) and 2% respondents have disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.54, which lies very close to strongly agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.65782) and coefficient of variation (65.82348). The positive value of skewness (1.262) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (83.44) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that tourism impacts are advantageous to national economy.

GRAPH 5.17

Tourism Impacts are advantageous to national economy

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

3% 2%

42% 53%
Tourism Attracts More Spending in the Region

It has been seen that when there is growth in tourist arrival in any destination it leads to more spending by the tourists. In this regard when sample population was asked their opinion 45% of respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.18) and more than half of the respondents agreed to the statement. This means that local people have a strong faith that tourism leads to more spending that leads to the development of the area. There were only 3% of respondents who had shown neutral attitude about the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.58, which lies very close to strongly agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.55377) and coefficient of variation (55.43818). The positive value of skewness (0.222) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (42.14) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that tourism attracts more spending in the region.

Graph 5.18

Tourism attracts more spending in the region
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Tourism Attracts More Investment in the Region

The growth of tourism also attracts more investment from public and private sectors for development of tourism infrastructure. More and more tourism stakeholders are attracted for making investments in destinations. In this regard when respondents were asked their opinion 12% of total respondents strongly agreed and 48% of respondents agreed (Graph 5.19) to the statement. There were 24% of respondents who had shown neutral attitude about the statement while 16% of population disagreed to the statement. This means that local people don’t have good agreed faith that tourism leads to more investment that leads to the infrastructural development of the area. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 2.44, which lies close to neutral level and little toward agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.90252) and coefficient of variation (90.30271). The positive value of skewness (0.351) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (31.2) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people have very less agreed level that tourism attracts more spending in the region.

GRAPH 5.19
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There Should Be Government Incentives for Tourism Development

The government incentives in terms of tax rebates, subsidies, credit guarantees, infrastructural development, promotion etc. are the ways which can boost the tourism industry. While asked the sample population in this regard more than half (51%) of total respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.20) to the statement and 46% of respondents agreed to the statement. This means that local people strongly desire that government should give various types of incentives for the tourism development. There were only 3% of respondents who had shown neutral attitude about the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.52, which lies between strongly agreed and agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.55922) and coefficient of variation (55.97082). The positive value of skewness (0.45) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (41.78) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that tourism attracts more spending in the region.

GRAPH 5.20

There should be government incentives for tourism development
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Prices of Many Goods and Services in the Region Have Increased Because of Tourism

Tourism industry has a negative economic impact that it leads to rise in the prices of goods and services in the region. In this regard when sample population was asked, respondents have shown a strong acceptance to the statement. There were 48% of the respondents who had strongly agreed to the statement while more than half (51%) of the population agreed (Graph 5.21) to the statement. While there were only 1% respondents who have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 1.53, which lies between strongly agreed and agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.52136) and coefficient of variation (52.17124). The positive value of skewness (0.096) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (47.18) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people strongly agree with the statement that prices of many goods and services in the region have increased because of tourism.

GRAPH 5.21
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Non-Residents Should Be Allowed To Develop Tourism Attractions in This Area

It is also blamed by the local residents that the major benefit of the tourism industry is captured by the outsiders. If tourism has to flourish in a sustainable manner local community has to be made integral part in planning, growth as well as in benefits also. In this regard when respondents were asked to put their opinion, only few (5%) of the sample population strongly agreed, while 9% of respondents agreed (Graph 5.22) to the statement. There was 12% of the sample population who had shown neutral attitude for the statement, 48% respondents disagreed to the statement and 26% of the respondents strongly disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 3.81, which lies towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.07961) and coefficient of variation (108.002). The negative value of skewness (-1.037) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall above average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (61.5) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that non-resident should be allowed to develop tourism attractions in this area.

GRAPH 5.22
Non Himachali Owned Businesses Are Beneficial for the Region’s Tourism Industry

In various destinations of Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una districts the non-Himachali owned businesses are also flourishing which are dissatisfying the local residents. When sample population was asked to put their opinion, only few (5%) of the total respondents strongly agreed, while 17% of respondents agreed to the statement. While there were more than half (51%) of the total respondents disagreed (Graph 5.23) and 27% respondents have shown neutral attitude. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 3.24, which lies towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.91143) and coefficient of variation (91.17541). The negative value of skewness (-0.907) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall above average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (45.76) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that non Himachali owned businesses are beneficial for the region’s tourism industry.

Graph 5.23
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There Should Be a Specific Tax on Tourists

It is also supposed that tourists contribute a lot of socio-cultural and environmental impacts upon the destinations. So to compensate the negative impacts there should be specific tax to be imposed upon the tourists so as to make the remedial measures in that regard. For this view when sample population was asked to put their point of view only few (4%) of the total respondents strongly agreed, while 14% of respondents agreed (Graph 5.24) to the statement and 9% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. While there were more than half (55%) of the total respondents disagreed and 18% respondents had completely disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 3.69, which lies towards disagreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.05117) and coefficient of variation (105.121). The negative value of skewness (-0.943) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall above average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (82.1) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that there should be a specific tax on tourists.

GRAPH 5.24
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<tr>
<th>There should be a specific tax on tourists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourism Creates More Jobs For Outsiders Than For Local People In The Region

It is also blamed that tourism creates more jobs for outsiders than for local people. In this regard when sample population was asked to put their point of view 16% of the total respondents strongly agreed, while more than half (56%) respondents agreed (Graph 5.25) to the statement and 19% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. There were only 2% respondents who disagreed and 7% respondents had completely disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.8 have worked out to be 2.28, which lies towards agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.99575) and coefficient of variation (99.6234). The positive value of skewness (1.288) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (90.3) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree with the statement that tourism creates more jobs for outsiders than for local people in the region.

GRAPH 5.25

Tourism creates more jobs for outsiders than for local people in the region
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### Table 5.9

**Community Perception about Environmental Impacts of Tourism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Impacts of Tourism</th>
<th>Extent of Awareness</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>C.V</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Local community should control tourism Development</td>
<td>156 (39)</td>
<td>212 (53)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.61455</td>
<td>36.36391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tourism provides an incentive for the restoration of historic buildings</td>
<td>124 (31)</td>
<td>204 (51)</td>
<td>60 (15)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.75879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The construction of hotels and other tourist facilities has destroyed the natural environment in the region</td>
<td>164 (41)</td>
<td>204 (51)</td>
<td>8 (2)</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.77662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Tourism provides an incentive for the conservation of natural resources</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
<td>204 (51)</td>
<td>16 (4)</td>
<td>156 (39)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.04563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Impacts of tourism are advantageous for the environment?</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>48 (12)</td>
<td>60 (15)</td>
<td>184 (46)</td>
<td>96 (24)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.04563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The benefits of tourism are greater than the costs to the people of the area</td>
<td>68 (17)</td>
<td>88 (42)</td>
<td>32 (8)</td>
<td>132 (33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>400 (100)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.12146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Data collected through questionnaire, S.D Standard Deviation, C.V. - Coefficient of Variation, Values in bracket show percentages
5.5 COMMUNITY PERCEPTION ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM

Local Community Should Control Tourism Development

Local community is most important stakeholder of the tourism industry so they should be involved in tourism planning and development activities. In this regard when respondents were asked that whether they should control tourism development 39% of the total respondents strongly agreed with the statement and more than half (53%) of total respondents agreed (Graph 5.26) to the statement while 8% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. This clearly indicates that local people are more inclined toward supporting the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.9 have worked out to be 1.69, which lies between strongly agreed and agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.61455) and coefficient of variation (36.36391). The positive value of skewness (0.963) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (78.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree with the statement that local community should control tourism Development.

GRAPH 5.26
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Tourism provides an incentive for the restoration of historic buildings

Tourism generates sufficient funds for the preservation and conservation and restoration of historic buildings. In this regard when sample population was asked 31% of the total respondents strongly agreed with the statement and more than half (51%) of total respondents agreed (Graph 5.27) to the statement while 15% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. There were very few (3%) respondents who disagreed to the statement. This clearly indicates that local people are very much inclined toward supporting the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 5.9 have worked out to be 1.9, which lies between strongly agreed and agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.75879) and coefficient of variation (39.93632). The positive value of skewness (0.595) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (107.04) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree with the statement that tourism provides an incentive for the restoration of historic buildings.
The Construction of Hotels And Other Tourist Facilities Has Destroyed The Natural Environment

Tourism creates a lot negative environmental impacts upon a destination. There is huge amount of construction of hotels, restaurants and other related tourist facilities in Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una districts. It has been seen that these constructions has adversely affected the natural environment of these areas. In this regard when sample population was asked 41% of the total respondents strongly agreed with the statement and more than half (51%) of total respondents agreed (Graph 5.28) to the statement while 2% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. There were very few (6%) respondents who disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 6.27 have worked out to be 1.73, which lies between strongly agreed and agreed level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (0.77662) and coefficient of variation (44.89133). The positive value of skewness (0.562) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (60.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree with the statement that the construction of hotels and other tourist facilities has destroyed the natural environment in the region.

GRAPH 5.28

The construction of hotels and other tourist facilities has destroyed the natural environment in the region
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Tourism Provides An Incentive For The Conservation Of Natural Resources

Tourism also provides incentives for conservation of natural areas. Ecotourism is very good example in which environment awareness, conservation and community benefit is promoted. When sample population was asked 6% of the total respondents strongly agreed (Graph 5.29) with the statement and more than half (51%) of total respondents agreed to the statement while 4% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. There were also (39%) respondents who disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the sample as per the table 6.28 have worked out to be 2.76, which lies between agree and neutral level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.04563) and coefficient of variation (37.88514). The negative value of skewness (-0.493) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall above average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (58.24) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people agree to small extent with the statement that tourism provides an incentive for the conservation of natural resources.

GRAPH 5.29
Impacts of Tourism Are Advantageous For the Environment

Tourism has created very adverse impacts in various destinations of Himachal Pradesh. In this regard when sample population was asked, very few 3% of the total respondents strongly agreed with the statement and 12% of total respondents agreed to the statement while 15% respondents have shown a neutral attitude (Graph 5.30) for the statement. There were very high (46%) respondents who disagreed and 24% of respondents strongly disagreed to the statement. The mean score of the as per the table 6.29 have worked out to be 3.76, which lies more towards disagree level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.04563) and coefficient of variation (27.80931). The positive value of skewness (0.591) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (54.7) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that impact of tourism are advantageous for the environment.

GRAPH 5.30
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The Benefits of Tourism Are Greater Than the Costs

Tourism is said to beneficial for the community if local community perceive benefits of tourism greater than the costs to the people of the area. In this regard when sample population was asked, very 17% of the total respondents strongly agreed with the statement and 42% of total respondents agreed (Graph 5.31) to the statement while 8% respondents have shown a neutral attitude for the statement. There were 33% respondents who had disagreed with the statement. The mean score of the sample as per the table 6.30 have worked out to be 2.57, which lies between agree and neutral level. A lot of disparity in the responses of the sample from the mean has been disclosed by the computed value of standard deviation (1.12146) and coefficient of variation (43.63658). The positive value of skewness (0.908) denotes the disparity in the responses tends to fall below average. On applying chi-square test its calculated value (89.7) has been found to be showing significant difference at 1% level of significance which leads to the conclusion that local people disagree with the statement that impact of tourism are advantageous for the environment.

GRAPH 5.31
HYPOTHESIS TESTING

It is evident from the data analysis that various variables are correlated to each other which reject our hypothesis that the variables are uncorrelated in the population of local community. While discussing the local community opinion it is found that local people supports the statements for which people perceive benefits for them. A direct positive relationship exists between the perceived benefits of tourism and local residents’ support for tourism development.

Summary

Local people in Lahul-Spiti, Kullu and Una districts agreed strongly upon various impact statements. They agree that tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population and infrastructure development in the region. Tourism has multiplier impact and the money spent by the tourists circulates in different sections of the society directly or indirectly. Tourism is not only creating social, economic and environmental impacts upon the destinations destination but individual are also affected. Local people also believe that tourism impacts are good to their family. Tourism is also creating socio-cultural impact upon society. On the one side it is developing better cultural understanding between guests and hosts and on the other side it promoting peace and harmony. However people have concerns about some negative socio-cultural impacts. They also disagree that their standard of living is high because of tourism. It is also blamed that only few sections of the society avail the benefits of tourism, so people disagree with the statement that their standard of living is high because of tourism.

Tourism creates economic impacts in any destination. thus local people in selected destinations strongly believe that tourism impacts are advantageous to local area and tourism impacts are advantageous to the economy of Himachal Pradesh. Tourism has provided variety of employment opportunities in various destinations of Himachal Pradesh.

Tourism creates a very significant impact in national economy as a whole and local people strongly agree with this and also agree that tourism is attracting more spending in the region. Tourism is attracting more investment from public and private sectors for development of tourism infrastructure in selected districts. People also want from the government about more incentives in terms of tax rebates, subsidies, credit guarantees, infrastructural
Tourism industry has a negative economic impact that it leads to rise in the prices of goods and services in the region and tourist destinations of Himachal Pradesh are also not unaffected. Local people also show concerns that tourism is creating more jobs for outsiders than for local people in the region. Local community is most important stakeholder of the tourism industry and local community of the selected districts also feels that they should be involved in tourism planning and development activities. Local community has also shown some serious concerns about the negative environmental impacts created by tourism upon the destinations. The construction of hotels and other tourist facilities has destroyed the natural environment in the region. There is need of provision of funds from conservation of natural resources.