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The study evaluated the anticipated benefits and the perceived host community support for ethno-cultural tourism resource development in Kaduna State, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling technique was adopted for this study. Six local governments’ areas were chosen purposively because they accommodate different ethnic and cultural diversity within the state, representing about 33% of the total number of 23 LGAs in the state and have an estimated population of 1,639,621. The selected LGAs are also heterogeneous in terms of ethnicity, culture and religion. Semi-structured interview were administered to 316 respondents selected in the study area. Survey data were obtained through focus group discussion (FGD) in each ethnic community. FGDs were held with youths and elders. The sampled communities are Ham, Fulani, Hausa, Kagoro, Adara and Gbagyi, field observations were also carried out for holistic resource inventory in the ethnic communities. Documentary data were obtained from desk review method; information on tourism resources available in each ethnic community. The study revealed that the anticipated benefits of ethno-cultural tourism expected by the host communities are basically in terms of infrastructural development (road, water, electricity and communication services) and essential amenities (accommodation, restaurant, Tourist Travel Services, banking and bureau de change). The study recommends that lack of financial capital is a great hindrance for local communities to invest in the tourism industry. A mechanism for financial assistance, including provision of soft loans, needs to be in place in order to encourage host communities to invest in the industry. In turn, this would create employment opportunities to local communities, reduce poverty, improve living standards and make them much more supportive for tourism development.
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Introduction
Understanding local residents’ reactions toward tourism development and the factors that may influence their reactions is essential in achieving a host community's support for tourism development. Therefore, residents’ reactions towards tourism have been studied extensively by tourism researchers (Belisle and Hoy, 1990; Ahmed, 1996; Liu and Var, 1996; Long, Perdue, and Allen, 2000; Ap, 2002; King, Pizam and Milman, 2003; Getz, 2004; Lankford, 2004; Lankford and Howard, 2004; McCool and Martin, 2004; Akis, Peristianis and Warner, 2006; Jurowski, Uysal and Williams, 2007). These studies frequently suggest that local residents’ support for community tourism business affects their perception of tourism impacts including economic (Getz, 1996; Davis, Allen and Consenza, 1998; Perdue, Long and Kang, 2000), environmental, social, and cultural elements (Jafari, 2000; Murphy, 2005; Jafari, 2006). Although tourism researchers agree that residents' support is tied to economic, social, cultural, and environmental consequences, the structural effects of tourism impacts on local residents’ defines the level of support for tourism development and planning.

Major consideration affecting all aspects of tourism planning including fundamental decisions on attitude and policy is dependent on the extent to which either development or community support is given precedence. According to Ojo, (1978), the concept of development must come with a sense of community support, a kind of symbiotic relationship in the harnessing tourism potentials. After all, tourism exerts both detrimental and beneficial influences on local community. It degrades irreversibly the very attractions which justifies and attracts it, while on the other hand it enhances the socio-economic interest of the local people are challenged to appreciate the value of community support in tourism development (Husband and Thompson, 1990; Ibrahim, 2015).

Tourism in Kaduna State
Tourism and recreation features in Kaduna State include the Nok Settlement, Kagoro Hills, Kamuku National Park, Gamji Park, Zaria City Walls and Emir of Zazzau’s Palace (KSMC&T 2010). The National Museum in Kaduna was established in 1975 for the collections of ethnographic, archaeological and contemporary crafts. It has a permanent exhibition on Nigerian prehistory, ethnography of the peoples of Northern Nigeria and modern craft products. Kaduna State is a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic political entity. There are above 39 different ethnic groups, among which are; the Fulani, Hausa, Bajju, Atyap, Jaba, Adara, Gbagyi, Kurama, Ninzo, Ham, Koro, Kagoro, Gwong, Numana, Gure, Kaninkon, Moro’a, Kagoma, Kadara, Chawai, Gure, Ikulu, Kamuku, Kamantan, Kataf, Nimzam, Chori, Gyong Kaje among many other smaller ethnic groups. English is used as official language and is widely spoken all over the State (KSMC&T 2010). The rich cultural heritage of the people is reflected in their mode of dressing, music, dance, craftsmanship and hospitality. Hausa culture and tradition have overshadowed others but the Fulani, Mangawa, Ngizimawa and Badawa still maintain their culture and tradition in their areas of concentration. These are mostly seen through their mode of dressing, food processing and pattern of settlement. For practicing Muslims the Eid-el-fitr and Eid-el-kabir (Sallah) celebrations are the main festivities of the people, while Easter and Christmas celebration are observed by the Christians (KSMC&T 2010). Kaduna State forms a portion of Nigeria’s cultural melting pot. Apart from the six major ethnic groups found in the state, there are over twenty other ethnic minority groups, each with its language, history, art or religion different from the other.
Work of art and pottery (e.g. the “Nok Terracotta”) found in the southern parts suggest that it is a major cultural centre. Among the major ethnic groups are Kamuku, Gwari, Kadara in the west, Hausa and Kurama to the north and northeast. “Nerzil” is now used to describe the Jaba, Kaje, Koro, Kamanton, Kataf, Morwa and Chawai instead of the derogatory term “Southern Zaria People”. Also the Term “Hausawa” is used to describe the people of Igabi, Ikara, Giwa, Makarfi LGA’s, which include a large proportion of rural dwellers who are strictly “Maguzawas” (KSML&S, 2012). In the North, the Hausa and some immigrants from the southern states practice Islam while majority of the people in the Southern area are predominantly Christians. This explains the divide between Southern Kaduna and Northern Kaduna (KSMC&T 2010). The most prominent festival in Kaduna State is the Durbar others include Adara cultural festival, Afan national festival, Atyap cultural festival. Kaduna State festival of art and culture, Kalankuwa cultural festival, Mor'a cultural festival, Ninzo cultural festival, Nom-Anghan cultural festival, Tuk-Ham festival, Unum-Akulu cultural festival and Upenga cultural festival (KSMC&T 2011).

Statement of the Problem
Ethno-cultural tourism has enormous potential as an instrument for development and poverty reduction, even though the opportunities are not the same for each and every region because of ethno-cultural variations. This is why comparative community classification and evaluation study is necessary for characterizing ethno-cultural tourism indigenous sites (Ribeiro et al. 2008). Many studies (Wearing 2001; Singh and Singh, 2004; Lyons and Wearing 2008; Tomazos and Butler 2009; Lockstone, Smith and Baum 2010; Chan 2011) have supported ethno-cultural tourism as the solution of sustainable tourism. Nevertheless, the role of local people seems to be neglected by the tourism scholars. In fact, the impacts of ethno-cultural tourism on local people are usually assumed rather than researched (TRAM 2008). A study of local perceptions to ethno-cultural tourism project in the South-East Sulawesi area of Indonesia (Simmons 1994, in TRAM 2008) indicated that the locals only had a general idea of the ethno-cultural tourism project and they were not certain about the economic benefits of the projects. The challenge of this research is to evaluate the anticipated benefits of ethno-cultural tourism to the resident’s community. There is need therefore, to evaluate the ethno-cultural tourism potentials of some selected ethnic communities so as to exploit the comparative advantage of tourism in term of large ethnic grouping and enormous cultural diversity and provide useful information in relation to the lifestyles of people, their different ethnic background and diverse cultural heritage.

Purpose of the Study
Ethno-cultural tourism has enormous potential as an instrument for development and poverty reduction, even though the opportunities are not the same for each and every region because of ethno-cultural variations. This is why comparative community classification and evaluation study is necessary for defining indigenous touristic excursion sites (Ribeiro et al. 2008; Meng-hoa and Mai-lan, 2009). The majority of tourists originate from the Western world. Since they are the main consumers, interested in witnessing or learning about a culture different from their own, it follows that ethno-tourism occurs mainly in cultures that are not Western. South America is conspicuous for its ethno-cultural tourism venues, mainly because of its close proximity to a large and wealthy tourism market in North America.
Research Questions

a. What are the anticipated benefits of ethno-cultural tourism resource development in the selected ethnic communities?

b. What are the perceived impacts of ethno-cultural tourism development on residents’ community support?

Theoretical Framework

It has been said that tourism research of the 1960-70s focused on the positive aspects of tourism while the 1970-90s formed the negative (Jafari, 2006). Recently, as the host population has become a key element for the successful tourism business in the tourist destination, more researchers focused on explaining the nature of residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts using different theories (Jafari, 2000; Long, et al., 2000; Ap, 2002; Jurowski, et al., 2007). Previous research has revealed major impacts of tourism and identified the related variables, but theory is underdeveloped: “In most tourism destinations there is limited understanding of why residents respond to the impacts of tourism as they do, and under what conditions residents react to those impacts” (Ap 2002). Husband (1999) also addressed this issue by saying “There is, so far, no theoretical justification of why some people are, or are not, favorably disposed to tourism”.

In order to clarify the relationship between the impacts of tourism and residents’ community support for tourism development, several theories have been developed. One of the most influential theory is Doxey’s Irridex theory (1975) which suggests that residents’ attitudes toward tourism may pass through a series of stages from “euphoria,” through “apathy” and “irritation.” to “antagonism,” as perceived costs exceed the expected benefits. This theory is supported by Long et al.’s (2000) research results, which indicate residents’ support, are initially favorable but become negative after reaching a threshold. The Irridex theory indicates that residents’ support toward tourism would change over time within a predictable one-way sequence. It suggests that residents’ reactions toward tourism contain a sense of homogeneity (Mason and Cheyne, 2000). However, this notion is challenged by some research findings that reported heterogeneous community responses and diverse residents’ attitudes simultaneously existing in a community (McCool and Martin, 2004).

In accordance with this argument, a more complex theory was developed by Butler (1975), who suggested that both positive and negative attitudes could be held by residents in a community simultaneously and be expressed via active and passive support or opposition. This theory is supported by Murphy’s (2003) research results, which reveal the distinct attitude differences among residents, public officials, and business owners in three English tourist centers. Although the theory addresses the complexity of residents’ attitudes toward tourism, researchers still lacked theories explaining relationships between residents’ attitudes and perceived tourism impacts until Ap (2002) applied social exchange theory to tourism. According to the theory, exchange would initiate when asymmetrical inaction forms. Ap (2002) suggests that “residents evaluate tourism in terms of social exchange, that is, evaluate it in terms of expected benefits or costs obtained in return for the services they supply”. He concludes that when exchange of resources is high for the host actor in either the balanced or unbalanced exchange relation, tourism impacts are viewed positively, while tourism impacts are viewed negatively if exchange of resources is low. Social exchange theory has been
examined as a theoretical framework by researchers to describe residents’ support toward perceived tourism impacts and hence the demographic composition of host community details the individual effect on residents’ (Akis, et al. 2006).

In response to the call for establishing standardized instrumentation for use in tourism impact research (Crompton 1997), Lankford and Howard (2004) developed the tourism impact assessment scale (TIAS), which enables researchers to measure residents’ perception towards tourism in different contexts. It has been used in various tourism settings over the past decades, e.g., Thompson, Crompton and Kamp (1989) in United State of America, Lankford (2004) in Oregon and Washington, King, et al., (2003) in Minnesota and Lankford et al. (2004) in Taiwan. The results of all the studies have proven TIAS to be the most reliable and valid instrument to measure the perceived tourism impact of residents’. This theory has become a cornerstone for this research approach of investigating host community perceptions of tourism impacts for the determination of their support trend.

Assessment Model for Host Community Support for Tourism Development
This model breaks down the perceived impact of tourism development into four areas: economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts. The model examines the structural relationship among the dimensions of perceived tourism impacts, total impacts, and support for tourism development (King et al., 2003; Lankford, 2004; Lankford and Howard, 2004; Hernandez, Cohen and Garcia, 2006). The tourism impact dimensions influence total tourism impact, which affects the support for tourism development.

Figure 1: Tourism Impact Assessment Model (TIAM)

The theoretical underpinning of this model is social exchange theory, which posits that residents are likely to participate in an exchange with tourists if they believe that they are likely to gain benefits without incurring unacceptable costs. If residents perceive that the positive impacts of tourism development will be greater than the negative impacts, they are
inclined to be involved in the exchange and, therefore, support tourism development (Getz, 2004) in their community.

The Study Area
The study area is Kaduna State (Figure 2), six LGAs purposively chosen because of their overwhelming concentration of some ethnic groups which gives a fair representation of individual ethnic community (Ubale, 2010). The global location of the state is between Longitudes 06° 00’ and 09° 00’ east of Greenwich meridian and latitudes 09° 00’ and 11° 30’ north of Equator. The state has a population of 6,066,562 million (NPC Census 2006) and occupies an area of approximately 46,053 square kilometer. The state has a population density of 130 people/sq km. Its population makes up 4.3% of Nigeria’s total population. The sampled LGAs are Jaba, Kagarko, Zaria, Kaura, Katchia and Chikun with 2009 projected population of 1,639,621 having 836,523 males and 803,098 females.

Figure 2: Map of Kaduna State Showing the Study Area
Source: KSML&S, 2012

Materials and Methods

Instruments and Equipment for Data Collection:
A review of tourism literature produced numerous survey items (Liu and Var, 1996; Milman and Pizam, 1998; Perdue, et. al., 2000; Murphy, 2003; Lankford and Howard, 2004). The aims of these instruments were to measure perceived host community support for tourism development. The survey instrument for this study was developed by slightly modifying representative items and instruments used by previous scholars in tourism impacts studies.

Focus Group Discussion (FGD) were conducted in each ethnic community to gather data on the ethno-cultural tourism development benefits anticipated by ethnic communities, while Likert scale designed by Lankford and Howard (2004) which was adopted in the semi
structured interview to seek information on the perceived impacts that can affect host community support for ethno-cultural tourism development.

Sample Design and Population
Multi-stage sampling technique was adopted for this study. Firstly, six local governments’ areas were chosen purposively because they accommodate different ethnic and cultural diversity within the state, representing about 33% of the total number of 23 LGAs in the state and have an estimated population of 1,639,621. The selected LGAs are also heterogeneous in terms of ethnicity, culture and religion. Purposive sampling was also adopted while dealing with issues on perception, belief, religion and historical heritage in all sampled LGA, who according to Nachmias and Nachmias (2009) are considered to have intimate knowledge or judgment of their local environment, this data were obtained from community leaders, custodian of culture and tradition and religious leaders.

The total number of semi-structured interview schedule is 288, but to allow for 10% attrition rate of 28 additional respondents was added, a total of 316 respondents were interviewed and an average of atleast 45 respondents were interviewed in each Local Government Area. The formula for selecting the sample size was based on the expected positive response rate by Shittu (1991), of 75.64% positive response, (i.e. the respondents that are willing to participate in tourism activities) was adopted in this study. The total number of semi structured interview administered was determined using the minimum sample size formula, which read as follows:

\[
n = \frac{Z^2pq}{d^2}
\]

Where:
- \(n\) = Multiple Sample Size
- \(Z\) = Standard Normal Deviate (a constant 1.96)
- \(P\) = Expected Positive Response Rate
  - \(P\) is used in a previous similar study or else taken at 50%, i.e. 0.5
- \(q\) = Complementary Probability (1-\(p\))
- \(d\) = Degree of Precision, 0.05 at 95% (Abba 2007)

Methods of Data Collection
Focus Group Discussions (FGD’s) were held with youths, elders and aged. They were purposively selected (because of their knowledge and experience on community perception on ethno-cultural tourism project in their local community over time). They were selected outside the district of respondents participating in the semi-structured interview. The Focus Group Discussions followed predetermined checklists of open-ended questions which were unfolded in a reflexive manner that allowed both anticipated and unanticipated themes to be explored. In all eighteen (18) FGD were conducted in six districts, atleast three (3) FGD’s from each ethnic community. Semi-structured interview were administered to 316 respondents selected in the study area. The interview schedule contains questions on the respondents’ demographic characteristics and their views on the perceived tourism impact that can affect residents’ community support for ethno-cultural tourism development in Kaduna State. The respondents were chosen from Nok, Kagarko, Zaria City, Kagoro, Kufana and Kujama districts.
The reliability test was conducted for the entire variables. The results of the reliability test revealed an impressive figures which exceeded the minimum threshold level accepted (0.05) for an instrument to be reliable. None of the variable was deleted and this was attributed to the internal consistency of the values. A study conducted by Neal, (2010), revealed an alpha value of 0.85 to 0.92 as its Cronbach Alpha test results for the reliability. This result is similar to what this research recorded. Any results that is closer to 1.00, shows that it has a closer relationship with the internal consistency of the instrument.

Table 1: Test of Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Perceived Socio-Economic Impacts of Ethno-Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Section is Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Perceived Cultural Impacts of Ethno-Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section is Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Perceived Environmental Impacts of Ethno-Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section is Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Perceived Community Support for Ethno-Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section is Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher’s Compilation, 2014

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Anticipated Benefits Of Ethno-Cultural Tourism Development: The Focus Group Discussions (FGD’s) made it possible to ascertain the benefits host communities anticipate from ethno-cultural tourism as well as the importance of ethno-cultural tourism to the livelihood of resident communities. The data suggest that ethnic communities do not have good understanding of the importance of ethno-cultural tourism and they do not understand how culture conservation can transform into economic benefit to ethnic communities.

The economic benefit most ethnic community are anticipating from tourism development is basically in terms of employment, income generation and infrastructural development which include; Sale of cultural or handicraft products to visitors, Guided mountain trekking, Vending stalls along tourist routes, photography, Sale of agricultural products, and labour charges. Other include roads, water, electricity, communication and essential services like (tourist accommodation, restaurants, travel services, tour guide/tour information services, banking and money exchange, improved medical facilities and services, security services among others) and they believe it is the fastest way to enhance tourism development in the area and revitalize ethno-cultural attributes in the study areas.

Infrastructural Development:

a. Road: Majority of the roads leading to all this tourism resources locations are not motorable, a larger percent of all the roads are not motorable. The fairly motorable ones are
the ones within the rural city centre/local government headquarters. The anticipation of the local community is that to harness the tourism potentials in their ethnic community will translate to road infrastructural development if really they want to encourage tourist to visit those resource sites.

b. **Water:** All the ethnic communities are served water by the Kaduna State Water Board (KSWB) from various dams within the study areas (e.g. Gurara Dam, Kalla Dam, River Kaduna, Zaria Dam, River Wonderful, etc). Most of the community and villages depend on water from rivers, boreholes and wells. In some few instances there are dam water supplies from KSWB but only to areas within the local government headquarters. Availability of water in every community would enhance tourist interest to visit such areas.

c. **Electricity:** Almost all the ethnic communities are connected to the power holding company of Nigeria (PHCN) national grid but it usually being rationed between communities. Many a times, some communities would stay for more than three days without electricity and in the case of fault rectification can take a month or two depending on how community leaders pressurize the PHCN staff for attention.

d. **Communication Services:** There are currently various telecommunication services across all the ethnic communities. The communication outfits linked to the area include:
   - MTN Satellite Communication
   - Glo Satellite Communication
   - Airtel and Etisalat Satellite Communication

However, three ethnic communities (Dagaci, Mallagum and Dunya) are not yet connected to Airtel and Etisalat Satellite Communications, while the MTN telecommunication services in Kadarko is very poor and unreliable. The ethnic communities anticipate’s an improved telecommunication services if the tourism potentials of the areas are fully harnessed.

**Essential Amenities:**

a. **Accommodations:** The ethnic communities are of the opinion that the absences of standard hotels around the areas where all this tourism resources are located are the major reason why tourist hardly passes a night in the areas. Most tourist prefer to comedown from Kaduna, Nasarawa and Plateau State to explore their touristic pursuit and go back to their destination at or before night. The ethnic communities that have a standard hotel accommodation for tourist are the Hausa (Kongo Conference Hotel, Jim Harrison Hotel, Zaria Hotels, etc.) and Gbagyi (Access and Presidential Hotels) ethnic communities.

b. **Restaurants:** Mr. Biggs and Shagalinku restaurants are the very few standard restaurants in the study areas and this principally because of their urban settings. Another fairly standard restaurant was the one situated at the Jacaranda Resort centre at Kachia but other ethnic communities lacks standard restaurants that can cater for tourist visiting the areas.

c. **Tourist Travel Services:** Private taxis are used at sites that are located at the city centres but the major source of reaching this tourism sites are through the use of motor bikes. This is as a result of bad roads or lack of access roads to some of the tourism sites.
d. **Banking and Bureau De Change:** There are few banks in all the ethnic communities except in Zaria and Chikun where the presence of almost all Nigerian banks is felt. These banks provide services for indigenes/host communities, business men and women and tourist. The challenges faced by residents and tourist are network failure in banks, which makes time management very difficult for tourist and other customers.

**Ethno-cultural Tourism Enterprises Investment by Community Members**

About eighty percent of elders in the FGD are actually willing to invest in artifacts sales and production, while the youth are most interested in music and hotels business. Almost all the women in the FGD are more interested in restaurant business especially the sale of local dishes to tourist while few others are interested in selling of native and traditional clothing materials to tourist. The Aged are more interested in the knitting of traditional attires and caps that can be sold as souvenirs to the tourist.

**Perceived Socio-Economic Impact**

The Economic benefit accruing to the local community and the state as a whole is the same as it happens in other forms of tourism. More employment, higher income, improved standard of living etc. are some of the benefits.

**Table 2: Perceived Socio-Economic Impact (n=316)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tourism has created more jobs for your community.</td>
<td>3.5981</td>
<td>1.14081</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tourism has attracted more investment to your community.</td>
<td>4.0190</td>
<td>.99504</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tourism has led to more spending in your community.</td>
<td>4.1899</td>
<td>.99620</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Our standard of living has increased considerably because of tourism, in terms of income and social amenities.</td>
<td>1.8576</td>
<td>.88836</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The prices of goods and services have increased because of tourism.</td>
<td>2.6994</td>
<td>1.38980</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tourism has given financial benefits to local people and small business, through provision of accommodation, restaurants and sales artifacts.</td>
<td>3.7310</td>
<td>.88396</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tourism revenues are more important than revenues from other industries for local development.</td>
<td>4.0158</td>
<td>1.36501</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tourism improves the instrumental development of your community.</td>
<td>3.8987</td>
<td>1.39700</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2014
A positively strong agreement is observed in table 2, between the host community on the perceived economic impacts of tourism development. It implies that the resident’s community believed that tourism will create more jobs (M=3.59), attracts more investment in their community (M=4.01); Tourism has led to more spending in your community (M= 4.18); the standard of living of the people has increased considerably because of tourism (M= 1.85). Tourism improves the instrumental development of your community (M= 3.89). Majority of respondents are more interested in job creation, investment and infrastructure development as the major benefits anticipated from ethno-cultural tourism development. This is an indication that the perceived economic impact of ethno-cultural tourism development in the study area is very positive and will enhance community support for ethno-cultural tourism development, which is agreement with theoretical framework used in this study (Ojo, 1978; Pizam, 1988; Liu and Var, 1996; Milman and Pizam, 1998; Prentice, 2003; Jurowski et al., 2007).

Perceived Cultural Impact
Cultural impacts and local community support for tourism development reveals that local residents perceived tourism as a development that provides cultural identity and activity, cultural exchange, and valuable meeting experiences with tourists as shown in table 3. Respondents agreed that tourism can be a vehicle for intercultural dialogue and cross-cultural understanding e.g. interact, exchange stories, ideas and objects, and create a shared feeling of human belonging (M= 2.97) . Respondent’s are also of the opinion that Tourism can enhance community cultural development through tourist movement and exchange goods and services meeting tourists from other regions will be a valuable experience that will bring about better understanding of other culture and society (M= 4.66). All the ethnic communities agreed that cultural impact of ethno-cultural tourism will positively influence resident community support for tourism development.

Table 3: Perceived Cultural Impact (n = 316)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tourism as a vehicle for intercultural dialogue and cross-cultural understanding e.g. interact, exchange stories, ideas and objects, and create a shared feeling of human belonging.</td>
<td>2.9778</td>
<td>1.56230</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tourism can revitalize our cultural dispositions and local community consciousness.</td>
<td>3.3323</td>
<td>1.34532</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investment in cultural tourism development can be a kind of economic and investment diversification for the community.</td>
<td>4.3734</td>
<td>.57992</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tourism can enhance community cultural development through tourist movement and exchange goods and services.</td>
<td>4.6614</td>
<td>.48720</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2014
Perceived Environmental Impact
The perceived environmental impacts in table 4 suggests that local residents disagreed that tourism development creates traffic congestion, noise and pollution (M= 1.42), crowding, and destruction of the natural environment. However, the environmental impacts to support for tourism development suggests that the environmental impacts were negatively associated with support for tourism development. Thus, the less environmental impacts residents perceive the more support they have for tourism development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tourism has resulted traffic congestion, noise and pollution</td>
<td>1.4272</td>
<td>.61548</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Construction of hotels and other tourist facilities have destroyed the natural environment</td>
<td>1.7785</td>
<td>.60289</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tourism has resulted in unpleasantly overcrowded mountains, rivers, parks and also distorting the ecosystem of our environment</td>
<td>4.3006</td>
<td>.51775</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tourism will increase environmental awareness in your community</td>
<td>4.5538</td>
<td>.56368</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork, 2014

Tourism can degrade the environment, when visitors generate waste and pollution (air, water, solid waste, noise, and visual). Natural resource attractions can be jeopardized through improper uses or overuse. Providing tourist services can alter the landscape's appearance. Though respondent’ agreed that tourism will increase environmental awareness in their community. Mathieson and Wall, (1992) are also in support of this outcome that opportunities for the conservation and preservation of natural areas are also paramount to the residents’ communities.

Perceived Host Community Support for Tourism Development
Even though residents perceived that tourism development created negative social impacts, the total impact to enhance tourism development is positive with an average mean of 4.21. This positivism indicates that residents' perception of overall impacts of tourism development was positive and residents perceived that the benefits of tourism were greater than the costs of the tourism. Therefore, host communities were likely to support the harnessing of tourism potentials for development as illustrated in table 5, which shows an overwhelming support for events and outdoor programs (e.g. recreation facilities, festivals, exhibition, performance, art and craft expositions/villages, etc.) with an average mean of 3.77 and also Supporting service development (e.g., hotel, travel agency, restaurant, entertainment, souvenir center, etc.), with a positive average mean of 4.55 (Ibrahim, 2015).
Table 5: Perceived Host (Ethnic) Community Support for Tourism Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response by Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our community is more interested in nature base development</td>
<td>Ham: 1.5333 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulani: 1.7556 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausa: 1.3239 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kagoro: 4.8727 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adara: 2.4222 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbagyi: 1.8727 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community is more interested in attractions designs for large</td>
<td>Ham: 2.0000 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of tourists</td>
<td>Fulani: 1.8222 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausa: 1.6479 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kagoro: 1.7273 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adara: 1.4889 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbagyi: 1.7273 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community is more interested in cultural or historic base</td>
<td>Ham: 1.2889 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractions</td>
<td>Fulani: 1.5333 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausa: 4.4789 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kagoro: 2.4000 (Disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adara: 3.4444 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbagyi: 3.8000 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community is more interested in event/outdoor programs</td>
<td>Ham: 4.0000 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulani: 4.0000 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausa: 4.1831 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kagoro: 2.5273 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adara: 3.4444 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbagyi: 4.3818 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our community is more interested in supporting service development</td>
<td>Ham: 4.8667 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fulani: 4.6444 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hausa: 4.3803 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kagoro: 4.5636 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adara: 4.4667 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbagyi: 4.5273 (Agree)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ibrahim, 2015

This research supports the tenets of the Irridex model and indicates that residents in the study area overall have a favorable attitude toward tourism; if the trend of tourism development in
their communities are in relation to the potentials that abound within the community, they will be in total support of such development.

**Hypothesis Testing of Perceived Host Community Support for Tourism Development**

The analysis in table 4.14 shows that there is a positive relationship (0.727) between socio-economic impact and resident community support with p-value (0.000) which is less than 0.05. There is also a positive relationship (0.817) between cultural impact and resident community support with p-value (0.001) less than 0.05 and environmental impact (.522) and resident community support with p-value (0.003) reveals another positive relationship.

Table 4.14: Correlation Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired</th>
<th>Samples Correlations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Decision on Ho</th>
<th>Relationship is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>H0a. Economic impact and Host Community Support</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2</td>
<td>H0c. Cultural impact and Host Community Support</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3</td>
<td>H0d. Environmental impact and Host Community Support</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ibrahim, 2015

In Summary, perceived socio-economic, cultural and environmental tourism impact contributes significantly to residents community support for ethno-cultural tourism development.

**Summary of the Findings**

The purposes of this study is to evaluate the anticipated benefits of ethno-cultural tourism development and to investigate the perceived host community support for tourism development among some selected ethnic communities in Kaduna State. In earlier tourism studies, it has been acknowledged that tourism development yields benefits and costs into the host and local communities. Some studies suggested that according to the level of tourism development, residents' perceptions of tourism development impacts were different. The study also reinforces previous research findings and supports the premise that TIAS is a reliable and valid instrument to measure residents’ perceived impact toward tourism development. It also provides empirical evidence to support the assumptions associated with the Irridex and social exchange theory. Additionally, the study findings provide detail position of residents’ on community support for tourism development in the study area. It indicates that most respondents are favorable to the fact that tourism will enhance the perceived development of their community and hence they will support ethno-cultural tourism development. Particularly, the findings supported previous assertions that educating residents about the potential benefits of tourism is critical in obtaining the needed support for
tourism in enhancing residents’ involvement in the industry, and in achieving sustainable community development.

From above studies, it is emphasized that the investigation of perceived tourism impacts and host community support for tourism development among some selected ethnic communities in Kaduna State are needed. It is believed that the research efforts would help tourism practitioners and planners have a better understanding of the impacts of tourism development from the residents’ perspective and formulate better tourism strategy and planning. In fact, the tourism impact study from residents’ perspective is due to the fact that residents have been playing a vital role to bring a successful tourism development. It is believed that residents are more inclined to support tourism development if the positive impacts are more apparent to them. Let’s reflect on Lankford and Howard (2004) views that a great deal of progress has been made in the study of resident’s community support for tourism development, but a great deal is left to be done here in Kaduna State. No matter what future direction perceived impacts and host community support research takes, the most important goal must be to assure that the varied voices of the community are heard.

**Conclusion**

This study makes a significant contribution to the understanding of perceived tourism impacts and host community support for tourism development. The host community had both positive and negative perception towards tourism. Host communities and tourists both have a stake in maximizing the perceived tourism benefits and minimizing the perceived tourism social impacts that will accrue from tourism development. Social and environmental tourism impacts need to be taken into more serious consideration by the resident’s communities, if the legacies of hosting the tourist are to be viewed more positively by a greater portion of the residents of the community as thus:

- It is obvious that there are numerous ethno-cultural tourism potentials that abound across different ethnic groups in Kaduna State which remained untapped.
- The ethnic communities are willing to support ethno-cultural tourism development for economic benefits, job creation, infrastructural development, improved investment opportunities that will bring about improved tourism services and amenities that will enhance competitive advantage.
- That the respondents agreed that tourism has no economic, cultural and environmental effect on the host communities.

**Recommendations**

i. There is need for Kaduna State government to encourage rural base tourism development, since much of these ethno-cultural resources that constitute their heritage and at the same time tourist attractions abound in the rural areas and are begging for attention.

ii. There is the need for private public partnership (PPP) to foster visible ethno-cultural tourism development projects (tourism potential development, provision of social amenities to enhance competitive advantage and enlightenment campaigns), since the local and state Governments (basically in terms of infrastructural developing and policy issue that will providing an enabling environment for tourism projects to strive) cannot do all or meet all the yearnings of the people.
iii. Provision of social basic infrastructure is very vital to tourist (willingness to participate) and host community (anticipated benefit can be enhanced) before a tourism destination can enjoy both comparative and competitive advantages.

iv. The lack of financial capital is a great hindrance for local communities to invest in the tourism industry. A mechanism for financial assistance, including provision of soft loans, needs to be in place in order to encourage host communities to invest in the industry. In turn, this would create employment opportunities to local communities, reduce poverty, improve living standards and make them much more supportive for tourism development.

Future Research
To ascertain sustainable anticipated benefits from ethno-cultural tourism development, there will be need for a stakeholder’s collaboration in the planning process, hence there will be need for further studies on the roles of stakeholders in ethno-cultural tourism development planning in Kaduna State, Nigeria.
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