

## **Olumirin Waterfall Tourist Centre and Socio-cultural Transformation of Erin-ijesa Rural Community in Osun State, Nigeria**

**Gabriel Olusola Owagbemi & Lucky Wellington Bazunu**

Department of Sociology, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

### **Abstract**

Olumirin waterfall tourism is a recognized location in Nigeria and enlisted one of the natural tourisms which attracts both local and foreign visitors. In spite the fact that Olumirin waterfall is one of the tourist centres in the country, there is no visible social activities that can transform the rural community. It is in the light of this gap. that this study seeks to assess the benefits that would be attracted to the host community, if the waterfall is turned to a resource. This study therefore, seeks to assess the benefits of Erin-Ijesa waterfall as a natural tourist centre in the host community as well agent of socio-cultural change. This study adopted survey cross sectional research design. The survey was descriptive in nature and aimed at capturing primary data. The sample size for this study consisted of 385 respondents. Structured questionnaire and in-depth interview guide were utilized to elicit both quantitative and qualitative data. Data collected were analyzed using percentages and inferential statistics were also used to test the hypotheses. All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The chi square results however revealed that there was a significant relationship between years of residence and the impact of tourism on host community [ $r(391) = 0.162, p < 0.05$ ]. This was such that the higher the years of residence in the community, the more the people tends to perceive tourism as having positive impact on the community. This negated the formulated hypothesis 1 and it was rejected. Also, the respondents affirmed that the presence of Olumirin waterfall has contributed to the acknowledgement of the cultural practice in the community with  $X^2$  value of 139.048, df of 4 and a p value that was less than .05, the variances in the frequency distributions were significant. This implied that Olumirin waterfall has created higher values for the cultural features in Erin-Ijesa community. This negated the formulated hypothesis 2 and it was rejected. The study concluded that Olumirin waterfall tourism initiatives contributed significantly to social life of the local community. However, to sustain the contributions of this tourism initiatives to Erin-Ijesa rural community therefore, it was recommended that, there is need for State government and private individual to invest more on Olumirin waterfall so as to make it attractive to tourists and this will influence the social life of the community.

**Keywords:** Waterfall, Tourist Centre, Socio-Economic Transformation, Rural Community

**Background of the Study**

Tourism is one of the dynamic economic activities in creating socio-economic changes across the world which has been increasingly important (Hurma, Türksoy, & İnan, 2016). Tourism whether on large scale or small scale significantly transform the host community. This is particularly evident during the period of events and visits to the centres. Tourism offers significant contribution to the economic development, labour market and creates occupation opportunities directly and indirectly through the supply of goods and necessary services for tourist activities (Andereck & Vogt, 2000). Tourism produces social benefits to the host community. Culturally, tourism is considered as element of community enrichment; this is attributed to meeting of different cultures (Andereck & Vogt, 2000). The growth of tourism positively contributes to maintenance of natural environment by protecting, creating or maintaining national parks. Tourism movement which began as a result of wars and migration, has developed over time creating opportunities for pastimes, resting, fun, seeing new places and recreational activities (Aklanoğlu, 2010).

Tourism in general has been portrayed conventionally as an agent of change of social norms and moral values (Asomaning, 2003; Taylor, 2016). The encounter between tourists and host population causes social change, especially in isolated societies. The impact can be at the community level (crime, prostitution etc.) as well as at the individual and family level through the erosion of traditional norms (Athula et al., 2016; Taylor, 2016). Influxes of tourists bring diverse values to the host community and influence behaviours and family lifestyle where individuals and the collective community might try to please tourists or adopt tourist behaviours. Thus, interactions between residents and tourists can impact creative expression by providing new opportunities (positive) or by making individual unconscious of his/herself. Reviving cultural heritage as part of tourism development which will increase the demand for historical and cultural exhibits requires giving attention to the dwindling interest in host community cultures. Tourism comes with diffusion of cultural elements and changes in ways of life (Setokoe & Kariyana, 2014). Illegal activities tend to increase in the relaxed atmosphere of tourist areas. also the influx of tourists tends to increase alcoholism and teenage pregnancy, especially in beach communities and areas of high interest to tourists. People are likely to change their lifestyle such as alterations in local travel patterns to avoid tourist congestion and the avoidance of downtown shopping can damage a community socially and culturally (Setokoe & Kariyana, 2014; Martina, 2014).

In spite of the negative impacts of tourism on the host communities, there are so many advantages that can be attributed to it. Tourism improves the quality of life a community by increasing the number of attractions, recreational opportunities, and services (Shakya, 2014; Hurma et al., 2016). It can serve as a veritable tool through which cultural elements of the host community move to another cultural setting. In the same vein, tourism opens the door of interaction for the host community to meet people of different cultural background, make new friends which foster social cohesion, learn about the world, and expose themselves to new perspectives (Agboeze & Nwankwo, 2016). Experiencing different cultural practices enriches experiences, broadens horizons, and increases insight and appreciation for different approaches to living (Ojo, 2014; Agboeze & Nwankwo, 2016).

Olumirin waterfall is a tourism centre located in Erin-Ijesa town in Oriade Local Government, Osun state. As one of the Nigerian foremost tourism centres with international recognition, Olumirin is a site to behold. A cascading fall of waters that is surrounded by towering mountains that give a sense of wildlife mixed with serenity as one beholds the beauty nature it has to offer (Adetola and Adediran, 2014). At the basement of the mountainous cascade, is

a recreational garden that is provided by the State Government in the interest of thousands of tourists that are on daily basis attracted to the natural enclave across the globe (Adetola and Adediran, 2014). Transforming rural communities has been one of the cardinal policies of every successive government in Nigeria (Owagbemi, 2018). This is essential because the population of rural location is significant reflection of a country at large. It is evident that Olumirin waterfall is tourism attraction which has kindled government developmental expenditure in the location. It is also evident that the waterfall tourism is toast of visitation to numerous travelers. Yet it is not certain how this tourism translates to socio-cultural transformation of host community. This study triggers micro sociological paradigm to explore real benefits of the host community in tourism using individual base evidence and construct. Globally, tourism is major source of rapid transformation especially host communities which attract localization of infrastructure (Athula et al., 2016) The study therefore verifies preceding evidence in the case of Olumirin waterfall.

### **Statement of the Problem**

There is cultural barrier which inhibited growth of tourism and potential contribution the sector made to national income (Adetola and Adediran, 2014). These writers were particularly interested to identify that cultural suspicion is common place in natural tourism due to culture shock through contact with new culture, contact with people of different language, race, colour, style of dressing and religion which trigger feeling of suspicion. Similarly, Bogdan-Constantin et al (2018) claimed that cultural divergence which increased anxiety among rural population that host natural tourism locations hampered social interaction among visitors. In some cases, there is resistance by local indigenous people to thrive natural tourism centres because of fear to preserve traditional culture which is perceived threatened by visitors (Bogdan-Constantin et. al., 2018). Some writers have claimed that Africa is a location of attraction for natural tourism (Dei, 2000; Archabald, Naughton-Treves, 2001). The authors claimed that Africa is a toast of foreign patronage in natural tourism due to attraction of foreign Nationals to visit historical locations, natural endowments, magical centres and historic traditional festivals. Despite the potential that tourism has to place geographic location in global picture and economic transformation, resistance of culture mix has served as potential threat (Chuang, 2010).

Chuang (2010) also showed that tourism is potential social transformation of host communities. This is presented in the form of attraction of population growth, market location, attraction of investors, government attention and attraction of banks, security post and social amenities (World Tourism Organisation, [WTO] 2017). The interjection of tourism is that it is creation of value-added socio-economic gains which transverse location of host communities (WTO, 2009). The abundance of studies on tourism are interesting especially cases authors provided evidence of gains and losses associated with tourism. It is particularly breathtaking to identify scholarly evidence that tourism is potential for economic growth, social transformation, culture mix, population migration, market attraction, foreign visitor and expansion of host community for socio economic growth. The ability to define and quantify the various socio-cultural impacts of tourism on the local communities helps to create effective strategies that avoid potential conflicts between guest and host (Daye, 1997; Brunt & Courtney, 1999). Interestingly, Olumirin waterfall tourism is a recognized location in Nigeria and enlisted one of the natural tourisms which attracts both local and foreign visitors. Yet, this location is missing in the scholarly literature of tourism. This is gap in literature this is study is interested to fill.

### **Objectives of the Study**

This study seeks to

1. Examine belief system of Erin-Ijesa community on Olumirin waterfall as tourism zone
2. Identify cultural barriers inhibiting growth of Olumirin waterfall tourism
3. Examine forms of social change witnessed by people of Erin-Ijesa as host community of water-fall tourism.

### **Test of Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant relationship between indigenous resistance and tourism.
2. There is no significant relationship between cultural practice and tourism
3. There is no significant relationship between social change and tourism.

### **Literature Review**

#### **Background to Tourism**

Tourism is viewed as an expression of human behaviour (Kim, 2002). Harrill and Potts (2003) believed that "tourism is an invisible industry, encompassing transportation, lodging, and entertainment. Przeclawski (1986) also described tourism as the set of ideas, theories or ideologies for being a tourist, and that it is the behaviour of people in tourist roles, when these ideas are put into practice. Once a community becomes a destination, the lives of residents in the community are affected by tourism, and the support of the residents is essential for the development, planning, successful operation and sustainability of tourism (Kim, 2002). The quality of life of the residents should be a major concern for community leaders. Tourism is a complex industry. It provides employment opportunities and tax revenues and supports economic diversity. It has very different impacts, both positive and negative, or even mixed ones and comes in many shapes and forms such as social, cultural, economic, and environmental (Godfrey & Clarke, 2000).

Tourism is a source of social and economic change in many developing countries. According to World Tourism Organization [WTO] (2014; 2017), tourism is one of the world's fastest growing industries and one of the global engines of development. As one of the largest industries in the world, tourism employs 192.3 million workers (WTO, 2009). Bill Gates, founder of Microsoft identified tourism as one of the major growing industries for the next century, along with education and health (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2014). International tourism arrivals were predicted to grow by an estimated 4.3 percent per year and spending by an estimated 6.7 percent per year, providing communities and tourism interests with both a problem of managing such growth and the possibility of sustainable economic development (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2014). Mobility, disposable income, communication technologies and more discretionary time have contributed to the diversification of tourism (Setokoe & Kariyana, 2014; Taylor, 2016). In general, people have more opportunities to travel away from their daily routine. In 2005, tourism generated US\$735 billion (WTO, 2009) which is most often attributed to mass tourism. The global revenue from tourism has remained consistent more than a decade now except the novel covid-19 pandemic which significantly reduced travels and tours.

From a historical perspective, early planning of tourism focused on the economic benefits with little regard to the socio-cultural or environmental impacts (Sanagustin-Fons et al., 2018). During the 1960's and 70's, the prevalent thinking was that tourism was a clean industry with no fumes or pollution and had an economic multiplier effect to drive high employment (WTO, 2009). This attitude was soon challenged and the ideal of tourism for

producing high foreign exchange earnings were negated by the tourism related jobs that were seasonal and low paying in nature among others. This led to the 1990's where tourism policy makers and development agencies began to evaluate the economic, social, cultural, and political sustainability of tourism (WTO, 2009).

### **Impact of Tourism on Host Communities**

A goal of developing the tourism in a community is maximizing the net benefit of tourism for the local people while minimizing potential negative impacts. First, it is essential to identify the possible impacts. Tourism researchers have identified a large number of impacts. The impacts have been categorized into seven main areas as observed by Glenn (2001): economic, environmental, social and cultural, crowding and congestion, services, taxes, community attitude. Each category includes positive and negative impacts. Not all impacts are applicable to every community because conditions or resources differ. Community and tourism administrators balance an array of impacts that may either improve or negatively affect communities and their residents. The planning and marketing of tourism have been primarily oriented towards the needs of tourist, but this planning also includes efforts to manage the welfare of the host population. However, cases where tourism impacts are poorly controlled, it can result in disruption or destruction of local cultures and values and the deterioration of the social fabric of the host community (Kim, 2002).

Socio-cultural impacts of tourism are the effects of tourism on host community's interaction of direct and indirect relations with tourists. For a variety of reasons, host communities are often the weaker party in interactions with their guests and service providers, there is the need to leveraging any influence they might have. These influences are not always apparent, as they are difficult to measure, depend on value judgments and are indirect or hard to identify. According to Brunt and Courtney (1999), socio-cultural impacts refer to the changes in the norms and values of the society that are more apparent in the short term but lead to longer terms and gradual change in a society's values, beliefs and cultural practices. Murphy (1985) describes social impacts as more immediate changes in the social structure of a community and adjustments to the destination's economy and industry while cultural impacts are long-term changes in a society's norms and standards, which gradually emerge in a community's social relationships and artifacts. Socio-cultural impacts arise when tourism brings changes in value systems, behaviour, norms, lifestyle among others threatening indigenous identity (Shakya, 2014). This change is exacerbated by tourists who demand instant local cultural products and alteration through culture mix.

There is concern that tourism development may lead to tourism dominated communities losing their cultural identity by catering for the perceived needs of tourists particularly from abroad (Setoko & Kariyana, 2016). This is based on the observations of other 'destinations' having compromised their sense of identity. The extent to which socio-cultural impacts of tourism are experienced by host communities depends on a number of factors which include: the number and type of tourists; cohesiveness of the community; dependence on tourism; the nature and pace of tourism development in the area and the socio-economic and cultural conditions of the host communities (Zaei & Zaei, 2013; Sanagustin-Fons, Lafita-Cortés and Moseñe, 2018). In other words, tourism has the power to affect cultural change. While presenting a culture to tourists may help preserve the culture, it can also dilute or even destroy it. The point is to promote tourism that gives incomes and create respect for the local tradition and culture.



**Theoretical Framework****Social Exchange Theory**

This study relies on Social Exchange Theory (SET) as theoretical framework. Social exchange is a social psychological and sociological perspective that explains process of negotiated exchange between parties (Blau, 1964; Giddens, 2016; Ritzer, 2016). Exchange theory is based on the principle that human beings are reward-seeking and punishment avoiding and that people are motivated to action by the expectation of profits (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Faulker & Tideswell, 1997). It assumes that social relations involve exchange of resources among groups seeking mutual benefits from exchange relationships. The primary motive of exchange is the improvement of the community's economic benefits (Giddens, 2016; Ritzer, 2016). Exchange theory has social-psychological and sociological perspective that explains social change and stability as a process of negotiated exchanges between people in society. Exchange theorists argue that all human relationships are formed by the use of subjective cost-benefit analysis and the comparison of alternatives. This theory is concerned with understanding exchange of resources between parties in interactive situation where the objects offered for exchange have value, are measurable and there is mutual dispensation of rewards and costs between actors (Ap, 1992; Giddens, 2016).

Central to exchange theory is subjective negotiation between actors to determine the line of agreeable satisfaction, benefits and cost. The theory is root of subjective sociology found in the Weber's social action and rational choice of social behaviour (Ritzer, 2016). In Weber's interpretive action theory, it was intellectual debate to engage sociological imagination of understanding meanings that sustains social action (Giddens, 2016). Weber offered classical foundation that triggers rational choice scholars to develop social theory of rational action. It was the intellectual engagement of exchange theorists to build micro sociological integration at the level of individual. Also, social exchange theory is interested in interpretive understanding of economic gains and losses and interchange between actors to maximise gains and reduce cost (Ritzer, 2016). Following subjective cost-benefit model in exchange theory, scholars have simulated social relationship as reflection of socio-economic benefits and cost.

In the context of this study, the expectation of host community which accommodates Olumirin waterfall tourism is simulated in exchange relation. This can be classified. First, the tourism in the host community is a natural endowment which is found in the host community. The availability of this scarce endowment means attraction in public space and convergence of visitors. Second, there is preponderance of subjective estimation that gauges benefit to every actor in the social space of host community. Actors consist of visitors, host community and managers and the tourism centre. Third, there is preponderance to redistribute not only benefits of the tourism, but also cost is redistributed. Benefits manifest in the form of revenues to managers of the centre; maximization of satisfaction by users in terms of safety, perfect conduciveness of the location and acceptance by host community. Similarly, at the level of host community, benefit is redistributed in real gains to community, infrastructure gains, social amenities and demographic change. Besides, cost is redistributed to enhance the exchange relation between actors. In this case, the exchange is hampered where it is visible that cost is skewed against actor in the relations. It must be visible that host community does not bear burden of cultural loss or dilute without compensating the loss in comparable measure on other ground such as economic and social transformation. Visitors must also find equilibrium level to compensate fare and charges paid to access tourism location in the form

of maximum experience and acceptance. Manager of the tourism zone also found common ground to compensate investment. This exchange exists in continuum to sustain social relations of patronage of Olumirin waterfall. The task of this study therefore is to explore the model of social exchange which surrounds this process.

## **Methodology**

### **Research Design**

This study adopts survey cross sectional design. The survey shall be descriptive conclusive design which aims to capture primary data. Survey for this study shall be carried out in phases. First phase shall delineate Erin-Ijesa into clusters of interwoven study areas (SAs) which makes for easy data collection. Second phase provides for selection from available SAs which shall make for affordable coverage. Third phase consists of SAs and application of data collection. Cross section of research participants shall be selected from residents who live in the SAs as permanent members. This study shall consist of resident members of host community who live as permanent residents. The population consists of male and female, cross section of occupation, religious affiliation and ethnic divide. Community heads, opinion leaders and officials of the tourism centre shall be captured.

Sample size for this study consists of 385. Sampling techniques shall consist of purposive, cluster, proportionate random ballot and accidental sampling. Purposive method is applied to determine choice of this study location, Erin-Ijesa. This community is host to waterfall tourism and offers attributes needed by the researcher to conduct the study. Cluster sampling applies to delineate SAs for purpose of clarity and identification. Three clusters are identified in the SAs and labeled. The label consists of primary identifier, secondary identifier and tertiary identifier. Primary is marked by community which shares synonymous with the waterfall. This consist of Erin-Ijesa, the host community. Secondary identifier consists of community which is directly adjoining to primary identifier. This community does not host the tourism but it provides feeder roads to the centre. Tertiary identifier is community within the local government which exist some distance from host community and feeder roads. A cluster of two communities applies which consists of host and feeder road community.

Random ballot applies to select two communities from feeder cluster and this consists of Urokin and Ayetoro. Host community is purposively applied. The SAs therefore consist of three locations (Erin-Ijesa, Urokin and Ayetoro). These communities vary in population size with Erin-ijesa occupying 45%, Ayetoro30% and Urokin25% using estimated proportion of the three communities. Accidental sampling shall be applied to reach respondents for data collection.

The study adopted quantitative data collection method. The data was classified in statistical categories. Questionnaire was applied to generate primary data for this study. The questionnaire was structured questions and classified into sub section to capture the study objectives. Section A consists of questions on demographic characteristics of respondents. Section B captured belief system of residents; Section C dealt with cultural barriers in the host community; and Section D captured social transformation associated with tourism.

Quantitative data were analysed using parametric descriptive and inferential statistics. In this case, quantitative data were assigned numeric code and input in computer machine through the use of software called statistical package for social sciences, also known as SPSS (version 23.0). Data generated were analyzed through statistical tools which consist of descriptive and inferential statistics.

## Discussion of Findings

Table I

*Frequency Distribution showing Respondents' Personal Information*

Factors	Options	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	184	46.8
	Female	209	53.2
	Total	393	100.0
Age	20 years and below	12	3.1
	21 - 30years	75	19.1
	31 - 40years	84	21.4
	41 - 50years	107	27.2
	51 - 60years	82	20.9
	61 - 70years	31	7.9
	71 - 80years	2	.5
Total	393	100.0	
Marital Status	Single	49	12.5
	Married	299	76.1
	Widow	45	11.5
	Total	393	100.0
Educational Qualification	No Formal Education	27	6.9
	Primary Education	104	26.5
	Secondary Education	199	50.6
	Tertiary Education	59	15.0
	Others	4	1.0
Total	393	100.0	
Residential Area	Erin-Ijesa	322	81.9
	Erin-Oke	26	6.6
	Ayetoro	33	8.4
	Awaye	12	3.1
	Total	393	100.0
Years of Residence	10 years and below	22	5.6
	11 - 20years	84	21.4
	21 - 30years	92	23.4
	31 - 40years	71	18.1
	41 - 50years	67	17.0
	51 - 60years	42	10.7
	61 - 70years	15	3.8
Total	393	100.0	

Considering the social demographics, it was noted that 53.2% of the sample were females, while 46.8% were males. The age distribution was such that 3.1% were below the age of 21, 19.1% were within the age range of 21 and 30 years, 21.4% were aged within the range of 31 and 40 years, 27.2% were within the age range of 41 and 50 years, 20.9% were within the age grouping of 51 and 60 years, 7.9% were within the age ranges of 61 and 70 years, while just 0.5% were aged between 71 and 80 years. The I table also showed the distribution of the respondents based on their marital status. It was noted that 12.5% were single, 76.1% were



married, while 11.5% were widowed. The education qualification showed that 6.9% had no formal education, 26.5% had primary form of education, 50.6% had secondary education, 15% had tertiary form of education, while 1.0% had other forms of education qualification outside the identified ones. Lastly observed was the residence area of the respondents and it was noted that 81.9% of the sampled respondents were from Erin-Ijesa, 6.6% were from Erin-Oke, 8.4% were from Ayetoro, while 3.1% were from Awaye. The distribution of the respondents based on their years of residence in the community showed that 5.6% had lived in the community for less than 11 years, 21.4% had lived there for years ranging between 11 and 20, 23.4% had lived within the community for between 21 and 30 years, 18.1% had been residence of the community for years ranging between 31 and 40 years, 17% had been residence of the community for years ranging between 41 and 50 years, 10.7% had been residence of the community for years ranging between 51 and 60 years, while 3.8% had been residence of the community for years ranging between 61 and 70 years.

**Research Question 1:**What is the impact of the host community on Olumirin waterfall tourist centre?

Table II

*Frequency and Percentage summary on statement regarding the impact of the host community on Olumirin waterfall tourist centre*

Items		Response					Total
		SA	A	UN	D	SD	
You are involved in Olumirin tourist centre activities	F	158	80	12	111	32	393
	%	40.2	20.4	3.1	28.2	8.1	100.0
The host community plays prominent roles in the Olumirin waterfall tourist centre activities	F	69	166	27	99	32	393
	%	17.6	42.2	6.9	25.2	8.1	100.0
Erin-Ijesa community has control over what happens in Olumirin waterfall tourist centre	F	104	56	25	138	70	393
	%	26.5	14.2	6.4	35.1	17.8	100.0
The host community faces barriers when trying to get involved in Olumirin tourist centre activities	F	58	86	57	160	32	393
	%	14.8	21.9	14.5	40.7	8.1	100.0
Osun State government incorporates the indigenes of Erin-Ijesa into the management team of Olumirin waterfall tourist centre	F	80	102	46	126	39	393
	%	20.4	26.0	11.7	32.1	9.9	100.0
The indigenes of Erin-Ijesa community participate in decision making in Olumirin waterfall tourist centre	F	101	89	45	98	60	393
	%	25.7	22.6	11.5	24.9	15.3	100.0
Erin-Ijesa local community has a degree of control over Olumirin tourist centre	F	115	113	15	104	46	393
	%	29.3	28.8	3.8	26.5	11.7	100.0
Averaged Total	F	94	109	33	109	48	393
	%	24.0	27.7	8.4	27.7	12.2	100.0

Note: ® Items reversed for average summary

Table II shows the responses on statements related to the impact of the host community on Olumirin waterfall tourist centre and it was noted that a good number of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement that said they were involved with the activities in Olumirin tourist centre, 20.4% agreed, 3.1% were undecided, 28.2% disagreed, while 8.1% strongly disagreed. It was also observed that 17.6% of the respondents strongly agree with the statement that said the host community plays prominent roles in the Olumirin waterfall tourist centre activities, 42.2% agreed, 6.9% were indecisive, 25.2% disagreed, while 8.1% strongly disagreed. On the contrary, a larger percentage of the respondents (35.1%) disagreed with the statement that said Erin-Ijesa community has control over what happens in Olumirin waterfall tourist centre, 17.8% strongly disagreed, 6.4% were undecided, 14.2% agreed, while 26.5% strongly agreed. This means that the community is not in control of the happenings in the waterfall.

It was observed in the distribution that a larger percentage of the respondents (40.7%) disagreed with the statement that said they face barriers when trying to get involved in Olumirin tourist centre activities, 8.1% strongly disagreed, 14.5% were indecisive, 21.9% agreed, while 14.8% strongly agreed. From a different perspective, it was noted that Osun State government incorporates the indigenes of Erin-Ijesa into the management team of Olumirin waterfall tourist centre. This was such that 26% agreed, 20.4% strongly agreed, 11.7% were undecided, 32.1% disagreed, while 9.9% strongly disagreed. Further confirming the opinions, it was observed that the indigenes of Erin-Ijesa community participate in decision making in Olumirin waterfall tourist centre. This was such that 25.7% of the respondents strongly agreed, 22.6% agreed, 11.5% were indecisive, 24.9% disagreed, while 15.3% strongly disagreed. It was also indicated that Erin-Ijesa local community has a degree of control over Olumirin tourist centre. This was such 29.3% strongly agreed, 28.8% agreed, 3.8% were undecided, 26.5% disagreed, while 11.7% strongly agreed. On a conclusive note, it was indicated that the percentage of the respondents that agree and disagree with the idea that the host community exercises some form of control over Olumirin waterfall tourist centre was even with 27.7% each. However, the percentage of those that strongly agree with the idea (24%) was higher than those that strongly disagreed (12.2%), while those that were undecided were 8.4%. This implied that the host community had certain form of impact on Olumirin waterfall tourist centre and these have to do with decision making regarding the tourist destination.

**Research Question 2:** Is there any relationship between the cultural features of Erin-Ijesa community and Olumirin waterfall tourism centre?

Table III

*Frequency and Percentage summary showing the relationship between the cultural features of Erin-Ijesa community and Olumirin waterfall tourism centre*

Items		Response					Total
		SA	A	UN	D	SD	
Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has led to revitalization of the local community pride	F	138	167	28	49	11	393
	%	35.1	42.5	7.1	12.5	2.8	100.0
Olumirin waterfall centre has led to protection of culture and local heritage of the Erin-Ijesa community	F	112	153	47	71	10	393
	%	28.5	38.9	12.0	18.1	2.5	100.0
The visit of tourists to Olumirin waterfall affects the indigenous cultural values	F	96	115	27	110	45	393
	%	24.4	29.3	6.9	28.0	11.5	100.0
Averaged Total	F	115	145	34	77	22	393
	%	29.3	36.9	8.6	19.6	5.6	100.0

The test on the association between Olumirin waterfall tourism centre and the cultural features of Erin-Ijesa community were presented in Table 4. It was noted that a large percentage of the respondents supported the statement that said Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has led to revitalization of the local community pride. This was such that 35.1% strongly agreed, 42.5% agreed, 7.1% were undecided, 12.5% disagreed, while 2.8% strongly disagreed. It was also noted that most of the respondents supported the statement that said Olumirin waterfall centre has led to protection of culture and local heritage of the Erin-Ijesa community. This was such that 28.5% strongly agree, 38.9% agreed, 12% were undecided, 18.1% disagreed, while 2.5% strongly disagreed. Lastly, a good number of the respondents also affirmed that visit of tourists to Olumirin waterfall affects the indigenous cultural values. The distribution was such that 24.4% strongly agreed, 29.3% agreed, 6.9% were undecided, 28% disagreed, while 11.5% strongly disagreed. Averaging the scores, it was noted that Olumirin waterfall upheld the cultural values of the host community with 29.3% of the respondents strong agreement to this, 36.9% agreement, 8.6% indifferent response, 19.6% disagreement and 5.6% strong disagreement. This implied that there is relationship between the cultural features of Erin-Ijesa community and Olumirin waterfall tourism centre in a form that Olumirin waterfall has created higher values for the cultural features in Erin-Ijesa community.

**Research Question 3:** What are the forms of social change witnessed by the people of Erin-Ijesa as host community of Olumirin waterfall tourism?

Table IV

*Frequency and Percentage summary showing the forms of social change witnessed by the people of Erin-Ijesa as host community of Olumirin waterfall tourism*

Items		Response					Total
		SA	A	UN	D	SD	
Olumirin tourist centre has impacted on your social and personal life	F	208	73	8	89	15	393
	%	52.9	18.6	2.0	22.6	3.8	100.0
The effect of Olumirin waterfall have changed your lifestyle	F	50	204	7	112	20	393
	%	12.7	51.9	1.8	28.5	5.1	100.0
Olumirin tourist centre has improved the standard of living of Erin-Ijesa people	F	144	109	21	96	23	393
	%	36.6	27.7	5.3	24.4	5.9	100.0
Rural tourism initiatives has stimulate the construction of schools in Erin-Ijesa community	F	22	41	27	183	120	393
	%	5.6	10.4	6.9	46.6	30.5	100.0
The impacts of Olumirin waterfall centre is advantageous for your family	F	76	170	24	96	27	393
	%	19.3	43.3	6.1	24.4	6.9	100.0
Olumirin waterfall centre has led to social exchange between the host community and the guest	F	89	214	47	38	5	393
	%	22.6	54.5	12.0	9.7	1.3	100.0
Olumirin waterfall centre has led to establishment of health centres in Erin-Ijesa community	F	38	46	41	134	134	393
	%	9.7	11.7	10.4	34.1	34.1	100.0
Olumirin waterfall centre has stimulated the development of infrastructure in Erin-Ijesa community	F	92	100	20	94	87	393
	%	23.4	25.4	5.1	23.9	22.1	100.0
Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has contributed to the development of transportation service in Erin-Ijesa community	F	54	121	23	111	84	393
	%	13.7	30.8	5.9	28.2	21.4	100.0
The management of Olumirin waterfall tourist centre gives students of the local community school bursaries	F	32	54	33	78	196	393
	%	8.1	13.7	8.4	19.8	49.9	100.0
Averaged Total	F	81	113	25	103	71	393
	%	20.6	28.7	6.4	26.2	18.1	100.0

The test on the forms of social change experienced by the people of Erin-Ijesa community as a result of the presence of Olumirin waterfall tourism center was presented in Table 5. It was observed that majority of the respondents affirmed that Olumirin tourist centre has impacted on their social and personal life. This was in a way that 52.9% of the respondents strongly agree, 18.6% agreed, 2% were indecisive, 22.6% disagree, while 3.8% strongly disagreed. It was also noted that 51.9% of the respondents agreed with the statement that said the effect of Olumirin waterfall have changed their lifestyle, 12.7% strongly agreed, 1.8% were undecided, 28.5% disagreed, while 5.1% strongly disagreed. This means that the effect of the presence of Olumirin waterfall had changed their lifestyle. Further observations showed that 36.6% of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement that said Olumirin tourist centre

has improved the standard of living of Erin-Ijesa people, 27.7% agreed, 5.3% were indecisive, 24.4% disagreed, while 5.9% strongly disagreed. On contrary grounds, it was noted that most of the respondents negated the perception that rural tourism initiatives has stimulate the construction of schools in Erin-Ijesa community. This was such that 46.6% disagreed with the statement, 30.5% strongly disagreed, 6.9% were indifferent, 10.4% agreed, while 5.6% strongly agreed. It was affirmed by most of the respondents that the impact of Olumirin waterfall centre was advantageous for their family. This was with 43.3% agreement, 19.3% strong agreement, 6.1% indifferent response, 24.4% disagreement and 6.9% strong disagreement. The result further confirmed that Olumirin waterfall centre has led to social exchange between the host community and the guest. This was such that 54.5% of the respondents agreed with the statement, 22.6% strongly agreed, 12% were indifferent, 9.7% disagreed, while 1.3% strongly disagreed. With a negating perspective from most of the respondents, it was observed that 34.1% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that said Olumirin waterfall centre has led to establishment of health centres in Erin-Ijesa community, 34.1% also strongly disagreed, 10.4% were indifferent, 11.7% agreed, while 9.7% strongly agreed. The responses on the statement that said Olumirin waterfall centre has stimulated the development of infrastructure in Erin-Ijesa community was such that 23.4% strongly agreed, 25.4% agreed, 5.1% were undecided, 23.9% disagreed, while 22.1% strongly disagreed. The responses on the statement that said Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has contributed to the development of transportation service in Erin-Ijesa community was such that 28.2% disagreed, 21.4% strongly disagreed, 5.9% were inconclusive, 30.8% agreed, while 13.7% strongly agreed. Lastly, it was indicative that most of the respondents negated the statement that said the management of Olumirin waterfall tourist centre gives students of the local community school bursaries. This was such that 49.9% strongly disagreed, 19.8% disagreed, 8.4% were undecided, 13.7% agreed, while 8.1% strongly agreed. Averagely, it was indicated that 20.6% of the respondents strongly agreed with the perception that Olumirin waterfall tourism has influenced the social life of the people living in the community, 28.7% agreed, 6.4% were undecided, 26.2% disagreed, while 18.1% strongly disagreed. This implied that Olumirin waterfall tourism influenced the social life of the people of Erin-Ijesa positively, except for those aspects of the construction of schools, establishment of health centres and the development of transportation services in the community.

### Test of Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between indigenous residence and the impact of tourism on host community

Table V

*Simple Correlation showing the relationship between indigenous residence and the impact of tourism on host community*

Variable	Mean	SD	N	Df	r	p
Years of Residence	33.03	15.64	393	391	.162	< .05
Impact of Tourism on Host	30.74	8.50				

The result in Table V showed that there was a significant relationship between years of residence and the impact of tourism on host community [ $r(391) = .162, p < .05$ ]. This was such that the higher the years of residence in the community, the more the people tends to

perceive tourism as having positive impact on the community. This negates the formulated hypothesis and it was rejected.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between cultural practice and tourism

Table VI

*Chi Square summary showing relationship between the cultural practice of Erin-Ijesa community and Olumirin waterfall tourism centre*

Items		Response					Total
		SA	A	UN	D	SD	
The presence of Olumirin waterfall has contributed to the acknowledgement of the cultural practice in the community	F %	115 29.3	145 36.9	34 8.6	77 19.6	22 5.6	393 100.0
Chi Square	X <sup>2</sup>	139.048					
	df	4					
	p	< .05					

Table VI shows the relationship between cultural practice and tourism. It was noted that presence of Olumirin waterfall has contributed to the acknowledgement of the cultural practice in the community with 29.3% of the respondents strong agreement to this, 36.9% agreement, 8.6% indifferent response, 19.6% disagreement and 5.6% strong disagreement. With X<sup>2</sup> value of 139.048, df of 4 and a p value that was less than .05, it was indicated that the variances in the frequency distributions were significant. This implied that there is relationship between the cultural practice of Erin-Ijesa community and Olumirin waterfall tourism centre in a form that Olumirin waterfall has created higher values for the cultural features in Erin-Ijesa community. This negated the formulated hypothesis 3 and it was rejected.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relationship between social change and tourism

Table VII

*Chi Square summary on the relationship between social change in Erin-Ijesa community and Olumiri tourist center.*

Items		Response					Total
		SA	A	UN	D	SD	
Olumirin tourist centre has impacted on the social and personal life of the people in the host community	F %	81 20.6	113 28.7	25 6.4	103 26.2	71 18.1	393 100.0
Chi Square	X <sup>2</sup>	59.900					
	df	4					
	p	< .05					

It was indicated in Table 7 that 20.6% of the respondents strongly agreed with the perception that Olumirin tourist centre has impacted on the social and personal life of the people in the host community, 28.7% agreed, 6.4% were undecided, 26.2% disagreed, while 18.1% strongly disagreed. The variances in this distribution was confirmed with the chi square result since the X<sup>2</sup> value of 59.900, df of 4 had a p value that was less than .05 level of significant. This implied that Olumirin waterfall tourism influenced the social life of the people of Erin-Ijesa



positively, thus justifying the relationship between social change and tourism as significantly positive. This was not in support of the formulated hypothesis 4 and it was also rejected.

### **Summary of the Findings**

This study reveals that Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has impacted positively on the host community as was attested to by the respondents. The impacts range from; community direct involvement in some of the activities in Olumirin tourist centre, even though, they are not fully in-charge of the tourist centre, yet, Osun State government incorporates the indigenes of Erin-Ijesa into the management team of Olumirin waterfall tourist centre. This finding are in line with that of Rahman (2010) who opine that the local community of Cox's Bazar in Bangladesh is involved in tourism activities but has minimal involvement in the decision making process, the local community is totally excluded from the policy formulation process. The study establishes a relationship between Olumirin waterfall tourism centre and the cultural features of Erin-Ijesa community, the center has led to revitalization of the local community pride and it has projected the indigenous culture of the Erin-Ijesa people. This finding is in line with Ibănescu et al (2018) who found out that there is a significant positive effect of tourism on rural areas translated into higher values of all the indexes analyzed.

The study affirmed that visit of tourists to Olumirin waterfall affects the indigenous cultural values. Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has impacted on social and personal life of Erin-Ijesa people, it has changed their lifestyle and led to social exchange between the host community and the guest, except for those aspects of the construction of schools, establishment of health centres and the development of transportation services in the community. This negated the work of Chong (2014) where he opined that tourism helps reducing poverty, improves education attainment, and has positive impact on health, infrastructure and the environment in developing countries.

### **Conclusion**

This study concludes that Olumirin water fall tourist center has been viewed as having a positive impact on the social life of the community. The findings of this study revealed a clear indication of the community's feelings about Olumirin waterfall tourist center and social development in Erin-Ijesa community. Their responses showed that the degree of their involvement in decision making at Olumirin waterfall tourist center is very minimal and for this, they denied knowing much about the activities going on at the tourist centre. They also attested to the fact that their contact with the guests who visit the tourist center afford them the opportunity to show-case their culture and this has enabled them giving new life to some elements of their culture which were dwindling. The study also concludes that Olumirin waterfall tourist centre has impacted positively on the livelihood of the people of Erin-Ijesa, despite the fact that its presence has not attracted provision of social amenities to the host community from the State government.

### **Recommendation**

More indigenes of the Erin-Ijesa community should be incorporated into the decision making body of Olumirin tourist center; Osun State government and other private individual should invest and focus more on provision of social amenities to the host and surrounding communities, this will make these communities attractive and conducive for tourists and it will influence the social life of the community.

## References

- Adetola, S. O., and Adediran, O. K. (2014). Attitudes of local residents towards sustainable ecotourism development in Olumirin Waterfall Southwestern Nigeria, *Ethiopian journal of environmental studies & management* 7(5). 561 – 571,
- Agboeze, M. U., & Nwankwo, E. A. (2016). Hosts' perception of impacts of community development schemes and tourism projects in Southeast Nigeria *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (5), 361-370.
- Anderreck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39. (1), 27-36.
- Ap, J. (1992). Resident's Perceptions on tourism impacts, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19 (3), 665-690.
- Asomaning, H. (2003). Social sharing our cultural values through tourism, Ghana News Agency
- Athula, W.K., Gnanapala, J. A., & Sandaruwani, R. C. (2016). Socio-economic impacts of tourism development and their implications on local communities, *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2, (5). 59-67.
- Blau, P. (1986). Exchange and power in social life, 2nd edition, New York, Routledge.
- Bogdan-Constantin, I., Oana, M. S., Alina, M., & Corneliu, I. (2018). The impact of tourism on sustainable development of rural areas: Evidence from Romania, *Sustainability*, 10, 3529.
- Briedenhann, J., & Wickens, E. (2004). Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas—Vibrant hope or impossible dream? *Tour. Manag.* 25, 71–79. [CrossRef]
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perception and socio-cultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
- Chong, W. Y. (2014) The influences of tourism in developing countries - Analysis of the case South Africa, An MSc thesis submitted to Erasmus School of Economics, Erasmus University, Rotterdam
- Chuang, S. T. (2010). Rural tourism: Perspectives from social exchange theory. *Soc. Behav. Personal. Int. J.*, 38, 1313–1323. [CrossRef]
- Daye, M. (1997) 'Messages to hosts.' Masters dissertation submitted to the University of Surrey: Guildford.
- Dei, L. A. (2000). Community participation in tourism in Africa. In Dieke, P. ed. Political economy of tourism development in Africa. New York, Cognizant Publications.
- Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5 (1), 3-2.
- Giddens, A. (2016). Introduction to Sociology, Seagull 10th Edition, International Kindle Paperlite.
- Godfrey, K., & Clarke, J. (2000). The tourism development handbook: A practical approach to planning and marketing. London: Continuum.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived Impacts of Tourism: the case of Samos. *Annals of tourism research*, 23 (3), 503-526.
- Harrill, R., & Potts, T. D. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: attitudes towards tourism development in Charleston, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233-44.
- Hurma, H., Türksoy, N., & Inan, C. (2016). The role of tourism activities in rural development, IBANESS Conference Series – Prilep / Republic of Macedonia.

- Ibănescu, B., Stoleriu, O. M., Munteanu, A., & Iatu, C. (2018). The impact of tourism on sustainable development of rural areas: Evidence from Romania, *Sustainability*, 10, 3529; doi:10.3390/su10103529.
- Kim, K. (2002). The effects of tourism impacts upon quality of life residents in the community. Blacksburg: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. London, Routledge.
- Owagbemi, G. O. (2018). Assessing the relocation of Adekunle Ajasin University to Akokoland on transportation system and rural development in Ondo State, *Humanities and Social Sciences Letters*, 2018, 6(2): 51-58.
- Ojo, J. S. (2014) Managing Tourism for socioeconomic development in Nigerian Local Government: A case study of Idare Local Government. *Journal of African studies and Development*. 6, (2). 29-35.
- Przeclawski, K. (1986). *Humanistic foundation of tourism*. Warsaw: Poland: Institute of tourism.
- Polit, D., & Hungler, B. (1991) "Nursing research: Principles and Methods" New York: JB Lippincott.
- Rahman, M. D. (2010). Exploring the socio-economic impacts of tourism: A study of Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh, Thesis submitted to the Cardiff School of Management in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Cardiff School of Management University of Wales Institute, Cardiff, UK.
- Ritzer, G. (2016). *Essentials of sociology*, International Kindle Paperlite, Sage Publications Inc.
- Sanagustin-Fons, I. D., Lafita-Cortés, T., & Moseñe, J. A. (2018). Social perception of rural tourism impact: A Case Study, *Sustainability*, 10, (339). 1-25. doi:10.3390/su10020339
- Setoko, T. J., & Kariyana, I. (2016). Tourism in rural communities and implications for sustainable rural development, *African journal of hospitality, tourism and leisure*; special edition, 5 (3) , 1-17.
- Shakya, M. (2014) : Social capital, tourism and socio-economic transformation of rural society: Evidence from Nepal, IEE Working Papers, No. 208, ISBN 978-3-927276-94-9, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Institut für Entwicklungsforschung und Entwicklungspolitik (IEE), Bochum.
- Taylor, E. (2016) *Culture, tourism and sustainability: an ethnographic study of rural community development in Jamaica*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Coventry: Coventry University.
- United Nation World Tourism Organization UNWTO. (2014). Annual Report of World Tourism Organization. Retrieved on March 30, 2014 from [http://dtxtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto\\_annual\\_report\\_2014.pdf](http://dtxtq4w60xqpw.cloudfront.net/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto_annual_report_2014.pdf).
- UNWTO. (2017). Annual Report; World Tourism Organization: Madrid, Spain,
- UNWTO. (2009). Indicators of sustainable development for tourism destination: A guidebook. Retrieved from <http://www.unwto>.
- UNWTO. (2004). Statistics and economic measures of tourism. Retrieved 8th August, 2019 [www.world-tourism.org](http://www.world-tourism.org).
- Zaei, M. A., & Zaei, M. E. (2013). The impacts of tourism industry on host community, *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Research*.1, (2), 12-21.