

Leisure Tourism and Sustainable Livelihoods in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa

Paul Nkemngu Acha-Anyi *

Department of Tourism, Hospitality and Sports Management, Faculty of Business Science, Walter Sisulu University, Buffalo City – College street campus, East London, Email, Pacha-anyi@wsu.ac.za

**Corresponding Author*

How to cite this article: Acha-Anyi, P.N. (2020). Leisure Tourism and Sustainable Livelihoods in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 9(4):500-514. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720-33>

Abstract

This study explores the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods from a visitors' perspective. Quantitative research methods were employed in collecting data from (n) 369 respondents within the precincts of a number of waterfronts in the Eastern Cape Province. Using exploratory factor analysis and analysis of variance the study finds a generally positive perception of leisure tourism impacts on sustainable livelihoods. The main implication of this study is that there is an increasing awareness among people that the benefits of leisure tourism come at a cost. This study contributes to existing literature highlighting the imperative to narrow the gap between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods from the unique perspective of the Eastern Cape Province.

Keywords: Leisure tourism, sustainability, livelihoods, Eastern Cape

Introduction

Leisure tourism has been associated with benefits to physical health (Zhang & Zhang, 2018; Huang, Cheng & Chang 2019; Godovykh & Ridderstaat, 2020), mental health (Levi, Dolev, Collins-Kreiner & Zilcha-Mano, 2018) and self-fulfilment (Amato, Lundberg, Ward, Schaalje, & Zabriskie, 2016; Yachin, 2018). Research by Sun, Xu, Köseoglu and Okumus, (2020) and De Bloom, Kinnunen, & Korpela, (2014) has also suggested that leisure tourism participation improves performance at work, while Minnaert (2014) purports that leisure tourism benefits vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities and low income families. However, Snyman (2018), Kastenholz, Eusébio and Figueiredo, (2015) and Thomas (2018) caution against the general assumption that leisure tourism is a panacea for development and improved livelihoods in all communities. Hence, Su, Wall, Wang, and Jin (2019) and Pyke, Pyke and Watuwa, (2020) advice that further studies undertaken to ascertain the relationship between leisure tourism and the sustainability of livelihoods in various communities.

The Eastern Cape Province can be described as having the ideal setting for leisure tourism considering its rich endowment with natural, cultural and heritage resources (Mxunyelwa & Lloyd, 2019). With multiple beaches spread along its 800 kilometre Indian Ocean coastline, numerous game reserves and a strong indigenous cultural appeal, the province has a diverse tourism product offering (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2014). However, this leisure tourism potential has not been fully harnessed to improve the livelihoods of people in the province as evident in the high poverty rate of 67.3% (Stats SA, 2019) in the province. The motivation for the current study is therefore, to explore the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa. The paper is



structured as follows: literature review on leisure tourism, livelihoods and sustainability, materials and methods, discussions, conclusions and recommendations.

The concept of sustainable livelihoods has its roots in studies associated with rural development, even though it has been extended to a wide range of fields (Tao & Wall, 2009; Mbaiwa, 2011; Snider, 2012; Wu & Pearce 2013; Su et al., 2019). Sustainable livelihoods focuses on the potential, assets and activities that enable individuals to make a living (Wu & Pearce, 2013, Morgan, Pritchard & Sedgley, 2015; Lasso & Dahles, 2018). Households form the nucleus of the sustainable livelihoods concept as the wellbeing and sustenance of individuals aggregates to the community level (Su et al., 2016). One of the early definitions of livelihoods was given by Chambers and Conway (1992) who assert that a livelihood is considered sustainable when it can withstand and revive from challenges or shocks, acquire and improve capabilities and assets, and provide livelihood opportunities for future generations. Su et al. (2016) assert that a major indicator of livelihood sustainability is livelihood diversity. Mbaiwa and Stronza (2011) elucidate on the diversity component of sustainable livelihoods by suggesting that diversity of available options is key, while Kheiri and Nasihatkon (2016) emphasis on the spread of income obtained from multiple sources as an important consideration. Further impetus has been placed on the aspect of livelihood freedom or the opportunity to choose from diverse activities, harness resources and consolidate strategies for livelihood sustenance (Su et al., 2019).

Leisure tourism and livelihoods

The role of leisure tourism in promoting social change and economic development has been widely acknowledged in research (Wu & Pearce, 2013; Gao & Wu, 2017; Su et al., 2019; Randle, Zhang & Dolnicar, 2019). Leisure tourism has been credited with providing individuals with the opportunity to socialise with people from diverse socio-economic backgrounds such as education levels, income groups, cultural identities and so on (Minnaert, Maitland & Miller, 2009; McCabe & Johnson, 2013). Pyke, Pyke and Watuwa, (2020) suggest that participation in leisure tourism leads to improvements in physical and mental health, increases immunity against diseases and reduces the risk of cardiovascular diseases. Further health benefits of leisure tourism were advanced by Seeman, Berkman, Blazer and Rowe, (1994) who purported that leisure tourism reduces stress levels and increases the quality and longevity of life. Cornman, Goldman, Gleib, Weinstein and Chang, (2003) reported on the psychological benefits derived from leisure tourism by affirming that it boosts self-esteem.

From a more general perspective, Higgins-Desbiolles (2006) asserts that leisure tourism is a great social force as through it people become more conscious of humanity, gain new knowledge, improve sensitivity to other cultures and appreciate life better. Hemingway and Jack (2013) further highlight that the social bonds formed through leisure tourism are important contributors to well-being and livelihood. Moreover, leisure tourism reduces social isolation, provides social support and enhances a healthy environment for family relations and friendships to flourish (Nawijn & Veenhoven, 2011; Pyke et al., 2020). Research has established that leisure tourism is particularly helpful on the well-being, life satisfaction and livelihood of older people (Hunter-Jones & Blackburn, 2007; Dolnicar, Yanamandram & Cliff, 2012; Hagger & Murray, 2013). Victor, Scambler and Bond (2009) refer to the emotional and psychological benefits of creating and sharing memories which refresh and revitalise the mental health of older people.

In addition, empirical evidence illustrates that leisure tourism has been instrumental in enhancing opportunities for economic growth and diversification, especially in the local economy (Nyikana & Tichaawa, 2018; Tao & Wall, 2009; Wall & Xu, 2016; Goa & Wu, 2017). Lasso and Dahles (2018) affirm the significant contribution of leisure tourism to poverty



alleviation through support for small businesses, income generation and job creation. Studies by Higgins-Desbiolles (2013) and Porter, Orams and Lück, (2015), found that increase in tourists' arrivals led to reduced pressure on natural resources as more community members increasingly focused on producing souvenirs and other goods for tourists' consumption rather than trying to sustain their livelihood through hunting and other environmentally destructive means. The interest and admiration shown by leisure tourists on cultural practices and rituals has often resulted in pride among community members in the local culture and a renewed appetite for cultural preservation (Su, Wall & Jin, 2016).

Nonetheless, Tao and Wall, (2009) and Sirima and Backman, (2013) have drawn attention to the potential negative impacts of tourism development, especially with regards to the disruption of economic systems, socio-political processes and cultural norms. Lasso and Dahles (2018) also caution against the over-dependence on tourism by communities as fluctuations in tourists' arrivals could have devastating impacts on livelihoods. On the other hand, a rise in tourists' numbers that breaches local carrying capacity can lead to antagonism and social tensions between locals and visitors (Tao & Wall, 2009; Wall & Xu, 2016; Goa & Wu, 2017).

Conceptual framework for sustainable livelihoods in a tourism context

Research on sustainable livelihoods has proposed a variety of frameworks to guide communities and stakeholders towards the attainment of this laudable goal (Tung & Ritchie, 2011; Zehrer, 2009; Nthiga, Duim, Visseren-Hamakers & Lamers, 2015; Pearce & Zare, 2017; Jinhai, Zhang, Li, Zeng, Sun, Zhou & Zhang, 2018). The sustainable livelihood framework was initiated by the Department for International Development (DFID) in the United Kingdom as an instrument for analysing community livelihoods (Tao & Wall, 2009). The composite nature of the tourism product and the subjective nature of tourism experiences poses considerable challenges in finding consensus on the ideal attributes of a sustainable livelihood framework that can be applicable in a leisure tourism context (Fesenmaier & Xiang, 2017). Uysal, Berbekova and Kim (2020) advance the view that to be holistic, a sustainable livelihood framework should contain both objective and subjective indicators, but equally consider supply and demand-side components. Harilal and Tichaawa (2018) unpack the concept of sustainable livelihoods further by identifying five components of human capital, natural capital, social capital, physical capital and financial capital as constituting the pillars of a sustainable livelihood framework. Similarly, Jinhai et al. (2018) affirm the five components of the sustainable livelihood framework but posit that psychological assets such as self-confidence and policy assets such as tourism development support guidelines should enhance the sustainable livelihood framework, particularly in a tourism context. Further research has highlighted the holistic and interdependent nature of sustainable livelihood assets (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012; Nthiga, Duim, Visseren-Hamakers & Lamers, 2015). This entails that a sustainable livelihood framework should comprise a comprehensive set of indicators and illustrate how available local leisure tourism resources at the destination could impact on wellbeing (Pullman & Gross, 2004; Kim, Uysal & Sirgy, 2013).

Alonso and Nyanjom (2016) situate tourism within the transformative component of the four stage framework of the livelihood production process. The framework is grounded within the macro-economic environment, supported by political stability, terms of trade, climate, among other factors (Kheiri & Nasihatkon, 2016) which serve as the enabler of leisure tourism development. Community assets which are a key component of sustainable livelihoods constitute the second pillar of the framework. These community assets are packaged (transformed) into tourism products and marketed to tourists to sustain livelihoods within communities (Muresanetal., 2016; Sanches-Pereira et al., 2017).



Leisure tourism studies have proposed indicators to measure the sustainability of tourism activities within communities (Assaf & Josiassen, 2012; Assaf & Dwyer, 2013; Assaf, & Josiassen, 2016;). Although there is generally accent on economic benefits such as job creation, revenue generation and investment opportunities, the World Tourism Organisation (2004) and the Institute for Sustainable Futures (2011) have emphasised a more holistic approach with balanced perspective on the sustainability triple bottom-line comprising of socio-cultural elements, economic aspects and environmental elements.

From the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) to Quadruple Bottom Line (QBL) of sustainability

The concept of sustainability has been extensively discussed in both academic and business circles, with wide-ranging implications on planning, implementation and development (Pyke et al., 2020; Collin & Collin, 2010; Coyle, 2011; Cohen, 2011). From a livelihood perspective, the application of sustainability principles can be defined as the commitment to and implementation of accountable governance principles in order to achieve economic viability and growth, consistent social justice and respect of ecological processes (Doppelt, 2010; Slavin, 2011; Tumlin, 2012; Portney, 2013). This explains why scholars such as Tumlin (2012) and Akinsete and Nelson (2017) have described sustainability as the pursuit of the competing triple bottom line objectives of satisfying people, planet, and profit, or balancing equity, ecology, and economy.

However, Savitz and Weber (2013) posit that while the initial triple bottom line imperative was focused on challenging corporates in the private sector to implement strategies that balance economic prosperity with ecological sustainability and social justice, that imperative has extended to public sector organisations that are positioned to develop policies and design innovative ways to avoid the depletion of global resources beyond recovery. Hence, a new strand of sustainability literature has emerged advocating for a paradigm shift from the triple bottom line to the quadruple bottom line, with governance as the fourth tier of sustainability (Elkington, 2006; Loorbach, 2007; Aras & Crowther, 2008; Zahringer, 2014). Reid (2012) and Zahringer (2014) argue that the vision and foresight required to make governance decisions that embrace a holistic present while being mindful of multi-generational impacts is just as important as the other three aspects of sustainability. Alibašić (2017) defines governance as the ability to engage relevant stakeholders and initiate positive transformation in a transparent and accountable manner that results in profitable business operations, social equity and environmental protection.

The current study is grounded on the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) of sustainable livelihoods as expounded in previous studies (Uysal & Sirgy, 2019; Su et al., 2019; Vogt et al., 2020), from which applicable indicators covering economic, socio-cultural and environmental aspects have been derived to examine the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods in the Eastern Cape. The study contributes to the body of knowledge on leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods by analysing perceptions from the Eastern Cape Province.

Eastern Cape Provincial context

The Eastern Cape Province is estimated to have a population of 6, 734, 001, constituting 11.3% of the population of South Africa in 2020 (Statistics South Africa, 2020). The province is currently the fourth most populous in the country after Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal and the Western Cape provinces. Statistics South Africa (2019) describes the Eastern Cape as the poorest in economic performance with the lowest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita of R81, 875 in 2017. The province is largely rural with subsistence agriculture as the economic lifeline of most families (ECSECC, 2019). The Eastern Cape vision 2030 Provincial Development Plan (PDP) also acknowledges the main obstacles to development in the province



such as high unemployment, poor standard of education, poor infrastructure, poor spatial planning, over-dependence on the motor vehicle manufacturing industry, widespread disease burden, uneven and poor public services, and corruption (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2014). On the other hand, the province has an economically strategic location with the over 800 kilometre coastline on the shores of the Indian Ocean, rich bio-diversity and mineral and energy resources (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2014). Paradoxically, the socio-economic situation of the people in the Eastern Cape province can be described as dire with a high percentage of people living below the upper-bound of poverty line (UBPL) of 67.3% (Stats SA, 2019), high unemployment rate of 35.6% (ECSECC, 2019) and a high disease burden (Province of the Eastern Cape, 2014). This highlights the urgent need for action to improve the livelihood situation of people in the Eastern Cape Province and the opportunity presented by the potential for leisure tourism, especially along the coastline in the province.

Materials and methods

This study employed a quantitative research approach in order to attain its objective of exploring the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods in the Eastern Cape. The choice of this research approach was informed by the motivation to get the views of as many leisure participants as possible during the data collection period between the 10 of September and the 30 of November 2019. The development of the research instrument, data collection procedure and data analysis are detailed below.

The development of a questionnaire followed an extensive review of literature on leisure tourism, livelihoods and sustainability. This culminated in the retention of 18 domains of sustainable livelihood measurement covering economic, environmental, social and cultural dimensions of sustainability. A preliminary questionnaire was compiled and pilot tested to ensure that all questions were devoid of ambiguity, clear, direct to the point and easy to understand. Participants in the pilot stage consisted of four researchers from the department of tourism management, two lecturers from the department of Hospitality management, and four research students studying for the Advanced Diploma course in Tourism Management. Feedback from the pre-testing of the questionnaire led to further re-structuring and language editing. A section on demographic characteristics was added to the questionnaire in order to contextualise the responses collected during the field study.

Prior to engaging in the data collection exercise, five field workers from the Advance Diploma in Tourism Management research group were trained on maintaining ethical conduct during data collection. Data collection for the study took place during the months of September and October 2019, mainly around the beaches in the Eastern Cape Province. Respondents were randomly approached as they were walking or sitting by the waterfront and asked if they would be willing to participate in the study. Those who consented to be part of the study were handed a questionnaire with a pen to self-complete. Apart from a few respondents who needed a brief explanation to understand the context of the study, most participants expressed difficulties in completing the questionnaire. Of the 388 completed and returned questionnaires, 19 were discarded due to various violations such as incompleteness or multiple answers while 369 were retained for analysis.

In preparation for the data analysis, all completed questionnaires (n = 369) were captured and cleaned on a Microsoft® Excel® spreadsheet and analysed using the IBM SPSS, version 25. The data analysis involved descriptive analysis to establish frequencies and mean values, an exploratory factor analysis to reduce the large data set to manageable sizes and explore the underlying patterns (Creswell & Clark, 2011), and analysis of variance to ascertain the statistical significance of various demographic characteristics on the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods.



Results

The results of this study are presented in three sections; starting with an overview of the demographic profile of the respondents, followed by results of the exploratory factor analysis and lastly the analysis of variance. Most of the respondents in this study were males (52%), between the ages of 21 and 30 years old (47%) and 31-40 years (29%). The place of origin of most of the respondents was the Eastern Cape Province (64%), followed by the KwaZulu-Natal province (13%) and the Western Cape province (10%). Most of the respondents could be described as regular visitors (84%) to the Eastern Cape beaches as they had between 3 and 5 previous visits, while relatively few were first-time visitors (9%).

Factor analysis of the respondents' perceptions of tourism and sustainable livelihoods

A factor analysis was conducted in order to gain insight into the underlying patterns explaining the respondents' perceptions of the impacts of coastal tourism on sustainable livelihoods. Prior to engaging in the factor analysis, the suitability of the dataset for data reduction was assessed using IBM's Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 25. The results revealed an acceptable Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) of .82, high above the minimum recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1974) and produced a statistically significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity result of .000, below the maximum accepted value of .05 (Bartlett, 1954), hence validating the factorability of the data set.

The 18 items relating to the positive and negative impacts of tourism on sustainable livelihoods were subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) using the Oblimin rotation with Kaiser Normalization method. The results presented in table 1 below reveal that the 18 items indicating various tourism impacts loaded on four key factors, explaining 61% of the total variance of the items. These four factors were labelled according to the similarities of their impacts as: economic impacts (factor 1), negative social impacts (factor 2), positive socio-cultural impacts (factor 3) and environmental impacts (factor 4).

An analysis of mean values was done to understand the relative importance of key tourism impacts on sustainable livelihoods as perceived by the respondents. It is evident from the mean values displayed on the last column of the factor analysis (table 1) that the respondents attribute the most importance to economic impacts of tourism (3.98), closely followed by positive socio-cultural impacts (3.95), environmental impacts (3.76) and negative social impacts (3.53).

Table 1: Factor analysis for tourism impacts

Factor label	Components			
	Factor 1 Economic impacts	Factor 2 Negative Social impacts	Factor 3 Positive socio-cultural impacts	Factor 4 Environmental impacts
More tourists visiting Eastern Cape beaches will result in ...				
Less poverty	.806			
More Income	.801			
More investment	.756			
Increase in the value of property	.744			
Growth in Small businesses	.741			
Increase in government revenue	.547			
More Jobs	.365			
More diseases		.867		
More crime		.833		
More prostitution		.807		
Greater peace			.787	
More cultural awareness			.741	
More entertainment facilities			.604	
Greater cultural pride			.557	



Improved transport facilities			.503	
More pollution				.750
More littering				.640
Greater protection of plants				.405
Cronbach's alpha	.825	.742	.746	.580
Mean	3.98	3.53	3.95	3.76

The results of the Component Correlation Matrix (table 2) further validate the independence of each of the four factors as, apart from the moderate correlation (.326) between factor 1 and 3, there is generally weak correlation among the factors of < 3 (Akoglu, 2018).

Table 2: Component Correlation Matrix for tourism impact factors

Components	1	2	3	4
1	1.000	.139	.326	.069
2	.139	1.000	.117	.199
3	.326	.117	1.000	.113
4	.069	.199	.113	1.000

Results of the analysis of variance

Following a determination of the major factors from tourism participation and the perceived propensity to influence sustainable livelihoods, it was considered insightful to explore the data further for any statistically significant differences between the mean values of key independent variables such as gender and age groups, and various tourism impacts (dependent variables). To this end, the gender variable was subjected to an independent-samples T-test while age groups were tested through a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Results of the independent-samples T-test and effect sizes

The analysis from the independent samples T-tests compared the mean values of females (n=177) and males (n=192) based on the four key factors extracted from the factor analysis (economic impacts, negative social impacts, positive socio-cultural impacts and environmental impacts). The aim of the analysis was to elucidate any differences between females and males with regards to specific constructs within the factors and among the four factors. The results are presented in tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 below.

Table 3: Results of the independent samples T-test economic impacts

Gender	Female (n=177)		Male (n=192)		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect sizes
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev.			
As a result of more tourists visiting Eastern Cape beaches, there has been ...							
More jobs	4.05	1.152	4.10	1.140	.476	.634	0.0006
More income	3.96	1.140	4.01	1.109	.382	.703	0.004
Growth in small businesses	4.18	.946	4.14	.990	.342	.733	0.002
Less poverty	3.89	1.136	3.97	1.023	.677	.499	0.0006
More investment	4.03	1.038	4.06	.963	.274	.784	0.002
Increase in the value of property	3.81	1.115	3.94	1.037	1.106	.269	0.0002
Increase government revenue	3.72	1.161	3.87	1.125	1.231	.219	0.0001
Total	3.95	1.098	4.01	1.055	0.641	0.6	0.001

Results from the independent samples T-test comparing the mean values of females and males with regards to economic impacts of tourism on sustainable livelihoods indicate that male respondents have a generally more positive inclination (4.01) than females (3.95). Further scrutiny reveal, however, that female respondents perceive more positive economic impacts of tourism with regards to growth in small businesses (4.18) than their male counterparts (4.14).



However, as the overall sig. (2-tailed) value is 0.6, above the 0.05 cut-off limit (Pallant, 2013), there is no statistically significant difference based on gender. Similarly, the results of the effect sizes calculated as Eta squared =

$$\frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)}$$

reveals a small effect of 0.001 (Cohen, 1988).

Table 4: Results of the independent samples T-test and negative social impacts

Gender As a result of more tourists visiting Eastern Cape beaches, there has been ...	Female (n=177)		Male (n=192)		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect sizes
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev.			
More diseases	3.39	1.361	3.48	1.306	.643	.52	0.0007
More crime	3.56	1.364	3.73	1.257	1.245	.21	0.0001
More prostitution	3.36	1.424	3.63	1.371	1.810	.071	0.0001
Total	3.44	1.383	3.61	1.311	1.233	.3	0.0003

With regards to the potential negative social impacts of tourism on sustainable livelihoods, results of the independent samples T-test (table 4) reveal that female respondents perceive the negative impacts to be less grave (3.44) than males (3.61). As with the economic impacts, there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of females and males as evident in the sig, (2-tailed) value of .3 (Pallant, 2013). The effect size is minimal as it is less than 0.01 (Cohen, 1988).

Table 5: Results of the independent samples T-test and socio-cultural impacts

Gender As a result of more tourists visiting Eastern Cape beaches, there has been ...	Female (n=177)		Male (n=192)		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect sizes
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev.			
More peace in the community	3.80	1.072	4.05	.879	2.457	.015	0.00001
More pride in culture	3.93	1.126	4.02	1.076	.728	.467	0.0006
More cultural awareness	3.95	1.067	3.95	.956	.038	.970	0.003
More entertainment facilities	3.98	1.131	4.11	1.015	1.131	.259	0.0002
Better transport facilities	3.59	1.125	4.04	1.002	4.081	.000	0.0
Total	3.85	1.104	4.03	.99	1.69	0.3	0.0008

The independent samples T-test results from the socio-cultural impacts of tourism on sustainable livelihoods (table 5) indicate no statistically significant differences between the perceptions of females (3.85) and males (4.03) and the magnitude of the differences in the mean scores is quite small (0.0008).

Table 6: Results of the independent samples T-test and environmental impacts

Gender As a result of more tourists visiting Eastern Cape beaches, there has been ...	Female (n=177)		Male (n=192)		t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Effect sizes
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev.			
More pollution	3.68	1.267	3.97	1.137	2.354	.019	0.000001
More littering	3.60	1.280	3.96	1.025	3.004	.003	0.0000002
More plant protection	3.66	1.301	3.66	1.239	.046	.96	0.003
Total	3.65	1.283	3.86	1.13	1.8	0.3	0.001

The final independent samples T-test examined for possible significant differences in the mean scores of females and males with regards to negative and positive environmental impacts. Similarly, the results reveal no statistically significant differences in the mean values



of females and males. The effect size score of 0.001 confirms that the magnitude of the differences is quite small.

Results of the analysis of variance between age groups and perceived tourism impacts

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also performed to establish if there were any statistically significant differences in relation to age groups and perceived impacts of tourism on sustainable livelihoods. Following the age brackets featured in the questionnaire, six age groups were defined as: 20 years or less (group 1), 21 – 30 years (group 2), 31 – 40 years (group 3), 41 – 50 years (group 4), 51 - 60 years (group 5) and above 60 years (group 6). The six age groups were tested for statistically significant differences by means of ANOVA.

Table 7: Results of the analysis of variance based on age groups

Age group (in years)	≤R20 (n=30)		21 – 30 (n=173)		31 – 40 (n=107)		41 – 50 (n=28)		51-60 (n=23)		60+ (n=8)		P Value	Effect size
	Mean	Std dev.	Mean	Std dev.	Mean	Std dev.	Mean	Std Dev.	M	Std dev.	Mean	Std dev.		
Economic impacts	3.66	1.18	3.85	1.12	4.12	0.95	4.25	0.86	4.49	0.78	3.77	1.15	0.07	0.05
Negative social impacts	3.73	1.32	3.56	1.32	3.41	1.45	3.75	1.14	3.20	1.34	3.88	1.22	0.3	0.02
Socio-cultural impacts	4.00	.925	3.80	1.11	4.11	0.99	4.03	0.91	4.09	.804	3.90	1.00	0.2	0.03
Environmental impacts	3.65	1.26	3.75	1.15	3.77	1.32	4.02	1.02	3.75	1.09	3.38	1.51	0.4	0.02
Total	3.76	1.17	3.74	1.57	3.85	1.18	4.01	0.98	3.88	1.00	3.73	1.22	0.2	0.03

Results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) between age groups revealed no statistical significance at the $p < 0.05$, as the p value was found to be 0.2. The effect size calculated using eta squared, was 0.03, and therefore considered to have a small effect.

Discussion

This study focused on the livelihood situation in the Eastern Cape to analyse the perceived impacts of leisure tourism on livelihoods sustainability in the province. It was established through a review of literature that although the overarching motivation for leisure tourism is to have positive impacts on livelihoods, negative impacts are unavoidable. This therefore necessitates that actions be taken to maximise positive impacts and minimise negative effects, both in the short and long term. The results from this study reveal the following points of interest with regards to perceptions of the participants on the relationship between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods in the Eastern Cape Province.

It is evident from the results of the factor analysis that participants in this study identify four dimensions of impacts of leisure tourism on sustainable livelihoods, labelled according to similarity of influence as economic impacts, negative social impacts, socio-cultural impacts and environmental impacts. It is interesting that economic impacts are prioritised with a mean value of 3.98 above other impacts. This finding is in line with previous studies (Kheiri & Nasihatkon, 2016; Lasso & Dahles, 2018; Su et al., 2019; Pyke et al., 2020) which found that economic impacts were considered more important by most stakeholders.

Besides highlighting the economic impacts, this study equally indicates that socio-cultural impacts of leisure tourism on sustainable livelihoods are rated more highly (3.95) than environmental impacts (3.76). Similar findings were reached by Tao & Wall, (2009); Uysal & Sirgy (2019) and Vogt et al., (2020) while other studies (Slavin, 2011; Tumlin, 2012; Portney, 2013; Akinsete and Nelson (2017) found that environmental impacts had greater preference among respondents.



Despite the generally positive perceptions on the economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts of leisure tourism on sustainable livelihoods in this study, it is also evident that the respondents consider the social costs of leisure tourism to be high (3.53). This is surprising because a number of studies have found the relationship between positive and negative impacts of tourism to be wide, with perceptions of negative impacts significantly lower (Kheiri & Nasihatkon, 2016; Su et al., 2019; Uysal & Sirgy, 2019; Vogt et al., 2020).

The findings of this study also illustrate that there are no statistically significant differences between females and males with regards to the perceived economic impacts (p (2-tailed) = 0.6), negative social impacts (p (2-tailed) = 0.3), socio-cultural impacts (p (2-tailed) = 0.3) and environmental impacts (p (2-tailed) = 0.3) on sustainable livelihoods. Results of the effect sizes proved quite small as there were all below 0.2 (Cohen, 1988).

Similarly, results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) between various age groups reveal no statistically significant differences at the $p=0.2$ in relation to perceptions on various impacts of leisure tourism (economic, negative social, socio-cultural, and environment) on sustainable livelihoods. Once more, the influence of the effect sizes was found to be small (0.03).

Conclusions and recommendations

The findings from this study suggest a number of implications for leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods. Firstly, the element of freedom has emerged as pivotal and indispensable to both leisure tourism and sustainable livelihoods. Leisure tourism takes place when people have time available to them after meeting all other obligations while sustainable livelihoods entails that individuals exercise the freedom to choose from multiple opportunities, assets and livelihood options. Secondly, the implication of freedom stated above also implies that the notion of sustainable livelihoods should not be perceived as static. While the dimensions of the triple bottom line provide a consistent baseline for sustainability, the rising consciousness of communities could enable them identify additional components that would further enshrine sustainable livelihood within their community. The addition of the governance component (Loorbach, 2007; Aras & Crowther, 2008; Reid, 2012; Savitz & Weber, 2013; Zahringer, 2014) of sustainability illustrates the point.

In addition, the positive co-relation between leisure tourism and sustainable livelihood implies that both are mutually beneficial and should be actively pursued. Moreover, the high perception of negative social consequences of leisure tourism is concerning. Further research is therefore encouraged to find ways of alleviating such perceptions and proposing ways of dealing with the potential negative impacts of leisure tourism.

The significance of this study lies in the illustration of the potential for leisure tourism to contribute to the improvement of sustainable livelihoods in the Eastern Cape Province. This study highlights the urgency in implementing policies that would ensure that the largely untapped leisure tourism resources in the province can be used to improve sustainable livelihoods in communities. Finally, the theoretical contribution of this study emanates from the increasing consciousness among community members of the social thresholds of using leisure tourism as an instrument of sustainable livelihoods. This adds to existing literature by indicating that the pursuit of leisure tourism as a means of improving sustainable livelihoods should only be done within certain limits.

References

- Akinsete, E. & Nelson, M., A. (2017). Deconstructing sustainable development. *The International Journal of Sustainability in Economic, Social, and Cultural Context*, 13(1), 53–71.



- Akoglu, H. (2018). User's guide to correlation coefficients. *Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 18(3), 91-93.
- Ali, F., Ryu, K. & Hussain, K. (2016). Influence of experiences on memories, satisfaction and behavioral intentions: A study of creative tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33(1), 85–100.
- Alibašić, H. (2017). Measuring the sustainability impact in local governments using the quadruple bottom line. *The International Journal of Sustainability Policy and Practice*, 13(3), 37-45.
- Amato, M. P., Lundberg, N., Ward, P. J., Schaalje, B. G. & Zabriskie, R. (2016). The mediating effects of autonomy, competence, and relatedness during couple leisure on the relationship between total couple leisure satisfaction and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 48(5), 349–373.
- Aras, G. & Crowther, D. (2008). Governance and sustainability: An investigation into the relationship between corporate governance and corporate sustainability. *Management Decision*, 46 (3), 433–48.
- Assaf, A. G. & Josiassen, A. (2016). Frontier analysis: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(5), 612–627.
- Assaf, A. G. & Dwyer, L. (2013). Benchmarking international tourism destinations. *Tourism Economics*, 19(6), 1233–1247.
- Assaf, A. G. & Josiassen, A. (2012). Identifying and ranking the determinants of tourism performance: A global investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 388–399.
- Chambers, R. & Conway, G. (1992). *Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century*. Brighton: IDSIDS Discussion Paper 296.
- Cohen, J.W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. United States, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Cohen, S. (2011). *Sustainability management: Lessons from and for New York City, America, and the Planet*. Columbia University Press. USA. New York.
- Collin, R. M. (2010). *Encyclopedia of sustainability*. Volume 1., Greenwood Press. California: Santa Barbara.
- Cornman, J. C., Goldman, N., Gleib, D. A., Weinstein, M. & Chang, M. C. (2003). Social ties and perceived support: Two dimensions of social relationships and health among the elderly in Taiwan. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 15(4), 616–644.
- Coyle, S. J. (2011). *The built environments and its supporting systems*. In Sustainable and Resilient Communities: A Comprehensive Action Plan for Towns, Cities, and Regions, S. J. Coyle (Ed.) John Wiley & Sons, Inc. USA. NJ. Hoboken.
- de Bloom, J., Kinnunen, U. & Korpela, K. (2014). Exposure to nature versus relaxation during lunch breaks and recovery from work: development and design of an intervention study to improve workers' health, well-being, work performance and creativity. *BMC Public Health*, 14(3), 488-496.
- Dolnicar, S., Yanamandram, V. & Cliff, K. (2012). The contribution of vacations to quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 59–83.
- Doppelt, B. (2010). *Leading change toward sustainability: A change-management guide for business, government and civil society*. (2nd. ed.) Greenleaf Publishing Limited. UK, Sheffield.
- Elkington, J. (2006). Governance for sustainability. *An International Review*, 14 (6), 522–29.
- Eastern Cape Socio-Economic Consultative Council (ECSECC). (2019). *Eastern Cape labour market overview*. Available at https://www.ecsecc.org/documentrepository/informationcentre/ecsecc-labour-report-210619_73742.pdf. [Retrieved 11 June 2020].



- Fabinyi, M., Knudsen, M. & Segi, S. (2010). Social complexity, ethnography and coastal resource management in the Philippines. *Coastal Management*, 38(6), 617–632.
- Fesenmaier, D. R. & Xiang, Z. (2017). *Introduction to tourism design and design science in tourism*. In D. R. Fesenmaier, & Z. Xiang (Eds.). *Design science in tourism: Foundations of destination management* (pp. 3–16). Springer. Switzerland.
- Gao, J. & Wu, B. (2017). Revitalizing traditional villages through rural tourism: A case study of Yuanjia Village, Shaanxi Province, China. *Tourism Management*, 63(2), 223-233.
- Godovykh, M. & Ridderstaat, J. (2020). Health outcomes of tourism development: A longitudinal study of the impact of tourism arrivals on residents' health. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 17(1), 132-144.
- Hagger, C. & Murray, D. (2013). *Anticipating a flourishing future with tourism experiences*. In S. Filep & P. Pearce (Eds.), *Tourist experiences and fulfilment: Insights from positive psychology* (pp. 186–202). Routledge. UK: Abingdon.
- Harilal, V. & Tichaawa, T.M. (2018). Ecotourism and alternative livelihood strategies in Cameroon's protected areas. *EuroEconomica*, 37(1), 133-148.
- Hemingway, A. & Jack, E. (2013). Reducing social isolation and promoting well-being in older people. *Quality in Ageing & Older Adults*, 14(1), 25–35.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2006). More than an “industry”: The forgotten power of tourism as a social force. *Tourism Management*, 7(6), 1192–1208.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2013). *Aboriginal hostels limited: A case through peace in tourism in Australia*. In L. Blanchard, & F. Higgins-Desbiolles (Eds.), *Peace through tourism: Promoting human security through international citizenship*. Routledge. USA: New York.
- Huang, Y., Cheng, J. & Chang, L.L. (2019). Understanding leisure trip experience and subjective well-being: An illustration of creative travel experience. *Applied Research Quality Life*, 15(2), 1161–1182.
- Hunter-Jones, P. & Blackburn, A. (2007). Understanding the relationship between holiday-taking and self-assessed health: An exploratory study of senior tourism. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31(1), 509–516.
- Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF).(2011). *Australian tourism sustainable performance indicators final report no 3: preparing the framework, report*. Prepared for the National Tourism Alliance, Sydney – Australia. Available at: https://sustain.pata.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Australian-Tourism-Sustainability-Performance-Indicators-Report-1_Presenting-the-Framework.pdf. [Retrieved 9 July 2020].
- Jinhai, M., Zhang, J., Li, L., Zeng, Z., Sun, J., Zhou, Q. & Zhang, Y. (2018). Study on livelihood assets-based spatial differentiation of the income of natural tourism communities. *Sustainability*, 10(353), 1-20.
- Kastenholz, E., Eusébio, C. & Figueiredo, E. (2015). Contributions of tourism to social inclusion of persons with disability. *Disability & Society*, 30(8), 1259-1281,
- Kheiri, J. & Nasihatkon, B. (2016). The effects of rural tourism on sustainable livelihoods (case study: Lavij rural, Iran). *Modern Applied Science*, 10(10), 10–22.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36(3), 527–540.
- Lasso, A. & Dahles, H. (2018). Are tourism livelihoods sustainable? Tourism development and economic transformation on Komodo Island, Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(5), 473–485.



- Levi, E., Dolev, T., Collins-Kreiner, N. & Zilcha-Mano, S. (2018). Tourism and depressive symptoms. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2018.04.001>.
- Lin, Y., Huang, W. Yang, C. & Chiang, M. (2014). Work–leisure conflict and its associations with well-being: The roles of social support, leisure participation and job burnout. *Tourism Management*, 45(5), 244–252.
- Loorbach, D. (2007). Governance for Sustainability. *Sustainability: Science, Practice & Policy*, 3(2): 1–4.
- Mbaiwa, J. E. (2011). Changes on traditional livelihood activities and lifestyles caused by tourism development in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Tourism Management*, 32(4), 1050–1060.
- Mbaiwa, J. E. & Stronza, A. L. (2010). The effects of tourism development on rural livelihoods in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(5), 35–656.
- McCabe, S. & Johnson, S. (2013). The happiness factor in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41(1), 42–65
- Minnaert, L. (2014). Social tourism participation: The role of tourism inexperience and uncertainty. *Tourism Management*. 40(3), 282-289.
- Minnaert, L., Maitland, R. & Miller, G. (2009). Tourism and social policy: The value of social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(2), 316–334.
- Morgan, N., Pritchard, A. & Sedgley, D. (2015). Social tourism and well-being in later life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52(1), 1–15.
- Muresan, I. C., Oroian, C. F., Harun, R., Arion, F. H., Porutiu, A. & Chiciudean, G. O. (2016). Local residents' attitude toward Sustainable rural tourism development. *Sustainability*, 8(1), 89-100.
- Mxunyelwa, S. & Lloyd, H. (2019). Management Capacity within Small to Medium Tourism Enterprises (SMTEs) in the Eastern Cape Province. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 8 (4), 1-12.
- Nawijn, J. & Veenhoven, R. (2011). *The effect of leisure activities on life satisfaction: The importance of holiday trips*. In I. Brdar (Ed.), *The human pursuit of well-being: a cultural approach* (pp. 39-53). Springer. Netherlands: Dordrecht.
- Nthiga, R., Duim, R., Visseren-Hamakers, I. & Lamers, M. (2015). Tourism-conservation enterprises for community livelihoods and biodiversity conservation in Kenya. *Development Southern Africa*, 32(3), 1 – 17.
- Nyikana, S. & Tichaawa, T.M. (2018). Sport tourism as a local economic development enhancer for emerging destinations. *EuroEconomica*, 1(37), 70-83.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual* (5th ed.). McGraw Hill. England: Berkshire.
- Pearce, P. L. & Zare, S. (2017). The orchestra model as the basis for teaching tourism experience design. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 30(4), 55–64.
- Porter, B. A., Orams, M. B. & Lück, M. (2015). Surf-riding tourism in coastal fishing communities: A comparative case study of two projects from the Philippines. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 116(5), 169-176.
- Portney, K. E. (2013). Taking sustainable cities seriously: economic development, the environment, and quality of life in American cities. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 6(3), 1-5.
- Province of the Eastern Cape. (2014). Eastern Cape Vision 2030 Provincial Development Plan. Available at: http://www.ecdc.co.za/media/1643/ec-vision-2030-plan_271014-2.pdf. [Retrieved 21 June 2020].



- Pyke, J., Pyke, S. & Watuwa, R. (2020). Social tourism and well-being in a first nation community. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77(2), 38–48.
- Randle, M., Zhang, Y. & Dolnicar, S. (2018). The changing importance of vacations: Proposing a theoretical explanation for the changing contribution of vacations to people’s quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 77(3). 1-18.
- Reid, R. H. (2012). Achieving organizational capacity for sustainable communities. *Public Administration Review*, 72 (6), 853–55.
- Sanches-Pereira, A., Onguglo, B., Pacine, H., Coelho, S. T., Galindo, M. F. G. & Muwanga, M. K. (2017). Fostering local sustainable development in Tanzania by enhancing linkages between tourism and small-scale agriculture. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 162(3),1567–1581.
- Savitz, A. W. & Weber, K. (2013). The triple bottom line: how today’s best-run companies are achieving economic, social, and environmental success-and how you can too. Revised and Updated Edition. USA: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seeman, T. E., Berkman, L. F., Blazer, D. & Rowe, J. W. (1994). Social ties and support and neuroendocrine function: The MacArthur studies of successful aging. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 16(2), 95–106.
- Sirima, A. & Backman, K. F. (2013). Communities' displacement from national park and tourism development in the Usangu Plains, Tanzania. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16(7–8), 719–735.
- Slavin, M. I. (2011). *The rise of the urban sustainability movement in America: creating the Green Metropolis*. In *The Rise of the Urban Sustainability Movement in America*, M. I. Slavin, (Ed.) 1–19. Island Press. USA. Washington, D.C.
- Snider, R. (2012). *Land tenure, ecotourism, and sustainable livelihoods: “Living on the edge” of the greater Maasai Mara, Kenya*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Waterloo.
- Snyman, S. (2018). *Impacts of tourism on host communities*. In P.N. Acha-Anyi, (Ed.), Introduction to tourism planning and development: igniting Africa’s tourism economy (pp. 319-342). Van Schaik, South Africa: Pretoria.
- Spenceley, A. & Meyer, D. (2012). Tourism and poverty reduction: Theory and practice in less economically developed countries. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20, 297-317.
- Statistics South Africa (Stats SA). (2019). *Four facts about our provincial economies*. Available at <http://www.statssa.gov.za/?p=12056>. [21 June 2020].
- Statistics South Africa. (2020). Mid-year population estimates 2020. Available at <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022020.pdf>. [10 August 2020].
- Su, M. M., Wall, G. & Jin, M. (2016). Island livelihoods: Tourism and fishing at long islands, Shandong Province, China. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 122(5), 20–29.
- Su, M. M., Wall, G., Wang, Y. & Jin, M. (2019). Livelihood sustainability in a rural tourism destination - Hetu Town, Anhui Province, China. *Tourism Management*, 71(1), 272–281.
- Sun, X., Xu, H., Köseoglu, M.A. & Okumus, F. (2020). How do lifestyle hospitality and tourism entrepreneurs manage their work-life balance? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 85(2), 204-222.
- Thomas, T. K. (2018). Inclusions and exclusions of social tourism. *Asia- Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 85-99
- Tao, T. & Wall, G. (2009). Tourism as a sustainable livelihood strategy. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 90–98.
- Tumlin, J. (2012). Sustainable transportation planning: Tools for creating vibrant, healthy, and resilient communities. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. USA: Hoboken, NJ.



- Tung, V. W. S. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2011). Exploring the essence of memorable tourism experiences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1367–1386.
- Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. J. (2019). Quality-of-life indicators as performance measures. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76(2), 291–300.
- Uysal, M., Berbekova, A. & Kim, L. H. (2020). Designing for quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 83(2), 231-243.
- Victor, C., Scambler, S. & Bond, J. (2009). *The social world of older people: Understanding loneliness and social isolation in later life*. Open University Press. UK: Berkshire.
- Vogt, K. L. & Andereck, K. P. (2020). Designing for quality of life and sustainability. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 83(2) 102-114.
- Wight, P. (2007). *Ecotourism, CSR, and the fourth dimension of sustainability. Critical issues in ecotourism: Understanding a complex tourism phenomenon*. In J. Higham (Ed.) *Critical Issues in Ecotourism: Understanding a complex tourism phenomenon*. (pp. 214-240). Elsevier Ltd. UK. Oxfordshire.
- World Tourism Organisation. (2004). *Guide on indicators*. Spain: Madrid.
- Wu, M. Y. & Pearce, P. L. (2013). Host tourism aspirations as a point of departure for the sustainable livelihoods approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(3), 440–460.
- Yachin, J. M. (2018). The ‘customer journey’: Learning from customers in tourism experience encounters. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 28(3), 201–210.
- Zahringer, L. (2014). The quadruple bottom line: Adding purpose to the mix. Available at <https://www.seechangemagazine.com/the-quadruple-bottom-line-adding-purpose-to-the-mix/>. [12 July 2020].
- Zehrer, A. (2009). Service experience and service design: Concepts and application in tourism SMEs. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 19(3), 332–349.
- Zhang, L. & Zhang, J. (2018). Impacts of leisure and tourism on the elderly’s quality of life in intimacy: a comparative study in Japan. *Sustainability*, 10(3), 248-261.