

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

This research used a mixed method (both qualitative and quantitative). A checklist and interview guide was developed to explore the existing management system at Lumbini. Information was collected by site observation and feedback from all related stakeholders. Questionnaires were developed and translated into local language to collect primary quantitative data from surrounding community (4 VDC).

The results from the research of “Sustainable Tourism Management at Lumbini heritage site in Nepal: A proposed Model” was presented by using various descriptions and tables. SPSS 14.0 for windows facilitated data analysis and presentation.

The result is divided into several specific sections concerning with the site observation, respondents socioeconomic characteristics, opinion and other significant results and discussion.

- 1) Site Observation of Lumbini Heritage Site with a Checklist
- 2) Present Condition of Lumbini Master Plan Implementation
- 3) Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
- 4) Opinion with Tourism Development and Management at Lumbini
- 5) General Information from Community People about Tourism and their Involvement
- 6) Statistical Analysis
- 7) Results of Interview with Various Tourism Stakeholders

#### **3.1 Site Observation of Lumbini Heritage Site with a Checklist**

The Lumbini heritage researcher observed Site with a checklist during fieldwork period. After the field study at Lumbini, it was found that Lumbini is lacking its sustainable management. There were many tasks to do in order to make it this heritage site a competitive destination. Infrastructure development, proper site management, tourism planning, decision-making issues, community participation and stakeholder's collaboration were the main issues for its sustainability. Table 3.1 shows its present condition of management.

**Table 3.1** Site Observation of Lumbini Heritage Site with a Checklist

S.N.	Issues	Have	Not Have	Explanation
<b>1.</b>	<b><i>Basic Planning Requirements:</i></b>			
a.	Boundary survey and description	✓		4.2 km. (33.5%) Completed.
b.	Land use plan:	✓		UNESCO preparing it now.
c.	Conservation site plan:		✓	
d.	A Utilities and service plan:		✓	
e.	A community Development Plan:		✓	
f.	A tourism plan:		✓	
<b>2.</b>	<b><i>Staffing</i></b>			
				Total Number of staff= 140
a.	Organization chart	✓		
b.	Permanent staff	✓		No. =125
c.	Part time staff		✓	
d.	Contract staff	✓		No. =15
<b>3.</b>	<b><i>Budgeting:</i></b>			
3.1	<b><i>Income sources</i></b>			
a.	Government Fund	✓		NRS. 80 million annually
b.	Policies and Visitor Related Income	✓		NRS. 5 Million
c.	Uses of Site Fees	✓		Office expense
d.	Local Taxes	✓		Land fees from monasteries.
3.2	<b><i>The expense budget:</i></b>			
a.	Regular Staff Cost	✓		NRS. 25 Millions
b.	Repair and Maintenance Works	✓		
c.	New Construction Works	✓		NRS. 5.5 Millions
<b>4.</b>	<b><i>Image and Marketing System</i></b>			
			✓	

Table 3.1 (Continued)

S.N.	Issues	Have	Not Have	Explanation
a.	Tools of Marketing	✓		Printed materials
<b>5.</b>	<b><i>Recording and Analyzing Visitor's Data:</i></b>			
a.	On- Site Data Collection:	✓		Only foreigners visitors data
b.	Collection Techniques:	✓		Registration
c.	Use of Collected Data:	✓		Different uses
<b>6.</b>	<b><i>Visitors and Local Population;</i></b>			
a.	Categories of Visitors	✓		Domestic and foreigners
b.	Visitor's Satisfaction Survey		✓	TRPAP did on 2006
c.	Accommodation of Special Visitors		✓	Monasteries accommodation
<b>7.</b>	<b><i>Illegal Site Exploitation:</i></b>			
<b>8.</b>	<b><i>Welcoming Visitors:</i></b>			
a.	<b>Do they have any provision's</b>		✓	
<b>9.</b>	<b><i>Visitors Amenities and Services</i></b> <i>(accommodation, travel, guiding)</i>	✓		4 English tour guides in the site employed by LDT.
<b>10.</b>	<b><i>Site Interpretation and Visitor Education:</i></b>		✓	
<b>11.</b>	<b><i>Printed information</i></b>	✓		
a.	Online Information's	✓		www.lumbinitrust.com
<b>12.</b>	<b><i>Signage</i></b> <i>(highway, around, emergency)</i>	✓		(Not sufficient)
<b>13.</b>	<b><i>Exhibits:</i></b> <i>(slides show, video)</i>		✓	
<b>14.</b>	<b><i>Guides</i></b> <i>(site employed, outsider)</i>	✓		4 English guides site employed.
<b>15.</b>	<b><i>Safety Precautions</i></b>		✓	Have an ambulance, security system.
<b>16.</b>	<b><i>Others:</i></b>			

### **3.2 Present Condition of Lumbini Master Plan Implementation**

#### **Lumbini Master Plan**

As the birthplace of Lord Buddha, the sacred area of Lumbini is one of the holiest places of one of the world's great religions and its remains contain important evidence about the nature of Buddhist pilgrimage centers from a very early period. In terms of the categories of cultural property set out in article 1 of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, Lumbini is a site. (Nomination document Lumbini Nepal, No. 666rev). It was inscribed in 1997 as a World's heritage property.

In order to protect and develop these values of Lumbini, it is necessary to take account various measures and perspectives in a wider context. Lumbini is being managed by the visionary development Master Plan prepared by Kenzo Tange in 1978. The administration of this site is being carried out by LDT under the act of "Lumbini Development Trust" in 1985.

There are three components of the Master Plan. The central 1x 3 mile strip is divided into three components and each of these has special significance as the Religious-Cultural- Tourism center (refer appendix D)

- Sacred Garden
- Monastic Enclave
- New Lumbini Village and Cultural centre.

#### **A. Legal and Administrative Management**

Government of Nepal ratified the convention for the protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972). After inscribed Lumbini on the World Heritage List in 1997. It becomes responsibility for the state party to follow the Conventional and operational procedures. To conserve and preserve the property the legislation Ancient Monument preservation Act 1956- Fifth Amendment 1988 was applicable.

The principle legislation for the development of Lumbini is "Lumbini Development Trust Act 1985- amendment 2003 (Refer annex E). In 2002 LDT has prepared The Lumbini Monastic Zone By-Laws 2058 and many internal by-laws and regulations to conduction staffing, financing, administration site management and development work.

The development of Lumbini and its surrounding area has been formulated in the Master Plan, which was approved in 1978. The Master Plan is still the main basis for all developmental works, all works is being carried out within the main master plan area of 1 mile by 3 miles (Weise, 2006). The Master Plan, which initially proposed to be implemented by 1985, is still under implementation.

Various declarations, policy decisions and plans have been formulated in different interval till now. An action plan based on the World Buddhist Summit Declaration is being approved by the Cabinet as an action plan for the development of the Lumbini. Furthermore, Local self-governance Act 1999 as a basic administration in district and VDC level.

The principle authority for the administration of Lumbini is the LDT, was established in 1985, superseding the previously established Lumbini Development Committee (Refer appendices E& F).

### **B. Economic Management**

According to LDT Act, the objective of the LDT is to obtain funds and other forms of assistance from national and international sources to implement “the Plan”. The member states and international religious communities are carrying out various projects in the monastic zone. However, the financing of the LDT relies on government funds. The amount is on average approximately forty million rupees (Weise, 2006). This annual allocated amount based on a proposal submitted by the LDT of expected expense for the following year.

The LDT has other income sources. According to the monastic by-laws, the LDT should additionally be getting incomes from the monasteries and specifically through:

**Land charge:** Annual payments to the LDT by the lessee of each plot of the monastic zone.

**Service charge:** Payments made to the LDT for monitoring the construction works within the plots of the Monastic Zone.

### **C. Master Plan Implementation**

Although Lumbini development project was started 30 years ago, the delays in the implementation of the LMP have created more problems than originally visualized and much there remains to be done despite the significant achievement made. The tables above indicated that some of the major infrastructure works have not started due to lack of the adequate financial and technical resources giving rise to un-sequential development and implementing process. It was very difficult to evaluate about exact progress of LMP implementation. Only one third of works was completed according to Lumbini Master Plan till date (Dhungana, 2007).

It indicated the LMP should be implemented in a realistic manner, through prioritization or phasing of implementation of the works. LDT management should have strong leadership and a clear management structure to coordinates the works and allocates the resources, with on integrated models of community participation. The details of present status of Lumbini Master Plan implementation are presented on appendix J.

### **3.3 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

The demographic characteristics of respondents were analyzed individually into frequency and percentage. There was gender, age, marital status, religion, education level, occupation, and household's monthly income, their social role in the community and their tourism role. From the study, the demographic characteristics of respondents could be described as follows:

#### **Gender**

The majority of respondents were female that contributed 53.8% or 199 persons and the rest of 46.2% or 171 persons were male. This result was compatible with the general information of Lumbini area, female was encouraged to participate in the survey, however, in total population male population was more then female.

#### **Age group**

The majority of the respondents were in the range of 31-45 years old, 140 persons out of 370 (37.8%) in this age range. There were 35.1% persons from age group 15-30 old. Followed by age group 46-60 years 21.6% and respondents over 60 years were only 5.4%. The reason was that when the researcher administered the survey to the sampled households, the

adult family members who were literate in the family carried out the questionnaire. Neither too young nor too old age groups participated in the survey. When there were more than one adult in the family presented at the time of the survey, the family was free to choose the representative to answer the questionnaire. Therefore, the majority of respondents were in 31-45 years old age group; however sometimes they decided answer after discussing all family members.

#### **Marital status**

The majority of respondent was married group. They were 77% or 285 persons. It was obvious that about 73% of respondents were from age 15 to 45 years. Although 15-30 years old respondents age group were 35%, but there were 16.5% single respondents which has proved that in this society people get marriage too early. Remaining 6.5% respondents were widowed.

#### **Religion**

The majority of respondents were Muslim that contributed 53.2% or 197 persons and there were 42.4% Hindu respondents, followed by 3.2% of Buddhist and 1.1% Christian. It has shown that very few Buddhist religion group people live in the surrounding village of Lumbini. This is a Buddhist site protected and preserved by the majority of Muslim and Hindu (Refer table 3.8).

#### **Education Level**

The majority of respondents had non-education. They were illiterate, 179 persons (48.4%) respondents can not read and write. And 73 people (19.7%) had primary level education. Similarly, Secondary Level 20.8%, Intermediate level 7.3% and Bachelors level 3.8% respectively. There were not master's degree holder respondents.

#### **Occupation**

The majority of the respondent was in agricultural farming. There were 182 persons 49.2% of the total respondent population. The reason was the indication of a rural villager's traditional occupation. The students were 12.7% or 47 students. Likewise, 7.6% self business, 6.8% tour operator including tour guides, 5.4% driver including rickshaw puller, 4.9% labor/ worker, 4.1% government job, 2.7% others, 2.2% working in hotel, 2.2% were unemployed/ retired, 1.4% working in LDT and 1.1% owned their travel agency respectively.

### Monthly Household Income

The majority of respondent's household income was less than Nepalese Rupees (NRS) 3,000 per month, 255 persons or 68.9%. This was compatible with the majority of occupations that were agriculture-farming, students. The second largest range income was NRS 3,001-10,000, which earned by 21.1% respondent and 6.5%, earned NRS. 10,001 - 20,000 per month. Only, 13 persons or 3.5%, earned over NRS 20,000 and most of them were the self-business group including travel agents.

### Social Role (Within Community)

The majority of the respondents were the local people who were without social role. They didn't join any social group in the community. Those respondents were 310 or 83.8%. Only 60 or 16.2% responds they have social role. They were a member of any type of community formed by government, local government and National and International NGOs.

### Tourism Role (Within Community)

The majority of respondents were without any involvement and participation in tourism and tourism related activities. They were 340 persons or 91.9%. Only 8.1% responds were getting involved in the tourism or related activities. Most of the respondents were related to TRPAP program. It was launched in the surrounding 7 VDCs including this research area 4 VDCs (Table 3.2)

**Table 3.2** Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

S.N.	Personal Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
1.	<b>Gender</b>		
	a. Male	171	46.2%
	<b>b. Female</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>53.8%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 3.2** (Continued)

S.N.	Personal Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
2.	<b>Age group</b>		

	a. 15-30 Years	130	35.1%
	<b>b. 31-45 Years</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>37.8%</b>
	c. 46-60 Years	80	21.6%
	d. 60> Years	20	5.4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
3.	<b>Marital Status</b>		
	a. Single	61	16.5%
	<b>b. Married</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>77.0%</b>
	c. Widowed	24	6.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
4.	<b>Religion</b>		
	a. Hindu	157	42.4%
	b. Buddhist	12	3.2%
	<b>c. Muslim</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>53.2%</b>
	d. Christian	4	1.1%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
5.	<b>Educational Level</b>		
	<b>a. Non education</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>48.4%</b>
	b. Primary level	73	19.7%
	c. Secondary level	77	20.8%
	d. Intermediate Level	27	7.3%
	e. Bachelor's Level and more	14	3.8%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 3.2 (Continued)

S.N.	Personal Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage
6.	<b>Occupation</b>		
	a. Government job	15	4.1%
	b. Hotel	8	2.2%
	c. Student	47	12.7%
	d. Driver including rickshaw puller	20	5.4%
	<b>e. Farming</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>49.2%</b>
	f. Travel agency	4	1.1%
	g. Working at Lumbini	5	1.4%
	h. Tour operator	25	6.8%
	i. Self business	28	7.6%
	j. Labor/worker	18	4.9%
	k. Unemployed/retired	8	2.2%
	l. Other	10	2.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
7.	<b>Household Income Monthly (NRS.)</b>		
	<b>a. 3,000 &lt; Less</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>68.9%</b>
	b. 3,001 - 10,000	78	21.1%
	c. 10,001 - 20,000	24	6.5%
	d. 20,001 > More	13	3.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
8.	<b>Social Role</b>		
	a. Yes	60	16.2%
	<b>b. No</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>83.8%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>
9.	<b>Tourism Role</b>		
	a. Yes	30	8.1%
	<b>b. No</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>91.9%</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>100%</b>

### 3.4 Community Opinion with Tourism Development and Management at Lumbini

Analyzing opinions of communities with tourism development and management at Lumbini, the questionnaire was divided into twenty three questions issues which were mainly about socio-cultural benefits from tourism, Environmental benefits, economic benefits, adverse effects form tourism and participation level within the tourism activities. They were ranged into 5 levels from the strongly agree to strongly disagree as follows:

<b>Interval Level</b>	<b>Opinion Levels of respondents</b>
5	Strongly Agree
4	Agree
3	Fair
2	Disagree
1	Strongly Disagree

In addition, The SPSS software was used to analyze the level of local community thinking towards the sustainable tourism management. A Likert scale was used to assess the level of theirs opinion in all set of questionnaires, the meaning of each assessed level was ranged on interval level at 0.80. All assessment ranging scales was analyzed by the descriptive statistic including frequency, percent and mean.

The analysis of mean is based on the interval level that is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{The interval level} &= (\text{Maximum} - \text{Minimum})/n \\ &= (5-1)/5 \\ &= 0.80 \end{aligned}$$

Then, it was ranged the level of each assessment as follows:

<b>Assessed levels</b>	<b>Score of Answer</b>	<b>Meaning Determined with Scores</b>
5	4.21- 5.00	Strongly Agree / Strong Satisfaction
4	3.41-4.20	Agree
3	2.61-3.40	Neutral
2	1.81-2.60	Disagree/ Dissatisfaction

1                      1.00-1.80                      Strongly Disagree/ Strong Dissatisfaction

According to results of investigation from table 3.4 below, indicated that the respondents opinion with, “tourism is good for their community” was rated at “strongly agree level” (mean =4.56). However, “I personally benefited from the tourism”, was also rated at “neutral level” (mean =3.29).

The statements “tourism enhances opportunities to learn and exchange among the nations” have the mean score of “agree level” (mean=4.02). Similarly, “tourism enhances the community pride” was rated at “agree level” (mean = 4.12).

The respondent’s opinion with, “tourism preserves the cultural heritage” was rated “agree level” (mean = 4.07). Similarly, “tourism improves education, health and safety” was rated as “agree level” (mean = 3.88). And “tourism creates new jobs for the local people” was rated at “agree level” (mean = 3.98).

Likewise, “tourism provides business for the local people”, was rated at “agree level” (mean = 3.98). Similarly “tourism provides public facilities” was rated “agree level” (mean=4.02).

Likewise, “tourism grows local economy and helps to reduce the poverty” was rated at “agree level” (mean = 3.85). And “tourism promotes local environment” rated at “agree level” (mean=3.88). Similarly, “tourism preserves the attractions” was rated at “agree level” (mean = 3.87). The resident’s opinion with “tourism creates cleanliness of community” was rated “agree level” (mean = 3.87). “Tourism helps to preserve heritage properties” also rated “agree level” (mean = 3.77). Similarly, the main distribution of respondent’s opinion with “tourism raises the market price” rated at “agree level” (mean = 3.71).

However, “tourism harms moral and environment in the community” was indicated “neutral level” (mean = 2.84). The respondent’s opinion with “tourism raises crime” was rated “disagree level” (mean = 2.06). Similarly, “tourism stops local’s from site access” was rated “disagree level” (mean = 2.30).

The opinion from respondents with, “I participate in tourism planning” was rated at “disagree level” (mean = 2.05). Likewise, “I participated in tourism related decision-making and problem solving” was rated “disagree level” (mean=2.05). Similarly, rated “disagree level” with indicator, “I participate in tourism activities” (mean = 2.11). Interestingly, the community

people rated their “neutral level of agree” with the indicator, “I benefited from tourism from tourism participation” (mean = 2. 80). However, in overall they evaluated “agree level” with “tourism is good for them and their community (mean = 3. 88). For the detail refer table 3.3 as follows.

**Table 3.3** Community Opinion about Sustainable Tourism Management at Lumbini

S.N.	Key indicator	SA %	A %	N %	DA %	SDA %	Mean Value	S.D.
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>67.0</b>	25.4	5.9	0.5	1.1	<b>4.56</b>	<b>0.73</b>
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	<b>24.6</b>	23.8	23.5	12.4	15.7	<b>3.29</b>	<b>0.37</b>
3.	Learn/exchange cultures among the nations	<b>38.9</b>	31.4	23.5	5.7	0.5	<b>4.02</b>	<b>0.94</b>
4.	Enhances community pride	<b>43</b>	34.3	17.3	3.0	2.4	<b>4.12</b>	<b>0.96</b>
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage	38.6	<b>39.2</b>	16.2	2.7	3.2	<b>4.07</b>	<b>0.97</b>
6.	Improve education, health and security	33.8	<b>36.2</b>	17.8	8.9	3.2	<b>3.88</b>	<b>1.07</b>
7.	Creates new job for local residents	<b>38.6</b>	33.8	18.4	5.4	3.8	<b>3.98</b>	<b>1.07</b>
8.	Provides more business for local people	<b>38.9</b>	33.5	18.4	5.4	3.8	<b>3.98</b>	<b>1.06</b>
9.	Tourism improves public facilities	<b>37.8</b>	37.6	16.8	4.9	3.0	<b>4.02</b>	<b>1.00</b>
10.	Grows local economy, reduces poverty	<b>34.9</b>	30.8	23.8	5.9	4.6	<b>3.85</b>	<b>1.10</b>
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	31.9	<b>34.3</b>	25.7	6.2	1.9	<b>3.88</b>	<b>0.99</b>
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	<b>33.2</b>	31.4	20.4	4.1	3.0	<b>3.87</b>	<b>1.01</b>

**Table 3.3** (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	SA %	A %	N %	DA %	SDA %	Mean Value	S.D.
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	31.1	<b>35.9</b>	20.8	8.6	3.5	<b>3.81</b>	<b>1.07</b>
14.	Helps to preserve heritage properties	<b>31.1</b>	29.7	27.6	8.6	3.0	<b>3.77</b>	<b>1.07</b>
15.	Raises price for goods	<b>30.5</b>	30.0	25.4	8.6	5.4	<b>3.71</b>	<b>1.14</b>
16.	Harms moral standards and environment	13.2	<b>23.0</b>	<b>23.0</b>	16.8	24.1	<b>2.84</b>	<b>1.36</b>
17.	Causes rise in crime	1.9	11.1	18.9	28.1	<b>40.1</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>1.09</b>
18.	Stops locals from site access	10.3	10.5	14.3	29.5	<b>35.4</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>1.23</b>
19.	I participate in the tourism planning	8.1	5.4	13.8	29.2	<b>43.5</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>1.23</b>
20.	I participate in decision making/ problem solving	6.8	5.9	18.4	23.5	<b>45.4</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>1.21</b>
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	5.1	10.3	16.2	28.1	<b>40.3</b>	<b>2.11</b>	<b>1.19</b>
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	11.9	23.5	25.9	10.5	<b>28.1</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>1.38</b>
23.	In overall, good for community and myself	33.5	<b>38.6</b>	17.0	4.1	6.8	<b>3.88</b>	<b>1.12</b>

**Remarks:**

SA= Strongly agree, A= Agreed, N= Neutral, DA= Disagreed and SDA= Strongly disagree

S.D. = Standard deviation

### 3.5 General Information about Sustainable Tourism, Participation and Infrastructures

The results from general information about tourism development within the community, knowledge level of local people regarding tourism and tourism related infrastructure in the area are as follows:

The majority of respondents 322 (87%) said that they do not sell any kinds of tourism related goods and services in tourism. Only 48 respondents or (13%) were selling the products to tourism market. It showed the level of income generation status of the local community.

There were 305 respondents (82.4%) they were not getting any training related to tourism activities. Only 65 respondents (17.6%) get different trainings related to tourism career.

Likewise, the majority of respondents 335 (90.5%) they and their families members were not get involve in any tourism related trips and exhibitions. Only 35 respondents (9.5%) were involved in tourism trips and exhibitions.

261 respondents (70.5%) agreed that there were tourists in theirs community. And 37 (10%) responded that there were not any tourists in theirs community.

Likewise, the majority of respondents 136 (36.8%) they don't know about whether there are any new tourism destination places except Lumbini. But 131 respondents replied that there were not any new places. 103 respondents or (27.8%) said that there are new places to which can convert as tourism products.

The majority of respondents 342 (92.4%) said that were not public toilets in their community. But a very few 28 respondents (7.6%) there are public toilets. It has shown the sanitation situation in those areas.

Most of the respondents 254 (68.6%) they believe that tourism provide education for community. And 43 respondents (11.6%) they were not agree to believe It. 73 respondents (19.7%) they were neutral or they said don't know.

Likewise, 284 respondents (76.8%) mentioned that there is drinking water facility in theirs community and 86 respondents or (23.2%) answered that there was no drinking water in the community.

The majority of respondent's 240 persons (64.9%) responded that there are health posts within one-hour distance in the community. But 130 (35.1%) were mentioned that there were not health services in their community.

The Majority of respondents 166 (44.9%) responded that there were not any complaints against tourists. 126 (34.1%) respondents don't know it and there were 78 respondents (21.1%) said that there were some complaints against tourists.

The majority respondents 215 (58.1%) agreed that they getting economic and social benefits from tourism activities in their community. 114 (30.8%) respondents were not bewaring and said don't know. Only 41 respondents (11.1%) replied that there is no economic and social benefits from tourism in their community.

The majority of respondents 206 (55.7%) were not involve in any types of tourism activities. 164 respondents (44.3%) were involve in different tourism activities. 205 respondents (55.4%) agreed that they were getting jobs in Lumbini. But 89 (24.1%) responded that they are not getting jobs in Lumbini and 76 respondents (20.5%) responded don't know.

254 respondents (68.6%) responded that they don't know about sustainable tourism, whereas 116 respondents (31.4%) know about sustainable tourism. The Majority of respondents 237 (64.1%) were not getting adequate information about heritage tourism. But, 133 (35.9%) were getting adequate information about heritage tourism.

250 respondents (67.6%) they wanted to increase more tourism in their community but 85 respondents (23%) don't want to have more tourism in the community. A few numbers of respondents 35 (9.5%) they responded don't know.

The majority of respondents 228 (61.6%) responded they don't know that Lumbini is a world heritage site. But 142 respondents (38.4%) knew that Lumbini is a world heritage Site. Similarly, the majority respondents 220 (59.5%) they don't want to comment, suggest and recommend. 150 respondents (40.5%) were given their comments, suggestions and recommendations. Please refer below table 3.4 for detail information.

**Table 3.4** General Information about Tourism and Involvement and Infrastructure

S.N.	Issues	Community Response		
		Yes %	No %	Don't know

1.	Do you/ family selling some products/services to tourism industry?	13.0	<b>87.0</b>	-
2.	Do you/family get any tourism related trainings?	17.6	<b>82.4</b>	-

**Table 3.4** (Continued)

S.N.	Issues	Community Response		
		Yes %	No %	Don't Know
3.	You/family get involve in trips/ exhibitions	9.5	<b>90.5</b>	-
4.	Are there any tourists in your community?	<b>70.5</b>	19.5	10.0
5.	Are there any new tourist places in your community?	27.8	35.4	<b>36.8</b>
6.	Are there public toilets in your community?	7.6	<b>92.4</b>	-
7.	Do you think that tourism provides education for community?	<b>68.6</b>	11.6	19.7
8.	Do you have drinking water facility in community?	<b>76.8</b>	23.2	-
9.	Are there health posts in your community?	<b>64.9</b>	35.1	-
10.	Were there any complaints against tourists in your community?	21.1	<b>44.9</b>	-
11.	Were there any economic and social benefits from tourism in your community?	<b>58.1</b>	11.1	-
12.	Do you involve in tourism activities before in your community?	<b>55.7</b>	44.3	-
13.	Are local people from your community-getting job in Lumbini?	<b>55.4</b>	24.1	20.5
14.	Do you know about sustainable tourism?	31.4	<b>68.6</b>	-
15.	Do you getting adequate information's about Heritage Tourism?	35.9	<b>64.1</b>	-
16.	Do you want more tourism, In your community?	<b>67.6</b>	23.0	9.5%
17.	Do you know lumbini is a heritage site?	38.4	<b>61.6</b>	-
18.	Do you have any comments / suggestions and recommendations?	40.5	<b>59.5</b>	-

### 3.6 Statistical Analysis of Key Opinion Indicators

The results of statistical analysis are as follows:

#### 3.6.1 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Genders” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among respondents was to identify the opinion in tourism related activities in the Lumbini and around for sustainable tourism management classified by their gender. The test result of independent samples t-test was used to indicate the significant differences among genders and key indicator, of the study.

Male respondents had the Highest positive thinking (mean =4.67) towards tourism is good for their community. There was statistically significant difference between male and female respondents. Furthermore, indicators, “tourism helps to preserve heritage properties,” “tourism raises price of goods,” and “tourism stops local from site access” indicated statistically significant difference between the male and female in 95% confidence level and 5% error. All three indicators have more mean score of female respondents. It is because female were more conscious about negative impacts of tourism.

Most importantly, it showed that, both male and female respondents had different evaluation at beginning and end of the questions. They were very positive about tourism but when they were requested to evaluate for negative impacts e.g. raises price of goods, increase crime, and degrades the environment and moral standards of the community. It was noted during the survey that people want to reduce their poverty through tourism. Further, they were willing for support from this sector (Table 3.5).

**Table 3.5** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Gender”

S.N.	Key Indicators	Gender (Mean)		T- Test	
		Male	Female	T- value	P- value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.47</b>	2.59	<b>0.009*</b>
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.19 (Fair)	<b>3.37</b> (Fair)	-1.28	0.204
3.	Opportunity to learn and exchange the culture among the nations	<b>4.12</b>	3.93	1.85	0.064
4.	Enhances community pride	<b>4.19</b>	4.06	1.27	0.204
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage	4.04	<b>4.09</b>	-0.48	0.632
6.	Improve education, health and security	3.84	<b>3.91</b>	0.69	0.490
7.	Creates new job for local residents	3.89	<b>4.05</b>	-1.45	0.148
8.	Provides more business for local	3.94	<b>4.01</b>	-0.61	0.542
9.	Tourism improves public facilities	4.04	<b>4.10</b>	0.29	0.769
10.	Helps to grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty	3.78	<b>3.90</b>	-1.04	0.298
11.	Promotes local environment	3.78	<b>3.95</b>	-1.65	0.100
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.84	<b>3.90</b>	-0.63	0.525
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.74	<b>3.89</b>	-1.35	0.176
14.	Helps to preserve Heritage properties	3.64	<b>3.88</b>	-2.16	<b>0.031*</b>
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	3.55	<b>3.85</b>	-2.51	<b>0.012*</b>
16.	Harms moral standard and environment	2.83	<b>2.85</b>	-0.20	0.840
17.	Causes rise in crime rates.	<u>2.15</u>	<u>1.98</u>	1.47	0.142
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.09</u>	<u>2.48</u>	-2.83	<b>0.005*</b>
19.	I participate in the tourism planning activities	<u>1.96</u>	<u>2.13</u>	-1.29	0.198
20.	I participate in decision making/ problem solving activities	<u>2.08</u>	<u>2.02</u>	0.44	0.656
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.14</u>	<u>2.09</u>	0.40	0.684
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism	<b>2.87</b>	2.74	0.92	0.355

	participation	(Fair)	(Fair)		
--	---------------	--------	--------	--	--

**Table 3.5** (Continued)

S.N.	Key Indicators	Gender (Mean)		T- Test	
		Male	Female	T- value	P- value
23.	Overall evaluation, tourism is good for our community and me	3.84	<b>3.90</b>	-0.52	0.600

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, which were not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators

**Remarks:**

- 1: T - Value = Independent sample T-Test (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d. f. for numerator = 3, d. f. for denominator = 396
- 3: P - Value = Level of statistically significant (2 tailed)
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “underlined” numbers showed disagree with the statement.

### 3.6.2 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Age - Group” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among the groups of respondents was to identify the opinion level in different tourism indicators as in questionnaires for the sustainable tourism management at Lumbini heritage site and around the community classified by their age group. The test result of One-Way ANOVA was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

From the test it was found that there was only one opinion, “tourism causes rise in crime rate” indicated statistically significant difference among the age groups. The more than >61 years had more mean scores (2.75) at fair level. However, As oppose to 15- 30 years old age

group rated “disagree level” with mean=1. 98). Result indicated that old people were more concerned of community crime but young people were not agreeing that tourism causes the crime.

P- Values of 22 indicators were over 0.05 that indicated there were no statistically significant differences among these four age groups. For the same reason all age groups indicated that tourism provides both benefits and costs. They indicated no difference but disagree level regarding participation issues (Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Age group” of the Respondents

S.N.	Indicators	Age Group (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		15-30	31-45	46-60	61>	F Value	P Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.68</b>	<b>4.50</b>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>4.40</b>	1.90	0.128
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.25 (Fair)	<b>3.37</b> (Fair)	3.30 (Fair)	2.90 (Fair)	0.75	0.518
3.	To learn/exchange the culture among the nations	<b>4.13</b>	3.92	4.03	3.90	1.22	0.301
4.	Enhances community pride	<b>4.22</b>	4.03	4.13	4.05	0.89	0.444
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts.	<b>4.21</b>	3.98	4.02	3.95	1.48	0.210
6.	Improve education, health and security	<b>3.91</b>	3.82	3.95	3.80	0.30	0.825
7.	Tourism Creates new job for local residents	<b>4.00</b>	3.92	4.06	3.90	0.36	0.776
8.	Provides more business for local people	<b>4.07</b>	3.92	3.98	3.80	0.69	0.559
9.	Tourism improves public facilities	<b>4.12</b>	4.03	3.90	3.80	1.16	0.323
10.	Grows local economy and reduces poverty	<b>3.99</b>	3.78	3.83	3.50	1.55	0.200
11.	Promotes a focus on the local	<b>3.96</b>	3.83	3.87	3.70	0.60	0.612

	environment						
12.	Conserve the attractions	<b>4.00</b>	3.80	3.85	3.70	1.20	0.307
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	<b>3.80</b>	3.85	3.88	3.45	.956	0.414
14.	Helps to preserve heritage	<b>3.76</b>	3.75	3.92	3.35 (Fair)	1.95	0.191

**Table 3.6** (Continued)

S.N.	Indicators	Age Group (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		15-30	31-45	46-60	61>	F Value	P- Value
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	<b>3.80</b>	3.66	3.63	<b>3.80</b>	0.51	0.661
16.	Tourism harms moral standards and environment	2.89 (Fair)	2.82 (Fair)	2.66 (Fair)	<b>3.40</b> (Fair)	1.64	0.180
17.	Tourism causes rise in crime rates	1.98	2.07	2.01	<b>2.75</b> (Fair)	2.95	0.033*
18.	Stops local from site access	2.26	2.35	2.27	<b>2.40</b>	0.13	0.941
19.	I participate in the tourism planning	1.95	2.12	2.15	<b>1.80</b>	0.90	0.441
20.	I participate in decision making/ problem solving	1.98	2.15	2.02	<b>1.85</b>	0.67	0.568
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	2.16	2.15	2.06	<b>1.80</b>	0.63	0.593
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	2.61 (Fair)	2.90 (Fair)	3.02 (Fair)	<b>2.45</b>	2.21	0.087
23.	Overall evaluation, good for community / myself	4.03	3.77	3.87	<b>3.65</b>	1.58	0.193

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. S<sub>da</sub> indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

- 1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. For numerator= 3, d.f. For denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “underlined” numbers showed disagree with the statement respectively

### **3.6.3 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Marital Status” of the Respondents**

Comparison of mean scores among the groups of respondents was to identify the opinion level in different tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management at Lumbini heritage site in Nepal classified by their marital status. The One-Way ANOVA test was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

P-values in 12 key indicators, out of 23 indicators were less 0.05. Therefore, in those indicators indicate the statistically significant difference among 3 groups of marital status. However, 11 indicators did not indicate statistically significant difference. For the same reason, all group respondents presented their opinion to agree about it is good for the community and for them.

The following indicators, “tourism is good for the community”, “provides opportunities to learn and exchange the culture among the nation”, “enhances community price,” “provides more business for locals”, “preserves cultural heritage and crafts”, “provides public facilities”, “tourism harms moral standards” and “tourism is good for community and people” indicated statistically significant difference among the marital groups. Interestingly, single group rated the highest “agree level” which proved that singles were more concerned for these indicators. However, tourism harms moral and degrades environment indicate the “fair level” significant difference, because single group were not agreed with this indicator.

At the same time following indicators indicated significant difference among the groups with the highest mean score of married group. The indicators were “creates job for local people”, “grows local economy and reduces poverty”, “promotes local environment”, “creates cleanliness in the community” indicated statistically significant difference among groups. Married group were more serious about those indicators (Table 3.7).

**Table 3.7** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Marital Status” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key indicator	Marital Status (Mean value)			ANOVA	
		Single	Married	Widowed	P value	F Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>3.91</b>	11.12	<b>0.000*</b>
2.	I personally benefited from Tourism	3.06 (Fair)	<b>3.35</b> (Fair)	3.12 (Fair)	1.29	0.274
3.	Opportunity to learn/exchange the culture among the nations	<b>4.09</b>	4.04	3.54	3.42	<b>0.034*</b>
4.	Enhances community pride	<b>4.32</b>	4.12	3.54	5.91	<b>0.003*</b>
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts.	<b>4.22</b>	4.08	3.50 (Fair)	5.09	<b>0.007*</b>
6.	Helps to improve education, health and security	3.90	<b>3.92</b>	3.75	2.91	0.055
7.	Tourism creates new job for local residents	4.01	<b>4.02</b>	3.41	3.67	<b>0.026*</b>
8.	Provides more business for local people	<b>4.04</b>	4.02	3.33 (Fair)	4.90	<b>0.008*</b>
9.	Tourism improves public facilities	<b>4.11</b>	4.05	3.45	4.23	<b>0.015*</b>
10.	Grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty	3.80	<b>3.92</b>	3.12 (Fair)	6.06	<b>0.003*</b>
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	3.78	<b>3.84</b>	3.33 (Fair)	4.66	<b>0.010*</b>
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.81	<b>3.92</b>	3.45	2.48	0.085

13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.62	<b>3.90</b>	3.33 (Fair)	4.54	<b>0.011*</b>
-----	----------------------------------	------	-------------	----------------	------	---------------

**Table 3.7** (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	Marital Status (Mean vales)			ANOVA	
		Single	Married	Widowe d	P value	F Value
14.	Tourism helps to preserve heritage properties	3.59	<b>3.84</b>	3.41	2.82	0.060
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	<b>3.83</b>	3.70	3.50 (Fair)	.765	0.466
16.	Tourism harms moral standards and environment	<b>3.26</b> (Fair)	2.76 (Fair)	2.79 (Fair)	3.43	<b>0.033*</b>
17.	Causes rise in crime rates	<u>2.16</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>1.95</u>	0.36	0.692
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.04</u>	<u>2.34</u>	<u>2.54</u>	1.65	0.194
19.	I participate in the tourism planning activities	<u>1.72</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>2.12</u>	2.68	0.070
20.	I participate in decision making/ problem solving	<u>1.83</u>	<u>2.12</u>	<u>1.70</u>	2.46	0.087
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.14</u>	<u>2.10</u>	<u>2.16</u>	0.04	0.954
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	2.88 (Fair)	<b>2.89</b> (Fair)	<u>2.29</u>	1.82	0.163
23.	Overall evaluation, it is good for our community and me	<b>3.95</b>	3.94	<u>3.00</u>	8.18	<b>0.000*</b>

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value

- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. For numerator= 3, d.f. For denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement respectively

#### 3.6.4 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Religion Groups” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among religious group of respondents was identified the opinion level in different tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management of Lumbini heritage site. The One-way ANOVA test was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

The indicators, “grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty”, “promotes a focus on the local environment”, “helps to conserve the attractions”, “tourism helps to preserve heritage properties”, “tourism raises price for goods” and “causes rise in crime rates.” indicated statistically significant difference among the religious groups with the highest mean score in Christian religious group. It indicated that they are more educated and was concerned and aware about tourism and benefits and effects.

However, Christian group had the lowest mean score in decision-making and problem solving (1.75). Majority of indicators they did not statistically significant difference among the religious groups (Table 3.8).

**Table 3.8** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Religions” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key indicator	Religion (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		Hindu	Buddhist	Muslim	Christi an	F Value	P Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b><u>4.64</u></b>	<b><u>4.58</u></b>	<b><u>4.50</u></b>	<b><u>4.75</u></b>	1.18	0.316

2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.26 (Fair)	<b>4.33</b>	3.26 (Fair)	2.75 (Fair)	2.58	0.053
3.	To learn/ exchange among the Nations	4.10	4.16	3.94	<b>4.50</b>	1.24	0.294
4.	Enhances community pride	4.19	4.08	4.07	<b>4.25</b>	.480	0.696
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts	4.16	4.00	3.99	<b>4.50</b>	1.17	0.318

**Table 3.8** (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	Religion (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		Hindu	Buddhist	Muslim	Christi an	F Value	P Value
6.	Improve education, health and security	3.94	4.00	3.81	<b>4.50</b>	0.97	0.407
7.	Creates new job for local	4.08	4.16	3.87	<b>4.50</b>	1.66	0.174
8.	Provides more business for local people	4.05	4.25	3.89	<b>4.75</b>	1.57	1.94
9.	Improves public facilities (road, water soupy etc.)	4.14	4.08	3.91	<b>4.75</b>	2.22	0.085
10.	Grows local economy and reduces poverty	4.01	3.66	3.72	<b>4.50</b>	2.73	0.044*
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	4.03	3.83	3.75	<b>4.25</b>	2.67	0.047*
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	4.03	3.75	3.74	<b>4.50</b>	3.01	0.030*
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.95	4.00	3.69	<b>4.50</b>	2.38	0.069
14.	Tourism helps to preserve heritage	3.91	4.00	3.63	<b>4.50</b>	2.78	0.041*
15.	Raises price for goods	4.00	3.33 (Fair)	3.49	<b>4.25</b>	6.78	0.000*

16.	Harms moral standards and environment	2.78 (Fair)	2.75 (Fair)	2.88 (Fair)	<b>3.75</b>	0.75	0.518
17.	Causes rise in crime rates	<u>1.85</u>	<u>1.91</u>	<u>2.22</u>	2.75 (Fair)	3.98	0.008*
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.34</u>	<u>1.75</u>	<u>2.31</u>	<u>2.25</u>	0.75	0.522

**Table 3.8** (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	Religion (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		Hindu	Buddhist	Muslim	Christi an	F Value	P Value
19.	I participate in the tourism planning	<u>2.12</u>	<u>2.31</u>	<u>1.97</u>	<u>2.00</u>	0.74	0.529
20.	I participate in decision making/ problem solving	<u>2.22</u>	<u>2.41</u>	<u>1.89</u>	<u>1.75</u> <u>Sda</u>	2.54	0.056
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.29</u>	<u>2.41</u>	<u>1.95</u>	<u>2.25</u>	2.57	0.053
22.	I gain benefit through tourism participation	2.75 (Fair)	3.08 (Fair)	2.82 (Fair)	3.00 (Fair)	2.58	0.855
23.	Overall evaluation, good for community/ myself	3.96	4.33	3.77	4.50	1.90	0.129

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

- 1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. For numerator= 3, d.f. For denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement respectively

### 3.6.5 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Education” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among educational level group of respondents was identified the opinion level in different tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management and development. The One-way ANOVA was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups of key indicators.

“Tourism stops local people to site access” indicated the statistically significant difference among educational groups with the highest mean score with bachelor level educational group; it is obvious because they are much concern about negative impacts of tourism. However the lowest mean score rated by intermediate education level with disagree level.

P-values of 22 indicators were over 0.05. Therefore, the opinion in all indicators including benefits and costs from tourism as well as in participation level did not indicate any statistically significant difference among 5 educational groups. For the same reason, all group respondents presented their opinion to agree with tourism was good for community and for them (Table 3.9).

**Table 3.9** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Education” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key Indicators	Education Level (Mean value)					ANOVA	
		1	2	3	4	5	F Value	P Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.58</b>	<b>4.63</b>	<b>4.77</b>	<b>4.85</b>	2.06	0.085
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.37 (Fair)	<b>3.52</b>	3.01 (Fair)	3.11 (Fair)	2.92 (Fair)	1.83	0.122
3.	Learn and exchange among the nations	3.97	4.01	3.96	4.29	<b>4.57</b>	1.95	0.100
4.	Enhances community pride	4.09	4.16	4.00	4.37	<b>4.50</b>	1.37	0.243
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts	4.07	4.17	3.92	<b>4.18</b>	4.14	0.78	0.537

Table 3.9 (Continued)

S.N.	Key Indicators	Education Level (Mean value)					ANOVA	
		1	2	3	4	5	F Value	P Value
6.	Improve education, health and security	3.94	3.87	3.72	3.81	<b>4.14</b>	0.78	0.539
7.	Tourism creates new job for local residents	3.93	3.78	3.92	4.14	<b>4.50</b>	1.13	0.340
8.	Provides more business for local people	3.93	4.08	3.87	4.03	<b>4.57</b>	1.86	0.187
9.	Tourism improves public facilities	3.94	4.20	3.89	4.14	<b>4.50</b>	2.06	0.085
10.	Grows local economy and reduces poverty	3.79	4.01	3.84	3.70	<b>4.14</b>	0.88	0.475
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	3.86	3.94	3.83	3.85	<b>4.07</b>	0.26	0.898
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.86	3.90	3.92	3.62	<b>4.14</b>	0.69	0.598
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.85	<b>3.95</b>	3.74	3.66	3.64	0.57	0.678
14.	Tourism helps to preserve Heritage	3.73	<b>3.87</b>	3.77	3.77	3.71	0.24	0.912
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	3.67	3.90	3.53	3.88	<b>3.92</b>	1.31	0.263
16.	Harms moral standards and environment	2.73 (Fair)	2.86 (Fair)	2.90 (Fair)	3.11 (Fair)	<b>3.35</b> (Fair)	1.09	0.357
17.	Causes rise in crime rates	<u>2.15</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>1.81</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>2.28</u>	1.44	0.217

Table 3.9 (Continued)

		Education Level (Mean value)					ANOVA	
--	--	------------------------------	--	--	--	--	-------	--

S.N.	Key Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	F Value	P Value
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.43</u>	<u>2.41</u>	<u>1.93</u>	<u>1.77</u> <u>Sda</u>	<b>3.21</b> (Fair)	4.98	<b>0.001*</b>
19.	I participate in the tourism planning	<u>2.06</u>	<u>2.13</u>	<u>1.85</u>	<u>2.44</u>	<u>1.78</u> <u>Sda</u>	1.42	0.224
20.	I participate in decision making	<u>1.93</u>	<u>1.97</u>	<u>2.27</u>	<u>2.37</u>	<u>2.14</u>	1.62	0.167
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.04</u>	<u>2.36</u>	<u>2.44</u>	<u>2.07</u>	1.85	0.118
22.	I gain the benefited by tourism participation	2.92 (Fair)	2.87 (Fair)	<u>2.55</u>	2.74 (Fair)	<u>2.35</u>	1.40	0.233
23.	Overall, good for community and myself	3.90	<b>4.04</b>	3.63	3.92	4.00	1.35	0.249

1= Non education, 2= Primary level, 3= Secondary level, 4= Intermediate level and 5= Bachelors level

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

#### Remarks:

- 1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. For numerator= 3, d.f. For denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “bolted” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement respectively

### **3.6.6 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Occupations” of the Respondents**

Comparison of mean scores among different occupational group of respondents was identified the opinion level in different tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management and development. The One-Way ANOVA was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

The following four indicators “Tourism provides opportunity to learn and exchange the culture among the nations”, “enhances the community pride”, “improves public facilities” and “tourism harms moral standards and environment” indicated statistically significant differences among the groups. The respondents who working in Lumbini had the highest mean score with agree level. However, in indicator, “tourism harms moral standards and environment” Government service holders had the highest mean score indicated that they were much careful for environment and social norms and standards (Table 3.10).

**Table 3.10** Statistical comparison of Key Opinion Indicators among “Occupations” of the Respondents

Indicator	Occupation (Mean value)												ANOVA
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	j.	k.	l.	
1.	4.73	4.75	4.76	4.75	4.43	4.25	<b>5.00</b>	4.76	4.42	4.61	<b>5.00</b>	4.60	F = 1.85 P = 0.44
2.	2.86 (Fair)	3.87	3.31 (Fair)	3.90	3.28 (Fair)	3.50	3.80	3.12 (Fair)	3.07 (Fair)	3.11 (Fair)	<b>4.00</b>	3.20 (Fair)	F = 1.02 P = 0.421
3.	4.26	4.25	4.25	4.10	3.86	3.75	<b>5.00</b>	4.36	3.89	3.77	4.75	4.20	F = 2.31 <b>P= 0.009*</b>
4.	4.26	4.12	4.38	4.40	3.91	3.75	<b>5.00</b>	4.32	4.10	4.27	4.87	4.40	F = 2.47 <b>P = 0.005*</b>
5.	4.26	4.37	4.25	3.80	3.92	3.25	4.20	4.40	4.21	4.16	<b>4.50</b>	4.40	F = 1.65 P = 0.083
6.	4.06	4.00	3.91	3.85	3.74	3.00	4.20	4.28	4.00	4.05	<b>4.25</b>	4.20	F = 1.15 P = 0.317
7.	4.40	4.25	4.10	3.90	3.82	3.75	4.60	4.32	3.89	4.05	<b>4.62</b>	4.30	F = 1.65 P = 0.083
8.	4.33	4.37	4.17	3.75	3.80	3.75	<b>5.00</b>	4.32	4.10	4.05	4.37	3.90	F = 1.76 P = 0.059
9.	4.40	4.50	4.21	3.95	3.85	3.00	<b>4.60</b>	4.48	4.00	3.83	4.50	4.40	F = 2.41

													<b>P = 0.007*</b>
8.	4.33	4.37	4.17	3.75	3.80	3.75	<b>5.00</b>	4.32	4.10	4.05	4.37	3.90	F = 1.76 P = 0.059

**Table 3.10** (Continued)

Indicator	Occupation (Mean value)												ANOVA
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	j.	k.	l.	
10.	4.06	4.12	3.85	3.50	3.76	3.25	3.60	4.36	3.92	3.66	<b>4.50</b>	4.30	F = 1.46 P = 0.143
11.	3.80	4.12	3.89	3.79	3.85	3.00 (Fair)	4.20	4.32	3.85	3.66	<b>4.12</b>	4.00	F = 1.04 P = 0.406
12.	3.93	4.12	4.00	3.60	3.80	3.50	4.00	4.36	3.42	3.66	3.87	<b>4.10</b>	F = 1.02 P = 0.424
13.	3.40 (Fair)	4.25	3.72	3.85	3.79	3.50	4.00	4.32	3.60	3.66	4.37	<b>4.40</b>	F = 1.52 P = 0.120
14.	3.40 (Fair)	3.62	3.76	4.00	3.80	3.25 (Fair)	3.80	4.12	3.57	3.72	<b>4.25</b>	3.70	F = 1.13 P = 0.332
15.	3.33 (Fair)	3.87	4.04	3.65	3.66	3.00 (Fair)	3.40 (Fair)	3.84	3.50	<b>4.00</b>	3.62	<b>4.00</b>	F = 1.05 P = 0.441
16.	<b>3.46</b>	3.25 (Fair)	3.40 (Fair)	3.15 (Fair)	2.58	2.75 (Fair)	3.60	2.40	2.82 (Fair)	3.55 (Fair)	3.37 (Fair)	2.70 (Fair)	F = 2.68 <b>P = 0.003*</b>

17.	<u>2.40</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2.14</u>	<u>2.75</u>	<u>1.90</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.20</u>	<u>2.36</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>1.70</u>	F = 1.66 P = 0.079
		<u>Sda</u>										<u>Sda</u>	
18.	<u>2.60</u>	<b>3.00</b> (Fair)	<u>1.97</u>	<u>2.45</u>	<u>2.35</u>	<u>2.25</u>	2.80 (Fair)	<u>2.40</u>	<u>2.17</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.30</u>	F = 0.76 P = 0.675

Table 3.10 (Continued)

Indicator	Occupation (Mean value)												ANOVA
	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.	g.	h.	i.	j.	k.	l.	
19.	<u>2.20</u>	<u>1.62</u>	<u>1.70</u>	<u>2.30</u>	<u>2.17</u>	<u>1.50</u>	<u>2.60</u>	<u>2.40</u>	<u>1.78</u>	<u>1.72</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>2.20</u>	F = 1.19 P = 0.291
		<u>Sda</u>	<u>Sda</u>			<u>Sda</u>			<u>Sda</u>	<u>Sda</u>			
20.	<u>2.13</u>	<u>1.50</u>	<u>2.04</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>2.07</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.60</u>	<u>1.96</u>	<u>1.82</u>	<u>1.77</u>	<u>2.37</u>	<u>2.00</u>	F = 0.68 P = 0.756
		<u>Sda</u>								<u>Sda</u>			
21.	<u>2.20</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2.21</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2.12</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>2.00</u>	<u>2.08</u>	<u>1.89</u>	<u>1.72</u>	<u>1.87</u>	<u>1.90</u>	F = 0.69 P = 0.744
										<u>Sda</u>			
22.	3.66	3.12 (Fair)	2.97 (Fair)	3.40	<u>2.58</u>	<u>2.25</u>	<b>3.80</b>	3.36	2.92 (Fair)	2.72 (Fair)	3.00 (Fair)	3.00 (Fair)	F = 1.64 P = 0.076
23.	3.66	4.00	4.02	4.15	3.74	3.25 (Fair)	4.00	4.20	4.03	3.61	4.12	<b>4.70</b>	F = 1.46 P = 0.144

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value

2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information in sample data that has been used up), d.f for numerator=3, d.f for denominator = 396

3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant

4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement.

5. Numbers 1,2... 23 indicated ‘Indicator’ as in table 3.3 and a,b,..1 indicated occupations ordered as in table 3.2 respectively.

### 3.6.7 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Household Monthly Income” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among different occupational group of respondents was identified the opinion level in different tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management and development. The One-Way ANOVA was used to indicate the significant difference among age groups and key indicators.

Only four indicators: “tourism creates new job for local residents”, “Provides more business for local people”, “tourism improves public facilities” and “causes rise in crime rates” indicated statistically significant difference among the income groups. The highest income group rated the highest “agree level” for 3 benefits related indicators because they might be benefited from tourism. However, for “causes rise in crime rates” indicator second highest income group had the highest mean with “neutral level”. That indicated they were not confirming about this indicator (Table 3.11).

**Table 3.11** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators among “Household Monthly Income” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key indicator	H.H. Monthly income. Mean value				ANOVA	
		< Less 3,000	3,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	More > 20,001	P Value	F Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<u>4.50</u>	<b>4.62</b>	<u>4.83</u>	<b>4.84</b>	2.45	0.063
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.29 (Fair)	<b>3.44</b>	3.16 (Fair)	<u>2.53</u>	1.71	0.164
3.	Opportunity to learn/exchange the culture	4.02	3.92	4.08	<b>4.46</b>	1.24	0.292
4.	Enhances community pride	4.11	4.07	4.12	<b>4.61</b>	1.20	0.309
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts	4.01	4.08	4.33	<b>4.61</b>	2.24	0.083

Table 3.11 (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	H.H. Monthly Income (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		Less < 3,000	3,001- 10,000	10,00- 120,000	More > 20,001	F Value	P Value
6.	Improve education, health and security	3.86	3.79	4.04	<b>4.46</b>	1.63	0.181
7.	Tourism creates new job for local residents	3.88	4.12	4.12	<b>4.76</b>	3.84	<b>0.010*</b>
8.	Provides more business for local people	3.90	4.01	4.29	<b>4.69</b>	3.07	<b>0.028*</b>
9.	Tourism Improves public facilities (Road, water	3.91	4.15	4.33	<b>4.76</b>	4.66	<b>0.003*</b>
10.	Grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty	3.79	3.94	3.87	<b>4.38</b>	1.43	0.233
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	3.85	3.85	3.95	<b>4.30</b>	0.90	0.438
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.84	3.89	4.00	<b>4.23</b>	0.74	0.526
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.78	3.87	3.83	<b>4.23</b>	0.76	0.523
14.	Tourism helps to preserve Heritage	3.74	3.84	3.79	<b>3.92</b>	0.28	0.839
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	3.68	<b>3.82</b>	3.75	3.69	0.29	0.828
16.	Tourism harms moral standards and environment	2.76 (Fair)	2.97 (Fair)	<b>3.50</b>	2.84 (Fair)	1.20	0.309

Table 3.11 (Continued)

S.N.	Key indicator	H.H. Monthly Income (Mean value)				ANOVA	
		Less < 3,000	3,001- 10,000	10,001- 20,000	More > 20,001	F Value	P Value
17.	Causes rise in crime rates.	<u>1.98</u>	<u>2.16</u>	<b>2.66</b>	<u>2.07</u>	3.19	<b>0.024*</b>
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.19</u>	<u>2.53</u>	<u>2.58</u>	<b>2.69</b>	2.17	0.910
19.	I participate in the tourism planning activities	<u>2.03</u>	<u>2.16</u>	<u>1.79</u> <u>Sda</u>	<u>2.15</u>	0.61	0.604
20.	I participate in decision / problem solving activities	<u>2.07</u>	<u>2.06</u>	<u>1.79</u> <u>Sda</u>	<u>2.00</u>	0.40	0.751
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.09</u>	<u>2.29</u>	<u>1.75</u> <u>Sda</u>	<u>2.15</u>	1.36	0.255
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	2.76 (Fair)	2.88 (Fair)	2.83 (Fair)	3.00 (Fair)	0.23	0.873
23.	Overall evaluation, tourism is good for our community and me	3.85	3.85	3.95	<b>4.38</b>	0.96	0.411

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

#### Remarks:

- 1: F - Value = One-Way ANOVA (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator=3, d.f. for denominator = 396
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement.

### 3.6.7 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Social Roles” of the Respondents

Comparison of mean scores among respondents was identified in the opinion level about different types of tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management and development classified by their social roles. The result of T-Test was used to indicate the significant difference among their social roles and key indicators.

Their P-values of “tourism is good for community”, “creates jobs for local people”, “provides more business”, “increase public facilities,” “preserves heritage”, “harms moral and environment”, “participated in planning”, “participated in decision making” and “tourism good for community and for me” had P- value lower than 0.05. Therefore, it proved that those who taking social role have had more positive opinion significantly difference then those who were without social role (Table 3.12).

**Table 3.12** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Social Role” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key Indicator	Social Role (Mean value)		T- Test	
		Without Social role	Undertaking Social role	T Value	P Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.52</b>	<b>4.76</b>	-2.33	<b>0.020*</b>
2.	I personally benefited from tourism	3.28 (Fair)	<b>3.33</b> (Fair)	-2.55	0.799
3.	Opportunity to learn/exchange the culture among the nations	4.00	<b>4.10</b>	-0.67	0.501
4.	Enhances community pride	4.09	<b>4.30</b>	-1.54	0.123
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts	4.04	<b>4.21</b>	-1.25	0.212
6.	Helps to improve education, health and security	<b>3.88</b>	<b>3.88</b>	0.00	0.997
7.	Tourism creates new job for local residents	3.92	<b>4.25</b>	-2.15	<b>0.032*</b>

**Table 3.12** (Continued)

		Social Role (Mean value)	T- Test
--	--	--------------------------	---------

S.N.	Key Indicator	Without Social role	Undertakin g Social role	T Value	P Value
8.	Provides more business for local people	3.93	<b>4.23</b>	-1.99	<b>0.047*</b>
9.	Tourism improves public facilities (road, water etc.)	3.97	<b>4.26</b>	-2.04	<b>0.041*</b>
10.	Grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty	3.82	<b>4.00</b>	-1.11	0.264
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	3.84	<b>4.06</b>	-1.58	0.113
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.86	<b>3.93</b>	-0.45	0.648
13.	Creates cleanliness	3.79	<b>4.00</b>	1.38	0.167
14.	Tourism helps to preserve Heritage properties	3.71	<b>4.05</b>	-2.19	<b>0.029*</b>
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	3.71	<b>3.73</b>	-0.12	<b>0.900*</b>
16.	Tourism harms moral standards and environment	2.77 (Fair)	<b>3.20</b> (Fair)	-2.20	<b>0.028*</b>
17.	Causes rise in crime rates.	<u>2.02</u>	<u>2.28</u>	-1.67	0.096
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.26</u>	<u>2.53</u>	-1.44	0.150
19.	I participate in the tourism planning activities	<u>1.96</u>	<u>2.51</u>	-3.21	<b>0.001*</b>
20.	I participate in decision / problem solving activities	<u>1.96</u>	<u>2.51</u>	-3.27	<b>0.001*</b>
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.05</u>	<u>2.43</u>	-2.23	0.026*
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	2.76	<b>3.03</b> (Fair)	-1.39	0.163
23.	Overall evaluation, it is good for our community and me	3.82	<b>4.18</b>	-2.28	<b>0.023*</b>

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

- 1: T - Value = Independent sample T-Test (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator= 3, d.f. for denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The **“bolted”** number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the **“bolted underlined”** numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and **“underlined”** numbers showed disagree with the statement.

### **3.6.9 Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Tourism Role” of the Respondents**

Comparison of mean scores among respondents was identified in the opinion level about different types of tourism indicators for the sustainable tourism management and development classified by their social roles. The T-Test was used to indicate the significant difference among their social roles and key indicators.

P-values of 5 indicators “tourism provides opportunities to learn/exchange among the nation”, “preserves heritage properties”, “i participated in planning,” “ decision making/ problem solving”, and “participated in tourism activities” had less than 0.05. Therefore, the opinion in those indicators indicated the statistically significant difference between the respondents with their tourism role. For the same reason, the respondents in different tourism role presented the different level of interest in those indicators. In all indicators the respondents group with undertaking tourism role had higher agree level, but in the indicators they have fair level of mean score that indicated they were not satisfied with participation related all indicators.

However, P-values of other indicators were over 0.05 indicated there were not statistically significant differences among the respondents with their tourism related roles in their community (Table 3.13).

**Table 3.13** Statistical Comparisons of Key Opinion Indicators between “Tourism Role” of the Respondents

S.N.	Key Indicator	Tourism Role (Mean value)		T- Test	
		Without Role	Undertaking Role	T Value	P Value
1.	Tourism is good for community	<b>4.55</b>	<b>4.73</b>	-1.3	0.103
2.	I personally benefited from Tourism	3.25	<b>3.70</b>	-1.69	0.090
3.	Opportunity to learn/exchange the culture among the nations	<b>4.06</b>	3.60	2.57	<b>0.010*</b>
4.	Enhances Community Pride	<b>4.12</b>	4.06	0.34	0.733
5.	Helps to preserves cultural heritage/ crafts	4.07	<b>4.10</b>	-0.15	0.874
6.	Helps to improve education, health and security	<b>3.90</b>	3.60	1.51	0.131
7.	Tourism Creates new job for local residents	3.97	<b>4.10</b>	-0.63	0.523
8.	Provides more business for local people	3.97	<b>4.06</b>	-0.44	0.657
9.	Tourism Improves public facilities	4.00	<b>4.23</b>	-1.18	0.235
10.	Grows and expand local economy and reduces poverty	3.84	<b>3.96</b>	-0.58	0.561
11.	Promotes a focus on the local environment	3.86	<b>4.10</b>	-1.26	0.208
12.	Helps to conserve the attractions	3.87	<b>3.86</b>	0.06	0.948
13.	Creates cleanliness of community	3.81	<b>3.96</b>	-0.75	0.450
14.	Tourism helps to preserve Heritage properties	3.73	<b>4.20</b>	-2.28	<b>0.023*</b>
15.	Tourism raises price for goods	3.71	<b>3.76</b>	-0.25	0.802
16.	Tourism harms moral standards and environment	2.83 (Fair)	<b>2.93</b> (Fair)	-0.36	0.716

**Table 3.13** (Continued)

S.N.	Key Indicator	Tourism Role (Mean value)		T-Test	
		Without Role	Undertaking Role	T Value	P Value
17.	Causes rise in crime rates	<u>2.07</u>	<u>2.03</u>	0.17	0.859
18.	Stops local from site access	<u>2.28</u>	<u>2.53</u>	-0.97	0.332
19.	I participate in the tourism planning activities	<u>1.96</u>	<b>3.10</b> (Fair)	-5.00	<b>0.000*</b>
20.	I participate in decision / problem solving activities	<u>1.95</u>	<b>3.13</b> (Fair)	-5.25	<b>0.000*</b>
21.	I have an involvement in tourism activities	<u>2.05</u>	<b>2.90</b> (Fair)	-3.80	<b>0.000*</b>
22.	I gain the benefit through tourism participation	2.78 (Fair)	<b>3.03</b> (Fair)	-0.94	0.346
23.	Overall evaluation, it is good for our community and me	3.87	<b>3.90</b>	-0.09	0.092

\* Indicates statistically significant differences between groups at  $P \leq 0.05$

All mean scores, not alphabetically indicated, agree with indicators. Sda indicates strongly disagree.

**Remarks:**

- 1: T - Value = Independent sample T-Test (computed) value
- 2: Degree of freedom (the amount of information from the sample data that has been used up), d.f. for numerator= 3, d.f. for denominator = 369
- 3: P- Value = Level of statistically significant
- 4: The “**bolted**” number showed highest mean value for each indicator among the groups, the “**bolted underlined**” numbers showed the indicator with the highest mean score and “**underlined**” numbers showed disagree with the statement.

## **.7 Results of Interview from Various Tourism Stakeholders**

### **Interviews**

Interviews were the main qualitative method of data collection. Interviews were conducted with civil servants at different levels. In addition, tourism related stakeholders (hotel, travel, tour, transports etc.) were interviewed. The sampling was purposeful, strategic and judgmental. It means people and organizations were chosen for the interview on the basis of own judgments of their knowledge and expertise to fulfill these research objectives. The major strategy of sampling was to cover all potential people related to the research work and those who could be easily available.

Most respondents were selected for two reasons; first, personal contact and second, their expertise and interest in the related field. The method was selected mainly because it provides enough freedom for respondents to express their idea on the topic. The informal discussion atmosphere was intended to encourage subjects to speak freely and completely about the research issues. The issues for the interview were the existing heritage management condition of Nepal.

Interviews were conducted in the local Nepali language by using interview guide (Appendix C). Relevant questions were asked in between a conversational manner. The researcher felt that interview allowed participants to express their thoughts more freely, which helped me to obtain more accurate information based on their experience and knowledge. All interviews were undertaken informally in their offices on a face-to-face basis. Altogether 15 interview sessions were conducted with different people. The list of interviewees is as below in table 3.14.

The main recommendations from the interviews were as follows:

#### **1. Brief introduction and tourism situation of Lumbini and existing management system?**

Most of all interviews they introduced Lumbini as a unique tourism product of Nepal. They stressed that it has two fold images, First, the birthplace of Lord Buddha and the next; it is a world heritage property. Lumbini is managed by LDT and implementing Master Plan. Some of Government officials were satisfied with existing management however, business people

and VDCs or local government representatives were not fully satisfied by existing management system.

## **2. How important of Tourism industry in Lumbini from your viewpoint?**

Most of them think that the tourism industry is very important as one of the main source of income for local economy. It brings revenue from services and it enhances community pride, enhances the culture and environment in the community. Tourism increases the fame of the Lumbini and spreads worldwide. Furthermore, they said that Lumbini is only the main attraction in this region, which can directly and indirectly support to the local people; they could sell their agriculture products as a souvenir and can get involve in various tourism business as well as opportunities for employment and skill development.

## **3. Reasons, why Nepalese world heritage sites are in the list of danger?**

### **How can it get free from the list?**

They think that those sites, which were in the world heritage in danger, because they were unable to maintain and fulfill the terms and conditions, assigned from World Heritage Committee. Some of the interviewees mentioned that heritage property need strong support from locals but due to the lack of awareness to heritage properties are losing their strength. The trend of urbanization is also a cause for heritage sites being endangered.

The exceptional urban and architectural heritage of Kathmandu, Patan and Bhaktapur has been severely affected by uncontrolled urban development. The property is composed of seven Monument Zones, which, since the time of inscription in 1979, have unfortunately been seriously altered, resulting in a general loss of authenticity and integrity of the property as a whole. For these reasons the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2003. UNESCO is working with the Nepalese authorities to help them develop a long-term management plan to conserve the remaining World Heritage values of the property and adopt corrective measures to address illegal building activities.

## **4. Do you understand the concept of sustainable tourism development?**

Most of them mentioned that sustainable tourism development means the ways to maintain environment and make it better for long term by developing systematic tourism management and understanding tourism activities for a certain area. They emphasized that in

cause of developing countries like Nepal the host community must economically and socially benefited by the tourism for its sustainability. The income from the tourists should be spent in infrastructure and to increase local employment for sustainable tourism development.

**5. What are the problems for sustainable tourism development at Lumbini Heritage Site?**

For this heritage site local participation is being negligible. There was lack of promotion from Government side. There was no mechanism to provide regular economic benefit for community local people from tourism. The main problem they mentioned that there were not sustainable legal protection frameworks. They added problems of funding and infrastructure.

**6. What should be done to solve those problems, if you were authorized person?**

Almost all of the interviewees mentioned, sustainable tourism as a ongoing process rather than one time activity. It should be managed the demand and supply efficiently. For sustainability of any tourism product, each attraction should be maintained always and local people should be benefited from the attractions. Government should be making law; rules and regulations so that it could follow the norms of UNESCO, follow code of conduct and amendment of existing necessary rules. All problems should be solved with active consultation and participation of surrounding community and all stakeholders.

**7. Do you think community participation is necessary for sustainable tourism?**

All were strongly agreed and stressed that community participation is the most necessary tools for sustainable tourism development. They thought that there was a vital need to find the means and ways for participation. Community should be participated in employment and income generating programs. They need to get benefits permanently from the tourism sites in their community.

**8. According your idea what are the methods or strategies to involve local community at Lumbini for its sustainable destination?**

They focused that all stakeholders' need to jointly decide the methods and strategies and to implement it properly. To encourage local participation they should have knowledge and awareness about tourism. Further more they should have right in tourism

resources, they must make their rules and regulation and they should make them responsible for those activities. A participatory approached sustainable Heritage management model should be implemented in Lumbini.

**9. What do you want to suggest to Government/Private sector/tourism business sector regarding the sustainable development of Lumbini?**

They mentioned that for sustainable development of Lumbini all stakeholders should play their own defined roles. Government should play the leading role; they should build infrastructure and community participation friendly policy, rule and regulations. They all agreed that government should construct an international airport in Lumbini area. The immigration rules and regulation should be making tourism friendly and need to find out the ways how do lengthen the stay of the tourists in the Lumbini.

Private sector should provide quality products and need to maintain consistency and timely service. Local skills and agricultural products should be encouraged and promote. They all agreed that TRPAP program as a successful program to reduce rural poverty and to increase local economy, so this type of programs should continued in the surrounding area of the Lumbini. Tourism activities should be increased by collaboration among Government, local government national and International NGOs and community people. Business sector should be encouraged to involve local people in tourism industry and encourage local products, local style and skills.

**10. Are there any community-supported programs in Lumbini?**

They all stressed that there were not enough community-supported programs. However, all were giving emphasis on it. TRPAP was implementing some community-supported programs. LDT, also have some scholarship programs for students within the surrounding community but they were not satisfied by those types minimal programs. They focused that community should be provided a regular economic gaining programs for their support.

**11. What does sustainable tourism management mean to you in the context of Nepal?**

In Nepalese context sustainable tourism should be able to protect bio-diversity of the Nation; tourism should provide economic benefits for people and preservation of local arts, cultures and traditions. Need to focus to conserve natural, cultural and social environment.

Undoubtedly, sustainable tourism program should be able to reduce mass poverty through tourism development and mechanism for equitable distribution.

**12. Please explain the community-heritage site relationship in Nepal?**

There was not strong community heritage sites relationship in Nepal. In few heritage sites they have relationship providing 50% income to buffer zone. There were many incidents against the protection of heritage sites. However, In natural heritage sites the people were killing the wildlife which shown the weak relationship between heritage managers and local people. Furthermore, lack of education and awareness to the community also being a barrier for smooth community heritage site management relationships.

**13. In your view, what are the main barriers for sustainable management of World Heritage Sites? Could you please list with solutions?**

They focused that the existing rule, policies, guidelines and code of conducts are not sufficient to make Lumbini a sustainable destination. They added that all rules and regulations should be world heritage friendly, furthermore, the existing system in appointment of top management personnel's by political appointment is not good, they should be chosen by their knowledge and experiences in this field. Heritage professionals only can manage a heritage site properly rather than a political leader.

They pointed the necessity of management plan and need to involve local people in every step of tourism planning and implementation. Further, it is need that the role and responsibilities of all stakeholders should be separated. The most important suggestion they gave that, local people only can preserve and protect this heritage site, if they are not ready to actively participate it would be always impossible for sustainable management of the heritage property.

**14. What are your suggestions to make Lumbini a Sustainable?**

The main suggestions were as follows:

- World heritage friendly rules and regulations
- Active participation of local community people
- Collaboration and understanding among all stakeholders
- Management plan

- Involve local peoples all levels of management and decision-making

**15. Do you have any more comment, suggestions and recommendations about the sustainable management of Lumbini Heritage Site?**

For sustainable management of Lumbini heritage site, they suggested that it is most urgent to implement Lumbini Master Plan. They suggested developing infrastructures, local participation, and collaboration among all stakeholders as well as need to develop marketing and promotional strategies.

**Table 3.14** List of interviewees

S.N.	Designation	Organization
1.	Joint-secretary (Planning)	Ministry of Culture Tourism and Civil Aviation
2.	Director general	Department of Archeology
3.	Chief Executive Officer	National Academy of Tourism and Hotel Management
4.	National Program Manager	TRPAP (MoCTCA)
5.	Manager	Lumbini Development Trust
6.	Manager	Nepal Tourism Board
7.	President	Local Hotel Association, Lumbini
8.	President	Local Travel Agents Association, Lumbini
9.	President	Local Tour Guide Association, Lumbini
10.	President	Rickshaw Pullers Association, Lumbini
11.	In charge	Tourism Office, Belahiya , Rupandehi
12.	VDC Head	Ekala Village Development Committee
13.	VDC Head	Tenuhawa Village Development Committee
14.	VDC Head	Lumbini Village Development Committee
15.	VDC Head	Madhuwani Village Development Committee