

## FACTORS AFFECTING THE IMPACT OF PILGRIMAGE TOURISM

**Dr.U.Dadakalandar ,**

**Guest Faculty in Department of Business Management, Vikrama Simhapuri University College,  
Kavali , Email: [kalandar.mba@gmail.com](mailto:kalandar.mba@gmail.com)**

**Dr.B.Swapna,**

**Guest Faculty in Department of Business Management, Vikrama Simhapuri University College,  
Kavali , Email: [swapnasetty17@gmail.com](mailto:swapnasetty17@gmail.com)**

### **Abstract:**

*Pilgrimage tourism is a form of journey; it provides an opportunity for people to visit sacred places, and it is a feature that is common to more or less all societies. India has a versatile culture, and it is a religious nation. The outcome of the research is factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism in Andhra Pradesh. It includes social impact, economic impact, cultural impact, infrastructural impact, and entrepreneurial impact. The standard of living of the local people and dependents of pilgrimage tourism can be increased by encouraging pilgrimage tourism in India. It is accurate in terms of practical results. The current research will give new insight into the world of research. The structured, closed-ended questionnaire used to collect data from various selected prominent pilgrimage destinations in Andhra Pradesh collected 400 samples from 4 destinations, which included 100 samples from each destination. The outcome of the analysis is a t-test and an ANOVA. The current study examines factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism in Andhra Pradesh.*

**Keywords:** *Tourism, Pilgrimage Tourism, Temples, Social Impact, Economic Impact, Cultural Impact, Infrastructural Impact, Entrepreneurial Impact.*

### **Introduction**

India is an influence of religions; each religion has its own essentials and proposed lifestyle to measure it as in a perfect world. Pilgrimage tourism is that kind of excluded or powerfully driven for spiritual reasons. Pilgrimage has great significance within the cultural context of the country. The practice of pilgrimage in India is so proudly enriched by the social mind and the plethora of sacred places. India is a second to none when it comes to the diversity seeable in the various religions that it fills as an amalgamating pot, which is so much bigger in number than the entire sub continent.

### **Pilgrimage Tourism in Andhra Pradesh**

Andhra Pradesh is the fourth-largest state in India. The state is known for its pilgrimage sites. Andhra Pradesh is home to the richest and second-most visited religious places in the world. The state of magnificent architecture and exquisiteness that gives the impression of the Lord Venkateswara Temple in Tirupati is the most prominent religious place with in the state.

### **Sri Venkateswara Swamy Temple**

Sri Venkateswara Swamy Temple could be a landmark Vaishnavite temple situated with in the hill town of Tirumala at Tirupati in the Chittoor district of the state of India. The temple was built on the seventh hill. These Tirumala hills are part of the Seshachalam Hills range. The hills are located 85 meters above sea level. One must travel approximately 22 kilometers to succeed in Tirumala via the Alipiri entrance.

### **Sri Kalahasteeswara Swamy Temple**

Sri Kalahasteeswara Swamy Temple is one of the most famous Shiva temples in South India and also one of the most impressive temples in India. It is considered one of the traditional and must-visit holy places of the state.

### **Kanaka Durgamma Temple**

The Kanaka Durga Temple is one of the simplest places to go in Vijayawada. Set along the banks of the Krishna River and surrounded by the picturesque Indrakeeladri Hills, this holy shrine is constructed in Dravidian-style architecture and is devoted to Goddess Durga.

### **Mallikarjuna Swamy Temple**

The shrine of Lord Mallikarjuna Swamy Temple is situated on a flat top of the Nallamala hills in the town of Srisailem province. Mallikarjuna Swamy Temple has taken into account the unitedness of the 12 Jyothirlinga temples dedicated to Lord Shiva, attracting devotees from every where in the country.

### **Survey of Literature**

Most of the studies have measured its importance and socio-economic development through pilgrimage tourism (**S. Vijayanand 2012**). In this case study, the land use pattern, socio-economic conditions, and tourism-related employment in the area have shown a marked influence on Shahdara Sharief Village. (**M.Ashfaq & S.Parveen, 2015**). Therefore, notable investment in tourism development should be of interest to the government, as this helps ensure the local communities' economic benefits. (**Bakri et.al.,2014**). The present work is an attempt to study the socio-economic impacts of pilgrimage tourism at Katra and its surrounding areas and also study the share of this pilgrimage center in the state economy. (**N. Gill & R.P. Singh, 2013**). The study presents tourism development in the context of socio-economic aspects, and geo-visualization is done by a tourism and tourist variation map of the study area. (**V. Prasad Sati, 2015**). Pilgrimage tourism is one of the most cultural and socio-economic activities in the mountain region. It has been practiced since time immemorial and is a major source of income, as about 40% of the total income is earned from its practices. (**P. Sujatha & U. Dadakalandar, 2019**). A research study has examined socio-economic growth in the various southern parts of India. Their effect on the social and economic lives of people living in the same place and nearby localities This study is for destination evaluation and an assessment of the economic impacts of tourism. (**S.K. Gupta & Kumar Maurya, 2019**). There is a significant increase in employment generation, the quality of life of the local community, and significant tourism and basic infrastructure development in the region. (**Dinesh Vallabh et al., 2018**). It reveals the economic benefits brought to their community by religious tourism. The public sector should partner with the private sector and come up with different strategies that can boost the local economy. (**Jajang Gunawijaya and Annisa Pratiwi 2018**). The study has been conducted based on local communities and could contribute to tourism development in rural areas. (**Bello Yekinni Ojo and Bello Mercy Busayo, 2017**). These studies examined the correlation between religious tourism and the economic development of host communities in Africa with a focus on Nigeria had not been reported. (**Hadrian Amril, 2017**). This study aims to analyze the socio-economic factors affecting tourism trips generated by Jambi residents. These factors are age, education, and family status. (**Castillo Canalejo, Ana Maria et al., 2016**). The local community of residents and their attitudes and perceptions are a group of essential interests when analyzing and managing the economy, socio-cultural, and environmental impact of tourism development in a certain region. (**Fatemeh Shafaei and Badaruddin Mohamed, 2015**). The intention of this study is based on the model development of social impact assessment. Attitudinal surveys are the most common method of addressing a range of social and cultural impacts. (**Geethika Nayoni and W.K. Atula Gnanapala, 2015**). The study is going to investigate whether the community has received socio-economic impacts on local communities through tourism development, with special reference to Kandalama. (**Jeetesh Kumar and Kashif Hussain 2014**) It reveals that evaluating tourism's economic effects is the economic impact of tourism. (**Norjanah Mohd Bakri et al., 2014**).The outcome of the research is the perceptions of local communities about the economic impacts of tourism development in Langkawi, Malaysia.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To study the prominent pilgrimage tourism destinations.

2. To measure the social impact of pilgrimage tourism destinations.
3. To evaluate the economic impact of pilgrimage tourism destinations.
4. To assess the cultural impact of pilgrimage tourism destinations.
5. To identify the infrastructural impact of pilgrimage tourism destinations.
6. To examine the entrepreneurial impact of pilgrimage tourism destinations.

### Scope of the Study

There are a large number of pilgrimage destinations in Andhra Pradesh. Every district has one or two heritage sites, and every year a lot of pilgrims visit the destinations. In order to simply do it, the purview of the study is restricted. The scope of the present study is confined to the various factors influencing pilgrimage tourism destinations in Andhra Pradesh.

### Need for the Study

This study implies that tourism plays a significant role in developing the economic position of the country. India has prominent destinations to attract foreign tourists, which facilitates and strengthens the economy of the country. Pilgrimage tourism will create an unforgettable experience for the tourists who visit the pilgrimage destinations.

### Limitations of the Study

The outcome of the research cannot be generalized to all parts of the country. Because of the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism, In fact, the data is being assessed through the selected prominent pilgrimage tourism destinations in Andhra Pradesh.

### Hypotheses Testing

- ❖ *H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference between opinion on factors influencing on impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to gender of the respondents.*
- ❖ *H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant difference between opinion on factors influencing on impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to age group of the respondents.*
- ❖ *H<sub>03</sub>: There is no significant difference between opinion on factors influencing on impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to educational qualification of the respondents.*
- ❖ *H<sub>04</sub>: There is no significant difference between opinion on factors influencing on impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to occupation of the respondents.*

The present research study aims to investigate the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism in Andhra Pradesh.

### Research Methodology

The information for the current study has been collected as reliable data from two main sources: primary sources and secondary sources.

### Primary Data

The first-hand information, which was a personally administered questionnaire and a structured interview, was collected from the local people.

### Secondary Data

This information was obtained from journals, textbooks, the internet, and alternative supporting written materials.

### Sample Size

From the prominent pilgrimage destinations, we have taken 400 samples. At each destination, 100 samples were collected.

Andhra Pradesh :	Tirumala	Srikalahasti	Vijayawada	Srisailem
------------------	----------	--------------	------------	-----------

### Sampling Method

The data has been collected on the basis of stratified random sampling. From each stratum, 100 samples were collected; the total sample size will be around 400, which is sufficient to conduct the research in the specified areas.

### Statistical Tools

- Frequency test
- t-Test
- ANOVA

### Results & Discussions

The following table provides the classification of the respondents in the sample selected from Andhra Pradesh along the various demographic dimensions. The sample consists of 400 respondents in total, drawn from the four famous pilgrimage destinations in Andhra Pradesh.

**Table.1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Demographic Variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	213	53.2
Female	187	46.8
<b>Age</b>		
< 30 years	96	24.0
31-40 years	135	33.8
41-50 years	113	28.2
> 50 years	56	14.0
<b>Educational Qualification</b>		
Illiterate	51	12.8
Below SSC	64	16.0
SSC to Intermediate	89	22.3
Under Graduates	133	33.3
Post Graduates	62	15.5
Others	1	.3
<b>Occupation</b>		
Non-Tourism related	146	36.5
Tourism related	254	63.5

*Source: Primary Source*

### Inference:

From the above table.1 reveals that out of 400 sample respondents, (53.2%) of the respondents are Male categories and (46.8%) of the respondents are Female categories. It indicates that (33.8%) of the respondents are between 30-40 years age group, followed by (28.2%) of the respondents are between 40-50 years age group, (24%) of the respondents are below 30 years age group and (14%) of the respondents are above 50 years age group. It evaluates that (33.3%) of the respondents are under graduates followed by (22.3%) of the respondents are SSC to Intermediates, (16%) of the respondents are below SSC, (15.5%) of the respondents are post graduates, (12.8%) of the respondents are illiterates and (0.3%) of the respondents are other qualifications. It observed that (63.5%) of the respondents occupation is tourism related and (36.5%) of the respondents occupation is non-tourism related occupation.

**Independent Sample t-test**

An independent sample t-test examines whether there is a significant difference in a qualitative or numerical variable between the two groups or categories of respondents. The independent variable must be categorical with only two categories, and the dependent variable must be quantitative or numerical. Two group means are compared to determine whether they are significantly different from each other. We need to examine several statistics, one of which is the p-value. This value must be 0.5 or below to determine whether a significant difference between the two groups exists.

**Table.2: Factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to gender**

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.	Null Hypothesis
Social Impact	Male	213	4.0376	.70610	.152	.697	Accepted
	Female	187	4.0642	.65266			
	Total	400	4.0500	.68093			
Economic Impact	Male	213	3.9155	.49754	.382	.537	Accepted
	Female	187	3.9465	.50516			
	Total	400	3.9300	.50073			
Cultural Impact	Male	213	3.8169	.61375	.531	.467	Accepted
	Female	187	3.7647	.81533			
	Total	400	3.7925	.71465			
Infrastructural Impact	Male	213	3.9108	.81062	.080	.777	Accepted
	Female	187	3.8877	.81861			
	Total	400	3.9000	.81342			
Entrepreneurial Impact	Male	213	4.1502	.70441	.251	.617	Accepted
	Female	187	4.1872	.77059			
	Total	400	4.1675	.73539			

Source: Field Survey  
 Significant at 5% level

In

**Inference:**

Table 2 reveals the mean and standard deviation of the respondents opinions on the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism and the gender of the respondents. Regarding "social impact," the statement got the highest mean value by gender; female respondents got 4.0642, and male respondents got 4.0366, respectively. The calculated p-value is 0.697, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e., ( $P > 0.05$ ). The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the social impact factor with respect to the gender of the respondents.

Regarding "Economic Impact", the statement got the highest mean score by gender: 3.9465 for female respondents and 3.9155 for male respondents. The calculated p-value is 0.537, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e., ( $P > 0.05$ ). The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the economic impact factor with respect to the gender of the respondents.

Regarding "Cultural Impact", the statement received the highest mean value for gender, with 3.8169 male respondents and 3.7647 female respondents. The calculated p-value is 0.467, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e., ( $P > 0.05$ ). The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the cultural impact factor with respect to the gender of the respondents.

Regarding "Infrastructural Impact", the statement got the highest mean value for gender, with 3.9108 male respondents and 3.8877 female respondents. The calculated p-value is 0.777, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e., ( $P > 0.05$ ). The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the infrastructural impact factor with respect to the gender of the respondents.

Regarding "Entrepreneurial Impact", the statement received the highest mean score by gender: 4.1872 for female respondents and 4.1502 for male respondents. The calculated p-value is 0.617, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e., ( $P > 0.05$ ). The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the entrepreneurial impact factor with respect to the gender of the respondents.

**Table.3: Factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to occupation**

Factors	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.	Null Hypothesis
Social Impact	Non-Tourism related	146	4.0068	.77457	.923	.337	<b>Accepted</b>
	Tourism related	254	4.0748	.62104			
	Total	400	4.0500	.68093			
Economic Impact	Non-Tourism related	146	3.9247	.52635	.026	.872	<b>Accepted</b>
	Tourism related	254	3.9331	.48643			
	Total	400	3.9300	.50073			
Cultural Impact	Non-Tourism related	146	3.8493	.52970	1.455	.228	<b>Accepted</b>
	Tourism related	254	3.7598	.80106			
	Total	400	3.7925	.71465			
Infrastructural Impact	Non-Tourism related	146	3.9521	.81649	.941	.332	<b>Accepted</b>
	Tourism related	254	3.8701	.81175			
	Total	400	3.9000	.81342			
Entrepreneurial Impact	Non-Tourism related	146	4.1712	.73681	.006	.939	<b>Accepted</b>
	Tourism related	254	4.1654	.73602			
	Total	400	4.1675	.73539			

Source: Field Survey  
 Significant at 5% level

In

**Inference:**

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation of the respondents opinions on the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism and occupation. Regarding "Social Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at the occupation: 4.0748 is tourism-related and 4.0068 is non-tourism-related. The calculated p-value is 0.337, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the social impact factor with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

Regarding "Economic Impact", the statement received the highest mean value for the occupation: 3.9331 is tourism-related and 3.9247 is non-tourism-related. The calculated p-value is 0.872, which is more

than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the economic impact factor with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

Regarding "Cultural Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at the occupation: 3.8493 is non-tourism and 3.7598 is tourism-related. The calculated p-value is 0.228, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the cultural impact factor with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

Regarding "Infrastructural Impact", the statement received with the highest mean value of 3.9521 is non-tourism, and 3.8701 is tourism-related. The calculated p-value is 0.332, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the infrastructural impact factor with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

Regarding "Entrepreneurial Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at 4.1712, which is non-tourism-related, and 4.1654, which is tourism-related. The calculated p-value is 0.939, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on the entrepreneurial impact factor with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

#### ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is an analysis tool used in statistics that splits an observed aggregate variability found inside a data set into two parts: systematic factors and random factors. The systematic factors have a statistical influence on the given data set, while the random factors do not. Analysis uses the ANOVA test to determine the influence that independent variables have on the dependent variable in a regression study.

**Table.4 :Factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to age**

Factors	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-Value	Sig.	Null Hypothesis
Social Impact	< 30 years	96	3.9792	.69554	1.450	.228	Accepted
	31-40 years	135	4.1407	.58798			
	41-50 years	113	3.9912	.77339			
	> 50 years	56	4.0714	.65663			
	Total	400	4.0500	.68093			
Economic Impact	< 30 years	96	3.8958	.53270	1.027	.380	Accepted
	31-40 years	135	3.8963	.47746			
	41-50 years	113	3.9558	.50691			
	> 50 years	56	4.0179	.48584			
	Total	400	3.9300	.50073			
Cultural Impact	< 30 years	96	3.6979	.79630	1.653	.177	Accepted
	31-40 years	135	3.7852	.66226			
	41-50 years	113	3.7965	.73387			
	> 50 years	56	3.9643	.63143			
	Total	400	3.7925	.71465			
Infrastructural Impact	< 30 years	96	3.8958	.83954	.490	.690	Accepted
	31-40 years	135	3.9111	.83279			
	41-50 years	113	3.8407	.77421			
	> 50 years	56	4.0000	.80904			
	Total	400	3.9000	.81342			

Entrepreneurial Impact	< 30 years	96	4.2292	.70306	.718	.542	<b>Accepted</b>
	31-40 years	135	4.1852	.63698			
	41-50 years	113	4.1504	.75854			
	> 50 years	56	4.0536	.94233			
	Total	400	4.1675	.73539			

Source: Field Survey

In

Significant at 5% level

**Inference:**

Table 4 shows the mean and standard deviation of the respondents' opinions on factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism and the age group of the respondents. Regarding "Social Impact", the statement got the highest mean score at age: 4.1407 is 31–40 years old, followed by 4.0714 is above 50 years old, 3.9912 is 41–50 years old, and 3.9792 is below 30 years old. The calculated p-value is 0.228, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on social impact with respect to the age group of the respondents.

Regarding "Economic Impact", the statement received the highest mean value at the age: 4.0179, which is above 50 years, followed by 3.9558, which is 41–50 years, 3.8963, which is 31–40 years, and 3.8958, which is below 30 years. The calculated p-value is 0.380, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on economic impact with respect to the age group of the respondents.

Regarding "cultural impact," the statement got the highest mean value at age: 3.9643 is above 50 years, followed by 3.7965 is 41–50 years, 3.7852 is 31–40 years, and 3.6979 is below 30 years. The calculated p-value is 0.177, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on cultural impact with respect to the age group of the respondents.

Regarding "Infrastructural Impact", the statement received the highest mean value at the age: 4.0000 is above 50 years, followed by 3.9111 is 31–40 years, 3.8958 is below 30 years, and 3.8407 is 41–50 years. The calculated p-value is 0.690, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on infrastructural impact with respect to the age group of the respondents.

Regarding "Entrepreneurial Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at the age: 4.2292 is below 30 years, followed by 4.1852 is 31–40 years, 4.1504 is 41–50 years, and 4.0536 is above 50 years. The calculated p-value is 0.542, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on entrepreneurial impact with respect to the age group of the respondents.

**Table.5: Factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to educational qualification**

Factors	Educational Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-Value	Sig.	Null Hypothesis
Social Impact	Illiterates	51	4.1176	.68256	2.617	.024	<b>Accepted</b>
	Below SSC	64	4.0938	.68357			
	SSC to Intermediate	89	3.9888	.68248			
	Under Graduates	133	4.1429	.60481			
	Post Graduates	62	3.8226	.77933			
	Others	1	5.0000	.74568			

	Total	400	4.0500	.68093			
Economic Impact	Illiterates	51	3.8039	.52989	2.596	.025	<b>Accepted</b>
	Below SSC	64	3.9531	.45179			
	SSC Intermediate to	89	3.8989	.52321			
	Under Graduation	133	4.0376	.49857			
	Post Graduation	62	3.8226	.46250			
	Others	1	4.0000	.49865			
	Total	400	3.9300	.50073			
Cultural Impact	Illiterates	51	3.8039	.66392	.928	.463	<b>Accepted</b>
	Below SSC	64	3.7969	.75969			
	SSC Intermediate to	89	3.6966	.71358			
	Under Graduation	133	3.8722	.72209			
	Post Graduation	62	3.7581	.69390			
	Others	1	3.0000	.64523			
	Total	400	3.7925	.71465			
Infrastructural Impact	Illiterates	51	3.8627	.74886	.609	.693	<b>Accepted</b>
	Below SSC	64	3.9531	.86244			
	SSC Intermediate to	89	3.9551	.82448			
	Under Graduation	133	3.8647	.85972			
	Post Graduation	62	3.8548	.69770			
	Others	1	5.0000	.67987			
	Total	400	3.9000	.81342			
Entrepreneurial Impact	Illiterates	51	4.1373	.72165	2.908	.014	<b>Accepted</b>
	Below SSC	64	4.3125	.58757			
	SSC Intermediate to	89	4.1573	.65538			
	Under Graduation	133	4.2406	.80858			
	Post Graduation	62	3.8871	.77046			
	Others	1	5.0000	.78654			
	Total	400	4.1675	.73539			

Source: Field Survey  
 Significant at 5% level

In

**Inference:**

Table 5 depicts the mean and standard deviation of the respondents opinions on factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism and their educational qualifications. Regarding "Social Impact", the statement shows the highest mean value at the educational qualification level: 5.0000 for other qualifications, followed by 4.1429 for under graduates, 4.1176 for illiterates, 4.0938 for SSC, 3.9888 for SSC to intermediates, and 3.8226 for postg raduates. The calculated p-value is 0.24, which is more than the standard significant value at the 1% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.01$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the opinions on social impact with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.

Regarding "Economic Impact", the statement received the highest mean value at the educational qualification level: 4.0376 for under graduates, followed by 4.0000 for other qualifications, 3.9531 for below SSC, 3.8989 for SSC to intermediates, 3.8226 for post graduates, and 3.8039 for illiterates. The calculated p-value is 0.025, which is more than the standard significant value at the 1% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.01$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the opinions on economic impact with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.

Regarding "Cultural Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at the educational qualification: 3.8722 is under graduates, followed by 3.8039 is illiterate, 3.7969 is below SSC, 3.7581 is post graduates, 3.6966 is SSC to intermediates, and 3.0000 is other qualifications. The calculated p-value is 0.463, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in opinion on cultural impact with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.

Regarding "Infrastructural Impact", the statement received the highest mean value at the educational qualification: 5.0000 is other qualifications, followed by 3.9551 is SSC to Intermediates, 3.9531 is below SSC, 3.8647 is under graduates, 3.8627 is illiterate, and 3.8548 is post graduates. The calculated p-value is 0.693, which is more than the standard significant value at the 5% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.05$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the opinions on infrastructural impact with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.

Regarding "Entrepreneurial Impact", the statement got the highest mean value at the educational qualification: 5.0000 is other qualifications, followed by 4.3125 is below SSC, 4.2406 is under graduatess, 4.1573 is SSC to intermediates, 4.1373 is illiterate, and 3.8871 is post graduates. The calculated p-value is 0.014, which is more than the standard significant value at the 1% level of significance, i.e.,  $p > 0.01$ . The distribution is insignificant. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the opinions on entrepreneurial impact with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.

### **Findings of the Study**

- It was observed that (53.2%) of the respondents were male and (46.8%) were female.
- It indicates that (33.8%) of the respondents belong to 31–40 years, followed by (28.2%) of the respondents belonging to 41–50 years, (24%) of the respondents belonging to below 30 years, and (14%) of the respondents belonging to above 50 years.
- It implies that (33.3%) of the respondents are under graduates, followed by (22.3%) of the respondents who belong to SSC to Intermediate, (16%) of the respondents belong to SSC, (15.5%) of the respondents belong to SSC to Intermediates, (12.8%) of the respondents are illiterate, and (0.3%) of the respondents have other qualifications.
- It reveals that (63.5%) of the respondents belong to tourism-related occupations, and (36.5%) of the respondents belong to tourism-related occupations.
- Therefore, the null hypotheses are accepted with respect to all factors. Hence, there is no significant difference in opinion on the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to the gender of the respondents.
- Therefore, the null hypotheses are accepted with respect to all factors. Hence, there is no significant difference between the opinions of the respondents with respect to their age group.

- Therefore, the null hypotheses are accepted with respect to all factors. Hence, there is no significant difference between the opinions on the impact of pilgrimage tourism with respect to the educational qualifications of the respondents.
- Therefore, the null hypotheses are accepted with respect to all factors. Hence, there is no significant difference between the opinions on the impact of pilgrimage with respect to the occupation of the respondents.

### **Suggestions of the Study**

- Pilgrimage tourism shows that the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism are more considerable. Government and development agencies need to come forward with various central and state government strategies to develop pilgrimage tourism in south India.
- There is also much scope for the development of the business sector with the help of pilgrimage tourism in south India.
- Pilgrimage tourism will also assist in developing infrastructure in that specific area. So, there is a need to strengthen the infrastructure as well.

### **Conclusion**

The results of the foregoing study have demonstrated that pilgrimage tourism is playing a significant role in factors influencing the impact of tourism development. The socio-economic conditions show that there's wide variation in the earnings of the ritual functionaries. This work is an effort to review the Andhra Pradesh pilgrimage tourism destinations and the factors influencing the impact of local people's perspectives. The study reveals that pilgrimage tourism in Andhra Pradesh has improved the income and standard of living of the local people. It often provides consistent sources of revenue, employment, and income to a destination economy. The study aims to analyze the factors influencing the impact of pilgrimage tourism.

#### **Scope for Future Research:**

The scope of future research can also be extended in the area of comparative study between the states with respect to pilgrimage tourism development. In fact, the scope of the research can be extended to the area of marketing strategies to develop pilgrimage tourism in the respective area.

### **References**

1. P. Sujatha & U. Dadakalandar (2019) Socio economic Impact of Pilgrim Tourism in South India, International Journal of basic and applied Research, Vol-9,No-5,pp.675-681
2. S.Samantha, R.K.Nanda, P.Rautaray & David Lagourie Gosling,(2019) Socioeconomic study of ritual functionaries (SEVAKS) of world-famous Shri Jagannath temple, Puri, India, Cogent Social Sciences, Volume-5,Issue-1,pp-1-39
3. S.K.Gupta & Abhishek Kumar Maurya (2019) Destination Evaluation and Tourism Economic Impact Assessment: A Case Study of Varanasi, Journal of The Gujarat Research Society, Volume-21,Issue-14,pp.1446-14456
4. P.Sujatha & U.Dadakalandar (2018) Problems and Prospects of Pilgrimage Tourism Towards Bara Shaheed Dargah (Roti Festival) with special Reference to Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh.Vol-6,Issue-2,pp.293-306
5. U.Dadakalandar & P.Sujatha (2018) A Study on Impacts of Pilgrimage Tourism with Respect to Annavaram Satya Narayana Swamy Temple in Andhra Pradesh, Journal of Tourism & Hospitality, Vol-7,Issue-5,pp.1-4

6. Dinesh Vallabh, Sindisisisa Maxongo & Lawzi Apleni (2018) Residents 'Perception of the economic benefits brought by religious tourism: A case study of Quigney. East London. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, Volume-7(4),pp.1-15
7. Jajang Gunawijaya and Annisa Pratiwi (2018)"How Local Community could Contribute on Vocational Higher Education (ICVHE) 2017" The Importance on Advancing Vocational Education to Meet Contemporary Labor Demands," KNE Social Sciences, pages:826-834. DOI: 10.18502/Kss.V3i11.2809.
8. Bello Yekinni Ojo & Bello Mercy Busayo (2017) Exploring the Relationship between Religion Tourism and Economic Development of a Host Community, International Journal of Business and Management Invention, Volume-6, Issue-9,pp.41-51
9. Hardiani Amril (2017) Socio-economic determinants of tourism trips by Jambi residents, Journal Perspective Pembiayaan dan pembangunan Daerah, volume-4,No-4,pp.219-230
10. Castillo Canalejo, Ana Maria, Nunez Tabales, Julia M & Sanchez Canizares, Sandra Maria (2016) Local Community 'Perceptions on Tourist Impacts and Associated Development: A Case Study on Sal and Boa Vista Islanda, Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, Volume-7,No-1,pp.383-394
11. Fatemeh Shafaei and Badaruddin Mohamed (2015) A Stage-Based Model Development Study on Tourism Social Impact Assessment, International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume-5, Issue-3, pp. 1-6
12. Geethika Nayomi & W.K.Athula Gnanapala (2015) Socio-Economic Impacts on Local Community through Tourism Development with special Reference to Heritance Kandalama. Tourism Leisure and Global change,volume-2,p-TOC-57
13. Jeetesh Kumar & Kashif Hussain (2014) Evaluating tourism's economic effects comparison of different approaches, Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 144 (2014) 360-365
14. Norjanah Mohd Bakri, Mastura Jaafar & Diana Mohammad (2014) Perceptions of Local Communities on the Economic Impacts of Tourism Development in Langkawi, Malaysia. Article available at <http://www.shs-conferences.org> or <http://dx.org/10.105/shsconf/2014/201100>
15. Mohammad Ashfaq & Shazia Parveen (2014) Socio-Economic Impact of Pilgrimage Tourism: A Geographical Enquiry to MataVashino Devi, International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Vol-4,Issue-7,pp.1-16
16. S.Vijayanand (2014) The Issues and Perspectives of Pilgrimage Tourism Development in Tanjur, International Journal of Tourism & Hospitality Reviews, Vol-1,No-1,pp.61-70
17. S.Vijayanand(2013) Pilgrimage Tourism and its Issues and Challenges with special reference to Nagapattinam District, ASEAN Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, Vol-12,pp.119-140.