

A Perceived image of Hill Stations of the Satara District, Maharashtra- by Domestic Tourist

Dr. Rajashri Ramesh Chavan, Asst. Professor, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Varye, Satara

Dr. Sarang Shankar Bhola, Associate Professor, Karmaveer Bhaurao Patil Institute of Management Studies and Research, Varye, Satara

ABSTRACT:

The paper aims to distinguish the tourist satisfaction with existing tourist amenities at hill stations of Maharashtra Mahabaleshwar and Panchgani located in Satara district and to understand the tourist pattern by means of their demographic profile.

Hypothesis set to test the relationship between occupation and perception of tourist towards importance of service and amenities. The study further examines the relationship between occupation and other tourist details viz. tourist travel pattern, purpose of visit, mode of travel, average length of stay and stay arrangement.

Tourists' opinion measured through 5 point likert scale. The probable demographic and tourist travel pattern data collected through close ended questions. 32 tourist services and amenities listed to consider the responses from tourist. 65 tourist's samples have been interviewed. One sample 't' test, ANOVA and Chi-square test have used to test the proposed hypotheses. The SPSS 19 version has been used to analyse the collected data. The destination is more preferred to visit with family and travelled using personal car. Metro town tourists who are the vicinity of Satara found higher at the destination. Tourist have showed their dissatisfaction only towards air and rail facility and as well felt least important. The result of hypotheses testing reveals that tourists are not satisfied with all available tourist services and amenities. Tourist occupation and purpose of visit, tourist travel pattern, 'mode of travel used to reach', average length of stay, stay arrangement, and 'source used to know the destination' are independent variables. There is weak association between occupation and importance of tourist services and amenities. Results raise scope for further researches as to confirm the impact of psychological and economical factors in deciding tourism, sustainable tourism development at hill station and to analyse trend of the tourist arrival at hill stations.

Key Words:

Hill station, tourist arrival, tourist pattern, Demographic profile

INTRODUCTION:

Tourism is the fastest growing industry in the world. Tourism needs to be marketed, just as any other product indeed more so, because it is an industry in which the customer still has an immense variety of choice. However, the marketing of tourist destination differ in some important respects from the marketing of other goods and services and an awareness of these differences is important in a successful promotion of the images of tourist places. Mahabaleshwar a hill station is 4500 feet above the sea level and was once upon a time the health resort of the British. Maharaj Pratapsingh of Satara decided to develop Mahabaleshwar between 1818 to 1830 as a health centre. John Malcolm, the Governor then, visited Mahabaleshwar in 1828. General Peter Lodwick was responsible for restoring the sanatorium in the city. He also developed the place appropriately as a resort. Before Lodwick, other British officers like Sir Charles Mallet have been known to have visited Mahabaleshwar. The site has multiple tourist attractions like Bombay Point, Arthur Seat, Kates Point, Lodwick-Wilson Point, Elphinston Point, Venna Lake, Lingmala waterfall, Tapola. The Mahadeo temple is close by at Shrikshetra Mahabaleshwar, the place which is the source of the five rivers Krishna, Koyna, Venna, Savitri and Gayatri. The Venna Lake offers excellent boating facilities and the market and food stalls surrounding the lake are also a high point of tourist interest. Mahabaleshwar produces strawberries, mulberries, carrots and honey.

Panchgani, as the name indicates, is surrounded by five mountains. This hill station is just 20 km. from Mahabaleshwar in Satara district, 98 km from Pune at a height of 1372 meters. The rocky cliffs, deep valleys, clean and cool air, peace and quiet, dense foliage, interesting trekking trails, gardens, orchards and flowering plants, has made a favourite spot for many a tourist. The outlets for strawberries, mulberries, saffron carrots, honey, jams and jellies, fruit jelly sweets, fruit syrups, are a major tourist attraction of Panchgani. Apart from these fruit orchards maintained by the jam and jelly manufacturing companies add to the attraction. The plant nurseries selling exotic flower cutting and fruit saplings are popular among

tourists. Panchgani also houses several residential schools for many years.

These two well-known hill stations of Maharashtra located in Satara district. It was observed that at Panchgani tourist arrival was 1378655 in 2010-11. At Mahabaleshwar is 1323765 in 2011-12. Panchgani and Mahabaleshwar are famous for their scenic beauty which has capacity to attract and hold the large tourist flow. The paper aims to know the domestic tourists' travel pattern, demographic profile and to understand their satisfaction level on the available tourist services and amenities. Also to know the perceptual importance of these tourist services and amenities for the visited tourist at hill station.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

(Debasish Batabyal, November 2013)The study has touched upon a number of theoretical and empirical issues relating to the formulation of travel booking and thereby contributing to the destination marketing strategies for the appropriate development of tourism in Sikkim in the backdrop of the present market conditions in India and abroad.

(Varughese, April 2013)This paper analyses the marketing activities, the various problems faced by tourism service providers and the perception of tourists towards backwater tourism in Kerala. Tourist's satisfaction with the main elements of tourism products was measured by using Likert's five point rating scale. A majority of the tourists were satisfied with backwater tourism and were dissatisfied with the lack of cleanliness of backwaters and hygiene factors.

(Mohapatra, July 2011)Paper has analyzed the change in tourism industry in years and has tried to give few suggestions for further improvement. The researcher has also highlighted some major ecotourism spots of Orissa. Tourism can become Orissa's core competency sector creating employment, enhancing production, productivity and contributing significantly towards development of the state.

(H., November 2011)Tourism sector is making a significant contribution to the state economy. Therefore, it needs to be well nurtured by making a proper policy on tourism sector by the central as well as the state governments. It is also the responsibility of the concerned State to exhibit the various tourism products available in the state. The policy of tourism should be in such a direction. The state government's initiations in marketing the tourism products are evaluated in this article (Manish, April 2009) Study tries to find out the factors which are crucial for the success of tourist destinations and their positioning. The researcher also tries to find out the status of these factors in India

and suggested some measures which can be utilized for up gradation of tourism Industry in India.

(Kuma, 2009)Promotion needs adjustment to variation in travel media, availability of sales personnel and other promotional inputs. As the level of international tourism increases, the entire organization is directed towards the tourist and travel market.

(Chavan Rajashri Ramesh, 2013)Study was proposed with objectives to know the tourism perception on attraction of tourism products, to know the motivators to tourism, the pricing perception, determine the awareness and opinion for other worth seeing destinations of Satara district and to know the opinion of tourist on potential of tourism in Satara district. It is macro study where image of Satara to come up as tourist destination in tourist point of view is checked. However, individual tourism product makes the difference in perceiving the image. Therefore efforts made to conduct the study on the perceived image of hill station of Satara district, Maharashtra to bridge the gap.

METHODOLOGY:

The present study is an attempt to focus on the satisfaction of tourist regarding available tourist amenities and services along with their travel pattern and demographic profile. Designed four hypotheses to test as Tourists are satisfied with available tourist service and amenities or $\mu \cdot 3$. There is no significant difference between occupation and perception of tourist towards importance of tourist service and amenities. There is no correlation between occupation and tourist travel pattern and Occupation of tourist and their perception towards importance of tourist services and amenities are not correlated. Both primary and secondary data have been used to conduct the study. Unpublished press documents were consulted to collect the tourist arrival data. On the other hand, a survey has been conducted with the help of a structured schedule to interview the tourist on the site of location. Tourists' opinion have been measured through 5 point likert scale where score 1 assigned to strongly dissatisfied to 5 to strongly satisfied. The probable demographic and tourist travel pattern data collected through close ended questions. 32 tourist service and amenities listed to consider the responses from tourist. These variables taken from the Government of India, Tourism Ministry market research report 2010. The target population of the study was tourist from both Mahabaleshwar and Panchgani hill stations. Altogether 65 samples have been interviewed at the site of location. One sample 't' test, ANOVA and Chi-square test tools are used to test the proposed hypotheses. The SPSS 19 version has been used to analyse the collected data.

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

Collected data have been analysed through frequency and percentage. This data depicts that Maharashtra other than Satara, tourists' percentage is higher (63.07%) who visit hill station compared to other states tourist. Male tourist found more (72.3%) compared to female. The age-group 25-45 found more at hill station. Mainly students, Officer/Executives Middle or Semi and juniors followed by self employed professional occupational categorical tourist found more at hill station. Almost 96.9% tourists do not prefer packaged tours to reach to the site. Family tourist travel pattern (75.4%) found at hill station. Tourism (47.7%) and Leisure (43.1%) are the purpose to visit the site. Personal Car is highly (72.3%) preferred by the tourists who visited the destination. 50.8% tourists' average length of stay is more than two days and rest preferred day visit and overnight. Average spending per person of tourist is to the range of Rs. 500-1500 according to the opinion of 83.1% tourist. Budget hotels are more preferred who stayed at the site. Source 'Friends and relatives' (56.9) and 'personal effort' (21.5%) are used to know the destination. Majority (60%) tourists have made their repeat visit. Tourist are strongly satisfied with the 'telephone/ mobile services', 'Availability of commercial

transportation', 'Availability of hotels', 'Power supply' and 'Behaviour of service personnel at wayside restaurants and Dhabas' while the mean score is more than 3 and rank obtained first, second, third, fourth and fifth respectively. However they are strongly dissatisfied with the 'Availability of authorised tour operators', 'Air connectivity', 'Rail connectivity', 'Level of road taxes on vehicle' and 'Administration of the road taxes' as these variable received highest ranks respectively as the mean score is less than 3. Comparatively 'Air Connectivity' and 'Rail Connectivity' rated higher rank among the importance of tourist services and amenities at hill station. According to opinion of tourists all mentioned tourist services and amenities are most important and highly essential at hill station.

HYPOTHESES TESTING

H₁: Tourists are satisfied with available tourist services and amenities.

One Sample 'T' test executed to examine the tourist satisfaction level by considering test value 3 which is median of 1-5 likert scale which has been used to determine the satisfaction level. In other words the hypotheses can set $H_0 : \mu < 3$ and $H_1 : \mu \geq 3$

Figure: 1 Descriptive Analysis of Satisfaction Level of Tourist

Sr.	Satisfaction Level towards Tourist Services and Amenities	One-Sample Statistics			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1.	Air Connectivity	65	1.43	.585	.073
2.	Rail Connectivity	65	1.98	.760	.094
3.	Quality Of Roads	65	3.45	.751	.093
4.	Quality Of Wayside Amenities	65	3.57	.865	.107
5.	Public Convenience Along Roads	65	3.09	.824	.102
6.	Sewage And Drainage System	65	3.65	.759	.094
7.	Garbage Disposal	65	3.82	.497	.062
8.	Condition Of City Roads	65	3.55	.587	.073
9.	Drinking Water Supply	65	3.55	.830	.103
10.	Condition Of Street Lighting	65	3.54	.831	.103
11.	Traffic Mgt	65	3.46	.812	.101
12.	Condition Of Traffic Or Transport Signage	65	3.35	.959	.119
13.	Availability Of Commercial Transportation	65	4.02	.649	.081
14.	Behaviour Of Drivers Of Commercial Transportation	65	3.31	1.457	.181
15.	Availability Of Authorized Tour Operators	44	.93	1.469	.221
16.	Availability Of Hotels	65	3.98	.780	.097
17.	Behaviour Of Service Staff At The Hotel	65	3.43	1.380	.171
18.	Tariff Structure Of The Hotel Rooms	65	2.83	.928	.115
19.	Hygiene At Wayside Restaurants And Dhabas	65	3.57	.706	.088
20.	Availability Of Petrol Pump	65	2.86	.864	.107
21.	Behaviour Of Service Personnel At Wayside Restaurants And Dhabas	65	3.83	.720	.089
22.	Levels Of Road Taxes On Vehicle	65	2.28	.976	.121
23.	Administration Of The Road Taxes	65	2.48	1.032	.128
24.	Public Utilities At The Tourist Attraction	65	2.78	.944	.117
25.	General Cleanliness Tourist Attraction And Area Around It	65	3.62	.630	.078

One-Sample Statistics					
Sr.	Satisfaction Level towards Tourist Services and Amenities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
26.	Condition Of Signage Within The Tourist Attraction	65	3.57	.829	.103
27.	Parking Facility At The Tourist Attraction	65	3.34	.815	.101
28.	Availability Of Trained Tourist Guide	65	3.60	.581	.072
29.	Behaviour Of The Guides At The Tourist Attraction	41	3.20	.558	.087
30.	Conservation Of Heritage Sites	65	2.94	1.767	.219
31.	Power Supply Situation	64	3.97	.563	.070
32.	Telephone/Mobile Services	65	4.14	.583	.072

Figure 1 reveals the descriptive statistics of opinion of tourists towards 32 tourists' services. Out of 32 tourists' services and amenities tourist were satisfied with most of the services since the mean score is more than 3 with little standard deviation. However some of the services viz. conservation of heritage sites, public utilities at the tourist attraction, administration of the road taxes, levels of road

taxes on vehicles, availability of petrol pump, tariff structure of the hotel rooms, availability of authorised tour operators, rail and air connectivity shows the strong dissatisfaction while the mean score is less than 3. Thus result infers that tourists are satisfied with most of the services except few of them mentioned in aforesaid.

Figure 2: One Sample Test Statistics

To test the set hypotheses one sample 't' test has been used and the details are as follows.

Sr.	One-Sample Test							Null Hypotheses
	Test Value = 3					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper		
1.	Air Connectivity	-21.609	64	.000	-1.569	-1.71	-1.42	Reject
2.	Rail Connectivity	-10.769	64	.000	-1.015	-1.20	-.83	Reject
3.	Quality Of Roads	4.792	64	.000	.446	.26	.63	Reject
4.	Quality Of Wayside Amenities	5.303	64	.000	.569	.35	.78	Reject
5.	Public Convenience Along Roads	.903	64	.370	.092	-.11	.30	Failed to Reject
6.	Sewage And Drainage System	6.864	64	.000	.646	.46	.83	Reject
7.	Garbage Disposal	13.237	64	.000	.815	.69	.94	Reject
8.	Condition Of City Roads	7.605	64	.000	.554	.41	.70	Reject
9.	Drinking Water Supply	5.382	64	.000	.554	.35	.76	Reject
10.	Condition Of Street Lighting	5.227	64	.000	.538	.33	.74	Reject
11.	Traffic Mgt	4.585	64	.000	.462	.26	.66	Reject
12.	Condition Of Traffic Or Transport Signage	2.975	64	.004	.354	.12	.59	Reject
13.	Availability Of Commercial Transportation	12.607	64	.000	1.015	.85	1.18	Reject
14.	Behaviour Of Drivers Of Commercial Transportation	1.703	64	.093	.308	-.05	.67	Failed to Reject
15.	Availability Of Authorised Tour Operators	-9.339	43	.000	-2.068	-2.51	-1.62	Reject
16.	Availability Of Hotels	10.171	64	.000	.985	.79	1.18	Reject
17.	Behaviour Of Service Staff At The Hotel	2.516	64	.014	.431	.09	.77	Reject
18.	Tariff Structure Of The Hotel Rooms	-1.470	64	.146	-.169	-.40	.06	Failed to Reject
19.	Hygiene At Wayside Restaurants And Dhabs	6.496	64	.000	.569	.39	.74	Reject
20.	Availability Of Petrol Pump	-1.292	64	.201	-.138	-.35	.08	Failed to Reject

Sr.	One-Sample Test							Null Hypotheses
	Test Value = 3							
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
				Lower	Upper			
1.	Behaviour Of Service Personnel At Wayside Restaurants And Dhabs	9.308	64	.000	.831	.65	1.01	Reject
2.	Levels Of Road Taxes On Vehicle	-5.971	64	.000	-.723	-.97	-.48	Reject
3.	Administration Of The Road Taxes	-4.085	64	.000	-.523	-.78	-.27	Reject
4.	Public Utilities At The Tourist Attraction	-1.840	64	.070	-.215	-.45	.02	Failed to Reject
5.	General Cleanliness Tourist Attraction And Area Around It	7.878	64	.000	.615	.46	.77	Reject
6.	Condition Of Signage Within The Tourist Attraction	5.539	64	.000	.569	.36	.77	Reject
7.	Parking Facility At The Tourist Attraction	3.346	64	.001	.338	.14	.54	Reject
8.	Availability Of Trained Tourist Guide	8.327	64	.000	.600	.46	.74	Reject
9.	Behaviour Of The Guides At The Tourist Attraction	2.240	40	.031	.195	.02	.37	Reject
0.	Conservation Of Heritage Sites	-.281	64	.780	-.062	-.50	.38	Failed to Reject
1.	Power Supply Situation	13.776	63	.000	.969	.83	1.11	Reject
2.	Telephone/Mobile Services	15.743	64	.000	1.138	.99	1.28	Reject

Figure 2 represents the 't' statistics of 32 listed tourist services and amenities for 64 degree of freedom. The 'P' value of 26 tourist services and amenities is 0.00 which is less than the threshold value (alpha value) 0.001 at two tailed with 95% of confidence level. Whereas six services viz. public convenience along roads, behavioural of drivers of commercial transportation, tariffs structure of hotel rooms, availability of petrol pump, public utilities at the tourist attraction and conservation of heritage site shows the 'p' value 0.370, .093, 0.146, 0.201, .070 and 0.780 which are higher than the alpha value 0.05 at two tailed with 95% confidence level.

Thus in case of 26 tourist items test is significant as the probe value is 0.00. There is a cause to reject null hypotheses $\mu < 3$ to accept alternative hypotheses that $\mu > 3$ since the 't' statistics of respective items lie at right side i.e upper tail. It shows there is sufficient evidence to reject

null hypotheses $\mu < 3$ for the acceptance of alternative hypotheses $\mu > 3$.

Rest of 6 items' independent 't' test is insignificant as the 'p' value is more than threshold 0.005. In this situation evidence are not enough to reject null hypotheses that $\mu < 3$ in favour of alternative hypotheses $\mu > 3$.

To conclude in this situation null hypotheses is rejected with 26 tourist service items and rest 6 items null hypotheses failed to reject to accept alternative hypotheses that tourist are satisfied with available tourist services and amenities. Results depicts that tourists are satisfied with most of the services and amenities and dissatisfied with few ones.

H₂ : There is significant difference between occupation and perception of tourist towards importance of tourist service and amenities.

Figure 3: One Way ANOVA

ANOVA							
Tourist Services and Amenities		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Null Hypotheses
Air Connectivity	Between Groups	15.251	10	1.525	.938	.506	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	87.764	54	1.625			
	Total	103.015	64				
Rail Connectivity	Between Groups	23.932	10	2.393	1.492	.168	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	86.621	54	1.604			
	Total	110.554	64				

ANOVA							
Tourist Services and Amenities		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Null Hypotheses
Quality of roads	Between Groups	4.001	10	.400	1.067	.403	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	20.245	54	.375			
	Total	24.246	64				
Quality of wayside amenities	Between Groups	5.875	10	.588	1.244	.286	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	25.510	54	.472			
	Total	31.385	64				
Public convenience along roads	Between Groups	5.156	10	.516	1.253	.280	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	22.229	54	.412			
	Total	27.385	64				
Sewage and drainage system	Between Groups	7.775	10	.778	1.281	.264	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	32.779	54	.607			
	Total	40.554	64				
Garbage Disposal	Between Groups	1.675	10	.168	.641	.772	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	14.110	54	.261			
	Total	15.785	64				
Condition of city roads	Between Groups	2.303	10	.230	.693	.726	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	17.943	54	.332			
	Total	20.246	64				
Drinking water supply	Between Groups	4.593	10	.459	1.499	.165	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	16.545	54	.306			
	Total	21.138	64				
Condition of street lighting	Between Groups	4.000	10	.400	1.355	.226	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	15.938	54	.295			
	Total	19.938	64				
traffic mgt	Between Groups	6.134	10	.613	2.056	.045	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	16.112	54	.298			
	Total	22.246	64				
Condition of traffic or transport signage	Between Groups	3.489	10	.349	1.279	.265	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	14.726	54	.273			
	Total	18.215	64				
Availability of commercial transportation	Between Groups	2.650	10	.265	.928	.515	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	15.412	54	.285			
	Total	18.062	64				
behaviour of drivers of commercial transportation	Between Groups	2.816	10	.282	.991	.462	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	15.338	54	.284			
	Total	18.154	64				
Availability of authorised tour operators	Between Groups	14.177	10	1.418	1.040	.424	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	73.607	54	1.363			
	Total	87.785	64				
availability of hotels	Between Groups	.931	10	.093	.474	.899	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	10.607	54	.196			
	Total	11.538	64				
Behaviour of service staff at the hotel	Between Groups	3.034	10	.303	1.574	.140	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	10.412	54	.193			
	Total	13.446	64				
Tariff structure of the hotel rooms	Between Groups	4.058	10	.406	2.158	.035	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	10.157	54	.188			
	Total	14.215	64				
Hygiene at wayside restaurants and dhabs	Between Groups	2.128	10	.213	.819	.612	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	14.026	54	.260			
	Total	16.154	64				
Availability of petrol	Between Groups	3.792	10	.379	1.964	.056	Failed to

ANOVA							
Tourist Services and Amenities		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Null Hypotheses
pump	Within Groups	10.424	54	.193			Reject
	Total	14.215	64				
Behaviour of service personnel at wayside restaurants and dhabs	Between Groups	8.819	10	.882	1.527	.155	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	31.181	54	.577			
	Total	40.000	64				
Levels of road taxes on vehicle	Between Groups	3.820	10	.382	.621	.789	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	33.195	54	.615			
	Total	37.015	64				
Administration of the road taxes	Between Groups	1.833	10	.183	.610	.799	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	16.229	54	.301			
	Total	18.062	64				
Public utilities at the tourist attraction	Between Groups	3.644	10	.364	1.561	.144	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	12.602	54	.233			
	Total	16.246	64				
General Cleanliness tourist attraction and area around it	Between Groups	1.534	10	.153	.370	.955	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	22.405	54	.415			
	Total	23.938	64				
Condition of signage within the tourist attraction	Between Groups	4.650	10	.465	1.180	.325	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	21.288	54	.394			
	Total	25.938	64				
parking facility at the tourist attraction	Between Groups	2.756	10	.276	.874	.562	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	17.029	54	.315			
	Total	19.785	64				
Availability of trained tourist guide	Between Groups	7.337	10	.734	1.732	.097	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	22.879	54	.424			
	Total	30.215	64				
Behaviour of the guides at the tourist attraction	Between Groups	2.234	10	.223	.670	.747	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	18.012	54	.334			
	Total	20.246	64				
Conservation of heritage sites	Between Groups	2.348	10	.235	.933	.511	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	13.590	54	.252			
	Total	15.938	64				
Power supply situation	Between Groups	4.367	10	.437	1.846	.074	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	12.771	54	.237			
	Total	17.138	64				
Telephone/mobile services	Between Groups	1.721	10	.172	1.071	.400	Failed to Reject
	Within Groups	8.679	54	.161			
	Total	10.400	64				

Figure 3 represent result of hypotheses reveals that for 31 degree of freedom, F statistic score is .348, test is insignificant as the probe value is 0.956 which is more than 0.05 level (two tailed). It shows that result do not support to reject null hypotheses. Thus, we failed to reject null hypotheses that there is no significant difference between the perception of samples respondents towards importance of tourist services and amenities with

occupation for alternative hypotheses there is significant difference between the perception of samples respondents towards importance of tourist services and amenities with occupation.

H3: Correlation between occupation and tourist travel pattern

Figure 4

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability	Null Hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	11.910	20	.919	.910			Failed to reject
Likelihood Ratio	12.564	20	.895	.911			
Fisher's Exact Test	16.762			.909			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.296	1	.586	.603	.310	.024	
N of Valid Cases	65						

Result derived from figure 4 that the for 20 degree of freedom the chi-square statistics is 11.910, for which probe value is 0.919 at two tailed which is much greater than alpha score 0.05 with 95% level of confidence. In this situation researcher failed to reject null hypotheses that there is no correlation between occupation and tourist

travel pattern to accept alternative hypotheses that there is consistent relation between occupation and tourist travel pattern. The pearson correlation score is 0.024 which depicts none or extremely weak association between occupation and tourist travel pattern.

Occupation and Purpose of Visit

Figure 6

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability	Null Hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	15.192	30	.989	.991			Failed to reject
Likelihood Ratio	16.175	30	.981	.982			
Fisher's Exact Test	27.267			.981			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.064	1	.800	.802	.405	.006	
N of Valid Cases	65						

The figure 6 reveals chi-square statistics for 30 degree of freedom is 15.192, the 'P' value is 0.989 at two tailed which is greater than alpha 0.05 at 95% of confidence level. Therefore researcher failed to reject null hypotheses that tourist occupation and purpose of visit is not correlated in favour of alternative hypotheses that tourist's

occupation and purpose of visit is correlated. It means occupation and purpose of visit to the destination are two independent variables. Also the r score is 0.006 which reveals the none to extremely weak relation between the occupation purpose of visit.

Occupation and Mode of Travel used

Figure 7

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability	Null Hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	29.326	40	.893				Failed to Reject
Likelihood Ratio	31.740	40	.821	.779			
Fisher's Exact Test	35.840			.828			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.077	1	.782	.791	.402	.010	
N of Valid Cases	65						

Figure 7 infers the chi-square statistics for 40 degree of freedom score is 29.326, the probe value is 0.893 at two

tailed which is more than alpha 0.05 with 95% of level of confidence. Thus test is insignificant. It means this result

do not permit researcher to reject null hypotheses that occupation and 'mode of travel used to reach' to the hills station is not correlated in favour of alternative hypotheses that occupation mode of travel used to reach to the hill station is correlated. It means both variables are

independent. Along with this linear association score is 0.010 which shows the strength of association between occupation and mode of travel since it infers the extremely weak strength between them.

Occupation and Average Length of Stay
Figure 8

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability	Null Hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	20.423	20	.432				Failed to reject
Likelihood Ratio	24.052	20	.240	.408			
Fisher's Exact Test	19.715			.368			
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.441	1	.230	.241	.122	.009	
N of Valid Cases	65						

Figure 8 reveals the chi-square statistics for 20 degree of freedom 20.423, the 'P' value is 0.432 at two tailed with 95% of confidence level, which is more than alpha 0.05 so the test is insignificant. It shows that the researcher failed to reject the null hypotheses that occupation and average length of stay is not correlated in favour of alternative hypotheses that occupation and average length

of stay is correlated. It means occupation and average length of stay are two independent variables. The linear score also orates the strength of association between the two variables occupation and length of stay, in this case the score is .009 which is none or extremely weak strength between them.

Occupation and Stay Arrangement
Figure 9

Chi-Square Tests						
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Null Hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	39.738	40	.482			Failed to reject
Likelihood Ratio	42.114	40	.380	.556		
Fisher's Exact Test	37.744			.365		
Linear-by-Linear Association	.141	1	.707			
N of Valid Cases	65					

Figure 9 reveals the chi-square statistics for 40 degree of freedom 39.738, the 'P' value is 0.482 at two tailed with 95% of confidence level, which is higher than alpha score 0.05, so the test is insignificant. Researcher failed to reject the null hypotheses that occupation and stay arrangement

are not correlated in favour of alternative hypotheses that occupation and stay arrangement are correlated. It means both variables are independent. The linear score is not computed due to insufficient memory.

Occupation and Source use to know the destination
Figure 10

Chi-Square Tests							
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)	Point Probability	Null hypotheses
Pearson Chi-Square	41.650	40	.399				Fail to reject
Likelihood Ratio	41.999	40	.384	.117			
Fisher's Exact Test	50.145			.126			
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	.992	1.000	.508	.015	
N of Valid Cases	65						

Figure 10 orates the chi-square statistics for 40 degree of freedom 41.650, the 'P' value is 0.399 at two tailed with 95% of confidence level, which is more than threshold value 0.05 where the test is insignificant. In this situation researcher failed to reject the null hypotheses that occupation and source used to know the destination are not correlated in favour of alternative hypotheses that occupation and source used to know the destination is correlated. It means occupation and source used to know

the destinations are two independent variables. In this case linear score is 0.015 which reveals the extremely weak strength between occupation and source used to know the destination.

H₄ : Occupation of tourist and their perception towards importance of tourist services and amenities are correlated.

Figure 11

Correlation between occupation and Importance of tourist services with the view of tourist

Correlations				
		Occupation	Importance mean	Null hypotheses
Occupation	Pearson Correlation	1	.107	Failed to reject
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.559	
	N	65	32	
Importance mean	Pearson Correlation	.107	1	Failed to reject
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.559		
	N	32	32	

Figure 11 describe the correlation between occupation and importance mean in which Pearson correlation between occupation and importance mean is 0.107 in which significant value is 0.559 at two tailed, which is more than probe value 0.05 at 95% of confidence level. Thus, given result do not support to reject null hypotheses that occupation and importance of tourist services and amenities are not correlated to accept null hypotheses that occupation and importance of tourist services and amenities are correlated. Therefore the null hypotheses failed to reject that occupation and importance of tourist services and amenities are not correlated. In this case pearson correlation value reflect the strength of correlation, the value is 0.107 which is also extremely weak. It means there is extremely weak association between occupation and perception of tourist on importance of tourist services and amenities.

CONCLUSION:

To conclude the results, at the hills station, large age group 25-35 of all occupational categories are visiting the site, and they have been used personal car to visit the destination. Most of the tourist found from the origin of rest of Maharashtra. To summarise results of hypotheses, given results do not permit to prove that tourists are satisfied with all available tourist services and amenities. Failed to reject null hypotheses that tourist occupation and purpose of visit is not correlated, there is no correlation between occupation and tourist travel pattern. occupation and 'mode of travel used to reach' to the hills station is not correlated, occupation and average length of stay is not correlated., occupation and stay arrangement are not correlated, occupation and source used to know the

destination are not correlated and occupation and importance of tourist services and amenities are not correlated. Thus researcher could say Tourism and demographic profile of tourist are not correlated. These results raise the scope for further study to investigate impact of psychological factors or economical factors to determine tourism and also to understand the Prospects of Hill station, Sustainable tourism development at hill station, trend for growth of tourist arrival.

ANNEXURE

Table 1: Distribution of Total Samples as per their Origin (n=65)

Sr.	Name of Origin	Frequency	%
1.	Gujarat	4	6.2
2.	Andhra Pradesh	1	1.5
3.	Karnatak	5	7.7
4.	Delhi	1	1.5
5.	Rajsthan	1	1.5
6.	Orissam	1	1.5
7.	Maharashtra other than Satara	41	63.07
8.	Satara District	11	4.5
Total		65	

Source: Field Data

Table 2: Distribution of Samples Gender wise (n=65)

Sr.	Gender	Frequency	Percent
1.	Male	47	72.3
2.	Female	18	27.7
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 3: Distribution of Samples Age wise
(n=65)

Sr.	Age-Group	Frequency	Percent
1.	15-25	4	6.2
2.	25-35	22	33.8
3.	35-45	25	38.5
4.	45-55	9	13.8
5.	55&above	5	7.7
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 4: Distribution of Samples as per Occupation
(n=65)

Sr.	Occupation	Freq- uency	Percent
1.	Unskilled Worker	2	3.1
2.	Skilled Worker	5	7.7
3.	Shop Owners	7	10.8
4.	Industrialist With No Employees	3	4.6
5.	Industrialist With 1-9 Employees	1	1.5
6.	Self Employed Professional	7	10.8
7.	Clerical Salesmen	2	3.1
8.	Supervisory Level	6	9.2
9.	Officer/Executive Junior	10	15.4
10.	Officer/Executive Middle Or Semi	10	15.4
11.	Student	12	18.5
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 5: Tourist Travel Pattern
(n=65)

Sr.	Packaged tour travelling	Frequency	Percent
1.	Yes	2	3.1
2.	No	63	96.9
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 6: Travel Pattern of Respondents
(n=65)

Sr.	Travel pattern	Frequency	Percent
1.	Alone	2	3.1
2.	With family	49	75.4
3.	In a group	14	21.5
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 7: Purpose of Visit
(n=65)

Sr.	Purpose of visit	Freq- uency	Percent
1.	Culture/Heritage/Monument	1	1.5
2.	Leisure	28	43.1
3.	Friends and relatives	5	7.7
4.	Tourism	31	47.7
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 8: Mode of Travel
(n=65)

Sr.	Mode of travel used	Frequency	Percent
1.	Bus	7	10.8
2.	Train	5	7.7
3.	Personal Car	47	72.3
4.	Two Wheeler	2	3.1
5.	Other	4	6.2
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 9: Length of Stay
(n=65)

Sr.	Average Length of stay	Frequency	Percent
1.	Overnight	9	13.8
2.	Day visit/excursion	23	35.4
3.	More than two days	33	50.8
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 10: Average Spending Per Person by Tourist
(n=65)

Sr.	Average Spending	Frequency	Percent
1.	<Rs. 500	6	9.2
2.	Rs. 500-1000	26	40.0
3.	Rs. 1000-1500	28	43.1
4.	Rs. 1500-2000	3	4.6
5.	>Rs. 2000	2	3.1
6.	Total	65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 11: Stay Arrangement
(n=65)

Sr.	Stay Arrangement	Frequency	Percent
1.	Star hotel	6	9.2
2.	Budget hotel	25	38.5
3.	Friends and relatives	9	13.8
4.	Other	6	9.2
5.	NA	19	29.2
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 12: Used Source to Know the Destination

(n=65)

Sr.	Source to know	Frequency	Percent
1.	Travel agent/Tour operator	1	1.5
2.	Website	11	16.9
3.	Personal effort	14	21.5
4.	Friends and relatives	37	56.9
5.	Other	2	3.1
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 13: Frequency of Visit

(n=65)

Sr.	Frequency of visit	Frequency	Percent
1.	First visit	26	40.0
2.	Repeat visit	39	60.0
Total		65	100.0

Source: Field Data

Table 14: Opinion of Respondents towards Promotion of Destination

Sr.	Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	Ad Play Imp Role	65	3.88	.761
2.	Need Promotional Activity	65	3.97	.749
3.	Lack of Advt Hinder Tourism Devt	65	3.88	.875

Source: Field Data

Table 15: Respondents' Opinion on Media effectiveness

Sr.	Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	Media effectiveness newspaper	55	3.42	1.272
2.	ME Television	58	3.95	1.395
3.	ME Magazine	51	1.96	2.163
4.	ME information material	46	1.24	2.024
5.	ME Posters	43	1.56	2.074
6.	ME Cable TV	48	2.08	2.314
7.	ME website	36	.39	1.128
8.	ME Motivation by tour operator	47	2.53	2.244
9.	ME WOM	37	.73	1.557
10.	ME Newspaper article	37	.32	1.029
11.	ME Publication in house newsletters	36	.08	.500

Source: Field Data

Table 16: Price Perception of Respondents

(n=65)

Sr.	Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	Price perception (PP)on Food and drink	54	2.41	1.499
2.	PP on Accommodation	51	2.20	1.497
3.	PP on Transport	41	2.02	1.725
4.	PP on Packaged Tours	35	.23	.73106
5.	PP on Informational Material	38	.66	1.300
6.	PP on Shopping Items	49	1.06	1.265

Source: Field Data

Table 17: Respondents Satisfaction Level towards Available Tourist Service and Amenities at Site.

Sr.	List of Tourist Services and Amenities	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	Air Connectivity	31	1.43	.585
2.	Rail Connectivity	30	1.98	.760
3.	Quality of roads	17	3.45	.751
4.	Quality of wayside amenities	10	3.57	.865
5.	Public convenience along roads	23	3.09	.824
6.	Sewage and drainage system	7	3.65	.759
7.	Garbage Disposal	6	3.82	.497
8.	Condition of city roads	13	3.55	.587
9.	Drinking water supply	13	3.55	.830
10.	Condition of street lighting	15	3.54	.831
11.	traffic mgt	16	3.46	.812
12.	Condition of traffic or transport signage	19	3.35	.959
13.	Availability of commercial transportation	2	4.02	.649
14.	behavior of drivers of commercial transportation	21	3.31	1.457
15.	Availability of authorized tour operators	32	.93	1.469
16.	availability of	3	3.98	.780

	hotels			
17.	Behaviour of service staff at the hotel	18	3.43	1.380
18.	Tariff structure of the hotel rooms	26	2.83	.928
19.	Hygiene at wayside restaurants and Dhabas	10	3.57	.706
20.	Availability of petrol pump	25	2.86	.864
21.	Behaviour of service personnel at wayside restaurants and Dhabas	5	3.83	.720
22.	Levels of road taxes on vehicle	29	2.28	.976
23.	Administration of the road taxes	28	2.48	1.032
24.	Public utilities at the tourist attraction	27	2.78	.944
25.	General Cleanliness tourist attraction and area around it	8	3.62	.630
26.	Condition of signage within the tourist attraction	10	3.57	.829
27.	parking facility at the tourist attraction	20	3.34	.815
28.	Availability of trained tourist guide	9	3.60	.581
29.	Behaviour of the guides at the tourist attraction	22	3.20	.558
30.	Conservation of heritage sites	24	2.94	1.767
31.	Power supply situation	4	3.97	.563
32.	Telephone/mobile services	1	4.14	.583

Source: Field Data

Table 18: Respondents Satisfaction Level towards Available Tourist Service and Amenities at Site

Sr.	List of Tourist Services and Amenities	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1.	Air Connectivity	31	3.12	1.269
2.	Rail Connectivity	30	3.26	1.314
3.	Quality of roads	10	4.49	.616

4.	Quality of wayside amenities	19	4.38	.700
5.	Public convenience along roads	19	4.38	.654
6.	Sewage and drainage system	21	4.34	.796
7.	Garbage Disposal	17	4.42	.497
8.	Condition of city roads	10	4.49	.562
9.	Drinking water supply	3	4.63	.575
10.	Condition of street lighting	5	4.57	.558
11.	traffic mgt	8	4.51	.590
12.	Condition of traffic or transport signage	12	4.48	.533
13.	Availability of commercial transportation	7	4.55	.531
14.	behaviour of drivers of commercial transportation	13	4.46	.533
15.	Availability of authorized tour operators	32	2.18	1.171
16.	availability of hotels	2	4.77	.425
17.	Behaviour of service staff at the hotel	25	4.29	.458
18.	Tariff structure of the hotel rooms	22	4.32	.471
19.	Hygiene at wayside restaurants and Dhabas	13	4.46	.502
20.	Availability of petrol pump	22	4.32	.471
21.	Behaviour of service personnel at wayside restaurants and Dhabas	29	4.00	.791
22.	Levels of road taxes on vehicle	27	4.12	.761
23.	Administration of the road taxes	26	4.25	.531
24.	Public utilities at the tourist attraction	8	4.51	.504
25.	General Cleanliness tourist attraction and area around it	15	4.43	.612
26.	Condition of signage within the tourist attraction	15	4.43	.637
27.	parking facility at the tourist attraction	17	4.42	.556
28.	Availability of trained tourist guide	22	4.32	.687
29.	Behaviour of the	28	4.11	.562

	guides at the tourist attraction			
30.	Conservation of heritage sites	5	4.57	.499
31.	Power supply situation	3	4.63	.517
32.	Telephone/mobile services	1	4.80	.403

Source: Field Data

Table 19: Tourist Arrival at Hill Stations

Year	No. of Tourist Arrival at Panchgani	No. of Tourist Arrival at Mahabaleshwar
2000-2001	1032574	1343674
2001-2002	689544	876645
2002-2003	794564	901,110
2003-2004	777987	931210
2004-2005	845908	983800
2005-2006	713987	901018
2006-2007	812654	923100
2007-2008	909321	1127960
2008-2009	1144190	1343603
2009-2010	1262700	1467702
2010-2011	1378655	1576465
2011-2012	NA	1623765

REFERENCES:

- [1] Government of Indian , Ministry of Tourism ,Division, Marketing Research. (2010). Infrastructure Gaps in Tourism Sector in Nanded, Maharashtra. New Delhi: Ministry of Tourism, Govt of India.
- [2] Debasish Batabyal, D. D. (November 2013). Management of Travel Booking in the Light of Destination Marketing: Evidence from an Alpine Indian State- Sikkim. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 43 (11), 36-45.
- [3] H., R. (November 2011). Marketing of Tourism Products in Karnataka: Policy Implications. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 41 (11).
- [4] Kuma, S. A. (2009). Trends of Marketing Management in Tourist Attractions. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 39 (5).
- [5] Manish, S. (April 2009). Assessing International Heritage Tourist Satisfaction in India. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 39 (4).
- [6] Mohapatra, N. (July 2011). Economics of Ecotourism: A Study On Orissa. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 36-40.
- [7] Varughese, A. (April 2013). Problems and Prospects of Backwater Tourism in Kerala with Special Reference to Alappuzha District. *Indian Journal of Marketing* , 43 (4), 18-29.
- [8] Chavan Rajashri Ramesh, B. S. (2013). A Perceived Image of Satara to Come up as a Tourist Destinations-by Domestic Tourism. *Pezzottatite Journals* , 2 (2), 386-392.