

## AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF TOURIST'S PERCEPTION REGARDING SELECT TOURIST DESTINATIONS OF HARYANA

AARTI SHARMA\*, MOHIT KUKRETI\*\* AND S. C. BAGRI\*\*\*

**Abstract:** *The current research focuses on empirical examination of domestic and international tourist's perception regarding the five select tourist destinations such as BrahmSarovar, Pinjore, Mansa Devi, Morni and Surajkund destinations of Haryana in India. Due to the increasing importance of service quality in all service industries, it has become imperative to take necessary steps towards its improvements as well as advancements. This study employed modified SERVQUAL model consisting of 30 items for assessing tourist's expectations and perceptions regarding the overall quality of tourism related services. An ANOVA was applied to find out the significant mean difference if any, between the domestic and foreign tourists towards service quality. The results confirmed that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean perception regarding 'economic activity' between the domestic vs. foreign tourists. The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that there are only three variables - Information availability, Employee response and Tourism facility, which significantly affected tourist's overall satisfaction.*

**Key words:** *destination, tourist perception, service quality*

### INTRODUCTION

The tourist destinations are considered as an important element in the travel and tourism industry (Fyall & Leask, 2007). A destination consists of a combination of tourism products and services which provide a unique experience to tourists (Buhalis, 2000). Tourist satisfaction is an important element for the successful tourist destination marketing (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Rajesh, 2013) and consequently it is important for tourists to revisit and recommend the destination (Oppermann, 2000; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Jang & Feng, 2007).

This article focuses on empirical examination of tourist's (domestic as well as foreign) perception regarding select tourist destinations of Haryana in India. These days service quality is becoming important in all the service industries; therefore,

---

\* Research Scholar Management, Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun, India.

\*\* Program Director, College of Applied Science Ibri, Oman.

\*\*\* Dean Faculty of Management Science, H.N.B. Garhwal University, Srinagar, India.

it has become imperative to take necessary steps towards its improvements as well as advancements. This study compare and contrast the service quality perceptions of domestic and foreign tourists visiting Haryana and assesses the level of satisfaction of tourists in terms of service quality dimensions in Brahmsarovar, Pinjore, Mansa Devi, Morni and Surajkund destinations in Haryana.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The quality of tourism experience depends on the quality of service provided by the players in the industry. This is because the quality of service in tourism plays an important role in the process of delivery (Wyllie 2000). The quality of service has received considerable attention from researchers and practitioners alike. Service quality is considered as a standard used to assess the effectiveness of a particular leisure service agency, including the tourism service sector (Godbey, 1997). Viewed as a means by which customers distinguish between competing organizations (Marshall and Murdoch, 2001), service quality is known to contribute to market share and customer satisfaction (Anderson and Zeithaml, 1984; Buzzell and Gale, 1987; Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985; Zeithaml, 2000). Parasuraman *et al.* (1985) designed the SERVQUAL instrument to identify and measure the gaps between customers' expectations and perceptions of service quality. A number of practitioners and researchers (Atilgan, Akinci, & Aksoy, 2003; Juwaheer & Ross, 2003; have applied modified versions of SERVQUAL to measure service quality in the hospitality industry. The review of the literature indicated that the number of empirical studies in tourism is limited. However, there has been less efforts to examine the impact of service quality on tourist satisfaction in Haryana. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the service quality perceptions of domestic and foreign tourists visiting Haryana and to assess the level of satisfaction of tourists in terms of service quality dimensions in different tourism destination. For any research under taken it is essential to indicate the variables considered along with their operational and measurement procedures. Information gathered through past reviews finally resulted in identification and selection of variables for the present study such as *Consumer demographics, Consumer satisfaction, Service Quality dimensions, General image of Destination, Overall satisfaction*. These variable are extremely important as these help in determining consumer overall perceptions regarding different service quality dimensions.

In this study, seven main destination dimensions have been selected as factors that could affect tourist satisfaction. In view of that this study hypothesizes:

- H<sub>1</sub>:** There is no statistical significant difference in perception of service quality dimensions<sup>4</sup> between Indian and Foreign tourists visiting Haryana. And
- H<sub>2</sub>:** There is no statistical significant difference in tourists' perception of service quality dimensions<sup>5</sup> in different tourism destinations of Haryana.

## METHODOLOGY

As many as 650 tourists were initially approached to collect the required data for the study. Cluster sampling technique was used during the course of present research. However, only 383 questionnaires filled by the respondents, 263 domestic tourists and 120 foreign tourists with a response percentage of 58.92 percent were found complete in all respects for the analysis.

To collect the primary data a structured questionnaire was designed and used. The questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part focused on the demographic information and travel characteristics of tourist respondents. The second part focused on the measurement of consumer's satisfaction level regarding various facilities available in different locations (Brahmsarovar, Pinjore, Mansa Devi, Morni and Surajkund) in Haryana. The final and third part of the questionnaire asked consumer's perceptions regarding different dimensions of service quality (Information availability, Employee response, Tourism facility, Safety and security, and Economic activity) in Haryana Tourism Industry.

The modified SERVQUAL model consisting of 30 items has been used for assessing tourist's expectations and perceptions regarding the overall quality of tourism related services.

The study is mainly focused on the analysis of respondents' perception towards the available facilities of hospitality and tourism industry in aforementioned study areas. Thus, due to the nature of this study, the researcher employed different statistical tools to draw the conclusion. This study includes analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare these service quality dimensions in terms of (a) Domestic vs. Foreign tourists, and (b) Different tourism destinations, and finally section five includes multiple regression analysis to examine various service quality dimensions.

## DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

This first section describes the descriptive analysis of demographic as well as psychographic characteristics of tourists visiting Haryana. Table 4.1 provides relevant statistics that shows the diversity of sample respondents of the study. In table 4.1, out of 383 total respondents, majority of respondents (75.7%) were male, while rest 24.3% were female respondents. 59% of the total sample respondents were married and a majority of them (approx. 60%) has at least one college degree (UG or PG). 63.7% of them were service class, and 79.1% had income group of more than 30,000 per month. Sample respondents were well diverse in terms of their locality as they were 38.6% from city, 24.8% from Metropolitan city, 20.9% from township, and rest 15.7% from village. We found less number of foreigners (n = 120) compared to domestic travelers (68.7%) visiting these areas, as there are several other preferred locations, especially for foreign tourists including Shimla (Himachal Pradesh), Rishikesh (Uttarakhand) and so on.

## ANOVA

**Service quality vs Type of Tourist**

This section provides empirical evidences on whether different kinds of tourists (domestic vs. foreign) have any difference in perception on various service quality dimensions included in this study. The research included seven service quality dimensions for this purpose.

$H_1$ : There is no statistical significant difference in perception of service quality dimensions<sup>6</sup> between Indian and Foreign tourists visiting Haryana.

Thus, ANOVA has been used to find out the significant mean difference if any, between the domestic and foreign tourists towards the various service quality dimensions included in this study. The outcome is shown in table 1. In this table, the only significance value is 0.042 (i.e.,  $p = .042$ ), which is below 0.05, and therefore, there is a statistically significant difference in the mean perception of service quality between the tourists (domestic vs. foreign). In rest of the cases, we don't find any difference in their perception. Thus, foreign tourists have difference in their opinion on economic activities conducted within Haryana. It might be because foreign

**Table 1**  
**Service quality vs Type of Tourism (One-way ANOVA)**

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Emp_Res	Between Groups	.388	1	.388	.724	.396
	Within Groups	203.791	380	.536		
	Total	204.179	381			
Saf_Sec	Between Groups	.053	1	.053	.080	.777
	Within Groups	250.056	380	.658		
	Total	250.109	381			
Eco_Act	Between Groups	2.663	1	2.663	4.176	.042
	Within Groups	242.330	380	.638		
	Total	244.993	381			
Inf_Avl	Between Groups	.147	1	.147	.505	.478
	Within Groups	110.810	380	.292		
	Total	110.958	381			
Tou_Fac	Between Groups	.106	1	.106	.303	.583
	Within Groups	133.639	380	.352		
	Total	133.746	381			
Ovr_Sat	Between Groups	1.087	1	1.087	1.640	.201
	Within Groups	252.412	381	.662		
	Total	253.499	382			
Gen_Img	Between Groups	.378	1	.378	.937	.334
	Within Groups	153.238	380	.403		
	Total	153.616	381			

Note: Information availability - Inf\_Avl; Employee response - Emp\_Res; Tourism facility- Tou\_Fac; Safety and security - Saf\_Sec; Economic activity - Eco\_Act; Overall satisfaction - Ovr\_Sat; General image - Gen\_Img.

travelers have different economic background, their buying power is comparatively higher than domestic travelers, or even their pattern on spending money is entirely different.

### Service quality vs Tourism Destination Visited

Once again, a series of ANOVA is applied to examine the tourists' perceptions of all seven service quality dimensions in different tourism destination visited. Table 2 shows combined statistics of all ANOVAs outcomes. In this table, there is no statistically significant difference in the mean tourists' perception of service quality in different destinations. Thus, tourists don't have any difference in their opinion on these service quality dimensions in different destinations within Haryana. It might be because all these locations have similar kind of service settings, and all are under the same control body (i.e. Haryana Tourism Corporation).

$H_2$ : There is no statistical significant difference in tourists' perception of service quality dimensions<sup>7</sup> in different tourism destinations of Haryana.

**Table 2**  
Service quality vs Tourism destination visited (One-way ANOVA)

		Sum of Squares	d.f.	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Ovr_Sat	Between Groups	.645	4	.161	.241	.915
	Within Groups	252.854	378	.669		
	Total	253.499	382			
Emp_Res	Between Groups	1.026	4	.257	.476	.753
	Within Groups	203.153	377	.539		
	Total	204.179	381			
Saf_Sec	Between Groups	1.855	4	.464	.704	.589
	Within Groups	248.254	377	.658		
	Total	250.109	381			
Eco_Act	Between Groups	4.753	4	1.188	1.865	.116
	Within Groups	240.240	377	.637		
	Total	244.993	381			
Inf_Avl	Between Groups	1.383	4	.346	1.190	.315
	Within Groups	109.574	377	.291		
	Total	110.958	381			
Tou_Fac	Between Groups	.534	4	.134	.378	.824
	Within Groups	133.212	377	.353		
	Total	133.746	381			
Gen_Img	Between Groups	1.212	4	.303	.750	.559
	Within Groups	152.404	377	.404		
	Total	153.616	381			

**Table 3**  
**Multiple Comparisons (by Tukey HSD)**

Dependent Variable	(I) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	(J) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Ovr_Sat	Brahmsarovar	Pinjore	-.00703	.13141	1.000	-.3672	.3532	
		Mansa Devi	.02710	.13926	1.000	-.3546	.4088	
		Morni	-.01576	.13610	1.000	-.3888	.3573	
	Pinjore	Surajkund	.09597	.13569	.955	-.2760	.4679	
		Brahmsarovar	.00703	.13141	1.000	-.3532	.3672	
		Mansa Devi	.03413	.13034	.999	-.3231	.3914	
	Mansa Devi	Morni	-.00873	.12696	1.000	-.3567	.3393	
		Surajkund	.10299	.12652	.926	-.2438	.4498	
		Brahmsarovar	-.02710	.13926	1.000	-.4088	.3546	
	Morni	Pinjore	-.03413	.13034	.999	-.3914	.3231	
		Surajkund	-.04286	.13507	.998	-.4131	.3274	
		Brahmsarovar	.06886	.13466	.986	-.3002	.4380	
	Surajkund	Pinjore	.01576	.13610	1.000	-.3573	.3888	
		Mansa Devi	.00873	.12696	1.000	-.3393	.3567	
		Surajkund	.04286	.13507	.998	-.3274	.4131	
	Emp_Res	Brahmsarovar	Pinjore	.11172	.13139	.915	-.2484	.4719
			Surajkund	-.09597	.13569	.955	-.4679	.2760
			Morni	-.10299	.12652	.926	-.4498	.2438
		Pinjore	Brahmsarovar	-.06886	.13466	.986	-.4380	.3002
			Morni	-.11172	.13139	.915	-.4719	.2484
Surajkund			-.10173	.11795	.910	-.4250	.2216	
Mansa Devi		Mansa Devi	-.05456	.12499	.992	-.3972	.2880	
		Morni	.03770	.12254	.998	-.2982	.3736	
		Surajkund	.00975	.12179	1.000	-.3241	.3436	
Morni		Pinjore	.10173	.11795	.910	-.2216	.4250	
		Mansa Devi	.04717	.11699	.994	-.2735	.3678	
		Surajkund	.13943	.11436	.740	-.1740	.4529	
Surajkund		Pinjore	.11148	.11356	.863	-.1998	.4227	
		Mansa Devi	.05456	.12499	.992	-.2880	.3972	
		Morni	-.04717	.11699	.994	-.3678	.2735	
Brahmsarovar		Pinjore	.09227	.12161	.942	-.2411	.4256	
		Surajkund	.06431	.12086	.984	-.2670	.3956	
		Morni	-.03770	.12254	.998	-.3736	.2982	
Pinjore		Pinjore	-.13943	.11436	.740	-.4529	.1740	
		Mansa Devi	-.09227	.12161	.942	-.4256	.2411	
	Surajkund	-.02795	.11832	.999	-.3523	.2964		
Mansa Devi	Brahmsarovar	-.00975	.12179	1.000	-.3436	.3241		
	Pinjore	-.11148	.11356	.863	-.4227	.1998		
	Mansa Devi	-.06431	.12086	.984	-.3956	.2670		
Morni	Morni	.02795	.11832	.999	-.2964	.3523		
	Surajkund	.04542	.13039	.997	-.3120	.4028		
	Brahmsarovar	-.03235	.13817	.999	-.4111	.3464		
Saf_Sec	Pinjore	.13958	.13546	.841	-.2317	.5109		
	Mansa Devi	.14115	.13463	.833	-.2279	.5102		
	Surajkund							

contd. table 3

Dependent Variable	(I) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	(J) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. Interval	95% Confidence		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Eco_Act	Pinjore	Brahmsarovar	-.04542	.13039	.997	-.4028	.3120	
		Mansa Devi	-.07778	.12932	.975	-.4322	.2767	
		Morni	.09415	.12642	.946	-.2524	.4407	
		Surajkund	.09573	.12553	.941	-.2484	.4398	
	Mansa Devi	Brahmsarovar	.03235	.13817	.999	-.3464	.4111	
		Pinjore	.07778	.12932	.975	-.2767	.4322	
		Morni	.17193	.13443	.704	-.1965	.5404	
	Morni	Surajkund	.17350	.13360	.692	-.1927	.5397	
		Brahmsarovar	-.13958	.13546	.841	-.5109	.2317	
		Pinjore	-.09415	.12642	.946	-.4407	.2524	
	Surajkund	Mansa Devi	-.17193	.13443	.704	-.5404	.1965	
		Surajkund	.00157	.13079	1.000	-.3569	.3601	
		Brahmsarovar	-.14115	.13463	.833	-.5102	.2279	
	Inf_Avl	Brahmsarovar	Pinjore	-.09573	.12553	.941	-.4398	.2484
			Mansa Devi	-.17350	.13360	.692	-.5397	.1927
			Morni	-.00157	.13079	1.000	-.3601	.3569
			Surajkund	.09327	.12826	.950	-.2583	.4448
		Pinjore	Mansa Devi	.20025	.13592	.581	-.1723	.5728
			Morni	.29040	.13325	.190	-.0748	.6556
			Surajkund	.00370	.13244	1.000	-.3593	.3667
			Brahmsarovar	-.09327	.12826	.950	-.4448	.2583
		Mansa Devi	Mansa Devi	.10698	.12722	.918	-.2417	.4557
			Morni	.19713	.12436	.508	-.1437	.5380
			Surajkund	-.08957	.12349	.951	-.4281	.2489
			Brahmsarovar	-.20025	.13592	.581	-.5728	.1723
		Morni	Pinjore	-.10698	.12722	.918	-.4557	.2417
			Morni	.09015	.13224	.960	-.2723	.4526
			Surajkund	-.19656	.13143	.566	-.5568	.1637
			Brahmsarovar	-.29040	.13325	.190	-.6556	.0748
		Surajkund	Pinjore	-.19713	.12436	.508	-.5380	.1437
			Mansa Devi	-.09015	.13224	.960	-.4526	.2723
			Surajkund	-.28671	.12866	.172	-.6394	.0660
			Brahmsarovar	-.00370	.13244	1.000	-.3667	.3593
		Brahmsarovar	Pinjore	.08957	.12349	.951	-.2489	.4281
			Mansa Devi	.19656	.13143	.566	-.1637	.5568
			Morni	.28671	.12866	.172	-.0660	.6394
Surajkund			-.01511	.08662	1.000	-.2526	.2223	
Brahmsarovar		Mansa Devi	-.09670	.09180	.830	-.3483	.1549	
		Morni	-.16482	.08999	.357	-.4115	.0818	
		Surajkund	-.09546	.08945	.823	-.3406	.1497	

contd. table 3

Dependent Variable	(I) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	(J) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. Interval	95% Confidence		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Tou_Fac	Pinjore	Brahmsarovar	.01511	.08662	1.000	-.2223	.2526	
		Mansa Devi	-.08159	.08592	.877	-.3171	.1539	
		Morni	-.14971	.08399	.385	-.3799	.0805	
		Surajkund	-.08034	.08340	.871	-.3089	.1483	
	Mansa Devi	Brahmsarovar	.09670	.09180	.830	-.1549	.3483	
		Pinjore	.08159	.08592	.877	-.1539	.3171	
		Morni	-.06812	.08931	.941	-.3129	.1767	
	Morni	Surajkund	.00125	.08876	1.000	-.2420	.2445	
		Brahmsarovar	.16482	.08999	.357	-.0818	.4115	
		Pinjore	.14971	.08399	.385	-.0805	.3799	
	Surajkund	Mansa Devi	.06812	.08931	.941	-.1767	.3129	
		Surajkund	.06937	.08689	.931	-.1688	.3075	
		Brahmsarovar	.09546	.08945	.823	-.1497	.3406	
	Brahmsarovar	Pinjore	Brahmsarovar	.08034	.08340	.871	-.1483	.3089
			Mansa Devi	-.00125	.08876	1.000	-.2445	.2420
			Morni	-.06937	.08689	.931	-.3075	.1688
			Surajkund	.03301	.09551	.997	-.2288	.2948
	Pinjore	Mansa Devi	Brahmsarovar	-.00741	.10121	1.000	-.2848	.2700
			Morni	-.06279	.09922	.970	-.3348	.2092
			Surajkund	-.05684	.09862	.978	-.3272	.2135
			Brahmsarovar	-.03301	.09551	.997	-.2948	.2288
	Mansa Devi	Morni	Mansa Devi	-.04042	.09473	.993	-.3001	.2192
			Morni	-.09580	.09260	.839	-.3496	.1580
			Surajkund	-.08985	.09196	.865	-.3419	.1622
Brahmsarovar			.00741	.10121	1.000	-.2700	.2848	
Morni	Surajkund	Pinjore	.04042	.09473	.993	-.2192	.3001	
		Morni	-.05538	.09847	.980	-.3253	.2145	
		Surajkund	-.04943	.09787	.987	-.3177	.2188	
		Brahmsarovar	.06279	.09922	.970	-.2092	.3348	
Surajkund	Mansa Devi	Pinjore	.09580	.09260	.839	-.1580	.3496	
		Mansa Devi	.05538	.09847	.980	-.2145	.3253	
		Surajkund	.00595	.09581	1.000	-.2567	.2686	
		Brahmsarovar	.05684	.09862	.978	-.2135	.3272	
Brahmsarovar	Morni	Pinjore	.08985	.09196	.865	-.1622	.3419	
		Mansa Devi	.04943	.09787	.987	-.2188	.3177	
		Morni	-.00595	.09581	1.000	-.2686	.2567	
		Surajkund	.02340	.10216	.999	-.2566	.3034	
Gen_Img	Mansa Devi	Pinjore	.12689	.10826	.767	-.1698	.4236	
		Morni	-.03514	.10613	.997	-.3261	.2558	
		Surajkund	.07964	.10549	.943	-.2095	.3688	

contd. table 3



Dependent Variable	(I) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	(J) Name of Tourism Destination Visited	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig. Interval	95% Confidence	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Pinjore	Brahmsarovar	-.02340	.10216	.999	-.3034	.2566
		Mansa Devi	.10349	.10133	.845	-.1742	.3812
		Morni	-.05854	.09905	.976	-.3300	.2130
		Surajkund	.05624	.09836	.979	-.2134	.3258
	Mansa Devi	Brahmsarovar	-.12689	.10826	.767	-.4236	.1698
		Pinjore	-.10349	.10133	.845	-.3812	.1742
		Morni	-.16203	.10533	.538	-.4507	.1267
		Surajkund	-.04725	.10468	.991	-.3342	.2397
	Morni	Brahmsarovar	.03514	.10613	.997	-.2558	.3261
		Pinjore	.05854	.09905	.976	-.2130	.3300
		Mansa Devi	.16203	.10533	.538	-.1267	.4507
		Surajkund	.11478	.10248	.796	-.1661	.3957
Surajkund	Brahmsarovar	-.07964	.10549	.943	-.3688	.2095	
	Pinjore	-.05624	.09836	.979	-.3258	.2134	
	Mansa Devi	.04725	.10468	.991	-.2397	.3342	
	Morni	-.11478	.10248	.796	-.3957	.1661	

The table 3 (Multiple Comparisons) shows which groups differed from each other. The Tukey post hoc test is generally the preferred test for conducting post hoc tests on a one-way ANOVA, but there are many others. We can see from the table below that there is no statistically significant difference in service quality perceptions between the groups that visited the different tourism destinations.

#### MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Finally, to examine all the seven service quality dimensions in terms of their effects on tourists' overall satisfaction, we applied multiple regression analysis. To apply multiple regression analysis, tourists' overall satisfaction is taken as the dependent variable (Y) to be predicted by six service quality dimensions (Information availability, Employee response, Tourism facility, Safety and security, Economic activity, and General image) as the independent variables (IDVs), based on corresponding 35 variables using a 5-point Likert scale. In this case, since most of the factors are extracted through exploratory factor analysis, and even the additional factor (Overall image) is self-developed, therefore we use alternate method (called Step-wise method); factors are entered into the equation one by one, based on their relevance.

Table 4 shows that out of six independent service quality dimensions, only three (Information Availability, Employee Response, and Tourism Facility) entered into the regression equation as only these three were found significant enough to enter into it. There are three models in Table 4 – (i) Model 1 – only Information availability

as one IDV; (ii) Model 2 – both Information availability and Employee Response as IDVs; and (iii) Information availability, Employee Response and Tourism Facility as three IDVs (or predictors of overall satisfaction) in to the regression equation.

**Table 4**  
**Variables Entered/Removed**

<i>Model</i>	<i>Variables Entered</i>	<i>Method</i>
1	Information Availability (Inf_Avl)	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Employee Response (Emp_Res)	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Tourism Facility(Tou_Fac)	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

(a) Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction (Ovr\_Sat)

The model summary is given in Table 5. As noted earlier too, the regression model at the final stage consists of the three independent variables (Information availability, Employee Response and Tourism Facility). All these variables in the model remain statistically significant, avoiding the need to remove a variable in the stepwise process. Thus, this model is finalized and contains all variables as predictors of the dependent variable (Overall satisfaction).

In a stepwise method, however, the regression model can be markedly affected by issues such as multicollinearity. In the following section, provides an overview of the estimation of the regression model from the perspective of overall model fit. Table 5 provides a step-by-step summary detailing the measures of the overall fit of the regression model developed in the present research to predict overall satisfaction of respondents in terms of different service quality dimensions. Each of the three variables added to the regression equation made substantial contributions to the overall model fit, with a substantive increase in the  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$ , while also slightly decreasing the standard error of estimate. With only the first three variables, 61.7 percent of the total variance in overall satisfaction is explained with a confidence interval of 95 percent.

**Table 5**  
**Model Summary<sup>d</sup>**

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>
1	0.676 <sup>a</sup>	0.457	0.455	0.400
2	0.768 <sup>b</sup>	0.589	0.586	0.348
3	0.785 <sup>c</sup>	0.617	0.613	0.337

a. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl

b. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl, Emp\_Res

c. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl, Emp\_Res, Tou\_Fac

d. Dependent Variable: Ovr\_Sat

**Table 6**  
**Nova**

	<i>Model</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>d.f.</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	Regression	34.929	1	34.929	60.915	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	217.894	380	.573		
	Total	252.823	381			
2	Regression	47.661	2	23.830	44.022	.000 <sup>c</sup>
	Residual	205.162	379	.541		
	Total	252.823	381			
3	Regression	49.976	3	16.659	31.043	.000 <sup>d</sup>
	Residual	202.846	378	.537		
	Total	252.823	381			

a. Dependent Variable: Ovr\_Sat

b. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl

c. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl, Emp\_Res

d. Predictors: (Constant), Inf\_Avl, Emp\_Res, Tou\_Fac

Table 6 shows that all these three dimensions are statistically significant as well. Other three variables (Safety and security, Economic activity, and General image), which are not entered into regression equation were not statistically significant. Thus, tourists perceived there must be at least proper tourism facilities, along with efficient employees and availability of tourism related information.

**Table 7**  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>		
1	(Constant)	1.481	.284		5.213	.000
	Inf_Avl	.561	.072	.372	7.805	.000
2	(Constant)	1.240	.280		4.423	.000
	Inf_Avl	.423	.075	.280	5.601	.000
	Emp_Res	.270	.056	.242	4.850	.000
3	(Constant)	1.133	.284		3.992	.000
	Inf_Avl	.274	.104	.181	2.637	.009
	Emp_Res	.257	.056	.231	4.611	.000
	Tou_Fac	.194	.093	.141	2.077	.038

a) Dependent Variable: Ovr\_Sat

Table 7 shows standardized as well as unstandardized regression coefficients of variables included after each step of multiple regression model. As final outcome after step 3, there are three variables (Information availability, Employee response and Tourism facility) in the final regression model and based on the values reported in Table 7, these variables can be examined. To assess their relative importance, one can use both the unstandardized coefficients (B) as well as standardized (or beta) coefficients, but preferably beta coefficients is used for such

purpose. In Table 7, beta coefficients are listed in the column headed *Standardized Coefficients*. Here, we can make direct comparisons among the variables to determine their relative importance in the regression variate. In the present case, information availability is the most important dimension ( $\beta = .104$ ), followed by tourism facility ( $\beta = .093$ ) and finally employee responsiveness ( $\beta = .056$ ). With a steady decline in the  $\beta$  coefficients across the variables, it is difficult to categorize variables as high, low, or otherwise. However, viewing the relative magnitudes does include that, for example, information availability shows a more marked effect (almost two times) than employee responsiveness.

## CONCLUSION

This article examines various existing dimensions of service quality and also develops few new service quality dimensions (Information availability, Employee response, Tourism facility, Safety and security, and Economic activity). While examining aforementioned dimensions, thirty-five practices under the seven different dimensions including *overall satisfaction* and *general image* were developed from the literature and subsequently from expert survey. To assess the relative importance of each dimension, a multiple regression analysis is also conducted. Such relative importance will be useful to practitioners and policy makers of hospitality service industry, while targeting tourists and hoteliers. It also contributes to existing knowledge of service quality research.

Based on the further analysis of tourist's perception, the study found the five crucial factors affecting tourist's perception regarding different service quality variables. Using factor analysis technique, the study suggested the following five crucial factors –

- ❖ *Tourism facility* that consists of strong communication system, money changer and e-transfers facilities, perfect physical facilities, advanced transport facilities, professionally trained guides and interpreters, accommodation facilities as same as website description, excellent modern accommodation facilities and availability of recreational facilities.
- ❖ *Employee response* that includes employees are never too busy to respond, employees' interest towards tourist problems, proper arrangement for the tourist needs, employees' prompt services, help and attention as and when needed, employees inspire for the tourists' revisit intention and employee's appearance.
- ❖ *Economic Activity* that consists of event attractions, entry fee and other charges are reasonable, attractive package tours, interesting and economic trip and availability of tourism materials.
- ❖ *Information Availability* including error-free records, reliable and accurate information, updated information, completeness and correctness of website data and online accessibility.

- ❖ *Safety and Security* consisting of helpful law and order, tourist feels safe and safe and secure visit to Haryana.

In addition to aforementioned service quality dimensions extracted from factor analysis, two more dimensions were added – *General image* and *overall satisfaction* of tourists while examining whether there is any statistical significant difference in perception of service quality dimensions<sup>8</sup> between Indian and Foreign tourists visiting Haryana. To do so, ANOVA was applied to find out the significant mean difference if any, between the domestic and foreign tourists towards these service quality dimensions. Results confirmed that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean perception regarding 'economic activity' between the domestic vs. foreign tourists. However in other case, the study don't find any perceptual differences. The reasons behind this might be foreign travelers have different economic background, their buying power is comparatively higher than domestic travelers, or even their pattern on spending money is entirely different.

Additionally, in order to examine all these seven service quality dimensions in terms of their effects on tourists' overall satisfaction, a multiple regression analysis is also applied. In other words, it is applied to predict the overall satisfaction of the tourists visiting in different tourism destinations of Haryana. Results of the multiple regression analysis showed that there are three only variables - *Information availability*, *Employee response* and *Tourism facility*, which significantly affected tourist's overall satisfaction. To assess their relative importance, the study made a direct comparisons among these variables in order to determine their relative importance in the regression variate. Here, information availability was found as a most important dimension ( $\beta = .104$ ), followed by tourism facility ( $\beta = .093$ ) and finally employee responsiveness ( $\beta = .056$ ). Thus, it can be concluded that information availability shows a more marked effect (almost two times) than employee responsiveness in affecting tourist's overall satisfaction.

### **References**

- Anderson, Carl R., & Zeithaml, Carl P. (1984), Stage of the Product Life Cycle, Business Strategy, and Business Performance. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 5-24.
- Atilgan, E., Akinici, S., & Aksoy, S. (2003), Mapping service quality in the tourism industry. *Managing Service Quality*, 13(5), 412-422.
- Buhalis, D. (2000), Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management* 21(1): 97-116.
- Buzzell, Robert D., & Gale, Bradley T. (1987), *The PIMS Principles*. New York: Free Press.
- Chen, C.F. & Tsai, D.C. (2007), How destination image and evaluative factor affect behavioural intentions. *Tourism Management* 28(4): 1115-1122.
- Fyall, A. & Leask, A. (2007), Destination marketing: Future issues-strategic challenges. *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 7(1): 50-63.
- Godbey, G. (1997), *Leisure and leisure services in the 21st century*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.

- Jang, S & Feng, R. (2007), Temporal destination revisit intention: The effects of novelty seeking and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*. 2007, 28: 580-590.
- Juwaheer, T.D., & Ross, D.L. (2003), A study of hotel guest perceptions in Mauritius. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(2), 105–115.
- Marshall, Gary, & Murdoch, Ian (2001), Service quality in the Marketing of Consulting Engineer. Paper presented at the 2nd International Construction Marketing, brookes UK.
- Oppermann, M. Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*. 2000: 39: 78-84.
- Parasuraman, A, Zeithaml, V.A, & Berry, L.L (1985), A conceptual model of service quality and its implication for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 41-50.
- Rajesh, R. (2013), Impact of Tourist Perceptions, Destination Image and Tourist Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Conceptual Model. *Pasos* 11(3) : 67-78.
- Wyllie, R.W (2000), *Tourism and society*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005), An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: structural model. *Tourism Management* 26: 45-56.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (2000), Service quality, profitability and the economic worth of customers: what we know and what we need to learn. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28 (1), 67-85.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.  
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.