

Association Between Tourist Satisfaction Dimensions and Nationality: An Empirical Investigation

Mohinder Chand*, Amit Kumar**, Harpal Kaule***

Abstract *The Today, tourism has been appreciated and recognized as an economic giant, globally. In, fact, it has become livelihood for more than three dozen countries especially, developing nations. According to WTTC (2015) tourism contributes 10 percent of global GDP, 7.0 percent of the total world exports, 30 percent of services exports and 9.09 percent of global employment while in India the contribution of tourism in GDP has been 4.90 per cent and accounting for 6.78 per cent of total employment in the country. Tourist behaviour has become more complex and complicated regarding the choosing tourist destinations / services. Therefore, most of the academicians have turned their interest towards evaluating tourist behaviour. Keeping in view the importance of tourist behaviour and tourist satisfaction, the present research paper is aimed to find out the association between tourist satisfaction dimensions and nationality of the tourists.*

Keywords: *Tourist Satisfaction, Destination Attributes, Tourist Behaviour, Nationality and Tourism*

INTRODUCTION

Modern era of travel however seems to be started about 4000 B.C. after the invention of money by the Sumerians. Early travel in the Orient particularly in India and China was also largely based on trade and commerce. It is on record that long before the Christian era, travelers visited India in search of fortune. During the Middle Ages of tourism for religious purpose began. The powerful influences of a crusading religion that slowly penetrated a foreign land, such as Christianity in Europe and later in America and Buddhism, Islam and Hinduism in Asia took place to permit an assimilation and perpetuation of very distinctive languages, literature, music, art, architecture, philosophy, and form of government. Religion thus played and continues to play a crucial part in travel. The word “tourist” is derived from the term “tour”, which, according to Webster’s International Dictionary means, “a journey at which one returns to the starting point; a circular trip usually for business, pleasure

or education during which various places are visited and for which an itinerary is usually planned”. A tourist is defined by World Tourism Organization (WTO) as “only foreigner who spent not less than 24 hours and not more than six months in a country other than his native country and stays in hotels and spends money in his own currency”. From a supply side perspective, the tourism industry may be defined as “the aggregate of all businesses that directly provide goods or services to facilitate business, pleasure, and leisure activities away from the home environment” (Smith, 1998). O’Driscoll and Ernest Parson’ defined tourism as “an activity concerned with leisured and comfortably off travelers who were content to enjoy scenery, works of art and the general atmosphere of being ‘abroad’ has been replaced by something quite different”. The following definition of tourism provided by Swiss Professors Hunziker and Krapf (1942) may be described as the most acceptable one. It has also been adopted by the International Association of Scientific Experts on Tourism (IASET). “Tourism is the sum

* Professor, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India.
Email: mohinderchand@rediffmail.com

** Assistant Professor Directorate of Distance Education Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India.
Email: ak.amitmathur@gmail.com

*** Research Scholar, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Haryana, India.

of phenomenon and relationships arising from the travel and stay of non-residents, in so far as they do not lead to permanent residence and are not connected with any earning activity". Hermann V. Schullord (1910), defined tourism as the sum total of operations, mainly of an economic nature, which directly relate to entry, stay and movement of foreigners inside and outside a certain country, city Or region. According to Alister Mathieson and Geoffery Wall (1982), "tourism is the temporary movement of people to destinations outside their normal places of work and residence, the activities undertaken during their stay in those destinations and the facilities created to cater to their needs". According to Tourism Society of Britain "Tourism is the temporary short-period movement of people to destinations outside the places where they normally live, work; and activities during their stay at these destinations". This definition includes movement of people for all purposes. Technically, tourism comprises of activities undertaken by the tourists to satisfy their respective urges during in and reroute their destinations and the toughistic systems within which tourism industry works (Chand, 2000). "Tourism is a composite phenomenon which embraces the incidence of a mobile population of travelers who are strangers to places they visit "(Bhatia, 1982). Travel, as adventure has exited from time immemorial while tourism is a relatively new concept and is the product of the rapid mean of modern communication, amenities and refinements. That science and technology has provided. Modern Tourism is the most striking phenomenon of 21st century and offers us an opportunity to learn, enrich humanity and to identify what may be termed as goal for a better life and better society. As an industry the impact of tourism is manifold. Tourism industry nourishes a country's economy, stimulates development process, restores cultural heritage, and helps in maintaining international peace and understanding. Tourism is a highly fragile and competitive industry and calls for people's involvement at all levels. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, tourism as an industry had probably achieved a higher profile in the public consciousness of the developed world than ever before. There has, of course. Been a steady growth in the numbers of tourists over several decades, but the critical reasons were the impacts on international tourism of (1) the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, (2) the American led invasion of Iraq, (3) airline financial failures, and (4) government and traveler responses to the SARS virus (Lew et. al., 2004). Tourism does not exist in isolation. It has certain basic components without which it cannot operate. These three basic components of tourism as follows: (1) Transport, (2) Locale (Attractions and Amenities), and (3) Accommodation. While elements of tourism include (1) Pleasing Weather, (2) Scenic attractions, (3) Historical and Cultural factors, (4) Accessibility, and (5) Amenities. The most significant characteristic of this industry is that it is least pollutant for which it is also called

"Smokeless Industry". The importance of this industry can well understand as it promotes national integration, builds better international understanding besides generating a vast employment opportunities. In fact, the whole economy of many counties like Singapore, Thailand, and France etc. are solely based on tourism.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

During last two decades the research on tourist satisfaction has become a central point for the tourism and hospitality researchers. Over the years tourism market has become very complex and the marketers have diversified their marketing strategies to attract and repeat tourist. Thus, the changing market environment has forced the tourism researchers to go for more and more market oriented research to explore and to conduct applied research on tourist satisfaction. In fact, tourist satisfaction research occupied a pivotal place in the modern hospitality research. Recently, numerous scholars have demonstrated the need and significance of tourist satisfaction globally (Albayrak and Caber ,2016; Chand and Kaule, 2016; Khuong et. al , 2016;, Thiumsak and Ruangkanjanases, 2016; Tsai, 2016; Bagri and Kala, 2015; Bernini et.al 2015; Corte et.al 2015; Liao et.al 2015; Pavesi et.al 2015; Chand and Dahiya, 2014, Khuong and Ha, 2014; Vieira et.al, 2014; Lai and Vinh , 2013; Neuts et.al, 2013). Thus, it has become paramount to review previous researches on foreign tourist satisfaction in Indian context from different dimensions.

Pizam, et. al (1978) identified eight factors of tourist satisfaction with Cape Cod, Massachuseits (USA) as a tourist destination. They derived factors like: beach opportunities, cost, hospitality, eating and drinking water facilities, accommodation facilities, environment and extent of commercialization by using factor analytic approach on data obtained from a survey of 685 vacationing tourists. Furthermore, Ross and Iso-Ahola (1991) explored motivation and satisfaction dimensions of sightseeing tourists by field study. They tested 225 tourists for their motives before the day's tour and for their satisfaction after it and data were collected on 10 different tour buses. Their results indicated a considerable similarity between motivation and satisfaction dimensions, with knowledge seeking, social interaction, and escape emerging as important motive and satisfaction factors. They found that a group of tourists who came together by chance scored higher on the knowledge-seeking motive and on five satisfaction dimensions than did the regular tour group and convention group.

Vogt and Fesenmaier (1995) stated that tourists evaluate tourism service on the based on "who" delivers as oppose to the nature of the services and they evaluated that a tourism experience of tourists by service dimensions include reliability, responsive, assurance and access. They described

a study, which measures tourists and retailers' perceptions of service level in a tourist destination. They used a service quality model to develop survey items and interpret the results.

Gnoth (1997) introduced a model of tourism motivation and expectation formation in his theoretical study which was based on the behavioral notion of derives reduction and cognitivist constructs of attitudes and values. He founded the satisfaction of inner directed values and motivations depends on classes of objects and to meet the same, planners need to follow specific parameters in their product design and resource management as they are expressed in tourists motivations. And the satisfaction of outer directed values target specific objects and to meet this planner can choose from substitutable products and product configurations. On the other hand, Crompton and McKay (1997) identified the motivational factors to attend events at a festival with the help of the escape-seeking dichotomy and the push-pull factors conceptual frameworks. These two outlines were used to lead progress of a mechanism to measure motives. They explored six motivational factors i.e. cultural exploration, novelty/regression, known group socialization, external interaction/socialization, recover equilibrium, and gregariousness out of which former four were uncovered first time by them. They confirmed the utility of the escape-seeking dichotomy with consistency with the guiding push factors framework.

Babin and Griffin (1998) focused on advancement in both satisfaction research and measurement theory to provide a more precise view of consumer satisfaction and dissatisfaction than has been previously offered and offered conceptualization, which maximizes face validity and is more true to the nature of reflective indicators of latent constructs. While on the other hand Tribe and Snaith (1998) measured the tourist satisfaction at Varadero, Cuba with the application of HOLSAT technique which was a modified SERVQUAL research instrument to measure satisfaction with the approaches of satisfaction attitudes through expectations/performance analysis. They explored the incipient limitations and submit the technique to improve the rationality for further research works in future which pursue to utilize HOLSAT technique for measurement of tourist's satisfaction with destination attributes. HOLSAT was now new tool for other researchers and they utilized this technique for their research work on the measurement of satisfaction level at destination.

Foster (1999) outlined the measurement method for tourists' satisfaction for the Australian tourism industry and the means by which these methods could be advanced further to offer a better measurement technique for satisfaction measurement with Australia as a destination. Each sector of tourism industry have endeavored the customer satisfaction

measurement as part of their quality assurance programs since the importance of quality concerns in gradually competitive milieu has been recognized. He set up some examples of the methods which have been commenced at the organizational level and the endorsement outline. He proposed the idea that expansion of satisfaction measurement form organizational level to the destination level would be helpful to make destination more competitive. He concluded that tourists' satisfaction extent with a destination is abstractly different from assessing satisfaction with each destination attribute while on the other hand satisfaction at the destination level is influenced by each attribute individually.

Latu and Everett (2000) reviewed the global literature related to tourists' satisfaction and its measurement to described that satisfaction measurement is not only quantitative term but also includes some other aspects like given information to clients by organization, experiences passed by current consumers to future consumers and the facts given by critics about destination to the managers. They stressed that measurement of satisfaction is not an easy task having multidimensional and transient nature. Tourists' satisfaction is the responsibility of all the levels of management of destination as for dissatisfied tourists everyone will be liable.

Pawitra and Tan (2003) assessed the usefulness of integrating Kano's model, SERVQUAL and quality function deployment. The proposed approach aims to help organizations evaluate customer satisfaction, and to assist in innovative product/service development through the identification of attributes that are attractive to the customer. They evaluate the image of Singapore as a tourist destination from the perspective of tourists from Indonesia. They analyzed attributes of Singapore as a tourist destination and determined key strengths and weakness also.

Masarrat (2012) investigated magnitude of satisfaction of foreign tourists visiting Uttaranchal. Masarrat found that with the sanitary conditions of elegant hotels tourists got satisfaction while with the behavior of bus drivers and conductors, tourists were dissatisfied. The touristic spots, religious places, the river, the adventure tourism spots, natural parks and the peaceful environment of Uttaranchal delivered ample magnitude of satisfaction to tourists but on the other hand the communication and banking conveniences delivered gap between tourists which caused dissatisfaction in tourists. Masarrat identified the causes of this gap which include lacking of tourism destination package, inappropriate interpretation conveniences, deprived conditions of conventional buses and share taxies, unpleasant upkeep of city roads, traffic congestion, lacking of adequate information on official web site and lacking of eminent souvenirs at Uttaranchal. Masarrat recommended that destination management must eliminate the gap to deliver satisfaction to tourists visiting tourism destinations in Uttaranchal.

Chand and Dahiya (2014) proposed a conceptual framework to investigate the impact of tourists' perceived service quality, on satisfaction and loyalty. To test the conceptual framework, structural equation modeling (SEM) has been used to analyse the data collected from 558 tourists visiting in India. The results of the study indicate that tourist satisfaction is significantly and positively related to loyalty. Tourist satisfaction has found to be an important mediator between perceived service quality and tourist loyalty.

Whereas Bagri and Kala (2015) investigated tourists' satisfaction by inspecting the association between destination characteristics significance and performance at spiritual and adventure tourist destination Trijuginarayan, situated in Garhwal Himalaya in Uttarakhand. They revealed that traits related to spiritual and cultural tourism nature, atmosphere and weather, a variety of tourist activities, hospitality and safety are important aspects in defining tourist satisfaction, whereas basic facilities such as accommodation, transportation, tourism infrastructure and hygiene and cleanliness at destination are of significant prominence in tourists' satisfaction assessment. They found that the core products delivered positive magnitude of satisfaction to the tourists while basic tourists' amenities failed to deliver positive magnitude of satisfaction which caused dissatisfaction with them. They suggested tourism stakeholders to develop effective strategies for steady development and to enhance destination performance for positive magnitude of tourists' satisfaction.

Chand and Kaule (2016) examined the magnitude of tourist's satisfaction transversely with particular nationality features using both quantitative and qualitative research methods. They discovered that the tourists had higher expectations than perceived magnitude of satisfaction in all groups of variables and tourists perceived poor performance values which caused somehow dissatisfaction with them. They found that demographic aspects such as gender and age had no influence on the magnitude of satisfaction whereas the nationality of tourists had impact on the level of satisfaction. They described also that the performance value of various amenities at Indian destinations had the highest impact on tourists' behavior intentions for future trips.

Although most of the related literature shows that, the major driving forces of tourist satisfaction such as tourist expectations, perceived quality, perceived value and destination image were identified, few theoretical and empirical investigated the relationship between the tourist characteristics with tourist satisfaction and the revisit intentions. A number of research studies have been conducted in order to measure tourist satisfaction in different areas of the tourism and travel industry. The number of empirical investigations to measure tourist satisfaction with destinations has also increased over the past decade (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Pizam et al., 1978; Qu & Li, 1997).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The Study Area

The present study focused on the Data collected from tourists visiting at various tourist destinations locating in North India. According to Government of India definition, North India includes the states of Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Rajasthan as well as Union Territory of Chandigarh and Delhi.

The Sampling Procedure

Using a convenience sampling approach, tourists visiting Delhi, Chandigarh, Jaipur, Agra, Amritsar, Jammu, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Jaisalmer, Udaipur, Ajmer, Shimla and Kullu-Manali, Dalhousie, were surveyed and asked to fill up the questionnaire. The sample size of this study was collected more than 400 tourists visiting in the study area out of which only 250 questionnaires were found usable.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

This study is empirical in nature and based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data will be collected through structured questionnaire. The questionnaire will be administrated on the various parameters of satisfactions of tourists and will be constructed based on an extensive literature review. A structured questionnaire will be developed consisting of various questions related to demographic profile of respondents in the first part and satisfaction variables in second part.

Hypothesis

H1: There is significant difference between tourist satisfaction dimensions' and demographic profile of tourists..

H2: There is significant association between tourist satisfaction dimensions and nationality.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The demographic profile of the respondents is shown in Table 1. The gender distribution of the respondents was quite even, with 64% male respondents and 36% female respondents. Age is one of the factors, which influence tourist's expectation and satisfaction. The dominant age group of the respondents was 21 to 40 years with 42%; followed by 41-50 years with 30%. Whereas, both teenage travellers and old travellers occupied 22% and 6% sample respectively. It is very clear from this discussion that the age group 21 to 40 years takes more

interest in tour, because that is age to enjoy. They don't have much burden about his or her family etc. and they can earn and spend. Education is very important in modern society. It influences tourism activity. In terms of level of education, 36% of the respondents had been senior secondary followed by 32% respondents who had been educated to graduation level and post-graduation and metric level respondents were 18% and 14% respectively. No respondent in this research study was below metric level. In terms of duration of the stay of tourists in India, the majority of tourists (40%) stayed 5 to 10 days followed by tourists (32%) who preferred 1 to 5 days stay at India. Only 28% respondents preferred more than 2 weeks. With regards to nationality, tourists from Germany accounted for the majority of the response rate (22%); followed by British (18%) and Russian (14%). While tourists from Canada accounted for 10% and tourists from other countries like France, U.S.A., Italy, Australia, Israel, Belgium, Uruguay, Ukraine etc. collectively accounted for 36% of total respondents.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents (N=250)

	Frequency	Percentage
GENDER		
Male	160	64
Female	90	36
AGE		
<20 Years	55	22
21-40 Years	105	42
41-50 Years	75	30
>50 Years	15	06
EDUCATION		
Metric	35	14
Senior Secondary/ Equivalent	90	36
Graduation	80	32
Post-Graduation	45	18
DURATION OF STAY		
1-5 Days	80	32
5-10 Days	100	40
> 10 Days	70	28

	Frequency	Percentage
OCCUPATION		
Teaching	20	08
Industry	120	48
Student	80	32
Not Working	30	12
NATIONALITY		
German	55	22
British	45	18
Russian	35	14
Canadian	25	10
Others	90	36

In order to test the second hypothesis (H1) one way ANOVA was performed. Table 2 presents the F Value from One way ANOVA. While looking at the table it is clear that the factor Food & Beverage has the highest mean score and it is gender and age at 10% level and with Nationality at 5% level, where as there is no significance with education and occupation. Accommodation has the 2nd highest value in terms of mean score, which is significant with gender and age at 10% level and with nationality at 1% level, while there is no significance with education and occupation. Then factors destination attributes and overall satisfaction share the same mean score and they are significant with gender, age and nationality at 10% level, while there is no significance at all with education and occupation. Tourism facilities comes at number five in terms of mean score value and is significant with gender at 10% level and age at 1% level, while there is no significance with education, occupation and nationality. The last factor in terms of mean score is Transport which is significant with gender and age at 10% level and with nationality at 1% level, while there is no significance with occupation and education. The analysis of the data indicates that there is statistically significant relation between tourist satisfaction dimensions and demographic profile of tourists; hence the H1 is partially accepted.

Table 2: F-values from the One-way ANOVA of Demographic Profile of Tourists on Tourist Satisfaction Dimensions

Tourist Satisfaction Dimensions		Demographic Profile of Tourists					
Measures	Mean scores	Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Nationality	
DESTINATION ATTRIBUTES (DA)	4.50	5.135**	4.447**	1.761	1.556	5.360**	

Tourist Satisfaction Dimensions		Demographic Profile of Tourists				
Measures	Mean scores	Gender	Age	Education	Occupation	Nationality
ACCOMMODATION (AC)	4.70	4.441**	4.545***	1.456	0.857	5.640***
TRANSPORT (TP)	4.40	4.141**	4.750**	0.789	0.823	3.571*
FOOD & BEVERAGES (FB)	4.78	4.591**	4.652*	0.457	1.115	4.820**
TOURISM FACILITIES (TF)	4.65	4.672**	3.668*	1.118	1.350	3.450
OVERALL SATISFACTION (OS)	4.5	3.90**	3.927**	0.682	1.045	3.531**

Further, in order to test the association between tourist satisfaction dimensions and nationality as a whole, in other words to test the hypothesis 4 (H4) i.e., There is significant association between tourist satisfaction dimensions and nationality, Chi-Square was performed.

Nationality with Destination Attributes

In table 3, Pearson chi square significance value at .005 shows the association between nationality and Destination Attributes. The contingency co-efficient of .734 indicates that association is strong. Based on chi square value we found that there is highly significant relation between nationality and destination attributes.

Table 3: Nationality with Destination Attributes (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.010*	3	.005
Likelihood Ratio	13.877	3	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.406	1	.121
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 6 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 2.41

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.782	.005
	Cramer's V	.782	.005
	Contingency Co-efficient	.734	.005
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Nationality with Accommodation

In table 4, Pearson chi square significance value at .094 shows the association between nationality and accommodation. However the contingency coefficient of .452 indicates that association is not strong. Therefore we found that there is statistically significant relation between nationality and accommodation.

Table 4: Nationality with Accommodation (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.929 ^a	4	.094
Likelihood Ratio	9.234	4	.056
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.652	1	.017
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 0.48

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.476	.094
	Cramer's V	.476	.094
	Contingency Co-efficient	.452	.094
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Nationality with Transport

In table 5, Pearson chi square significance value at .00 shows the association between nationality and transport. However the contingency co-efficient of .646 indicates that association is strong. Therefore we found that there is highly significant relation between nationality and transport.

Table 5: Nationality with Transport (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.009 ^a	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.910	12	.069
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.793	1	.051
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 18 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 0.04

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.846	.000
	Cramer's V	.489	.000
	Contingency Coefficient	.646	.000
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Nationality with Food & Beverages

In table 6, Pearson chi square significance value at .00 shows the association between nationality and food & beverages. However the contingency co-efficient of .592 indicates that association is strong. Therefore we found that there is statistically significant relation between nationality and food & beverages.

Table 6: Nationality with Food & Beverages (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.178 ^a	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.051	9	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.014	1	.005
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 18 cells (90.0%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 0.04

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.734	.000
	Cramer's V	.424	.000
	Contingency Coefficient	.592	.000
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Nationality with Tourism Facilities

In table 7, Pearson chi square significance value at .012 shows the association between nationality and tourism facilities. The contingency co-efficient of .561 indicates that association is statically strong. Therefore we found that there is little and statistically significant relation between nationality and tourism facilities.

Table 7: Nationality with Tourism Facilities (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	25.666 ^a	12	.012
Likelihood Ratio	20.196	12	.063
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.483	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 17 cells (85.0%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 0.07

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.677	.012
	Cramer's V	.391	.012
	Contingency Co-efficient	.521	.012
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Nationality with Overall Satisfaction

In table 8, Pearson chi square significance value at .000 shows the association between nationality and overall satisfaction. However the contingency co-efficient of .618 indicates that association is strong. Therefore we found that there is highly significant relation between nationality and overall satisfaction.

Table 8: Nationality with Tourism Facilities (Chi-Square Tests)

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-Sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.694 ^a	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	15.633	9	.075
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.747	1	.097
N of Valid Cases	250		

a. 13 cells (81.3%) have expected count less than 5. The Minimum expected count is 0.04

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.787	.000
	Cramer's V	.454	.000
	Contingency Co-efficient	.618	.000
N of Valid Cases		250	

Not assuming the null hypothesis.

Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

The results of Chi-Square test reveal that results are statistically highly significant and statistically significant association between tourist satisfaction dimensions and nationality. Hence, we accept H2.

CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that the mean scores of the expectations in all categories were lower than the mean scores of the level of satisfaction. This implied that customers had high expectations and the tourist destinations need to enhance their service quality. One of the reasons may also come from the fact that most of tourist destinations lacked of environmental conditions, high costs, security system lacked an updated technology, hygienic level of food and others. The demographic factors of education, occupation, and income had high influence the level of satisfaction. Nationality wise comparison revealed insignificant differences. This can be explained by the fact that the majority of respondents had their own requirements and had expected professional services. Since it was a pilot study to understand the relationship of demographic (nationality wise) variables with destinations satisfaction attributes. Therefore, the subsequent papers will consider and take various perspectives in depth to analyse the tourist's expectations and satisfactions in Indian contexts.

REFERENCES

- Albayrak, T., & Caber, M. (2016). Destination attribute effects on rock climbing tourist satisfaction: An asymmetric impact-performance analysis. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(3), 280-296.
- Babin, B. J., & Griffin, M. (1998). The nature of satisfaction: An updated examination and analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 41(2), 127-136.
- Bagri, S. C., & Kala, D. (2015). Tourists' satisfaction at Trijuginarayan: An emerging spiritual and adventure tourist destination in Garhwal Himalaya India. *Turizam, Original Scientific Paper*, 19(4), 165-182.
- Bernini, C., Urbinati, E., & Vici, L. (2015). Visitor expectations and perceptions of sustainability in a mass tourism destination, *Working Paper Series*, Alma Mater Studiorum-Università di Bologna, Centro Studi Avanzati sul Turismo Via Angherà 22-47921 Rimini.
- Chand, M., & Dahiya, A. (2014). The impact of Service Quality on tourist satisfaction and loyalty in Indian tour operation industry. *International Journal of Sales & Marketing Management Research and Development (IJSMMRD)*, 4(5), 1-14.

- Chand, M., & Kaule, H. (2016). Relationship between tourist characteristics and destination satisfaction: A cross national study. *Tourism a multifaceted Perspective*, pp. 41-52. Bharti Publications, New Delhi.
- Corte, V. D., Sciarelli, M., Cascella, C., & Gaudio, G. D. (2015). customer satisfaction in tourist destination: The case of tourism offer in the city of Naples. *Journal of Investment and Management, Special Issue: Attractiveness and Governance of Tourist Destinations*, 4(1-1), 39-50. doi: 10.11648/j.jim.s.2015040101.16
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.
- Foster, D. (1999). Measuring customer satisfaction in the tourism industry, *Third International & Sixth National Research Conference on Quality Management*, The Centre for Management Quality Research at RMIT University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3001.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 283-304.
- Khuong, M. N., Hong An, N. T., & Uyen, N. T. M. (2016). Direct and Indirect Effects on International Tourists 'Destination Satisfaction - The Case of the World Natural Heritage of Halong Bay, Vietnam. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(2), 85-91.
- Khuong, M. N., & Ha, H. T. T. (2014). The influences of push and pull factors on the international leisure tourists' Return Intention to Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam - A Mediation Analysis of Destination Satisfaction. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 5(6), 490-496.
- Lai, W.-H., & Vinh, N. Q. (2013). An application of AHP approach to investigate tourism promotional effectiveness. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 19(1), 1-22.
- Latu, T. M., & Everett, A. M. (2000). Review of Satisfaction Research and Measurement Approaches, Science & Research Internal Report 183, Department of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Liao, Z., Jin, M., & Huang, L. (2015). Survey analysis on tourist satisfaction in Jiuzhai valley. *International Journal of Multimedia and Ubiquitous Engineering*, 10(6), 89-98.
- Masarrat, G. (2012). Tourists' satisfaction towards tourism products and market: A case study of Uttaranchal. *International Journal of Business and Information Technology*, 2(1), 16-25.
- Neuts, B., Romão, J., van Leeuwen, E., & Nijkamp, P. (2013). Describing the Relationships between Tourist Satisfaction and Destination Loyalty in a Segmented and Digitalized Market, Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper, Tinbergen Institute. The Netherlands, TI 2013-164/III, 1-15.
- Pavesi, A., Gartner, W., & Guillet, B. D. (2015). The effects of a negative travel experience on tourists' decisional behavior. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/jtr.206
- Pawitra, T. A., & Tan, K. C. (2003). Tourist satisfaction in Singapore - A perspective from Indonesian tourists. *Journal: Managing Service Quality*, 13(5), 399-411.
- Pizam, A., Neumann, Y., & Reichel, A. (1978). Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5(3), 314-322.
- Ross, E. L. D., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 226-237.
- Thiumsak, T., & Ruangkanjanases, A. (2016). Factors influencing international visitors to revisit Bangkok, Thailand. *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(3), 220-230.
- Vieira, J., Couto, G., Pimente, P., Menezes, A., Moniz, A., & Sousa, F. (2014). The Satisfaction of the Nordic Tourist with the Azores as a Destination. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 13(1), 58-72.
- Vogt, C. A., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1995). Tourists and retailers' perceptions of services. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(4), 763-780.