



ISSN Print: 2394-7500
ISSN Online: 2394-5869
Impact Factor: 5.2
IJAR 2017; 3(1): 848-852
www.allresearchjournal.com
Received: 26-11-2016
Accepted: 27-12-2016

Shivani Agrawal
GLA University, Mathura,
Uttar Pradesh, India

Factors affecting Tourist's satisfaction level at religious visit: A study of Brij-Kshetra

Shivani Agrawal

Abstract

Tourism has a positive economic impact on the employment and on the gross income of a country. Uttar Pradesh, the most populous state in India is the largest contributor to the gross state domestic product (GSDP) from the service sector with GDP: \$109.770 billion and GDP per capita: \$ 488 billion and tourism industry is a major contributor to the state's economy. Attraction of more tourists is important towards a particular place which will ultimately lead to sustainable development of that place. Thus, this study was conducted with the objective of finding out those factors which are responsible for tourist's satisfaction and also to identify the relationship between those factors and overall tourist's satisfaction level visiting a Brij-Kshetra. Data of this study was collected from 300 tourists visiting Mathura, Vrindavan, Barsana, Goverdhan and Gokul. Appropriate statistical analysis such as factor analysis, correlation and regression analysis were used according to respective objectives. This study will help the Ministry of Tourism for the further development of the Brijkshetra (Mathura Region).

Keywords: Tourist, satisfaction, religious visit

1. Introduction

Tourist satisfaction is a pulling power to attract and also the main element of tourist behaviour. If a developer wants to produce successful attractions then his plan and establishments must elicit user satisfaction. Satisfaction was a concept that was very important for understanding and evaluating tourist's behaviour. Chon and Olsen in 1991 discovered about the goodness of fit correlation between tourists expectations and their satisfaction. After tourists have bought the travel service and products, and then evaluation of their experience of the travel product is better than expectations, they will feel satisfied with the visit. Expectation is defined as performance of establishment, ideal performance or says desired performance. In terms of relationship between expectation and satisfaction, expectation can be defined as a prior estimation made by the tourist's while receiving the service. Tourist satisfaction is related to the mental state of the tourists rather than the physical state. Tourists can see their satisfaction when tourists visit to their favorite destination. Tourist satisfaction refers to the feeling of pleasure that is generated after visiting the particular place. Tourists measures the satisfaction level by comparing the expected services with the actual services that is received at the place. If tourists are satisfied with their visits then it will lead to repeat in the visit and a positive image spread through word of mouth and also there will be increment in the number of tourists for visiting a particular place. Therefore it can be determined by a combination of perceived value and quality, tourist's expectations and actual experience. An overall tourist satisfaction will influence to increase the number of days to stay and increase the expenditure. And it is also very important to understand satisfaction changes with the time and with the change in the place. If a visitor receives a poor quality of service then tourist will never again visit the place in his/her life. Argued that religion and spirituality are still the most common motivations for travel and many major tourism destinations have developed largely pursuant to their connections to sacred people, places and events. Many researchers identified factors related with tourist satisfaction on a functional basis. Tourist's product is definitely the experience comprising of different services like transportation, accommodation, tours and other tangible services. These services affect tourist's satisfaction and result in their retention. Shown in their researches that value and spiritually expressive attributes of travel are very important as well.

Correspondence
Shivani Agrawal
GLA University, Mathura,
Uttar Pradesh, India

2. Religious Visit at Brij-Kshetra

Mathura-Vrindavan region is popularly known as ‘Brij-Kshetra’. This place is famous for the birth of ‘Lord Krishna’. And the surrounded places are famous for ‘Leelas’ done by the ‘Krishna and Radha’ with their friends ‘Gopis and Gwalas’. Therefore, Brij-kshetra is the most attracted place for tourist. Tourist visits these places with religious sentiment, their deep faith and their obligation for God. In Brij-kshetra, most popular festivals which are celebrated enthusiastically by the tourists are as follows:

- Shivaratri Bhai Dauj
- Holi Janmastami
- Ram navami Radhastami

Tourists enjoy these festivals with a great feeling of love towards the God. Thus, large no. of tourists are attracted towards Brij-kshetra during these festivals. Some most attracted places in Brij-kshetra are as follows:

- Mathura Nandgaon
- Vrindavan Goverdhan
- Gokul Dauji
- Barsana Ramanreti

Visiting Brij-kshetra with the feeling of love, faith and obligation towards God will be known as ‘Religious Visit’. Religious visit is not only a visit to a particular place but may also for humanitarian cause. There are many travelers who are committed and tend to save religious or spiritual experiences. Religious visits have the advantage together the people around the world of all age group and of all religion and they generally travel in small groups. Religious visit gave an opportunity to increase the individual’s self-awareness and spirituality factor within them. Therefore, Religious Visit has its own importance in the eye of tourist. Tourists come here to pray to God with a pure heart for their good health and wealth.

3. Objectives

- To identify the factors affecting tourist’s satisfaction level while visit to a Brij-kshetra.
- To identify the relationship between factors and overall tourist’s satisfaction level.
- To measure the tourist’s satisfaction by examining the impact of each factor on tourist’s satisfaction level.

4. Research Methodology

To accomplish research, 26 destination attributes were identified which are responsible for understanding the tourist’s satisfaction level while visiting different places. These attributes are extracted from the 7 research papers which are used in this research study for understanding the tourist satisfaction level for their religious visits. Pilot study was done on 30 tourists coming to visit Brij-kshetra. During pilot testing few mistakes were observed in the questionnaire then modifications were done accordingly.

After modifications, 300 tourists were approached across the Brij-Kshetra such as Mathura, Vrindavan, Barsana, Goverdhan and Gokul by using convenient sampling procedure. Data collected from February 2015 to April 2016. In questionnaire, four pointer Likert Scale were used. The following research methodologies are used in this research:

Sampling Design	
Data Required	Primary data
Data Collection Instrument	Questionnaire
Operational Design	
Tools for data analysis	* Factor Analysis
	* Correlation
	* Regression Analysis

Reliability Analysis: Reliability analysis tests the goodness of all the variables using the cronbach alpha coefficient. Cronbach alpha was chosen to analyze the degree of consistency among the items in a construct. Hair *et al.*, [50] has mentioned that cronbach alpha value must be 0.70 for the reliable result. The result of reliability analysis is given below:

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.826	26

This table shows the reliability of data through the value of Cronbach’s alpha which is 0.826, means that data is 82.6% reliable.

5. Data Analysis & Interpretation

Objective 1: To identify the factors affecting tourist’s satisfaction level while visit to a Brij-kshetra.

For this objective we have used factor analysis to identify the factors of tourist satisfaction at Brij-kshetra with the twenty attributes. Varimax rotation matrix of factor analysis was used to analyze the items and it extracted five factors (20 attributes) with item loadings ranging from 0.553 to 0.787. Following tables are the result of factor analysis:

Table 5.1: KMO and Barlett’s Test of Factor Affecting Tourist Satisfaction

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.789
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1409.901
	df	190
	Sig.	.000

KMO Statistic is computed as 0.789 which indicates the value in the acceptance region of the factor analysis model. Barlett’s test of Sphericity tests the hypothesis whether the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix. Here, Chi-Square statistic is 1409.901 with 190 degree of freedom. This value is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 5.2: Factor Analysis of Factors Affecting Tourist Satisfaction at Bri-Kshetra

S. No	Attribute Name	Factor Loading	Factor	Initial Eigenvalues		
				Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	Sight Seeing	0.671	Aesthetic Appeal	3.887	19.435	19.435
2	Handicraft Collection	0.658				
3	Local art forms	0.590				
4	Historical importance	0.716				
5	Religious Study material	0.586				
6	Textile products	0.693				
7	Parking Facilities	0.599	Accessibility	3.070	15.348	34.783
8	Cleanliness	0.677				
9	Safety & Security	0.633				
10	Road/ Air/ Rail networks	0.600				
11	Attitude of local people	0.579				
12	Hospitality Facilities	0.640	Supporting Infrastructure	1.585	7.925	42.708
13	Boating	0.553				
14	Tourist Information Center	0.671				
15	Recreational and Entertainment services	0.701				
16	Quality of food and drink	0.724	Food & Services	1.271	6.357	49.065
17	Price of Gifts	0.673				
18	Affordable Packages	0.560				
19	Tourist guide	0.787	Health & Guide Service	1.046	5.232	54.297
20	Health care facilities	0.580				

Aesthetic Appeal (Factor 1) contained six attributes and explained 19.435% of the variance in the data, with an eigenvalue 3.887. The attributes associated with this factor are sightseeing, handicraft collection, local art forms, historical importance, religious study material and textile products.

Accessibility (Factor 2) accounted for 15.348% of the variance, with an eigenvalue of 3.070. This factor was loaded with five attributes and they are parking facilities, cleanliness, safety and security, road/air/rail networks and attitude of local people.

Supporting Infrastructure (Factor 3) loaded with four attributes and this factor is accounted for 7.925% of the variance, with an eigenvalue of 1.585. Attributes are hospitality facility, boating, tourist information centers and recreational and entertainment services.

Food and Services (Factor 4) contained three attributes with an explained % of the variance of 6.357 and having an

eigenvalue of 1.271. Attributes are quality of food and drink, price of gifts and affordable packages.

Health & Guide Service (Factor 5) contained two attributes with an explained % of the variance of 5.232 and having an eigenvalue of 1.046. Attributes are tourist guides and health care facilities.

Objective 2: To identify the relationship between factors and overall tourist’s satisfaction level.

For this, Correlation is implemented and hypothesis is as follows:

- **H₀:** There is no relationship between selected destination attributes and overall tourist’s satisfaction level
- **H_a:** There is a relationship between selected destination attributes and overall tourist’s satisfaction level

Table 5.3: Correlation between Factors and Overall tourist’s satisfaction

		Aesthetic Appeal	Accessibility	Supporting Infrastructure	Food & Service	Health & Guide Service
Overall Tourist Satisfaction Level	Pearson Correlation	.987**	.804**	.943**	.982**	.970*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.005	.000	.000	.030

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlation coefficient measured the strength of linear between two variables. Here, correlation coefficient is measured between overall satisfaction of the respondents and five factors (Aesthetic Appeal, Accessibility, Supporting Infrastructure, Food & Services and Health & Guide Service). The correlation between overall tourist’s satisfaction level and five factors is positive and significant. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that there is strong relationship between the selected destination attributes and overall tourist’s satisfaction level. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Objective 3: To measure the tourist’s satisfaction by examining the impact of each factor on tourist’s satisfaction level

For this objective, Linear Regression is used to predict the value of a dependent variable by atleast one independent variable. Here, dependent and independent variables are as follows:

Dependent Variable	Tourist Satisfaction
Independent Variable	1. Aesthetic Appeal
	2. Accessibility
	3. Supporting Infrastructure
	4. Food & Service
	5. Health & Guide Service

Hypothesis 1: For Aesthetic Appeal and Tourist’s Satisfaction

- **H₀₁:** Aesthetic Appeal is not a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

- **H_{a1}:** Aesthetic Appeal is a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

Table 5.4: Linear Regression for Impact of Aesthetic Appeal on Tourist’s Satisfaction

Independent variable	Dependent variable Tourist’s Satisfaction						
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Beta	t	Sig.
Aesthetic Appeal	.987 ^a	.975	.973	390.978	.987	19.773	.000 ^b

The regression results showed that Aesthetic Appeal is a significant predictor of tourist’s satisfaction and positively related to tourist’s satisfaction with Beta 0.987 and P-Value 0.000. 97.30% of the variance is explained by aesthetic appeal in tourist’s satisfaction. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that aesthetic appeal is a good predictor of tourist’s satisfaction. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 2: For Accessibility and Tourist’s Satisfaction

- **H₀₂:** Accessibility is not a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.
- **H_{a2}:** Accessibility is a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

Table 5.5: Linear Regression for Impact of Accessibility on Tourist’s Satisfaction

Independent variable	Dependent variable Tourist’s Satisfaction						
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Beta	t	Sig.
Accessibility	.804 ^a	.647	.603	14.675	.804	3.831	.005 ^b

The results showed that Accessibility is a significant predictor of tourist’s satisfaction and positively related to tourist’s satisfaction with Beta 0.804 and P-Value 0.005. 64.07% of the variance is explained by accessibility in tourist’s satisfaction. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that accessibility is a good predictor of tourist’s satisfaction. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 3: For Supporting Infrastructure and Tourist’s Satisfaction

- **H₀₃:** Supporting Infrastructure is not a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.
- **H_{a3}:** Supporting Infrastructure is a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

Table 5.6: Linear Regression for Impact of Supporting Infrastructure on Tourist’s Satisfaction

Independent variable	Dependent variable Tourist’s Satisfaction						
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Beta	t	Sig.
Supporting Infrastructure	.943 ^a	.888	.870	47.738	.943	6.909	.000 ^b

The regression results showed that Supporting Infrastructure is a significant predictor of tourist’s satisfaction and positively related to tourist’s satisfaction with Beta 0.943 and P-Value 0.000. 88.80% of the variance is explained by supporting infrastructure in tourist’s satisfaction. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that supporting infrastructure is a good predictor of tourist’s satisfaction. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 4: For Food & Service and Tourist’s Satisfaction

- **H₀₄:** Food & Service is not a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.
- **H_{a4}:** Food & Service is a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

Table 5.7: Linear Regression for Impact of Food & Service on Tourist’s Satisfaction

Independent variable	Dependent variable Tourist’s Satisfaction						
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Beta	t	Sig.
Food & Service	.982 ^a	.965	.957	110.970	.982	10.534	.000 ^b

The regression results showed that Food & Service is a significant predictor of tourist’s satisfaction and positively related to tourist’s satisfaction with Beta 0.982 and P-Value 0.000. 96.50% of the variance is explained by food & service in tourist’s satisfaction. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that food & service is a good predictor of tourist’s satisfaction. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 5: For Health & Guide Service and Tourist’s Satisfaction

- **H₀₅:** Health & Guide Service is not a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.
- **H_{a5}:** Health & Guide Service is a good predictor of Tourist’s Satisfaction.

Table 5.8: Linear Regression for Impact of Health & Guide Service on Tourist's Satisfaction

Independent variable	Dependent variable Tourist's Satisfaction						
	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F	Beta	t	Sig.
Health & Guide Service	.970 ^a	.941	.912	32.000	.970	5.657	.030 ^b

The regression results showed that Health & Guide Service is a significant predictor of tourist's satisfaction and positively related to tourist's satisfaction with Beta 0.970 and P-Value 0.030. 91.20% of the variance is explained by supporting infrastructure in tourist's satisfaction. So, at the 0.05 level of significance there is enough evidence to conclude that health & guide service is a good predictor of tourist's satisfaction. Here, Null Hypothesis is rejected.

6. Findings & Conclusion

On the basis of result of this study, it can be conclude that several recommendations are needed to increase tourist's satisfaction at religious visit to Brij-Kshetra. This study has revealed that five factors (aesthetic appeal, accessibility, supporting infrastructure, food & service and health & guide service) have a positive strong significant relationship with the overall tourist's satisfaction. The findings of this study can be useful to the planners and marketers of religious tourism in formulating strategies as to maintain or enhance their competitiveness. In other words, they should focus more on maintaining or improving factors that contribute to the overall satisfaction of tourists. Thus, this study helps to identify the importance of destination factors as perceived by the tourists who visit the Brij-Kshetra.

7. References

- Aksu A, İçigen E, Ehtiyar R. A Comparison of Tourist Expectations and Satisfaction: A Case Study from Antalya Region of Turkey, 2010. retrieved on April 26, 2015 from http://www.dgt.uns.ac.rs/turizam/arhiva/vol_1402_akin.pdf
- Bihar's annual tourist statistics report. retrieved on April 26, 2015 from <http://tourism.gov.in/CMSPagePicture/file/marketresearch/statisticalsurveys/04%20bihar%20tourism%20annual%20statistics%20%20report%20final.pdf>
- Chadha N. Tourist Satisfaction With Hill Station Destinations - A case study of Shimla Town, 2014. retrieved on April 26, 2015 from <http://www.indianresearchjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/nikhitha.pdf>
- Chaudhary M, Aggarwal A. Tourist Satisfaction and Management of Heritage Sites in Amritsar, 2012. retrieved on April 26, 2015 from <http://www.sajth.com/old/july2012/Microsoft%20Word%20%20005+Manjula+Chaudhary.pdf>
- Chandra Pant B. Uttarakhand Tourism: A Swot Analysis, 2011. retrieved on April 28, 2015 from http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/7068/1/Bipin_Chandra_Pant.pdf
- Ghule SR. Satisfaction level of tourists at religious tourist centers in Ahmed Nagar, 2013. retrieved on May 05, 2015 from <http://www.pgspcf.org/pdf/may/print/PDFARDIJ-print-may-2013-v8-page50-page55.pdf>
- Huh J. Tourist satisfaction with Cultural/Heritage: The Virginia Historic Triangle, 2002. retrieved on June 09, 2015 from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-05142002-171010/unrestricted/Thesis.pdf>
- Isaac R. Understanding the Behaviour of Cultural Tourists, 2008. retrieved on June 09, 2015 from <http://www.tramresearch.com/atlas/Rami%20Issac%20PhD.pdf>
- Jusoh J, Masron T, Hamid N, Shahrin N. Tourist Expectation and Satisfaction towards Physical Infrastructure and Heritage Elements in Melaka UNESCO World Heritage Site, 2013. retrieved on July 24, 2015 from http://www.google.co.in/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCIQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.mcser.org%2Fjournal%2Findex.php%2Fajis%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F800%2F831&ei=qassvcd1cy_buqtr1yadag&usq=afqjcnelypb-lhjnvtabxxfi8a3nxe7a&bvm=bv.90790515,d.c2e
- Khan AH, Haque A, Rahman MS. What Makes Tourists Satisfied? An Empirical Study on Malaysian Islamic Tourist, 2013. retrieved on August 25, 2015 from <http://www.idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr14%2812%2913/11.pdf>
- Khaki A, Sahaf M. Satisfaction of visiting tourist to Kashmir division, 2011. retrieved on January 05, 2016 from <http://sajth.com/old/vol4issue1/H%20Aijaz%20A.pdf>
- Lather SA, Singh R, Singh A. Comparing the Levels of Expectation and Satisfaction of Indian and Foreign Adventure Tourists Visiting India, 2010. retrieved on January 20, 2016 from <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/138111/2/1comparing%20the%20levels.pdf>
- Mendes J, Guerreiro M. Tourist Satisfaction and Destination Loyalty intention: A Structural and Categorical Analysis, 2006. retrieved on January 20, 2016 from http://www.business-and-management.org/library/2006/11--2544Oom_do_Valle,Silva,Mendes,Guerreiro.pdf
- Viramgami H, Patel J. A comparative study of tourist resources of Gujarat state, 2012. retrieved on January 25, 2016 from http://zenithresearch.org.in/images/stories/pdf/2012/feb/eijmms/19_eijmms_vol2_issue2_feb2012.pdf