2006

Destination image and willingness to visit India : a study of Bay Area travelers

Subha Rajamohan
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Rajamohan, Subha, "Destination image and willingness to visit India : a study of Bay Area travelers" (2006). *Master's Theses*. 3023.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.ghft-x2hb>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3023

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

DESTINATION IMAGE AND WILLINGNESS TO VISIT INDIA:
A STUDY OF BAY AREA TRAVELERS

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

By

Subha Rajamohan

December 2006

UMI Number: 1441117

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1441117

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Subha Rajamohan

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF
RECREATION AND LEISURE STUDIES

Dr. Gonzaga da Gama
Associate Professor, Recreation and Leisure Studies
Committee Chair

Dr. Tsu-Hong Yen
Associate Professor, Hospitality Management
Committee Member

Dr. Ranjan Bandyopadhyay
Assistant Professor, Recreation and Leisure Studies
Committee Member

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

DESTINATION IMAGE AND WILLINGNESS TO VISIT INDIA: A STUDY OF BAY AREA TRAVELERS

by Subha Rajamohan

Focusing on the San Francisco Bay Area travelers, this study aimed to identify the recreation and leisure needs, determine the destination image of India, and explore the relationship between destination image and the willingness to visit. A quantitative research design was employed. Findings for the three groups of travelers (business only, leisure only, and fusion) indicated that safety, stability, cleanliness, and hygiene were of paramount importance and casinos, theme parks, and nightlife were the least important. The results identified an overall positive destination image for India. The relationship was strong between destination image and the willingness to visit again and with friends and family; moderate between destination image and willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions, willingness to spend money to experience India, and willingness to go to cultural events; and marginal between destination image and the willingness to buy arts and handicrafts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Gonzaga da Gama, for his ideas and suggestions during the thesis. I would like to thank him for channeling my efforts to help me achieve perfection. I would like to thank him for his valuable support and knowledge.

I am grateful to Dr. Tsu-Hong Yen, for identifying the potential in me to pursue a Master's degree and providing me with necessary guidance to get into the Recreation program. I appreciate his critical assistance, support, efforts, and constant encouragement in the thesis completion.

I am thankful to Dr. Ranjan Bandyopadhyay, for his knowledge in the field of tourism and his support during the thesis completion process.

Finally, I thank God for giving me a wonderful and supportive family. I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family. My parents and brother were always there to support, help, and motivate me through my years of education. My husband instilled the confidence in me to pursue my dreams. Last and not the least is my twenty-one month old daughter Nireesa, who was, is, and will always continue to be a constant source of inspiration. She would be always sitting by my side with my book and when anyone asked about me, she would be quick to say "mommy compu (computer) mommy cool (school)." I love you always!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I Introduction-----	1
Problem Statement-----	3
Purpose of the Study -----	4
Conceptual Foundation for the Study-----	5
Significance of the Study -----	6
Definition of Terms -----	7
Structure of Thesis-----	7
CHAPTER II Review of Literature-----	9
Destination Image -----	9
Perceived Destination Image Concept-----	9
Destination Image Formation Theory and Model-----	10
Importance of Destination Image -----	13
Destination Branding-----	14
Market Positioning -----	15
Tourism Overview of India -----	16
Destination Image of India -----	17
Business Tourism-----	18
Definition of Business Tourism -----	18
India and Business Tourism-----	19
Business Tourism and Destination Image-----	20

	Page
CHAPTER III Method -----	22
Research Design -----	22
Research Target and Sampling Method -----	23
Research Study Site -----	23
Instrument-----	24
Questionnaire Design -----	24
Validity and Reliability -----	27
Pilot Study -----	28
Data Collection-----	29
Procedures -----	29
Data Analysis-----	30
Summary -----	32
CHAPTER IV Results -----	33
Description of Sample -----	34
Demographics of Respondents -----	34
Respondent's Travel Details -----	37
Final Destination-----	39
Cities Visited -----	39
Purpose of Visit-----	39
Length of Stay-----	39
Prior Visits-----	40

	Page
Recreation and Leisure Needs of San Francisco Bay Area Travelers-----	40
Recreation and Leisure Needs -----	40
Comparison of Recreation and Leisure Needs among the Three Traveler Groups-----	44
Destination Image of India -----	47
Destination Image Formation -----	48
Comparison of Destination Image of India among the Three Traveler Groups-----	54
Willingness to Visit -----	57
Comparison of Willingness to Visit among the Three Traveler Groups--	60
Relationship between Destination Image Dimensions and Willingness to Visit-----	63
Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Business Only Group -----	67
Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Leisure Only Group-----	70
Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Fusion Group -----	73
Summary -----	76
CHAPTER V Discussion and Conclusion-----	79
Discussion -----	80

	Page
Recreation and Leisure Needs -----	81
Destination Image -----	82
Willingness to Visit -----	84
Relationship Assessment of Destination Image Dimensions and Willingness to Visit -----	85
Limitations-----	88
Conclusion -----	88
Recommendations -----	89
Areas for Future Research -----	91
REFERENCES-----	92
APPENDIX A Construct of Destination Image and Attributes -----	98
APPENDIX B Informed Consent Form -----	99
APPENDIX C Survey Questionnaire -----	100
APPENDIX D Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board Approval Letter -----	103

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 Demographics of Respondents-----	35
Table 2 Respondents Travel Details -----	37
Table 3 Frequency Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Needs of Travelers-----	41
Table 4 Comparison of Means between Recreation and Leisure Needs and the Business Only, Vacation Only, and Fusion Group-----	44
Table 5 Frequency Distribution of Destination Image of India -----	49
Table 6 Comparison of Means between Destination Image and the Business Only, Vacation Only, and Fusion Group -----	55
Table 7 Frequency Distribution of Willingness to Visit for Travelers to India-----	59
Table 8 Comparison of Means between Willingness to Visit between the Business Only, Vacation Only, and Fusion Group -----	61
Table 9 Correlation between Destination Image and the Willingness to Visit for Travelers -----	64
Table 10 Correlation between Destination Image and the Willingness to Visit for Business Only Group -----	68
Table 11 Correlation between Destination Image and the Willingness to Visit for Leisure Only Group -----	71
Table 12 Correlation between Destination Image and the Willingness to Visit for Fusion Group-----	74

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Travel and tourism is one of the largest industries in the world. It comprises of five major sectors (accommodation sector, attraction sector, transport sector, travel organizers' sector, and destination organization sector), which makes travel and tourism an important economic contributor (Middleton, 2001). Tourism is one of the fastest-growing economic sectors in the world in terms of foreign exchange earnings and job creation. According to the World Tourism Organization (2005), the number of international arrivals has risen from a mere 25 million in 1950 to an estimated 763 million arrivals in 2004, corresponding to an average annual growth rate of 6.5 %. The latest data published in UNWTO World Tourism Barometer (2006), indicates a growth of 808 million international tourist arrivals in the year 2005. This increase positions the tourism industry to experience tremendous progress in the future. As a result, many countries are promoting tourism because of its exceptional economic potential.

"The Tourism 2020 Vision" put forth by the World Tourism Organization forecasts that India will see a rapid advancement of 5.7% every year from 1995-2020, reaching the goal of 6.7 million arrivals per year. The UNWTO World Tourism Barometer (2004) data presents an excellent result (+26%) for international arrivals to India because of enhanced marketing efforts, product development, and the upsurge of business travelers due to the globalized economy. United States is the number one spender on business travel and India is forecasted to be one of the sixth fastest growing countries for business travel between the years 2007-2016, and third in generating travel

and tourism demand (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2006). Thus, the current trend as articulated above indicates that India is gaining a strong hold on tourism because of the business and economic development.

Riddle (1999) stated that business tourists are less cost-sensitive than leisure tourists. Business tourists spend on an average twice as much per day than leisure tourists. Their purchase decisions are influenced primarily by their ability to use time efficiently within business travel schedules. Hence, many business travelers extend their business trips for pleasure whenever they can. The Travel and Tourism Forecast World (2005) indicates that 80% of the arrivals into India are for business related reasons. Therefore, it can be inferred that India is trying to tap the business market segment in its attempt to increase the economic benefits from tourism.

International tourist arrivals to India are expected to rise considerably between the years 2005-2009 (Travel & Tourism Forecast World, 2005). The increase in economic growth is perceived to be the driving force for the current boom in international tourism. India remains the unquestioned leader for offshore development as a preferred site for North American and European companies and it is a well known business destination for technology related travel (Nicholson & Sahay, 2001). As per the Ministry of Tourism India (2005), United States is the second largest market of foreign tourist arrivals to India. The yearly Ministry of Tourism statistics (2005) indicate that the nation received 618,000 tourists from US alone, which is 15.8 % of the total market share. Within the United States, one of the areas that have witnessed increased outbound business travel to India

has been the San Francisco Bay Area in Northern California because of globalization, outsourcing, and its proximity to Silicon Valley.

Problem Statement

The latest data on arrivals from Ministry of Tourism of India (2005) indicate that 3.92 million foreign tourists arrived in India, suggesting that India is a preferred destination. While being an attractive destination for business travelers and Indian expatriates, India only ranked forty first among international tourist destinations (Travel & Tourism Forecast World, 2005). Although, the growth rate for Indian tourism has been impressive, however, the share in global tourist arrivals is insignificant and has been merely around 0.8% of total market share (Travel and Tourism Forecast World). Furthermore, despite the increased influx of visitors and extensive marketing efforts, India still gets a very small share of all foreign visitors to South-East Asia (Chaudhary, 2000). The Ministry of Tourism of India acknowledges that there is a tremendous potential for developing and marketing the diverse products and experiences of India to support various tourism segments like adventure, culture, festival, heritage, leisure, spiritual, and business tourism.

In the past, the Government of India has not promoted tourism in an organized fashion or made known the wealth of historic sites that India has to offer (Neelakantan, 2004). Moreover, the travelers to India were not made aware of the destination attractions and in fact, what they did know was negative (Kale & Weir, 1986). Hence, many travelers continue to be unaware of the tourist attractions and destinations in India that are in close proximity to the most frequented cities for business related travel such as

Bangalore, Hyderabad, Mumbai, Kolkata, Delhi, and Chennai. While the Government of India is trying to attract more international tourists to the country, currently the destination image does not appear to meet the expectations of many travelers in North America. Most of the information available in North America about India is a negative portrayal, primarily emphasizing what it does not have rather than what it does have (Chaudhary, 1996).

One of the major impediments for tourist activities is limited destination knowledge of visitors and perceived negative images provoked by political instability, poverty, and humanitarian conditions (Grosspietsch, 2006). Thus, one of the major objectives of any destination positioning strategy is to reinforce positive images held by target audience, and to correct negative images or create new ones (Pike & Ryan, 2004). Therefore, the Government of India needs to position the country as a destination with quality attractions, facilities and services for visitors, including business travelers. Thus, it can be assumed that the success or failure of any destination for tourist development depends largely on the image held by potential tourists and how effectively these images are managed by the local government and tourism planners (Sonmez & Sirakaya, 2002).

Purpose of the Study

The Ministry of Tourism of India needs to gain an understanding of how the visitors hope to perceive the destination, what their recreational and leisure needs are, and design effective plans to increase the visitation and benefits from the business and other tourist market segments. Furthermore, strategies are necessary to spread tourism beyond the Taj Mahal and the golden triangle of Delhi-Agra-Jaipur (Neelakantan, 2004). To

achieve this goal, there is the need to package the array of attractions that the country has to offer, improve on the facilities, develop a clear destination brand image, and position India favorably in international markets. It is therefore, reasonable to assume that, as a starting point, the Government of India will need data on current perceptions, needs, and issues influencing visitation by North American travelers in order to design effective strategies to shape the image of the destination favorably, thus necessitating the current research investigation.

The purpose of the investigation was three-fold including:

1. To identify what are the recreational and leisure needs of San Francisco Bay Area travelers to India as a tourist destination
2. To determine what is the perceived image of India as a travel destination by San Francisco Bay Area travelers
3. To explore the relationship between destination image and the willingness to visit again, willingness to visit with friends and family, willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions, willingness to spend money to experience India, willingness to buy art and handicrafts, and willingness to go to cultural events.

Conceptual Foundation for the Study

The conceptual foundation for this study was based on the model of the formation of destination image by Baloglu and McCleary (1999). They developed and tested a conceptual model of the determinants of destination image. According to the model, destination image consists of cognitive or perceptual evaluations (beliefs or knowledge of destination attributes), affective evaluations (feelings or attachments towards the

destination attributes), and overall or global image (formed as a result of both cognitive and affective evaluations of the destination). Beerli and Martin (2004) further extended the model by Baloglu and McCleary. The attributes and dimensions identified by Beerli and Martin has been modified and replicated for the present study. This study extends the destination image model to business and other segments of travelers. Though the travel decisions for business travelers are based on business needs, the willingness to spend extra time and money visiting attractions, extending the trip for leisure purpose, revisiting the destination, could be determined by other factors including destination image. This is one of the primary research questions investigated by the current study.

Significance of the Study

The results of this research could reflect on the business travelers' willingness to spend extra time and money to experience India as a tourism destination and their motivation to visit again with friends and family. This research aimed to figure out the perceived image of India in the minds of travelers. It further sought an insight on how to attract business travelers to visit surrounding leisure attractions by creating high awareness, through strategic planning, branding, and tourism marketing. The information from this study would be very useful for the tourism service providers like hotels, tour operators, airlines, and destination specialists. The study had a potential to help the destination stake holders to position themselves better in the global market. Moreover, this research tried to reveal the recreational and tourism needs of travelers. The study could lead to further knowledge in branding, market positioning, and perceived destination image.

Definition of Terms

This study was based on two main concepts: destination image and business travel as they pertain to India. Destination image was defined as the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person holds of the place (Kotler, Haider, & Rein, 1993). Destination awareness includes concept of image and competitiveness (Blain, Levy, & Ritchie, 2005). According to Seddighi and Theocharous (2002), high and positive destination brand awareness reduces the need for detailed information search and contributes towards the destination ultimately becoming the destination of choice. From that perspective, brand image plays a significant role in the success of a destination, since image, is seen as a mental picture formed by sets of attributes that define the destination and exercises a strong influence on consumer behavior (Beerli & Martin, 2003).

Business tourism is expected to be one of the hottest growth markets for travel industry (Riddle, 1999). Business travel was defined as traveling away from home for work related purpose, to attend meeting, conferences, exhibitions, and events (Middleton, 2001). The expansion of the Indian economy and increase in business travel in to the country has in turn continued to drive tourism growth. Hence, this study would figure out the perceived destination image held by business travelers and other types of travelers about India.

Structure of Thesis

Chapter I, the introduction, sets the pace of the research by targeting the problem statement, purpose of the study, research questions, and the significance of this study. Chapter II, the review of literature, consolidates the research so far done on the topics of

destination image, business tourism, branding, and market positioning. Chapter III concentrates on the methodology of the research by identifying the target sample, the design of research, formulating the instrument, data collection, and analyzing methods. Chapter IV represents the finding and the results of the data collection. Chapter V discusses the results with its limitations and concludes the study with implications to future research.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

This section discusses the destination image theory and model, importance of destination image, the destination India, and business tourism. This chapter provides additional confirmation for the need for the current study. A comprehensive review of the literature indicated that extensive research has been conducted on destination image from the perspective of leisure travelers, while, the focus on business travelers has been limited.

Destination Image

Perceived Destination Image Concept

Though the concept of destination image has been widely researched for the past thirty years, yet the definition of the term remains vague and lacks conceptual structure (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Several authors have attempted to clarify the definition of destination image. Kotler, Haider, and Rein (1993) defined destination image as the impressions, beliefs, ideas, and expectations accumulated towards a place. This definition was the improved version of what was proposed by Crompton in 1979 (Gallarza, Saura, & Garcia, 2002). Another widely used definition of destination image has been the one proposed by Lawson and Baud-Bovy (1977). As stated by them, destination image is the expression of all knowledge, impressions, prejudices, and emotional thoughts that an individual or a group has of a particular object or place. Destination image is a personal perception of a place which can vary from one person to another (Kotler et al.). Thus, whether travelers visit a destination or not depends on the perceived destination image among other factors. Perception is the way an individual

selects and organizes mass of information relating to attitudes, motivations, experience, and existing knowledge (Middleton, 2001). Therefore, consumer buying decisions are based on attitudes, experiences, and images of the destination. Hence, according to Middleton, suppliers strive to enhance the perceived positive aspects of destination and reduce any perceived negative aspects. Moreover, due to the organic nature of destination image, some places need to develop supply resources to match demand and to meet traveler's needs (Uysal, Chen, & Williams, 2000). As per these authors, destinations make an effort to create and enhance images of existing resources. Based on the studies conducted for the past three decades, it has been determined that the destination image has become the pivotal aspect of destination marketing strategy (Gallarza, Saura, & Garcia, 2002).

Destination Image Formation Theory and Model

Gunn (1988) conceptualized destination image as consisting of seven stages that a traveler takes into consideration while determining the destinations to visit. The Gunn's seven stage theory consists: a) the "organic image" (deals with tourist impression of a destination without physically having visited the area); b) "induced image" (deals with image formed due to exposure to promotional materials); c) deciding to visit the destination; d) visiting the destination; e) sharing the destination experience; f) returning home to reflect and evaluate the experience; and g) modifying the image based on the experience which could be the same or different from original. The resulting image is based less on the actual information and more on the individual's perception of that information. Thus, the image rather than the product itself drives the consideration of the

specific brand of consumer choice. Jenkins (1999) stated that Gunn's stage theory implied that the images held by potential visitors were much different from repeat visitors whose images tend to be more realistic and complex.

The two models of destination image formation that provided the theoretical underpinnings for the current study included the general framework of destination image formation (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999) and the model of the formation of destination image (Beerli & Martin, 2004). The destination image framework of Baloglu and McCleary consists of three major determinants that influence the destination image: cognitive or perceptual evaluations (beliefs or knowledge of destination attributes), affective evaluations (feelings or attachments towards the destination attributes), and overall or global image (formed as a result of both cognitive and affective evaluations of the destination). The framework indicates that factors influencing the destination image are personal and stimulus. According to the model, the personal factors affecting destination image are psychological and social. The psychological factors are tourism motivations, values, and personality of the perceiver and the social factors are the socio-demographics (age, education, marital status, and others). The stimulus factors affecting destination image are the types and amount of information sources, previous experience, and distribution of the information. Various information sources consist of travelogues, brochures, advertisements, movies, and promotional material, which lead to traveler's destination choice.

Beerli and Martin (2004) extended the previous destination image theoretical model developed by Baloglu and McCleary (1999). They posited that information

sources and personal factors together influenced the perceived destination image. These information sources formed either primary or secondary category. Personal factors include motivations, vacation experience, and socio-demographic characteristics. Beerli and Martin stated that perceived image was formed from the image projected by the destination in consort with the individual's own needs, motivations, prior knowledge, preferences, and other personal characteristics. As indicated by the model, personal factors affect the cognitive perception of an individual and the motivation exerts a direct influence on the affective component of destination image. Thus, motivation either has a direct or indirect influence on overall image while affective image also influences the overall image. They mentioned that the selection of attributes used in designing the destination image model primarily depends on the attractions of each destination, on its positioning, and on the objectives of the assessment of perceived image, which in turn will determine whether general or specific attributes are to be chosen. The nine dimensions of destination image as summarized by them includes perception attributes or items such as natural resources (beaches, mountains, richness of scenery, and weather), general infrastructure (quality of roads, airports, development of health services, development of telecommunications, and development of transportation), tourist infrastructure (hotels, restaurants, tourist information centers, access to destination, and bars), tourist leisure and recreation (theme parks, zoos, water parks, casinos, nightlife, adventure activities, and shopping), culture, history, and art (museums, historical sites, gastronomy, festivals, and handicrafts), political and economic factors (political stability, economic development, safety, and prices), natural environment (pollution, overcrowding,

attractiveness of cities, traffic congestion, and cleanliness), social environment (hospitality of the residents, poverty, quality of life, and language barriers), and atmosphere of the place (luxurious, exotic, relaxing, stressful, fun, mystic, and interesting).

Due to the selective processes involved in determining the attributes of destination image, the potential traveler may have a significant mixed perception (both positive and negative) of the destination when compared to first timers and repeat visitors (Vogt & Andereck, 2003). Furthermore, the long stay visitors perceived social opportunities and attractions to be better than short stay travelers (Vogt & Andereck), suggesting in theory that an increase in the number of visitors and length of stay should lead to greater revenue being generated.

Importance of Destination Image

Image creation has emerged as a crucial destination-marketing concept in the tourism industry, with the destination image impacting consumer's buying decision making ability (Kim & Richardson, 2003). Bigne, Sanchez, and Sanchez (2001) stated that the destination image is a key factor for destination managers, as it provides information on the perceived quality and satisfaction (evaluation of stay), the intention to return, and recommend the destination (future behavior). Hence, the process of image formation is important to determine the target market, branding, and market positioning of a destination. Planners and marketers must design specific techniques and strategies that will make a destination more attractive and competitive in target markets. The destination needs has to be viewed as a brand and has to be marketed strategically in

order to keep up with the changes in tourism sector, competition among tourist destinations, and changes in tourists' expectations and habits (Beerli & Martin, 2003).

Destination branding. Important criteria for holiday-goers to visit a destination are cost of transportation, quality of services, facilities (hotels, restaurant, nightlife), quality of the promotion and also the cost of the vacation package (Seddighi & Theocharous, 2002). These authors suggest that effective development of tourism market requires the product to project an image that is compatible with the expectations of potential tourists. Destination branding includes concept of image and competitiveness (Blain, Levy, & Ritchie, 2005). As per these authors, destination branding is considered to be a set of marketing activities that support the creation of a name, symbol, logo, word mark or other graphic that readily identifies and differentiates a destination from its alternative. Furthermore, they indicate that branding consistently conveys the expectation of a memorable travel experience that is uniquely associated with that particular destination. It serves to consolidate and reinforce the emotional connection between the visitor and the destination and reduces consumer search costs and perceived risks. Finally, all of these activities together serve to create a destination image that positively influences consumer destination choice (Blain et al.).

Branding consists of two dimensions: functional and emotional (Sirgy & Su, 2000). The functional dimension includes tangible socio-economic elements such as price, ambiance, quality, and type of hotels while the emotional dimension consists more of intangible attributes such as the motivation and self-image which are the psychological factors affecting the destination image (Sirgy & Su, 2000; Beerli & Martin, 2003). As

such, branding is necessary to differentiate a destination's tourism products from those of its competitors and create a favorable and unique position in the visitor's mind (Laws, Scott, & Parfitt, 2002). Positive destination brand awareness reduces the need for detailed information search and contributes towards the destination ultimately becoming the choice destination for visitors (Seddighi & Theocharous, 2002).

Market positioning. In order to ensure the long term success of a destination, it is vital to create a competitive position which will be helpful to marketers, developers, and planners in developing strategies (Chen & Uysal, 2002). Thus, destination positioning plays a significant role in the perceived image of the destination. As identified by Seongseop, Chun, and Petrick (2004), destination positioning is defined as the process of how a destination compares in regional, national, and international terms to a place for certain type of activity or as a viable alternative location to other destination that may have a stronger or a well established position. In other words, one of the major objective of any destination positioning strategy is to reinforce positive images held by target audience, and to correct negative images or create a new ones (Pike & Ryan, 2004). Brand awareness through market positioning has the potential to encourage travelers to visit and revisit a destination.

The individual preference to visit a destination many a time is based on loyalty and the relationship destination marketing (Fyall, Callod, & Edwards, 2003). According to the authors, the marketing definition of consumer loyalty for a destination is based on repeat visits or the recommendation of the place to other people. In tourism literature, the loyalty toward the destination is based on "push" and "pull" factors (Crompton, 1979;

Yoon & Uysal, 2005). When making destination choice, an individual is pushed by motivation and need variables to make travel decisions and pulled by destination attributes (Crompton, 1979). In other words, push aspects are related to emotional or internal elements and pull motivations are related to external, cognitive, and situational aspects. Some of the push elements are the desire to escape from routine, health, family togetherness, and prestige. The pull elements are the attractions such as, the natural scenery, the resort, and activities, which can all be promoted by effective advertising. Push motives have been useful in explaining the desire to go on a vacation, while pull motives have been useful in explaining the destination choice and promotion of loyalty in consumers (Goossens, 2000). Thus, the level of awareness and perceived image of the pull factors leads to increase in destination visitation (loyalty) and an increase in expenditure by travelers.

Tourism Overview of India

The Ministry of Tourism of India (2005) portrays the nation as a land of natural beauty with mountains (Himalayas) in the North and surrounded by three seas in the south providing a long coastline with pristine beaches. Moreover, there are numerous other natural attractions like the deserts, jungles, rivers, and trekking trails. With more than five thousand years of rich traditions, India offers a cultural heritage, magnificent historical sites and royal cities, colorful and vibrant people, and diverse festivals. Due to rich endowments in cultural and natural attractions, India has always been appealing to the tourists for its old world charm, mysticism, adventure and educational reasons.

As is the case with most countries, India has acknowledged that tourism holds great potential as an instrument of economic development. The Annual Report 2004-2005 published by the Government of India mentions tourism as the third largest earner of foreign exchange and employer of the most manpower. India has followed a growth trend from 17 thousand international arrivals in 1951 to 3.92 million arrivals in 2005 (Ministry of Tourism of India, 2005). Moreover, it is estimated that there will be 9% annual increase of tourist arrivals during 2005-2009 (Travel and Tourism Forecast World, 2005). The growth in tourist arrivals has been accredited to global software technology sector, economic development, and visits by Indians settled overseas or from Indian origin.

Destination Image of India

There have been a few studies conducted on the destination image and marketing of India. The overall destination image as identified in these studies has been negative (Kale & Weir, 1986; Ahmed & Krohn, 1992; Chaudhary, 2000). Some of the important negative attributes of destination image for India were the poverty, the unclean conditions, political instability, poor transportation, not many good hotels, not much nightlife and entertainment, lack of adventure activities, expensive, crowded, language barriers, and uncomfortable climate (Kale & Weir, 1986). As per these authors, some positive destination attributes were identified including the culture and history, exotic atmosphere, unique customs, and food. Chaudhary (2000) findings were consistent with prior research suggesting that while India had a strong positive cultural image, it lacked in the infrastructure and safety. India did not do a good job of marketing itself in North

America (Kale & Weir, 1986). The destination planners and Government of India needed to transition from selling services to marketing them (Ahmed & Krohn, 1992). There were seven specific steps recommended by Ahmed and Krohn to develop tourism in India. These were correcting the negative image, identifying target markets, strategic location of tourist offices, developing promotional themes, correcting attitudinal problems, improving product strategies, and promoting India as a convention destination. The Government of India has acknowledged the importance of the seven recommendations and is striving to develop tourism. Neelakantan (2004) articulated that there has been a sudden active interest undertaken by the Government of India to promote tourism in past two years. Thus, the present study focused on determining the recreation and leisure needs of travelers, exploring the current image, and figuring the relationship between destination image and willingness to revisit and spend extra time and money.

Business Tourism

Definition of Business Tourism

Business tourism is expected to be one of the hottest growth markets for travel industry (Riddle, 1999). Business travel is defined as traveling away from home for work related purpose including attending meetings, conferences, exhibitions, and events (Middleton, 2001). Business tourists have been identified as the biggest spenders and each destination should target them to increase profitability (Blank, 2005). When compared to leisure travelers who are typically seasonal, business travelers generate an all year demand (Blank). In other words, business travelers tend to travel both during peak and off peak times. As articulated by Riddle, business tourists are less cost-

sensitive than leisure tourists, spending on average twice as much per day. Business travelers spend more than the leisure travelers and their purchase decisions are influenced primarily by their ability to use time efficiently within business travel schedules.

Business travelers are partial tourists who devote part of their free time during the trip for leisure purposes (Uriely, 2001). The author contends that business travelers consider tourist related activities a by product of the visit, as they are visiting the destination for the purpose of professional and business related work. Hence, there is a possibility of business tourists to extend their stay for pleasure reasons and to visit the destination again for leisure purpose based on the prior experience at the destination.

India and Business Tourism

According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (2006) India is the sixth largest country in the world to grow their business travel the fastest between the years 2007-2016. The Office of Travel and Tourism Industries (2006) indicated that India ranked 15th in tourist recipient from the United States of America when compared to other countries. California Travel and Tourism Commission (2004) data indicated that India ranks eighth in California's overseas market. In California, San Francisco Bay Area is the hub for technology related activity. Generally this area includes the Silicon Valley that is traditionally known for technology companies like Cisco Systems, Juniper Networks, KLA-Tencor, National Semiconductor, Oracle, Yahoo Inc., Sun Microsystems, Google, and so forth.

Due to the economic reasons, a majority of these firms are outsourcing to cheaper offshore locations like India. One of the reasons for international outsourcing by firms in

advanced economies is because labor is cheaper in less developed countries (Long, 2005). Because there are a large number of English speaking professionals, companies with good track record for successful outsourcing projects, a reasonable cost differential, and a strong scientific education, many North American and European companies are outsourcing software activities to India (Nicholson & Sahay, 2001). Thus, there is a requirement for business related travel between the host and outsourcing company. Business travelers are important customers to hotel industry and any hotel that targets this market sector would have to understand the needs and wants of the business travelers (Weaver & McCleary, 1991). Hence, it is of paramount importance for the government of India to consider the business travelers as one of the vital tourism revenue generating segments.

Business Tourism and Destination Image

The destination image literature has focused primarily on leisure tourism. There has been very little research done to figure the destination image from the business traveler perspective. International travel for business purposes is a very important component of international tourism, particularly in value terms, and has increased along with the growth in international trade (Kulendran & Wilson, 2000). Thus, it is accepted fact that the business travelers are a major contributor to the tourism industry. Though the purpose of the trip for the business traveler is primary instrumental (pragmatic reason for destination choice like work related), they tend to combine business with pleasure (Pizam, Uriely, & Reichel, 2000). Thus, according to Pizam et al., if business travelers have a satisfying tourist experience, they could be a tool for improving destination image

and reputation. An important aspect revealed by Baloglu and McCleary (1999), was that destinations should figure their target markets and tailor their image development and positioning efforts to specific sociodemographic and motivation market segments.

A summary of the related literature reviewed in this chapter indicates that determining the destination image is a crucial concept for tourism stakeholders as it has implications on market positioning, competitiveness, and brand image strengthening. All of these aspects play an important role for sustaining tourism development and identifying target markets. With the influx of travelers to India, it is imperative to determine the destination image held by them and to also identify the recreational and leisure needs based on the importance of image attributes such as natural resources, attractions, infrastructure, social environment, and facilities and services of the destination. Moreover, an effort needs to be made to determine whether positive destination image influences the traveler's ability to revisit, visit with friends and family, spend extra time to visit famous attractions, and spend money to experience the destination and to partake in tourist related activities (buying arts and handicrafts, and going to cultural events).

CHAPTER III

Method

There has been previous research conducted on the impact of destination image on leisure travelers, including studies by Grosspietsch (2006) on Rwanda, Beerli and Martin (2003) on Spain, Hui and Wan (2003) on Singapore, Chaudhary (2000) on India, and Choi, Chan and Wu (1999) on Hong Kong. However, very limited research has focused on business travelers. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceived destination image of India among San Francisco Bay Area travelers and to explore the relationship between destination image and the willingness to visit again and spend extra time and money to experience the destination. Several specific research questions, previously articulated in Chapter I was addressed in the investigation. This chapter describing the methods employed in conducting the research investigation is presented in the following sections. They are the research design, research target and sampling method, study site, research instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

This study employed structured, quantitative design to determine the destination image of India. Potential participants were approached and requested to complete a self-administered survey instrument containing questions pertaining to destination image attributes. There are several advantages of conducting self-administered survey including the feasibility of collecting large samples, ability to generalize findings, cost-effectiveness, and enhanced flexibility on the number of questions being asked on the same topic (Rubin & Babbie, 2005). Moreover, self-administered questionnaires are

quick to administer, presenting itself as an important advantage to be considered, given the current study site and target sample.

Research Target and Sampling Method

The target population for this study were travelers who were eighteen years or over. According to the Ministry of Tourism India (2004) annual statistics, United States (US) was the second largest market of foreign tourist arrivals to India and the country received 526,120 travelers from US in 2003. Thus, based on the recommended sample sizes by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample of 384 respondents was determined appropriate for this study, ensuring necessary statistical power for data analyses. It was assumed that this sample size would be able to generate enough respondents in the three groups (business travelers, leisure travelers, and fusion travelers) traveling to India. Convenience sampling method was used for this study as it was difficult to pre-determine the potential travelers and to locate them. Participants were randomly recruited from the many travelers going to India on the survey days and given questionnaires to complete. A total of 385 valid questionnaires provided the data for the current study.

Research Study Site

California Travel and Tourism Commission data (2004) indicated that California was doing extremely well in business travel compared to the rest of the nation and India ranked eighth in California's overseas market. This was primarily due to the existence of Silicon Valley – the premier technology area located in the San Francisco Bay Area. San Francisco International Airport is one of the busiest international airports in California with daily flights to India. Given its popularity as travel destination, India was chosen as

the research destination and San Francisco Airport in Bay Area in Northern California (USA) was selected as the study site. This airport is the only one in the Bay Area that offers quite a few flights to India on a daily basis. The study site for recruiting respondents was the check-in counters of five major airlines serving India including Singapore Airlines, Cathy Pacific, Lufthansa, China Airlines, and British Airways.

Instrument

Questionnaire Design

A review of literature identified prior studies on the topic of destination image. Key studies in this area included Beerli and Martin (2003) and Chaudhury (2000). Reviewing their findings it was determined that the survey employed in their study would be an appropriate data collection tool for the current investigation. Following a pilot test and guidance from an expert panel, the original survey was modified and tested for validity and reliability. This information is elaborated in the validity and reliability section.

The modified questionnaire used in the present study had three sections. Section one of the survey contained questions on leisure and recreation needs of travelers; section two consisted of destination image questions; and, questions related to demographics and travel details of the participants were included in section three of the survey. For a detailed description of the survey, please refer to Appendix C.

The first section of the survey instrument consisted of twenty one attributes for which the degree of importance had to be indicated by the respondents. In order to determine which factors of image attributes were important in the selection of a

destination, an “implicit importance” method (travelers choose response based on the importance of attributes that has already been identified) or an “explicit importance” method (respondents mention what is important to them) have been identified by Uysal, Chen, and Williams (2000). In this study an implicit importance method was used to identify the factors that were vital to travelers to India. This section required the participants to make a selection based on a five-point Likert type scale wherein 1= very unimportant, 2= unimportant, 3= neutral, 4= important, and 5= very important.

As mentioned in review of literature the concept of destination image consists of three constructs: cognitive image, affective image, and overall image. In section two of the survey, twenty-seven items were identified to measure those three constructs. For details on the constructs and dimensions, please refer to Appendix A. The cognitive image construct (beliefs or knowledge of destination attributes) consisted of seven dimensions, which were natural resources, attractions, culture and art, general infrastructure, tourist infrastructure, atmosphere, social and economic setting, and environment. The first dimension natural resources was evaluated by three image attributes, which were pleasant weather, good beaches, and scenic beauty (lakes, mountains, rivers, wildlife, etc.). The second dimension, culture and art, was evaluated by attributes like rich cultural heritage, museums and historical sites, art and handicrafts, good nightlife, adventure activities (scuba, hunting, fishing, rafting, etc.), and shopping. The third dimension, general infrastructure, was evaluated by three image attributes that were good transportation system, good health services, and good telecommunications. The fourth dimension, tourist infrastructure, was evaluated by three image attributes,

which were good deluxe hotels and restaurants, tourist information centers, and good bars, club, and discotheques. The fifth dimension of cognitive image atmosphere was evaluated by one attribute namely, exotic place. The sixth dimension, social and economic setting, was evaluated by six image attributes. These were safe destination, expensive destination, poverty, friendly and hospitable people, language barriers, and place for economic development. The last dimension environment consisted of two image attributes, namely clean country and overcrowded and polluted. Each attribute was measured using a five-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree.

The affective image construct (feelings or attachments towards the destination attributes) was evaluated by two attributes: relaxing place and boring and unattractive place. The overall/global image construct of the destination was evaluated by one attribute, overall positive image. Each dimension and construct was calculated by summing up the values of the attributes and dividing them by the number of attributes in that dimension. The image was said to be positive if the resulting value had a high score and negative if the score was low.

Moreover, six additional questions were included in the survey to determine the willingness to visit. They were willingness to visit with friends and family, willingness to extend visit to see some famous attractions, willingness to spend extra money to experience the destination, willingness to buy art and handicrafts, and willingness to go to cultural events. Furthermore, there was a question on effective marketing and promotion. Each item was measured by 5-point Likert type scale, that is, 1 = strongly

disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. In order to encourage respondent's attention to the survey, four negative items of destination image were included. These items were: India is an expensive destination; India is associated with poverty; India is overcrowded and polluted; and, India is a boring and unattractive place. These four items were reverse coded for accurate data analysis. The questions in the third section of the survey were aimed at gaining an understanding of the traveler's background and travel details. There were six questions in this section. These were the description of the final destination of the traveler, the cities that would be visited in India, the purpose of visit which identified the target sample, the estimated length of stay, number of prior visits, and the demographics of the respondent. Since the main focus of the study was to understand the impact of the destination image of India on United States of America (US) travelers, participants who were not US citizens and or were not based in the US were excluded from this study.

Validity and Reliability

Validity is a descriptive term used of a measure that accurately reflects the concept that it is intended to measure (Rubin & Babbie, 2005). The survey instrument had very high face validity as it had already been used in prior research studies on destination image. Content validity of the instrument was established through previous research (Beerli and Martin, 2003; Chaudhary, 2000). Moreover, the questionnaire was reviewed by two experts to verify if the scales accurately measured the concept examined in this study. Beerli and Martin formulated the nine dimension frame of destination image by incorporating every aspect of a destination which could potentially be used as

an attribute for measurement. The perceived image dimensions were developed for Spain as a destination. Hence, these dimensions were modified and replicated for India to identify the image perception held by Bay Area travelers. The study conducted by Chaudhury was used to assist in the selection of specific dimensions and the attributes as they related to India.

Internal consistency reliability is measured by coefficient alpha and it can be computer software generated (Rubin & Babbie, 2005). The method assumes that a questionnaire has many items, and thus, assesses the correlation of the scores on each item with the scores on the rest of the items. The reliability of the scale was assessed by Cronbach's coefficient alpha and it was .84 for both section one (recreation and leisure needs) and section two (destination image) of the questionnaire.

Pilot Study

The survey instrument was piloted around the check-in counter of Singapore Airlines at San Francisco International Airport. Potential US travelers to India were approached and asked to fill out the survey. Ten travelers going to India participated during the pilot testing stage. Respondents took about ten to twelve minutes to answer the questionnaire. The pilot test yielded three business travelers, two vacationers and five fusion travelers (visiting friends and family). Based on the suggestions of the participants and the feedback from two professors from San Jose State University, the questionnaire was finalized and the final version as used in the study is presented in Appendix C.

Data Collection

Procedures

Data was collected at the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) in California between March 17, 2006 and August 5, 2006. SFO airport is one of the largest international airport having served 3.3 million travelers in 2003 with the percentage increasing to 17.6% in 2004 (California Travel and Tourism Commission, 2004).

The survey was administered around the check-in counters of the five major airlines previously identified serving daily flights to India. During the data collection period, the researcher visited the airports four times every week, twice on weekdays and the other two times on the week-ends. This was done to coincide with the flight schedules of the airlines. On each visit, the survey was administered 3-4 hours before the departure of flight as the travelers were more willing to participate in the study. The researcher approached potential travelers waiting in the check-in line and introduced herself, mentioned the topic of the study, and explained the purpose of the research verbally due to the time constraints of the participants. The potential participants were asked whether they were eighteen or older and if they have traveled to India, planning to travel or traveling to that country on the given day. Based on their answers and consistent with the criteria for participation in the study, travelers were invited to participate in the study. If they agreed to participate in the study, the respondents were given the informed consent (Appendix B) and the questionnaire (Appendix C). Respondents were informed that their involvement in the study was voluntary, they could drop out anytime, and the information they provided would be kept confidential and their

anonymity would be maintained. They were also informed that the researcher would be available to answer any questions pertaining to the study or the questionnaire. Once the respondent had completed the survey, the researcher checked the questionnaire to see if all questions are answered. Finally, the researcher thanked the participants for their time and efforts to participate in the investigation.

The data collection progress was slow averaging six to eight surveys per flight per day. The response rate on the valid returned surveys was satisfactory. Out of the 435 questionnaire handed out to the participants, thirteen were returned incomplete wherein the respondents had not filled major parts of the survey, and thirty seven respondents were not United States citizens or lived in the country. The non-United States residents were excluded from the study as the purpose of the study was to find the San Francisco Bay Area traveler's perceived destination image of India. The data collection yielded 385 valid surveys that were part of the analysis of the data. The valid return rate of the completed surveys was 88.51%.

The current investigation was approved by the Human Subjects – Institutional Review Board of San Jose State University prior to data collection. A copy of the letter is attached in Appendix D.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS Version 11) software. Responses were coded and entered into SPSS for analysis. First, frequency analysis was conducted to ensure the data was entered correctly and minimize errors in data entry. Respondents (travelers) were categorized into three traveler groups

based on their purpose of visits. Purpose of visit was a multiple responses question in the survey. Therefore this question was recoded into business only travelers, leisure only travelers, and fusion travelers. Business travelers were defined as participants who chose only business related purposes as their primary motive to travel. The leisure only group chose only vacation as their main purpose of travel. The fusion travelers were those who chose a combination of purposes like business together with visiting attractions, vacation with visiting family and friends, business with vacation, vacation with visiting attractions, and so forth. The main objective of this study was to compare leisure needs and destination image among pure business travelers, pure vacation travelers, and the fusion travelers.

Three statistical methods for data analyses were employed. The first was descriptive statistics that included the frequencies, means, and percentages. The descriptive statistics provided the results on the recreation needs of the travelers, destination image, and the profile of travelers. The second statistical method was the One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) which determined whether there were significant differences in recreation and leisure needs among the three groups (business travelers, leisure travelers, and fusion travelers). One-way ANOVA was also conducted to test the differences in perceived destination image attributes among the three groups of travelers. If a main effect was found in ANOVA, Scheffe post hoc comparison was further conducted to compare the differences between two groups. The third statistical method included Correlation which was used to find relationship between destination

image and willingness to visit items. Furthermore, correlation analyses were performed for the three groups of travelers, respectively.

Summary

A quantitative survey method was employed for conducting the present research study. A convenience sampling method was used to recruit research participants traveling to India. Questionnaires were handed to respondents around the check-in counter area of five major airlines to India. The airlines that were identified for data collection were Singapore Airlines, Cathay Pacific, Lufthansa, China Airlines, and British Airways.

Responses yielded 385 valid surveys. The surveys were coded and entered into SPSS for data analyses. The data was categorized into three groups (business only, leisure only, and fusion) of travelers based on purpose of visit. Descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA and correlation were three forms of data analysis conducted for the three groups of travelers. Results from the data analysis will be presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter presents the findings of the study. The research questions proposed in the study were answered through the use of various statistical procedures. The three main research questions of the study were as follows: The first was to identify what are the recreational and leisure needs of San Francisco Bay Area travelers to India as a tourist destination. The second was to determine the perceived image of India as a travel destination among Bay Area travelers. Finally, the third question was to investigate the relationship between destination image of India and the willingness to visit. Based on the purpose of travel, three groups of travelers were identified: business only travelers, leisure only travelers, and fusion travelers.

The findings chapter is organized into four sections representing demographics of respondents, recreation and leisure needs of travelers, destination image of India, and the willingness to travel. The first section provides the general description of the sample based on demographics which include gender, age, nationality/citizenship, and country of residence of the respondents. This section also includes information on respondents' travel details like the final destination, cities visited in India, the purpose of travel, duration of stay, and number of prior visits. Section two provides the general results on recreation and leisure needs of the travelers and also identifies the recreation and leisure needs of three main traveler groups (business only, leisure only, and fusion). Section three focuses on the general results of destination image held by all the travelers. It also distinguishes the destination image held among the three groups. Section four

concentrates on the relationship between destination image and the willingness to visit again, willingness to visit with friends and family, willingness to extend the visit to see some famous attractions, willingness to spend extra money to experience India, willingness to buy arts and handicrafts, and willingness to go to cultural events. This section also identifies the relationship between destination image and willingness among the three major groups.

Description of Sample

Demographics of Respondents

In this section the demographics of the respondents are presented. Table 1 summarizes the results of the frequency distribution of demographic variables such as gender, age, nationality/citizenship, and country of residence was represented. Of the total sample of 385 respondents who were eighteen and over, 74.29% respondents were male (n=286), and 25.71% respondents were female (n=99). As indicated in Table 1, 79.06% of respondents were between the ages of 30 and 55 years (n=302), 12.30% of respondents were above 55 years (n=47), and 8.64% of respondents were under 30 years (n=33). There were three respondents who did not answer this question. The nationality of the respondents included 58.07% were from United States of America (n=223); 16.41% were from India (n =63); and followed by 6.51% were from Germany (n=25). As the Table 1 indicates, the other nationalities comprised of a small percentage of the total respondents. There was one participant who did not answer this question. The main country of residence was United States of America (n=375) at 97.66%. The other

countries of residence were India, United Kingdom, and Canada. There was again one respondent who did not reply to this question.

Table 1

Demographics of Respondents

Variables	Items	Population	Valid %
Gender	Male	286	74.29
	Female	99	25.71
Age	Under 30 years	33	8.64
	30-55 years	302	79.06
	Above 55 years	47	12.30
	Missing value	3	
Nationality /Citizenship	United States of America	223	58.07
	India	63	16.41
	United Kingdom	19	4.95
	Germany	25	6.51
	Singapore	9	2.34
	Austria	9	2.34
	Canada	17	4.43
	France	4	1.04
	Japan	9	2.34
	Belgium	6	1.56
	Missing value	1	

Table 1 (continued).

Variables	Items	Population	Valid %
Country of Residence	United States of America	375	97.66
	India	1	0.26
	United Kingdom	4	1.04
	Canada	4	1.04
	Missing value	1	
	Total	385	100.00

Respondent's Travel Details

This section includes the respondent's travel details such as final destination, cities visited in India, the purpose of travel, duration of stay, and number of prior visits presented in a frequency distribution Table 2.

Table 2

Respondent Travel Details

Variable	Items	Frequency	Valid %
Final destination	India	191	49.61
	Others	194	50.39
	Total	385	
Cities visited	Bangalore	164	42.60
	Delhi	181	47.01
	Chennai	87	22.60
	Hyderabad	76	19.74
	Kolkata	31	8.05
	Mumbai	104	27.01
	Others	151	39.22
	Total	794 ^a	

Table 2 (continued).

Variable	Items	Frequency	Valid %
Purpose of visit	Business	230	59.74
	Vacation	171	44.42
	Visiting friends and family	79	20.52
	Visiting attractions	52	13.51
	Educational	9	2.34
	Other	8	2.08
	Total	549 ^a	
Length of stay	Under 5 days	28	7.27
	5-10 days	139	36.10
	11-20 days	133	34.55
	More than 20 days	85	22.08
	Total	385	
Prior visits	0 visits	99	25.71
	1-2 visits	149	38.70
	3-4 visits	32	8.31
	More than 4 visits	105	27.27
	Total	385	

Note. ^aBecause this is a multiple response item, the sum is greater than total sample.

Final destination. Of the total 385 valid responses, 50.39% respondents indicated that the final destination was not India (n=194), and 49.61% of respondents were traveling to India (n=191). The other final destinations mentioned by respondents in the open ended question were Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Belgium, South Korea, Australia, and Austria.

Cities visited. This was a multiple response question in the survey and many travelers chose a combination of cities to be visited or were visited. It was observed that, 47.01% chose Delhi alone or Delhi and a combination of other cities, closely followed by Bangalore at 42.60%. Of the valid responses, 39.22% of respondents had visited other cities like Goa, Agra, Jaipur, Varanasi, Shimla, Cochin, Pune, and Noida. Mumbai was identified as the fourth most frequently visited city. Chennai, Hyderabad, and Kolkata received only a small share of travelers.

Purpose of visit. This was a multiple response question in the survey and many travelers chose a combination of travel purposes. The four main purposes of visit as identified by the respondents were business at 59.74%, vacation at 44.42%, 20.52% for visiting friends and family, and visiting attractions at 13.51%. Educational and other (agriculture, archaeology, and religious) purposes of traveling to India formed a small percentage.

Length of stay. Of the 385 respondents, 36.10% of respondents went to India between 5 and 10 days (n=139) and 34.55% of respondents went between 11 and 20 days (n=133). In addition, 22.08% of respondents went for more than 20 days (n=85) and rest of the respondents went to India for less than 5 days.

Prior visits. Of the total sample of 385 respondents, 38.70% of respondents had visited India once or twice (n=149). The findings indicated, 27.27% of respondents had made more than four prior visits (n=105), 25.71% of respondents (n=99) were first time travelers to India, and 8.31% of respondents had visited India between three to four times (n=32).

Recreation and Leisure Needs of San Francisco Bay Area Travelers

This section presents the frequency distribution of the recreation and leisure needs identified by San Francisco Bay Area travelers to India. In addition, the descriptive statistics of the twenty one recreation and leisure needs items in the survey are also represented. Finally, one-way ANOVA analysis was used to compare means of the three groups of travelers (business only, leisure only, and fusion) based on their recreation and leisure needs.

Recreation and Leisure Needs

The frequency distribution of recreation and leisure needs of all the three groups comprising of 385 respondents is presented in Table 3. Of the 21 items of recreation and leisure needs, safety and stability (Mean=4.21, SD=0.81) and cleanliness and hygiene were identified as being the most important (Mean=4.21, SD=0.89). This was followed by hospitality to tourist (Mean=4.16, SD=0.79), natural scenery (Mean=4.15, SD=0.77), and quality of hotels and restaurants (Mean=4.13, SD=0.90). The lowest item of importance was casino, theme parks, and nightlife (Mean=2.57, SD=1.01), closely followed by large availability of bars, discotheques, clubs (Mean=2.62, SD=1.08), indicating a low priority for travelers.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Recreation and Leisure Needs of Travelers

Items	VU		U		Neutral		I		VI		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Good beaches	13	3.38	33	8.57	83	21.56	187	48.57	69	17.92	3.69	0.97
Good weather	5	1.3	12	3.12	64	16.62	198	51.43	106	27.53	4.01	0.83
Natural scenery	3	0.78	10	2.6	41	10.65	204	52.99	127	32.99	4.15	0.77
Quality of roads, airports, and ports	5	1.3	26	6.75	100	25.97	158	41.04	96	24.94	3.82	0.93
Quality of health services	6	1.56	21	5.45	96	24.94	161	41.82	101	26.23	3.86	0.92
Quality of telecommunications	4	1.04	41	10.65	85	22.08	123	31.95	132	34.29	3.88	1.03
Quality of hotels and restaurants	8	2.08	16	4.16	39	10.13	176	45.71	146	37.92	4.13	0.90
Large availability of bars, discotheques, clubs	65	16.88	114	29.61	125	32.47	65	16.88	16	4.16	2.62	1.08

Table 3 (continued).

Items	VU		U		Neutral		I		VI		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Tourist information centers	19	4.94	60	15.58	132	34.29	138	35.84	36	9.35	3.29	1.00
Casinos, theme parks, and nightlife	60	15.58	122	31.69	134	34.81	60	15.58	9	2.34	2.57	1.01
Shopping	26	6.75	83	21.56	108	28.05	128	33.25	40	10.39	3.19	1.10
Adventure activities like skiing, scuba diving	22	5.71	56	14.55	115	29.87	135	35.06	57	14.81	3.39	1.08
Museums, heritage buildings, and monuments	6	1.56	29	7.53	81	21.04	187	48.57	82	21.30	3.81	0.91
Rich culture	6	1.56	23	5.97	58	15.06	188	48.83	110	28.57	3.97	0.90
Variety of handicrafts	6	1.56	49	12.73	124	32.21	149	38.70	57	14.81	3.52	0.95

Table 3 (continued).

Items	VU		U		Neutral		I		VI		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Festivals and concerts	14	3.64	48	12.47	136	35.32	141	36.62	46	11.95	3.41	0.97
Hospitality to tourists	6	1.56	2	0.52	54	14.03	187	48.57	136	35.32	4.16	0.79
Language barriers	16	4.16	60	15.58	126	32.73	126	32.73	57	14.81	3.38	1.05
Safety and stability	6	1.56	7	1.82	37	9.61	185	48.05	150	38.96	4.21	0.81
Cleanliness and Hygiene	5	1.30	14	3.64	50	12.99	143	37.14	173	44.94	4.21	0.89
Overcrowding and traffic congestion	9	2.34	36	9.35	100	25.97	151	39.22	89	23.12	3.71	1.00

Note. VU = very unimportant; U = unimportant; I = important; VI = very important; f = frequency; % = valid percent.

Comparison of Recreation and Leisure Needs among the Three Traveler Groups

The respondents were categorized into three main groups based on their purpose of trip. These were business only comprising of 142 travelers (36.88%), leisure only with 73 respondents (18.96%), and fusion travelers which was 170 respondents (44.16%). The results of the one-way ANOVA for the three groups based on their recreation and leisure needs are depicted in Table 4.

Table 4

Comparison of Means of Recreation and Leisure Needs between Business Only (n=142), Leisure only (n=73), and Fusion Group (n=170)

Items	Business only		Leisure only		Fusion		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Good beaches	3.65	1.02	3.81	0.92	3.67	0.95	0.66
Good weather	3.91	0.89	3.97	0.80	4.11	0.78	2.30
Natural scenery	4.04	0.88	4.29	0.68	4.18	0.69	2.69
Quality of roads, airports, and ports	3.73	0.94	3.79	0.76	3.89	0.98	1.19
Quality of health services	3.89	0.90	3.82	0.90	3.84	0.95	0.19
Quality of telecommunications	3.96	0.91	3.70	1.09	3.88	1.10	1.60
Quality of hotels and restaurants	4.16	0.94	4.16	0.88	4.09	0.89	0.27
Large availability of bars, discotheques, clubs	2.75 _a	1.01	2.25 _{ab}	1.06	2.67 _b	1.11	5.67*
Tourist information centers	3.28	0.92	3.21	1.13	3.34	1.01	0.44

Table 4 (continued).

Items	Business only		Leisure only		Fusion		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Casinos, theme parks, and nightlife	2.61	1.01	2.41	0.98	2.61	1.01	1.19
Shopping	3.12	1.01	3.04	1.27	3.31	1.07	2.03
Adventure activities like skiing, scuba diving, fishing, rafting, and trekking	3.35	1.13	3.34	1.11	3.44	1.03	0.38
Museums, heritage buildings, and monuments	3.68	0.97	3.93	0.87	3.86	0.87	2.44
Rich culture	3.92	0.98	3.97	0.91	4.01	0.83	0.33
Variety of handicrafts	3.49	0.94	3.62	0.99	3.52	0.93	0.47
Festivals and concerts	3.32	0.95	3.32	0.97	3.52	0.99	2.16
Hospitality to tourists	4.14	0.86	4.33	0.78	4.09	0.74	2.28
Language barriers	3.43	1.01	3.29	0.94	3.39	1.12	0.44
Safety and stability	4.16	0.94	4.40	0.72	4.17	0.72	2.42
Cleanliness and Hygiene	4.17	0.99	4.36	0.75	4.18	0.87	1.24
Overcrowding and traffic congestion	3.77	1.02	3.77	0.98	3.64	0.99	0.82

Note. Means with the same subscript differ significantly by the Scheffe Test.

* $p < .05$.

The business only respondents considered cleanliness and hygiene (Mean=4.17, SD=0.99), safety and stability (Mean=4.16, SD=0.94), quality of hotels and restaurants (Mean=4.16, SD=0.94), and hospitality to tourist (Mean=4.14, SD=0.86) as items of great importance. Casino, theme parks, and nightlife (Mean=2.61, SD=1.01), large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs (Mean=2.75, SD=1.01), shopping (Mean=3.12, SD=1.01), and tourist information centers (Mean=3.28, SD=0.92) were the least important items for the business only group.

The leisure only group considered safety and stability (Mean=4.40, SD=0.72), cleanliness and hygiene (Mean=4.36, SD=0.75), closely followed by hospitality to tourist (Mean=4.33, SD=0.78), and natural scenery (Mean=4.29, SD=0.68) as important recreation and leisure needs items. Leisure only group of travelers rated quality of hotels and restaurants (Mean=4.16, SD=0.88) at the same level of importance as business only group. The items of less importance for the leisure only group of travelers were large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs (Mean=2.25, SD=1.06), casino, theme parks, and nightlife (Mean=2.41, SD=0.98), and shopping (Mean=3.04, SD=1.27).

The fusion only group considered cleanliness and hygiene (Mean=4.18, SD=0.87) and natural scenery (Mean=4.18, SD=0.69) as the first two most important items. Safety and stability (Mean=4.17) and good weather (Mean=4.11, SD=0.78) followed next in importance. The least important items included casino, theme parks, and nightlife (Mean=2.61, SD=1.01), large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs (Mean=2.67, SD=1.11), and shopping (Mean=3.31, SD=1.07). An interesting finding was that the

least important items pertaining to recreation and leisure needs for the fusion group were identical to the business only and leisure only travelers.

One-way ANOVA was performed to compare if there were any significant differences among the three traveler groups. The purpose of travel had a significant effect on the item of recreation and leisure needs of large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs ($F=5.67$, $p=0.004$). In addition, the Scheffe paired multiple comparison test was performed to examine the difference in means among the three groups. Results indicated a significant difference between leisure only traveler group (Mean=2.25, SD=1.06) and business only group (Mean=2.75, SD=1.01) and between leisure only group (Mean=2.25, SD=1.06) and fusion group (Mean=2.67, SD=1.11). As a result, it can be inferred that business only and fusion group prefer the availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs.

Destination Image of India

In this section the results of analysis of destination image of India is presented. As elaborated in the review of literature, the destination image comprises of three constructs including cognitive image, affective image, and overall image. The cognitive image consists of seven dimensions represented by twenty four items, affective image has two items, and overall image has one item (Appendix A). In the current study, destination image was analyzed using descriptive statistics to measure the average score of each destination items. Further, one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to test the significant difference in means between the three main traveler groups (business only, leisure only, and fusion) as they pertained to the image of India as a tourist destination.

Destination Image Formation

Frequency distribution of destination image of India among the 385 respondents has been presented in Table 5. The affective image (Mean=3.64, SD=0.71) had the highest mean among the destination image variables, followed by overall image (Mean=3.40, SD=0.87), and cognitive image (Mean=3.36, SD=0.36). Of the seven cognitive image dimensions, atmosphere (Mean=4.07, SD=0.81) had the highest average agreement, followed by attractions, culture, and arts (Mean=3.85, SD=0.46). Environment (Mean=2.19, SD=0.66) had the least average agreement, followed closely by general infrastructure (Mean=3.02, SD=0.69). Moreover, of the total 27 destination image items, rich cultural heritage (Mean=4.56, SD=0.66), arts and handicrafts (Mean=4.38, SD=0.67), museums, historical sites (Mean=4.29, SD=0.68), and place of economic development (Mean=4.19, SD=0.81) were the four items with the highest average agreement with respondents choosing either agree or strongly agree the most often. The items of destination image with least agreement means were clean country (Mean=2.19, SD=0.84), overcrowded and polluted (Mean=2.20, SD=0.83), associated with poverty (Mean=2.32, SD=0.85), and good transportation system (Mean=2.68, SD=1.06).

Table 5

Frequency Distribution of Destination Image of India

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Cognitive Image											3.36	0.36
Natural Resources											3.54	0.61
India has pleasant weather	12	3.12	99	25.71	118	30.65	134	34.81	22	5.71	3.14	0.97
India has good beaches	4	1.04	49	12.73	157	40.78	140	36.36	35	9.09	3.40	0.86
India has got lots of scenic beauty (lakes, mountains, wildlife)	2	0.52	13	3.38	57	14.81	192	49.87	121	31.43	4.08	0.80
Attractions, Culture, and Art											3.85	0.46
India has rich cultural heritage	3	0.78	1	0.26	16	4.16	121	31.43	244	63.38	4.56	0.66
India offers museums, historical sites	0	0.00	5	1.30	33	8.57	192	49.87	155	40.26	4.29	0.68
India has art and handicrafts	2	0.52	1	0.26	26	6.75	174	45.19	182	47.27	4.38	0.67

Table 5 (continued).

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
India has good nightlife	13	3.38	57	14.81	250	64.94	64	16.62	1	0.26	2.96	0.68
India has adventure activities (scuba, hunting, fishing, rafting, etc)	12	3.12	42	10.91	219	56.88	97	25.19	15	3.90	3.16	0.79
India has a range of products for shopping	6	1.56	17	4.42	96	24.94	209	54.29	57	14.81	3.76	0.81
General Infrastructure											3.02	0.69
India has good transportation system	52	13.51	130	33.77	108	28.05	81	21.04	14	3.64	2.68	1.06
India has quality health services	16	4.16	86	22.34	205	53.25	70	18.18	8	2.08	2.92	0.81
India has good telecommunications	4	1.04	50	12.99	115	29.87	189	49.09	27	7.01	3.48	0.84

Table 5 (continued).

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Tourist Infrastructure											3.33	0.51
India has good deluxe hotels and restaurants	2	0.52	17	4.42	84	21.82	224	58.18	58	15.06	3.83	0.75
India has good tourist information centers	18	4.68	79	20.52	191	49.61	91	23.64	6	1.56	2.97	0.83
India has bars, clubs and discotheques.	2	0.52	31	8.05	254	65.97	90	23.38	8	2.08	3.18	0.62
Atmosphere											4.07	0.81
India is a exotic destination	4	1.04	12	3.12	53	13.77	199	51.69	117	30.39	4.07	0.81
Social and Economic Setting											3.50	0.45
India is a safe destination	7	1.82	49	12.73	103	26.75	188	48.83	38	9.87	3.52	0.90

Table 5 (continued).

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
India is an expensive destination ^a	2	0.52	67	17.40	74	19.22	176	45.71	66	17.14	3.62	0.98
India is associated with poverty ^a	46	11.95	214	55.58	84	21.82	36	9.35	5	1.30	2.32	0.85
Indians are friendly and hospitable	5	1.30	2	0.52	55	14.29	197	51.17	126	32.73	4.14	0.77
India has no language barriers	7	1.82	103	26.75	105	27.27	131	34.03	39	10.13	3.24	1.02
India is the place for economic development	1	0.26	17	4.42	40	10.39	176	45.71	151	39.22	4.19	0.81
Environment											2.19	0.66
India is a clean country	74	19.22	190	49.35	102	26.49	12	3.12	7	1.82	2.19	0.84
India is overcrowded and polluted ^a	64	16.62	210	54.55	90	23.38	13	3.38	8	2.08	2.20	0.83

Table 5 (continued).

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Affective Image											3.64	0.71
India is relaxing place	43	11.17	91	23.64	127	32.99	91	23.64	33	8.57	2.95	1.12
India is a boring and unattractive place ^a	4	1.04	2	0.52	29	7.53	175	45.45	175	45.45	4.34	0.73
Overall Image											3.40	0.87
India has a overall good image	5	1.30	62	16.10	114	29.61	183	47.53	21	5.45	3.40	0.87

Note. SDA = strongly disagree; D = disagree; A = agree; SA = strongly agree; f = frequency; % = valid percent.

Comparison of Destination Image of India among the Three Traveler Groups

Atmosphere, the cognitive image dimension had the highest average mean for all the three groups: business only (Mean=4.01, SD=0.84), leisure only (Mean=4.14, SD=0.84), and fusion group (Mean=4.09, SD=0.77). Environment, the cognitive image dimension on the other hand had the least average mean for the three traveler group: business only (Mean=2.27, SD=0.62), leisure only (Mean=1.95, SD=0.61), and fusion group (Mean=2.24, SD=0.68).

One-way ANOVA was performed to compare if there were any significant difference among the three traveler groups. As Table 6 indicates, there are significant differences in mean between the three groups for the following cognitive image dimensions: natural resources ($F=9.09$, $p=0.001$), attractions, culture, and art ($F=5.25$, $p=0.006$), general infrastructure ($F=17.45$, $p=0.001$), tourist infrastructure ($F=9.69$, $p=0.001$), social and economic setting ($F=8.63$, $p=0.002$), and environment ($F=6.34$, $p=0.002$). The other two destination image constructs affective image ($F=19.29$, $p=0.001$) and overall image ($F=55.21$, $p=0.001$) also differed significantly among the three traveler groups.

Table 6

Comparison of Means of Destination Image between the Business Only (n=142), Leisure only (n=73), and Fusion Group (n=170)

Items	Business only		Leisure only		Fusion		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
CINR	3.49 _a	0.58	3.34 _b	0.67	3.67 _{ab}	0.58	9.09*
CIACA	3.81 _a	0.45	3.75 _b	0.47	3.93 _{ab}	0.45	5.25*
CIGI	2.98 _{ab}	0.63	2.67 _{ab}	0.69	3.21 _{ab}	0.68	17.45*
CITI	3.32 _a	0.48	3.11 _{ab}	0.52	3.42 _b	0.51	9.69*
CIA	4.01	0.84	4.14	0.84	4.09	0.77	0.66
CISES	3.48	0.45	3.34 _a	0.38	3.59 _a	0.45	8.63*
CIE	2.27 _a	0.62	1.95 _{ab}	0.61	2.24 _b	0.68	6.34*
AI	3.49 _a	0.66	3.39 _b	0.66	3.88 _{ab}	0.70	19.29*
OI	3.39 _{ab}	0.73	2.62 _{ab}	0.78	3.74 _{ab}	0.79	55.21*

Note. CINR = cognitive image natural resources; CIACA = cognitive image attractions, culture, and art; CIGI = cognitive image general infrastructure; CITI = cognitive image tourist infrastructure; CIA = cognitive image atmosphere; CISES = cognitive image social and economic setting; CIE = cognitive image environment; AI = affective image; OI = overall image.

Means with the same subscript differ significantly at $p < .05$ by the Scheffe Test.

* $p < 0.05$.

Purpose of travel had a significant effect on the destination image. The Scheffe post hoc test of paired multiple comparison indicated that there were a significant differences between traveler groups. The cognitive image dimension of natural resources differed significantly between business only (Mean=3.49, SD=0.58) and fusion group (Mean=3.67, SD=0.58), and between leisure only (Mean=3.34, SD=0.67) and fusion group (Mean=3.67, SD=0.58). Similarly, cognitive image dimensions of attractions, culture, and art differed significantly between business only (Mean=3.81, SD=0.45) and fusion group (Mean=3.93, SD=0.45), and between leisure only (Mean=3.75, SD=0.47) and fusion group (Mean=3.81, SD=0.45). The three traveler groups differed significantly in their means for the cognitive image dimension of general infrastructure. There was a significant difference between business only (Mean=2.98, SD=0.63) and leisure only (Mean=2.67, SD=0.69) and between business only (Mean=2.98, SD=0.63) and fusion (Mean=3.21, SD=0.68), and between leisure only (Mean=2.67, SD=0.69) and fusion (Mean=3.21, SD=0.68). For the tourist infrastructure dimension of cognitive image both business only (Mean=3.32, SD=0.48) and leisure only (Mean=3.11, SD=0.52) differed significantly with each other. Also there was significant difference between fusion group (Mean=3.42, SD=0.51) and leisure only (Mean=3.11, SD=0.52). Environment as a cognitive image dimension also differed significantly among the groups. The significant difference was between business only (Mean=2.27, SD=0.62) and leisure only (Mean=1.95, SD=0.61), and between fusion group (Mean=2.24, SD=0.68) and leisure only (Mean=1.95, SD=0.61). Finally, social and economic setting dimension of

cognitive image significantly differed between leisure only (Mean=3.34, SD=0.38) and fusion group (Mean=3.59, SD=0.45).

The affective image construct differed significantly between business only (Mean=3.49, SD=0.66) and fusion group (Mean=3.88, SD=0.70), and between leisure only (Mean=3.39, SD=0.66) and fusion group (Mean=3.88, SD=0.70).

There was a significant difference in the means for the overall image construct between the three groups. There was a significant difference between business only (Mean=3.39, SD=0.73) and leisure only (Mean=2.62, SD=0.78), between business only (Mean=3.39, SD=0.73) and fusion (Mean=3.74, SD=0.79), and between leisure only (Mean=2.62, SD=0.78) and fusion (Mean=3.74, SD=0.79).

Willingness to Visit

Willingness to visit India comprised of six items on the survey. The six items of willingness to visit were: willingness to visit again; willingness to visit with friends and family; willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; willingness to spend extra money to experience India; willingness to buy arts and handicrafts; and willingness to go to cultural events. This section presents the frequency distribution, descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA for the six willingness items among the three traveler groups (business only, leisure only, and fusion). In addition, correlation analyses were conducted to determine the relation between destination image dimensions and willingness items are presented.

As is evident from Table 7, willingness to buy Indian arts and handicrafts (WBAH; Mean=3.90, SD=0.89) had the highest average agreement and willingness to

visit with friends and family (WVFF; Mean=3.20, SD=1.26) had the least average agreement. An item that had the second highest average agreement was willingness to extend visit to see some famous attractions (WEVA; Mean=3.80, SD=0.99), followed closely by willingness to visit again (WVA; Mean=3.78, SD=1.02), and willingness to spend extra money to experience India (WSEM; Mean=3.78, SD=0.93).

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Willingness to Visit for Travelers to India (N=385)

Items	SDA		D		Neutral		A		SA		Mean	SD
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
WVA	9	2.34	44	11.43	64	16.62	172	44.68	96	24.94	3.78	1.02
WVFF	37	9.61	93	24.16	83	21.56	101	26.23	71	18.44	3.20	1.26
WEVA	14	3.64	27	7.01	68	17.66	188	48.83	88	22.86	3.80	0.99
WSEM	10	2.60	33	8.57	59	15.32	211	54.81	72	18.70	3.78	0.93
WBAH	10	2.60	21	5.45	52	13.51	218	56.62	84	21.82	3.90	0.89
WCE	14	3.64	21	5.45	110	28.57	179	46.49	61	15.84	3.65	0.93

Note. SDA = strongly disagree; D = disagree; A = agree; SA = strongly agree; f = frequency; % = valid percent; WVA = willingness to visit again; WVFF = willingness to visit with friends and family; WEVA = willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; WSEM = willingness to spend extra money to experience India; WBAH = willingness to buy arts and handicrafts; WCE = willingness to go to cultural events.

Comparison of Willingness to Visit among the Three Traveler Groups

In this section, the comparison of means of the six willingness items between business only, leisure only, and fusion traveler groups are presented. The highest mean average for the business only group was for willingness to visit again (Mean=3.85, SD=0.88), followed by willingness to buy arts and handicrafts (Mean=3.82, SD=0.88). The least average mean was willingness to visit with friends and family (Mean=2.97, SD=1.09), followed by willingness to go to cultural events (Mean=3.54, SD=0.86).

The leisure only group has the highest average mean for willingness to buy arts and handicrafts (Mean=3.81, SD=1.01), followed by willingness to go to cultural events (Mean=3.42, SD=1.05). Closely behind was willingness to spend extra money to experience India (Mean=3.41, SD=1.08) and willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions (Mean=3.38, SD=1.11). The least average mean for leisure only group was willingness to visit with friends and family (Mean=2.37, SD=1.06).

The three highest average mean items for fusion group were willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions (Mean=4.08, SD=0.96), willingness to visit again (Mean=4.04, SD=1.00), and willingness to spend extra money to experience India (Mean=4.02, SD=0.83). The least average mean for fusion group was willingness to visit with friends and family (Mean=3.74, SD=1.23). Table 8 summarizes the comparison of mean between the three groups.

Table 8

Comparison of Means of Willingness to Visit between the Business Only (n = 142), Leisure Only (n = 73), and Fusion Group (n = 170)

Willingness Items	Business only		Leisure only		Fusion		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F
I am likely to visit India again	3.85 _a	0.88	3.07 _{ab}	1.00	4.04 _b	1.00	26.82**
I am likely to visit India with my friends and family	2.97 _{ab}	1.09	2.37 _{ab}	1.06	3.74 _{ab}	1.23	40.77**
I am likely to extend my visit to see some famous attractions	3.68 _a	0.85	3.38 _b	1.11	4.08 _{ab}	0.96	15.50**
I am likely to spend extra money to experience India as a tourist destination	3.70 _a	0.90	3.41 _b	1.08	4.02 _{ab}	0.83	12.45**
I am likely to buy Indian art and handicrafts	3.82	0.88	3.81	1.01	4.00	0.84	2.08
I am likely to go to cultural events	3.54 _a	0.86	3.42 _b	1.05	3.85 _{ab}	0.90	7.45**

Note. Means with the same subscript differ significantly by the Scheffe Test.

*p < .05. **p < .01.

Results of a one-way ANOVA conducted for the three traveler groups indicated that there was a significant difference in willingness to visit again ($F=26.32$, $p=0.001$), willingness to visit with friends and family ($F=40.77$, $p=0.001$), willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions ($F=15.50$, $p=0.003$), willingness to spend extra money to experience India ($F=12.45$, $p=0.006$), and willingness to go to cultural events ($F=7.45$, $p=0.007$) among the three groups.

The Scheffe paired multiple comparison test showed a significant difference in mean for willingness to visit again between business only (Mean=3.85, SD=0.88) and leisure only (Mean=3.07, SD=1.00), and between the fusion group (Mean=4.04, SD=1.00) and leisure only group (Mean=3.07, SD=1.00).

All the three groups differed significantly with each other for the item willingness to visit with friends and family. The means differed significantly between business only (Mean=2.97, SD=1.09) and leisure only (Mean=2.37, SD=1.06), and the means differed significantly between business only (Mean=2.97, SD=1.09) and fusion (Mean=3.74, SD=1.23), and the means differed significantly between leisure only (Mean=2.37, SD=1.06) and fusion (Mean=3.74, SD=1.23).

The means among the groups of travelers differed significantly for the item willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions. There was a significant difference in mean between business only (Mean =3.68, SD=0.85) and fusion (Mean=4.08, SD=0.96), and the means differed significantly between leisure only (Mean=3.38, SD=1.11) and fusion (Mean=4.08, SD=0.96). The item willingness to spend extra money to experience India differed significantly in their means among the three traveler groups.

The means differed significantly between business only (Mean =3.70, SD=0.90) and fusion (Mean=4.02, SD=0.83), and the mean differed significantly between leisure only (Mean=3.41, SD=1.08) and fusion (Mean=4.02, SD=0.83). The item willingness to go to cultural events differed significantly in means for the three groups between business only (Mean =3.54, SD=0.86) and fusion (Mean=3.85, SD=0.90), between leisure only (Mean=3.42, SD=1.05) and fusion (Mean=3.85, SD=0.90).

Relationship between Destination Image Dimensions and Willingness to Visit

Correlation analyses were conducted to explore the relationship between the destination image dimensions and the willingness items. Table 9 presents the relationship between the cognitive image dimensions of natural resources (CINR), attractions, culture, and art (CIACA), general infrastructure (CIGI), tourist infrastructure (CITI), atmosphere (CIA), social and economic setting (CISES), and environment(CIE), affective image (AI), and overall image (OI) and willingness items including willingness to visit again (WVA), willingness to visit with friends and family(WVFF), willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions (WEVA), willingness to spend money to experience India (WSEM), willingness to buy art and handicrafts (WBAH), and willingness to go to cultural events (WCE).

Table 9

Correlation between Destination Image and the Willingness to Visit for Travelers

Items	WVA	WVFF	WEVA	WSEM	WBAH	WCE
CINR	0.30**	0.20**	0.39**	0.43**	0.30**	0.29**
CIACA	0.25**	0.23**	0.37**	0.37**	0.27**	0.30**
CIGI	0.29**	0.37**	0.33**	0.29**	0.22**	0.27**
CITI	0.31**	0.31**	0.25**	0.23**	0.28**	0.35**
CIA	0.07	0.03	0.23**	0.22**	0.16**	0.19**
CISES	0.39**	0.32**	0.34**	0.29**	0.09	0.23**
CIE	0.19**	0.32**	0.22**	0.19**	0.15**	0.26**
AI	0.43**	0.46**	0.29**	0.28**	0.20**	0.32**
OI	0.69**	0.71**	0.58**	0.57**	0.32**	0.49**
Mean	3.78	3.20	3.80	3.78	3.90	3.65
SD	1.02	1.26	0.99	0.93	0.89	0.93

Note. WVA = willingness to visit again; WVFF = willingness to visit with friends and family; WEVA = willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; WSEM = willingness to spend money to experience India; WBAH = willingness to buy art and handicrafts; WCE = willingness to go to cultural events; CINR = cognitive image natural resources; CIACA = cognitive image attractions, culture, and art; CIGI = cognitive image general infrastructure; CITI = cognitive image tourist infrastructure; CIA = cognitive image atmosphere; CISES = cognitive image social and economic setting; CIE = cognitive image environment; AI = affective image; OI = overall image.

**p < .01.

The strength of the relationship between variables is measured by the values ranging from positive one to negative one. The value of +1 indicates a perfect positive relationship, 0 indicates no relationship, and -1 indicates a perfect negative relationship. The positive relationship is considered weak if values of r (Pearson correlation coefficient) fall between +0.00 to +0.33. For a moderate relationship r ranges between +0.34 to +0.67 and for strong relationship between +0.68 to +0.99. The negative relationship is weak when r ranges from -0.33 to 0.00, moderate when r is between -0.67 to -0.34 and strong when r falls between -0.68 to -0.99.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.07$, $p < 0.01$), and environment ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again. The cognitive image dimension of social and economic setting ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$) and affective image ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to visit again. The overall image ($r = 0.69$, $p < 0.01$) had a strong positive correlation with willingness to visit again.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.03$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$), and environment ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again with friends and family. The cognitive image dimension of general infrastructure ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$) and affective image ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.01$) was moderately correlated to willingness to visit again.

with friends and family. The overall image ($r = 0.71$, $p < 0.01$) had a strong positive correlation with this willingness item.

The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions.

The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to spend money to experience India. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to spend money to experience India.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.09$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.01$), affective image ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$) were all only marginally correlated with willingness to buy art and handicrafts.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) environment ($r = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$) were only marginally correlated with willingness to go to cultural events. The cognitive image dimension of tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$) and overall image ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated with this willingness item.

Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Business Only Group

As Table 10 indicates, there was a significant relationship with the destination image dimensions and the willingness items for the business only group ($n=142$). The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$), atmosphere ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.05$), and affective image ($r = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again. The cognitive image dimensions of attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation with willingness to visit again.

Table 10

Correlation between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Business Only Group

Items	WVA	WVFF	WEVA	WSEM	WBAH	WCE
CINR	0.33**	0.26**	0.34**	0.44**	0.34**	0.27**
CIACA	0.40**	0.20*	0.36**	0.40**	0.22**	0.25**
CIGI	0.16	0.33**	0.17*	0.20*	0.24**	0.17*
CITI	0.19*	0.22**	0.01	0.08	0.36**	0.38**
CIA	0.21*	0.09	0.29**	0.30**	0.08	0.14
CISES	0.35**	0.23**	0.27**	0.30**	0.18*	0.25**
CIE	0.18	0.24**	0.05	0.06	0.17*	0.16
AI	0.26**	0.30**	0.12	0.16	0.14	0.17*
OI	0.52**	0.56**	0.55**	0.56**	0.35**	0.48**
Mean	3.85	2.97	3.68	3.70	3.82	3.54
SD	0.88	1.09	0.85	0.90	0.88	0.86

Note. WVA = willingness to visit again; WVFF = willingness to visit with friends and family; WEVA = willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; WSEM = willingness to spend money to experience India; WBAH = willingness to buy art and handicrafts; WCE = willingness to go to cultural events; CINR = cognitive image natural resources; CIACA = cognitive image attractions, culture, and art; CIGI = cognitive image general infrastructure; CITI = cognitive image tourist infrastructure; CIA = cognitive image atmosphere; CISES = cognitive image social and economic setting; CIE = cognitive image environment; AI = affective image; OI = overall image.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.26, p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.20, p < 0.05$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.33, p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.22, p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.23, p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.30, p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again with friends and family. The overall image ($r = 0.56, p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation with this willingness item.

The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.17, p < 0.05$), atmosphere ($r = 0.29, p < 0.01$), and social and economic setting ($r = 0.27, p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.34, p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.36, p < 0.05$), and overall image ($r = 0.55, p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation with this willingness item.

The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.20, p < 0.05$), atmosphere ($r = 0.30, p < 0.01$), and social and economic setting ($r = 0.30, p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to spend money to experience India. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.44, p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.40, p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.56, p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to spend money to experience India.

The cognitive image dimensions of attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.22, p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.18, p < 0.05$), and environment ($r = 0.17, p < 0.05$) were marginally correlated with willingness to buy art and handicrafts. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.34, p < 0.01$),

tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.35$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.17$, $p < 0.05$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.17$, $p < 0.05$) were marginally correlated with willingness to go to cultural events. The cognitive image dimension of tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$) and overall image ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated with this willingness item.

Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Leisure Only Group

Table 11 presents the correlation between the destination image dimensions and the willingness items for the leisure only ($n = 73$) traveler group. The cognitive image dimensions of tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$) and environment ($r = 0.26$, $p < 0.05$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again. The cognitive image dimension of social and economic setting ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$), affective image ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.66$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to visit again.

Table 11

Correlation between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Leisure Only Group

Items	WVA	WVFF	WEVA	WSEM	WBAH	WCE
CINR	0.19	-0.03	0.36**	0.46**	0.33**	0.33**
CIACA	-0.04	0.20	0.38**	0.45**	0.36**	0.40**
CIGI	0.11	0.30*	0.40**	0.37**	0.16	0.41**
CITI	0.23*	0.15	0.37**	0.33**	0.20	0.32**
CIA	0.12	0.24*	0.15	0.18	0.31**	0.31**
CISES	0.43**	0.31**	0.43**	0.27*	-0.13	0.19
CIE	0.26*	0.45**	0.40**	0.30*	0.20	0.36**
AI	0.38**	0.24*	0.34**	0.16	0.10	0.44**
OI	0.66**	0.63**	0.61**	0.52**	0.19	0.59**
Mean	3.07	2.37	3.38	3.41	3.81	3.42
SD	1.00	1.06	1.11	1.08	1.01	1.05

Note. WVA = willingness to visit again; WVFF = willingness to visit with friends and family; WEVA = willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; WSEM = willingness to spend money to experience India; WBAH = willingness to buy art and handicrafts; WCE = willingness to go to cultural events; CINR = cognitive image natural resources; CIACA = cognitive image attractions, culture, and art; CIGI = cognitive image general infrastructure; CITI = cognitive image tourist infrastructure; CIA = cognitive image atmosphere; CISES = cognitive image social and economic setting; CIE = cognitive image environment; AI = affective image; OI = overall image.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.05$), atmosphere ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.05$), and social and economic setting ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again with friends and family. The cognitive image dimension of environment ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$), affective image ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.05$), and overall image ($r = 0.63$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to willingness to visit again with friends and family.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.38$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.43$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), affective image ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.61$, $p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation with willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions.

The cognitive image dimensions of tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.05$), and environment ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.05$) were marginally correlated with willingness to spend money to experience India. The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.37$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated to with this item.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$) and atmosphere ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$) were only marginally correlated with willingness to buy art and handicrafts. The cognitive image dimension of attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$) was moderately correlated.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$), and atmosphere ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$) were only marginally correlated with willingness to go to cultural events. The cognitive image dimensions of general infrastructure ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$), affective image ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.01$), and overall image ($r = 0.59$, $p < 0.01$) were moderately correlated with willingness to go to cultural events.

Relationship between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Fusion Group

As Table 12 indicates, there was a significant relationship with the destination image dimensions and the willingness items for the fusion group ($n=170$). The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$), and environment ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again. The affective image ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation and overall image ($r = 0.70$, $p < 0.01$) had a strong positive correlation with this item.

Table 12

Correlation between Destination Image and Willingness to Visit for Fusion Group

Items	WVA	WVFF	WEVA	WSEM	WBAH	WCE
CINR	0.22**	0.10	0.36**	0.33**	0.20**	0.21**
CIACA	0.21**	0.16*	0.32**	0.25**	0.24**	0.25**
CIGI	0.29**	0.26**	0.29**	0.19*	0.21**	0.20**
CITI	0.32**	0.30**	0.25**	0.21**	0.24**	0.30**
CIA	-0.03	-0.09	0.24**	0.19*	0.15*	0.18*
CISES	0.32**	0.28**	0.28**	0.21**	0.07	0.18*
CIE	0.19*	0.30**	0.22**	0.20*	0.10	0.27**
AI	0.48**	0.51**	0.27**	0.31*	0.25**	0.30**
OI	0.70**	0.73**	0.49**	0.54**	0.36**	0.41**
Mean	4.04	3.74	4.08	4.02	4.00	3.85
SD	1.00	1.23	0.96	0.83	0.84	0.90

Note. WVA = willingness to visit again; WVFF = willingness to visit with friends and family; WEVA = willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions; WSEM = willingness to spend money to experience India; WBAH = willingness to buy art and handicrafts; WCE = willingness to go to cultural events; CINR = cognitive image natural resources; CIACA = cognitive image attractions, culture, and art; CIGI = cognitive image general infrastructure; CITI = cognitive image tourist infrastructure; CIA = cognitive image atmosphere; CISES = cognitive image social and economic setting; CIE = cognitive image environment; AI = affective image; OI = overall image.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The cognitive image dimensions of attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.26$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), and environment ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to visit again with friends and family. The affective image ($r = 0.51$, $p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation and overall image ($r = 0.73$, $p < 0.01$) had a strong correlation with this willingness item.

The cognitive image dimensions of attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.32$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions. The cognitive image dimension of natural resources ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$) and overall image ($r = 0.49$, $p < 0.01$) had a moderate correlation with this willingness item.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), environment ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$), and affective image ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.05$) were marginally correlated with willingness to spend money to experience India. The overall image ($r = 0.54$, $p < 0.01$) was moderately correlated to willingness to spend money to experience India.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), tourist

infrastructure ($r = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.15$, $p < 0.05$), and affective image ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to buy art and handicrafts. The overall image ($r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$) was moderately correlated with this item.

The cognitive image dimensions of natural resources ($r = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$), attractions, culture, and art ($r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$), general infrastructure ($r = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$), tourist infrastructure ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$), atmosphere ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$), social and economic setting ($r = 0.18$, $p < 0.05$), environment ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$), and affective image ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.01$) were marginally correlated with willingness to go to cultural events. The overall image ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$) was moderately correlated with this willingness item.

Summary

The current study on destination image and willingness to visit resulted in some interesting findings. The sample for this study was 385 respondents of which the majority was male. The primary age group was between 30 to 55 years. Most of the participants were either United States of America nationals or were residing in the USA. There were total of 142 respondents from business only group, 73 respondents were from leisure only group, and the rest 170 respondents were from fusion traveler group. Most of the respondents stayed in India for 5 to 10 days and had completed one to two prior visits. Some of the most frequented cities were Delhi and Bangalore.

In relation to the recreation and leisure of the travelers, the items of safety and stability and cleanliness and hygiene were ranked most important with casino, theme parks, and nightlife being ranked the least important by the travelers. The business only group considered cleanliness and hygiene as most important and casino, theme parks, and

nightlife as least important. On the other hand, leisure only respondents considered safety and stability as most important and large availability of bars and discotheques as least important. The fusion only group considered the cleanliness and hygiene and natural scenery as most important items and casino, theme parks, and nightlife were identified as least important. There was significant difference between the three traveler groups pertaining to the recreation and leisure needs item of large availability of bars, discotheques.

In terms of the constructs of destination image, the affective image had the highest mean score and the cognitive image had the least score. Among the seven cognitive image dimensions, atmosphere had a high average agreement and environment had a low average agreement. Moreover, of the total 27 destination image items, India having rich cultural heritage had the highest average agreement with respondents and India is a clean country had the least average agreement. There was a significant difference in means for the cognitive image dimensions of natural resources, attractions, culture, and art, general infrastructure, tourist infrastructure, social and economic setting, and environment, affective image, and overall image among the three groups.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, there were six items that comprised of willingness to visit. Among the willingness to visit items, willingness to buy Indian arts and handicrafts had the highest average agreement and the willingness to visit with friends and family had the least average agreement among the three traveler groups. There was a significant relationship between willingness to visit and the destination image constructs of cognitive image (natural resources, attractions, culture, and art,

general infrastructure, tourist infrastructure, atmosphere, social and economic setting, and environment), affective image, and overall image. There was a strong correlation between overall image and willingness to visit with friends and family and a marginal correlation between cognitive image dimension of atmosphere and willingness to visit with friends and family.

CHAPTER V

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of the current study was three fold. First, the study identified the recreation and leisure needs of the San Francisco Bay Area travelers visiting India. In addition, the perceived destination image of India by these travelers was determined. Finally, the study explored the relationship between destination image and willingness to visit. Willingness to visit in the current study was conceptualized in the following manner – willingness to visit again, willingness to visit with friends and family, willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions, willingness to spend money to experience India, willingness to buy art and handicrafts, and willingness to go to cultural events.

A structured quantitative research design was employed in the current investigation. A convenience sample of travelers to India from San Francisco International Airport (California, USA) was used. Participants who were eighteen and older were solicited to participate in the study. They were approached around the check-in counters of five major airlines with flights to India and were requested to fill the self administered questionnaire containing various sections including recreation and leisure needs, destination image statements on India, and demographics (Appendix C). The data collection yielded 385 valid surveys reflecting a response rate of 88.51%.

During data analysis, the respondents were categorized into three groups based on purpose of travel – business only group, leisure only group, and fusion group. The business only group consisted of individuals visiting India purely for business reasons.

The leisure only group included travelers visiting India for pleasure and vacation purposes. The fusion group was made up of travelers, whose reasons for visiting India were varied. They were business, pleasure and vacation, visiting friends and family, visiting attractions, and education. Statistical methods used for data analyses included descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, and correlation.

Three different sections constitute the structure of this chapter. The first section discusses the study findings as they relate to the research questions. The limitations of the study are elaborated in the second section and the conclusions including areas for future research and implications for stakeholders comprise the final section.

Discussion

The past 30 years has seen a tremendous increase in research studies focused on understanding the concept of destination image. The primary focus of these studies was on leisure travelers (Grosspietsch, 2006; Beerli & Martin, 2003; Chaudhary 2000; Choi et al., 1999; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Scholarly discourse on destination image pertaining to other groups of travelers has been silent. Furthermore, the World Tourism Organization has identified business travelers as a legitimate tourism entity. With the advent of globalization, there has been an increase in the number of people traveling across various borders for business related activities. These business travelers devote part of their free time to experience the destination and partake in tourist related activities in the host destination (Uriely, 2001). Given the sparse literature on business travelers, the current study was formulated. It focused on the destination perception by business travelers when compared to leisure travelers and fusion travelers (traveling for business

and pleasure). In addition, this research determined the recreation and leisure needs as well as willingness to visit of the business travelers, the leisure travelers, and the fusion group.

Recreation and Leisure Needs

Kale and Weir (1986) acknowledged the importance of identifying the tourist needs in order to develop better promotional programs and make potential travelers aware of what the destination has to offer. Relating to the recreation and leisure needs, the findings from the current study deserve deeper investigation. While traveling to India, San Francisco Bay Area travelers rated safety, stability, cleanliness, and hygiene as items of high importance. Furthermore, quality of hotels and restaurants and hospitality to tourists were identified as important by business only group. For the leisure only group, important items pertaining their recreation and leisure needs included hospitality to tourists and natural scenery, while for the fusion group, natural scenery and good weather ranked important.

Another interesting finding related to the recreation and leisure needs was the level of importance assigned to casinos, theme parks and nightlife. In fact, none of the three groups of travelers considered them important. There was a significant difference between the three groups for the large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs in India. Business only and fusion travelers rated this as important when compared to leisure group, suggesting that business and fusion travelers expect the large availability of bars, discotheques, and clubs when they visit India.

Destination Image

As articulated in previous chapters, the destination image comprises of three constructs, namely, cognitive image, affective image, and overall image (Beerli & Martin, 2004). A mean score of > 3.00 for destination constructs indicated a positive image, whereas a mean score of < 3.00 was suggestive of a negative image. The findings in the current study indicated that the San Francisco Bay Area travelers had an overall positive image of India (mean score of > 3.00 across the three destination constructs). This finding does not coincide with previous research studies on India. In prior research on India, overall image was negative with a few positive attributes used to promote the destination (Kale & Wier, 1986; Chaudhary, 2000). The Government of India has taken an active interest in the tourism development in the past couple of years (Neelakantan, 2004). The current positive image may be due to the increased interest and better promotion and marketing. Some of the high mean score items, signifying a strong positive image included the rich cultural heritage, museums, historical sites, arts and handicrafts, place for economic development, friendly and hospitable people, not a boring and unattractive place, scenic beauty, and an exotic destination. These items are consistent with previous studies on India (Kale & Wier, 1986; Chaudhary, 2000).

There were quite a few negative image items or the improvement areas identified by travelers in the current study. They considered the country not to be very clean, overcrowded and polluted, poverty stricken, having bad transportation system, having a poor quality health service, not a relaxing place, and not having good nightlife. These findings provide support to previous research conducted by Chaudhary (2000).

Perception about the transportation system varied in the current research when compared to previous research. Chaudhary identified transportation facilities as being in the mid-range level, while transportation facilities in the current study were rated as negative, reflected by the low mean score. A likely explanation for this finding is that the transportation system in India has not been able to keep pace with the increased number of visitors.

The destination image differed among the three traveler groups. The leisure only group had an overall negative image of India as a tourist destination. Both the business only group and the fusion group had a positive overall image of India with the fusion group having a highest overall positive image. Both the business only and the leisure groups agreed that the general infrastructure needed a face lift. The fusion group disagreed reflecting a positive image for this item. The perception of the business only and leisure only group about infrastructure finds support in prior research studies and common understanding. India as a destination is typically portrayed as unclean and unhygienic, overcrowded, polluted, with animals in the streets. This perception is confirmed by the findings of the current study. All the three traveler groups perceived the cognitive environment dimension (clean country, overcrowding, and polluted) as negative.

The most positive destination dimensions included the cognitive image atmosphere and cognitive image attractions, culture, and art, further reiterating that India had a rich cultural heritage, museums, historical sites, arts and handicrafts, shopping and was an exotic destination. The business only group did not differ significantly with either

the leisure only group or the fusion group on the dimension of cognitive image social and economic setting. A possible explanation for this finding is that this group of travelers primarily visits a destination for business purposes and therefore the social and economic settings have no bearing on their travel motives or perception. Summarizing the findings on destination image of India, it can be concluded that India has a positive image with quite a few areas for improvement. These are consistent with the findings by Baloglu and McCleary (1999) and Beerli and Martin (2004) in their research on leisure travelers, allowing for extension of their framework to other groups of travelers.

Willingness to Visit

The San Francisco Bay Area travelers projected a very positive image for India reflected by how they rated the willingness items. They were willing to visit India again, with friends and family, extend their visit to see famous attractions, spend extra money to experience India, buy arts and handicrafts, and go to culture events. However, there were some differences in their willingness to visit among the three groups. Both business only and leisure only group of travelers were negatively inclined in their willingness to visit India with friends and family. In contrast, the fusion group was positively inclined to visit India with friends and family. In addition, the fusion group was more interested in frequent visitation, extending their trip to see attractions, and was willing to spend extra money to experience various tourist activities. This finding provided support to the assertion made by Yoon and Uysal (2005), that level of satisfaction from previous visit was a mediating factor between destination loyalty and travel motivation.

The desire to revisit India was significantly different between the business only and leisure group. A plausible explanation could be that business travelers are obligated to revisit a destination based on business needs, whereas for the leisure group, destination loyalty is based on previous satisfaction level and perceived image of the destination attributes. Business travelers may not have choice in making decisions to revisit because the primary reason for travel is business needs.

Relationship Assessment of Destination Image Dimensions and Willingness to Visit

A unique finding from the current study was that there was a strong positive correlation between the overall destination image and the willingness to visit again and with friends and family. Furthermore, the willingness to extend the visit to see famous attractions and the willingness to spend money to experience India were also strongly correlated with overall image. These findings suggest that the positive image of India may lead to frequent visitations with enhanced opportunities to experience the destination.

There was a marginal correlation between cognitive image atmosphere and the willingness to visit, suggesting that India being an exotic destination has no bearing on willingness to revisit, spend time, and money on tourist related activities. The willingness to buy arts and handicrafts also had a marginal relationship with the destination image. A possible explanation for this could be that travelers were either unaware or are not interested in Indian arts and handicrafts. However, an alternative explanation could be that destination image did not affect the buying of arts and handicrafts.

For the business only group, most of the destination image constructs and dimensions were either moderately or marginally correlated with the willingness items, indicating that the business only group of travelers was not visiting India based primarily on the destination image. Rather they were doing so because of professional obligations. An additional finding of note was that the overall image was moderately correlated with all the willingness items. This indicates that for future visitation, ability to spend more time and money in tourist related activities by the business only group is linked with the image of India. Another interesting finding related to this group was that the cognitive image environment (cleanliness, pollution, and overcrowding) and affective image (boring, unattractive, and not a relaxing place) did not seem to affect the willingness items that much. A plausible explanation for this as articulated above is that business only travelers are motivated primarily by their business needs and professional obligations.

The findings for the leisure group indicate that the overall destination image was moderately correlated with most of the willingness to visit items with the exception of willingness to buy arts and handicrafts. Willingness to buy arts and handicrafts was not significantly correlated with most of the destination image dimensions and constructs. A possible reason for this could be that this group of travelers was buying arts and handicrafts regardless of their perceived destination image of India. The willingness to extend visit to see some famous attractions was moderately correlated with destination image constructs and dimensions, indicating the effect of destination image on this item. Moreover, the willingness to go to cultural events was either marginally or moderately

correlated with all the dimensions and constructs of destination image excluding the cognitive social and economic setting. An explanation for this could be the leisure traveler group was more interested in cultural tourism, and was more impacted by the destination image.

For the fusion group, there was a strong correlation between the overall image and the willingness to visit again and with friends and family, suggesting that a positive destination image leads to increased frequency of re-visitation. The cognitive image (general infrastructure, attractions, culture and arts, and tourist infrastructure), affective image, and overall image were significantly correlated with willingness to visit. A likely explanation was that the fusion group of travelers comprised of both business and pleasure travelers and was affected by destination image considerably. In addition, the willingness to buy arts and handicrafts and willingness to attend cultural events were weakly correlated with destination image, signifying that the travelers were willing to buy Indian handicrafts regardless of their perceived destination image. Also, this weak correlation may also imply that the travelers are less inclined to attend cultural events.

When queried about the marketing and promotional strategies utilized by the Government of India, all the travelers indicated marketing and promotion was not targeted to various segments of travelers. Furthermore, about 70% of the travelers agreed that the Government of India was not doing a good job in promoting India as a destination in the USA. This finding is supported by the research conducted by Ahmed and Krohn (1992). Each of the three groups of travelers indicated that India should expand efforts in promoting India as a destination to travelers in the USA.

Limitations

This research study had several limitations pertaining to the theoretical constructs and the methodology. The study integrated most of the factors affecting destination image as identified in the research by Beerli and Martin (2004). However, some of the factors like motivation to travel and information sources were excluded due to the length of the questionnaire and the time constraint for the participants. Also, the use of a convenience sampling method limits the generalization of the findings and does not ensure the elimination of selection bias. Hence, the results cannot be generalized to different destinations and should be limited to the individuals participating in the study and traveling to India on that given day.

Conclusion

There were three research questions formulated to establish the perception of India among San Francisco Bay Area travelers. The first one was to identify the recreation and leisure needs of the Bay Area travelers to India. The findings of the study confirmed that safety, stability, cleanliness, and hygiene were of paramount importance to all the three groups of travelers and casinos, theme parks, and nightlife the least important. There was a significant variation in the expectations pertaining to the large availability of bars, discotheques, and club for the leisure only group of travelers when compared to the other two groups.

The second research question was to determine the perceived image of India as a travel destination. The results of the study indicated that India had a strong positive image for having rich cultural heritage, museums, historical sites, arts and handicrafts.

India was viewed as a place for economic development, had friendly and hospitable people, and scenic beauty. Moreover, the nation has a positive image of being an attractive and exotic destination. The negative images that India possessed were lack of cleanliness, overcrowding, pollution, poverty, poor transportation system, poor health service, and a lack of good nightlife. The travelers considered the country not to be a relaxing place. This implies that the positive image of India is impacted by the negative attributes.

The final question was to investigate the relationship between destination image of India and the willingness to visit. There was a strong relationship between destination image and willingness to revisit and willingness to visit with friends and family. The relationship was moderate between the destination image and willingness to extend visit to see famous attractions, to spend money to experience India, to go to cultural events. The relationship was marginal for destination image and willingness to buy arts and handicrafts.

Recommendations

The findings of the study present allows for several recommendations for various stakeholders. The two main stakeholders addressed will be the policy makers (tourism planners and government) and the travelers. The tourism planners must further promote and enhance the positive brand image as India has already established itself very well as a historical and diverse cultural destination. It is imperative that the Government of India target the areas identified as needing improvement so as to better position the country in the global market and strengthen the brand image. The transportation system needs to be

developed to be able to sustain the increased influx of tourist. Health services, tourist information centers, nightlife, poverty, cleanliness, pollution, and overcrowding have been identified as needing immediate attention. Furthermore, India is not viewed as a relaxing destination. To address this negative perception, the country has to market itself further as a spiritual revival destination, promoting yoga, ayurveda, spas, and health retreats.

An important finding of this study was that despite being aware of the various arts and handicrafts, travelers were less inclined to purchase them. Efforts should be made by the government to investigate the cause of this situation and strategize alternative means to market the numerous arts and handicrafts. A recommendation aimed primarily at destination planners is that they should identify ways to position India competitively in the South East Asian market. If India addresses all of the areas that this current study has identified as needing improvement, it would be a desirable destination and would attract travelers to revisit and encourage them to spend more time and money. Findings from the study strongly support the need for India to develop promotional strategies specifically targeting various segments of travelers.

This study has uncovered information on the expectations and the needs of the travelers to India. If the recommendations based on the findings are implemented by policy makers particularly in the areas of marketing, making improvements, and sustainability, India will attract more travelers. The business travelers visiting the country will be encouraged to extend their trip to pursue various tourist activities. The leisure and the fusion groups will be persuaded to experience and explore the diverse

forms of tourism in India. If the expectations of the three groups of travelers are met an effective brand image of India could be created which in turn would command loyalty (frequent visitation).

Areas for Future Research

Based on the current findings, future research could investigate additional factors of the destination image model, including information sources and the motivation to travel. In addition, qualitative research could be undertaken to gain a deeper understanding of the travel experience for each of the three travel groups. Marketing studies could be initiated to determine the strategies and reasons for the difference in the destination image for the three groups. Finally, future research could identify the cause and the rationale behind the strength of relationship between destination image and willingness to visit.

References

- Ahmed, Z. U., & Krohn, F. B. (1992). Marketing India as a tourist destination in North America-challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 11*(2), 89-98.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(4), 868-897.
- Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2003). Tourists' characteristics and perceived image of tourist destinations: A quantitative analysis, a case study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management, 25*(5), 623-636.
- Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(3), 657-681.
- Bigné, J. E., Sánchez, M. I., & Sánchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: Inter-relationship. *Tourism Management, 22*(6), 607-616.
- Blain, C., Levy, S. E., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2005). Destination branding: Insights and practices from destination management organizations. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*(4), 11, 328.
- Blank, D. (2005). Business travel on the rise. *Hotel & Motel Management, 220*(5), 1-2.
- California Travel and Tourism Commission. (2004). Travel forecast. Retrieved June 27, 2006, from <http://www.gocalif.ca.gov/tourism/pdfs/TravelForecast.pdf>
- Chaudhary, M. (1996). India's tourism: A paradoxical product. *Tourism Management, 17*(8), 616-619.

- Chaudhary, M. (2000). India's image as a tourist destination, a perspective of foreign tourists. *Tourism Management*, 21(3), 293-297.
- Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M. (2002). Market positioning analysis: A hybrid approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(4), 987-1003.
- Choi, W. M., Chan, A., & Wu, J. (1999). A qualitative and quantitative assessment of Hong Kong's image as a tourist destination. *Tourism Management*, 20(3), 361-365.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations of pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Fyall, A., Callod, C., & Edwards, B. (2003). Relationship marketing: The challenge for destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 644-659.
- Gallarza, M. G., Saura, I. G., & García, H. C. (2002). Destination image: Towards a conceptual framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 56-78.
- Goossens, C. (2000). Tourism information and pleasure motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 301-321.
- Grosspietsch, M. (2006). Perceived and projected images of Rwanda: Visitor and international tour operator perspectives. *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 225-234.
- Gunn, C. A. (1988). *Vacationscape: Designing tourist regions*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Hui, T. K., & Wan, T. W. D. (2003). Singapore's image as a tourist destination. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(4), 305-313.
- India. (2005, December). *Travel & Tourism Forecast World*, pp. 148-157.

- India Tourism Statistics 2004. (2004). Retrieved September 18, 2006, from
<http://www.tourism.gov.in/statistics/ITS2004.pdf>
- Jenkins, O. H. (1999). Understanding and measuring tourist destination images.
International Journal of Tourism Research, 1(1), 1-15.
- Kale, S. H., & Weir, K. M. (1986). Marketing third world countries to the western
 traveller: The case of India . *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(2), 2-7.
- Kim, H., & Richardson, S. L. (2003). Motion picture impacts on destination images.
Annals of Tourism Research, 30(1), 216-237.
- Kotler, P., Haider, D. H., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing places: Attracting investment,
 industry, and tourism to cities, states and nations*. New York: Free Press.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities.
Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.
- Kulendran, N., & Wilson, K. (2000). Is there a relationship between international
 trade and international travel? *Applied Economics*, 32, 1001-9.
- Laws, E., Scott, N., & Parfitt, N. (2002). Synergies in destination image management: A
 case study and conceptualization. *International Journal of Tourism Research*,
 4(1), 39-55.
- Lawson, F., & Baud-Bovy, M. (1977). *Tourism and Recreational Development*. London:
 Architectural Press.
- Long, N. V. (2005). Outsourcing and technology spillovers. *International Review of
 Economics & Finance*, 14(3), 297-304.

- Middleton, V. T. C. (2001). *Marketing in Travel and Tourism* (3 ed.). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Ministry of Tourism of India (2005). Annual Report 2004-2005. Retrieved September 17, 2006, from <http://www.tourism.gov.in/AnnualReport04-05.pdf>
- Neelakantan, S. (2004). India Benefits From Focus on Tourism. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 167(3), 44.
- Nicholson, B., & Sahay, S. (2001). Some political and cultural issues in the globalization of software development: Case experience from Britain and India. *Information and Organization*, 11(1), 25-43.
- Office of Travel and Tourism Industries.(2006). Select Destinations Visited by U.S. Resident Travelers 2004-2005. Retrieved September 18, 2006, from <http://tinet.ita.doc.gov/view/f-2005-08-001/index.html>
- Pike, S., & Ryan, C. (2004). Destination Positioning Analysis through a Comparison of Cognitive, Affective and Conative Perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 10,333.
- Pizam, A., Uriely, N., & Reichel, A. (2000). The intensity of tourist–host social relationship and its effects on satisfaction and change of attitudes: The case of working tourists in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 21(4), 395-406.
- Riddle, D. (1999). Business Tourism. *International Trade Forum*, (3), 4, 7.
- Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2005). Research methods for social work. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole-Thomson Learning.

- Seddighi, H. R., & Theocharous, A. L. (2002). A model of tourism destination choice: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 475-487.
- Seongseop, K. S., Chun, H., & Petrick, F. J. (2005). Positioning analysis of overseas golf tour destinations by Korean golf tourists. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 905-917.
- Sirgy, M. J., & Su, C. (2000). Destination image, self-congruity, and travel behavior: Toward an Integrative Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(4), 340-352.
- Sonmez, S., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). A distorted destination image: The case of Turkey. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(2), 185-196.
- Tourism 2020 Vision - South Asia (2001). Retrieved June 27, 2006, from <http://pub.world-tourism.org:81/WebRoot/Store/Shops/Infoshop/Products/1184/1184-1.pdf>
- Uriely, N. (2001). Travelling workers' and 'working tourists': Variations across the interaction between work and tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 1-8.
- Uysal, M., Chen, J. S., & Williams, D. R. (2000). Increasing state market share through a regional positioning. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 89-96.
- Vogt, C. A., & Andereck, K. L. (2003). Destination perception across a vacation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 348-354.
- Weaver, P. A., & McCleary, K. W. (1991). Basics bring 'em back. *Hotel & Motel Management*, 206 (11), 29-30, 32.
- WTO Tourism Highlights. (2005). Retrieved July 11, 2006, from <http://www.world-tourism.org/facts/menu.html>

WTO World Tourism Barometer.(2004). Retrieved January 15, 2006, from

<http://www.world-tourism.org/facts/menu.html>

World Travel and Tourism Council. (2006). Retrieved 22 July, 2006, from

<http://www.wttc.org/2006TSA/pdf/Executive%20Summary%202006.pdf>.

Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56.

Appendix A

Construct of Destination Image and Attributes

Cognitive Image	
<i>Natural Resources</i>	
	Pleasant weather
	Good beaches
	Scenic beauty (lakes, mountains, wildlife, etc.)
<i>Attractions, Culture, and Art</i>	
	Rich cultural heritage
	Museums and historical sites
	Art and Handicrafts
	Good nightlife
	Adventure activities (scuba, fishing, hunting, rafting, etc.)
	Shopping
<i>General Infrastructure</i>	
	Good transportation
	Good health services
	Good telecommunications
<i>Tourist Infrastructure</i>	
	Good deluxe hotels and restaurants
	Good tourist information centers
	Bars, clubs, and discotheques
<i>Atmosphere</i>	
	Exotic destination
<i>Social and Economic Setting</i>	
	Safe destination
	Expensive destination
	Poverty
	Friendly and hospitable
	No language barriers
	Place for economic development
<i>Environment</i>	
	Clean country
	Overcrowded and polluted
<hr/>	
Affective Image	
	Relaxing place
	Boring and unattractive place
<hr/>	
Overall Image	
	Overall good image

Appendix B

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Department of Recreation
and Leisure Studies**

One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0060
Voice: 408-924-3000
Fax: 408-924-3061

sjsu.edu/recreation

Informed Consent Form

This study 'Destination Image and Willingness to Visit India: A Study of Bay Area Travelers' is being conducted by Subha Rajamohan and Dr. Gonzaga Da Gama, Dept. of Recreation & Leisure Studies at San Jose State University.

The perceived image of India as a travel destination by Bay Area travelers as well as the San Francisco Bay Area travelers' recreational and leisure needs from India as a tourist destination will be examined. The study has a potential to help the destination stake holders to position themselves better in the global market. Moreover, this research gives insight to the recreational and tourism needs of travelers.

The data will be collected at the San Francisco International Airport in the months of March to August, 2006. If you agree to participate in the study, you will be asked to fill a questionnaire which would take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Participation in this study is on a voluntary basis: therefore, you may refuse to participate in the entire study or in any part of the study. You will receive no monetary compensation. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose not to participate. There are no direct benefits. If you decide to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative consequences.

All of your responses to the questionnaires will be completely anonymous. The data set will be kept separate from the consent forms. In addition, in the case where the results of this study are published, no information that could identify you will be ever included. There are no anticipated risks involved in the study; probabilities and magnitude of harm or discomfort are no greater than encountered in daily life. If you have additional questions concerning the study or the results, you may contact either Subha Rajamohan (408-398-9893) or Dr. Gonzaga Da Gama (408-924-3005) at the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies. Any complaints about the research work may be presented to Dr. Gonzaga Da Gama (Interim Chair), at the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies (408-924-3000). Questions or complaints about research, participants' rights, or research-based injury may be presented to Dr. Pamela Stacks (Associate Vice President) of Graduate Studies and Research (408-924-2480). Thank you very much for participating in this study. You will receive a copy for your records.

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

Appendix C
Survey Questionnaire

SECTION 1

Please check the appropriate box to indicate the degree of importance of the attributes while travelling to India (5 indicates "very important"; 1 indicates "very unimportant")

Recreation and leisure needs	Very Unimportant 1	Unimportant 2	Neutral 3	Important 4	Very Important 5
Good beaches	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Good weather	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Natural scenery	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of roads, airports, and ports	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of health services	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of telecommunications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of hotels and restaurants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Large availability of bars, discotheques, clubs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tourist information centers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Casinos, theme parks, and nightlife	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shopping	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adventure activities like skiing, scuba diving, hunting, fishing, rafting, and trekking	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Museums, heritage buildings, and monuments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Rich culture	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Variety of handicrafts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Festivals and concerts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hospitality to tourists	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Language barriers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Safety and stability	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cleanliness and Hygiene	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overcrowding and traffic congestion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION 2

Please check the appropriate box that would best represent your opinion about images of India (1 indicates "strongly disagree;5 indicates "strongly agree").

Destination images of India	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
India has pleasant weather	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
India has good beaches	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
India has got lots of scenic beauty (lakes, mountains, wildlife)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
India is a safe destination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
India is a exotic destination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
India is relaxing place	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Destination Images of India	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neutral 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
India is a boring and unattractive place	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India is an expensive destination	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India is a clean country	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India is overcrowded and polluted	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India is associated with poverty	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has rich cultural heritage	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India offers museums, historical sites	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has art and handicrafts	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
Indians are friendly and hospitable	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has no language barriers	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has good nightlife	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has adventure activities (scuba, hunting, fishing, rafting, etc)	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has a range of products for shopping	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India is the place for economic development	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has good transportation system	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has quality health services	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has good telecommunications	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has good deluxe hotels and restaurants	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has good tourist information centers	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has bars, clubs and discotheques	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
The government of India has done a good job promoting and marketing India in the USA.	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to visit India again	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to visit with friends and family	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to extend my visit to see some famous attractions	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to spend extra money to experience India as a tourist destination	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to buy Indian art and handicrafts	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
I am likely to go to cultural events	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]
India has a overall good image	[]	[]	[]	[]	[]

SECTION 3

What is your final destination?

[] India [] Other: Please indicate. _____

If traveling to India, what city are you visiting?

[] Bangalore [] Delhi [] Chennai [] Hyderabad [] Kolkata
[] Mumbai [] Other: Please indicate _____

What are the purposes of your visit to India?

☐ Business ☐ Vacation ☐ Visiting friends and family ☐ Visiting attractions
☐ Educational ☐ Other: Please indicate_____

My estimated length of stay is:

☐ Under 5 days ☐ 5-10 days ☐ 11-20 days ☐ More than 20 days

Number of prior visits to India if any.

☐ 0 visit ☐ 1- 2 visits ☐ 3-4 visits ☐ More than 4 visit

Which of the following best describes you?

Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Age: ☐ Under 30 ☐ 30-55 ☐ Above 55

Nationality/Citizenship. _____

Country of residence. _____

Appendix D

Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Office of the Provost
Associate Vice President
Graduate Studies & Research**

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0025
Voice: 408-924-2427
Fax: 408-924-2477

E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Subha Rajamohan
919 Visconti Pl.
Santa Clara, CA 95050

From: Pam Stacks, AVP
Graduate Studies & Research

Date: November 28, 2005

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request for exemption from human subjects review under category "B" in the study entitled:

**"San Francisco Bay Area Travelers' Perceived Destination Image of India-
Implications for Business Travelers."**

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project or the subject's data collected for the research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project and concerning all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must immediately notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted. This approval is granted for a one-year period and data collection beyond November 28, 2006 requires an extension request.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

Cc: Gonzaga da Gama

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno,
Foster, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Maritime Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus