

Factors of External Information Search influencing the choice of destination tourism: A study conducted in Northern Region of India

SANTOSH PANDEY

Principal, GIHS Mahavidyalaya
India

Abstract:

Every season many tourists visit various tourist destinations in north India. Some places are famous and have specific attractions for tourists to visit. However, some places are not very famous, despite of really interesting resources to attract tourists. This study analyzed tourists' preferences and choices for tourist destinations, and the study also analysed the factors influencing external information search for the aforementioned purpose. The survey was distributed in a randomly to tourists. The identified population included 507 hundred male and female tourists. After collecting the data the results was analysed to understand what motivates tourists to travel options in northern region of India. This study sought to analyze key motivational factors that lead tourists to destinations in northern region and influence their external information search.

Key words: Tourists, Consumer Behaviour, Decision, External Information Search & Tourism Destination.

1. INTRODUCTION

India has rich history, culture and geographical diversity that make its global tourism appeal large and diverse. It offers heritage and cultural tourism which is a large industry. The World Travel and Tourism Council calculated that tourism

generated \$131 billion or 6.4% of the nation's GDP in 2014. It was accountable for 41.3 million jobs, 7.9% of its total employment. The GDP of the tourism sector has expanded 23.9% between 1990 and 2016. The sector is foretold to grow at an average annual rate of 8.7% in the next decade. In a 2015 forecast the World Travel and Tourism Council predicted the annual growth to be 9.8% between 2015 and 2021.

1.1. External influences on purchase decision

Purchasing behaviour can also be affected by external influences, such as culture, sub-culture, social class, reference groups, family and situational determinants.

1.1.1. Culture

Culture is the broadest and most abstract of the external factors. Culture refers to the complexity of learning meanings, values, norms, and customs shared by members of a society. Cultural norms are relatively stable over time, therefore, culture has a major impact on consumer behaviour. Marketers interested in global expansion are especially interested in understanding cross-cultural differences in purchasing and consumption. For instance, Ferrari, one of the world's top brands found that Chinese consumers are very different from their Western counterparts. Whereas consumers in the US, UK and Australia expect to wait 12 months for a custom-made Ferrari, prospective Chinese buyers want to drive the vehicle off the showroom floor. China is an 'instant-gratification market'. Buyers see their friends riding around in a luxury car and want to have the same as quickly as possible. To meet the growing demand for luxury goods, Ferrari and other luxury car makers have been forced to modify their production processes for Asian markets.

1.1.2. Subcultures

People with shared interests tend to form informal groups known as subcultures. Subcultures may be based on age, geographic, religious, racial, and ethnic differences. More often, however, a subculture occurs when people with shared interests form a loose-knit group with a distinctive identity (sometimes called consumer tribes). Members of subcultures are self-selected, and signal their membership status by adopting symbols, rituals or behaviours that are widely understood by other members of the tribe (e.g. a dress code, hairstyle or even a unique way of speaking).

Subcultures are important to marketers for several reasons. Firstly, given that subcultures can represent sizeable market segments which are profitable and influential, there are obvious advantages in developing and selling products and services that meet the needs of subculture members. Secondly, and perhaps less obviously, many new fads and fashions emerge spontaneously from within these tribal groups. Trend-spotters are accordingly interested in studying the lifestyles and activities of tribes in a effort to spot new trends before they go mainstream

1.1.3. Social Class

Social class refers to relatively homogenous divisions in a society, typically based on socio-economic variables such as educational attainment, income and occupation. Social class can be very difficult to define and measure, however marketers around the world tend to use a conventional classification which divides any given population into five socio-economic quintiles (e.g. In Australia the groups AB, C, D, E and FG, where AB is the top socio-economic quintile, but in much of Asia the quintiles are labelled I, II, III, IV and V where I is the top quintile).

1.1.4. Reference Groups

A reference group is defined as "a group whose presumed perspectives or values are being used by an individual as the basis for his or her judgment, opinions, and actions." Reference groups are important because they are used to guide an individual's attitudes, beliefs and values. Insights into how consumers acquire a given value system can be obtained from an understanding of group influence and group socialisation processes.

A number of distinct types of reference groups can be identified:

Aspirational groups refer to a group to which an individual does not currently belong, but possibly aspires to become a member because the group possesses characteristics which are admired.

Associative Reference Groups refers to a group or groups to which an individual belongs, such as friends, family and work groups that can exert a positive influence on consumers.

Disassociative Reference Groups - a group which has a negative image; individuals may disapprove of the disassociative group's values, attitudes or behaviours and may seek to distance themselves from such groups.

Opinion Leaders can exert considerable social influence because of their product knowledge, expertise and credibility. In the marketing literature, opinion leaders are also known as influencers, mavens and even hubs. Opinion leaders are specific to a product category, so that an opinion leader for computers is not likely to be an opinion leader for fashion. Typically, opinion leaders have high levels of involvement with the product category, are heavy users of the category and tend to be early adopters of new technologies within the category. Journalists, celebrities and bloggers are good examples of an opinion leader due to their broad social networks and increased ability to influence people's decisions. Indeed, recent evidence suggests

that bloggers may be emerging as a more important group of opinion leaders than celebrities.

In order to leverage the value of opinion leaders in marketing strategies, it is important to be able to identify the unique opinion leaders for each category or situation and this can be very challenging. Some techniques that can be used are through key informants, socio-metric techniques and self-questionnaires. More often, however, marketers use gut instinct to identify opinion leaders. For example, marketers of athletic shoes have been known to provide gym/ aerobic instructors with free shoes in the hope that class members will adopt the same brand as the instructor. Marketers of cosmetics and skincare preparations regularly provide fashion editors with free samples in the hope that their products will be mentioned in fashion magazines.

1.2. Research Objectives and Hypotheses

Research Objective-1: To find out the discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-1: *There is discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.*

Null Hypothesis (H0)-1: *There is no discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.*

Research Objective-2: To find out the association between the **Age** of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-2: *There is association between the Age of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search*

Null Hypothesis (H0)-2: *There is no association between the Age of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search.*

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Destination

Destinations can be regarded as any well-defined geographical area such as a continent, a region, a country, a town or an attraction (Hall 2000; Ritchie and Crouch 2003). They are an important symbol and a means of attracting tourists (Ko 2005). They are viewed away from home places (Ryan 2005) where people travel to enjoy the products and services (such as accommodation, attractions, events and other tourist facilities) which provide different experiences for the tourists to enjoy (Buhalis 2000; Ritchie and Crouch 2003). These destinations are therefore critical to the tourist experiences.

2.2. Tourist Behaviours


It has been observed that the complete image of the destination is significant not only on the destination choice process but also on tourist behaviours in common (Ashworth & Goodall, 1988; Bigné, Sánchez, & Sánchez, 2001). The intents to revisit the destination and to spread a positive word-of-mouth have been the two most significant behavioural costs in destination image and post-consumption behaviour studies. The intention to revisit has been extensively studied in tourism research for its signal of customer loyalty. In the marketing discipline, the concept of customer retention has been widely emphasized because attracting new customers is more affluent than retaining existing customers (Rosenberg & Czepiel, 1984).

2.3. Engel-Kollat-Blackwell Model

This model was created to describe the increasing, fast-growing body of knowledge concerning consumer behavior. This model, like in other models, has gone through many revisions to improve its descriptive ability of the basic relationships between components and sub-components, this model consists also of four stages;

First stage: decision-process stages

The central focus of the model is on five basic decision-process stages: Problem recognition, search for alternatives, alternate evaluation (during which beliefs may lead to the formation of attitudes, which in turn may result in a purchase intention) purchase, and outcomes. But it is not necessary for every consumer to go through all these stages; it depends on whether it is an extended or a routine problem-solving behavior.



(Source: Engel , Blackwell, and Miniard,(1995) page No 95)

Model: The Engel-Kollat-Blackwell Model of Consumer Behavior.
(Source: Engel , Blackwell, and Miniard,(1995) page No 95)

Second stage: Information input

At this stage the consumer gets information from marketing and non-marketing sources, which also influence the problem recognition stage of the decision-making process. If the consumer still does not arrive to a specific decision, the search for external information will be activated in order to arrive to a choice or in some cases if the consumer experience dissonance because the selected alternative is less satisfactory than expected.

Third stage: information processing

This stage consists of the consumer's exposure, attention, perception, acceptance, and retention of incoming information. The consumer must first be exposed to the message, allocate space for this information, interpret the stimuli, and retain the message by transferring the input to long-term memory.

Fourth stage: variables influencing the decision process

This stage consists of individual and environmental influences that affect all five stages of the decision process. Individual characteristics include motives, values, lifestyle, and personality; the social influences are culture, reference groups, and family. Situational influences, such as a consumer's financial condition, also influence the decision process.

This model incorporates many items, which influence consumer decision-making such as values, lifestyle, personality and culture. The model did not show what factors shape these items, and why different types of personality can produce different decision-making? How will we apply these values to cope with different personalities? Religion can explain some behavioral characteristics of the consumer, and this will lead to better understanding of the model and will give more comprehensive view on decision-making.

2.4. Other Literature Review related to Tourist Behaviour

Cronin and Taylor (1992); suggest that consumer satisfaction has even greater effect on purchase intentions than service quality. However, in the leisure and tourism context loyalty to a destination is a more complex notion and is not always dependent on customer satisfaction.

Hu and Ritchie (1993); observed that attractiveness of a destination is based on the feelings, beliefs and opinions of tourists about the perceived capacity of destination to provide satisfaction.

Costa and Ferrone (1995);observed that choosing the travel destination is a very important and long-way decision process for the tourist, and understanding of the factors that influence decision-choice process is extremely important for the tourism industry. In order to stay competitive in this very competitive industry, tourism organizations should understand the decision process of their tourists that can be divided into different target markets.

Chaudhary (2002);Studies on gap analysis between perceptions and expectations on different attributes, perceived attractiveness of a destination depends on the psychological and social economic characteristics of tourists; hence different tourists gave different weightage to the various factors on the basic of their socioeconomic background.

Choi et al (2004); investigate on tourist information preferences both from the point of content and source of information.

According to the travel and Tourism competitiveness report brought out by the World Economic Forum (2009); India's share in International tourist arrivals; which was 0.34% in 2002, has increased to 0.49% during 2005 and is expected to reach 15% by 2010. India is ranked in the Asia-Pacific region and 62nd overall in a list of 133 assessed countries in 2008; up three places since 2007.The states of Rajasthan, Kerala and

Himachal Pradesh have promoted their tourist spots on a worldwide basis. Other tourist destinations are coming up. Recently the Indian tourism industry has specified tourism policy which is based on certain core nationalistic ideals and standards, i.e. Swagat or welcome, Sahyog or co-operation, Soochna or Information, Samrachna or Infrastructure, Suvidha or facilities, Safaai or Cleanliness and Suraksha or Security.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter defines the research design, research objectives, population samples, data collection procedures and the techniques of data analysis for examining the factors that affect choice of destination within northern region of India. This research is exploratory in nature. A survey was designed to measure the perceptions of tourists visiting northern region of India (Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Haryana & Punjab), with the help of the questionnaires and schedules using close ended dichotomous questions, multiple choice questions, five point LIKERT scale such as strongly agree-1, agree-2, neutral-3, disagree-4, and strongly disagree-5.


To collect information / data for the research purpose we have used ***convenient sampling technique***. The target population, to which I would like to draw inferences, comprises the tourists visiting northern region of India, The total Sample size was of 507 tourists. For the analysis of the data, IBM SPSS Statistics 22 version software has been used to perform Frequency analysis with Pie charts.

4. DATA ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION & FINDINGS

4.1. Demographic Analysis

Table- 1.: Age

age		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	20-30 years	160	31.6	31.6	31.6
	31-40 years	251	49.5	49.5	81.1
	41-50 years	63	12.4	12.4	93.5
	51-60 years	16	3.2	3.2	96.6
	More than 60 years	17	3.4	3.4	100.0
Total		507	100.0	100.0	




Interpretation & Findings:

From the above crosstab, it can be said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 31.6% respondents belong to 20-30 age group, 49.5% respondents belong to 31-40 age group, 12.4% respondents belong to 41-50 age group, 3.2% respondents belong to 51-60 age group and 3.4% respondents belong to more than 60 age group.

Table- 2.: Gender

Gender		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	356	70.2	70.2	70.2
	Female	151	29.8	29.8	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	




Interpretation & Findings:

From the above crosstab, it can be said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 70.2% respondents were females and 29.8% respondents were males.

Table- 3.: Marital Status

Marital Status					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	295	58.2	58.2	58.2
	Married	194	38.3	38.3	96.4
	Other	18	3.6	3.6	100.0
	Total	507	100.0	100.0	



Interpretation & Findings:

From the above crosstab, it can be said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 58.2% respondents were singles, 38.3%

respondents were married and 3.6% respondents belong to other category.

4.2. Analysis: Gender based information search

Analysis: T-Test: Male & Female: External Information Search

The Independent T Test compares the means of two variables. It computes the difference between the two variables for each case, and tests to see if the average difference is significantly different from zero.

Following is sample output of a T test. We compared the mean test scores of **the factors of external information search of male tourists and female tourists** in order to see whether there is any significant difference between the perception / attitude of male tourists and female tourists.

Table- 4. Group Statistics

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Word of mouth	Male	356	4.2051	.67559	.03581
	Female	151	4.5099	.79051	.06433
Relatives	Male	356	3.8371	.71316	.03780
	Female	151	4.0464	.79446	.06465
Members of the family	Male	356	3.8933	.85571	.04535
	Female	151	3.6689	1.03744	.08443
Spouse	Male	356	2.6601	1.66139	.08805
	Female	151	3.5298	1.34565	.10951
Choice of Children	Male	356	4.3202	1.11771	.05924
	Female	151	3.7020	1.26909	.10328
Female members of the family	Male	356	4.3258	1.06441	.05641
	Female	151	3.7550	1.16027	.09442
Male members of the family	Male	356	3.9944	1.17244	.06214
	Female	151	3.0530	.97835	.07962
Friends	Male	356	3.7360	.67382	.03571
	Female	151	3.3245	1.12279	.09137
Co-workers	Male	356	3.5169	.72946	.03866
	Female	151	3.0795	1.04258	.08484
Experience of my friends	Male	356	3.7079	.90323	.04787
	Female	151	3.3709	1.14668	.09332
Experience of my relatives	Male	356	4.1264	1.03911	.05507
	Female	151	3.5364	.91488	.07445
Social networking sites	Male	356	3.3680	1.05189	.05575
	Female	151	3.2252	1.07810	.08773

Santosh Pandey- **Factors of External Information Search influencing the choice of destination tourism: A study conducted in Northern Region of India**

Advertisements	Male	356	3.2472	1.22905	.06514
	Female	151	2.9934	1.23016	.10011

Table- 5. Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Word of mouth	Equal variances assumed	11.409	.001	-4.411	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.141	247.308	.000
Relatives	Equal variances assumed	.774	.380	-2.919	505	.004
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.794	257.355	.006
Members of the family	Equal variances assumed	18.914	.000	2.529	505	.012
	Equal variances not assumed			2.341	240.596	.020
Spouse	Equal variances assumed	27.529	.000	-5.689	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.189	345.623	.000
Choice of Children	Equal variances assumed	12.400	.000	5.466	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			5.193	253.350	.000
Female members of the family	Equal variances assumed	3.998	.046	5.374	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			5.190	262.092	.000
Male members of the family	Equal variances assumed	5.134	.024	8.668	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			9.321	335.759	.000
Friends	Equal variances assumed	121.265	.000	5.087	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			4.194	197.382	.000

Table- 6. Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test					
		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
Word of mouth	Equal variances assumed	-.30488	.06911	-.44066	-.16909
	Equal variances not assumed	-.30488	.07362	-.44989	-.15987
Relatives	Equal variances assumed	-.20928	.07170	-.35014	-.06842
	Equal variances not assumed	-.20928	.07489	-.35675	-.06180
Members of the family	Equal variances assumed	.22438	.08871	.05009	.39868
	Equal variances not assumed	.22438	.09584	.03560	.41317
Spouse	Equal variances assumed	-.86969	.15288	-1.17005	-.56932
	Equal variances not assumed	-.86969	.14052	-1.14607	-.59331
Choice of Children	Equal variances assumed	.61824	.11311	.39601	.84047
	Equal variances not assumed	.61824	.11906	.38376	.85271
Female members of the family	Equal variances assumed	.57088	.10622	.36219	.77957
	Equal variances not assumed	.57088	.10999	.35430	.78745
Male members of the family	Equal variances assumed	.94140	.10861	.72803	1.15478
	Equal variances not assumed	.94140	.10100	.74274	1.14007
Friends	Equal variances assumed	.41145	.08088	.25255	.57036
	Equal variances not assumed	.41145	.09810	.21799	.60492

Table- 7. Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Co-workers	Equal variances assumed	8.726	.003	5.395	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			4.691	214.845	.000
Experience of my friends	Equal variances assumed	33.536	.000	3.534	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			3.213	232.535	.001
Experience of my relatives	Equal variances assumed	.703	.402	6.052	505	.000
	Equal variances not assumed			6.371	318.740	.000
Social networking sites	Equal variances assumed	.807	.369	1.388	505	.166
	Equal variances not assumed			1.374	276.540	.171
Advertisements	Equal variances assumed	2.445	.119	2.126	505	.034
	Equal variances not assumed			2.125	282.508	.034

Table- 8. Independent Samples Test

Independent Samples Test					
		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
Co-workers	Equal variances assumed	.43738	.08107	.27810	.59667
	Equal variances not assumed	.43738	.09324	.25361	.62116
Experience of my friends	Equal variances assumed	.33700	.09535	.14966	.52435
	Equal variances not assumed	.33700	.10488	.13037	.54364
Experience of my relatives	Equal variances assumed	.58998	.09749	.39845	.78151
	Equal variances not assumed	.58998	.09261	.40778	.77218
Social networking sites	Equal variances assumed	.14281	.10292	-.05939	.34501
	Equal variances not assumed	.14281	.10395	-.06182	.34744
Advertisements	Equal variances assumed	.25381	.11939	.01925	.48838
	Equal variances not assumed	.25381	.11944	.01872	.48891

Interpretation: Finally, we see the results of the T Test. We should keep in mind that, this test is based on the difference between the two variables. To the right of the T- Test, Differences, we see the T, degrees of freedom, and significance.

If the significance value is less than .05, there is a significant difference.

If the significance value is greater than .05, there is no significant difference.

Interpretation: It can be seen that there is **no** significant difference between the males' perception and females' perception for Social Networking Sites so we can say that there is **no** difference between perception of male tourists & Perception of female tourists.

As the significance value in case of social networking sites is .166 when Equal variances assumed & .171 when Equal variances not assumed, it shows that the significant value is greater than .05, hence it can be said that there is no significant difference.

So, it can be concluded that social networking sites influences the choice of destination equally in case of males and females.

It can be seen from the above table that other factors have significant value less than .05, so, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the perception of males and perception of females for the following factors that influence external information search of males and females respectively.

1. Word of mouth
2. Relatives
3. Members of the family
4. Spouse
5. Choice of Children
6. Female members of the family
7. Male members of the family
8. Friends
9. Co-workers
10. Experience of my friends
11. Experience of my relatives

12. Advertisements

As our **Research Objective-1, Hypotheses-1** were-

Research Objective-1: To find out the discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-1: *There is discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.*

Null Hypothesis (H0)-1: *There is no discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the factors that influence External Information Search.*

From the above findings, it can be concluded that researcher was able to find out the discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the **factors that influence External Information Search.**

So, it can be said that our **Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-1** is **accepted** and our **Null Hypothesis (H0)-1** is **rejected**, hence it can be concluded that our **Research Objective-1** is **fulfilled**.

Analysis: Association between (Factors of External Information Search) choice of destination influenced by word of mouth and Age of respondents.

Table- 9. Crosstab: Word of mouth

Crosstab			Word of mouth					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	0	6	17	37	100	160
		% of Total	0.0%	1.2%	3.4%	7.3%	19.7%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	2	9	4	153	83	251
		% of Total	0.4%	1.8%	0.8%	30.2%	16.4%	49.5%

Santosh Pandey- **Factors of External Information Search influencing the choice of destination tourism: A study conducted in Northern Region of India**

	41-50 years	Count	0	0	0	37	26	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	5.1%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	0	2	15	0	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	3.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total	Count		2	15	23	258	209	507
	% of Total		0.4%	3.0%	4.5%	50.9%	41.2%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 41.2% respondents strongly agreed, 50.9% respondents agreed, 4.5% respondents were neutral, 3.0% respondents disagreed and 0.4% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘Word of mouth’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism. Most of the Respondents in the age group of 31-40 years accepted that their choice of destination is influenced by Word of mouth communication.

H0: The two factors are independent.
H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).
Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 10. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	106.424 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	125.813	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.514	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 12 cells (48.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .06.			

Table-11. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.417	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Relatives** and **Age** of respondents.

Table- 12. Crosstab: Relatives

Crosstab			Relatives					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	6	10	49	79	16	160
		% of Total	1.2%	2.0%	9.7%	15.6%	3.2%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	4	5	8	204	30	251
		% of Total	0.8%	1.0%	1.6%	40.2%	5.9%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	0	41	22	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.1%	4.3%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	2	0	13	2	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	2.6%	0.4%	3.4%
Total		Count	10	17	57	353	70	507
		% of Total	2.0%	3.4%	11.2%	69.6%	13.8%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 13.8% respondents strongly agreed, 69.6% respondents agreed, 11.2% respondents were neutral, 3.4% respondents disagreed and 2.0% respondents strongly disagreed that '**Relatives**' plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Most of the Respondents in the age group of 31-40 years accepted that their choice of destination is influenced by their relatives.


Table- 13. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	136.656 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	134.828	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	30.129	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 12 cells (48.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .32.			

Table-14. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures		
	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.461
N of Valid Cases	507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.		
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.		

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Members of the family** and **age of respondents**.

Table- 15. Crosstab: Members of the family

			Members of the family					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	4	18	93	34	11	160
		% of Total	0.8%	3.6%	18.3%	6.7%	2.2%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	3	6	48	165	29	251
		% of Total	0.6%	1.2%	9.5%	32.5%	5.7%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	2	0	61	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	12.0%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	0	16	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	2	2	0	13	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	2.6%	3.4%
Total		Count	7	26	145	199	130	507
		% of Total	1.4%	5.1%	28.6%	39.3%	25.6%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (Tourists), 25.6% respondents strongly agreed, 39.3% respondents agreed, 28.6% respondents were neutral, 5.1% respondents disagreed and 1.4% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘Members of the family’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism. Most of the Respondents in the age group of 31-40 years accepted that their choice of destination is influenced by their members of the family.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 16. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	414.149 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	394.582	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	154.809	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 12 cells (48.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .22.			

Table-17. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.671	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by spouse** and **age** of respondents.

Table- 18. Crosstab: Spouse

			Spouse					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	14	36	60	37	13	160
		% of Total	2.8%	7.1%	11.8%	7.3%	2.6%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	147	14	32	16	42	251
		% of Total	29.0%	2.8%	6.3%	3.2%	8.3%	49.5%

Santosh Pandey- **Factors of External Information Search influencing the choice of destination tourism: A study conducted in Northern Region of India**

	41-50 years	Count	4	0	0	0	59	63
		% of Total	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.6%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	0	16	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	0	4	0	13	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.6%	3.4%
Total	Count		165	50	96	53	143	507
	% of Total		32.5%	9.9%	18.9%	10.5%	28.2%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (Tourists), 28.2% respondents strongly agreed, 10.5% respondents agreed, 18.9% respondents were neutral, 9.9% respondents disagreed and 32.5% respondents strongly disagreed that spouse plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Table- 19. Chi-Square Tests


Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	405.619 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	399.488	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	54.831	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 8 cells (32.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.58.			

Table- 20. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.667	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level

of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Choice of Children** and **age** of respondents.

Table- 21. Crosstab: Choice of Children

Crosstab			Choice of Children					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	18	16	57	50	19	160
		% of Total	3.6%	3.2%	11.2%	9.9%	3.7%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	8	10	22	28	183	251
		% of Total	1.6%	2.0%	4.3%	5.5%	36.1%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	2	2	0	0	59	63
		% of Total	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	11.6%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	0	16	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	0	2	2	13	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.6%	3.4%
Total		Count	28	28	81	80	290	507
		% of Total	5.5%	5.5%	16.0%	15.8%	57.2%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (Tourists), 57.2% respondents strongly agreed, 15.8% respondents agreed, 16% respondents were neutral, 5.5% respondents disagreed and 5.5% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘Choice of Children’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table-22. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	212.878 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	249.058	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	91.297	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 10 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .88.			

Table- 23. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.544	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Female members of the family** and **age of respondents**.

Table- 24. Crosstab: Female members of the family

Crosstab								
			Female members of the family					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	4	42	36	53	25	160
		% of Total	0.8%	8.3%	7.1%	10.5%	4.9%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	3	8	38	25	177	251
		% of Total	0.6%	1.6%	7.5%	4.9%	34.9%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	2	0	6	55	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	10.8%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	0	16	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	2	0	2	0	13	17
		% of Total	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	2.6%	3.4%
Total		Count	9	52	76	84	286	507
		% of Total	1.8%	10.3%	15.0%	16.6%	56.4%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 56.4% respondents strongly agreed, 16.6% respondents agreed, 15% respondents were neutral, 10.3% respondents disagreed and 1.8% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘**Female members of the family**’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Table-25. Chi-Square Tests


Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	202.230 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	222.955	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	77.355	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		

a. 11 cells (44.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Table- 26. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.534	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Male members of the family** and **age** of respondents.

Table- 27. Crosstab: Male members of the family

Crosstab			Male members of the family					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	8	30	57	37	28	160
		% of Total	1.6%	5.9%	11.2%	7.3%	5.5%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	5	45	22	34	145	251
		% of Total	1.0%	8.9%	4.3%	6.7%	28.6%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	20	2	41	0	63
		% of Total	0.0%	3.9%	0.4%	8.1%	0.0%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	4	0	13	0	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	13	99	81	141	173	507
		% of Total	2.6%	19.5%	16.0%	27.8%	34.1%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 34.1% respondents strongly agreed, 27.8% respondents agreed, 16.0% respondents were neutral, 19.5% respondents disagreed and 2.6% respondents strongly disagreed that “**male members of the family**” plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.
H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).
Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 27. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	255.905 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	267.202	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.933	1	.087
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 10 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .41.			

Table-28. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.579	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between choice of destination influenced by Friends and age of respondents.

Table- 29. Crosstab: Friends

Crosstab								
			Friends					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	9	26	46	59	20	160
		% of Total	1.8%	5.1%	9.1%	11.6%	3.9%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	0	34	26	182	9	251
		% of Total	0.0%	6.7%	5.1%	35.9%	1.8%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	2	57	4	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	11.2%	0.8%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	4	0	13	0	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	9	64	74	327	33	507
		% of Total	1.8%	12.6%	14.6%	64.5%	6.5%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 6.5% respondents strongly agreed, 64.5% respondents agreed, 14.6% respondents were neutral, 12.6% respondents disagreed and 1.8% respondents strongly disagreed that **friends** plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 30. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	114.218 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	130.977	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	18.817	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 12 cells (48.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.			

Table-31. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
	Value	Approx. Sig.	
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.429	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Co-workers** and **age** of respondents.

Table-32. Crosstab: Co-workers

Crosstab								
			Co-workers					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	12	34	59	37	18	160
		% of Total	2.4%	6.7%	11.6%	7.3%	3.6%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	4	11	65	162	9	251
		% of Total	0.8%	2.2%	12.8%	32.0%	1.8%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	39	24	0	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	4.7%	0.0%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	16	0	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	2	0	15	0	0	17
		% of Total	0.4%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total	Count	18	45	194	223	27	507	
	% of Total	3.6%	8.9%	38.3%	44.0%	5.3%	100.0%	

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 5.3% respondents strongly agreed, 44% respondents agreed, 38.3% respondents were neutral, 8.9% respondents disagreed and 3.6% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘**Co-workers**’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Table- 33. Chi-Square Tests


Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	175.994 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	187.962	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.018	1	.893
N of Valid Cases	507		

a. 8 cells (32.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.

Table- 34. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.508	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Experience of my friends** and **age** of respondents.

Table- 35. Crosstab: Experience of my friends

Crosstab								
			Experience of my friends					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	12	38	45	49	16	160
		% of Total	2.4%	7.5%	8.9%	9.7%	3.2%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	6	28	29	161	27	251
		% of Total	1.2%	5.5%	5.7%	31.8%	5.3%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	2	37	24	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	7.3%	4.7%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	2	0	15	0	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	18	68	76	278	67	507
		% of Total	3.6%	13.4%	15.0%	54.8%	13.2%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 13.2% respondents strongly agreed, 54.8% respondents agreed, 15% respondents were neutral, 13.4% respondents disagreed and 3.6% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘**Experience of my friends**’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.
H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).
Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 40. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	133.854 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	143.900	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	48.846	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 9 cells (36.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.			

Table-41. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.457	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between choice of destination influenced by Experience of my relatives and age of respondents.

Table- 42. Crosstab: Experience of my relatives

Crosstab			Experience of my relatives					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	8	41	52	41	18	160
		% of Total	1.6%	8.1%	10.3%	8.1%	3.6%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	0	4	43	52	152	251
		% of Total	0.0%	0.8%	8.5%	10.3%	30.0%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	0	2	43	18	63
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	8.5%	3.6%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	0	0	16	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	0	2	0	13	2	17
		% of Total	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	2.6%	0.4%	3.4%
Total		Count	8	47	97	165	190	507
		% of Total	1.6%	9.3%	19.1%	32.5%	37.5%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 37.5% respondents strongly agreed, 32.5% respondents agreed, 19.1% respondents were neutral, 9.3% respondents disagreed and 1.6% respondents strongly disagreed that **‘Experience of my relatives’** plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).

Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Table- 43. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	262.732 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	270.548	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	47.016	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		

a. 9 cells (36.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .25.


Table- 44. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.584	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination influenced by Social networking sites** and **age** of respondents.

Table- 45. Crosstab: Social networking sites

Crosstab			Social networking sites					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	6	48	52	32	22	160
		% of Total	1.2%	9.5%	10.3%	6.3%	4.3%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	2	26	31	177	15	251
		% of Total	0.4%	5.1%	6.1%	34.9%	3.0%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	0	39	0	4	20	63
		% of Total	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.8%	3.9%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	0	16	0	0	0	16
		% of Total	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	2	13	2	0	0	17
		% of Total	0.4%	2.6%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total	Count	10	142	85	213	57	507	
	% of Total	2.0%	28.0%	16.8%	42.0%	11.2%	100.0%	

Interpretation & Findings: from the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 11.2% respondents strongly agreed, 42% respondents agreed, 16.8% respondents were neutral, 28% respondents disagreed and 2% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘**Social networking sites**’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.

H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).


Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)

Table-46. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	286.332 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	295.427	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	16.175	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 11 cells (44.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .32.			

Table-47. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.601	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			



Analysis: Association between **choice of destination** influenced by **Advertisements** and **age** of respondents.

Table-48. Crosstab: Advertisements

Crosstab			Advertisements					Total
			Strongly disagree	Disagree	Don't Know/Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
age	20-30 years	Count	5	34	66	39	16	160
		% of Total	1.0%	6.7%	13.0%	7.7%	3.2%	31.6%
	31-40 years	Count	11	10	55	160	15	251
		% of Total	2.2%	2.0%	10.8%	31.6%	3.0%	49.5%
	41-50 years	Count	37	2	0	6	18	63
		% of Total	7.3%	0.4%	0.0%	1.2%	3.6%	12.4%
	51-60 years	Count	16	0	0	0	0	16
		% of Total	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%
	More than 60 years	Count	15	2	0	0	0	17
		% of Total	3.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%
Total		Count	84	48	121	205	49	507
		% of Total	16.6%	9.5%	23.9%	40.4%	9.7%	100.0%

Interpretation & Findings: From the above crosstab, it can said that out of total 507 respondents (tourists), 9.7% respondents strongly agreed, 40.4% respondents agreed, 23.9% respondents were neutral, 9.5% respondents disagreed and 16.6% respondents strongly disagreed that ‘**Advertisements**’ plays role in decision making process of choice of destination for tourism.

H0: The two factors are independent.
H1: The two factors are not independent (associated).
Tool Used: Chi Square Test (Analyze → Descriptive Statistics → Crosstabs)


Table- 49. Chi-Square Tests

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	408.927 ^a	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	366.947	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	71.423	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	507		
a. 8 cells (32.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.51.			

Table- 50. Symmetric Measures

Symmetric Measures			
		Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.668	.000
N of Valid Cases		507	
a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.			
b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.			

Interpretation & Findings: From the table we find out that asymptotic significance for Pearson Chi Square comes out to be 0.000 (less than 0.05) so we **reject null hypothesis** at 5% level of significance. Hence it can be concluded that **two variables are associated**.



As our **Research Objective-2, Hypotheses-2** were-
Research Objective-2: To find out the association between the **Age** of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search.

Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-2: *There is association between the **Age** of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search*

Null Hypothesis (H0)-2: *There is no association between the **Age** of the tourists visiting North India and the factors that influence External Information Search.*

From the above findings, it can be concluded that researcher was able to find out the discrepancy gap between the perception of male tourists and female tourists visiting North India for the **factors that influence External Information Search.**

So, it can be said that our **Alternate Hypothesis (H1)-2** is **accepted** and our **Null Hypothesis (H0)-2** is **rejected**, hence it can be concluded that our **Research Objective-2** is **fulfilled**.

CONCLUSION & FINDINGS

Findings of T-test: External Information Search

Difference between the perception of males and females for the factors that influence external information.

- It can be seen that there is **no** significant difference between the males' perception and females' perception

for Social Networking Sites so we can say that there is **no** difference between perception of male tourists & Perception of female tourists.

- As the significance value in case of social networking sites is .166 when Equal variances assumed & .171 when Equal variances not assumed, it shows that the significant value is greater than .05, hence it can be said that there is no significant difference.
- So, it can be concluded that social networking sites influences the choice of destination equally in case of males and females.
- It can be seen from the above table that other factors have significant value less than .05, so, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the perception of males and perception of females for the following factors that influence external information search of males and females respectively.
 1. Word of mouth
 2. Relatives
 3. Members of the family
 4. Spouse
 5. Choice of Children
 6. Female members of the family
 7. Male members of the family
 8. Friends
 9. Co-workers
 10. Experience of my friends
 11. Experience of my relatives
 12. Advertisements

Findings of Chi Square Test: External Information Search

There is statistically significant association between Factors of External Information Search that influence the choice of tourism **destination** of the tourists that visited northern

region of India. Following were the factors of external information search-

- Word of mouth
- Choice of Children
- Female members of the family
- Male members of the family
- Friends
- Relatives
- Members of the family
- Spouse
- Experience of my friends
- Experience of my relatives
- Co-workers
- Social networking sites
- Advertisements

Tourists select Northern region of India mainly because of aforementioned factors that motivate them to visit.

There is statistically significant association between Factors of Internal Information Search that **influence the choice of tourism destination** of the tourists that visited northern region of India. Following were the factors of Internal Information Search-

- My previous experience
- My knowledge
- My Religious values
- My religion
- My belief & values
- My cultural and traditional values
- My Moral values

On the basis of the above findings of the study on 'External Information Search influencing tourists decision regarding choice of destination tourism in Northern region of India, it can be concluded that brand promotion of tourism destination must

be done in such a way so that tourists may recall it whenever they want, it means that' promotions should be so attractive that it could be recalled.

Indians are basically religious people, so spiritual destinations must be promoted as per the spiritual needs of tourists. Religious festivals and their dates or season must be emphasized upon.

The results of this empirical study on Northern region of India tourism brand promotion leads to the conclusion that Northern region of India tourism brand promotion measures are effective in positioning Northern region of India as a powerful tourism destination brand. This has been justified very well by the results of tourism brand image, tourism brand loyalty, tourism brand awareness and various tourism product attributes.

The brand promotion measures adopted by government and private entrepreneurs helped to transform the state into a powerful tourism destination brand. Tourists viewed Northern region of India as a destination with nature based attractions. This image may be developed due to the positioning of the state as a destination blessed by nature through the campaign 'spiritual country'. Northern region of India is considered as a safe destination with well-behaved hosts. The destination brand has the potential to evoke an emotional attachment among tourists. The positive brand image and brand loyalty towards Northern region of India tourism is influential in bringing more tourists to the destination.

5.1. RECOMMENDATIONS & MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The abovementioned findings and conclusion must be seen as opportunities in destination tourism sector in the changing situations, which also demand marketing plans by the concerned authorities to influence the external information

search of the tourists and to face them effectively & avail of the opportunities to its full potential. In short these specific issues of marketing strategy for northern region states are:

- A new market strategy is needed which must be driven by new ideas and with the tune of business environment;

- Efforts should also be taken to concentrate more on the untapped and unexplored potential of tourism sector like religious tourism. The major pilgrimage centres of Northern region of India must be developed and given publicity in order to promote pilgrim tourism. The practice of marketing and branding tourist destinations is becoming a widely recognized practice among tourism marketing organizations.

The findings of present research study have substantial implications on private, public and governmental sectors that manage the tourism operations in order to maximize the influence on external information search. The study provides useful primary data that can guide research students and supervise academics interested in tourism destination marketing.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "Annual Report 2009–10". Ministry of Tourism, Government of India.
- "India Tourism Statistics at a Glance". Market Research Division, Ministry of Tourism, Government of India.
- "Uttaranchal Tourism, Uttarakhand India Tourism, Uttaranchal Travel, Tourism In Uttaranchal, Adventure Trekking Tour Uttaranchal India, Trekking Wildlife Hill Station Tour Packages Uttaranchal India". Uttaranchaltourism.in.
- Altekar, Sadashiv, A. (1965). Education in Ancient India, Sixth, Varanasi: Nand Kishore & Bros.

- Ashworth, G., & Goodall, B. (1988). Tourist image: marketing considerations. In B. Goodall, & G. Ashworth (Eds.), *Marketing in the tourism industry: The promotion of destination regions* (pp. 213e238). London: Routledge.
- Bigné, J. E., Sánchez, M. I., & Sánchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behavior: inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, 22(6), 607e616.
- Blanke, J.; Chiesa, T, (2011). *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2011: Beyond the Downturn*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum. pp. 17, 66, 216.ISBN 978-92-95044-18-0.
- Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 97e116.
- Buhalis, D. (2001), *Tourism in Greece: Strategic Analysis and Challenges*, *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp.440-480
- Bureau of immigration, Govt. of India, for 2014-2015.
- Choi, K. S., Cho, W. H., Lee, S. H., Lee, H. J., and Kim, C. K. (2004). The Relationships among Quality, Value, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intention in Health Care Provider Choice: A South Korean Study. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(8), 913–921.
- Chopra, A. (2008). "Organ-transplant black market thrives in India". *The San Francisco Chronicle*.
- Choudhury, A.U. (2002). Survey of Mrs Hume's pheasant in North East India. Technical Report No. 5. The Rhino Foundation for Nature in NE India, Guwahati, India. 30pp. [Final report to the Oriental Bird Club, UK]
- Costa, J., and Ferrone, L. (1995), "Sociocultural Perspectives on Tourism Planning and evelopment",

International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 7, No. 7, pp. 27-35.

- Cronin, J. J., and Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), 55–68.
- Daniel, K., Tversky, A. (2000). Choice, Values, Frames. The Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0-521-62172-0.
- Das et al., (2007) Google news personalization: Scalable online collaborative filtering. Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW'07), 2007
- Hall, C. M., Butler, R. & 1998, 'Tourism and recreation in rural areas: Myth and reality', in D. Hall & J. O'Hanlon (eds), *Rural Tourism Management: Sustainable Options*, pp. 97-108, Scottish Agricultural College, Ayr.
- Hall, M. C. (2000). Tourism planning, policies, processes and relationships. England: Prentice Hall.
- Hu, Y and Ritchie B J R (1993), "Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual approach," *Journal of Travel Research*, fall, 25-34.
- India: How does Travel & Tourism compare to other sectors?" World Travel and Tourism Council.
- Inskeep, E. (1991). Tourism planning, an integrated and sustainable development approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- James Reason (1990). Human Error. Ashgate. ISBN 1-84014-104-2.
- Kepner, Charles H.; Tregoe, Benjamin B. (1965). The Rational Manager: A Systematic Approach to Problem Solving and Decision-Making. McGraw-Hill.
- Ko, T. G. 2005, 'Development of a tourism sustainability assessment procedure: A conceptual approach', *Tourism Management*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 431-445.

- Kutty, Ambalika D., and Himanshu K. (2007) "Too much info!" Monash Business Review 3.3 Academic OneFile. Web. 3 Mar. 2013.
- Manente, M. (2009), Destination management and economic background: defining and monitoring local tourist destination, *Enzo Paci Papers on Measuring the Economic Significance of Tourism*, Vol. 6, pp. 363 -384.
- McIntosh R and Goeldner C (1990) *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies* (6th ed.), New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ministry of tourism, Govt. of India, for 2016
- Moutinho, L. (1987), Consumer behavior in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21, 2-44.
- Ritchie, J. R. B. & Crouch, G. I. 2003, 'The competitive destination: A sustainability perspective', *Tourism Management*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1-7.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. and Zins, M. (1978). Culture as determinant of the attractiveness of a tourism region. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5 (2), 252-267.
- Ritchie, J.R.B. and Zins, M. (1978). Culture as determinant of the attractiveness of atourism region. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5 (2), 252-267.
- Ritchie, J.R.B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003), *The competitive destination: A sustainable tourism perspective*. Wallingford, UK: CABI Publishing.
- Rosenberg, L., Czepiel, J.A. (1984) *Marketing Approach to Customer Retention*. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 1 (2), 45–51.
- Ryan, C. 2005, 'Equity, management, power sharing and sustainability: Issues of the 'new tourism'', *Tourism Management*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 17-26.
- Schacter, Gilbert, Wegner (2011). *Psychology*. Worth. p. 369.
- Triantaphyllou, E. (2000). *Multi-Criteria Decision Making: A Comparative Study*. Dordrecht, the

Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers p. 320. ISBN 0-7923-6607-7.

- UNEP and UNWTO, 2005, A book titled 'Making Tourism More Sustainable'.
- UNWTO, 2005, A book titled 'Making Tourism More Sustainable'.
- Uysal, M., Hosany, S., Ekinci, Y., & (2000). Destination image and destination personality. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1 (1), 62e81.
- Zubeda, Hamid (2012); "The medical capital's place in history". *The Hindu*.