

# Satisfaction of Tourists Visiting major Destinations of Chhattisgarh

Abhishek Chakraborty<sup>1\*</sup> and Dr. Souren Sarkar<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Management, Bhilai Institute of Technology, Near Bhilai House, Durg-491001 C.G INDIA

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Management Studies, Shankaracharya Group of Institute, Bhilai C.G India

abhi2106@gmail.com

## Abstract

**Introduction** – The study is conducted to collect information about Satisfaction of Tourists visiting major Destinations of Chhattisgarh to identify the need of visitors and address them.

**Purpose** - The study aimed to analyze the requirement of standardization of tourism activity at Chhattisgarh.

**Design/Methodology/Approach** – Primary Data from respondents visiting various destination of Chhattisgarh has been gathered.

**Findings** - Results show that there is a huge gap and tourism activity has to upgrade to a level so that it may contribute towards economic reward & fortify society.

**Research Limitations/Implications** – Respondents were reluctant to answer the questionnaire.

**Keyword(s)** – Satisfaction, Tourism, Destination.

## I. INTRODUCTION

India has a lot of tourism resources to offer to the tourists of the world & thus tourism industry is flourishing in our country with strong credentials offering all types of tourism products becomes a strong reason to pull inbound tourist from different parts of the world (MRSS India, 2016) some strengths of our country regarding this are easy immigration procedures, fair usage of information technology to disseminate information, competitive pricing of tourism facilities thus tourism has grown but when state wise division is made Chhattisgarh contributes very less to the industry.

Chhattisgarh offers astonishing tourist destinations to its tourists that include ancient monuments, wildlife, ancient caves, waterfalls, Buddhist sites, palaces, rock paintings, unusual natural landscapes, lush green forests (Govt Of India) as the state is situated in the heart of India, is endowed with a rich cultural heritage and attractive natural diversity huge opportunity for tourism industry is there (Know India)

## II. LITERATURE

(IBEF, 2018) Presently in India Tourism accounts for 9.6 per cent of the GDP and in terms of foreign exchange earnings it is 3rd largest for the country & (UNWTO, 2017) is expected to reach 15.3 million by 2025 thus the strong momentum is expected to continue in the coming years a projection is made international tourist arrivals will grow in Asia and the Pacific by 5%-6% more all these projections are making tourism sector more demanding and a good avenue to make money by the investors for coming years (IBEF, 2018) direct contribution of travel and tourism to GDP is expected to reach US\$ 147.96 billion by 2027. Offering a diverse portfolio of niche

tourism products India is developing a large market for travel and tourism in the world. (IBEF, 2018) India ranked third among 184 countries in terms of travel & tourism's total contribution to GDP in 2016. (FEEs, 2017).

Tourism destination has been defined in various ways by different authors. (Gunn, 2002) it can be an area that contains a critical mass of development that has the potential to satisfy traveler needs. (Keller, 1998) Attraction can be the reason for a tourist for a particular place India due to its geographical and cultural diversity becomes one of the favorite destinations for the visitors. (Buhalis, 2000) A destination can also well thought-out to be a combination of tourism products that offering integration of different experiences to potential visitors.

### Tourism of India

(Ministry of Tourism, 2018) A blend of traditions, culture and vibrant geographies, India is a destination with Snow Mountains, sea coasts green forest, Places of spiritual & religious significance including many events making it a multicolored country destination capturing the heart of every tourist. (Govt Of India) There are 29 states and 7 Union territories in the country. Every state in the country contributes towards tourism & has some distinct feature to offer tourists and the visitors some states have developed tourism activity and some are at a developing phase.

Out of the 29 States Chhattisgarh (IBEF, 2018), came into being on November 1, 2000. Fortunate to have a low population density & fairly good literacy rate but as far as tourism as an industry is considered Chhattisgarh has a huge scope of development although few initiatives have been taken by the state Government like (MRSS India,

2016)combined expansion of particular tourism areas and constructivecollaboration between Government and Private Sector, infrastructural development & up gradation of available human resources,reinforcing the institutional machinery.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- I. **Sampling design and data collection** - The data has been collected from visitors visiting various destinations of Chhattisgarh.
- II. **Target population:** Sampling elements - tourists visiting Chhattisgarh.
- III. **Sampling units-** individuals (in the case of couples/families/groups, everyone in the group could be a sampling unit)
- IV. **Sampling frame** - Sampling is done at the from visitor visiting 15 important tourist destinations more than 200 samples were collected out of which 147 were valid for the study.
- V. **Sampling technique:** Convenience sampling from 147 respondents.
- VI. **Time frame:**November2017 to April2018,November –May being the tourist season in Chhattisgarh

#### Statement of the Problem

Chhattisgarh is situated in the heart of our country and is a state which is having abundance of natural beauty, Dense forest, historic monuments, spiritual & religious places but when we track the level of tourism activity we find something is stopping Tourism industry to flourish at Chhattisgarh. Thus it is necessary to find the possible problems related to development of tourism industry at Chhattisgarh.

#### Objectives of the study

1. To Identify the potential of different tourist destinations of Chhattisgarh.

2. To identify the opportunities to promote Chhattisgarh as tourist destination.
3. To assess the interventions for improving the quality and quantity of basic tourism infrastructure for prioritized tourism destinations.
4. To identify the overall satisfaction of tourist visiting different destinations of Chhattisgarh and suggest measures for increasing the pace of development.

#### Hypothesis

**H<sub>1</sub>:**There is significant difference in opinion of tourist at different tourist destinations.

**H<sub>2</sub>:**There is significant difference in popularity of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>3</sub>:**There is significant difference in Safety of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>4</sub>:**There is significant difference in ease of transportation of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>5</sub> :**There is significant difference in development of tourist places without harming natural resources of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>6</sub>:**There is significant difference in Climatic conditions of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>7</sub> :**There is significant difference in friendliness of local people of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>8</sub>:**There is significant difference variety of shopping possibilities of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>9</sub>:**There is significant difference general qualities of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>10</sub>:**There is significant difference in pricing policy of tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>11</sub>:**There is significant difference in staying worth at tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>12</sub>:**There is significant difference in overall satisfaction level of tourist destinations among tourists.

### Demographic Profile

Age wise Classification of Subject								
Age	Male		Female		Grand Total		Statistics	P-Value
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Range							Pearson Chi- square: 125.08	0.000
18-25	33	47.1	29	37.7	62	42.2		
26-40	14	20.0	19	24.7	33	22.4		
41-55	12	17.1	18	23.4	30	20.4		
Above 55	11	15.7	11	14.3	22	15.0		
Grand Total	70	100	77	100	147	100		

Table 1: Age Wise Classification of Subject

Classification on the basis of Income per Month of subjects								
Income per Month	Male		Female		Grand Total		Chi-Square Value	P-Value
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Below 10000	23	32.9	31	40.3	54	36.7	Pearson Chi-square: 112.2	0.000
10000-25000	26	37.1	19	24.7	45	30.6		
25000-50000	8	11.4	12	15.6	20	13.6		
50000-100000	13	18.6	15	19.5	28	19.0		
Grand Total	70	100	77	100	147	100		

Table 2: Classification on the basis of Income per Month of subjects

Classification on the basis of Occupation of subjects								
Occupation	Male		Female		Grand Total		Chi-Square Value	P-Value
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Self Business	24	34.3	15	19.5	39	26.5	Pearson Chi-square: 44.7	0.000
Service	41	58.6	27	35.1	68	46.3		
No-Job	5	7.1	35	45.5	40	27.2		
Grand Total	70	100	77	100	147	100		

Table 3: Classification on the basis of Occupation of subjects

**Age-Wise:** The 147 response obtained, their age-wise distribution is shown in table. In the age band 18-25, total 62 responded which accounts to 42.2% of the total sample with mean age of 21.67 years and standard deviation of 1.62. In the age band 26-40, total 33 people responded which accounts to 22.4% of the total sample with mean age of 30.96 years and standard deviation of 1.46. In the age band of 41-55 years, 30 responses achieved which are 20.4% of the total sample with mean age of 45 years with standard deviation of 3.32. In the last age group above 55 years have mean age of 57.18 years with standard deviation of 2.98. From this table it can be seen that test statistic is statistically significant: Pearson Chi-square = 125.08,  $p < .05$ . Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there are statistically significant differences in the age-band of the male and female respondents.

**Income Per month:** The 147 response obtained, their monthly income distribution is shown in table, having mean income of Rs. 8,424 for less than Rs. 10,000 per month which comprise of 36.7% of sample. In the income band 10,000-25,000, are having 45 respondents which accounts to 30.6% of the total sample. In the income band 25000-50000, 20 people responded which accounts to 13.6% of the total sample and for income range of 50,000 to 100000, 28 people responded which accounts for 19% of total sample. From this table it can be seen that test statistic is statistically significant: Pearson Chi-square= 112.2,  $p < .05$ . Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there are statistically significant differences in the income per month of the male and female respondents.

**Occupation:** Out of total response 26.5% (39) of the response is that they are retired and are currently have no job while 26.5% (39 out of 147) are having their own business and are busy with their business while 46.3% of the total respondents are in job or service. From this table it can be seen that test statistic is statistically significant: Pearson Chi-square=44.7,  $p < .05$ . Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there are statistically significant differences in the occupation of the male and female respondents.

Classification on the basis of places visited by tourists						
Tourist Place	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Achanak Marg	2	2.9		0.0	2	1.4

<b>Bhoramdeo Temple</b>	4	5.7	6	7.8	10	6.8
<b>Champaranya</b>	2	2.9	3	3.9	5	3.4
<b>Dhamtari</b>	2	2.9	1	1.3	3	2.0
<b>Dongargarh</b>	25	35.7	30	39.0	55	37.4
<b>Ghatarani, Jatmayi, amarkantak</b>	3	4.3	2	2.6	5	3.4
<b>GirodhpuriDham</b>	2	2.9	2	2.6	4	2.7
<b>Jagdapur</b>	7	10.0	11	14.3	18	12.2
<b>Kawardha</b>	1	1.4		0.0	1	0.7
<b>Mainpat</b>	7	10.0	6	7.8	13	8.8
<b>Manghata</b>		0.0	1	1.3	1	0.7
<b>Rajim</b>	3	4.3	6	7.8	9	6.1
<b>Ratanpur</b>	2	2.9	1	1.3	3	2.0
<b>Shirpur</b>	3	4.3	3	3.9	6	4.1
<b>Tirathgarh Water Fall</b>	7	10.0	5	6.5	12	8.2
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>100</b>

*Table 4: Classification on the basis of places visited by tourists*

The above table describes the various proportions of tourists at different tourist destination of state of Chhattisgarh. The collected data represents 15 different tourist destination of the state. The collected data shows difference in tourism of males and females according to their preferences.

**H<sub>1</sub>: There is significant difference in opinion of tourist at different tourist destinations.**

**Ranks**

	Tourist Places	N	Mean Rank
Tourist Opinion	AM	2	70.50
	BT	10	59.80
	CP	5	70.50
	DT	3	109.17
	DGG	55	79.98
	GJA	5	60.70
	GD	4	99.50
	JP	18	49.33
	KW	1	70.50
	MP	13	72.23
	MG	1	70.50
	RJ	9	76.44
	RP	3	109.17
	SP	6	68.08
	TWF	12	80.54
	Total	147	

*Table 5: Mean rank of tourist places*

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Tourist Opinion
Chi-Square	17.775
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.217

*Table 6: Chi-Square test statistics*

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Tourist Places

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.217), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in opinion of tourist at different tourist destinations.

**H<sub>2</sub>: There is significant difference in popularity of tourist destinations among tourists.**

**Ranks**

	Tourist Places	N	Mean Rank
Tourist Place Popularity	AM	2	44.25
	BT	10	50.95
	CP	5	69.90
	DT	3	52.17
	DGG	55	73.65
	GJA	5	81.30
	GD	4	96.50
	JP	18	63.78
	KW	1	68.00
	MP	13	90.65
	MG	1	68.00
	RJ	9	93.33
	RP	3	106.00
	SP	6	68.17
	TWF	12	75.13
Total		147	

*Table 7: Mean Rank of tourist places*

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Tourist Place Popularity
Chi-Square	14.781
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.393

*Table 8: Chi-Square test statistics*

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: Tourist Places

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.393), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in popularity of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>3</sub>: There is significant difference in Safety of tourist destinations among tourists.**

**Ranks**

	Tourist Places	N	Mean Rank
Safety	AM	2	84.00
	BT	10	83.30
	CP	5	83.50
	DT	3	100.17
	DGG	55	73.89
	GJA	5	113.10
	GD	4	96.13
	JP	18	61.25

KW	1	84.00
MP	13	70.23
MG	1	84.00
RJ	9	79.94
RP	3	83.17
SP	6	44.75
TWF	12	60.33
Total	147	

**Table 9: Mean rank of tourist places**

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Safety
Chi-Square	15.265
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.360

**Table 10: Chi-Square test statistics**

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.360), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in safety of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>4</sub>: There is significant difference in ease of transportation of tourist destinations among tourists. Ranks**

	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank
Ease of Transportation	AM	2	40.00
	BT	14	95.54
	CP	5	68.50
	DT	3	105.17
	DGG	57	70.82
	GJA	5	73.80
	GD	5	63.80
	JP	14	60.89
	KW	1	90.00
	MP	11	79.41
	MG	1	90.00
	RJ	13	75.50
	RP	2	40.00
	SP	8	84.69
	TWF	6	72.08
Total	147		

**Table 11: Mean rank of tourist places**

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Ease of Transportation
Chi-Square	12.112
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.597

**Table 12: Chi-Square test statistics**

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.597), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in ease of transportation of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>5</sub>: There is significant difference in development of tourist places without harming natural resources of tourist destinations among tourists.**

		Ranks		
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank	
Development of Tourist Facilities	AM	2	96.00	
	BT	10	59.75	
	CP	5	61.50	
	DT	3	69.00	
	DGG	55	77.07	
	GJA	5	104.70	
	GD	4	62.25	
	JP	18	57.28	
	KW	1	15.00	
	MP	13	74.81	
	MG	1	139.50	
	RJ	9	91.22	
	RP	3	69.00	
	SP	6	58.08	
	TWF	12	85.67	
Total		147		

*Table 13: Mean rank of tourist places*

		Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
		Development of Tourist Facilities	
Chi-Square			18.004
Df			14
Asymp. Sig.			.207

*Table 14: Chi-Square test statistics*

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.207), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in development of tourist places without harming natural resources of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>6</sub>: There is significant difference in Climatic conditions of tourist destinations among tourists.**

		Ranks		
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank	
Climatic Conditions	AM	2	52.75	
	BT	10	50.85	
	CP	5	87.20	
	DT	3	80.00	
	DGG	55	67.88	
	GJA	5	102.10	
	GD	4	88.88	
	JP	18	86.25	
	KW	1	80.50	

	MP	13	80.27
	MG	1	134.50
	RJ	9	65.89
	RP	3	37.17
	SP	6	66.75
	TWF	12	89.38
Total		147	

*Table 15: Mean Rank of tourist places*

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Climatic Conditions
Chi-Square	19.581
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.144

*Table 16: Chi-Square test statistics*

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.144), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in climatic conditions of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>7</sub>: There is significant difference in friendliness of local people of tourist destinations among tourists.**

**Ranks**

	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank
Friendliness of Local People	AM	2	82.00
	BT	10	68.55
	CP	5	71.10
	DT	3	57.50
	DGG	55	76.30
	GJA	5	81.40
	GD	4	89.38
	JP	18	60.75
	KW	1	82.00
	MP	13	81.77
	MG	1	29.00
	RJ	9	81.83
	RP	3	57.50
	SP	6	55.08
	TWF	12	86.04
Total		147	

*Table 17: Mean rank of tourist places*

**Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>**

	Friendliness of Local People
Chi-Square	9.133
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.822

*Table 18: Chi-Square test statistics*

a. Kruskal Wallis Test



b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.822), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in Friendliness of Local People of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>8</sub>: There is significant difference variety of shopping possibilities of tourist destinations among tourists.**

		Ranks		
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank	
variety of shopping possibilities	AM	2	49.50	
	BT	10	54.80	
	CP	5	73.30	
	DT	3	71.50	
	DGG	55	78.91	
	GJA	5	83.00	
	GD	4	72.63	
	JP	18	66.53	
	KW	1	5.50	
	MP	13	71.19	
	MG	1	71.50	
	RJ	9	93.83	
	RP	3	56.83	
	SP	6	38.50	
	TWF	12	96.54	
Total		147		

Table 19: Mean rank of tourist places

		variety of shopping possibilities
Chi-Square		18.454
Df		14
Asymp. Sig.		.187

Table 20: Chi-Square test statistics

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.187), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in variety of shopping possibilities of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>9</sub>: There is significant difference general qualities of tourist destinations among tourists.**

		Ranks		
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank	
General Qualities	AM	2	78.25	
	BT	10	70.45	
	CP	5	51.70	
	DT	3	120.83	
	DGG	55	77.07	
	GJA	5	91.30	
	GD	4	68.50	
	JP	18	63.81	
	KW	1	109.50	

MP	13	69.85
MG	1	47.00
RJ	9	77.39
RP	3	88.67
SP	6	53.67
TWF	12	77.42
Total	147	

Table 21: Mean rank of tourist places

Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
	General Qualities
Chi-Square	12.288
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.583

Table 22: Chi-Square test statistics

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.583), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in General Qualities of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>10</sub>: There is significant difference in pricing policy of tourist destinations among tourists.**

Ranks			
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank
Pricing Policy	AM	2	98.50
	BT	10	50.60
	CP	5	58.30
	DT	3	50.67
	DGG	55	76.55
	GJA	5	98.50
	GD	4	73.38
	JP	18	71.61
	KW	1	98.50
	MP	13	68.69
	MG	1	41.00
	RJ	9	82.56
	RP	3	60.17
	SP	6	72.92
	TWF	12	87.71
	Total	147	

Table 23: Mean rank of tourist places

Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
	Pricing Policy
Chi-Square	12.057
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.602

Table 23: Chi-Square test statistics

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.602), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in Pricing Policy of different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>11</sub>: There is significant difference in staying worth at tourist destinations among tourists.**

Ranks			
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank
Staying	AM	2	85.75
	BT	10	47.60
	CP	5	69.40
	DT	3	76.67
	DGG	55	70.84
	GJA	5	97.40
	GD	4	59.63
	JP	18	88.78
	KW	1	113.00
	MP	13	82.69
	MG	1	58.50
	RJ	9	67.67
	RP	3	113.00
	SP	6	40.58
	TWF	12	83.00
	Total	147	

Table 24: Mean rank of tourist places

Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
	VAR00002
Chi-Square	19.024
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.164

Table 24: Chi-Square test statistics

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

From the Kruskal Wallis test statistics, the p-value is greater than 0.05 (0.164), therefore at 95% confidence interval it can be concluded that there is no sufficient evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in staying worth at different tourist destinations among tourists.

**H<sub>12</sub>: There is significant difference in overall satisfaction level of tourist destinations among tourists.**

Ranks			
	TouristPlaces	N	Mean Rank
Overall Satisfaction Level	AM	2	85.00
	BT	10	64.55
	CP	5	73.10
	DT	3	65.17
	DGG	55	75.52
	GJA	5	106.00
	GD	4	68.38
	JP	18	63.89
	KW	1	85.00

MP	13	75.31
MG	1	85.00
RJ	9	76.28
RP	3	85.00
SP	6	65.75
TWF	12	75.79
Total	147	

**Table 23: Mean rank of tourist places**  
Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>

	Overall Satisfaction Level
Chi-Square	6.763
Df	14
Asymp. Sig.	.943

**Table 23: Chi-Square test statistics**

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: TouristPlaces

#### IV. FINDINGS

Tourism in Chhattisgarh is mainly driven by the youth in the age band of 18-25 years with respect to kind of destination. The respondents have visited around 15 tourist destinations in the state which includes temples, dense forest, and jungle safari to dams, of which Dongargarh was one of the favorite destinations as it includes pilgrimage with natural beauty while Jagdalpur water fall stood second best destinations. From the statistical analysis with 95% confidence interval, it was found that there was no significant difference in the opinion of tourists at different destinations in terms of facilities and convenience. It was found that the local people friendliness, climatic conditions, recreational facilities of all destinations were favorable for tourism.

#### V. CONCLUSIONS

The above study reveals the current tourism activity equal importance should be given for both new destinations development & responsible management of existing tourist destination. The concern areas were infrastructure, hotels, shopping facilities as well more scope for recreational facilities. The aim of the above study was to identify weak areas of destination management for achieving competitive position for generating economic benefits and sustain the destination proper planning and implementation is required. The study also shows that there is a huge difference in satisfaction level of tourist due to lack of tourism model to be implemented at ground level as to enhance the carrying capacity of a destination planning of infrastructure, super infrastructure and trained human resource is must and as a developing state tourism education must be provided so that scientific outlook for managing destination can be used to give maximum satisfaction to tourist.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Buhalis, D. D. (2000). *Marketing the competitive destination of the future*. 35 Marylebone Road london: www.scirp.org.
- [2] FEEs. (2017, April). Retrieved April 14, 2018, from <http://tourism.gov.in>: [http://tourism.gov.in/sites/default/files/Other/FEE\\_Press\\_Note\\_April\\_17.PDF](http://tourism.gov.in/sites/default/files/Other/FEE_Press_Note_April_17.PDF)
- [3] Govt Of India. (n.d.). Retrieved April 15, 2018, from Know India: <http://knowindia.gov.in>
- [4] Gunn, C. A. (2002). *Tourism planning : basics, concepts, cases*. Retrieved April 14, 2018, from <https://trove.nla.gov.au/work>
- [5] IBEF . (2018, March). Retrieved April 12, 2018, from India Brand Equity Foundation: <https://www.ibef.org/industry/indian-tourism-and-hospitality-industry-analysis-presentation>
- [6] Keller, K. L. (1998). *Strategic Brand Management*:. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- [7] Know India. (n.d.). <http://knowindia.gov.in/states-uts/chhattisgarh.php>. Retrieved April 17, 2018, from <https://india.gov.in/>: <http://knowindia.gov.in/states-uts/chhattisgarh.php>
- [8] Ministry of Tourism. (2018, April 13). Retrieved April 14, 2018, from Ministry of Tourism: <http://tourism.gov.in/>
- [9] MRSS India. (2016, April). *India Inbound Tapping the Power Packed Growth Engine*. Retrieved April 17, 2018, from [samanda.syiem@ficcicom.com](mailto:samanda.syiem@ficcicom.com).
- [10] UNWTO . (2017). *United Nations World Tourism Organisation*. Retrieved april 18, 2018, from UNWTO: [http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/annual\\_report\\_2016\\_web\\_0.pdf](http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/annual_report_2016_web_0.pdf)
- [11] World Atlas . (n.d.). Retrieved april 15, 2018, from World Atlas: <https://www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/asia/in.htm>