

TOURIST SATISFACTION IN THE TRANS-HIMALAYAN REGION: EXPLORING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TOURISTS

Ghulam MUSTAFA

*Research Scholar, Department of Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India
mustafaecoju@gmail.com*

Aroon SHARMA

*Professor, Department of Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India,
aroonju1@gmail.com*

Abstract

Ladakh has emerged as one of the most popular adventure tourism destinations in India during the last few years. The total number of tourist arrivals far exceeds the local population. The tourism-related services and facilities play a dominant role while selecting a destination for their vacation. The satisfaction survey about the quality of tourism services and facilities available to tourists such as accommodation, quality and variety of cuisines, local transportation, public facilities, shopping facilities, health services, trekking and rafting, the behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots and overall value of money at the destination was carried out. Their demographic, socio-economic, and travel characteristics of visitors were also collected. The study has analyzed the relationship of satisfaction of sample tourists towards tourism-related services and facilities in Leh district using cross-tabulation. Chi-square test was used to know whether there is any significant relationship between the type of tourists and the services and facilities that were availed during their stay in Leh district. This study is relevant for tourism stakeholders as it provides valuable information to identify differences among foreign and domestic tourists about services and facilities which eventually may support greater understanding for improving tourism products and services.

Keywords: *Tourism destination, tourism facilities, tourists' satisfaction, tourists' perceptions*

JEL Classification: *L83, Z32.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, the travel and tourism sector has emerged as the main driving force in the economic growth of many countries in the world. The governments in developing countries perceived tourism as an important means to stimulate economic growth (Tosun, 1998). Bond and Ladman (1972) argued that the tourism industry is very desirable for many developing and underdeveloped countries because it is labour-intensive and capital saving in nature. The most immediate or direct impacts of tourism development in any area are the creation of income and employment opportunities, an increase in the standard of living, infrastructure development, improve the local economy, tax revenue, benefits small business, increases the cost of living, etc. Singh and Tantray (2017) notes that the tourism industry not only creates substantial-high multiplier effects but also improves the inter-sectoral linkages in the economy. Khalil, Kakar, Waliullah, and Malik (2007) notes that the development of tourism generally been considered a positive contribution to economic growth. Singh and Unjum (2016) argued that tourism has now become a major industry of the Indian economy, contributing significantly to foreign exchange

earnings and helping as a potential generator of employment opportunities.

Ladakh has fascinated many travelers, visitors, and explorers from far off lands since ancient times (Jina, 2004). Ladakh has been known by several names such as 'Mar Yul' (the low land); 'Mang Yul' (the land of snow). The great Chinese traveler, Fa-Hien who visited Ladakh in 400 A.D. called it, 'Kie Cha' (Bora, 2004). Leh district of Ladakh region has emerged as one of the most popular destinations for both domestic and foreign tourists in India. It offers a wide range of experiences including adventure, recreational, spiritual, and nature-based tourism. Tourism is the most dominant economic activity in Leh district. The tourism industry in Leh is booming due to the increase in the number of tourist arrivals both domestic and foreign. Leh district was opened to tourism only in the year 1974 by the Government of India. Since then it has become an important tourist destination for both foreign and domestic tourists. Since 1974 as many as 798039 foreign tourists and 1370473 domestic tourists have visited Leh. The tourist numbers have multiplied by more than five times in the last decade, mainly due to an increasing share of domestic tourists visiting Leh. The number of tourist infrastructure including hotels, guesthouses, and restaurants have also increased at a

rapid pace. Tourism has become a tool for the economic development of the region. Michaud (1996) argued that tourism presented an economic alternative to the loss of the caravan trade in Leh. Ladakh has enormous tourist resources. Ladakh is a land of contrasts and has the most fascinating natural environment. It possesses natural beauty like glaciers, sand dunes, rivers, high altitude lakes. The region offers different types of tourist attractions such as trekking routes, adventurous sports like rock climbing, mountaineering, and river rafting (Mustafa & Sharma, 2019).

Tourist satisfaction is strongly affected by the service quality, perception, and experience of tourism destinations they visited. The tourism industry in Ladakh has the potential to grow and is likely to play an important role in the economic development of the region. Against this backdrop, this research is intended to respond to the developments of the tourism environment in Leh district. A care understanding of tourist perception would enable tourism destination planners to better fulfill tourist needs and wants to the destination accordingly. The focus of this research is to investigate the tourist satisfaction of domestic and foreign tourists towards existing services and facilities in Leh and to explore the interrelationship between them.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Tourist satisfaction has long been a focal point in tourism research. Therefore understanding tourist satisfaction is of extreme importance for the tourism industry for its long term success of the destination. Tourist's overall view of a specific location is normally defined as the destination image (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). Tourist satisfaction brings benefits for key stakeholders including the industry, the visitors, and the local communities (Wang, 2016). Oliver (1997) defined satisfaction as the consumers' overall affective response to product use. Satisfaction is determined by a combination of consumer expectations, perceived value and quality, and actual experience (Wang, 2016). In the service industry, quality is the necessity to satisfy the consumers (Wood, 1991).

Tourist satisfaction is mainly defined as an individual emotional state after experiencing the trip (Baker and Crompton, 2000). It depends on the collective satisfaction of various things, where the role of each participant is vital (Corte, Sciarelli, Cascella & Gaudio, 2015). The satisfaction of the trip is essential in the success of tourist business and it must be constantly checked during the evaluation of the visitor to the destination because satisfaction is the basis for tourist loyalty (Tornow & Wiley, 1991). The quality of the service is evaluated by visitors according to factors such as comfort, friendliness, security, cleanliness,

accommodation, transportation, and infrastructure (Castro, Quisimalin, Pablos, Gancino & Jerez, 2017). Tourist satisfaction depends on the overall holiday experience related to the satisfaction of tourists' needs with respect to destination attributes important for tourists.

Tourist satisfaction is a clear measure of how well the tourism-related products and services are doing in relation to a set of customer requirements. Tourist satisfaction is critical because it has an effect on visitor's next destination choice (Ahmed, 1991; Fuch & Weiermair, 2004), consumption of goods and services, and a choice to revisit a given destination (Stevens, 1992). Tourist satisfaction becomes an important variable for recommending the destination (Silaban, Pasaribu, & Silalaho, 2019). Tourist satisfaction provides the faithfulness to a destination by re-visits in the future and also enhances positive word-of-mouth toward that particular destination. Studies find that there is a significant relationship between a destination image, tourist satisfaction, revisit intention, and word-of-mouth toward a destination (Fornell, 1992). Thus ensuring tourist satisfaction is very important to the long term success of the destination because it encourages them to revisit the destination. The satisfied tourists also tell their relatives and friends, providing free advertisement and helping promote increase travel to the destination. On the contrary, unsatisfied tourists will generate negative word-of-mouth.

Empirical Studies on Tourist Satisfaction

Tourist satisfaction studies with regard to the destination are very important to understand the level of satisfaction among tourists. It helps to identify the drivers of satisfaction and causes of dissatisfaction with various tourism-related products and services. These studies help to formulate policies related to future tourism development in the region or destination. It is measured using both qualitative and quantitative methods and it has been examined in various empirical studies. Naidoo, Munhurrin, and Ladsawut (2010) carried out a study with Mauritius as a holiday destination. The study found that out of 18 destination attributes 13 attributes were positively disconfirmed and the highest occurred with shopping, spa, and cultural and historical sites. Whereas 5 destination attributes the quality of hotels, reasonable price, peaceful environment, attractive beaches and sunny and warm weather were negatively disconfirmed as they fall below the expectation of tourists. Corte, Sciarelli, Cascella, and Gaudio (2015) investigated how destination attributes and services affect tourist satisfaction. The study has used 14 tourist satisfaction indicators and found that tourists visiting Naples are not completely satisfied confirming that it has not a clear destination image.

Hussain and Kumar (2015) investigated how destination image works toward tourist satisfaction by exploring the difference between local and foreign tourists. The study found that local tourists use to get travel information from their personal network and they enjoy shopping, whereas foreign tourists enjoy the diversity and culture of the city. Both categories of tourists highlighted public transportation as a major issue. Aliman, Hashim, Wahid, and Harudin (2016) investigated the antecedents of tourist satisfaction among visitors to Langkawi Island in Malaysia. They found that tourists were mostly satisfied with their visits to the island. They also found that destination image, tourist expectations, costs and risks, and social security have a positive and significant influence on tourist satisfaction. Gaki, Kostopoulou, Parisi, and Lagos (2016) using quantitative methods had investigated the satisfaction of tourists visiting the Ionian Islands in Greece. The research results showed that tourists travelling in groups, and those travelling for leisure purposes, to explore new places, to meet new people are more satisfied. They also found that value for money is one of the most important factors affecting the overall assessment of satisfaction and loyalty and that there is a positive relationship between loyalty and satisfaction. Ghose and Johann (2018) examined what motivate tourists to feel satisfied with their trip and what motivates them to make recommendations to others to visit Poland. The study found that hotels, restaurants and meals, the atmosphere of their stay and nature affected their satisfaction but did not affect the likelihood of making recommendations to others. Herle (2018) assessed the image of destination as perceived by tourists who have visited and which aspects related to a destination have the greatest impact on their satisfaction and loyalty. The study found that destinations comfort, tourist attractions and accommodation and food services have a significant influence on the satisfaction and loyalty of tourists towards a destination whereas the study also found that infrastructure and transport, as well as destination's discomfort, appeared not to be a determining factor for Romanian tourist in forming the overall image of the destination. Silaban, Pasaribu, and

Silalaho (2019) in their study showed that accommodation and destination have positively and significantly affected tourist satisfaction.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is done using the quantitative method. The primary data is collected using a self-administered questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale to collect responses from tourists both foreign and domestic regarding the tourism-related services and facilities in Leh district. The sample of the study consisted of foreign and domestic tourists visiting Leh-Ladakh, India. The self-administered questionnaire was designed based upon extensive review of literature. There are two main sections, (1) socio-demographic and travel characteristics of tourists; (2) tourist satisfaction regarding various tourism services and facilities that were available in the research area. The number of respondents selected for the study was based on the Non-Probability Convenience Sampling technique. A total of 150 questionnaires were distributed to tourists both foreign and domestic, out of which 100 were domestic and 50 were foreign tourists. The most important objective of the study was to collect information about the quality of tourism products and services available to tourists at the destination. For that, the respondents were asked to rate their experience on a five-point Likert scale with 5 as 'very satisfied' and 1 as 'very dissatisfied'. Tourists were asked to rate their experience across ten chosen dimensions. SPSS 20.0 was employed to produce desired results.

IV. FINDINGS

This section provides the outcome of research as resulted from the primary data collected using the questionnaire. This section is divided into two parts; the first part presents the results of respondents demographic, socio-economic and travel characteristics are examined. The second part presents a further analysis of the satisfaction survey.

Socio-Demographic and Travel Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1: Respondent's Profile

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
	Nationality	
Domestic	100	66.67
Foreign	50	33.33
Total	150	100.00
	Gender	
Male	94	62.67
Female	56	37.33
Total	150	100.00

Journal of tourism

[Issue 30]

Age		
20-29	16	10.67
30-39	73	48.67
40-49	37	24.67
50-59	24	16.00
Total	150	100.00
Marital Status		
Married	55	36.67
Unmarried	95	63.33
Total	150	100.00
Educational Status		
Up to matriculation	1	0.67
Higher secondary	15	10.00
Graduate	87	58.00
Postgraduate and above	47	31.33
Total	150	100.00
Occupational Status		
Student/Researcher	24	16.00
Public Sector	26	17.33
Private Sector	42	28.00
Self Employed	57	38.00
Other	1	0.67
Total	150	100.00
Annual Income Level (INR)		
Up to 3 lakhs	49	32.67
3 to 6 lakhs	36	24.00
6 to 10 lakhs	29	19.33
10 lakhs and above	36	24.00
Total	150	100.00
Purpose of Visit		
Adventure	76	50.67
Recreation	44	29.33
Religious and Cultural	8	5.33
Business	9	6.00
Research	8	5.33
Other	5	3.33
Total	150	100.00
Source of Information		
Friends and Families	72	48.00
Social Media and Internet	50	33.33
Books, Newspapers, and Magazines	19	12.67
Tourism Advertisement	9	6.00
Total	150	100.00
Mode of Transport		
Flight	105	70.00
Bus/Taxi	24	16.00
Own vehicle	7	4.67
Motorcycle	14	9.33
Total	150	100.00
Nature of Companions		
Alone	29	19.33
With family members	38	25.33

With friends	63	42.00
With co-workers	12	8.00
With groups	8	5.33
Total	150	100.00
Nature of Tour		
Organized/Packaged tour	57	38.00
Semi organized tour	45	30.00
Self-guided tour	48	32.00
Total	150	100.00
Length of Stay		
Up to 5 days	29	19.33
6 to 10 days	70	46.67
11 to 15 days	32	21.33
More than one month	19	12.67
Total	150	100.00

Source: Primary Survey

Table 1 reveals that among sample respondents 100 tourists were foreigners and 50 were domestic tourists. It was found that the majority of the respondents 78% were males and 22% were females. As for the distribution of age is concerned, the 30-39 age group was the main dominant group, which constitutes up to 48.67% of the total number for both foreign and domestic tourists. The marital status of the respondents revealed that the majority of the tourists were unmarried, which accounts for up to 63.33% of the total tourists. In the case of education level, 58% of tourists had graduate degree qualifications, however, only one respondent had an education level of up to matriculation. The results indicate that tourists were well educated. In the case of occupational level, most of the tourists were self-employed (38%), followed by (28%) respondents work in the private sector. The number of respondents who work in the public sector accounts for (17.33%, however, 16% of the respondents were either students or researchers. In the case of Annual income level, (32.67%) respondents had an annual income level of up to 3 lakhs INR, (24%) of the respondents had higher income level of more than 10 lakhs and above. In the case of purpose of visit, half of the respondents (50.67%) visited Leh district for adventure activities, followed by (29.33%) of the respondents visited for recreation. However, the fewer number of respondents visited for business (6.00%) and research purposes (5.33%). In the case of Source of information, 48% of the respondents

get to know about the destination from friends and families, followed by social media and the internet which accounts for 33.33%. However, only 6% of the respondents get to know about Leh from tourism advertisements. In the case of the mode of transport, the majority of the tourists (70%) preferred flight to reach Leh, while only 4.67% of the respondents had used their own vehicle to reach the destination. In the case of the nature of companions, 42% and 25.33% of the respondents visited Leh with friends and with family members respectively. 19.33% of the respondents visited alone. In the case of the nature of the tour, 38% of the respondents had organized tour and 30% had a semi-organized tour. While 32% of the respondents did not use the services of any tour or travel operator, their nature of tour was self-guided. In the case of the length of stay, 19.33% of the respondents had a length of stay up to 5 days, 46.67% of tourists had a length of stay between 6 to 10 days. 21.33% had a length of stay between 11 to 15 days. Whereas 12.67% had length os stay of more than one month.

Tourists' Satisfaction

This section provides a statistical analysis of the data collected. More specifically cross-tabulation and Chi-square tests are used to examine the relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards services and facilities that they availed during their stay in Leh district. The table that follows summarizes the results.

Table 2: Nationality of Tourists * Accommodation services and facilities Cross tabulation

		Accommodation services and facilities					Total
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied	
Domestic	Count	8	14	11	49	18	100
	% of total	5.3%	9.3%	7.3%	32.7%	12.0%	66.7%

Nationality of tourists	Foreign	Count	7	7	6	21	9	50
		% of total	4.7%	4.7%	4.0%	14.0%	6.0%	33.3%
Total		Count	15	21	17	70	27	150
		% of total	10.0%	14.0%	11.3%	46.7%	18.0%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 2 shows the opinion of sample tourists toward accommodation facilities. Among the domestic tourists, 49 (32.7%) were satisfied with accommodation facilities, 18 (12.0%) were very satisfied, 14 (9.3%) were dissatisfied, 8 (5.3%) were very dissatisfied, and 11 (7.3%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists 21 (14.0%) were satisfied, 9 (6.0%) were very satisfied, 7 (4.7%) were dissatisfied, 7 (4.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 6 (4.0%) were of no opinion.

Table 3: Nationality of Tourists * Quality and Variety of Cuisines Cross tabulation

		Quality and variety of cuisines					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	6	14	11	55	14	100
		% of total	4.0%	9.3%	7.3%	36.7%	9.3%	66.7%
Nationality of tourists	Foreign	Count	10	5	4	26	5	50
		% of total	6.7%	3.3%	2.7%	17.3%	3.3%	33.3%
Total		Count	16	19	15	81	19	150
		% of total	10.7%	12.7%	10.0%	54.0%	12.7%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 3 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards quality and variety of cuisines. Among the domestic tourists, 55(36.7%) were satisfied, 14(9.3%) were very satisfied, 14(9.3%) were dissatisfied, 6(4.0%) were very dissatisfied, and 11(7.3%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 26(17.3%) were satisfied, 5(3.3%) were very satisfied, 5(3.3%) were dissatisfied, 10(6.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 4(2.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 4: Nationality of Tourists * Local Transportation Cross tabulation

		Local Transportation					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	0	6	27	53	14	100
		% of total	0.0%	4.0%	18.0%	35.3%	9.3%	66.7%
Nationality of tourists	Foreign	Count	0	10	4	30	6	50
		% of total	0.0%	6.7%	2.7%	20.0%	4.0%	33.3%
Total		Count	0	16	31	83	20	150
		% of total	0.0%	10.7%	20.7%	55.3%	13.3%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 4 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards local transportation. Among the domestic tourists, 53(35.3%) were satisfied, 14(9.3%) were very satisfied, 6(4.0%) were dissatisfied, and 27(18.0%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 30(20.0%) were satisfied, 6(4.0%) were very satisfied, 10(6.7%) were dissatisfied, and 4(2.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 5: Nationality of Tourists * Public facilities Cross tabulation

		Public facilities					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	19	41	10	30	0	100
		% of total	12.7%	27.3%	6.7%	20.0%	0.0%	66.7%
	Foreign	Count	10	20	10	10	0	50
		% of total	6.7%	13.3%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Total	Count	29	61	20	40	0	150	
	% of total	19.3%	40.7%	13.3%	26.7%	0.0%	100.0 %	

Source: Primary Survey

Table 5 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the public facilities. Among the domestic tourists, 30(20.0%) were satisfied, 41(27.3%) were dissatisfied, 19(12.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 10(6.7%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 10(6.7%) were satisfied, 20(13.3%) were dissatisfied, 10(6.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 10(6.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 6: Nationality of Tourists * Shopping facilities Cross tabulation

		Shopping facilities					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	5	3	23	50	19	100
		% of total	3.3%	2.0%	15.3%	33.3%	12.7%	66.7%
	Foreign	Count	3	12	8	25	2	50
		% of total	2.0%	8.0%	5.3%	16.7%	1.3%	33.3%
Total	Count	8	15	31	75	21	150	
	% of total	5.3%	10.0%	20.7%	50.0%	14.0%	100.0 %	

Source: Primary Survey

Table 6 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the shopping facilities. Among the domestic tourists, 50(33.3%) were satisfied, 19(12.7%) were very satisfied, 3(2.0%) were dissatisfied, 5(3.3%) were very dissatisfied, and 23(15.3%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 25(16.7%) were satisfied, 2(1.3%) were very satisfied, 12(8.0%) were dissatisfied, 3(2.0%) were very dissatisfied, and 8(5.3%) were of no opinion.

Table 7: Nationality of Tourists * Availability of Health services Cross tabulation

		Health services					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	5	9	47	28	11	100
		% of total	3.3%	6.0%	31.3%	18.7%	7.3%	66.7%
	Foreign	Count	10	6	13	16	5	50
		% of total	6.7%	4.0%	8.7%	10.7%	3.3%	33.3%
Total	Count	15	15	60	44	16	150	
	% of total	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%	29.3%	10.7%	100.0 %	

Source: Primary Survey

Table 7 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the availability of health services. Among the domestic tourists, 28(18.7%) were satisfied, 11(7.3%) were very satisfied, 9(6.0%) were dissatisfied, 5(3.3%) were very

dissatisfied, and 47(31.3%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 16(10.7%) were satisfied, 5(3.3%) were very satisfied, 6(4.0%) were dissatisfied, 10(6.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 13(8.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 8: Nationality of Tourists * Trekking and Rafting Cross tabulation

		Trekking and Rafting					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	0	9	49	32	10	100
		% of total	0.0%	6.0%	32.7%	21.3%	6.7%	66.7%
	Foreign	Count	0	8	17	20	5	50
		% of total	0.0%	5.3%	11.3%	13.3%	3.3%	33.3%
Total		Count	0	17	66	52	15	150
		% of total	0.0%	11.3%	44.0%	34.7%	10.0%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 8 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards trekking and rafting. Among the domestic tourists, 32(21.3%) were satisfied, 10(6.7%) were very satisfied, 9(6.0%) were dissatisfied, and 49(32.7%) were of no

opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 20(13.3%) were satisfied, 5(3.3%) were very satisfied, 8(5.3%) were dissatisfied, and 17(11.3%) were of no opinion.

Table 9: Nationality of Tourists * Behaviour of Local Population Cross tabulation

		Behaviour of Local Population					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Nationality of tourists	Domestic	Count	0	1	11	52	36	100
		% of total	0.0%	.7%	7.3%	34.7%	24.0%	66.7%
	Foreign	Count	0	14	4	23	9	50
		% of total	0.0%	9.3%	2.7%	15.3%	6.0%	33.3%
Total		Count	0	15	15	75	45	150
		% of total	0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	50.0%	30.0%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 9 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the behaviour of the local population. Among the domestic tourists, 52(34.7%) were satisfied, 36(24.0%) were very satisfied, 1(0.7%) were dissatisfied, and 11(7.3%) were

of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 23(15.3%) were satisfied, 9(6.0%) were very satisfied, 14(9.3%) were dissatisfied, and 4(2.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 10: Nationality of Tourists * Cleanliness of tourist spots Cross tabulation

		Cleanliness of tourist spots					Total	
		Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied		
Domestic		Count	5	3	12	48	32	100
		% of total	3.3%	2.0%	8.0%	32.0%	21.3%	66.7%
		Count	10	12	4	21	3	50

Journal of tourism

[Issue 30]

Nationality of tourists	Foreign	% of total	6.7%	8.0%	2.7%	14.0%	2.0%	33.3%
			Count	15	15	16	69	35
Total		% of total	10.0%	10.0%	10.7%	46.0%	23.3%	100.0%

Source: Primary Survey

Table 10 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the cleanliness of tourist spots. Among the domestic tourists 48(32.0%) were satisfied, 32(21.3%) were very satisfied, 3(2.0%) were dissatisfied, 5(3.3%) were very dissatisfied, and 12(8.0%) were of no opinion. Among

the foreign tourists 21(14.0%) were satisfied, 3(2.0%) were very satisfied, 12(8.0%) were dissatisfied, 10(6.7%) were very dissatisfied, and 4(2.7%) were of no opinion.

Table 11: Nationality of Tourists * Overall value of money Cross tabulation

Nationality of tourists			Overall value of money					Total
			Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Can't say	Satisfied	Very satisfied	
			Domestic	Count	0	13	7	
	% of total	0.0%	8.7%	4.7%	24.7%	28.7%	66.7%	
Foreign	Count	0	3	8	26	13	50	
	% of total	0.0%	2.0%	5.3%	17.3%	8.7%	33.3%	
Total	Count	0	16	15	63	56	150	
	% of total	0.0%	10.7%	10.0%	42.0%	37.3%	100.0%	

Source: Primary Survey

Discussion on Tourist Satisfaction

Table 11 shows the opinion of sample tourists towards the overall value for money. Among the domestic tourists, 37(24.70%) were satisfied, 43(28.7%) were very satisfied, 13(8.7%) were dissatisfied, and 7(4.7%) were of no opinion. Among the foreign tourists, 26(17.3%) were satisfied, 13(8.7%) were very satisfied, 3(2.0%) were dissatisfied, and 8(5.3%) were of no opinion.

Table 12: Test results of the research hypothesis

SNo	Hypothesis	Pearson Chi-Square	Degrees of freedom	Asymp. Sig (2-side)	Test Result
H1	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards accommodation services and facilities.	1.579	4	.812	Accepted
H2	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards quality and variety of cuisines.	7.323	4	.120	Accepted
H3	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards local transportation.	12.343	3	.006	Rejected
H4	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards public facilities.	3.775	3	.287	Accepted
H5	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards shopping facilities.	20.910	4	.000	Rejected

H6	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards health services.	11.688	4	.020	Rejected
H7	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards trekking and rafting facilities.	3.761	3	.288	Accepted
H8	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards the behaviour of the local population.	28.440	3	.000	Rejected
H9	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards the cleanliness of tourist spots.	32.618	4	.000	Rejected
H10	There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards the overall value of money.	8.597	3	.035	Rejected

Source: Primary Survey

Discussion on Research Hypothesis

Chi-square test is used to know whether there is any relationship with satisfaction regarding accommodation, quality, and variety of cuisines, local transportation, public facilities, shopping facilities, health services, and trekking and rafting, behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots, overall value for money, and the type of tourists in Leh district.

Hypothesis Testing: There is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards accommodation, quality and variety of cuisines, local transportation, public facilities, shopping facilities, health services, trekking and rafting, behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots, and overall value for money.

It can be seen from Table 12 that the asymp. Sig (2 – sided) or p-value is greater than 0.05 in the case of accommodation facilities, quality and variety of cuisines, public facilities, and trekking and rafting. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted and concluded that there is no significant relationship between the type of tourists and the accommodation facilities, quality and variety of cuisines, public facilities, and trekking and rafting.

It can also be seen from table 12 that the asymp. Sig (2 – sided) or p-value is less than 0.05 in the case of local transportation, shopping facilities, health services, behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots, and overall value for money. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that there is a significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards local transportation, shopping facilities, health services, behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots, and overall value for money.

V. CONCLUSION

Out of the 150 tourists surveyed in this study, the majority of the sample tourists were satisfied with the Accommodation facilities, Quality, and variety of Cuisines, Local transportation, Easy accessibility to the area, Shopping facilities, Trekking and Rafting facilities, Behaviour of local population, Cleanliness of tourist spots and Overall value for money. However, the opinion of sample tourists also showed that the Public facilities in Leh are very poor. The opinion of sample tourists towards the availability of Health services showed that domestic tourists were more satisfied than foreign tourists towards Health facilities in Leh. The findings from the chi-square value showed that there is no significant relationship between the type of tourists towards and the services and facilities like accommodation facilities, quality and variety of cuisines, public facilities, trekking and rafting facilities. However, the findings from the chi-square value also showed that there is a significant relationship between the type of tourists and their satisfaction towards local transportation, shopping facilities, health services, behaviour of the local population, cleanliness of tourist spots, and overall value for money

There is a positive growth of tourist arrivals in Leh district. However, the majority of the tourists in the satisfaction survey revealed that the public facilities were not good at Leh. Therefore, the government should actively participate in developing basic infrastructures such as roads, internet, drinking water, toilet facilities, and all other basic amenities in all tourist destinations within Leh. The findings of the study revealed that most of the tourists are satisfied with the existing trekking and rafting facilities. The benefits from tourism must reach

every region in Leh district, and the local government must ensure sustainable and equitable tourism development. The new trekking routes must be identified

so that the poor and the marginal families in far-off villages can benefit from tourism by working as tourist guides and by running homestays.

VI. REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, Z. U. (1991). The influence of the components of a state's tourist image on product positioning strategy. *Tourism Management*, 12(4), 331–340.
2. Aliman, N. K., Hashim, S. M., Wahid, S. D. M., & Harudin, S. (2016). Tourists' satisfaction with a destination: An investigation on visitors to Langkawi Island. *British Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(5), 1–20.
3. Baker, D. A., & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 785–804.
4. Bond, M. E., & Ladman, J. R. (1972). Tourism : A strategy for development. *Nebraska Journal of Economics and Business*, 11(1), 37–52.
5. Bora, N. (2004). *Ladakh Society and Economy*. Anamika Publishers & Distributors (P) Ltd., 4697/3, 21A, Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi 110002.
6. Castro, J.C., Quisimalin, M., de Pablos, C., Gancino, V., & Jerez, J. (2017). Tourism Marketing: Measuring Tourist Satisfaction. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 10, 280–308. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jssm.2017.103023>
7. Corte, V. D., Sciarelli, M., Cascella, C., & Gaudio, G. D. (2015). Customer Satisfaction in Tourist Destination: The Case of Tourism Offer in the City of Naples. *Journal of Investment and Management*, 4(1-1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.11648/jjim.s.2015040101.16>
8. Fakaye, P.C., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time and repeat visitors to the lower Rio Grande valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 10–16.
9. Fornell, C. (1992). National customer satisfaction barometer: The Swedish experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 6–21.
10. Fuchs, M., & Weiermair, K. (2004). Destination benchmarking: An indicator-system's potential for exploring guest satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3), 212–225.
11. Gaki, E., Kostopoulou, S., Parisi, E. D., & Lagos, D. G. (2016). Tourism : The ealuation of tourism satisfaction in Island destinations: The case of the Ionian Islands of Greece, 56th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Cities & Regions: Smart, Sustainable, and Inclusive?" 23-26 August 2016, Vienna, Austria, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve.
12. Ghose, S., & Johann, M. (2018). Measuring tourist satisfaction with destination attributes. *Journal of Management and Financial Sciences*, 11(34), 9–22.
13. Herle, F. A. (2018). The impact of destination image on tourists' satisfaction and loyalty in the context of domestic tourism. *Marketing from Information to Decision Journal*, 1(2), 14–26.
14. Hussain, K., & Kumar, J. (2015). Destination perception and loyalty: Exploring the difference between Local and Foreign Tourists. *Journal of Tourism*, 16(2), 27–42.
15. Jina, P. S. (2004). *Famous Western Explorers to Ladakh*. M.L. Gidwani Indus Publishing Company FS-5, Tagore Garden. New Delhi 110027.
16. Khalil, S., Kakar, M. K., Waliullah., & Malik, A. (2007). Role of tourism in economic growth: Empirical evidence from Pakistan economy. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 46(4), 985–995. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41261208>
17. Michaud, J. (1996). A historical account of modern social change in Ladakh (Indian Kashmir) with special attention paid to tourism.
18. Mustafa, G., & Sharma, A. (2019). Residents' perceptions towards impacts of tourism development in the Trans-Himalayan region of Leh-Ladakh, India. *Tourism Innovations: A Journal of Indian Tourism and Hospitality Congress (ITHC)*, 9(2), 7–13.
19. Naidoo, P., Munhurrin, P. R., & Ladsawut, J. (2010). Tourist satisfaction with Mauritius as a holiday destination. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 4(2), 113–123.
20. Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioural perspective on the consumer*. New York: McGraw Hill.
21. Silaban, P. H., Pasaribu, A., & Silalahi, A. D. K. (2019). The influence of human aspect of accommodation and destination on tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering*, 8(7), 985–995.
22. Singh, K., & Unjum, I. (2016). Tourism in Jammu and Kashmir economy: Role and performance. *Journal of Economic & Social Development*, 12(2), 112–123.
23. Singh, S., & Tantray, M. A. (2017). Bussiness opportunities in Jammu and Kashmir tourism. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 5(6), 135–140.
24. Stevens, B. F. (1992). Price value perceptions of travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(2), 44–48.
25. Tornow, W. W., & Wiley, J. W. (1991). Service quality and management practices: A look at employe attitudes, customer satisfaction, and bottom-line consequences. *Human Resource Planning*.
26. Tosun, C. (1998). Roots of unsustainable tourism development at the local level: The case of Urgup in Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 19(6), 595–610.
27. Wang, Y. (2016). "More Important Than Ever: Measuring Tourist Satisfaction." Griffith Institute for Tourism Research Report No. 10.
28. Wood, S. B. (1991). *Using Service to Outperform the Competition*, New Jersey. Bank Marketing.