ABSTRACT

This paper aims at identifying the influence of different information sources in image management of Indian destinations. Six different information sources namely, word-of-mouth, tourism department publications like travel brochure, PR effort in print media, and in electronic media, professional sources (like tour operators etc.) and cognitive wisdom of the tourists are examined. The influences of these information sources are tested for a few segments of tourists based on certain common segmentation variables like origin, age, benefit sought and exposure of the travelers. It is observed that often-neglected source of information - cognitive wisdom (of the tourist) plays the most prominent role in shaping the image about a destination. On the other hand, it is seen that one of the most debated communication mediums in services marketing -the referral affects image formation process the least. The influences of almost all the information sources across various segments are found to be significantly different. It is concluded that the influence of the tourism department publications are highly correlated with the other information sources (except for word-of-mouth).
Introduction

Destination marketers have been trying to catch the consumers’ leisure time and disposable income relentlessly. Interestingly, unlike other products and services there is nothing urgent or emergency (under normal circumstances) about a holiday. Therefore, the panacea of leisure marketing lies, among others, in promoting and communicating the image of the product, mainly that of the destination. Importance of image in creating acceptability among the target market has been acknowledged by many researchers including Gunn (1972), Chon (1990), Echtner and Ritchie (1991), Stabler (1988), Gallarza, Saura and Gracia (2002), Chacko (1997), Chen and Uysal (2002), and Sarma (2003). Chon had examined a set of 23 papers and concluded that destination image plays crucial role in travelers’ purchase related decision making. Pike (2002) reported 142 literatures related to destination image, which indicate the present day researchers’ interest on destination image building and management.

Conceptual Framework:

In recent times destination management is gaining increasing attention from National Tourism Organisations (NTOs) (Kotler et al. 2004). It is also acknowledged that image management is a very important area of overall destination management. The concept of image management consists of building and maintenance of external image of a destination. The image of a destination may be tourist segment specific. This in turn facilitates the destination’s positioning and thereby reduce the risk elements for the prospective travellers, specially for those who are visiting the destination for the first time (Kamra, 1997). Image management helps a destination manager in lengthening the maturity phase and initiation of rejuvenation (both crucial stages of the destination life cycle) of a destination (Butler, 1980; Gilbert, 1990; Andriotis, 2001). Creation of new images and subsequent switching among these also provide the marketers with the discretion of choosing target market(s) (Baum, 1998). Pike (2002), and Murphy (1999) have reported that studies on destination image suggest successful achievement of the goal of matching the needs of the target groups with the physical features actually present in destination. Obviously, this can be done through mediums of communication those serve as the sources of information for the tourists.

The Sources of Information:

Image of a destination is a pure cognitive state of mind, and is not necessarily a readymade one for all visitors (though marketers will always insist upon having such built in packaged formulation). Many prospective visitors may have to formulate the image about a
destination for the first time during the decision making process. On the other hand those who subscribe to a packaged image would like to reconfirm, and if need be reformulate it. In any case, image formation is a nonessential pre-visit (pre-purchase) exercise the prospects go through. Fodness and Murray (1997) in their study of leisure tourist segmentation have identified a number of information sources trusted by the tourists while forming image of a destination. These sources, in fact, act as tools which facilitate image formation. Such communication mediums include brochures, guidebooks, local tourist offices, travel guides, travel agents, magazines, newspapers, friends and relatives, and personal experiences. In another study in 1999 the same authors have identified seven information search clusters. These include pre-purchase mix (heavy use of wide variety of contributory sources), tourist bureau, personal experience, ongoing (Magazine and newspaper), on site (referrals from informal sources), automobile clubs and travel agency. Klenosky and Gitelson (1998) also have reported many “formal” and “informal” information sources capable of affecting the tourists’ perceptions. According to them the common unique continuum (that influences images of a destination) plays a vital role in the recommendation process of the travel agents.

Pearce, Morrison et al. (1996) used many information sources in their study of clustering visitors to Queensland. These include Government run travel centres, travel agents, referrals, travel guides and books. On the other hand Stefanou (2000) and Markwick (2001) discussed at length the role of postcards as a communication medium in relation to image of Greece and Malta respectively. Smith and Gregory (2000) also analysed the influence of information sources like recommendation from friends and family, and signs and billboard on short duration (e.g., weekend) visitors. Sung, Morrison, and O’Leary (2000) have pointed out the effectiveness of various information sources like specialised guide-books, web page, videotapes/CDs in reaching adventure travelers. In another study Vogt and Fesenmaier (1998) established significant relationship among many broad level information needs of the tourists and different segmentation variables like age, income, and other socio-dynamic factors. They concluded that information sources play significantly important roles in fulfilling “aesthetic” needs, which include the need for an image of a destination too. In yet another study it is reported that the tourists from diverse cultural background use different information sources while evaluating different destinations (Gursoy and Umbreit; 2004). Bieger and Laesser (2004) have very recently used a variety of information sources in their study on source process model using data from “Travel Market Switzerland 2001”. The study was a bid to measure the relative importance of these sources of information with relation to different group of tourists. The importance of these sources in decision making has been
measured using a 4 point “Likert-type” scale. The list includes destination information brochure, regional information brochure, hotel listing, tour operator brochure, oral information sources like retailer/agency, railway station, tourist information at destination, NTOs at Switzerland, advertisement in newspapers and magazines, travel guidebooks, video, CD-ROM, DVD, trade fair, radio/TV broadcast, video text, internet, friends and relatives and others.

Cognitive Wisdom: Almost all the sources discussed above are external in nature, wherein the tourists look for more accurate and specific physical information regarding a destination. However, few authors (Fodness and Murray, 1997; Vogt and Fesenmaier, 1998; Gursoy and Umbreit, 2004) have suggested that the initial information processing starts with the internal knowledge base of the tourist. Internal knowledge is defined as decision relevant information stored in an individual’s long-term memory (feelings, experiences etc.) (Crotts, 1998). Internal source may provide enough input to the tourist that might help generating certain image of the destination. Images based on this information source would sneak into the tourist’s mind without any active effort (like directed fact search) from his/her end. This may be a result of learning experience of the tourists over the years, and the sources of such learning may be one’s long term exposure to external communication received from the destination marketer, one’s past experience in similar and nearby destination, and referrals. This internal information source may be called cognitive wisdom of the tourist. Social psychologists have defined wisdom to be the “pinnacle” of successful human development because it comprises such positive qualities as ego, integrity and maturity, judgement and interpersonal skills, and an exceptional understanding of life (Clayton, 1982; Erikson, 1963; 1964; Erikson, Erikson and Kivnick, 1986 as cited by Ardelt, 2000). According to Kunzmann and Baltes (2003) wisdom involves both general knowledge about human nature that transcends a given cultural context and historical period, and more specific knowledge about variations in the meaning and conduct. The cognitive component of wisdom refers to the ability to see the truth, that is to perceive reality as it is and not as one wants it to be (Hart, 1987; Maslow, 1970 as in Ardelt, 2000). Thus cognitive wisdom can be defined as the understanding of life (in this case the destination) derived from general knowledge, personal experience etc. which can help the tourists in gaining truth specific knowledge about a perceived reality.

Considering the role it plays in image building and thus in decision making cognitive wisdom may be treated as an important tourist information source. Interestingly, the results of the Pilot Survey (which is described below) conducted for this study revealed the existence of
this factor. Gunn's (1988, as cited by Therkelsen, 2003) "organic image" is formulated through such cognitive wisdom of the tourists. In fact, influencing cognitive wisdom is the ultimate long-term objective of the PR efforts of the destination marketers. Obviously, cognitive wisdom cannot be manipulated in the short run. Images formed thus are very difficult to be changed or rebuilt and as such this source may play an important role in the context of the study.

It would, at this juncture, be prudent to discuss a few points about the Indian tourism in general and tourism communication in India in particular. India, though larger in size and richer in touristic offerings than many leading tourist destinations, is responsible for only less than 1% of the total tourism receipt (Sarma, 2003) generated in the world. India received only around 3.91 million tourists in the year 2005 (Foreign Tourist Arrivals, 2005) compared to a global arrival of 808 million (Radhakrishnan, 2006). It is worth mentioning that the communication network used by the average traveler in India has been limited to the traditional information sources. The Internet connectivity is still considerably minimal. Hence, the marketers heavily rely upon PR in print and electronic media, printed brochures, fliers, post cards, and formal and informal referrals. Apart from these, a recently developed trend in the country has been the extensive use of the tourism distribution channel, i.e., the tour and travel operators and agents. Ironically enough, the Indian tourism industry traditionally has not been accustomed in using advertisements unlike their counterparts elsewhere in the globe. Therefore, the visitors are not used to receive messages through advertisements. Thus the effects of advertisement are not studied separately in the present work. Of course, such effects, if any, have automatically been measured along with the information sources described above.

Sources of Information considered for this Study: A pilot survey among 50 respondents was conducted to verify the data collection instrument, which was prepared based on the extant literature. The instrument basically wanted to measure the influence of the information sources in forming perception about the destination in a 10-point scale. The author was present himself while these 50 interviews were conducted. Minor changes in language of the questions were made based of the feedback. It is found from the Pilot Survey that destination perception is based also on the general knowledge of the respondents apart from the sources described above. Hence a new information source was incorporated in the final research instrument. Thus a cluster of six information sources was selected to study their impacts on tourists' perception on a destination. These are- informal referrals (like word-of-mouth); official tourism publications (like travel brochures); other publications aimed at
tourists in print media (like magazines and newspapers); information available in electronic media (in media like TV/Radio); professional sources (like tour operator/travel agent); and cognitive wisdom at the disposal of the tourist.

**Research Questions:**

It is imperative to study the level of importance the tourists assign to each of this information for their effective manipulation for strategic destination management. This is necessary also because different segments of tourists may not depend equally on each of these sources. As noted above, studies around the globe have been conducted for understanding the segment-wise information search behaviour of the tourists. However, such works in the Indian context are missing. Therefore, a separate empirical work with respect to India was felt necessary. As it is already mentioned that Indian marketers have been using traditional medium of communication, the studies done elsewhere may not reflect the actual scenario prevalent in India.

Thus pertinent research questions may be "How important is the role of these information sources for image management of Indian destination?", "Does each of the sources influence the perception of the tourists equally?", "Do the effects vary from tourist to tourists?" To elicit the answers to such questions the following objectives were set for the present study.

**Objectives:**

This paper aims at studying the influences of different information sources in relation to destination image among the visitors to Indian destinations. In order to achieve this objective the study endeavours to identify the information sources having significantly different effects against four discrete groups (as shown in table 2) of tourists.

The paper also tries to derive the interrelationship among the six information sources as a secondary objective.

**Methodology followed**

To study the impact of communication through various information sources a sample survey was conducted among 505 tourists visiting different Indian destinations. Tourists or prospective tourists, both domestic and foreign origins (either of these) and persons above the age of 18 years were considered as the primary elements for the sample survey. The minimum age limit is chosen to ensure selection of mature individual as sample. Individuals were treated as the Sampling Units as the existence of groups was not considered as an
important point for the purpose of the study. Whole of India, particularly Shimla (n=65), Manali (n=43) and Panaji (Goa) (n=184), the most visited tourist places of the country, and Assam (n=213) are treated as the extent of the survey. Shimla, Manali and Panaji were selected as the nodal points to collect responses on the basis of their sheer capability to attract all kinds of tourists- from different regions of the country and from throughout the globe. Getting a tourist to answer the questionnaire was relatively easy in these places as the visitors have more time to spare in such locations, compared to their very busy schedules in other places like the cities-which they visit just for transit purposes. Assam is where the study is originated and hence it is cost effective to sample visiting tourists in Assam. No other method was employed to filter samples. Finding a reliable sampling frame of all elements of the population was impossible simply because of the fact that the tourists are a moving lot and hence no stationary base is available to register them. Also the study objectives do not necessarily need a definite frame of the population. So, a sampling frame is not identified in this survey. As the study is exploratory and a sampling frame cannot be defined, no probabilistic method of sampling can be employed. Therefore, an improvised non-probabilistic convenience method with judgement is used as the basic method for selection of samples. The samples were selected on the spot. However, care was taken to include respondents belonging to cross-section of the demography of tourists. The respondents were asked to identify the importance to each of the six information sources while developing perceptions (images) about a destination. This was measured in a 10-point interval scale, 0 being the least influential and 9 the most influential information source. The questionnaire is prepared specifically for this survey, with items taken from the literature survey as referred to above. Reliability analysis of the items returned a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.8025, where Hotelling’s T-squared test suggests that the item mean scores are different from each other (hypothesis is rejected at $\alpha=0.05$). Both the statistics confirm that the scales are reliable.

In order to achieve the first and the major objective of the study the following general hypothesis is formulated.

Roles the information sources play in destination image formation are independent of classification categories of the tourists. That is, irrespective of the class of the tourists the influences of the six information sources are equal.

To test this, tourists are grouped as per the scheme shown in Table 2 and four individual hypotheses are formulated in order to measure the effects of the media types at the segment level.
Some other sub hypotheses are also formulated as and when felt necessary for achieving the overall objectives and these are explained in the analysis part.

**Analysis:**

The responses from the sample survey were analysed using SPSS 11.0 and some important results are reported in this paper. The mean scores of the preferences against the media types without using any classification category are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 indicates that tourists visiting Indian destinations rely mostly on their cognitive wisdom, while informal referrals (word-of-mouth) and information from tourism department are given the least importance.

Media influence may be different on different tourist segments (Fodness and Murray, 1997; Klenosky and Gitelson, 1998; Vogt and Fesenmaier, 1998; Gursoy and Umbreit, 2004), and to study such distinct behaviour in Indian context a segment-wise analysis is offered below.

**Bases for Segmentation:** Various classification categories can be used to segment the tourists, and then to study the interrelationship, if any, among these tourist groups and their dependence on information sources. Many authors have studied the segmentation criteria of the tourist market. Demographic characteristics like age has been the favourite segmentation variable for many tourism researchers. Calantone and Johar (1984), Gitelson and Kerstetter (1990), Bonn, Furr and Uysal (1992), Yoon and Shafer (1996), Kozak and Rimmington (2000) (as cited by Smith and Gregory, 2000) have advocated age as one of the most important variables for segmentation of tourists. On the other hand, benefit sought by the travelers has also been quite extensively used by various researchers for segmentation purposes. For example, Crompton (1979) emphasised that benefit segmentation focuses on tourist motivation, which has always been portrayed as critical variable in destination marketing process. Frochot and Morrison (2000) has identified and discussed implication of many research models using benefit segmentation. Mathéison and Wall (1982), and Pearce (1982) had also used a classification variable based on the benefits looked for by the tourists. Thus it is natural to group the tourists by age, and sought benefits (motivation). Another
obvious and popular classification category for differentiating tourists has been the place of origin (geographic variable). The tourists here may be divided into two distinct groups: domestic and foreign travelers. Yet another important segmentation criterion may be the exposure level of the tourists. It is expected that if a tourist is highly traveled he will be making decisions with ease compared to a tourist who seldom come out from the comfort of his surroundings. Researches have shown that as the exposure level builds up the tourists become more sensitive to certain decision criteria (Sarma, 2004). Table 2 depicts the segmentation scheme used here to study the impact of various information sources on tourists.

Having identified the bases, the segments may now be tested for significantly different influence from different information sources. For this purpose four hypotheses are proposed to be tested. These are described below.

The first hypothesis is related to the influence of the information sources on segments based on origin of the tourist. This hypothesis tests the belief that the information sources are having equal influence on Indian and non-Indian tourist groups. If there remain significantly distinct effects on different media types for Indian and Non Indian tourists this hypothesis is to be rejected.

\[ H_{01} : \text{The impacts of different information sources on destination image building are not significantly different based on origin of the tourists.} \]

For testing this, \( H_{01} \) may further be divided into six specific hypotheses, which would examine the difference of mean scores for both the segments against different information sources.

The sub hypotheses can be expressed in mathematical terms as follows.

\[ H_{01a} : \mu_{\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{\text{Foreign}} \quad \text{1(a)} \]

Where, \( \mu_{a} \) indicates the population mean of the score for word-of-mouth
\( H_{01b}: \mu_{b\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{b\text{Foreign}} \quad I(b) \)

Where, \( \mu_b \) indicates the population mean of the score for Tourism Department Publication

\( H_{01c}: \mu_{c\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{c\text{Foreign}} \quad I(c) \)

Where, \( \mu_c \) indicates the population mean of the score for Print Media.

\( H_{01d}: \mu_{d\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{d\text{Foreign}} \quad I(d) \)

Where, \( \mu_d \) indicates the population mean of the score for Electronic Media.

\( H_{01e}: \mu_{e\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{e\text{Foreign}} \quad I(e) \)

Where, \( \mu_e \) indicates the population mean of the score for Professional Source.

\( H_{01f}: \mu_{f\text{Domestic}} = \mu_{f\text{Foreign}} \quad I(f) \)

Where, \( \mu_f \) indicates the population mean of the score for Cognitive Wisdom.

The resultant values are shown in Table 3.

As seen from the Table, all individual hypotheses may be rejected at \( \alpha = 0.05 \), and hence the overall hypothesis \( H_{01} \) is rejected. It is, therefore, concluded that the influence of media is different for different segments based on origin of the tourists. Descriptive statistics show that the mean scores of non-Indian travelers on various information sources range from 6.2 to 7.7, while the same is from 5.2 to 6.9 for Indian travelers. This clearly indicates that Indian travelers are less influenced by these media. However, for both the segments cognitive wisdom of the respondent registers the highest influence.

Age of the target segment might be crucial for the marketers while choosing the media portfolio. The tourists are divided into three distinct age groups, namely, between 18
and 25 years of age, between 25 and 50, and more than 50 years. Following hypothesis is formulated for testing the belief.

\[ H_{02}: \text{The influence of different information sources on the tourists is indifferent to their age.} \]

The mathematical versions of the hypotheses have not been shown here for fear of repetition.

One-way ANOVA is to be used as the segments based on age exceed two. The descriptive statistics show that the mean scores across different age groups against the six information sources do not differ much. However, the ANOVA will confirm whether these differences are really insignificant. The test results are shown in Table 4.

| Table 4 |

It is evident from the Table that the null hypothesis for equality of mean scores across various age groups can be rejected (at \( \alpha = 0.05 \)) for all information sources other than word-of-mouth. The descriptive statistics indicate that the oldest group of tourists (above 50 years of age) is least influenced by professional sources, while the youngest one (between 18 and 25 years of age) attaches minimal significance to tourism department publications. However, the middle-aged segment is least affected by word-of-mouth. In all the cases cognitive wisdom of the tourists plays the most important role.

The influence of media vehicles might also differ based on inner motives of the tourists. Hypothesis \( H_{03} \) is tested for determining this. As discussed above the tourists are divided into six distinct categories and the present hypothesis intends to test the belief that information sources are equally effective for all these six segments.

\[ H_{03}: \text{Influence of information sources for image building is not related to the benefit sought by the tourists during the tour.} \]

This hypothesis is likely to test the influence of information sources across various benefit segments of the tourist. ANOVA test results along with the descriptive statistics are shown in Table 5 below.

| Table 5 |
It is seen that information sources other than word-of-mouth have registered significant difference (at $\alpha=0.05$) of mean scores across the benefit segments. Cognitive wisdom has scored the highest average influence for all segments except for conservationists. It is also evident from the Table that explorers are highly influenced by the information sources, while the group mass tourist is least affected by these. This may be given due weightage while profiling the segments.

As pointed out earlier the experience of travel may play an important role in image creation for a destination. Such experience and reliance on information sources might have a positive relationship and hence the following hypothesis is tested.

$H_{04}$: The impact of information sources is indifferent to the exposure level of the tourist.

Experience helps the travelers move upward in the learning curve, and hence the travelers’ dependence on different media type may differ based on such exposure level. ANOVA test results are shown in Table 6 It is seen from the test results that $H_{04}$ may be rejected at $\alpha$ value 0.05 for the information sources except for word-of-mouth. Thus it can be concluded that the affects of different media in image building is different for the exposure segments. It is evident from the Column A of Table 6 that the naïve travelers are shy of using any of the information sources for image processing.

**Interrelationship among the information sources:**

The information sources, on the other hand, may not be independent of each other. In other words, one information source might affect some others, and thus the collective influence of such interrelated sources are delivered to the tourists. The present media types for touristic information are tested with correlation analysis to ascertain the relationship(s) among them, if any. The data gathered for the segment-wise analyses are used here also. The following correlation matrix was resulted from the data.

It is distinct from the correlation matrix shown in Table 7 that the informal source of “word-of-mouth” is not related to any of the other five media types discussed here. This might confirm the belief that “word-of-mouth” being a part of post consumption behaviour (positive or negative referrals are generated only after experiencing a visit) does not
significantly effect the influences of any other source of information. This implies its independent nature. However, the same is not seen for other information sources considered here. Interestingly, Tourism Department Publications registers high correlation with other four types of media. Its’ coefficient of correlation is seen to be the highest with recommendation of professional source. It is, however, not clear from this study whether influence of professional source in destination image formation is dependent on tourism department publication or vice-versa. High correlation is also seen between professional source and electronic media. The relationship among the two important media types of today’s world -- the print and the electronic media is easily understood and as expected they are having high correlation. These two information sources have positive and moderate relationship with the recommendation of professional sources. Of course, common sense would endorse the view that more the exposure of a destination in such media more would be the interest generated by the professional travel industry, and thus the recommendation rate might increase.

With this correlation analysis we may formulate an exploratory causal loop diagram as a model. However, this model is subject to refinement and the present study may not be sufficient to prove all the relational aspects shown in here. The loop diagram is depicted in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

**Conclusion:**
Discussion above suggests that the travelers have a distinct preference towards the information sources, and the effects of all these types of media are different. Informal referrals or the word-of-mouth, however, is found to have insignificant effects across various groups of travelers indicating equal attention from all types of tourists. Cognitive wisdom is the most influential information source for almost all groups of tourists visiting Indian destination. This observation is important because it (cognitive wisdom) cannot be manipulated over a short period of time and hence short-term strategies may not work for destination image management. It is also observed that the foreign visitors to India are more influenced by this media than their Indian counterparts. The tourists across the age groups are having almost the same preferences, but the oldest group is least influenced by the professional sources. However, on the other hand, the benefit group ”Explorer” depends more
on professional sources. Overall influence of information sources as a whole on "Mass Tourist" is relatively low compared to other benefit groups, while for “Missionaries” the effects are almost same. In all, the “Holidaymakers” are highly sensitive to the information sources. Government tourism department publications like travel brochures are the least preferred information source for destination perception development across the benefit segments. It is also seen that the least experienced travelers are least affected by the information sources. As the experience of travel increases the influence of media is also found to be increasing across the groups. Segment-wise, tourism department does not affect naïve travelers much, while the highly traveled tourists are not much influenced by referrals.

The marketers must offer adequate importance to the hitherto unnoticed source of information – cognitive wisdom, which is found out to be the most influential image builder for a destination. The destination promoters should judiciously direct its campaigns towards achieving an advantageous passive knowledge among the target groups.

Referrals, often treated as the most crucial promotional tools in services marketing, have proved to have singular effects, which are not significantly related to any of the other five information sources. This is in expected line, as the referrals are generated by experiences of earlier travelers. However, the high level of correlation between tourism department publications and other four sources is interesting to note, and this is, perhaps, the indicator of the influence of the publications from NTOs (National Tourism Organisations) in ultimate opinion building in the industry. If this is true, then the role of NTOs is very crucial, and it confirms earlier findings that the onus for macro level marketing including the positioning of a destination (Sarma, 2003) is with the NTOs.

**Limitations:**

This study suffers from a few limitations. All these are related to the scope of the study. Firstly, the Internet is excluded from the study, and hence the effects of Internet on tourists’ perception have not been discussed in this work. Moreover, this paper explores only a few segmentation variables, which may not be sufficient for a large potential market. However, while selecting the segmentation variables proper care is taken to include the widely used ones. Another important limitation of the study is the consideration of image of a destination as the only influencing criteria. Thus the influence of the information sources at different stages of decision making (for selecting a place for visit) has not been taken into
consideration. Presumably, the image formation process precedes such decision. The strategies to manipulate different information sources are also not covered in this study. Further research may be commissioned to study such strategies so as to help in manipulating the information sources towards attaining a desired image be created among targeted tourists. The study on interrelationship between different information sources is only exploratory in nature and other tools like System Dynamics Modeling might offer greater understanding of the macro level effects of such relationship.
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Table 1: Mean scores on information sources without using any category classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information sources (Scores range from 0 to 9)</th>
<th>Word of Mouth</th>
<th>Tourism Department Publications</th>
<th>Other Print Publication</th>
<th>Electronic media TV/Radio</th>
<th>Professional Source</th>
<th>Cognitive Wisdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Segmentation of Tourist Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Segmentation base</th>
<th>Different segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographic Origin Age</td>
<td>Indian, Non-Indian (foreign) Between 18 and 25 years of age, Between 25 and 50, Above 50 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Benefits sought</td>
<td>Missionary, Mass tourist, Conservationist, Explorer, Adventurer, and Holidaymaker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Experience of travel</td>
<td>Naïve traveler, Moderately traveled persons, Experienced travelers, and Most experienced travelers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Independent Samples Test – t-test for equality of means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Non-Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>263.30 0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Dept Publication</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-6.95</td>
<td>258.20 0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-4.14</td>
<td>246.77 0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-4.37</td>
<td>235.37 0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Source</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-6.25</td>
<td>265.38 0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive wisdom</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>259.91 0.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undenlined figures indicate the highest scores for the segments, while the bold figures denote the lowest ones in a 0-9 point interval scale.

* The individual hypothesis is rejected at \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
Table 4: ANOVA test Results for Information Sources for Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Group-wise mean scores</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18-25 yrs</td>
<td>25-50 yrs</td>
<td>&gt;50 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Dept Publication</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>162.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>115.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>149.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Source</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>259.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive wisdom</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underlined figures indicate the highest scores for the segments, while the bold figures denote the lowest ones in a 0-9 point interval scale.

* Individual hypothesis rejected at $\alpha=0.05$
Table 5: ANOVA test Results for Information Sources for Benefit Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Benefit Segment wise mean scores</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Dept.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Source</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive wisdom</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS FOR BENEFIT SEGMENTS
A: Missionary; B: Mass Tourist; C: Conservationist; D: Explorer; E: Adventurer; F: Holidaymaker

* Underlined figures indicate the highest scores for the segments, while the bold figures denote the lowest ones in a 0-9 point interval scale.
* Individual hypothesis rejected at α=0.05
Table 6: ANOVA test Results for Information Sources on Exposure Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>Exposure Segment wise mean scores</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of- mouth</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Dept Publication</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>449.98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>139.24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>353.51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Source</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>767.06</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive wisdom</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>308.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGENDS FOR EXPOSURE SEGMENTS
A: Naive travelers; B: Moderately traveled; C: Experienced travelers; D: Most experienced travelers.

Underlined figures indicate the highest scores for the segments, while the bold figures denote the lowest ones in a 0-9 point interval scale.

* Individual hypothesis rejected at α=0.05
Table 7: Information Sources: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information sources</th>
<th>Word of Mouth</th>
<th>Tourism Department Publications</th>
<th>Other Print Publication</th>
<th>Electronic media TV/Radio</th>
<th>Professional Sources</th>
<th>Cognitive Wisdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Department Publications</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Print Publication</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic media TV/Radio</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Sources</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlation coefficients are significant at $\alpha=0.05$
Figure 1: Causal Loop Diagram for Information Sources