CHAPTER – 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE & RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Literature review sets the academic tone for the research. It provides a comprehensive discussion on the existing literature on tourist destination image, providing a framework for exploring into India’s image as a tourist destination for the East Asian market. Thus, the present chapter is devoted to critically examine the existing tourism destination image as perceived by especially by the East Asian tourists’ in Indian context. Finally, this chapter also describes the research methodology consisting of Objectives of the study, Hypotheses, Research Methodology (Sampling and Data Collection, Research Instruments, Destination image attributes and Method of analysis), Factors Derived, Study area, Methods of Analyses, Significance of the Study, Limitations of the Study and Organisation of the Proposed Study.

2.1 DESTINATION IMAGE- CONCEPTUAL UNDERPINNINGS

Recently, the term destination image has become the central point for discussion among the tourism & hospitality academicians. The tourism researchers have demonstrated that destination image is the determining force for the tourists to choose any destination for their visit. Thus, it has become pivotal for the researchers to explore new feasibilities and scope for new developments and attract the quality tourists to a particular destination. The concept of image is correlated to diverse issues in the tourism research literature, but is directly in relation to tourism destination and discussions yield evidence of how tourism destinations influence the provision of various types of products, services, safety, and security in the country. It is noticed from various researches (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Echtner & Ritchie, 1991; Gallarza et al., 2002) that the image of the destination has much significance such as while destination choice, service selection and so forth. Destination image has significant role in the minds of travellers while choosing a destination and eventually, goal of every destination is to influence potential tourists’ travel related decision.
making with due course of marketing activities. Moreover, all elements responsible for the development of an image can’t be controlled, tourism marketers want to strategically create, strengthen and, if necessary, transform the image of their destination (Chi & Qu, 2008). The final goal of any destination is to influence potential travellers’ trip related decision making and choice through marketing activities. Even though, it is not possible to manipulate all aspects of image formation, tourism marketers always try to strategically create, strengthen and, if necessary, change the image of the destination by converting a strong destination brand. Hence, image studies are considered as significant part of marketing and branding strategies. However, each individual doesn’t have the same image of a destination, as image perception keep changing according to different influences, such as personal, cultural and psychological ones.

In recent years, there is tremendous competitiveness in the tourism industry. The competitiveness has become increasingly demanding, entailing challenge not only among the countries in close geographic proximity but also among regions and even competition at the global level with same tourists’ facilities. Moreover, with an increase in the international arrivals the competition among the similar destinations is increasing day by day. We can say that each tourist destination has an image and some destinations have stronger image over the others. Destination image is considered as one of the important sources of competitive advantage, when a tourist destination is considered competing for tourists for existing and newly developed destinations. While planning destination development, the developers must give emphasis to build positive image of the destination among markets so that destination have a competitive advantage over other similar destinations. Further, in order to develop a competitive position, it is important to develop and transmit a favourable image to potential tourists in target markets. In today’s scenario there is indeed need to evaluate the strength and weakness of tourist destinations of each area, as it is important to potential tourists’ images of that destination. Accordingly, image is the raw material of the destinations to participate in the context of the worldwide competition regarding tourism: it represents the way for destinations to establish
themselves and reaching to a sufficient degree of recognition. In the context of tourism study, destination images have become important as the competition between tourists’ destinations has increased.

So, the marketers and research scholars have therefore highlighted the importance of the image in context of marketing the destinations. Moreover, the creation of positive destination image has been claimed to affect the very viability of destinations as there is commonly accepted notion that images affect travel choice behaviour. Interestingly, it is widely accepted that images are complex in nature and consist of many different dimensions and components. Tourists’ perception of a destination’s image as a preferred choice for travel is crucial.

Gunn (1972) based on the type of information transmitted to the tourist(s) identified two types of tourist images of the destination as organic, induced & complex.

- Organic image: All of the information transmitted unintentionally by legislative body of tourism destinations. Such information may be transmitted either via electronic media such as internet, television and radio, written material such as books on geography or history, magazines, newspapers or by people living at a tourist destination.

- Induced image and complex image: The image formed by the promotions and communications of the tourism organizations involved in a region.

According to Gunn (1972) the last stage of the continuum is the complex image which is a result of an actual visitation. Induced sources of image include tour operators’, travel brochures and website content, promotional videos, advertisements, etc. The possibility for destination image to be induced has important marketing connotations. Although the physical product, i.e., the destination’s attributes and attractions, is rarely altered or altered slowly, the potential visitor’s perceptions, or images, can be manipulated through informational sources. Generally, a country’s destination management organisations (DMO) have modest influence over organic sources, although it is important for the DMOs to know what is being communicated
about the country by organic agents to the potential travellers. Based on the knowledge of the contemporary media coverage, the DMO can intensify the positive aspects of the image, as well as counter, if needed, negative or imprecise information in their induced materials (Kale & Weir, 1986). Gartner (1993) summarized several basic principles with regard to destination image change that can be used as guidelines in any marketing activity of a destination’s DMO. They are:

- The larger the element, the more slowly images change;
- Induced image formation attempts must be focused and long term;
- The smaller the entity in relation to the whole, the less of a chance to develop an independent image; and
- Effective image change depends on an evaluation of presently held tourism images.

Various scholars such as Baloglu and Brinberg (1997); Walmsley and Young (1998); Chen (2001); Hong, Kim, Jang, & Lee (2006) listed two main and important components of destination image as “cognitive” and “affective”. The first component cognitive or perceptual, also known as the designative component is “the beliefs and facts about the perceived attributes of the destination” (Alcaniz et al. 2009). Moreover, another component of destination recognised was effective or evaluative. Affective or evaluative component is the individual(s) feelings about the destination” (Alcaniz et al. 2009). O’Neill & Jasper (1992) also advised that affective image is the component that deals with the emotional response of visitors to a destination. Further, Kim and Yoon (2003) proved that destination image is a combination of affective and cognitive components that have direct effect on overall image. The overall image is considered as third component of the image, which may be similar to, or different from, the above two mentioned components (Baloglu & Love, 2005; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Gartner, 1993). Further, Qu et al (2011) stated that overall image or perceived image of a destination is better to be measured.

Gartner (1993) stated that the difference between induced and organic images is the amount of control destinations have over what is being presented. To further
Gartner (1993) presented a systematic classification of image-change agents, a list of eight different image formation agents were included.

1. Overt Induced I – It refers to the conventional forms of advertising through television, radio, brochure, billboards, and print media promotion by destination area promoters with direct attempts to push a particular destination image to perspective visitors. Now a days, advertising faces confront with low credibility perceived by customers.

2. Overt Induced II – This information agent refers to the information received or requested from tour operators, wholesalers, and organizations that have a vested interest in the travel decision process but not directly associated with a particular destination. Tour operators and wholesalers may depict and delivery idealistic images to the consumer because of their business interest in profit; destination promoters should be aware of the potential risk and be caution in order to successfully promote a realistic destination image.

3. Convert induced I – This information agent refers to the use of a recognizable spoke person; this agent is anticipated to overcome the credibility problem inherent in over Induced I agent. Using a Celebrity spokesperson increase message recall especially when the celebrity is identified and brand name is mentioned early in the advertisement. An endorsement from a satisfied customer is another form of this agent if choosing a celebrity is not possible.

4. Covert Induced II – This information agent refers to articles, reports, or stories where the consumer is unaware of the promotional effort behind these pieces.

5. Autonomous – This agent refers to independently produced reports, documentaries, moves, and news articles; all above sources are either belong to news or popular culture category.

6. Unsolicited Organic - This information agent is the unrequested information received from individuals who have been to the destination or who believe they have the knowledge of the destination. A person without a fully developed image of a destination may be heavily influenced by this kind of information.
7. Solicited organic - This information agent refers to information requested by the consumer from other individuals, particularly respected sources such as family, friends, and opinion leaders. This type of agent will influence the holiday decision of the consumer more than unsolicited organic agents.

8. Organic agent – It refers to information acquired during a trip to the destination by the consumer, thus the organic image formation has the highest credibility.

Many scholars (Gartner 1993, Pike & Ryan 2004, and White 2004) suggested another element in the destination image construct, called as cognitive or behavioural element which is resembles to how travellers act toward a destination on the basis of the cognition and affect they have about it. Pike & Ryan (2004) revealed that conation reflects a possibility of destination selection, or brand purchase, and can be understood as a tendency to visit a destination within a certain time frame. In other words, we can say that cognitive and affective components both affect cognitive element of destination image.

2.2 DESTINATION IMAGE ATTRIBUTES:

Numerous research scholars have tried to identify the brand image attributes of different countries (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; O’Leary & Deegan, 2005; Stepchenkovaa & Morrison, 2008; Qu,, Kim & Im 2011; Naidoo & Ramseook - Munhurrun, 2012). These researches have tried to consider some attributes that have been arranged along the functional-psychological continuum, mainly by using the unstructured techniques to elicit the relevant destination image attributes and dimensions, then using these attributes in a structured way to investigate images.

Similarly, Etchner and Ritchie (1993) suggested a list of attributes that have been arranged along the functional-psychological continuum that consists of 35 physical and measurable as well as abstract items such as tourist sites, historic sites, beaches, hospitality, opportunity for adventure, quality of service, fame. The study suggested that in order to have effective positioning and marketing strategy, appropriate and suitable destination image must be created and managed. Further,
they advised that each destination has some functional components that are more tangible and some psychological components that are more abstract. As a result, “functional features are defined as directly observable or measurable such as scenery, costs, and climate; whereas psychological characteristics cannot be directly measured such as friendliness and atmosphere” (Etchner & Ritchie, 2003).

It is found that destination image is a changing, developing construct and mostly depends on the traveller’s personality, earlier experience with a destination, quantity and quality of information received about a particular destination. According to Firmino Santos & Carneiro (2006) demographic variables of a tourist influence the touristic image of the destination. Similarly, Beerli and Martín (2004) also supported that motivation; socio-demographic variables and experience are vital factors for forming the image of a tourist destination. Thus, the way we construct images of places has changed extremely, both from a supply – projecting of identity – as well as demand – perceiving of images – perspective. As conflicted to a one way push process of supply driven mass communication, place identity is now being created, imagined and consumed through dynamic interactive processes, in physical as well as virtual environments (Molenaar 1996, 2002). Jenkins and McArthur (1996) suggested that each person's image of a specific destination is unique, comprising their possessed memories, associations and imaginations of the particular destination. Many researchers have analysed the factors influencing image formation. Hunt (1975) and Scott et al. (1978) stated that destination image development is determined partially by distance from the destination, because mostly people like to visit the destinations near their place of stay and perceive the information about them through the media and from friends and relatives. Moreover, they summarised that people have stronger and more realistic images of a destination if it is near their place.

Fakeye and Crompton (1991) mentioned that destination image is composed of a three levelled process such as organic, induced and complex image. They stated that marketing operations have to be done for these different image types. According to this model, a potential visitor has an image about destinations beforehand which is defined as organic image. The one has “induced image” after gained some
information about destinations from particular commercial sources actively with the motive of travel, and after comparing alternative destinations, choosing and visiting destination the one has “complex image”. Organic image is the image that is shaped by general historical knowledge or news without marketing activities. Induced image is shaped in the process of exposing destination marketing materials and complex image is the image type which is formed after visiting that destination. This complex image will be effective to evaluate the alternatives in terms of revisit that destination, when the need of revisit occurs.

Stabler (1988) segregated the factors influencing the formation of a consumers' destination image into demand and supply factors. The demand factors generally correspond with Gunn's organic image formation, whereas the supply factors correspond to induced image formation. Whereas Tocquer and Zins (2004) analysed the perceptual influences on tourists with regard to a specific destination and proposed a model of image formation development with the help of four stages as given below:

(a) Vague/unrealistic image: This type of image arises from advertising, education and word of mouth dissemination among friends/relatives. Generally, it is formed before the tourist travels to the destination. In this way, customers feel a trip as healthy.

(b) Distortion of the image: At this stage, the customer decides to go on a trip/tour, deciding the time to be spent on trip, destination choice and type of tourism product. Clearly, we can say that at this stage the image of trip is changed, clarified and expanded. So, the image developed becomes during first stage is more clear once upon the tour plan has been finalized.

(c) Improved image: When a traveler has the tour experience itself. At this stage, there is direct experience of the destination or tourism product and image is improved by distorting elements and strengthening elements that prove to be truthful.

(d) Resulting image: The fourth and last stage refers to the up to date memory of the trip experience and can result to nostalgia, regret or fantasy. Subsequently,
a set of new images will be formed that will affect future decisions about that same tourism product.

Interestingly, some scholars anticipated the interpretation of the image before visiting and with the image built-up after the visit to tourist destination. Phelps (1986) suggested that the primary image is the image built after the visit to a tourist destination and the secondary image is seen as the image built-up prior the visit to a tourist destination. Later, Gunn (1988) and Mansfeld (1992) illustrated two types of images in the secondary image: the organic image that derives from non-commercial information and the induced image with respect to information processed by the business organization responsible for the destination (Figure 2.1).

Figure: 2.1: Image types according to type of knowledge (Adapted from Phelps, 1986, Gunn, 1998 and Mansfeld, 1992).

Fakeye and Crompton (1991) analyzed the path taken by tourists in search of information regarding a tourist destination. Altogether, these authors suggested that a potential tourist always has a secondary organic image of a set of destinations (Figure 2.2). Then, on the basis of their motivations and perceptions, they will aggressively search for information. However, potential tourists have a strong or a weak organic image and/or direct or indirect experience with the tourist destination will manipulate the amount of information required and efforts made in this search process. After this, the different alternatives found will be analyzed on the basis of the initial organic
image, personal experiences and the induced formal image. Then the destination visited will develop the primary image that, in turn, will influence the future search process of destination choice.

![Figure 2.2: Types of secondary image (Adapted from Gunn, 1998 and Mansfeld, 1992)](image)

In most of the studies (Phelps, 1986; Stabler, 1988; Chon, 1991, 1992; Echtner and Ritchie, 1991; Botterill and Crompton, 1996; Selby and Morgan, 1996), the process of image formation is not well understood and there is a need of theoretical framework for understanding it. In the initial development stage of constructing a theoretical framework, (Gunn' 1972) seven-stage theory is useful memory. Gunn’s theory (Figure 2.3) involves a constant building and modification of images that are visualized at various levels which are organic, induced, and modified-induced. The organic image is formed through the accumulation of information came from unbiased sources such as school, books, television documentaries, and the experience of friends and family. Induced image is developed through marketing and commercial promotions, such as advertising and brochures form tourists’ services. Modified-induced image is formed from the result and evaluations of tourists’ actual experiences of the destination. Altogether, stage theory disguised that the images held by potential visitors, non-visitors and returned visitors differs a lot.
Figure: 2.3. Stage-theories of destination images. Source: Gunn (1972)

Gunn (1972) had clearly interpreted change between pre-conceived images and post-images holding by travelers. Images involved from easy, indistinguishable, mythical, and orthodox to comprehensive, realistic, and holistic.

Several researchers (Moutinbo, 1987; Gartner, 1993; Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Walmsley & Young, 1998; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a, b) stated that image is formed through various reasons and emotional interpretations from customers, and is a consequence of two related components, that is: (1) cognitive assessment that refers
to one’s knowledge and belief towards an object, and (2) affective assessment that refers to one’s feeling towards an object.

To build the image of a tourist destination due to the growth of web platforms (internet) as information sources, methods for supervision of brands or destination images have changed (Christodoulides & Jevons, 2011; Christodoulides, Jevons, & Bonhomme, 2012). Much research has focused on analyzing the impact of the Internet on corporate brands (e.g., Ind & Riondino, 2001; Lindstrom, 2001; Stuart & Jones, 2004).

Various researchers noted the capability of the internet to affect subjective, individual perceptions and choice, such that the image of the destination is: (1) an important concept in tourist management (Chen & Hsu, 2000; Kozak, 2001, 2002; Seddighi & Theocharous, 2002), (2) a principal dimension of the value of the brand (Konecnik & Gartner, 2007), and (3) a significant component for establishing a brand model for the destination (Cai, 2002). Thus, the same destination could construct different images for various collectives of potential consumers (Serra et al., 2002). That is, destination image implies perceptions of a place, as reflected by associations that tourists store in their memories (Cai, 2002). Different approaches for measuring a destination's image rely on indicators and variables that can be classified in different ways. Moreover, Echtner and Ritchie (2003) suggested ordering the attributes of a tourist destination on a dimension ranging from psychological to functional.

Echtner and Ritchie (1991) anticipated a list of attributes for measuring the characteristics of a destination, divided into two parts: (a) related to the specific features of the region (e.g., friendliness of inhabitants, beauty of the city or region, quality of food), (b) related to infrastructures and entertainment facilities at the destination. Another classification recommends dividing the attributes of a tourist destination into cognitive and affective attributes (Qu et al., 2011). Cognitive evaluations imply beliefs or knowledge about the attributes of a destination; an affective evaluation twig from feelings about the destination. In combination, they determine perceptions of the overall image of the destination (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999).
Many scholars opined that the cognitive component is an antecedent of the affective component (Anand, et al., 1988; Erickson; Stern & Krakover, 1993). In the tourism context specifically, Baloglu & McCleary (1999) and Stern & Krakover (1993) demonstrated empirically that assessments of cognitive and affective perceptions have direct influences on images. In similar vein, Beerli and Martin (2004), Hosany et al. (2007), and Qu et al. (2011) each have constructed models for evaluating destination image. Beerli and Martin (2004) analysed associations using attributes proposed by previous studies, as well as the associations among different components of the perceived image and the factors that influence destination image, including information sources (primary and secondary), information obtained prior to and after the visit, motivations, other tourist(s) experiences, and socio-demographic characteristics. Baloglu and McCleary (1999) proposed a similar methodology that describes the motivations of tourists. Qu et al. (2011) described that cognitive, affective, and unique facets of the image of the tourist destination influence the possibilities of repeat visits of the tourist(s) and intentions to recommend the destination (word of mouth). Thus, all these studies entail, information sources amalgamated with delicate factors likely explain the formation of cognitive, affective, and distinctive images of the tourist destination and provide a central base for evaluating users’ behaviour with respect to loyalty to the destination or willingness to visit. Therefore, essentially there is need to analyze how different web/internet platforms harmonize the indicators that conventionally have comprised information sources, as a latent variable. To examine the brand image of tourist destinations, we studied three models: Beerli and Martin's (2004) comprehensive view of the image, with its main focus on the cognitive and functional dimensions; Hosany et al.’s (2007) in-depth consideration of the affective and psychological dimensions; and Qu et al.’s (2011) research of the unique dimension.

To understand the differentiate images that visitors and non-visitors have of a destination is invaluable, enabling the salient attributes of the raw image and the re-evaluated image to be incorporated into tourism marketing planning (Selby and Morgan, 1996). Marketers can also use imagery to increase remembered satisfaction and to encourage repeat purchases of holidays.
Martineau (1958) suggested a clear distinction between the functional and psychological elements of image when considering an item such as a retail store and suggested that functional characteristics are directly observable or measurable whereas we cannot measure psychological characteristics directly (such as friendliness, atmosphere). Further, he pointed out that both of these components play a critical role in determining the image of a store. We may make arguments to the virtues of measuring holistic impressions versus individual attributes or functional versus psychological characteristics. There may be some merits in examining a conceptualisation that could more completely capture all of these components of image. In this way, image may consist of perceptions of individual product attributes collectively with holistic impression. The measurement of image may involve methodologies to capture perceptions of individual functional attributes such as price levels, amount of parking, as well as psychological attributes such as friendliness of staff, product exchange easily. Moreover, more holistic impressions would need to be measured. Functional holistic images are based on physical characteristics i.e. a mental image of the store front and layout. Psychological holistic images apprehend feelings about the overall impressions of the atmosphere or mood of the store. Figure 2.4 exhibits the concept of image with four distinct components:

![Figure 2.4: The Personality of the Retail Store (Source: Martineau, 1958).](image-url)
In this way, holistic images are based on combinations and interactions of attributes and, in turn, the perceptions of each attribute may be influenced by overall impressions and feelings. Furthermore, the dividing line between functional and psychological characteristics is not clear.

The moment, at which the potential tourist picks a destination as a possible choice, there is construction of primary image of that destination in the mind of that potential tourist. Moreover, Chon cited that the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors are responsible for the construction of a primary image. Further he concluded that neither specific ‘push’ factors nor specific ‘pull’ factors are associated or that an organic, induced or complex image must be present before a primary image can be constructed.

Moreover, there exist a vague complex set of associations which is not easily explained. To explain this complex set of association is by analysing that is whether a potential tourist is ‘push’ oriented or ‘pull’ oriented. So, in this way, we can differentiate the association between push and pull factors into three types. Firstly, the needs (push factors) of potential tourist can overtake over attractions of the destination (pull factors). Secondly, the potential tourist has specific needs that can only be satisfied at particular destinations. Thirdly, sometimes both ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors are equally responsible for driving a potential tourist.

Meinung (1989) analysed destination images and suggested that attractiveness of a tourist region can be grouped into three major categories as given below:

(a) Primary or static factors - the landscape, forms of landscape, the climate, the mode of travel to and within the region and the culture of the region.

(b) Secondary or dynamic factors - tourism supply (accommodation, catering, and entertainment), administrative and political settings, and the market position of the region (growth, decline etc.).

(c) Tertiary or current decision factors - marketing of the region, prices in the target province and country of origin and the organisation of tourism within the region in relation to administration and economic organisation.
2.3 MEASUREMENT OF DESTINATION IMAGE

Almost from last four decades destination image research has gained much attention in tourism management literature (Gunn, 1972; Goodrich, 1978; Pearce, 1982; Phelps, 1986; Calantone et al., 1989; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Milman and Pizam, 1995; Chaudhary, 2000). It is believed that Gunn (1972) was among the first who recognized the different means by which the cognitive images of a country are formed. Gunn’s theory is to build and constantly change the images which are perceived at various levels, names, organic, induced and changed - induced. Chon (1990) used the cognitive consumerism behaviour theory and developed a model to study destination image and tour buying behaviour of traveller. The core point of the model is that the tour buying behaviour can be described as an imagination changing frame with the overall experience of the trip and the study advocated that positive image and a positive travelling experience will produce a positive incongruence, a much more positive assessment of the tourist destination. Some other scholars (Chon, 1990; Mackay and Fesenmaier, 2000; Kozak et al., 2004; Chen and Tsai, 2007; Chand, 2010a) also found that tourists’ motivation transmits to the pull factors attracting tourists to the destination; these pull factors are, in essence, tied to tourists’ perceived image of a destination. Tourism researchers stated that image is a crucial component among individuals in the process of deciding a destination (Prebensen, 2007). Moreover, a wide array of tourism management literature suggested variables of tourists’ destination choice performs with relation to destination image such as socio-psychological motivation, benefit, socio-demographics, economic, family togetherness and geographical distance (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Goodrich, 1978; Chaudhary, 2000; Julta, 2000).

Echtner & Ritchie (1993) developed a framework for the measurement of the image of a destination using a permutation of both techniques, consisting of three sequences i.e. attribute-holistic, functional-psychological and common-unique. The Figure 2.5 depicts that the first continuum refers to specific attributes (e.g. accommodation facilities, climate) versus more holistic impressions (belief, mental pictures of the places). The functional-psychological dimension includes two
characteristics of image: first, directly observable and measurable (e.g. price) and second, that are intangible (e.g. safety, atmosphere of a place).

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 2.5: Source: Echtner & Ritchie (1991, 1993).**

The common-unique refers to the common features of a destination versus the unique ones. A destination’s image consists of both, evaluation on common functional characteristics (e.g. price, transportation, and climate) and evaluation on common psychological features (e.g. safety, fame and friendliness). On the other hand, images can include unique functional features (e.g. Paris Fashion week) and unique psychological features (e.g. the romantic atmosphere in Paris). The continuums partly cover and influence each other, and it can be difficult to distinguish between functional and psychological characteristics.

Analysis of destination image has grown as a significant string of tourism research from past few decades (Chon 1990; Fakeye and Crompton 1991; Dagostar and Isotalo 1992; Crompton and Ankomah 1993; Milman and Pizam 1995; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Murphy and Pritchard 1997; Baloglu and McCoery 1999; Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Pike 2002; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002; Peters and Pikkemaat 2003).
Gallarza, Saura et al. (2002) suggested a conceptual framework for tourism destination images with four characteristics which describe the image construct as: (a) The nature of images is complex (not unequivocal), (b) multiple (in elements and processes), (c) relativistic (subjective and generally comparative), (d) and dynamic (over time and space). Therefore, many definitions of destination images have been given (Coshall 2000; Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002; Klenosky 2002) and most of them summarised that image as the sum of perceptual beliefs, ideas, and impressions based on information processing from a the various sources from time to time resulting in a mental construct (Gartner 1993; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997). Crompton (1979) gave the most frequently cited definition of a
destination image as image may be defined as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination (Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002). Thus, a destination image is tourist’s total impression which is formed as a result of the evaluation of various destination components and attributes whereby differences in meaning, number and importance of dimensions may occur (MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997).

Generally, image construct is mainly determined by two major factors: personal factors and stimulus (destination) factors (Crompton 1979; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002). Dann (1996) used the push and pull theory, the push or person determined image factors squeeze psychological factors such as values, motivations, personality as well as social factors such as age, education, marital status. The pull or destination established image factors precise the influence of external motivation and physical objects as well as previous experiences (Baloglu and McCleary 1999). The significance of studying this relationship between the push and pull factors depend on each other instead of being entirely independent has been recently strengthened by Klenosky (2002). Focussing on destination determined image factors and following Echtner and Ritchie’s (1993) path breaking module on the measurement of destination images, tangible (as functional) and intangible (as psychological) attributes of a destination can be distinguished: while tangible attributes are characteristics of the image which are directly observable, whereas intangible attributes are less tangible and more difficult to observe. Additionally, attribute-based or holistic image components and common or unique image factors have to be included for the measurement of destination images as these three continuums collectively outline tourists’ destination image (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993).

A mutual agreement among scholars is that both affective and cognitive tourist evaluations are coincident elements for tourists’ image construction. While the cognitive evaluation refers to the beliefs or the knowledge about destination attributes, the affective assessment refers to feelings or emotional responses towards destination attributes (Gartner 1993; Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002; Pikkemaat and Peters 2003). Baloglu and McCleary
1999; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002 have agreed over earlier research (Gartner 1993; Dann 1996): that in fact cognitive images are formed prior to affective images. Therefore, affect is more likely to serve as an dominant variable between cognitive evaluations and the overall image construct (Baloglu and McCleary 1999).

Mazursky & Jacoby (1986) stated that image is a set of cognitions and affects that represent an entity to an individual. Dobni & Zinkhan (1990) revealed that a perceptual phenomenon formed through consumers’ reasoned and emotional interpretation. On the other hand, Gensch (1978) supported cognitive interpretation of image as a set of relevant attributes and stated that products hardly ever are measured or calculated as single lump sum entities; rather, it is the attributes of the alternatives that are measured and compared, and form the basis for choice selection. Further, Engel et al. (1986) supported this and stated that image is the individual’s prejudiced perceptions, which refers to how an alternative performs on important measurable criteria. Social and environmental psychological belief regards cognition and affect as interrelated elements, where affect is largely dependent on cognition. Whereas, Russel & Snodgrass (1987) stated that the affective component should be distinguished from the perceptual/cognitive element to better understand how people evaluate environments or places and this affective component of destination image expresses feelings toward a destination, which can be favourable, unfavourable, or neutral. Gartner (1993) advised that the affective component comes into play at the stage when different travel alternatives are evaluated. Image and destination image are defined different ways in research studies which are made in different areas (Baloglu, 1997; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Ditcher, 1985; Gallarza et al. 2002; Gartner, 1993; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Kotler, 1994; Tasci, 2003) and discussed in different aspects of alternative approaches. Moreover, there is not a common definition which can be accepted by all scholars. Gunn (1972), in his first study of conceptualization of image formation process defined destination image as “indicative of a personal preference about a place”. Uner et al. (2006) analysed that tourism researcher’s different approach on image differs on definitions for image to come up and also moved from Gallarza, et al. (2002) who discussed literature
integration of image definitions in the study and defined image as “an entity of information, ideas and feelings about a random subject”. Likely, Lawson and Baud-Bovy (1977) defined destination image as “a definition of all the information, impressions, inequity and emotional thoughts of a person or group about a particular place or object”. Moreover, collectively it is observed that ‘destination image is a sum of impressions and beliefs that people have about a place’ (Alvarez and Campo, 2014). However, it’s problematic to understand image as overall impression without distinguish it into separate, more elements. Destination image tourism scholars generally agreed that destination image holds at least two idiosyncratic components i.e. cognitive and affective. The cognitive, or perceptual, element refers to one’s knowledge and beliefs about a destination, while affective element refers to a traveller’s feelings towards a destination. Moreover, there has not been a mutual consensus about the definition of destination image in the related literature. The destination image has widely recognised that image has important effect on potential tourists’ decision of choosing a destination for vacation among various available options. Specially, Gartner (1993) suggested that image can be considered as an important tool, applied in some activities such as advertising, promotions, or similar marketing activities. Leisen (2001) and Ozdemir (2008) analysed that while choosing of a destination, destination image is more important than destination itself. Similarly, Ozdemir (2008) and Akyurtand Atay (2009) suggested that destination image is the most vital factor that effects travellers’ purchasing decision and level of satisfaction. Ozdemir (2008) described that the effects of destination image not only emerges on the destination choosing but also general tourist behaviour and manner and most important is to focus on how destination image effects tourists’ decisions about destination. Destination image is key role of successful tourism promotion and marketing process, how destination image particularly the complex image which emerges after the visit or in other words actual image, basic image or primary image is perceived by tourists, to be known by destination management organisations (DMOs) which are set up in the Skelton construct of destination oriented marketing concept.
Baloglu (1996) developed two different approaches about stating the dimensions that affect image formation on the early studies about image, moreover a consensus has been set up about that the dimensions that affect image formation originate from individual and also destination. Further Baloglu and McCleary (1999) revealed that image is build-up by two main factors i.e. stimulus factors and personal factors such as external stimulus and perceived physical objects whereas second factor describe about characteristics - social and psychology of the perceiver. Moreover, Tasci (2003) analysed that the information sources that has socio-psychologic visit behaviours and socio-demographic features of tourists and previous visit experiences step forward as the most important variables that affect destination image. As one of the two basics (together with brand awareness) of brand knowledge (Keller 1993), some researchers conceptualize destination image as organized in “associative network”, consisting of various nodes (pieces of information stored in memory) and many links (or associations between nodes), where the association strength between nodes “depend critically on the frequency of co-occurrence between the cue and the outcome” (Van Osselaer and Janiszewski 2001). Thus, creating a brand image accounts to recognize the most relevant associations and strengthening their associations to the brand (Cai 2002). Beerli and Martin (2004a) developed a model to measure destination by all means, due to lack of the reliability, acceptability and validity of the measurements of destination image. They classified nine different dimensions/attributes that affect the image are; natural resources, general infrastructure, touristic infrastructure, tourist leisure and recreation, culture, history and art, political and economic aspects, natural environment, social environment and atmosphere of the destination.

Molenaar (1996, 2002) opined that to build image of the destinations has changed profoundly, both from a supply i.e. projecting of identity, as well as demand i.e. perceiving of images (perspective). Therefore, tourists participate actively in the service practice and create meaning to the event. It implies that consumers are also actively engaged in the process of forming and attaching meaning to tourism destination image (Padgett & Allen, 1997). Thus, it could be assumed that the media
and the interactive nature of the internet add whole new dimensions to marketing destination image and branding. Similarly, Go & Haywood, (2003) opined that the key to the omnipresence of global brands, computer reservation systems, multinational benchmarking and the need to view competition both from international and at the same time local perspectives. Interestingly, recent years witnessed a new trend in destination attribute research i.e. photo cards. The photo postcard is the most usually distributed and easily accessible souvenir that is available at most of the tourist(s) destinations (Albers & James, 1988; Markwick, 2001). MacKay & Fesenmaier, (1997) stated that Photo postcards do not only represent destinations, but also speak about attributes, characteristics, concepts, values, and ideas. Jenkins, (2003) suggested visual images are indeed a strong element of tourist destination marketing and govern all forms of tourism promotion, from travel brochures and television advertisements to internet websites. Yuksel & Akgul, (2007) suggested that postcards facet multiple construal of a single destination image including chronological snapshots of change in the destination over time to time. Various scholars have found that people recollect and distinguish pictures better than words (Singh & Formica, 2006). Markwick (2001) examined postcards from Malta and found that while certain stereotypical images of Malta were sustained, the image offered in postcards has expanded the destination’s image. Further, Yuksel and Akgul (2007) suggested that postcard - induced feelings about the tourist destination set up the degree to which the destination would be valued as a travel destination. Similarly, Milman (2010) developed a theoretical framework of four types of postcards and revealed that only a small percentage of the postcards represented authentic and true images of Alanya, Turkey while most of the postcards offered ambiguous and confusing images of the destination. Jeeyeon et al. (2011) analysed that of postcards concludes the photographs, symbols, and icons featured on the postcards provided ambiguous multiple meanings of a destination/place. The authors found that the majority of the postcards offered for sale did not feature a realistic illustration of Orlando but a misleading environment or fantasy.
Augustyn and Ho (1998) suggested that destination marketing can be facilitated easily with a better understanding of the needs and motives of potential tourists and making the services /developing the requirements accordingly. If we want to market destinations successfully, we must measure the destination image and thereafter a marketing strategy has to be determined regarding that image (Ceylan, 2011). Chen (2001) opined that, the researches which reveal tourists’ image of a destination help destination marketing experts to distinguish between strengths and weakness of the destination and provide advantageous and significant information about service delivery and product developing. Heung and Quf (2000) stated that in context of market segmentation and designing the successful promotional campaign, there is need to understand the preferences and travel related behaviour of the potential tourists. Further, the scholar analysed that it is crucial to develop infrastructure, products and services to satisfy tourists’ preferences. Laws (1995) has stated that the mostly tourists have experiences with other destinations services, and their perceptions are influenced by comparisons among facilities, attractions and service standards.

Carmichael (1992) stated that image of a place affects tourist decision-making rather than its actual characteristics. In other words, destination images influence a tourist's travel decision-making, cognition and behaviour at a destination as well as satisfaction levels and remembrance of the experience. Collective image of a destination held at the population level is believed hard to change (Gartner & Hunt, 1987; Li & Vogelsong, 2006), images held by individuals could be dynamic (Gallarza et al., 2002) and may be modified by one’s experience, involved in a circular process of negotiation between destination traits (Kapferer 1997) and visitor experience (Gilbert and Hancock, 2006). Some scholars argued that destination image can be considered as an umbrella concept, including many other brand factors such as perceived quality and brand personality (Esch et al. 2006). Generally, it is agreed that destination image plays a key role, both in the travellers’ decision-making process (Sirgy and Su 2000; Woodside and Lyonski 1989; Qu et al. 2011), as it assists travellers with the differentiation between destinations (O’Leary and Deegan 2003),
and in achieving destination’s competitive advantage (Baloglu and McCleary 1999b), as it allows to identify a place through positive, strong, distinctive and sole mental representations or perceptions (Li et al. 2008). Croy (2003) put forward that destination image is critical and plays important role in the decision-making process as all decision-making factors, such as time, money, and family, are based on the image of the destinations to satisfy the decision maker’s driving force. Moreover, the familiarity and the complexity of the images held for a destination plays an important role in decision-making process of a potential tourist.

Dimanche (2003) revealed that as much stronger is the relationship between the image of the destination and customer needs and desires; there are more likely intentions to have purchase for that destination. Moreover, if the consumer has a strong image of a destination, it will probably have a significant role either for good or for bad. A strong negative perception would probably lead even not to consider the destination.

Xi (2015) found that different religious tourism motivations have positive impact on religious tourism image. The tourists with motivation of learning will need more convenience of transportation and equipment. Therefore, upgrade the transportation and equipment will attract more tourists who have the learning motivation. Only the push factors of the religious tourism motivation have impact on the tourists’ satisfaction. Religious tourism motivations have very low impact on the tourists’ loyalty. Religious tourism image have positive impact on the satisfaction. The different religious tourism image will have different kind of satisfaction. Religious tourism image have low impact on the tourists’ loyalty. The brand image is a perception of the receiver and depends on the previous experiences and on the marketer’s communication skills (Staniciou et.al. 2011). It has been widely acknowledged that the image perceived by tourists of a destination plays significant role in their decision-making, destination choice, post-trip evaluation, and future behaviors (e.g.Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Echtner & Ritchie, 1991; Gallarza, Saura, & García, 2002). Leisen (2001) and Ozdemir (2008) analysed that while choosing of a destination, destination image attributes are more important than destination itself.
Similarly, according to Ozdemir (2008), Akyurtand Atay (2009) destination image is
the most important factor that effects tourists’ purchasing decision and level of
satisfaction. Ozdemir (2008) described that the effects of destination image not only
appears on the destination deciding but also general tourist behaviour and manner and
most important is to focus on how destination image effects tourists’ decisions about
destination.

Neethiahnanthan et al. (2014) explored eight dimensions of destination travel
attributes which can possibly explain the international tourists’ satisfaction with Kuala
Lumpur. The dimensions were attractions, accommodation and food, culture, people,
climate and image, commodities, convenience and price. The study revealed that only
climate and culture had the noteworthy positive influence on the overall tourist
satisfaction among travellers. Asian and Western tourists were significantly different
in the relationship between the perception of ‘attractions’ and ‘satisfaction’. Finally,
the study highlighted that travel attributes play an important role in satisfying the
tourists and the role of gender, age and marital status and geographical origin in the
relationship between travel attributes and tourist satisfaction. Moreover, the study
will also help to develop new products, services and specific strategies for different
groups of tourists.

Recently, it has observed that tourists’ knowledge about the destination image
attribute would certainly increase the tourist loyalty about the destination. Probably,
tourists who perceive a destination as favourable are more likely to re-visit or
recommend that destination to other via word of mouth (WOM). Some scholars stated
that the destination image directly influenced tourist loyalty (Bosque & Martín, 2008;
Lee et al., 2008), some analysed the indirect relationship (Castro et al., 2007; Chi &
Qu, 2008), and still some others found that destination image imply both direct and
indirect influence on tourist loyalty (Bigne, Sanchez, & Sanchez, 2001; Chen &Tsai,
2007). The measurement of tourist loyalty has included re-visit intention, intention to
recommend, complaints, and switch behaviours (Alcaniz et al., 2009; Horng et al.,
2012; Hung & Petrick, 2012). Destination image and tourist loyalty are multi-
dimensional constructs with derivative measurements. Various studies have used
cognitive image, affective image, overall image, or different amalgamations of the three as substitute for destination image (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Campo et al., 2010; Chen & Tsai, 2007). Although a number of studies have suggested that destination image naturists’ loyalty relationship, variations in model specifications, as well as constraint of sample sizes, make it difficult to unearth a solid linkage between the two multidimensional constructs. Moreover, it is commonly identified problem in social and behavioural sciences, as argued by Hunter et al., (1982) that “the studies will never be accurately comparable in design, measures, and so forth and the results will usually vary across studies in uncommon ways”. Hongmei Zhang et al., (2014) revealed that the impact of destination image on tourist loyalty is important, with varying degrees. Cognitive image had a significant impact on attitudinal, behavioural, and composite loyalty. The research pointed that overall image has the maximum impact on tourist loyalty, followed by affective image and cognitive image respectively. Cognitive effective joint image did not demonstrate a stable impact on tourist loyalty. Self-congruity had significant impact on behavioural loyalty and composite loyalty, with relatively high effect sizes. In other words, we can say that compared to cognitive and affective image; self-congruity had higher effect sizes on behavioural loyalty. Compared to cognitive image, self-congruity also showed higher effect sizes on composite loyalty. The combined effect sizes of affective image on attitudinal, behavioural, and composite loyalty confirms the significant impact of affective image on tourist loyalty. So, the authors concluded that overall image extensively influence attitudinal, behavioural, and composite loyalty. Thus, the overall image had the greatest impact on tourist loyalty, with significant direct effects and total effects.

Destination image yields a positive influence on perceived quality, satisfaction and intentions to revisit the destination (Bigne et al., 2001; Chi & Qu, 2008). Positive image developed after positively satisfaction will result positive evaluation of a destination. Tourist loyalty at the destination would improve if the image has a direct effect on behavioural objective through quality, perceived value and satisfaction, which in turn affects behavioural intentions of the tourists. Further, it can be
simplified as more favourable images will lead to a higher probability of returning to the same destination i.e. revisit the destination. However, there has been no attempt to integrate available results on the relationship of destination image and tourist loyalty. At the level of individual studies, no consensus has been reached regarding the magnitude and course of the relationships. The images of a tourist destination often depend on information and contents generated by travellers, suppliers, and residents. Rajesh (2013) developed holistic theoretical model of destination loyalty with the help of tourist perception, destination image, tourist satisfaction and its attributes. He analysed that antecedents of tourist perception, destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty may provide insight in the process of forming destination loyalty at both construct and indicator level.

Chand (2012) investigated the perceived attributes among the tourists visiting in the Indian destinations. The results found that there are no significant differences in perceived image of India as tourist destination among visitors from four countries. However, the results reveal that perceived image of India as tourist destination found different as per demographic characteristics. The study also suggested that tour operators and tourism planners should need to consider cultural segmentation while building their tourism strategies for tourism marketing. Baloglu & Mangaloglu (2001) put forwarded that destination images are as much important for travel intermediaries as for individual travellers. Similarly, Konecnik (2012) pointed that the role of travel intermediaries in promoting and formulating images of the destination has increased to a large extent, especially for international destinations as international travellers more likely tend to use travel intermediaries in their destination selections for travel”. Moreover, travel intermediaries play important role in image formation of a destination (Ashwoth & Voogd 1994). Further, Baloglu and Mangaloglu (2001) analysed that as tourism product is intangible and similar to each other, the competition among various destinations take place by images. As a matter of fact the main purpose of positioning strategies is to build a new positive image instead of the negative image of a destination or to enhance the positive image of the destination.

Sergio (2011) said that image attributes of a destination can be divided into two types - the primary image i.e. which are formed after visiting a tourist destination
and the secondary image i.e. the image formed by a person prior to visit to a particular destination. Further, author suggested that variables such as age, race, level of education, motivation and cultural values strongly influence the image that a person already has prior to visit a destination. In other words, the destination image is one of the most significant elements of a tourist destination, and becomes a crucial aspect for the success or failure of tourism management. Chon et al. (1991) reviewed 23 frequently cited destination image researches and concluded that the most popular themes were the role and influence of destination image in traveller buying behaviour and satisfaction. His study further revealed that a destination image has a central role in an individual’s travel buying related decision making and that the individual traveller’s satisfaction/dissatisfaction with a travel purchase largely depends on the comparison of his expectations about the destination, or a previously held destination image, and his perceived performance of the destinations. Likewise, Pike (2002) examined 142 tourism destination images studies, published in the literature during the period 1973 - 2000, to provide destination image scholars with a suggestive direction to the context, method and focus of previous studies in this area. Baloglu and Mangaloglu (2001) claimed that the growing competitive structure of tourism industry has made image as mandatory for touristic destinations to develop affective plans and strategies. Destinations mostly concetrate on the perceived image than competition in market place. Similarly, Molina et al., (2010) analysed that the use of information sources as promotion tools strongly influence the formation of tourist destination images. The research advocated that the image generated by tourist brochures is firmly related to actual destination image and the inclusion of image and tourist information in one model not only serves to highlight the significance of image, but also provides a better explanation for destination choice. Further, they concluded that brochures and guides have proved to be the most valued information sources.

Various other cross-cultural researches in tourism literature suggested that tourist’s preconditions destination image influences travel motivation. Whereas some authors suggested the potential effects of a tourist destination and opined that
destination image plays a crucial role in establishing destination marketing strategy (Chand, 2010a; Kelly and Daniel, 2000; Lee and Lee, 2006; Mackay and Fesenmaier, 2000). Kozak et al. (2004) studied cross-cultural differences in consumer behaviour and, particularly destination image. The scholar analysed that there are significant differences in tourist behaviour in their perception towards destination image. Crotts and Pizam (2003) pointed out that culture is one of the main forces that influence tourists’ decision-making in tourism choice. Iverson (1997) recognized behavioural difference between Japanese and Korean tourists and found that Korean tourists take less time in travel planning than Japanese nationals. Likewise, Kozak et al. (2004) examined cross-cultural difference between English and German tourists visiting Turkey and Mallorca, found surprisingly difference between British and German tourists in terms of their perception of destination image i.e. the authors suggested that there are significant differences in the tourist behaviour in their perception towards destination image. Lee and Lee (2006) in their study focused on Guam’s image as perceived by the two most important national to the Guam’s inbound tourism industry, Korean and Japanese leisure travellers and the research identified the differences and similarity between the two nationality groups. The result found that Korean and Japanese tourist differs in terms of their destination image, which not only pulls a significant influence on destination choice but also preconditions tourist destination behaviours and attitudinal consequences.

Many researchers evaluated that tourist(s) source of information is crucial factor for destination image and destination choice (Gursoy and McCleary, 2004; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Um and Crompton, 1990; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989). However, Milman & Pizam (1995) believed that sources of information is just influence the tourists’ preferences and intentions for destination choice. Some researchers suggested that the most of the tourist behaviour models incorporated the search of external information as a significant component (Bettman, 1979; Engel et al., 1978; Gursoy and McCleary, 2004; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Schmoll, 1977; Um and Crompton, 1990; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989). Second, some scholars had examined the influence of information sources on tourists’ preferences and intentions.
(Mayo, 1973; Milman and Pizam, 1995). Third, other studies have focused on the relationship between information sources, destination chosen and travel decisions (Baloglu, 2000; Bieger and Laesser, 2004; Chen and Gursoy, 2000; Eagles, 2000; Getz and Sailor, 1993; Gitelson and Crompton, 1983; Goossens, 1994; Gursoy and McCleary, 2004; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Santos, 1998; Sirakaya and Woodside, 2005; Um and Crompton, 1990; Wicks and Schuett, 1991, 1993; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989; Woodside et al., 2000; Woodside and Dubelaar, 2002). Finally, another important factor is image. Image plays significant role for destination marketers so as to differentiate their destination in this highly competitive market (Yilmaz et al., 2009). In this way, formal such as brochures and informal information sources such as word of mouth, relatives and friends influence the image formation of a tourist destination (Beerli and Martin, 2004; Crompton, 1979; Etzel and Wahlers, 1985). Similarly, the role of information sources in forming destination images has also been highlighted by many researchers such as Baloglu (2000); Baloglu and Mangaloglu (2001); Echtner and Ritchie (2003); Gursoy and McCleary (2004); Sonmez and Sirakaya (2002); Um and Crompton (1990) and Woodside and Lysonski (1989). Whereas, tourists create images of alternative destinations, so image also emerges as a complex element in the destination choice process (Um and Crompton, 1999). This is consistent with the concept that information sources and the attributes of the different destinations outline the basis for different image and experience expectations.

Beerli and Martin (2004b) analysed that the structural features such as age, education, gender, income status, and cultural degree etc. - of tourists are most significant factors about choosing the region by tourists. The effects of socio-demographic variables on destination image are analysed by many researchers (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Baloglu, 1997; Chen and Kerstetter, 1999; Alhemoud and Armstrong, 1996; Walsmley and Young 1998; MacKay and Fesenmaier 2000; Joppe et al. 2001; Mac Kay and Fesenmaier, 1997; Hui and Wan, 2003; Stern and Krakover, 1993; Ahmed, 1991; and Albayrak and Ozkul, 2013). Further, some scholars claimed that age and educational status, which are socio-demographic
features, are the most important factors that affect destination image (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999), on the whereas some other researchers showed that gender and age are the most important factors (Walmsley and Jenkins, 1993). Another scholar Baloglu (1997) revealed that the destination selection process of a tourist, image formation before the visit is the most important period and because of that before affecting behaviour it is needed to understand how image forms. It is understood that among all socio-demographic characteristics age and educational level affects image mostly. Likely, in a research done on German tourists visiting the USA, it was found that the most significant factor that fluctuate perceived image is age. In some of the studies mentioned, the perceived destination image differs by nationality of the tourists. Also, Beerli and Martin (2004a) stated that, socio-demographic features of visitors have an effect on perceived image. It is observed that, generally women evaluate destination more positively. Age affects cognitive perception more, and as people get older, the probability to perceive destinations positively increases. Nationality especially has an important role on effective perception.

Patterson & Spreng (1997) revealed that satisfaction has direct relationship with revisit desire and satisfaction is the basis of prospect behavioural intentions of a tourist. A good behavioural intention symbolizes the loyalty about the destination. Customer loyalty is much significant for company. Loyalty customer will tell good experience to their friends, family or other potential customers (Shoemaker & Lewis, 1999). Chi and Qu (2008) found that destination image directly affects tourism satisfaction; destination image and satisfaction are the ancestor of the overall satisfaction. Image of a destination influences the level of satisfaction with tourists’ experience. Positive images of the destination will get high level of satisfaction whereas negative images will get low level of satisfaction (Salem, 2009). Moreover, the effects of destination image on post-visit tourist behaviour are generally acknowledged in tourism literature. Most research studies point out the relation between destination image and the tourists’ post-visit evaluative answer. When the tourists will have positive on-trip experience and positive overall destination image, there are more chance of re-visit to destination (Chon, 1992; Ross, 1993). Martin and
Waalen (2001) advised that there is always a direct relationship between destination loyalty and the positive destination image. Some other scholars claimed that the tourists will tend to become more loyal to a destination if they had various cultural experiences and a proper mode of travel at that place. Gucer (2010) analysed the factors affecting destination image under two titles: individual features and destination sourced features. Individual features include demographic features of the visitors such as gender, age, educational status, marital status, income status, and nationality and also include the motivation factors that attract people to go on holiday. Whereas destination sourced factors include information sources and destination specialities. Information sources are previous experiences of one, friends, relatives, travel agencies, travel guides, tourism bureaus, advertisements, newspapers, magazines, internet, television, radio, movies etc. and destination specialities include the perception of the features of destination by individuals or the services that a destination can offer. A person’s image of a tourism destination significantly affect the search for information, evaluation of the information and the decision to choose a final tourism destination, over other similar destinations (Baloglu et al., 1999; Ortega and Gonzales, 2007; Pike, 2010 and Wang and Gao, 2010). The image, held by a tourist about a destination, consists of a number of factors and their interrelationship to produce a ‘bundle of benefits’, which the tourists may be looking for. A number of these factors, forming a rational image for a tourist, have been identified in the literature (Ching-Fu and Dung Chun, 2007; Beerli and Martin, 2004).

Some scholars (Wang and Gao, 2010; Kim et al., 2007) described that tourists construct images of a tourism destinations on the basis of information strata from various available sources. Further, Kim et al. (2007) stated that sources of information can be marketing-dominated and non-marketing-dominated. The marketing-dominated information comes from visual sources such as advertising in the mass media, brochures, tourist guides, portals and the Internet. The non-marketing dominated information is obtained from daily basis contacts such as friends, family members, and personal experiences. The availability of various sources of information will not only form the tourist’s personal frame of references/images, but will also be
helpful for destination choice for travel and the planning of his/her trip to a
destination (Wang and Gao, 2010; Kim et al., 2007). Gabriel Baffour Awuah and
Venilton Reinert (2011) while studying tourist’s information search behaviour, the
respondents were asked to give the sources, from which they obtained their
information about the tourism destination under study, Brazil. For instance, TV as a
source of information turned out to be the key source, from which the respondents get
their information, followed by information from friends and family members. Tasci,
Gartner and Cavusgil (2007) stated that nowadays the results of tourism image
research are used by marketers to conduct intelligent destination marketing i.e. most
important decisions regarding planning, development, positioning, and promotion
depend on the results revealed from these researches.

Walmsley and Jenkins (1993) in their study about measuring the perceived
image of different touristic places of Australia, found that the images of some regions
changes by the gender and age of visitors and strongly recommended that age and
gender are the most important factors that can affect the destinations’ image. In
similar vein, MacKay and Fessenmaier (1997) put forward that age and marital status
of tourists has no affect on perceived image. However, same study found that there
are some differences between individuals gender, income status and image perception.
In the study which is held on the Y generation tourists’ perception of destination
image in Istanbul, Albayrak and Ozkul (2013) identified that the gender, education
and income status of tourists visiting a destination differs by their perceived image.
Further, Sahbaz and Kilicar (2009) opined that perceived image differs by gender and
the perceived image of women about Mardin participating in research is more
positive. While studying about the image of Pennsylvania, Chen and Kerstetter (1999)
stated that gender, age and number of family members of tourists, affect perceived
image importantly. Further, this study revealed that there is a strong relationship
between perceived destination image and nationality of tourist and nationalities affect
destination image and destination image differs by the nationalities. Alhemoud and
Armstrong (1996) stated that destination image differs by age and nationality. Some
other scholars claimed that perceived image differs only by nationality variable
Whereas Hui and Wan (2003) pointed out that there are some differences in destination image sourced only by nationality and there is no difference sourced by other socio-demographic features of the tourists.

Some research scholars argue that image is very different from branding (Morgan et al. 2004) while others argue that branding is overwhelmingly associated with image (Pritchard and Morgan 2001). In the context to tourism destinations, there are several different definitions of image (Echtner and Ritchie 1991, 1993; Gartner 1989; ; Hunt 1975; Mayo 1973). Some authors commonly argue that in case of tourism destination and in case of consumer products (commodities), image plays an important part of brand (Fakeye and Crompton 1991; Coshall 2000; Hankinson 2004). A strong image contributes to build a brand and it will result as the success of the market. However, as long as the image is positive, a destination brand would have a strong position in the market and therefore a brand strengthens its image. Bigne et al. (2001) suggested that recurring intentions and recommending intentions are influenced by tourism image and quality variables of the destination.

Chon (1992) analysed the effects of mis-match between the image and expectations of a destination and the actual experience of that destination and associated this to models of buyer behaviour. The study result was that a positive image and positive travel experience will result in a relatively positive evaluation of a destination, whereas a negative image and a positive experience will cause a highly positive evaluation of a destination. The most negative evaluation will result from a positive image and negative experience. In other words, we can say travel experience of a tourist may affect the image of destination positively or negatively. Pearce (1982), and Woodside and Lysonski (1990) demonstrated that there is strong relationship between positive perceptions of destinations and positive purchase decisions. Even though these perceptions may not be based on fact or first-hand experience, they nevertheless exert an essential persuade on a potential tourist’s decision to visit a destination. Similarly, negative images will determine potential tourists and result in a decision not to purchase the holiday at specific destination.
Yoon and Kim, (2000) said that destination image can be affective and cognitive image. Moreover, this study revealed that affective image has more impacts on developing destination image. Thus, destination attributes that are associated with internal sources or feeling of travel such as exotic atmospheres, relaxation, scenic beauty, and good climate, are most useful components for developing a destination's image. Similarly, cognitive image components such as personal safety, good restaurant, suitable accommodations, friendly people and unique architecture of the monuments could be better destination attributes to develop destination image. Bouzari (2012) pointed that cognitive attributes directly affects the overall image. Likely, supported by previous researches, cognitive attributes that can be characterized in terms of functional and psychological, have great influence and effect on overall image of the tourists (Echtner & Ritchie, 1991; Walmsley & Young, 1998; Chen & Uysal, 2002). Similarly, some other authors (O’Neill & Jasper, 1992; Kim & Yoon, 2003) revealed the affective attributes affect overall image. The affective attributes that is discussed in terms of whether the destination is pleasant or not, relaxing or distressing and other ideas and believes about a destination have great impact on overall image of a destination. Further, they pointed out that future behaviour is strongly affected by overall image. Some more scholars examined the relation between overall image and future behaviour and confirmed that there is positive and direct relation between these dimensions (Alcaniz et al., 2009; Alhemoud & Armstrong, 1996; Chen & Kerstetter, 1999; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Joppe et al., 2001; Ross, 1993).

Moreover, we can suggest that the destination-projected image might not be always the same as the received image, and the perceivers can also create images through personal experience. So, in this way, information transmission between suppliers, intermediaries and customers has become more complicated since the arrival of the Internet (Choi et al., 2007). Today internet has become human need like food, shelter etc. Gartner (1993) and Gunn (1988) proved that whenever it comes to shaping image of a tourist destination, internet is considered most useful source of information over other traditional sources, such as friends and associates, commercial
agents, suppliers, destination marketing organizations, advertising, media, and travel
guides or documentaries. Although used as an information source, the internet also
comprises a communication path that many traditional information sources are far
behind. Beerli & Martin (2004) justified that the internet is purely an information
source that surpasses traditional channels of communication. In modern life, the ease
to access social media and social networks make it possible for anyone to circulate
information about a destination visited that other tourists may consult. Local vendors
and local marketing organizations publish the information about the destination to
attract tourists directly without being dependent on intermediaries (WTTC, 2011).
Several similar studies have tried to understand how tourists use internet-based
communication medium to collect the information, as well as how tourism suppliers
can make best use of these medium of information (e.g., Buhalis & Law, 2008; Casalo
et al., 2010; Chung & Buhalis, 2008; Ho et al., 2012; Huertas, 2012; Litvin et al.,
2008; Munar, 2011; Papathanassis & Knolle, 2011; Xiang & Gretzel, 2010).
Moreover, most of the researchers analyzed different channels of information
individually, without taking consideration the combined weight of various web
platforms for determining the images of tourist destinations (Hyun & O'Keefe, 2012).
Whereas Biswas (2004) analysed that the information collected online is different
from its offline forms; information shared by the Internet, exclusively persuade the
process by which people develop images of the destination.

Li and Wang (2011) analysed destination image of China by content analysis
of travel blogs. Blog authors had a mixed image of China as a destination, reflected
various features of tourists’ experiences visiting China, from travelling between
destinations, visiting attractions and eating food to overall impressions. Most of the
bloggers perceived positively in terms of scenery/natural attractions,
fairs/exhibits/festivals, hospitality/friendliness/receptiveness and historic
sites/museums. International tourists look primarily upon China’s cultural attractions,
historical sites and natural sceneries (Xiao and Mair, 2006). Further, the research
concluded that these positive dimensions can be used to enhance China’s image.
Whereas, dimensions associated with negative words were crowdedness and local
infrastructure/transportation, indicating the major weaknesses of China’s tourism industry.

Lee and Lockshin (2011) applied a theoretical model to study relationship between the variables which are destination image, product beliefs and preference for domestic product and demonstrated that tourists with positive and favourable image of a destination tend to favour visiting or revisiting the destination. Further, the study concluded that “tourists may use destination image to form product beliefs. A favourable destination image leads to positive product beliefs. If a tourist is not satisfied with the destination visited (services) or if the tourist had a deprived experience about that destination, it will be very crucial to improve a destination’s image and method in order to generate future revisits to enhance the destination life. In similar vein other scholar recommended that “a positive image can suggest that the traveller’s poor experience was a rare exception” (Assaker et al., 2011). So, in other words we can say that we must try to improve a destination’s image, so travellers tend more to visit the destination and revisit intention will be increased.

Martin & Bosque (2008) stated that destination image should be considered a multi-dimensional phenomenon integrated by several cognitive and affective dimensions. Further, the authors suggested that mental image of a tourist destination depends upon the individuals’ beliefs about the destination (cognitive image), as well as feelings toward it (affective image). Tanvi (2007) claimed that destination image has different dimensions which work together to form an overall image. Positive image is always helpful to grab potential tourists and thus the destination managers are working constantly towards enhancing a positive image of these sub-tourism dimensions through various marketing strategies. Further, the author suggested that the overall image of India as perceived by the British is positive. However, study also revealed the fact that India’s image as a travel destination is a combination of both positive and negative perceptions. Finally, the author concluded that India’s image seemed to keep changing across its various tourism sub-sectors with respect to both British visitors and non- visitors. Konecnik (2004) stated that destination’s image has been recognized as complex and crucial concept in the destination selection process.
A positive image brand will encourage internal investment; tourism is a magnetic force for talented professional jobs, and if it is properly managed, it can transform sense of purpose and identity for the people of the country, region, or city (Anholt, 2004).

Meng and Uysal (2008) evaluated the gender differences about the perceived attributes of destination and said that there are significant gender differences about the perceived importance of destination attributes and travel values when potential tourists consider destination choices. Research also tried to evaluate the demographic controlling and travel behaviour variables such as age, gender, and marital status. Further, the authors pointed that there is a difference in perception of a destination according to gender i.e. women, in comparison with men put a higher importance on attributes related to the destination. Jenkins (1993) also observed similar result on in an Australian study of tourist perceptions of the Great Barrier Reef. The respondents who had visited the reef had to choose one of the best photographs from a group of seven images that has same features matching with their personal image. The results revealed that most of the respondent chose photograph with aerial view of the reef, despite a close-up view of coral, snorkelling, diving or boat trips, as this photograph was more commonly experienced by the respondents themselves.

The experiential dimension of leisure and tourism voyages has not been widely explored (Botterill and Crompton, 1996) and tourists’ expectations and reactions are considered important because they primarily reflect tourists' cognitions, satisfaction and emotional reactions to a specific tourist venue (Ross, 1993). Chen and Tsai (2007) examined that destination image has the most pivotal affect on behavioural intentions of the tourists. Destination image affects behavioural intentions directly or indirectly. Further, the result revealed that it is necessary to build the right image with positioning strategies in destination marketing. Destination image not only affects decision making process but also the behaviour of tourists after the decision making. So in this way, efforts of shaping a destination image or developing it ease the revisit or recommend behaviours of tourists.
Marshalls (2007) claimed that county image develops partially from natural elements that cannot be transformed or easily influenced as history, natural, geographical, people etc. However, promoters & policy makers can review geopolitics; policies etc. and manage the information sources (e.g. media) which could significantly improve the image of a given destination. Country’s “image” significantly influences consumer’s evaluation of a tourist destination. The prevailing country image determines the promotion approach that will be suitable in the target market. Further, author stated that effective image building should replicate the reality as promotion campaign should not be used solely as the activity of painting conceptual picture but depict the reality and meet expectation of tourist consumers.

Ghada Abdalla Mohamed (2008) studying Egypt’s image as a tourist destination applied path analysis model and claimed that the recreation destination image has a positive effect on behavioural variables and satisfaction in Hurghada. Whereas the image does not affect the factors of the quality of destination or a tour. Regarding the relationship between perceived quality and satisfaction, perceived quality of destination has a positive influence on satisfaction and willingness to return, its influence on willingness to recommend the destination did not satisfactorily provide evidence. On the other hand, perceived quality of the destination affects willingness to return and Satisfaction. So, we can say the quality of the destination in recreation tourism is more effective than the quality of the tour. With respect to the sequence: image → quality → satisfaction → post purchase behaviour suggested by the review of the literature, the analysis of the inter-relationships as a whole confirms this model to a large extent, although satisfaction does not affect behavioural variables. Furthermore these results approved the suggested matrix by the present study regardless of the relationship between the quality of the whole experience and behavioural variables. Besides, promotional tools affect perceived quality of destination & quality of the tour, but it does not affect the willingness to return, to recommend the destination or satisfaction.

Okumu & Yasin (2008) opined that the geographical area/ region need to be successful tourist destination, there is need to recognise the tourists’ perceived images
as these affects the individual’s subjective perception, behaviour and destination choice. The research examined the image differences of the three Mediterranean destinations - Italy, France and Morocco - as perceived by university student and the result found that perceived images of the three destinations are significantly different and university students promoting these destinations have differentiated images of Italy, France and Morocco. Similarly, Khan (2013) studied image of India and said that under the word “Experience” the tourists get across the umbrella image of India, collectively positive and negative perceptions. The holistic image of destination India is reflected as a country that offers an “unparalleled travel experience.” The result showed that India is recommended as a “must visit” destination. Further, the research suggested that this unique identity of India reflected in the word experience should be utilised by the destination marketing organization to create strong memorable image and branding of India. Interestingly, some other study suggested to improve image of country as a tourist destination, the destination marketing organizations should benefit from continuously monitoring after destination visit, images reported and disseminated by tourists (Venkatachalam and Venkateswaran, 2010). Oliver (1997) analysed that comparison of expectation and experience results in positive disconfirmation (experience exceeds expectation) or negative disconfirmation (expectation exceeds experience), leading to satisfaction and dissatisfaction of the tourist, respectively. The pre-trip / post-trip evaluation of destination image was adopted by a limited number of studies, which include scholars such as Chaudhary (2000), Pizam and Milman (1993), Weber (1997), Litvin and Ling (2001), and Truong & Foster (2006). Weber (1997) stated that German travellers’ post-trip perception exceeded over their expectation in a number of areas, such as landscapes, fauna, shopping, dining, hiking, etc. The positive confirmation of expectation had a significant impact on tourists’ satisfaction level. The gap analysis between expectation and performance can help management to take decision and improve the poor performance and enhance management’s understanding of satisfaction (Parasuraman et al., 1993; Jain & Gupta, 2004; Saleh & Ryan, 1991). It can also help to identify a destination’s strengths and weaknesses so that effective measures can be
taken to ensure tourists’ expectations are met at the destination visited (Chaudhary, 2000).

Tourism research scholars (Pizam & Milman, 1993; Weber, 1997; O’Leary & Deegan, 2005) proposed that the expectation of a tourist should be asked before the tourist visit to a destination. These scholars preferred the traditional pre-test/post-test model where travellers’ expectation is measured before the trip and the post-trip perception is measured after the tour. Contrary, this practice needs collecting matched pre- and post-trip samples, which is particularly complicated, time consuming and costly with international travel. Moreover, another significant weakness of the traditional model is the presence of reply changes prejudicially that could result to be misleading (Howard, 1980; Manthei, 1997; Rohs, 1999). Go and Kumar (2007) summarised that while choosing a destination, the personality of the tourist become important factor. Personality characters influence the differentiation between destinations (Murphy et al, 2007). Firmino Santos & Carneiro (2006) said that demographic variables of a tourist influence the tourist image of the destination. Similarly, Beerli and Martín (2004) also supported that motivation; socio-demographic variables and experience are important factors for forming the image of a tourist destination.

Tasci (2007) analysed that the age, race, and a previous visit to the tourist destination play important role for creation of destination image in the minds of tourists. Moreover, some other scholars advocate that education level and (socio-psychological) motivation to travel manipulate affective assessment of a tourist, i.e., feelings and emotions (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Gartner, 1993; Moutinho, 1987; Walmsley & Young, 1998). Tasci (2007) used a longitudinal approach to analyze the images of first-time and non-visitors to Michigan based on the secondary dataset provided by the Michigan Regional Travel Market Survey. Interestingly, the study revealed that people who had visited Michigan had a better overall image over other people who had not. Some scholars (Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Kaplanidou, 2007) have investigated the role of past travel experience in destination image formation using familiarity as an intermediate factor. They found that past travel experience has
increased individuals’ familiarity with a place, while familiarity positively affected individuals’ images of a destination (Baloglu, 2001). So, we may conclude that both perceptual-cognitive and affective measurement configures the overall image that people develop about a tourist destination (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999a). Personality traits of individuals influence the differentiation between destinations (Murphy et al, 2007). Therefore, travel experiences of the tourists manipulate individuals’ images of the destination.

Many research scholars have also confirmed the role of past travel experience in influencing perceived images. Whereas, some scholars have different conclusions as to what component of the perceived image is influenced by past travel (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007). Hu & Ritchie (1993) revealed a person’s previous visits positively affect specific attributes of the cognitive image such as destination attractiveness. Baloglu & Brinberg (1997) suggested that earlier visitation can lead to more affective images. In similar vein, some other researchers (Chen & Kerstetter, 1999; Hunt, 1975; Young, 1999) advocated the proposition that earlier visit to a destination had no significant influence on destination image. Interestingly, tourist’s choice of destination is the outcome of strong image of a destination. Chen and Kerstetter (1999) stressed that a tourist will choose one destination over another only if its positive image aspects surpass its negative image aspects. Alhemoud & Armstrong (1996) and Ross (1993) pointed that destination image must be not only positive but also so strong that it pushes the travellers to choose the destination for visit. Similarly, Bramwell & Rawding (1996) suggested that destinations should have idiosyncratic images which are different among tourists’ everyday life experiences in order to be chosen as a travel destination to visit. Hunt discovered that destinations with enormously exotic images may not be chosen by a potential tourist as such qualities might cause discomfort to the traveller. Interestingly, this proposition was supported by other researchers, MacKay and Fesenmaier (1997) analysed that visuals depicting the unique features of a destination may cause uncomforting at many times.
The travel destination preference model was developed by Plog (1974). Plog designed this model to explain how tourists’ personality characteristics find out their travel patterns and preferences. This model described that individual travellers can be categorised along the psychocentric /allocentric gamut based upon a group of personality characteristics. The gamut was divided into five segments: (a) psychocentric, (b) near-psychocentric, (c) mid-centric, (d) near-allocentric, and (e) allocentric. At one extreme of the scale are psychocentric travellers, who were referred as “self-inhibited, nervous, and non-adventuresome, preferring well-developed destination and travelling with groups”. At the other end of the scale there is allocentrics, who are referred as outgoing and self-confident, try to explore new things, and to explore the world, prefer independent trip experience at destinations that have not yet been developed. Historically, this model helped to provide one organizing theory of travel motivation. Moreover, this model has been widely quoted in the tourism literature; allocentric and psychocentric have become standard idiom in the field.

At the same time, it has been examined by many critics who objected aspects of the model's applicability and validity (Griffith & Albanese, 1996). It is believed that the most interesting debate was initiated by Smith (1990). He examined actual travel behaviour with in a multinational sample structure and revealed that Plog’s model failed to support the hypothesized relationship between personality characteristics and destination choice. Plog (1990) challenged that his model was not performed since Smith (1990) used the “wrong variables,” the “wrong Classification system,” and the “wrong sample.” So, the contradictory nature of the empirical results of Smith (1990) leads to questioning of Plog's model. However, Griffith & Albanese (1996) suggested that it may not be the question of the validity of the model, but rather the conditions under which the model was tested. Joppe et al. (2001) pointed out that destination choice depends on tourists’ needs and wants and benefits that the destination is believed to offer (Gartner & Shen, 1992). Similarly, Gartner (1993) suggested that choice of destination mainly depends on a “benefit package, unique to the destination, likely to provide the utmost fundamental reward to the
traveller,’’ which will be plagiaristic from destination image. Although importance of image on post-visit behaviour has been recognized, but it is considered one of the most hindered aspects of destination image theory since only a few researchers have studied this effect empirically. Ross (1993) found correlations among some destination dimensions and respondents’ evaluative variables. Interestingly, research revealed that if tourists have positive image of the destination in terms of the receptiveness dimension, they are more likely to revisit the destination. Milman and Pizam (1995) also stated that once tourists were satisfied with their experience they might keen to revisit a destination. Further, Joppe et al (2001) studied the dimensions affecting destination loyalty and found that different cultural experiences and convenient transportation were extensively related to destination loyalty. Further, some authors argue that awareness about a destination through tourist information plays an important role in tourists’ destination choice (Baloglu, 2001). Court and Lupton (1997) recognized the significance of well-designed and targeted marketing communication because, they argue, tourist information affects destination choice by gearing both awareness and interest, which will stimulate aspiration and guide to action. Milman and Pizam (1995) stated that awareness automatically may not create interest and, ultimately, a purchase decision. However, it is believed when choice is possible it is rational to assume that a decision process including the cognitive and affective image components does take place. Interestingly, Govers & Go (2003) stated that one of the most vital aspects of image formation for a tourist destination is to recognise the most significant variables, the tourist consider when evaluating a destination. Further, he suggested that the choice for a destination, respective to a particular target market, can be analysed by notifying the preferences of visitors relative to these variables and then matching them with their perception about the destination.

Chiang (2016) developed a theoretical model to study the relationships between destination image, place dependence, place identity, and destination loyalty among visitors in the Tainan night markets, Taiwan. In addition to clarifying the relationships between destination image, place dependence, place identity and
destination loyalty based on the cognitive model of Oliver (1980), his research verified the applicability of place attachment to the assessment of the behaviour of visitors to night markets. The research revealed that in night markets, destination image is an important predecessor of place dependence, place identity, and destination loyalty. Similar results were emphasized by some other scholars that destination image can affect both destination affection (Prayag & Ryan, 2012; Wang et al., 2011) and destination loyalty (Bosque & Martin, 2008; Qu et al., 2011; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). In fact, to maintain a good night market image is more significant in order to consolidate visitors and achieve positive marketing and management outcomes. Further, the scholar found that destination identity has a direct effect on destination loyalty Chiang (2016). Moreover, Loureiro (2014) put forwarded the significance of showing visitors how the local character of a specific destination is different from that of other places. As, destination image have direct effect on destination loyalty, it also affects destination loyalty through place identity. Therefore, to increase destination loyalty with the help of destination image, the effects of place identity should also be considered as vital and tourists’ destination loyalty can be indirectly increased by intensifying their arousing uniqueness. Further, Fakeye and Crompton (1991) also suggested that there is a correlation between the destination image and the tourists’ spending time at the destination and long-stay tourists are more likely to acquire more ingenuous and reliable image of the destination. Similarly, Fan et al. (2014) analysed the relationship between tourist destination image, place affection, and tourists’ environmentally responsible behaviour toward tourist resorts in China and found that both facility image and service image directly effects the destination dependence and the destination identity is significantly affected by security image, service image, and landscape image.

Dolores et al. (2012) take exploratory study on the Formation of a Tourist Destination’s Image via Information Sources: the Moderating Effect of Culture and found that that international tourists’ pre-visit image is prejudicially inclined by the level of ambiguity evading of their national cultures. Further, they proposed that tourists from high uncertainty avoidance cultures, such as France, Belgium or Italy,
hold more positive destination images after having only used the travel agency information than after having used both the travel agency and the internet, the earlier being an information source that is more on keeping with their culture-bound preferences. The use of the internet comparable to the travel agency information results in a deterioration of the destination image as internet is an information source associated with risk and therefore contradictory with their culture. On the other hand, tourists coming from low uncertainty avoidance cultures, such as the British, failed affected by the use of the internet compared to the travel agency. Further, research highlighted the effect of information sources (travel agencies and the internet) put forth on destination image formation and revealed that uncertainty avoidance, as a dimension of national culture, influences a destination’s pre-visit image by the information source used by the tourist. Nolan (1976) examined the sources of travel information used by domestic tourists in the USA and revealed that the information source used most often was the advice of friends and relatives (words of mouth), followed by guidebooks and commercial tourist information, then advertising publications. In terms of sound travel information sources, guidebooks were rated highest, whereas government services by the country and the advice of friends of relatives were rated most informative. Further, he also measured another variable ‘objectivity’ of the travel information sources by questioning respondents to rate whether the sources were biased / unbiased, and concluded that an overall bias in the communication of travel information (specially travel-brochures) was recognised by the respondents.

Sunarti & Sri Hartini (2015) found that the service quality of ecotourism considerably influences the functional destinations image and the psychological destinations image, but the service quality of ecotourism does not influence significantly toward the behavioural intentions. The functional destinations image significantly influences the behavioural intentions of the tourists and the psychological destinations image considerably influences the behavioural intentions. Further, the research revealed that the variables of service quality on ecotourism influence the functional destinations image which means that better the perception of
the service quality can develop the idea on the functional destinations image. Contrary, the less the perception of the service quality on the ecotourism will not develop the functional destination image. Similarly Kang and James (2004); Mohamad et al, (2013) studied the positive relationship between the service quality and image and found that the higher perception of the service quality will present the positive view on the functional destination image. Similarly, Baker & Crompton (2000) and Haque & Khan (2013) also advocated that there is a deep-seated relationship between the service quality and the behavioural intention at the destination. Chen & Tsai (2007) and Chi & Qu (2008), Guliling (2013), Rajesh (2003) found that the positive tourist destinations image influences the behavioural intentions of the foreign tourists to re-visit the destination in the future. Nunkoo and Ittoo (2013) revealed that the Psychological destinations image variable influences the behavioural Intentions. In other words, as better the psychological destinations image will be, as will develop the behavioural intentions of the foreign tourists.

Alessandro et al. (2016) concluded that tourism satisfaction is definitely influenced by country image, but, perhaps not surprisingly, satisfaction is influenced directly only by travellers’ destination beliefs, whereas the influence of country image and product beliefs is indirect. Elliot et al. 2011; Lee and Lockshin (2012) also reinforces the importance of consumers’ views and suggests that travellers classify their beliefs, forming their perceptions of trip satisfaction directly from the destination image of a country, and indirectly through the influence on that image of the country’s general and producer-based images. Further, Alessandro et al. (2016) put another supposition that destination beliefs are also influenced directly by product beliefs and product familiarity. Sirakaya et al. (2001) conducted a study with the aim of determining in how far images can predict the chances of potential travellers to select a certain place as vacation destination. The main aim of their study was to gain a deeper understanding of the role of images for destination choice of a particular market segment. Further, they revealed that people can actually compartmentalise their mental images and make an evaluation of each image according to its importance for the decision concerning the eventual choice. Moreover, all images
play equal roles and that some have to be managed more effectively and be carefully than others by the tourism planners. Tafiprios et al (2016) identified that cultural values influences the image of destination, hitherto did not influence the tourists' intention to visit. Further, they revealed that word of mouth variable influences the destination image and the intentions to visit. Moreover, destination image intervenes the influence of cultural values and word of mouth to the tourists' intentions to visit, but did not intervene the influence of motivation to the tourists' intentions to visit.

Mahadzirah et al. (2012) suggested that destination marketers while marketing a tourist destination should consider image factor as vital as it will affect tourists’ behavioural intention. Further, they revealed that if foreign tourists’ perceived favourable destination image, they will recommend the destination more positively than and as well as to undertake repeat visitations in future. Erdem & Swait (1998) studied that when tourists believe destination sources, the information provided is more likely to apply an influential effect on their views about destination image. Further, they stated that user generated content is very reliable; it can help tourists and travellers to build the image of a destination and purchaser access to information related to attributes, experiences and emotions shared by other tourists may then affect their perceived image of the destination. O’Leary and Deegan (1993) put forward that destination image researches provide a practical contribution for making effective marketing strategies. Economic environment research showed that competition between destinations has increased, however funding has decreased. This competes with the need for efficient evaluations of destinations and a profound comprehension of tourists’ needs (Formica, 2002). Further, Laws et al., (2002) explained that lack of information and comprehension creates barriers to the development and implementation of strategy in destination image management. O’Leary and Deegan (2003) examined the accountability of tourism players by stating, “those involved in image management must ensure that they are amplifying (not fabricating) positive attributes that represent the facts at the destination” and such strategic thinking will help to fill gaps between customer perceived expectations and actual customer experiences at the destination.
Hui & Wan (2003) analysed that by having a basic understanding of tourist’s perceptions and needs, a destination would be in a position to build and manage an appropriate destination image and commence a marketing strategy that would enable it to position itself as a choice destination. Destination images are inclined to socio-demographic characteristics, motivations, previous experience of the visit and information sources (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Beerli & Martin, 2004). Socio-demographic variables are known to influence the cognitive evaluations of destination image with many studies citing the influence of age and education (Gartner 1994; Dann 1996; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Beerli & Martin, 2004; Correia & Oom do Valle, 2006). Nationality of the tourists influence both cognitive and affective constructs (Beerli & Martin, 2004; Prayag & Ryan, 2011) with similar cultural traits bringing comfort to the individual (San Martin & Del Bosque, 2008). Covert induced images promoted by travel agents were found to have considerable influence (Beerli & Martin’s, 2004; Frias et al., 2008) however it is independent agents that prove to be commendable when influencing the formation of image (Govers et al., 2007; Llodra-Riera et al., 2015) creating a positive (Richards et al., 2003; Hsu et al., 2004) or negative impact (Sonmez & Sirakaya, 2002) on a destination’s image. The internet with its application of Web 2.0 tools creates an access for both senders and receivers of communication via text or visual format (Camprubi et al., 2013; Munar & Jacobsen, 2014). This enables a tailored form of “story telling” for particularly induced formation agents who can create an interaction with a specific market using resources effectively. The freedom of this user-friendliness however means that individuals are exposed to an array of sources making the management of a destination’s image a challenge for marketing managers.

Analysis of destination image attributes has grown as a significant string of tourism & hospitality research from past few decades (Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Chon 1990; Crompton and Ankomah 1993; Dagostar and Isotalo 1992; Dann 1996; Fakeye and Crompton 1991; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002; Milman and MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Murphy and Pritchard 1997; Peters and Pikkemaat 2003; Pike 2002; Pizam 1995; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002). Therefore,
many definitions of destination images have been given (Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Coshall 2000; Echtner and Ritchie 1993; Gartner 1993; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002; Klenosky 2002) and most of them summarised that image as the sum of perceptual beliefs, ideas, and impressions based on information processing from the various sources from time to time resulting in a mental construct (Gartner 1993; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997). Crompton (1979) gave the most frequently cited definition of a destination image that ‘an image may be defined as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination’ (Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002). Thus a destination image is tourist’s total impression which is formed as a result of the assessment of various destination components’ and attributes whereby differences in meaning, number and consequence of dimensions may occur (MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997).

The overall image construct is mainly determined by two major forces: personal factors and stimulus (destination) factors (Crompton 1979; MacKay and Fesenmaier 1997; Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002). Following this motivational research by using the push and pull theory (Dann 1981; Dann 1996) the push or person determined image factors embrace psychological factors, e.g. values, motivations, personality as well as social factors, e.g. age, education, marital status. The pull or destination determined image factors summarize the influence of external stimulus and physical objects as well as previous experiences (Baloglu and McCleary 1999). The importance of studying this relationship between the push and pull factors dependent of each other instead of being entirely independent has been recently strengthened by Klenosky (2002). Focussing on destination determined image factors and following thereby Echtner and Ritchie’s (1993) path breaking work on the measurement of destination images tangible (functional) and intangible (psychological) attributes of a destination can be distinguished: while tangible attributes are characteristics of an image which are directly observable (or measurable) intangible attributes are less tangible and more difficult to observe (and measure). Additionally, attribute-based or holistic image components and common or unique image factors have to be included for the
measurement of destination images as these three continuums altogether form tourists’ destination image (Echtner and Ritchie 1993).

A mutual agreement among scholars is that both affective and cognitive tourist evaluations are coincident elements for tourists’ image formation. Whereas the cognitive evaluation is associated to the beliefs or the knowledge about destination attributes, the affective evaluation refers to feelings or emotional responses towards destination attributes (Baloglu and Mangaloglu 2001; Gallarza, Saura et al. 2002; Gartner 1993; Pikkemaat and Peters 2003; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002). Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Sonmez and Sirakaya 2002 have agreed over earlier research (Gartner 1993; Dann 1996): that in fact cognitive images are formed prior to affective images. Therefore, affect is more likely to serve as an intervening variable between cognitive evaluations and the overall image construct (Baloglu and McCleary 1999).

An overall total impression, which is formed as a result of the evaluation of individual, attributes, which may contain both a cognitive and emotional component (Oxenfeldt, 1974-1975; Dichter, 1985). Similarly, Mazursky & Jacoby (1986) stated that destination image is a set of cognitions and affects that represent an entity to an individual. Dobni & Zinkhan (1990) revealed that a perceptual phenomenon formed through consumers’ reasoned and emotional interpretation. Baloglu (1996) developed two different approaches about stating the dimensions which affect image formation on the initial studies about image, moreover a consensus has been set up about that the dimensions which affect image formation originate from individual and also destination. Further, Baloglu and McCleary (1999) revealed that image is build-up by two main factors i.e. stimulus factors and personal factors. First factor describes about external stimulus and perceived physical objects whereas second factor describe about characteristics - social and psychology of the perceiver. Moreover, Tasci (2003) analysed that the information sources that has socio-psychologic visit behaviours and socio-demographic characteristics of tourists and past visit experiences step forward as the most important variables that affect destination image.

It has found that the tour guides are playing variety of roles which are very important for the tourism industry and image of destinations (Dahles, 2002; Pond,
Perception and thoughts of tour guides, as a significant role player, should be paid attention through the investigation of destination image as self-image data resources. Dahles (2002) emphasized the effect of tour guides on the destination image formation and image management as they play a fundamental responsibility in the social construction of a local identity. On a guided tour, tourists view and interpret local sights through the words of the tourist guides. Moreover, they are made to experience the environment according to the way in which the guide creates and represents it. However, the type of information and explanations provided for certain situations may be rather different from both the information that the government requires to be disseminated about a destination and the information which a local resident would provide, even though the guides are local residents”. It seems there is mutual consensus in the tourism literature that guides are not only key front line tourism staff of destinations but also representative and interface between host and visitor and a window on to a site, region or country (Ap and Wong, 2001; Cohen, Ifergan and Cohen, 2002; Dahles, 2002; Pond, 1993; Tosun and Temizkan, 2004; Zhang and Chow, 2004). Further, Zhang and Chow (2004) had examined many of past studies about guiding, and listed these mentioned roles in their study such as an ambassador, buffer, actor, supervisor, catalyst, culture agents, information giver, intermediary, interpreter/translator, leader, mediator, middleman, organizer, salesperson, shaman and teacher. Rahman & Simge (2016) investigated destination image: Tourist Guides as Self-Image Data Resources and revealed that tour guides are frontier and more intellectual staff of tourism industry, and are playing a significant role in the each of the stages of tourist experience in a destination and image formation process of that destination. Further, the authors stressed that for a successful tourism planning, destination management and marketing strategy, opinions of tour guides should be considered.

Buddhism has had a tremendous civilizing impact towards the socio-religious life of the Asian people since that period of the Asoka the Great, a time when the missionaries were sent to advertise the Buddhist religion to the remote areas (Armstrong, 2001). Up until the eighth century, Buddhism always remained deeply
entrenched within the most of the Asian countries, and then spread to other regions of the world. However, after its beginning to the East Asia countries, Buddhism became the dominant religion and has had profound effects to the East Asian culture. It has prejudiced the religious beliefs, social beliefs, cuisine, cultural celebrations and festivals as well as the art. Buddhism was spread to parts of the East Asian region as follows. In China, it was introduced in the first century CE; in Korea, it came in the fourth century CE and in Japan in the eighth century CE (Gyatso, 1995). Buddhism soon after its introduction became the leading spiritual tradition within these countries for a period of time, considering the fact that it was a religion that was primarily accepted by the royal classes (Mitchell, 2002).

Jeanette (2016) recognized that an ethical tourist destination image would be principally influenced by social factors such as having mutual respect between host and tourist, and where diversity and acceptance of all were present. This communicates a sense of tolerance between cultures; however the verbatim also highlighted the importance of authenticity and the need for the destination’s culture to be evident. This denotes a need for country identification and arguably differentiates one holiday destination from another. The need for a destination to have a true uniqueness resonates with this young sample and culture is a prominent attribute that represents self, feeling of belonging and identity. Finally, the results determined that an ethical destination image is constructed primarily via affective attributes, such as Wellbeing (being at peace, discovering oneself) and having a feeling of belonging and being secure. Further, environmental factors were considered to be the most influential in the ethical image of a tourist destination. Further, Li (2012) explored the destination image of China through international urban tourism and found that the internet provides enormous information to the travellers holding the information from the marketing aspect and the unbiased the sources from the tourists, such as e-newspapers, internet forum, and social-networking websites. Further, the author identified that the positive overall perceived image is the key to ensure destination loyalty. Overall perceived image is evaluated after experiencing the destination. Although destination loyalty is not directly affected by any negative images that
formed through travellers ‘actual experiences at the destination, but effectively reduce the chance of forming negative images could promote the chance of forming positive overall post-perceived images. However, it is argued that tourists’ overall experience consuming a combination of local tourism products and services develop their image of a destination after their visitation (Buhalis, 2000), perceived attractiveness, rather than overall satisfaction, is the antecedent of revisit intention (Um, Chon & Ro, 2006).

There is no consensus among researchers about what the sub-dimensions of destination image comprise. Some sub-dimensions, however, such as physically and emotionally immerse in the local culture, seeking or experiencing authenticity of site, attractions, comfort, value for money, site has symbolic meaning, seeking adventure, exotic atmosphere, feeling emotionally involved, have been widely, suggested (Chaudhary, 2000; Chen, 2001; Crotts and Pizam, 2003; Kozak et al., 2005; Chand, 2010a). Including those key sub-dimensions, the current study uses an exhaustive list of destination image items to test the perception of the respondents with regard to the importance of each item. Most of the destinations contend on their perceived images relative to competitors in the marketplace. Further, the tourists’ perceived images affect the individual’s subjective perception, consequent behaviour and destination choice, so recognizing the perceived image of a destination is significant to become successful (Chon, 1990, 1992; Echtner and Ritchie 1991; Gallarza et al., 2002; Hunt, 1975; Prebensen, 2007; Stabler 1988; Telisman Kosuta 1989). This central importance has led to a growing body of research on the tourism destination image.

The constructive analyses of previous literature have made a significant contribution to the scale development in destination image attributes and provide preliminary information for tourist destination image attributes. Understanding why people travel and which factors influence their behavioural intention while choosing a holiday destination are fundamental for tourism planners and marketers. Interestingly, the literature revealed that the term of destination image is linked to a variety of issues in the tourism research literature, but is most commonly mentioned in relation to tourism destination and discussions provide evidence of how tourism destinations
influence the provision of various types of services, safety, and security in the country. Although previous studies have developed critical attributes tied to tourists’ destination images, leading attributes that would help tourism scholars and practitioners measure the total attractiveness of a destination are still unknown. In addition, no such study was found that would help to enhance the image of India as a preferred destination among East Asian countries. These vital issues and considerations have motivated researchers to explore significant destination image attributes as perceived by the East Asian tourists especially in Indian context. Moreover, to explore untapped academic area which has huge tourist generating markets for India?

Thus, considering the above, it seems unlikely that one set of tourism destination image research will work equally well no matter what the context is. However, more research is needed in the tourism sector and in different contexts such as tourist perceptions towards the image of India as a tourist destination. To fill this gap present research has been conducted on an applied area entitled “INDIA’S IMAGE AS A TOURIST DESTINATION: THE PERCEPTION OF EAST ASIAN TOURISTS”.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter highlights the research methodology adopted in order to collect, analyse and interpret the data. A detailed description is provided exploring the rationale for choosing the specific techniques for data collection and analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Research in simple terms refers to search for knowledge. Research is a way of thinking, more than a set of skills, evaluating critically the different aspects of day-to-day problems; understanding and formulating guiding principles that administrate a particular procedure; and developing and testing new theories that contribute to the advancement of present literature. It is a scientific and systematic search for information on a particular subject or issue or problem. It is also known as the art of scientific investigation. Numerous social scientists have defined research in different ways.
In the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, D. Slesinger and M. Stephenson (1930) defined research as the manipulation of things, concepts or symbols for the purpose of generalizing to extend, correct or verify knowledge, whether that knowledge aids in the construction of theory or in the practice of an art.

Redman and Mory (1923) defined research as a systematized effort to gain new knowledge. Whereas, according to Clifford Woody (Kothari, 1988), research comprises defining and redefining problems, formulating hypotheses or suggested solutions; collecting, organizing and evaluating data; making deductions and reaching conclusions; and finally, carefully testing the conclusions to determine whether they fit the formulated hypotheses.

Thus, research is an addition to the available knowledge, which contributes to its further advancement. It is an attempt to pursue truth through the methods of study, observation, comparison and experiment. Summarising, research is the search for knowledge, using objective and systematic methods to find solution to a problem.

Research methodology is the process used to collect information and data for the purpose of making business decisions. The methodology may include publication research, interviews, surveys and other research techniques, and could include both present and historical information.

2.4 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main objectives of this research are -

- To identify the perceived image attributes being considered as vital by the tourists when it comes to choose India as a tourist destination.
- To study how the current image attributes differ among different cultures\nationality.
- To study the relationship of image perceived attributes whether these depend upon demographic characteristic of tourists.
- To examine the overall perceived importance attached to destination Attributes of Tourists’ Visiting in India,
• To suggest measures to tour operators, tourism planners and destination vendors to examine their product(s)\ service(s) offerings in cross-cultural perspective.

2.5  HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

On the bases of objectives, the following hypotheses are tested:

**H1:** There is a set of destination image attribute that is of most importance among the East Asian tourists to visit Indian destinations.

**H2:** The image attributes used to choose Indian tourist destination are not statistically significant with tourist culture\ nationality.

**H3:** There is a positive relationship between destination image attributes and specific demographic characteristic of tourists visiting in India.

**H4:** There is no significant relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables for overall perceived importance attached to destination Attributes of Tourists’ Visiting in India.

2.6  RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.6.1  Sampling and Data Collection

The present study is based on primary data collected through self structured questionnaire. The scholar initially made a pilot survey with English language written questionnaire, but most of the tourists were unable to understand the spirit of questions due to semantic barriers of communication. Therefore, the questionnaire was translated into three corresponding languages viz. Chinese, Japanese and Korean to make use in this research. In order to collect data, the researcher was assisted by the tour escorts (Chinese/Taiwanese, Korean & Japan). To complete usable questionnaire from the Japanese tourists the scholar has faced a moderate difficulty. Total 4000 questionnaire were distributed in the study areas by using convenience sampling, of which 2920 responses (73%) from different nationalities were found usable. However, to maintain statistical equality, only 700 respondents from each nation have been selected for analysis purpose. The survey was conducted during October 2014 – December 2015.
Table 2.1: Distribution of sample data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Questionnaire Distributed</th>
<th>Usable Data Received</th>
<th>Data Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>743 (78.2%)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>704 (64.00%)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>732 (75.46%)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>741 (75.61%)</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2 Research Instruments

The present study is based on primary data collected through a structured questionnaire developed from the exiting literature available in the area.

2.6.3 Destination image attributes

The main aim of the research is to investigate perceived attributes among East Asian tourists visiting in the Indian destinations. A convenient sampling method was applied to collect the data from foreign tourists (China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan).

The questionnaire consists two parts, part 1 containing demographic profile (gender, age group, nationality, occupation, education, type, type of accommodation used, travel planning, purpose of visit, inducement of visit, duration of tour, past experience and average annual income) of the respondents and second part includes tourist destination image variables derived from existing review of literature (Chaudhary, 2000; Kelly and Daniel, 2000; Chen, 2001; Crotts and Pizam, 2003; Kozak et al., 2004; Lee et al., 2005; Chand, 2010a; Lim, 2012).

The research used 81 image variables measured on a Likert-type 5-point scale ranging from 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 2= disagree and 1=strongly disagree in case of destination image.

2.7 FACTORS DERIVED

The exploratory principal factor analyses with Varimax rotation was applied on the 81 tourists’ perception variables categorised into nine factors. These factors are as follow:

(a) Cultural Dimensions (CD)
(b) Religious Dimensions (RD)

c) Family Dimensions (FD)

(d) Knowledge-Seeking Dimensions (KD)

(e) Destination /Sightseeing Dimensions (DD)

(f) Accommodation/Restaurants Service Dimensions (ARD)

(g) Basic Amenities Dimensions (BD)

(h) Safety & Security Dimensions (SD)

(i) Satisfaction /Prices Dimensions (PD)

2.8 STUDY AREA

The present study is based upon the data collected from Golden Triangle (Delhi- Agra – Jaipur) and Buddhist destinations at India.

Figure: 2.8 (Source: Maps of India, 2005)
2.9 METHOD OF ANALYSES

Data analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Version 20.0). The factor analysis, One way ANOVA and Multiple regression method were used to test the working hypothesis.

In order to achieve the objectives of present research and to the the working hypotheses, following analysis methods were employed:
1. Factor Analysis was performed to test that there is a set of destination image attribute that is of most importance among the East Asian tourists to visit Indian destinations.

2. One way ANOVA was performed to test the image attributes used to choose Indian tourist destinations are not statistically significant with tourist culture/Nationality.

3. One way ANOVA was executed to test that there is a positive relationship between destination image attributes and specific demographic characteristic of tourists visiting in India.

4. Multiple regression method was analyzed to check perceived importance attached to Destination Attributes of Tourists’ Visiting in India

2.10 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

1. This study will be the model study in the area of image of India as a tourist destination.

2. Present study highlights the destination image attributes which are considered vital while choosing India as a tourist destination.

3. The study will imply a model “destination image → trip quality → perceived value → tourists satisfaction → behavioral intentions after visit to India”.

4. This study will put together a theoretical relationship among destination image, service quality and perceived value that affect tourist satisfaction, which in turn persuade re-visit intentions and word-of-mouth (WOM) recommendations.

5. The study has made a modest attempt to add information to the very little empirical knowledge available referring to tourists’ perception of destination image of India.

6. This study enables understanding of how tourists scrutinize destination images to reach a decision on future action.

7. Helpful to design marketing plan for overseas markets.
8. This study will also help destination managers to define an advertisement strategy that makes India as a tourist destination more attractive.

9. The present study would be proved as an instrument for Government sector, tourism planners, and academician.

10. A model for researchers who are interested and working in this context.

2.11 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

All possible efforts were made to maintain the objectivity, validity and reliability of the study, yet certain limitations need to be kept in mind whenever its findings are considered for implementation. Such limitations are given under:

1. A limited number of studies have been conducted in the Indian context, which made it difficult to examine the problem with adequate number of references.

2. Language barrier has been recognized as a major drawback while collecting data.

3. This study is heavily based on primary data, which is very time consuming and cost effective.

4. Next limitation is measuring the perceived value of a destination image across a list of attributes, without any measure of attribute importance.

5. To understand the image of a destination is in isolation, given the purpose of study is to differentiate the image attributes from competing destinations in the minds of the potential costumers.

6. The conceptual formation process requires scholars’ personal mind/concept structures, which may lead to a limitation. Though the reliability and validity are still up to the requirements, it is necessary to mention it for future study suggestions.

7. Limitation of this research ignored to measure tourists’ perception before and after actual visitation in order to evaluate how well the image is promoted and actual image.

Finally, future researches should consider incorporating other significant items that have not been considered or omitted from other studies and are likely to influence the destination image attributes in perspective of Indian tourism industry.
2.12 ORGANISATION OF THE PROPOSED STUDY

This research has been divided into 4 chapters:

Chapter 1: Introduction

This gives a brief insight into the Indian tourism industry encompassing all its sub sectors with adequate emphasis on the East Asian market for Indian tourism. Further, this chapter gives a brief background of the study followed by the main objectives that the research aims to achieve.

Chapter 2: Literature review & Research Methodology

Literature review sets the academic tone for the research. It provides a comprehensive discussion on the existing literature on destination image, providing a framework for exploring into India’s image as a destination for the East Asian market.

Research methodology describes the objectives and procedure for carrying out the research. A detailed description is provided exploring the rationale for choosing the specific techniques for data collection and analysis.

Chapter 3: Research Analysis and Findings

In the research analysis, the data collected from the various research methods will be depicted, analyzed and interpreted to obtain the result of the study. The research findings have also been dealt with duly.

Chapter 4: Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations

This chapter will cover important findings, conclusion drawn by testing hypothesis and recommendations for tourism industry. This will also include suggestions for further study.
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