



## **TOURIST SATISFACTION, EXPERIENCE AND REVISIT INTENTION: A CASE STUDY IN NILGIRI DISTRICT**

**R. Abinaya\* & A. Balagurusamy\*\***

\* Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

\*\* Associate Professor & Head, Department of Commerce, Sri Ramakrishna Mission Vidyalaya College of Arts and Science, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

**Cite This Article:** R. Abinaya & A. Balagurusamy, "Tourist Satisfaction, Experience and Revisit Intention: A Case Study in Nilgiri District", International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education, Volume 11, Issue 2, July - December, Page Number 155-158, 2025.

**Copy Right:** © Crystal Pen Publication, 2025 (All Rights Reserved). This is an Open Access Article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17528296>

### **Abstract:**

The tourism sector has consistently emerged as one of the largest and fastest-growing economic industries. Among the prominent destinations in India, The Nilgiris has gained a large number of visitors due to its ecological diversity, cultural heritage and favourable climate. Identifying the determinants of tourist satisfaction in such destinations is essential for sustaining long-term growth. This study investigates the relationships among tourist satisfaction, overall experience and intention to revisit. It evaluates specific factors, including accommodation quality, service standards and environmental conditions that affect tourist satisfaction. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires that were distributed via Google forms to tourists at various locations in the Nilgiris. The findings highlight the importance of maintaining and improving service efficiency, ensuring visitor comfort, and promoting environmental sustainability as essential determinants of tourist satisfaction. Strengthening the aspects is expected to enhance the overall travel experience, repeat visitation, and contribute to the long-term development of tourism in the region.

**Key Words:** Tourism, Tourist Satisfaction, Revisit Intention, Service Quality, Nilgiris.

### **1. Introduction:**

Nilgiris tourism emphasizes the "Blue mountains" of Tamil Nadu. In Nilgiris the key attraction includes Ooty, Coonoor, and Kotagiri. Visitors can also explore shop for local products like tea, fruits and Toda embroidery. It is also known for indigenous tribal culture and shop. Activities like Wild life viewing in places like Mudumalai National Park, visiting tea plantation and experiencing the famous Nilgiris Mountain Railways gives satisfaction. According to the department of Tourism, The Nilgiris has experienced significant growth in visitors in present years. Tourist satisfaction is the response that arises in the form of joy or disappointment when tourists compare their actual travel experience with their prior expectations. It reflects how customer needs and expectations are met through tourism products or services. Providing high-quality services and positive experience can significantly enhance Tourist satisfaction. It is a cognitive evaluation and an emotional response to the travel experience. Research indicates that Tourist Satisfaction strongly predicts repeat visit intentions and the likelihood of recommending a destination to others.

Tourist satisfaction is identified by using these five indicators:

- Enjoyment of the visit
- Satisfaction with the decision to visit
- Appreciation of the destination
- Fulfilment of experiential needs
- Decision of visit

For tourism, repeat visit are critical in sustaining profitability and achieving market targets. It also emphasized that appositve experience is the most significant factor in motivating tourists to return. Tourist who experiences high satisfaction are likelier to revisit and share positive experiences with others. Several factors contribute to visitor satisfaction, including (a) product quality, (b) price, (c) service quality, and (d) ease of access. Tourists who experience high satisfaction are likelier to revisit and share positive experiences with others. Revisit intention refers to a visitor's likelihood of returning to a destination in the future based on their experiences. It is the willingness to visit again, to invite others, to share positive experiences and to prioritize the destination in future travel plans.

### **2. Objectives of the Study:**

- To identify and analyse the visiting pattern of tourists in Nilgiris.
- To assess the tourist's satisfaction and experience in Nilgiris.
- To evaluate the revisit intention towards Nilgiris.
- To study the present status and services provided to the visitors in Nilgiris.
- To examine the relationship between tourist satisfaction, experience and revisit intention towards Nilgiris.

### **3. Research Methodology:**

#### **3.1 Research Design:**

This study employs a quantitative approach to analyse satisfaction, experience and Revisit Intention. The aim is to obtain relevant and familiar data on the travel experiences of tourists visiting Nilgiris.

#### **3.2 Area of Study:**

The Study is conducted at Nilgiris district. Primary data is collected through questionnaire were distributed online via Google forms.

### 3.3 Sample Size:

The sample size of 100 respondents was collected in Nilgiris District.

### 4. Data Analysis and Interpretation:

The data collected from the respondents have been used from the following statistical tools. Simple percentage analysis has been used to find out probabilities or proportions within a dataset. ANOVA is used to compare the mean of two or more groups. F-test used to compare the variance of two or more groups and t-test determines difference between means of two groups or between a sample groups mean and a known value.

#### 4.1 Demographics and Data of the Respondents:

| S.No | Particulars | Classification    | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1    | Gender      | Male              | 44                 | 44%        |
|      |             | Female            | 56                 | 56%        |
|      |             | Total             | 100                | 100%       |
| 2    | Age Group   | Below 18 Years    | 01                 | 1%         |
|      |             | 18 Years-25 Years | 58                 | 58%        |
|      |             | 26 Years-35 Years | 30                 | 30%        |
|      |             | 36 Years-45 Years | 06                 | 6%         |
|      |             | 46 Years-60 Years | 04                 | 4%         |
|      |             | Above 60 Years    | 01                 | 1%         |
|      |             | Total             | 100                | 100%       |
| 3    | Occupation  | Student           | 42                 | 42%        |
|      |             | Employed          | 35                 | 35%        |
|      |             | Self-Employed     | 02                 | 2%         |
|      |             | Business          | 01                 | 1%         |
|      |             | Retired           | 01                 | 1%         |
|      |             | Total             | 100                | 100%       |

Source: Primary Data

#### Interpretation:

The above table interprets that 44% of the respondents are male and 56% of the respondents are female. 1% of the respondents are Below 18 years, 58% of the respondents are of 18 Years- 25 Years, 30% of the respondents are 26 years-35 years, 6% of the respondents are 36-45 years, 4% of the respondents are 46 years-60 years and 1% of the respondents are of Above 60 years. 42% of the respondents are students, 35% of the respondents are employed, 2% of the respondents are self employed, 1% of the respondents are doing business and 1% of the respondents are retired.

### 5. Statistical Result:

#### 5.1 ANOVA-Single Factor:

##### Association between Scale of Rating and Overall Satisfaction of Tourists:

| Groups                                   | Count | Sum | Average | Variance  |
|------------------------------------------|-------|-----|---------|-----------|
| Natural Attraction                       | 100   | 405 | 4.05    | 1.6035353 |
| Accommodation                            | 99    | 359 | 3.62    | 1.3997114 |
| Transportation                           | 100   | 364 | 3.64    | 1.1822222 |
| Local Food & Cuisine                     | 100   | 379 | 3.79    | 1.3796969 |
| Tourist Activities                       | 100   | 388 | 3.88    | 1.4602020 |
| Cleanliness & Environmental Conservation | 100   | 362 | 3.62    | 1.5915151 |
| Hospitality & Local Interactions         | 100   | 370 | 3.7     | 1.6262626 |
| Safety and Security                      | 99    | 377 | 3.80    | 1.7485054 |
| Value for Money                          | 100   | 372 | 3.72    | 1.3955555 |
| Overall Satisfaction                     | 100   | 430 | 4.3     | 1.1212121 |

| Source of Variation | SS        | Df  | MS        | F        | P-value  | F crit   |
|---------------------|-----------|-----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between Groups      | 42.149417 | 9   | 4.6832685 | 3.228521 | 0.000717 | 1.889340 |
| Within Groups       | 1433.1853 | 988 | 1.4505924 |          |          |          |
| Total               | 1475.3347 | 997 |           |          |          |          |

#### Interpretation:

The test statistical Anova (0.05,9) has p value of 0.000717. since the p value is less than 0.05, so we could reject the null hypothesis stating that there is significant association between scale of rating and natural attraction, accommodation, transportation, local food & cuisine, tourist activities, cleanliness & environmental conservation, hospitality & local interaction, safety and security, value for money and overall satisfaction.

#### ANOVA:

##### Satisfaction Level of Tourist Experience and Male Gender of the Respondents:

| Groups           | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
|------------------|-------|-----|---------|----------|
| Highly Satisfied | 5     | 22  | 4.4     | 15.3     |
| Satisfied        | 5     | 10  | 2       | 3.5      |
| Neutral          | 5     | 6   | 1.2     | 1.7      |
| Dissatisfied     | 5     | 1   | 0.2     | 0.2      |

|                     |   |   |     |     |
|---------------------|---|---|-----|-----|
| Highly Dissatisfied | 5 | 3 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
|---------------------|---|---|-----|-----|

| Source of Variation | SS     | Df | MS    | F        | P-value  | F crit   |
|---------------------|--------|----|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between Groups      | 89.36  | 4  | 22.34 | 0.930833 | 0.466003 | 2.866081 |
| Within Groups       | 480    | 20 | 24    |          |          |          |
| Total               | 569.36 | 24 |       |          |          |          |

#### Satisfaction Level of Tourist Experience and Female Gender of the Respondents:

| Groups              | Count | Sum | Average | Variance |
|---------------------|-------|-----|---------|----------|
| Highly Satisfied    | 5     | 29  | 5.8     | 99.2     |
| Satisfied           | 5     | 10  | 2       | 12       |
| Neutral             | 5     | 7   | 1.4     | 4.8      |
| Dissatisfied        | 5     | 2   | 0.4     | 0.8      |
| Highly Dissatisfied | 5     | 6   | 1.2     | 3.2      |

| Source of Variation | SS     | Df | MS    | F        | P-value  | F crit   |
|---------------------|--------|----|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| Between Groups      | 55.44  | 4  | 13.86 | 3.223256 | 0.033978 | 2.866081 |
| Within Groups       | 86     | 20 | 4.3   |          |          |          |
| Total               | 141.44 | 24 |       |          |          |          |

#### 5.2 ANOVA/'f'-Test Paired With Simple Two Means:

##### Satisfaction Level on Tourist's Experiences and Gender of the Respondents:

##### Hypothesis:

- Null Hypothesis (Ho): There is significant relationship between Satisfaction level on tourists experience and Gender.
- Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is no significant relationship between Satisfaction level on tourists experience and Gender.

| Particulars         | Male        | Female |
|---------------------|-------------|--------|
| Mean                | 24          | 4.3    |
| Variance            | 1784.64     | 39.365 |
| Observations        | 5           | 5      |
| Df                  | 4           | 4      |
| F                   | 45.33570431 |        |
| P(F<=f) one-tail    | 0.001377196 |        |
| F Critical one-tail | 6.388232909 |        |

##### Interpretation:

The above table represents the Satisfaction level on tourist experience and the Gender. Here the F cri value is 6.38823 and P value is 0.0013 so the F cri value is more than P value so it means that the ANOVA represents these two are not significant.

#### 5.3 ANOVA/'t'-Test Paired With Simple Two Means:

##### Satisfaction Level on Tourist's Experiences and Gender of the Respondents:

##### Hypothesis:

- Null Hypothesis (Ho): There is significant relationship between Satisfaction level on tourists experience and Gender.
- Alternate Hypothesis (H1): There is no significant relationship between Satisfaction level on tourists experience and Gender.

| Particulars                  | Male        | Female |
|------------------------------|-------------|--------|
| Mean                         | 2.16        | 1.68   |
| Variance                     | 4.468       | 2.772  |
| Observations                 | 5           | 5      |
| Pearson Correlation          | 0.984293661 |        |
| Hypothesized Mean Difference | 0           |        |
| Df                           | 4           |        |
| t Stat                       | 1.921537846 |        |
| P(T<=t) one-tail             | 0.063523196 |        |
| t Critical one-tail          | 2.131846786 |        |

##### Interpretation:

The calculated t-statistical value (1.921) is less than the critical t-value (2.131), so there is no significant difference between Level of satisfaction on tourist experience and gender. Hence alternate hypothesis is accepted.

#### 6. Findings:

About 60% of the respondents are satisfied with their visit in Nigiris. They found out few places are naturally attractive. Comparing to other places botanical garden has won many visitors heart and around 57% visitors had good experience and also few had bad experience because of facilities was not available in few places. Almost 70% of the people like to revisit Nilgiris. As many visitors prefer Ooty only because of the pleasant weather. The only issue that most of the tourists face is parking facility. In and around Ooty parking is becoming major issue and government has taken many steps but still it has not been resolved. Day by day tourist population is increasing in Nilgiris and people find difficult to reach their destination on time.

## **7. Conclusion:**

In this paper I conclude that in recent years Tourism is playing a major role in Nilgiri district. The cost of food and others essentials are less comparing to other tourist places. People of Nilgiris are humble and so many love to visit this place. I found that tourist have their best time in Nilgiris because of that greenery nature where ever they visit it looks pleasant. So, there is a strong relationship between Tourist satisfaction, experience and revisit intention. The level of satisfaction only makes the people to revisit the place.

## **References:**

1. J. H. Kim, The impact of memorable tourism experience on loyalty behaviours: The mediating effects of destination Image and satisfaction,” Journal of Travel Research, vol.57, no7, pp.856-870, 2018.
2. K. Boro, Destination service quality, Tourist satisfaction, and revisit intention: The moderating role of Income and occupation of Tourist,” Journal of tourism, Hospitality, and culinary Arts, Vol 14, No.3, Pp, 23-40, 2022
3. Oppermann M. Tourism destination loyalty. Journal of travel and research, 39(1), 78-84, 2020
4. Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L. A., & Lu, L. Destination image and tourism loyalty: Tourism management, 40, 213-223, 2014.
5. Smith M. K. Wellness tourism. In H. Konu, & M .K. Smith (Eds), Encyclopedia of tourism management and marketing, 2022.