

A STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE OF TOURISTS TOWARDS INDO-SARACENIC ARCHITECTURE IN CHENNAI

• **Mrs. K. VIJAYALAKSHMI**

Ph.D. (Full-Time) Research Scholar Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research (BIHER) No. 173, Agaram Road Selaiyur Chennai. Pin Code – 600 073 Tamil Nadu State.

• **Dr. T. MILTON**

Research Supervisor & Dean Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management Bharath Institute of Higher Education and Research (BIHER) No. 173, Agaram Road Selaiyur Chennai. Pin Code – 600 073 Tamil Nadu State.

ABSTRACT

The indo-saracenic structures are locating in various places across India and most of them are located in central part of India. There are so many buildings are used for public services in various places in India even today and they are having historical and heritage importance and are landmarks for people and places. The results reveal that tourists are having knowledge on heritage importance, cultural significance, historical importance, style, structure, arch and decoration of indo-saracenic architecture. Significant difference exists in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid profile of tourists excluding monthly income. Knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture has positive, moderate and significant relation with intent to revisit of tourists. Thus, tourism department should conduct promotional campaigns and awareness programmes for tourists in order to improve their knowledge on design and minars and it must popularize uniqueness of indo-saracenic architecture among tourists through proper advertisements and communication through online platforms. Besides, they should conduct tourism fair and sponsor cultural and festivals in order to popularize and promote heritage tourism with respect to indo-saracenic architecture among tourists in India and abroad.

Key Words: Architecture Indo-Saracenic, Knowledge, Tourists

1. INTRODUCTION

The architecture in colonized countries is representing the distinctive features of mixture of foreign and native structure and it is leading to a newer kind of architecture. The British rulers are attracting uniqueness of architecture of India and they are imitating its features on their buildings and bungalows. Institutions and military camps (Sengupta, 2010). Later, they introduce the new building style as mixture of India and British styles and they are creating contemporary styles of various structures with modern technologies and best planning of western countries and the domestic traditions and arts. Majority of these buildings are used for public services and they are having exclusive architecture (Choudhary et al 2018) and social and cultural importance in the places they stay in India.

The buildings and structures are constructed by British for various needs and purposes as a blend of Hindu, Gothic and Mughal type of architecture and many model buildings are constructed for schools, museums, hospitals, town and guest houses and the western style is incorporated in the cultural and architectural nature of India by British people. The indo-saracenic structures are locating in various places across India and most of them are located in central part of India (Sheeba and Dhas, 2018). There are so many buildings are used for public services in various places in India even today and they are having historical and heritage importance and are landmarks for people and places. Thus, it is necessary to study knowledge of tourists towards Indo-Saracenic architecture for promoting heritage tourism among them.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Lambert (2011) found that heritage features, perception, cultural consumption, knowledge, personal interest and attachment, physical attractions and facilities were attracting tourists to visit heritage and cultural tourism sites.

Lascio et al (2011) concluded heritage and cultural values, exhibitions, structural and design features, art, local community, facilities and personal motivation were attracting tourists towards heritage tourism destinations.

Vong and Ung (2012) revealed that heritage values, cultural activities, historical importance, experience, products and services and uniqueness were influencing tourists to visit heritage tourism sites. Kamamba (2012) found that attractions in heritage sites had increased value addition in terms of low cost, transport facilities and trading of local products and had enhanced personal experiences and exclusiveness of those places and values attached with them.

Sans and Ramírez (2013) concluded that cultural heritage and comfortability, climate and hospitality, night life and shopping facilities, culture and traditions, accommodation and value for money and natural atmosphere were features of image of heritage tourism places and they were influencing tourists for choosing heritage tourism destinations. Shankar and Swamy (2013) revealed that tourists were moderately aware of heritage sites and conservation of heritage values. Heritage and historical values, facilities, buildings and exclusive features of heritage sites were attracting tourists. Awareness programmes, seminars, exhibition of photo about heritage building or structure were creating awareness of heritage places among tourists.

Ray et al (2014) found that features related to history, culture, nature, promotion, knowledge and exclusives were the factors affecting museum visiting behaviour of tourists. Teo et al (2014) concluded that tourists were exhibiting cultural, heritage and responsiveness oriented visiting behaviour towards heritage places and they were highly concerning with environmental aspects of heritage places and enjoying uniqueness of those places.

Ismagilova et al (2015) revealed that archeology monuments, small and big historical cities, architectural structure, design and styles, museums, theaters and showrooms, local culture and arts were factors attracting tourists towards heritage tourism destinations. Kamal and Pramanik (2015) found that opportunities for learning new things, culture, artistic, personal motivation, historical importance and quality of information were factors affecting tourists to make visit to museums and promotional and service delivery strategies were adopting for promotion of heritage tourism destination.

Karaca et al (2016) concluded that respondents were moderately aware of historical structures, handicrafts and local food and they had low degree of awareness about activities, minstrels and ICH of sivas temple. Markham et al (2016) revealed that exclusiveness, amenities, historical and cultural significance, unique structures and landscapes were attracting huge quantum of tourists for heritage sites.

Buonincontri et al (2017) found that heritage values, attachment and tourism activities, heritage features, facilities, safety and security, social and cultural bonding, behaviour of local community and accessibility were affecting visiting behaviour of heritage tourists. Cudny (2017) concluded that cultural and heritage values, facilities, experiences, nature and heritage structures and maintenance of heritage sites were attracting tourists to visit those places.

Sapheri et al (2018) revealed that culture, food varieties, shopping facilities, places were attracting heritage tourists and in addition cultural, historical and diversity and unique features of heritage tourism destinations were also affecting selection of heritage destinations among tourists. Onpium and Kaewnuch (2018) found that tourism products, services, cultural, social and heritage values, information, personal motivation, experience and perception were factors influencing intention of young tourists to choose and visit heritage tourist places.

Bauer et al (2019) concluded that availability of information, exhibitions and festivals, interesting videos and films, attractive photographs, website features, heritage and cultural values were affecting tourists to choose museums in heritage tourism designations. Sharma et al (2019) revealed that traditions and heritage, services, historical importance, help of local people and value for money were attracting and affecting satisfaction of tourists towards heritage tourism destinations.

Pertiwi and Sulistyawati (2020) found that location was highly influencing selection and availing boarding and lodging facilities among tourists. Local touch and security were other factors were affecting selection of heritage places among tourists and marketing strategies were effectively promoting heritage tourism destinations. Mindanao et al (2020) concluded that historical and cultural exclusiveness, security for belongingness, features of heritage sites, behaviour of cooperation of local community, availability of information and museums, accessibility to transport facilities were attracting tourists to visit heritage tourism places.

Mugobi and Mlozi (2021) revealed that competitiveness and demands of tourists were significantly influencing use of information and communication technologies at world heritage sites and decision to use a new ICT system among tourists for selection of heritage tourism places among tourists was decided by environmental conditions of heritage places conducted tourism activities. Wang et al (2021) found that culture, entertainment, amenities related to boarding and lodging, sceneries, enjoyment and fun, relaxation and tourist memorability were

influencing reputation of heritage tourist destinations and they were affecting consumption behaviour of tourists in cultural and heritage tourism.

3. METHODOLOGY

Chennai is chose for conducting the existing study. Tourists are conveniently selected and data are collected from 180 tourists with the help questionnaire. Percentage analysis is done to study profile of tourists. Mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) are used to comprehend knowledge of tourists towards indo-saracenic architecture. ANOVA and t-tests are employed to examine difference in knowledge of tourists towards indo-saracenic architecture amid profile of tourists. Correlation analysis is applied to examine relation amid knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture and intent to revisit of tourists.

4. RESULTS

4.1. PROFILE OF TOURISTS

The profile of tourists is given in Table-1. The results explicate that 55.56% of them are domestic, while, 44.44% of them are foreign tourists, 51.11% of them are in male category, while, 48.89% of them are in female category, 37.78% are belonging to 36 – 45 of age, while, 17.22% are belonging to less than 25 years of age, 36.67% of them are having under graduation, while, 15.00% of them are having secondary education, 35.56% of them having income of Rs.35,001 – Rs.45,000, while, 9.44% of them are having income of above Rs.45,000 monthly.

Table-1. Profile of Tourists

Profile Type	Frequency	%
Domestic	100	55.56
Foreign	80	44.44
Gender		
Male	92	51.11
Female	88	48.89
Age		
Less than 25 Years	31	17.22
26– 35 Years	43	23.89
36 – 45 Years	68	37.78
More than 45 Years	38	21.11
Education		
Secondary	27	15.00
Higher Secondary	46	25.55
Under Graduation	66	36.67
Post Graduation	41	22.78
Monthly Income		
Below Rs.25,000	39	21.67
Rs.25,001 – Rs.35,000	60	33.33
Rs.35,001 – Rs.45,000	64	35.56
Above Rs.45,000	17	9.44

4.2. KNOWLEDGE OF TOURISTS TOWARDS INDO-SARACENIC ARCHITECTURE

The knowledge of tourists towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-2.

Table-2. Knowledge of Tourists towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture	Mean	SD
I am having knowledge on heritage importance	3.94	1.05
I am having knowledge on cultural significance	3.85	1.00
I am having knowledge on historical importance	3.92	0.95
I am having knowledge on design	3.39	0.99

I am having knowledge on style	3.77	0.83
I am having knowledge on structure	3.73	0.71
I am having knowledge on uniqueness	3.31	1.01
I am having knowledge on arch	3.67	1.05
I am having knowledge on minars	3.36	1.19
I am having knowledge on decoration	3.69	0.75

The tourists are agreed with they are having knowledge on heritage importance, they are having knowledge on cultural significance, they are having knowledge on historical importance, they are having knowledge on style, they are having knowledge on structure, they are having knowledge on arch and they are having knowledge on decoration, while, they are neutral with they are having knowledge on design, they are having knowledge on uniqueness and they are having knowledge on minars as opined by them.

4.3. PROFILE OF TOURISTS AND KNOWLEDGE TOWARDS INDO-SARACENIC ARCHITECTURE

The relation amid profile of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given below as.

4.3.1. Type of Tourists and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

The relation amid type of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-3.

Table-3. Type of Tourist and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Type	N	M	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Domestic	100	37.50	3.16	4.177	.000
Foreign	80	35.53	3.15		

Mean value of knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is 37.50 for the category of domestic tourists and it is 35.53 for the category foreign tourists and it elucidates that knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is better for the category of domestic tourists than the category foreign tourists .

Difference in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid type of tourists is significant since t - value of 4.177 is significant in 1% level.

4.3.2. Gender of Tourists and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

The relation amid gender of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-4.

Table-4. Gender of Tourist and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Gender	N	M	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Male	92	37.34	3.30	2.922	.004
Female	88	35.94	3.16		

Mean value of knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is 37.34 for tourists in male category and it is 35.94 for tourists in female category and it elucidates that knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is better for tourists in male category than female category.

Difference in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid gender of tourists is significant since t - value of 2.922 is significant in 1% level.

4.3.3. Age of Tourists and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

The relation amid age of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-5.

Table-5. Age of Tourist and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Age	N	M	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Less than 25 Years	31	35.55	3.20	5.788	.001
26– 35 Years	43	35.81	3.58		
36 – 45 Years	68	36.63	3.24		
More than 45 Years	38	38.45	3.25		

Mean value of knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is differing from 38.45 for tourists in more than 45 years of age to 35.55 for tourists in less than 25 years of age and it elucidates that knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is better for tourists in more than 45 years of age than other ages.

Difference in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid age of tourists is significant since F - value of 5.788 is significant in 1% level.

4.3.4. Education of Tourists and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

The relation amid education of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-6.

Table-6. Education of Tourist and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Education	N	M	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Secondary	27	35.64	3.53	4.837	.003
Higher Secondary	46	36.19	3.20		
Under Graduation	66	36.09	3.59		
Post Graduation	41	37.79	2.63		

Mean value of knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is differing from 37.79 for tourists with post graduation to 35.64 for tourists with secondary education and it elucidates that knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is better for tourists with post graduation than other education levels.

Difference in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid education of tourists is significant since F - value of 4.837 is significant in 1% level.

4.3.5. Monthly Income of Tourists and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

The relation amid monthly income of tourists and knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is given in Table-7.

Table-7. Monthly Income of Tourist and Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture

Monthly Income	N	M	SD	t-Value	Sig.
Below Rs.25,000	39	36.41	3.64	1.042	.375
Rs.25,001 – Rs.35,000	60	37.08	3.11		
Rs.35,001 – Rs.45,000	64	36.16	3.03		
Above Rs.45,000	17	37.18	4.07		

Mean value of knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is differing from 37.18 for tourists having income of above Rs.45,000 monthly to 36.16 for tourists having income of Rs.35,001 – Rs.45,000 monthly and it elucidates that knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture is better for tourists having income of above Rs.45,000 monthly than other monthly incomes.

Difference in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid monthly income of tourists is not significant since F - value of 1.042 is not significant.

4.4. RELATION AMID KNOWLEDGE TOWARDS INDO-SARACENIC ARCHITECTURE AND INTENT TO REVISIT OF TOURISTS

The correlation analysis is applied to examine relation amid knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture and intent to revisit of tourists and the result is given in Table-8.

Table-8. Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture and Intent to Revisit of Tourists

Particulars	Correlation Coefficient
Knowledge towards Indo-Saracenic Architecture and Intent to Revisit of Tourists	0.56

The correlation coefficient amid knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture and intent to revisit of tourists is 0.56 and it indicates that they have positive, moderate and significant relation among them in 1% level.

5. CONCLUSION

The foregoing analysis reveals that tourists are having knowledge on heritage importance, cultural significance, historical importance, style, structure, arch and decoration of indo-saracenic architecture. Significant

difference exists in knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture amid profile of tourists excluding monthly income. Knowledge towards indo-saracenic architecture has positive, moderate and significant relation with intent to revisit of tourists. Thus, tourism department should conduct promotional campaigns and awareness programmes for tourists in order to improve their knowledge on design and minars and it must popularize uniqueness of indo-saracenic architecture among tourists through proper advertisements and communication through online platforms. Besides, they should conduct tourism fair and sponsor cultural and festivals in order to popularize and promote heritage tourism with respect to indo-saracenic architecture among tourists in India and abroad.

REFERENCES

- Carol Boon Chui Teo, Noor Rita Mohd Khan, & Faizah Hj. Abd Rahim. (2014). Understanding cultural heritage visitor behavior: The case of Melaka as world heritage city. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 130, 1-10.
- Choudhary, S., Pipralia, S., & Kumar, N. (2018). *Energy efficiency assessment of Indo Saracenic buildings in India*, Paper Presented on International conference on Energy efficiency in Historic buildings (EEHB), Visby, Sweden.
- Cudny, W. (2017). The Ironbridge Gorge heritage site and its local and regional functions. *Bulletin of Geography. Socioeconomic Series*, 36(36), 61-75.
- Di Lascio, F. M. L., Giannerini, S., Scorcu, A. E., & Candela, G. (2011). Cultural tourism and temporary art exhibitions in Italy: A panel data analysis. *Statistical Methods & Applications*, 20(4), 519-542.
- Gulnara Ismagilova, Lenar Safiullin, & Ilshat Gafurov. (2015). Using historical heritage as a factor in tourism development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 157-162.
- Jonei Eger Bauer, Ana Paula Lisboa Sohn, & Bruno Santucci De Oliveira. (2019). Cultural tourism: A study on museums and the internet. *Review of Tourism*, 21(3), 291-308.
- Kamamba, D.M.K. (2012). *National cultural heritage register*. Antiquities Division, London.
- Markham, A. Osipova, E. Lafrenz Samuels, K., & Caldas, A. (2016). *World heritage and tourism in a changing climate*. United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, France.
- Miquel Àngel Bové Sans, & Raquel Laguado Ramírez. (2013). Destination image analysis for tarragona cultural heritage. *Review of Economic Analysis*, 5, 103-126.
- Mostafa Kamal, & Shah Alam Kabir Pramanik. (2015). Identifying factors influencing visitors to visit museums in Bangladesh and setting marketing strategies for museums. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 17(10), 85-92.
- Pertiwi, P.R., & Sulistyawati, A.S. (2020). Factors of influence in choosing accommodation: A study with reference to Mas village, an artistic heritage village in Ubud-Bali. *Journal of Business on Hospitality and Tourism*, 6(1), 27-42.
- Piera Buonincontri, Alessandra Marasco, & Haywantee Ramkissoon. (2017). Visitors' experience, place attachment and sustainable behaviour at cultural heritage sites: A conceptual framework. *Sustainability*, 9, 1-19.
- Pintusorn Onpium, & Kaewnuch. (2018). Factors influencing Thai youth tourists' intention to visit Lanna cultural heritage sites. *Siam Academic Review*, 21(1), 32-46.
- Regiena Mae D. Mindanao, Rammie Christian M. Abarintos, Roda C. Briones, JC F. Espiritu, Patricia Mae P. Vergara, & Jennie Margaret Apritado. (2020). Factors influencing tourist attendance at historical attractions. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(1), 103-124.
- Rudrendu Ray, Md Shah Azam, Md. Enayet Hossain, & Shah Alam Kabir Pramanik. (2014). *Factors affecting museum visit behavior in Bangladesh: an exploratory analysis*. Paper Presented in 3rd International Conference on Entrepreneurship and Business Management, Penang, Malaysia.
- Sapheri, A. Z. H., Jainal, A. M., Bakar, S. K. A., & Zahari, M. S. M. (2018). Factors influencing tourists visiting Kuching, Sarawak. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(16), 136-143.
- Shail Shri Sharma, Satnam Kaur Ubeja, & Varun Sarda. (2019). An empirical study: Factors affecting visitor's satisfaction towards heritage tourism destination in India. *International Bulletin of Management and Economics*, 11, 204-215.
- Shankar, B., & Chidambara Swamy. (2013). Creating awareness for heritage conservation in the city of Mysore: Issues and Policies. *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research*, 3(2), 698-703.

- Sheeba, J., & John T. Mesiah Dhas. (2018). A study on Indo-saracenic architectural heritage. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 118(22), 1737-1742.
- Stylianou Lambert, T. (2011). Gazing from home: Cultural tourism and art museums. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 403-421.
- Sukran Karaca, Gulsah Akkus, Ercan Sahbudak, & Mustafa Iskin. (2016). A study of awareness of cultural heritage: Sivas sample. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5(9), 73-81.
- Tania Sengupta. (2010). *Producing the province: Colonial governance and spatial cultures in district headquarter towns of eastern India 1786-c.1900*, University of Westminster, Westminster.
- Thereza Mugobi, & Shogo Mlozi. (2021). The impact of external factors on ICT usage practices at UNESCO world heritage sites. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 7(1), 3-12.
- Vong, L. T. N., & Ung, A. (2012). Exploring critical factors of Macau's heritage tourism: What heritage tourists are looking for when visiting the city's iconic heritage sites. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 231-245.
- Zhibiao Wang, Panpan Yang, & Dan Li. (2021). The influence of heritage tourism destination reputation on tourist consumption behavior: A case study of world cultural heritage Shaolin temple. *SAGE Open*, 3, 1-15.