

## A STUDY ON LEVEL OF SATISFACTION TOWARDS DISTRICT TOURISM PROMOTION COUNCIL IN KERALA

- **P.AKHILASAN**  
Part Time Research Scholar

- **Dr.B.KANNAN**

Assistant Professor & Research supervisor Periyar E.V.R.College (Autonomous), Tiruchirappalli  
Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli

### ABSTRACT

Tourism is one of the major and essential part of human being for refreshment and relaxation from stress and work pressure. Tourism, which has become an important money maker and employment generator for the hospitality industry. Tourism marketing is one of the major parts of marketing of services which consists of seasonal and conventional influences. Tourism marketing does include adequate of techniques that are comparable to traditional online marketing, but it has its specifics. With this view, the present research study made an attempt to understand the level of satisfaction towards District Tourism Promotion Council and its impact of marketing strategies in Kerala.

**KEY WORDS:** Tourism, Tourism marketing, marketing strategies, foreign tourists, digital marketing

### INTRODUCTION

India is one of the wildestrising tourist destinations in the world. With attractive varying sceneries from beaches to Snowclad Mountains with miscellaneous culture, traditions and cuisines, the country has sufficient to offer for international and domestic tourists alike. Awareness and marketing ingenuities such as the Incredible India movement along with the newly introduced e-visa opportunities help make travelling to India more reachable for international tourists. This has dramatically increased the arrival of overseas tourists between 2000 and 2018. Indiareceived ten million foreign tourists in 2018, out of which Bangladeshi tourists made up the largest share, followed by American and British tourists. With this view, the present research study made an attempt to understand the level of satisfaction towards District Tourism Promotion Council and its impact of marketing strategies in Kerala.

### TOUR AND TOURISM

The world 'tour' is derived from the Latin word tornus, meaning 'a tool for making a circle'. Tourism is also defined as the movement of the people from their normal place of residence to another place for a minimum period of twenty-four hours to a maximum of six months for the sole purpose of leisure and pleasure.

### DEFINITIONS OF TOURISM MARKETING

Tourism marketing is one of the major parts of marketing of services which consists of seasonal and conventional influences. Tourism marketing does include plenty of techniques that are comparable to traditional digital marketing, but it has its specifics. The following are the major definitions which describe tourism marketing with commonly acceptable words.

Tourism Marketing "as the systematic and coordinated execution of business policies by both private or public sector tourism organizations operated at the local, regional, national, or international level to achieve the optimal satisfaction of the needs of identifiable tourist groups, and in doing so to achieve an appropriate return."

**According to Paynter (1993)**, "Tour marketing is a systematic process consisting of marketing objective, strategies, schedules, marketing media, focused on the specific market segment and based on a substantial return on investment."

**World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO)** has defined tourism marketing as, "a management philosophy which, in the light of tourist demand, makes it possible through research, forecasting and selection of tourism products/services from suppliers, on the line with organization's purpose and tourists' satisfaction."

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Tourism in Kerala is one of the very popular terms which are known for it by its nature and climate. Tourism marketing in Kerala concerned with its social, economic and traditional values. Many studies have been undertaken relating to tourism marketing in Kerala. These reviews help to understand variables used in the early studies.

**Babu.P.George. (2007)**. Suggested that since collectivism and co-operatives are inseparably entrenched within the essential tourism experience, it endures to be better for all players in the backwater tourism of Alleppey to help each other, rather than participate in a risky mutually unhelpful game. Intentional planning may be made less contingency-dependent if governmental authorities are also stimulated to join the system.

**Arturo Molina., Mar Gómez., & David Martín-Consuegra. (2010).** Explained that the value of the advancement channel be contingent on its capacity to reach consumers and satisfy their interests and needs. In the tourism sector, the means of promotion institute an active and open way of receiving information for tourists.

**Proshanta Kumar Ghosh., & Debajit Datta. (2012).** Found that Kovalam is a classic example of a seaside alternative of the developing world where immediate monetary benefit has always taken the front seat whenever the questions of maintenance and sustainable management rise. In these places, conservational and community development have never been taken as the fundamentals for the improvement of tourism industry.

**Shihabudheen.N. (2012).** Explained that Kerala has been according enhanced thrust on tourism development as is the case with India as a whole. Because of the outstanding prospects of tourism for speedy economic development and that too for 'tourism resource rich' state like Kerala, ecotourism and such other sustainable representations of tourism have got marvellous growth probable in this state.

**Jacob John., & Seema Chelat. (2013).** Concluded that even though it has the potential and behaviour system for almost all diseases, lack of awareness and information prevent people from availing those benefits. They concentration on this unfamiliar aspect of Ayurveda.

**Naik. NTK., & Suresh Lal.B. (2013).** Found that study reveals that the Information Technology which is the part of globalization has brought about certain changes in healthcare sector. India is in a position to encompass its medical services to other countries like Gulf and European countries.

**Haseena.V.A. (2014).** Mentioned that Tourism has been known as an important sector of the global economy, with a contribution of about 91 per cent of domestic tourism. Ecotourism is an impending activity, especially appropriate for the boondock's areas like the state like Kerala.

**Anisha Ramdas. (2015).** Concluded that the inimitable strengths and budding of the state the focus should be on the development of new tourism services especially beach tourism, which is a main source of desirability to domestic and foreign tourists alike.

**Jose Bejoy., & Kannan.R. (2015).** Noted that, Sand banks were created with the rise in the sea level which formed the shape of the coastal area. Around 600 AD, written documents about the Malabar coast show that this region had Hindus, Christians, Muslims and a Jewish minority.

**Nikhi.N.K., & Santha.S. (2015).** Revealed that the study on the effectiveness of Responsible Tourism revealed that the major impact of Responsible Tourism is the increase in the standard of living of the respondents. The business houses were able to equipping themselves for Tourism.

**Corina Larisa Bunghez. (2016).** Concluded that tourism involvement to a destination's economy is influenced by abundant factors, such as infrastructure development, part of local authorities and private stockholders and places of tourism parts.

**Jitender Pal Singh Jammu. (2016).** Noted that at present, international yoga is famous and everyone is willing to learn it. Yoga tourism hold enormous hope for India is to make India's Brand. India is in beneficial position to tap these international opportunities in the Yoga tourism sector.

**Moli.P.Koshy., Vijay Kuriakose., & Paul.V.Mathew. (2016).** Concluded that Tourism emerges as a growing concept in destination marketing and management. When travellers as well as destination community call for responsible practices to achieve sustainability of destinations; tourism planners, business enterprises and travel agents are forced to ensure clean image and competitiveness of tourism destinations, in order to maintain good tourists inflow.

**Nagarjuna.G. (2016).** Concluded that the importance of tourism in the national economy is confirmed without any doubt. All the sectors of the tourism industry such as travel agency, tour operations, airlines, and hotels play a noteworthy role in transforming the economy of a country.

**Saranya.T. & Mariswamy.H.K. (2016).** Concluded that study was to recognize the reach of health and medical tourism and its marketing approaches with distinct reference Varkala, Trivandrum which is a foremost destination providing health treatment for the visitors. The survey gave me an idea about tourism in Kerala particularly the importance of Health and medical tourism.

**Tom Pious Amal Baby. (2016).** Explained that Kerala has appeared as one of the main tourism destinations on the national and international plot and is considered as the tourism trend compositor in the country.

**Gurneet Kaur. (2017).** Noted that online Marketing today is all about using the internet technologies to reach out to prevailing and newer audiences and engross with them. Today online marketing has interrupted industries and changed the way businesses stretched out to customers.

**Manoj.P.K. (2017).** Concluded that Ecosystem management in Thenmala attracted tourists from all over India. Ecosystem management deals with protective measures to preserve and conserve the natural landscape in its virgin state.

**Padma Mahanti., & Sanjeet Kumar. (2017).** Revealed that study highlights that the area is rich with medicinal as well as economic plants and avifaunal species which maintain the beauty and ecological balance of the study area. The preservation of this bio-wealth is actual important for the sustainability of the available taxi as well as the ecotourism which provide maintenance for the local people.

**Shobha Menon., Manoj Edward., & Babu.P. (2017).** Concluded that KTM represents an device to promote destination Kerala or if it is simply a stage to showcase the tourism related businesses that attend the event. Since the government of Kerala is a key supporter of the event, it is usual to expect that the objective of promoting the entire state tourism is respected.

**Nishad.A., Edwin Gnanadhas.M., & Rathiha.R. (2018).** Revealed that in Kerala, ecotourism has now been misapprehended. It is not appropriately realized by many tour operating companies. Tourism project developers may hurdle on the ecotourism movement and hence in the project an environmentally conscientious image get disconnected their business promoting techniques.

**Kanagavalli.G., & Haseena.K.P. (2019).** Concluded that Since all the mechanisms of a system are important for the appropriate working of a system, the tourism industry should get FDI in each constituent and should help to encourage the economic development the state and thereby in the country.

**Shameem.C.K., & Rajam.K. (2019).** Concluded that Kerala is a well known tourist place in south India. So, major fund allocated for the scheduled places in Kerala. make good prearrangement for that, the strength of female may be increased.

**Jinu Joseph. (2020).** Concluded that the need of the hour is to encourage quality on all fronts so as to provide world-class experiences to tourists without worsening in the society and in the environment, while at the same time strengthening the economy.

## RESEARCH GAB

Marketing of tourism is one of the furthestmost important studies which concerned which proportion of information relating to promotion of tourism sectors with ground-breaking and operative approaches. Earlier studies were made on marketing of tourism in general whereas this study was mainly focus on tourism marketing strategy of DTTC with respect to Kerala.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Tourism Marketing is a marketing strategy that uses detailed marketing plan and techniques to promote touristic products and services such as destinations, hotels and transport services, etc. Now a day's these sectors growing significantly owing that human mindset and approach. The tourism marketers need to centre of attention more on such destinations that provide both the business and advantages and pleasure to their customers. These pleasures depend on several factors like the ease of travelling, facilities of the hotels, nightlife of that place, activities offered and the overall culture of that place. Travels to long distance provide pleasure, happiness, adventures and live experience with nature and creators.

The purpose of tourism marketing is to encourage the business, make it stand out from rivals, attract customers, and generate brand awareness. Many modern tourism marketing strategies make use of the internet, with websites, online adverts, email and social media platforms often playing a key role. Tourism made an ground breaking approach to attract the customers through its conventional as well as information and communication technology strategies.

Tourism as a specialized product generates a number of significant considerations which need to be fully analyzed. The management of tour package cannot be separated from the management of service and quality. Thus, the marketing of the tour package is different from other products because the tour bundle is a service product where instead of selling physical goods an intangible experience is sold. Selling of experience is unique in measuring its monetary value. An understanding of the complexity of the tourism product concept is an essential pre-requisite for effective tour package marketing in this context. Thus there is need of innovative marketing strategies to popularise the tourism places and packages with the help of modern technologies. With this view the present study focus on is there any unique strategies adopted by DTTC to promote the tourism industry in Kerala.

## OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

1. To analyze the level of satisfaction towards District Tourism Promotion council in Kerala.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is descriptive in nature. It is descriptive in the sense that it gives a detailed description with regard to the performance of District Tourism Promotion Council in the marketing of Tourism in Kerala. The study is based on both the primary and secondary data. The primary data were collected from the tourists in Kerala with the help of a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was tested with 430 tourists in Kerala and utmost care was taken to avoid errors in data collection. The secondary data were collected from official records of tourism department of Kerala, Government of India report and other reliable records and reports.

### Sampling Design

The Proportionate Stratified Sampling Method was used to select the respondents in Kerala. The state of Kerala is divided into 14 revenue Districts from each district 110 sample respondents were identified with the total sample respondents of 440 of which 430 sample respondents were collected.

**Table No-1 Sample Respondents**

S.No	District	Sample distributed	Sample collected
1	Alappuzha	32	31
2	Ernakulam	32	31

3	Idukki	32	30
4	Kannur	32	30
5	Kasaragod	31	30
6	Kollam	32	30
7	Kottayam	32	30
8	Kozhikode	32	30
9	Malappuram	31	30
10	Palakkad	31	30
11	Pathanamthitta	31	30
12	Thiruvananthapuram	32	30
13	Thrissur	31	30
14	Wayanad	31	30
	<b>Total</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>430</b>

**Statistical Tools Used**

The collected data have been consolidated, tabulated and analyzed by using relevant statistical tools like, mean, standard deviation, co-efficient variance, Reliability test, T-test, one way ANOVA, and Regression Analysis and factor analysis. The SPSS 24.0 package was utilized for analyzing the data. The interpretation of the study is done by using tables to give meaningful results.

**Table: 2** Demographic Characteristics of Tourists visited Kerala

Demographic characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	Male	442	64.1
	Female	248	35.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Age</b>	Less than 25	110	15.9
	Between 26-30	139	20.1
	Between 31-40	178	25.8
	Between 41-50	167	24.2
	More than 50	96	13.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Community</b>	ST	82	11.9
	SC	166	24.1
	OBC	346	50.1
	FC	96	13.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Religion</b>	Hindu	428	62.0
	Muslim	124	18.0
	Christian	138	20.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Educational Qualification</b>	No Formal Education	98	14.2
	School Level	193	28.0
	College Level	249	36.1
	Others	150	21.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Occupation</b>	Self-employment	125	18.1
	Business	166	24.1
	Profession	262	38.0
	Government Jobs	137	19.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Annual Income</b>	Less than 1 Lakh	125	18.1
	1-5 Lakhs	166	24.1
	6-10 Lakhs	262	38.0
	More than 10 lakhs	137	19.9

	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
--	--------------	------------	--------------

Source: Primary data

The table 2 summarizes the demographic characteristics of tourists visited Kerala such as gender, age, community, religion, educational qualification, occupation and annual income. With regard to gender of tourists visited Kerala 442 (64.1%) of them were male and 248 (35.9%) of them was female tourists. Regarding the distribution of age of the tourists 110 (15.9%) of them were below 25 years of age, 139 (20.1%) of tourists were between 26 to 30 years of age, 178 (25.8%) of them were between 31 to 40 years of age, 167 (24.2%) of tourists were between 41 to 50 years of age and 96 (13.9%) of tourists visited Kerala were above 50 years of age. With regard to community of tourists visited Kerala, 82 (11.9%) of them belongs to ST community, 166 (24.1%) of tourists visited Kerala belongs to SC community, 346 (50.1%) of them belongs to OBC and 96 (13.9%) of tourists were belong to FC community. Regarding the religion of tourists 428 (62%) of them were Hindus, 124 (18%) of tourists belongs to Muslims and 138 (20%) of them were belongs to Christians. In terms of educational qualification of tourists, 98 (14.2%) of them have no formal education, 193 (28%) of tourists completed school level of education, 249 (36.1%) of them were finished college level of education and 150 (21.7%) of them were qualified with other educational qualification. With regard to occupation of the tourists visited Kerala, 125 (18.1%) of them engaged with self-employment, 166 (24.1%) of tourists were involved in business, 262 (38%) of them were occupied with other profession 137 (19.9%) of tourists were working in Government job. With respect to their annual income, 260 (37.7%) of tourists earned less than one lakh, 234 (33.9%) of tourists received 1 to 5 lakhs, 154 (22.3%) of them were got 6 to 10 lakhs per annum and 42 (6.1%) of them received more than 10 lakhs per annum.

The above details concluded that more male tourists were visited Kerala, the majority of age visited Kerala were in the middle age group i.e 31 to 40 years, OBC community was majority visited Kerala, tourists belongs Hindu religion were majority, majority of the tourists completed college level of education, tourists occupied with professional occupation play vital role and majority of tourists visited Kerala earned less than 1 lakh as their annual income.

**Table: 3**  
**Details of Tourism Related Information**

Demographic characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Native Place	Kerala	178	25.8
	South India	220	31.9
	North India	209	30.3
	Other Country	83	12.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Frequency of Visit	First Time	276	40.0
	2-5 Times	289	41.9
	More than 5 Times	125	18.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mode of Transport	Own Vehicles	262	38.0
	Bus	220	31.9
	Train	166	24.1
	Flight	42	6.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Source of Information	Friends	194	28.1
	Social Media	207	30.0
	Tour Agents	165	23.9
	Advertisement by DTPC	124	18.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Primary data

The table 3 showed the details of tourism related information like tourists native place, frequency of visit, mode of transport and sources of information. With regard to native place of tourists 178 (25.8%) of them were from Kerala, 220 (31.9%) of tourists were came from South India, 209 (30.3%) of tourist’s native place belongs to North India and 83 (12%) of them were came from other countries. In terms of frequency of visit to Kerala 276 (40%) of them were visited Kerala for first time, 289 (41.9%) of them were responded that they visited Kerala for 2 to 5 times and 125 (18.1%) of tourists visited Kerala for more than 5 times. With respect to mode of transport to visit Kerala 262 (38%) of them used to travel by their own vehicles, 220 (31.9%) of tourists visited Kerala by bus, 166 (24.1%) of tourists came by train and 42 (6.1%) of them used Flight to came Kerala. Regarding sources of information 198 (24.1%) of tourists got it through their friends, 207 (30%) collected the information through social media, 165 (23.9%) of them received information through tour agents, 124 (18%) of tourists collected information from the advertisement provided by DTPC.

From the above description it was found that majority of tourists visited Kerala were belongs to native place of South India, majority of tourists visited Kerala for 2 to 5 times, more tourists were used to came by their own vehicles, most of them received information through social media.

**Table: 4** Details of Tourism Related Information

Demographic characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Trips Arranged</b>	Self	207	30.0
	Tour Agency	248	35.9
	Friends and Relations	193	28.0
	Others	42	6.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Purpose of Visit</b>	Week end	110	15.9
	Vacation	165	23.9
	Get together	151	21.9
	Heritage	180	26.1
	Others	84	12.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Accommodation Facilities</b>	Guest House	125	18.1
	Lodges	177	25.7
	Resorts	263	38.1
	Hotels	125	18.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Companionship</b>	Family	152	22.0
	Friends	261	37.8
	Colleagues	180	26.1
	Alone	97	14.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Budget for Trip</b>	Less than 5000	317	45.9
	5001 – 10000	248	35.9
	More than 10000	125	18.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Primary data

The table 4 showed the details of tourism related information like trips arranged, purpose of visit, accommodation facilities, companionship and budget for trip. Regarding trip arrangement 207 (30%) of the arranged on their own, 248 (35.9%) of tourists arranged tour through tour agency, 193 (28%) of them arranged tour with the help of their family, relations and friends and 42 (6.1%) of them arranged tour through other sources. With regard to purpose of visit, 110 (15.9%) of them responded weekend tour, 165 (23.9%) tourists responded that vacation as the purpose of tour, 151 (21.9%) of them replied that get together, 180 (26.1%) of them reported heritage as the purpose and 84 (12.2%) replied other purposes. In terms of accommodation facilities 125 (18.1%) of tourists used guest houses, 177 (25.7%) utilized lodges for accommodation, 263 (38.1%) of them used resorts for accommodation and 165 (18.1%) of tourists used hotels for accommodation. With respect to companionship during tour 152 (22%) of them went with their family, 261 (37.8%) of tourist went with their friends, 180 (26.1%) of them went tour with their colleagues and 97 (14.1%) of

tourist went alone. With regard to budget for trip 317 (45.9%) of tourists allocated less than Rs 5000, 248 (35.9%) of them allocated Rs5001 to 10000 and 125 (18.1%) of tourists allocated more than Rs 10000 for tour.

To conclude, most of them arranged tour through tour agency, heritage was considered as the main purpose of the visit, majority of tourists used resorts for accommodation, majority of tourists went tour with their friends and most of them spent Rs 5001 to 10000 as budget for trip.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between age and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 5**  
**ANOVA for significant mean difference between age and level of satisfaction towards level of satisfaction among tourists**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	S
Transport facilities	Between Groups	11.994	4	2.999	<b>0.206</b>	<b>0.035*</b>
	Within Groups	9952.788	685	14.530		
	Total	9964.783	689			
Accommodation facilities	Between Groups	45.298	4	11.325	<b>0.697</b>	<b>0.049*</b>
	Within Groups	11129.283	685	16.247		
	Total	11174.581	689			
Food facilities	Between Groups	153.826	4	38.457	<b>2.307</b>	<b>0.057*</b>
	Within Groups	11419.739	685	16.671		
	Total	11573.565	689			
Marketing facilities	Between Groups	804.965	4	201.241	<b>16.478</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	8365.860	685	12.213		
	Total	9170.825	689			
Public behaviour	Between Groups	1150.068	4	287.517	<b>15.522</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	12688.187	685	18.523		
	Total	13838.255	689			
Public services	Between Groups	987.247	4	246.812	<b>19.618</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	8617.752	685	12.581		
	Total	9604.999	689			

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between age towards level of satisfaction among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 5) that there is a significant mean difference in the age towards transport facilities (F-value = 0.206,  $p < 0.05$ ), accommodation facilities (F-value = 0.697,  $p < 0.05$ ), food facilities (F-value = 2.307,  $p < 0.05$ ), marketing facilities (F-value = 16.478,  $p < 0.01$ ), public behaviour (F-value = 15.522,  $p < 0.01$ ), and public services (F-value = 19.618,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between community and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between community and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 6**  
**ANOVA for significant difference between community and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	S
Transport facilities	Between Groups	24.969	3	8.323	<b>0.574</b>	<b>0.032*</b>
	Within Groups	9939.814	686	14.490		
	Total	9964.783	689			
Accommodation facilities	Between Groups	60.093	3	20.031	<b>1.236</b>	<b>0.026*</b>
	Within Groups	11114.488	686	16.202		
	Total	11174.581	689			
Food facilities	Between Groups	162.094	3	54.031	<b>3.248</b>	<b>0.021*</b>
	Within Groups	11411.471	686	16.635		

	Total	11573.565	689			
Marketing facilities	Between Groups	602.205	3	200.735	<b>16.071</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	8568.620	686	12.491		
	Total	9170.825	689			
Public behaviour	Between Groups	2325.709	3	775.236	<b>46.194</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	11512.546	686	16.782		
	Total	13838.255	689			
Public services	Between Groups	1378.688	3	459.563	<b>38.323</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	8226.311	686	11.992		
	Total	9604.999	689			

( \* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between community towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 6) that there is a significant mean difference in the community towards perception about place (F-value = 27.956,  $p < 0.01$ ), perception about price (F-value = 27.926,  $p < 0.01$ ), perception about people (F-value = 2.395,  $p < 0.05$ ) and perception about promotion (F-value = 1.717,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between community and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between community and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 7**

**ANOVA for significant difference between community and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum Squares	ofdf	Mean Square	F	S
Place	Between Groups	54.787	3	18.262	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.032*</b>
	Within Groups	12530.135	686	18.266		
	Total	12584.922	689			
Price	Between Groups	123.951	3	41.317	<b>2.767</b>	<b>0.041*</b>
	Within Groups	10242.536	686	14.931		
	Total	10366.487	689			
People	Between Groups	79.658	3	26.553	<b>1.879</b>	<b>0.032*</b>
	Within Groups	9695.306	686	14.133		
	Total	9774.964	689			
Promotion	Between Groups	20.191	3	6.730	<b>0.672</b>	<b>0.049*</b>
	Within Groups	6867.873	686	10.011		
	Total	6888.064	689			

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between community towards level of satisfaction among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 7) that there is a significant mean difference in the community towards transport facilities (F-value = 0.574,  $p < 0.05$ ), accommodation facilities (F-value = 1.236,  $p < 0.05$ ), food facilities (F-value = 3.248,  $p < 0.05$ ), marketing facilities (F-value = 16.071,  $p < 0.01$ ), public behavior (F-value = 46.194,  $p < 0.01$ ), and public services (F-value = 38.323,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between educational qualification and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between educational qualification and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.



**Table 8 ANOVA for significant difference between educational qualification and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum Squares	ofdf	Mean Square	F	S
Place	Between Groups	1370.981	3	456.994	<b>27.956</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	11213.940	686	16.347		
	Total	12584.922	689			
Price	Between Groups	1128.209	3	376.070	<b>27.926</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	9238.278	686	13.467		
	Total	10366.487	689			
People	Between Groups	101.326	3	33.775	<b>2.395</b>	<b>0.047*</b>
	Within Groups	9673.638	686	14.102		
	Total	9774.964	689			
Promotion	Between Groups	51.324	3	17.108	<b>1.717</b>	<b>0.052*</b>
	Within Groups	6836.740	686	9.966		
	Total	6888.064	689			

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between educational qualification towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 8) that there is a significant mean difference in the educational qualification towards perception about place (F-value = 1.000,  $p < 0.05$ ), perception about price (F-value = 2.767,  $p < 0.05$ ), perception about people (F-value = 1.879,  $p < 0.05$ ) and perception about promotion (F-value = 0.049,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between educational qualification and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between educational qualification and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 9 ANOVA for significant difference between educational qualification and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum Squares	ofdf	Mean Square	F	S
Transport facilities	Between Groups	125.687	3	41.896	<b>2.921</b>	<b>0.033*</b>
	Within Groups	9839.096	686	14.343		
	Total	<b>9964.783</b>	<b>689</b>			
Accommodation facilities	Between Groups	111.255	3	37.085	<b>2.300</b>	<b>0.056*</b>
	Within Groups	11063.326	686	16.127		
	Total	<b>11174.581</b>	<b>689</b>			
Food facilities	Between Groups	90.554	3	30.185	<b>1.803</b>	<b>0.045*</b>
	Within Groups	11483.012	686	16.739		
	Total	<b>11573.565</b>	<b>689</b>			
Marketing facilities	Between Groups	208.442	3	69.481	<b>5.318</b>	<b>0.001**</b>
	Within Groups	8962.383	686	13.065		
	Total	<b>9170.825</b>	<b>689</b>			
Public behaviour	Between Groups	44.048	3	14.683	<b>0.730</b>	<b>0.034*</b>
	Within Groups	13794.208	686	20.108		
	Total	<b>13838.255</b>	<b>689</b>			
Public services	Between Groups	82.169	3	27.390	<b>1.973</b>	<b>0.017*</b>
	Within Groups	9522.829	686	13.882		
	Total	<b>9604.999</b>	<b>689</b>			

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between educational qualification towards level of satisfaction among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 9) that there is a significant mean difference in the educational qualification towards transport facilities (F-value = 2.921, p<0.05), accommodation facilities (F-value = 2.300, p<0.05), food facilities (F-value = 1.803, p<0.05), marketing facilities (F-value = 5.318, p<0.01), public behaviour (F-value = 0.730, p<0.05), and public services (F-value = 1.973, p<0.05).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between native place and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between native place and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 10 ANOVA for significant difference between native place and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	S
Place	Between Groups	294.473	3	98.158	<b>5.479</b>	<b>0.001**</b>
	Within Groups	12290.449	686	17.916		
	Total	12584.922	689			
Price	Between Groups	273.902	3	91.301	<b>6.206</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	10092.585	686	14.712		
	Total	10366.487	689			
People	Between Groups	61.525	3	20.508	<b>1.448</b>	<b>0.028**</b>
	Within Groups	9713.439	686	14.160		
	Total	9774.964	689			
Promotion	Between Groups	18.048	3	6.016	<b>0.601</b>	<b>0.015**</b>
	Within Groups	6870.016	686	10.015		
	Total	6888.064	689			

(\*\*p<0.01 significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between native place of tourists visited Kerala towards tourism marketing strategies and the result showed (Table 10) that there is a significant mean difference in the native place of tourists towards perception about place (F-value = 5.479, p<0.01), perception about price (F-value = 6.206, p<0.01), perception about people (F-value = 1.448, p<0.01) and perception about promotion (F-value = 0.601, p<0.01).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between native place and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between native place and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 11 ANOVA for significant difference between native place and level of satisfaction towards marketing strategies among tourists**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	S
Transport facilities	Between Groups	158.054	3	52.685	<b>3.685</b>	<b>0.012*</b>
	Within Groups	9806.729	686	14.296		
	Total	<b>9964.783</b>	<b>689</b>			
Accommodation facilities	Between Groups	132.175	3	44.058	<b>2.737</b>	<b>0.043*</b>
	Within Groups	11042.406	686	16.097		
	Total	<b>11174.581</b>	<b>689</b>			
Food facilities	Between Groups	259.541	3	86.514	<b>5.246</b>	<b>0.001**</b>
	Within Groups	11314.024	686	16.493		
	Total	<b>11573.565</b>	<b>689</b>			
Marketing facilities	Between Groups	146.339	3	48.780	<b>3.708</b>	<b>0.011*</b>
	Within Groups	9024.486	686	13.155		
	Total	<b>9170.825</b>	<b>689</b>			
Public behaviour	Between Groups	493.740	3	164.580	<b>8.461</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	13344.515	686	19.453		
	Total	<b>13838.255</b>	<b>689</b>			
Public services	Between Groups	299.865	3	99.955	<b>7.369</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	9305.134	686	13.564		

	<b>Total</b>	<b>9604.999</b>	<b>689</b>			
--	--------------	-----------------	------------	--	--	--

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between native place of tourists visited Kerala towards level of satisfaction among tourists and the result showed (Table 11) that there is a significant mean difference in the native place of tourists towards transport facilities (F-value = 3.685,  $p < 0.05$ ), accommodation facilities (F-value = 2.737,  $p < 0.05$ ), food facilities (F-value = 5.246,  $p < 0.01$ ), marketing facilities (F-value = 3.708,  $p < 0.05$ ), public behavior (F-value = 8.461,  $p < 0.01$ ), and public services (F-value = 7.369,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Null Hypothesis:** There is no significant mean difference between source of information and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Alternative Hypothesis:** There is a significant mean difference between source of information and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists.

**Table 12 ANOVA for significant difference between source of information and perception towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists**

		<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>S</b>
Place	Between Groups	243.930	3	81.310	<b>4.520</b>	<b>0.004**</b>
	Within Groups	12340.992	686	17.990		
	Total	12584.922	689			
Price	Between Groups	281.461	3	93.820	<b>6.382</b>	<b>0.000**</b>
	Within Groups	10085.026	686	14.701		
	Total	10366.487	689			
People	Between Groups	96.167	3	32.056	<b>2.272</b>	<b>0.059*</b>
	Within Groups	9678.796	686	14.109		
	Total	9774.964	689			
Promotion	Between Groups	46.952	3	15.651	<b>1.569</b>	<b>0.046*</b>
	Within Groups	6841.112	686	9.972		
	Total	6888.064	689			

(\* $p < 0.05$  significant at 5 percent level, \*\* $p < 0.01$  significant at 1 percent level)

One – way ANOVA was applied to find the significant mean difference between source of information towards tourism marketing strategies among tourists visited Kerala and the result showed (Table 12) that there is a significant mean difference in the source of information towards perception about place (F-value = 4.520,  $p < 0.01$ ), perception about price (F-value = 6.382,  $p < 0.01$ ), perception about people (F-value = 2.272,  $p < 0.05$ ) and perception about promotion (F-value = 1.569,  $p < 0.05$ ).

## SUGGESTIONS

Accommodation facilities are very essential for tourist service because new location change in environment and food habits influence the experience of Tourism. The following are the most important factors that influence the experience of the tourism Accommodation facilities are available in the state, Rooms and dormitories are well lighted and well ventilated, Simple but clean accommodation with proper sanitation and hygiene is available in the city at reasonable rates, more accommodation facilities are needed on the way to the tourist destinations and Tour operators are providing better accommodation facilities. Therefore, DTPC should ensure quality of accommodation on to all the people who are visiting to Kerala that will reflect customers' satisfaction and expectation.

Kerala is maintaining energetic and hygienic food behavior with more vegetables and meals. Tourist people are eagerly taking Kerala food for their enjoyment and taste. Food facilities are highly influenced by Quality of food is good, fresh and hygienic food is available at every tourist destination, Tasty and delicious food is available in the city at cheap rates, both vegetarian and non-vegetarian food is available in the city and Costly but excellent quality of food is available in the city. Therefore, DTPC should be very careful about the quality of the food which are provided in the hotels and restaurant with periodical measures. It is one of the very serious issues in marketing strategy of tourism.

Marketing a service is complex than a product. Service marketing needs special plan and strategies to adopt and update periodically. Marketing facilities provided by DTPC consists of Shop for art and craft are adequate in number in the state, Shopkeepers around the tourist destinations do not cheat the tourists, Prices are fixed in most of the shop having variety of good quality local handicraft/souvenirs, Fixed price shops give the feeling of fair shopping and there is needed to open more shopping centres of the state art and craft and other reputed items in the state. Therefore, DTPC should be alert on adoption of appropriate marketing strategies to promote tourism sector in Kerala.

Kerala is known for good culture and behavior by nature which is one of the reasons for increasing tourist in Kerala day by day. How public behave with tourist will reflect the continuity of visitors. The behavior of local is good towards tourists; there is a good feeling of safety in the state. There is a needed for proper knowledgeable tourists guides

while visiting the particular destinations, Government provides adequate facilities on the way and at every tourist destination in the state and Government publicity regarding state tourism is adequate. Therefore, public also responsible to promote the tourism activities and attract more tourist to Kerala.

Adequate telecommunication facilities are there in the state, Adequate banking facilities are there in the state, Adequate medical facilities are available at every tourist destination in the state, Adequate drinking water facilities are available and Adequate toilet facilities are available are the major expectation relating to public service facilities which are more relevant to tourism in Kerala. In this view Kerala Government may strengthen their public service facilities like transport, Hotel, Hospital, Educational institutions religious places, Law and order and infrastructure facilities.

## CONCLUSION

Kerala is one of the excellent tourism places where location and climate are amazing, and culture and tradition of Kerala is uniqueness in tourism industry. Government of Kerala also took various steps to promote tourism sector in the state. District Tourism promotion council is performing in a significant manner with innovative marketing strategies and approaches. Many organizations are associate with this council to promote and facilitate tourism activities. Marketing strategies adopted by DTPC is significantly playing a key role in promoting tourism in Kerala state. It is concluded that, Kerala is known for tourism, the strength of Kerala is tourism, and the identity of Kerala is Tourism. Therefore, DTPC should be more achieve and effective to adopt modern marketing strategies to attract more visitors to Kerala and Kerala government should strengthen its infrastructure facilities and other amenities to promote tourism in future.

## REFERENCES:

2. **Anisha Ramdas. (2015).** Prospects of Beach Tourism in Kerala – A Case Study Of Snehatheeram Beach In Thrissur District. *International Journal of Management and Social Science Research Review*, 1(16), 245.
3. **Arturo Molina., Mar Gómez., & David Martín Consuegra. (2010).** Tourism marketing information and destination image management. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(5), 722-728.
4. **Babu.P.George. (2007).** Alleppey Tourism Development Cooperative: The Case of Network Advantage Babu P George. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 12(2).
5. **Corina Larisa Bunghez (2016).** The Importance of Tourism to a Destination's Economy. *Journal of Eastern Europe Research in Business and Economics*, 2016.
6. **Gurneet Kaur. (2017).** The Importance of Digital Marketing in the Tourism Industry. 5(6).
7. **Haseena .V.A (2014).** Eco-Tourism In Kerala and Its Importance and Sustainability. *PARIPEX - Indian Journal of Research*, 3.
8. **Jacob John., & Seema Chelat. (2013).** Medical Tourism and Inclusive Growth: Significance of Ayurveda Sector. *Atna, J Tour Stud*, 8(2), 19-35.
9. **Jinu Joseph. (2020).** Economic Impact of Tourism in Kerala. *India-European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 610-617.
10. **Jitender Pal Singh Jammu. (2016).** Yoga Tourism In India. *International Journal of Information Movement*, 1(8), 1-6.
11. **Jose Bejoy., & Kannan.R. (2015).** Impacts of Sustainable Cultural Tourism in Fort Kochi Kerala. 3(1).
12. **Kanagavalli.G., & Haseena.K.P. (2019).** Examination on Foreign Direct Investment in the Tourism Industry in Kerala. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3).
13. **Manoj.P.K. (2017).** Impact of Ecotourism: Evidence from Thenmala Ecotourism Destination in Kollam District Kerala.4(1).
14. **Mohammed Safwan.A., & Ashraf Pulikkamath. (2018).** Tourism promotional activities and its impacts: An experience of DTPC Malappuram Kerala. *National Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 3(1), 906-911.
15. **Moli.P.Koshy., Vijay Kuriakose., & Paul .V. Mathew. (2016).** Measurement for Responsible Tourism: Development of A Stakeholder-Based Scale, 9(1).
16. **Nagarjuna.G. (2016).** A Comparative Analysis Of Competency Expectations Between Tourism Professionals And Tourism Academicians, 1-16.
17. **Naik.NTK., & Suresh Lal. B. (2013).** Keconomic Analysis Of Indian Medical Tourism. *International Healthcare Destination*,5(2).
18. **Nikhil.N.K., & SanthaS. (2015).** Effectiveness of Responsible Tourism at Kumarakom Kerala. *IJMIE*, 5(12).
19. **Nishad.A., Edwin Gnanadhas.M., & Rathiha.R. (2018).**..A Study On The Development of Eco Tourism In Kerala, 5(3).
20. **Padma Mahanti., & Sanjeet Kumar. (2017).** Major Biodiversity of poovar beach along the Neyaar River- a tourism destination of Kerala. *India International Research Journal of Environmental Science*, 6(2), 72-75.
21. **Proshanta Kumar Ghosh., & Debajit Datta. (2012).** Coastal tourism and beach sustainability – An assessment of community perceptions in Kovalam India, *GEOGRAFIA Online TM Malaysia Journal of Society and Space*, 8(7), 75 – 87.

22. **Saranya.T., & Mariswamy.H.K. (2016).** The Role of Health Tourism on Tourism Development in Kerala State: An Evaluation. *IRA-International Journal of Management & Social Sciences*.4 (2), 494-501.
23. **Shameem.C.K., & Rajam.K. (2019).** Socio-Economic Back Ground Study Of Kerala Touristers-A Analytical Study. *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, 11(12).
24. **Shihabudheen.N. (2012).** Problems and Prospects of Ecotourism in Kerala: Some Empirical Evidence from 'Kumbalangi' Panchayat In Ernakulam District (India). *Journal of Global Economy*, 8(4).
25. **Shobha Menon., Manoj Edward., & Babu.P. (2017).** George Inter-stakeholder collaboration in event management- a case study of Kerala Travel Mart. *Int. J. Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 5(4).
26. **Tom Pious Amal Baby. (2016).** A General Study of Responsible Tourism in Kerala. *Epitome Journal International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2 (11).
27. **Vaisakh.J., Swarna Abirami.L., Krishnachandran.C., & Arun.K. (2020)** .Tourism Marketing Through Social Media After Covid-19 in Kerala. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(7).