Indexed in

The American Journal of Economics and Business Innovation (AJEBI) is an international, peer-reviewed, and open-access journal that publishes articles that emphasize research, development, and application within the fields of business, economics, finance, marketing, management, business analytics, etc. The AJBEI reviews papers within approximately one month of submission and publishes accepted articles online immediately upon receiving the final versions.

Frequency: Three issues per year

Area of publication: Business, economics, finance, marketing, management, business analytics, start-ups, and financial innovations and technologies.

Editorial Team

Why do Tourists Visit a Himalayan Destination? Motivation, Barrier and Facilities Preference

Rohit Chauhan[1], Himanshu Jishtu[2*]

ABSTRACT

Tourist destination choices are a mix of push and pull motivations along with travel barriers. Indian Himalayas has a significant role in attracting tourists but is limited to already explored destinations. In the Western Himalayas, Shimla is among globally famous tourist destinations. The study area was Shimla, and data were collected from 299 tourists. Shimla was the summer capital of British India. Presently this city is the capital of the North-Indian state of Himachal Pradesh, India. The data collection tool, i.e., the structured questionnaire, had questions about the demographic profile, push-pull factors, travel barriers to visiting Srinagar and facilities preferences. The results were interpreted to explore the profile of tourists visiting a Himalayan destination, i.e., Shimla. It was found that generation Y tourists have a majority among tourists who visit Shimla, and pull factors were nature, adventure, and culture. While, security and distance (both geographical & cultural) are travel barriers that are absent in parallel with Shimla. In the case of facility preferences, two groups emerged, one with a preference for a cultural experience and the other group lacking the same. The facilities considered were the type of accommodation, transportation and food.

INTRODUCTION

Tourists visiting a destination is the product of a process that joins two ends in tourism. One end is tourist motivation or push factors, which is linked with demand, and demand is deep-rooted in the socio-psychological phenomenon of a tourist. The other end relates to the characteristics of a destination, which are called pull factors. These characteristics include tourism resources at a destination. Research in travel motivation started during the late 1970s and is still advancing. Early research was focused mainly on the reasons for travel (Crompton J. L., 1979; Dann G. M., 1977). The advances moved towards psychographics and tried to find the process of choosing a destination (Subedi, Chaudhary, & Shahi, 2022). Choosing a destination was achieved with the help of theory in which sets of destinations were considered and rejected in different phases (Woodside & Sherrell, 1977; Crompton J. , 1992; Crompton & Ankomah, 1993; Karl, Reintinger, & schmude, 2015; Um & Crompton, 1990; Woodside & Lysonski, 1989). In addition to destination choices, the factors motivating tourists to visit a destination and attracting tourists to a destination were called push and pull factors, respectively.

Contrary to the attractive and motivating forces, there are also a few barriers and deterrents to a destination. These included the barriers relating to geography, culture, absenteeism of the desired facility at the destination, natural disasters, political instability, and safety. These fears force a potential traveller to choose one destination over the other. This research is intended to look into the profiles of tourists visiting destinations in the Himalayas. The first half of this study looked for push and pull motivations for choosing a Himalayan destination. Additionally, the section looks into the

reasons for choosing one Himalayan destination over the other. The second half of this research will look at the preferences of tourists when choosing accommodation, transportation, and food during their visits. There would be an attempt of developing facility preference sets regarding accommodation, transportation, and food.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Travel motivation, destination choice, and push-pull factors

Tourists visiting a destination was considered as the sum of both push and pull motivations. With the introduction of push-pull theory, two forms of push factors, namely anomie and ego-enhancement were firstly identified (Dann G. M., 1977). Latter Crompton (1979) identified two categories of motivation for a tourist. These were socio-psychological and cultural. Socio-psychological motives included escape from routine, self-exploration and evaluation, relaxation, prestige, regression, kinship relationships and social interaction. In addition to socio-psychological, there were cultural motives constituting novelty and education. This research was followed by Dann M. G. (1981), who distinguished motivation from other relating terms and considered it an interpretable discipline.

Thereafter, the destination choice was approached through the process of narrowing down the destination in the tourist's mind during the planning phase. A famous and still surviving model was first introduced by (Woodside & Sherrell, 1977) called set theory. These sets dealt with tourist psychographics. Firstly, there major identified sets were evoked set, inert set, and inept set. Evoked set meant a set of those destinations which tourists were aware of and had some likelihood to visit

[1] Institute of Vocational Studies, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India.
[2] School of Hospitality & Tourism, Bahra University, Waknaghat, India
* Corresponding author's e-mail: himanshu@bahrauniversity.edu.in

in the coming period. Inert set meant the set of known destinations that tourists wish to visit but didn't decide when to visit. Inept set meant those destinations set, which tourists were aware of and didn't wish to travel.

These sets were rearranged, and a few others were introduced, resulting in the new models of destination choice (Crompton J. , 1992; Crompton & Ankomah, 1993; Um & Crompton, 1990; Woodside & Lysonski, 1989). The latest in the series of set theories was the work of (Karl, Reintinger, & schmude, 2015). The three initially defined sets were in the middle stage of the set theory presented in the study. The model says that initially, there exists a total set, which was narrowed down to unaware, unavailable aware and available aware sets. From the available aware set, evoked, inept and inert sets emerged. Evoked set thus finds consideration and two further sets named action and inaction sets emerge. The destination finally chosen emerges from an action set. The same study provided a typology for destination choice, including realistic planners, safe dreamers, unrealistic planners, daydreamers, and adventurers.

Literature on push and pull motives was further extended by other scholars. In addition to push motives includes status and personal development, knowledge of culture, interpersonal relationship, relaxation and pleasure. In addition to these, the pull motives include people, atmosphere and climate at the destination, hygiene, outdoor activities and built heritage (Antara & Prameshwari, 2018; Karamehmedovic, 2018; Prayag & Ryan, 2011). Literature on push and pull motives were further extended based on the specific form of tourism or based on demographics. For a cultural or recreational destination push factors include prestige, relationship, fun, escape/rest and knowledge. Pull factors for cultural and recreational destinations included infrastructure, entertainment, shopping, attraction and accessibility. It was also concluded that the cultural tourists were motivated by their quest for learning (Nikjoo & Ketabi, 2015). In the case of the senior travel push, motivations included personal development, relaxation and relationship. The pull motivations for senior travellers included facilities and hygiene, destination familiarity, value for money and destination proximity (Wijaya, Wahyudi, Benita, & Sugianto, 2018). Another study had identified three major motivations for seniors while they travel abroad. These included experiencing culture or nature, seeking knowledge or learning and seeking once in a lifetime experience (Otoo, Kim, & Choi, 2020).

Research Question 1: What are the motivations of tourists visiting a Himalayan destination?

Barriers to Destination choice

Contrary to motivations, there exist various barriers that restrict tourists from travelling to a destination. The barrier is related to risk, and risk perception for a potential journey relies highly on past travel experiences. These risks related to destination travel could be divided into socio-demographic, psychological and travel-related risks (Karl, Muskat, & Ritchie, 2020). Another study

concluded that segmentation of tourists based on risk could be done better using psychological and behavioural factors as compared to demographic factors among outbound tourists. If socio-psychographics were to be considered, tourists visiting a destination again or the tourists' visiting friends and relatives were the travellers having the least amount of perceived risk. This segment constituted most older age tourists and was called carefree travellers. The next segment identified was risked reducing travellers, who repeated visitors with children. The last segment identified was seriously concerned travellers, who were younger tourists and were visiting first time to a destination (Ritchie, Chien, & Sharifpour, 2016).

Based on the ability of an individual to interpret risk, tourists were classified into risk-averse tourists and risk resilient tourists. Risk-averse tourists are those whose travel decisions were affected by potential risks, and risk resilient tourists' decisions remain the same even in case of risk (Karl, Muskat, & Ritchie, 2020). Travel risk was also considered context-specific. A study showed that in the case of natural disasters, only psychological, physical and performance risks matter, neglecting three other risk types financial, time and social risk (Lenggogeni,, Ritchie, & Slaughter, 2019). In a study on Malaysian women's visit intention to India, it was found that performance and time risk negatively impacted visit intention. However, tourists' travelling choice was unaffected by physical, financial and socio-psychological risk (Khan, Chelliah, & Ahmed, 2019).

For the outbound travellers in Australia, major risks identified were safety, health, cultural risk and loss of property. Among these risks, safety was the major concern for approximately half of the respondents. Other fear factors included exposure to contagious diseases, terrorism, bad value for money, getting sick and feeling socially uncomfortable (Dolnicar, 2005). It was identified that natural hazards don't act as a barrier (Karl, Muskat, & Ritchie, 2020). Tourist destination choices were affected negatively by political instability, financial problems, non-suitable travel partner and time constraint (Karl, Reintinger, & schmude, 2015). The barrier of distance might be geographical or cultural. Geographical distance had both positive and negative impacts on travel intention. The same was the case with cultural distance, which as a deterrent also act as motivation for a few market segments (Yang, Hongbo, Li, & Harrill, 2018). There is a positive dimension to risk in tourism. There was a study that stated that tourists who travel for novelty were also ready for risks (Karl, Muskat, & Ritchie, 2020). Thus, it might be inferred that risk, which was normally considered a barrier, might act as motivation for a segment of tourists. The latest concept emerged when it was said that a new segment of tourists is emerging, called xenophobic tourism (Kock, Josiassen, & Assaf, 2019).

Research Question 2: Which factors influenced tourists to choose one destination and discard the other?

H1: Geographical distance is significantly associated with

geographical distance as a psychological barrier to visiting a destination.

H2: Religion has a significant relationship with cultural familiarity as a reason for selecting one destination over the other.

Tourist preferences for facilities

Travel decisions are also gets influenced by facilities that tourists seek at the destination. Basic facilities include facilities of accommodations, transportation and food. The preference for some specific type of facility results in satisfaction and thus strengthening of revisit intention. In the case of accommodation, a hotel was the preferred choice of senior travellers because of better medical coverage and safety as compared to other types of stays (Losada, Alen, Nicolau, & Dominguez, 2017). Accommodation preference for those tourists with the motivation of recreation were the hotels, which provide a lot of facilities (Nikjoo & Ketabi, 2015). In the case of students, safety was not the determining factor in choosing accommodation type. Instead, students choose accommodation based on fewer prices and geographical distance to services needed (Magni, Pescaroli, & Bartolucci, 2019).

Price always remains the key factor when choosing an accommodation type (Chen, Tsai, & Chiu, 2017). In negation to the hypothesis of price-determining accommodation type, a study done in New Zealand communicates that expenditure was not always a concern for travellers choosing different accommodation types. Even a traveller choosing freedom camper indulged in highly paid activities (Fieger, Prayag, Hall, & North, 2020). In a study of capsule hotels, it was found that the price of accommodation facilities doesn't impact the choice for accommodation but services facility and location impacts (Lee, Lee, & Moon, 2018). From the above debates, this can be concluded that price doesn't always have a role to play in determining the accommodation type. Accommodation types were also determined by the motivation of experiencing something.

A study was conducted in China, where tourist choices were studied for accommodation sharing with hosts, with other travellers and doesn't sharing accommodation with anyone. It was found that during the revisit, tourists were most interested in facilities where accommodation facilities were shared with the host. But this preference was only after becoming familiar with the destination and accommodation type (Xie, Kwok, Chen, & Wu, 2020). The established concept in hospitality is homestays, where the commercial and domestic domain merges. Tourists stay with the host family in the domestic environment, and an experience and feel emerge (Lynch, 2005). Homestays were considered a source of experiencing authenticity for tourists (Mura, 2015; Wang, 2007), providing comparatively lower prices to tourists (Agyeiwaah, Akyeampong, & Amenumey, 2013) and tool for improving host living standards (Regmi & Walter, 2016; Walter, Regmi, & Khanal, 2018). Camping is another such accommodation that is called close to

nature and helps in understanding the inner self (Jirasek, Roberson, & Jiraskova, 2016). The push factor in camping included the motivation through which the feeling of disconnection from nature, others and self could be addressed. The pull factors included the experience of nature (Hassell, Susan, & Jim, 2015). Camping attracts all the tourist segments and is considered relatively price efficient and self-catering (Lee C.-F. , 2020).

Beyond the famous gaze theory in tourism, a new concept emerged that was of non-visual experiences. These experiences were classified into peak and supporting experiences. These included food, hotel and transportation experiences (Quan & Wang, 2004), sharing of the tourist services helps in the formation of new experiences and scopes for the formation of new markets (Tussyadiah & Sigala, 2018). Transportation medium doesn't only act as a mobility medium, but they also act as an instrument to gain experiences. In the case of shared bikes, tourist experiences and satisfaction could be enhanced (Chen & Huang, 2020). It was concluded in research that innovations in tourism might encourage travellers to use public or shared transport, and it might help in reducing greenhouse gases emission levels (Kelly, Haider, & Williams, 2007). Further research themes for innovations in mobility and sharing were presented with the help of connected and autonomous vehicles, which provides hope for a sustainable future of travel transportation (Cohen & Debbie, 2019).

Food in tourism can act in both ways, as an attraction and as an impediment (Cohen & Avieli, 2004). Food act as a supporting or peak experience for tourists and a destination; food might act as a major attraction. It was also cautioned that while providing a novel experience to tourists with food, cultural distance and comfort must be taken into consideration (Quan & Wang, 2004). Local food in tourism was considered a way to achieve memorable tourism experiences (Stone, Soulard, Migacz, & Wolf, 2017), authenticity (Sims, 2008) and a tool to strengthen the revisit intention (Alderighi, Bianchi, & Lorenzini, 2016).

Research question 3: What are the facilities preferences of tourists visiting a Himalayan destination?

H3: Age is associated with tourist preference for hotels.

DATA & METHODS

Study area

This study was conducted at one of the famous tourist destinations in the Himalayas named Shimla. Shimla lies in the north of India and is presently the capital of the state of Himachal Pradesh. It has been the erstwhile capital of British India since 1864. The movement of foreigners can be traced back to the 1820s, but in 1864 it can be strongly said that a huge movement of people started to Shimla (Pradhan, 2017). During the pre-covid year of 2020, Shimla attracted 3.1 million tourists out of 17.2 million attracted by the whole of the state. Even during the year 2020, Shimla attracted a major share of 19% of total tourist arrivals to the state of Himachal

Pradesh (Department of Tourism and Civil Aviation, 2021). There are a total of 12 districts in the state of Himachal Pradesh, and Shimla lies in the South-East of the state. This Himalayan state is located in the western Himalayas between the union territory of Jammu-Kashmir and Ladakh in the northwest and the state of Uttarakhand in the South-East. In the union territory of Jammu and Kashmir, there lies a famous tourist destination of Kashmir.

Kashmir is a part of the Jammu and Kashmir union territory of India. Srinagar was the summer capital of the erstwhile Jammu and Kashmir state. Srinagar was also a major tourist destination in the western Himalayas. Kashmir has been dealing with political turmoil and terrorism since 1947 (Samnotra & Gupta, 2020). Srinagar and Shimla are located 665 km apart from each other if distance through road is to be considered. Distance by road from Delhi to Shimla is 345 Kms and from Delhi to Srinagar is 810 Kms. Air and railways connectivity to Shimla doesn't work well, and railways connectivity to Kashmir was not available. Religiously Srinagar accounts for 95% of the Muslim population and 4% of the Hindu population (Srinagar District Administration, 2021). Shimla accounts for 93.50% of the Hindu population and 2.29% of Muslims (Census Population, 2021).

Data collection

The research was based on quantitative methods and employed all of the primary data collected from tourists visiting Shimla. Data was collected with the help of a structured questionnaire asking for demographic profiles, motivations, barriers and facility preferences (Karim, Chowdhury, & Haque, 2022). A total of 316 questionnaires were collected from tourists visiting a heritage attraction and a leisure attraction located in Shimla town during January and February 2020. Out of 316, there were only 299 filled questionnaires with valid

responses. Participants included both domestic as well as foreign tourists. A screening question about the tourist's native place was asked, and only after confirmation of the respondent being a tourist questionnaire was administered. The administration of questionnaires was carried out through face-to-face mode. The questionnaire and its factors were based on the literature review.

Data was interpreted with the help of descriptive statistics. Correlation analysis was done with the help of IBM SPSS, and Kendall's tau was used. Kendall's tau was considered a better measure of non-parametric correlation as compared to Spearmen's rho correlation (Field, 2013, p. 278).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The data that was gathered did have demographic heterogeneity and is presented in Table 1. In the case of age group, the tourists most visiting Shimla were in the age group of 21-30 years and the age group of 31-40 years. The total number of these age group were equivalent to 65% of whole tourists. There seem to have gender disparity, where males were in large number as compared to female tourists. Tourists who were earning less than INR 500,000 were most numbers who were visiting Shimla. In the case of occupation, half of the tourists visiting Shimla were students, and the other one-third share of the tourists were either having business as a profession or were employees in a private organization. In the case of education, the greatest number of tourists visiting Shimla were graduates. A total of 157 out of 299 tourists (64.08% of domestic tourists) were from the neighbouring states and union territories of Uttar Pradesh, Haryana, Punjab, Chandigarh, Delhi and Jammu & Kashmir.

This study covered almost all the motivational factors

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of respondents, Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

		n	%			n	%
Age In years	10-20	42	14.0%	Occupation	Student	140	46.8%
	21-30	137	45.8%		Farmer	9	3.0%
	31-40	60	20.1%		Govt. job	29	9.7%
	41-50	32	10.7%		private job	54	18.1%
	51-60	15	5.0%		Home	21	7.0%
	61-70	10	3.3%		Business	46	15.4%
	71-80	3	1.0%	Education	No education	18	6.0
Gender	Male	203	67.9%		10th	40	13.4
	Female	96	32.1%		10+2	52	17.4
Income (In INR)	<500k	88	29.4%		Graduation	123	41.1
	500k-2.5m	49	16.4%		29.4%	52	17.4
	2.5m- 5m	12	4.0%		PhD.	11	3.7
	>5m	6	2.0%		Post Doc	3	1.0
	Not specified	144	48.2%	Nationality	Indian	245	81.94
					Foreigner	54	18.06

n: Number; %: Percentage

that might apply to a mountainous destination. This could be justified by the responses of tourists when there was a negligible number of tourists opting for the "other" option. The results are provided in Table 2, which shows that a maximum percentage of tourists visiting Shimla were motivated by sightseeing or natural beauty. This was followed by the tourist's motivation for leisure. Leisure and sightseeing motivations each were approximately equitant to 55%. This might be categorized into the first category of major motivators. These were followed by adventure experiences and cultural experiences. The demand for culture and adventure was made by approximately 36%

of tourists. Other major significant motivators included zeal for learning or knowledge, health & wellness and escaped from normal routine by 18.4%, 14.7% and 12.7%, respectively. The two factors having a negligible impact on motivations were peer pressure and visiting friends and relatives. The barriers to visiting Srinagar and choosing Shimla instead were distance (both physical (32.4%) and cultural (10.7%)). Safety (30.4%) was considered another major motivation behind choosing Shimla over Srinagar. Other barriers included economically competent and religious similarity.& Kashmir.

This study had covered almost all the motivational

Table 2: Motivations and barriers for choosing Shimla,

Motivational factors	n	%	Barriers	n	%
Sightseeing/ natural beauty	174	58.2%	Geographical distance	97	32.4%
Leisure	163	54.5%	Safety	91	30.4%
Adventure experience	117	39.1%	Cultural familiarity	32	10.7%
Cultural experience	104	34.8%	Economically competent	20	6.7%
Knowledge/ Learning	55	18.4%	Religious similarity	18	6.0%
Health and wellness	44	14.7%	Other	30	10%
Escape from the normal routine	38	12.7%	None	144	48.2%
Peer pressure	15	5%			
Visiting friends and relatives	4	1.3%			
Other	2	0.67%			
Note: Multiple answers were allowed					

Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

factors, To find the relationship between geographical distance and geographical distance as psychological barriers to a destination, tourist generating regions were classified into four categories named near, middle, far and very far. "Near" meant the states sharing their geographical boundaries with Himachal. "Middle" states meant those states which were adjoining the neighbouring states. States listed under the category 'Far' meant all other states in India, and the last category of "very far" included international tourists. A Chi-square test was performed on a dichotomous variable asking tourists about consideration of geographical distance as a reason for selecting Shimla over Srinagar and the

distance between the origin and destination provided in Table 3. There was a significant association between geographical distance and geographical distance as a psychological barrier to visiting a destination $\chi2$ (3) = 22.282, p < .001. Cramer's V statistic is .273 out of 1, significant at p<.001, which represents a small association between geographical distance and geographical distance as a psychological barrier. The tourists who were coming from the neighbouring state were most influenced by geographical distance. As the geographical distance between source and destination increases, geographical distance as a psychological barrier also decreases.

A Fisher's exact test was applied to two variables, one

Table 3: Geographical distance (between source and destination) and geographical distance as a psychological barrier,

	Value	df	Sig.	
H1: Pearson Chi-Square ($\chi2$)	22.282[a]	3	.000	Null Hypothesis accepted
	Crosstabulation			
	Distance (Source state/country- Shimla)			
Is geographical distance a barrier to visiting Srinagar?		Near	Middle	Far	Very Far	Total
	Yes	60.8%	18.6%	8.2%	12.4%	100%

Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

was the religion of a tourist, and the other was the consideration of religious familiarity of a destination as a barrier to visiting a destination provided in Table 4. Tourists following Hinduism and Islam were only considered. Shimla comprises approximately 95% of the local population following Hinduism, and the same percentage was of Islam followers in Srinagar. There was not a statistically significant association between the

religion of a tourist and religious familiarity as a reason for selecting a destination (p = .205). Based on cross-tabulation, it was found that 94% of tourists following the Hindu religion selected Shimla as a destination out of their religious familiarity with the destination

A Fisher's exact test was applied to two variables, one was the age of the tourist and the other was tourist preference for a hotel in accommodation provided in Table 5. There

Table 4: Association of age with a preference for the hotel

	Sig. (2-sided)		Null Hypothesis
H3: Fisher's Exact Test	.541		Not accepted
Crosstab			
		Age (in years)	
		10-40	>40	Total
While on tour choose a hotel	Unlikely	27%	73%	100%
	Likely	34%	66%	100%

Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

was not a statistically significant association between the age group of tourists and choice of hotel (p = .541). Based on cross-tabulation, it was evident that the tourists who were preferring hotels were mostly in the age group of more than 40 years.

Table 5: Association of age with a preference for the hotel

	Sig. (2-sided)		Null Hypothesis
H2: Fisher's Exact Test	.205		Not accepted
Crosstab			
		Religion	
		Hindu	Islam	Total
While on tour choose a hotel	No	77%	23%	100%
	Yes	94%	6%	100%

Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

Facilities preference

In the case of the preferences for accommodation, transportation and food, there seems to be a non-standardized demand. The mean for 299 tourists on a 5-point Likert scale wishing to stay in a hotel came to 4.58. Results of correlation and mean are provided in Table 6. The same mean for homestay and camping were 3.24 and 3.84. In the case of transportation, personal transportation was preferred, moreover shared transportation. The mean for personal transportation was 4.56, and the mean for shared transportation was 3.49. Familiar food was more preferred with a mean of 4.51 as compared to local cuisine with a mean score of 4.19. Kendall's rank correlation coefficient was computed among seven facility preferences. Hotel preference was more significantly related to personal transportation, τ =.183, p=.001, as compared to that of shared transportation. The same preference was significantly correlated with the familiar cuisine, τ =.160, p=.003.

Homestay preference was significantly related to tourists' preference for shared accommodation, τ =.154, p=.001 and local cuisine, τ =.130, p=.008. This meant

Table 6: Facilities preference of tourists, Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

Accommodation	Transportation preference		Food preference	
	Personal (4.56 m)	Shared (3.49 m)	Familiar (4.51m)	Local (4.19 m)
Hotel (4.58m)	1st (.183**)	2nd (.105*)	1st (.160**)	NS
Camping (3.83m)	1st (.223**)	2nd (.139**)	1st (.245**)	2nd (.139**)
Homestay (3.24m)	NS	1st (.154**)	NS	1st (.130**)
m mean, NS: Non-Significant, * p< .05, **p<.01, ***p<.001				

Facilities preference

that tourists who visit homestays prefer local cuisine and shared transportation. In the case of camping, there was a more significant relationship for personal transportation, τ =.183, p=.001, as compared to that of shared transportation, τ =.139, p=.004. Camping preference was significantly correlated with the familiar cuisine, τ =.160, p=.003, as compared to local food, τ =.139, p=.005. Tourists with a preference for camping were both interested in novelty and familiar facilities. Tourists preferring camping were comparatively more preferencing personal transportation and familiar food. In Table 7, facilities preference is divided into packages. Tourists who were asking for package 3 were the tourists seeking cultural value. Package 1 tourists were adventure seekers. Package 2 tourists were traditional tourists looking for regular tourist offerings.

Table 7: Type of packages based on tourist preference, Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

	Accommodation	Transportation	Food
Package 1	Camping	Personal transportation	Familiar food
Package 2	Hotel	Personal transporta-tion	Familiar food
Package 3	Homestay	Shared transportation	Local food
Package 4	Camping	Shared transportation	Local food

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on six items where preference related to accommodation, transportation and food was considered. Two factors were extracted which were based on tourist fear of experiencing new products and tourist preference for experiencing new products. The results of EFA are provided in Table 8. Results cannot be adopted because of the low KMO value and low Cronbach's alpha for both of the extracted factors

Table 8: Results of exploratory factor analysis for facilities preference

Item	Psychometric Preference	Allocentric Preference
Preference for familiar food	.791	-.096
Preference for personal transporta-tion	.773	-.129
Preference for hotel	.594	.130
Preference for shared transportation	.043	.799
Preference for local cuisine	-.092	.765
Preference for homestay	-.011	.535
% Variance Explained	28.524	23.801
Eigen Values	1.711	1.428
Cronbach's alpha	.548	.502
KMO=.445, Bartlett's χ2 = 199.014, p<.001		

Source: Based on Data from questionnaires

Discussion

The major tourist motivation for choosing Shimla as a destination was nature and leisure. These two motivations were selected by more than half of the respondents. Nature was also considered as motivation in another study (Otoo, Kim, & Choi, 2020). Leisure as motivation was only considered by the tourist seeking maintenance of their mental health (Cooper & Buckley, 2021). Another group of motivation factors selected by little greater than one-third of respondents were adventure and cultural experiences. These findings align with the previous studies, which said that tourists visit for the cultural experience (Antara & Prameshwari, 2018; Crompton J. L., 1979). Earlier findings of tourist motivations for learning (Li & Cai, 2012; Otoo, Kim, & Choi, 2020) and escape from the normal routine (Li & Cai, 2012; Nikjoo & Ketabi, 2015). Another motivation that pushes tourists toward Shimla is health and wellness.

Geographical or physical distance has emerged as one of the major reasons for not choosing one Himalayan destination over the other. Among the tourists who were travelling to Shimla were mostly from the neighbouring states, and there was a section from the far states, and there were also international travellers. This was found that with the increase in geographical distance between source and destination, the factor of geographical distance as a psychological barrier also decreases. The geographical distance was also considered a major travel deterrent in the study by McKercher & Mak (2019) and Yang, Hongbo, Li, & Harrill (2018). Another major issue that emerged for not choosing a nearby destination was safety. Another destination under consideration in this study was dealing with terrorism and political turmoil. Safety and risk at the destination were also considered major reasons by other studies (Dolnicar, 2005; Karl, Reintinger, & schmude, 2015). The next major problem that emerged as a barrier to visiting a destination was cultural or religious distance as was identified by Yang, Hongbo, Li, & Harrill (2018). A section of tourists coming to Shimla was coming out of the religious composition of Shimla.

However, the fisher test has concluded that there exists a non-significant association, but this could be said based on cross-tabulation. This could be interpreted in the sense that tourists who were considering religion as a reason for not travelling to Srinagar are xenophobic. This aligns with the earlier findings of segmenting tourists into the category of "xenophobic tourists" (Kock, Josiassen, & Assaf, 2019).

Hotels were the most preferred accommodation types, but there was a considerable preference for homestays and camping accommodation types. Accommodation types like homestays and camping were equally preferred but not to the extent that of hotels. Next was the preference for transportation, where most of the respondents preferred personal transportation. Shared transportation was also preferred by a considerable number of tourists visiting the destination. In the case of preference for food, local food and familiar food were preferred almost equally. A tourist typology based on similar interest in the type of accommodation, transportation and food could be identified. First, in the form of tourists have a preference for hotels, personal transportation and familiar food and tourists have a preference for homestays, shared transportation and local cuisine. The results based on the hotel and homestay categories could be easily aligned with the famous psychographic classification of tourists. Where the tourists' types were classified based on their interest in new things (Plog, 1974). In the case of tourist preference for camping, tourists were equally interested in both types of transportation and food.

CONCLUSION

Destination choice has always been motivated by a few of the common push and pull factors. Tourists going to a hill station were influenced by push factors of learning, escape, and leisure. Tourist visits a hill station out for their expectation of adventure, nature, culture, and health & wellness at the hill destination. Beyond the push and pull motivation, there exist some factors which negatively impact a tourist's decision to visit one destination over

another. Geographical distance plays a major role in selecting or ignoring one destination over another. With an increase in geographical distance between source and destination, the impact of distance on choosing a destination decreases. The factors which additionally play a role in rejecting a destination include safety, cultural distance, and value for money. There existed a section of tourists who considered culture as a factor in deciding a destination. This segment of tourists might be called xenophobic tourists.

There is heterogeneity in the facility preference of tourists. There exists a considerable share of tourists as per their choice of accommodation, transportation, and food. This also communicates that there exists a scope for all varied activities in the accommodation, transportation, and food sector. Tourists could be categorized based on their choices of facilities. Two facility preference categories existed, one having an interest in homogenous and standardized facilities and the other category of tourists interested in non-homogenous facilities. Tourists who wish to stay camping have interests in both types of transportation and food. The value of this study lies in the fact that such a study has never been done in the past, where different motivations, barriers and preferences were taken into consideration for destinations located in the Himalayas. However, previous studies were focused only on a single aspect.

Suggestions
• Managers in the Hill destinations can craft a set of tour packages providing different facilities in each set. The first set would comprise accommodation in hotels, personal transportation and familiar food. The second set would comprise homestays for accommodation, shared transportation and local cuisine.
• In addition to natural beauty, adventure and cultural resources must be focused on Himalayan destinations.
• In the case of domestic tourists who are at a geographically distant location from the Himalayas or in the case of international tourists, any Himalayan destination could be marketed. Geographical distance is not considered a problem by the above-mentioned categories.
• With the increase in several demands for homestays, shared transportation and local cuisine, tourism to rural areas must be marketed. Relating to this, tourists were also motivated by adventure and culture, which could better be served in the rural spaces.

Future research and limitations
This study was only conducted at a single destination. Future studies could be done at more than one destination with larger sample size. Facilities preference for tourists is an area where further research could help in providing more valued tour packages to the tourists based on their interest in cultural or non-cultural offerings.

REFERENCES

Agyeiwaah, E., Akyeampong, O., & Amenumeny, E. K. (2013). International tourist motivation to choose homestay: Do their socio-demographics have any influences. *Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 13(1), 16-26. doi:10.1177/1467358413517895

Alderighi, M., Bianchi, C., & Lorenzini, E. (2016). The impact of local food specialities on the decision to (re)visit a tourist destination: Market expanding or business stealing? *Tourism Management*, 57, 323-333. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2016.06.016

Antara, M., & Prameshwari, Y. A. (2018). Push and pull factors of tourists visit the tourism destination of bali, indonesia. J*ournal of Tourism and Hospitality Management,* 6(1), 112-120. doi:10.15640/jthm.v6n1a11

Census Population. (2021). *Shimla City Population* 2011 - 2021. Retrieved 12 3, 2021, from www.census2011.co.in: https://www.census2011.co.in/census/city/4-shimla.html

Chen, C.-F., & Huang, C.-Y. (2020). Investigating the effects of a shared bike for tourism use on the tourist experience and its consequences. *Current Issues in Tourism,* 24(1), 134-148. doi:10.1080/13683500.2020.1730309

Chen, C.-M., Tsai, Y.-C., & Chiu, H.-H. (2017). The decision-making process of and the decisive factors in accommodation choice. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20(2), 111-119. doi:10.1080/13683500.2015.1087476

Cohen, E., & Avieli, N. (2004). Food in tourism: Attraction and impediment. *Annals of tourism research,* 31(4), 755-778.

Cohen, S. A., & Debbie, H. (2019). Autonomous vehicles and the future of urban tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 74, 33-42. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2018.10.009

Cooper, M.-A., & Buckley, R. (2021). Tourist mental helath drives destination choice, marketing, and matching. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1-14. doi:10.1177/00472875211011548

Crompton, J. (1992). Structure of vacation destination choice sets. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(3), 420-434. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(92)90128-C

Crompton, J. L. (1979, December). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 408-424.

Crompton, J. L., & Ankomah, P. K. (1993). Choice set prepositions in destination decisions. *Annals of Toruism Research*, 20, 461-476.

Dann, G. M. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.

Dann, M. G. (1981). *Tourist motivation an appraisal. Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-219. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(81)90082-7

Department of Tourism and Civil Aviation. (2021). *Tourist statistics* 2008-2020. Shimla: Department of Toruism and Civil Aviation, Government of Himachal Pradesh. Retrieved 11 7, 2021, from https://himachaltourism.gov.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Tourist-Statistics-2008-2020.pdf

Dolnicar, S. (2005). Understanding barriers to leisure travel: Tourist fears as a marketing basis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 11(3), 197-208. doi:10.1177/1356766705055706

Fieger, P., Prayag, G., Hall, C. M., & North, C. (2020). The tourism value of international freedom campers to New Zealand. *Tourism Recreatin Research*, 45(2), 265-270. doi: Fieger, Peter; Prayag, Girish; Hall, C.

Michael; North, Chris (2019). The tourism value of10.1080/02508281.2019.1660042

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using ibm spss statistics.* New Delhi: Sage.

Hassell, S., Susan, M. A., & Jim, M. (2015). Exploring the motivations, experiences and menaings of camping in national parks. *Leisure Sciences,* 37(3), 269-287. doi:10.1 080/01490400.2014.995325

Jirasek, I., Roberson, D. N., & Jiraskova, M. (2016). The Impact of Families Camping Together: Opportunities for personal and social development. *Leisure Sciences*, 39(1), 79-93. doi:10.1080/01490400.2015.1136251

Karamehmedovic, D. (2018). Push-pull analysis towards creating holistic marketing of the cultural heritage tourism destination: *The case study of Dubrovnik. Izvorni znanstveni rad*, 29-51.

Karim, M. W., Chowdhury, M., & Haque, A. (2022). A Study of Customer Satisfaction Towards E-Wallet Payment System in Bangladesh. *American Journal of Economics and Business Innovation*, 1-10. doi:https://doi. org/10.54536/ajebi.v1i1.144

Karl, M., Muskat, B., & Ritchie, B. W. (2020). Which travel risks are more salient for destination choice? An examination of the tourist's decision-making process. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 18, 1-11. doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100487

Karl, M., Reintinger, C., & schmude, J. (2015). Reject or select: Mapping destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54, 48-64. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2015.06.003

Kelly, J., Haider, W., & Williams, P. W. (2007). A Behavioral assessment of tourism transportation options for reducing energy consumption and greenhouse gases. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(3), 297-309. doi:10.1177/0047287506292700

Khan, M. J., Chelliah, S., & Ahmed, S. (2019). Intention to visit india among potential travellers: Role of travel motivation, perceived travel risks, and travel constraints. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(3), 1-17. doi:10.1177/1467358417751025

Kock, F., Josiassen, A., & Assaf, A. G. (2019). The xenophobic tourist. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 74, 155-166.

Lee, C.-F. (2020). Understanding the factors determining the attractiveness of camping tourism: A hierarchical approach. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 17(5), 556-572. doi:10.1080/21568316.2020.1758761

Lee, W. S., Lee, J.-K., & Moon, J. (2018). Study on the preference for capsule hotel attributes using a choice experiment. *Tourism Economics*, 24(4), 492-499. doi:10.1177/1354816618765345

Lenggogeni,, S., Ritchie, B. W., & Slaughter, L. (2019). Understanding travel risks in a developing country: A bottom up approach. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 36(8), 941-955. doi:10.1080/10548408.201 9.1661329

Li, M., & Cai, L. A. (2012). The effects of personal values on travel motivation and behavioral intention. J*ournal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 473-487.

doi:10.1177/0047287511418366

Losada, N., Alen, E., Nicolau, J. L., & Dominguez, T. (2017). Senior tourists' accommodation choices. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 66, 24-34. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2017.06.014

Lynch, P. A. (2005). Socioogical impression in a hospitality context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 527-548.

Magni, M., Pescaroli, G., & Bartolucci, A. (2019). Factors influencing university students' accommodation choices: Risk perception, safety, and vulnerability. *Journal of Housing anf the Built Environment*. doi:10.1007/ s10901-019-09675-x

McKercher, B., & Mak, B. (2019). The impact of distance on international tourism demand. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 31, 340-347. doi:10.1016/j. tmp.2019.07.004

Mura, P. (2015). Perception of authenticity in a Malaysian homestay- a narrative analysis. *Tourism Management*, 51, 225-233.

Nikjoo, A. H., & Ketabi, M. (2015). The role of push and pull factors in the way tourists choose their destination. *Anatolia*, 26(4), 588-597. doi:10.1080/13 032917.2015.1041145

Otoo, F. E., Kim, S., & Choi, Y. (2020). Understanding senior tourists' prefrences and characteristics based on their overseas travel motivation clusters. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing,* 37(2), 246-257. doi:10.10 80/10548408.2020.1740136

Plog, S. C. (1974). Why destination area rise and fall in popularity. Cornell Hotel and Restaurant *Administration Quarterly*, 14(4), 55-58. doi:10.1177/001088047401400409

Pradhan, Q. (2017). *Empire in the hills.* Delhi: Oxford.

Prayag, G., & Ryan, C. (2011). The relationship between the 'push' and 'pull' factors of tourist destination: The role of nationality- an analytical qualitative research approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 121-143. doi:10.1080/13683501003623802

Qiu, R. T., Masiero, L., & Li, G. (2018). The psychological process of travel destination choice. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 35(6), 691-705. doi:10.1080/10 548408.2018.1435332

Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: an illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 24, 297-305. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00130-4

Regmi, K. D., & Walter, P. G. (2016). Conceptualising host learning in community-based ecotourism homestays. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 15(1), 51-63. doi:10.1080/14724 049.2015.1118108

Ritchie, B. W., Chien, P. M., & Sharifpour, M. (2016). Segmentation by travel related risk: An integrated approach. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 34(2), 274-289. doi:10.1080/10548408.2016.1156616

Samnotra, S., & Gupta, B. (2020). Peace and tourism: Exploring the erratic relationship in case of kashmir. *Journal of Tourism*, 21(1), 47-59.

Sims, R. (2008). Food, place and authenticity:

local food and sustainable tourism experience. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 17(3), 321-336. doi:10.1080/09669580802359293

Srinagar District Administration. (2021). *District Srinagar.* Retrieved 12 3, 2021, from srinagar.nic.in: https://srinagar.nic.in/demography/

Stone, M. J., Soulard, J., Migacz, S., & Wolf, E. (2017). Elements of memorable food, drink and culinary tourism experiences. *Journal of travel research*, 1-12. doi:10.1177/0047287517729758

Subedi, K. R., Chaudhary, N., & Shahi, M. (2022). Estimating Willingness to Pay for Recreational Services of Public Parks. *American Journal of Economics and Business Innovation*, 30-38. doi:https://doi.org/10.54536/ajebi.v1i1.143

Tussyadiah, L. P., & Sigala, M. (2018). Shareable tourism: tourism marketing in the sharing economy. Journal of *Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 35(1), 1-4. doi:10.1080/10548408.2018.1410938

Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 432-448. doi:10.1016/0160-7383(90)90008-F

Walter, P., Regmi, K. D., & Khanal, P. R. (2018). Host learning in community-based ecotourism in Nepal: The case of Sirubari and Ghalegaun homestays. *Tourism Management Perspectives,* 26, 49-58.

Wang, Y. (2007). Customized authenticity begins at home. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 784-804. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2007.03.008

Wijaya, S., Wahyudi, W., Benita, C., & Sugianto, E. (2018).

Travel motivation of indonesian seniors in choosing destination overseas. International Journal of Culture, *Tourism and Hospitality Research,* 12(2), 185-197. doi:10.1108/IJCTHR-09-2017-0095

Woodside, A. G., & Lysonski, S. (1989). A general model of traveler destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(8), 8-14. doi:10.1177/004728758902700402

Woodside, A. G., & Sherrell, D. (1977). Traveler evoked, inept and inert set of vacation destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(1), 14-18. doi:10.1177/004728757701600105

Xie, K., Kwok, L., Chen, C.-C., & Wu, J. (2020). To share or to access? Travelers' choice on the types of accommodation- sharing services. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management,* 42, 77-87. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.09.007

Yang, Y., Hongbo, L., Li, X., & Harrill, R. (2018). A shrinking world for tourists? Examining the changing role of distance factors in understanding destination choices. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 350-359. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.08.001

To share or to access? Travelers' choice on the types of accommodation- sharing services. J*ournal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 42, 77-87. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.09.007

Yang, Y., Hongbo, L., Li, X., & Harrill, R. (2018). A shrinking world for tourists? Examining the changing role of distance factors in understanding destination choices. *Journal of Business Research*, 92, 350-359. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.08.001