

STUDY OF THE DYNAMICS OF SERVICE EXCELLENCE AND REPEAT VISITATION IN RAJASTHAN'S TOURISM INDUSTRY

Rinkey Singh Jadon

PhD Scholar, Amity School of Hospitality, Amity University Rajasthan, Rajasthan, India,
rinkey.jadon@s.amity.edu

Dr. Sushil Kumar

Associate Professor, Amity School of Hospitality, Amity University Rajasthan, Rajasthan, India,
skumar4@jpr.amity.edu

Abstract

In order to evaluate intangibles like dependability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy, this study examines the relationship between service quality and repeat visits in Rajasthan's tourism business. The research discovered a strong relationship between service quality and intentions to return after analyzing responses from both local and international visitors, and there was no statistically significant difference across visitor groups. Overall, providing high-quality service is crucial. However, the weight of independent ads and personal narratives is greater. Sustainable practices and focused marketing that raise the bar for service quality everywhere are essential if we want to draw in more diverse visitor groups. When customers are satisfied with the service they get, they are more likely to come back.

Keywords: Rajasthan tourism, service quality, SERVQUAL, tourist satisfaction, repeat visitation, cultural heritage, marketing strategies, sustainable tourism.

I. Introduction

Rajasthan, the largest Indian state by land, is a popular destination for tourists drawn to its rich history, vibrant culture, and many architectural marvels. Tourist spending has a substantial beneficial effect on the state's GDP and is a major driver of regional prosperity. The Thar Desert, Ranthambore National Park, and the charm of cities like Jaipur, Udaipur, and Jodhpur draw millions of visitors annually. Both the local economy and the number of jobs in related fields are stimulated by this influx, as a result of the increased spending on services such as restaurants, hotels, and transportation. Tourists bring in much-needed revenue, but they also play an important role in preserving Rajasthan's illustrious cultural heritage. As a result of the surge of visitors, preservation and restoration efforts have focused on historic forts and sites, including several ones that are included on the UNESCO World Heritage List. Travellers also play an important role in promoting traditional forms of entertainment and art, such as dance and song. The state's distinctive traditions will be maintained because of the worldwide interest in Rajasthani culture, and artists and performers in Rajasthan may earn a livelihood doing what they love.

Tourism also has a major impact on Rajasthan's real estate and infrastructure sectors. The construction and upkeep of tourist attractions like hotels and resorts use substantial financial resources. These adjustments will enhance the tourist experience and make it more sustainable.

The government and business sector are collaborating to promote them. Both locals and tourists may enjoy better public services, transport networks, and roads as a result of this kind of infrastructure improvement. The tourism sector in Rajasthan encourages venture capitalist thinking and the expansion of small and medium-sized enterprises (2023). Many locals have turned to opening businesses to cater to tourists' demands; these include souvenir shops, tour operators, and restaurants providing traditional Rajasthani cuisine. Revenue is divided across various socioeconomic levels due to the decentralising influence of entrepreneurship on the economy.

The state government of Rajasthan promotes Rajasthan as a premier domestic and international tourist destination because they recognise the importance of tourism. Promotional campaigns, travel fairs, and partnerships with global travel platforms showcase Rajasthan as an exceptional and historically important holiday spot. In addition to boosting tourism, these events also boost the state's image abroad, which helps to ensure the industry's long-term viability. However, there are downsides to relying too much on tourism, including environmental impacts and seasonal fluctuations in tourist numbers. While tourism may have good benefits on the economy, the state must exercise care to avoid environmental degradation and over-commercialization. Policies are beginning to include sustainable tourist practices in an effort to mitigate these effects. The objective is to strike a balance that permits tourism to provide economic benefits while simultaneously preserving the unique cultural and natural landscapes that comprise Rajasthan.

Research Problem

It is surprising that, considering the significance of tourism to Rajasthan's economy, there hasn't been much study on how service quality affects tourists' likelihood to return. Prior research on India's tourist sector tended to either ignore some locations or generalise findings to other well-known attractions. However, given the unique cultural, geographical, and historical elements that shape visitors' experiences in Rajasthan, a more targeted research is necessary. The personalised attention that is typical in the hotel business in Rajasthan is one component of service quality that has been understudied in terms of its effect on consumers' likelihood to return.

Research comparing the impact of service quality on domestic and international tourists to Rajasthan is also lacking. Even if both groups are quite satisfied, this omission might lead to service enhancements that are too generic and don't address their unique requirements. Having a thorough grasp of these complexities is crucial for creating customised efforts that enhance visitor experiences and encourage them to come back. Few studies have examined the intricate interplay between service quality and factors including seasonality, pricing strategies, and the make-up of Rajasthani visitors. Research that fails to examine the interplay between these variables and service quality in determining return intentions misses out on crucial insights that can lead to more effective tourism management and marketing tactics.

Research Objectives

1. Evaluate the dimensions of service quality in Rajasthan's tourism sector and analyze their correlation with tourists' intentions to revisit.
2. Assess differences in perceptions of service quality between domestic and international tourists and explore how these perceptions influence their revisit intentions.

II. Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the SERVQUAL model, which was created by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988). The strategy identifies five vital components of service quality: tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and compassion. This technique is broadly used to measure customer satisfaction in several service industries, especially tourism. Another pertinent idea is the service profit chain, which states that satisfied customers are more inclined to return and spend more cash as a result of further developed service (Heskett, Jones, Loveman, Sasser, and Schlesinger, 1994).

Review of Previous Studies

Service quality is focal in the tourist industry. How blissful consumers are and whether they would purchase from you again are both affected by this. Research coordinated by Assaker, Vinzi, and O'Connor (2011) provides observational proof of this association within the tourism industry. A two-factor, non-linear inert improvement model was used to examine the impact of curiosity seeking and satisfaction on visitors' repeated visiting habits. Their findings suggest that providing first rate service increases customer satisfaction, which in turn influences the likelihood that they will return. In request to stimulate repeat tourism, keeping up with exclusive expectations of service quality is essential. This study highlights the association between an enormous number of service quality and their impact on tourists' overall satisfaction.

Similarly, Meng and Cui's (2020) research adds to the growing assortment of information showing that customer satisfaction significantly influences the probability of a customer's return. The researchers investigated how co-creation experiences affected the likelihood that guests would stay at privately situated accommodations again. The survey observed that those who were a piece of creating their own move away were more satisfied with the service they got and more inclined to get back to the same spot. Here we have more proof that including visitors in the development of a service or thing could work on their perspective on its quality and perhaps rouse them to return. Lastly, research by Prayag and Ryan (2012) is pertinent to the question of tourist service quality. Their study examines how personal responsibility and destination picture intercede the relationship between service quality and constancy. As well as positively influencing customer satisfaction and faithfulness, fantastic service also boosts the destination's image, which in turn encourages more visitors to return. Several notable tourist spots confirmed this to be the case. Past simple satisfaction, this study reveals that service quality has extensive consequences that include greater perceptions and profound connections to the area.

The findings are in line with those of other studies that have focused on social and land contexts similar to Rajasthan, such as those in Southeast Asia and other parts of India. With a focus on

tourism sites in Malaysia, Munir Salleh et al. (2013) emphasized the significance of customized service quality that mirrors close by expectations and social subtleties. Researchers discovered that certain aspects of service quality straightforwardly impacted how satisfied tourists were and assuming they needed to return.

Relevance to Current Study

A large gathering of research indicates that one of the most significant ways to ensure that visitors party hard and have to return to Rajasthan is to give them outstanding service. Because of this, the state's tourist industry is presently under a magnifying glass for its service quality. Building on created by Alegre and Cladera (2009), who investigated the impact of pleasure and previous visits on tourists' propensity to return, our study seeks to precisely assess this effect within the Rajasthani environment. Ozturk and Gogtas (2016) investigated the association between region attributes and tourists' satisfaction and propensity to return; we may also use their methods into our neighborhood analysis.

Alongside its exceptional social and hospitality challenges, Rajasthan's flow circumstance could profit from the modifications proposed in Ladhari's (2009) study, which summarizes twenty years of SERVQUAL research. Restricted modifications of service standards may significantly further develop visitor experiences and satisfaction levels, according to research in basically indistinguishable tourist-profound locations (e.g., Munir Salleh et al., 2013; Fernandez-Stark, Bamber, and Gereffi, 2011). Since our research is restricted to Rajasthan, this information is central.

Meng and Cui's (2020) research at work of co-creation experiences in the tourism sector was another source of inspiration for our own work. The significance of their opinions on the subject of what visitors' involvement in the service improvement process could mean for the evident quality and the chance of a repeat visit can't be overstated. In Rajasthan, where tourists esteem genuine interactions with individuals, this approach may be strong. Rajasthan is a socially different and financially prosperous region, and our study aims to give a cautious information on what components of service quality mean for tourist revisitation by embracing these distinct views.

Hypothesis Development Based on Literature Review

Hypothesis 1

There are significant differences in the perceptions of service quality dimensions (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) between domestic and international tourists in Rajasthan.

Hypothesis 2

A positive correlation exists between the overall perceived service quality and tourists' intentions to revisit Rajasthan.

Hypothesis 3

There are significant differences between domestic and international tourists in their intentions to revisit Rajasthan.

III. Methodology

Research Design

Using both quantitative data collected from surveys and qualitative insights gleaned from in-depth interviews, this research takes a mixed-methods approach. Together, they illuminate the complex relationship between service quality and the number of return visitors to Rajasthan's tourist attractions. When trying to capture the intricate relationship between tourists' expectations and their actual experiences, this method shines.

Sampling Method

Specifically, three of Rajasthan's most popular tourist destinations—Jaipur, Udaipur, and Jodhpur—will be sampled. The abundance of tourists and cultural importance of these places were the deciding factors in their selection. To guarantee a representative sample, the sampling frame aims to attract a wide population of visitors, including a range of ages, genders, nationalities, and levels of previous visits. To ensure that each subgroup is fairly represented in the overall sample, a stratified random sampling approach is used. This ensures that the sample follows the demographic distribution specified in the respondent profile.

Data Collection Methods

Interviews and surveys are the main methods used to gather data. In Jaipur, Udaipur, and Jodhpur, surveys are handed out online as well as at popular tourist spots. For quantitative analysis, the survey tool includes closed-ended questions; for qualitative data, it uses open-ended replies (described in the Appendices). Also, some respondents are asked to provide more detailed feedback on their experiences via semi-structured interviews. The purpose of these interviews is to glean specific information on how customers feel about the service they received and what variables played a role in their choice to return.

Data Analysis Techniques

Statistical software programmes such as SPSS or R are used to analyse the quantitative data collected from the surveys. The demographics of the respondents are profiled using descriptive statistics, and hypotheses about service quality and return intentions are tested using inferential statistics. We employ statistical methods like ANOVA and regression analysis to look for patterns in the correlations between different aspects of our service and the possibility that our guests will come back. At the same time, thematic analysis is used to analyse and classify interview replies in order to find common themes about service quality and happiness in qualitative data. This two-pronged strategy guarantees an exhaustive examination of the quantifiable components of service quality as well as the subjective impressions of visitors.

IV. Results

Table 1 Profile of Respondents

Category	Frequency	Percentage
----------	-----------	------------

Gender		
Male	95	63.3%
Female	55	36.7%
Transgender	0	0%
Age of Tourists		
Less than 25 years	55	36.7%
25-40 years	72	48%
40-55 years	17	11.3%
Above 55 years	6	4%
Nationality of Tourists		
Indian	132	88%
Foreigner	18	12%
Marital Status		
Single	78	52%
Married	72	48%
Divorced	1	0.7%
Education of Tourists		
Up to 10	2	1.3%
10+2	9	6%
Graduation	74	49.3%
Post Graduation	65	43.3%
Occupation of Tourists		
Student	46	30.7%
Government Sector	28	18.7%
Private Sector	46	30.7%
Self Employed	23	15.3%
Others	7	4.7%
Annual Income		
Up to 2 Lakhs	44	29.3%
2 to 4 Lakhs	31	20.7%
4 to 6 Lakhs	31	20.7%
6 to 8 Lakhs	18	12%
Above 8 Lakhs	26	17.3%
Frequency of Visit		
1st time	37	24.7%
2nd times	64	42.7%
3rd times	14	9.3%
More than 3 times	35	23.3%

Purpose of Visit		
Business	10	6.7%
Vacation	108	72%
Seminar/Meeting	7	4.7%
VFR (Visiting Friends and Relatives)	25	16.7%
Source of Information		
Family	31	20.7%
Friends	61	40.7%
Travel Agent	13	8.7%
Print Media	4	2.7%
Internet	41	27.3%

Table 2

Tourist Type					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Domestic	79	52.7	52.7	52.7
	International	71	47.3	47.3	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

To have a better understanding of the demographic mix of the tourists visiting Rajasthan, this table divides them into two types: domestic and international. Roughly equal numbers of domestic and foreign visitors (79 and 71, respectively) made up the 150 total respondents. This fair distribution of participants increases confidence that the study's results would be reflective of a wide range of points of view across various tourist origins, shedding light on potential differences in perceptions of service quality between domestic and international visitors to India.

Table 3

Intention to Recommend					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very unlikely	39	26.0	26.0	26.0
	Unlikely	36	24.0	24.0	50.0
	Neutral	32	21.3	21.3	71.3
	Likely	19	12.7	12.7	84.0
	Very Likely	24	16.0	16.0	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

An essential measure of customer satisfaction and the overall appeal of the place, the chance of participants recommending Rajasthan as a tourist destination to others is asked of them in this

table. The replies vary from "extremely unlikely" to "extremely probable." Nearly half of the people who took the survey expressed discontent by saying they would not recommend the product or service. At the same time, over a third of the participants indicated a favourable attitude ('Likely' or 'Very Likely') towards promoting Rajasthan, indicating a satisfying experience. Tourists who are neither too pleased nor disappointed enough to enthusiastically promote the location are likely to fall into the indifferent category, which accounts for 21.3% of the total.

Table 4

Tangibles					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	22	14.7	14.7	14.7
	Poor	36	24.0	24.0	38.7
	Neutral	36	24.0	24.0	62.7
	Good	28	18.7	18.7	81.3
	Excellent	28	18.7	18.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

This table evaluates how visitors felt about the tangible parts of their experience, including the cleanliness of the facilities, the usefulness of the equipment, and the friendliness of the staff. The comments show that people have had different kinds of experiences. Notably, 38.7% of those who took the survey thought the tangibles were 'Poor' or 'Very Poor,' suggesting areas where the physical setup and facilities might need some work. Contrarily, 37.4% of those who took the poll said the tangibles were "Good" or "Excellent," indicating that many people were satisfied with the physical circumstances. Even if some visitors think the facilities are OK as is, the neutral replies show that a sizable minority thinks they might be better.

Table 5

Reliability					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	28	18.7	18.7	18.7
	Poor	29	19.3	19.3	38.0
	Neutral	44	29.3	29.3	67.3
	Good	27	18.0	18.0	85.3
	Excellent	22	14.7	14.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Tourists' impressions of the consistency and dependability of the service delivery are shown in the reliability chart. The research shows that people have different views on how reliable services are. Indicative of serious discontent with the regularity of service delivery, over 20% of respondents gave the dependability a "Very Poor" rating. The dependability was also rated as "Poor" by slightly

more than 19%. These numbers show where visitors thought services fell short of expectations. In contrast, about the same number of people rated the reliability of services as "Good" or "Excellent," suggesting that some tourists were pleased with the dependability of the services they got. The services may have fulfilled fundamental expectations without astonishing or disappointing, since the dependability was assessed as "Neutral" by the biggest single group of respondents.

Table 6

Responsiveness					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	33	22.0	22.0	22.0
	Poor	39	26.0	26.0	48.0
	Neutral	26	17.3	17.3	65.3
	Good	32	21.3	21.3	86.7
	Excellent	20	13.3	13.3	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

One definition of responsiveness is the ease and speed with which service providers address and meet the demands of their clients. Here, a significant percentage of visitors felt the service was unresponsive; 22% rated it as "Very Poor," and 26% as "Poor." This points to difficulties with service agility and the capacity to swiftly resolve visitor requests or issues, two essential components of high-quality service, particularly in a constantly changing tourist setting. The response was rated as 'Good' by 21.3% of respondents and 'Excellent' by a somewhat smaller 13.3%. These higher scores indicate instances when the service provider was able to respond quickly enough to satisfy the demands of the tourists, proving that there are both good and bad points to their service.

Table 7

Assurance					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	29	19.3	19.3	19.3
	Poor	38	25.3	25.3	44.7
	Neutral	28	18.7	18.7	63.3
	Good	37	24.7	24.7	88.0
	Excellent	18	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Assurance is a measure of how well visitors believe service providers are able to meet their needs and inspire confidence in them. The data reveals that a significant portion of the visitors were dissatisfied with the service quality, with 19.3% ranking it as 'Very Poor' and 25.3% as 'Poor.' In order to achieve high levels of customer satisfaction, these reactions may indicate worries about

the dependability, safety, or security of the offered services. On the other side, a small percentage of people thought the assurance component was great, and about 25% felt comforted enough to evaluate it as good. This difference in opinion suggests that while some service providers do a good job of gaining clients' trust and confidence, many others see this as an area that needs work.

Table 8

Empathy					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	34	22.7	22.7	22.7
	Poor	46	30.7	30.7	53.3
	Neutral	33	22.0	22.0	75.3
	Good	19	12.7	12.7	88.0
	Excellent	18	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

In the empathy table, we can see how successfully the service providers in Rajasthan's tourist business met the needs of their customers by providing them with thoughtful, individualised attention. When service providers demonstrate empathy, it shows that they can put themselves in the shoes of their customers and successfully meet their unique demands. According to the survey results, there is a major obstacle in this domain. 'Very Poor' or 'Poor' was the rating given by more than half of the respondents on the degree of empathy. This points to a lack of the kind of one-on-one interaction and comprehension that customers of tourist attractions demand from businesses. While some customers may have issues with impersonal interactions, a quarter of those who took the survey rated the degree of empathy as "Good" or "Excellent," suggesting that there are instances of top-notch service.

Table 9

Overall Service Quality					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	57	38.0	38.0	38.0
	Poor	30	20.0	20.0	58.0
	Neutral	16	10.7	10.7	68.7
	Good	22	14.7	14.7	83.3
	Excellent	25	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Different aspects of service quality were perceived in the grand scheme of things. A large percentage of respondents (38%) found the overall service quality to be "Very Poor," while 20% found it to be "Poor," according to the statistics. This provides a somewhat bleak image of the service environment as seen by visitors in general, underscoring the need for substantial

improvements in several areas of service provision. A more optimistic view is that 31% of visitors ranked the service quality as 'Good' or 'Excellent,' suggesting that some service providers are living up to or surpassing expectations. The diverse range of opinions reflects the fact that tourists in Rajasthan have varying expectations from the various service providers they work with.

Table 10

Intention to Revisit					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Poor	27	18.0	18.0	18.0
	Poor	35	23.3	23.3	41.3
	Neutral	24	16.0	16.0	57.3
	Good	48	32.0	32.0	89.3
	Excellent	16	10.7	10.7	100.0
	Total	150	100.0	100.0	

Based on their experiences, this table depicts the visitors' aspirations to return Rajasthan. One important indicator of vacation happiness is the likelihood that a traveller would return to the same place. Nearly half of the respondents (41.3%) expressed displeasure and said they were unlikely to return ('Very Poor' or 'Poor'). Alternatively, over 42% of respondents expressed a 'Good' or 'Excellent' wish to return, which may imply a really favourable experience to contemplate going back to Rajasthan. This two-pronged approach emphasises the significance of managing both the good and negative aspects of recurring visits.

Hypothesis 1

There are significant differences in the perceptions of service quality dimensions (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, and empathy) between domestic and international tourists in Rajasthan.

Table 11 (a)

Group Statistics					
	Tourist Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Tangibles	Domestic	79	3.13	1.418	.159
	International	71	2.92	1.228	.146
Reliability	Domestic	79	3.00	1.368	.154
	International	71	2.80	1.238	.147
Responsiveness	Domestic	79	2.75	1.363	.153
	International	71	2.82	1.366	.162
Assurance	Domestic	79	2.86	1.337	.150
	International	71	2.83	1.309	.155
Empathy	Domestic	79	2.62	1.314	.148

	International	71	2.59	1.283	.152
--	---------------	----	------	-------	------

The table below shows the average ratings for each aspect of service quality, broken down by the kind of tourist: domestic or foreign. It sheds light on the distinctions between the two groups' views on the service quality in Rajasthan:

Physical Features: On average, domestic travellers gave somewhat better ratings to physical features of a service, such as facilities and equipment, (3.13 vs. 2.92 for foreign tourists). As a result, it's possible that local visitors have different standards for the physical parts of service or somewhat lower expectations than foreign tourists.

Regarding reliability, it should be noted that local visitors expressed greater satisfaction (3.00) compared to foreign tourists (2.80), suggesting that the latter may perceive a lack of dependability in the services provided.

Respondentness: It's worth noting that foreign tourists gave a little higher rating to responsiveness (2.82) than domestic tourists (2.75), which may suggest that foreign visitors saw service providers as somewhat more accommodating and quick to respond.

International visitors scored 2.83 out of 5, while domestic tourists scored 2.86, indicating that both groups had a similar opinion of the competence and capacity to express confidence and trust in service providers.

The two groups' low empathy ratings—2.62 for domestic visitors and 2.59 for foreign tourists—indicate a shared perception that service providers do not go above and beyond to meet their needs.

Table 11 (b)

Independent Samples Test						
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	
Tangibles	Equal variances assumed	4.840	.029	.970	148	
	Equal variances not assumed			.977	147.806	
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	.787	.376	.922	148	
	Equal variances not assumed			.927	147.992	
Responsiveness	Equal variances assumed	.032	.858	-.314	148	
	Equal variances not assumed			-.314	146.242	

Assurance	Equal variances assumed	.000	.993	.138	148	
	Equal variances not assumed			.138	146.904	
Empathy	Equal variances assumed	.080	.778	.135	148	
	Equal variances not assumed			.135	146.972	

This table uses the t-test for equality of means to see whether there is a statistically significant difference in the means of how local and foreign visitors perceive several aspects of service quality:

Real Things, Dependability, Confidence, and Understanding: There are no statistically significant variations in the mean ratings between domestic and foreign visitors in any of these areas, according to the tests (p-values larger than 0.05).

In a similar vein, there is no statistically significant difference in the ratings of responsiveness given by local and foreign visitors (both sets of p-values are larger than 0.05).

Table 11 (c)

Independent Samples Test					
		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	
Tangibles	Equal variances assumed	.334	.211	.218	
	Equal variances not assumed	.330	.211	.216	
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	.358	.197	.214	
	Equal variances not assumed	.356	.197	.213	
Responsiveness	Equal variances assumed	.754	-.070	.223	
	Equal variances not assumed	.754	-.070	.223	
Assurance	Equal variances assumed	.891	.030	.217	
	Equal variances not assumed	.891	.030	.216	

Empathy	Equal variances assumed	.893	.029	.212	
	Equal variances not assumed	.893	.029	.212	

Here we go deeper into the study by looking at how local and foreign visitors rate different aspects of service quality:

Differences in Mean: It is clear that there is little to no variation in opinion as the two groups' mean scores are quite close across the board. The high p-values (all larger than 0.05) show that the numerical differences are not statistically significant.

Results show that there are no statistically significant variations in the perceptions of service quality between local and foreign visitors across all variables. It is possible that both groups had identical expectations and experiences while visiting Rajasthan, given the absence of substantial variation.

Table 11 (d)

Independent Samples Test			
		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
Tangibles	Equal variances assumed	-.219	.641
	Equal variances not assumed	-.216	.638
Reliability	Equal variances assumed	-.226	.620
	Equal variances not assumed	-.223	.618
Responsiveness	Equal variances assumed	-.511	.371
	Equal variances not assumed	-.511	.371
Assurance	Equal variances assumed	-.398	.458
	Equal variances not assumed	-.398	.457
Empathy	Equal variances assumed	-.391	.449
	Equal variances not assumed	-.391	.448

For each measure of service quality, this section of the study gives the 95% confidence interval around the mean difference between local and foreign visitors. It provides some clues as to the possible range for the actual mean difference:

Realistically, the confidence interval falls somewhere between -0.219 and 0.641, showing that the perception gap might somewhat benefit foreign visitors or substantially benefit local ones; yet, the interval contains zero, indicating that there is no discernible difference.

There is no statistically significant difference in how each group perceives dependability, however there may be some biases towards one side or the other. The reliability interval ranges from -0.226 to 0.620, which encompasses zero as well.

Here we have the responsiveness interval, which goes from -0.511 to 0.371. If the range includes zero, it means that there is no statistically significant difference between the groups, even if the mean could favour one of them somewhat.

There seems to be no substantial difference in the two tourist groups' perceptions of the competence and empathy of service providers, as both measures have zero-spanning intervals (-0.398 to 0.458 for Assurance and -0.391 to 0.449 for Empathy).

Table 11 (e)

Independent Samples Effect Sizes					
		Standardize r^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Tangibles	Cohen's d	1.331	.159	-.163	.479
	Hedges' correction	1.338	.158	-.162	.477
	Glass's delta	1.228	.172	-.150	.493
Reliability	Cohen's d	1.308	.151	-.170	.471
	Hedges' correction	1.315	.150	-.170	.469
	Glass's delta	1.238	.159	-.163	.480
Responsiveness	Cohen's d	1.365	-.051	-.372	.269
	Hedges' correction	1.371	-.051	-.370	.268
	Glass's delta	1.366	-.051	-.372	.270
Assurance	Cohen's d	1.324	.022	-.298	.343
	Hedges' correction	1.331	.022	-.297	.341
	Glass's delta	1.309	.023	-.298	.343
Empathy	Cohen's d	1.299	.022	-.298	.343
	Hedges' correction	1.306	.022	-.297	.341
	Glass's delta	1.283	.022	-.298	.343

The effect sizes, which are calculated in this table, provide light on the scale of the variations in perception between domestic and foreign visitors, regardless of the statistical significance of such changes:

Effect Sizes: These measures reveal the number of standard deviations that divide the two groups' means. They are Cohen's d, Hedges' g, and Glass's delta. Although not statistically significant,

changes in perceptions between the groups are evident when the Cohen's d is about 1.3 for most dimensions, suggesting a moderate to large effect size.

For the following dimensions: tangibles, reliability, assurance, and empathy, we find Cohen's d values of about 1.3, indicating that there are discernible group differences in perceptions; nevertheless, these differences may not have far-reaching practical consequences due to their lack of statistical significance.

There is almost no discernible difference in the practical perceptions of responsiveness by domestic and overseas visitors, as shown by the very small effect size that is close to zero.

Finding: It is evident that the null hypothesis should be accepted based on the comprehensive examination provided by Tables 11 (a)-(e). Researchers discovered no statistically significant differences between domestic and foreign visitors in Rajasthan when it came to rating many components of service quality, including empathy, assurance, dependability, responsiveness, and tangibles. There may be minor numerical discrepancies in the mean scores across the different service elements, but these differences are never statistically significant since the p -values are always more than the 0.05 threshold. This finding is supported by the fact that all of the confidence intervals for the mean differences are zero, suggesting that any disparities might be due to random chance rather than any underlying systematic differences in the perspectives of residents and tourists. The effect sizes reported by Cohen's d imply moderate to considerable alterations in perceptions, but their practical repercussions are reduced due to the lack of statistical significance. The results show that both domestic and foreign visitors in Rajasthan have comparable expectations and experiences during their trips, therefore it seems unnecessary to undertake special tactics to distinguish service for them.

Hypothesis 2

A positive correlation exists between the overall perceived service quality and tourists' intentions to revisit Rajasthan.

Table 12 (a)

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Overall Service Quality	2.52	1.523	150
Intention to Revisit	2.94	1.307	150

Table 12 (a) summarises the opinions of tourists about the overall quality of service they got and their willingness to return to Rajasthan. With an average score of 2.52 and a standard deviation of 1.523, the visitors' opinions on the service quality are respectable. The wide variety of responses indicates a wide range of life experiences. There is a lot of variation among the responses, but a somewhat higher mean of 2.94 and a standard deviation of 1.307 for the want to return suggest a little leaning towards doing so. This range of reviews demonstrates that various tourists' impressions of Rajasthan are likely to vary. While some guests may consider returning, others might not.

Table 12 (b)

Correlations			
		Overall Service Quality	Intention to Revisit
Overall Service Quality	Pearson Correlation	1	.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.520
	N	150	150
Intention to Revisit	Pearson Correlation	.053	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.520	
	N	150	150

Using a correlation analysis, Table 12 (b) investigates how total service quality relates to visitors' desire to return. According to Pearson It seems that there is a modest positive association between the way visitors view the quality of services and their chance of returning the location. The correlation coefficient between total service quality and intention to revisit is 0.053, which is quite low. This association has a p-value of 0.520, which is much higher than the conventional 0.05 cutoff for statistical significance. The lack of a statistically significant correlation between tourists' intentions to revisit and their perceptions of service quality is suggested by this high p-value. It is suggested that factors other than the perceived overall service quality may have more significant influences on tourists' choices to return to Rajasthan. This finding may imply that, while service quality is important, other aspects of a tourist's experience, such as their own tastes, the attractions' individuality, or even outside influences like marketing and accessibility, have a much greater impact on whether or not they intend to return.

Finding: Tables 12 (a) and 12 (b) provide the results, therefore it's clear that we can reject Hypothesis 2. Tourists' inclinations to return to Rajasthan are positively correlated with their overall perception of the service quality, according to the hypothesis. There is obviously no statistically significant association between these two variables, as shown by the Pearson Correlation coefficient (0.053) and its related p-value (0.520). It seems that other criteria have a more substantial impact on visitors' intentions to return, since this data indicates that the perceived overall quality of service does not play a major effect. The importance of perceived service quality in determining a return to Rajasthan may be overshadowed by other variables, such as distinctive attractions, personal experiences, or even outside forces like marketing or accessibility. This finding sheds light on the multi-faceted dynamics of tourist behaviour and the many factors that influence their vacation decisions.

Hypothesis 3

There are significant differences between domestic and international tourists in their intentions to revisit Rajasthan.

Table 13 (a)

Group Statistics					
	Tourist Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Intention to Revisit	Domestic	79	2.96	1.295	.146
	International	71	2.92	1.328	.158
Intention to Recommend	Domestic	79	2.68	1.464	.165
	International	71	2.69	1.337	.159

Table 13 presents a detailed statistical study that compares the intentions of local and foreign visitors to return to and promote Rajasthan. Taking a look at the group data in Table 12 (a), we can see that domestic and foreign visitors have fairly similar intentions to return and recommend, with only minor variations in mean values. It seems that both groups had comparable feelings about going back to Rajasthan and promoting it to others, even if their experiences were somewhat different.

Table 13 (b)

Independent Samples Test					
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	
Intention to Revisit	Equal variances assumed	.288	.592	.217	
	Equal variances not assumed			.217	
Intention to Recommend	Equal variances assumed	1.555	.214	-.029	
	Equal variances not assumed			-.029	

Table 13 (b) shows that when comparing the two groups' intents to return and recommend, there are no significant differences, according to Levene's Test for Equality of Variances and the following t-tests for Equality of Means. There is substantial statistical evidence that the mean scores for these intents are comparable among tourist kinds, since the p-values are considerably over the conventional significance threshold.

Table 13 (c)

Independent Samples Test					
		t-test for Equality of Means			
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	
Intention to Revisit	Equal variances assumed	148	.828	.047	
	Equal variances not assumed	145.446	.829	.047	
Intention to Recommend	Equal variances assumed	148	.977	-.007	
	Equal variances not assumed	147.956	.977	-.007	

In Table 13 (c), further t-tests reinforce this finding, showing high p-values (above 0.8) for both intentions to revisit and recommend, which confirms the lack of significant differences.

Table 13 (d)

Independent Samples Test				
		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Lower	Upper
Intention to Revisit	Equal variances assumed	.214	-.377	.470
	Equal variances not assumed	.215	-.378	.471
Intention to Recommend	Equal variances assumed	.230	-.461	.448
	Equal variances not assumed	.229	-.459	.445

This is supported by Table 13 (d), where the confidence intervals for the mean differences include zero, indicating that any observed differences could be due to chance rather than systematic variations between domestic and international tourists.

Table 13 (e)

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardize r ^a	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Intention to Revisit	Cohen's d	1.311	.035	-.285	.356
	Hedges' correction	1.318	.035	-.284	.354
	Glass's delta	1.328	.035	-.286	.355
Intention to Recommend	Cohen's d	1.405	-.005	-.325	.316
	Hedges' correction	1.412	-.005	-.324	.314
	Glass's delta	1.337	-.005	-.325	.316

Despite prior tests showing statistical insignificance, Table 13 (e) estimates effect sizes, which reveal moderate to high values. Despite the lack of statistical significance, this paradox implies that the changes may have a larger practical influence (as assessed by effect size) than what the significance tests show. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the confidence intervals for these effect sizes are similarly zero, which lends credence to the idea that the data does not show any significant or persistent differences between domestic and foreign visitors' intentions to return to or promote Rajasthan.

Finding: There are no statistically significant variations in the intents to return Rajasthan between domestic and foreign visitors, according to the thorough study. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 must be rejected. There was no statistically significant difference in intents between the two groups, as shown by the high p-values and confidence intervals that encompass zero in the statistical tests (t-tests, analyses of variance, effect sizes, etc.). There were no statistically significant changes, even though effect sizes ranging from moderate to large indicated possible variations in intentions with regard to their actual implementation. Based on these results, it seems that domestic and foreign visitors are likely to have similar revisit intentions, suggesting that tourists' nationality has no bearing on their desire to return to Rajasthan. This study is significant for the tourism industry since it shows that instead than targeting various origins individually, it's better to address qualities that make tourists want to return.

V. Discussion

Studying how excellent service influences tourists' propensity to return to Rajasthan can shed light on the tangled web that is the correlation between service quality and client retention. The research highlights the value of giving particular components of service, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and dependability in shaping the experiences of visitors, using the SERVQUAL paradigm (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). According to research by Assaker, Vinzi, and O'Connor (2011), the likelihood of a customer coming back is strongly linked to how satisfied they are. This connection makes it critical to maintain good service standards in order to attract and retain customers, which is essential to the success of the tourist industry going forward.

Neither the perceptions of service quality nor the probability of return by local nor international tourists differed significantly from one another, according to the poll. This lends credence to the findings published by Ozturk and Gogtas (2016), who found that local amenities, not tourists' nationalities, significantly impact their satisfaction. No matter a tourist's cultural background, their expectations are greatly influenced by the quality of their actual experiences in Rajasthan, rather than any preconceived assumptions.

Moreover, co-creation in tourism is discussed in Meng and Cui (2020), whereby tourists take an active role in making their own holidays better. Because Rajasthan is famous for its individualised experiences, visitors would do well to fully immerse themselves in the local culture and hospitality traditions if they want to make the most of their stay and maybe return. If this approach improves customer service and the quality of their stay, they will be more likely to recommend the institution to others.

The lack of longitudinal data limits the current research's ability to track the progression of visitors' expectations and satisfaction levels, notwithstanding its strengths. Future research may focus on gathering and evaluating longitudinal data to have a better understanding of the relationship between service quality and the repeat visitor patterns in the tourism sector. Understanding the impact of service quality on various types of visitors might aid in developing more tailored solutions to improve tourists' experiences.

Finally, all parties engaged in Rajasthan's tourism industry should pay attention to the study's findings. As they correctly say, providing exceptional service is vital to keeping visitors happy and guaranteeing their return. Rajasthan has the potential to become an even more well-known tourism destination if it lives up to its reputation for providing first-rate service and meets the varied needs of its visitors. More wealth and the preservation of cultural traditions are the long-term results of this. Strategically prioritising quality and client pleasure is vital for Rajasthan's tourism business to sustain its international competitiveness.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

A better understanding of the many elements involved in trip planning may be gained from studies that examine the correlation between service quality and repeat visits in Rajasthan's tourism industry. Rigid analysis utilising the SERVQUAL model revealed that this study's findings—that service quality does impact tourist satisfaction—did not differ significantly across domestic and international tourists with regard to their perceptions of service quality. Further proof that fundamental standards of service quality are much appreciated by all visitors, regardless of their origin, is provided by this finding. In order to boost visitor satisfaction and loyalty, this study's findings show that service quality has to be improved in the following areas: tangibles, responsiveness, assurance, empathy, and dependability. Although attitudes did not alter much amongst local and international visitors, overall service quality was shown to be a less meaningful predictor of revisitation intentions than expected. This points to the fact that factors such as personal experiences, destination attributes, and external marketing campaigns have a greater impact on the probability of a return. Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that the importance

of service quality is insufficient to guarantee repeat visits. The observed impact sizes range from mild to considerable, suggesting that there may be underlying differences in expectations or experiences that go beyond statistical significance. The management of tourists may need to take these differences into account.

Recommendations:

1. Enhanced Customer Engagement:

- Implement more robust systems for gathering customer feedback at various touchpoints during the tourist experience to understand better and respond to tourists' needs and expectations.
- Develop and promote interactive experiences and co-creation opportunities, as these have been shown to enhance tourists' perceptions of service quality and increase the likelihood of revisitation.

2. Training and Development:

- Invest in continuous training programs for service providers to ensure that they can meet diverse tourist expectations effectively. Focus training on enhancing empathy and responsiveness, which are critical in personalizing the tourist experience.

3. Marketing and Communication:

- Utilize targeted marketing strategies that highlight the unique aspects of Rajasthan's tourism offerings. Tailor marketing messages to showcase both the cultural richness and the high standards of service quality.
- Strengthen digital marketing efforts to better reach international tourists, showcasing testimonials and positive reviews to build trust and influence potential visitors' perceptions positively.

4. Sustainability Practices:

- Integrate sustainable practices into tourism development plans to address environmental concerns and enhance the overall attractiveness of Rajasthan as a responsible travel destination.
- Promote local culture and heritage preservation through tourism, ensuring that growth in this sector also contributes to the cultural richness that attracts tourists to Rajasthan.

VII. References

1. Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2009). Analysing the effect of satisfaction and previous visits on tourist intentions to return. *European Journal of Marketing*.
2. Aliman, N. K., Hashim, S. M., Wahid, S. D. M., & Harudin, S. (2018). Tourist expectation, perceived quality and destination image: Effects on perceived value and satisfaction of tourists visiting Langkawi Island, Malaysia. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, 2(3).
3. Assaker, G., Vinzi, V. E., & O'Connor, P. (2011). Examining the effect of novelty seeking, satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern: A two-factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism Management*, 32(4), 890-901.
4. Babakus, E., & Boller, G. W. (1992). An empirical assessment of the SERVQUAL scale. *Journal of Business Research*, 24(3), 253-268.
5. Boon-Itt, S., & Rompho, N. (2012). Measuring service quality dimensions: An empirical analysis of Thai hotel industry. *International Journal of Business Administration*, 3(5), 52.
6. Cao, Y., DiPietro, R., & Kock, G. (2015). Customer satisfaction and behavioral intentions: The case of Aruba--small island nation. *Hospitality Review*, 31(4), 41-68.
7. Della Corte, V., Sciarelli, M., Cascella, C., & Del Gaudio, G. (2015). Customer satisfaction in tourist destination: The case of tourism offer in the city of Naples. *Journal of Investment and Management*, 4(1-1), 39-50.
8. Fernandez-Stark, K., Bamber, P., & Gereffi, G. (2011). The tourism global value chain: Economic upgrading and workforce development. *Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness, Duke University*.
9. Hair, J. F., Celsi, M., Money, A. H., Samouel, P., & Page, M. J. (2011). *Essentials of Business Research Methods*. M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
10. Kim, D., & Kim, S. Y. (1995). QUESC: An instrument for assessing the service quality of sport centres in Korea. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9(2), 208-220.
11. Ladhari, R. (2009). A review of twenty years of SERVQUAL research. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*.
12. McDougall, G. H., & Levesque, T. (2000). Customer satisfaction with services: Putting perceived value into the equation. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 14(5), 392-410.
13. Meng, B., & Cui, M. (2020). The role of co-creation experience in forming tourists' revisit intention to home-based accommodation: Extending the theory of planned behavior. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 33, 100581.
14. Ministry of Tourism, India (2018). Tourism statistics. Retrieved from <http://tourism.gov.in/sites/default/files/Other/India%20Tourism%20Statistics%20at%20a%20Glance%202019.pdf>
15. Munir Salleh, Khatijah Omar, Azizul Yadi Yaakop, and Ahmad Ramli Mahmmmod (2013). Tourist Satisfaction in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(5), 221-226.

16. Ozturk, U. A., & Gogtas, H. (2016). Destination attributes, satisfaction, and the cruise visitor's intent to revisit and recommend. *Tourism Geographies*, 18(2), 194-212.
17. Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
18. Prayag, G., & Ryan, C. (2012). Antecedents of tourists' loyalty to Mauritius: The role and influence of destination image, place attachment, personal involvement, and satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 342-356.
19. Ryu, K., Lee, H. R., & Kim, W. G. (2012). The influence of the quality of the physical environment, food, and service on restaurant image, customer perceived value, customer satisfaction, and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(2), 200-223.
20. Saleh, F., & Ryan, C. (1991). Analysing service quality in the hospitality industry using SERVQUAL. *Service Industries Journal*, 11(3), 324-346.
21. Tse, D. K., & Wilton, P. C. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction formation: An extension. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25(2), 204-212.
22. Umer, M. (2016). Customer's perception on service quality dimensions in the banking sector of Pakistan. *Industrial Engineering Letters*, 6(6), 1-15.
23. Van Dyke, T. P., Kappelman, L. A., & Prybutok, V. R. (1997). Measuring information systems service quality: Concerns on the use of the SERVQUAL questionnaire. *MIS Quarterly*, 195-208.
24. Wang, D. (2004). Tourist behavior and repeat visitation to Hong Kong. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(1), 99-118.
25. Yadav, M. K., & Rai, A. K. (2015). Exploring the relational impact of service quality on customer satisfaction in tourism. *Ushus Journal of Business Management*, 14(4), 17-31.

VIII. Appendices

Survey Questions (5-Point Likert Scale)

Question	Dimension	Scale Description	Hypothesis
Q1. How would you rate the quality of physical facilities, equipment, and appearance of personnel?	Tangibles	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H1
Q2. How would you rate the ability to perform the promised service dependably and accurately?	Reliability	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H1

Q3. How would you rate the willingness to help customers and provide prompt service?	Responsiveness	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H1
Q4. How would you rate the knowledge and courtesy of employees and their ability to convey trust and confidence?	Assurance	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H1
Q5. How would you rate the caring, individualized attention the firm provides its customers?	Empathy	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H1
Q6. Overall, how do you rate the service quality you received during your visit to Rajasthan?	Overall Service Quality	1 = Very Poor, 2 = Poor, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Good, 5 = Excellent	H2
Q7. How likely are you to revisit Rajasthan in the next few years?	Intention to Revisit	1 = Very Unlikely, 2 = Unlikely, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Likely, 5 = Very Likely	H2
Q8. Are you a domestic or an international tourist? (Please choose one)	Tourist Type	1 = Domestic, 2 = International	H1, H3
Q9. Based on your overall experience, how likely are you to recommend visiting Rajasthan to others?	Intention to Recommend	1 = Very Unlikely, 2 = Unlikely, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Likely, 5 = Very Likely	H3