

**ANALYSIS OF TOURIST SATISFACTION AND PERCEPTION - A PATHWAY TO SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY-BASED RURAL TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SHIVARAPATTANA, KARNATAKA**

Mukunda B. G.\* &amp; G. Vijay\*\*

**Abstract:** The growth of sustainable rural tourism is contingent upon the happiness of rural tourists. Community-Based Rural Tourism (CBRT) has great promise for revitalizing traditional tourist concepts and attitudes and facilitating a substantial transition towards a new path for the long-term sustainability of rural communities. Rural areas have seen significant economic and social transformation in recent years; population issues and the abandonment of conventional economic pursuits have affected these regions. Rural tourism has been viewed as a potential avenue for financial success, community revitalization, and a healthy social environment. Only if rural tourism is planned sustainably might this be the case. Such sustainable development seeks to reduce environmental and cultural resource damage, improve visitor satisfaction, and foster future economic growth. The Shivarapattana village in the Kolar district has a long and illustrious history dating back to the Chalukyan empire in the production of architectural sculptures for temples. This article attempts to evaluate and quantify tourists' satisfaction and perceptions of the village's infrastructure facilities from several angles. The sample size of 668 is selected and Simple Random Sampling is used to collect the Primary data. The study revealed that stone idols are the most popular, and tourists are delighted with the variety and styles of sculptural pieces.

**Keywords:** Rural Tourism; Tourist satisfaction; Sustainable Development; Shivarapattana; Community Development; Tourist perception.

**ANÁLISE DA SATISFAÇÃO E PERCEÇÃO DOS TURISTAS -  
UM CAMINHO PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO  
SUSTENTÁVEL DO TURISMO RURAL DE BASE  
COMUNITÁRIA EM SHIVARAPATTANA, KARNATAKA**

**Resumo:** O crescimento do turismo rural sustentável depende da felicidade dos turistas rurais. O turismo rural de base comunitária (QBRT) é uma grande promessa para revitalizar os conceitos e atitudes tradicionais do turismo e facilitar uma transição substancial rumo a um novo caminho para a sustentabilidade a longo prazo das comunidades rurais. As áreas rurais passaram por uma transformação econômica e social significativa nos últimos anos; questões populacionais e o abandono de atividades econômicas convencionais impactaram essas regiões. O turismo rural tem sido visto como um caminho potencial para o sucesso financeiro, a revitalização da comunidade e um ambiente social saudável. Só se o turismo rural for planejado de forma sustentável poderá ser esse o caso. Esse desenvolvimento sustentável busca reduzir os danos ao meio ambiente e aos recursos culturais, melhorar a satisfação dos visitantes e promover o crescimento econômico futuro. A vila de Shivarapattana no distrito de Kolar tem uma longa e ilustre história que remonta ao império Chalukyan na produção de esculturas arquitetônicas para templos. Este artigo busca avaliar e quantificar a satisfação e a percepção do turista em relação às instalações de infraestrutura da vila, a partir de diferentes ângulos. O tamanho da amostra de 668 é selecionado, e a amostragem aleatória simples é utilizada para coletar os dados primários. O estudo revelou que os ídolos de pedra são os mais bem avaliados, e os turistas estão encantados com os tipos e estilos de peças escultóricas.

**Palavras-chave:** Turismo Rural; Satisfação do turista; Desenvolvimento sustentável; Shivarapattana; Desenvolvimento Comunitário; Percepção do turista.

**ANÁLISIS DE LA SATISFACCIÓN Y PERCEPCIÓN DE LOS  
TURISTAS: UN CAMINO HACIA EL DESARROLLO  
SOSTENIBLE DEL TURISMO RURAL COMUNITARIO EN  
SHIVARAPATTANA, KARNATAKA**

**Resumen:** El crecimiento del turismo rural sostenible depende de la felicidad de los turistas rurales. El turismo rural comunitario (CBRT, por sus siglas en inglés) es muy prometedor para revitalizar los conceptos y actitudes tradicionales del turista y facilitar una transición sustancial hacia una nueva orientación hacia la sostenibilidad a largo plazo de las comunidades rurales. Las zonas rurales han experimentado una importante transformación económica y social en los últimos años; Los problemas de población y el abandono de las actividades económicas convencionales han impactado a estas regiones. El turismo rural ha sido visto como una vía potencial para el éxito financiero, la revitalización de la comunidad y un entorno social saludable. Solo si el turismo rural se planifica de forma sostenible, podría ser así. Este desarrollo sostenible busca reducir el daño al medio ambiente y a los recursos culturales, mejorar la satisfacción de los visitantes y fomentar el crecimiento económico futuro. La aldea de Shivarapattana en el distrito de Kolar tiene una larga e ilustre historia que se remonta al imperio Chalukyan en la producción de esculturas arquitectónicas para templos. Este artículo se propone evaluar y cuantificar la satisfacción y la percepción turística a partir de las infraestructuras del pueblo desde diversos ángulos. Se selecciona un tamaño de muestra de 668 y se utiliza el muestreo aleatorio simple para recopilar los datos primarios. El estudio reveló que los tipos de ídolos de piedra son los mejor valorados, y los turistas están encantados con los tipos y estilos de piezas escultóricas.

**Palabras clave:** Turismo rural; Satisfacción del turista; Desarrollo sostenible; Shivarapattana; Desarrollo Comunitario; Percepción turística

HOW TO CITE: Mukunda, B. G. & Vijay, D. G. (2025). Analysis of Tourist Satisfaction and Perception: a Pathway to Sustainable Community-Based Rural Tourism Development in Shivarapattana, Karnataka. *Latin American Journal of Tourismology*, 11 (Regular Issue). Retrieved from: <https://periodicos.ufrb.br/index.php/rlaturismologia/article/view/43193>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17675855>



Licenciada por  
Creative Commons  
Atribuição Não Comercial /  
Sem Derivações/ 4.0 / Internacional

\* PhD in Tourism Management, Masters in Tourism Administration 5 Years Integrated course & Assistant Professor, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Travel and Tourism, Mount Carmel College, Autonomous, No. 58, Palace Rd, Vasanth Nagar, Bengaluru – 560 052, Karnataka, India. Ph:9591091637, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6568-1578 E-mail: [bgmukunda8@gmail.com](mailto:bgmukunda8@gmail.com)

\*\* Ph.D in Tourism, M.Phil in Tourism, Master of Tourism Management, Bachelor of Tourism Studies, Professor & Research Supervisor (Tourism Management), Department of Commerce and Business Management, Chaitanya (Deemed to be University), Kishanpura, Warangal (Urban District), Hanamkonda – 506 001, Telangana, India, E-mail: [drqvijayam@gmail.com](mailto:drqvijayam@gmail.com)

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Rafat (2012) notes that there are several ways to define customer satisfaction, ranging from cognitive or emotive methods to those that highlight the particular or cumulative nature of the transaction. Wang et al. (2022) use the distinctive production lifestyle, folk customs, rural scenery, rural residence, and rural culture as the object. Rural tourism combines sightseeing, excursions, entertainment, leisure, experiences, vacations, and shopping within the rural spatial environment.

It also uses the distinctions between urban and rural areas to plan, design, and combine products. Huang and Crofts, (2019), study of visitor satisfaction in rural tourism allows for the prompt identification of issues that arise during the process, which has some practical implications for raising visitor satisfaction in rural tourism. Abesey et al., (2015); Boroujeni & Turkman, (2013); Karamuz & Araghinejad, (2014), Economic experts now refer to it as invisible exports.

Since several economic sectors are involved in the tourism business, a larger proportion of the community benefits from sales of products and services to visitors. As a result, in terms of how benefits are distributed, the tourist industry is more in line with social fairness (one of the fundamental tenets of sustainable development). On the other hand, travel fosters social and cultural interactions and helps societies become more familiar with the customs and cultures of different communities.

These interactions in turn support tolerance, security, and peace among diverse cultures – all crucial elements of sustainable development. Taghavi & Soleimani (2017) argue that guest satisfaction is one of the most critical factors in ensuring future business success. Today, many companies utilize visitor satisfaction as a vital performance indicator to assess how well their operations are working.

Designing proper processes that ensure the services provided fulfil the expectations of visitors allows for tourist satisfaction. Nahid & Akbar, (2016); Tapak et al., (2019), according to research into tourism literature, a destination's ability to satisfy visitors is a key consideration when choosing a location. When tourists have a positive experience, they are more inclined to return or suggest the place to others. The majority of service industries now consider visitor satisfaction to be an important concern.

Sanjivani, Kannada Newspaper (2022), The Hindu Newspaper (2022), The development of rural destinations and local communities, as well as their overall economic prosperity, is heavily dependent on rural tourism. Nonetheless, travellers are essential to the growth of any tourism. Governments and other service providers can better understand the conveniences that appeal to tourists by analyzing visitor satisfaction data.

This information can then be used to develop future plans that effectively attract large numbers of both local and foreign tourists. The Shivarapattana village of Kolar district has a rich historical background, dating back to the Chalukyan period, in the field of temple architectural sculpture.

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Tourist Satisfaction and Perception

Kumari et al., (2020), assessing, and understanding the relationship will help policymakers in a destination deal with the environment that is becoming more competitive for tourist visits. It would be possible to assess visitors' satisfaction, quality, and value, as well as how these elements interact to affect destination loyalty, by examining the relationship between a destination's offerings and visitors' perceptions of them.

Nunkoo et al (2019), achieving sustainable tourism development requires communities to have favourable attitudes and views of tourism. Wijenayaka et al. (2021) present travellers as service consumers who, depending on where they are, satisfy their demands with both material and intangible goods. Many businesses assume their customers are typically happy with their products or services because the number of complaints is low.

Conversely, customer complaints are a highly accurate measure of total customer satisfaction. Tiwari et al., (2021), People who profit economically from a destination's growth are more likely to support and collaborate with it. Kannan et al. (2014) developed a model that included some particular indicators to quantify the physical, social, cultural, economic, and environmental consequences of tourism at the destination. Lin et al., (2016), it is also highly popular and helpful for the ar

### 2.2 Community-Based Tourism & Community-Based Rural Tourism Development

According to Veloso et al. (2021), travellers are developing more sustainable and ethical profiles to increase their sense of social responsibility. In addition, these new visitor profiles actively seek out unique experiences and places with distinct identities. They also demonstrate respect and admiration for the customs, histories, and cultures of the communities they visit, as well as responsible use of natural resources without endangering the welfare of future generations.

Lima et al., (2022), CBT has been examined, discussed, and included in the public policy framework from both social and economic angles as a method for local development. De Lourdes (2023), as a tourist model, CBT promotes social cohesiveness, relationships, and a shared sense of communal life. It encourages people to live better lives and fosters a strong feeling of belonging, respect for the community's culture, and inclusivity.

Expanding upon these foundational ideas, cognitive behavioural tourism (CBT) arises as a substitute for traditional tourism. It includes and puts into practice several alternative tourist approaches, including, but not limited to, community tourism, ecotourism, nature tourism, solidarity tourism, rural tourism, and ethnic tourism.

These substitutes encourage guests and hosts to participate in an intercultural process, which helps to make tourism more sustainable. Gabrielli, (2017) claims that these models develop in tandem with traditional tourism. Setiawan et al., (2021), Prior studies have demonstrated the significance of the roles played by

entire village communities in implementing CBT in rural areas.

The results of these previously published CBT publications show that rural CBT sustainability may persist with community support for rural tourist activities. Mayaka et al. and Pramanik et al. (2019) emphasized in their published work the distinctions between the application of CBT programs and their theoretical counterparts. The outcomes highlighted the efforts of the local community in implementing the intended CBT development programs.

Kayat, (2014), Community-based Rural Tourism (CBRT) is a term used to describe several community-run tourism initiatives in rural regions. CBRT is a more "responsible" tourism that supports sustainable development. Hutagalung et al., (2022), due to their enormous influence on fostering local community empowerment and sustainably advancing social responsibility, community-based tourist villages are currently a global issue.

### 2.3 Role of Rural Tourism

Kantar and Svržnjak, (2017), in Koprivnica-Krizevci county, rural tourism is still in its infancy, despite the fact that it is acknowledged as a potential catalyst for the development of rural regions. Because of the unsustainable local and global development conditions, it cannot be regarded as fully sustainable. Kaptan et al. (2020) found that, in many industrialized and developing nations, rural tourism has been shown to be an effective development strategy for rural regions.

This kind of development aims to preserve a rural community's customs while fostering its expansion. Slater, (2020), the COVID-19 epidemic has led to an upsurge in the demand for short-term recreational activities from urban tourists. Marques et al., (2022), noted that as rural development no longer only depends on agriculture, this movement represents a new opportunity that should be taken as visitors' preferences switched from exotic to local rural tourism amid COVID-19.

Instead, other activities, including rural tourism, have opened doors for rural communities. Christou, (2020); Getz, (2008), Agricultural festivals, crafts, historic buildings, natural preservation, nostalgia, cuisine, and chances for family time and relaxation are just a few of the distinctive events and activities that rural tourism offers that urban residents find appealing. Polukhina et al., (2021), the three sustainability pillars as being essential to the growth of rural tourism both before and after the Covid-19 Pandemic Challenges.

The shortcomings of federal and local policies are also highlighted, including the lack of structural measures to improve the long-term management of Russian tourist destinations. Tugade, (2020), rural tourism benefits include increased Government income, the creation of jobs, the influx of foreign money, and the development of skills, turning agriculture into a contemporary service sector.

### 2.4 Contributions of Rural Tourism to Sustainable Community Development

Atun et al., (2019); Cheng and Zhang, (2020); Choi and Sirakaya, (2006); Chong and Balasingam,

(2019); Cunha et al., (2020), Rural tourism enhances employment opportunities and stability, local residents' income, investment, entrepreneurial opportunities, agricultural production value-added, capital formation, economic resilience, business viability, and local tax revenue.

López-Sanz et al., (2021), through increased connections with customers and other value chain participants, rural tourism can serve as a means of exposing farmers to prospective new markets. In these situations, rural tourism offers a variety of societal advantages. Among them is enhanced depopulation prevention in rural areas. Kelliher et al., (2018); López-Sanz et al., (2021); Ryu et al., (2020); Silva and Leal, (2015).

The restoration of historical structures and community identities, improved quality of life, the revitalization of regional crafts, customs, and cultures, and more opportunities for social interaction and exchange – all of which boost community visibility, pride, and cultural integrity – are additional advantages. Di and Laura, (2021); Lane, (1994); Ryu et al., (2020); Yang et al., (2021), improved natural environmental conservation, biodiversity, environmental awareness, infrastructure, green chemistry, pristine land, and family land are among the environmental advantages brought about by rural tourism.

### 2.5 Heritage Tourism:

Brooks et al., (2023), one of the earliest forms of leisure travel is heritage tourism, which makes up a considerable portion of the travel business. It describes the act of travelling to locations due of their ties to intangible, cultural, and natural heritage. Its goal is to highlight significant links to a common history at a particular tourism destination. Madiseng et al., (2024),

The intricate relationships between heritage and rural tourism are crucial to understand, as they can impact local communities' health and well-being and boost their economies. Van Der Merwe, (2016); Navarrete, (2019), Heritage tourism, a subset of cultural tourism centred on unique historical locations and artifacts associated with the aristocracy or royalty, is growing in significance in South Africa.

Nidhi et al., (2019), here, the term "heritage" refers to the intersecting forms of tangible heritage, such as buildings, monuments, and works of art; intangible heritage, such as folklore, language, music, celebrations, and traditions; and natural heritage, or culturally condensed landscapes and places of significant biodiversity. Heritage tourism is a substantial sector of the tourism industry, orientated towards showcasing the heritage of a tourism destination and contributing to global interchange and inter-cultural understanding.

### 2.6 Review of Literature on Empirical Data Analysis and Theories

Adebajo, B. & Bukola, T. (2023), researchers can combine quantitative and qualitative data using descriptive statistics, facilitating a comprehensive analysis of issues. Rana, R. and Singal, R. (2015), It ought to be clear that the Chi-square test only assesses the probability that two variables are unrelated to one

another, or, in other words, if they are connected at all. Jörg & Schering (2014).

The process entails breaking down the overall observed variance in the data into discrete parts that may be attributed to different sources as well as those brought on by random or chance fluctuation. It enables the execution of robust hypothesis testing to identify the variables influencing the experiment's outcome. Although hypothesis testing is a highly valuable component of ANOVA, it is by no means the only aspect.

## 2.7 Research Gap

Upon examining the existing literature on the topic, it was found that many viewpoints from across the globe have been used to analyze visitor satisfaction and perceptions of Sustainable Rural Community-Based Tourism Development.

Rural tourism has significant room to grow, as research on it is pretty promising. Researchers have studied the extent and potential of rural tourism, sustainable rural development, marketing and promotion, community participation, the function of rural tourism, and community engagement of rural tourism regions.

A review of earlier research found no studies specifically examining tourists' perceptions and satisfaction with sustainable community-based rural tourism in Shivarapattana, Karnataka, underscoring the importance of the current study.

## 2.8 Objectives of the Study

- To understand the Tourist Satisfaction and Perception on Sustainable Community-Based Rural Tourism Development in the Village.
- To measure the Tourist Satisfaction levels on various infrastructure facilities in the Shivarapattana.
- To identify various tourist satisfaction indicators in the promotion of Sustainable Community-Based Rural Tourism in the village
- To suggest various measures to enhance Tourist Satisfaction and perception on promotion of Heritage and Sculpture Village Shivarapattana.

## 2.9 Hypothesis

H01: There is no significant difference in the different tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the Tourist Age.

H02: There is no significant difference in perceptions of the relationship between tourists and the sculptor community in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village, based on Tourist Age.

H03: There is no significant difference in the different tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage Village based on the tourist Gender.

H04: There is no significant difference in the perception towards a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the tourist Gender.

H05: There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in

Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the tourist education.

H06: There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the Educational Qualification of the tourists.

H07: There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the Occupation of the tourists.

H08: There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village based on the Occupation of the tourists.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

Both primary and secondary data are gathered to complete this research. The study included both qualitative and quantitative data. The Structured Questionnaire is prepared to analyze the Tourist Satisfaction and perception levels in the village, and the Random Sampling Method is adopted in the study. The sample of 668 tourists was selected for data collection, and the collected data were categorized, tabulated, and analyzed using SPSS.

In the study, descriptive analysis is conducted using Mean, Mode, and Standard deviation, Inferential analysis using the proper and valid Hypothesis formulation and testing, and quantitative analysis using the One-way ANOVA test, t-test, and Chi-square test. Secondary data were collected from various research journals, books, annual reports, thesis reports, and newspaper articles.

Descriptive statistics addressed multiple issues related to Sustainable Community-Based Tourism Development. The chi-square test was used to analyze the Independence of different variables in the study, such as Gender, impacts of rural tourism, etc. A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to know the results of various hypotheses in the current research study.

## 4. RESULTS ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Rural Tourism in Karnataka

Rural tourism is travel that highlights the rural way of life, art, culture, and legacy (FAITH Report, 2021; Government of India/UNDP India, Ministry of Tourism, 2008). This type of tourism enhances the area's social and economic well-being and promotes relationships between visitors and residents, creating a more satisfying travel experience. Enabling the country's rural residents to progress the industry is the primary goal of rural tourism. The UNDP (United Nations Development Project) and the Karnataka Ministry of Tourism have selected Anegundi and Banavasi for the Rural Tourism Project.

### 4.2 Overview of Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village

According to the Hindu Newspaper (2022), about 60 miles from Bengaluru, is the tiny Handicraft village of Shivarapattana, which is located in the Kolar district. Shivarapattana, which was well known during the medieval Western Ganga Dynasty, is known as

'Shilpakashi' (the Kashi of sculpture) in Karnataka. Prashanta, (2020), according to the Ministry of Textiles' report, Bangalore district's Shivarapattana Cluster is part of the Karnataka State.

The Shivarapattana cluster can create 12 SHGs and over 100 SHGs, sustaining a large labor force. Each day, the mobilization gains momentum. Stone carving is a centuries-old art form in which unpolished chunks of natural stone are carefully carved. These artisans are well-known for their finely carved pillars, temple stone slabs, and God and Goddess Idols.

The products are consistently in demand year-round. The artisans need close to 25 days to produce each piece of art. Larger and more complex works can take weeks, months, or even years to make, whereas smaller ones can be finished in a few days. Karnataka, Kerala, and Andhra Pradesh are among the states where the majority of the temples that receive the idols are located. The Karnataka State Handicrafts Development Corporation (Cauvery Handicrafts), which

assisted 20 artisans, registered them, provided technology, and trained them to make idols. Artisans may sell their wares in government-run museums.

#### 4.3 Measurement of Tourist Satisfaction Indicators

The study ranked the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators (Table 1.1) based on the mean rating on a scale of 1 to 5. The results, as shown in the following table, revealed that Types of Stone Idols was the top-rated factor, with a mean (M) value of 4.44 and a standard deviation (SD) of 1.35. Most of the tourists were satisfied with the Stone Craft Sculptural Styles (M=4.07, SD=0.39), Safety & Security Circumstances (M=3.5, SD=0.49), and Sculptors' Behavioural Attitudes (M=3.95, SD=0.21). The tourists were highly dissatisfied with "Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People" (M=3.43, SD=0.48) and Condition of "Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village" (M=2.64, SD=0.44) in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Tourist Satisfaction Indicators

Tourist Satisfaction Indicators	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Types of Stone Idols	3.4	10	4.44	1.35
Stone Craft Sculptural Styles	3.5	5	4.07	0.39
Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes	3.5	4.25	3.95	0.21
Quality Road Connectivity	3.5	4.75	3.89	0.38
Safety & Security Circumstances	2.5	4.5	3.5	0.49
Tourist-Friendly Practices by Local People	2.5	4.75	3.43	0.48
Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village	1.8	3.4	2.64	0.44

Source: Primary Data.

#### 4.4 Demographic Profile of the Tourists

##### 4.4.1 Age

Socio-economic activity and age are connected. People in their twenties and thirties can actively participate in socio-economic activities. Table 1.2 displays the age distribution of the tourists. According to the statistics in this table, the majority of tourists (31.10%) were between the ages of 31 and 40, followed by those between 41 and 50 (27.77%) and those between 21 and 30 (18.70%). The study also included tourists aged below 20 years (09.8%), 51–60 years (08.70%), and those aged above 60 years (04.70%).

H01: There is no significant difference in the different tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Tourist Age.

In Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village, a one-way ANOVA was performed to determine

whether the mean scores for visitors of varying ages differed significantly on tourist satisfaction indices.

Table 2. Tourists Age Profile

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Below 20	65	09.03
21-30	125	18.70
31-40	210	31.10
41-50	180	27.77
51-60	58	08.70
More Than 60	30	04.70
Total	668	100.00

Source: Primary Data

The different tourist satisfaction indicators identified in the study included: Quality of Road Connectivity, Stone Craft Sculptural Styles, Types of Stone Idols, Sculptors' Behavioural Attitudes, Tourist-Friendly Practices by Local People, Safety & Security Circumstances, and Sanitation & Hygienic Conditions of the Village. The tourists were categorized into five age groups: under 20, 21–30, 31–40, 41–50, 51–60, and over 60 years old.

Table 3. One way ANOVA between Age and Tourist Satisfaction Indicators

Tourist Satisfaction Indicators	Age	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	F-value	P-value
Quality Road Connectivity	Below20	65	3.61	0.38	23.51	0.00
	21-30	125	3.33	0.55		
	31-40	210	3.38	0.24		
	41-50	180	3.63	0.62		
	51-60	58	3.35	0.13		
	More than 60	30	2.71	0.00		
	Total	668	3.49	0.48		
	Below20	65	3.99	0.20		

Stone Craft Sculptural Styles	21-30	125	4.41	0.17	<b>9.74</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	31-40	210	4.93	2.27		
	41-50	180	4.37	0.56		
	51-60	58	4.19	0.30		
	More than 60	30	3.42	0.00		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>1.35</b>		
Types of Stone Idols	Below20	65	4.03	0.00	<b>25.83</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	21-30	125	3.84	0.22		
	31-40	210	4.12	0.47		
	41-50	180	4.28	0.40		
	51-60	58	4.21	0.25		
	More than 60	30	3.58	0.00		
Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>23.09</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Below 20	65	2.89	0.33		
	21-30	125	2.74	0.46		
	31-40	210	2.40	0.28		
	41-50	180	2.52	0.35		
	51-60	58	2.60	0.40		
Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People	More than 60	30	3.40	0.00	<b>21.36</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>0.44</b>		
	Below20	65	3.75	0.00		
	21-30	125	4.00	0.25		
	31-40	210	3.88	0.28		
	41-50	180	4.05	0.10		
Safety & Security Circumstances	51-60	58	4.00	0.00	<b>32.07</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	More than 60	30	4.00	0.00		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>0.22</b>		
	Below20	65	3.63	0.13		
	21-30	125	3.82	0.33		
	31-40	210	3.87	0.40		
Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village	41-50	180	3.90	0.30	<b>29.45</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	51-60	58	4.50	0.25		
	More than 60	30	3.75	0.00		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>0.38</b>		
	Below20	65	3.38	0.13		
	21-30	125	3.50	0.47		
	31-40	210	3.30	0.42	<b>29.45</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	41-50	180	3.60	0.54		
	51-60	58	4.13	0.38		
	More than 60	30	3.25	0.00		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>0.49</b>		

Source: Primary Data

It is clear from the following table that visitors of different ages have significantly varying Mean scores on several tourist satisfaction metrics like Quality Road Connectivity ( $F=23.51$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Stone Craft Sculptural Styles ( $F=9.74$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Types of Stone Idols ( $F=25.83$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes ( $F=23.09$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People ( $F=21.36$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Safety & Security Circumstances ( $F=32.7$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), and Sanitation & Hygienic conditions ( $F=29.45$ ,  $P=0.00$ ). The hypothesis that there is no

significant variation in the tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village depending on the age of the tourists was rejected for all the components since the level of significance was 0.01.

H02: There is no significant difference in the perception towards a relationship between tourists and the sculptor community people in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Tourist Age.

Table 4. One-way ANOVA test the relationship between Tourist Age and Community Members

A g e	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	p-value
Below 20	74	4.36	0.07	8.314	0.00
21-30	132	4.32	0.37		
31-40	175	4.19	0.32		
41-50	186	4.23	0.20		
51-60	56	4.07	0.07		
More than 60	45	4.29	0.00		
Total	<b>668</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>0.27</b>		

Source: Primary Data

It is clear from table 1.4 above that, in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, visitors of various ages have significantly different mean scores

on the "Perception towards Relationship between Tourists and Community Members" ( $F = 8.314$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) depending on their age.

The significance level was 0.01. In Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village, the premise that "there is no significant difference in the perception towards a relationship between tourists and sculptor community people based on the tourist age" was therefore rejected.

#### 4.4.2 Gender

Table 1.5 displays the gender distribution of the study's participants. According to the table's statistics, 40.66% of visitors were women and 59.14% were men.

Table 5. Gender of Tourists

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	395	59.14
Female	273	40.66
<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

Table 6. Independent Sample t-test between Tourism Satisfaction Indicators and Gender

Tourist Satisfaction Indicators	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-value	p-value
Types of Stone Idols	Male	395	3.91	0.39	<b>2.72</b>	<b>0.02*</b>
	Female	273	4.01	0.45		
Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village	Male	395	3.98	0.39	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>0.66</b>
	Female	273	3.95	0.48		
Quality Road Connectivity	Male	395	3.75	0.49	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.39</b>
	Female	273	3.52	0.51		
Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People	Male	395	2.60	0.32	<b>-1.10</b>	<b>0.25</b>
	Female	273	2.87	0.59		
Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes	Male	395	4.79	1.64	<b>6.38</b>	<b>0.00**</b>
	Female	273	3.87	0.36		
Good Safety & Security Circumstances	Male	395	3.91	0.28	<b>3.63</b>	<b>0.00**</b>
	Female	273	3.89	0.27		
Stone Craft Sculptural Styles	Male	395	3.57	0.59	<b>2.71</b>	<b>0.02*</b>
	Female	273	3.46	0.38		

\*.: Significance at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Tourist satisfaction indicators such as Stone Craft Sculptural Styles (T=2.71, P=0.02) at a significance level of 0.05, Sculptors Behavioural Attitudes (T=6.38, P=0.00) at a significance level of 0.01, Types of Stone Idols (T=2.72, P=0.02) at a significance level of 0.05, and Good Safety & Security Circumstances (T=3.63, P=0.00) at a significance level of 0.01 clearly show a significant difference in the mean score between male and female tourists.

However, since the P value is greater than 0.05, there was no discernible difference in the mean scores between male and female tourists across the various tourist satisfaction indicators, including the village's hygienic and sanitary conditions, the quality of road connectivity, and the locals' tourist-friendly practices. Sanitation and Hygienic Conditions of the Village, Quality Road Connectivity, and Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People are examples of tourist satisfaction indicators that support the hypothesis that there is no discernible difference in the various indicators based on the gender of the tourists. However, based on gender and indices of visitor happiness, the idea was disproved.

H04: There is no significant difference in the perception towards a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the tourist Gender.

An Independent Samples t-test was used to determine whether the mean scores of male and female

H03: There is no significant difference in different tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the tourist Gender.

An independent sample t-test was used to determine if the mean ratings of male and female visitors on markers of visitor satisfaction at Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village differed significantly. The different tourist satisfaction indicators identified in the study included Quality Road Connectivity, Stone Craft Sculptural Styles, Types of Stone Idols, Sculptors' Behavioural Attitudes, Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People, Safety & Security Circumstances, and Sanitation & Hygienic Conditions of the Village.

visitors differed significantly in their perceptions of the interaction between tourists and sculptors at Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village, based on the gender of the tourists.

Table 7. Independent Sample t-test between the relationship between tourists and sculptors and Gender

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	p-value
Male	395	4.24	0.33	0.26	0.26
Female	273	4.23	0.14		

Source: Primary Data

According to Table 1.7 above, there is no statistically significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female visitors by gender for the aspects that affect their happiness in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village.

#### 4.4.3 Education

To identify tourists' preferences, it is important to understand their educational backgrounds. The education profile of the tourists shows that the majority were Graduates (38.77%) and Postgraduates (25.77%), followed by Intermediate (16.31%). The study also included tourists with other Diploma/ITI/Polytechnic (11.37%) and Secondary School qualifications (7.78%).

Table 8. Educational Backgrounds of Tourists

Educational Qualification	No. of Responded Tourists	Percentage
SSC	52	7.78
Intermediate	109	16.31
Graduate	259	38.77
Post-Graduate	172	25.77
Others	76	11.37
<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

H05: There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the tourist education.

To determine the significance of the difference in mean scores between visitors with various "Educational Qualifications" on various "Tourist Satisfaction Indicators" at Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, a one-way ANOVA test was performed. The

different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators identified in the study included Quality Road Connectivity, Stone Craft Sculptural Styles, Types of Stone Idols, Sculptors' Behavioural Attitudes, Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People, Safety & Security Circumstances, and Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village. The Educational Qualification of the tourists was categorized as School and Secondary, Intermediate, Undergraduate and Postgraduate.

Table 9. One way ANOVA between Education and Tourist Satisfaction Indicators

Tourist Satisfaction Indicators	Education	N	Mean	Std.Deviation	F-value	P-value
Types of Stone Idols	School &Secondary	92	4.03	0.33	<b>29.79</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	199	4.57	0.50		
	Under Graduate	196	3.95	0.42		
	Post Graduate	181	4.05	0.42		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>0.48</b>		
Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village	School &Secondary	85	5.08	0.41	<b>25.61</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	189	5.09	2.12		
	Under Graduate	206	4.03	0.25		
	Post Graduate	188	4.97	0.50		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>1.35</b>		
Quality Road Connectivity	School &Secondary	72	3.74	0.42	<b>14.09</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	189	4.65	0.36		
	Under Graduate	236	3.96	0.46		
	Post Graduate	171	4.19	0.24		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>0.40</b>		
Tourist friendly practices by Local People	School &Secondary	92	3.04	0.49	<b>14.62</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	189	2.67	0.34		
	Under Graduate	236	2.54	0.49		
	Post Graduate	151	2.70	0.42		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>0.44</b>		
Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes	School &Secondary	91	4.07	0.00	<b>17.85</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	199	4.09	0.16		
	Under Graduate	206	3.84	0.22		
	Post Graduate	172	3.99	0.25		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>0.22</b>		
Stone Craft Sculptural Styles	School & Secondary	98	4.67	0.42	<b>6.88</b>	<b>0.00</b>
	Intermediate	189	3.93	0.44		
	Under Graduate	196	3.99	0.31		
	Post Graduate	185	3.71	0.36		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>0.38</b>		
Good Safety & Security Circumstances	School & Secondary	91	3.64	0.52	<b>1.86</b>	<b>0.27</b>
	Intermediate	191	3.49	0.42		
	Under Graduate	246	3.46	0.44		
	Post Graduate	140	3.51	0.59		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>0.41</b>		

Source: Primary Data.

Table 1.9 above illustrates that there is a notable variation in theme scores for visitors with varying levels of education on several Tourist Satisfaction Indicators, such as Types of Stone Idols (F = 29.79, P= 0.00), Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village (F= 25.61, p= 0.00), Quality Road Connectivity (F = 14.09, P= 0.00), Tourist friendly practices by Local People (F=14.62, P=0.00), Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes (F= 17.85, P= 0.00), and Stone Craft Sculptural Styles

(F=6.88, P=0.00). The level of significance was 0.01. However, as the p-value was higher than 0.05, there was no discernible difference between visitors with varying educational backgrounds on the Tourist Satisfaction Indicators such as Good Safety & Security Circumstances (F = 1.86, P = 0.27). As a result, the hypothesis that "There is no significant difference in the tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the education of the



tourists" was rejected for all other tourist satisfaction indicators but accepted for service quality.

H06: There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Educational Qualification of the tourists.

The significance of variation in mean scores among visitors with different occupations regarding their opinions on the link between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village was tested using a one-way ANOVA. The visitors' educational backgrounds were divided into four categories: school and secondary, intermediate, undergraduate, and postgraduate.

Table 10. One-way ANOVA between Tourist Education and Sculptors

Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	p-value
School & Secondary	83	4.19	0.12	17.60	0.00
Intermediate	191	4.21	0.29		
Under Graduate	204	4.17	0.20		
Post Graduate	190	4.39	0.30		
<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>0.27</b>		

Source: Primary Data

From Table 1.10, it is seen that there is a significant difference in the mean between tourists involved in different occupations on the "Perception toward Relationship between Tourists and Sculptors" ( $F = 17.60$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) in the Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village. The level of significance was 0.01. Therefore, it was decided that there was no discernible difference in how visitors and sculptors at Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village

perceived their connection, regardless of visitors' educational background.

#### 4.4.4 Occupation:

An analysis of the occupation of the tourists in the study shows that the majority of the tourists were working in Government organizations (32.03%) and in Private Organizations (17.39%). Professionals are (15.56%), Students were identified (14.37%), and Self Employees are (20.65%).

Table 11. Occupational status of Tourists

Category	No. of Tourists	Percentage
Students	96	14.37
Govt. Employee	214	32.03
Pvt. Employee	116	17.39
Professional	104	15.56
Self-Employment	138	20.65
<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Primary Data

H07: There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Occupation of the tourists.

In Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, a one-way ANOVA was used to determine the significance of differences in mean scores for visitors engaged in various "Occupations" on "Tourist Satisfaction Indicators." The different Tourist

Satisfaction Indicators identified in the study included Quality Road Connectivity, Stone Craft Sculptural Styles, Types of Stone Idols, Sculptors' Behavioural Attitudes, Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People, Safety & Security Circumstances, and Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village. The occupation of the tourists was categorized as Agriculture, Self-Employment, Government Employment, and Private Employment.

Table 12. One-way ANOVA between Occupation and Tourist Satisfaction Indicators

Tourist Satisfaction Indicators	Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	p-value
Types of Stone Idols	Agriculture	145	3.29	0.41	21.70	0.00
	Self-Employment	287	4.29	0.32		
	Government	143	3.73	0.16		
	Private	133	3.29	0.82		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>0.42</b>		
Stone Craft Sculptural Styles	Agriculture	90	3.74	0.81	13.77	0.00
	Self-Employment	264	3.95	1.48		
	Government	151	4.26	0.46		
	Private	163	4.41	0.36		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>1.39</b>		
Quality Road Connectivity	Agriculture	92	4.25	0.56	19.48	0.00
	Self-Employment	294	4.01	0.01		
	Government	154	4.17	0.35		
	Private	128	3.92	0.33		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>4.07</b>	<b>0.40</b>		
Tourist friendly practices by Local People	Agriculture	125	3.00	0.38	18.71	0.00
	Self-Employment	272	2.70	0.36		
	Government	139	2.49	0.53		
	Private	132	2.53	0.28		

	Total	668	2.65	0.44		
Sculptors Behavioural Attitudes	Agriculture	130	3.81	0.21	19.46	0.00
	Self-Employment	264	4.07	0.21		
	Government	141	4.08	0.12		
	Private	133	3.83	0.19		
	Total	668	3.95	0.22		
Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village	Agriculture	110	4.06	0.33	16.46	0.00
	Self-Employment	189	3.75	0.31		
	Government	141	3.83	0.45		
	Private	228	3.96	0.34		
	Total	668	3.90	0.38		
Good Safety & Security Circumstances	Agriculture	129	3.25	0.47	19.31	0.00
	Self-Employment	294	3.44	0.33		
	Government	141	3.62	0.67		
	Private	104	3.58	0.28		
	Total	668	3.50	0.49		

Source: Primary Data

From the above table 1.12, it is clear that, there is a significant difference in the mean score between tourists involved in different Occupation on the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators like Types of Stone Idols ( $F = 21.70$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ), Stone Craft Sculptural Styles ( $F = 13.77$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ), Quality Road Connectivity ( $F = 19.48$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ), Tourist friendly practices by Local People ( $F = 18.71$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ), Sculptors Behavioral Attitude ( $F = 19.46$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ), Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village ( $F = 16.46$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ) and Good Safety & Security Circumstances ( $F = 19.31$ ,  $P = 0.00$ ). The level of significance was 0.01. Hence, the hypothesis that "There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on

the Occupation of the tourists" was rejected for all the factors.

H08: There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Occupation of the tourists.

To determine the significance of variation in mean scores among visitors with different occupations regarding their views of the interaction between visitors and sculptures at Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, a one-way ANOVA was performed. The visitors' jobs were divided into four categories: government, private, self-employment, and agriculture.

Table 13. One way ANOVA between Occupation and Relationship between Tourists and Sculptures

Occupation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-value	p-value
Agriculture	175	4.18	0.12	31.87	0.00
Self-Employment	189	4.07	0.26		
Government	206	4.38	0.27		
Private	98	4.24	0.28		
Total	668	4.23	0.27		

Source: Primary Data

Table 1.13 shows that, in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, there is a significant difference in the mean score between visitors with different occupations on the "Perception towards Relationship between Tourists and Sculptors" ( $F = 31.87$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ). The level of significance was 0.01. Hence, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Occupation of the tourists" was rejected.

#### 4.5 Overall Tourist Satisfaction on Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village

The study also collected data on tourists' Overall satisfaction with the salient features of Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture Village. Over 43.26% ( $N = 289$ )

of tourists were Highly Satisfied, 35.02% ( $N = 234$ ) of tourists were Satisfied, and only 21.70% ( $N = 145$ ) of tourists were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with Stone Carving and Idol Making activity in Shivarapattana village.

Table 14. Overall Tourist Satisfaction on Shivarapattana Sculptural Heritage village

Overall Satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	145	21.70
Satisfied	234	35.02
Highly Satisfied	289	43.26
Total	668	100

Source: Primary Data

H09: There is no significant difference in the overall tourists' satisfaction with Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village

Table 15. Cross tabulation on tourist overall satisfaction on Salient Features of Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village

Tourists	Overall tourist's satisfaction on Salient Features of Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village			Total	Chi-Square Value	p-value
	Neither satisfied Nor dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied			
Available Transport facilities	35	42	48	125		

Marketing & Promotional Activities	38	75	63	176	5.53	1.996
Government Supportive Steps	32	59	75	166		
NGO's & Service Providers Contribution	41	72	88	201		
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>668</b>		

Source: Primary Data

In the above table, 1.15 shows that the p-value is greater than 0.05, thus the Null Hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference ( $\chi^2(6) = 5.53$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ) among tourists in their overall satisfaction with their visit to the Eco-Tourism destinations. A chi-Square test was also conducted to test the significance of the difference in Overall Tourists Satisfaction in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village

## 5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### 5.1 Findings from the research study

- There is a significant difference in the Mean score between tourists with different Age on different tourist satisfaction indicators like Quality Road Connectivity ( $F=23.51$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Stone Craft Sculptural Styles ( $F=9.74$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Types of Stone Idols ( $F=25.83$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes ( $F=23.09$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Tourist Friendly Practices by Local People ( $F=21.36$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Safety & Security Circumstances ( $F=32.7$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), and Sanitation & Hygienic conditions ( $F=29.45$ ,  $P=0.00$ ). The level of significance was 0.01; hence, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, based on the Age of tourists, was rejected for all factors.

- The statement "Based on the Tourist Age, there is no discernible difference in the perception of the relationship between tourists and the sculptor community people in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village" was rejected.

- There is no significant difference in the Mean score observed between Male & Female tourists on the different tourist satisfaction indicators, like Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village, Quality Road Connectivity, and tourist-friendly practices by Local People, as the P value is greater than 0.05.

- There is a significant difference in theme score between tourists with different educational attainment on the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators like Types of Stone Idols ( $F = 29.79$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village ( $F= 25.61$ ,  $p= 0.00$ ), Quality Road Connectivity ( $F = 14.09$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Tourist friendly practices by Local People ( $F=14.62$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Sculptors Behavioral Attitudes ( $F= 17.85$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), and Stone Craft Sculptural Styles ( $F=6.88$ ,  $P=0.00$ ). The level of significance was 0.01. However, no significant difference was found between tourists with different educational qualifications on the Tourist Satisfaction Indicators like Good Safety & Security Circumstances ( $F = 1.86$ ,  $P= 0.27$ ) as the p-value was greater than 0.05. Hence, the hypothesis that "There is no significant difference in the tourist satisfaction indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Education of the tourists" was accepted for Service Quality and rejected for all other Tourist Satisfaction Indicators.

- There is a significant difference in the mean between tourists involved in different Occupations on the "Perception toward Relationship between Tourists and Sculptors" ( $F = 17.60$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ) in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village. The level of significance was 0.01. Hence, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Educational Qualification of the tourists" was rejected.

- There is a significant difference in the mean score between tourists involved in different Occupation on the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators like Types of Stone Idols ( $F = 21.70$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Stone Craft Sculptural Styles ( $F= 13.77$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Quality Road Connectivity ( $F = 19.48$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Tourist friendly practices by Local People ( $F=18.71$ ,  $P=0.00$ ), Sculptors Behavioral Attitude ( $F= 19.46$ ,  $P= 0.00$ ), Sanitation & Hygienic conditions of the Village ( $F=16.46$ ,  $P=0.00$ ) and Good Safety & Security Circumstances ( $F=19.31$ ,  $P=0.00$ ). The level of significance was 0.01. Hence, the hypothesis that "There is no significant difference in the different Tourist Satisfaction Indicators in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Occupation of the tourists" was rejected for all the factors.

- There is a significant difference in the mean score between tourists involved in different Occupation on the "Perception toward Relationship between Tourists and Sculptors" ( $F=31.87$ ,  $p=0.00$ ) in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village. The level of significance was 0.01. Hence, the hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the perception toward a relationship between tourists and sculptors in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village based on the Occupation of the tourists" was rejected.

- Regarding overall satisfaction with the visit to the eco-tourism locations, there is no significant difference ( $\chi^2(6) = 5.53$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) between the visitors. To determine the significance of the variation in overall tourist satisfaction in Shivarapattana Heritage and Sculpture village, the Chi-Square test was also performed. The null hypothesis is accepted since the p-value is greater than 0.05.

### 5.2 Risks and Challenges in Sustainable Community-Based Rural Tourism Development in Shivarapattana:

#### 1. Income stability and distribution

The revenue from the sale of souvenirs, lodging, and food services is increasing, but it has peaked and then stagnated. The revenue from ticket sales is also increasing, but it is not growing. Even though tourism has increased employment, the villages' share of the work is unequal.

#### 2. Conservation of local values and quality of life

Even though tourism has increased the community's sense of pride and legacy, there is a growing risk of losing traditional arts and crafts. Since most of the highly skilled artisans are now elderly and over 80% of stone sculptures are standard items requiring less craftsmanship and hence, it is especially crucial to preserve the distinctiveness of village products.

### 3. Community support for tourism development and community support policies

A portion of the current infrastructure needs further improvement because it was not constructed correctly. People are unwilling to take part in, or play a major role in, the design and execution of local tourist development initiatives, or to start new tourism-related enterprises, because they lack the necessary skills. Every CBT community should have its requirements met by the Government.

### 4. Policy and managerial implications

Consultative engagements with stakeholders are crucial requirements for sustainability, and government plays a significant role (Giampiccoli & Saayman, 2018). The study identified tourists' satisfaction and perceptions of Sustainable community-based rural tourism development that require external assistance to support the process and enhance the success of CBT. The government should define a common standard for CBT development in Karnataka and develop policies aligned with national, regional, and local tourism development strategies that protect natural and cultural heritage, with special emphasis on the destination's unique values and features. In this context, the Government needs to develop, follow, and enforce policies that empower the community and enhance its capacities.

Additionally, management regulations and proven monitoring procedures analysing the entire tourist impact and evaluating its sustainability need to be designed and executed. External parties may assist the community in undertaking monitoring and evaluation activities. To increase destination competitiveness, local governments should address conflicts of interest between communities or families participating in tourism and those not engaging in activities to promote social cohesion and protect shared values and natural assets. To empower the community to manage and sustain tourism in the region over the long run, it will be necessary to facilitate the timely implementation of policies that support enterprises and communities, and to aid in the development of jobs and high-quality, needs-based training.

The following were some of the recommendations from my research studies:

- The Handicraft Industry should organize regular Handicraft Expos and Exhibitions in main cities including Bangalore to promote Shivarapattana stone crafts among the people.
- The development of the town's infrastructure, including walkways, street lighting, well-kept sanitary facilities, waste disposal facilities, and roads and canals, is facilitated by the community's promotion as a sculptural historical village.

- The State Government under the PPP model has to construct tourist complexes, sculptures, and Heritage Museums in all popular cities for the huge sales of handicrafts.

- The tourist's behavioural attitudes toward local community people should be in a dignified manner.

- The tourist should not spoil the village's internal beauty by non-usage of non-biodegradable Plastic and polythene covers at the destination.

- More Information centers and shopping stalls should be established for selling of Stone Crafts of Shivarapattana in major cities in Karnataka.

- The Government should encourage the community members to establish more Home Stays, which help create employment.

- The Karnataka State Tourism Development Corporation (KSTDC), along with other private travel and tour operators, should promote this Sculptural Heritage Village through Special Interest Packages among the school children and college students.

- The community has to be encouraged and involved in all promotional activities as a whole but not as individual members.

- Host and Tourist Interactions to be encouraged for the better quality of the services and hands-on experiences

## 6 CONCLUSION

In many places, the tourism industry is expanding and important. Despite being regarded as a sustainable development model for the tourism sector, concerns have emerged about CBT's detrimental effects on the local community. However, there is insufficient research assessing satisfaction and perceptions, and the progress of CBT towards sustainable Rural tourism development, to identify essential activities that assure long-term sustainability.

In India, rural tourism is now a niche travel offering with significant potential to attract upmarket customers looking to escape the stress of big cities and find mental tranquillity in a rural setting. The purpose of rural homestays is to attract visitors interested in discovering more about the many crafts and ways of life found in our numerous communities. This stops the migration of people from villages to big cities and also generates jobs in the communities. Karnataka has great potential for rural tourism, thanks to its beautiful art and architecture and its abundance of sculptured temples.

The state has an excellent chance to grow its rural tourist industry. The Shivarapattana heritage and sculpture village is an asset to the state of Karnataka and has played a vital role in the picturesque art of idol sculpture. The local community involvement is quite strong behind the success and role model oriented rural tourism in the heritage and sculpture village, of Shivarapattana. If a rural tourism village like Shivarapattana, practices Sustainable Rural tourism principles and practices it leads to employment generation, regional development and poverty eradication. Along similar lines, tourists get unique types of experiences, and tourists become repeat customers in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Abesey, S., Allah, S., Tahmasebi, I. S. (2015). Investigating the relative efficiency of tourism management in the provinces of the country in the third and fourth development plans. *Economic Strategy*, 7, 198.
- Adebajo, B. & Bukola, T. (2023). Introduction to Descriptive statistics. Recent Advances in Biostatistics. 10.5772/intechopen.1002475.
- Atun, R.A., Nafa, H., Türker, (2019). Envisaging sustainable rural development through 'context-dependent tourism': case of Northern Cyprus. *Environmental Development Sustainability*, 21, 1715–1744. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-018-0100-8>.
- Beigpoor Shahriyar, Rafat. (2012). Factors that influence tourist satisfaction. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research (Online)*. 12. 61-79.
- Brooks, C., Waterton, E., Saul, H., Renzaho, A. (2023). Exploring the relationships between heritage tourism, sustainable community development and host communities' health and wellbeing: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE* 18(3): e0282319. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0282319>
- Boroujeni, H.Z., & Turkman, N. (2013). Analysis of the development of religious tourism in Hamedan Province. *Scientific Management Iran*, 30, 57–80.
- Cheng, L., & Zhang, J. (2020). Is tourism development a catalyst of economic recovery following natural disaster? An analysis of economic resilience and spatial variability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2019.1711029>
- Christou, P.A., (2020). Tourism experiences as the remedy to nostalgia: conceptualizing the nostalgia and tourism nexus. *Current Issues in Tourism* 23(5), 612–625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1548582>
- Choi, H-S.C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.05.018>
- Chong, K.Y., & Balasingam, A.S. (2019). Tourism sustainability: economic benefits and strategies for preservation and conservation of heritage sites in Southeast Asia. *Tourism Reviews*, 74(2), 268–279. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-11-2017-0182>
- Chuang, S.-T. (2013). Residents & Attitudes Toward Rural Tourism in Taiwan: a Comparative Viewpoint. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 152–170. doi: 10.1002/jtr.1861
- Cunha, C., Kastenholz, E., Carneiro, M.J. (2020). Entrepreneurs in rural tourism: do lifestyle motivations contribute to management practices that enhance sustainable entrepreneurial ecosystems? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 44, 215–226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.06.007>
- Di, T.F., & Laura, M. (2021). How green possibilities can help in the future sustainable conservation of cultural heritage in Europe. *Sustainability* 13(7):3609. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13073609>
- FAITH, (2021). Report on Rural Tourism, Ministry of Tourism, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
- G. Juhi, (2020). Study of Factors Affecting Tourist Satisfaction at Selected Heritage Destinations of Rajasthan, *Our Heritage*, 68(1), 11-14.
- Gabrielli, Cassiana. 2017. Turismo responsável: Caminhos possíveis? *Revista De Turismo Contemporâneo*. 5, 81–97.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: definition, evolution and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 403–428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.017>
- Giampiccoli, A., & Saayman, M. (2018). Community-based tourism development model and community participation. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7(4), 1–27
- Govender, K., Chuchu, M., Eugene, & Tinashe, (2021). Perceptions of Local Tourists, Attitudes and Willingness to Visit Local Destinations: A Destination Image Case. *Business Management Analysis Journal (BMAJ)*, 4, 1-24. 10.24176/bmaj.v4i2.6175.
- Jörg, K. & A.G. Schering. (2014). Analysis of Variance ANOVA, WILEY Online Library.
- Huang S. S. and Crotts J. (2019). Relationships between Hofstede's cultural dimensions and tourist satisfaction: a cross-country cross-sample examination, *Tourism Management*. (2019) 72, 232–241, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.001>, 2-s2.0-85058239701.
- Hutagalung, H., Purwana, D., Suhud, U., Mukminin, A., Hamidah, H., & Rahayu, N. (2022). Community Self-Reliance of Rural Tourism in Indonesia: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(7), 1151-1168. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5215>.
- Kannan, D.; de Sousa Jabbour, A.B.L.; Jabbour, C.J.C. (2014). Selecting green suppliers based on GSCM practices: Using fuzzy TOPSIS applied to a Brazilian electronics company. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 233, 432–447.
- Karamuz, M., & Araghinejad, S. (2014). *Advanced hydrology* (Vol.). Amir Kabir University.
- Kantar, S., & Svržnjak, K. (2017). Development of Sustainable Rural Tourism. *DETUROPE*, 9, 26-34. 10.32725/det.2017.003.
- Kaptan, A.Ç., Cengiz, T.T., Özkök, F., Tatlı, H. (2020). Land use suitability analysis of rural tourism activities: Yenice, Turkey. *Tourism Management* 76, 103949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.07.003>.
- Kayat, K. (2014). Community-Based Rural Tourism: A Proposed Sustainability Framework, *Environmental Science, Sociology and Business*, DOI:10.1051/SHSCONF/20141201010.
- Kelliher, F., Rein, L., Johnson, T.G., Joppe, M. (2018). The role of trust in building rural tourism micro firm network engagement: a multi-case study. *Tourism Management*. 68, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.02.014>
- Kumari, N., Khanna, J., Kumar, P., Patyal, S. (2020). Assessing the Factors Impacting Destination Loyalty in Sustainable Tourism: A Case Study of Sanasar Village, an Emerging Tourist Spot in Jammu and Kashmir (North India). In: Chahal, H., Pereira, V., Jyoti, J. (eds) *Sustainable Business Practices for Rural Development*. Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-9298-6\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-9298-6_8)
- Lane, B. (1994). What is rural tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(1&2), 7–21, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589409510680>
- Lin, M.H.; Hu, J.Y.; Tseng, M.L.; Chiu, A.S.F.; Lin, C.Y. (2016). Sustainable development in technological and vocational higher education: Balanced scorecard measures with uncertainty. *Journal of Cleaning Production*, 120, 1–12.
- López-Sanz, J.M., Penelas-Leguía, A., Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, P., Cuesta-Valiño, P. (2021). Sustainable development and rural tourism in depopulated areas. *Land*, 10(9), 985. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10090985>.
- Marques, C.P., Guedes, A., Bento, R. (2022). Rural tourism recovery between two COVID-19 waves: the case of Portugal. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(6), 857–863. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1910216>.
- Mayaka, M.; Croy, W.G.; Wolfram Cox, J. A. (2019). Dimensional approach to community-based tourism: Recognising and differentiating form and context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 74, 177–190.
- Ministry of Tourism, Government of India / UNDP India (2008). Report on Redefining Tourism - Experiences and Insights from Rural Tourism Projects in India
- Nahid, E.B. & Akbar, (2016). The effects of the mental image of is Isfahan tourists on the development of tourism. *Journal of Tourism Management Studies*, 31, 109–25.
- Ngo, T. H., & Creutz, S. (2022). Assessing the sustainability of community-based tourism: a case study in rural areas of Hoi An, Vietnam. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2116812>.

- Navarrete, T. (2019). Digital Heritage Tourism: Innovations in Museums. *World Leisure Journal*, 61(3), 200–14.
- Nidhi, W., & Blessing, A., Paul, J., Emma, W. (2019). The Impact of Heritage Tourism on Sustainable Community Development, Health and Wellbeing: A Systematic Review Protocol. *Social Science Protocols*. 2. 1-10. 10.7555/ssp.2019.2655.
- Nunkoo, R., Seetanah, B., and Agrawal, S. (2019). "Guest editorial: Innovations in sustainable tourism research", *Tourism Review*, 74 (2), 129-137.
- P. Steven, (2005). Tourism destination branding complexity. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 14(4), 258-9
- Phillip, S., Hunter, C., Blackstock, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 754–758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.001>.
- Pramanik, P.D.; Ingkadijaya, R.; Achmadi, M. (2019). The Role of Social Capital in Community-Based Tourism. *Journal of Indonesia Tourism Development Studies*. 7, 62–73.
- Prashanta, K. S. (2020). A Study by Energy and Resource Institute (TERI), feasibility and potential of solar P V applications in the MSME Sector in Rural India project. Retrieved <https://www.teriin.org/sites/default/files/2021-02/feasibility-study-solar-applications-MSMEs.pdf>
- Polukhina, A., Marina, S., Marina, E., Oxana, S., Oksana, A., and Anton, A-O. (2021). The Concept of Sustainable Rural Tourism Development in the Face of COVID-19 Crisis: Evidence from Russia. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 14, 38. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm14010038>
- Rajesh, R. (2013). Impact of Tourist Perceptions, Destination Image and Tourist Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Conceptual Model. *Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 11, 67-78. 10.25145/j.pasos.2013.11.039.
- Rana R, Singhal R. Chi-square test and its  
Rana, R and Singal, R. (2015). Chi-square test and its application in hypothesis testing. *Journal of Practice Cardiovascular Science*.1, 69-71.
- Retrieved from  
<http://www.craftclustersofindia.in/site/index.aspx?Cid=662>
- Ryu, K., Roy, P.A., Kim, H., Ryu, H. (2020). The resident participation in endogenous rural tourism projects: a case study of Kumbalangi in Kerala, India. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 37(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2019.1687389>
- Sanjivani, Kannada News Paper (2022 25<sup>th</sup> July).
- Setiawan, P., Moaaz, K., Yitno, P., and Lóránt, D. D. 2021. "Rethinking Sustainable Community-Based Tourism: A Villager's Point of View and Case Study in Pampang Village, Indonesia" *Sustainability* 13, no. 6: 3245. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063245>
- Silva, L., & Leal, J. (2015). Rural tourism and national identity building in contemporary Europe: evidence from Portugal. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 38,109–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.02.005>
- Slater, S. J. (2020). Recommendations for keeping parks and green spaces accessible for mental and physical health during COVID-19 and other pandemics. *Previous Chronicle*  
Disclose <https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd17.200204>
- Taghavi, M & Soleimani, A. G., (2017). The factors influencing the growth of the tourism industry. *Economic Research*, 3, 157.
- Tapak, L., Abbasi, H., & Mirhashemi, H. (2019). Assessment of factors affecting tourism satisfaction using K-nearest neighborhood and random forest models. *BMC Residence Notes*. 12, 749 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-019-4799-6>
- Tiwari, S.; Tomczewska-Popowycz, N.; Gupta, S.K.; Swart, M.P. (2021). Local Community Satisfaction toward Tourism Development in Pushkar Region of Rajasthan, India. *Sustainability*, 13, 13468. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313468>
- The Hindu News Paper (2022 03<sup>rd</sup> April).
- The Hindu News Paper, (August 2, 2022).
- Van Der Merwe, C.D. (2016). Tourist guides' perceptions of cultural heritage tourism in South Africa. In: Szymańska, D. and Biegańska, J. (Edn.). *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series* 34, 117–30.
- Yacob, S., & Siregar, Ade Perdana & Erida., Erida & Lidyah, Rika. (2021). The loyalty of rural tourism destination: A perspective of destination quality perception, satisfaction, and behaviour intention in Indonesia. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 10, 2147-4478, 10.20525/ijrbs.v10i7.1404.
- Yang, J., Yang, R.X., Chen, M.H., Su, C.H., Zhi, Y., Xi, J.C. (2021). Effects of rural revitalization on rural tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 47, 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.02.008>
- Wijenayaka, A, & Kakuluwa, M. G, Amal, (2021). Importance of the Satisfaction in the Tourism Sector. 02, 427-429. 10.6084/m9.figshare.17713442.v1.

#### CRedit author statement.

Term	Definition	Author 1	A2
Conceptualization	Ideas, formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims.	x	x
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models.	x	x
Software	Programming, software development; designing computer programs; implementation of the computer code and supporting algorithms; testing of existing code components.		
Validation	Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/ reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs.		
Formal analysis	Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyze or synthesize study data.	x	x
Investigation	Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection.	x	x
Resources	Provision of study materials, reagents, materials, patients, laboratory samples, animals, instrumentation, computing resources, or other analysis tools.	x	x
Data Curation	Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse.	x	x
Writing - Original Draft	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation).	x	x
Writing - Review & Editing	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre-or post-publication stages.	x	x
Visualization	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/ data presentation.	x	x

Term	Definition	Author 1	A2
Supervision	Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team.		x
Project administration	Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution.		
Funding acquisition	Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication.		

Source: reproduced from Elsevier (2022, s/p), based upon Brand et al. (2015).

---

Processo Editorial / Editorial Process / Proceso Editorial  
 Editor Chefe / Editor-in-chief / Editor Jefe: PhD Thiago D. Pimentel (UFJF).  
 Recebido / Received / Recibido: 27.08.2025; Revisado / Revised / Revisado: 14.10.2025; Aprovado / Approved / Aprobado:  
 26.11.2025; Publicado / Published / Publicado (online): 04.12.2025.  
 Artigo ressubmetido / Resubmitted paper/ Artículo reenviado.  
 Documento revisado por pares / Peer-reviewed paper / Documento revisado por pares.