



Quantifying The Tourism Potential And Satisfaction Of Tourists From Wildlife Tourism Destinations: A Study Of National Parks And Wildlife Sanctuaries Of J & K, UT Of India

Tanveer Nasir^{1*}, Danish Iqbal Raina¹

^{1*}Center for Hospitality & Tourism, Baba Ghulam Shah Badshah University, Rajouri, J&K, India

**Corresponding Author: Tanveer Nasir*

**Center for Hospitality & Tourism, Baba Ghulam Shah Badshah University, Rajouri, J&K, India*

Article History

Received:

Revised:

Accepted:

Abstract

Assessing the tourism potential of wildlife tourism destinations of Jammu and Kashmir is crucial for successful and sustainable tourism planning and development. Tourism potential indicates the development and success of tourism in various regions and destinations. The present study deals with the mathematical model evaluation of the tourism potential as well as SPSS (Statistical package For Social Sciences) of the wildlife tourism destinations of Jammu and Kashmir. The primary objective of the study is to evaluate the tourism potential of the wildlife destinations, Frequency of satisfied tourists and Satisfaction of tourists at wildlife destinations with the attributes of destinations. The model employs the weighted sum method (WSM) to calculate potential tourism values, for analyzing the frequency and satisfaction SPSS software was incorporated in the analysis for getting mean score. A simple random sampling technique with a structured questionnaire (N = 400) was used to accomplish the research objective. 15 wildlife sanctuaries and 4 national parks were taken into consideration were from the questionnaire were collected from the tourists. destination attributes (Environmental) got score 0.90-0.92 except E6 (Cleanness at destinations) which got lower grade. Followed by the Physical aspect of the destination such as Quality of Roads Availability of Food near Wildlife Destinations, Availability of local Cuisines and Availability of Multiple Cuisines (Grade Score in-between 80-90). In case of social and cultural attributes the results got the grades of 0.90 which very close to 1 that indicates that wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir are having huge potential in social and cultural attractiveness. Overall, the findings determine the significance of enhancing the need to enhance the quality of destination attractiveness attributes like cleanness at wildlife destination, Availability of Tourist Information Centers, Availability of Shopping Facilities and Availability of General Market near Wildlife destinations Jammu and Kashmir to utilize the tourism potential of Wildlife Tourism Destinations of Jammu and Kashmir fullest.

CC License
CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0

Keywords: Wildlife; Satisfaction; Facilities; National Parks; Sanctuaries; J & K

Introduction

Wildlife tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of tourism in the worldwide. Worldwide, wildlife-oriented tourism is estimated to generate annual revenue of US \$47 - \$ 155 billion. 16% of people take annual trips for the primary purpose of non-consumptive interactions with wildlife, and there are estimated to be up to 60 million birdwatchers, in the United States. Wildlife tourism developed rapidly after Second World War in the form of wildlife viewing in national parks and game refuge on government or state-owned land. Viewing wildlife is being promoted in many governments controlled protected areas in Australia and overseas. The global market size of wildlife tourism is estimated as being 12 million trips each year. Africa accounts for around one half of all these trips, with South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania and Botswana being the top destinations. Some destinations rely heavily on wildlife tourism, but could survive without it. Wildlife tourism contributes roughly \$500 million to the Kenyan economy or 14% of GDP. On the other hand, places such as the Galapagos Islands rely almost exclusively on wildlife tourists. Other destinations are enjoying increased influxes of visitors due to strong interest in certain mammals. For example, there has been considerable growth in whale watching at Kaikoura in New Zealand and Puerto Piraminde in Argentinean Patagonia. Interest in wildlife is growing considerably, in particular as its exposure in the international media increases. As with bird watching, the National Geographic Channel and other renowned television channels have generated increased interest amongst consumers. There is still considerable potential for growth within this market and it is expected to expand by between 8% and 10% per annum over the next decade. Wildlife tourists are some of the most diverse of any niche market. They range from the experienced specialists who like to seek “virgin” places that remain relatively undiscovered to the inexperienced tourist travelling on a package to one of Africa’s well-known game reserves. Across this spectrum, consumers vary considerably in age, gender and socio-economic grouping. Package tourists vary from budget travelers through to those staying in small exclusive lodges or tented camps. The increasing emotional attachment to nature, especially to wildlife, could be a promising approach to enhancing engagement with biodiversity. There are various reasons why people are drawn to nature, ranging from aesthetic pleasure to Wilson’s biophilia hypothesis and the sense of prosperity or security. Many of these reasons are rooted in emotional responses to nature, often stemming from significant personal experiences in natural settings (Dallimer et al., 2012). Kals, Schumacher, and Montada (1999) argued that emotional affinity toward nature tends to strengthen with more specific and concrete nature interactions. The term “nature” is a broad concept, encounters with wild animals can serve as individual representatives of nature (Seppänen & Väliaverronen, 2003; Vining, 2003). These interactions frequently evoke strong emotional reactions, including feelings of awe, joy, curiosity, and privilege (Ballantyne, Packer, & Hughes, 2009; Schanzel & McIntosh, 2000). Such experiences are often described as transformative, leading individuals to view encounters with wildlife as significant and powerful events that shape their attitudes and behaviors towards nature as a whole (Folmer, Haartsen, & Huigen, 2013; Vining, 2003). Lott (1988) even found that encountering a wild animal could be perceived as a sign of one’s character, as people believe animals are good judges of character. Creating opportunities for individuals to engage with wildlife and nature through interest and curiosity is another strategy. Scientific knowledge, particularly in biology and natural history, forms the basis of understanding biodiversity. Although formal education provides some scientific learning, up to 95% of science learning occurs through voluntary experiences (Falk & Dierking, 2010; Longnecker, 2016). Non-consumptive wildlife-oriented tourism, a form of voluntary learning experience, has gained popularity, offering people the chance to learn about wildlife during leisure activities. While the primary intention may not always be learning, individuals often develop long-term interests through these experiences, which can influence their social identity and behaviors (Liu & Falk, 2014). Personal interests cultivated through such experiences can spill over into various aspects of life, affecting behaviors in different contexts (Azevedo, 2011; Liberatore et al., 2018; Liu & Falk, 2014). However, specialists tend to be independent travelers, who are likely to stay in basic accommodation and are generally very flexible with their travel arrangements. Whilst the luxury end of the package market tends to be the most demanding in terms of infrastructure and services, they also generate the greatest income. These consumers tend to be in the third age group (50-55 years), often including the early retired. The main source markets for wildlife tourism are: United States, Europe (UK, Germany and Netherland being the top 3 markets), Canada and Australia. Africa is the market leader and accounts for around one half of all wildlife tourism trips worldwide. The traditional wildlife destinations of South Africa, Kenya, Botswana

and Tanzania receive the greatest volume of visitors. However, there are a number of emerging wildlife destination which demonstrate the desire of consumers to seek out new destinations, in particular these are Antarctica (Whales, Penguins and seals), Bolivia (New World's largest concentration of large animals such as the Giant River Otter and Jaguar) and Finland (Particularly Hiidenportti National Park for bears, wolves and lynx). Terrestrial protected areas around the world receive approximately 8 billion visitors per year (Balmford, 2015). Marine and inland waters also attract millions of tourists annually (Prideaux, 2009). The expansion of the wildlife tourism industry occurs amidst global concerns such as unpredictable climate changes, political tensions, rapid human population growth, diminishing wilderness areas, and declining species populations. Existing literature extensively discusses the concerns and debates regarding the impacts of tourism on delicate environments (Gladstone, Curley, & Shokri, 2013; Gössling, 2002; Holden, 2008), as well as the negative consequences of tourism on wildlife, local communities, and habitats (Buckley, 2000; Gladstone et al., 2013; Green & Higginbottom, 2001). While the commercial and economic benefits of wildlife tourism are evident in supporting communities and conservation efforts, the exploration of its fewer tangible benefits is also gaining attention. These include the psychological benefits of engaging with wildlife (Curtin, 2013) and the positive changes in human behavior prompted by environmental interpretation (Ballantyne, Packer, & Sutherland, 2011; Skibins, Powell, & Hallo, 2013). Wildlife tourism, especially in natural and aesthetically pleasing environments, has the potential to reconnect humans with the natural world. Although acknowledged for its potential negative impact on biodiversity, wildlife tourism can also heighten awareness of the intrinsic value of nature and wildlife, foster support for conservation efforts, and cultivate caring relationships (Kals et al., 1999; Milton, 2002).

Evolution of Wildlife Tourism

Tourism has historical roots in the exploration of wildlife activities, particularly in African countries. The origins of Wildlife Tourism can be traced to tourists visiting various African countries with the intent of experiencing wildlife activities. These early tourists immersed themselves in the rich African wildlife by exploring ecosystems and engaging with the inhabitants. Some wildlife enthusiasts sought to observe animals in their natural habitats, leading to visits to wildlife sanctuaries and participation in safari tours. This trend opened up significant opportunities for nature-based tourism across the African continent. Examples include wildlife watching organized by luxury hotels in Kenya, wilderness backpacking in the European Rockies, and meticulously planned Antarctic cruises to observe penguins and killer whales (Shackley, 1996). Growing awareness of the importance of nature conservation and the principles of responsible and sustainable tourism contributed to a growing interest in wildlife watching. This trend was particularly evident in the United States, where over 75 million people annually engage in wildlife watching, making it the country's top outdoor recreational activity. In 1992, the successful California Watchable Wildlife Programme was established, marking a significant milestone in this domain (Garrison, 1997). Larrman & Durst (1987) conceptualized 'nature travel' or 'nature-oriented tourism' as a form of tourism that blends education, recreation, and often adventure. Boo (1990) considered 'eco-tourism' synonymous with 'nature-based tourism,' defining it as traveling to relatively undisturbed or uncontaminated natural areas with the specific aim of studying, admiring, and enjoying the scenery, flora, fauna, and cultural aspects. Tourists today seek immersive experiences by exploring ecosystems and habitats, not as outsiders but as responsible contributors to the conservation of nature and wildlife. Therefore, individuals with an interest in and motivation to observe wild animals in their natural habitats are termed nature-based tourists (Shackley, 1996). The essence of nature-based tourism lies in its ability to attract visitors to destinations where nature itself is the primary attraction. For example, Ferrari (1982) identified abundant natural resources in the African continent and pinpointed 21 suitable locations for promoting nature-based tourism. A 1980 US survey on "non-consumptive wildlife" indicated that approximately 29 million US citizens embarked on 310 million trips related to such activities (Boo, 1990). Remarkably, Rwanda, a land locked African country gains one-third of its foreign exchange from the nature-based wildlife tourism activities, especially tourists visiting 'Volcano National Park' to see the gorillas. In the US, tourists annually spend an estimated \$14 billion on wildlife-related activities such as watching, travel, wildlife feeding, and photography (Vickerman, 1988). Amid various forms of mass tourism, nature-based tourism has emerged as a standout attraction for tourists

Growth of Wildlife Tourism

Wildlife tourism is a widespread form of nature-based tourism that is often seen as a sustainable development tool. It is characterized as non-consumptive and environmentally positive for wildlife (Newsome et al., 2012; Rodger et al., 2007; WTTC, 2019). The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) reports that wildlife tourism makes a substantial contribution to the global Gross Domestic Product (GDP). In 2018, it contributed

approximately US \$120.1 billion, accounting for 4.4% of the estimated direct global travel and tourism GDP of US \$2,751 billion (WTTC, 2019). The distribution of different wildlife tourism sectors' contributions varies across regions, with Africa contributing 36.3%, Latin America 8.6%, Asia-Pacific 5.8%, North America 2%, and Europe only 1.6%. Over the past two decades, wildlife tourism has experienced global growth and has attracted increased attention from research scholars (Semeniuk et al., 2010; Sedarati et al. 2019). Tourism based on interactions with wildlife is increasing in popularity across the world (Reynolds & Braithwaite, 2001). The Ecotourism Society (1998) considered the scale of this market, estimating that between 40 and 60% of international tourists were nature tourists, of whom 20–40% of these were wildlife-related tourists. It also estimated that in 1994 there were between 106 million and 211 million wildlife-related tourists worldwide, although this could have included tourists who took a wildlife or nature-based trip as part of their holiday experience. In the United States over 75 million people watch wildlife each year and it is now the country's number one outdoor recreational activity (Ceballos-Lascurain, 1998). In response to this growth, a national group of governmental agencies and conservation organisations created the Watchable Wildlife Initiative in 1990. Its goals are to promote wildlife viewing, conserve biodiversity, foster environmental education and generate economic opportunities based on ecotourism. California's Watchable Wildlife Programme was established in 1992 and is now the largest and most successful programme through its promotion of 'six steps to sustainable success' (Anderson and Garrison, 1997). They include selecting sites based on regional diversity, biological sustainability and quality viewing as well as ensuring that each site provides adequate visitor services and resource protection. Another key goal is to provide 'seamless' recreational and educational opportunities focusing on quality products and a state-wide programme of visibility shared between all agencies. Other goals include establishing partnerships, identification of market segments, and the development of cooperative market strategies (Anderson and Garrison, 1997). Wildlife Tourism Cater and Cater (2001) describe the explosive growth of whale watching through the examples of the industry in Kaikoura, New Zealand and Puerto Piramide in Argentinian Patagonia. Both destinations registered a 15–20-fold increase in visitation during the 1990s with over 60,000 visitors undertaking whale watching in Kaikoura by the late 1990s and in excess of 80,000 at Puerto Piramide. There has also been an increase in underwater observatories and semi-submersibles for the passive viewing of marine life. Such facilities have proliferated in recent years and are marketed as being environmentally friendly while providing visitors with the opportunity to observe and appreciate marine life in its natural setting (Cater & Cater, 2001). An integral part of such experiences is the interpretation provided by the experience so that visitors are motivated to protect the marine environment. Wildlife tourism is on the increase in China. Many nature reserves, forest parks and scenic sites are now targeting tourists. The Chinese State Tourism Administration China designated 1999 as the national Year of Ecotourism with the theme of 'Touching, Understanding and Protecting Nature'. A survey of 100 provincial and national nature reserves across 29 provinces found that 82% were engaged in nature-based, predominantly wildlife, tourism (Nianyong & Zhuge, 2001).

Objective of the Study

- To explore the potential of wildlife tourism in Jammu and Kashmir
- To analyze the Frequency of the Tourists Satisfaction
- To analyze the satisfaction of associated with attributes of Wildlife Tourism

Methodology

This study was conducted with the help of mathematical model evaluation of the tourism potential at wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir. The model employs the weighted sum method (WSM) to calculate potential tourism values as well SPSS tool was used to determine the satisfaction of tourists regarding the 15 attributes at wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir. A simple random sampling technique with a structured questionnaire (N = 400) was used to accomplish the research objectives. The attributes for analyzed for to checking the potential of wildlife tourism of Jammu and Kashmir from the tourist's perspective were wildlife diversity, Lakes and rivers, Climate, quality of environment, availability of wildlife species, quality of the urban surroundings as well as safety and security at wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir.

Data Analysis Environment

Regarding the satisfaction of tourist with different aspects of environment, it was measured with seven factors. Table 1.1 shows for six factors of environment, i.e., wildlife diversity (243), lakes/rivers (228), climate (232), environment (228), availability of wildlife species (229) and for safety and security (232), most of the respondents were satisfied with them. Only for quality of urban surrounding, majority of the tourist (189) showed dissatisfaction.

Table 1.1 Showing frequency and percentage of responses by the tourists about destination Attributes

Environment	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Wildlife Diversity	Highly Satisfactory	243	60.75
	Satisfactory	47	11.75
	Average	9	2.25
	Unsatisfactory	85	21.25
	Highly Unsatisfactory	16	4
Lakes /rivers	Highly Satisfactory	228	57
	Satisfactory	47	11.75
	Average	28	7
	Unsatisfactory	76	19
	Highly Unsatisfactory	21	5.25
Climate	Highly Satisfactory	232	58
	Satisfactory	37	9.25
	Average	26	6.5
	Unsatisfactory	77	19.25
	Highly Unsatisfactory	28	7
Quality of Environment	Highly Satisfactory	228	57
	Satisfactory	42	10.5
	Average	29	7.25
	Unsatisfactory	78	19.5
	Highly Unsatisfactory	23	5.75
Availability of wildlife species	Highly Satisfactory	229	57.25
	Satisfactory	42	10.5
	Average	25	6.25
	Unsatisfactory	79	19.75
	Highly Unsatisfactory	25	6.25
Quality of Urban Surrounding	Highly Satisfactory	11	2.75
	Satisfactory	57	14.25
	Average	89	22.25
	Unsatisfactory	189	47.25
	Highly Unsatisfactory	54	13.5
Safety & Security	Highly Satisfactory	232	58
	Satisfactory	37	9.25
	Average	27	6.75
	Unsatisfactory	76	19
	Highly Unsatisfactory	28	7

From the table it is clearly Indicated that majority of the tourists were satisfied with the Wildlife Diversity, Lakes/ Rivers, Climate, Quality of Environment, Availability of wildlife Species and with safety and security at the wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir indicating that there is potential in the wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir that can satisfy the needs and wants of tourists from the environmental aspect of wildlife tourism which is main components/ attributes for the destination for qualifying to be wildlife tourism destination, so it clearly evident that Jammu and Kashmir is having huge potential of wildlife Tourism.

Ranking on mean**Potential and satisfaction of tourists from wildlife tourism attributes of Jammu & Kashmir****Table 2.1 showing ranking of attributes on basis of mean score and standard deviation**

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rank
Wildlife Diversity	400	1.96	1.35	1
Diverse historical attractions	400	1.98	1.34	2
Hospitality of local people	400	1.99	1.33	3
Friendliness of people	400	2.02	1.36	4
Lakes /rivers	400	2.04	1.37	5
Quality of Environment	400	2.07	1.39	6
Availability of wildlife species	400	2.07	1.41	7
Safety & Security	400	2.08	1.42	8
Climate	400	2.08	1.43	9
Availability of local cuisine	400	2.17	1.44	10
Availability of food	400	2.33	1.45	11
Quality of Roads	400	2.39	1.19	12
Local Transport	400	2.98	1.03	13
Tourist info Centers	400	3.09	.90	14

The table 2.1 presents the mean scores and standard deviations for various attributes related to wildlife tourism in Jammu & Kashmir, as rated by 400 tourists. Here's a brief interpretation:

1. Wildlife Diversity (Rank 1): Tourists highly value the diverse wildlife in Jammu & Kashmir, with a mean score of 1.96, indicating strong satisfaction.
2. Diverse Historical Attractions (Rank 2): Historical attractions also contribute significantly to tourist satisfaction, with a mean score of 1.98.
3. Hospitality of Local People (Rank 3): The hospitality of local people is perceived positively, with a mean score of 1.99.
4. Friendliness of People (Rank 4): The friendliness of the local population is appreciated, although slightly less than other factors, with a mean score of 2.02.
5. Lakes/Rivers (Rank 5): The presence of lakes and rivers is considered a positive aspect of wildlife tourism, with a mean score of 2.04.
6. Quality of Environment (Rank 6): The overall quality of the environment is rated positively, with a mean score of 2.07.
7. Availability of Wildlife Species (Rank 7): The variety and availability of wildlife species contribute to tourist satisfaction, with a mean score of 2.07.
8. Safety & Security (Rank 8): Safety and security are important considerations for tourists, and they are generally satisfied, with a mean score of 2.08.
9. Climate (Rank 9): The climate is considered a relatively important factor, with a mean score of 2.08.
10. Availability of Local Cuisine (Rank 10): The availability of local cuisine is moderately appreciated, with a mean score of 2.17.
11. Availability of Food (Rank 11): General food availability is rated slightly lower, with a mean score of 2.33.
12. Quality of Roads (Rank 12): The quality of roads is perceived positively but falls lower in satisfaction compared to other factors, with a mean score of 2.39.
13. Local Transport (Rank 13): Satisfaction with local transport is relatively lower compared to other attributes, with a mean score of 2.98.
14. Tourist Info Centers (Rank 14): Tourist information centers receive the lowest satisfaction rating, with a mean score of 3.09.

Weighted Sum Method (WSM) has been chosen in this study for Assessment of Wildlife Tourism Potential of Jammu and Kashmir. The methodology is furnished here in five sequential steps.

Step 1: Level-1 Attributes and Weight (Wi) Assignment

Three broad aspects namely physical, socio-cultural and environmental aspects have been considered as level-1 attributes for assessing tourism potential. The assignment of weights was worked through tourist survey. The weight value for a certain parameter was considered null if they are similar throughout the zone. So, three

different weights are considered in the first stage (W_p for physical, W_s for socio-cultural and W_e for environmental).

Step 2: Level-2 Attributes and Weight (w_j) Assignment

Each aspect of level-1 has a set of variables considered as level-2 attributes. These sets are explained here under.

1) Physical (W_p) aspects include quality of roads, quality of accommodation, availability of local transport, easy access to wildlife areas of J&K, sufficient parking near wildlife destinations and availability of food near wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir.

2) Socio-cultural (W_s) factors include hospitality of local people, customs & traditions of host community, safety and security for the visitors and diverse historic attractions

3) Environmental (W_e) aspects are wildlife diversity, lakes and rivers, climate, quality of environment, availability of wildlife species and quality of surroundings. Every respondent is asked to rank the attributes (1, 2, 3 ... n) for each group/set separately according to their preferences. The ranking data is arranged in matrices separately for each set-in table-1

Step 3: Intra-Attribute Scaling (s_j)

Level of quality or service for each attribute may not be similar for all the tourists. Depending upon variations in quality/quantity, each attribute is scaled in a 5-point scaling. These scales are related to grades from 1-5 based on logical interpretation and quantification of various levels. Hence, the step 1 and 2 indicates a global approach to be used for all parameters and step 3 is a local approach based on different variations set logically. For scaling, 1 refers to the worst/weakest quality (Highly unsatisfied) and 5 indicate the best/strongest quality (Highly satisfied). For computation, the lowest value is considered as 0.20 followed by 0.40, 0.60, 0.80 and the highest being 1.

Step 4: Computation of Aggregate Potential Value Potential value of a tourist spot is finally aggregated in an additive way. Value of W_i and w_j will range from 0-1 and s_j has 5 different values (0.20, 0.40, 0.60, 0.80 and 1.00). Lower values indicate weakness of tourism potential. The expression is as follows:

Total Potential (V) = Potential Value for Physical Aspects (V_p) + Potential Value for Sociocultural Aspects (V_s) + Potential Value for Environmental Aspects (V_e)

Or, Total Potential (V) = $W_p \cdot [w_{1s1} + w_{2s2} + \dots + w_{nsn}]$ physical + $W_s \cdot [w_{1s1} + w_{2s2} + \dots + w_{nsn}]$ socio-cultural + $W_e \cdot [w_{1s1} + w_{2s2} + \dots + w_{nsn}]$ environmental

Or, Potential (V) = $\sum W_i \cdot [\sum w_j s_j]$

Where,

W_i is the weight of Parameter level 1 for i th attribute,

w_j is weight of parameter level 2 for j th attribute

s_j is the scaling grade for j th attribute of level 2

Tourism Potential Results

Result of Step 1

As per expert opinion, weights (W_i) for physical, socio-cultural and environmental aspects had been considered as 0.40, 0.20 and 0.40, respectively.

Result of Step 2

The attributes under socio-cultural, physical and environmental aspects were selected from detailed literature review ((Li & Lo, 2004; McKercher & Ho, 2006; Sanchez Rivero et al., 2016). The socio-cultural aspects included four attributes in the preference order of hospitality of local people, customs and traditions of host community, diverse historic attraction and safety and Security at wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir as shown in table-3.1.

Table 3.1 The value of weights for the selected attributes.

Attributes and Ranks		Weights
Socio-cultural Attributes		
Rank 1	Hospitality of local people	0.40 [4/10]
Rank 2	Customs & Traditions of Host Community	0.30 [3/10]
Rank 3	Diverse Historic Attractions	0.20 [2/10]
Rank 4	Safety & Security	0.10 [1/10]
Cumulative Value: 1+2+3+4+5= 10		
Physical Attributes		
Rank 1	Quality of Roads	0.15 [12/78]
Rank 2	Quality of Accommodation	0.14 [11/78]
Rank 3	Availability of Local Transport	0.13 [10/78]
Rank 4	Easy Access to Wildlife Areas	0.12 [9/78]
Rank 5	Sufficient Parking Near Wildlife Destinations	0.10 [8/78]
Rank 6	Availability Of Food at wildlife spots	0.09 [7/78]
Rank 7	Availability of local Cuisines	0.08 [6/78]
Rank 8	Variety of Multiple Cuisines	0.06 [5/78]
Rank 9	Availability of Tourist Information Center	0.05 [4/78]
Rank 10	Availability of Shopping Facilities	0.04 [3/78]
Rank 11	Availability of Leisure Activates	0.03 [2/78]
Rank 12	Availability of Market	0.01 [1/78]
Cumulative Value= 1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10=11=12=78		
Environmental Attributes		
Rank 1	Wildlife Diversity	0.28 [6/21]
Rank 2	Lakes & Rivers	0.23 [5/21]
Rank 3	Climate	0.19 [4/21]
Rank 4	Quality of Environment	0.14 [3/21]
Rank 5	Availability of Wildlife Species	0.09 [2/21]
Rank 6	Cleanliness at site	0.04 [1/21]
Cumulative Value= 1+2+3+4+5+6= 21		

After normalization (i.e., the sum of all weights will be 1), attribute 1 will obtain 4/10 i.e., 0.40, attribute 2 as 0.30, attribute 3 as 0.20 and attribute 4 as 0.10.

The socio-culture aspects had been distributed over 6 parameters. The preference order was hospitality of local people, friendly nature of host community, customs & traditions of host community, safety and security for the visitors and diverse historic attractions.

The physical aspects had been distributed over 12 parameters. The preference order was quality of roads, quality of accommodation, availability of local transport, easy access to wildlife areas, sufficient parking near wildlife destinations and availability of food, availability of local Cuisines, availability of multiple cuisines, availability of tourist information centers, availability of Shopping Facilities, availability of Leisure activities and availability of general market as shown in table 3.1. The environmental aspects had been distributed over 6 parameters. The preference order was wildlife diversity, lakes and rivers, climate, quality of environment, availability of wildlife species and quality of surroundings as shown in table 3.1.

Result of Step 3: Interpretations of comparative marking of 1-5 were based on availability of Wildlife Species at Wildlife Destinations of J & K. Table 3.2 exhibits a sample scaling of a single parameter. For ease of computation, the values from 0.2 – 1.0 has been provided.

Table 3.2: Interpretation of Scaling for a Sample Attribute

Attribute	1 (0.20)	2 (0.40)	3 (0.60)	4 (0.80)	5 (1.00)
Availability of Wildlife Species	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Average	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied

Result of Step 4:

(a) Total Potential Value VT ($\sum W_i[\sum w_{jsj}]$) = 0.40*Potential Value in Socio-cultural Aspects (Vs) + 0.20*Potential Value in Physical Aspects (Vp)+0.40*Potential Value in Environmental Aspects (Ve)

(b) Potential Value in Socio-Cultural Aspects VS ($\sum w_{jsj}$) = 0.40*Hospitality of Local People (SC1) + 0.30*Customs & Traditions of Host Community (SE2) + 0.20*Diverse Historic Attractions (SE3) + 0.10*Safety & Security (S4)

(c) Potential Value in Physical Aspects VP ($\sum w_{jpj}$) = 0.15* Quality of Roads (P1) + 0.14* Quality of the accommodation (P2) + 0.13* Availability of Local Transport (P3) + 0.12* Easy Access to wildlife Areas (P4) + 0.10* Sufficient Parking near Wildlife Destinations of Jammu and Kashmir(P5) + 0.09* Availability of Food near Wildlife Destinations (P6) +0.08*Availability of local Cuisines (P7) + 0.06*Availability of Multiple Cuisines (P8) + 0.05* Availability of Tourist Information Centers (P9) + 0.04 *Availability of Shopping Facilities (P10) + 0.03 *Availability of Leisure activities (P11) +0.01* Availability of General Market (P12).

(d)Potential Value in Environmental Aspects Ve ($\sum w_{jej}$) = 0.28* Wildlife Diversity (E1) + 0.23* Lakes & Rivers (E2) +0.19* Climate (E3) +0.14* Quality of Environment (E4) +0.09* Availability of Wildlife Species (E5) + 0.04* Cleanliness at wildlife destinations of J & K (E6).

As calculated, potential values of sociocultural (VS), physical (VP), environmental aspects (Ve) and total (VT) range from 0 to 1.

Table 3.3: Potential Values for Wildlife Tourism in Jammu & Kashmir

Table 3.3: Potential values for Wildlife Tourism in Sumatra & Rushmi				
ASPECTS	ATTRIBUTES	GRADES	Potential alues	Total Potential Value
SOCIAL & CULTURAL	SC1	0.90	0.90	0.79
	SC2	0.90		
	SC3	0.90		
	SC4	0.90		
PHYSICAL	P1	0.81	0.72	
	P2	0.70		
	P3	0.72		
	P4	0.70		
	P5	0.71		
	P6	0.91		
	P7	0.89		
	P8	0.89		
	P9	0.70		
	P10	0.72		
	P11	0.70		
	P12	0.72		
ENVIRONMENTAL	E1	0.92	87	
	E2	0.90		
	E3	0.90		
	E4	0.90		
	E5	0.90		
	E6	0.76		

Conclusion of the study:

Tourists in Jammu & Kashmir highly value wildlife diversity, historical attractions, and the hospitality of local people. Safety, climate, and environmental quality are also important. Areas for improvement include the availability of local cuisine, general food availability, and the quality of roads. Additionally, local transport and tourist information centers may need attention to enhance the overall tourist experience.

The tourism potential has been quantified as 0.79 considering the physical, socio-cultural and environmental aspects of the place which indicate that Wildlife tourism have huge potential to attract tourists. As per the data collected from the respondents who visited the wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir the areas of strength are an exceptionally Wildlife Diversity, Lakes & Rivers, Climate, Quality of Environment, Availability of Wildlife Species, hospitality of local people, customs & traditions of host community, safety and security for the visitors and diverse historic attractions, as it is evident from the Table no 3.1 which shows that these destination attributes (Environmental) got score 0.90-0.92 except E6 (Cleanness at destinations) which got lower grade. Followed by the Physical aspect of the destination such as Quality of Roads Availability of Food near Wildlife Destinations, Availability of local Cuisines and Availability of Multiple Cuisines (Grade Score in-between 80-90). In case of social and cultural attributes the results got the grades of 0.90 which very close to 1 that indicates that wildlife destinations of Jammu and Kashmir are having huge potential in social and cultural attractiveness. The areas of weakness in physical aspects are Quality of the accommodation, Availability of Local Transport, Easy Access to wildlife Areas and Sufficient Parking near Wildlife Destinations of Jammu and Kashmir as i got the results in-between 0.70- 0.76 which were not too much satisfying as they could be enhanced as other attributes which got the results touching 0.90-0.92, which were showing high satisfaction towards destination attractiveness attributes which is indication of huge potential of destination attractiveness, so there is the need to enhance the quality of destination attractiveness attributes like cleanness at wildlife destination, Availability of Tourist Information Centers, Availability of Shopping Facilities and Availability of General Market near Wildlife destinations Jammu and Kashmir to utilize the tourism potential of Wildlife Tourism Destinations of Jammu and Kashmir fullest.

Reference

1. Anderson, D. M., & Garrison, D. J. (1997). Ecology and oceanography of harmful algal blooms.
2. Azevedo, F. S. (2011). Lines of practice: A practice-centered theory of interest relationships. *Cognition and Instruction*, 29, 147–184. doi:10.1080/07370008.2011.556834
3. Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Hughes, K. (2009). Tourists' support for conservation messages and sustainable management practices in wildlife tourism experiences. *Tourism management*, 30(5), 658-664.
4. Ballantyne, R., Packer, J., & Sutherland, L. A. (2011). Visitors' memories of wildlife tourism: Implications for the design of powerful interpretive experiences. *Tourism management*, 32(4), 770-779.
5. Balmford, A., Green, J. M., Anderson, M., Beresford, J., Huang, C., Naidoo, R., ... & Manica, A. (2015). Walk on the wild side: estimating the global magnitude of visits to protected areas. *PLoS biology*, 13(2), e1002074.
6. Boo, E. (1990). *Ecotourism: the potentials and pitfalls: country case studies*. WWF.
7. Buckley, B. C. (2000). Interactive multimedia and model-based learning in biology. *International journal of science education*, 22(9), 895-935.
8. Cater, C., & Cater, E. (2001). Marine environments. In *The encyclopedia of ecotourism* (pp. 265-282). Wallingford UK: CABI Publishing.
9. Curtin, S. (2013). Lessons from Scotland: British wildlife tourism demand, product development and destination management. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2(3), 196-211.
10. Dallimer, M., Irvine, K. N., Skinner, A. M., Davies, Z. G., Rouquette, J. R., Maltby, L. L., & Gaston, K. J. (2012). Biodiversity and the feel-good factor: understanding associations between self-reported human well-being and species richness. *BioScience*, 62(1), 47-55.
11. Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2010). The 95 percent solution. *American Scientist*, 98(6), 486-493.
12. Ferrari, A. L., Brenner, T. L., Dalcomo, M. T., & Nunes, H. R. C. (1982). O Precambriano das folhas Itaboraí, Maricá, Saquarema e Baía de Guanabara. In *CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE GEOLOGIA* (Vol. 32, pp. 103-114).
13. Folmer, A., Haartsen, T., & Huigen, P. P. (2013). The role of wildlife in emotional attachment to a nature-based tourism destination. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 12(3), 131-145.
14. Garrison, A. D. (1997). Darwin 1942. *Australian Defence Force Journal*, (122), 41-77.
15. Gladstone, D. L. (2013). *From pilgrimage to package tour: Travel and tourism in the third world*. Routledge.
16. Gladstone, W., Curley, B., & Shokri, M. R. (2013). Environmental impacts of tourism in the Gulf and the Red Sea. *Marine pollution bulletin*, 72(2), 375-388.
17. Gossling, S. (2002). Global environmental consequences of tourism. *Global environmental change*, 12(4), 283-302.

- 18.Green, R., Higginbottom, K., & Northrope, C. (2001). *A tourism classification of Australian wildlife*. CRC for Sustainable Tourism.
- 19.Holden, A. (2016). An introduction to tourism–environment relationships. In *Ecotourism and environmental sustainability* (pp. 17-30). Routledge.
- 20.Kals, E., Schumacher, D., & Montada, L. (1999). Emotional affinity toward nature as a motivational basis to protect nature. *Environment and behavior*, 31(2), 178-202.
- 21.Kals, E., Schumacher, D., & Montada, L. (1999). Emotional affinity toward nature as a motivational basis to protect nature. *Environment and behavior*, 31(2), 178-202.
- 22.Laarman, J. G., & Durst, P. B. (1987). Nature travel in the tropics. *Journal of Forestry*, 85(5), 43-46.
- 23.Liberatore, A., Bowkett, E., MacLeod, C. J., Spurr, E., & Longnecker, N. (2018). Social media as a platform for a citizen science community of practice. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*, 3(1), 3-3.
- 24.Liu, C. C. and Falk, J. H. (2014). ‘Serious Fun: Viewing Hobbyist Activities through a Learning Lens’. *International Journal of Science Education, Part B* 4 (4), pp. 343–355.
- 25.Longnecker, N. (2016). An integrated model of science communication—More than providing evidence. *Journal of Science Communication*, 15(05), Y01.
- 26.Lott, D. F. (1988). Feeding wild animals: The urge, the interaction, and the consequences. *Anthrozoös*, 1(4), 255-257.
- 27.Milton, K. (2003). *Loving nature: Towards an ecology of emotion*. Routledge.
- 28.Newsome, D., Moore, S. A., & Dowling, R. K. (2012). *Natural area tourism: Ecology, impacts and management*. Multilingual Matters.
- 29.Nianyong, H., & Zhuge, R. (2001). Ecotourism in China's nature reserves: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(3), 228-242.
- 30.Prideaux, B., & Cooper, M. (Eds.). (2009). *River tourism*. Cabi.
- 31.Reynolds, P. C., & Braithwaite, D. (2001). Towards a conceptual framework for wildlife tourism. *Tourism management*, 22(1), 31-42.
- 32.Reynolds, P. C., & Braithwaite, D. (2001). Towards a conceptual framework for wildlife tourism. *Tourism management*, 22(1), 31-42.
- 33.Rodger, K., Moore, S. A., & Newsome, D. (2007). Wildlife tours in Australia: Characteristics, the place of science and sustainable futures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(2), 160-179.
- 34.Schänzel, H. A., & McIntosh, A. J. (2000). An insight into the personal and emotive context of wildlife viewing at the Penguin Place, Otago Peninsula, New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1), 36-52.
- 35.Sedarati, P., Santos, S., & Pintassilgo, P. (2019). System dynamics in tourism planning and development. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 16(3), 256-280.
- 36.Semeniuk, C. A., Haider, W., Cooper, A., & Rothley, K. D. (2010). A linked model of animal ecology and human behavior for the management of wildlife tourism. *Ecological Modelling*, 221(22), 2699-2713.
- 37.Seppänen, J., & Väliaverronen, E. (2003). Visualizing biodiversity: The role of photographs in environmental discourse. *Science as Culture*, 12(1), 59-85.
- 38.Shackley, M. (1996). *Wildlife tourism*. International Thomson Business Press.
- 39.Skibins, J. C., Powell, R. B., & Hallo, J. C. (2013). Charisma and conservation: charismatic megafauna's influence on safari and zoo tourists' pro-conservation behaviors. *Biodiversity and conservation*, 22, 959-982.
- 40.Travel, W. T. T. C., & Impact, T. E. (2012). World Travel and Tourism Council. Retrieved September, 30, 2012.
- 41.Vining, J. (2003). The connection to other animals and caring for nature. *Human Ecology Review*, 87-99.