
VIRTUAL AND REAL EXPERIENCE OF TOURISTS IN PONDICHERRY DESTINATION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Venkata Rao. Y¹ and Thrinadha Rao. B²

¹*Department of Tourism Studies, School of Management, Pondicherry University,
Puducherry India.*

²*Department of Management, NEHU, Tura Campus Chandmari, Tura, Meghalaya, India*

Abstract

In the last one and half decade, tourism business has been redefined due to its extensive alignment with information and communication technology (ICT). No longer has tourist had to travel and physically present for having real experience of fauna and flora of an exotic tourist destination. ICT is widely used in not only all tour and travel related but also in creating virtual tours. A virtual world is a computer-mediated reality which presents the user with an experience which can be reasoned about as if it is a world, but the representation of that world is not required to be analog to a possible physical alternative. Several academics and practitioners have identified the online shopping experience or virtual experience as a crucial e-commerce marketing issue. Considering that an online customer is information technology user, one can argue that the virtual experience is a more complicated issue than the physical/real experience. Puducherry, being gateway to France of India, is predominantly known place as tourism destination not only in India but also across the world. As such, the present has been conducted in Puducherry to study the difference between virtual experience and real experience of the tourist. For the study propose, the sampled respondents were drawn from major tourist spots of Pondicherry. Both primary and secondary data are used and the primary data is enumerated from field survey method and analyzed with suitable statistical tools. The analysis of the primary data has brought out interesting facts about the tourist virtual and real experience. The key findings of the study are: the tourists are largely getting information from friends and other people, whereas the websites (virtual sources) are the second major source of information to know about the tourist destination. It is interesting to note that the most of the variables are showing moderate correlation among themselves. Partial correlation was used to find out the impact of correlations among the variables while controlling reliability and trust worthiness of information and matching of tourist's imaginary expectation with real experience. In the regression analysis, all the variables are tested for multicollinearity and standard error. All the variables are categorized into three groups /models and analyzed with regression. All the models are statistically significant. The multicollinearity and standard error of the variables in all the three models are very less. Paired T- Test was conducted to estimate the impact of virtual experience on real experience. It shows a significant impact of virtual experience on real experience. Thus, the present study is empirically evident in reflecting impact of virtual experiences over real experience of the tourist on their travel to experience physically the features of tourist destination.

Keywords: Virtual, Real Experience, Tourism

Introduction

Virtual world (VW) is a spatially based depiction of a persistent virtual environment, which can be experienced by numerous participants at once, who are represented within the space by avatars" (Koster, 2004). A *virtual world* is a computer-mediated reality which presents the user with an experience which can be reasoned about as if it is a world, but the representation of that world is not required to be analog to a possible physical alternative. The

realm of practical or actual experience, as opposed to the abstract, theoretical, or idealized sphere of the classroom, laboratory, etc. recent college graduates looking for Jobs in the real world of rising unemployment.

The VW has become increasingly popular in recent years, with over 200 million registered avatars in nine VWs (Kingsley and Wankel, 2009)³. For example more than half a million users, weekly log in to second life. The most recently popular VW communities are Second Life, Active Worlds, Kaneva, Multiverse, Brand Worlds and Worlds.com. The implementation of VWs is being ubiquitously applied in many industries with even training and distance educational services using VWs to explore new educational environments that can enhance learning effectiveness. Because of its popularity and potential implications, there has been an explosion of interest in studying and measuring Virtual Experience (VE) (Novak, Hoffman and Yung, 2000; Takatalo, Nyman and Laaksonen, 2008; Faiola and Smyslova, 2009⁷; Thomas et al., 2010).

Several academics and practitioners have identified the “online shopping experience” or “virtual experience” as a crucial e-commerce marketing issue. Tamimi et al. (2003)¹⁴ define the online shopping experience as a process of four stages describing the successive steps of an online transaction. Considering that an online customer is not simply a shopper but also an information technology user (Cho and Park, 2001) one can argue that the online experience is a more complicated issue than the physical shopping experience: the Web experience can be defined as the consumer’s total impression about the online company (Watchfire Whitepaper Series, 2000) resulting from his/her exposure to a combination of virtual marketing tools “...under the marketer’s direct control, likely to influence the buying behavior of the online consumer” (Constantinides, 2002, p. 60).

Many people view travel and tourism as luxurious, relaxing, and as exciting opportunities to experience new cultures, to see new sights, and find adventure. Although traveling can be all of those things for the consumer (traveler), tourism is more than just taking vacation to an exotic destination-it is also a living and breathing industry that is complex and diverse. In order for the tourism industry to flourish and thrive, it needs professionals who make intelligent business and marketing decisions (Gartrell, 1994). Behind all the travel pamphlets, Internet tourism advertisements, and travel package television commercials are individuals who make strategic decisions of how to market tourism destinations in ways that will convince consumers to travel. It is challenging and interesting to seek creative ways to market tourism destinations with appealing advertisements that help persuade consumers to actually travel. For tourism destination marketers, it is imperative to know what forms of advertising should be used to attract and convince consumers to make travel-purchasing decisions.

Virtual worlds create an opportunities for engaging and exciting experiences for distance learners and educators. Virtual worlds like second life offer distance learning experiences so visually real that students can almost reach out and touch them.¹⁵

This study focuses on the virtual experience of the tourist gained through different forms of information like newspapers, magazines, websites, photo exhibitions, movies/documentary, and through friends and to know how far the tourist are influenced by the virtual experience. And later to find out whether the real experience is being matched with the virtual experience.

Literature Review

Stacey Szumiak and Neha Singh (2007), titled “*Studying the Impacts of Tourism Destination Advertising Using Text, Pictures, and Virtual Worlds*” This study compares three

types of tourism advertising media: text, pictures, and virtual tour experience. The purpose is to explore which form is most effective in getting consumers to make tourism-purchasing decisions, based on their involvement with the advertisement (ad), their attitudes toward the ad, and the intention to travel to the destination the ads are marketing.

Amanda Davies and Barney Dalgarno (2009), titled “*Learning fire investigation the clean way: The virtual experience*”, this paper describes a quantitative and qualitative study exploring the effectiveness of this teaching resource. A key finding from this study was that students felt that the virtual fire investigation task had important advantages over undertaking a real investigation task, even though there were some limitations in the overall degree of realism of the experience. The results also suggested that students found that the visual fidelity and navigation capabilities provided within the environment were quite adequate for carrying out their fire investigation activity.

Jesse Fox, et al. (2009), titled “*Virtual Experiences, Physical Behaviors: The Effect of Presence on Imitation of an Eating Avatar*”, in this study, the role of presence in the imitation of a virtual model was examined. Immersive virtual environment technology (IVET) was used to create photorealistic virtual representations of the self that were depicted eating food in a virtual world. Changes in the virtual environment (via a changing or unchanging body) were incorporated to create variance in perceived subjective presence. Based on previous research, presence was hypothesized to affect the relationship between the environmental manipulations and the behavioral outcome of imitating the avatar’s eating behavior. They showed that presence did indeed affect imitation, but that the effects varied for men and women in accordance with previous research on sex differences in eating behavior. Men who experienced high presence were more likely than low presence men to imitate the virtual model and eat candy, whereas women who experienced high presence were more likely than low presence women to suppress the behavior and not eat candy.

Laura W. Jodice and William C. Norman (2007) titled, “*Interest in “virtual” and “real” shrimp related experiences among coastal and shrimp festival tourists in South Carolina, USA*”, this paper compares South Carolina Coastal Tourists and Beaufort, South Carolina Shrimp Festival attendees with respect to their interest in ‘virtual’ and ‘real’ shrimp-related experiences. Results of the analyses revealed that South Carolina Coastal Tourists were significantly more interested in ‘virtual’ than ‘real’ experiences and that there was not a significant difference between an interest in ‘real’ and ‘virtual’ opportunities for Festival Tourists.

Hairong Li et al. (2001) titled, “*The Role of Virtual Experience in Consumer Learning*”, this paper reports the findings of four studies. The first study is a pre-test designed to delineate three test products corresponding with the salient properties geometric, material and mechanical necessary to examine virtual affordances. The second study examines the differences in consumer learning between two forms of interactive content in order to test the relationships between real, perceived and virtual affordances. The third study extends and further compares the cognitive activities of consumers when evaluating different forms of interactive products. Finally, the fourth study examines the effects of 3-D product visualization in an online environment compared to television advertising in order to isolate the effect of user-controlled interactivity, a core component of virtual affordances, while holding media richness constant.

Chris Campbell (2009) titled, “*Pre-service education students using an online virtual world*”. This research study analyses a project where pre-service education students accessed Second Life as part of a 4th year elective course. The students had not used this virtual world prior to being introduced to it in class. They completed a problem-based learning experience in Second Life that allowed the students to explore the virtual world, as well as develop an

activity that could be taught to a high school class. These studies have given space to the investigator to raise the following research questions are raised.

- What are the ways of getting (information) virtual experience?
- How the tourists are influenced by their virtual experience?
- What is the impact of virtual experience on decision making?
- What is the perception of tourist regarding to his/her virtual and real experiences?

In the light of above research question, the present study has undertaken to address the objectives as follows.

- To find out the ways of getting virtual experience.
- To know how far the tourist are influenced by virtual experience.
- To understand, analyse and interpret the impact of virtual experience on decision making.
- To draw logical conclusion by assimilating the perception of tourist regarding to his/her virtual and real experiences by providing empirical evidence.

Research Methodology

This exploratory study adopts a qualitative research approach to investigate the virtual attributes which are influencing tourist's real experiences. A questionnaire was constructed having open and close ended questions with four point scale. Simple Random Sampling method is adopted for this research. Since the members are large in number it was distributed randomly and collected responses from 70 respondents. The sample of this study includes both domestic (different parts of India) and international tourists (Germany, France, Canada, Scotland, Italy, and Chile). The researcher has used SPSS 17 software package to analyse the primary data collected through schedule.

The present research attempt is made on the analysis of data with the help of the following statistical tools like Correlation, Regression, Descriptive statistics, Paired t-test and independent sample t-test

Data Analysis: The percentage analysis is done to find out the percentage of the respondents who opted for the source of information. From the above table it is derived that maximum (37 per cent) respondents have got information through their friends having, 17 per cent of the respondents are from websites, 14 per cent are from movies/documentaries, 12 per cent are from books (other sources) and the rest are getting information from Newspapers, Magazines and through Photo exhibitions.

Table 1: Getting information through different channels

<i>Sl. No</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	Newspaper	6
2	Websites	17
3	Magazines	9
4	Movies/documentary	14
5	Photo exhibition	5
6	Friends	37
7	Others	12

Correlation matrix: Pearson's product moment Correlation coefficient was used to investigate the relations among different variables which influence virtual experience of tourists, impact of virtual experience on decision making and the perception of tourists regarding their virtual and real experience.

Table-2: Correlation Matrix

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
idea of visiting Pondicherry	1	.11	.009	.017	.015	.000	.006	.051	.0002	.049	.028	.002	.008	.000
pictorial material	.333**	1	.226	.334	.322	.077	.038	.056	.085	.180	.237	.044	.174	.000
influenced by sources of info	.132	.578**	.034**	1	.348	.017	.009	.024	.091	.174	.273	.050	.008	.053
reliability & trust	.124	.568**	.541**	.590**	1	.241	.073	.182	.121	.421	.207	.057	.024	.089
info drawn your attention	.000	.279*	.468**	.134	.491**	1	.488	.243	.033	.070	.003	.023	.118	.009
framing imagination	-.076	.195	.456**	-.095	.271*	.699**	1	.297	.029	.094	.013	.075	.068	.028
your decision to visit	.228+	.236*	.197	.156	.426**	.493**	.545**	1	.039	.082	.041	.002	.002	.016
After visiting your feeling	.013	.292*	.386**	.303*	.349**	.184	.171	.198	1	.163	.071	.006	.119	.000
how far match	.222+	.425**	.585**	.417**	.649**	.264*	.307**	.287*	.404**	1	.186	.086	.024	.053
understanding a place	.169	.487**	.333**	.523**	.456**	.058	-.114	.203+	.268*	.432**	1	.343	.012	.012
guiding tourist	-.054	.212+	.128	.224+	.240*	-.152	-.275*	-.054	.079	.294*	.586**	1	.002	.153
Age	-.094	.417**	.460**	.090	.156	.344**	.261*	.042	.345**	.157	.110	.048	1	.028
qualification	-.024	-.004	.070	-.232+	-.299*	.098	.170	-.129	.021	-.231+	-.113	-.392**	.116	1

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

+Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: primary data analysis

There was a medium positive correlation between idea of visiting Pondicherry and the influence of pictorial presentation of respondents, $r = .333$, $P < .01$, with medium level of influence of pictorial presentation associated with increasing medium level of idea of visiting Pondicherry. The influence of pictorial presentation helps to explain nearly 11 percent of the variance in respondents' scores on the idea of visiting Pondicherry. The influence of pictorial presentation is moderately correlated with the attracted by material information ($r = .48$, $P < .01$), matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .425$, $P < .01$), knowing and understanding a place ($r = .487$, $P < .01$), age of the respondents ($r = .417$, $P < .01$), and highly correlated with influence by sources of information ($r = .578$, $P < .01$), and reliability and trust worthiness of information ($r = .568$, $P < .01$). It is observed that there is a low correlation with information drawn your attention ($r = .279$, $P < .05$), decision to visit Pondicherry ($r = .236$, $P < .05$), and comfortableness ($r = .292$, $P < .05$). The influence of pictorial representation helps to explain nearly 22.6 percent in respondents scores are attracted by material information, 33.4 percent are influenced by sources of information, reliability and trust worthiness of information (32.2 percent), knowing and understanding a place (18 percent), age of respondents (17.4 percent), sources of information drawn your attention (7.7 percent), decision to visit Pondicherry (5.6 percent), and comfortableness (8.5 percent).

The variable attracted by material information of sources has medium positive correlation with influenced by sources of information ($r = .34$, $P < .01$), information drawn your attention ($r = .468$, $P < .01$), framing imagination about Pondicherry as tourist destination ($r = .456$, $P < .01$), comfortableness ($r = .386$, $P < .01$), knowing and understanding a place ($r = .333$, $P < .01$), age of the respondents ($r = .460$, $P < .01$), and largely correlated with reliability and trust worthiness of information ($r = .541$, $P < .01$), matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .585$, $P < .01$). Attracted by material information helps to explain nearly 11.4 percent, 21.9 percent, 20.7 percent, 14.9 percent, 11 percent, 21.2 percent with medium correlations, 29.2 percent and 34.2 percent with high correlations respectively. Influenced by sources of information has large /high positive correlation with reliability and trust worthiness of

information ($r = .590, P < .01$), and knowing and understanding a place ($r = .523, P < .01$), with high level of influenced by sources of information associated with higher levels of reliability and trust worthiness of information and knowing and understanding a place. Medium correlation with comfortableness ($r = .303, P < .05$), matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .649, P < .01$), it explains nearly 42.1 percent in matching real with imaginary experience and it has medium correlation with information drawn your attention ($r = .491, P < .01$), imaginary Pondicherry influenced on respondents decision to visit Pondicherry ($r = .426, P < .01$), comfortableness ($r = .349, P < .01$), knowing and understanding a place ($r = .456, P < .01$) and these variables helps to explain 24.1 percent, 18.2 percent, 12.1 percent and 10.7 percent by reliability and trust worthiness of information. It is found that reliability and trust worthiness of information has small positive correlation with framing imagination about Pondicherry as a tourist destination ($r = .271, P < .05$), virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable ($r = .240, P < .05$) and negatively correlated with qualification of the respondents ($r = -.299, P < .05$).

The variable information drawn your attention shows large positive correlation with framing imagination about Pondicherry as a tourist destination ($r = .699, P < .01$), with high level of information drawn your attention associated with higher levels of framing imagination about Pondicherry as a tourist destination. It helps to explain 48.8 percent framing imagination and shows medium correlation with respondents decision to visit Pondicherry ($r = .493, P < .01$), age ($r = .344, P < .01$) and small correlation with matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .264, P < .05$).

Framing imagination about Pondicherry has high positive correlation with respondents' decision to visit ($r = .545, P < .01$), medium correlation with matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .307, P < .01$) and these two helps to explain 29.7 percent and 9.4 percent of the variance respectively by the variable framing imagination. Respondents' decision to visit Pondicherry has small positive correlation with matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .287, P < .05$). Comfortableness shows medium correlation with matching real with imaginary experience ($r = .404, P < .01$), age ($r = .345, P < .01$), and small correlation with knowing and understanding a place ($r = .268, P < .05$), and these helps to explain 16.3 percent, 11.9 percent and 7.1 percent of variances respectively by comfortableness. Matching real with imaginary experience shows medium positive correlation with knowing and understanding a place ($r = .432, P < .01$), and small positive correlation with virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable ($r = .294, P < .05$), and these two variables helps to explain 18.6 percent and 8.6 percent of variance respectively by matching real with imaginary experience. There was a positive correlation between knowing and understanding a place and virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable at real location ($r = .586, P < .01$), with high levels of understanding a place associated with higher levels of virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable and it helps to explain 34.3 percent of variance in virtual information guiding by understanding a place.

Partial correlation: Partial correlation was used to explore the relationship among the variables while controlling reliability and trust worthiness of information and matching real with imaginary experience. There was a medium positive correlation between influenced by sources of information and influenced by pictorial presentation ($r = .362, P < .01$), information drawn your attention and attracted by material information ($r = .330, P < .01$). Framing imagination about Pondicherry as tourists destination has medium positive correlation with attracted by material information ($r = .346, P < .01$), medium negative correlation with influenced by sources of information ($r = -.343, P < .01$), high positive correlation with information drawn

your attention ($r = .704, P < .01$). Respondents' decision to visit Pondicherry has medium positive correlation with information drawn your attention ($r = .362, P < .01$), framing imagination about Pondicherry ($r = .499, P < .01$), knowing and understanding a place has medium positive correlation with influenced by sources of information ($r = .350, P < .01$), medium negative correlation with framing imagination about Pondicherry ($r = -.325, P < .01$). Virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable has medium negative correlation with framing imagination about Pondicherry ($r = -.411, P < .01$), and high positive correlation with knowing and understanding a place ($r = .534, P < .01$). The variable age has medium correlation with influenced by pictorial presentation ($r = .400, P < .01$), attracted by material information ($r = .458, P < .01$), information drawn your attention ($r = .318, P < .01$), qualification has medium positive correlation with influenced by material information and medium negative correlation with virtual information guides tourist to feel more comfortable ($r = -.342, P < .01$).

Table 3: Partial Correlation Matrix

Control Variables		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Matching real with imaginary exp. & reliability and trust worthiness	idea of visiting pondi	1.000	.096	.001	.064	.004	.023	.038	.007	.008	.016	.017	.000
	Pictorial	.311 ⁺	1.000	.051	.131	.000	.0014	.000	.010	.090	.006	.16	.047
	Material	-.035	.227 ⁺	1.000	.000	.11	.119	.002	.030	.002	.005	.209	.109
	influenced by sources of info	.064	.362* *	.009	1.000	.047	.117	.017	0.01	.123	.009	.000	.004
	Info. drawn ur attention	-.056	.007	.330* *	-.218 ⁺	1.00 0	.495	.131	.001	.041	.096	.101	.085
	framing imagination	-.154	.037	.346* *	-.343**	.704 **	1.000	.249	.001	.105	.168	.048	.082
	your decision to visit	.196	-.009	-.052	-.131	.362 **	.499**	1.00 0	.003	.000	.033	.000	.000
	After visiting ur feeling	-.084	.103	.176	.118	.038	.043	.056	1.00 0	.007	.002	.093	.024
	understanding a place	.094	.301 ⁺	.045	.350**	- .203	-.325**	.007	.085	1.00 0	.285	.000	.001
	guiding tourist	-.127	.079	-.076	.096	- .311 +	-.411**	- .183	- .054	.534 **	1.000	.000	.116
	Age	-.132	.400* *	.458* *	-.006	.318 **	.221 ⁺	- .028	.306 +	.030	-.003	1.000	.031
	qualification	.024	.217 ⁺	.331* *	-.069	.292 +	.288 ⁺	- .001	.158	.038	-.342**	.177	1.00 0

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

+Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Primary data analysis

Regression Analysis : A standard multiple regression was performed between reliability and trust worthiness of information as the dependant variable and influenced by sources of information, pictorial presentation and attracted by material information as independent variables. All the correlated variables are categorized into 3 models and standard multiple regression was performed.

Model -1: A standard multiple regression was performed between reliability and trust worthiness of information as dependent variable and influenced by sources of information,

pictorial presentation and attracted by material information as independent variable. The model was tested for multicollinearity. The variable influenced by sources of information has the values for VIF is 1.513 and tolerance is .661, this means nearly 65.2 percent the variability of independent variable is influenced by sources of information is not explained by the other independent variable is in the model -1 (the cooks distance value (min .000, max .269) for the entire model is less than 1. This shows that the multicollinearity effect is very less to the independent variable influenced by sources of information and to the entire model -1). The variable influenced by pictorial presentation has the values for VIF is 1.731 and tolerance is .578. It shows that 57.4 percent (1-R²) of the variability of this independent variable is not explained by the other independent variable in this model. The value for VIF and tolerance of the independent variable attracted by material information are 1.303 and .768 respectively. This shows that 49.6 percent of the variability of this independent variable is not explained by other independent variables in this model -1 is less than 1. This shows that effect of multicollinearity is very less in the model -1.

Table 4: Regression Analysis.

Independent Variable	Model – 2			Model - 3		Model - 4		
	influenced by sources of info	Pictorial	material	info drawn your attention	framing imagination	After visiting real/phys exp	knowing a place	Virtual guiding
Mean	2.10	2.11	2.50	2.20	2.24	1.99	1.87	2.21
Sd	.935	.971	.847	.878	.770	.466	.797	.866
R ²	.348	.426	.504	.322	.297	.276	.187	.283
Adjusted R ²	.339	.409	.482	.301	.287	.255	.175	.250
Beta	.362	.207	.320	.218	.393	.318	.289	.099
Sig	.001	.074	.002	.126	.007	.005	.034	.447
VIF	1.513	1.731	1.303	1.956	1.956	1.088	1.647	1.539
F	36.314**	24.829**	22.362**	15.889**	28.792**	12.782**	15.636**	8.663**
Tolerance	.661	.578	.768	.511	.511	.919	.607	.650
Cooks Distance	Min .000	Max .269		Min .000	Max .150	Min .000	Max .066	

* p < 0.05, two-tiled test

** p < 0.01, two-tiled test

Model – 1: Dependent Variable: how are you influenced by reliability and trust worthiness of information?

Model – 2: Dependent Variable: To what extent the imaginary Pondicherry influenced on your decision to visit.

Model – 3: Dependent Variable: After visiting the place (having real/physical experience) how far you feel that you match with the imaginary expectation/experience?

Source: Primary data analysis.

In the model -1, the variables influenced by sources of information (F = 36.314, SD = .935, R² = .348, AR² = .339, Beta = .362, P < .001), influenced by pictorial presentation (F = 24.829, SD = .971, R² = .426, AR² = .409, Beta = .207, P < .10) and attracted by material information (F = 22.362, SD = .847, R² = .504, AR² = .482, Beta = .320, P < .002) are statistically significant. In the model -1 the variable influenced by sources of information explains 33.9 percent (AR² = .339) of the variance, influenced by pictorial presentation explains 40.9 percent (AR² = .409) of the variance and attracted by material information explains (AR² = .482) 48.2 percent of variance in the independent variable is reliability and trust worthiness of information. The variables influenced by sources of information makes the strongest unique contribution (beta = .362, P < .001) to explain the dependent variable reliability and trust worthiness of information, when variance explained by all other variables (i.e. influenced by

pictorial presentation (beta =.207, $P < .10$), information drawn your attention (beta =.320, $P < .002$) in the model-1 are controlled.

The variables influenced by sources of information ($P=.001$) attracted by material information ($P=.002$) are significant at 1 percent level of significance and influenced by pictorial presentation ($P=.074$) is significant at 10 percent level of significance with the dependent variable reliability and trust worthiness of information. This shows that if one standard deviation changes in independent variable influenced by sources of information, pictorial presentation and attracted by material information will bring .362, .207 and .320 deviations change respectively in the dependent variables reliability and trust worthiness of information.

Model -11: A standard multiple regression was performed between decision to visit as the dependent variable and information drawn your attention and framing imagination about Pondicherry as independent variable. The model was tested for multicollinearity. The VIF AND tolerance values of the variable information drawn your attention are 1.956 and .511 respectively. (The variable information drawn your attentions VIF and tolerance values are 1.956 and .511 respectively). It means nearly 67.8 percent of the variability of the independent variable information drawn your attention is not explained by the other independent variable in the model -11. The variable framing imagination about Pondicherry's VIF and tolerance values are 1.956 and .511 respectively. It means nearly 67.8 percent of the variability of the independent variable framing imagination about Pondicherry is not explained by other variable in this model. The cooks distance value (min .000, max .150) for the entire model -1 is less than 1. It shows that the effect of multicollinearity is very less.

The F value of information drawn your attention (15.889**) and framing imagination about Pondicherry (28.792**) shows that the model -1 is statistically significant. The variable information drawn your attention ($R^2=.322$, $AR^2=.301$) explains 30.1 percent of the variance and framing imagination about Pondicherry ($R^2=.297$, $AR^2=.287$) explains 28.7 percent of the variance in the independent variable decision to visit. The variable framing imagination about Pondicherry (Beta=.393, $P<.007$) makes the strongest unique contribution to explaining the dependent variable decision to visit, when variance explained by the other variable i.e. information drawn your attention (Beta=.218, $P=.126$) in the model is controlled. The variable framing imagination about Pondicherry is significant at 1 percent level of significance with the dependent variable decision to visit. This shows that one standard deviation increase will increase 0.393 standard deviation in the dependent variable decision to visit.

Model 111: Standard multiple regression was performed between matching real with imaginary experience as the dependent variable, feeling about real experience, and virtual guiding as independent variable. The values VIF (1.647) and tolerance (.607) of the variability of the Independent Variable is not explained by the other variables in the model. Feeling about real experience's VIF (1.088) and tolerance (.919) shows that nearly 72.4 percent of the variability of this Independent Variable is not explained by the other variables in this Independent Variable is not explained by the other variables in this model. Virtual guiding VIF (1.539) and tolerance (.650) shows that nearly 71.7 percent of the variability of this independent variable is not explained by the other variables in this model. The cooks distance value (min: 000, max: .066) for this model is less than 1. It shows that the effect of multicollinearity is very less.

The F value of variables in the model III, (15.636**), feeling about real experience (12.782**), and virtual guiding (8.663**) shows that the model is statistically significant. The variables ($R^2=.187$, $AR^2=.175$) explains 17.5 percent of variance, feeling about real experience ($R^2=.276$, $AR^2=.255$) explains 25.5 percent of variance and virtual guiding ($R^2=.283$, $AR^2=.250$) explains 25 percent of variance in the dependent variable matching real with

imaginary experience. In the model III, the variable feeling about real experience (Beta=.318, P=.005) makes the strongest unique contribution to explain the dependent variable matching real with imaginary experience, when variance explained by the other variables i.e. (Beta=.289, P<.05), virtual guiding (Beta=.099, P=.447) are controlled. The variable feeling about real experience is significant at 1 percent level of significance and is significant at 5 percent level of significance with the dependent variable matching real with imaginary experience. The variable virtual guiding is not significant with the dependent variable even at 10 percent level.

Independent sample t- test: In independent sample t -test was conducted to compare drawing your attention, framing imagination and decision to visit by males and females. There was a significant difference in scores for gender and the three variables. The scores for drawing your attention, males (M= 1.95, SD= .697) and females (M= 2.57, SD= .997, t (68) = -3.060, P= .003 (two tailed)). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean differences= -.619, 95% CI=-1.023 to -.215) was moderate (eta squared= .121), framing imagination, males ((M= 2.02, SD= .680) and females (M= 2.57, SD= .790; t (68) = -3.092, P= .003 (two tailed)). The magnitude of difference in the means (mean difference= -.548, 95% CI= -.901 to -.194) was moderate (eta squared = .1233), decision to visit, males (M= 1.98, SD= .643) and females (M= 2.64, SD= .911, t (68) = -3.590, P= .001 (two tailed)). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean differences = -.667, 95% CI=-1.037 to -.296) was large (eta squared= .1593).

Table5: Independent Sample t - test

Independent Samples t - test															
		Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
														Lower	Upper
drawn your attention	Equal variances assumed	male	42	1.95	.697	.108	11.468	.001	-3.060	68	.003	-.619	.202	-1.023	-.215
	Equal variances not assumed	female	28	2.57	.997	.188			-2.853	44.338	.007	-.619	.217	-1.056	-.182
Framing imagination	Equal variances assumed	male	42	2.02	.680	.105	5.192	.026	-3.092	68	.003	-.548	.177	-.901	-.194
	Equal variances not assumed	female	28	2.57	.790	.149			-3.000	51.930	.004	-.548	.183	-.914	-.181
decision to visit	Equal variances assumed	male	42	1.98	.643	.099	10.439	.002	-3.590	68	.001	-.667	.186	-1.037	-.296
	Equal variances not assumed	female	28	2.64	.911	.172			-3.353	44.677	.002	-.667	.199	-1.067	-.266

Paired t - test

Table 6: Paired t - test

Paired Samples Test

		Pair 1	Pair 2
		information drawn u r attention - how far you match	your decision to visit - After visiting u r feeling
Paired Differences	Mean	.271	.257
	Std. Deviation	.962	.863
	Std. Error Mean	.115	.103
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
	Lower	.042	.051
	Upper	.501	.463
T		2.361	2.493
Df		69	69
Sig. (2-tailed)		.021	.015
Eta squared		0.07469	0.08263

A Paired Sample T test was conducted to evaluate the impact of virtual on real experience of tourists. There was a statistically significant decrease in scores from (pair-1) information drawn your attention ($M= 2.20$, $SD= .878$) to match real with imaginary experience ($M= 1.93$, $SD= .688$), $t(69) = 2.361$, $P= .021$ (two tailed). The means decrease in pair-1 scores was .271 with 95% confidence interval ranging from .042 to .501. The eta squared statistic (.075) indicated a moderate effect size. The scores from pair-2, decision to visit ($M= 2.24$, $SD= .824$) to after visiting your feeling ($M= 1.99$, $SD= .466$), $t(69) = 2.493$, $P = .015$ (2 tailed). The mean decrease in pair -2 scores was .257 with a 95% of confidence interval ranging from .051 to .463. The eta squared statistics (0.083) indicated a moderate effect size.

Discussions and Conclusion

In the correlation matrix (Table -2) first five variables represent the influence of different ways of virtual experience, next (6, 7, and 8) three variables represent the impact of virtual experience on tourist's decision to visit. And the next four variables (9-12) represent the opinion of virtual and real experience. The first variable correlated only with the pictorial presentation. The other three variables are largely correlated with the variable reliability and trust worthiness of information. Impact of virtual experience and framing imagination about a destination is highly positively increasing with increasing information. Drawing attention and decision to visit is positively largely increasing with increasing framing imagination. In the section opinion of virtual and real experience, the comfortableness of a place is moderately positively correlated with matching real with imaginary experience. Understanding a place is also positively moderately correlated with matching real with imaginary experience. Understanding a place is largely correlated with virtual guiding.

Partial correlation (Table -3) reveals that when the variables reliability and trustworthiness of information and matching real with imaginary experience are correlated, the moderate and large correlations among all the variables are slightly reduced, but the correlation between framing imagination and information drawn your attention increased from 48.8 percent ($r = .699^{**}$) (table 2) to 49.5 percent ($r = .704^{**}$; table 3). In the same way the negative correlation between guiding tourist and framing imagination from 7.5 percent ($r = -.275^{*}$; table-1) to 16.8 percent ($r = -.411^{**}$; table 3). The small correlation among the variables in bi-variate correlation (table 2) is not at all significant even at 10 percent level of significance.

This shows that the correlated variables highly affects the low correlated variables and moderately affects on medium and large correlated variables i.e. the impact of reliability and trustworthiness of information and matching real with imaginary experience are highly influencing tourists towards taking a decision to visit a place.

The table-4 : Regression analysis reveals that all three models are statistically significant and there is no multicollinearity effect among the variables.

In model 1, the variables influenced by sources of information makes the strongest unique contribution (Beta= .362) to explain the dependent variable reliability and trustworthiness of information when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled for. It reveals that the correlation (table 2) matrix of these two variables is ($r = .590^{**}$) high when compared with other variable. It shows that influenced by sources of information brings significant variance in the dependent variable reliability and trustworthiness of information. Material information also making significant unique contribution (beta=.320) to the dependent variable, but it is comparatively less than the variable influenced by sources of information. The regression model 1 in table-4 says that reliability and trustworthiness of information is highly contributed by influenced by sources of information and material information. Framing imagination about a destination highly influences the individual to take a decision to visit a place. Here in model 2 (table -3) the variable framing imagination makes the highest unique contribution (beta= .393) to explain the dependent variable decision to visit. This is also supported by correlation ($r = .545$, table-1). Generally /destination and virtual guiding about a place make individuals more comfortable at the destination during real experience. In model-3, the variables and virtual guiding are contributing very less towards matching real with imaginary experience. The variable feeling about real experience making moderately significant unique contribution (beta =.318) in the dependent variable matching real with imaginary experience. This shows that there is a gap between virtual and real experience.

The paired sample T test also reveals (table 6) that there is a mean difference between virtual and real experience. The eta squared values (.075 and .082) also indicate that there was a moderate effect with substantial difference in virtual and real experience of individuals. The independent sample t test (table-5) says that there is a mean difference between male and female individuals for drawing your attention, framing imagination and taking decision. The mean difference are -.619, -.548 and -.667 for the above three variables. The eta squared values says drawing your attention (0.12), framing imagination (.12) are causing moderate variance. The eta squared values says that there was a moderate variance caused by gender in drawing your attention (0.12), framing imagination (.12) and large variance in decision to visit (.15). Taking decision to visit a place and matching real with imaginary experience is also important by some other factors like availability of accommodation facilities, sanitations, amenities, parking, drinking and dining facilities at that particular place.

References:

- Amanda Davies and Barney Dalgarno (2009), titled "*Learning fire investigation the clean way: The virtual experience*" Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, Vol.25 (1), 1-13.
- Chris Campbell (2009)¹⁷ titled, "*Pre-service education students using an online virtual world*". Journal of virtual world research, Vol. 2. No.1
- Efthymios Constantinides (2004) Influencing the online consumer's behavior: the Web experience, Emerald Group Publishing Limited · ISSN 1066-2243, Vol. 14(2) 111-126.

- Faiola, A. & Smyslova, O. 2009. Flow Experience in Second Life: The Impact of Tele presence on Human-Computer Interaction. *Online Communities*, 574-583.
- Gartrell, Richard B. (1994). *Destination Marketing For Convention and Visitor Bureaus*. Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company: Iowa.
- Hairong Li et al. (2001) titled, “*The Role of Virtual Experience in Consumer Learning*” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, p.4.
- Janyth Ussery (2010) “Putting the real in virtual reality for educators and students”, *Journal of virtual studies* Vol. 1 p.12.
- Jesse Fox, Jeremy Bailenson and Joseph Binney (2009) *Virtual Experiences, Physical Behaviors: The Effect of Presence on Imitation of an Eating Avatar*, *Massachusetts Institute of Technology* Vol. 18, No. 4, August 2009, 294–303.
- Kingsley, J. & Wankel, C. 2009. Introduction. In: WANKEL, C. & KINGSLEY, J. (eds.) *Higher Education in Virtual Worlds*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Koster, R. (2004, January 07) A virtual world by any other name? [Msg 21] Message posted to http://terranova.blogs.com/terra_nova/2004/06/a_virtual_world.html
<http://worldtheory.blogspot.com/2007/06/define-virtual-world.html>
- Laura W. Jodice and William C. Norman (2007), “Interest in “virtual” and “real” shrimp related experiences among coastal and shrimp festival tourists in South Carolina, USA” *Proceedings of the 5th Coastal & Marine Tourism Congress, Auckland, New Zealand, Sept. 11-14, 2007*.
- Novak, T. P., Hoffman, D. L. & Yung, Y.F. 2000. Measuring the customer experience in online environments: A structural modeling approach. *Marketing Science*, 19, 22.
- Singh Neha (2007) the role of involvement and incongruency in tourism print ads on attitude toward the ads. Ph.D. Dissertation: Temple University.
- Takatalo, J., Nyman, G. & Laaksonen, L. 2008. Components of human experience in virtual environments. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24, 1-15.
- Tamimi, N., Rajan, M. and Sebastianelli, R. (2003), “The state of online retailing”, *Internet Research, Applications and Policy*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 146-55.
- Thomas, K., Fueller, J., Stieger, D. & Matzler, K. Year. *Avatar-Based Innovation: Consequences of the Virtual Co-Creation Experience*. In: JOHANN, F., DANIEL, S. & KURT, M., Eds. *The 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2010. 1-11.