# MEASURING ECONOMIC IMPACT OF TOURISM GROWTH IN SHEKHAWATI REGION

Dr. Palak Bhardwaj[1] and Priyanka Kumari[2]

Assistant Professor[1], Lecturer, Department of Geography, SSBB Govt. College, Sangwara, Dungarpur (Rajasthan),

Research Scholar[2], Pacific University, Udaipur.

## ABSTRACT

Tourism is composed not only of leisure travelers but also other groups such as business travelers, and these non-leisure travelers often act and spend in the same way as leisure travelers. Tourism and travel professionals know that their industry is exposed to political, health, and economic undulations. The current study is largely empirical in approach. Including all the stated objectives the study also focuses on the analysis, for this purpose the responses about the shekhawati tour and their activities was collected from tourists during their visit to this land of Havalies. For this purpose the views of 500 respondents were taken on various Economic impacts at shekhawati region on 9 variables. The multiple regression analysis tools were used to identify the variables which satisfied the tourists related with the Economic impact. The respondents believed that Prices of the commodities have increased due to tourism, it has created job opportunity, It would be a shame if the local population of Shekhawati region does not benefit more from the development of Tourism and Putting a local community members in tourism business management could have a negative impact on service quality and experience tourism.

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism is composed not only of leisure travelers but also other groups such as business travelers, and these non-leisure travelers often act and spend in the same way as leisure travelers. Tourism and travel professionals know that their industry is exposed to political, health, and economic undulations. Often it is heard that these ups and downs are outside of tourism and travel professionals' control. While to some extent industry leaders are forced to react to circumstances outside of their control, an awareness of current challenges can help these leaders to prepare for eventual challenges and to seek ways in which to lessen the negative impact of exigent circumstances. List of some of the current challenges facing the tourism and travel industry includes Sale of heritage Havelies prohibited in parts of Shekhawati, No construction or repair, Marwari businessmen migrated from here and slowly Shekhawati lost its sheen, Poor standards of living, No cleanness, Lack of Sustainable development, The potential for growth in the area is yet untapped, Chartism problem, Unequitable development, Chettiar houses (Villas) rarely return, and many of the houses stand empty, Falling prices of agricultural product, Poor infrastructure, lack of resources, unemployment, Lack of entrepreneurship and Economic instability. Thus the study includes the above problems to identify that what is the problem of tourism of tourism in area of shekhawati.

This research work is in the form of 'ex-post-facto' study in which the researcher tried to study the existing perceptions of the Tourists regarding the experiences of their visit of shekhawati region, their main attraction points and problems, without manipulating in any way the scenario as it stands presently. Thus, the study is largely empirical in approach. Including all the stated objectives the study also focuses on the analysis, for this purpose the responses about the

shekhawati tour  and their activities was collected from tourists during their visit to this land of Havalies.

## OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the current research work are enlisted in following point:

1.     To measure the economic impact of tourism activities on shekhawati circuits.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Shinde (2010)[i]** demonstrated how indigenous religious entrepreneurs drive religious tourism in a non-western context. Building on the case study of Vrindavan, an emerging religious tourism destination in India, it explains religious tourism as a natural progression of traditional pilgrimage economy, where entrepreneurship springs from socio-cultural and ritual exchanges and knowledge of religious protocols and procedures between indigenous religious functionaries and visitors. Using religious hegemony, social status and networks, religious entrepreneurs innovate, develop new products and expand the cultural economy of rituals and performances to suit the demands of the burgeoning tourism.

**Lunt, Mannion & Exworthy (2013)[ii]** estimated that over 50,000 individuals from the UK each year elect to fund their own treatment abroad. Such treatments commonly include cosmetic and dental surgery; cardio, orthopaedic and bariatric surgery; IVF treatment; and organ and tissue transplantation. The UK has also experienced inward flows of patients who travel to receive treatment and pay out of pocket, being treated in both private and NHS facilities. The rise of 'medical tourism' presents new opportunities and challenges in terms of treatment options for consumers/patients and health policymakers. Such developments denote a commercialization, commodification and internationalization of health care in a way that UK policy has not experienced to date. This article addresses four key issues. They explain the rise of medical-related travel (applied to the UK), identify key policy considerations for the future, highlight important research gaps and explore conceptual frameworks which might help us understand better the observed patterns of medical tourism. Whilst the context for policy and practice was undoubtedly dynamic, they argue the need for greater clarity in understanding the emergent implications for health policy and health care delivery.

**Cohen (2012)[iii]** revealed that growing literature examines descriptive and normative questions about medical tourism such as: How does it operate? What were its effects? were home country patients or their governments failing in moral duties by engaging in or permitting medical tourism? By contrast, much less has been written on the regulatory dimension: What might be done about medical tourism if they were convinced that it posed ethical issues and were motivated to act? I shall argue that this kind of regulatory analysis was essential for bioethical analysis of medical tourism. This article focuses on these regulatory questions more directly, evaluating available methods, restrictions, costs, and benefits of home and destination country unilateral regulatory moves. This article also discusses more briefly multilateral treaty and private sector responses.

**Reddy (2008)[iv]** revealed that the research on the aspects of tourism and sustainability was growing with a concern that sustainable tourism principles were difficult to implement in developing countries. Within this context, the paper has engaged in the identification, selection and evaluation of sustainability indicators for rapid assessment of tourism development in one of the remotest and most sensitive destinations in the world, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands of

India (ANI). It reviews the indicator sets and research on indicator development frameworks and examines the identification and assessment of rapid economic indicators for the ANI. The ANI indicator development strategy considered indicators that were developed and assessed mainly for developed countries and evaluated a feasible bottom-up approach, which was mainly based on local knowledge for sustainable tourism initiatives in less-developed islands.

**Sharpley & Sundaram (2005)[v]** revealed that religious tourism ( tourism that was motivated by faith or religious reasons ) has been in evidence for centuries. In more recent times, however, it has been suggested that modern tourism has become the functional and symbolic equivalent of more traditional religious practices, such as festivals and pilgrimages. In other words, it was claimed by some that tourism was a sacred journey. To date, however, little work has been undertaken to explore this position; the purpose of this paper, therefore, was to contribute to this debate. Based on an exploratory study, it considers the motivations and experiences of Western tourists visiting the Sri Aurobindo Ashram and the nearby utopian township of Auroville in Pondicherry, south east India. It identifies two principal groups of visitors, namely 'permanent tourists' who have immersed themselves indefinitely in a spiritual 'Other', and temporary visitors. The latter were categorised into sub-groups which point to a variety of spiritual and non-spiritual motives. The paper concludes that there was a continuum of spirituality inherent in tourism, though this was related to tourists' experience rather than initial motivation.

**Scott, Gössling & Hall (2012)[vi]** revealed that ttourism was a major global economic sector that was undergoing tremendous growth in emerging economies and was often touted as salient for development and poverty alleviation in developing countries. Tourism was recognized as a highly climate-sensitive sector; the evaluation highlights the differential vulnerability of tourism destinations and that the resultant changes in competitiveness and sustainability will transform some international tourism markets. Feedbacks throughout the tourism system mean that all destinations will need to adapt to the risks and opportunities posed by climate change and climate policy. While notable progress has been made in the last decade, a number of important knowledge gaps in each of the major impact areas, key regional knowledge gaps, and both tourist and tourism operator perceptions of climate change risks and adaptive capacity indicate that the tourism sector was not currently well prepared for the challenges of climate change.

**Reddy, York & Brannon (2010)[vii]** expressed that Medical tourism was the act of travelling abroad for health care. The theory of planned behaviour was used to investigate the medical tourism beliefs of 336 undergraduate students in a basic psychology course at a large mid-western American university. Students did not have positive intentions for mere willingness to seek more information about travelling to a developing country to receive medical treatment. An educational intervention was necessary to help promote travel for medical treatment. The intervention may include educating person on the availability of quality health care, highly trained competent doctors and the ability to vacation and see another country.

**Hannam (2006)[viii]** discussed the contemporary politics of heritage tourism in India and focuses upon contested representations of The First War of Indian Independence/The Indian Mutiny of 1857. The severity of this conflict has been written about extensively from both British and Indian perspectives. One site in particular—the 'British' Residency at Lucknow—was and still was remembered as an important memorial to both the British and the Indians who died in this

conflict. However, the representations of the conflict were and have been contested. This paper thus examines this heritage dissonance by examining both official and lay representations of the residency.

**Wang, Yamada & Brothers (2011)**[ix] revealed that with both qualitative and quantitative approaches, this study examined the success factors of cultural tourism development. It discussed reasons why some cities may find it challenging to sustain cultural tourism development. The findings suggested that the lack of advantageous factors may be because all factors were highly related and that one factor's defect in marketing could easily affect the performance of all other factors. The challenge for cultural tourism development in a less competitive destination may be more related to elementary problems such as governmental leadership and funding rather than the important factors emphasized in theoretical models.

**Hannam (2008)**[x] explained that tourism was frequently acclaimed as one of the world's largest and most pervasive industries. Research into tourism has grown rapidly in recent years with many new books and journals appearing. In particular, this article notes that perhaps three new journals have marked the coming of age of tourism-related research, namely, Tourism *Geographies*, Tourist Studies *and finally* Mobilities. While a great deal of other research has been published in books and journals and indeed many other new tourism journals have been started, this article utilises the start of these journals as benchmarks for a theoretical engagement with tourism research. Current research goes on to review research that has been concerned primarily with host–guest interactions in terms of tourist studies. Indeed, both residents and tourist's performances have been the focus of much contemporary research particularly by researchers who have begun to view tourism as increasingly constitutive of everyday life rather than being simply an escape from it. Finally, it was argued that the concept of motilities helps us to understand global tourism in the context of other social and spatial travel processes.

**Chang (2000)**[xi] explored the 'thematic development' of Singapore's Little Historic District and the socio-spatial effects of this thematic enhancement scheme. Specifically, I argue that when landscapes were 'themed', which was often the case in urban tourism planning, places will be 'tamed' as a result. This argument was substantiated by the case of Singapore's Little India which was designated a historic district in 1989. I contend that as Little India was redeveloped as an Indian theme district with a mix of modern and traditional activities, it was tamed in three ways. The taming process was exemplified by: (1) a decline in traditional Indian-owned retail outlets and activities; (2) Little India's conversion into a retail attraction rather a place of residence; and (3) a dimming of its rich Indian cultural identity. The taming of *activities*, *community* and *identity*, I shall show, has also generated vociferous reactions from the grass-roots which can be described as anything but tame. Indeed, as gross-roots agencies (comprising merchants and residents) resist the government's development approach, there has been a fundamental rethinking of what Little India means to its person  and a re-evaluation of their communal ties to the place. As a result, a reassertion of Indian identity and community occurs even as Little India was being themed and tamed.

**Bigano, Hamilton, Lau, Tol, & Zhou (2007)[1]** presented a new, global database on tourist destinations. The database differs from other databases in that it includes both domestic and international tourists; and it contains, for the most important destinations, data at national level as well as at lower administrative levels. Missing observations were interpolated using statistical models. The data were freely accessible on the internet.

## DATA COLLECTION

For primary data collection a survey method were used by structured questionnaire of target respondents. The sample for the survey has covered 500 respondents.

The respondents profile was shown in table-1 as under:

**Table-1: Respondents Profile**

|  |  | Frequency | Percent |  |  | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 310 | 62.0 | Occupation | Self –Entrepreneurial farmer, owner of the shop, merchandiser, specialist | 84 | 16.8 |
|  | Female | 190 | 38.0 |  | | | |
| Age | 18—29 | 72 | 14.4 |  | Self-employed in manufacturing /handicraft, Service, Business | 220 | 44.0 |
|  | 30-39 | 49 | 9.8 |  | | | |
|  | 40-49 | 190 | 38.0 |  | | | |
|  | 50-59 | 189 | 37.8 |  | Office Worker/ services / non-manual work [university graduate employee | 59 | 11.8 |
| Education | X | 53 | 10.6 |  | | | |
|  | XII | 248 | 49.6 |  | Housewife, Student, Retired, Seeking work & others | 137 | 27.4 |
|  | Graduate | 21 | 4.2 |  | | | |
|  | P.G. | 154 | 30.8 |  | | | |
|  | Professional | 24 | 4.8 |  | | | |

The variables used under the study with their SPSS names are provided in table-2 as under:

**Table-2: Variables used under the study with their SPSS names**

| Q. No. | Question | SPSS name |
|---|---|---|
| **Dependent variables** | | |
| **1** | **How satisfied you are with Economic Impact/Impacts of tourism in shekhawati region** | **Sat** |
| **Economic Impact/Impacts** | | |
| 1 | Tourism leads to more investment and spending | Econ_1 |
| 2 | Living standard of shekhawati region has increased considerably due to tourism | Econ_2 |
| 3 | Prices are increased due to tourism | Econ_3 |
| 4 | Tourism created job opportunity | Econ_4 |

---

[1] Bigano, A., Hamilton, J. M., Lau, M., Tol, R. S.J. and Zhou, Y. (2007), A global database of domestic and international tourist numbers at national and subnational level. Int. J. Tourism Res., 9: 147–174. doi:10.1002/jtr.602

| 5 | Tourism give economic benefits to local people | Econ_5 |
| 6 | It would be a shame if the local population of Shekhawati region does not benefit more from the development of Tourism | Econ_6 |
| 7 | Putting a local community members in tourism business management could have a negative impact on service quality and experience tourism | Econ_7 |
| 8 | People should provide quality goods because it enriches our lives by its magnificence | Econ_8 |
| 9 | It would be a big financial burden for people of shekhawati region since they have to pay more due to high tourism activities. | Econ_9 |

As per the objective (to measure the Impact of tourism for improvement in shekhawati area) the agreement of the respondents related with the various areas are checked with the broader hypothesis. For this purpose following hypothesis was developed:

H1: the attributes configuring economic impact of tourism has significantly impact on the growth of shekhawati region.

To identify key variables in economic impact at shekhawati region multivariate regression analysis has been used with SPSS-19 software and results were shown in table-3 as under:

**Table-3: Multiple regression analysis forSatisfaction**

**Descriptive Statistics**

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Satisfaction | 3.7740 | .98634 | 500 |
| Econ_1 | 3.4800 | .64064 | 500 |
| Econ_2 | 1.8800 | .76601 | 500 |
| Econ_3 | 2.9200 | 1.05633 | 500 |
| Econ_4 | 2.1000 | .70070 | 500 |
| Econ_5 | 3.3000 | 1.31661 | 500 |
| Econ_6 | 3.6600 | 1.19468 | 500 |
| Econ_7 | 2.7000 | 1.20537 | 500 |
| Econ_8 | 3.3000 | .70070 | 500 |
| Econ_9 | 3.4400 | .75335 | 500 |

**Correlations**

| | | Satisfaction | Econ_1 | Econ_2 | Econ_3 | Econ_4 | Econ_5 | Econ_6 | Econ_7 | Econ_8 | Econ_9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Correlation | Sat | 1.000 | .023 | -.195 | -.106 | -.330 | .174 | .294 | -.335 | -.079 | .145 |
| | Econ_1 | .023 | 1.000 | -.291 | -.150 | -.062 | -.337 | -.231 | .031 | .170 | -.106 |
| | Econ_2 | -.195 | -.291 | 1.000 | -.235 | .246 | -.083 | -.264 | .308 | .179 | .057 |
| | Econ_3 | -.106 | -.150 | -.235 | 1.000 | -.179 | .118 | .248 | -.113 | -.076 | -.208 |
| | Econ_4 | -.330 | -.062 | .246 | -.179 | 1.000 | .098 | -.127 | .534 | -.061 | .030 |
| | Econ_5 | .174 | -.337 | -.083 | .118 | .098 | 1.000 | .829 | .120 | -.554 | .251 |
| | Econ_6 | .294 | -.231 | -.264 | .248 | -.127 | .829 | 1.000 | -.015 | -.500 | .144 |
| | Econ_7 | -.335 | .031 | .308 | -.113 | .534 | .120 | -.015 | 1.000 | -.273 | .079 |
| | Econ_8 | -.079 | .170 | .179 | -.076 | -.061 | -.554 | -.500 | -.273 | 1.000 | .243 |
| | Econ_9 | .145 | -.106 | .057 | -.208 | .030 | .251 | .144 | .079 | .243 | 1.000 |
| Sig. (1-tailed) | Sat | . | .304 | .000 | .009 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .040 | .001 |
| | Econ_1 | .304 | . | .000 | .000 | .081 | .000 | .000 | .244 | .000 | .009 |
| | Econ_2 | .000 | .000 | . | .000 | .000 | .031 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .102 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Econ_3 | .009 | .000 | .000 | . | .000 | .004 | .000 | .006 | .045 | .000 |
| | Econ_4 | .000 | .081 | .000 | .000 | . | .014 | .002 | .000 | .086 | .249 |
| | Econ_5 | .000 | .000 | .031 | .004 | .014 | . | .000 | .004 | .000 | .000 |
| | Econ_6 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .002 | .000 | . | .366 | .000 | .001 |
| | Econ_7 | .000 | .244 | .000 | .006 | .000 | .004 | .366 | . | .000 | .038 |
| | Econ_8 | .040 | .000 | .000 | .045 | .086 | .000 | .000 | .000 | . | .000 |
| | Econ_9 | .001 | .009 | .102 | .000 | .249 | .000 | .001 | .038 | .000 | . |
| N | Satisfaction | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_1 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_2 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_3 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_4 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_5 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_6 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_7 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_8 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |
| | Econ_9 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 | 500 |

**Variables Entered/Removed[a]**

| Model | Variables Entered | Variables Removed | Method |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Econ_7 | . | Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). |
| 2 | Econ_6 | . | Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). |
| 3 | Econ_3 | . | Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). |
| 4 | Econ_4 | . | Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100). |

a. Dependent Variable: Sat

**Model Summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .335[a] | .112 | .111 | .93019 | .112 | 63.065 | 1 | 498 | .000 |
| 2 | .442[b] | .196 | .192 | .88642 | .083 | 51.390 | 1 | 497 | .000 |
| 3 | .495[c] | .245 | .241 | .85935 | .050 | 32.802 | 1 | 496 | .000 |
| 4 | .522[d] | .273 | .267 | .84461 | .027 | 18.474 | 1 | 495 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7
b. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6
c. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6, Econ_3
d. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6, Econ_3, Econ_4

**ANOVA[e]**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 54.567 | 1 | 54.567 | 63.065 | .000[a] |

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Residual | 430.895 | 498 | .865 | | |
| | Total | 485.462 | 499 | | | |
| 2 | Regression | 94.946 | 2 | 47.473 | 60.418 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 390.516 | 497 | .786 | | |
| | Total | 485.462 | 499 | | | |
| 3 | Regression | 119.171 | 3 | 39.724 | 53.790 | .000[c] |
| | Residual | 366.291 | 496 | .738 | | |
| | Total | 485.462 | 499 | | | |
| 4 | Regression | 132.349 | 4 | 33.087 | 46.382 | .000[d] |
| | Residual | 353.113 | 495 | .713 | | |
| | Total | 485.462 | 499 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7
b. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6
c. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6, Econ_3
d. Predictors: (Constant), Econ_7, Econ_6, Econ_3, Econ_4
e. Dependent Variable: Sat

**Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients B | Std. Error | Standardized Coefficients Beta | t | Sig. | Correlations Zero-order | Partial | Part | Collinearity Statistics Tolerance | VIF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | (Constant) | 4.515 | .102 | | 44.205 | .000 | | | | | |
| | Econ_7 | -.274 | .035 | -.335 | -7.941 | .000 | -.335 | -.335 | -.335 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2 | (Constant) | 3.633 | .157 | | 23.17 | .000 | | | | | |
| | Econ_7 | -.271 | .033 | -.331 | -8.223 | .000 | -.335 | -.346 | -.331 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| | Econ_6 | .238 | .033 | .288 | 7.169 | .000 | .294 | .306 | .288 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| 3 | (Constant) | 4.149 | .177 | | 23.482 | .000 | | | | | |
| | Econ_7 | -.292 | .032 | -.356 | -9.075 | .000 | -.335 | -.377 | -.354 | .987 | 1.013 |
| | Econ_6 | .285 | .033 | .346 | 8.585 | .000 | .294 | .360 | .335 | .938 | 1.066 |
| | Econ_3 | -.217 | .038 | -.232 | -5.727 | .000 | -.106 | -.249 | -.223 | .926 | 1.080 |
| 4 | (Constant) | 4.615 | .205 | | 22.544 | .000 | | | | | |
| | Econ_7 | -.207 | .037 | -.253 | -5.566 | .000 | -.335 | -.243 | -.213 | .711 | 1.406 |
| | Econ_6 | .270 | .033 | .327 | 8.209 | .000 | .294 | .346 | .315 | .927 | 1.079 |
| | Econ_3 | -.234 | .037 | -.251 | -6.266 | .000 | -.106 | -.271 | -.240 | .915 | 1.093 |
| | Econ_4 | -.279 | .065 | -.198 | -4.298 | .000 | -.330 | -.190 | -.165 | .692 | 1.444 |

a. Dependent Variable: Sat

## Result: Assessing Overall Model Fit

The final Regression model with 4 independent variables (Econ_7, Econ_6, Econ_3, Econ_4) explains almost 26.7% of the variance of Improvement impact of tourism as per economic conditions during their visit to shekhawati region. Also, the standard errors of the estimate has

been reduced to 0.84461, which means that at 95% level, the margin of errors for Improvement impact can be calculated as ± 1.6554356 (1.96 X .84461). The 4 regression coefficients, plus the constraints are significant at 0.05 levels. The impact of multi colinerarity in the variable is substantial. They all have the tolerance value less than 0.692, indicating that the over 30 percent of the impact is of other variables in the equation .

## CONCLUSION

The ANOVA analysis provides the statistical test for overall model fit in terms of F Ratio. The total sum of squares (485.462) is the squared error that would accrue if the mean of impact of tourism has been used to predict the dependent variable. Using the values of impact of tourism this errors can be reduced by 27.26% (132.349/485.462). This reduction is deemed statistically significant with the F ratio of 46.382 and significance at level of $0.000^d$. With the above analysis it can be conclude that the impact of tourism with economic improvement is significant in shekhawati region.

**REFERENCES:**

[i] Shinde, K. A. (2010), Entrepreneurship and indigenous enterpreneurs in religious tourism in India. Int. J. Tourism Res., 12: 523–535. doi:10.1002/jtr.771

[ii] Lunt, N. T., Mannion, R. and Exworthy, M. (2013), A Framework for Exploring the Policy Implications of UK Medical Tourism and International Patient Flows. Social Policy & Administration, 47: 1–25. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9515.2011.00833.x

[iii] Cohen, I. G. (2012), How To Regulate Medical Tourism (And Why It Matters For Bioethics). Developing World Bioethics, 12: 9–20. doi:10.1111/j.1471-8847.2012.0 0317.x

[iv] Reddy, M. V. (2008), Sustainable tourism rapid indicators for less-developed islands: an economic perspective. Int. J. Tourism Res., 10: 557–576. doi:10.1002/jtr.700

[v] Sharpley, R. and Sundaram, P. (2005), Tourism: a sacred journey? The case of ashram tourism, India. Int. J. Tourism Res., 7: 161–171. doi:10.1002/jtr.522

[vi] Scott, D., Gössling, S. and Hall, C. M. (2012), International tourism and climate change. WIREs Clim Change, 3: 213–232. doi:10.1002/wcc.165

[vii] Reddy, S. G., York, V. K., and Brannon, L. A. (2010), Travel for treatment: students' perspective on medical tourism. Int. J. Tourism Res., 12: 510–522. doi:10.1002/jtr.769

[viii] Hannam, K. (2006), Contested representations of war and heritage at the Residency, Lucknow, India. Int. J. Tourism Res., 8: 199–212. doi:10.1002/jtr.567

[ix] Wang, S., Yamada, N. and Brothers, L. (2011), A Case study: discussion of factors and challenges for urban cultural tourism development. Int. J. Tourism Res., 13: 553–569. doi:10.1002/jtr.826

[x] Hannam, K. (2008), Tourism Geographies, Tourist Studies and the Turn towards Mobilities. Geography Compass, 2: 127–139. doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2007.00079.x

[xi] Chang, T.C. (2000), Theming Cities, Taming Places: Insights from Singapore. Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography, 82: 35–54. doi:10.1111/j.0435-3684.2000.00071.x