



ITHJ

International Tourism and Hospitality Journal
Journal Homepage: <https://rpajournals.com/ithj>

Evaluation of Factors Enhancing Effectiveness of Destination Management of Nature Based Tourism, Lagos, Nigeria

Dr Bola Olusola Adeleke^{*1}
Dr Kayode Ogunsusi²
Redeemer's University, Nigeria^{1,2}

Abstract

Effective destination management is pertinent in differentiating a particular nature based tourism destination. Structured questionnaire was used to gather data from staff and tourists to Lekki Conservation Centre (LCC) and Lufasi Nature Park (LNP), both in Lagos. Structured questionnaires were employed to address effectiveness of destination management from staff and responsiveness of tourism destination to tourists needs from tourists. Data were analysed using multiple regression analysis and ANOVA to predict the efficiency of destination management. Test of homogeneity of variance using Levene's test was carried out to test the null hypothesis that variance was equal across variables in the responsiveness of destinations to tourists' needs. Results of the study revealed that 55.7% tourists had secondary education in LCC, while in LNP 68.1% had tertiary education. LCC has a greater percentage of the response variable ($R^2 = 0.622$) in predicting the effectiveness of destination management by the educational statuses of staff than in LNP. In predicting the responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs using the educational statuses of tourists, LNP has a greater percentage of the response variable ($R^2 = 0.255$). Effectiveness of management of nature based tourism destination is a vital tool in improving the quality of service for competitive edge.

Keywords: Destination, Effectiveness, Management, Nature, Responsiveness, Tourism

Corresponding author: Dr Bola Olusola Adeleke; E-mail: adelekeb@run.edu.ng

Introduction

The enjoyments of wildlife or natural areas that have not been developed are the core values of nature-based tourism (Luo, 2018). According to Jenkins and Pigram (2003), nature-based tourism may be defined as all forms of activities that revolves on the use of the natural environment and includes many activities, ranging from sitting under a tree to walking around in the wilderness. Nature-based tourism is being developed into a mechanism for turning biodiversity into a marketable commodity through its conservation from which projects could spring up that will deliver benefits to local people (Naidoo & Adamowicz 2005; Balmford et al. 2009; Brock, 2015; Biggs et al., 2016; Nickerson, et al., 2016). Nature-based tourism and other forms of "green" tourism have become an important source of monetary income for many local communities throughout the world (Akama & Kieti, 2007; Makindi, 2016). Attractions in nature-based tourism are important to the tourism production process because they are the first impetus to motivate tourists travelling to any destination.

Visitor attractions according to Swarbroke (2000) and Marzuki (2016) are central motivating factors that spur people to travel in the first instance. Apart from being the heart of the tourism production process, they also provide a focus for much tourist activity which is vital for enhancing destination competitiveness (Su and Huang, 2019). But, the development of nature-

based tourism destinations can only be sustained when the behavior of destination managers and visitors among other factors are ethically responsible (Deng et al., 2002). Various scholars have worked on how to improve on a destination's competitive advantage (Mihalić, 2000; Zhang et al., 2011; Su and Huang, 2019). The framework developed by Crouch and Ritchie (1999) for destination management was based on effective use of resources, while the one based on comparative advantages of a broad number of categories of factor endowments such as human resources, physical resources, knowledge resources, capital resources, infrastructure, and historical and cultural resources was developed by Porter (1990) and Enderwick (1990).

Literature Review

The issue of tourism destination is a key concept that has a decisive influence on the choice of places that tourists will visit for which Buhalis (2000) and Tolica et al. (2017) recognized that there is need for destinations to differentiate their products. This differentiation point can be achieved by harnessing the various resources and agents of the destination for the purpose of making such destination competitive among its contemporaries (Cai et al., 2007; Cvelbar et al., 2015; Mendieta-Peñalver et al., 2016). One of such is 'on the job training and development of staff' which is very important so as to ensure efficiency in performance, and to reduce staff turnover (Cho and Kang, 2005). Tourism professional who are well educated especially by working strategically with Universities are essential to the provision of quality service, and their ability can be harnessed and utilized to the fullest (Zagonari, 2009; Alexakis, 2011; Jasinskas et al., 2015; Romanova et al., 2016). Individual innovators that have been able to intrigue the interest of local residents and also involve them have brought tourism innovation into some tourism destinations (Hall, 2004; Genç and Genç, 2017), while Briton (1991) drew attention to how the construction of only one hotel in an area has been able to spur further developments in that area. As regards accessibility to capital for starting and running a tourism business, Esu (2015) in his own finding reported inadequacy of funds as a major contributor to the slow development of the tourism industry. Findings of Banerjee (2014) and Liu et al. (2017) have, however, revealed that access to assets affects the start-up and operations of tourism businesses, which reduces financial profitability.

The impacts of communication between tourist, and between tourists and residents have been variously discussed by many scholars. Findings have shown that extroversion contributes to interaction development between customers, which consequently influences the desires of stay satisfaction, and loyalty (Zgolli and Zaiem, 2017; Aldaihani & Ali, 2018). Even, negative views of visitors about residents as a result of initial communication (Kingsbury 2005; Hasani et al., 2016), did not deter visitors from recommending or returning to tourism destination in the future (Skipper (2009). But, this negative behavior is the most reason why tourists usually complain and are dissatisfied with service provision (Kozak, 2006), and that is the experience that they usually carry about (de Albuquerque and McElroy, 2001). This attitude of the host towards the visitor can influence the latter's decision about returning to the destination or recommending it to others (Thyne et al. (2004). The attitude is also critical to developing the tourism industry sustainably (Fan et al., 2019).

In the findings of Ukaj (2015) and Sinclair and Stabler (2002), there is link between domestic resources utilization and direct investment by foreign firms in the tourism industry, which can bring about economic growth and sustainable development. With international tourism, potential foreign investors can get information about other countries and so identify investment possibilities (Samimi et al., 2011; Sanford and Dong, 2000). In particular, international tourism can increase competition among tourism firms, which will enhance efficiency (Krueger, 1980; Backman et al., 2017).

The quantity and quality of entrepreneurs are very important in drawing visitors to any tourism destination, and in particular in transforming tourism resources into tourist attractions (Koh and Hatten, 2002). The innovativeness of entrepreneurs and their vision are keys to shaping the fortune of modern tourism industry, especially by influencing tourism development beyond their own individual contributions (Russell, 2006; Ryan et al., 2012; Omerzel, 2015). In recent years,

attention has turned to the guide's roles in relation to sustainability outcomes, including improving levels of understanding and valuing of sites, communities, cultures and environments, influencing and monitoring on-site visitor behaviour, and fostering pro-conservation attitudes and behaviours (Weiler & Kim, 2011; Hu & Wall, 2012; Poudel and Nyaupane, 2013).

Many scholars have worked on the development of image for tourism destinations and their relationships with the process of formulating expectations when evaluating attributes of the product/service offer, which has direct relationship with consumer satisfaction and loyalty (Rodríguez del Bosque, 2006; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Anderson et al., 1994; Chiu et al., 2016). Opperman (1999) found that developing and projecting a unique and recognizable brand is important for international recognition. Naidoo et al (2011) specifically reported in his finding on nature based tourist attractions in which satisfaction was found to mediate the relationship between nature-based tourist attractions and visitor loyalty, with likelihood of visitor recommending the attractions to others. It was also found by Aleksandra (2013) that it is not enough to attract tourists to destinations but also there is need to create activities for entertaining the visitors at the destinations so that they will have value for their money spent. In his own finding Su et al. (2017) reported that service fairness and service quality are both significant and positive in developing overall satisfaction and trust toward providers of services in tourism destinations.

Within the confines of competing nature-based tourism destinations, what can differentiate a particular destination and make it have competitive advantage is exceptional service quality where studies have been variously undertaken by researchers (McQuilken, Breth and Shaw, 2000; Mihalič , 2000; Zhang et al., 2011; Akroush et al., 2016). This study therefore aimed at evaluating nature tourism competitiveness using the effectiveness of nature tourism destination management and, by extension comparing between two similar nature-based tourism destinations in order to achieve this objective.

Simply because of tourism growth and its contribution to economic boom in many regions, many studies have been directed only to simple economic variables (Dwyer, 2000; Dwer et al., 2001; Kayar and Kozak, 2010; Zhang et al., 2011; Candela, 2012; Khandaker and Islam, 2017; Qin et al., 2018), which has downplayed the significance of other variables particularly staff and management effectiveness in destination performance evaluation. Dang and Huang (2014) used demographic characteristics to compare overall satisfaction and it was found that nationality, age, occupation and monthly income has no significant impact on it, but, significant difference in satisfaction was found by education. Therefore, for this study, in the regression analysis hypothesis was formulated about the means of the groups on the dependent variable of educational status of tourists and staff. The dependent variable differentiated individual tourists and staff on some quantitative (continuous) dimensions.

Research Objective

Comparison of the effectiveness of nature tourism destination management between LCC and LNP

Hypotheses

In this study, the following hypotheses were formulated to address the efficiency of management of nature-based tourism destinations, as well as the responsiveness of the tourism destination to tourists' needs.

H1: Effectiveness of destination management on tourists' needs is not significantly predicted by the educational status of staff.

H2: Tourists' needs in nature tourism destination is not significantly responsive to destination management.

H3: Responsiveness of nature tourism destination to tourists' needs is not significantly predicted by the educational status of tourist.

Research Methodology

Structured questionnaire was used to gather data from staff and tourists to Lekki Conservation Centre (LCC) and Lufasi Nature Park (LNP), both in Lagos, Nigeria a week prior to the Easter

celebration in 2017. A total of 615 copies of questionnaire were administered among respondents of both destinations. Out of this 512 copies were administered among tourists, while 103 copies were administered among staff of both destinations. A total of 240 copies of questionnaire were administered among tourists in LCC, while 272 copies were administered to tourists in LNP. Questions on demographic characteristics were included. Questions were asked from staff to address effectiveness of destination management on a five-point rating scale of very good to not good. Also, questions to address responsiveness of tourism destination to tourists were administered on tourists using five-point Likert scale of very satisfied to very unsatisfied.

Qualitative descriptive analysis was used to verbally summarize information on demographic profile and Levene's test. Regression analysis was carried out to predict the effectiveness of destination management by the educational status of staff in LCC and LNP. One-way analysis of variance was used to measure the factors that made heritage destinations of LCC and LNP to be responsive to tourists' needs. Test of homogeneity of variance using Levene's test was carried out to test the null hypothesis that variance was equal across variables in the responsiveness of destinations to tourists' needs (groups). The assumption of homogeneity of variance is that independent samples ANOVA of all compared groups have the same variance. In the one-way ANOVA, hypothesis was formulated about the means of the groups on the dependent variable of educational status of tourists. The dependent variable differentiated individual tourists on some quantitative (continuous) dimension. An overall analysis-of-variance test was conducted in multiple regressions to assess whether group means of effectiveness of destination management by staff and responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs were significantly different among the groups. Regression analysis was carried out as a confirmatory test on ANOVA to specify which of the variables are significant discriminators in evaluating responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs.

Results and Analysis

Demographic Analysis

The demographic profile of staff respondents in LCC revealed that there were 57.5% males and 42.5% females amongst the respondents. Most respondents had tertiary education (65%), followed by secondary education (25%), while 10% had primary education. The age distribution of respondents showed that majority (42.5%) of them were within the age range of 26-35 years, 20% were within 46-55 years. Also, the demographic profile of staff respondents in LNP revealed that there were 40% males and 60% females amongst the respondents. Majority of the respondents (48.9%) had tertiary education, 37.8% had secondary education, while only 13.3% had primary education.

The demographic profile of tourist respondents in LCC revealed that sampled respondents were almost equally split among males (48%) and females (52%). Most respondents (55.7%) had secondary education, while the rest (44.3) had primary education. Also, the demographic profiles of tourists in LNP revealed that sampled respondents were also almost equally split among males (52.2%) and females (47.8%). Most respondents (68.1%) had tertiary education, 24.6% had secondary education, while 7.2% had primary education.

Women participated more in nature tourism than men in LCC which agreed with the findings of Tangeland et al. (2013) and Kumar (2015). But, in LNP men were found to involve in nature-based tourism than women, and this agreed with the findings of Mason and Cheyne (2000) and Harrill and Potts (2003) who found more women opposed to tourism development. Data on educational background of respondents revealed that in the

two destinations under consideration, most of the respondents had at least secondary education. This is in tandem with the finding of Bello et al. (2017) in which education was found as one of the limiting factors affecting community participation in ecotourism.

Effectiveness of nature tourism destination management

The results of multiple regressions used in testing hypotheses for effectiveness of destination management as predicted by educational status of staff in LCC and LNP are presented in Table 1. When all 15 predictors of factors that measured destination responsiveness to tourists' needs were regressed with the dependent variable which was educational status of staff, the R² adjusted (0.320) for LCC was greater than that of LNP (0.156). The overall strengths of the relationships were strong for both destinations, but, stronger for LCC (R = 0.789) than LNP (R = 0.666). In LCC, the percentage variance of prediction (R²) was explained by 62.20%, while that of LNP was explained by just 44.30%. The F-value stood at 2.059 and 1.541 respectively for LCC and LNP. The F-test overall showed that the relationships between educational status of staff and effectiveness of destination management in both destinations were not statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypotheses were accepted for both destinations, and so the destinations' managements were not effective in taking care of tourists' needs.

For LCC and LNP, the p-values for all the constructs were greater than 0.05, and so their null hypotheses were accepted (not significant) and so concluded that the educational status of staff in the two destinations did not significantly predict that the variables were significant in enhancing the effectiveness of LCC and LNP management. However, the null hypothesis for the construct of 'attitudes of resident towards tourist' ($B = 0.421$; $\beta = 0.500$; $p = 0.026$) was significant in enhancing the effectiveness of destination management for LCC. But, for LNP this was not significant ($B = -0.091$; $\beta = -0.141$; $p = 0.505$). Out of the 15 constructs, 12 of them (variables 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15) had positive relationships with the predictor variable in LCC, while only five (variables 4, 5, 8, 10 and 15) had same relationships in LNP.

The greater R² value in LCC means that the educational statuses of staff have the propensity to predict effectiveness of destination management better than LNP. The model for LCC accounted for more than half of the variation in LCC, while it accounted for less than half of the variation in LNP. This is in agreement with the finding of Desai et al. (2010). R², the coefficient of multiple determinations of the variance responsiveness of destination management was stronger in LCC than LNP. The coefficient was greater than 50% in LCC and is acceptable for any field that attempts to predict human behaviour. But, in LNP it was less than 50%. Morgan (2018) agreed that an R-sq of 50% is relatively high for the social sciences, and also that an R-sq of around 30% is pretty good in most cases. These findings provide evidence for the predictive validity of the effectiveness of destination management by staff of the two destinations (Ekinci and Hosany, 2006) with regards to those variables that had positive relationships with the predictor variable.

The effectiveness of destination management as predicted by the educational status of staff has revealed that 'the constructs of platform for skill training and learning new ideas' have been viewed as a key tool for promotion of learning and enhancement of performance on the job in order for organizations to maintain productivity and stay competitive (Zagonari, 2009; Salas et al., 2012; Percival et al., 2013). How tourism institutions gain access to capital according to Liu et al. (2017) is mediated by implementation authorities who are at the frontline to determine access to assets for start-ups and operations. The young small and medium scale tourism businesses which are the

engine rooms of economic growth face the greatest financial constraints (Banerjee, 2014). So, creating an enabling environment by governments in which new entrants with drive and good ideas can get started in business will help good firm to grow (Nasr, 2010). Investments in tourism destination by foreign firms have been shown to have complex advantages to the local community (Davidson and Sahli, 2015). Findings from various researchers have also revealed that Communication between tourist and residents may spring up both positive and negative attitudes towards tourists. These attitudes may have implications on the tourists' behavior about satisfaction, decision to make repeat visit, or recommending the destination to others (Thyne et al., 2004; Skipper 2009; Kingsbury, 2005; Zgolli and Zaiem, 2017). Availability of new and local market for local products such as local foods being conceptualised as "authentic" products that symbolise the place and culture of the destination has the potential to enhance the visitor experience by connecting consumers to the region and its perceived culture and heritage as discovered by Sims (2009) and Bessiere (1998). Tourism training responsive to visitor needs as revealed in the finding of Weiler and Walker (2014) demonstrated that, when informed by theory and research, training can successfully equip guides to engage visitors, impact their understanding and empathy, and enrich their experience.

The statistical significance of attitudes of resident towards tourist in enhancing the effectiveness of destination management for LCC is in tandem with the finding of Thyne et al. (2004) as this variable may influence the tourists' decision about staging a comeback or even recommending the destination to others. Negative attitudes of residents towards tourists are the most reasons why tourists are dissatisfied and complain about service provision (Kozak, 2006).

Table 1. Regression of Educational Status of Staff with Effectiveness of Destination Management

S / N o	Model	Coefficients (Lekki Conservation)					Coefficients (Lufasi)				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	-1.253	0.929		-1.348	0.193	4.349	0.535		8.123	0.000
1	Platform for skill training and learning new ideas	0.000	0.213	0.000	-0.001	0.999	-0.094	0.164	-0.098	-0.570	0.573
2	Attraction of investment and development projects	-0.191	0.265	-0.178	-0.720	0.480	-0.041	0.175	-0.053	-0.235	0.816
3	Accessibility to venture capital for starting tourism business	-0.314	0.194	-0.322	-1.616	0.122	-0.211	0.151	-0.280	-1.402	0.171
4	Investment in tourism destination by foreign firms	0.272	0.185	0.301	1.468	0.158	0.080	0.155	0.113	0.513	0.612
5	communication between tourist	0.087	0.196	0.085	0.444	0.662	0.004	0.160	0.005	0.022	0.982
6	Communication between tourist and residents	0.027	0.148	0.030	0.179	0.859	-0.126	0.149	-0.167	-0.846	0.404
7	Investment	0.202	0.184	0.211	1.0	0.287	-	0.180	-0.142	-	0.502

	environment for tourist development				93		0.123			0.681	
8	Tourism destination contacts with major origin markets	0.061	0.163	0.075	0.377	0.710	0.061	0.143	0.085	0.424	0.674
9	International awareness of tourism destination's product	0.100	0.170	0.105	0.590	0.562	-0.244	0.128	-0.352	-1.907	0.067
10	Resident support for tourism development	0.396	0.216	0.401	1.833	0.082	0.163	0.164	0.199	0.995	0.328
11	Attitudes of resident towards tourist	0.421	0.176	0.500	2.396	0.026	-0.091	0.136	-0.141	-0.675	0.505
12	Availability of new and local market for local products	-0.069	0.182	-0.076	-0.379	0.709	-0.073	0.184	-0.092	-0.398	0.694
13	Tourism training responsive to visitor needs	0.249	0.160	0.267	1.560	0.134	-0.036	0.143	-0.044	-0.250	0.805
14	Tourism industry responsive to visitor needs	0.116	0.207	0.098	0.563	0.579	-0.148	0.128	-0.244	-1.151	0.259
15	Links between destination and travel trade for promoting	0.150	0.143	0.183	1.049	0.307	0.089	0.140	0.120	0.634	0.531
		R 0.789 R ² 0.622 R ² adjusted 0.320 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.485 F-Value 2.059 F-sig 0.064					R 0.666 R ² 0.443 R ² adjusted 0.156 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.654 F-Value 1.541 F-sig 0.155				

Acceptability of Responsiveness of Nature Tourism Destination to Tourists' Needs

The result of responsiveness of nature tourism destinations to tourists' needs as presented in Table 2 showed that most respondents (49%) did not accept that the industry was responsive to visitor needs in LCC, while 51% accepted in LNP. For Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism business, most respondents (98% and 62% respectively in LCC and LNP) also showed acceptability. On responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs 97% of respondents in LCC showed their levels of acceptability, while only 42% slightly accepted in LNP. As regards packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors, 95% responses were at acceptable level in LCC, while 45% accepted in LNP. For tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction, most responses (89%) were also acceptable in LNP, while about half (52%) of them also accepted in LNP. The level of acceptability by respondents for value for money in destination experiences was high (84%) in LCC, while 42% accepted in LNP. Response for overall destination image was acceptable (53%) in LCC, while 35% accepted this in LNP.

If nature-based tourism through its biodiversity conservation objectives is to deliver benefits to local people and any nation, it must have a differentiation point that will make it have competitive edge over all other destinations. Exceptional service quality in all of the variables considered for this study will have to come into play. This according to

Mcquilken *et al.* (2000), Mihalić (2000) and Zhang *et al.* (2011) will make the nature-based tourism destinations to have competitive advantage.

Table 2. Acceptability of Responsiveness of Destination to Tourists' Needs

S/No	Variable	Totally acceptable (%)		Acceptable (%)		Slightly acceptable (%)		Unacceptable (%)		Totally Unacceptable (%)	
		LC C	LN C	LC C	LN C	LCC	LNC	LCC	LNC	LCC	LNC
1	Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs	5	45	41	51	5	4	49	-	-	-
2	Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism business	-	28	98	62	2	10	-	-	-	-
3	Responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs	-	17	97	41	3	42	-	-	-	-
4	Packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors	2	10	95	45	3	41	-	4	-	-
5	Tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction	-	23	89	52	11	-	-	16	-	9
6	Value for money in destination experiences	5	25	84	42	11	30	-	-	-	3
7	Overall destination image	3	30	53	35	44	17	-	16	-	2

Responsiveness of Nature Tourism Destinations to Tourists' Needs

Responsiveness of nature tourism destination to tourists' needs is as presented in Table 3. The results showed that for LCC all the seven variables considered had p-values greater than 0.05, so their null hypotheses were accepted (none was significant), while six variables were not significant in LNP. This implied that the variable of 'tourism industry being responsive to visitor needs' was not significant in enhancing the destination management effectiveness of the two destinations ($F(1, 236) = 0.702$, $P = 0.406$). Likewise, qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses ($F(1, 236) = 0.791$, $P = 0.377$); responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs ($F(1, 236) = 1.632$, $P = 0.206$); packaging of tourism destination experience for visitors ($F(1, 236) = 0.259$, $P = 0.613$); tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction ($F(1, 236) = 2.380$, $P = 0.128$); value for money in the destination experiences ($F(1, 236) = 0.021$, $P = 0.885$) and; overall destination image ($F(1, 236) = 0.238$, $P = 0.627$) were not all significant in enhancing the destination management effectiveness of the destinations. However 'overall destination image' was significant in enhancing responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs in LNP $F(3, 260) = 4.015$, $P = 0.011$).

Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs has been analysed variously by Ballantyne, et al., (2009), Weiler & Kim (2011) and Hu & Wall (2012), with success of individual destinations being found to depend on the development and projection of unique identity that is responsive to the needs of visitors (Opperman, 1999). In the finding of Su et al. (2017), the duo of service fairness and quality have significant and positive impacts on customer satisfaction and trust towards the tourism industry.

The quality of entrepreneurs in the tourism business has been discovered by scholars as a factor that is highly influential in attracting and re-attracting visitors to tourism destinations (Koh and Hatten, 2002). They are not only important in attracting customers, but, they are also vital in transforming the tourism resources and fortune of a destination into tourist attractions over time (Ryan *et al.*, 2012). The innovation, dynamism, flair and vision of entrepreneurs are

the key tourism factors that are highly influential at a given point in time, and capable of having long lasting effect on shaping the fortunes of a destination over time (McKercher, 1999; Russell and Faulkner, 1999; Koh and Hatten, 2002; Russell, 2006; Ryan *et al.*, 2012).

Staff training and development in the tourism industry has been recommended by a number of scholars as vital tools to provision and delivery of quality service, because management will be able to harness and utilize to the fullest the intellectual capacity of their workers (Cho and Kang, 2005; Zagonari, 2009; Alexakis, 2011). But, this according to MacLaurin (2008) can better be achieved if tourism industries will work strategically with Universities in this regards. The responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs reflects the standard that consumers expect with regards to products or services offered (Teas, 1993). This is often consummated in the image paraded by the destination which is necessary for the formulation of expectation that has direct relationship with consumer satisfaction (Rodríguez del Bosque, 2006). The ability of tourism firms in ensuring visitor satisfaction has been viewed by Anderson *et al.* (1994) as being central in the consumer behavior constructs as it influences future organizational performance. Naidoo *et al* (2011) confirmed that a satisfied visitor to nature-based tourist attractions will be more loyal. Packaging of tourism destination experience for visitors too is central to expectation formulation which inadvertently determines satisfaction, loyalty and other post-purchase behaviours (Zeithaml *et al.*, 1993). The value that tourists to nature-based tourism attractions will have for their experiences according to Aleksandra (2013) will depend to a large extent on the creation of activities that can improve the touristic offer. According to Su *et al.* (2017), the image of tourism destination has a significant effect on overall destination satisfaction.

In LNP where overall destination image was the only variable that was significant in enhancing responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs, the finding is not in tandem with the finding of Kozak and Rimmington (2000), in which it was found that identifying and measuring consumer satisfaction with each attribute of a destination is very important, because satisfaction/dissatisfaction of consumer with just one of the components may lead to consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the overall destination (Kozak and Rimmington, 2000). But, in this case, none of the variable was significant, and so there is no way for linkage with satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the overall destination image.

Table 3. Evaluation of responsiveness of nature tourism destination to tourists' needs

S/No	Variable	ANOVA (Lekki Conservation)						ANOVA (Lufasi Nature Park)					
		Groups	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	SS	Df	MS	F	Sig.	
		Responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs											
1	Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs	Between	3.152	1	3.152	2.880	0.406	7.336	12	0.611	1.910	0.137	
		Within	264.784	236	1.122			83.216	260	0.320			
		Total	267.936	237				90.52	272				
2	Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses	Between	0.052	1	0.052	3.250	0.377	5.664	12	0.472	1.364	0.262	
		Within	3.884	236	0.016			89.988	260	0.346			
		Total	3.936	237				95.652	272				
3	Responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs	Between Groups	0.208	1	0.208	6.500	0.206	4.224	12	0.352	0.640	0.592	
		Within Groups	7.528	236	0.032			143.024	260	0.550			
		Total	7.736	237				147.248	272				
4	Packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors	Between Groups	0.052	1	0.052	1.040	0.613	1.664	12	0.139	0.250	0.861	
		Within Groups	11.884	236	0.050			144.076	260	0.554			
		Total	11.936	237				145.74	272				
5	Tourism firms	Between	0.960	1	0.960	9.50	0.12	20.816	12	1.73	2.501	0.067	

	ensuring visitor satisfaction	Groups				5	8			5		
		Within Groups	23.842	236	0.101			180.340	260	0.694		
		Total	24.788	237				201.160	272			
6	Value for money in destination experience	Between Groups	0.016	1	0.016	0.097	0.885	2.972	12	0.248	0.363	0.780
		Within Groups	38.936	236	0.165			177.316	260	0.682		
		Total	38.952	237				180.288	272			
7	Overall destination image	Between Groups	0.300	1	0.300	0.946	0.627	51.456	12	4.288	4.015	0.011
		Within Groups	74.716	236	0.317			277.704	260	1.068		
		Total	75.000	237				329.160	272			

Responsiveness of Nature Tourism Destinations to Tourists' Needs As Predicted By Educational Status of Tourists

The results of multiple regressions used in testing hypotheses for nature tourism destinations to tourists' needs are as presented in Table 4. In LCC, when all seven predictors of factors that measured destination responsiveness to tourists' needs were regressed with the dependent variable which was educational status at tolerance limit of 0.125 when all predictors in the model were set to zero, the model was found to be less fit (R^2 adjusted = 0.074) than the model for LNP with R^2 adjusted of 0.169. The overall strengths of the relationship was weak for LCC ($R = 0.272$), but was strong for LNP ($R = 0.505$). The strength of the relationship (R^2 , the coefficient of determination or coefficient of multiple determination) between the model and response variable was explained by just 7.4% for LCC, while that of LNP was explained by 25.5% of the variance of destination responsiveness. The F-value for LCC was 0.749, while that of LNP was 2.980. The F-test overall showed that the relationship between educational status of tourists and destination responsiveness to tourists' needs was not statistically significant in LCC, but, was significant for LNP. Therefore, the null hypothesis for LNP was rejected because the model for the regression provides a better fit than the intercept model only. This implies that the coefficients are jointly not all equal to zero for LNP.

Responsiveness of nature tourism destinations to tourists' needs as predicted by educational status of respondents is as presented in Table 4. The result showed that for LCC, five out of seven variables had negative relationships (variables 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7) with the independent variables, while two had positive relationships (responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs and; tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction). For LNP, three variables had negative relationships (1, 3 and 4) while the remaining four had positive relationships (qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses; tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction; value for money in destination experience and; overall destination image). In LCC, none of the variables was significant in predicting responsiveness of the destination to tourists' needs. But, in LNP three of the variables with negative relationships were significant in predicting the destination's responsiveness to tourists' needs: responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs ($B = -0.259$; $\beta = -0.2431$; $p = 0.024$); responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs ($B = -0.226$; $\beta = -0.271$; $p = 0.042$) and; overall destination image ($B = 0.186$; $\beta = 0.333$; $p = 0.006$).

The greater R^2 value in LNP means that the values can predict responsiveness of nature tourism destinations to tourists' needs better than LCC. Although the model accounts for less than half of the variation in both LCC and LNP, but, they still agreed with the finding of Desai *et al.* (2010). The inability of the model for LCC to predict responsiveness of the destination to tourists' needs is attributed to the extent of misfit of the model for the destination. R^2 , the coefficient of multiple determinations of the variance

of destination responsiveness to management was stronger in LNP than LCC, as three of the variables with negative relationships were significant in predicting the destination responsiveness to tourists' needs in LNP. Although, the coefficients for the two destinations were less than 30%, a value that is acceptable for any field that attempts to predict human behaviour. Notwithstanding the finding of Morgan (2018) that an R-sq of 50% is relatively high for the social sciences, but, an R-sq of around 30% is pretty good in most cases. However, the three variables in LNP that were significant in predicting the destination's responsiveness to tourists' needs according to the finding of (Ekinici and Hosany, 2006) provide evidence for the predictive validity of the effectiveness of destination management by staff of the destination.

The variables that were significantly predicted by the educational status of tourists to be responsive to tourists' needs was a further confirmation of the importance of measuring consumer satisfaction with each attribute of a destination. This measurement according to Kozak and Rimmington (2000) may lead to consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the overall destination if there is consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with just one of the components. The finding for this study further confirms the use of multiple regressions in validating which of the variables tested using ANOVA are significant discriminators. Results have thus revealed the following factors of "responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs; responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs and; overall destination image" as significant discriminators in evaluating the responsiveness of destination to tourism needs in LNP.

Table 4. Responsiveness of nature tourism destinations to tourists' needs as predicted by educational status of respondents

S/N o	Model	Lekki Conservation Centre					Lufasi Nature Park				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			B	Std. error	Beta		
	(Constant)	2.08	1.33		1.56	0.13	2.90	0.49		5.89	0.00
1	Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs	0.02	0.07	0.04	0.24	0.81	-0.26	0.13	-0.24	-2.08	0.04
2	Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses	-0.24	0.83	-0.06	-0.29	0.77	0.11	0.12	0.10	0.88	0.38
3	Responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs	-0.15	0.67	-0.05	-0.22	0.83	-0.23	0.10	-0.27	-2.31	0.02
4	Packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors	-0.21	0.39	-0.09	-0.53	0.60	-0.04	0.10	-0.05	-0.39	0.70
5	Tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction	0.34	0.25	0.22	1.37	0.18	0.02	0.08	0.02	0.20	0.84
6	Value for money in destination experience	-0.01	0.21	-0.01	-0.04	0.97	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.60	0.55
7	Overall destination image	-0.08	0.15	-0.09	-0.51	0.62	0.19	0.07	0.33	2.84	0.01
		R 0.272 R ² 0.074 R ² adjusted -0.048 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.513 F-Value 0.605 F-sig 0.749					R 0.505 R ² 0.255 R ² adjusted 0.169 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.560 F-Value 2.980 F-sig 0.009				

Conclusion

Finding of this study revealed that the managements of the two nature tourism destinations were not effective in taking care of tourists' needs as predicted by the educational status of staff. This was confirmed by responses of the tourists as the variable of 'industry was responsive to visitor needs' was the only one that was unacceptable to most of the respondents. LCC, however, has a greater percentage of the response variable (R^2) in predicting the effectiveness of destination management by the educational statuses of staff than in LNP. The prediction identified "attitudes of resident towards tourist" as the only significant factor that enhanced the effectiveness of destination management in LCC.

In predicting the responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs using the educational status of tourists, LNP predicted the effectiveness of destination management more than LCC. No variable predicted responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs in LCC, while components of "responsiveness of tourism industry to visitors needs"; "responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs"; and "overall destination image" were found as significant discriminators in predicting the effectiveness of destination management LNP.

Also, the two variables in LCC that had positive relationships with the predictor variables responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs and; tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction should be leveraged upon in enhancing the management of the destination. For LNP, four variables that had positive relationships – qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses; tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction; value for money in destination experience and; overall destination image should all be leveraged upon also in enhancing the effectiveness of the destinations' management.

In the evaluation of effectiveness of destination management, it is necessary to measure this with each attribute of a destination because ineffectiveness in the management of just one of the components may lead to ineffectiveness in the management of the overall destination. Improving the effectiveness of management in the two nature-based tourism destinations will imprint a differentiation point in the destinations that will make them have competitive edge over all other destinations.

Recommendations

Management of the nature tourism destinations should put in place measures that will improve the effectiveness of destination management. On responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs in LCC, that the 'industry was responsive to visitor needs' was the only variable that was unacceptable to most of the respondents. The LCC should therefore work extra hard in the area of making the 'industry responsive to visitor needs'.

The significant discriminators on tourists' needs as predicted by the educational status of tourists in LNP should be used as leverages to enhance the destination management effectiveness. This should also be extended to the other destination. The managements of the two destinations should put in place measures that will make all the variables work together so that they can together improve the effectiveness of destination management.

Research Limitation and Future Direction

The evaluation of factors enhancing effectiveness of destination management of nature based tourism is a niche field and, as such, research directly related to this is limited, especially in Nigeria. Nature-based tourism operators in Nigeria are yet to fully understand the great importance of research of this nature in development of the sector, and as such the researchers had to find time to give preliminary education on this before they were given

full access to the destinations. Also, visitors to nature-based tourism destination are unusually impatient, and as such it took a lot of efforts from the researchers to get desired responses from the respondents.

For this study only educational status of respondents was used to predict the effectiveness of destination management in nature-based tourism destinations, other demographic variables should be used in future to get fuller insight to the research.

References

- Akama, J. S., and Kieti, D. (2007). Tourism and socio economic development in developing countries: A case study of Mombasa Resort in Kenya. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16, 735-748.
- Akroush, M. N., Jraisat, L. E., Kurdieh, D. J., Al-Faouri, R. N., and Qatu, L. T. (2016). Tourism service quality and destination loyalty – the mediating role of destination image from international tourists’ perspectives, *Tourism Review*, 71(1), 18-44.
- Aldaihani, F. M. F. & Ali, N. A., (2018). Factors Affecting Customer Loyalty in the Restaurant Service Industry in Kuwait City, Kuwait. *Journal of International Business and Management*, 1(2), 1-14.
- Aleksandra, M. (2013). Nature-based tourism as an introduction to ecotourism experience- A new approach. *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, 6(1), 75-96.
- Alexakis, G. (2011). Transcendental leadership: The progressive hospitality leader’s silver bullet. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(3), 708–713. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.12.005
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., and Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 56–66.
- Backman, M., Klaesson, J. and Öner, O. (2017). Innovation in the hospitality industry: Firm or location? *Tourism Economics*, 23(8), 1591-1614. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1354816617715159>
- Balmford, A., Beresford J., Green J., Naidoo R., Walpole M., and Manica A. (2009). A global perspective on trends in nature-based tourism. *PLoS Biology*, 7, 1–6.
- Bello, F. G., Lovelock, B. and Carr, N. (2017). Constraints of community participation in protected area-based tourism planning: the case of Malawi. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 16(2), 131-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2016.1251444>.
- Biggs, D., Amar, F., Valdebenito, A., and Gelcich, S. (2016). Potential Synergies between Nature-Based Tourism and Sustainable Use of Marine Resources: Insights from Dive Tourism in Territorial User Rights for Fisheries in Chile. *PLoS One*, 11(3), e0148862. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0148862>
- Britton, S. (1991). Tourism capital and place toward a critical geography of tourism: Environments & planning. *Society & Spaces*, 9, 451-478.
- Brock, A. (2015). “Love for sale”: Biodiversity banking and the struggle to commodify nature in Sabah, Malaysia. *Geoforum*, 65, 278-290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.08.009>
- Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*, 21, 97–116.
- Cai, L.A., Qui, H., and Li. G. (2007). Towards a competitive destination brand in a mass market. *Tour. Anal.*, 12, 463–472.

- Candela, G. A. F. P. (2012). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. Springer: Berlin, Germany.
- Chiu, W., Zeng, S., and Cheng, P. S. (2016). The influence of destination image and tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty: a case study of Chinese tourists in Korea. *International Journal of Culture Tourism and Hospitality Research* 10(2), 223-234. DOI: 10.1108/IJCTHR-07-2015-0080
- Cho, M., and Kang, S. K. (2005). Past, present, and future of tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 5(3), 225-250. doi:10.1300/J172v05n03
- Crouch, G. I., and Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and societal prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 137-152.
- Cvelbar, L. K., Dwyer, L., Koman, M., and Mihalič, T. (2015). Drivers of Destination Competitiveness in Tourism: A Global Investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1041-1050. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0047287515617299>
- Deng, J., King, B. E. M., and Bauer, T. (2002). Evaluating natural attractions for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2):, 422-438.
- Desai, S. P., Gravallesse, E. M., Shadick, N. A. (2010). Hand bone mineral density is associated with both total hip and lumbar spine bone mineral density in post-menopausal women with RA, *Rheumatology*, 49, 513-519.
- Dwyer, L. M. N., Forsyth, P., and Rao, P (2001). International price competitiveness of Australia's mice industry. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3, 123-139.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., and Rao, P. (2000). The price competitiveness of travel and tourism: A comparison of 19 destinations. *Tourism Management*, 21, 9-22.
- Ekinci, Y., and Hosany, S. (2006). Destination personality: an application of brand personality to tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127-139. <http://jtr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/45/2/127>
- Enderwick, P. (1990). The international competitiveness of Japanese service industries: A cause for concern. *California Management Review*, 32(4), 22-37.
- Fan, D. X. F., Liu, A., and Qiu, R. T. R. (2019). Revisiting the relationship between host attitudes and tourism development: A utility maximization approach. *Tourism Economics*, 25(2), 171-188. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1354816618794088>
- Genç, R., and Genç, E. A. (2017). Market-oriented innovations in tourism. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 7(1), 51-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22243534.2017.1355606>
- Hall, C. M. (2004). *Small firms and wine and food tourism in New Zealand; Issues of collaboration, cluster and lifestyle*. In Thomas R (ed.) 2004: Small firms in tourism, International Perspectives. London: Advances in Tourism Research Series, Elsevier Ltd.
- Harrill, R., and Potts, T. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233-244.
- Hasani, A., Moghavvemi, S. and Hamzah, A. (2016). The Impact of Emotional Solidarity on Residents' Attitude and Tourism Development. *PLoS One*, 11(6), e0157624. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0157624>
- Hu, W., and Wall, G. (2012). Interpretative guiding and sustainable development: a framework. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4, 80-85.
- Jasinskas, E., Streimikiene, D., Svagzdiene, B., and Simanavicius, A. (2015). Impact of hotel service quality on the loyalty of customers. *Economic Research*, 29(1), 559-572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1177465>

- Kayar, Ç. H., and Kozak, N. (2010). Measuring destination competitiveness: An application of the travel and tourism competitiveness index (2007). *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 19, 203–216.
- Khandaker, S. and Islam, S. Z. (2017). International Tourism Demand and Macroeconomic Factors. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(5), 389-393. <http://www.econjournals.com>
- Koh, K. Y., and Hatten, T. S. (2002). The tourism entrepreneur: The overlooked player in tourism development studies. *International Journal of Hospitality Tourism Administration*, 3(1), 21-48.
- Kozak, M., and Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as of season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38, 260 - 269.
- Kumar De, U. (2015). Sustainable Nature-based Tourism, Involvement of Indigenous Women and Development: A Case of North-East India. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(3), 311-324.
- Luo, W. (2018). Evaluating Tourist Destination Performance: Expanding the Sustainability Concept. *Sustainability*, 10, 516. Doi: 10.3390/su10020516.
- Makindi, S. M. (2016). Local communities, biodiversity conservation and ecotourism: a case study of the Kimana Community Wildlife Sanctuary, Kenya. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, Special edition*, 5(3). <http://www.ajhtl.com/>
- Marzuki, A. (2016). A proposed framework for nature-based tourism destinations evaluation. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 78(5), 127-134. <http://www.jurnalteknologi.utm.my/>
- Mason, P., and Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, 391–411.
- Mendieta-Peñalver, L. F., Perles-Ribes, J. F., Ramón-Rodríguez, A. B., and Such-Devesa, M. J. (2016). Is hotel efficiency necessary for tourism destination competitiveness? *An integrated approach*. 24(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.5367/2Fte.2016.0555>
- Mihalič, T. (2000). Environmental management of a tourist destination: A factor of tourism competitiveness. *Tourism Management*, 21, 65–78.
- Morgan, D. L. (2018). When investigating human behavior for example effect of attitude and norm on buying behavior could r-square be as low as 05 or even less. Department of Sociology, Portland State University, United States. <https://www.researchgate.net/post/>
- Naidoo, P., Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., and Seegoolam, P. (2011). An assessment of visitor satisfaction with nature-based tourism attractions. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 4(1), 87-98.
- Naidoo, R., and Adamowicz, W. (2005). Economic benefits of biodiversity exceed costs of conservation at an African rainforest reserve. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science*, 102(46), 16712–16716.
- Nickerson, N. P. Jorgenson, J., and Boley, B. B. (2016). Are sustainable tourists a higher spending market? *Tourism Management*, 54, 170–177.
- Omerzel, D. G. (2015). 2nd global conference on business, economics, management and tourism, 30-31 October 2014, Prague, Czech Republic Innovativeness in Tourism: Model Development. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 750 – 756
- Oppermann, M. (1999). Predicting destination choice – A discussion of destination loyalty. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 5(1), 51-65.
- Pigram, J.J. (1983). Outdoor Recreation Resource Management. London: CroomHelm. Cited in Naidoo *et al.* (2011).

- Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*, New York: Macmillan Business.
- Poudel, S., and Nyaupane, G. P. (2013). The Role of Interpretative Tour Guiding in Sustainable Destination Management: A Comparison between Guided and Nonguided Tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(5), 659-672. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0047287513478496>
- Qin, Y., Luoluoyuyan, Y., Zhao, Y., and Zhang, J. (2018). Research on relationship between tourism income and economic growth based on meta-analysis. *Sciendo*, 3(1), 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.21042/AMNS.2018.1.00008>
- Rodríguez del Bosque, I. A., San Martín, H., and Collado, J. (2006). The role of expectations in the consumer satisfaction formation process: Empirical evidence in the travel agency sector. *Tourism Management*, 27(3), 410-419.
- Romanov, S., Popov, A., and Kushevsckaya, R. (2016). Tourism Education in the Tourism Industry as a Key to Competitiveness Galina Romanova. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(SI), 107-113. <http://www.econjournals.com/>
- Russell, R. (2006). *The contribution of entrepreneurship theory to the TALC model*. In Butler RW (ed). *The Tourism area lifecycle Vol 3. Conceptual and theoretical issues*, Channel View Publication, UK, 105-124.
- Ryan, T., Mottiar, Z., and Quinn, B. (2012). The Dynamic Role of Entrepreneurs in Destination Development. *The Journal of Tourism Planning & Development*. doi:10.1080/21568316.2011.630747
- Sanford, D.M., and H. Dong (2000). Investment in Familiar Territory: Tourism and New Foreign Direct Investment. *Tourism Economics*, 6(3), 205-19.
- Sinclair, M. T., and Stabler, M. (2002). *The Economics of Tourism*, London: Routledge.
- Su, L., and Huang, Y. (2019). How does Perceived Destination Social Responsibility Impact Revisit Intentions: The Mediating Roles of Destination Preference and Relationship Quality. *Sustainability*, 11, 133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/su11010133>
- Swarbrooke, J. (2000). *Sustainable Tourism Management*. Wallingford: CABI International. Cited in Naidoo *et al.* (2011).
- Tangeland, T., Aas, O., and Odden, A. (2013). The socio-demographic influence on participation in outdoor recreation activities – Implications for the Norwegian domestic market for nature-based tourism. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 13(3), 190-207.
- Tolica, E. K., Gorica, K., Panajoti, V. H., and Pjero, E. (2017). The Role of Internet and SEO in Branding Destinations: Case of Albania as a New Destination in Balkans. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 6(1), 45-52. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>
- Ukaj, F. (2015). Impact of international business on Kosovos economic development with emphasis on tourism. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 35-39.
- Weiler, B., and Kim, A.K. (2011). Tour guides as agents of sustainability: Rhetoric, reality and implications for research. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36(2), 113-125.
- Zagonari, F. (2009). Balancing tourism education and training. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(2–9). doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.03.006
- Zhang, H., Gu, C.-L., Gu, L. W., and Zhang, Y. (2011). The evaluation of tourism destination competitiveness by topsis & information entropy—A case in the Yangtze River delta of China. *Tourism Management*, 32, 443–451.