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ABSTRACT

Kenya’s western tourist circuit is undoubtedly the country’s best kept secret. However, in spite of this, the circuit is one of the least competitive as most tourists prefer coastal beaches and selected protected areas. The purpose of this research was to establish the strategic determinants of tourism destination competitiveness in Kenya’s Western Tourist Circuit. This study was grounded on and guided by Ritchie and Crouch (2003) model of destination competitiveness. The variables under study were: destination attractors, support resources, destination management and safety and security. The objectives of the study were: to examine the effect of destination attractors on destination competitiveness, to establish the effect of support resources on destination competitiveness, to determine the effect of destination management on destination competitiveness and to examine the effect of safety and security on the relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and destination competitiveness. Explanatory research design was used to gather information while convenience sampling technique was used to arrive at a sample size of 102. Closed-ended questionnaires were used to collect data with key respondents being tourists. Multiple regression analysis was used to test hypothesis and deduced models that explained the strategic determinants of tourism destination competitiveness. Destination attractors were found to positively and significantly affect destination competitiveness whereas destination management and support resources had a negative though insignificant effect on destination competitiveness. Safety and security had a negative moderation on relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness and a positive moderation effect on the relationship between destination attractors and destination competitiveness, with effects being significant. However, Safety and security did not significantly moderate the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness. The study recommends the following: a strong spirit of partnership and collaboration between all stakeholders to realize the potential of the destination in order to maximize available resources. There’s need to upgrade the competitive position of the circuit by improving its image and creating awareness both at local and international levels. There’s also need for destinations to manage and organize their resources efficiently in order to provide a unique tourist experience that outperforms alternative destination experiences. The study also serves the purposes of providing updated knowledge on theories, concepts, ideas and empirical studies on competitiveness in the context of tourism destination competitiveness. Further research can be carried on critical issues in the competitive process, competitive forces at the destination level. Future studies can also broaden the geographical scope by sampling the remaining seven circuits and within those circuits, sample many destinations. This would help understand tourists’ choice and loyalty for particular destinations. Finally future studies can try and identify the strengths and weaknesses in the destinations within the seven circuits which in turn will help develop correct positioning strategies.
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DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Attraction: is any object, person, place, or concept that draws people either geographically or through remote electronic means so that they may have an experience.

Destination: is a geographical area consisting of all the services and infrastructure necessary for the stay of a specific tourist or tourism segment.

Destination Competitiveness: this study looks at destination competitiveness as a concept that encompasses productivity levels of various components of the tourist industry and qualitative factors affecting the attractiveness or otherwise of the Kisumu Impala Sanctuary.

Tourism: is the temporary short-term movement of people to destinations outside the places where they normally live and work, and activities during their stay at these destinations; it includes movement for all purposes, as well as day visits or excursions.

Tourism Circuit: is a route in which at least three major tourist destinations are located such that none are in the same town or city and at the same time they are not separated by a long distance. In this case, the study was conducted in western tourism circuit.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

This chapter describes the background of the study, defines the problem of the study, highlights main and specific objectives, explains the significance of the study and concludes by pointing out limitations to the study.

1.2 Background of the study

Competitiveness is a broad concept, which may be perceived through different angles namely: products, companies, branches of the economy or national economies, in the short run or the long run. The definitions offered provide both a micro and macro meaning of competitiveness. From a macro perspective competitiveness is a national concern and the ultimate goal is to improve the real income of the community. From a micro perspective, it is seen as a firm level phenomenon. In order to be competitive, any organization must provide products and services, which satisfy the never ending desires of the modern consumer (Omerzel, 2006).

In the past tourism destinations believed that it was enough to have only the tourists, destination resources, low salaries and attractive exchange rates for them to compete and be successful in the international tourism industry (Bordas 1994). This approach gave rise to the formulation and implementation of strategies and policies that aimed mainly at stimulating tourist volumes. In most cases, the results were not as expected leading to questioning of this strategy. Empirical studies on destination competitiveness continue to differ from author to author and subsequently from destination to destination, implying that competitive factors regarding destinations cannot be the same for all destinations (Phakdisoth & Kim, 2007). For instance, a study on
competitiveness of Hong Kong as an international conference destination in South-East Asia, Qu et al. (2000) concluded that accommodation, conventional facilities, accessibility, safety and infrastructure system were perceived as important tourist choice. Kim and Kim (2003) in their analysis of Seoul as an international convention destination pointed out service quality, transportation, meeting room facilities and destination attractiveness as major attributes for choosing a destination. Poon, (1993) revealed long-term profits and continued patronage as being essential in attaining competitive advantages.

Wang, Hsu, and Swanson (2012), findings revealed that China’s tourism competitiveness relies on five underlying dimensions: destination management, tourism resources, tourism superstructure, infrastructure and destination-supporting factors. Melville & Annari (2015) pointed out political and economic stability, economic climate, marketing, quality and variety of food as being the most important components contributing to competitiveness of South Africa as a tourism destination. The National Department of Tourism Growth Strategy refers (2011 & 2016), referred to SA as a quality tourism destination that offers world class service with the correct marketing approach that fulfils the expectations of tourists. As stated by the policy and practice for global tourism by UNWTO (2011), destination competitiveness is one of the major themes associated with destination development as it affects the profitability and long term sustainability of destinations. It further states that factors shaping destination competitiveness are: investment, productivity, macro-economic policy, branding, image, price, market share, visitor satisfaction, safety, quality of experiences, innovation, strategy and training of human resources.
The global market place has become increasingly competitive, posing a challenge to the tourism industry as with other industries. This increase has resulted in intense competition between destinations to grow their market share (Navickas and Malakauskaite, 2009; Blanke and Chiesa, 2013; Pearce and Schänzel, 2013). In recent years, Asia has risen to prominence as a generator of destination for tourists, challenging the traditional dominance of Europe and North America with diversity and difference playing a key factor in competitiveness (Henderson, 2015). Africa on the other hand has had a smaller share in global tourism distribution due to intense competition amongst global tourist destinations (Blanke and Chiesa, 2013). The study is guided by Ritchie and Crouch (2003) model of destination competitiveness. The model conceptualizes destination competitiveness as a function of core resources and attractors, supporting factors and resources, destination management and qualifying determinants. The model also points out the importance of global macro environment and competitive micro environment surrounding the destinations.

1.2.1 Kenya Western Tourist Circuit

Kenya’s western tourist circuit is referred to as the country’s “best kept secret” because of the presence of natural and cultural attractions that have not been exploited for development of various forms of sustainable tourism. The circuit is home to historical and archeological sites such as Thim-lich Ohinga; Other attractions Got Abindu caves in Kisumu, Lake Victoria fresh water body; inland beaches, Kakamega Tropical Rain Forest, Yala Swamp ecosystem, Homa Bay hill and Mt. Elgon, Mfangano island, Tindinyo water fall in Nandi, national parks and game reserves such as: Mt. Elgon and Ruma National Parks in Bungoma and Homa Bay Counties respectively, nature conservancies, museums and diverse cultures, among others. Despite the presence of these treasures, the destination is one of the least competitive in tourism as most
tourists to Kenya prefer coastal beaches and selected protected areas (Nyamweno et. al., 2016). Western Tourist Circuit is still lagging behind as statistics by KNBS, (2015) revealed increase in visitations from 29.4% to 34.2% in 2010-2014 for attractions in Nairobi tourist circuit and 43.8% to 50.9% for attractions in Coastal tourist circuits. From 2010-2014, low visitation rates of 3.39% to 4.77% were recorded for Western tourist circuit.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

Despite Kenya Tourism Board being charged with the mandate to develop, coordinate and implement a national as well as regional tourism marketing strategy (Kenya law, 2013), a clear disparity still lies in the growth and preference of the country's tourism as concentration of tourists still remains in the Coastal and Nairobi circuits and a handful of game reserves and national parks (Ndivo, 2013; GoK 2008; 2010; GoK 2013). A survey conducted in 2015 revealed that Kenya’s western tourist circuit is home to several natural, cultural/historic attractions. However, most of these attractions are not known to potential domestic and international visitors and therefore they are hardly visited for purposes of enjoying and learning (Nyamweno et. al., 2016). A study by Ndivo, Waudo and Waswa (2012), sought to examine the attractiveness of both the individual attractions on the basis of frequency of distribution and return visitation. Individual attractions such as; Nairobi National Park had the highest visitation rate of 75% followed by Mombasa Island at 68.6%. Kakamega Tropical Rain Forest had a visitation rate of 19% while Kisumu Impala sanctuary had 13% visitation rate. As highlighted in KNBS (2015) report, western tourist circuit had the lowest visitation rates of 3.39% to 4.77% from 2010-2014. This is a bit low taking into account that a number of initiatives such as reduction of park entry fees to subsidized rates, hotel concessions for tourists and free entry to parks during Kenya’s Independence Day have since been undertaken by the Ministry of Tourism
to encourage tourism but to no avail as visitation patterns remains low in western tourism circuits (Kamau, *et al.* 2015). The ability of a destination to meaningfully distinguish itself from competitors is no longer an advantage but a necessity (Vanja *et al.*, 2012). Therefore, it is on this backdrop that the researcher intends to conduct an in-depth study on strategic determinants of destination competitiveness.

1.4 **Objectives of the Study**

The broad and specific objectives of the study are as highlighted:

1.4.1 **Broad objective**

The main purpose of the study is to establish determinants of destination competitiveness in western tourist circuit, Kenya.

1.4.2 **Specific objectives of the study**

The study was guided by the following specific objectives:

i. To examine the effect of destination attractors on destination competitiveness.

ii. To establish the effect of support resources on destination competitiveness.

iii. To determine the effect of destination management on destination competitiveness.

iv. To examine the effect of safety and security on relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and destination competitiveness.

1.5 **Research Hypothesis**

The study was guided by the following hypothesis:

Ho₁: Attractiveness of a destination has no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness.

Ho₂: Support resources in a destination have no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness.
Ho₃: Destination management has no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness.

Ho₄: Safety and security has no significant effect on the relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and the destination competitiveness.

1.6 Scope of the study

The study was undertaken in a period of eight weeks from 1st January, 2017 – 31st March, 2017. It focused on establishing determinants of tourism destination competitiveness in western tourist circuit.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The main contribution of the present study is to identify the perceptions of tourists regarding the factors that drive or inhibit the competitiveness of Western tourist circuit as a tourism destination at national and international level. The study is also of significance to Kenya’s tourism industry as it will help destination managers strategically plan and cope with competition between destinations and between firms within a destination in order to remain market relevant. It is also expected that the study will contribute to the body of knowledge for researchers especially in the field of tourism destination competitiveness.

1.8 Limitations of the study

Lack of cooperation from some respondents made it difficult to capture important information that would have been of importance to the study. A number of managers were also over protective of any information the researcher tried to obtain from their clients. This forced the researcher to use tour guides to discretely have tourists’ complete questionnaires. There was also a challenge with one of the study areas as it did not have enough tourists from whom the study
could generate adequate sample. In this case, the researcher had to distribute questionnaires to other study areas.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

This chapter reviewed literature under the following topics; theoretical framework, concepts of tourist destination, tourism destination competitiveness, tourism destination strategies, influence of destination attractors, support resources, destination management and situational conditions on tourism destination competitiveness, research gaps and conceptual framework.

2.2 Theoretical Literature Review

The study was guided by Ritchie and Crouch (2003) model of destination competitiveness.

2.2.1 Ritchie and Crouch Model of Destination Competitiveness

Ritchie and Crouch (2003) conceptualized destination competitiveness as a function of core resources and attractors, supporting resources, destination management and qualifying determinants. The model looks at the magnitude of the global macro environment and the competitive microenvironment surrounding the destination. From the model, natural and cultural resources form the basic elements which attract tourists. Supporting resources provides a foundation for the development of a strong tourism industry. Qualifying determinants include factors which have the capacity to modify the influence of the other components, positively or negatively. These qualifying determinants may limit the capacity of a destination to attract and subsequently to satisfy potential tourists. In this way, they may impact upon destination competitiveness. Destination management involves activities that enhance the appeal of the core resources and attractors, to strengthen the quality and effectiveness of the various supporting factors, and to minimize any constraints imposed by the qualifying determinants. This model
provides an avenue to understand the complex, fragmented and interrelated nature of the tourism industry and internal relationships among factors.

2.3 **Review of empirical literature**

The study reviewed empirical literature on effect of destination attractors, support resources, destination management and safety and security on destination competitiveness.

2.3.1 **Destination attractors**

A study by Vengesayi (2017), on conceptual model of tourism destination competitiveness and attractiveness suggests that, popularity of tourism destinations can be enhanced by a combination of the factors of competitiveness and attractiveness. He further posits that the more a destination reflects the feelings and opinions of its visitors the more its perceived to be attractive and likely to be chosen. Ferrairo, (1979) held the same opinion that attractiveness of a tourist destination encourages people to visit and spend time at the destination. Therefore the major value of destination attractiveness is the pulling effect it has on tourists and it tourism does not exist. A study by Falk and Hagsten, (2018), on the art of attracting international conferences to European cities revealed that cultural offerings are one of the attractors. Cellini, 2011; Ribaudo and Figini, 2017; Su and Lin, 2014; Yang et al. 2010 also contributed to the fact that cities with cultural attractions and historical heritages are more attractive for both conference locations and tourists in general. A study by Cucca et al. (2016) also revealed that the natural and cultural endowment positively affects the efficiency score of the Italian regions.

Omerzel (2006) identified identified inherited, created and support resources as providing various characteristics of a destination that make it attractive to visit. He further classified inherited resources as natural and cultural. He saw supporting factors and resources (general
infrastructure, quality of services, hospitality, and accessibility of destination) as providing the foundation for a successful tourism industry. A study by Dwyer et al. (2014), observed that inherited natural and sociocultural bases are important competitive advantages for Slovenian tourism. Results of a study by Chin et al. (2014) on rural tourism destination competitiveness revealed that cultural heritage and natural resources are important indicators determining destination competitiveness. Rivera et al. (2008); Reimer & Walter, (2014) also found out that cultural heritage attractions form critical attributes for development of destination competitiveness. A study by Omerzel and Mihalič (2008), found out that tourism managers grade the competitiveness of natural and cultural attractions higher than created resources and management.

Dwyer and Forsyth, (2011) posits that in order to achieve competitive advantage, a tourist destination must ensure that its overall attractiveness in terms of natural or scenic beauty, culture, and tourist experience, is superior to that in the many alternative destinations available. Maharaj and Balkaran (2014), also found out that, countries that offer travellers access to natural assets have a competitive advantage. Ramkissoon, Uysal and Brown (2011), analyzed the structural relationship between destination image and cultural behavior intentions using the structural equation modelling. Results showed that destination image is a salient factor influencing the cultural behavioral intentions of tourists. The research also attempted to investigate which dimensions of image had the highest influence on behavioral intentions and found out that cultural attributes exerted the highest influence on tourists’ behavioral intentions. Bahar and Kozak (2007) also observed that new destinations emerged in the market, some existing one make further progress and others decline as a result of tourists and suppliers becoming more concerned about cultural values.
An interview by Broadbent and Broadbent (2013), pointed out Ethiopia’s culture and nature as the greatest assets for its destination competitiveness and among the most important cultural destination in the African continent like Egypt and Morocco with very diverse options of cultural experiences. Pietsch and Ringbeck (2013) in their study pointed out the importance of cultural resources as it enhanced a country’s competitiveness. Different resources in different destination have different appeal to different tourists. Endowed resources have been considered as the primary sources of measuring destination attractiveness (Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Prideaux, 2004). According to Dwyer & Kim (2003), natural resources are one key factor leading to the satisfaction of visitors to the destination. In addition, cultural heritage in a destination is also the main forces attracting the prospective visitors (Murphy et al., 2000).

According to Melian-Gonzalez and Garcia-Falcon, (2003), destination resources are assets that a destination possesses. They are the strategic assets which determine the level of activity a destination can achieve. They further assert that they are the core resources on which tourism at a destination is based. Mo, Howard and Havitz (1993) however held a different opinion. They argued that destination service infrastructure is, after destination environment, the most important factor in a tourist’s experience. Cracolici and Nijkamp (2009) emphasized the need for tourist well-being of individual tourists and need to regard destination attractiveness as one of the key determinants of TDC. Zhang and Gu (2011) established a quantified model of four determinants for comprehensive assessments of TDC, namely tourism resources endowment, tourism reception capacity, tourism industrial strength and tourism support ability. It is therefore important to note that attractiveness of a destination constitutes the primary motivations for a foundation upon which a successful tourism industry can be established.
2.3.2 Support resources

Service quality and customer satisfaction have been critical concepts in the fields of recreation and tourism as well as in marketing. They have been used as indicators of profitability for successful achievement of organizational objectives. Most studies have paid attention to the distinctiveness of these concepts, the ways and means to measure them, and their interrelationship vis-à-vis their influence on outcomes (Lee, 2014). Tasci and Knutson (2004) however subscribe to a different line of thought. They hold that regardless of the type of tourism management tool used, the authentic qualities of the destination and community need to be preserved to keep the local identity of the destination. According to Claudio and Constanza (2017), a destination must have an appropriate level of development in terms of services and destination offer (connectivity, infrastructure, attractions, excursions, hotels, restaurants, etc.). Without these services, the destination cannot compete against other similar alternative tourist destinations.

Infrastructure on the other hand is a critical component of a sustainable and competitive tourism sector which is not only essential for destinations in maintaining and expanding capacity, but also allows for, and encourages improvements in quality, competitiveness and productivity (Cockerell and Goodger, 2011). In Kenya, the travel and tourism sector has been one of the key economic drivers generating over 10% of the country’s GDP and total formal employment. However, lack of infrastructural capacity for the tourism sector coupled with limited investment capital was and has been recognized as the main drawbacks to achieving the country’s goals for the sector (Republic of Kenya, 2008). Egypt’s tourism sector has historically played a central role in the economy, with its total contribution to GDP rising from 8.5% in 1988 to 17.5% in 2010 (WTTC, 2011). It being one of the best tourist destinations of the Middle East region and
Arab countries particularly, are destinations of choice for tourists from around the world. The country’s attractions are diverse, ranging from unique archeological sites, to sandy beaches and cultural festivals, to desert trekking. The well-developed tourism infrastructure such as: sizable bed capacity and direct international connections, has also helped Egypt’s tourism sector attract an increasing diverse range of visitors from Europe, Asia and the Middle East regions (Nasr, 2016).

Destinations have become increasingly reliant on the delivery of quality products and services. Meeting visitor needs and achieving business goals are increasingly inseparable and therefore a commitment to quality by every enterprise in a destination is necessary to achieve and maintain international competitiveness (Go & Govers, 2000). Johns, (1993) perceives quality of tourism services as being crucially linked to the context of service experiences. In consumer settings, both the focal (service) and the contextual (environmental) dimensions of a product play a significant role in determining quality (Gotlieb et al., 1994). Campos-Soria et al. (2005) notes that service quality not only has a positive and direct effect on competitiveness but also an indirect one on competitiveness via other variables such as occupancy rates. McCabe et al. (2012), somehow shared the same opinion that, tourism stakeholders must appreciate the changing role of technology and be willing and ready to embrace it.

According to Iunius et al. (2015), several challenges regarding European tourism industry have been identified with experts trying to formulate several policies within the newest Tourism Action Framework: stimulate long-term competitiveness in the European tourism sector, promote the development of sustainable and high-quality tourism and consolidate the image and promotion of European Tourist destination. As a result, ICT has become a keyword within the European policy. According to the authors, decision makers in European destinations should
focus on identifying innovative ways to implement the new Tourism Action Framework adopted by the European Commission, through ICT applications, in order to support long-term competitiveness achievement.

Dwyer and Forsyth (2010), illustrate that information technology and communication systems are part of the infrastructure that enhances tourism in any region. Further, the two scholars point out that, tourists in the contemporary society want to connect with their relatives once they reach the destination. This means that access to internet and mobile telephony must be guaranteed in the region. The researchers further explain that, demand and supply based on tourism, as a product cannot be of success when information technology infrastructure is not provided. Technological forces paves way for major opportunities and threats that must be considered during formulation of strategies.

According to Buhalis (2000), technological change can, create new markets, change relative cost positions in an industry, reduce or eliminate cost barriers between businesses, create shortages in technical skills, result in changing values and expectations of employees, managers, customers, and create new competitive advantages. Taking advantage of new technologies and the internet can also enable destinations to enhance their competitiveness. E-commerce capabilities can help improve a destination’s competitiveness because of the efficiencies gained through internet technologies (Porter et al., 2001). The new IT tools enable smaller players, to compete on an equal footing with larger players thereby increasing their competitiveness. With new technology and communications, operational costs are reduced and flexibility, interactivity, efficiency, productivity, and competitiveness are enhanced (WTTC, 2001).
According to Wang, Hsu and Swanson (2012), the foundation for building a successful tourism destination, such as a destination’s infrastructure, facilitating resources, enterprise, and accessibility, makes up the supporting factors and resources component. Tőzsér (2010), found out that infrastructure is among the key factors determining attractiveness of a tourist destination. Once at a destination, tourists need also to be able to gain easy access to tourist sites and resources. According to Duval (2007) transport is the trajectory by which movement and mobility is facilitated and it represents the means by which people are shuttled from place to place. Most importantly, it allows for some places to become accessible and connected across networks. He summarizes by asserting that, accessibility is the most critical aspect of understanding transport networks in the context of tourist flows.

Daracha (2013), in his study suggested that focus should be placed on alternative means of transport through direct policies or subsidies. Dominguez et.al. (2015), sought to address the research question of what factors make destination competitive in Australia and Spain. Findings showed that competitive factors are different in determinance, importance and are country-dependent. For Spain, climate, locale and tourist structure are the most important whereas, quality of services, brand and infrastructure were of great importance for Australia. Azzopardi and Nash (2015), in their study a framework for island destination competitiveness – perspectives from the island of Malta found out that public infrastructure supports tourism competitiveness in direct and indirect ways. Respondents stated that the efficiency, costs, speed, and quality of goods and services produced and delivered by industries that support tourism rely on the availability, reliability, safety and efficiency of general infrastructural services.

Loureiro and Ferreira (2015), Sao Tome´ and Príncipe pointed out the need for tourism industry to build basic urban infrastructure for access and provide a legal superstructure. They also
pointed out the need for state to control the quality of the tourist product, institutional promotion of destinations, treatment and distribution of tourism information and deployment and maintenance of basic urban infrastructure. Zhou et al. (2015), applied a hybrid analytical hierarchy process (AHP) to evaluate West Virginia’s resource–based tourism competitiveness in relation to its neighbouring states. Findings revealed that West Virginia performed well in adventure-based and nature-based activities but had a competitive edge on hospitality and friendliness of residents. However, West Virginia was seen to be less competitive on variety and quality of restaurants.

According to Portolan, (2012), Croatia private accommodation capacities are a growing segment of the lodging industry. In the year 2010 for instance, 2,684 million tourists were registered with 19.4 million overnight stays. This is an indication that private accommodation as a secondary type of accommodation cannot be neglected as the amount of expenditures realized in private accommodation is big. Jani and Minde (2016), assessed destination competitiveness of East African countries specifically Tanzania and Uganda, and revealed that accommodation and visitor services were highly competitive in Uganda while transport system and travel motivation were highly competitive in Tanzania. This is an indication that both accommodation and transport system play a determinant role in destination competitiveness.

2.3.3 Destination management

Buhalis, (2000); Pearce, (2001); Grängsjö, (2003); Lee & King, (2006) and Pansiri & Courvisanos, (2010) point out key themes addressed in destination management and strategies as; sustainable development, marketing, planning, organization, operation, strategic alliances, destination networks and impact assessment. These themes can vary depending on spatial scale
contexts including regional, national, local and central government. Therefore, it is important for
destination managers and strategists to consider the development and management of destination
resources (created and supporting factors) through the formulation, implementation, and impact
assessment of tourism strategies and policies that are applied to changing environments. Such
strategies and policies are meant to enhance destination competitiveness, taking into account
both situational and demand conditions.

A study by Chen et al. (2016), sought to explore the notion of destination resources and
competitiveness through comparative analyses of tourists’ perceptions and satisfaction. From the
results, Kinmen Island has not effectively utilized its coastal, historical, and natural resources to
gain competitiveness. Therefore, the local authority should aim to promote tourism via effective
utilization of unique resources on the island, management practices related to inherited and
created resources must be seriously considered to further establish its international awareness
and image. Barbosa, Oliveira and Rezende (2010), asserts that gauging the competitiveness of
tourist destinations in terms of marketing, identifying competitors and determining destination
advantages and disadvantages relative to competitors is a vital marketing technique for tourist
destinations.

Tőzsér (2010), on the other hand argues that management activities and the trends of tourism
developments are affected by the factors of the macro-environment, their decisions and
measures, which is beyond the scope of destination management systems. The same ideology is
reported by World Economic Forum for Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report (2013) that
analyzing existing destination marketing and tourism development planning in the context of
challenges of a more volatile macroeconomic environment is vital. Cvelbar et al. (2016), held
that the drivers of destination competitiveness in developing countries are tourism infrastructure
and destination management, while in developed countries, competitiveness drivers depend on the tourism-specific factor of destination management as well as on wider economic conditions such as general infrastructure, macro-environment and business environment.

Wang, Hsu & Swanson, (2012) identified destination management as the most important dimension of Chinese tourism destination competitiveness and was reflected by five indicators namely: destination marketing, human resource development, destination management organization, information management, and crisis management. Findings suggested several potentially important strategies that Chinese tourism enterprises should consider as; executing effective marketing campaigns such as keeping destination information up to date via an integrated marketing communications program, focusing on employee development by enhancing service providers’ professional knowledge and needs-satisfying skills through effective on-the-job training programs and finally, having a crisis management plan in place (e.g., crowd management) for populated tourist destinations. Armensiki et al. (2011), explored and compared the competitiveness of the tourism industry in Serbia and Slovenia, using the integrated model of destination competitiveness. The results showed that both destinations are more competitive in their natural, cultural, and created resources, but less competitive in destination management with unfavourable demand conditions.

Mihalic et al. (2011), provided a better understanding of destination competitiveness and elements that affect competitive position of a tourism destination. Integrated model of destination competitiveness was used to analyze competitiveness of mentioned destinations and results showed that destinations under study were more competitive in their natural, cultural, and created resources, but less competitive in the destination management and therefore called for relevant proposals to improve competitive positions of these destinations. In his study, tourist
motives and destination competitiveness: A gap analysis perspective, Pansiri (2014) explored the use of gap analysis in examining the demand-side and supply-side perceptions of international tourists’ motives for visiting Botswana, along with Botswana’s competitiveness as a tourist destination. Study reveals that Botswana’s competitiveness as a destination is average and in order for Botswana to be globally competitive, particular attention should be directed at improving the way the destination is managed.

According to Lee and King (2006), a tourism destination is shaped by the capabilities, strategies and competitive environment of destination firms and organizations. Du Toit and Fourie (2012) found proof that climate and environmental factors boost African countries’ comparative advantage in travel service exports. Whereas environmental factors may of course explain the underlying reasons for tourist arrivals, being (relatively) constant, it cannot explain the rapid growth in tourist arrivals, except to the extent that other debilitating factors, acting as binding constraints, are now softened, enabling countries to realize their comparative advantage. Destination environment in terms of climate, scenery, ambience and friendliness has been found to be a key predictor of destination ‘quality’ (Murphy et al., 2000). Resource stewardship is an increasingly important function of destination managers in both the private and public sectors. This recognizes the importance of long-term ‘sustainable competitiveness’ that acknowledges the stewardship of ecological, social and cultural resources.

Dwyer et al. (2014), also supports the fact that public sector supports and creates the framework for tourism development. Thereby, the importance of public-private partnerships is also immense, especially in striving for sustainable tourism development and reaching competitive position on the market. According to Pansiri (2014), destination managers and strategists should consider the development and management of destination resources (created and supporting
factors) through the formulation, implementation, and impact assessment of tourism strategies and policies that are applied to changing environments. Such strategies and policies are meant to enhance destination competitiveness, taking into account both situational and demand conditions. Mulec and Wise (2013) used the integrated model to observe Vojvodina Province competitiveness, addressing inherited resources, created resources, supporting factors, destination management, demand conditions, and situational conditions. From the results, as much as Vojvodina Province possesses much in terms of natural and cultural resources, more investments, marketing and strategic management/planning are needed to make the destination more attractive to international visitors to improve the region’s competitiveness. Similar conclusions were echoed by (Mihalicˇ et al., 2011).

Yuzbasioglu et al. (2014), asserts that tourism and tourism enterprises need to play an active role to overcome the environmental issues since global environmental issues such as climate change, impunity and depletion of the ozone layer have created adverse effect on the natural surroundings. There’s need for tourism enterprises to offer environmental friendly products and services to green tourists inorder to be sustainable. Planning also improves the environmental quality of tourist destinations within the context and framework of sustainable development goals as they are among the key factors for the selection of a tourist destination. Tourism planning should also take into account preservation of the natural environment. Delineating environmental quality as well as branding tourist destinations helps create an enjoyable and memorable experience for the tourists. As a result, tourists align their loyalty to a particular destination and ultimately, the attraction of even more tourists which lead to a boom in the tourism industry of the region (Rezvani et al., 2018).
Recent studies have proposed that development of new products and services within destinations should be strongly interconnected (Touhino & Konu, 2014; Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014; Zehrer et al., 2014) as cooperation between tourism actors seems to be the primary driving force for innovation within the model of destinations (Beritelli, 2011). Competitive advantage requires the management’s ability to balance the multidimensional components of the tourism system (Perna et al., 2018). Loureiro and Ferreira (2015), are of the opinion that destination management should focus on those activities which enhance the appeal of the core resources, strengthen the quality and value of the supporting factors and resources. Competition among tourism destinations continue to intensify with destinations requiring the ability to effectively manage all components of the tourism industry to ensure competitive advantage is developed and maintained (Bornhorst, Ritchie and Sheehan, 2010).

One way of achieving competitiveness in tourism is through designing appropriate competitive strategies, arising from market research that determines market forces and enhance understanding of international tourist movements in various regions. Claudio and Constanza (2017), explored the main features and requirements of destination competitiveness, as well as the main drivers and inhibitors of the competitiveness of Chile as a tourist destination from a stakeholder perspective and found out that awareness and promotion of the destination is extremely relevant for destinations in emerging economies. Andrades and Dimance (2017), examined issues that have affected and continue to affect tourism in Russia and findings revealed a slag in tourism development. This was as a result of numerous issues such as destination image, infrastructure, quality management and sustainable management, despite its great potential. Poon (1993) suggested four key principles which destinations must follow if they are to be competitive: put the environment first; make tourism a leading sector; strengthen the
distribution channels in the market place, and build a dynamic private sector. However, according to Dwyer and Kim (2003), these principles are too broad and general to be meaningful to tourism stakeholders and policy makers.

Hosting of mega events and marketing are some of factors that have played a role in South Africa's competitive performance since 1994. According to Blanke and Chiesa (2013), strengths that make South Africa a desirable destination according to the Travel and Tourism Report are natural resources, cultural resources, world heritage sites, fauna and flora, creative industries, international fairs and exhibitions, infrastructure, air transport, rail quality, policy and regulations, property rights and few visa requirements.

2.3.4 Safety and security

The performance of the tourism industry depends on the industry’s overall structure and the positive environment in which it is situated. According to Ahmed, Azam and Bose (2010), the success or failure of a tourism destination depends on being able to provide a safe and secure environment for visitors. Crime is a growing concern among tourism stakeholders who fear the potential damage that it may inflict on the perception of safety and, by extension, the industry (Volker & Sore´e, 2002). Of even greater concern than crime is the issue of visitor harassment, which also according to them, impacts on the tourist’s sense of safety. It may be claimed that, although varying in severity, it is a widespread phenomenon. Wilde and Cox (2008) are also in agreement that among the destination deterrents are security and safety. Such factors are barriers to visiting a particular destination and consequently tourism growth.

According to World Tourism Organization (1996), the success or failure of a tourism destination depends on the destinations’ ability to provide a safe and secure environment for its visitors. Further, Eitzinger and Wiedemann, (2008) state that, if tourists trust in the safety and security of
a destination, then perceived risk should be lower. According to WEF, (2015) report, tourists are likely to be deterred from travelling to dangerous countries or regions, making it less attractive to develop the tourism sector in those places. According to Lui and Pratt (2017), peace and safety can be a necessary to attract tourists to a destination. Zhou et al. (2015), concluded that safety and security represent a significant element in the evaluation of the competitiveness of the tourism destination.

According to Cizmar and Weber (2000), a destination is considered competitive if it can attract and provide safety to prospective tourists. Elements of safety and security such as political instability/unrest, probability of terrorism, crime rates, record of transportation safety, corruption of police/administrative services, quality of sanitation, prevalence of outbreak of disease, quality/unreliability of medical services and medication are critical qualifying determinants of destination competitiveness (Crotts, 1996). Destination stakeholders must address the risks associated with safety and security. The need to focus on risk and crisis management is important in today’s tourism environment. It is also important for destinations to communicating destination’s risk management strategies in order to maintain visitation and cooperation between governments and tourism operators (Beirman, 2010).

Political instability is important in determining the desirability of a tourist destination (Phakdisoth and Kim, 2007). Teo, Chang and Ho (2001) explored the effects of political instability on tourism development. Results showed man-made disasters such as war, political instability, civil disturbances, insurgency, industrial accidents and terrorist acts can present the same problems seen with a natural disaster, plus additional threats: physical threats, social and political instability and possibly a residual or continued threat from crime and hostile groups. Khanou, Pawson and Ivanovich (2009) agree that man-made threats may also shift from area to
area, constantly changing the dynamics of the risk environment and requiring flexible and real
time responses. In an article by Loureiro and Ferreira (2015), Sao Tome’ and Príncipe (STP)
social, environmental, and economic constraints, findings revealed qualifying determinants as
being peace and safety among other key determinants. A study by Ryglova et al., (2015),
revealed sense of security as the most significant quality destination factors for the residents of
Czech Republic. The factor sense of security contains security issues of the destination, which
includes not only local security situation but also security in form of health risk, safe natural
conditions, crime rate among other factors.

According to WEF (2015), terrorism has been on the rise, while countries such as Middle East,
Ukraine and South East Asia have faced geo-political tensions. Negative environmental changes
have also led to changes in tourism activities such as decline in tourist travel (Zivkovich, 2014),
with numerous research pointing out several insecurity factors as being reasons for decline
and bites from exotic animals and insects as being causes of decline in in-bound tourism. The
world has changed over the attacks in London, Madrid and Newyork. Shelley (2014), global
change or disaster such as: civil riots and war, ethnic conflicts, trafficking, smuggling of
narcotics and weapons as being reasons for decline in tourism travel. Planned targeting of
tourists and terrorism facilities by terrorists represents a gradual alarming trend that results in
several factors. Knowledge and disruption of tourist flows is one of such factors that can have
severe economic and socio-political repercussions on the countries GNP (Kordic et al., 2015).

According to Du Plessis et al. (2017), results revealed that safety and security as well as
uncertainty of political stability of the country remain the primary factor that threatens South
Africa’s tourism industry like many other tourist destinations competitiveness. In Porter's (1990)
diamond of competitive advantage, safety and security forms part of the demand conditions which constitute the standards of demand. Therefore, safety and security is a standard that tourists expect from an experience just as they expect quality experiences, and it should be a priority to the government to ensure safety and security for all. South Africa won the rights to host the 2010 FIFA World Cup (Briedenhann & Wickens 2004). This not only established that South Africa was capable of hosting successful mega events and hosting millions of tourists, but it also demolished the perceived inadequate safety and security measures regarding tourists that had been present since the political instability in the early 1990s (George & Swart 2012).

Kozak et al. (2007), conducted a research on the impact of the perception of risk on international travellers. The primary focus was to investigate the impact of perceived risk on the tendency to travel internationally and to explore whether there would be any difference in the perception of risky places among the three Hofstedes’s uncertainty avoidance index. From the results, majority of travellers were more likely to change their travel plans to a destination that has elevated risk. Findings further suggest that international travellers appear to be sensitive towards occurrence of any type of risks in their suggested destination. According to Sonmez and Graefe, (1998) and Brunt et al., (2000), it is important to understand the basic human need for safety and security inorder to make potential visitors feel secure prior to, or during their vacations. Unfortunately, safety and security problems are often destination specific. Risk and safety concerns have appeared to be a central issue of visitors’ decision-making evaluations. Results suggest that such incidents may have a devastating effect not only on where they have appeared, but also on the decision–making of visitors who would be interested in touring these places. According to Donaldson et al. (2009), the intention of tourists to visit urban destinations is influenced by their perceptions or their knowledge of the specific destination. Risk perceptions,
have an impact on travel behavior. In their study, Re-creating urban destination image: Opinions of foreign visitors to South Africa on safety and Security, findings revealed that more than a third of the respondents were worried about their safety before travelling to South Africa and that the central business districts of Cape Town and Johannesburg were the most feared places they visited. 6% of the respondents admitted to be victims of crime. However, with the hosting of mega events like the 2010 World Cup, perceptions of the visitors changed for the better.

George and Booyens (2014), study aimed to investigate tourists’ perceptions of safety and security whilst on a township tour. Findings showed, majority (73%) of respondents felt safe whilst on a township tour. Eighty-three percent of those surveyed were satisfied with the township tour that they went on, whilst 82% of respondents said that they would recommend a township tour. A study by Salman and Hasim (2012), aimed to trace the factors for visiting Malaysia, image of Malaysia as a tourism destination and competitiveness of Malaysia as a tourism destination among outbound Middle East tourists to Malaysia. From the results, most of the Middle East tourists, safety and security is extremely important for choosing Malaysia as a foreign country for long-haul travel.

2.4 Research Gap

From the literatures reviewed, it’s clear that empirical studies on competitiveness differ from author to author and from destination to destination, implying that competitive factors regarding destinations can never be the same for all destinations. It is also quite clear that studies on competitiveness do not share the same concepts, methodological approach or ways of evaluation and therefore, a challenge lies in trying to attain a deeper understanding of specific salient factors determining competitiveness of a destination. The study has gone ahead to categorize frequently
highlighted destination competitiveness elements into few relevant variables applicable to tourism destinations in western tourist circuit, with the aim of establishing the main determinants of destination competitiveness.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

Destination attractors form the primary elements which attract tourists. They are the fundamental reasons why prospective visitors choose a destination over the other. They include; natural resources, heritage/culture and created resources. The support resources are the basic foundation elements in a destination, i.e.) general infrastructure, accessibility and quality of service. Destination management factors on the other hand enhance the appeal of destination attractors, strengthen the quality and effectiveness of the support resources and best adapt to situational conditions (Crouch and Ritchie 1999). They include; marketing, planning and development and environmental management. Safety and security influence (either positively or negatively) the potential of a destination’s competitiveness. It mitigates destination competitiveness by filtering the influence of destination attractors, support resources and destination management. Each of these factors positively or negatively influence volume of tourist arrivals, volume of repeat visits, investment opportunities and destination awareness.
Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework
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Source: Researcher, (2017)
2.5.1 Concept Tourism destination

Destinations are often seen as the geographical regions serving integrated services to tourists and are composed of the combination of the tourism products or the places with distinct natural attractiveness and properties that may be appealing to the tourists. A proposed tourist destination may be a country or a continent, city, town, an island or places with natural and outstanding landscapes (Buhalis, 2000; Metrin, Baloglu & Ozan, 2009). Barros et al. (2011), defined tourism destination as a geographical area where tourists enjoy various types of experiences. He assumed that a destination is a geographical area in which a tourist can have at least one tourism experience and which, from a destination management organization point of view, can be managed i.e.) can be organized and developed to attract tourists). This study considers places with distinct natural attractiveness and outstanding landscapes as a tourism destination with focus being on perceptions of domestic tourists.

2.5.2 Concept of tourism destination competitiveness

Competitiveness in the tourism industry proves an equally complex and multidimensional issue (Wong, 2009) and, in the view of Balan, Balaure & Veghes (2009), competitiveness has become one of the most commonly deployed concepts for describing approaches to the sustainable development of tourist destinations in recent years. Various authors have provided some inputs into the understanding and practical research of competitiveness in tourism destinations (De Keyser and Vanhove, 1994; Faulkner et al., 1999; Bonn et al., 2005; Cracolici and Nijkamp, 2008; Miller et al., 2008; Dragićević et al., 2009). However, there is no accepted definition of competitiveness and the means to measure it (Croes 2005; Papatheodorou and Song 2005, Gomezelj and Mihalič, 2008).
Porter (1990) viewed competitiveness as an outcome of a nation’s ability to innovatively achieve, or maintain, an advantageous position over other nations in key industrial sectors. According to D’Hartserre, (2000), destination’s competitiveness is the ability to create and integrate value-added products that withstand its resources while maintaining market position relative to competitors’. Hassan, (2000) defines destination competitiveness as the ability of a destination to attract the possible tourists to its region and satisfy their needs and wants. Hudson et al. (2004) viewed a destination’s competitiveness as the country’s ability to proportionately generate more wealth than its competitors in the world markets. Kim (2000) posits tourism sector competitiveness as the capacity, endowed by the prevailing tourism market conditions, the human resources and the tourism infrastructures of a country, to generate added value and boost national wealth. IMD (1994), defined competitiveness as the effective combining of both assets—either inherited or created and processes to transform the assets into economic results.

Hong (2008) defines tourism competitiveness as the ability of a destination to create, integrate and deliver tourism experiences, including value-added goods and services considered to be important by tourists. These experiences sustain the resources of a destination, and help it maintain a good market position relative to other destinations. From the literature reviewed, it’s clear that there is no definition of destination competitiveness which has been agreed upon to date and which has a complete and perfect content as Chon & Mayer, (1995); Metrin, Seyhmus and Ozan, (2009) previously stated. Therefore, this study conceptualizes destination competitiveness as a cluster or system, taking into account the notion that tourist attractions, infrastructure and services jointly determines what a destination has to offer to its visitors.
2.5.3 Concept of tourism destination strategies

Beerli and Mortin (2004) pointed out that tourist destinations must be regarded as brands, which have to be managed from a strategic point of view. Studies have shown that tourism destination competitiveness can be enhanced through the pursuit of strategies, including marketing, destination management and sustainable development (Buhalis, 2000; Dwyer and Kim, 2003; Ritchie and Crouch, 2000). Arguing from a market perspective, Buhalis (2000) has claimed that destination competitiveness can be enhanced through product development, distribution channels, promotion and communication and, most importantly, through pricing. Ritchie and Crouch (2000) have proposed a variety of competitive strategies, which emphasize destination management approaches and activities including organization, marketing, information, quality of service experience, human resource development, visitor management, finance and venture capital and resource stewardship. It is their view that destination competitiveness be enhanced through a carefully selected and well-executed programme of destination management.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

This chapter focuses on research methodology under the following sub headings: model specifications, model assumptions, data types and measurements, research design and data collection procedures, data presentation and analysis as well as the ethical considerations employed in the study.

3.2 Model Specifications

Generalized linear regression model was used to investigate the relationships between individual variables. Generalized linear model refers to a larger class of models popularized by McCullagh and Nelder (1982). In these models, the response variable is assumed to follow an exponential family distribution with mean which is assumed to be some function. The dependent variable is destination competitiveness while independent variable is ‘strategic determinants’, measured using destination attractions, support resources and destination management. The beta (β) coefficient for each independent variable was generated from the models below;

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \varepsilon \]  

...Model 1

\[ Y= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 Z + \beta_5 ZX_1 + \beta_6 ZX_2 + \beta_7 ZX_3 + \varepsilon \]  

...Model 2

Where, Y - Destination competitiveness,

\( \beta_0 \) – is a constant term

\( \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5, \beta_6 \) and \( \beta_7 \), are model coefficients
\( X_1 \) – destination attractors,

\( X_2 \) – support resources,

\( X_3 \) – destination management and

\( Z \) – Moderating variable which is safety and security

\( \varepsilon \) - Error term

3.3 Model Assumptions

The assumptions derived from Generalized Linear Models are:

i. The dependent variable does not need to be normally distributed, but it typically assumes a distribution from an exponential family.

ii. The Model does not assume a linear relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables but it does assume linear relationship between transformed response

iii. The homogeneity of variance does not need to be satisfied.

iv. Errors need to be independent but not normally distributed.

3.4 Data Types and Measurements

The section covers an in-depth discussion on measurement of variables, data types, instrument validity and reliability.
Table 3.1: Measurement of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination attractors</td>
<td>These are tourist resources (both natural and man-made) that form part of attractions in a destination</td>
<td>Natural attractions</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural attractions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Created resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Resources</td>
<td>These are foundations that build a successful tourism destination</td>
<td>General infrastructure</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Management</td>
<td>This involves developing and managing destination resources</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Competitiveness</td>
<td>Ability of a destination to attract possible tourists to its region and satisfy their needs and wants</td>
<td>Volume of tourist arrivals</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New investment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>Are measures that ensure a destination is habitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Researcher (2017)

3.4.1 Data Types

The study used primary data which was information obtained from tourists visiting the targeted tourist destinations in western tourist circuit.

3.4.2 Instrument Validity

Validity is the degree to which you are measuring what you are supposed to, more simply, the accuracy of your measurement (Adams et al., 2007). The study adopted content, construct and face types of instrument validity. Content validity refers to the extent to which the items or behaviours fully represent the concept being measured (Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009). This was ensured by aligning the contents of the questionnaire with the conceptual framework. Construct validity on the other hand is the degree to which scores on a test can be accounted for
by the explanatory constructs of a sound theory (Kothari, 2004). It was ensured through adopting variables and constructs from different theories. Face validity is the extent to which a test is subjectively viewed as covering the concept it purports to measure (Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009). This was ensured through seeking advice from supervisors who helped improve the content of the research instrument.

3.4.3 Instrument Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which an instrument measures the same way each time it is used under the same conditions with the same subjects (Adams et. al., 2007). Cronbach coefficient alpha was used to determine the degree to which the items in the questionnaires correlated. Cronbach’s alpha of more than 0.7 was taken as the cut off value for being acceptable (Cohen et al., 2003). As table 3.1 indicates, the scales are internally reliable, ranging between 0.746 and 0.871.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Scale Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Attractors</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>50.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Resources</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>33.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Management</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>55.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Competitiveness</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>32.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2017)
3.5 **Research Design and Data Collection procedures**

This section looked into the research design ideal for the study and data collection procedures.

3.5.1 **Research Design**

The study employed explanatory research design. As Orodho (2002) posits, the method is ideal for gathering information about people’s perceptions, attitudes, opinions and feelings on a range of social issues. Kothari (2004) however gives its purpose as, describing the state of affairs as it exists at present. It was also very ideal in attaining a deeper understanding of salient factors determining tourism destination competitiveness.

3.5.2 **Target Population**

The study targeted tourists visiting Kisumu Impala Sanctuary set on the shore of Lake Victoria, Thim-Lich Ohinga which is a historic, archeological and cultural site found in Nyatike Sub-County of Migori County, Kakamega Tropical Rain Forest Reserve is the only remaining tropical rainforest (Kambona, 2013 and Nyamweno *et al.*, 2016) and Ruma National Park in Homa-Bay County. These destinations were ideal for the study as they have plenty of resources to attract more tourists but are least competitive in Kenya’s tourism. The target population was freelance hence not quantifiable.

3.6 **Sample size and sampling procedure**

The sample size and sampling procedure ideal for the study are discussed as follows:

3.6.1 **Sample Size**

The sample size comprised of 102 respondents who were tourists visiting the destinations under study in western tourist circuit.
3.6.2 Sampling Procedure

Convenience sampling builds a sample on the basis of finding convenient or available individuals (Ruane, 2006). Convenience sampling was used to select a sample size of 102 respondents who were tourists visiting the destinations. This technique was ideal as it helped recruit respondents with ease and also helps facilitate data collection within a period duration of time (Saunders et. al., 2012).

3.7 Research Instrument

Questionnaires were used to collect data. A questionnaire is a list of questions prepared and distributed for the purpose of securing responses (Singh, 2006). Closed-ended questionnaires were used to gather information which covered a wide range of topics related to the thematic areas of the study. This type of questionnaire was ideal for this study as it helped improve the reliability and consistency of the data. The research instrument had only one section which covered questions on research variables. Concise statements were presented on a 5 point Likert scale which allowed the respondents to express their views from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3.8 Data Analysis and Presentation

This section delves into the data analysis and procedures adopted.

3.8.1 Data Analysis

Eviews was used as a tool to aid analysis. The tool helps carry out statistical analysis of the relationships among series (www.eviews.com). Inferential analysis was used to analyze variables of interest that is the independent variable-strategic determinants and dependent variable-
destination competitiveness. Multiple regression analysis was used to deduce a model that explained the strategic determinants of tourism destination competitiveness. This analysis was ideal since the study had one dependent variable against three independent variables (Kothari, 2004).

3.8.2 Hypothesis Testing

The researcher adopted Z-test to test null hypothesis and infer the influence of strategic determinants on destination competitiveness. This is a hypothesis test based on the Z-statistic which tests the mean of a normally distributed population with known variance (Ruane, 2006).

3.9 Ethical Consideration

This study was conducted in Kisumu Impala Sanctuary, Ruma National Park, Thim-lich Ohinga historical site and Kakamega Tropical Rain Forest Reserve. The researcher got authority to conduct research from the National Commission for Science, Technology and Innovation (NACOSTI). Prior to issuing questionnaire, the consent of each respondent was sought and the nature of study explained to them. They were informed that the information gathered from them would be used only for academic purposes. A combination of all the above aimed at ensuring that the respondents gave correct and vital information.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Overview

This chapter presents results of data analysis. As part of the descriptive statistics, the demographic variables analyzed were: respondents’ age and frequency of visits to the tourist attractions. The findings were also organized according to the objectives: to examine the effect of destination attractors on tourism destination competitiveness, to establish the effect of supporting resources on tourism destination competitiveness, to determine the effect of destination management on tourism destination competitiveness and to examine the effect of safety and security on destination competitiveness. The purpose of the study was to establish main determinants of destination competitiveness in western tourist circuit. Consequently, the independent variable was strategic determinants while dependent variable was destination competitiveness.

4.2 Response rate

150 copies of research questionnaires were distributed and only 102 (68%) questionnaires were returned. Orodho (2003) recommends a response rate of 60% hence the response rate was deemed adequate for the study.

4.3 Descriptive statistics of study variables

From the findings, destination management had the highest mean of 4.284, standard deviation of 0.408, maximum of 5.000 and minimum of 2.850. This was followed by support resources with a mean of 4.195, standard deviation of 0.523, maximum of 5.000 and minimum of 4.250. Destination attractors recorded a Mean of 4.194, Standard deviation of 0.486, a maximum and
minimum of 5.000 and 2.000 respectively. Safety and security had a Mean of 4.078, standard deviation of 0.670, maximum of 5.000 and minimum of 1.000. Destination Competitiveness recorded the lowest mean of 3.892, standard deviation of 1.107, maximum of 5.000 and minimum of 2.000. Jarque-Bera test was used to test normality. From the results, probability was less than 0.05 an indication that data was not normal. To mitigate this, the models were run using generalized linear model which does not require data to be normally distributed.

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>JB (Prob.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Competitiveness</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>10.898 (0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Attractors</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.194</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>14.423 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Management</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.284</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>14.940 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Resources</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.195</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>24.200 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>4.078</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>83.420 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2017)

4.4 Correlation Results

The study sought to establish whether a relationship exists between the variables under study. The independent variables were: destination attractors, support resources and destination management. The moderating variable was safety and security while the dependent variable was destination competitiveness. Results in table 4.2 indicate that safety and security positively and significantly correlated with both destination attractors and support resources. The results concur with Cizmar and Weber (2000) findings that, a tourist’s choice for a specific destination is to a larger extent determined by external factors such as safety. The same views were held by Wilde and Cox (2008); Ahmed et al. (2010); Zhou et al. (2015) and Lui and Pratt (2017). Crotts (1996)
pointed out record of transportation safety, corruption of police/administrative services, quality of sanitation, prevalence of outbreak of disease, quality/unreliability of medical services and medication as being critical qualifying determinants of destination competitiveness. However, with numerous research pointing out several insecurity factors as being reasons for decline in tourism travel, Zivkovich (2014) held a contrary opinion, that negative environmental changes lead to changes in tourism activities such as decline.

Support resources and destination management also positively and significantly correlated, an indication that they both contribute to the success of a destination. This confirms findings by Claudio and Constanza (2017) findings that a destination must have appropriate level of development in terms of services and destination offer without which a destination cannot compete against similar alternative destinations. The results also concurred with Wang, Hsu and Swanson (2012), findings that the foundation for building a successful destination lies with the destination’s infrastructure, facilitating resources and accessibility. However, Dominguez et al. (2015) held a contrary opinion that competitive factors differ in determinacies, importance and are country-dependent.

Results also revealed that destination management positively and significantly correlated with destination attractors. This is an indication that proper management of destination attractors leads to successful growth and development of a destination. Similar results were echoed by Loureiro and Ferreira (2015) that destination management should focus on those activities which enhance the appeal of core resources and attractors. Perna et al. (2018) and Bornhorst et al. 2010 also held the opinion that management should have the ability to balance the multidimensional components of the tourism system inorder to achieve a competitive advantage. Support resources and destination attractors also correlated positively and significantly with destination attractors,
which concurred with findings by Blanke and Chiesa (2013), that support resources and destination attractors are strengths that make a destination desirable. The same sentiments are echoed by Omerzel (2006) who identified inherited, created and support resources as providing various characteristics of a destination that makes it attractive to visit.

**Table 4.2 Correlations matrix of variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Destination Attractors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Support Resources</td>
<td>.682**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] Destination Management</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.644**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] Safety and Security</td>
<td>.214*</td>
<td>.223*</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] Destination Competitiveness</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Source: Survey data (2017)

### 4.5 Hypothesis Testing

To test the hypotheses, the independent variables were regressed against the dependent variable – destination competitiveness. Generalized Linear Model was run for all the two models and results presented in tables 4.3 and 4.4. **Z-statistic** was used to determine whether to or not to reject the null hypothesis while the likelihood ratio test (LR test) was used to compare the goodness of fit of the two statistical models. **LR statistics** were significant for the two models (8.066; p-value=0.045<0.05 and 20.546; p-value=0.005< 0.05) an indication that there was a regression relationship between the variables in the models. The results are presented in table 4.3 and table 4.4 respectively.
4.5.1 The effect of destination attractors on destination competitiveness

The hypothesis that destination attractors does not affect destination competitiveness was rejected as results showed destination attractors ($\beta=0.812$, p-value=$0.011<0.05$) had a significant positive effect on destination competitiveness. This implies that attractiveness of a destination constitutes the primary motivation for a tourist to elect a particular destination. The results concur with findings Vangesayi (2017), that attractiveness enhances the popularity of a tourism destination. Omerzel (2006) is also in agreement that destination attractors play an important role in determining tourism destination competitiveness. Therefore for a tourist destination to have a competitive edge, it must ensure that its overall attractiveness in terms of natural or scenic beauty, culture and tourist experience is superior to other alternative destinations (Dwyer and Forsyth, 2011).

4.5.2 Effect of support resources on destination competitiveness

The hypothesis that support resources does not affect destination competitiveness was not rejected as results ($\beta=-0.443$, p-value =$0.087>0.05$) show an insignificant negative effect on destination competitiveness. As such, support resources do not affect destination competitiveness in western tourist circuit. Wang et al. (2012) held a contrary opinion, that supporting factors and resources component forms the basic foundation for building a successful tourist destination, such as a destination’s infrastructure, facilitating resources, enterprise and accessibility. Additionally, Claudio and Constanza (2017), argued that a destination must have an appropriate level of development in terms of services and destination offer.
4.5.3 Effect of destination management on destination competitiveness

The hypothesis that destination management does not affect destination competitiveness was not rejected for destination management as results ($\beta=-0.523$, p-value $=0.126>0.05$) show an insignificant negative effect on destination competitiveness. The results differed with Loureiro and Ferreira (2015), who argued that destination management should focus on activities which enhance the appeal of the core resources and attractors, strengthen the quality and effectiveness of the supporting factors and resources. The results also differed with Mulec and Wise (2013), as they stressed on the need to market and strategically manage destinations to attract visitors’ in order to improve the region’s competitiveness.

Table 4.3: Regression Model 1
Dependent Variable: Destination Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>z-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Attractors</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Management</td>
<td>-0.523</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>-1.530</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Resources</td>
<td>-0.443</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-1.711</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.589</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>4.423</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean dependent variable 3.892  S.D. dependent variable 1.107
Deviance statistic 1.167  Restr. Deviance 123.814
LR statistic 8.066  Prob(LR statistic) 0.045

Source: Survey data (2017)
4.5.4 Moderation effect of safety and security on relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and destination competitiveness

The hypothesis that safety and security has no significant effect on the relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and destination competitiveness was not rejected. Results ($\beta=2.497$, p-value=$0.069>0.05$) show insignificant positive effect on destination competitiveness. This finding contradicts Ahmed et al. (2010) study that the success or failure of a tourism destination depends on the destination ability to provide a safe and secure environment for its visitors. It also contradicts findings by Beirman (2010), who stressed on the need for destinations to communicate destination’s risk in order to maintain visitation and cooperation between governments and tourism operators.

a) Moderating effect of safety and security on the relationship between destination attractors and destination competitiveness

The hypothesis that safety and security does not moderate the relationship between destination attractors and destination competitiveness was rejected ($\beta=1.231$; p-value=$0.001<0.05$). The regression results indicate that safety and security, positively and significantly moderated the relationship between destination attractors on destination competitiveness. This confirmed findings by Cizmar and Weber (2000) that safety and security forms part of key decisions by potential tourists to visit certain destinations. On its own still destination attractors had a positive significant relationship an indication that with or without safety and security as the moderating variable, destination attractors determined the competitiveness of a destination. As Ritchie and Crouch, (2010) pointed out that attractions are competitive factors determining the success of tourist destinations.
b) **Moderating effect of safety and security on the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness**

The hypothesis that safety and security does not moderate the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness was not rejected. The regression results ($\beta=-0.628; p\text{-value}=0.056>0.05$) reveal that safety and security, negatively and insignificantly moderated the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness. This disapproves a study by Azzorpadi and Nash (2015) that tourism support industries should rely on safety.

c) **Moderating effect of safety and security on the relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness**

The hypothesis that safety and security does not moderate the relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness was rejected. The regression results ($\beta=-1.155; p=0.002<0.05$) reveal that safety and security, negatively and significantly moderated the relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness. This confirms the findings by Beirman, (2010) on the need to focus on risk and crisis management in a destination as it helps communicate destination’s risk management strategies. It also helps maintain visitation and cooperation between governments and tourism operators.
### Table 4.4 Regression Model 2

**Dependent Variable:** Destination Competitiveness

**Method:** Generalized Linear Model (Quadratic Hill Climbing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>z-Statistic</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Attractors</td>
<td>-4.133</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>-2.552</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination Management</td>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Resources</td>
<td>2.276</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security*Destination Management</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>-3.165</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security*Support Resources</td>
<td>-0.628</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>-1.910</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security*Destination Attractors</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>3.195</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.063</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>-1.019</td>
<td>0.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean dependent variable                     | 3.892       | S.D. dependent variable | 1.107 |
| Deviance statistic                          | 1.081       | Restr. Deviance         | 123.814 |
| LR statistic                                | 20.546      | Prob(LR statistic)      | 0.005 |

Source: Survey data (2017)
The tests of hypothesis are as summarized in table 4.6 below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Beta (p-value)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0$: Attractiveness has no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness</td>
<td>0.812 (p&lt;.05)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: Support resources have no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness</td>
<td>-0.443 (p&gt;.05)</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$: Destination management has no significant effect on tourism destination competitiveness</td>
<td>-0.523 (p&gt;.05)</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$: Safety and security has no significant effect on the relationship between destination attractors and destination competitiveness</td>
<td>1.231 (p&lt;.05)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_4$: Safety and security has no significant effect on the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness</td>
<td>-0.628 (p&gt;.05)</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_5$: Safety and security has no significant effect on the relationship between destination management destination competitiveness</td>
<td>-1.155 (p&lt;.05)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data (2017)
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Overview

This chapter presents a summary of the study findings. It also gives conclusions of the study as well as the recommendations derived from the conclusions drawn. The recommendations further outline how development strategies could be revisited by destination managers to incorporate both domestic and international tourists in decision making so that they benefit from the venture. Finally, the chapter outlines suggestions for further research for scholars who may be interested in delving on studies pertaining competitiveness of destinations.

5.2 Summary of findings

The hypothesis on destination attractiveness and destination competitiveness sought to find out whether there was a relationship or not between the variables. Findings revealed \( \beta=0.812; p=0.011<0.05 \) that destination attractiveness had a significant effect on destination competitiveness. The second hypothesis sought to find out whether there was a relationship or not between supporting resources on destination competitiveness. From the findings \( \beta=-0.443; p=0.087>0.05 \), support resources had a negative insignificant effect destination competitiveness, an indication that support resources does not influence competitiveness of a destination. The third hypothesis sought to find out whether there was a relationship or not between destination management on destination competitiveness. Findings \( \beta=-0.523; p=0.126>0.05 \) indicated that destination management had a negative insignificant effect on destination competitiveness. The fourth hypothesis sought to establish whether safety and security as the moderator had effect on the relationship between destination competitiveness determinants and the destination
competitiveness. From the findings, safety and security had \((\beta=2.497; p=0.069<0.05)\) a positive significant effect on destination competitiveness.

The hypothesis that safety and security does not moderate the relationship between destination attractors and destination competitiveness was rejected \((\beta=1.231; p\text{-value}=0.001<0.05)\), an indication that with or without safety and security as the moderating variable, still destination attractors determines the competitiveness of a destination. Further, the moderation effect of safety and security on the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness was not rejected \((\beta=-0.628; p\text{-value}=0.056>0.05)\), an indication that even if the moderation effect of safety and security is considered, still the relationship between support resources and destination competitiveness remains insignificant. The moderating effect of safety and security on the relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness was rejected \((\beta= -1.155; p=0.002<0.05)\), an indication that when the moderation effect of safety and security is considered, the relationship between destination management and destination competitiveness becomes significant.
5.3 Conclusions

From the findings, destination attractiveness determines competitiveness of Western Tourist Circuit. Therefore, it is important to note that a good performance and position in the tourism market does not only depend on capability of a destination to attract tourists, it also requires: the destination to differentiate its products and services by managing the natural and cultural resources adequately. The manner in which the destination is marketed should be broadened taking into account diversification. The low turnout of tourists in the circuit should alarm tourism stakeholders to engage in strong promotional activities.

5.4 Recommendations

Achieving a competitive edge in the tourism market does not depend on capability of a destination to manage and organize its resources, it also requires:

i. A strong spirit of partnership and collaboration among all stakeholders in order to realize the potential of the destination and maximize available resources.

ii. The upgrade of competitive position of western tourist circuit by creating awareness both at local and international levels.

iii. Destination management through adequate management of destination attractors, provide the basis for differentiation from competitive tourist circuits. Destinations within the circuits should manage and organize their resources efficiently in order to provide a tourist experience that must outperform alternative destination experiences.
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

This study served the purpose of providing updated knowledge on theories, concepts, ideas, and empirical studies on competitiveness in the context of tourism destinations competitiveness. Therefore, further research should:

i. Examine critical issues in the competitive process, competitive forces at the industry as well as at the destination level.

ii. Broaden the geographical scope by sampling the remaining seven tourist circuits and within those circuits, sample many destinations. This would help understand tourists’ choice and loyalty for particular destinations.

iii. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the destinations under study, which in turn will help develop correct positioning strategies.
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APPENDICES

Appendix I: Questionnaire

Dear respondent,

I am currently a student in Rongo University pursuing studies for the award of Master of Business Management (Strategic Management option). I am carrying out a study titled Strategic Determinants of Destination Competitiveness. A Case of Western tourist circuit, Kenya. This questionnaire is purely academic and all responses shall be accorded at most confidentiality. Your participation is most welcome.

Determinants of Tourism Destination Competitiveness

Rank the following statements by ticking the corresponding box of the appropriate rank.

SA stands for Strongly Agree, A stands for Agree, UD stands for undecided, D stands for Disagree and SD stands for Strongly Disagree.

1. Destination attractors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural attractions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature-based activities such as bushwalking, bird watching and camping are being offered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is favorable weather/climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environment within and outside the tourist attraction is clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of flora (wild animals) and fauna (vegetation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural attractions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The attraction showcases different artistic/Architectural features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attraction offers an opportunity to learn more about other cultures, their ways of life and heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a variety of cuisine to be sampled within the tourist attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are cultural precincts and (folk) villages within the attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Created Resources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Created Resources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality accommodations within and outside the Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
efficiency in local transport
convention/exhibition facilities
recreational facilities

2. Support resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support resources</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General infrastructure</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate health/medical facilities to serve tourists</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of local transport to the attractions</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of user friendly guidance or information services pertaining the attraction</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need for new technologies to improve the interpretation of tourist attractions</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of service</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attraction offers effective and efficient service delivery</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of financial institutions</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are programmes to ensure/monitor tourist satisfaction</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need to develop training programmes to enhance quality of service</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Destination management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist attractions should seek to increase resident awareness and reputation of domestic holidays</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s need to engage domestic tourists through social networks such as you tube, twitter, facebook, whatsapp, etc to ensure efficient communication</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure consistency in the marketing message, there is need to collaborate with other tourist destinations on the ‘fit’ between destination products and visitor preferences</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s need for co-operation (e.g. Strategic alliances) between firms in destinations to promote tourism</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need for tourist attractions to effectively position their tourist products and services</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and development</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and development should focus on the uniqueness of the destination</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist attractions ‘vision’ should reflect resident values</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing tourism development in the destination is responsive to visitor needs</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is need to increase the recreational and leisure opportunities</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is need to create experiences in the tourist attraction in order to differentiate it from other tourist attractions.

Tourist attractions need to identify major competitors and their product offerings.

**Environmental management**

There’s need for public-sector recognition on importance of ‘sustainable’ tourism development.

There’s need for private sector recognition on importance of ‘sustainable’ tourism development.

There are laws and regulations protecting the environment and heritage.

There is need to research and monitor environmental impacts of domestic tourism.

### 4. Safety and security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Conditions</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Safety and security measures have been ensured within the attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Destination Competitiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume of tourist arrival</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tourist attraction offers unique resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tourist attraction offers a good variety of tourist activities (special events/festivals, entertainment etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume of Repeat visits</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is high quality of services/amenities at the destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tourist destination is committed to providing a satisfactory vacation experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New investment opportunities</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tourist destination has high quality tourism infrastructure (accommodation, telecommunication system, local transport)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tourist destination is committed to providing a safe and secure environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination awareness</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tourist destination is committed to promoting a positive image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is easy access to meaningful information about the destination before travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: The Map of Western Tourist Circuit, Kenya

Source: Adopted from Counties Map of Kenya, 2010
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