



**ICRESH 2020**

**International Conference on Recent Social Studies and  
Humanities  
(Online)**

Venue (online sessions coordinated at)  
Faculdade Letras, Universidade Lisboa, Alameda da Universidade, 1600-214 Lisboa,  
Portugal

**Proceedings Book**





EUROPEAN CENTER FOR SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

ICRESH 2020

International Conference on Recent Social Studies and Humanities

(Online)

Edited by Prof. Dr. Ahmet Ecirli

Proceedings Book

ISBN 978-1-64970-605-8

Venue (online sessions coordinated at)

Faculdade Letras, Universidade Lisboa, Alameda da Universidade, 1600-214 Lisboa, Portugal

#### **Publishing steps of the Proceedings and Organization of ICRESH 2020**

The first meeting has been held on 24 February 2020 concerning the announcement of the ICRESH 2020 by the executive members of the committee. The first call for participation for submission of abstracts and full papers in social sciences, educational studies, economics, language studies and interdisciplinary studies, was announced to the registered subscribers of EUSER email database as well as through conference alerts services on 9 March 2020. The submitted abstracts and papers have been reviewed in terms of eligibility of the titles as well as their contents and the authors whose works were accepted were called to submit their final version of the papers until 20 April 2020. What follows is the result of these academic efforts.

**Typeset by EUSER**

Printed in Lisbon

**Copyright © 2020 EUSER**

© All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher or author, except in the case of a reviewer, who may quote brief passages embodied in critical articles or in a review. Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that the material in this book is true, correct, complete, and appropriate at the time of writing. Nevertheless, the publishers, the editors and the authors do not accept responsibility for any omission or error, or for any injury, damage, loss, or financial consequences arising from the use of the book. The views expressed by contributors do not necessarily reflect those of the European Center for Science Education and Research.

[info@euser.org](mailto:info@euser.org)

## **International Scientific and Advisory Board**

**Ewa Jurczyk-Romanowska**, PhD - University of Wroclaw, Poland

**M. Edward Kenneth Lebaka**, PhD - University of South Africa (UNISA)

**Sri Nuryanti**, PhD - Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Indonesia

**Basira Azizaliyeva**, PhD - National Academy of Sciences, Azerbaijan

**Federica Roccisano**, PhD -

**Neriman Kara** - Signature Executive Academy UK

**Thanapauge Chamaratana**, PhD - Khon Kaen University, Thailand

**Michelle Nave Valadão**, PhD - Federal University of Viçosa, Brazil

**Fouzi Abderzag**, PhD

**Agnieszka Huterska**, PhD - Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

**Rudite Koka**, PhD - Rīgas Stradiņa universitāte, Latvia

**Mihail Cocosila**, PhD - Athabasca University, Canada

**Gjilda Alimhilli Prendushi**, PhD -

**Miriam Aparicio**, PhD - National Scientific and Technical Research Council - Argentina

**Victor V. Muravyev**, PhD - Syktyvkar State University of Pitirim Sorokin, Russia

**Charalampos Kyriakidis** - National Technical University of Athens, Greece

**Wan Kamal Mujani**, PhD - The National Universiti of Malaysia

**Maria Irma Botero Ospina**, PhD - Universidad Militar Nueva Granada, Colombia

**Mohd Aderi Che Noh**, PhD - National University of Malaysia

**Maleerat Ka-Kan-Dee**, PhD

**Frederico Figueiredo**, PhD - Centro Universitário Una, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

**Iryna Didenko**, PhD - Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

**Carlene Cornish**, PhD - University of Essex, UK

**Sadegh Ebrahimi Kavari**, PhD

**Mohammed Mahdi Saleh**, PhD - University of Jordan

**Andrei Novac**, MD - University of California Irvine, USA

**Ngo Minh Hien**, PhD - The University of Da Nang- Universiy of Science and Education, Vietnam

**Kawpong Polyorat**, PhD - Khon Kaen University, Thailand

**Haitham Abd El-Razek El-Sawalhy**, PhD - University of Sadat City, Egypt

**Ezzadin N. M.Amin Baban**, PhD - University of Sulaimani, Sulaimaniya, Iraq  
**Ahmet Ecirli**, PhD - Institute of Sociology, Bucharest, Romania  
**Dominika Pazder**, PhD - Poznań University of Technology, Poland  
**Sassi Boudemagh Souad**, PhD - Université Constantine 3 Salah Boubnider, Algérie  
**Lulzim Murtezani**, PhD - State University of Tetovo, FYROM  
**Ebrahim Roumina**, PhD - Tarbiat Modares University, Iran  
**Gazment Koduzi**, PhD - University "Aleksander Xhuvani", Elbasan, Albania  
**Sindorela Doli-Kryeziu** - University of Gjakova "Fehmi Agani", Kosovo  
**Nicos Rodosthenous**, PhD - Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece  
**Irene Salmaso**, PhD - University of Florence, Italy  
**Non Naprathansuk**, PhD - Maejo University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>THE AGRO EXPORTS OF ORGANIC NATIVE PRODUCTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY IN PERU</b> .....	<b>7</b>
EDELINA COAYLA YSABEL BEDÓN	
<b>THE EFFECT OF CORRUPTION AND FDI ON THE ECONOMIC GROWTH IN ALBANIA: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS FROM 2002 TO 2019</b> .....	<b>21</b>
TEUTA XHINDI KEVIN SHESTANI	
<b>A COMBINED APPROACH INTERVENTION TO PROMOTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS’ INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE</b> .....	<b>33</b>
KAROL CUBERO VÁSQUEZ	
<b>COMPETITIVENESS OF TOURIST DESTINATIONS THEORETICAL STUDY OF THE MAIN MODELS</b> ..	<b>43</b>
DIAMANTINO RIBEIRO PEDRO HENRIQUES LUIZ PINTO MACHADO	
<b>EUROPEAN SCHOOL INTEGRATION PROCESS - THE CASE OF ALBANIA</b> .....	<b>62</b>
VALBONA CINAJ BUKURIE KALLANXHI (HAXHIA)	
<b>METH AND MURDER: THE VIOLENT SUCCESS OF DUTERTE’S WAR ON DRUGS</b> .....	<b>78</b>
MARK LEE	
<b>DETERMINANTS UNDERSCORING VOCATIONAL TRAINING: A SOUTH AFRICAN PUBLIC SERVICE CASE</b> .....	<b>93</b>
PETRONELLA JONCK	
<b>STUDY CHANGES IN THE LEVEL OF MORAL FIGHTING BETWEEN MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS - A CASE STUDY MADRASA HAXHI MAHMUD DASHI AND QEMAL STAFA SECONDARY SCHOOL</b> ..	<b>108</b>
FATIH UFUK BAĞCI	

**IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION PROCESSES AMONG ASIAN IMMIGRANT ENTREPRENEURS IN  
POLAND. CASE STUDY BASED ON VIETNAMESE, CHINESE, INDIAN, SOUTH KOREAN, AND  
FILIPINO GROUPS..... 126**

RENATA CZEKALSKA

ADAM W. JELONEK

---

## Competitiveness of Tourist Destinations Theoretical Study of the Main Models

**Diamantino Ribeiro**

Universidade de Évora; CEFAGE-UÉ,

**Pedro Henriques**

Universidade de Évora; CEFAGE-UÉ

**Luiz Pinto Machado**

Universidade da Madeira, CEFAGE-UÉ

### Abstract

Since the early 1990s, several models have been developed to study and analyze the Competitiveness of Tourist Destinations (CTD). The importance of using models that allow results focused on destination performance and real-time access to results by decision makers and managers is fundamental; this premise has motivated us to study in depth the scope and applicability in time and space of each of the 9 models analyzed (1. Crouch e Ritchie (1999); 2. Dwyer e Kim (2003); 3. Enright e Newton (2004); 4. Gooroochurn e Sugiyarto (2005); 5. Fórum Mundial (2007); 6. Mazanec, Wöber e Zins (2007); 7. Hong (2008); 8. Kim (2012); 9. Cvelbar e al. (2016)). The study made it possible to understand the virtue and usefulness of each model, which helped to systematize the advantages and disadvantages pointed out to each one and their eventual complementarity, and in this way we started the theoretical construction of a new CTD base model aligned with current needs, which will be the object of specific study in another article. This review of the literature led to the conclusion that, although there is a wide range of approaches, the various authors end up drawing an ideological line in terms of objectives and results for tourist destinations: the Competitiveness of the Tourist Destination should aim at the socio-economic prosperity of the destination and contribute to increase the well-being of the local population.

**Keywords:** Competitiveness; Tourist destination; Economy; Models; Tourism.

### Introduction

As a result of the exponential growth of tourism, particularly in the years following the global financial crisis, there has been an almost unlimited expansion of tourism supply, which has consequently led to increased competition between tourist destinations, fostering creativity, innovation and continuous improvement. Other factors such as the ability to meet the expectations of modern tourists, the creation of new products and experiences, and the increase in the quality of services and products, contribute to greater competitive pressure from the organizations involved in the sector in general, and in each destination in particular.

---

It is therefore increasingly important to develop models that contribute to the assessment of the competitiveness of tourist destinations (CTD).

In this study, a theoretical review of the models most commonly used in the study of tourist destination competitiveness is carried out; this synthesis is part of a broader study on the competitiveness of tourist destinations and on the importance of using models that allow results focused on performance and real-time access to results by decision-makers and managers, so that their intervention and decision is focused, effective and agile.

To this end, it is particularly important to understand to what extent CTD models can contribute to creating a real competitive advantage and how their approach is simply analytical or whether they can somehow be implemented as a management tool, contributing to good governance and results-oriented management of the member organisations of a tourist destination.

### **Some models of Tourist Destination Competitiveness**

One of the major problematic issues of this subject is related to the conceptual approach. There are many definitions of tourist destination and competitiveness of tourist destination. It is not intended to carry out a study on the different approaches, some aspects of these two concepts are highlighted.

First of all, the presence of attraction factors (physical, resources, natural landscape or social factors, such as the spoken language and the sympathy of the local population) are considered necessary conditions, but not sufficient to transform a territory into a tourist destination. The key factor for the rise and continued development of a tourist destination lies in the quality and effectiveness of relations between service providers and, between them and the environment of the destination. Effective relations can offer the tourist destination the basis for agility in dynamic and turbulent market conditions. Offering an ever more demanding tourist an integral, flexible and personal experience, as a result of interactions between specialized service providers, can be a winning strategy for the tourist destination to develop in a sustainable way and emerge in global competition (Ammirato, 2014; Dunn Ross, E., Iso-Ahola, 1991; Buckley, 1994).

Tourism competitiveness is based on the level of productivity determined by the set of tourist product destinations, policies, environmental factors and competitive advantage (Cucculelli, M., & Goffi, 2016; Koo, C., Shin, S., Gretzel, U., Hunter, W. C., & Chung, 2016).

Additionally, the level of competitiveness is the main determinant of a destination's performance in the global tourism sector (Hanafiah, M., Hemdi, M., & Ahmad, 2016b).

In short, a destination must remain competitive to optimize its full potential and sustain and control a large part of the rapidly growing tourism market (Hanafiah, M., Hemdi, M., & Ahmad, 2016a). The competitiveness applied to Tourism and in particular to Tourist Destinations refers to the ability of a given destination to provide goods and services considered by Tourists superior to other competing destinations (Abrham, 2014).

To maintain the competitiveness of a destination, stakeholders need to continuously improve tourism offers by developing new services and products. This is a key challenge for tourist destinations to strengthen and even maintain their competitive positions in an increasingly competitive global market (Forum, 2013). Also, the assessment of the competitiveness of a destination depends directly on the policies adopted, especially with regard to resource



management. For this reason, the issue of tourist destination competitiveness has become essential for strategic planning and for researchers of tourist destination issues (Mendola, D., & Volo, 2017).

We now present the CTD models that in our opinion have stood out in scientific literature in recent years.

### **Calgary model from Ritchie and Crouch (1999)**

One of the most recognised contributions in this area is undoubtedly the model proposed by Ritchie e Crouch (1999). Its main objective is to identify and consider the important factors that characterize the competitiveness of a destination (Duarte, Simões, & Crespo, 2016)

The authors were pioneers in developing conceptual contributions on the competitiveness of tourist destinations (CTD), developing the well-known Calgary competitiveness model (Garau, 2006; Hanafiah, M. & Zulkifly, 2019).

With the Calgary model, the authors offer a frame of reference to help the destination compete more efficiently and argue that one of the goals of a competitive tourist destination is to increase the well-being of the local population. The authors establish that in order to understand the long-term competitiveness of a destination, two elements must be taken into account:

- comparative advantage (endogenous resources) which are the resources of the destination (human resources, physical resources, knowledge of resources, availability of capital, tourism infrastructure, historical and cultural resources and size of the economy) and
- competitive advantage (deployed resources) that concern the ability to use these resources effectively in the long term (auditing and inventory, maintenance, growth and development, and efficiency).

Ritchie e Crouch (1999) consider that the competitiveness of tourism is always conditioned by factors external to the system itself.

They identify as macroenvironmental:

- economic, technological, environmental, political, legal, socio-cultural and demographic factors.

On the other hand, the authors take into consideration the competitiveness of the microenvironment:

- residents, employees, social circles, financial institutions, tourists, tourism enterprises, etc..

Ritchie e Crouch propose a model whose key are the resources, since they work as attraction factors and attract tourists to the destination. According to the authors, competitiveness depends essentially on resources and basic attractions and on factors supporting the destination itself.

They also contemplate the existence of a policy of planning and development of destinations, in addition to limiting and/or amplifying determining factors that influence competitiveness.

Crouch and Ritchie's conceptual model is not a "predictive or causal" model, but only explanatory.

In addition to the elements indicated, the authors state that the following aspects should also be considered:

- Determinants and sustainability of the destination (location, interdependencies, security, awareness/image, cost/value).
- Policy, Planning and Development of the Destination (definition of the system, philosophy/values, vision, audit, positioning/branding, development, competitive/collaborative analysis, monitoring and evaluation).
- Destination Management (resources, marketing, financing, organization, human resources development, information/research, quality of service/experience, visitor management, crisis management).
- Resources and Basic Attractions (climate, culture, history, market links, mix of activities, special events, entertainment and structure).
- Support Factors and Resources (infrastructure, accessibility, facilitating resources, hospitality, business, political willingness).

The Calgary model has been improved several times by other tourism researchers and continues to be constantly tested, strengthened, and challenged. For example, Kim (2012), criticised the structure of Ritchie and Crouch for failing to recognise the role of the economy and globalisation in the competitiveness of destinations. Heath (2003), also criticized the model for ignoring the impact of environmental factors on the competitiveness of fate. In turn, Beeton (2005), expresses concern that the Calgary model of Ritchie and Crouch focuses on a specific tourism model that seems to come mainly from research in developed countries rather than including undeveloped countries. In addition, there is concern that the Calgary model of Ritchie and Crouch will focus on a specific tourism model that seems to come mainly from research carried out in developed countries rather than including undeveloped countries, Dwyer e Kim (2003) They argued that the Ritchie and Crouch model was not sufficient to account for the competitiveness of the tourist destination, since only tourism supply factors were used, while demand factors were neglected. Another limitation is that some of the indices proposed by the authors could not be calculated, apart from excluding ecological quality (Duarte et al., 2016).

However, the studies developed by Crouch and Ritchie served as a basis for several studies and authors that complemented the model, alerting however the need for constant comparisons between the various competitors (destinations) for a certain set of indicators representative of their competitiveness (Hong, 2008; Ivars-Baidal, Celdrán-Bernabeu, Mazón, & Perles-Ivars, 2019; Mendola, D., & Volo, 2017).

In 2003, Heath presents a model for South Africa's competitiveness that manages to encompass elements from the more generalist literature, but also indicators of competitiveness in tourism defined by authors such as Crouch and Ritchie.

According to Hong (2008), the Calgary model, although adequate and precise to explain the phenomenon of tourism competitiveness, has some limitations in terms of its transposition into measurement exercises, therefore, it does not define any order of importance of the factors, nor does it reflect on the interaction between comparative advantages, competitive advantages and tourism competitiveness and, finally, it uses a qualitative rather than quantitative approach (Hong, 2008).

### **Dwyer and Kim model (2003)**

Dwyer e Kim (2003) complement the CTD model of Crouch e Ritchie (1999) adding several variables.

Dwyer and Kim's model establishes a clearer relationship between the dimensions, allowing the identification of those that directly or indirectly influence competitiveness; moreover, it proposes new indicators, complementing some limitations that some authors pointed out to the model of Crouch e Ritchie (1999).

Dwyer e Kim (2003), in line with Crouch and Ritchie (1999), argue that the competitiveness of fate is an objective for socio-economic prosperity.

Although the Dwyer and Kim model has several variables to evaluate competitiveness, it is not easy to apply as it lacks information that allows comparing different destinations (Domareski-Ruiz, Akel, & Gonçalves Gândara, 2015).

The set of indicators developed by Dwyer and Kim are important for the definition of the CTD. The model proposed by Dwyer e Kim (2003) considers four main determinants distributed in four blocks:

- Resources
- Tourism destination management
- Situational conditions
- Demand

These determinants complement each other in order to achieve tourism competitiveness. They therefore argue that the results of competitiveness should be visible in the socio-economic prosperity of the tourist destination and in increasing the quality of life of its population (Domareski-Ruiz et al., 2015).

Dwyer and Kim's Model identifies six main factors:

1. Main resources (resources endowed and created);
2. Support factors and resources (general infrastructure, quality of services and accessibility);
3. Destination management factors (activities and functions);
4. Conditions of demand (consciousness, perception and preferences);
5. Situational conditions (economic, social, cultural, demographic, environmental, political, etc.)
6. Market performance indicators.

Dwyer and Kim's model objectively suggests links between the various elements of the CTD when compared to Calgary's model, (Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, 2003). In addition, Dwyer and Kim's model recognises supply and demand conditions as essential determinants of CTD, which is in line with the concept that a competitive destination must constantly seek to increase demand by continuously developing tourism products.

Domareski e Ruiz (2015) mention some limitations of the model, including its practical application, since the collection of information on each destination, although it considers it

useful, may become impractical in terms of cost and also due to the lack of available data that allow comparison between destinations (Domareski-Ruiz et al., 2015).

The model built by Dwyer and Kim was used to measure the competitiveness of destinations like South Korea and Australia. The authors consider several indicators to quantify the competitiveness of destinations, but recognize that they could have added or adjusted the basis of the research (Dwyer, L., & Kim, 2003).

Furthermore, according to Kim and Dwyer, it would be interesting to evaluate the indicators according to their degree of importance for tourism in South Korea or Australia; but such action would be complicated as it would require a very disaggregated examination of the reasons for visitors to each destination and continuous monitoring of changes in their preferences.

The model was applied by Dwyer e Kim, (2003) first in Australia and then in Korea; then Gomezelj (2006) used in Slovenia followed by several other researchers such as Omerzel and Mihalic (2008), Armenski et al (2011), Khoshkhoo et al (2015).

Lee and King (2009) developed a study on the determinants of Taiwan's competitiveness as a tourist destination using the Delphi method; building on earlier research by Dwer and Kim, Ritchie e Crouch (2003) e Enright e Newton (2004) The authors identified in a pilot study a total of 69 determinants separated into three dimensions and nineteen topics of analysis.

In the year 2011, Crouch sought to assess the importance and impact of a set of attributes of competitiveness, which were analyzed by a panel of experts using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP); this study concluded that of the 36 attributes analyzed, 10 attributes were identified whose importance was recognized, being the physiography and climate, mix of activities, culture and history, tourist superstructure, security, value/cost, accessibility, special events, recognition and image and also location.

#### **Enright and Newton model (2004)**

Enright e Newton (2004) argue that the CTD is related to the capacity of attraction and satisfaction of tourists. The authors present a simple CTD model, aimed at empirical application. For them, the competitiveness of the tourist destination should not be seen as an abstract element, being necessary to define measurement parameters that allow an evolutionary and comparative evaluation between destinations.

In the model developed, the perspective of importance-performance analysis is adopted, presenting results based on the combination of the importance of each question of the tourist destination's competitiveness with the destination's performance in each of these aspects.

In this way, Enright and Newton improve the previous theoretical perspectives by distinguishing the determinants of the tourist destination's competitiveness by degree of importance. The model consists of a long list of determinants of tourist destination competitiveness, separated into two categories: tourism-specific factors and business factors in general (Enright, M. & Newton, 2004).

The list of specific factors has been drawn up based on the key and attractive resources of Ritchie e Crouch (1999), Some adaptations and the addition of specific items of urban destinations are made based on previous studies on the subject. For the definition of business factors in general, it has expanded the research beyond the area of tourism, taking as reference

the literature on competitiveness in a broader way. Altogether, 52 variables were listed, 14 being related to tourism specific factors and 37 to business factors in general.

Enright e Newton, (2004) study the competitiveness of tourist destinations from the perspective of supply, specifically conducted surveys of professionals in the tourism sector in Hong Kong. They first inquire about the importance of attractive and business factors in the competitiveness of urban tourism in the Asia-Pacific area. They then compare Hong Kong with its main competitors and estimate the relative competitiveness of each country in relation to these factors. The authors use the IPA grid, a method of frequent analysis in tourist destination research, but not in the literature in general, which allows them to prioritize among the determinants of competitiveness and of Hong Kong's relative position relative to its main competing destinations (Garau, 2006). The model also shows the result of the analysis in a more accessible and practical way for decision making (Enright, M. & Newton, 2004).

It allows the identification of the key factors of the destination represented in four quadrants:

Q1- Attributes to maintain: the destination is in a better position than its competitors.

Q2- Useless efforts: the destination has a good relative position, but they are not important factors for competitiveness.

Q3- Non-Determinants: elements which, although they do not have a good relative position, are also not decisive in their competitiveness.

Q4-Fundamentals: attributes where fate has to concentrate, as these are important elements and fate does not yet have a good relative situation.

The authors intend to contribute with a quantitative analysis and an empirical methodology that is able to provide a basis for management and political decision-making in the tourism sector. In addition, this study identifies a number of competitors in urban tourism in the Asia-Pacific region and proposes a classification of the importance of attractions and factors related to the tourism industry in the region. However, they are unable to achieve a ranking of destinations' competitiveness and do not take into account the motivations of visitors (Garau, 2006).

The contribution of Enright e Newton, (2004) makes it possible to compare the competitiveness of one destination against another or other competing destinations. For this reason, it is impossible to establish a ranking of competitiveness of destinations. In some cases, the data are processed only in the country being studied and not in that of its competitors. In addition, they sometimes identify countries that they consider to be major competitors without comparing them.

### **Gooroochurn e Sugiyarto Model (2005)**

The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), in collaboration with the Christel DeHaan Travel Research Institute (TTRI) at the University of Nottingham, has created the "Competitiveness Monitor (CM)" for tourism in order to develop benchmarks between countries (Gooroochurn, N., & Sugiyarto, 2005).

Gooroochurn e Sugiyarto, (2005) believe that not all factors have equal impact on the competitiveness of the tourist destination. The weights, from zero to one, granted to each of the eight indicators, are as follows:

1. Technology (0,220).
2. Social Index (0,217).
3. Human Resources (0,153).
4. Price (0,147).
5. Openness (0,126).
6. Infrastructure (0,101).
7. Human Factor (0,033).
8. Environment (0,003).

After calculating the competitiveness index, a classification is assigned which makes it possible to establish the degree of CTD of the respective countries (Garau, 2006).

From the application of the model, it is concluded that the most competitive tourist destinations are: United States, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Australia. The less competitive ones are: Burkina Faso, Chad, Benin, Ethiopia and Cambodia (Gooroochurn, N., & Sugiyarto, 2005).

Gooroochurn e Sugiyarto, (2005), try to solve the issue of lack of data and thus manage to compare the competitiveness of several countries (Garau, 2006). Meanwhile, Garau, (2006), states that the model reports some visible disadvantages in the results. They reveal that, except for the United States, none of the other countries mentioned above as more competitive appears in the ranking of the most visited countries in the world (according to the world ranking of the main tourist destinations in millions of tourist arrivals) such as France, Spain, China and Italy. In addition, the weight given to the indicators may be questionable (for example, the indicator with the greatest weight is Technology, while the Environment is considered the lowest weight factor).

Authors, such as Ritchie e Crouch, (2003), and others, emphasize that natural and environmental resources are one of the main attractions of a destination (Garau, 2006).

The indicators presented refer to social, human, economic and environmental aspects. However, they do not take into account the business structure of tourist destinations and therefore deviate from the structural approach that considers the company as an essential part of the competitiveness of destinations (Flores, D. & Barroso, 2009).

Navickas (2009), based on the Competitiveness Monitor described above, has modified some of the indicators used in this model to assess the competitiveness of tourist destinations and included additional indicators to reflect the conditions necessary for a contemporary tourism system. For example, the price competitiveness indicator was complemented with the restaurant price indicator and the prices of tourism supply of goods and services (souvenirs, etc.). Regarding infrastructure development indicators, they propose to improve the competitiveness of tourist destinations by aggregating more transport-related indicators: rail network, quality of the telecommunications system and airlines. Regarding the human dimension of the tourism sector, they add the population indicator; finally, in terms of social development indicators, they replace the "personal computers" indicator with "number of cafés with Internet".

Some authors such as Taberner, (2007) indicate that the results of the Competitiveness Monitor deviate from reality, since countries considered to be more competitive do not end up appearing among the main international destinations (Vieira, D., Hoffmann, V., Dias, C., & Carvalho, 2009).

### **World Economic Forum Models (2007)**

The World Economic Forum was established in 1971 as a non-profit foundation and is based in Geneva, Switzerland. Its activities are based on an institutional culture founded on the interest of the parties, stating that organizations are responsible for themselves and all parts of society (Aguillar, 2017).

Its main mission is the commitment to improving the state of the world. The Forum brings together the world's leading political leaders, businesses, and other members of society at large who define regional and global agendas and their own. The main elements of the World Economic Forum are independence, impartiality and detachment from any special interest (Aguillar, 2017).

The World Economic Forum defines competitiveness as the set of institutions, policies and factors that determine the level of productivity of an economy. This definition has evolved since 2000, where it is added that a competitive country enables a high standard of living, employment, and economic growth in the medium and long term. It may be implied that, since then, economic and geopolitical issues are changing and economies are moving forward and forward very rapidly, and the competitive concept must also be reworked (Aguillar, 2017).

O Fórum Económico Mundial publicou o Índice de Competitividade Global (ICG), desenvolvido por Xavier Sala-Martín em colaboração com o Fórum. O ICG combina 114 indicadores que capturam conceitos importantes para a produtividade e a prosperidade a longo prazo e que se agrupam em 12 pilares:

1. Institutions
2. Infrastructures
3. Macroeconomic environment
4. Health and primary education
5. Higher education and training
6. Efficiency of the goods market
7. Efficient labour market development
8. Technological Rapidity
9. Market size
- 10 Sophistication
11. Innovation
12. Business

These pillars are organized within three sub-indices: basic requirements, increased efficiency and factors of sophistication and innovation.

Almost thirty years after the start of work in the field of competitiveness, the World Economic Forum created in 2007 the "Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Index" (TTCI) due to the great importance of the sector for the world economy.

At the World Economic Forum, the TTCI is defined as measuring the set of factors and policies that enable the sustainable development of the travel and tourism sector, which in turn contributes to the development and competitiveness of the country (World Economic Forum, 2015).

In the last edition of the CTD, published in 2015, data from 141 countries were presented. The methodology developed has undergone some adaptations since its creation in 2007, but has maintained the same logical structure. Currently, the TTCI is composed of four sub-indices; each sub-indices is composed of different pillars. Finally, each pillar is made up of a series of measurable indicators. The TTCI is made up of the successive aggregation of scores, from the indicator level to the sub-indices level, by means of arithmetic mean. Thus, all indicators have the same weight in the formation of the pillars, all pillars have the same weight in the formation of the sub-indices, and all sub-indices are equally important in the formation of the final index (World Economic Forum, 2015).

The TTCI has been specially designed for application in countries; for this reason it becomes difficult to use in regions or destinations (G. I. Crouch, 2011); since tourism is a local economic activity, an analysis at country level cannot distinguish between local or regional realities (Rodrigues, L., & Carrasqueira, 2011).

#### **Mazanec, Wöber and Zins Model (2007)**

Mazanec, Wöber e Zins (2007) present a theoretical model of Tourist Destination Competitiveness distinguishing causes and consequences. According to the authors, the previously published models confuse these two categories of variables both in theoretical terms and in their empirical applications.

In their theoretical model, they consider that the CTD results from 8 factors that can be estimated based on 25 measurable indicators; the 8 factors, are:

- 1) Openness: visa requirement for foreigners, openness to tourism, openness to trade, taxation on international trade.
- 2) Culture and heritage: World Heritage Sites.
- 3) Infrastructure: roads, public health structures, access to drinking water.
- 4) Communication structure: Internet hosts, fixed telephone lines, mobile telephony.
- 5) Social competitiveness: GDP per capita, life expectancy, newspapers, television sets.
- 6) Price competitiveness: hotel rates, purchasing power parity.
- 7) Environmental preservation: population density, carbon dioxide emissions, ratified environmental treaties.
- 8) Education: adult literacy rate, schooling.

In addition, they state that the CTD has as a consequence the market share and the growth rate of tourism demand of the destination. Market share is measured in two different ways, in a common way and in such a way as to deduct the effect of the distances between the receiving



countries and the main tourist issuing markets. This set of consequences is used as a way of measuring the CTD.

The model developed was empirically tested in a sample of 169 countries. The parameters were estimated using a model of structural equations with treatment for missing data. The results led to the conclusion that the factors "culture and heritage", "social competitiveness" and "education" contribute to the CTD. On the other hand, the communication structure revealed a negligible influence on CTD, while the influences of price competitiveness, infrastructure, environmental preservation and openness were not confirmed (Mazanec, J. A., Wöber, K., & Zins, 2007).

### **Hong Model (2008)**

Hong (2008) identifies two main approaches to competitiveness measurement issues:

- In a first topic, the competitiveness of a given industry is assessed from the point of view of cost-benefit analyses, the most common being those related to productivity or prices.
- Another approach focuses on the resources of a given organization, such as assets, organizational processes, information or knowledge.

The recognition of the polemic related to the identification of a factor as determining the competitiveness of an industry has led to the development of several approaches to measuring competitiveness that consider numerous factors and that, following this observation, establish relative rankings (Hong, 2008).

Hong refers to tourism competitiveness as "the ability of a destination to create, integrate and offer tourist experiences, including value-added products and services considered important by tourists". (Hong, 2009, p. 109).

According to the author, these tourist experiences support the resources of a destination and contribute to maintaining a good market position in relation to other competitors.

The author suggests a model for analyzing the competitiveness of a tourist destination that takes into account the comparative advantages of Ricardo:

- natural resource conditions (exogenous comparative advantages)
- degree of technological change (endogenous comparative advantages)

and Porter's competitive advantages, which explain the increase in trade between countries with similar allocations of factors; tourism management, offering quality education and training to improve comparative and competitive advantages; and, finally, environmental conditions, both domestic and global (Hong, 2009).

Hong refers to the Ritchie and Crouch model as the most important work in assessing the competitiveness of tourism. However, it states that there are certain issues to be improved. With his model, he wants to address some of the gaps he identifies in the Calgary model.

- First, the author clarifies that the order of factors and categories of variables should be treated more strictly, according to their relevance.
- Second, he states that the Calgary model does not evaluate the interaction between comparative and competitive advantages and tourism competitiveness.

- Finally, it points out that many of the factors present in the Ritchie and Crouch model are evaluated in a qualitative rather than quantitative manner.

The model and methodology proposed by Hong allow us to weigh and prioritize the importance of each factor and indicator in terms of their contribution to the competitiveness of the tourist destination.

1. Exogenous comparative advantages are the most important factor (49.18%) for improving the competitiveness of a tourist destination and, more specifically, the cultural and natural resources;
2. Other important factors are competitive advantages (17.27%);
3. Tourism management (12.01%);
4. Endogenous comparative advantages (10.62%)
5. Overall environmental conditions (6.03%);
6. The least relevant factor is the domestic environment conditions (4.89%)

Modelo de Kim (2012)

Kim (2012) suggests the tourist destination as a model of competitiveness divided into two groups of countries (high and low income) in order to identify the most significant factors of this competitiveness. The degree of impact of the factors is different between the two groups of countries analyzed: for countries with higher incomes, the most important factor is the main resources; while for countries with low incomes, it is the globalization of the economy (Kim, 2012).

Thus, Kim applied his competitiveness model to the study of a set of countries, and used as determining questions:

- The main features and attractions.
- Complementary conditions (tourist infrastructure and destination infrastructure in general terms).
- Destination management.
- Demand conditions.

The indicators used are part of the Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Index of the World Economic Forum.

Among the main features and attractions are the variables:

- natural resources (sites classified as natural heritage by UNESCO, protected areas and environmental quality);
- cultural resources (sites classified as cultural heritage by UNESCO);
- created resources (sports stadiums per capita, average number of fairs and exhibitions and percentage of exports of creative industries).

Complementary conditions include the following variables:

- tourism infrastructure.
- air infrastructure.
- ground infrastructure.
- information and communication technology infrastructure, hospitality and accessibility.

The management of the destination includes:

- the prioritization of tourism policy (TTCI score);
- the quality of the education system;
- the availability of educational and training services;
- the degree of training of human resources and;
- environmental management (sustainability of tourism development, CO2 emissions per capita and number of environmental treaties ratified).

Finally, demand conditions include:

- price competitiveness (cost of access to destination, prices in purchasing power parity, taxation, fuel prices, average price of rooms),
- tourism receipts as a percentage of GDP and the recommendation of business trips.

#### **Model of Cvelbar et al (2016).**

According to Cvelbar et al (2016), The competitiveness of the tourist destination indicates the level of productivity of this activity, that is, the ratio between the tourist product and the amount of resources used in production.

In operational terms, the authors measure this variable based on the total contribution of tourism to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country and on the number of workers in the tourism sector.

The model, places CTD as an intermediate objective, the final objective being the socio-economic prosperity of residents.

The CTD is then:

- a set of tourism factors (original resources, destination management and tourism infrastructure), and of
- a set of economic factors based on the economy (macro-environment, general infrastructure and the business environment)

Each factor was experimentally evaluated according to a series of indicators. 55 indicators were selected from 8 data sources, including: World Economic Forum, World Tourism Organization, World Travel and Tourism Council, United Nations Development Programme, International Living, Future Brand and Lonely Planet. The influence of each factor on the CDT was calculated from annual data from 139 countries for the period 2007 to 2011. The parameters were calculated using a statistical regression model.

Since the data used is a panel, the regression included fixed effects in order to address the interdependence of the data. The model was estimated for the total sample and also for partial samples, according to the level of development of the country. Thus, it was possible to evaluate the effect of each factor on CTD by distinguishing between developed and developing countries.

The results found showed that the main determinants of CTD are:

- the macroenvironment.
- the business environment.
- the general infrastructure.

It should be noted that these factors are part of the overall economic set of factors, not the tourism factors. The main determinant of the CDT in developing countries is the tourist infrastructure.

The influence of destination management on the CDT is small, especially in developing countries.

Finally, in the study, there are no compelling results on the effect of the original resources on the CDT.

### Systematization of Models

Table 1 below summarizes the main advantages and disadvantages pointed out for each of the models described:

Table 1 - Advantages of disadvantages pointed to the models

<p><b>1. Crouch e Ritchie (1999)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It presents a wide variety of indicators and determinants of competitiveness.</li> <li>- It establishes an initial categorization of the importance of factors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It establishes an initial categorization of the importance of factors.</li> <li>- Establishes an initial categorization of the importance of the factors.</li> <li>- It presents a problem in its practical application, because although the collection of all the information about the destination in relation to the proposed factors would be very useful, it would also be very complicated at the same time.</li> <li>- In most cases, it is unfeasible due to the small number of existing and comparable data between destinations.</li> <li>- Variables and indicators to measure the environment and natural resources of the destinations are missing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Dwyer e Kim (2003)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It makes the difference between the competitiveness base and the local conditions of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The same importance is given to all indicators.</li> <li>- In most cases, it is not feasible due</li> </ul>

	<p>the destination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It proposes quantitative and qualitative indicators of tourism competitiveness.</li> </ul>	<p>to the small number of data available and comparable between destinations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Variables and indicators to measure the environment and natural resources of destinations are missing.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Enright e Newton (2004)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It studies the competitiveness of tourist destinations from the perspective of supply.</li> <li>- Contribution of a quantitative analysis and an empirical methodology capable of providing a basis for management and political decisions in the tourism sector.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It only allows you to compare the competitiveness of a destination against other competitors.</li> <li>- In some cases, the data are only processed in the country being studied and not in that of its competitors.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Gooroochurn e Sugiyarto (2005)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each indicator is given a different importance.</li> <li>- It allows the competitiveness of different tourist destinations to be compared and a ranking to be drawn up according to their degree of competitiveness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The results are not consistent with the reality of destinations.</li> <li>- The weight given to the indicators may be questionable.</li> </ul>
<b>5. Fórum Mundial (2007)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Range of issues and areas of analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficulty in using the methodology, given its competition</li> </ul>
<b>6. Mazanec, Wöber e Zins (2007)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- CDT is the result of 8 factors that can be estimated based on 25 measurable indicators.</li> <li>- In addition, the CDT results in market share and the rate of growth of tourism demand of the destination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The communication structure revealed little influence on the CTD, while the influences of price competitiveness, infrastructure, environmental preservation and openness were not confirmed.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Hong (2008)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It uses indicators and variables proposed by other authors in their models, which provides reliability.</li> <li>- It considers and classifies the importance of each factor and indicator in relation to the relevance of its contribution to the competitiveness of the tourist destination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The questionnaires were sent to academic researchers with experience in the subject and to government officials working in tourism. It would be interesting to compare the study with all agents involved in the tourism sector to complete the perspective.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Kim (2012)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Divides the destinations into High and Low Income Countries which can be interesting in terms of comparison and specification of the dimensions to analyze.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Essentially macro-economical model</li> <li>- There are no application studies of the model.</li> </ul>
<b>9. Cvelbar e al. (2016)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Model that allows to relate the tourist product and the recruits used.</li> <li>- A different approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Model with complexity in its use</li> </ul>

---

### Final considerations

In recent years tourism has been one of the factors that has contributed most to the economic growth of many countries. A country can be as a whole as a tourist destination or contain several tourist destinations.

Although several concurrent approaches are admitted, several models of analysis of the competitiveness of tourist destinations have been developed over the years. Competitiveness has been associated in the tourism literature as a critical element for the success of tourist destinations. Therefore, in the analysis models particular emphasis is given to the identification and analysis of the various factors that influence the competitiveness of tourist destinations. As described in Table 1, the most representative models of CTD analysis have advantages and disadvantages. On the side of the disadvantages, for example, it can be seen that the issue of exclusion of the environmental protection factor is one of the most common to the models analysed, although in the conceptualisation of tourist destinations, the attraction factors (physical, resources, natural landscape) are highly predominant. The interaction of physical factors with social ones, etc. results in the attractiveness and competitiveness of the tourist destination, as they defend (Dunn Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991); (Ammirato, 2014); (Buckley, 1994).

From our point of view, this study highlights the need to understand to what extent CTD models can contribute to really create a competitive advantage and how their approach is simply analytical or if, in any way, they can be implemented as a management tool, contributing to good governance and a results-oriented management of the organizations integrating a tourist destination.

The study of the models presented in this work allows us to infer that they are mostly analytical and lack the agility and capacity to promote rapid reaction with the aim of correcting weaknesses or producing indicators that promote the creation and implementation of services or products that are facilitators of the success of organizations and their tourist destination.

It is important that research is adjusted to new realities and new needs in terms of time and space. From the perspective of the analysis of the CDT, it is necessary, in our opinion, to include key current factors such as the level of digital transformation and its impact on the competitiveness of the tourist destination, as well as the comparison between destinations.

Finally, one of the factors that we consider fundamental is the crossing of the opinions of Tourists, Residents and managers and policy makers, basically to ensure that the Pyramid, Tourist, Resident, Manager remains sustainable both for the tourist, for the destination and naturally for the resident, because as several authors argue, namely Ritchie & Crouch (1999) e Dwyer e Kim (2003), the Competitiveness of the Tourist Destination should aim at the socio-economic prosperity of the destination and contribute to increase the well-being of the local population.

### References

- [1] Abrham, J. (2014). Competitiveness of the Tourism Destination in the Global Economy. In Paper presented at the 8th International Days of Statistics and Economics. Prague.

- [2] Aguillar, F. (2017). Correlation between the World Economic Forum and the World Bank: Competitiveness in Switzerland in the Mechanical, Electrical and Metal Industry. University of Guadalajara.
- [3] Ammirato, S. A. M. F. M. D. G. (2014). Tourism Destination Management: A Collaborative Approach. *IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, (434), 208–216.
- [4] Armenski, T., Omerzel Gomezelj, D., Djurdjev, B., Đeri, L., & Dragin, A. (2011). Destination Competitiveness: A Challenging Process for Serbia. *Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography*, (5 (1)), 19–33.
- [5] Beeton, S. (2005). *Film-induced tourism*. Channel View Publications.
- [6] Buckley, R. (1994). Framework for ecotourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 661–669.
- [7] Crouch, G. I. (2011). Destination Competitiveness: An Analysis of Determinant Attributes. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(1), 27–45.
- [8] Crouch, Geoffrey I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and societal prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 137–152.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(97\)00196-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(97)00196-3)
- [9] Cucculelli, M., & Goffi, G. (2016). Does sustainability enhance tourism destination competitiveness? Evidence from Italian Destinations of Excellence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 370–382.
- [10] Domareski-Ruiz, T. C., Akel, G. M., & Gonçalves Gândara, J. M. (2015). Estudos de Competitividade Turística – Comparativo do Modelo de Dwyer e Kim e do Estudo de Competitividade dos 65 Destinos Indutores do Brasil. *Turismo e Sociedade*, 8(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.5380/tes.v8i1.34299>
- [11] Duarte, J., Simões, N., & Crespo, N. (2016). Competition in Tourism Arrivals: A Multidimensional Index of Geographical Structural Similarity. *Tourism Analysis*, 21, 29–45.
- [12] Dunn Ross, E., & Iso-Ahola, S. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 226–237.
- [13] Dwyer, L., & Kim, C. (2003). Destination Competitiveness: Determinants and Indicators. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(5), 369–414.
- [14] Enright, M. & Newton, J. (2004). Tourism destination competitiveness: a quantitative approach. *Tourism Management - Volume 2*, 25, 777–788. Retrieved from *Tourism Management* %0AVolume 25, Issue 6, December 2004, Pages 777-788%0A
- [15] Flores, D. & Barroso, G. (2009). *Análisis de la competencia en la actividad turística* (Septem Ed.). Oviedo.
- [16] Forum, W. E. (2013). *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2013*.
- [17] Garau, J. (2006). Propuesta de dos índices para la mediación de la competitividad de los destinos de sol y playa del Mediterráneo: avance de resultados desde el punto de vista de la demanda. In E.-F. Barcelon (Ed.), *XV Simposio Internacional de turismo y ocio*. Bcelona.
- [18] Gomezelj, D. O. (2006). Competitiveness of Slovenia as a touristic destination. *Managing Global Transition*, 4(2), 167–189.
- [19] Gooroochurn, N., & Sugiyarto, G. (2005). Competitiveness indicators in the travel and tourism industry. *Tourism Economics*, 11(1), 25–40.
- [20] Hanafiah, M., Hemdi, M., & Ahmad, I. (2016a). Competitiveness indicators in the travel and tourism industry. A case of ASEAN region. *Turizam: Međunarodni Znanstveno-Stručni Časopis*, 64(3), 251–260.

- [21] Hanafiah, M., Hemdi, M., & Ahmad, I. (2016b). Tourism destination competitiveness: Towards a performance-based approach. *Tourism Economics*, 22(3), 629–636.
- [22] Hanafiah, M. & Zulkifly, M. (2019). The Evolution of Tourism Destination Competitiveness (TDC) Models. In . A. Hanafiah & M. I. Zulkifly (Ed.), *Positioning and Branding Tourism Destinations for Global Competitiveness* (IGI Global, pp. 23–48). USA.
- [23] Heath, E. (2003). Towards a model to enhance destination competitiveness. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 12(4), 137–141. Retrieved from [https://books.google.pt/books?id=ALQ0CwAAQBAJ&pg=PA59&dq=Heath,+E.+\(2003\)+Towards+a+model+to+enhance+destinations+competitiveness&hl=pt-PT&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj14uPg6anpAhWJnxQKHR\\_2CR8Q6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=Heath%2CE.\(2003\)Towardsamodeltoenhancedesti](https://books.google.pt/books?id=ALQ0CwAAQBAJ&pg=PA59&dq=Heath,+E.+(2003)+Towards+a+model+to+enhance+destinations+competitiveness&hl=pt-PT&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj14uPg6anpAhWJnxQKHR_2CR8Q6AEIKjAA#v=onepage&q=Heath%2CE.(2003)Towardsamodeltoenhancedesti)
- [24] Hong, W. C. (2008). *Competitiveness in the Tourism Sector. A Comprehensive Approach from Economic and Management Points* (Physica). Verlag.
- [25] Hong, W. C. (2009). Global competitiveness measurement for the tourism sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(2), 105–132.
- [26] Ivars-Baidal, J. A., Celdrán-Bernabeu, M. A., Mazón, J. N., & Perles-Ivars, Á. F. (2019). Smart destinations and the evolution of ICTs: a new scenario for destination management? *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(13), 1581–1600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2017.1388771>
- [27] Khoshkhou, M., Nadalipour, Z., & Pourjam, A. (2015). Global Travel and Tourism Competitiveness: An Evaluation of Iran Tourism industry in the world. *International Conference on Management, Economics and Humanities*.
- [28] Kim, N. (2012). *Tourism destination competitiveness, globalization, and strategic development from a development economics perspective*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- [29] Knežević Cvelbar, L., Dwyer, L., Koman, M., & Mihalič, T. (2016). Drivers of Destination Competitiveness in Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1041–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515617299>
- [30] Koo, C., Shin, S., Gretzel, U., Hunter, W. C., & Chung, N. (2016). Conceptualization of smart tourism destination competitiveness. *Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems*, 26(4), 561–576.
- [31] Lee, C. F., & King, B. (2009). A determination of destination competitiveness for Taiwan's hot springs tourism sector using the Delphi technique. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(3), 243–257.
- [32] Mazanec, J. A., Wöber, K., & Zins, A. H. (2007). Tourism Destination Competitiveness: From Definition to Explanation? *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(1), 86–95.
- [33] Mendola, D., & Volo, S. (2017). Building composite indicators in tourism studies: Measurements and applications in tourism destination competitiveness. *Tourism Management*, 59, 541–553.
- [34] Navickas, V. & M. (2009). The Possibilities for the Identification and Evaluation of Tourism Sector Competitiveness Factors. *Engineering Economics*, 1(61), 37–44.
- [35] Omerzel Gomezelj, D. & Mihalic, T. (2008). Destination competitiveness-Applying different models, the case of Slovenia. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 294–307.
- [36] Ritchie, J. R. B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003). *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*. (CABI Publications, Ed.).



- 
- [37]Ritchie, J., & Crouch, G. (1999). Tourism, Competitiveness, and Societal Prosperity. *Journal of Business Research*, 44, 137–152. Retrieved from <http://turismoadministracaoehospitalidade.wordpress.com>
- [38]Rodrigues, L., & Carrasqueira, H. (2011). A Comparative Analysis of Sun and Sea Tourist Destinations Competitiveness. The Case of the Algarve vs. Southern Spain. *Estudios y Perspectivas En Turismo*, 20, 855–875.
- [39]Taberner, J. G. (2007). Propuesta de dos índices para la medición de la competitividad de los destinos de sol y playa del mediterráneo: avance de resultados desde el punto de vista de la demanda. *Revista de Análisis Turístico*, 4, 50–67.
- [40]Vieira, D., Hoffmann, V., Dias, C., & Carvalho, J. (2009). Atributos Determinantes da Competitividade dos Destinos de Sol e Praia Brasileiros. *Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa Em Turismo*, 13(2), 128–143.
- [41]World Economic Forum. (2015). *The Global Competitiveness Report 2015-2016*.