JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES

ISSN Print: 2984-8288, ISSN Online: 2984-8385
Vol. 3 No. 5, pp. 26-39, May 2025

Sustainability of the Social, Financial, Environmental, and Infrastructural Capital in the Tourists' Destination Sites in Southwestern Cebu, Philippines

May Ann C. Pulgo[1], Judy Ann O. Ferrater-Gimena[2], Jose Marie M. Anoos[3], Yolanda C. Sayson[4], Kingie G. Micabalo*[5]
[1,3]Cebu Technological University, Cebu, Philippines
[2,4,5]University of Cebu, Cebu, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: kmicabalo@uc.edu.ph

Date received: February 22, 2025
Date revised: March 17, 2025
Date accepted: April 6, 2025

Originality: 90%
Grammarly Score: 99%
Similarity: 10%

Recommended citation:
Pulgo, M.A., Gimena, J.A., Anoos, J.M., Sayson, Y., & Micabalo, K. (2025). Sustainability of the social, financial, environmental, and infrastructural capital in the tourists' destination sites in Southwestern Cebu, Philippines. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(5), 26-39. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.112

Abstract. Tourism provides socio-economic benefits, enhances environmental protection, and improves the well-being of rural communities. This study assessed the sustainability of selected tourism sites in southwestern Cebu to inform the development of a tourism sustainability plan. A descriptive research design was employed, using two researcher-designed questionnaires to gather data from 60 community members and 25 tourists selected through random sampling. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, Chi-square Test of Independence, and One-Way ANOVA. Findings revealed that both groups perceived financial and manufactured capital as sustainable, while social and human capital were moderately sustainable, and natural capital was less sustainable. Aesthetic appeal, facilities, accessibility, and visitor experience were rated excellent, while customer service and value for money were rated good. Significant relationships were found between respondents' demographics and their perceptions of sustainability, with differences observed between community members and tourists in their assessment of financial, natural, and manufactured capital. The study recommends implementing a tourism development plan that prioritizes environmental conservation, service improvements, and equitable economic opportunities for local communities while maintaining high-quality tourism facilities.

Keywords: Tourism; Siebert's four capital; Ecotourism sustainability; Southwestern Cebu Philippines.

1.0 Introduction

Opportunities for sustainable tourism development and preservation of its competitiveness are primarily influenced by the quality of the environment, which is crucial for preserving and attracting natural and cultural heritage, as well as other values, goods, and resources. For sustainability, one should consider any tourism that contributes permanently to the protection and promotion of the environment, natural and other resources, cultural values, and integrity of the local community (Angelkova et al., 2012). The government should not merely set aside conservation areas or construct tourist destinations in rural areas but should also empower local communities to participate in all stages of planning, developing, and managing the tourism venture. Involving community members in the formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of supporting tourism regulations would be beneficial for the sustainable development of rural tourism. Building partnership among all tourism-related stakeholders in rural tourism management is an ideal tool for promoting rural tourism (Lekaota, 2015). Communities should feel empowered in tourism, should be knowledgeable of the sector, and should derive

benefits from development for them to trust the local government. The most important lesson is that if the tourism sector is properly managed and developed, it can have beneficial political effects on the government, such as increasing their legitimacy vis-à-vis the citizens (Nunkoo, 2015).

Tourism is one of the fastest-growing and highly productive industries worldwide. It is a work-escalated industry since it is an undeniably essential source of income. The luring condition pulls in travelers. One unequivocal motivation behind why individuals need to visit a place is its charming condition, whether man-made or natural. Condition and tourism are almost related to each other. Hence, ecotourism is a concern for everyone. Tending to the earth is the essential concern of the tourism industry, which influences society and the financial well-being of the general population. The components of ecotourism include the preservation of biodiversity, protection of imperiled species to the greatest extent possible, supporting the local population, creating employment opportunities for individuals in the community, and promoting sustainable tourism practices.

Is ecotourism sustainable? Any destination that seeks to attract tourists must protect its resources while facilitating a sense of integration with the local community. It is commonly but incorrectly thought that the private sector is exclusively responsible for protecting the environment and local communities (Wood, 2002). Educating stakeholders through ecotourism will foster greater appreciation and partnership towards the sustainable use, conservation, and protection of the environment. Compiling and disseminating information and best practices will enhance awareness and interest in ecotourism (National Ecotourism Steering Committee, 2002).

Moalboal, Cebu, is situated in the Southwestern part of Cebu. It is a fourth-class municipality in the province of Cebu, Philippines. It is the most acclaimed of its kind in the underwater world and has been considered outstanding among other diving destinations in Cebu. The undersea attractions drew travelers back time and again. Truth be told, there are a few outsiders who have held onto Moalboal as their second home and are now living there. Approximately 10 kilometers away from Moalboal is the neighboring town of Badian, which also boasts its own unique attractions. It is the home of the enchanting Kawasan Falls. The town likewise houses one of Cebu's interesting beach resorts. Badian is famous for its outdoor activity called canyoneering, which has been enjoyed by adventurous visitors, usually during summer or on sunny days. Alegria is another municipality located in the Southwestern portion of Cebu Island. Alegria is a 4th-class municipality in the province of Cebu, located 117 kilometers away from Cebu City, the province's capital. Alegria boasts its pristine beaches, scenic and enchanting waterfalls, and unexplored caves, among other attractions. The town is also proud of its rich seabed that is perfect for snorkeling and diving.

Today, these distinguished ecotourism sites that visitors can find in Southwestern Cebu are facing environmental issues. The people in the community who benefit from earning a livelihood in these areas have a great concern for the conservation of the natural resources that attract tourists. Implementing best practices to sustain ecotourism sites should be exercised now, before it is too late to preserve the natural resources that have been enjoyed by people and are currently a source of income. Hence, this study aims to identify the dilemma on sustainability and the recent situation in tending these tourist destinations in the hope of addressing environmental issues and concerns of the stakeholders for them to sustain the protected areas.

For financial sustainability in the ecotourism venture, it is recommended to recognize the role of the general public. Specifically, it is the public that ultimately determines the attributes and ecological features that affect the sustainability of ecotourism sites. This perspective may aid in planning, designing, and maintaining sustainable tourist sites, integrating revenue-generating measures with environmental conservation and preservation (Uriely et al., 2007).

It is a common observation that there are imminent problems with the sustainable conditions of the popular tourist sites in the Southwestern part of Cebu due to the irresponsible use of this natural beauty by both the local community and the tourists due to a lack of serious enforcement of environmental laws and other related legislations that protect and conserve the beauty spots of these towns. It is also a common observation that the current situation of these tourist destinations if not adequately addressed, might lead to the deterioration of natural resources. The worst-case scenario is the possible depletion of its natural beauty. This current dilemma

prompted the investigation to determine the sustainability of tourist destination sites in the Southwestern corridor of Cebu Province.

Although previous research highlights the importance of stakeholder collaboration, community involvement, and environmental conservation in sustainable tourism (Angelkova et al., 2012; Lekaota, 2015; Nunkoo, 2015), there is a lack of knowledge about the regional challenges specific to ecotourism destinations in Cebu's southwest corridor. Theoretical and global perspectives on sustainability have been extensively explored in previous studies; however, empirical research on the actual implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, as well as the direct impact of tourism on the ecological integrity of these places, remains limited.

Additionally, although research emphasizes the importance of financial sustainability and public involvement in ecotourism (Uriely et al., 2007), there is a lack of knowledge about how local communities in Moalboal, Badian, and Alegria strike a balance between their reliance on tourism for economic growth and environmental conservation. A significant study gap is the lack of thorough evaluations of these sites' long-term viability that consider both stakeholder concerns and regulatory enforcement. By examining the sustainability issues that these ecotourism areas are currently facing, assessing the success of conservation initiatives, and analyzing the socioeconomic and environmental impacts of tourism in the area, this study aims to bridge this gap.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study used a descriptive-survey research method designed by the researchers based on Siebert's Four Capital Model of Sustainability that determined the profile of the people in the community and the tourists, tourist's destination sites in Southwestern Cebu, sustainability of the identified tourists' destination sites in Southwestern, Cebu in the aspects of social, financial, natural, and manufactured capital, and the ratings on the tourists' destination sites in Cebu in terms of aesthetic beauty, facilities, customer service monetary worth, accessibility and over-all experience.

2.2 Research Locale

The researcher sent letters of request to the Local Tourism Office of the municipalities under study. Once approval was obtained, the researcher hired the services of field investigators or enumerators to administer the questionnaires at various tourist destination sites. Each item in the questionnaire was translated into the Cebuano dialect to ensure that respondents could understand the questions and accurately convey their intent. The researcher administered the questionnaires in the towns of Moalboal, Badian, and Alegria.

2.3 Research Respondents

This investigation consisted of 60 respondents, divided into two groups. The first groups of respondents involved in the study were selected employees from tourist destinations, delicacy and handicraft sellers, tourist guides, and boatmen in the community. The second group of respondents was the tourists who visited the tourist destination areas in Southwestern Cebu Province. A random sampling technique was applied to determine the number of respondents.

2.4 Research Instrument

The Cronbach's Alpha result of 9.663 denotes that the self-made questionnaire was highly reliable for administration. The study employed two sets of researcher-designed questionnaires to collect data on the profiles of the two groups of respondents: the community members and the tourists. Lastly, for data analysis, it applied frequency and simple percentage, weighted mean, OneWay ANOVA, and Chi-Square Test Independence.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Profile of the Participants

This part presents, analyzes, and interprets data on the sustainability of tourist destinations in the southwestern corridor of Cebu, based on the perceptions of tourists and community members. The data were presented in tables with corresponding analysis and interpretation. Table 1 presents the profile of the community's residents. There were more respondents from the community who belonged to the 18-21 age group, comprising 33.33%. On the other hand, only three people (6.67%) within the 26-30 age bracket were available for an interview. This data

indicates that young people from the local community in these three municipalities were engaged in and earned income from local tourism activities. Further, it could be inferred that the mean age of this group of respondents was 31.73, with a standard deviation of 12.56.

Table 1. *Profile of the people in the community*

Indicators	Frequency	Percentage
Age (in years)		
18 - 21	20	33.3
22 - 25	8	13.3
26 - 30	3	5.00
31 - 35	4	6.67
36 - 40	11	18.3
Above 40	14	23.3
Gender		
Female	29	48.3
Male	31	51.6
Civil Status		
Married	30	50.0
Separated	3	5.00
Single	27	45.0
Highest Educational Attainment		
College Graduate	12	20.0
College Level	14	23.3
High School Graduate	31	51.6
High School Level	3	5.00
Years of Involvement in Tourism		
Less than a year	15	25.0
1 - 3	18	30.0
4 - 6	9	15.0
7 - 10	9	15.0
More than 10	9	15.0
Average Income Earned from Tourism (in PhP)		
Less than 7,890	30	50.0
7,890 - 15,780	17	28.3
15,780 - 31,560	9	15.0
More than 31,560	4	6.67

Additionally, most community stakeholders who responded to the survey were male, at 51.67%, while females comprised 48.33%. This data suggests that at the time of administering the survey questionnaire, males exhibited accommodating behavior in their responses. Moreover, half (50%) of the respondents were married, while only 5% were separated at the time of the survey. Although civil status changes occasionally, the data suggest that people in rural areas are more likely to marry at an earlier age than those living in fast-paced cities.

In terms of highest educational attainment, the majority of respondents were high school graduates, comprising 51.67%, while five out of fifty respondents could not complete high school. This data indicates that in rural communities, most people are unable to attend college due to financial constraints. So, they remained in their place of origin and earned a living through whatever type of livelihood or economic activity was available in their area. Since tourism in southwestern Cebu has proliferated with the popularity of diving in Pescador Island, sardine runs in Moalboal, and canyoneering in Alegria and Badian, these people would engage in any tourism activity to earn income, either as their primary means of survival or as additional income to defray other household expenses.

Regarding their length of time in the tourism industry, out of fifty (50), eighteen (18) have been involved for 1-3 years (36.00%). It can be noted in the data that there were only nine (9) people who have been engaged in any tourism activity for more than ten (10) years. The mean or average number of years of involvement in tourism for these individuals in the community was 5.632 years, with a standard deviation of 6.796. This indicates that the tourism industry in Southwestern Cebu has undergone significant evolution over the years. The popularity of tourist adventure activities, such as canyoneering in Badian and Alegria, Cebu, and diving in Pescador Island, Moalboal, Cebu, as well as the discovery of white sand beaches in southwest Cebu, contributed to the increased involvement of more people in the community in the operation of various tourist destinations. The development

of local tourism in the area has provided a livelihood to the fisherfolk, farmers, and locals. So they do not have to go to the cities to look for jobs.

For the average income earned from tourism, half, or 50.00%, of the individuals earned less than Php 7,890.00 per month. However, the mean income was higher at Php 11,425.00, with a standard deviation of Php 12,257.00. Although this level of income is below the minimum wage in Region 7, the amount of income is considered at the sustenance level since the essential commodities in the rural areas are relatively cheap, even though the people can grow vegetables and fruit trees on their farm and the yard for selling in the local market or for direct consumption.

Table 2 shows the profile of the tourist respondents. The data indicate that more respondents were aged above 40 years, comprising 28%, while there were only 8% who fell within the age brackets of 26-30 years and 31-35 years. Since the southwestern part of Cebu is more than 50 kilometers from Cebu City, it requires additional costs for travel and accommodation. Those tourists who can afford to travel and enjoy leisure activities are often those with more financial resources, typically individuals with better incomes and advanced adulthood stages.

Table 2. *Profile of the tourist respondents*

	Frequency	Percentage
Age (in years)		
18 - 21	12	16.0
22 - 25	16	21.3
26 - 30	6	8.00
31 - 35	6	8.00
36 - 40	14	18.6
Above 40	21	28.0
Gender		
Female	38	50.6
Male	37	49.3
Civil Status		
Annulled	1	1.33
Married	37	49.3
Separated	6	8.00
Single	31	41.3
Nationality		
American	13	17.3
British	8	10.6
Chinese	2	2.67
Filipino	21	28.0
German	4	5.33
Israel	8	10.6
Korean	11	14.6
Swedish	8	10.6
Purpose of Visit in Southwestern Cebu		
Business	3	4.00
Diving	1	1.33
Relaxation	43	57.3
Vacation	28	37.3
Duration of Stay(in Weeks)		
Less than a week	28	37.3
1 week	27	36.0
2 weeks	9	12.0
3 weeks	5	6.67
4 weeks	6	8.00
Disposable Income During the Visits		
Less than ₱ 162,990.00	6	8.00
₱162,990-₱271,650	2	2.67
Less than ₱ 6,447.71	2	2.67
₱6,447.71 - ₱ 31,238.55	1	1.33
More than ₱ 31,238.55	7	9.33
Less than ₱ 31,238 .55	9	12.0
P 5,000 - P 10,00	20	26.6
More than P 10,000	28	37.3

Regarding gender, there were 38 female tourists (50.67%), while male tourists comprised 49.33%. During the survey, female tourists were more accommodating than male tourists in sharing their time to answer the questionnaire. Moreover, 49.33% of the respondents were married at the time of the survey, with six tourists (8%) answering that they were separated. Since it was summertime during the survey administration, it was also the season for families to spend time together and splurge on relaxation. So, the respondents are those who were already married. Regarding nationality, more Filipinos (28.00) visited the tourist destination site in southwestern Cebu, while Chinese account for only 2.67%. The tourist spots in the area are just a three-hour drive from Cebu City. During their vacation, most visitors are young Filipino professionals who intend to escape the hustle and bustle of fast-paced city life. Only a few visit for business purposes; based on observation, they are Chinese businessmen looking for business investment opportunities in three municipalities.

Most tourists (57.33%) who visited the southwestern part of Cebu province came to relax, while only a few (1%) came for diving. Diving is popular in Moalboal, especially on Pescador Island, and sardines are run in Panagsama, Moalboal, and Cebu. Therefore, it is expected that only a few will respond that their purpose of visiting is diving, as it is not a popular activity in Alegria and Badian, Cebu. Regarding the length of stay, twenty-eight (28) individuals stayed in southwestern Cebu for less than a week, accounting for 37.33%, while five (5) stayed for three (3) weeks. The average number of days tourists stayed in the area was 16 days, with a standard deviation of 28 days. Because more guests are young professionals who typically visit for relaxation, they usually stay for less than a week. At the same time, those who enjoy various outdoor activities, including water activities, tend to stay longer.

Regarding the disposable budget during the visit, twenty-eight (28), comprising 37.33%, spent more than Php 10,000.00. The most visited sites are those with diverse bodies of water, where guests can enjoy various water activities. These tourism activities require visitors to pay for the safety gear provided by the tour operators and fees for the trained tour guides. Therefore, those who opt for water adventures are expected to spend more time engaging in their desired outdoor activity. For foreign tourists, there were more who spent less than $3,000, which is equivalent to one hundred fifty-five thousand five hundred fifty pesos (Php 155,550.00) at the exchange rate of $1:Php 51.85 at the time of the study's conduct. At the current economic condition in the Philippines, this amount of money is too huge for an average Filipino income earner. However, it is not as significant for foreign tourists since the value of their money in their country of origin is generally high.

3.2 Sustainability of the Four Types of Capital of the Tourists' Sites in Southwestern Cebu

Table 3 presents data on the respondents' perceptions of the level of sustainability of the identified tourist destination sites in Moalboal. Badian, and Alegria. The two groups of respondents assessed the high sustainability of the financial capital or economic resources of the tourists' destination sites in the study area, as indicated by a consolidated mean of 3.46.

Table 3. *Sustainability of the four types of capital of the tourists' sites in southwestern Cebu*

Type of Capital	People in the Community (n = 60)		Tourists (n = 75)		Consolidated (N = 135)	
	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation	Mean	Interpretation
Social or Human Capital/	3.34	Highly Sustainable	3.04	Relatively Sustainable	3.21	Relatively Sustainable
Financial or Economic Capital	3.41	Highly Sustainable	3.51	Highly Sustainable	3.46	Highly Sustainable
Natural/Environmental Capital	2.77	Relatively Sustainable	2.06	Less Sustainable	2.41	Less Sustainable
Manufactured/ Infrastructural Capital	3.63	Highly Sustainable	2.93	Relatively Sustainable	2.98	Relatively Sustainable
Overall Mean	**3.29**	**Highly Sustainable**	**2.89**	**Relatively Sustainable**	**3.02**	**Relatively Sustainable**

For social and manufactured capital, it was found to be sustainable in many cases only, given that most workers in tourism businesses at tourist' sites lack formal training in customer service, as most of them have not attended college and have only reached the high school level. Since the income in rural areas is very minimal or even below the poverty line, residents have a lower propensity to attend college. Their main hindrance to achieving higher educational qualifications is financial constraints, resulting from a lack of income opportunities and the distance of their location from cities where colleges and universities are situated. Instead, they tend to get married early

and start their own family. This is a manifestation of the vicious cycle of poverty. For manufactured capital, the existing medical facilities do not meet the need for serious injuries that may occur during guests' outdoor adventures. There are some tourist sites where the pathways or roads to the sites are not yet well-developed or concreted, making them less accessible to visitors. Additionally, only two existing malls are not yet fully operational in some areas, offering limited products and services necessary for vacationers.

However, the natural or environmental capital was assessed as less sustainable, based on the consolidated mean of 2.41. This means the environment was not cared for in terms of cleanliness and physical protection. Additionally, existing man-made structures, such as cottages, restaurants, bars, and bridges, were built on the perimeters of beaches and waterfalls, which compromised the natural beauty of these natural resources. These are culprits of the endangered sustainability of the natural capital. Although many people in the community gain a financial advantage by increasing their income through business in tourist destination sites, they cannot ensure its cleanliness. The many man-made structures have destroyed the natural splendor of the tourist sites, as several establishments have devastated the environment. The congested population in some tourist destinations contributed to the obliteration of the tourist sites.

Ecotourism makes a difference in the natural preservation and financial improvement. The salaries and consumption of neighborhood individuals have increased since the advent of ecotourism. Interest in ecotourism, the level of education, an increase in profitable human capital, and a pay increase have improved people's careers. Therefore, mindfulness and instruction programs related to tourism, as well as methodologies to extend the length of stay for guests, would be recommended (Rijal & Sapkota, 2015).

3.3 Ratings on Tourists' Destination Sites

The respondents rated it as excellent in terms of aesthetic beauty, facilities, accessibility, and overall experience. However, the aspects of customer service were only rated as good (Table 4). Most employees hired in many establishments have attained higher educational attainment, such as a college degree, since, in general, the people in the community are financially scarce. For this reason, instead of finishing school, they opt to seek employment to meet the financial needs of their families. The lack of formal education has also been evident in the low quality of service provided to guests, which has not satisfactorily met the expectations of most tourists. Hence, local government units should require workers to undergo free training provided by the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), based on the core competencies of the tourism sector, to address this dilemma. Moreover, regarding the equitable monetary worth, the ratings of the two groups of respondents were only good. Vacationers expect to be given appropriate services that are acceptable to global standards, for they spend much money on tourism products and services. Therefore, they look forward to getting the value of their money for excellent goods and services that they need during their vacation and relaxation.

Table 4. *Ratings on Tourists' destination sites*

Indicators	People in the Community (n = 60)		Tourists (n = 75)		Consolidated (N = 135)	
	Mean	**Interpretation**	**Mean**	**Interpretation**	**Mean**	**Interpretation**
Aesthetic Beauty	3.32	Excellent	3.33	Excellent	3.33	Excellent
Facilities	3.23	Good	3.37	Excellent	3.30	Excellent
Customer Service	3.02	Good	2.82	Good	2.92	Good
Equitable Monetary Worth	3.21	Good	3.12	Good	3.17	Good
Accessibility	3.38	Excellent	3.50	Excellent	3.44	Excellent
Over-all Experience	3.53	Excellent	3.40	Excellent	3.47	Excellent
Overall Mean	**3.28**	**Excellent**	**3.26**	**Excellent**	**3.27**	**Excellent**

3.4 Relationship Between Variables

There is a significant relationship between the respondents' gender and their evaluation of the sustainability of the manufactured capital. This means that the difference in gender among the respondents relates to their viewpoint on how the man-made resources present in southwestern Cebu would be sustainable in the future.

Table 5. *Relationship between the profile of the people in the community and the level of sustainability of the tourists' destination sites*

Variable	X^2	df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
A. Age					
Social Capital	6.38	5	11.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	5.90	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	12.4	15	24.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	19.6	15	24.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Gender					
Social Capital	0.00	1	3.84	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	0.61	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	8.82	3	7.81	Significant	Ho rejected
Manufactured Capital	8.98	3	7.81	Significant	Ho rejected
C. Civil Status					
Social Capital	3.97	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	4.42	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	2.66	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	4.25	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
D. Educational Attainment					
Social Capital	4.82	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	10.9	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	9.86	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	12.3	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
E. Years Involved in Tourism					
Social Capital	1.59	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	3.08	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	6.26	12	21.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	10.0	12	21.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
F. Average Income Earned in Tourism					
Social Capital	0.59	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	3.60	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	16.8	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	15.0	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted

Table 6. *Relationship Between the profile of the tourists and the level of sustainability on the tourists' destination sites*

Variable	X^2	Df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
A. Age					
Social Capital	5.36	5	11.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	13.1	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	24.8	15	24.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	7.71	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Gender					
Social Capital	0.78	1	3.84	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	1.21	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	1.21	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	3.15	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
C. Civil Status					
Social Capital	1.23	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	4.12	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	4.03	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	2.06	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
D. Nationality					
Social Capital	7.92	7	14.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	18.5	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	36.0	21	32.6	Significant	Ho rejected
Manufactured Capital	18.1	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
E. Purpose of Visit					
Social Capital	1.98	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	2.80	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	80.0	9	16.9	Significant	Ho rejected
Manufactured Capital	4.50	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
F. Duration of Stay					
Social Capital	8.02	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	5.71	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	13.4	12	21.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	11.4	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
G. Disposal Income During Visits					
Social Capital	2.47	7	14.067	Not significant	Ho accepted
Financial Capital	9.21	14	23.685	Not significant	Ho accepted
Natural Capital	14.8	21	32.671	Not significant	Ho accepted
Manufactured Capital	10.6	14	23.685	Not significant	Ho accepted

The results show a significant relationship between tourists' nationalities and their perceptions of the sustainability of the natural or environmental capital of the tourist spots in the municipalities of Alegria, Badian, and Moalboal. This means that the perceived future continuity of the tourists' spots in the study environment varies according to the respondents' origins. It has been observed that most visitors from Western countries are more concerned about properly caring for the environment. At the same time, Filipinos are not as meticulous about the effects of exploiting our natural resources. However, since the people in the locality are primarily poor, the consideration of protecting the environment tends to be compromised with the economic gains from tourism activity for survival. The massive poverty among the people near ecotourism sites, such as rivers, waterfalls, lakes, seas, and islands, threatens the cleanliness and conservation of natural resources, as these environmental resources are often their primary source of livelihood. Therefore, they tend to prioritize income over protection.

A significant relationship is also found between the tourists' purpose for visiting and their assessment of the viability of the natural or environmental capital of the tourists' sites in the three municipalities. The opinion of the tourists depends on why they visit the place. Therefore, the norms to be used in the assessment vary depending on the perceived beauty and use of any tourism site in relation to its economic value for the community.

Table 7. *Relationship between the profile of the people in the community and their ratings on tourists' destination sites*

Variable	X^2	Df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
A. Age					
Aesthetic Beauty	19.6	10	18.3	Significant	Ho rejected
Facilities	19.2	10	18.3	Significant	Ho rejected
Customer Service	18.0	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Equitable Monetary Worth	17.2	15	24.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	5.69	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	5.37	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Gender					
Aesthetic Beauty	1.20	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	1.00	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	3.86	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Equitable Monetary Worth	5.06	3	7.81	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	2.33	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	0.58	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
C. Civil Status					
Aesthetic Beauty	8.97	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	2.58	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	8.35	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Equitable Monetary Worth	4.37	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	6.78	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	4.42	4	9.48	Not significant	Ho accepted
D. Educational Attainment					
Aesthetic Beauty	11.5	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	18.6	6	12.5	Significant	Ho rejected
Customer Service	10.1	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	17.6	9	16.9	Significant	Ho rejected
Accessibility	8.79	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	9.97	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
E. Years Involved in Tourism					
Aesthetic Beauty	9.97	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	4.88	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	11.1	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Equitable Monetary Worth	12.6	12	21.0	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	11.6	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	7.61	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
F. Average Income Earned in Tourism					
Aesthetic Beauty	6.35	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	5.08	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	2.13	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Equitable Monetary Worth	6.08	9	16.9	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	1.62	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	4.04	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted

There is a significant relationship between respondents' age and their ratings on the aesthetic beauty of the site and the condition of the tourism facilities. Young respondents have a different appreciation from the older ones on the beauty. A significant relationship exists between respondents' age and their ratings of the site's aesthetic beauty of nature, which is the attraction and the reason why tourists visit southwestern Cebu. Expectedly, those young individuals may have lower standards regarding the quality of facilities, as their primary purpose for visiting ecotourism sites is typically for adventure and enjoyment. In comparison, those more mature respondents

have higher standards for various aspects that the tourism site can offer, as they have more life experience. In addition, the relative maturity of the person relates to their idea on how to evaluate the future maintainability of natural sites in rural areas.

Moreover, there is a significant relationship between the educational attainment of the community's residents and their assessment of the quality of facilities and the relative monetary value of tourist spots during their visit to the study locale. This implies that the differences between respondents in their perceptions of the quality of the facilities that are available at the destination sites and perceived monetary worth during their visit depend on their level of education since those who finished college have better standards in assessing the condition of the amenities and how they calculate on the relative value of the money being spent against the quality of service that they get. In contrast, they visit the tourist sites.

Table 8. *Relationship between the profile of the tourists' and their ratings on the tourist's destination sites*

Variable	X^2	Df	Critical Value	Significance	Result
A. Age					
Aesthetic Beauty	11.1	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	13.2	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	12.0	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	14.0	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	6.50	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	16.9	10	18.3	Not significant	Ho accepted
B. Gender					
Aesthetic Beauty	2.24	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	3.64	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	0.00	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	1.12	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	0.14	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	1.24	2	5.99	Not significant	Ho accepted
C. Civil Status					
Aesthetic Beauty	4.02	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	8.17	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	1.16	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	4.47	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	4.73	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	6.83	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
D. Nationality					
Aesthetic Beauty	22.0	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	10.0	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	14.38	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	11.6	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	16.5	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	7.49	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
E. Purpose of Visit					
Aesthetic Beauty	3.37	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	6.19	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	18.7	6	12.5	Significant	Ho rejected
Monetary Worth	5.31	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	2.00	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	3.45	6	12.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
F. Duration of Stay					
Aesthetic Beauty	4.72	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	6.57	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	4.59	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	9.89	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	7.43	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	5.06	8	15.5	Not significant	Ho accepted
G. Disposal Income During Visits					
Aesthetic Beauty	7.78	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Facilities	9.75	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Customer Service	9.23	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Monetary Worth	10.0	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Accessibility	12.4	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted
Over-all Experience	12.6	14	23.6	Not significant	Ho accepted

There is a significant relationship between the purpose of tourists' visits and their ratings on the customer services rendered to them at the various destination sites of the study. This means that the respondents' assessment of the standard of hospitality they experienced depends on why they reached the area. Therefore, those whose purpose is business are not keen on adhering to international standards in the tourism service. At the same time, those who

come for relaxation and to appreciate the local community and nature would not mind complying with the aforementioned norms, as they tend to be more appreciative of the local culture and what is available in the community rather than imposing their experience from their home country or country of origin. It cannot be denied that providing quality customer service that adheres to global tourism standards is always a plus factor in sustaining the influx of tourists to various tourist sites, especially those that cater to foreign tourists.

Table 9. *Significant differences on the perceptions of the people in the community on the sustainability of tourists destination sites*

When Grouped By	df	Sum Square	Mean Square	F- value	P-Value	Significance	Results
A. Social Capital							
Between Group	5	2.78	0.55	1.33	0.249	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	354	147	0.41				
Total	359	150					
B. Financial Capital							
Between Group	5	5.95	1.19	2.90	0.014	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	354	145	0.41				
Total	359	151					
C. Natural Capital							
Between Group	5	27.3	5.46	11.1	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	354	173	0.49				
Total	359	200					
D. Manufactured Capital							
Between Group	5	15.3	3.06	7.38	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	354	147	0.41				
Total	359	162					

There is a significant difference in perception between community stakeholders and tourists regarding the level of sustainability of tourist destination sites, particularly in terms of financial, natural, and manufactured capital. These data mean that these two groups of respondents differ on whether the income derived from the tourism sites of the various local stakeholders, the natural environment being the selling point of any ecotourism sites, and the goods that are offered to the tourists can be sustained in the long run.

Table 10. *Significant difference in the perception of the tourists on the level of sustainability of tourists' destination sites*

When Grouped By	df	Sum Square	Mean Square	F- value	P-Value	Significance	Results
A. Social Capital							
Between Group	5	2.06	0.41	1.48	0.194	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	444	123	0.27				
Total	449	125					
B. Financial Capital							
Between Group	5	8.47	1.69	4.89	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	444	153	0.34				
Total	449	162					
C. Natural Capital							
Between Group	5	3.05	0.61	1.57	0.168	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	444	173	0.39				
Total	449	176					
D. Manufactured Capital							
Between Group	5	7.32	1.46	7.93	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	444	82.0	0.18				
Total	449	89.3					

There is a significant difference in tourists' perception of the level of sustainability of tourist destination sites in terms of financial capital and manufactured capital, which leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis. These data indicate that the respondents differ in their perception of the viability of economic and infrastructural resources, as most tourists are transient visitors. They are not expected to be aware of the economic situation of the people who earn a living from local tourism. In addition, their ideas on whether the site will be sustained are based solely on what they observe and see during their short visit to the rural area.

Table 11. *Significant difference on ratings of the people in the community to the tourists' destination sites*

When Grouped By	df	Sum Square	Mean Square	F- value	P-Value	Significance	Results
A. Aesthetic Beauty							
Between Group	4	51.7	12.9	25.80	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	294	147	0.50				
Total	298	199					
B. Facilities							
Between Group	4	11.9	2.98	6.75	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	295	130	0.44				
Total	299	142					
C. Customer Service							
Between Group	4	23.6	5.91	14.50	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	295	120	0.40				
Total	299	14					
D. Monetary Worth							
Between Group	4	10.4	2.60	6.00	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	295	127	0.43				
Total	299	138					
E. Accessibility							
Between Group	4	7.31	1.82	4.17	0.003	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	295	129	0.43				
Total	299	136					
F. Over-all Experience							
Between Group	4	2.73	0.68	1.90	0.110	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	295	105	0.35				
Total	299	108					

There is a significant difference in the perceptions of people in the community and their ratings of aesthetic beauty, facility quality, customer service, monetary value, accessibility, and overall experience at tourist destination sites. These results indicate that the people in the community and the tourists differ in their evaluation of the beauty of nature, characteristics of the facilities and amenities that are present in the tourist sites, the attributes of the services provided to the tourists, the reasonability of the money being paid by the tourists in visiting the tourist's spots, accessibility of the spots, as well as the satisfaction out of the experience in going to the three municipalities. The local respondents have different assessments of the quality of tourist destination spots, as their ideas are based on limited knowledge of life in the rural area, especially among respondents with only a high school education.

Table 12. *Test of significant difference in tourists' ratings on tourist destination sites*

When Grouped By	df	Sum Square	Mean Square	F- value	P-Value	Significance	Results
A. Aesthetic Beauty							
Between Group	4	7.78	1.94	5.16	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	370	139	0.37				
Total	374	147					
B. Facilities							
Between Group	4	44.9	11.2	22.3	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	370	186	0.50				
Total	374	230					
C. Customer Service							
Between Group	4	18.0	4.51	11.6	0.000	Significant	Reject Ho
Within Group	370	142	0.38				
Total	374	161					
D. Monetary Worth							
Between Group	4	0.33	0.08	0.40	0.809	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	370	76.5	0.20				
Total	374	76.8					
E. Accessibility							
Between Group	4	0.41	0.10	0.32	0.862	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	370	117	0.31				
Total	374	117					
F. Over-all Experience							
Between Group	4	1.05	0.26	1.04	0.385	Not Significant	Accept Ho
Within Group	370	93.1	0.25				
Total	374	94.1					

There is a significant difference in tourists' evaluation of the destination sites regarding aesthetic beauty, facilities, and customer service. This means their observations differ regarding the aesthetic beauty, facilities, and customer service at the tourist destination sites. However, there is no significant difference in the tourists' ratings of the destination sites regarding monetary worth, accessibility, and overall experience. Typically, the assessment of foreign tourists varies based on their experiences in their country of origin, due to the differences in economic conditions between the Philippines and other Asian, Western, and American nations. However, based on observations, foreign tourists have demonstrated an understanding and appreciation of the Philippines' white sand beaches, cold waterfalls, and the majestic underwater world.

4.0 Conclusion

The current condition and usage of the people regarding the various natural resources found in the tourist spots in the southwestern part of Cebu do not bode well for its future sustainability, as there are aspects that have not been managed well by the stakeholders, particularly in the environmental aspect. So, suppose this wrong practice of not conserving and protecting the environment is not corrected. In that case, it will eventually lead to the destruction of the ecotourism sites, which will profoundly impact the future economic viability that provided livelihood to the residents or the community through various business activities. The irresponsible use and management of the natural beauty of tourist destination sites, if not mitigated, will eventually destroy the aesthetic beauty of nature, which is supposedly the primary reason why various foreign and domestic tourists visit these places in the southwestern corridor of Cebu Province. For this reason, the presumption of whether the money paid by tourists to visit these tourist sites is commensurate with the total satisfaction people feel is now in question. Moreover, community-based tourism should ensure that the human, financial, natural, and manufactured capital is taken care and its management should strike a balance between economic and environmental sustainability so that the future viability and each of the stakeholder's interest are satisfied and that everybody that benefits from the natural resources will religiously follow the state policies to ensure that the tourists' destinations are well taken care of for the future generation to enjoy.

The study emphasizes the need for a balanced approach to tourism in southwest Cebu, ensuring both environmental preservation and economic benefits. Better conservation measures are required due to the lower ranking of natural capital, even when infrastructure and financial sustainability are good. To make tourism more sustainable and inclusive, local regulations should prioritize eco-friendly projects, better customer service, and increased community involvement. Future studies can compare sustainability initiatives across different locations, examine the long-term environmental effects, and assess the efficacy of new regulations. The area can preserve its natural and cultural heritage for future generations while retaining its allure by striking a balance between development and preservation.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

The authors' contributions are as follows: Mary Ann C. Pulgo served as the Principal Author, responsible for conceptualization, design, data collection, and overall analysis of the study. Judy Ann O. Ferrater-Gimena provided critical oversight as the Ethics Reviewer, ensuring the study adhered to ethical standards. Jose Marie M. Anoos contributed as the Data Analyst, focusing on the statistical analysis and interpretation of the results. Yolanda C. Sayson served as the Editor, refining the manuscript for clarity and coherence. Kingie G. Micabalo acted as the Content Reviewer, ensuring the accuracy and relevance of the study's content.

6.0 Funding

This study was supported by the Research Office of University of Cebu, which also provided funding for the publication fee.

7.0 Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the conduct of this study, the analysis of data, or the publication of its findings.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researchers express their heartfelt gratitude to the people of Moalboal, Badian, and Alegria for their support and cooperation during the conduct of this study. Sincere appreciation is extended to University of Cebu, particularly the Research Office, for their invaluable support and for funding the publication of this research

9.0 References

Angelkova, T., Koteski, C., Jakovlev, Z., & Mitrevska, E. (2012). Sustainability and competitiveness of tourism. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 44, 221-227. https://shorturl.at/eyQV9

Armstrong, A. D., Hou, J. Y., Malvar, A. S., McLean, T. M., & Pestiaux, J. (2012). Research brief #1: Community-based ecotourism. https://goo.gl/WaHwN3

Armstrong, R. (2012). An analysis of the conditions for success of community-based tourism enterprises. ICRT Occasional Paper, 21, 1-52. https://goo.gl/tRQVkE

Avgousti, K. (2008). Assessment issues regarding tourism partnerships, competitiveness, and sustainability: The case of Cyprus. The Cyprus Journal of Sciences, 6, 169-180. https://shorturl.at/oCHRS

Baggio, R., & Moretti, V. (2018). Beauty as a factor of economic and social development. Tourism Review of AIEST - International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism, 73(1), 68-81. https://shorturl.at/joPVY
Bakan, R., & Bosnic, I. (2012). Public-private partnership: A model for sustainable tourism development in regional park Mura–Drava–the possibility of tourist valorization of abandoned army barracks. Economy of Eastern Croatia Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow, 1, 201-206. https://shorturl.at/lvyV4
Buhalis, D., & Michopoulou, E. (2011). Information-enabled tourism destination marketing: Addressing the accessibility market. Current Issues in Tourism, 14(2), 145-168. https://goo.gl/eurc9G
Camus, S., Hikkerova, L., & Sahut, J. M. (2012). Systemic analysis and model of sustainable tourism. International Journal of Business, 17(4), 365-348. https://shorturl.at/rOT07
Castellanos-Verdugo, M., Vega-Vázquez, M., Oviedo-García, M. Á., & Orgaz-Agüera, F. (2016). The relevance of psychological factors in the ecotourist experience satisfaction through ecotourist site perceived value. Journal of Cleaner Production, 124, 226-235. https://shorturl.at/dklWY
Chakraborty, S. (2010). Sustainable and value-based tourism in Nepal: A perspective. International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Systems, 3(1). https://shorturl.at/lpqA5
Chen, K., Feng-Hsiang, C., & Wu, C. (2013). Investigating the wellness tourism factors in hot spring hotel customer service. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 25(7), 1092-1114. https://shorturl.at/dhuzC
Cunha, S. K. D., & Cunha, J. C. D. (2005). Tourism cluster competitiveness and sustainability: Proposal for a systemic model to measure the impact of tourism on local development. BAR - Brazilian Administration Review, 2(2), 47-62. https://shorturl.at/gnR67
Curran, M. A. (2009). Wrapping our brains around sustainability. Sustainability, 1(1), 5-13. https://goo.gl/DR3iYG
D'Este, P., Rentocchini, F., & Vega-Jurado, J. (2014). The role of human capital in lowering the barriers to engaging in innovation: Evidence from the Spanish innovation survey. Industry and Innovation, 21(1), 1-19. https://shorturl.at/ehIET
Denstadli, J. M., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2011). The long and winding roads: Perceived quality of scenic tourism routes. Tourism Management, 32(4), 780-789. https://shorturl.at/pzKY1
Dowling, R. (1998). Ecotourism in Southeast Asia: Appropriate tourism or environmental appropriation? Asia-Pacific Journal of Tourism Research. https://goo.gl/h6T56i
Fong, S., & Lo, M. (2015). Community involvement and sustainable rural tourism development: Perspectives from the local communities. European Journal of Tourism Research, 11, 125-146. https://goo.gl/Skt9Y5
Ford, R. M., Williams, K. J., Smith, E. L., & Bishop, I. D. (2014). Beauty, belief, and trust: Toward a model of psychological processes in public acceptance of forest management. Environment and Behavior, 46(4), 476-506. https://shorturl.at/suFU5
Hall, A. (1998). Sustainable agriculture and conservation tillage: Managing the contradictions. Canadian Review of Sociology, 35(2), 221-251. https://shorturl.at/hnNOT
Hanrahan, J., & Maguire, K. (2016). Local authority provision of environmental planning guidelines for event management in Ireland. European Journal of Tourism Research, 12, 54-81. https://shorturl.at/grBCT
Ihamäki, P. (2012). Geocachers: The creative tourism experience. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology, 3(3), 152-175. https://shorturl.at/eKLV4
Jaakkola, E., & Alexander, M. (2014). The role of customer engagement behavior in value co-creation: A service system perspective. Journal of Service Research, 17(3), 247-261. https://shorturl.at/luBT1
Jurdana, D. S., & Zmijanovic, L. (2014). The effect of tourism seasonality on protected areas. Tourism & Hospitality Industry, 131-146. https://shorturl.at/uwx79
Lanfranchi, M., Giannetto, C., & De Pascale, A. (2014). Nature-based tourism: Natural balance, impacts, and management. Calitatea, 15, 224-229. https://goo.gl/1s4VKS
Lee, C. (2016). An investigation of factors determining industrial tourism attractiveness. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 16(2), 184-197. https://shorturl.at/hFV26
Lee, C. F., Huang, H. I., & Yeh, H. R. (2010). Developing an evaluation model for destination attractiveness: Sustainable forest recreation tourism in Taiwan. Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18(6), 811-828. https://shorturl.at/oMPQX
Lekaota, L. (2015). The importance of rural communities' participation in the management of tourism: A case study from Lesotho. Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes, 7(5), 453-462. https://goo.gl/uWDs4a
Mendoza-Gonzalez, G., Martínez, M. L., Guevara, R., Perez-Maqueo, O., Garza-Lagler, M., & Howard, A. (2018). Towards a sustainable sun, sea, and sand tourism: The value of ocean view and proximity to the coast. Sustainability, 10(4), 1012-1025. https://shorturl.at/arzAL
Mishra, J. M. (2014). Agents in sustainable tourism development: Understanding their involvement and engagement. International Journal of Education and Management Studies, 4(1), 64-69. https://shorturl.at/adlN1
Mouzughi, Y., Bryde, D., & Al-Shaer, M. (2014). The role of real estate in sustainable development in developing countries: The case of the Kingdom of Bahrain. Sustainability, 6(4), 1709-1728.
National Ecotourism Steering Committee. (2002). National ecotourism strategy. New Zealand Official Development Assistance.
Pagoso, C., Dinio, R., & Villasis, G. A. (2006). Macroeconomics. Rex Book Store.
Park, S., & Santos, C. A. (2016). Exploring the tourist experience: A sequential approach. Journal of Travel Research, 56(1), 16-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515624017
Petrick, J. F. (2002). Development of a multi-dimensional scale for measuring the perceived value of a service. Journal of Leisure Research, 34(2), 119-134. https://shorturl.at/aoW58
Putra, S. M., Wijaya, A. F., & Nurpratiwi, R. (2015). Tourism destination management: Case study in Department of Culture and Tourism, Pasuruan Regency. Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Development Studies, 3(1), 11-18. https://shorturl.at/clAC1
Radnic, R. A. (2010). Economic crisis and recession as a challenge for future development of tourism in Croatia and the European Union. Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management in Opatija Biennial International Congress. Tourism & Hospitality Industry, 683-691. https://shorturl.at/abDQU
Razovic, M. (2013). Sustainable development and level of satisfaction of tourists with elements of the tourist offer of a destination. Tourism in South East Europe, 2, 371-385.
Rijal, K., & Sapkota, R. P. (2015). Role of ecotourism in environmental conservation and socioeconomic development in Annapurna Conservation Area, Nepal. International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology, 22(3), 251-258. https://shorturl.at/esuwS
Said, H. M., & Rahman, S. A. (2011). Promoting coastal region of Pahang as the new ecotourism destination: Issues and challenges. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 4(15), 251-264.
Siebert, H. (2008). Economics of the environment: Theory and policy. Springer Publications.
Siebert, H., & Siebert, H. (1981). Economics of the environment. Lexington Books.
Stasiak, A. (2013). Tourist product in experience economy. Tourism, 23(1), 27-36. https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2013.0230
State, O., & Bulin, D. (2016). Aspects of responsible tourism: A quantitative approach. Amfiteatru Economic, 18(10), 781-797.
Swarbrooke, J. (1999). Sustainable tourism management. CABI Publishing International.
Tao, T. C., & Wall, G. (2009). Tourism as a sustainable livelihood strategy. Tourism Management, 30(1), 90-98. https://shorturl.at/jxTXY
Tawinunt, K., Phimonsathien, T., & Fongsuwan, W. (2015). Service quality and customer relationship management affecting customer retention of long-stay travelers in the Thai tourism industry: A SEM approach. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 8(2), 459-477. https://shorturl.at/jEJKV
University of Melbourne. (2014). Environmental behavior: Reports from the University of Melbourne provide new insights into environmental behavior. Ecology, Environment & Conservation. https://shorturl.at/eklDO
Uriely, N., Reichel, A., & Shani, A. (2007). Ecological orientation of tourists: An empirical investigation. Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7(3-4), 161-175. https://goo.gl/6MfLiF
Valentin, A., & Spangenberg, J. H. (2000). A guide to community sustainability indicators. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 20(3), 31-392. https://shorturl.at/tQ157
Vansiya, Y. N., & Ragothaman, S. (2012). Tourism development in Gujarat: Progress and prospects. Global Journal of Research in Management, 2(1), 65-80. https://shorturl.at/gkJMX
Wakefield, K. L., & Blodgett, J. G. (1999). Customer response to intangible and tangible service factors. Psychology & Marketing, 16(1), 51-68. https://goo.gl/NPchvh
Wang, W., Chen, J. S., Fan, L., & Lu, J. (2012). Tourist experience and wet parks: A case of Zhejiang, China. Annals of Tourism Research, 39(4), 1763-1778. https://shorturl.at/atzBN
Wen, J. (1998). Evaluation of tourism and tourist resources in China: Existing methods and their limitations. International Journal of Social Economics, 25(2/3/4), 467-485. https://shorturl.at/sBDEN