

Educational Tourism Destination Readiness and Opportunities of a State University



Maria Cristina I. Canson¹ and Merlita V. Caelian²

¹Central Philippines State University, Kabankalan City, Philippines

²University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, Bacolod City, Philippines

Article history:

Submitted: 30 January 2022

Revised: 22 March 2022

Accepted: 25 March 2022

Keywords:

Tourism management

6As of tourism

Readiness of tourism destination

Educational tourism

Descriptive-comparative

State university

Negros Occidental

*Corresponding Author:

Maria Cristina I. Canson

teena_canson@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT. A state university can be a tourist destination since it possesses the A's of tourism in addition to its engagement in teaching and conduct of research. Thus, this descriptive-comparative research investigated the readiness of a Philippine state university as an educational tourism destination. It used a researcher-made questionnaire to assess the presence of attractions, accessibility, accommodation, activities, amenities, and accountability or the 6As from the perspective of 262 internal and external stakeholders. It also identified opportunities for the promotion and enhancement of tourism resources. Results show that the state university is very ready as a tourism destination in terms of the 6As. It means it highly possesses the resources, components, and conditions needed to operate as a tourism destination. The resources recommended for promotion are farm and nature attractions. The majority of opportunities for enhancement are in accessibility.

1.0. Introduction

Academic institutions can be tourist destinations, as educational tourism has a large share in global tourism programs (Attaalla, 2020). Universities realized their civic mission by engaging in educational tourism. Universities can incorporate teaching, research, and community engagement outside their premises (Goddard et al., 2016). When a university fully possesses the necessary resources, components, and or conditions such as attractions, accessibility, accommodation, activities, and amenities, it is very ready as a tourist destination (Sujaritchai & Artnarong (2016), while accountability is highlighted on the need of the tourists for communication for better customer service (Sahid, 2018). This is because the A's of tourism influence the decision-making of tourists to choose to visit a particular place (Arpornpisal, 2018).

In educational tourism, the university and its regional roles are closely linked to each other and embedded in the educational journey (Tomasi et al., 2020). Educational tourism is picking up in Asia spurred by globalization and thus a need for greater international exposure by both students and teachers (Rahimi et al., 2018; Lee & King, 2016). International tourist interest is likewise increasing in most ASEAN countries, with a growing rate of inbound student arrivals (Maga & Nicolau, 2018). Hence, universities in the ASEAN need to engage in intergovernmental collaboration in tourism (Wong, 2010).

The major sub-sectors in Philippine tourism include ecotourism, medical, health and wellness, and retirement, meetings, incentives, conventions and exhibitions (MICE), adventure, outdoor and sports, amusement, entertainment and leisure, and cultural and heritage tourism (Javier & Elazigue, 2011) and educational tourism. Educational tourism is often considered general education tourism, specifically referring to ecotourism and cultural heritage tourism (Lee, 2018; McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017). As a result, the industry contributed a gross value added of PHP1.0 trillion, representing an 8.2% increase in the share of the country's GDP. It also created up to 5.0 million jobs, which is a 12.7% increase in national employment from 2014 (Department of Tourism, 2016), hence the need



This article published by Philippine Social Science Journal (PSSJ) is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material). Under the following terms, you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

for universities to keep their programs responsive to the industry's needs (Mungai et al., 2021) and improve the image, reputation, and readiness of the destination university (Tomasi et al., 2020).

The huge potential of tourism to bring positive results has encouraged the country to bank on it for post-pandemic economic recovery (Department of Budget and Management Memo No. 136 series of 2021) and international educational excellence. According to the DBM Memo, the country will rely heavily on tourism to revive the economy brought down by the COVID-19 pandemic. Partly in support of efforts aimed at the recovery of the Philippine tourism industry, the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) launched in 2021 an international competitiveness building program called Edutourism: Study in the Philippines to develop the country as an education hub. The project is part of a bigger initiative to establish the Philippines as a center of quality higher education in identified niche/programs of excellence in the ASEAN (CHED, 2021).

Negros Occidental has been identified as a priority tourism area under the National Tourism Development Plan 2016-2022 and Tourism Regional Strategic Action Plan. Evidently, its tourism traffic is good. In particular, the tourism industry trends in Southern Negros Occidental between 2014 and 2017 manifested a good number of visitor arrivals except for 2016 with a slight decrease (Mendoza, 2018).

Being a priority area, Negros Occidental's state universities and colleges are qualified to avail of CHED's grants for proposals on enhancing tourism products. A State University in Southern Negros Occidental was among the recipient of this grant, which seeks to improve the resources of universities for tourism under the core principle of glocalization of education (CHED, 2021).

Areas for improvement in tourism destinations are usually identified through readiness assessments (Soeswoyo, 2016; Chotsopanon, 2018). The improvements are made to satisfy customers to ensure repeat visits and loyalty (Ismail & Rohman, 2019). Destination readiness assessments were also done to determine the extent of management effort and investment, particularly of governments, in national tourism development thrusts (Widyastuti & Dharmesti, 2020). The process often includes identifying areas as a potential for development as attractions (Kunz & Ratliff, 2019; Mahadewi, 2017).

Studies reviewed include the promotion of educational tourism by HEIs as demonstrated by its tourism products such as nature, farm, health and wellness, and culture and heritage (Widyastuti & Dharmesti, 2020; Arcana & Wiweka, 2016; Darroca, 2020; Santoso et al., 2019). The most successful destinations recognize the broader implications of the relationship between tourism, culture, traditions, and nature, hence creating employment and development of the local community in the long term. In fostering local development through educational tourism, the role of universities includes students' involvement in place-based activities, increased tourism business, and generating economic and social benefits to the community. Locally, there is a perceived high demand for universities in educational and scientific activities (Ramirez, 2021). These imply that HEIs as regional educational hubs should develop the potential of educational tourism destinations (Tomasi et al. 2020).

However, there is a dearth of studies on readiness assessments for tourism destinations, especially for universities or colleges. This is particularly absent in the case of universities and colleges in Negros Occidental. For this reason, the researcher conducted a study to determine the readiness of a state university in terms of the 6A's of tourism – attractions, accessibility, accommodation, activities, amenities, and accountability. The study also identified opportunities for the promotion and enhancement of tourism resources.

2.0. Framework of the Study

The study theorized that the tourism destination readiness of a Philippine State University is dependent on the availability of resources and conditions that support tourism. These are determined by internal and external stakeholders who know the destination's core features, capabilities, and conditions.

The study is anchored on the Resource-Based View (RBV) Theory. The RBV Theory promotes identifying the organization's unique internal resources and capability strengths to achieve sustainable competitive advantage. It is an inside-out view that looks at an organization as a collection of physical, human, and organizational resources (Madhani, 2010). Based on the theory, the resources must be valuable, rare, have imperfect imitability, and non-substitutability to provide a competitive advantage; and must be valuable, heterogeneously distributed across competitors, and imperfectly

mobile for the competitive advantage to be sustainable. The theory is commonly used to analyze the potential, competitiveness, or success indicators of businesses, including tourism enterprises.

The RBV theory is relevant to the study in that identifying the unique internal resources and capability strengths of the university was done using the lens of the 6As.

Attractions refer to the destination's unique, rare, interesting, or unusual tangible and non-tangible resources that compel people for a visit. This study classified these resources under the tourism product categories nature, farm, education, health and wellness, and culture and heritage. Accessibility refers to roads, road networks, and public transportation that enable tourists to visit the destination. It also refers to online bookings and an inquiry system that allow guests to set an appointment for a tour or ask for tourism-related information. Further, it refers to the availability of the attractions throughout the seasons of the year and the possibility of reaching them on foot or by all types of vehicles. Accommodation refers to lodging facilities such as hotels, guest houses, and dorms within the university or 20-25 minutes from the university. Activities are all typical leisure activities that tourists may engage in during their visit to the tourism destination. Amenities are the basic facilities and infrastructure that support tourism activities and make tourists comfortable. Accountability refers to resources and mechanisms that enable a destination to achieve good governance. It consists of tourism plans and policies, and activities that would protect the university's assets. It also includes systems for communicating with clients, guests, or tourists.

Attractions and accessibility are the unique, valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable, non-substitutable, heterogeneously distributed, and imperfectly mobile internal resources that, in the context of this study, the theory refers to as the competitive advantage of the university over other educational tourism destinations. While accommodation, activities, amenities, and accountability complete the whole collection of the university's internal resources.

3.0. Methodology

The study used a descriptive-comparative research design. The respondents of the study were 239 internal stakeholders and 23 external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders were chosen by stratified random sampling, while external stakeholders were chosen by proportional stratified random sampling.

The researcher utilized a researcher-made survey instrument designed to measure tourism destination readiness based on the aspects or attributes: attractions, accessibility, accommodations, activities, amenities, and accountability. The 5As or the aspects or attributes were based on the Tourism Guidebook for Local Government Units (2017). The accountability aspect was included to project the participation of governance in tourism. Part II contained the survey on the tourism destination readiness of the University in terms of attractions, accessibility, accommodations, activities, amenities, and accountability.

The attractions were sub-categorized into tourism products nature, farm, health and wellness, culture and heritage, and education. Statements ranged from one to 13 items per sub-category or aspect. The measurement of the tourism destination readiness used a Likert-type scale of 1 to 4 with the following interpretation: 3.00-4.00 mean range is very ready corresponding to the verbal interpretation, "The attribute, resource, or condition is highly present;" 2.00 – 2.99 is ready corresponding to "The attribute, resource, or condition is present;" 1.00 - 1.99 is almost ready corresponding to "The attribute, resource, or condition is moderately present;" and 0.99 – 1.00 is not ready corresponding to "The attribute, resource, or condition is not present." Part III was a checklist to determine aspects of tourism where opportunities for promotion and enhancement possibly exist.

The survey questionnaire was subjected to content validation using Lawshe's Content Validation Ratio. The resulting Content Validation Index after the process was 0.89. The survey questionnaire was also subjected to a reliability test by pilot testing. Responses were analyzed through Cronbach's Alpha method, and the alpha coefficient was 0.973. The researcher distributed the link to the online survey through messenger. This was the preferred mode of conduct to ensure the safety of both researcher and respondents during the time of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Face-to-face administration of the questionnaires was also done for respondents who were not reached online. Enumerators were employed to administer the survey to parent officers and community leaders. The data were then tabulated, transcribed, and analyzed. Descriptive analysis was used for the profile of respondents using frequency count and percentage distribution. Mean and standard deviation were used for the readiness rating of the attributes.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of the variables. The normality test revealed that the variables of attraction [KS=0.059, p=0.028], accessibility [KS=0.126, p=0.000], accommodation [KS=0.202, p=0.000], activities [KS=0.148, p=0.000], amenities [KS=0.071, p=0.003], and accountability [KS=0.121, p=0.000] were not normally distributed, hence the use of nonparametric tests for inferential results.

Mann Whitney U test was used to determine the significant difference in the extent of readiness of a Philippine State University as a tourism destination in terms of attraction, accessibility, accommodation, activities, amenities, and accountability when stakeholders are grouped according to designation as internal and external stakeholders.

4.0. Results and Discussion

Extent of Tourism Destination Readiness

Table 1 shows that the readiness of the state university, as a whole (M=3.09, SD=0.49), is very ready according to both internal and external stakeholders. This means the University fully possesses the necessary resources, components, and conditions to allow tourist destination management to conduct tourism activities successfully. It further shows that the state university can cater to tourists in a diverse range of product needs. The finding means that the University can now be fully operated as a tourism destination because it has appropriate resources and support services. It supports the premise stated by Sujaritchai and Artnarong (2016) that the presence of these factors (As) of tourism determines the success of a destination. It is because the 5As influence the decision-making of tourists to choose to visit a particular place (Arpornpaisal, 2018).

In terms of the variables, accommodation got the highest rating (M=3.25, SD=0.72), followed by attractions (M=3.15, SD=0.52), amenities (M=3.09, SD=0.55), and accessibility (M=3.09, SD=0.63); the least was activities (M=3.02, SD=0.64). The sixth attribute, accountability, was rated lowest or only ready (M=2.94, SD=0.70).

The highest mean rating was provided to accommodation (M=3.25: SD=0.72), interpreted as very ready. This signifies that the destination excels in terms of the availability of temporary sleeping or lodging provisions, as evidenced by three-star hotels located at the nearest urban center proximate to the University. The availability of accommodation is important as it closely relates to the study of Novianti et al. (2019), which likewise determined the availability of accommodation amenities within the campus and three-star hotels within its proximity. Both supported the potential of a university to become an educational tourism attraction. Results, however, become insignificant when viewed from the studies of Arpornpaisal (2018) and Arcana and Wiweka (2016), in which accommodation rated low among the factors that influence the decision of tourists to travel.

Attractions were rated the second-highest (M=3.15, SD=0.52), interpreted very ready. This is significant because attractions are top determinants of a destination's potential, supporting the University's overall readiness rating. It means the destination has sufficient natural and anthropic resources with strong appeal, uniqueness, or interesting characteristics. This suggests the fitness of the destination for operation as a tourism destination because it has elements that can draw tourist visits. This finding aligns with the study of Ismail and Rohman (2019), which states that attraction can influence customer satisfaction and loyalty, hence the success of tourism in a particular area. The study of Hoang et al. (2018) is confirmed because it determines where development can best be carried out. However, it does not align with the study of Soeswoyo (2016), wherein despite the high readiness of attractions, the overall result is not yet ready due to deficiencies in other attributes.

The readiness in terms of amenities as a whole (M=3.09, SD=0.55) is very ready. Amenities ranked third highest among the 6As. Overall, the University possesses the basic facilities and infrastructure that support tourism activities and make tourists comfortable. The high readiness result is significant considering that amenities are often put alongside attraction and accessibility in terms of importance (Novianti et al., 2019; Santoso et al., 2019). These three are the basic A's of tourism. Ismail and Rohman (2019) affirmed that facilities indeed influence customer loyalty. The result aligns with that of Soeswoyo (2016), which highlighted the strong influence of amenities as support to the overall readiness of a destination.

The readiness in terms of accessibility as a whole (M=3.09, SD=0.63) is very ready. The rating score was raised by the availability of public transportation from major urban centers to the University

but lowered by lower ratings on the availability of online bookings and inquiries. This means that enabling factors, such as road infrastructure and transportation at the least, are available to allow tourist visits to the destination. This is due to the University's location along a national highway plied by all types of vehicles and its proximity from the urban centers of two provinces. These support the overall very ready rating of the state university and its potential to become a successful tourism destination. However, due to the online platforms for bookings and inquiries that were observed to be not as highly present, the accessibility is diminished. The low rating suggests that while this system is present, there is a need to make it fully available to increase the University's potential and support its readiness.

In line with the results of the study of Darroca (2020), the use of public transport is perceived as convenient and provides satisfaction to tourists. The significant role of accessibility in influencing the viability of a destination for tourism supports the study of Arpornpaisal (2018) and Hoang et al. (2018), which put the influence of accessibility on the readiness and potential of a destination as one of the strongest factors. However, results negate those of Ismail and Rohman (2019), which determined that accessibility does not influence customer satisfaction and loyalty.

The readiness in terms of activities as a whole ($M=3.02$, $SD=0.64$) is very ready mainly because of the availability of coffee and dining experience around the campus. However, external shareholders rated the item "shopping, souvenir items and gift buying" at the low level of ready ($M=2.68$; $SD=0.89$), lowering the result. The ratings mean sufficient leisure activities could be enjoyed within the University aside from visiting major nature, farm, and health and wellness attractions or participating in educational-related events or happenings. However, there is a need to make souvenirs and gift buying a more enjoyable activity when visiting the destination. The significance of creating activities within a tourism destination agrees with the studies of Mahadewi (2017) and Oladeji (2020). It is also in consonance with the approach specified in the study of Chotsopanon (2018) that tourist attractions with a medium level of ability to create local experiences should provide additional activities.

Accountability was rated the lowest ($M=2.94$; $SD=0.70$), interpreted as ready. In particular, a low score was given to social media sites for tourism and client feedback mechanisms. This means the University still has room to enhance systems that ensure it takes responsibility for its actions and continuously improves customer service. This brings to the fore the results of the studies of Sahid (2018) and Purnomo et al. (2019) that highlighted the need for communication with tourists as an indicator of accountability and good governance. Meanwhile, with regards to client feedback, the low result is similar to the study of Mahadewi (2017), which interpreted that the findings indicated management's weakness in terms of performance evaluation. In concurrence, Albu and Cimpean (2017) put a high value on satisfying customers by adding to their model for assessing tourism the aspect of online reviews and recommendations. This development was done considering the widespread use of the internet by people looking for destinations to visit.

By tourism product, specific results show high readiness for nature, farm, health and wellness, and education tourism products. The specific items rated very high are diverse but essentially nature-based, particularly pollution-free environment, farming technologies, landscape, landforms, and water bodies.

The results are similar to those of Mahadewi (2017), Widyastuti and Dharmesti (2020), Arcana and Wiweka (2016), Darroca (2020), and Santoso et al. (2019), wherein very good ratings were obtained mainly because of the presence of attractors in the form of scenic natural views and peaceful atmosphere. In consonance, this study found out that the main attractor was the natural environment, even if the destination offers other tourism products. Meanwhile, the diversity of the attractive features that were rated high coincides with Artnarong and Sujaritchai (2016) and Arpornpaisal (2018) and Darroca (2020), which emphasized the need for variety in tourist destinations to make it more attractive.

Culture and heritage got a slightly lower mean rating of very ready due to the lower ratings for the practice of indigenous cultural activities and museums and galleries. The result deviates from the assertion of Hoang et al. (2018) that cultural-historical value is the ultimate determinant of internal tourism potential. However, it exemplifies what Soeswoyo (2016) is pointing out that in order for a destination to offer cultural attraction, it is not enough to have a unique culture. The elements that make up the culture must be packaged for the enjoyment of tourists.

Table 1. Extent of Readiness of a Philippine State University as a Tourism Destination

Variables	Internal			External			Overall		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Attractions	3.14	0.52	VR	3.22	0.43	VR	3.15	0.52	VR
Accessibility	3.08	0.63	VR	3.21	0.66	VR	3.09	0.63	VR
Accommodation	3.24	0.73	VR	3.33	0.68	VR	3.25	0.72	VR
Activities	3.03	0.65	VR	2.88	0.62	R	3.02	0.64	VR
Amenities	3.08	0.56	VR	3.19	0.37	VR	3.09	0.55	VR
Accountability	2.94	0.72	R	2.91	0.56	R	2.94	0.70	R
Readiness	3.08	0.50	VR	3.14	0.37	VR	3.09	0.49	VR

Legend: VR=Very Ready, R=Ready, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, Int=Interpretation

Difference in the Extent of Tourism Destination Readiness

Table 2 shows that there is no significant difference in the extent of readiness of a Philippine State University as a tourism destination in terms of attraction [U=2592.5, p=0.653], accessibility [U=2379.0, p=0.283], accommodation [U=2598.5, p=0.653], activities [U=2336.5, p=0.228], amenities [U=2490.5, p=0.457], and accountability [U=2521.0, p=0.510] when stakeholders are grouped according to designation as internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders assessed the University as very ready (M=3.08: SD=0.50); external stakeholders also assessed it as very ready (M=3.09: SD=0.49), with almost the same mean ratings. This means that the findings are consistent, indicating and confirming the result that the University is very ready to engage in tourism activities.

The result is similar to Mahadewi (2017) and Oladeji (2020). In the same line, the studies share a common finding: that stakeholders who agree on the high readiness of the destination were also highly aware and receptive of the potential tourism development in their area. Both findings support the overall readiness rating of very ready and the claim of Ismail and Rohman (2019) that an agreement between the local community and management is also an indicator that visitors will most likely be satisfied with the destination’s tourism services. Awareness, common understanding, support, and good tandem between internal and external stakeholders justify the no significant difference of their findings on the attributes.

Table 2. Difference in the Extent of Readiness of a Philippine State University as Educational Tourism Destination

Variable	U	Z	p
Attractions	2592.5	-0.450	0.653
Accessibility	2379.0	-1.073	0.283
Accommodation	2598.5	-0.449	0.653
Activities	2336.5	-1.205	0.228
Amenities	2490.5	-0.744	0.457
Accountability	2521.0	-0.658	0.510

Note: the difference is significant at p<0.05

Opportunities for Promotion of Resources

Table 3 shows respondents’ answers on which resources of the university may be promoted as tourism attractions; responses revealed that 168 or 64.1% identified agricultural production technology; 166 or 63.4% water bodies; 160 or 61.1% farm products; 142 or 54.2% plant and animal species; 141 or 53.8% natural landform; and 140 or 53.4% farm management technology. The respondents were asked about the specific names of the resources for promotion as tourism attractions. The answers were numerous and extensive. Those least recommended for promotion as tourism attractions are items related to education, culture, and heritage.

Three or 50% of the top six resources recommended for promotion as tourism attractions were under the theme farm tourism and nature. This means that stakeholders are highly aware of

agricultural production and management technologies, farm products, and natural assets that the University may promote to outsiders. This also implies that stakeholders believe these resources have enough aesthetic and educational value to be worth traveling for, seeing, or experiencing. This supports the idea that the University is ready for promotion and operation as a tourism destination. The high awareness of the community was similarly highlighted in the studies of Mahadewi (2017) and Kunz and Ratliff (2019), which state that this is important to destination branding, thus, potential. Multiple sectors of the community could become sources to define their very own destination brand through self-analysis, according to the study. This supports the findings of Tomasi et al. (2020) that higher education institutions and actors at the destinations could work together to develop marketing strategies that would project a positive image of both the institution and the destination.

The high awareness of stakeholders of the attractions in the destination reflects the study of Mahadewi (2017), wherein stakeholders rated the destination as very good, driven by a high rating on awareness of rural communities of the destination. The extent and variety of attractions, including sports facilities and technology demonstration projects, recommended for promotion show that the University could practically offer almost all its operations, resources, and facilities as tourism objects as a long-established educational institution. Meanwhile, the lack of recommendation for educational tourism is similar to the findings of Arcana and Wiweka (2016), which determined that in terms of motivation, tourists' motivation is still 'tourism first' rather than 'education first.' This suggests management intervention to make stakeholders aware of alternative tourism other than nature and farm tourism.

Table 3. Resources for Promotion as Educational Tourism Attractions

Resources	f	%
Agricultural production technology	168	64.1
Water Bodies [waterfalls, lagoon, etc.	166	63.4
Farm Products	160	61.1
Plant and animal species	142	54.2
Natural landform	141	53.8
Farm management technology	140	53.4
Technology and technological projects	111	42.4
Learning Facilities	105	40.1
Indigenous communities	101	38.5
Natural, cultural, historical, and religious sites	99	37.8
Training and experiential activities	98	37.4
Educational gatherings	78	29.8
Man-made cultural and historical structures	77	29.4
Festivals	64	24.4
Others	4	1.5

Opportunities for Enhancement of Resources

Table 4 shows respondents' answers on which resources of the University need to be enhanced for tourism purposes. It is shown that 179 or 68.3% identified "trails to natural and cultural attractions," 164 or 62.6% "road within the campus," 159 or 60.7% "signages," 157 or 59.9% "infrastructures such as tourist sheds and viewing decks," 155 or 59.2% "food services," 149 or 56.9% "web and social media sites," 145 or 55.3% "souvenir shops," 142 or 54.2% "museums and galleries," 134 or 51.1% "quality of lodging accommodation," and 132 or 50.4% "visitor lounges." The resources they least recommended for improvement were the basic, particularly electricity, communication, water, drainage, and communication.

The recommendations highlight the specific resources, infrastructure, and services that stakeholders deem lacking or need improvement in order for the University to offer a comfortable stay in the destination. These are the items that management must include in its Tourism Development Plan to ensure customer satisfaction.

The contrasting ready rating with recommendations for improvement to make the destination more suitable for tourism purposes has similarities to the findings of Soeswoyo (2016) in a study of a cultural village. It was found out that the destination has infrastructures and some tourist facilities, but not all of them were functioning optimally. Meanwhile, the recommendation to improve web and social media sites supports the point made by Kunz and Ratliff (2019) to include awareness factors in the Tourism Potential Index. The results fortify the recommendation in the study of Widyastuti and Dharmesti (2020), which is to develop a strong social media presence for the tourism village to enhance its potential. It also agrees with the findings of Ismail and Rohman (2019) that amenities and ancillary services must be improved to attain customer satisfaction. Overall, these affirm the study of Tomasi et al. (2020) that higher education institutions can enhance the potential of educational tourism destinations.

Table 4. Physical Resources to be enhanced for Tourism Purposes

Physical Resources	f	%
<i>Attractions</i>		
Museums and galleries	142	54.2
Natural landscape and surroundings	126	48.1
<i>Accessibility</i>		
Trails to natural and cultural attractions	179	68.3
Road within the campus	164	62.6
Signage	159	60.7
<i>Accommodations</i>		
Quality of lodging accommodations	134	51.1
<i>Activities</i>		
Souvenirs and local products	128	48.9
<i>Amenities</i>		
Infrastructures, such as tourist sheds and viewing decks	157	59.9
Food services	155	59.2
Visitor lounges	132	50.4
Seminar and training facilities	124	47.3
Souvenir shops	145	55.3
Potable water	121	46.2
Restrooms	121	46.2
Dining amenities	120	45.8
Convenience shops	119	45.4
Drainage	115	43.9
Cleaning water supply	114	43.5
Communication	114	43.5
Solid waste management	112	42.7
Convention venues	106	40.5
Car parking	100	38.2
Electricity	81	30.9
<i>Accountability</i>		
Web and social media sites	149	56.9
Tour guides	130	49.6

5.0. Conclusion

The state university is very ready to become a tourism destination as measured according to the 6A's of tourism. This means that the university highly possesses the needed resources, components, and conditions to be a tourist destination.

The university is very ready in terms of attractions, implying that varied types of natural and anthropic resources with strong appeal, uniqueness, or interesting characteristics are highly observable in its area. It is also very ready in terms of accessibility, indicating that transportation systems and infrastructure are highly available for tourists. It further means that the destination is highly accessible throughout all seasons of the year and by all modes of transportation. The university is also very ready in terms of accommodation because sleeping or lodging facilities are highly present and within its service area. Likewise, the university is very ready in terms of activities, signifying that leisure or recreational activities other than that done for educational purposes may also be highly enjoyed within or around the campus. The university is also very ready in terms of amenities. It has more than the basic facilities and infrastructure that facilitate tourism and make tourists comfortable. The university is rated ready in terms of accountability, suggesting it has basic mechanisms and systems that ensure management responsibility and good customer service.

Both internal and external shareholders concur that the university is very ready to become a tourist destination, evidenced by the more than the adequate level of physical assets and organizational mechanisms to conduct tourism activities successfully. As to resources for promotion, they recommended that the university advertise farm and natural tourism assets as attractions. It was suggested to improve accessibility and certain amenities. These comments of stakeholders were included in the Tourism Development Plan as the output of the study.

6.0. Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

7.0. Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Albu, R. G. & Cîmpean, R. (2017). Opinions on the main elements to be considered in potential assessment models in tourism. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Economic Sciences. Series V*, 10(1), 69-78.
- Arcana, K. & Wiweka, K. (2016). Educational tourism's product strategy at Batur Global Geopark, Kintamani-Bali. *In Asia Tourism Forum 2016-the 12th Biennial Conference of Hospitality and Tourism Industry in Asia* (pp. 316-322). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v3i7.137>
- Arpornpisal, C. (2018). Tourism elements influence the decision making in traveling to visit Phra Pathom Chedi, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand. *Asian Administration & Management Review*, 1(1). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3190064
- Attaalla, F. A. H. (2020) Educational tourism as a tool to increase the competitiveness of education in Egypt: A critical study. *Journal of Travel, Tourism and Recreation*, 2(2), 34-41. <https://tinyurl.com/2s42a2my>
- Commission on Higher Education (CHED). (2021). Study in the Philippines program: Education tourism. Briefer. Chotsopanon, J., Sangchatkaew, S., Mongkolnimitr, S., Sri-sumang, S., & Pakkantorn, R. (2018). Potential and readiness of tourism supply of second-tier destinations in Thailand under the LINK Project. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts)*, 11(5), 340-354. <https://he02.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/Veridian-E-Journal/article/view/161011>
- Daroca, J. F. (2020). Farm tourism: Unleashing Iloilo's potential through sustainable tourism. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 57(9), 7236-7240. <http://psychologyandeducation.net/pae/index.php/pae/article/view/5622>
- Department of Budget and Management (DBM). (2021). Budget priorities framework for the preparation of the FY 2021 agency budget proposals. Memo No. 136, series of 2021.
- Department of Tourism (DOT). (2016). National Tourism Development Plan 2016-2022. https://itsmorefunincentralluzon.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/NTDP-2016-2022_Executive-Summary.pdf
- Department of Tourism (DOT). (2017). Tourism guidebook for local government units. http://www.tourism.gov.ph/Guidebook_Manual/TourismGuidebook.pdf
- Goddard, J., & Kempton, L. (2016). The civic university: Universities in leadership and management of place.

- Hoang, H. T. T., Truong, Q. H., Nguyen, A. T., & Hens, L. (2018). Multicriteria evaluation of tourism potential in the central highlands of Vietnam: Combining Geographic Information System (GIS), Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and Principal Component Analysis (PCA). *Sustainability*, 10(9), 3097. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10093097>
- Ismail, T. & Rohman, F. (2019). The role of attraction, accessibility, amenities, and ancillary on visitor satisfaction and visitor attitudinal loyalty of Gili Ketapang Beach. *J Manajemen Teori dan Terapan*, 149-165. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e3ef/ce834406283bcf9015cd7751d135eef462fb.pdf>
- Javier, A. B., & Elazigue, D. B. (2011). Opportunities and challenges in tourism development roles of local government units in the Philippines. *In 3rd Annual Conference of the Academic Network of Development Studies in Asia, Nagoya University, Japan*. <https://tinyurl.com/2p8rdva2>
- Kunz, M. B. & Ratliff, J. M. (2019). A preliminary investigation into tourism readiness: Proposing a tourism potential index. https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1283&context=ama_proceedings
- Lee, C. F. & King, B. (2016). International students in Asia: Travel behaviors and destination perceptions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 457-476. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10941665.2015.1062786>
- Lee, S. A. (2018). A study on the selection factors and cluster types of educational tourism. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 118(19), 1373-1384.
- Madhani, P. M. (2010). Resource-Based View (RBV) of competitive advantage: An overview. Resource-based View: Concepts and Practices, *Pankaj Madhani, ed*, 3-22. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1578704
- Maga, A., & Nicolau, P. (2018). Conceptualizing educational tourism and the educational tourism potential (evidence from ASEAN countries). <https://tinyurl.com/sj3vfzcn>
- Mahadewi, N. M. E. (2017). Rural tourism development through tourist village destination in Badung Regency, Bali. *Journal of Advance Research in Dynamical & Control Systems*, 11(11). <http://repo.ppb.ac.id/id/eprint/19>
- McGladdery, C. A., & Lubbe, B. A. (2017). Rethinking educational tourism: Proposing a new model and future directions. *Tourism Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-03-2017-0055>
- Mendoza, T. J. H. (2018). Tourism industry in Southern Negros Occidental. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 1(1). <https://tinyurl.com/85x3kxae>
- Mungai, M. W., Kieti, D. M., & Cheloti-Mapelu, I. (2021). The tourism education and the tourism industry imbalances: A review of skills, curriculum proponents and the way forward. *European Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 9(3), 14-26. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3885444
- Novianti E., Putra, R. R., Permadi, R. W. A., Maulana, M. I., & Wulung, S. R. P. (2019). Educational tourism and its development program in supporting sustainable regional development at Padjadjaran University, Jatinangor. *The 1st International Conference on Tourism and Entrepreneurship 2019*, (pp. 45-55). Bangka Belitung, Indonesia. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343696279_Educational_Tourism_and_Its_Development_Program_in_Supporting_Sustainable_Regional_Development_at_Padjadjaran_University_Jatinangor
- Oladeji, S. O., Ariyo, O. T., & Alabi, O. I. (2019). Potentials of agrotourism on social and economic development of the selected agricultural farms and adjoining communities in South-Western Nigeria. *Czech Journal of Tourism*, 8(2), 119-142. <https://sciendo.com/pdf/10.2478/cjot-2019-0008>
- Purnomo, S., Rahayu, E. S., Riani, A. L., Suminah, S., & Udin, U. D. I. N. (2020). Empowerment model for sustainable tourism village in an emerging country. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, 7(2), 261-270. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no2.261>
- Rahimi, R., Akgunduz, Y., Koseoglu, M. A., & Okumus, F. (2018). Mobility patterns of asian students: The case of tourism and hospitality management students in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 30(2), 85-94. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2018.1436972>
- Ramirez, C. A. A. (2021). San Carlos City, Negros Occidental: Prospects and Perspectives as Meetings, Incentives, Conventions, and Exhibitions Destination. *Philippine Social Science Journal*, 4(2), 90-103.
- Sahid, A., Amirullah, I., Azis, A., Rachman, A. A., & Bin-Tahir, S. Z. (2019). Application of bureaucratic accountability in public service. *In Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration Conference (EROPA 2018)* (pp. 87-90). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/eropa-18.2019.11>
- Santoso, A. B., Kurniawan, E., & Syifaiddin, M. (2019). The development of eco-edutourism village in mangrove tapak forest area, Tugurejo, Tugu Sub-District as a Community-Based Tourism. *In International Conference on Rural Studies in Asia (ICoRSIA 2018)* (pp. 328-333). <https://doi.org/10.2991/icorsia-18.2019>
- Soeswoyo, D. M. (2016). Exploring the readiness of Betawi cultural village as a sustainable cultural tourism destination in Jakarta. *In Asia Tourism Forum 2016-the 12th Biennial Conference of Hospitality and Tourism Industry in Asia* (pp. 93-98). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/atf-16.2016.13>
- Sujaritchai, S. & Artnarong, W. (2016). Assessment of tourism attraction potentials in 3 eastern borders provinces. *Interdisciplinary Research Review*, 11(6), 14-19. <https://doi.org/10.14456/jtir.2016.28>
- Tomasi, S., Paviotti, G., & Cavicchi, A. (2020). Educational tourism and local development: The role of universities. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 6766. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176766>

- Widyastuti, D. & Dharmesti, T. R. (2020). The attractiveness of Kreet tourism village: Applying components of tourism analysis. *Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities, 4*, 00007. <https://doi.org/10.29037/digitalpress.44354>
- Wong, E. P., Mistilis, N., & Dwyer, L. (2010). Understanding ASEAN tourism collaboration—the preconditions and policy framework formulation. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 12*(3), 291-302. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.757>

Additional Authors' Information:

MARIA CRISTINA I. CANSON*
teena_canson@yahoo.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6590-6362>

MERLITA V. CAELIAN
merlita_caelian@yahoo.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4671-4047>