

Stakeholders Perspective on Competitiveness and Sustainability of Farm Destinations



Hermilina A. Mendoza

Abstract

Farm tourism is becoming one of the Philippines' most profitable businesses. The potential of farms has prompted the formation of farm destinations in the province of Cavite. Considering its emergence, seeking the best approach to preserve competitiveness is vital towards farms' long-term viability. The purpose of this study is to examine the perspectives of farm tourism supply-side stakeholders on the competitiveness and sustainability of farm destinations in upland Cavite. Specifically, to determine their degree of agreement on destination competitiveness in terms of inherited, created, and support resources, situational and demand conditions, and destination management; and their degree of agreement on economic, social, and environmental sustainability. Descriptive-correlational research was employed on the data gathered from 158 participants. The data analyses used were weighted mean, standard deviation, Pearson-r correlation, and multiple regression. The findings revealed that the supply-side stakeholders “Agree” on competitiveness and on the sustainability of farm destinations. The result of the regression analysis showed that situational conditions, destination management, and demand conditions are predictors of sustainability and that there are positive and significant relationships between competitiveness and sustainability. The result suggested the need to strengthen farm destination accessibility, uplift the livelihood of residents, and enhance the farms green marketing strategies.

Keywords:

farm destination, competitiveness, sustainability, stakeholders, farm tourism

Suggested Citation: Mendoza, H. A. (2021). Stakeholders Perspective on Competitiveness and Sustainability of Farm Destinations. *International Journal of Academe and Industry Research*, Volume 2, Issue 3, pp. 26- 47.

About the author:

Graduate of Doctor in Business Administration. A permanent faculty and the campus research director at Cavite State University Silang campus.

1. Introduction

The province of Cavite is known as one of the tourism destinations in the Philippines. Farm tourism emerged in the province and became one of the most valuable businesses. Currently, in the upland area alone, there are thirty-four established farm destinations. Its rapid expansion is due to the region's favorable climate, stunning natural surroundings, and hilly terrain. Such that, it becomes an attractive and tempting place to visit. City people like to travel the upland part of Cavite to escape the city's hustle and bustle and enjoy a journey to a rural lifestyle and serenity.

Farm tourism is a mixture of agriculture and tourism which diversify and transforms farms into farm destinations for business. Farm destinations offer a fresh idea of agricultural development, as well as optimism for reviving the economy. This concept was born to enhance farms in remote areas as alternative destinations for local and international visitors. The emergence of farm destinations in the province of Cavite results in to increase in visits. The influx of tourists in the province increased by 11% in 2017, reaching 6.62 million arrivals, with domestic tourism alone made an estimated 96,720,627 visitors that year (Santiano, 2018). In upland Cavite composed of Silang, Indang, Mendez, Amadeo, Alfonso, Tagaytay City, Maragondon, Magallanes, and General Aguinaldo, there were 3,661,342 tourists in 2017 (Cavite Ecological Profile, 2017).

Tourism advantages for the destination community are utmost when destination governance fosters both sustainability and competitiveness (Day, 2016). It is crucial to recognize the competitive edge when compared to other farm destinations to sustain. Identifying factors that influence competitiveness is imperative. Farm destination has to operate on its elements, such as resources, destination management, demand condition, and situation conditions to be competitive (Zehrer & Hallman 2015).

Stakeholders play an essential role in the development of tourism. They provide insight into tourist competitiveness and sustainability. Thus, it is crucial to know their perspective to identify what to prioritize.

This paper contributes to new knowledge on the competitiveness and sustainability of farm destinations in upland Cavite, focusing on the supply side stakeholders' perspectives. It also aims to answer if there is a positive and significant relationship between competitiveness and sustainability of farms and if competitiveness is a predictor of sustainability. Likewise, this study addresses the scarcity of relevant literature about the impact of tourism in the province (Notorio et al., 2016).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Competitiveness

The world is full of changing conditions particularly in the field of business, competition exists and the necessity to compete with rivals drives direct upgrading and moving toward a high level of competitive advantage. Due to rivalry, the question of farm destination competitiveness became essential. While the concept of competitiveness originated in the realm of economics, its use in the tourist industry has sparked a fresh round of arguments over how the term should be defined (Abreu Novais, 2017). The attempt towards creating one common definition of competitiveness seems to be doomed and failed (Siudek and Zawojcka, 2014). As per the World Economic Forum (WEF), competitiveness is “the set of institutions, policies, and factors that determine the level of productivity” (Day, 2016). For D’Hautserre (2000) competitiveness of a destination is “*the ability of a destination to maintain its market position and share and/or improve upon them through time*”.

For destinations to become competitive, they must strategically promote specific factors that distinguish them from the others. They must provide a much better experience to tourists than alternative destinations do. The competitiveness and attractiveness of destinations vary depending on various characteristics tailored to the specific needs of tourists. Farm destinations competitiveness depends on resources, destination management, demand circumstances, and situation conditions (Zehrer and Hallman, 2015).

Gaining a competitive edge for farm destinations is possible by combining their many bundles of resources. Resources provide attractiveness, ambiance, experience, and attractions. These are the input of the company (Claude, 2018). If destination can enhance the resources inside its framework, it can be more competitive (Day, 2016). Resources encompass the various characteristics of a destination that makes it attractive to visit. These resources could be man-made and natural. According to Zainuddin et al. (2016), inherited resources are natural and cultural elements of destinations. Natural resources are components that exist without the inputs of humans (Sawe, 2018). These resources are the primary element of destination attraction. Created resources on the other hand include the services and activities provided by the farm. Moreso, support resources are elements of destination competitiveness that provides a foundation for the success of the tourism industry. It may be difficult for a location with an excess of core resources and attractors but a scarcity of supporting factors to compete. Accessibility, entrepreneurship, communications, infrastructure, and transportation are some of the support resources of the farms.

Related literature showed that support services are one factor on whether or not potential tourists visit one destination over another. According to Hanafiah et al. (2016), tourists consider the core and created resources in their decision to visit a destination. Also, Yozcu (2017) revealed that in Istanbul the rate of competitiveness is high due to endowed

and created resources. Further, Abocejo (2015), exposed that in Cebu City, Philippines, tourism competitiveness increased through its diversified historical and natural resources, rich cultural milieu, well-established land, sea, and air transportation infrastructure, presence of hotels, and resorts, and a booming industrial and manufacturing economy. Moreover, a study on the tourism competitiveness of UAE conducted by Michael et al. (2019), revealed that tourist competitiveness is affected by destination resources, destination infrastructure and support services, and the overall business climate.

Aside from resources, the situational conditions of farm destinations influence tourist decisions to visit. Barbe et al. (2016), divulged that the main assets of Uruguay's rural tourists are the locals' warmth and friendliness, natural and cultural attractions, and the country's stability and safety. Also, in the United Arab Emirates, Eid et al. (2019) found that the political stability and image have a significant impact on visitor satisfaction and on their willingness to recommend the destination. When cultural and natural assets of destinations are not adequately managed and conditioned, wrongdoings may emerge, women and youths may be abused, and money-related advantages may also leak out of the economy (Weldearegay, 2017).

Likewise, the demand conditions also form part of the competitive advantage. Demand condition was identified by Michael Porter as one of the drivers of competitive advantage. Creation of demand from the market based on their preferences is crucial for the farms since customers in the economy are very demanding and that firm should strive to satisfy them. Home demand condition is the internal demand need for specific goods or services to meet the need of a sophisticated and demanding market (Estevao et al., 2018). Demand conditions include local consumers' sophistication, adoption of products, concerns on ethics, size, and growth of the local market, among others (Dlamin et al., 2014).

The condition of how the destination is managed is vital to the competitiveness of the destination. Effective tourism destination management encouraged tourist visitation. By establishing policies that are beneficial to business, such as safety and security, health and hygiene, better drinking water and sanitation, human resources, and labor market conditions destinations become competitive (Calderwood & Soshkin, 2019).

2.2. Sustainability

Competitiveness relates to viability to compete and sustainability is the ability to maintain the quality of its physical, social, cultural, and environmental resources (Carmichael & Senese, 2014). Sustainability is concerned with a scarcity of resources; either at present or at some projected time in the future. The 1987 Brundtland Commission has introduced the concept of sustainability on its Brundtland Report as "meeting the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs" (Gurung, 2012).

Applying sustainability on farm tourism requires environmental, economic, and social equity. Sustainable tourism is a way of traveling and exploring a destination while respecting its culture, environment, and people (Arnould, 2017). The World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) defined sustainable tourism as “tourism that takes full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment, and host communities” (Day, 2016). It aims to maintain a high level of visitor satisfaction while also assuring tourists of a meaningful experience, improving their awareness of sustainability issues, and encouraging sustainable tourism behaviors (Ahmed, 2016).

For the United Nations Environment Protection (UNEP) and World Tourism Organization (UNWTO), sustainable tourism should make optimal use of environmental resources that constitute a key element in tourism development, maintaining essential ecological processes and helping to conserve natural heritage and biodiversity; respect the host communities' sociocultural authenticity, preserve their built and living cultural heritage, and traditional values, and contribute to intercultural understanding and tolerance; and ensure long-term economic viability by delivering equitable socio-economic benefits to all stakeholders, including steady employment and income-earning possibilities for host communities, as well as contributing to poverty reduction (Sustainable Tourism, n.d.).

Certainly, farm tourism plays a relevant role in sustainable development because of its growth and substantial contribution to the economies of many nations and local destinations. Economic sustainability is the capacity of an economy to support a defined level of economic production indefinitely (Singh, 2019). Its advent is towards a more productive farm destination that provides more opportunities for people.

Several related studies showed the importance of tourism in the economy. In the Philippines, farm tourism has a positive impact on economic sustainability. The country is now one of the world's top agritourism destinations, with the sector's push for more revenue streams for farmers (Ocampo, 2019). In Ethiopia, Wondwossen (2014) divulged that destination competitiveness is crucial for tourism expansion and economic growth by providing job and revenue production. Moreover, the findings of Choenkwan et al. (2016) study in Phu Ruea revealed that the agri-tourism system generates a significant amount of revenue for the area and provides several job possibilities for residents.

Aside from economic opportunities, farm tourism brings a positive influence on social well-being. The study of Chelangat (2017), at Mara Triangle, Kenya showed that rural tourism initiatives contribute to community empowerment. Moreso, Zgolli & Zaiem (2017) found that in Arab countries, the responsible behavior of residents creates a positive effect on the choice of tourists in visiting a destination. However, there is also a negative impact on the socio-cultural dimension brought about by tourism. Kostalove (2017) exposed that at Zell am See Kaprun in Arab countries, the residents have a negative attitude towards tourism

development and feel that almost all the aspects of the destinations are negatively affected by the traffic congestion.

The principle of sustainable tourism guarantees that the advantages of tourism are maximized while the negative effects are minimized (Day, 2016). Consequently, the interest of the tourism sector is often in conflict with local resource and land-use practices. These are due to the construction of general infrastructure and activities associated with the development of destinations. According to Waseema (2017), in Maldives the impact of climate change is eroding the sustainability of the tourism industry.

Nonetheless, related literature showed that environmental sustainability is possible despite the development of destinations. The study of Recio et al. (2014) revealed that agritourism has no environmental effects as assessed by residents in the selected municipalities of the 4th District of Batangas.

2.3. Stakeholders Perspective

Tourism governance remains indistinct on how tourist stakeholders engage and how this connection can help attain sustainability (Roxas et al., 2020). Defining the duty and scope of activity of stakeholders in detail is necessary (Zibert et al., 2017). Their support is critical to the long-term survival of destinations. Their collaboration is vital towards the development of sustainable tourism. Freeman (1984), as cited in Geiger (2017), defines stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization's objectives”.

Supply-side stakeholders' participation in the tourism industry makes the destination competitive (Fathimath, 2015). As stated in previous research, Destination Management Organizations that actively encourage collaboration among destination stakeholders are critical to competitiveness (Volgger & Pechlaner, 2014). One of the keys to managing natural resources as stated by Sarma (2018) is multi-stakeholder interaction. Despite the complexity of the planning process, a high level of stakeholder cooperation is considered the main element of successful destination management planning (Pjerotic, 2017).

To promote broad involvement and consensus building, sustainable tourism development necessitates educated participation from all key stakeholders as well as strong political leadership (UNEP & UNWTO, 2005 pp.11).

2.4. Theoretical Framework

The study used the Integrated Model of Destination Competitiveness of Omerzel Gomezelj and Mihalič's (2008) which aims to provide a more accurate image of relationships between various elements that are tailored to a specific set of destination competitiveness characteristics. Its major determinants are inherited, created, and support resources, which

were grouped to emphasize the relevance of resources. Destination management, situational and demand conditions are also factors to consider. The integrated model presupposes reciprocal reliance between the various elements. The model was used to study the competitiveness of several destinations by Dwyer, Livaic, and Mellor in Australia and Korea (2003) and Omer-zel- Gomezelj and Mihalic (2008) in Slovenia in 2008 (Armenski et al., 2011).

To determine the sustainability of farm destinations, the study used the United Nations Environment Program and World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) sustainable tourism combined input in publication “Making Tourism More Sustainable Guide for Policy Makers” in 2005. The Guide explains what sustainability means in tourism, how to establish strategies and policies for more sustainable tourism, and what instruments are needed to make the policies function on the ground.

The environmental, economic, and socio-cultural elements of tourist development are all addressed by sustainability principles, and an appropriate balance must be struck between these three dimensions to ensure long-term viability. As a result, sustainable tourism should: make the best use of environmental resources, which are a critical component of tourist development, while also preserving vital ecological processes and contributing to the conservation of natural resources and biodiversity; contribute to intercultural understanding and tolerance by respecting the socio-cultural authenticity of host communities, preserving their built and live cultural heritage, and traditional values; ensure long-term economic viability by delivering equitable socio-economic benefits to all stakeholders, including steady employment and income-earning possibilities for host communities, as well as contributing to poverty alleviation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

To acquire the needed data concerning the competitiveness and sustainability of farm destinations in the upland area of Cavite, the descriptive correlational method of research was used. This method is a quantitative research method that gathers quantifiable data for statistical analysis of the population sample. The descriptive correlational design summarized the data and measures the relationships of competitiveness in terms of inherited, created, and support resources, situational conditions, demand conditions, and destination management with economic, social, and environmental sustainability.

3.2. Participants of the Study

There were 158 who responded to the questionnaires. The participants are the supply side stakeholders of the farm destinations in upland Cavite that operate for more than five

years. These are composed of officers from the Department of Tourism, the barangay officials (24%), farm suppliers (9%), farmworkers (60%), and managers/operators of farm destinations (7%).

3.3. Sampling Technique

Given the scope of the study, the purposive sampling technique was used to determine the participants. Purposive sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, is a non-probability sampling that chooses participants in their surveys based on the researchers' judgment. In this study, the Local Government Official (LGU) participants were from the agriculture and tourism offices.

3.4. Instrumentation

The study used a self-made instrument, following standard procedures on the psychometric validation. First, drafting the items following the specification from reviewed literature, then seeking item review from a pool of experts from the academe and tourism office and statistical treatment for psychometric validation. The part one of the instrument is divided into six sections under destination competitiveness, covering inherited resources, created resources, support resources, situational condition, destination management, and demand condition. Part two of the questionnaire is three sections; economic, social, and environmental sustainability. Based on reliability statistics, Cronbach's alpha is 0.61 for competitiveness and 0.60 for sustainability which means that the instrument developed has moderate internal consistency reliability.

3.5. Data Gathering Procedure

A proposed letter was given to the Local Government Unit of the Tourism Office which was done as a permission to give questionnaires to the farm destinations in different municipalities in Mendez, Maragondon, Alfonso and the city of Tagaytay. The respondents were given a brief explanation of the directions for filling out the surveys. To assess the viability of the farms, they had to have been in operation for at least five years. The researcher personally attended to the distribution and retrieval of surveys. After then, the information gathered was analyzed.

3.6. Data Analysis

The mean and standard deviation were utilized to analyze the competitiveness and sustainability of the farms. To generate the results of correlation of variables, Pearson's R Correlation Coefficient and Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) were utilized.

4. Findings And Discussion

Table 1

Stakeholders' Degree of Agreement on Competitiveness of Farm Tourism

	M	SD	VI
Inherited Resources			
The quality of farm destination resources is good.	4.25	0.693	SA
The structure designs are artistic.	4.15	0.691	A
The farm destinations have abundant natural resources attractions.	4.41	0.695	SA
The farm destinations have a good climate.	4.5	0.698	SA
Inherited Resources Over-all Mean	4.35		SA
Created Resources			
The farm activities are appropriate to the needs of visitors.	4.43	0.761	SA
The improvement of leisure activities or recreation activities are updated (e.g field rides, hiking, etc.).	3.8	0.899	A
Products for sale inside the destination have good quality (souvenir shops, farm products shops)	4.22	0.754	SA
Farm destination activities are organized properly.	4.38	0.787	SA
The farm offers cultural presentations. (restaurant, deli products, food stand, catering)	4.22	0.731	SA
The quality of accommodation services is good. (hotel inn, motel, bed and breakfast, cottages, campsite)	4.16	0.821	A
There is a sufficient number of transportation services.	3.5	1.19	A
Created Resources Over-all Mean	4.05		A
Support Resources			
The communication services are clear (cellphone and internet access)	3.82	0.981	A
The proximity of banking services is within 5 km radius.	2.77	1.08	NAND
The proximity of medical services is within 5 km radius.	3	0.845	NAND
The drainage system is proper.	4.62	0.771	SA
The facilities for disabled guests are sufficient.	2.58	0.952	D
Restrooms are clean.	4.82	0.454	SA
The informational and directional signage are clear.	3.42	1.04	A
Support Resources Over-all Mean	3.57		A
Situational Condition			
The destination is accessible	2.29	1.03	D
The place is near to other tourist destinations	3.28	0.807	NAND
There are available local businesses inside the farm (concessionaires)	3.81	1.27	A
There is strong cooperation with partner firms (e.g travel and tour agencies)	4.57	0.708	SA
The employees working in the destination are trained	4.9	0.434	SA
The destination is safe and secured.	4.91	0.397	SA
The destination has a clean water system.	4.74	0.507	SA
There is a sufficient supply of electricity at the destination.	4.81	0.425	SA
Situational Condition Over-all Mean	4.16		A
Demand Condition			
Farm destinations have a strategy towards satisfying tourists	4.78	0.568	SA
The farms build tourists awareness through online advertisement	4.57	0.632	SA
Planning for the non-seasonality of tourist inflows is prioritized by farm destinations	3.67	0.833	A
There is a follow up for tourist repeat visit	4.34	0.788	SA
Demand Condition Over-all Mean	4.34		SA
Destination Management			
The farm management cooperate with the government towards the development of farms.	3.94	0.788	A
The government formulates policies for farm destinations.	3.53	0.819	A
The stakeholders coordinate in the management of farm destinations	2.63	1.05	NAND
There are adequate tourism education programs for farm workers	2.25	1.23	D
Destination Management Over-all Mean	3.09		NAND
Competitiveness Over All Mean	3.93		A

Legend: 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree; 1.81-2.60=Disagree; 2.61-3.40= Neither Agree nor Disagree; 3.41-4.20=Agree; 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree

The results in Table 1 show that the participants “Agree” (M=3.93) on the competitiveness of farm destinations. It denotes that farm destinations located in upland Cavite are competitive. The participants “Strongly Agree” (M= .35) on competitiveness indicated through its inherited resources. It is presupposed since the upland area of Cavite is in a region with a rich natural composition of rivers, streams, and mountain ranges.

The top is indicator is on the item that “farm destinations have a good climate” (M=4.50). It confirms to Notorio et al. (2016) affirmation that the locals perceived that the greatest asset of the province of Cavite is the unique climate of the upland areas. The item on “farm destinations have abundant natural resources attractions” got the second to the highest mean of (4.41). The result implies that since farm tourism is near to nature, it provides what it has to give. The indicator that “the quality of farm destination resources is good” with a (4.25) mean result is next. The item on artistic design got the lowest mean of (4.15). It presupposes the need for farm destinations to improve in the aspect of creativity or layout. Creativity is a strategy in building places that seek to increase attractiveness (Richards, 2020).

As shown in the table, the participants "Agree" (M=4.05) on competitiveness indicated through the farms created resources. It implies that the farm owners appreciate that they cannot rely only upon the natural beauty of the destinations, the development of additional resources is necessary to satisfy tourists.

The highest indicator is the item “the farm activities are appropriate to the needs of visitors” with a weighted mean of (4.43), followed by the item on “the farm destination activities are organized properly” with a mean of (4.38). The item on “the improvement of leisure activities or recreation activities are updated” got a mean of (3.80). It implies that farm destinations need to innovate their farm offerings. Innovation is a vital catalyst for the survival and growth of tourism. This strategy in production and marketing is crucial to compete. Estevao et al. (2018) found that innovation is necessary to company success in regional areas of Porto and Norte I Portugal.

Nevertheless, the item on “sufficient number of transportation services” got the lowest mean (M=3.50). It presupposes the need to develop the transport system of farm

destinations. Access to transportation should be the priority of farms to attract tourists to visit. As per Ibanescu et al. (2018), one of the factors affecting tourism impact on rural areas in Central and Eastern Europe is poor tourism infrastructure. In addition, Choenkwan et al. (2015) stated that the main determinants of the successful mountain agro-tourist in Phu Ruea District, Northern Thailand are the richness of natural resources, scenic landscapes, and pleasant climate, and the accessibility and distance as well.

In terms of competitiveness indicated through support resources, the participants “Agree” ($M=3.57$). It implies that the farm destinations in the region distinguished the value of support services to achieve tourist satisfaction.

The top indicator is on clean restroom with a mean of (4.88). It refutes the findings of Notorio et al. (2016) that clean toilet is an identified need of tourist destinations in the province of Cavite. Nonetheless, the result showed that facilities for disabled visitors are insufficient with the lowest mean of (2.58), which means that it must be enhanced and improved since supporting resources are initiatives from farm management. The destinations must include PWD-friendly facilities in their development plans to entice more tourists to come.

As seen in the table, the result shows that the participants “Agree” ($M=4.16$) on competitiveness indicated through the situational condition. It only proves that farm destinations value good situational conditions.

The indicator on safety and security has the highest mean of 4.91. The result is similar to Lago (2017) in Quezon province, who found that tourism and agriculture were relatively strong in terms of situational conditions and that safety and security are some of the considerations of tourists to visit. Moreso, Diaz, and Rodriguez (2016) stated that the key factors that have a direct and significant relationship with achieving the sustainability of a tourism destination concerning the performance obtained include security which signifies safety.

The bottom item is the accessibility of destinations which generated a weighted mean of (2.29). It indicates that farm destinations in upland Cavite need to focus on the aspect of the development of infrastructures to improve the accessibility of destinations since the growth of the tourism industry depends mainly on its accessibility.

The findings showed that the participants “Strongly Agree” on the demand condition of farm destinations with a mean of (4.34). It implies that farms are competitive in the aspect of creating demand conditions. The findings revealed that the highest mean of (M=4.78) is item number one, indicating that farms have a strategy to satisfy tourists. Gakie et al. (2016) stated that tourist satisfaction is a vital factor to consider in tourism. It can influence their choice of destination and their desire to return in the future. Sustainable tourism should also maintain a high level of tourist satisfaction and provide a meaningful experience for visitors by increasing their understanding of sustainability concerns and encouraging them to engage in sustainable tourism activities. The lowest mean of (3.67) is the item on prioritizing planning strategies when the season of tourist inflow is low. It signifies that farm destinations need to plan to ensure visitations even during low seasons.

As presented in the table, the supply-side stakeholder “Neither Agree nor disagree” (M=3.09) on competitiveness in terms of destination management. It denotes that there is a need to improve in the aspect of managing. A farm destination with an excellent management strategy often has a strong capacity for implementing new trends and innovations (He, 2020).

The highest mean of (3.94) is on the item “the farm management cooperate with the government towards the development of farms”. It indicates that cooperation between stakeholders is crucial to have a better organization of farm destinations. The government has a significant role in the development and marketing of tourism destinations (Adillon, 2019).

Moreso, the result revealed that the farm education program is an area of concern (M=2.25). This finding is similar to Dlamini et al.(2014), in Swaziland, the result showed that one of the constraining factors to competitiveness is the unavailability of professional labor (M=1.63).

Table 2 shows that the participants “Agree” on the sustainability of farm destinations in upland Cavite with an overall mean of (4.12). It implies that farm destinations in the region are sustainable. The result simply means that farms sustainability is present in the region.

Table 2**Stakeholders Agreement on Sustainability of Farm Destinations**

	M	SD	VI
Economic Sustainability			
The farm destination market share is growing, thus the farm income increase.	4.38	0.772	SA
The farm destination helps increase the internal revenue allotment of the community thru payment of taxes.	4.15	0.697	A
The farm destination increases employment which yields earnings for the people in the community.	3.04	1.02	NAND
The farm destination attracts more spending from tourists.	4.28	0.807	SA
Farm destinations support the community thru partnership	3.23	0.799	NAND
Economic Sustainability Over-all Mean	3.82		A
Social Sustainability			
There is a clear policy for social tourism.	3.87	0.615	A
The farm destination uplifts the livelihood of the residents.	2.86	1.03	NAND
The farm destination promotes safe working conditions for employees and tourists.	4.39	0.836	SA
Farm destination helps increase deeper understanding of the different cultures.	4.69	0.572	SA
The farm destinations have social development program	4.46	0.737	SA
Social Sustainability Over-all Mean	4.05		A
Environmental Sustainability			
The farm destination implements regulatory measures towards environment conservation.	4.32	0.761	SA
The farm destination helps to increase awareness of the natural environment.	4.48	0.72	SA
The farm destination adopts green marketing practices.	4.24	0.761	SA
The farm destination uses eco-friendly resources.	4.62	0.672	SA
The farm destination uses the waste segregation technique.	4.82	0.415	SA
Environmental Sustainability Over-all Mean	4.5		SA
Sustainability Over all Mean	4.12		A

Legend: 1.00-1.80=Strongly Disagree; 1.81-2.60=Disagree; 2.61-3.40= Neither Agree nor Disagree; 3.41-4.20=Agree; 4.21-5.00=Strongly Agree

The result revealed that the participants “Agree” (M=3.82) on farm destinations economic sustainability. This result is similar to the study of Manalo et al. (2019) in the province of Batangas, the respondents strongly agreed on the economic benefits of agri-tourism. The top indicator is on the item “farm destinations have growing market shares and increasing income” (M=4.38). The growth in tourist flow is an opportunity for farms. The item “influencing tourists to spend more” generates a high mean of (4.28). More spending from tourists is a beneficial contribution to the local economy since it brings more cash. Alam (2016) as cited in Lou et al. (2016), stated that tourism contributes to economic growth through a wide range of avenues, including foreign currency profits, attracting international investment, boosting tax revenues, and generating new jobs possibilities.

The item on “increasing the employment of the residents” obtained the lowest mean of 3.04. It only shows that the farm destinations in upland Cavite do not hire the locals as farmworkers and do not bring economic benefits to the residents. This finding differs from Buted et al. (2014) study in Calatagan, Batangas, respondents strongly agree that the employment opportunities provided by the farms bring economic benefits to the residents.

The participants “Agree” that farm destinations have social sustainability with a mean of (4.05). It connotes that farm destinations in the area promote social sustainability. The item “increasing a deeper understanding of the different cultures” got the highest mean of 4.69. It confirms Notorio, et al. (2016) findings that in the province of Cavite, preservation of society and culture is the priority of the tourism industry.

On the item “farm destinations have social development programs”, the participants “Strongly Agree” which obtained the second to the highest mean of (4.46), followed by the item “farm destination promotes safe working conditions for employees and tourists” with a mean of (4.39). The result contradicts Notorio et al. (2016) study that in the province of Cavite, safety and security are concerns with the shortage of police personnel and increasing crime. Promoting safe working conditions entices visitation of tourists, it affirmed the study of Barbe (2016) in Uruguay that one of the main strengths is the security and safety of the place.

However, the supply-side stakeholders “Neither Agree nor Disagree” that farm destinations uplift the livelihood of the residents, with the bottom rate of (M=2.86). This result showed the necessity to focus efforts on planning to help improve the standard of living of the locals. According to Manalo et al. (2019), the economic growth of farms may be formed by the number of workers and consequently their standard of living.

Considering the environmental sustainability, the supply-side stakeholders “Strongly Agree” (M=4.50) that farm destinations in the upland area of Cavite are environmentally sustainable. The item on “farm destination uses the waste segregation technique”, was “Strongly Agreed” by the participants with the highest mean of (4.82). It implies that the farm destinations support the clean and green project of the region.

The item on farms using eco-friendly resources got the second-highest mean of (4.62), followed by the item on helping to increase awareness of the natural environment with a mean of (4.48). It implies that farm tourism is intrinsically linked to the natural environment since it provides what nature has to give.

The indicator on the farm destination adopts green marketing practices obtained the lowest mean of (4.24). It is necessary for the farms in the region to focus on green marketing strategies because it is an essential means of educating people about the environment and sustainability (Study.com, n.d.). Developing tourism is beneficial to the economy, and advocating for ecological civilization construction, sustainable and green development is the content foundation (Lou, et al., 2016).

Table 3***Correlation Coefficient between Destination Competitiveness and Sustainable Tourism***

Dependent Variables	Sustainable Tourism		
	r	p value	Verbal Interpretation
Destination Competitiveness	.416*	.001	Positively and significantly correlated

*p value lower than margin of error

Based on the result presented in Table 3, competitiveness is positively and significantly correlated with sustainability ($r=.416$, $p\leq.001$). It implies that improving the availability of resources (inherited, created, support), situational condition, destination management, and demand condition will increase the likelihood of having sustainable tourism in economic, social, and environmental aspects. This result complements current global literature that competitiveness in the marketplace contributes to sustainable tourism (Day, 2016).

Table 4***Regression Weights of Independent Variables to the Dependent Variables***

Dependent Variables	Sustainable Tourism		
	Beta	p value	Verbal Interpretation
Inherited Resources	0.114	0.124	Not a significant predictor
Created Resources	0.058	0.455	Not a significant predictor
Support Resources	0.148	0.077	Not a significant predictor
Situational Condition	0.224	0.005	Significant predictor
Destination Management	0.401	0.001	Significant predictor
Demand Condition	0.152	0.046	Significant predictor

*p value lower than margin of error

Table 4 shows that among the specified indicators of competitiveness, situational condition ($B=.224$, $p<.05$), destination management ($B=.401$, $p\leq.001$), and demand condition ($B=.152$, $p<.05$) are significant predictors of sustainability among farm destinations in Upland Cavite. This result complements the assumptions and evidence sustained in global

studies, which assert that competitiveness has been identified in the tourism literature as a critical factor for the success of tourism destinations (Goffi, 2013) and a vital factor to appraise its performance (Hanafiah et al., 2016).

5. Conclusion

Results of this study confirmed the presupposed level of competitiveness of farm destinations in Upland Cavite. Having the mean scores and standard deviation of each category, it can be safely assumed that the potential for sustainability is relative for these farm destinations. Correlating competitiveness and sustainability of farm tourism in upland Cavite yielded a positive and significant correlation coefficient ($r=.416$, $p\leq.001$). Specific indicators for this predictive relationship included situational condition ($B=.224$, $p<.05$), destination management ($B=.401$, $p\leq.001$), and demand condition ($B=.152$, $p<.05$). However, notable results were found in the limitation of transport system ($M=3.50$, $SD=1.19$), poor tourism education program ($M=2.25$, $SD=1.23$), low level of employment of residents ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.03$), restricted livelihood provision complementary to the needs of the tourist farms ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.03$), and need to increase of nature-based marketing strategies ($M=4.24$, $SD=.761$).

Upland Cavite, having been located in a region with rich natural composition of rivers, streams, and mountain ranges, could arguably be premised as high in inherited resources. However, the farm destinations in upland Cavite cannot compete against more established tourist destination when considering the overall aspects of destination resources particularly on the support services. Furthermore, the tourism industry has yet to achieve its full potential, as evidenced by the neutral result on managing of destinations. Creation of farm destinations opportunities on competitiveness can only be achieved through substantial involvement of stakeholders particularly in managing the conditions of destinations since tourist carefully evaluates if the destination condition before making a decision to travel. Sustainability is highly regarded by farm destinations by taking account on current and future impacts on the environmental aspects which leads to creating a balance on pillars of sustainability. The predictors per specification can greatly be accounted for the development of programs on the sustainable farm destinations in upland Cavite.

Gleaned from the results yielded in the analyzed data, the following recommendations are deemed necessary to be noted: inclusion of facilities that will cater to the immediate needs of the PWD tourists; encourage government investment and support by providing helping resources particularly on the aspect of infrastructures and accessibility; coordination with the local government sector is necessary towards the creation of barangay resolution for farm destinations on employment policies that will provide opportunities for the residents and on transport policies to help the transport operators in the community; develop livelihood programs and projects complementary to the daily necessities of the farm

destination such as the making of paper bags, organic soap, and shampoo, souvenir items; initiate green marketing strategies such as the highlight for nature-based and climate-smart infrastructures, organic farming, less carbon-used facilities to support the earth; initiation of a tourism education program for farmers who intends to pursue farm tourism as part of their agricultural endeavors. Further study is recommended using a qualitative research design to strengthen the survey result.

References

- Abocejo, F. T. (2015). Tourism competitiveness of Cebu in Central Philippines: status, challenges and sustainability. *Taiwan-Philippines Cultural Dialogue IV*. 91-112.
- Abreu Novais, M. (2018). *Tourism Destination Competitiveness: A Supply and Demand Perspective*. PhD Thesis, UQ Business School. The University of Queensland. <https://doi.org/10.14264/uql.2018.244>
- Adillon, R. (2019). Diamond model: a theoretical framework for the sustainable development of tourism. *Hospitality & Tourism Management International Journal*, 1, (1) <https://doi.org/10.15406/ahoaj.2019.03.00099>
- Ahmed, S. (2016). Sustainable Tourism Development in Bangladesh: A Case Study of Cox's Bazar Bangladesh. Centria University of Applied Science. <https://www.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/111074/FINAL%20THESIS.pdf>
- Armenski, T., Nemanja D., Markovic V., & Jovanovic, T. (2011). Integrated model of destination competitiveness. *Geographica Pannonica*, 15 (2): 58-69. doi: 10.5937/GeoPan1102058A
- Arnould, P.L. (2017). What is Sustainable Tourism and Why is it Important?. Visit.org blog. <https://blog.visit.org/what-is-sustainable-tourism/>
- Barbe, F., Triay, M.G., & Haufe, C. (2016). *The competitiveness of the Uruguayan Rural Tourism Sector and Its Potential To Attract German Tourists*. DOI:[10.1108/CR-06-2015-0050](https://doi.org/10.1108/CR-06-2015-0050)
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*. 17 (1), 99-120.
- Buted D.R., Ylagan A.P., & Mendoza, E. (2014). Promoting the tourism industry of Calatagan Batangas, Philippines. *Quest Journals, Journal of Research in Business and Management*, 2 (5), 1-4.

- Calderwood, L.U., & Soshkin, M. (2019). *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2019: Travel and Tourism at a Tipping Point*. ISBN- 13: 978-2-940631-01-8
http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TTCR_2019.pdf
- Carmichael, Barbara & Senese, Donna. (2014). Competitiveness and Sustainability in Wine Tourism Regions: The Application of a Stage Model of Destination Development to Two Canadian Wine Regions. *The Geography of Wine: Regions, Terroir and Techniques*. 159-178. 10.1007/978-94-007-0464-0-9.
- Cavite Ecological Profile, (2017). The Official Website of the Province of Cavite.
<http://cavite.gov.ph/home/cavite-ecological-profile-2017/>
- Chelangat, C. (2017). Contribution of Rural Tourism Initiatives to Community Livelihoods in the Mara Triangle, Kenya.
URI: <http://ir.mu.ac.ke:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/734>
- Choenkwan S., Promkambut A., Hayao F. & Rambo T. (2016). Does Agri tourism Benefit Mountain Farmers? A Case Study in Phu Ruea District, Northeast Thailand, 36 (2).
<https://doi.org/10.1659/MRD-JOURNAL-D-15-00111.1>
- Claude, R. (2018). Organizational factors and competitiveness: a case study of medium and large manufacturing enterprises in Rwanda. *Journal of Business and Financial Affairs*. 7 (4): 354. DOI: 10.4172/2167-0234.1000354
- Day, J. (2016). Sustainable Tourism Model. An Integrated System Approach to Managing Tourism Growth: A Destination Marketing Organization Perspective. Purdue University.
<https://www.purdue.edu/colombia/partnerships/orinoquia/docs/3241%20An%20Integrated%20Systems%20Approach%20to%20Managing%20Tourism%20Growth.pdf>
- D' Hartserre, A. (2000). Lessons in managerial destination competitiveness in the case of Foxwoods Casino Resort. *Tourism Management*. 21 (1), 23-32.
- Dlamini, B.P., Kirsten, J.F., & Masuku, M.B. (2014). Factors affecting the competitiveness of the agribusiness sector in Swaziland. *Journal of Agricultural Studies*, 2(1).DOI: 10.5296/jas.v2i1.4775 <http://hdl.handle.net/2263/45492>
- Diaz, M.R., & Rodrigues, T.F. (2016). Determining the sustainability factors and performance of tourists destination from the stakeholder's perspective. *Sustainability*, 8, doi:10.3390/su8090951
- Eid, K., El-Kassrawy, Y.A. & Agaga, G. (2019). Integrating destination attributes, political (in) stability, destination image, tourists satisfaction and intention to recommend: A study of UAE. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*
. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1096348019837750>

- Estevão, Cristina & Nunes, Sara & Ferreira, João J. & Fernandes, Cristina. (2018). Tourism sector competitiveness in Portugal: applying Porter's Diamond. *Tourism & Management Studies*. 14 (1). 30-44. DOI.10.18089/tms.2018.14103.
- Fathimath, Amira. (2015). The Role of Stakeholder Collaboration in Sustainable Tourism Competitiveness: The Case of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Gaki, Eleni; Kostopoulou, Stella; Parisi, Evangelia; Lagos, Dimitris (2016) : The evaluation of tourism satisfaction in island destinations: the case of the Ionian Islands of Greece, 56th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Cities & Regions: Smart, Sustainable, Inclusive?", *Econstor*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/174645>
- Geiger, O.(2017). The impact of stakeholder relations on the sustainability of tourism development An Indonesian case study. The Arctic University of Norway. <https://munin.uit.no/bitstream/handle/10037/11782/thesis.pdf?sequence=2>
- Goffi, G. (2013) Determinants of Tourism Destination Competitiveness: A Theoretical Model and Empirical Evidence. The Hongkong Polytechnic University.
- Gurung, L. (2012). Exploring Links between Tourism and Agriculture in sustainable Development: A Case Study of Kagnebi. VDC, Nepal. Lincoln University.
- Hanahiah, M.H., Hemdi, M.A., Ahmad, I. (2014). Tourism destination competitiveness: Towards a performance-based approach. *Tourism Economics*.<https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2014.0446>
- Ibănescu B-C, Stoleriu OM, Munteanu A, Iațu C. The impact of tourism on sustainable development of rural areas: evidence from Romania. *Sustainability*. 2018; 10(10):3529. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103529>
- Kostalove, B. (2017). Tourism Impact and Residents Perspectives: The Case of Zell am See Kaprun. Modul Vienna University. <https://www.modul.ac.at/index.php?eID=dumpFile&t=f&f=9403&token=6086fac0acc3e882590a1b3abd2dd98bd36ca7f>
- Lago, N.A. (2017). Tourism demand and agriculture supply: basis for agritourism development in Quezon Province. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(3), 1-9.
- Lou, Y., Chen, Y., & Zheng. W. (2016). A literature review on evaluating tourism destinations. Xiamen University. <https://www.scitepress.org/Papers/2016/64499/64499.pdf>
- Manalo, C.C., Amboy, S.M., Gamil, R.S., Geroy, A.C., & Festijo, B.T. (2019). Benefits of agritourism in Batangas province. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*. Vol. 6 (3), 8-16. P-ISSN 2362-8022 E-ISSN 2362-8030

- Michael, N., Reisinger Y., & Hayes, P. (2019). The UAE's tourism competitiveness: business perspective. *Tourism Management Perspective*, 30, 53-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.02.002>
- Notorio, A., Mandigma, E., Desingano, B., Buenviaje, & J., Mejia, G. (2016). Predictors of sustainable tourism perceptions: a case of the province of Cavite, Philippines. *Proceeding of the 4th International Conference on Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 4, 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.17501/icoht.2016.4106>
- Notorio, P.A., Mandigma, E.C. Jr., Desingano, B. R., Buenviaje, J.S., & Mejia, G.R. (2016). Sustainable tourism development needs in the province of Cavite, Philippines, *The Social Sciences*. 11(20). DOI:[10.3923/sscience.2016.4871.4874](https://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2016.4871.4874)
- Ocampo, K.R. (2019). PH is one of the world's top agritourism destination. *Inquirer*. <https://business.inquirer.net/280507/farm-tourism-growing-in-ph>
- Omerzel-Gomez D., & Mihalic T. (2008). Destination competitiveness-applying different models, the case of Slovenia. *Tourism Management*, 29 (2), 294-307. DOI: [10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.009)
- Pjerotic, L.(2017). A stakeholder cooperation in implementation of the sustainable development concept: Montenegrin tourists destinations. *Journal of International Studies*. Vol. 10 (2).
- Recio, V.L. , De Ade, A.M.,Esguerra, C. M.,Mandanas, S.A., Masangkay, J.t., Mendania, J.A., Apritado, J. (2014). Status and prospects of agri-Tourism in selected municipalities of the 4 th District of Batangas. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*.2(4), 72.
- Richards, G. (2020). Designing creative places: The role of creative tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol (85).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102922t>
- Roxas, F.M., Rivera, J.R., & Gutierrez, E.M.(2020).Mapping stakeholders' roles in governing sustainable tourism destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*. Vol (45), 387-398.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.09.005>
- Sarma, S.D. (2018). Preserve natural resources, promote farming. *The Tribune*. <https://www.teriin.org/opinion/preserve-natural-resources-promote-farming>
- Santiano, L. (25 October 2018). Cavite redefines tourism amid digital transformation. The Official Website of Province of Cavite. <https://cavite.gov.ph/home/2018/10/25/cavite-redefines-tourism-amid-digital-transformation/>
- Sawe, B. E. (27 August 2018). What are Natural Resources? *Environment*. <https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/what-are-natural-resources>

- Singh, H. (30 March 2019). Sustainable development: background, definition, pillars and objectives. *Jagran Josh*. <https://www.jagranjosh.com/general-knowledge/sustainable->
- Siudek, T., & Zawojka, A. (2014). Competitiveness in the economic concepts, theories, and empirical research. *Economia*, 13 (1): 91-108.
- Study.com (n.d.). Why is Green Marketing Important? - Objectives & Benefits. <https://study.com/academy/lesson/why-is-green-marketing-important-objectives-benefits.html>
- Sustainable Tourism (n.d.) What is sustainable tourism?. Green Ideas for Tourism. <http://www.greentourism.eu/en/Post/Name/SustainableTourism>
- UNEP & WTO (2005). Making Tourism More Sustainable. A Guide from Policy Makers. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/8741/-Making%20Tourism%20More%20Sustainable_%20A%20Guide%20for%20Policy%20Makers-2005445.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y
- Volgeer, M. & Pechlaner, H. (2014). Requirements for destination management organizations in destination governance: Understanding DMO success. *Tourism Management*. 41, 64-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.09.001>
- Wahogo, J.K. (2006). An Application of Porter's Diamond Model to Analyse Competitiveness of Kenya's Tourism Industry. University of Nairobi Research <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/21413>
- Waseema, M. (2017). Enhancing Destination Competitiveness for a Sustainable Tourism Industry: The Case of Maldives. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 10, (02) 11-24.
- Weldearegay, H. (2017). The entry points to sustainable tourism destination competitiveness (STC): philosophical approach. *Journal on Tourism and Hospitality*, 6, (6). DOI: 10.4172/2167-0269.1000323
- Welteji, D., Zerihun, B. (2018). Tourism–Agriculture Nexuses: practices, challenges and opportunities in the case of Bale Mountains National Park, Southeastern Ethiopia. *Agric & Food Secur* 7, 8 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-018-0156-6>
- Wondowossen, T. (2014). Competitiveness as an indicator of sustainable development of tourism: applying destination competitiveness indicators to Ethiopia. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6: 71-95.
- Yozcu, O. K. (2017). Competitiveness of Istanbul as a tourism destination for luxury market. *Journal of Tourismology*, 3 (2), 2-13.

- Zainuddin Z., Radzi S., Salehuddin M. & Zahari M. (2016). Perceived destination competitiveness of Langkawi island, Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 222, (23), 390-397: DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21834/aje-bs.v3i10.318>
- Zehrer, A., & Hallman K. (2015). A stakeholder's perspective on policy indicators of destination competitiveness. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 4, (2), 120-126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.03.003>
- Žibert, Maja & Koščak, Marko & Prevolšek, Boris. (2017). The importance of stakeholder involvement in strategic development of destination management: the case of the Mirna Valley destination. *Academica Turistica*. 10. 43-55. 10.26493/2335-4194.10.43-55.
- Zgolli, Samar & Zaiem, Imed. (2018). The responsible behavior of tourist: the role of personnel factors and public power and effect on the choice of destination. *Arab Economic and Business Journal*. 13. 168-178. DOI: [10.1016/j.aebj.2018.09.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aebj.2018.09.004)