Differences in perception of the importance of generic competencies among destination regions

Aleksa Š. Vučetić

Published online: 18 Jun 2018.

Submit your article to this journal ↗

Article views: 64

View Crossmark data ↗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Differences in perception of the importance of generic competencies among destination regions

Aleksa Š. Vučetić [ID]

Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality, University of Montenegro, Kotor, Montenegro

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on establishing the level of the gap in the perception of the importance of generic competencies among respondents from different regions within a tourism destination in transition. Montenegro and its tourism sector are taken as an example, with its three geographical regions: coastal, central and northern region. The research is based on a survey of respondents (employees in the tourism sector and students on internship) in hotels, travel agencies, tourism organisations, museums, national parks, ports of nautical tourism and business units of airline companies. The study seeks to establish the level of the gap in the perception of the importance of generic competencies of respondents among the aforementioned regions in the destination. In addition to identifying the differences, the study seeks to identify the strength of links between certain aggregate and individual generic competencies, among and within the coastal, central and northern region of Montenegro, a country whose tourism sector is in the transitional process of accession to the European Union. This survey can serve as a good example for future practical and theoretical research in the field of generic competencies and regional affiliation of human resources.

1. Introduction

Montenegro as a transitional tourism destination, being involved in the process of European Union (E.U.) accession, should harmonise its tourism sector with the new economic, environmental and social requirements. One of the main problems to be resolved in this process is the lack of balanced regional development, which is why the governmental institutions should create an economic and legal framework for rapid alignment with the new requirements.

Regional disparities in the field of tourism development can be illustrated by the extent of the accommodation capacities built, and the tourism turnover realised in the coastal, central and northern regions of Montenegro. The area of the destination is 13,812 km^2, of which 1591 km^2 belongs to the coastal region, 4917 km to the central region, and 7304 km^2

CONTACT Aleksa Š. Vučetić [✉] aleksavucetic@gmail.com

to the northern regions. In 2013 the number of visitors by regions was: the coastal region 1,348,394 (90.4%) visitors; central region 82,509 (5.5%) visitors; and northern region 61,103 (4.1%) visitors. The coastal region includes the municipalities of Herceg Novi, Kotor, Tivat, Budva, Bar and Ulcinj (148,683 inhabitants, or 24% of total population); the central region includes the municipalities of Cetinje, Podgorica, Danilovgrad and Niksic (293,509 inhabitants, or 47.3% of total population), and the northern region includes the municipalities of Andrijevica, Berane, Bijelo Polje, Kolasin, Mojkovac, Plav, Pljevlja, Pluzine, Rozaje, Savnik and Zabljak (177,837 inhabitants, or 28.7% of total population) (MONSTAT, 2014).

The Regional Development Strategy of Montenegro is based on competitiveness, innovation, and employment. The level of development of the regions in Montenegro is as follows: the coastal region is 62% above the average, the central region is 23.5% above the average, and the northern region is 49.9% under the average, looking at the destination as a whole. The average number of employees by regions in the period 2006–2013 was: in the coastal region 49,605 employees (28.9%), in the central region 96,170 employees (56.1%), and in the northern region 25,699 employees (15%) (MEVCG, 2014).

The process of harmonisation with the E.U. entails adjustment of the higher education system in Montenegro to European Higher Education Area, Bologna Declaration, Quality Assurance, Lifelong Learning, and other similar E.U. processes. The focus of changes is on the introduction of competencies in the education system based on European Qualifications Framework (EACEA, 2015; Munar & Montano, 2009).

In order to reduce the disparities in competencies between employees and students of tourism and hotel management in Montenegro and those from E.U. member states, the Human Resources Development Strategy in the Tourism Sector of Montenegro was adopted. It envisages the development of a catalogue of competencies arising from the specific needs of the tourism sector. (MTZZS, 2007). Given that the general competencies are an important factor of competitiveness of the destination (Nobre, Walker, & Harris, 2012), rapid alignment with the standards of competencies of the E.U. is expected, in order to enable faster and more sustainable development of tourism in Montenegro, especially in its northern and central regions. Croatia is a good example how the development of generic competencies in human resource could increase the competitiveness level of the tourism destination on the global tourism market. At the same time, Croatian tourism policy-makers are making significant efforts in the development of generic human resource competencies in the tourism sector which are regionally balanced.

This survey can contribute to the field of establishing models for analysing the gap in the perception of the importance of generic competencies among the respondents from different, and within the same, regions in destinations. For this purpose, standard parametric and nonparametric statistical methods of analysis are used. After a brief introduction, the next section presents theoretical findings concerning generic competencies. The second section presents a research methodology, the third part of this paper contains the research results, and finally, the last part of this paper contains the concluding remarks.

2. Literature review

Generic competencies (or capabilities) are one of the key elements of competitive advantage of a tourism destination; that is, a strategic resource that contributes to the development of a unique competitive advantage (Kearns, 2010; Leonidou, Leonidou, Fotiadis, & Zeriti,

2013; Slack, Chambers, & Johnston, 2013). Generic competencies through unique knowledge, talent (D'Annunzio-Green & Watson, 2008; Tavitiyaman, Weerakit, & Ryan, 2014), and organisational skills (Becerra-Fernandez & Leidner, 2008) of human resources create an organisationally unique and sustainable competitive advantage (Okumus, Altinay, & Chathoth, 2010).

In the literature about tourism, generic competencies are referred to in connection with tourism graduates (Lopez-Bonilla & Lopez-Bonilla, 2014; Spowart, 2011; Wang & Tsai, 2014; Zehrer & Mössenlechner, 2009), professional knowledge (Donina & Ineta, 2014; Jeou-Shyan, Hsuan, Chih-Hsing, Lin, & Chang-Yen, 2011), leadership (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011; Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), communications (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011; Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), decision-making (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011) (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011), problem-solving (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011; Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), self-management (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011), personal relationship (Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011), managers (D'Annunzio-Green & Watson, 2008; Jeou-Shyan et al., 2011; Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), analysis (Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), creativity (Tavitiyaman et al., 2014), and employability (Wang, 2013).

On the tourism labour market, generic competencies are of primary importance (Munar & Montano, 2009), and the aim of the destination as a whole is to successfully manage employees and their competencies with a view to achieving long-term competitive advantage (Pablos & Lytras, 2008). The importance of generic competencies has influenced surveys of competencies in the hospitality industry (Jauhari, 2006), and in terms of training in the field of competencies in the tourism sector (Kalargyrou & Woods, 2011).

In the literature about tourism, the regional aspect is very important and is usually referred to in connection with efficiency assessment (L. Zhang, Botti, & Petit, 2016), regional development (Arnaud, 2016; Korent, Vuković, & Brčić, 2015; Z. Yang & Cai, 2016), price competitiveness (Tkalec & Vizek, 2016), destination image (Ryu, L'Espoir Decosta, & Andéhn, 2016), climate and seasonality (Razumova, Rey-Maquieira, & Lozano, 2016; Scott, Simpson, & Sim, 2012), destination resources (Hadjikakou, Miller, Chenoweth, Druckman, & Zoumides, 2015; Naidoo & Sharpley, 2016; Ram, Björk, & Weidenfeld, 2016), tourism demand (Brida, Disegna, & Osti, 2013; Merida & Golpe, 2016; Naef & Ploner, 2016; Y. Yang, Liu, & Li, 2015), regional innovativeness (Božić & Rajh, 2016), economic policy (Coles, Dinan, & Hutchison, 2014; G. Zhang, Han, Pan, & Huang, 2015), selective tourism types (Anderson, 2014; Müller, 2015), and sustainable development (Scuttari, LuciaDella Lucia, & Martini, 2013).

From the geographical, i.e., the regional aspect, there are a number of surveys (Jackson & Murphy, 2006), which have focused on clusters in a destination and regional planning in this regard (Ivars Baidal, 2004), but also on best marketing practice in the destination (Cox & Wray, 2011); however, there has been no survey that directly concerns research into specific generic competencies at the level of a tourism destination.

Research into the perception of the importance of generic competencies and analysing the disparities at the regional level within the same destination, as is the case in this paper, or at the level of multiple destinations, can be of great importance when it comes to balanced regional development. In this respect, the survey can be of interest not only for transitional tourism sectors such as the tourism sector of Montenegro, but may also be very interesting for developed and highly competitive tourism destinations. Reducing differences in the perception of the importance of generic competencies, regarding possessing certain generic competencies by students and employees in the tourism sector, can have a direct impact on

raising the level of competitiveness of less developed regions in a destination and alleviating the problem of uneven regional development of the tourism sector in the destination.

3. Methodology

After conducting a pilot survey, the final content of the survey was created. The survey is based on survey material filled out by 3165 respondents (1828 workers in the tourism sector and 1337 students of tourism and hotel management) in Montenegro. Collecting of data on the perception of the importance of generic competencies was conducted in three regions of Montenegro: coastal region (R1), the central region (R2), and northern region (R3). The respondents were selected by random sampling, and the survey was conducted individually with all respondents in all municipalities in Montenegro. The number of respondents (sampled in 274 companies, organisations, and institutions) by regions is $N=1436$ in the coastal region, $N=1025$ in the central region, and $N=704$ in the northern region.

Generic competencies are marked as follows. IGC-1: Capability of planning and organisation of activities; IGC-2: Capability of building business networks; IGC-3: Capability of managing oneself and time; IGC-4: Innovative and creative capability; IGC-5: Capability of flexibility and adaptability to the given circumstances; IGC-6: Capability of critical perception and problem-solving; IGC-7: Leadership capabilities; IGC-8: Lifelong learning capability; IGC-9: Capability to acquire the multidisciplinary knowledge; IGC-10: Capability of individual and collective work; IGC-11: Capability of alert reacting in given circumstances; IGC-12: Capability of respecting the differences and prevention of conflict; IGC-13: Capability of writing a report; and IGC-14: Communication capabilities. Aggregate generic competencies are marked as follows: AGC-1 / Organisational competencies (IGC-1 and IGC-2), AGC-2 / Behavioural competencies (IGC-3, IGC-4, IGC-5, IGC-6, IGC-7, IGC-8, IGC-9, IGC-10, IGC-11, and IGC-12), and AGC-3 / Technical competencies (IGC-13 and IGC-14). Respondents marked answers as follows: very irrelevant (j = −2), irrelevant (j = −1), neutral (j = 0), important (j = +1), and very important (j = +2).

Empirical research was carried out in I.B.M. S.P.S.S. Statistics software, and the main statistical methods used in this survey were analysis of variance (A.N.O.V.A.) and the nonparametric method Spearman's correlation. The main objective of the survey is to point out the impacts of different regions on the perception of the importance of aggregate and individual generic competencies. Hypothesis 1. There is a vast gap in the respondents' perception of the importance of aggregate and individual generic competencies among different regions, especially in the coastal region (R-1) on one side and central (R-2) and northern (R-3) regions on the other side.

4. Results

In order to establish the difference in the perception of the importance of generic competencies of respondents by regions of Montenegro, the A.N.O.V.A. method was first applied, after which the nonparametric correlation method was applied, in order to determine the strength of links in the perception of the importance of generic competencies of the respondents. The subject matter of the survey will be the aggregate and individual generic competencies (Table 1).

Variance in perception of the importance of individual generic competencies in all regions is $p>0.05$, i.e., it is not statistically relevant. In all regions, the majority of results are distributed

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of individual generic competencies by regions.

Variables	R-1					R-2					R-3				
	N	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	N	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis	N	Mean	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis
IGC-1	1,436	1.1692	.493	−1.046	2.704	1,025	1.1298	.511	−1.303	3.963	704	1.0497	.576	−1.178	2.655
IGC-2	1,436	.8593	.680	−.720	.534	1,025	.8644	.692	−.967	1.338	704	.7898	.695	−.652	.256
IGC-3	1,436	1.2883	.499	−1.187	3.012	1,025	1.3112	.494	−1.280	3.430	704	1.1563	.616	−1.186	2.260
IGC-4	1,436	1.1072	.632	−1.060	1.930	1,025	1.1610	.581	−1.129	2.356	704	1.0227	.679	−1.127	1.987
IGC-5	1,436	1.1922	.541	−.992	1.947	1,025	1.1522	.555	−1.035	2.116	704	1.0284	.631	−1.007	1.841
IGC-6	1,436	1.1532	.551	−1.063	2.423	1,025	1.1395	.526	−.972	2.008	704	1.0270	.652	−1.089	1.913
IGC-7	1,436	.9262	.828	−.799	.438	1,025	.9961	.684	−.824	.869	704	.8920	.884	−.936	.667
IGC-8	1,436	1.0244	.686	−1.019	1.574	1,025	1.0176	.720	−.936	.962	704	.9588	.759	−.826	.537
IGC-9	1,436	.9032	.632	−.799	1.044	1,025	.9356	.654	−.859	1.147	704	.8963	.693	−.945	1.227
IGC-10	1,436	1.2131	.536	−1.134	2.613	1,025	1.2566	.500	−1.175	3.005	704	1.1207	.519	−.895	1.657
IGC-11	1,436	1.0327	.625	−.896	1.467	1,025	1.0859	.582	−.872	1.385	704	.8565	.666	−.816	1.000
IGC-12	1,436	1.1476	.555	−.944	1.919	1,025	1.0976	.598	−1.008	1.884	704	.9901	.542	−.757	1.269
IGC-13	1,436	.8440	.763	−.792	.634	1,025	.8478	.733	−.770	.564	704	.8324	.737	−.956	1.068
IGC-14	1,436	1.4074	.529	−1.396	2.831	1,025	1.3932	.530	−1.551	3.901	704	1.2912	.594	−1.282	2.387

Source: Research results.

on the right side of the mean value: $-1.396 \leq$ R-1 Skewness $\leq -.720$; $-1.551 \leq$ R-2 Skewness $\leq -.770$; and $-1.282 \leq$ R-3 Skewness $\leq -.652$. Distribution of results of perception of individual generic competencies in all regions is more pointed than normal: $438 \leq$ R-1 Kurtosis ≤ 3.012; $564 \leq$ R-2 Kurtosis ≤ 3.963; and $256 \leq$ R-3 Kurtosis ≤ 2.655. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances indicates that the assumption of homogeneity of variance in all regions is challenged: in terms of aggregate technical competency SGC-3 [Sig (AGC-1) = .105, Sig (AGC-2) = .637, Sig (AGC-3) = .000]. Levene's test confirmed that the assumption of homogeneity of variance is challenged: in the coastal region in terms of seven individual generic competencies [Sig (IGC-1) = .000, Sig (IGC-2) = .000, Sig (IGC-5) = .003, Sig (IGC-7) = .001, Sig (IGC-9) = .001, Sig (IGC-12) = .000, and Sig (IGC-13) = .001]; in the central region in terms of 11 individual generic competencies [Sig (IGC-1) = .002, Sig (IGC-2) = .001, Sig (IGC-3) = .029, Sig (IGC-4) = .001, Sig (IGC-5) = .004, Sig (IGC-9) = .036, Sig (IGC-10) = .020, Sig (IGC-11) = .033, Sig (IGC-12) = .000, Sig (IGC-13) = .003, and Sig (IGC-14) = .020], and in the northern region in terms of three individual generic competencies [Sig (IGC-2) = .000, Sig (IGC-11) = .020, and Sig (IGC-12) = .017]. On the other hand, Tukey HSD[a,b] test shows the fulfilment of the requirement of homogeneity on the basis of the size of population of respondents by regions [Sig (IGC-1) = .448, Sig (IGC-2) = .117, Sig (IGC-3) = .765, Sig (IGC-4) = .293, Sig (IGC-5) = .470, Sig (IGC-6) = .915, Sig (IGC-7) = .195, Sig (IGC-8) = .202, Sig (IGC-9) = .532, Sig (IGC-10) = .380, Sig (IGC-11) = .298, Sig (IGC-12) = .308, Sig (IGC-13) = .918, and Sig (IGC-14) = .905].

Statistically significant differences in the perception of the importance of aggregate generic competencies are manifested between the respondents of the coastal region on the one hand and the central and northern regions on the other hand (Table 2). The highest difference in the perception of the importance of generic competencies is manifested in respect of AGC-2 (between the northern and coastal regions), while the least difference

Table 2. Multiple comparisons of aggregate generic competencies by regions.

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Region	(J) Region	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
AGC-1	R-3	R-2	−.04607	.05462	.676	−.1741	.0820
		R-1	−.32691*	.05134	.000	−.4473	−.2065
	R-2	R-3	.04607	.05462	.676	−.0820	.1741
		R-1	−.28085*	.04563	.000	−.3878	−.1739
	R-1	R-3	.32691*	.05134	.000	.2065	.4473
		R-2	.28085*	.04563	.000	.1739	.3878
AGC-2	R-3	R-2	−.07010	.05700	.436	−.2038	.0635
		R-1	−.39835*	.05357	.000	−.5240	−.2727
	R-2	R-3	.07010	.05700	.436	−.0635	.2038
		R-1	−.32825*	.04761	.000	−.4399	−.2166
	R-1	R-3	.39835*	.05357	.000	.2727	.5240
		R-2	.32825*	.04761	.000	.2166	.4399
AGC-3	R-3	R-2	−.00062	.06660	1.000	−.1568	.1555
		R-1	−.37434*	.06260	.000	−.5211	−.2276
	R-2	R-3	.00062	.06660	1.000	−.1555	.1568
		R-1	−.37373*	.05563	.000	−.5042	−.2433
	R-1	R-3	.37434*	.06260	.000	.2276	.5211
		R-2	.37373*	.05563	.000	.2433	.5042

Source: Research results.
*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

is manifested in respect of AGC-3 (identical between the northern and central regions). When it comes to the impact of the size of population on calculation of statistical results, according to the Cohen's criterion, all three aggregate competencies belong to the group of medium impact on statistical results [r (AGC-1) = .018, r (AGC-2) = .023 and r (AGC-3) = .018]. The differences in the perception of the importance of generic competencies are greater among the regions than within the regions.

In terms of perception of importance of organisational generic competencies among the regions (Table 3), the least matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-1 (between coastal and northern regions – Sig = .001), and the most matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-2 (between coastal and central regions – Sig = .988); in behavioural generic competencies among regions, the least matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-11 (between central and northern – Sig = .000), and the most matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-9 (between coastal and northern regions – Sig = .981); and in technical generic competencies among the regions, the least matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-14 (between coastal and northern regions – Sig = .002), and the most matching perception is that of individual competence IGC-13 (between coastal and central regions – Sig = .994). According to Cohen's criterion, all individual generic competencies can be classified into a group of small-size impact of the size on the statistical results [r (IGC-1) = .004, r (IGC-2) = .001, r (IGC-3) = .007, r (IGC-4) = .004, r (IGC-5) = .007, r (IGC-6) = .005, r (IGC-7) = .002, r (IGC-8) = .001, r (IGC-9) = .000, r (IGC-10) = .005, r (IGC-12) = .007, r (IGC-13) = .000, and r (IGC-14) = .004], and in the group of medium-size impact on the statistical results [r (IGC-11) = .012]. In order to determine the difference in the strength of links in the perception of importance of generic competencies among individual regions, but also within the regions, it is necessary to apply the method of Spearman's nonparametric correlation.

Sig. (2 tailed) is in all cases ≤ 0.01, which means that the respondents' perceptions of the importance of aggregate generic competencies among the regions are significant and not random (Table 4). In all three regions, the strength of links concerning the perception of the importance of aggregate generic competencies is positive. In the northern region, the most important correlation is between AGC-2 and AGC-3 (49.6% of common variance), and the least important is between AGC-1 and AGC-2 (42.1% of common variance). In the central region, the most important correlation is between AGC-2 and AGC3 (47.6% of common variance), and the least important is between AGC-1 and AGC-2 (46.1% of common variance). In the coastal region, the most important correlation is between AGC-2 and AGC-3 (62.7% of common variance), and the least important is between AGC-1 and AGC-3 (59.4% of common variance).

Sig. (2-tailed) is in all cases ≤ 0.01, which means that the links on the perception of the importance of individual generic competencies among the regions are significant and not random (Table 5). In all regions the strength of links is positive (changes in growing perception of the importance of an individual competence bring about an increase in the perception of the importance of another individual competency).

In the coastal region, 36.3% correlations among individual competencies belong to the interval of a very high degree of correlation, and 63.7% belong to the interval of a high degree of correlation. Within the perception of importance of organisational generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-2 (33.1% of common variance); in behavioural generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-5 and IGC-6

Table 3. Multiple comparisons of individual generic competencies by regions.

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Region	(J) Region	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
IGC-1	R-3	R-2	−.08004	.03522	.060	−.1626	.0025
		R-1	−.11950*	.03310	.001	−.1971	−.0419
	R-2	R-3	.08004	.03522	.060	−.0025	.1626
		R-1	−.03946	.02942	.372	−.1084	.0295
	R-1	R-3	.11950*	.03310	.001	.0419	.1971
		R-2	.03946	.02942	.372	−.0295	.1084
IGC-2	R-3	R-2	−.07462	.04058	.157	−.1698	.0205
		R-1	−.06956	.03814	.162	−.1590	.0199
	R-2	R-3	.07462	.04058	.157	−.0205	.1698
		R-1	.00506	.03389	.988	−.0744	.0845
	R-1	R-3	.06956	.03814	.162	−.0199	.1590
		R-2	−.00506	.03389	.988	−.0845	.0744
IGC-3	R-3	R-2	−.15497*	.03542	.000	−.2380	−.0719
		R-1	−.13205*	.03329	.000	−.2101	−.0540
	R-2	R-3	.15497*	.03542	.000	.0719	.2380
		R-1	.02292	.02958	.719	−.0465	.0923
	R-1	R-3	.13205*	.03329	.000	.0540	.2101
		R-2	−.02292	.02958	.719	−.0923	.0465
IGC-4	R-3	R-2	−.13825*	.03873	.001	−.2291	−.0474
		R-1	−.08452	.03640	.053	−.1699	.0008
	R-2	R-3	.13825*	.03873	.001	.0474	.2291
		R-1	.05373	.03235	.221	−.0221	.1296
	R-1	R-3	.08452	.03640	.053	−.0008	.1699
		R-2	−.05373	.03235	.221	−.1296	.0221
IGC-5	R-3	R-2	−.12379*	.03682	.002	−.2101	−.0375
		R-1	−.16379*	.03460	.000	−.2449	−.0827
	R-2	R-3	.12379*	.03682	.002	.0375	.2101
		R-1	−.04001	.03075	.395	−.1121	.0321
	R-1	R-3	.16379*	.03460	.000	.0827	.2449
		R-2	.04001	.03075	.395	−.0321	.1121
IGC-6	R-3	R-2	−.11252*	.03681	.006	−.1988	−.0262
		R-1	−.12621*	.03460	.001	−.2073	−.0451
	R-2	R-3	.11252*	.03681	.006	.0262	.1988
		R-1	−.01369	.03075	.896	−.0858	.0584
	R-1	R-3	.12621*	.03460	.001	.0451	.2073
		R-2	.01369	.03075	.896	−.0584	.0858
IGC-7	R-3	R-2	−.10405*	.04361	.045	−.2063	−.0018
		R-1	−.03414	.04099	.683	−.1303	.0620
	R-2	R-3	.10405*	.04361	.045	.0018	.2063
		R-1	.06991	.03643	.133	−.0155	.1553
	R-1	R-3	.03414	.04099	.683	−.0620	.1303
		R-2	−.06991	.03643	.133	−.1553	.0155
IGC-8	R-3	R-2	−.05875	.04134	.330	−.1557	.0382
		R-1	−.06557	.03886	.210	−.1567	.0256
	R-2	R-3	.05875	.04134	.330	−.0382	.1557
		R-1	−.00681	.03454	.979	−.0878	.0742
	R-1	R-3	.06557	.03886	.210	−.0256	.1567
		R-2	.00681	.03454	.979	−.0742	.0878
IGC-9	R-3	R-2	−.03930	.03955	.581	−.1321	.0534
		R-1	−.00690	.03718	.981	−.0941	.0803
	R-2	R-3	.03930	.03955	.581	−.0534	.1321
		R-1	.03241	.03304	.589	−.0451	.1099
	R-1	R-3	.00690	.03718	.981	−.0803	.0941
		R-2	−.03241	.03304	.589	−.1099	.0451
IGC-10	R-3	R-2	−.13585*	.03531	.000	−.2186	−.0531
		R-1	−.09235*	.03319	.015	−.1702	−.0145
	R-2	R-3	.13585*	.03531	.000	.0531	.2186
		R-1	.04349	.02949	.303	−.0257	.1126
	R-1	R-3	.09235*	.03319	.015	.0145	.1702
		R-2	−.04349	.02949	.303	−.1126	.0257

(*Continued*)

Table 3. (*Continued*).

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Region	(J) Region	Mean Difference (I–J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
IGC-11	R-3	R-2	−.22932*	.03856	.000	−.3197	−.1389
		R-1	−.17620*	.03625	.000	−.2612	−.0912
	R-2	R-3	.22932*	.03856	.000	.1389	.3197
		R-1	.05312	.03221	.225	−.0224	.1287
	R-1	R-3	.17620*	.03625	.000	.0912	.2612
		R-2	−.05312	.03221	.225	−.1287	.0224
IGC-12	R-3	R-2	−.10750*	.03683	.010	−.1939	−.0211
		R-1	−.15758*	.03462	.000	−.2387	−.0764
	R-2	R-3	.10750*	.03683	.010	.0211	.1939
		R-1	−.05007	.03076	.234	−.1222	.0221
	R-1	R-3	.15758*	.03462	.000	.0764	.2387
		R-2	.05007	.03076	.234	−.0221	.1222
IGC-13	R-3	R-2	−.01542	.04232	.929	−.1147	.0838
		R-1	−.01162	.03978	.954	−.1049	.0816
	R-2	R-3	.01542	.04232	.929	−.0838	.1147
		R-1	.00379	.03535	.994	−.0791	.0867
	R-1	R-3	.01162	.03978	.954	−.0816	.1049
		R-2	−.00379	.03535	.994	−.0867	.0791
IGC-14	R-3	R-2	−.10198*	.03609	.013	−.1866	−.0174
		R-1	−.11619*	.03392	.002	−.1957	−.0367
	R-2	R-3	.10198*	.03609	.013	.0174	.1866
		R-1	−.01421	.03015	.885	−.0849	.0565
	R-1	R-3	.11619*	.03392	.002	.0367	.1957
		R-2	.01421	.03015	.885	−.0565	.0849

Source: Research results.
*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 4. Spearman's correlation of aggregate generic competencies by regions.

Regions		AGC-1	AGC-2	AGC-3
R-1	AGC-1	-	.764**	.761**
	AGC-2	-	-	.782**
	AGC-3	-	-	-
R-2	AGC-1	-	.662**	.695**
	AGC-2	-	-	.701**
	AGC-3	-	-	-
R-3	AGC-1	-	.629**	.660**
	AGC-2	-	-	.702**
	AGC-3	-	-	-

Source: Research results.

(39.4% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-3 and IGC-9 (14% of common variance); and in technical generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-13 and IGC-14 (14.3% of common variance).

Within the perception of importance of generic competencies between organisational and behavioural individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-3 (35.8% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-2 and IGC-12 (12.8% of common variance); in organisational and technical individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-14 (21% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-2 and IGC-14 (10.4% of common variance); and in behavioural and technical competencies, the most important link is between IGC-10 and IGC-14

Table 5. Spearman's correlation of individual generic competencies of the coastal region.

R-1	.575**	.598**	.523**	.504**	.487**	.488**	.423**	.414**	.457**	.390**	.455**	.343**	.458**
GC-1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GC-2	-	.440**	.520**	.393**	.432**	.505**	.441**	.481**	.373**	.389**	.358**	.422**	.323**
GC-3	-	-	.551**	.545**	.502**	.427**	.432**	.374**	.478**	.392**	.430**	.312**	.514**
GC-4	-	-	-	.559**	.515**	.515**	.450**	.450**	.445**	.383**	.409**	.354**	.441**
GC-5	-	-	-	-	.628**	.449**	.448**	.449**	.524**	.519**	.561**	.316**	.514**
GC-6	-	-	-	-	-	.519**	.478**	.451**	.543**	.453**	.534**	.368**	.520**
GC-7	-	-	-	-	-	-	.501**	.523**	.406**	.423**	.430**	.412**	.365**
GC-8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.595**	.453**	.434**	.416**	.342**	.390**
GC-9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.504**	.502**	.459**	.420**	.333**
GC-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.518**	.563**	.401**	.548**
GC-11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.582**	.362**	.396**
GC-12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.427**	.518**
GC-13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.378**
GC-14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Research results.

(30% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-3 and IGC-13 (9.7% of common variance).

In the central region, 19.8% correlations among individual competencies belong to the interval of a very high degree of correlation, and 80.2% belong to the interval of a high degree of correlation (Table 6). Within the perception of importance of organisational generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-2 (33.1% of common variance); in behavioural generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-8 and IGC-9 (41.7% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-7 and IGC-10 (13.8% of common variance); and in technical generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-13 and IGC-14 (14.8% of common variance).

Within the perception of importance of generic competencies between: organisational and behavioural individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-3 and IGC-4 (29.6% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-2 and IGC-10 (12.5% of common variance); in organisational and technical individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-14 (20.1% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-1 and IGC-13 (8.9% of common variance); and in behavioural and technical individual competencies, the important link is between IGC-10 and IGC-14 (27.6% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-3 and IGC-13 (8.5% of common variance).

In the northern region, 27.5% correlations among individual competencies belong to the interval of a very high degree of correlation, and 72.5% belong to the interval of a high degree of correlation (Table 7). Within the perception of importance of organisational generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-2 (36.4% of common variance); in behavioural generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-3 and IGC-4 (38% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-3 and IGC-8 (13.2% of common variance); and in technical generic competencies, the most important link is between IGC-13 and IGC-14 (21.1% of common variance).

Within the perception of importance of generic competencies between organisational and behavioural individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-1 and IGC-3 (29.4% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-2 and IGC-10 (13.5% of common variance); in organisational and technical individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-2 and IGC-13 (21.1% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-2 and IGC-14 (15% of common variance); and in behavioural and technical individual competencies, the most important link is between IGC-3 and IGC-14 (27.8% of common variance), and the least significant between IGC-5 and IGC-13 (12.4% of common variance).

The results of this study would not be the same if the research conducted in the private sector was separated from that in the state sector. More precisely, a smaller gap in perception of the importance of generic competencies among destination regions would be found in the private sector than in the state sector. Differences in perception are primarily the result of differences in the quality of the educational system, but also are generated by negative transitional changes in the socio-cultural, demographic, and economic system of the Montenegro.

Table 6. Spearman's correlation of individual generic competencies of the central region.

R-2													
GC-1	.575**	.542**	.544**	.468**	.469**	.404**	.389**	.418**	.454**	.427**	.461**	.299**	.448**
GC-2	-	.410**	.479**	.398**	.382**	.434**	.404**	.446**	.354**	.391**	.402**	.376**	.332**
GC-3	-	-	.607**	.521**	.437**	.342**	.405**	.379**	.484**	.373**	.436**	.292**	.495**
GC-4	-	-	-	.622**	.542**	.499**	.470**	.469**	.446**	.405**	.466**	.318**	.469**
GC-5	-	-	-	-	.592**	.472**	.432**	.472**	.500**	.468**	.490**	.311**	.438**
GC-6	-	-	-	-	-	.510**	.480**	.469**	.511**	.461**	.493**	.382**	.433**
GC-7	-	-	-	-	-	-	.532**	.520**	.372**	.378**	.404**	.354**	.367**
GC-8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.646**	.456**	.420**	.458**	.354**	.352**
GC-9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.463**	.477**	.498**	.426**	.371**
GC-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.579**	.552**	.377**	.525**
GC-11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.616**	.425**	.453**
GC-12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.469**	.512**
GC-13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.385**
GC-14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Research results.

Table 7. Spearman's correlation of individual generic competencies of the northern region.

R-3	GC-1	GC-2	GC-3	GC-4	GC-5	GC-6	GC-7	GC-8	GC-9	GC-10	GC-11	GC-12	GC-13	GC-14
GC-1	-	.603**	.542**	.541**	.530**	.485**	.473**	.376**	.393**	.422**	.423**	.425**	.406**	.441**
GC-2		-	.420**	.479**	.379**	.436**	.467**	.404**	.404**	.368**	.369**	.389**	.459**	.387**
GC-3			-	.616**	.564**	.494**	.425**	.363**	.441**	.436**	.347**	.413**	.363**	.527**
GC-4				-	.609**	.542**	.528**	.453**	.478**	.441**	.375**	.409**	.413**	.507**
GC-5					-	.573**	.441**	.429**	.487**	.471**	.487**	.495**	.352**	.443**
GC-6						-	.505**	.491**	.494**	.509**	.434**	.508**	.442**	.485**
GC-7							-	.520**	.518**	.437**	.382**	.447**	.443**	.399**
GC-8								-	.559**	.485**	.406**	.451**	.365**	.425**
GC-9									-	.548**	.527**	.509**	.427**	.409**
GC-10										-	.547**	.529**	.391**	.495**
GC-11											-	.596**	.400**	.407**
GC-12												-	.436**	.506**
GC-13													-	.459**
GC-14														-

Source: Research results.

5. Discussion

One-way A.N.O.V.A. and Spearman's correlation explored the differences in the perception of respondents in different regions of the destination of the importance of generic competencies. For this purpose three aggregate generic competencies were used: organisational competencies, behavioural competencies, and technical competencies; and there were 12 individually dependent variables: Capability of planning and organisational of activities; Capability of building business networks; Capability of managing oneself and time; Innovative and creative capability; Capability of flexibility and adaptability to the given circumstances; Capability of critical perception and problem-solving; Leadership capabilities; Lifelong learning capability; Capability to acquire the multidisciplinary knowledge; Capability of individual and collective work; Capability of alert reacting in given circumstances; Capability of respecting the differences and prevention of conflict; Capability of writing a report; and Communication capabilities.

Independent variables were: the northern region, central region, and southern regions. There was no serious violation of assumption for one-way A.N.O.V.A.; this is the main reason that the nonparametric statistical method of Spearman correlation instead of Pearson correlation was used.

Reviewing the results of the general average values of aggregate-dependent variables by combinations of different regions in the area revealed significant differences in the perception of the importance of generic competencies regarding (using Bonferroni's adjustment $p < 0.004$):

a) 'Organisational competencies' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 32,691$ and SE = .05134 and Sig. = .000); and coastal region and central region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 28,085$ and SE = .04563 and Sig. =.000).

b) 'Behavioural competencies' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 39,835$ and SE = .05357 and Sig. = .000); and coastal region and central region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 32,825$ and SE = .04761 and Sig. = .000).

c) 'Technical competencies' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 37,434$ and SE = .06260 and Sig. = .000); and coastal region and central region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 37,373$ and SE = .05563 and Sig. = .000).

Reviewing the results of the general average values of individual-dependent variables by combinations of different regions in the area revealed significant differences in the perception of the importance of generic competencies regarding (using Bonferroni's adjustment $p < 0.004$):

a) 'Capability of planning and organisation of activities' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 11,950$ and SE = .03310 and Sig. = .001).

b) 'Capability of managing oneself and time' between respondents in – central region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 15,497$ and SE = .03542 and Sig. = .000) and coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 13,205$ and SE = .03873 and Sig. = .001).

c) 'Innovative and creative capability' between respondents in – central region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 13,825$ and SE = .03463 and Sig. = .001).

d) 'Capability of flexibility and adaptability to the given circumstances' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)} = \pm 16,379$ and SE = .03460

and Sig. = .000) and central region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 12,379 and SE = .03682 and Sig. = .002).

e) 'Capability of critical perception and problem-solving' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 12,621 and SE = .03460 and Sig. = .001).

f) 'Capability of individual and collective work' between respondents in – central region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 13,585 and SE = .03531 and Sig. = .000).

g) 'Capability of alert reacting in given circumstances' between respondents in – central region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 22,932 and SE = .03856 and Sig. = .000) and coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 17,620 and SE = .03625 and Sig. = .000).

h) 'Capability of respecting the differences and prevention of conflict' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 15,758 and SE = .03462 and Sig. = .000).

i) 'Communication capabilities' between respondents in – coastal region and northern region ($MD_{(I-J)}$ = ± 11,619 and SE = .03392 and Sig. = .002).

6. Conclusion

The focus of the survey in this paper is the establishment of differences in the perception of the importance of generic competencies among the employees in the tourism sector and students of tourism and hospitality, both between and within different regions (coastal region, central region, and northern region) in a transitional tourism destination such as Montenegro. The subject matter of the survey is topical not only because of the analysis of generic competencies as a factor of competitiveness of tourism regions, and thus the factors that can reduce the existing imbalance in regional development, but also because of the small number of scientific papers which focus on their research into regional development on specific generic competencies.

The survey covered 3165 respondents across the entire territory of Montenegro, i.e., its three regions, which are disproportionate in terms of geographic area, the number of local governments they include, the total number and the number of working population, the level of overall economic and tourism development, perception of the importance of generic competencies, as well as the speed of the E.U. accession process. Respondents in all three regions and 274 various companies, institutions, and organisations in the tourism sector of Montenegro were asked to rate the importance of aggregate (three in total) and individual generic competencies (14 in total).

Regarding the generic competencies of employees and those who will soon be employed in the tourism sector (students of tourism and hotel management) – a key factor of competitiveness of the tourism offer in the three aforementioned regions in Montenegro – it is expected that there is a gap in the perception of the importance of aggregate and individual generic competencies among regions. In order to establish, on a scientific basis, the significant differences both among the regions and also within the regions, the statistical methods of A.N.O.V.A. and the nonparametric method Spearman's correlation were applied.

A.N.O.V.A. indicated that there are problems related to the normality of the sample distribution (which is typical for statistical samples in social research). Levene's test confirmed

that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was partly challenged also between aggregate and individual generic competencies, but the Tukey HSD[a,b] test and Cohen's criteria indicated that the influence of lack of homogeneity of variance among different groups would be medium, i.e., that it would not significantly affect the results. It was established that the differences between regions are evident, with the greatest differences between the most developed tourism region (coastal region) and less developed (central region) and underdeveloped tourism region (northern region). The largest gap in the perception of respondents on the importance of generic aggregate competencies was expressed in terms of behavioural aggregate competencies between the coastal and northern regions, while the largest gap between individual generic competencies was expressed at the level of organisational generic competencies (capability of planning and organisation of activities), also between the coastal region and northern region.

The weakest links (level of perception of importance) within the same regions, at the level of aggregate generic competencies, were expressed in the northern region between 'organisational competencies' and 'behavioural competencies' (39.6% common variance), while at the level of individual generic competencies the largest gap was expressed between behavioural and technical competencies, i.e., between 'capability of managing oneself and time' and 'capability of writing a report' (8.5% common variance). Central Region has the smallest number of correlations that belong to the very high degree of reciprocity (correlation).

The data presented suggest that the perception of the importance of generic competencies of respondents by regions is directly related to the level of economic development, i.e., level of development of the regional tourism sector. In order to mitigate the uneven tourism development of certain regions in Montenegro in the future, it will be necessary to initiate more intensive changes in the field of education in the northern and central regions, related to the acquisition of generic competencies of employees in the tourism sector and students of tourism and hotel management. Namely, economic and tourism policy-makers should take generic competencies as one of the key factors of tourism development of individual regions more into account in their future decision-making.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

ORCID

Aleksa Š. Vučetić http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4790-7545

References

Anderson, W. (2014). Cultural tourism and poverty alleviation in rural Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 13*(3), 208–224. doi:10.1080/14766825.2014.935387

Arnaud, F. (2016). Memorial policies and restoration of Croatian tourism two decades after the war in former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 14*(3), 270–290. doi:10.1080/14766825.2016.1169348

Becerra-Fernandez, I., & Leidner, D. (2008). *Knowledge management: An evolutionary view*. New York, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Božić, L., & Rajh, E. (2016). The factors constraining innovation performance of SMEs in Croatia. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 29*(1), 314–324. doi:10.1080/1331677x.2016.1168040

Brida, J. G., Disegna, M., & Osti, L. (2013). The effect of authenticity on visitors' expenditure at cultural events. *Current Issues in Tourism, 16*(3), 266–285. doi:10.1080/13683500.2012.674105

Coles, T., Dinan, C., & Hutchison, F. C. (2014). Tourism and the public sector in England since 2010: A disorderly transition? *Current Issues in Tourism, 17*(3), 247–279. doi:10.1080/13683500.2012.733356

Cox, C., & Wray, M. (2011). Best practice marketing for regional tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 28*(5), 524–540. doi:10.1080/10548408.2011.588112

D'Annunzio-Green, N., & Watson, S. (2008). Where are we now? A review of management development issues in the hospitality and tourism sector. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 20*(7), 758–780. doi:10.1108/09596110810897592

Donina, A., & Ineta, L. (2014). The compliance of tourism education with industry needs in Latvia. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation, 5*(3), 91–120.

EACEA. (2015). *The European higher education area in 2015: Bologna process - implementation report* (pp. 300). Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic_reports/182EN.pdf

Hadjikakou, M., Miller, G., Chenoweth, J., Druckman, A., & Zoumides, C. (2015). A comprehensive framework for comparing water use intensity across different tourist types. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 23*(10), 1445–1467. doi:10.1080/09669582.2015.1044753

Ivars Baidal, J. (2004). Regional tourism planning in Spain: Evolution and perspectives. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(2), 313–333. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.001

Jackson, J., & Murphy, P. (2006). Clusters in regional tourism: An Australian case. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*(4), 1018–1035. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2006.04.005

Jauhari, V. (2006). Competencies for a career in the hospitality industry: An Indian perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 18*(2), 123–134. doi:10.1108/09596110610646673

Jeou-Shyan, H., Hsuan, H., Chih-Hsing, L., Lin, L., & Chang-Yen, T. (2011). Competency analysis of top managers in the Taiwanese hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 30*(4), 1044–1054. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.03.012

Kalargyrou, V., & Woods, R. H. (2011). Wanted: Training competencies for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 23*(3), 361–376. doi:10.1108/09596111111122532

Kearns, P. (2010). *HR strategy: creating business strategy with human capital* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Korent, D., Vuković, K., & Brčić, R. (2015). Entrepreneurial activity and regional development. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 28*(1), 939–958. doi:10.1080/1331677x.2015.1084237

Leonidou, L. C., Leonidou, C. N., Fotiadis, T. A., & Zeriti, A. (2013). Resources and capabilities as drivers of hotel environmental marketing strategy: Implications for competitive advantage and performance. *Tourism Management, 35*, 94–110. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2012.06.003

Lopez-Bonilla, J. M., & Lopez-Bonilla, L. M. (2014). Current issues in method and practice. holistic competence approach in tourism higher education: An exploratory study in Spain. *Current Issues in Tourism, 17*(4), 312–326. doi:10.1080/13683500.2012.720248

Merida, A., & Golpe, A. A. (2016). Tourism-led growth revisited for Spain: Causality, business cycles and structural breaks. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 18*(1), 39–51. doi:10.1002/jtr.2031

MEVCG (2014). *Strategija regionalnog razvoja Crne Gore za period 2014–2020 godine*. Podgorica: Vlada Republike Crne Gore.

MONSTAT (2014). *Statistical yearbook*. Podgorica: Montenegro Statistical Office.

MTZZS. (2007). *Strategija razvoja ljudskih resursa u sektoru turizma u Crnoj Gori* (pp. 83). Retrieved from http://www.bjelasica-komovi.me/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/HRD-Strategija-razvoja-ljudskih-resursa-u-sektoru-turizma-u-Crnoj-Gori.pdf

Müller, M. (2015). What makes an event a mega-event? Definitions and sizes *Leisure Studies, 34*(6), 627–642. doi:10.1080/02614367.2014.993333

Munar, A. M., & Montano, J. J. (2009). Generic competences and tourism graduates. *The Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism, 8*(1), 70–84. doi:10.3794/johlste.81.206

Naef, P., & Ploner, J. (2016). Tourism, conflict and contested heritage in former Yugoslavia. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 14*(3), 181–188. doi:10.1080/14766825.2016.1180802

Naidoo, P., & Sharpley, R. (2016). Local perceptions of the relative contributions of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 5*(1), 16–25. doi:10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.11.002

Nobre, F. S., Walker, D., & Harris, R. (2012). *Technological, managerial and organizational core competencies: Dynamic innovation and sustainable development*. Hershey: Business Science Reference.

Okumus, F., Altinay, L., & Chathoth, P. K. (2010). *Strategic management for hospitality and tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Pablos, P. O. D., & Lytras, M. D. (2008). Competencies and human resource management: Implications for organizational competitive advantage. *Journal of Knowledge Management, 12*(6), 48–55. doi:10.1108/13673270810913612

Ram, Y., Björk, P., & Weidenfeld, A. (2016). Authenticity and place attachment of major visitor attractions. *Tourism Management, 52*, 110–122. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.010

Razumova, M., Rey-Maquieira, J., & Lozano, J. (2016). The role of water tariffs as a determinant of water saving innovations in the hotel sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 52*, 78–86. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.09.011

Ryu, J. S., L'Espoir Decosta, J. N. P., & Andéhn, M. (2016). From branded exports to traveler imports: Building destination image on the factory floor in South Korea. *Tourism Management, 52*, 298–309. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2015.07.004

Scott, D., Simpson, M. C., & Sim, R. (2012). The vulnerability of Caribbean coastal tourism to scenarios of climate change related sea level rise. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 20*(6), 883–898. doi:10.1080/09669582.2012.699063

Scuttari, A., LuciaDella Lucia, M., & Martini, U. (2013). Integrated planning for sustainable tourism and mobility. A tourism traffic analysis in Italy's South Tyrol region. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 21*(4), 614–637. doi:10.1080/09669582.2013.786083

Slack, N., Chambers, S., & Johnston, R. (2013). *Operations management* (7th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Spowart, J. (2011). Hospitality students' competencies: Are they work ready? *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 10*(2), 169–181. doi:10.1080/15332845.2011.536940

Tavitiyaman, P., Weerakit, N., & Ryan, B. (2014). Leadership competencies for hotel general managers: The differences in age, education, and hotel characteristics. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 15*(2), 191–216. doi:10.1080/15256480.2014.901069

Tkalec, M., & Vizek, M. (2016). The price tag of tourism: Does tourism activity increase the prices of goods and services? *Tourism Economics, 22*(1), 93–109. doi:10.5367/te.2014.0415

Wang, Y.-F. (2013). Constructing career competency model of hospitality industry employees for career success. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 25*(7), 994–1016. doi:10.1108/ijchm-07-2012-0106

Wang, Y.-F., & Tsai, C.-T. (2014). Employability of hospitality graduates: Student and industry perspectives. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 26*(3), 125–135. doi:10.1080/10963758.2014.935221

Yang, Z., & Cai, J. (2016). Do regional factors matter? Determinants of hotel industry performance in China. *Tourism Management, 52*, 242–253. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.024

Yang, Y., Liu, X., & Li, J. (2015). How customer experience affects the customer-based brand equity for tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 32*(sup1), S97–S113. doi:10.1080/10548408.2014.997959

Zehrer, A., & Mössenlechner, C. (2009). Key competencies of tourism graduates: The employers' point of view. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 9*(3-4), 266–287. doi:10.1080/15313220903445215

Zhang, G., Han, J., Pan, Z., & Huang, H. (2015). Economic policy uncertainty and capital structure choice: Evidence from China. *Economic Systems, 39*(3), 439–457. doi:10.1016/j.ecosys.2015.06.003

Zhang, L., Botti, L., & Petit, S. (2016). Destination performance: Introducing the utility function in the mean-variance space. *Tourism Management, 52*, 123–132. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.017