Asian Review of Social Sciences
ISSN: 2249-6319 Vol. 8 No. S1, 2019, pp. 52-59

Index of Destination Choice: A Framework for Ranking Nations According to Preference for Destination

P. Paul Jose
Associate Professor, St.Thomas College, Thrissur, Kerala, India
E-Mail: jose_paul09@yahoo.co.in

Abstract **- The present paper is about framing an index to evaluate and rank the countries world over according to the choices of the tourists as their destinations. Most of the literature on the evaluation of the performance of Tourism sector fails to provide a methodology to rank the various countries of the world according to some robust index. This paper is an attempt to fill this gap. Drawing on the secondary data on indicators related to tourism from various organizations, an index, namely, Index of Destination Choice (IDC)has been devised. This index is based on indicators representing five sub dimensions that have pronounced influence in the sector of tourism. The Index brings down the features of each of the nations involved in the study to values ranging from '0' to '1' indicating that higher value of index of a country stands for higher degree of choice of tourists for that particular destination. The advantages of the present Index of Destination Choice lie in its quick comprehensibility and easiness to compute. The proposed index enables comparison between various countries included in the computations.**
Keywords: **Tourism, GDP, Economic Existence, Environment**

I. INTRODUCTION

Tourism is a rapidly evolving commercial sector generating economic benefits in terms of contribution to GDP and employment generation in the host countries. Tourism, when taken as an economic activity, can be seen as possessing many distinctive features that render it one of the most important industries among the countries worldwide. It is the world's No.3 export earner. Besides, Tourism and Travel generated 10.2 percent of global GDP and 292 million jobs in 2016 (UNWTO, 2017). Tourism sector has the distinction of having second rank among the various industries ranked according to GDP dispersion.

Apart from the general features alluded to tourism sector; it can also claim to possess certain distinctive features as is shown in Table I and Table II. Table I shows the average benchmark industry regional employment and GDP dispersion rankings for the year 2014.Travel& Tourism ranks as the second most evenly distributed industry, interms of employment and GDP, second only to education, which ranks as the first most evenly distributed industry among those benchmarked. It can be noted that Manufacturing has been ranked only as 3 and Financial Services as 5 among the frontline sectors.

Besides, Tourism, as an economic activity, makes solid contributions to many fronts of the economy of a country. The realms to which it contributes at the global level are shown in Table II. All the eight indicators show growth during the period 2011 to 2017.

TABLE I AVERAGE (ACROSS COUNTRIES) BENCHMARK INDUSTRY REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND GDP DISPERSION RANKINGS

	Employment	**GDP**
Travel & Tourism	2	2
Mining	6	5
Education	1	1
Manufacturing	3	3
Communications	4	4
Financial Services	5	6

Source: Oxford Economics; Note: Rankings 1= more evenly dispersed and 6= more clustered/less evenly dispersed

Exports of various countries globally through tourism grew from USD 1.15 trillion in the year 2011 to USD 1.46 trillion in 2017 involving an average annual growth rate for 4.17 percent. The sector has caused a domestic expenditure of governments and individuals world over of USD 3.71 trillion in the year 2017, which showed a CAGR of 3.60 percent, when the period ended in 2017. The total contribution the sector made to GDP at the global level is USD 7.88 trillion in 2017 marking a CAGR of 3.85 percent from USD 6.29 trillion in 2011. This primarily reflects the economic activity generated by industries such as hotels, travel agents, airlines and other passenger transportation services (excluding commuter services). But it also includes, for example, the activities of the restaurant and leisure industries directly supported by tourists apart from the wider effects from investment, the supply chain and induced income impacts. Moreover, the direct contribution of Travel & Tourism to GDP is expected to grow by 4.0percent per annum to USD 3537.1billion (3.5percent of GDP) by 2027. Further, it is forecast to rise by 3.9 percent per annum to USD 11512.9 billion by 2027, which is 11.4 percent of GDP (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017). Employment is the fastest growing element of the sector of tourism; it grew at a CAGR of 24.2 percent by the end of the period in 2017 to 297.2 million opportunities from 258.1 million opportunities in 2011. It is forecast that by 2027, Travel and Tourism will account for 381.7 million jobs, both directly and indirectly, an increase of 2.5 percent per annum over the next ten years.In short, Tourism, world

over, is an economic sector which makes solid contributions to many domains of economic existence of nations.

Moreover, developing the Travel and Travel sector provides growth opportunities for all countries, regardless of their wealth, and offers job opportunities at all skill levels. According to the UNWTO, the tourism industry employs 1 in 11 of the world's workers and accounts for a similar percentage of GDP. It continues to grow more quickly than the economy as a whole, driven by technological, socio-economic and cultural forces which are driving more people to move internationally more frequently (World Economic Forum, 2016).

TABLE II THE ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTION OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM AT GLOBAL LEVEL (REAL 2016 PRICES IN TRILLION USD)

S. No.	Indicators	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	CAGR
1	Visitor exports	1.15	1.20	1.26	1.32	1.37	1.40	1.46	4.17
2	Domestic Expenditure (Includes Government and Individual Spending)	3.00	3.10	3.20	3.34	3.46	3.57	3.71	3.60
3	Direct contribution of Travel and Tourism to GDP	1.93	1.99	2.06	2.16	2.24	2.31	2.39	3.70
4	Capital investment	0.66	0.69	0.70	0.74	0.78	0.81	0.84	4.08
5	Government collective spending	0.38	0.38	0.39	0.40	0.41	0.42	0.43	2.49
6	Total Contribution of Travel & Tourism to GDP	6.29	6.51	6.74	7.06	7.37	7.61	7.88	3.85
7	Direct contribution of Travel & Tourism to employment	9.95	10.16	10.29	10.46	10.68	10.87	11.10	1.84
8	Total contribution of Travel & Tourism to employment (in millions)	258.1	264.1	270.4	277.2	286.2	292.2	297.9	24.2

Source: https://www.wttc.org/

Notes: Direct contribution of Travel and Tourism to employment includes both Direct contribution of Travel & Tourism to employment and its indirect contribution.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVE OF THE PRESENT PAPER

In spite of the role of the sector of Travel and Tourism to the growth of economies, the attempts to evaluate the ranks of various countries world over in promoting the global tourism are restrained either because of the unwieldiness of the methodology adopted (World Economic Forum, 2016) or because of the lack of comprehensiveness.In other words, there are scant attempts to evaluate the countries based on factors leading to choice of destinations by tourists. Studies that attempted to evaluate the tourism destinations generally centered on some specific and limited issues only. Paramati, Alam and Chen (2016) studied the relationship among tourism, economic growth and carbon dioxide emissions and compared the impact of tourism on economic growth and carbon dioxide emissions in developing and developed countries, while, Samitas,Asteriou, Polyzos and Kenourgios (2017) related the impact of terrorism on tourism demand in Greece. Some studies have attempted to evaluate the tourism sector of specific countries with limited variables like satisfaction (Aksu, Icigen, &Ehtiyar, 2010); economic growth and tourists arrivals (LeitAlo&Shahbaz, 2016); effects of tourism on natural resources, environmental pollution, physical environment and tourist activities (Rabbany, Afrin, Rahman, Islam, &Hoque, 2013); impact of tourism on GDP and the environment in developing countries (Kruja, Lufi, &Kruja, 2012 : Nemati, &Raisi, 2014); tourism and economic growth (Shakouri, Yazdi, Nategian&Shikhrezai, 2017) and tourism and macroeconomic equilibrium, production, consumption and prices, employment and wages and investment (Morales, 2003). Generally, there has been no attempt to evaluate methodologically the destinations according to factors influencing the choice of a particular destination. However, the yearly The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Reports brought out by the World Economic Forum ranks the countries according to Tourism Competitiveness Index specially developed for the purpose. But the computation of the index involves as many as 4 dimensions and 14 sub dimensional pillars spread over 104 indicators. The very fact that the Index of Tourism Competitiveness involves so many dimensions, sub dimensions and indicators testifies to its unwieldiness and difficulty in computation. The present attempt is to devise an index which involves far fewer dimensions and indicators and easy computations. The index has been framed with the objective of incorporating data on aspects like the information about the tourism destinations, cleanliness of the destinations, general safety and security of the destinations, facilities available at the destinations and price levels prevailing at the destinations. Care has been taken to make an index easy and simple to compute, at the same time, ensuring comparability across countries.

III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

As stated earlier, the present paper attempts to frame an index to rank the countries world over according to the choice of the global travelers as their destinations using the Index, namely, Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*. *IDC*has been framed drawing heavily from the Human Development Index (HDI). The HDI is a simple Arithmetic Mean of normalized indices in the dimensions of life expectancy (X_1)

literacy *(X_2)*, and (the log of) real GDP per capita *(X_3)*. The reason for taking logarithms of income is explained as follows. Of the three dimensions, both life expectancy and literacy are taken to be valuable in themselves. Income is perceived as a means for pursuing other ends, therefore, a distribution sensitive measure of income is recommended. This calls for the use of logarithm of income, which ensures a strictly concave transformation and the average of the logarithms of incomes tends to be greater as the given total income is more equally distributed. As the next step, a maximum and a minimum values are determined for each of the three proxies given the actual values. The deprivation measure then places a country in the range of zero to one as defined by the difference between the maximum and the minimum. Thus I_{ij} is the deprivation indicator for the jPthP country with respect to the i^{thP} variable, and the normalized value is obtained by the following formula devised by UNDP (1990):

$$H_i = \frac{1}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{3} H_{ij} \quad (1)$$

Where,

$$H_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij} - \underset{j}{MinX_{ij}}}{\underset{j}{MaxX_{ij}} - \underset{j}{MinX_{ij}}} \quad (2)$$

A. Formula for Index of Destination Choice (IDC)

The IDC is computed in two stages. In the first stage, an index is calculated for each of the five dimensions relating to a tourism destination–a countryin the present case – such as Information *(I)*, Cleanliness *(C)*, Safety and Security *(S)*, Facilities *(F)*, and Expensiveness of the destination *(E)* to be incurred at the destination and by dividing the difference between the actual value and the minimum value of the dimension by the range concerned. This step helps in holding the value of each dimension between 0 and 1.

For the selected countries, Individual Dimensions of Index of Destination Choice of β^{th} Country *:*

$$d_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{A_{\alpha\beta} - m_\alpha}{M_\alpha - m_\alpha}, \alpha \in \{I, C, S, E, F\} \text{ and}$$

$A_{\alpha\beta}$ = Actual value of dimension α of β^{th} Country

M_α = Maximum value of dimension α of Countries, and

m_α = minimum value of dimension α of Countries

$$\text{IDC of } \beta^{\text{th}} \text{ Country} = \left[\frac{1}{4}\sum_{1}^{4} d_{\alpha\phi}\right], \alpha \in \{I, C, S, E.F\}$$

The dimension and indicators used can be explained as follows:

Information (I) **-** Information about the destination is one of the most important driving forces behind the choice of a particular destination by a tourist. More the number of arrivals at a particular destination, more the chances for the destination to be better known among the prospective tourists, therefore, more probable to be chosen as the next destination. Proxy for information about a destination is the number of foreign tourist arrivals in each country each year. The choice of the number of arrivals as the proxy for information about destination is also justified on the grounds that the demand for tourism in a particular destination in a given period depends upon demand in the previous period as well (Sinclair &Stabler, 1997), which explains the experience of tourists who have visited the destination. And, it has also to be mentioned that information about the arrival of tourists will necessarily be of the relevant previous year. The demand for a new location may be negatively influenced by a particular consumer's lack of experience and knowledge of it as well. In a nutshell, the more information consumers have about a destination, the greater the demand for it. This is also consistent with the finding that some consumers develop the habit of making repeat visits to particular destinations (Darnell, Johnson, & Thomas, 1992; Martin & Witt, 1988; Syriopoulos, 1995; Witt, 1980; Witt & Martin, 1987) and is similar to the effect of habit persistence in aggregate consumption expenditure (Braun, Constantinides, &Ferson, 1993).

Cleanliness(C) **-** General cleanliness of the destination is an important dimension encouraging overseas as well as domestic tourists to choose a particular destination. It has two sub components such as an invisible component and a visible component. The invisible component is about the atmospheric cleanliness related to presence of clean atmosphere. The visible component is related to the surroundings kept clean by the residents, which is essential for the healthy existence and availability of clean water. For the purpose of the Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*, the dimension of Cleanliness dealt with two indicators such as Carbon dioxide Emissions and Improved Sanitation facilities at the destination country.Carbon dioxide emissions are those stemming from the burning of fossil fuels and the manufacture of cement. They include carbon dioxide produced during consumption of solid, liquid, and gas fuels and gas flaring. Carbon dioxide emissions are measured in metric tons per capita. Access to improved sanitation facilities refers to the percentage of the population using improved sanitation facilities. Improved sanitation facilities are likely to ensure hygienic separation of human excreta from human contact. They include flush/pour flush (to piped sewer system, septic tank, and pit latrine), Ventilated Improved Pit (VIP) latrine, pit latrine with slab, and composting toilet. Improved sanitation facilities are measured in number per hundred of population of each country with access to improved sanitation. Tourists are quite particular about their health and cleanliness of surroundings. Physically and psychologically comforting accommodation contributes to quality holiday experience. Pollution free and clean environment provides them with a sense of contentment. After choosing the indicators for the

dimension of Cleanliness *(C)*, as stated above, the dimension is measured with the help of these two indicators. Each of the two indicators is normalized individually according to the abovementioned formula. After this step, the dimensional index is arrived as the average of the normalized values of the two separate indices. Before finding out the average, each of the normalized indices is deducted from '1' so that the normalized figures indicate higher values of the indicators represented by them.

Safety and security(S) - There is a close link between the level of peace at the destination and tourism growth. Tourists would like to feel safe and secure throughout their stay, regardless of places that they are at. Peace creates a welcoming environment for tourists. It has been proved that wars and terrorism affect tourism at least in the short term (Larson, Brun, Ogaard, & Selstad, 2011; Llorca-Vivero, 2008; Neumayer, 2004; Spillerman & Stecklov, 2009); therefore, the safety and security aspects of each destination is given reckoning in the framing of the Choice of Destination Index. The dimension of Safety and Security *(SS)* of each destination country is measured from the Global Peace Index (GPI) score assigned by the Institution for Economics & Peace. The score assigned by the Institution for Economics & Peace is interpreted as higher score implying less peacefulness and the less attractiveness of the country and *vice versa*. In order that the sub dimensional index relating to Safety and Security once computed from the score assigned to each country from the Global Peace Index (GPI) to represent the actual status of safety and security of a particular destination has to be deducted from '1', since higher values of computed sub dimensional index from the score of GPI means less peacefulness and attractiveness of the destination. And, now higher values of the sub dimensional index of Safety and Security (as represented by the Global Peace Index values deducted from '1') mean higher peacefulness and better attractiveness of the destination. It is stated that perceptions of instability are increasingly influencing tourist flows. Ultimately, the growth and survival of the travel and tourism industry is entirely dependent on the chances to have a safe travel experience. Advances made in the last decade could be undone by factors including current geopolitical tensions from the Middle East to Ukraine; the growing terrorism threat from ISIS; and the risk of pandemics, as exemplified by the Ebola outbreak(World Economic Forum, 2016).

Facilities - One of the determining factors of tourism attractiveness and choice of destination is the facilities available there, both infrastructural and otherwise. Investment in infrastructural facilities is directly related to the GDP of a country in as much as that GDP growth cannot be attained without sufficient investment in infrastructure in various sectors; therefore, GDP per capita is selected as the proxy for rate of development attained and infrastructural facilities offered at the destination.

Expensiveness of the destination - Inflation as measured by the consumer price index reflects the annual percentage change in the cost to the average consumer of acquiring a basket of goods and services that may be fixed or changed at specified intervals, such as yearly. The demand for the destination goes down with inflation in the host country. The inflation in host country would diminish the tourist spending in that country. It is measured in annual percentage. The sub dimensional index derived from this indicator is deducted from '1' to make sure that higher value of index of Expensiveness of destination is identified with destinations with lower levels of inflation.

Secondary Data on various indicators chosen for the framing of the Index of have been derived from web sites of various world level organizations such UNWTO (United Nation's World Tourism Organization), WTTC (World Travel and Tourism Council) and World Development Indicators.

B. Strengths of the present index and its limitations: Simplicity and easiness for computation are the main strengths of the Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*. The Index is easily understandable by virtue of the limited number of dimensions and indicators employed in its framing and statistical easiness involved in computations. At the same time, each sub dimensional index is assured of normalized value representing data. While Tourism Competitiveness Index is based on 104 indicators spread over 4 dimensions and 14 sub dimensional pillars, Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)* is based on 5 dimensions and 6 indicators only. However, the computation of Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)* is subject to limitations due to the unavailability of data on many countries of the world. Unavailability of data used for representing the dimensions has limited the number of countries to be included in the computations to 99 and the period of study from 2008 to 2014. However, it is hoped that this limitation caused by the unavailability will not adversely affect the usefulness of the Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Depending on the value of IDC, countries are categorized into three categories, viz.:

1. $0.5 < IDC \leq 1.0$ – high degree of choice of destination
2. $0.3 \leq IDC < 0.5$ – medium degree of choice of destination
3. $0.0 \leq IDC < 0.3$ – low degree of choice of destination

Table III exhibits the distribution of Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*.Based on the results; the countries have been classified as

1. Those countries whose Index of Destination Choice remains at high degree throughout the period under consideration. Among those countries which have

remained at high degree of Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*, France is the only country which has been able to maintain its rank throughout the period under consideration; it remains No. 1 throughout the period. The countries that remain with high degree of Index of Destination Choice throughout the period of study are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Lithuania, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UAE and USA.

2. Majority of the countries have remained at the medium degree as regards the Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*. The countries are Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameron, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cote d' Ivories, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Macedonia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Moldova, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Philippine, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
3. Some of the countries have improved their Indices of Destination Choice; for example, Albania, Bulgaria and Jordan
4. Some other countries have remained at the low degree of Destination Choice by the tourists, for example, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Pakistan.
5. Lastly, some countries have regained their Indices of Destination Choice, for example, Kenya, whose index improved from low degree (0.27) in 2008to medium degree (0.33) in 2014 and Ethiopia, whose index improved from 0.15 in 2008 to 0.31 in 2014.

TABLE III. DISTRIBUTION OF INDEX OF DESTINATION CHOICE *(IDC)* OVER THE PERIOD OF STUDY

S. No.	Countries	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	S. No.	Countries	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
1	Albania	0.49	0.46	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.51	0.50	51	Kuwait	0.53	0.49	0.48	0.53	0.50	0.54	0.54
		(45)	(50)	(47)	(46)	(49)	(47)	(45)			(35)	(37)	(39)	(36)	(43)	(39)	(38)
2	Australia	0.62	0.61	0.60	0.63	0.66	0.65	0.65	52	Latvia	0.48	0.47	0.52	0.51	0.52	0.54	0.54
		(20)	(22)	(20)	(20)	(18)	(21)	(21)			(46)	(44)	(32)	(42)	(38)	(36)	(39)
3	Austria	0.71	0.69	0.68	0.70	0.70	0.72	0.73	53	Lithuania	0.51	0.48	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.54	0.54
		(8)	(6)	(6)	(6)	(10)	(7)	(8)			(41)	(40)	(35)	(38)	(36)	(35)	(36)
4	Azerbaijan	0.37	0.41	0.36	0.40	0.44	0.45	0.45	54	Macedonia	0.46	0.47	0.45	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.49
		(87)	(64)	(74)	(77)	(58)	(65)	(61)			(56)	(48)	(46)	(54)	(51)	(56)	(48)
5	Bahrain	0.51	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.49	0.49	0.48	55	Madagascar	0.40	0.31	0.27	0.32	0.29	0.37	0.36
		(40)	(42)	(38)	(53)	(44)	(53)	(52)			(75)	(90)	(94)	(94)	(92)	(89)	(89)
6	Bangladesh	0.41	0.37	0.33	0.38	0.34	0.41	0.39	56	Malawi	0.41	0.37	0.35	0.42	0.22	0.31	0.25
		(70)	(77)	(84)	(83)	(80)	(81)	(81)			(71)	(80)	(79)	(68)	(98)	(98)	(99)
7	Belgium	0.65	0.64	0.62	0.64	0.65	0.67	0.67	57	Malaysia	0.58	0.58	0.57	0.60	0.54	0.60	0.58
		(18)	(15)	(19)	(18)	(19)	(16)	(15)			(27)	(25)	(26)	(25)	(30)	(26)	(32)
8	Bolivia	0.39	0.39	0.39	0.38	0.36	0.42	0.41	58	Mali	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.38	0.31	0.39	0.36
		(81)	(69)	(66)	(84)	(78)	(78)	(73)			(89)	(84)	(76)	(85)	(86)	(86)	(88)
9	Botswana	0.45	0.41	0.41	0.46	0.41	0.49	0.47	59	Mexico	0.52	0.45	0.46	0.49	0.50	0.50	0.48
		(58)	(63)	(58)	(57)	(67)	(50)	(54)			(38)	(53)	(45)	(49)	(41)	(49)	(51)
10	Brazil	0.48	0.44	0.43	0.47	0.46	0.49	0.46	60	Moldova	0.42	0.45	0.37	0.44	0.41	0.46	0.44
		(47)	(56)	(52)	(52)	(50)	(54)	(57)			(66)	(52)	(70)	(61)	(69)	(62)	(64)
11	Bulgaria	0.47	0.48	0.48	0.49	0.48	0.54	0.56	61	Mongolia	0.33	0.36	0.29	0.40	0.30	0.40	0.37
		(51)	(43)	(41)	(48)	(48)	(37)	(34)			(93)	(81)	(91)	(78)	(89)	(85)	(86)
12	Burkina Faso	0.37	0.37	0.42	0.41	0.31	0.41	0.42	62	Morocco	0.50	0.48	0.48	0.51	0.45	0.51	0.51
		(88)	(79)	(55)	(74)	(88)	(82)	(70)			(44)	(41)	(37)	(41)	(53)	(46)	(41)
13	Cambodia	0.31	0.39	0.34	0.37	0.35	0.41	0.40	63	Mozambique	0.40	0.38	0.27	0.38	0.33	0.41	0.40
		(96)	(68)	(81)	(88)	(79)	(83)	(80)			(74)	(72)	(95)	(86)	(83)	(80)	(79)
14	Cameroon	0.41	0.38	0.39	0.42	0.33	0.42	0.41	64	Namibia	0.40	0.35	0.37	0.43	0.37	0.44	0.42
		(68)	(74)	(68)	(73)	(81)	(76)	(74)			(73)	(85)	(69)	(66)	(77)	(70)	(68)

15	Canada	0.68	0.66	0.64	0.67	0.68	0.69	0.68	65	Netherlands	0.66	0.63	0.62	0.65	0.68	0.66	0.67
		(12)	(14)	(15)	(13)	(12)	(12)	(13)			(15)	(19)	(16)	(17)	(14)	(18)	(14)
16	Chile	0.54	0.55	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.57	0.54	66	Nicaragua	0.40	0.43	0.39	0.42	0.37	0.45	0.44
		(32)	(29)	(30)	(34)	(32)	(33)	(37)			(78)	(60)	(67)	(71)	(75)	(68)	(65)
17	China	0.59	0.58	0.53	0.57	0.54	0.58	0.57	67	Nigeria	0.32	0.24	0.16	0.28	0.25	0.32	0.29
		(25)	(23)	(29)	(27)	(29)	(31)	(33)			(95)	(98)	(98)	(98)	(94)	(96)	(97)
18	Colombia	0.40	0.36	0.36	0.40	0.45	0.43	0.40	68	Norway	0.75	0.72	0.71	0.75	0.78	0.74	0.74
		(77)	(83)	(75)	(79)	(55)	(75)	(77)			(2)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(4)
19	Costa Rica	0.50	0.47	0.47	0.52	0.50	0.52	0.51	69	Pakistan	0.30	0.21	0.15	0.29	0.30	0.31	0.29
		(43)	(47)	(44)	(37)	(42)	(43)	(43)			(97)	(99)	(99)	(96)	(91)	(97)	(98)
20	Cote d' Ivoire	0.35	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.31	0.33	0.36	70	Panama	0.48	0.46	0.44	0.48	0.43	0.49	0.49
		(90)	(86)	(78)	(90)	(85)	(94)	(90)			(48)	(51)	(49)	(51)	(61)	(52)	(50)
21	Croatia	0.54	0.52	0.54	0.56	0.53	0.58	0.60	71	Paraguay	0.45	0.45	0.41	0.45	0.42	0.48	0.46
		(34)	(32)	(28)	(30)	(35)	(29)	(26)			(57)	(54)	(57)	(59)	(65)	(57)	(59)
22	Cyprus	0.57	0.56	0.51	0.54	0.58	0.58	0.59	72	Peru	0.47	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.44	0.45	0.43
		(28)	(28)	(34)	(33)	(24)	(30)	(31)			(52)	(59)	(48)	(55)	(60)	(64)	(67)
23	Czech Republic	0.58	0.57	0.57	0.60	0.56	0.60	0.61	73	Philippines	0.41	0.38	0.35	0.39	0.42	0.44	0.41
		(26)	(26)	(25)	(23)	(27)	(25)	(23)			(69)	(75)	(77)	(80)	(66)	(71)	(72)
24	Denmark	0.71	0.68	0.66	0.70	0.71	0.72	0.73	74	Poland	0.56	0.52	0.52	0.57	0.54	0.60	0.60
		(7)	(8)	(12)	(9)	(8)	(8)	(7)			(30)	(34)	(31)	(29)	(31)	(27)	(25)
25	Dominican Republic	0.46	0.47	0.39	0.44	0.45	0.47	0.47	75	Portugal	0.62	0.61	0.59	0.60	0.58	0.62	0.63
		(55)	(46)	(65)	(63)	(54)	(59)	(55)			(21)	(21)	(22)	(26)	(23)	(22)	(22)
26	Ecuador	0.43	0.39	0.41	0.45	0.41	0.48	0.46	76	Qatar	0.53	0.63	0.64	0.63	0.57	0.61	0.59
		(63)	(67)	(60)	(58)	(68)	(58)	(56)			(36)	(17)	(14)	(22)	(25)	(23)	(30)
27	Egypt	0.46	0.42	0.40	0.46	0.43	0.45	0.38	77	Russia	0.40	0.32	0.31	0.37	0.46	0.40	0.38
		(54)	(61)	(62)	(56)	(63)	(67)	(82)			(76)	(89)	(89)	(87)	(52)	(84)	(83)
28	El Salvador	0.44	0.43	0.43	0.43	0.44	0.46	0.45	78	Saudi Arabia	0.48	0.44	0.42	0.49	0.49	0.52	0.53
		(59)	(58)	(53)	(65)	(59)	(63)	(63)			(49)	(55)	(54)	(50)	(46)	(44)	(40)
29	Estonia	0.51	0.52	0.48	0.50	0.53	0.53	0.55	79	Senegal	0.43	0.43	0.41	0.42	0.37	0.44	0.46
		(39)	(33)	(40)	(43)	(33)	(42)	(35)			(64)	(57)	(59)	(70)	(76)	(69)	(60)
30	Ethiopia	0.18	0.25	0.25	0.17	0.17	0.32	0.31	80	Singapore	0.62	0.61	0.59	0.63	0.64	0.67	0.66
		(99)	(96)	(96)	(99)	(99)	(95)	(95)			(22)	(20)	(21)	(21)	(20)	(15)	(18)
31	Finland	0.65	0.63	0.62	0.64	0.66	0.66	0.65	81	Slovakia	0.57	0.53	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.57	0.59
		(17)	(18)	(17)	(19)	(17)	(20)	(20)			(29)	(31)	(27)	(32)	(34)	(34)	(29)
32	France	0.81	0.80	0.76	0.80	0.82	0.80	0.80	82	Slovenia	0.59	0.58	0.57	0.60	0.57	0.60	0.61
		(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)			(24)	(24)	(24)	(24)	(26)	(24)	(24)
33	Germany	0.70	0.67	0.67	0.70	0.71	0.71	0.72	83	Spain	0.73	0.71	0.69	0.72	0.72	0.74	0.76
		(9)	(12)	(8)	(8)	(7)	(10)	(9)			(4)	(4)	(5)	(4)	(5)	(4)	(3)
34	Ghana	0.38	0.25	0.28	0.39	0.31	0.37	0.30	84	Sri Lanka	0.34	0.39	0.34	0.42	0.40	0.45	0.46
		(86)	(97)	(93)	(82)	(87)	(90)	(96)			(92)	(70)	(82)	(72)	(70)	(66)	(58)
35	Greece	0.60	0.57	0.52	0.57	0.58	0.59	0.60	85	Sweden	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.67	0.71	0.70	0.69
		(23)	(27)	(33)	(28)	(22)	(28)	(27)			(13)	(11)	(13)	(12)	(9)	(11)	(11)
36	Guatemala	0.39	0.40	0.37	0.39	0.39	0.43	0.42	86	Switzerland	0.74	0.72	0.72	0.75	0.76	0.76	0.76
		(79)	(66)	(71)	(81)	(73)	(74)	(69)			(3)	(3)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(2)	(2)
37	Honduras	0.40	0.38	0.36	0.41	0.40	0.43	0.41	87	Tanzania	0.38	0.30	0.33	0.35	0.23	0.39	0.37

		(72)	(76)	(73)	(76)	(72)	(73)	(71)			(83)	(92)	(83)	(89)	(97)	(87)	(84)
38	Hungary	0.56	0.51	0.50	0.56	0.52	0.58	0.59	88	Thailand	0.48	0.47	0.43	0.50	0.49	0.52	0.50
		(31)	(35)	(36)	(31)	(37)	(32)	(28)			(50)	(45)	(51)	(47)	(45)	(45)	(46)
39	Iceland	0.64	0.54	0.58	0.66	0.63	0.66	0.66	89	Trinidad and Tobago	0.39	0.36	0.28	0.41	0.38	0.41	0.41
		(19)	(30)	(23)	(16)	(21)	(19)	(19)			(80)	(82)	(92)	(75)	(74)	(79)	(76)
40	India	0.38	0.28	0.22	0.33	0.32	0.34	0.35	90	Tunisia	0.52	0.49	0.47	0.51	0.44	0.49	0.48
		(84)	(94)	(97)	(93)	(84)	(93)	(92)			(37)	(38)	(42)	(40)	(56)	(51)	(53)
41	Indonesia	0.44	0.42	0.40	0.45	0.40	0.47	0.45	91	Turkey	0.51	0.46	0.41	0.51	0.51	0.53	0.50
		(61)	(62)	(61)	(60)	(71)	(61)	(62)			(42)	(49)	(56)	(39)	(39)	(41)	(47)
42	Iran	0.35	0.34	0.33	0.33	0.23	0.26	0.32	92	Uganda	0.33	0.26	0.33	0.29	0.24	0.37	0.36
		(91)	(87)	(86)	(92)	(96)	(99)	(94)			(94)	(95)	(85)	(97)	(95)	(88)	(91)
43	Ireland	0.66	0.68	0.66	0.66	0.66	0.67	0.68	93	Ukraine	0.44	0.38	0.39	0.50	0.51	0.53	0.37
		(16)	(10)	(11)	(15)	(15)	(14)	(12)			(60)	(73)	(64)	(45)	(40)	(40)	(85)
44	Israel	0.44	0.39	0.39	0.44	0.56	0.48	0.49	94	UA E	0.73	0.70	0.69	0.72	0.71	0.75	0.74
		(62)	(71)	(63)	(62)	(28)	(55)	(49)			(5)	(5)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(3)	(5)
45	Italy	0.71	0.68	0.67	0.69	0.68	0.71	0.71	95	UK	0.67	0.64	0.62	0.66	0.69	0.66	0.67
		(6)	(9)	(10)	(10)	(13)	(9)	(10)			(14)	(16)	(18)	(14)	(11)	(17)	(17)
46	Jamaica	0.38	0.37	0.30	0.42	0.43	0.42	0.41	96	USA	0.69	0.69	0.67	0.70	0.79	0.73	0.73
		(85)	(78)	(90)	(69)	(62)	(77)	(75)			(10)	(7)	(9)	(7)	(2)	(6)	(6)
47	Japan	0.68	0.66	0.67	0.68	0.66	0.68	0.67	97	Uruguay	0.54	0.48	0.47	0.53	0.49	0.54	0.51
		(11)	(13)	(7)	(11)	(16)	(13)	(16)			(33)	(39)	(43)	(35)	(47)	(38)	(42)
48	Jordan	0.46	0.51	0.44	0.50	0.44	0.51	0.50	98	Zambia	0.42	0.33	0.34	0.42	0.33	0.43	0.40
		(53)	(36)	(50)	(44)	(57)	(48)	(44)			(67)	(88)	(80)	(67)	(82)	(72)	(78)
49	Kazakhstan	0.43	0.40	0.37	0.43	0.43	0.47	0.43	99	Zimbabwe	0.38	0.30	0.31	0.34	0.30	0.36	0.37
		(65)	(65)	(72)	(64)	(64)	(60)	(66)			(82)	(91)	(88)	(91)	(90)	(91)	(87)
50	Kenya	0.27	0.29	0.32	0.32	0.29	0.36	0.33									
		(98)	(93)	(87)	(95)	(93)	(92)	(93)									

Note: figures in parentheses indicate rank of each country

V. CONCLUSION

This paper is for proposing an index for ranking the countries of the world according to the preferences of the tourists for choosing them as their tour destinations. The computations made for the finalization of the index, which is named as Index of Destination Choice *(IDC)*, is enabled on the basis of a set ofsix indicators representing five dimensional indices spread over a period from 2008 to 2014. The robustness of the IDC is dependent upon the choice of indicators and availability of data for as many countries as possible. Availability of data about as many countries as possible over as many years is a fundamental requirement for testifying to the robustness of the index. In the present case, the period of time is restrained by the availability of data. The same reason has also restrained the number of countries included in the analysis. The results derived from the analysis show that generally tourists preferred countries have satisfied the basic indicator requirements.

REFERENCES

[1] Aksu, A., Icigen, E.T., & Ehtiyar, R.(2010). A comparison of tourist expectations and satisfaction: A case study from Antalya region of turkey. *Turizam*, *14*, 66-77.

[2] Braun, P. A., Constantinides, G.M., & Ferson, W.E. (1993). Time non separability in aggregate consumption: international evidence. *European Economic Review*, *37*, 897-920.

[3] Darnell, A., Johnson, P., & Thomas, B. (1992). Modeling visitor flows at the Beamish Museum. In P. Johnson and B. Thomas (Eds.), *Choice and demand in tourism.* London, UK: Mansell.

[4] Ghulam Rabbany, Md., Afrin, S., Rahman, A., Islam, F., & Hoque, F.(2013). Environmental effects of tourism. *American Journal of Environment, Energy and Power Research*, *7*, 117-130.

[5] Kruja, D., Lufi, M., & Kruja, I. (2012).The role of tourism in developing countries. The case of Albania. *European Scientific Journal*, *8*, 129-141.

[6] Larson, S., Brun, W., Ogaard, T., & Selstad, L. (2011).The effects of sudden and dramatic events on travel desire and risk judgments. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism, 11*, 268-285.

[7] LeitAlo, N.C., & Shahbaz, M. (2016).Economic Growth, Tourism Arrivals and Climate Change. *Bulletin of Energy Economics (BEE),4,* 35-43.

[8] Llorca -Vivero, R. (2008). Terrorism and international tourism: New evidence. *Defense and Peace Economics*, *19*, 169-188. doi. 10.1080/10242690701453917

[9] Martin, C.A., & Witt, S.F. (1988). Substitute prices in models of tourism demand. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*, 255-268. doi. 10.1016/0160-7383(88)90086-2

[10] Morales, J.F. (2003). Measuring the economic contributions of tourism: A proposal for some basic indicators. *EnzoPaci Papers, 3*, 101-140.

[11] Nemati, M., & Raisi, G. (2014). Impact of tourism on economic development. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences, 3*, 368-373.

[12] Neumayer, E. (2004). The impact of political violence on tourism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 48*, 259-281.

[13] Paramati, S.R., Alam, Md. S., & Chen, C.(2016). The effects of tourism on economic growth and co2 emissions: A comparison between developed and developing economies. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56, 712-724. doi.10.1177/0047287516667848

[14] Samitas, A.,Asteriou, D., Polyzos, S., & Kenourgios, D.(2017). Terrorist incidents and tourism demand: Evidence from Greece. *Tourism Management Perspective, 25*, 23-28.

[15] Shakouri, B.,Yazdi, S.K., Nategian, N., & Shikhrezai, N.(2017). The relation between international tourism and economic growth. *Journal and Tourism & Hospitality, 6*, 1-7. doi: 10.4172/2167-0269.1000295.

[16] Sinclair, M.T,.& Stabler, M.(1997).*The economics of tourism.* New York, NY: Routledge.

[17] Spillerman, S., & Stecklov, G. (2009). Societal responses to terrorist attacks. *Annual Review of Sociology, 35*, 167-189.

[18] Syriopoulos, T. (1995). A dynamic model of demand for Mediterranean tourism. *International Review of Applied Economics, 9*, 318-336. doi.org/10.1080/758537633

[19] UNDP. (1990). Human *development report 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[20] UNWTO. (2017).*UNWTO tourism highlights, 2017 edition*. Madrid, Spain: Author. Retrieved from https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284419029

[21] WEF. (2016). *The travel & tourism competitiveness report 2015: Growth through shocks.* Geneva, Switzerland: Author.

[22] Witt, S.F. (1980). An econometric comparison of UK and German foreign holiday behavior. *Managerial and Decision Economics, 1*, 123-131.doi.10.1002/mde.4090010305

[23] Witt, S.F., & Martin, C.A. (1987). Econometric models for forecasting international tourism demand. *Journal of Travel Research, 25*, 23-30. doi.10.1177/004728758702500306

[24] WTTC. (2017). *Travel & tourism economic impact 2017*. London, UK: Author.