

Measuring location selection factors for international resort parks

Chin-Tsai Lin · Pin-Ju Juan

Published online: 10 September 2009
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Abstract This study presents a framework of issues to analyze Porter's (The Competitive Advantage of Nations, 1990) Diamond model, and develops factors for determining the optimality of an international resort park location using the modified Delphi model. A panel of 16 experts from various backgrounds, including academia, government and business, provided input for the selection of location factors. Following three discussions, panel members reached consensus and selected the following set of 26 factors for optimizing location selection for international resort parks. This study also provides direction for applying the proposed model and suggestions for future research.

Keywords International resort park · Competitive advantage · Location selection factor · Diamond model · Modified Delphi method

1 Introduction

Taiwan's Tourism Bureau recently integrated its international advertising and promotion programs. Consequently, marketing activities for Taiwan have been actively targeted to particular tourism markets. The Pacific Asia Travel Association (PATA) forecasts that 347 million travelers will visit the Asia-Pacific region during 2006, representing a 7.83% increase over the previous year (Taiwan Tourism Bureau 2006). In such an intensely competitive tourism marketplace, optimizing the location of international resort parks is a serious goal task. Notably, the Taiwanese government has focused on developing international tourism areas as part of its efforts to realize the objectives in the Doubling Tourism Arrivals Plan.

C.-T. Lin (✉)
Graduate Institute of Business and Management,
Yuanpei University, No. 306, Yuanpei Street, Hsin-Chu City 30015, Taiwan
e-mail: ctlin@mail.ypu.edu.tw

P.-J. Juan
Department of Tourism and Hospitality, Tamkang University,
180, Linwei Road, Chiao-hsi Shiang, I-lan County 26247, Taiwan
e-mail: pj@ocit.edu.tw

Resorts are extremely sensitive to economic conditions at the worldwide. Locations that offer large blocks of land in one or a few titles are favored over those whose holdings are small and fragmented or shared by many individuals (Pearce 1989). Therefore, sufficiently large amounts of land are required for resort development. It must be more extensive than many other developments as it frequently must accommodate ancillary amenities to meet recreational and landscape needs (Gunn 1994).

Location is thus vital to hotel success (Urtasun and Gutierrez 2006). Most resort destinations have outdoor recreational amenities that use large areas of land. Resorts located by seas with clean beaches, in mountains, or near forests, provide different tranquil places to relax and play. Different land has different economic values and, thereby, different political and social implications. One extremely common method is to categorize hotels based on price. Most well-known resort hotels are in the upscale/luxury category; however, developers are beginning to construct economical properties in unconventional locations such as resort areas, center-city redevelopments, and high-tech industrial parks (Gee 1996).

Resorts can offer similar recreational activities, such as golf, swimming, tennis, hiking, boating, and skiing. The geographic target market for such resort properties are generally local, rather than national or international (Knutson et al. 2004). Developing a resort park destination engenders economic, social, and environment problems similar to those faced by urban developments. However, developers and those involved in planning must consider resort and host community relations, employment policy, capital investments, recreation development, infrastructure requirements, social effects, land use, and conservation (Worthington 2003).

Taiwan has considerable growth potential, as demonstrated by the establishment of numerous hotels and increasing competitiveness in the tourism sector relative to its competitors overseas. Location, which is a key strategic decision that has operational implications, has long been recognized in the industry (Jones 1999). In selecting a location, in addition to legislative restrictions, policymakers and business groups rarely address how to best select an optimal location during decision-making; this omission has significant impact on international competitiveness. Based on the resort development model adopted in Bali, Taiwan's Tourism Bureau will conduct feasibility assessments, and initial planning of resort areas (Taiwan Tourism Bureau 2005, 2006). Debbage (1990) found that corporate strategy and competitive economic behavior were significant factors in resort development in the Bahamas. This study develops a framework of issues for considering Porter (1990) Diamond model, and develops appropriate factors for determining the optimality of international resort park locations using a modified Delphi model. This study also provides directions for applying the model and offers suggestions for future research.

2 Location selection

This study first reviews the location factors that can affect growth of international resort parks in a society and the relationship between regional tourism development and the global competitiveness of a nation. This study then incorporates Porter's Diamond model (1990), a tool proposed for investigating competitive advantage at the country level, to generate an analytical framework for examining location selection problems for international resort parks.

2.1 Location selection factors for international resort parks

As location theory emerged, Weber (1909) examined a location problem for a factory. To determine one factory's optimal location by minimizing transportation costs, early location theory focused primarily on processing raw materials, and retail markets. The hospitality industry is unique because it encompasses privately owned, non-profit, and governmental-owned facilities; occasionally these facilities compete for the same customers. Thus, location selection in the hospitality sectors requires models that fit to this unique industry.

The role of land tenure and the influence of government policy in determining the extent and location of tourism facilities warrants further exploration (Pearce 1979). The strategic issue of location can be divided into two principal issues—where to locate a hospitality operation, and the specific issue of selecting a suitable site. In the hospitality industry, the factor central to location decisions is demand. In simple terms, operations are located where demand is highest, and sited such that demand can easily access the operation. Strategic success derives from matching business type and size with available sites (Jones 1999).

Location advantages comprise the size and nature of the city in which a hotel is to be located, the infrastructure within the region, and the perception of the region as an attractive business destination (Johnson and Vanetti 2005). Hammes (1994) suggested that land and labor in the local labor market on Hawaii's Big Island are extremely important to developments. In addition to traditional location factors, such as climate, beaches, and landscape, contemporary national tourism planning adds significant social and economic variables such as rural poverty, employment needs, and potential for regional economic impact to location decisions (Collins 1979).

It is argued that factors affecting tourism location decisions include the population of the surrounding area, spending power of this population, tourist expenditures in the area, quality of transportation links to the location, and competition (Hurley et al. 1998). Reichel et al. (1998) proposed using the seven criteria for location selection. However, Laundtorp and Wanhill (2001) suggested that facilities, infrastructure, local community, attraction, local economy, environment, culture, local structure of industry, and political position are factors key to different stages in a resort's lifecycle.

Resort capacity is a locality-specific factor determined by a combination of forces including the main tourist attractions of the resort, success in developing new tourism generating regions, the support given by local authorities, the support of the local residents for tourism development, the time that resorts take to expand their supply-side capacity, carrying capacity expressed as land available for development, availability of resources such as water, and political factors, composition of new investments in infrastructure, effect of competing resorts, changes over time in the national and international economies, the investment in new transport infrastructure, and distance that the resort lies from its major generating regions (Prideaux 2000).

Among the various studies that have mentioned the power of TV program affecting contemporary social life, some have focused on the influences of TV programs on a location from a tourism-marketing perspective (Kim et al. 2007).

2.2 Diamond model

The Diamond model developed by Porter provides an organizational structure for regional development linked to a theory of competitive behavior that accommodates of Taiwanese international resort parks. This study determines whether Porter's theory of competitive of

advantage and his 1998 notion of business clusters are appropriate for application to international resort parks.

Porter's Diamond model has six elements, and conceptually determines how a nation can succeed in a given industry. Although the elements in the model function independently, an advantage associated with a variable in one element can produce, or improve, the advantage associated with another variable. However, an advantage variable for all elements is not necessary for industry success. Individually and as a system, the determinants of competitive advantage create the context within which national firms are created and competed.

Porter's four determinants and two outside forces interact in the Diamond competitive advantage model, in which national competitiveness depends on interaction formation and quality. According to Porter, the four determinants of a nation shape the competitive environment faced by local firms and enhance or retard the creation of competitive conditions (Porter 1990). The four determinants and two factors are as follows:

1. *Factor endowments* These factors are associated with production, including land, labor and infrastructure, which factors required to compete in an industry. Factors can be generalized or specialized and help or hinder a firm in realizing its potential. Factor endowments are most strongly impacted by domestic rivalries. Local competitors promote the development of skilled human resources, related technologies, market-specific knowledge and specialized infrastructure. Competitors also attempt to develop appropriate factors to gain competitive advantage. When such type factors are developed and specialized in these markets, gaining sustainable competitive advantages is possible. This study adopts labor resources (Hammes 1994; Agarwal 1997), natural resources (Reichel et al. 1998), capital (Agarwal and Brunt 2006), and infrastructure (Hammes 1994; Andriotis 2006) as the four principal factors for international resort park location selection.
 - (a) *Labor resources*: Demand for international resort park personnel, including those engaged in accounting, personnel, purchasing, security, and public relations, and the quality and quantity of specialized talent for hospitability.
 - (b) *Natural resources*: Assessment of physical, chemical and biological environments (including land, water and air) the ecological system (including terrestrial and aquatic species, flora, fauna, and fragile life forms) and the visual environment (namely, landscape and townscapes) is necessary.
 - (c) *Capital*: Building an international resort park requires substantial capital.
 - (d) *Infrastructure*: Infrastructure comprises access of a site for the required utilities, such as water, energy and transportation resources, and communication services.
2. *Demand conditions* These conditions focus on consumer demand in the home country, which motivates firms to enhance their competitiveness. Moreover, demand conditions determine the existence of markets for products versus those for services. Such as essential enterprise advantages are created and sustained in a market, which is where firm strategy is developed and implemented to exploit demand conditions. Naturally, the existence of large and growing market segments for products generates favorable market conditions. For small firms, competitive advantage can be achieved in small niche markets that are often of little interest to large firms. Another characteristic of international resort park is sophisticated and demanding consumers, who typically pressure industrial firms to manufacture particular products. In this study, local economy (Agarwal and Brunt 2006), population (Lasanta et al. 2007), marketing division (Agarwal 1997; Morgan and Pritchard 1999), marketing scope (Morgan and Pritchard 1999), and local resident attitudes (Andriotis 2006) are the principal entities considered under demand conditions.

- (a) *Local economy*: The degree to which a project is expected to generate income at both individual and regional levels.
 - (b) *Population*: This factor comprises an assessment of the number of inhabitants, and demographic and tourism-sector structures.
 - (c) *Marketing division*: For traditional resorts offering sun, sea and sand holidays, major changes to market are required to develop products and services that meet the needs of market segments. Resort assessments have engendered significant market segments, such as the family and mature travel markets, and changed the business travel market.
 - (d) *Marketing scope*: This includes new customers and those displaced from competing resorts—in search for improved location, facilities, standards and prices—and other potential markets that can be serviced (convention facilities, banqueting).
 - (e) *Local resident attitudes*: Relationship of resident attitudes toward tourism as a function of their ability to control and affect decision-making in their community. Resident attitudes are necessary for hospitable and appealing tourist environments. Local resident attitudes can directly influence tourist experiences.
3. *Firm strategy, structure and rivalry* Government policies govern how companies are created, organized, managed, and the context for domestic rivalries (Hill 2007). It encompasses business strategies (Collins 1979; Johnson and Vanetti 2005; Urtasun and Gutierrez 2006), business structures (Papatheodorou 2004), strategic alliances (Medina-Munoz and Garcia-Falcon 2000), policymaker attitudes (Reichel et al. 1998; Prideaux 2000), vision (Michaud and Turner 2006) and entrepreneurial predilection (Altinay 2005, Michaud and Turner 2006) in a given industry.
- (a) *Business strategies*: Assessment of business competitive strategies, such as branding and the globalization of hotel chains.
 - (b) *Business structures*: Assessment of all positions in an organization, including part-time and seasonal positions. Furthermore, people are fundamental to an organization and have varying attitudes, beliefs, talents, abilities, motivations, and behaviors that shape their positions.
 - (c) *Strategic alliances*: Assessment of voluntary relationships between firms involving exchange, sharing, or co-development of products, technologies or services.
 - (d) *Policymaker attitudes*: The board of directors (administrators), consultants (including resort park management and financial personnel) and other professionals who want to retain their share in the international resort park market should focus on tourism operation management and improve tourism offerings.
 - (e) *Visions*: Vision is the assessment of organizational objectives and focus. A vision statement can help an organization achieve defined objectives.
 - (f) *Entrepreneurial predilection*: An entrepreneur as some with a vision for growth, while at the same time being innovative, risk-taking and able to change. Entrepreneurial predilection is the entrepreneur attained through a commitment to find positive and practical for international resort park location selection.
4. *Related and supporting industries* The presence or absence of supplier industries and related industries that compete internationally (Hill 2007). The existence or lack of related and supporting industries can assist (or hinder) the development of an industry. Examples encompass locally economic developed (Andriotis 2006), support of local activities (Kubas et al. 2005; Andriotis 2006), tourist shopping spots, local natural resources (Kubas et al. 2005; Andriotis 2006), local human resources (Andriotis 2006), medical centers and police stations for emergencies and property management information system in question.

- (a) *Locally economic development*: Tourism is increasingly important to national and regional economies.
 - (b) Support of local activities, such as accommodation, food, currency exchange services, souvenirs, and tour guides, is needed.
 - (c) *Tourist shopping spots*: Tourist shopping spot is selling products other than those directly consumed by the resident population are established. The shops might feature resort leisure wear, recreational items as well as art and craft galleries.
 - (d) *Local natural resources*: Offering a large variety of natural attractions, ranging from beautiful countryside scenery.
 - (e) *Local human resources*: Assessment of activities such as biking, hiking, fishing, sightseeing, sailing, bird watching, and golf, and regional cultural heritage such as castles, temples, cultural festivals, museums, manor houses, and aboriginal cultural villages.
 - (f) *Medical center and police station for emergencies*: There is a medical center and police station for emergencies to enter and be stationed in the international resort park.
 - (g) *Property Management Information System*: Records must be stored, processed, and maintained.
5. *Government* Government policy can markedly influence industry success (Andriotis 2006; Kim et al. 2007). For example, subsidies and other support policies influence factor endowments. Furthermore, demand conditions can be impacted by issues such as product regulations and standards. Tourism policies have considerable impact on the potential development of international resort parks; that is, governments clearly influence national competitiveness in the tourism industry. For instance, a government can penalize foreign firms either directly using tariffs, or indirectly through subsidies that provide short-term competitive advantages to domestic firms. Such discriminatory governmental measures shelter domestic firms, help governments prevent development of sustainable (long-term) competitive advantages for foreign firms. Examples include zoning limitations (Andriotis 2006), legal restrictions (Pearce 1979), stable and explicit government policy (Morgan and Pritchard 1999; Andriotis 2006; Kim et al. 2007), political environment (Morgan and Pritchard 1999; Agarwal and Brunt 2006; Andriotis 2006) and county industry policy (Morgan and Pritchard 1999).
- (a) *Zoning limitations*: Existing legislation governs park development.
 - (b) *Legal restrictions*: Assessment of availability and legal status of land suited to development.
 - (c) *Stable and explicit government policies*: Assessment of political stability and explicitness for tourism development, such as Executive Yuan's Challenge 2008 National Development Plan.
 - (d) *Political environment*: Planning regulations, public investment in say, infrastructure, partnership development, and financial incentives comprise the political environment.
 - (e) *County industry policy*: For example the East Taiwan Sustainability Development Plan.
6. *Chance* Many events are outside the control of firms, including inventions, technological breakthroughs, disasters, wars, popularity of television and movies, external political developments and major shifts in foreign market demand. Chance generates discontinuities in that alter competition or the competition itself.

Although some components of the Porter's Diamond model are derivative, the model chooses to focus on firm strategy rather than national strategy. Porter argues that firms, not nations, compete in international markets. To create firm-specific linkages between the four determinants and two external forces, Porter's model is a useful and potentially accurate predictor of future trends. However, Porter's policy recommendations restrict governmental industrial and trade policies rather than liberalizing foreign investment in domestic markets. Examples include disasters (Porter 1998), technical support (Agarwal 2002), technological innovation, the popularity of television and movies (Kim et al. 2007), market demand for major change (Andriotis 2006), utilizing two languages and conflict (Worthington 2003).

- (a) *Disasters*: The tourism market is vulnerable to natural disasters, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, droughts, and cyclones and politically motivated events, such as the coup in Fiji in 2000, the terrorist attack in the United States on September 11, 2001, the Bali attack in 2002, and outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome in Asia in 2003.
- (b) *Technical support*: Assessment capital investment leads to design and use of new production techniques.
- (c) *Technological innovation*: Advances in technology have enhanced the tourism experience and affected the way resorts market to business and leisure travelers.
- (d) *The popularity of television and movies*: Television (TV) is one of the most popular and influential vehicles for organizing consumers. Among the many studies that have examined the power of TV programs to affect contemporary social life, some have focused on the impact of TV programs on specific locations in the context of tourism marketing. Similarly, movies can provide armchair tourists with vicarious experience without incurring the costs associated with travel, time, health, and distance. Tourism literature has analyzed the effects of film on tourist flow, and its economic impact, intangible benefits, negative impact, symbolic meaning and value.
- (e) *Market demand for major change*: A population increase in another region can increase tourism levels; for example, a plastic operation creates a marked variation in demand for a local tourism market.
- (f) *Utilizing two languages*: Resort management can establish a bilingual placard and pamphlet system. Such a system should encompass written and visual materials including booklets, newspapers, magazines, brochures, advertisements, films, official documents, videotapes, photographs captions and web pages that provide information about tourism destinations.
- (g) *Conflict*: Terrorism and crime, such as the nightclub bombings in Bali on October 12, 2002, and bombings in the Philippines, can impact regional and global tourism flows. Tourism typically declines in areas at risk for war, terrorism and crime.

2.3 Modified Delphi method

This exploratory study applied a modified Delphi procedure. The goal of most Delphi applications is the reliable and creative exploration of ideas or production of adequate information for making decisions (Dijk 1986, 1989). The Delphi method is a structured process for collecting and distilling knowledge from a group of experts. Other exploratory studies have adopted the Delphi technique to resolve a specific issue, such as determining marketing strategies suited to a particular destination. Clearly, this technique has significant potential for both qualitative and quantitative tourism research. Miller (2001) cited the need for a "balanced"

panel and argued that an element of judgment must exist in such a spread of experts from different backgrounds, such as academia, government and business.

A consensus meeting following the anonymous written commentary stage is a regular technique that suited this study. Consensus was achieved $\geq 70\%$ of panel members agreed with the selection and application of the selected item. Although the 70% threshold for consensus is arbitrary, it has been utilized by other studies (Hsu and Hsu 2008; Hsu and Chen 2007; Lin and Juan 2009). An additional written commentary stage was conducted when consensus was 50–70%. When consensus was $\leq 50\%$, the item was rejected.

Panel members participating in this study comprised six tourism experts recommended by the potential panelists, and another list of potential panelists was drawn from an initial list of eight authors who published at least one peer-reviewed paper on hospitality development in journals such as the *Annals of Tourism Research*, *Tourism Management*, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *Journal of Outdoor Recreation Study*, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, and the first round of this study. Second, the study utilized snowball sampling (Coleman 1970) using eight internationally recognized hospitality tourism scholars, eight Taiwan Tourism Bureau government officers and eight business representatives from the tourism and hospitality industry identified by the Delphi board.

These experts provided names of potential Delphi panel members. Twenty-four potential panel members were identified, 20 of whom participated in the first round of this study. Prior to the second and third rounds, panel members who agreed to participate in the first round were contacted and the instrument was sent out to those willing to share their expertise in developing a factor set. Consequently, the number of panel members participating in the second and third rounds declined by 19 and 16, respectively, from December 16, 2006 to April 30, 2007. Therefore, the decision-making group, which ranged from 5 to 50 panelists, was not too large (Robbins 1994). Murry and Hammons (1995) argued that the modified Delphi method must summarize the opinions of 10–30 experts. In this study, 16 experts participated in the modified Delphi method-based decision group. Thus, this study used a smaller sample size than that in previous studies. The sampling method utilized in this Delphi study differs from conventional statistical sampling and inference techniques. Expert panel members were selected based on their relevant expertise and experience. To ensure non-interference, expert opinions were accumulated, after which the opinions of tourism administrators and experts are synthesized to identify the primary factors to be considered as quality evaluation criteria for location selection for international resorts in Taiwan.

3 Study methods

The survey instrument was constructed based on a comprehensive analysis of relevant literature and discussions with the Delphi board. The first round questionnaire had three sections—questions regarding definitions, principles, and potential factors. In Sects. 1 and 2 of the questionnaire, panel members were asked define and identify the principles of resort park location selection. Next, based on these definitions, panel members created a list of factors for resort park location selection that are useful in monitoring development progress or problems encountered in six key dimensions of tourism (factor endowments, demanded conditions, related and supporting industries, government, and chance). Panel members were also asked to explain how the proposed factor would be operational. Panel members were allowed complete freedom to investigate the topic and, thus, could elicit the opinions of panel members regarding what they considered to be factors germane to resort park location selection.

A group of seven academics reviewed the initial questionnaire. Delphi study data was recorded and analyzed with Excel software. Quantitative analysis comprised calculation of mean scores and interquartile ranges (IQRs). The experimental results from the first round of open-ended questions for factors for resort park location selection were classified and synthesized for use in the second and third rounds. The Delphi study was conducted as follows.

The first round was a one-day meeting held on November 28, 2006 involving six panel members. Replies to questionnaire were collated into 34 itemized factors or issues.

The second-round questionnaire was distributed to 19 panel members. Respondents were instructed to rate opinions in terms of agreement, disagreement or their opinion in terms of agreement, disagreement or their inability to comment using a five-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. A mean item score of ≥ 3.5 was used as a cutoff point.

Sixteen panel members participated in the third round. To decrease potential biases resulting from group discussions of panel members, statistical feedback (mean score for each item) was utilized when the Delphi panel distributed this round of questionnaires. Questionnaire responses were received from respondents in numerical and text form. Text answers were collated and analyzed for relevance. Generalization was applied such that opinion reflected consensus.

A software package incorporating the simple statistical was implemented efficiently on a personal computer with easy access to the vast quantity of data collected via the Delphi survey. Numerical answers were analyzed statistically. The following parameters were collated while analyzing questionnaire answers:

Mean: Mean is defined as the arithmetic average. In mathematical terms, mean is utilized to assess a frequency or probability distribution.

Interquartile range (IQR): The IQR indicates the range of responses, including the middle 50% and excludes the top and bottom 50% of responses. Quartile-limiting factors Q1 and Q3 were acquired by arranging expert answers in descending order and subdividing them into four equal parts (quartiles). The value between the first and second quartile was the first quartile-limiting factor Q1, whereas that between the third and fourth quartile was the third quartile-limiting factor Q3. In physical terms, the IQR yields the degree of consensus or dispute regarding responses. A low IQR indicates a high degree of consensus and vice versa. The principal goal of the Delphi exercise is to narrow the IQR as much as possible without pressuring the experts. The present used IQR to eliminate factors that had low IQR values, thereby suggesting respondent consensus (Chakravarti et al. 1998).

In addition to these parameters, was also utilized in with IQR. The mode represents the collection of similar responses. In this study, mode was employed to enumerate respondents who expressed a $\geq 75\%$ probability that a particular event will occur. When this value was $>50\%$ for all respondents, consensus was assumed. Hence, in cases where IQR did not reveal consensus, mode reflected the majority opinion.

This combination of mean and IQR was utilized to suggest reasonable consensus among respondents for a particular question (Chakravarti et al. 1998).

4 Study results

The 34 factors for six dimensions were identified. Table 1 summarizes responses from the second and third rounds of the Delphi study along with their mean scores, standard deviation, measurability, and soundness. Table 2 lists the top three sustainable factors for each dimension.

Table 1 The objective factors of each dimension

Dimension	Factors	Mean	IRQ	Rank
Factor endowments				
1	Labor resources	4.8	0.0	1
2	Natural resources	4.8	0.0	1
3	Capital	4.3	0.5	4
4	Infrastructure	4.5	0.5	3
Demand conditions				
1	Local economy	3.4	0.5	Delete
2	Population	3.0	0.5	Delete
3	Marketing division	4.3	0.5	1
4	Marketing scope	4.2	0.5	2
5	Local resident attitudes	3.6	0.5	3
Firm strategy structure and rivalry				
1	Business strategies	4.6	0.5	1
2	Business structures	4.6	0.5	1
3	Strategic alliances	3.4	0.0	Delete
4	Policymaker attitudes	4.3	0.5	4
5	Visions	4.6	0.5	1
6	Entrepreneurial predilection	4.1	0.5	5
Related and supporting industries				
1	Locally economic development	2.4	1.0	Delete
2	Support of local activities	3.0	1.3	Delete
3	Tourist shopping spots	1.8	1.0	Delete
4	Local natural resources	4.2	0.5	1
5	Local human resources	4.1	0.5	2
6	Medical center and police station for emergencies	4.1	1.0	2
7	Property management information system	3.2	0.5	Delete
Government				
1	Zoning limitations	4.8	0.1	1
2	Legal requirements	4.7	0.5	3
3	Stable and explicit government policy	4.4	0.5	4
4	Political environment	4.8	0.0	1
5	County industry policy	4.4	0.0	4
Chance				
1	Disasters	4.1	0.5	4
2	Technical support	3.4	0.5	Delete
3	Technological innovative	4.4	0.5	1
4	The popularity of television and movies	4.0	0.5	5
5	Market demand for major change	4.2	0.5	3
6	Utilizing two languages	4.4	0.5	1
7	Conflict	4.0	0.5	5

Note: Mean: each itemized factor of each category has been rated by panel members from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). Cutoff point: 3.5

Table 2 Checklist factors

Dimension	Factors
Factor endowments	
1	1. Labor resources
2	2. Natural resources
3	3. Infrastructure
4	4. Capital
Demand conditions	
5	1. Marketing division
6	2. Marketing scope
7	3. Local resident attitudes
Firm strategy structure and rivalry	
8	1. Business strategies
9	2. Business structures
10	3. Visions
11	4. Policymaker attitudes
12	5. Entrepreneurial predilection
Related and supporting industries	
13	1. Local natural resources
14	2. Local human resources
15	3. Medical center and police station for emergencies
Government	
16	1. Zoning limitations
17	2. Political environment
18	3. Legal requirements
19	4. Stable and explicit government policy
20	5. County industry policy
Chance	
21	1. Technological innovative
22	2. Utilizing two languages
23	3. Market demand for major change
24	4. Disasters
25	5. The popularity of television and movies
26	6. Conflict

Factors were selected using the following cutoff points: (a) a factor score ≥ 3.5 for the agreement rating (ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5) in the second round survey as a factor scoring ≥ 3.5 is the mid-point between agreement (4) and neutral (3), and neither agree nor disagree); and, (b) during the third round survey, all IQR scores were excluded if they were ≥ 0.5 or ≤ 1 .

Three survey rounds generated 34 factors for resort park location selection. The researchers agreed that the top priorities were vision and legal requirements for resort park location selection.

Four factors/issues were identified in factor endowments. These factors are as follows: labor resources (mean/IQR:4.8/0.0)[agreement mean/interquartile range], natural resources (4.8/0.0), infrastructure (4.5/0.5), and capital (4.3/0.5).

Five factors/issues were identified for demand conditions. These factors include marketing division (4.3/0.5), marketing scope (4.2/0.5), and local resident attitudes (3.5/0.5). Factors local economy (3.4/0.5) and population (3.0/0.5) are deleted.

Six factors/issues were identified in firm strategy structure and rivalry. These factors included business strategies (4.6/0.5), business structures (4.6/0.5), visions (4.6/0.5), policy-maker attitudes (4.3/0.5), and entrepreneurial predilection (4.1/0.5). Factor strategic alliances (3.4/0.0) was deleted.

Seven factors/issues were identified for related and supporting industries. These included the following factors: local natural resources (4.2/0.5), local human resources (4.1/0.5), medical center and police station for emergencies (4.1/1.0). Factors locally developed (2.4/1.0), support of local activities (3.0/1.3), tourist shopping spots (1.8/1.0), and property management information system (3.2/0.5) were deleted.

For government, five factors/issues were identified. These factors were as follows: zoning limitations (4.8/0.1), political environment (4.8/0.0), legal requirements (4.7/0.5), stable and explicit government policy (4.4/0.5), and county industry policy (4.4/0.0).

Seven factors/issues were identified for chance. The factors include the following: technological innovation (4.4/0.5), utilizing two languages (4.4/0.5), radically changing market demand (4.2/0.5), disasters (4.1/0.5), the popularity of television and movies (4.0/0.5), and conflict (4.0/0.5). Factor technical support (3.4/0.5) was deleted.

5 Conclusion and suggestions

After three rounds, the factors identified by the panel were transformed into a checklist. This checklist can assist local governments and the tourism industry in examining the current status of their resources. However, the checklist does not measure development impact or progress, but rather examines the availability of infrastructures needed to meet the general requirements for planning international resort parks. The Delphi panel generated 26 itemized factors (see Table 2) dealing with factor endowments, demand conditions, firm strategy structure and rivalry, related and supporting industries, government and chance. These six components are central conditions when selecting international resort park location. Based on study results, we suggest that the Diamond model is a useful framework for future research and its application will assist developers and planners gain insight into international resort parks.

This study solicited opinions from specialists in hospitality tourism. Further study should operationalize these identified factors and create a set of location selection criteria. The literature review suggests that only a few factors for international resort parks were tested in a destination setting. To enhance the efficiency and effectiveness in using factors to monitor the impact of resort park development and operation, these factors should be tested in a real-world international resort park settings.

Further studies should devise subjective factors for evaluating tourist attitudes towards, satisfaction with, and perceptions of, tourism development, and should test these factors to extend current tourism impact literature. Assessing the implementation of international resort park location using objective and subjective factors can help create competitive advantage.

References

- Agarwal, S.: The resort cycle and seaside tourism: an assessment of its applicability and validity. *Tour. Manag.* **18**(2), 65–73 (1997)
- Agarwal, S.: Restructuring seaside tourism: the resort lifecycle. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **29**(1), 25–55 (2002)

- Agarwal, S., Brunt, P.: Social exclusion and English seaside resorts. *Tour. Manag.* **27**(4), 654–670 (2006)
- Altinay, L.: The intrapreneur role of the development directors in an international hotel group. *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.* **25**(3), 403–419 (2005)
- Andriotis, K.: Hosts, guests and politics: coastal resorts morphological change. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **33**(4), 1079–1098 (2006)
- Chakravarti, A.K., Vasanta, B., Krishnan, A.S.A., Dubash, R.K.: Modified Delphi methodology for technology forecasting case study of electronics and information technology in India. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **58**(1), 155–165 (1998)
- Coleman, J.S.: Relational analysis: the study of social organizations with survey methods. In: Denzin, N.K. (ed.) *Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook*, pp. 115–126. Butterworths, London (1970)
- Collins, C.O.: Site and situation strategy in tourism planning: a Mexican case study. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **6**(3), 251–366 (1979)
- Debbage, K.: Oligopoly and the resort cycle in the Bahamas. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **17**(5), 513–527 (1990)
- Dijk, J.V.: Methods in applied social research: special characteristics and quality standards. *Qual. Quant.* **20**(4), 357–370 (1986)
- Dijk, J.V.: Popularising Delphi method. *Qual. Quant.* **23**(2), 189–203 (1989)
- Gee, C.Y.: *Resort Development and Management*. Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association, Lansing (1996)
- Gunn, C.A.: *Tourist Planning*. Taylor & Francis, Washington, DC (1994)
- Hammes, D.L.: Resort development impact on labor and land markets. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **21**(1), 729–744 (1994)
- Hill, C.W.L.: *International business: competing in the global marketplace*. McGraw-Hill, Boston (2007)
- Hsu, P.F., Chen, B.Y.: Developing and implementing a selection model for bedding chain retail store franchisee using Delphi and fuzzy AHP. *Qual. Quant.* **41**(2), 275–290 (2007)
- Hsu, P.F., Hsu, M.G.: Optimizing the information outsourcing practices of primary care medical organizations using Entropy and TOPSIS. *Qual. Quant.* **42**(2), 181–201 (2008)
- Hurley, S., Moutinho, L., Witt, S.F.: Genetic algorithms for tourism marketing. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **25**(2), 498–514 (1998)
- Johnson, C., Vanetti, M.: Location strategies of international hotel chains. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **32**(4), 1077–1099 (2005)
- Jones, P.: Operational issues and trends in the hospitality industry. *Hosp. Manag.* **18**(4), 427–442 (1999)
- Kim, S.S., Agrusa, J., Lee, H., Chon, K.: Effects of Korean television dramas on the flow of Japanese tourists. *Tour. Manag.* **28**, 1–14 (2007)
- Knutson, B.J., Beck, J.A., Yen, H.H.: Marketing the mid-price independently owned resort: a case study with implications for managers. *J. Hosp. Leis. Mark.* **11**(3), 65–79 (2004)
- Kubas, A., Yilmaz, F., Aktas, Y., Metin, N.: Analysis of visitor decision making system when visiting natural recreation sites by multinomial logit model. *Qual. Quant.* **39**(5), 615–623 (2005)
- Lasanta, T., Laguna, M., Vicente-Serrano, S.M.: Do tourism-based ski resorts contribute to the homogeneous development of the mediterranean mountains? A case study in the central Spanish Pyrenees. *Tour. Manag.* **28**(5), 1326–1339 (2007)
- Laundtorp, S., Wanhill, S.: The resort lifecycle theory: generating processes and estimation. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **28**(4), 947–964 (2001)
- Lin, C.T., Juan, P.J.: Developing a hierarchy relation with an expert decision analysis process for selecting the optimal resort type for a Taiwanese international resort park. *Expert Syst. Appl.* **36**(2), 1706–1719 (2009)
- Medina-Munoz, D., Garcia-Falcon, J.M.: Successful relationships between hotels and agencies. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **27**(3), 737–762 (2000)
- Michaud, J., Turner, S.: Contending vision of a hill-station in Vietnam. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **33**(3), 785–808 (2006)
- Miller, G.: The development of indicators for sustainable tourism: result of a Delphi survey of tourism researchers. *Tour. Manag.* **22**(4), 351–362 (2001)
- Morgan, N.J., Pritchard, A.: *Power and Politics at the Seaside—The Development of Devon's Resorts in the Twentieth Century*. University of Exeter Press, Exeter (1999)
- Murry, J.W., Hammons, J.O.: Delphi: a versatile methodology for conducting qualitative research. *Rev. High. Educ.* **18**(4), 423–436 (1995)
- Papatheodorou, A.: Exploring the evolution of tourism resorts. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **31**(1), 219–237 (2004)
- Pearce, D.G.: Towards a geography of tourism. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **6**(3), 245–272 (1979)
- Pearce, D.G.: *Tourist Development*. Longman Scientific & Technical, New York (1989)
- Porter, M.E.: *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. Free Press, New York (1990)
- Porter, M.E.: Clusters and the new economics of competition. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **76**(6), 77–90 (1998)
- Prideaux, B.: The resort development spectrum: a new approach to modeling resort development. *Tour. Manag.* **21**(3), 225–240 (2000)

- Reichel, A., Mehrez, A., Altman, S.: Neve-Ilan, Israel: a site selection and business feasibility case study. *Tour. Manag.* **19**(2), 161–170 (1998)
- Robbins, S.P.: *Management*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River (1994)
- Taiwan Tourism Bureau.: *Annual Report on Tourism 2004*. Tourism Bureau, MOTC, Taiwan (2005)
- Taiwan Tourism Bureau.: *2006 Annual Report on Tourism 2005*. Tourism Bureau, MOTC, Taiwan (2006)
- Urtasun, A., Gutierrez, I.: Hotel location in tourism cities: Madrid 1936–1998. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **33**(2), 382–402 (2006)
- Weber, A.: *Theory of the Location of Industries*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago (1909)
- Worthington, B.: Change in an Estonian resort: contrasting development contexts. *Ann. Tour. Res.* **30**(2), 369–385 (2003)