Evaluation of Leading Tourist Destination's Official Websites using the Balanced Score-Card Approach

Himanshu Singh[1] (Dav Insitute of Management)

Jeannie Bhatia[2] (Dav Insitute of Management)

Abstract

In the recent digitization era, transformation has been observed from traditional modes to the modern and effective ones, in the way people communicate, gather information and in terms of the factors that make or break a decision to travel. Recognizing the significance of electronic platform and online media in tourism and hospitality industry, the present study is intended at a comparative content analysis of the official tourism websites of world's top tourist destinations by incorporating the modified Balanced Score Card (BSC) approach. The top ten tourist destinations worldwide that comprise a major share of the global tourism have been examined on a set of critical success factors under the perspective of technical performance, user friendliness and site attractiveness, tourism effectiveness and food tourism effectiveness. Moreover, the study attempts to suggest some meaningful remedial measures in order to embolden the tourism promotion through official web portals of the destinations.

Keywords: World's top tourist destinations, tourism websites, balanced scorecard, DMOs.

Introduction

Being amongst the world's most important and rapidly expanding industries, the economic consequences of Tourism and Hospitality will continue to grow steadily. The Global Tourism industry after topping the 1 billion mark in 2012, grew by 4.3 per cent in terms of tourist arrivals from 1087 million in 2013 to 1133 million in 2014. The industry is worth $1.5 trillion (including export earnings through international passenger transport services) in 2014 with revenues rising nearly 4 per cent over the last year (UNWTO, 2014, 2015). Tourism and hospitality industry is one of the largest and most vibrant industries that constitute nearly 9 per cent of total GDP and generate 1 in every 11 jobs that signifies 9 per cent of the employment globally (International Labor Organization, 2010).

Over the past six decades tourism has continued to expand and diversify with emergence of new tourist destinations and traveler's interests. Consequently, despite periodic shocks, international tourist arrivals have shown uninterrupted growth from just 25 million in 1950 to 277 million in 1980 and from 435 million in 1990 to 674 million in 2000 (UNWTO, 2013). Moreover, in last two decades the industry has steadily grown at 3.5 to 4 per cent annually, except for the sporadic downfall during the economic recessions in 2001-02 and then in 2009. Post the recent global recession phase in 2009, although it was a crumpled recovery, but the industry generally instigated the recovery in 2010. The industry achieved the significant and historic milestone of 1 billion visitors worldwide in 2012 for the first time. The industry with

an average growth rate of 3.3 per cent annually has registered fifth consecutive year of robust growth in 2014 (UNWTO, 2015).

The global tourism is characterized partially by Pareto's 80-20 rule and just the top ten tourist destinations itself comprise nearly 40 percent of the global tourist arrivals and receipts. According to the statistics, seven of the top ten tourist destinations including France on top, Spain, Italy, Turkey, Germany, United Kingdom and Russian Federation are located in Europe, Two including United States and Mexico in the Americas, along with China from the Asia and Pacific Region. Most of these top tourist destinations have appeared in the top ten list for a number of years now. Table 1 shows the list of top tourist destinations based on number of international tourist arrivals along with receipts.

Table 1: International tourist arrivals and receipts at the leading tourist destinations

Rank	Country	International Tourist Arrivals					International Tourism Receipts				
		(in Million)			Change (%)		(in Billion US$)			Change %	
		2012	2013	2014	13/12	14/13	2012	2013	2014	13/12	14/13
1	France	83	83.6	83.7	2	0.1	53.6	56.7	55.4	5.6	-2.3
2	United States	66.7	70	74.8	5	6.8	126.2	172.9	177.2	7	2.5
3	Spain	57.5	60.7	65	5.6	7.1	56.3	62.6	65.2	7.6	4.2
4	China	57.7	55.7	55.6	-3.5	-0.1	50	51.7	56.9	3.3	10.2
5	Italy	46.4	47.7	48.6	2.9	1.8	41.2	43.9	45.5	6.6	3.7
6	Turkey	35.7	37.8	39.8	5.9	5.3	25.3	27.9	29.5	10.4	5.5
7	Germany	30.4	31.5	33	3.7	4.6	38.1	41.3	43.3	8.2	5
8	United Kingdom	29.3	31.1	32.6	6.1	5	36.2	41	45.3	12.1	10.3
9	Russian Federation	25.7	28.4	29.8	10.2	5.3	10.7	11.9	11.7	11.4	-1.9
10	Mexico	22.4	24.2	29.1	3.2	20.5	12.7	13.9	16.2	9.4	16.5
	Total	**454.8**	**470.7**	**492**	**3.4**	**4.5**	**450.3**	**523.8**	**546.2**	**16.3**	**4.2**

Source: World Tourism Organization (UNWTO, 2015)

Since these destinations comprise significant part of the global tourism and are projected to continue their supremacy in the coming years, the growth and performance of these nations shall determine the course of overall global industry, and consequently, it is important to understand the dynamics and features of these destinations.

Subsequently, the global tourism trends also reveal that over the last few years the role of e-media, internet and web resources have become noteworthy. According to the statistics the online travel booking revenue was more than 309 billion US$ in 2011 accounting to more than 29 percent of the total tourism receipts that rose to 470 billion US$ in 2014 comprising nearly 38 per cent of the total receipts worldwide (Statista, 2016). This significant increase in the popularity of the online mode as a source of information and transactions can't be ignored as far as the tourism industry is concerned. Considering the trends it may also be inferred that in the coming years the tourist destinations which would be able to capture and capitalize on this mode of operation, will lead the industry worldwide.

As the current top destinations are anticipated to decide the direction of the future trends in short and long term, and the use of online mode of operations is expected to surpass that of other mediums, it is significant to study the status of the gateway portals of these vital

destinations. Thus, taking note of the prologue, the presented study aims at evaluating the official tourism portals of the world's leading tourist destinations.

Literature review

In today's era of digitalization and electronic media, the online and web resources have become crucial and possess a vital position when it comes to information search. From the perspective of the information providers, the increasing competition and costs associated with disseminating information to masses, communication, purchases and marketing, the commercial internet applications have been noted to have immense potential as a primary platform of utmost importance in hospitality and tourism industry (Burger et al., 1997; Clyde & Landfried, 1995; Corigliano & Baggio, 2006; Law, Qi, & Buhalis, 2010).

With the burst in the number of online subscribers and users, the swelling transactions and trade using the electronic platform, the popularity of the technology is apparent. Thus a timely and appropriate utilization of this resource in order to extend an experience which shall become the gateway of any nation's tourism, is required (Alastair M. Morrison, Taylor, & Douglas, 2004). Moreover, the stakeholders needs to continuously improve, enhance and manage it to reap the benefits of this platform (Corigliano & Baggio, 2006).

With the advent of the online and electronic platform, numerous studies have advocated the importance of assessing a website's effectiveness and proposed various frameworks for its evaluation. Most of these studies examined the technical aspects like functionality, usability, hit rate, log analysis and other network statistics (Evans & King, 1999; Fletcher, Poon, Pearce, & Comber, 2002; Patton, 2002; Sterne, 2003; Stout, 1996; Yeung & Lu, 2004).

Schmidt & Spreng (1996) highlighted the influence of the travel related information disseminated online on travel decisions. MacKay & Fesenmaier (1997) highlighted the influence of pictures shared on the websites on prospective tourists' mind. Baggio (2003) analyzed the end-user evaluations and mapping contents and services offered online in European context. Giannopoulos & Mavragani (2011) described the use of information and communication technologies in the website design by the European official tourism portals.

Internet and the portals as a source of marketing tool and knowledge pertaining to local food and cuisines was highlighted by Kivela (2006). Horng & Tsai (2010) suggested that a platform for online itinerary planning and convenient final bookings, for accommodation, sight-seeing or food, can help in converting a potential tourist into a visitor. Thus, taken into consideration the facades of using images, information propagation relating to food and cuisine, an interface for planning itinerary and other factors, the government agencies and tourism boards should create portals that are aptly designed; are attention seeking and thought provoking; and provide crucial information for travelers to make informed decisions (Fletcher et al., 2002; Horng & Tsai, 2010; Kivela, 2006; MacKay & Fesenmaier, 1997).

Weeks & Crouch (1999) researched the aspects like inclusion of audio and video on the web pages, provision of maps of locations, emphasis on updated information and a provision for e-shopping, and found them significantly relevant. Lexhagen & Nysveen (2001) also emphasized on the importance of reservation services and other value added services. Important contact information, management functionality of the sites and use of web sites for promotion and advertising of local events, cuisine and other services have also been focused

upon by numerous authors including Kim & Kim (2010; Rand, Heath, & Alberts (2003); Seo, Yun, & Kim (2014); So & Morrison, (2003); Tanrisevdi & Duran (2011).

Based on the work of Kaplan & Norton (1992) on Balanced Scorecard, Morrison, Taylor, Morrison, & Morrison, (1999); So & Morrison (2004); (Alastair M. Morrison et al., 2004) devised the approach for the website analysis in the hotel and tourism industry. In the subsequent years, the approach was modified and adopted by various authors including Douglas & Mills (2004); Kline, Morrison, & John (2004); Dahiya & Duggal (2015); Himanshu & Jeannie (2015). The approach and model initially focused on technical aspect, user friendliness, overall attractiveness, and other related parameters. Lately the model was further developed and aspects like Tourism orientation and factors pertaining to food tourism were added (Dahiya & Duggal, 2015; Kim & Kim, 2010).

The review and prologue suggests that the prevailing scenario is characterized by changing consumer perceptions, intensifying significance of technology and the altering decision making patterns of travelers. Accordingly, for the present research, the portals of the top tourism destinations will be studied on four perspectives including technical; user friendliness and site attractiveness; tourism effectiveness and food tourism effectiveness, under the modified balanced score-card approach.

Methodology

The main purpose of the presented study is to analyze the content and performance of the official tourism websites of the world's leading tourist destinations on the identified perspectives. And subsequently to suggest country specific remedial measures on the evaluated parameters for the official tourism websites of the sampled destinations, in order to overcome the shortcomings and improve the overall tourist experience.

The research instrument

The study deliberates the Balanced Scorecard (BSC) approach devised by Morrison et al. (1999) based on Kalpan and Norton's work. Morrison et al. (1999) determined four balanced perspectives for the comprehensive evaluation of the websites including technical, customer, internal and marketing aspects having 25 Critical Success Factors. It was amongst the initial studies in tourism industry using the BSC approach in web site evaluation. This approach was thereafter adopted in evaluating the websites of various hospitality and tourism businesses in modified versions by (Dahiya & Duggal (2013, 2015); Douglas & Mills (2004); Feng, Morrison, & Ismail (2004); Kline et al. (2004); So & Morrison (2004) in their respective studies.

For the present study, a structured questionnaire developed by Dahiya & Duggal (2015) based on Morrison et al. (1999) was adopted as it is, consisting of 88 Critical success factors. The factors focus on information services offered on the websites, and are divided under four major perspectives with equal amount of weightage including *Technical, User Friendliness and Site Attractiveness, Tourism Effectiveness and Food Tourism Effectiveness*.

Survey sample design

For the study, the official tourism websites of the top ten tourist destinations, based on international tourist arrivals (as per UNWTO, 2015), have been selected as the sample.

Table 2: The official websites (URL) of the Nations considered for the Study

S. No.	Country	URL Address (Official Tourism Website)*
1.	France	http://us.france.fr/
2.	United States	http://www.gousa.in/
3.	Spain	http://www.spain.info/en/
4.	China	http://www.travelchina.gov.cn/
5.	Italy	http://www.italia.it/en/home.html
6.	Turkey	https://goturkey.com/
7.	Germany	http://www.germany.travel/en/index.html
8.	United Kingdom	http://www.visitbritain.com/en/EN/
9.	Russian Federation	http://www.russiatourism.ru/en/
10.	Mexico	http://www.visitmexico.com/

The list of websites includes only the official tourism portals maintained by the sampled nations

Analysis pattern

a. Technical Aspect: To evaluate the technical qualities of a website, objective measures and tools like Total Validator (https://www.totalvalidator.com) and Power Mapper (http://www.powermapper.com) have been used. By means of tools, five aspects including Link check, HTML code check, Browser compatibility, Load time and Spell check, that were originally assessed by Morrison et al. (1999); and Dahiya & Duggal (2015) on a 5-point Likert scale, were evaluated.

b. User-friendliness and Site Attractiveness: It comprises of three criterions: ease of contact (7 factors); ease of navigation (6 factors); and site attractiveness (12 factors), with 25 items in all under them. In order to reduce the level of potential evaluator subjectivity, for all the remaining three perspectives including this one, Morrison et al. (1999) measurements scales are changed from Likert formats to nominal scale - yes/no questions to indicate the presence or absence of critical success factors on the portal.

c. Tourism Effectiveness Perspective: To promote tourism, an effective website has to be informative and interactive fetching all the details about the tourist destination. Under this perspective, 35 CSFs distributed under four criterions including: information dimension (18 factors); accessibility (3 factors); communication dimension (9 factors); and management of website (5 factors), have been evaluated using a nominal scale - yes/no responses.

d. Food Tourism Effectiveness Perspective: To promote Food tourism, an effective website has to be informative and interactive fetching all the details about the culinary tourism of tourist destination. The food tourism perspective has been evaluated on 23 CSFs under four criterions: food culture information dimension (5 factors); food information (5 factors); food promotion via marketing (7 factors); and food search friendliness and customer orientation (6 factors), on a nominal scale with yes/no responses.

Each perspective was assigned a weighted score of 25 points out of a total weighted score of 100 points for the four perspectives combined. The above data has been collected and analyzed during period of October and November in year 2015.

Findings

In contemplation of the primary objective of the study the content analysis and performance evaluation was undertaken for the official tourism websites of the world's leading tourist destinations on the identified perspectives. Based on the analysis and evaluation the weighted scores of the sampled leading tourist destinations were calculated and are presented in Table 3 below.

It may be inferred on the basis of analysis that the tourism portal of United States with the highest total score and with a significant 88.48 rating points is the best amongst the sampled portals. With Scores above 80 rating points, the portal of United Kingdom secures second position in the list, followed by France, Germany and Spain. The portals of Turkey and Italy follow the ranking with a good score between 70 to 80 points and with scores between 60 and 70, the portals of Mexico and China may perhaps be rated as average. Only the portal of Russian Federation among the top ten destinations scored poorly on almost all the perspectives securing a total of 44.29 rating points.

Further, in regard to the four aspects discretely, it may be inferred that almost all the portals fared well on the perspective of *tourism effectiveness* and on parameters of *user-friendliness and site attractiveness* with a mean scores of 21.57 and 20.50 respectively. However, on aspect of the *food tourism effectiveness* and *technical aspect*, with a mean score of 16.63 and 16.00, there is a large scope of improvement for most of the portals.

Food and cuisine is one of the major attractions for the international tourist while travelling to these top tourist destinations whereas it was observed that the state of the official portals of the sampled destinations was not really up to the mark in most of the cases except for the portals of United States, France, Germany and United Kingdom. On this aspect, the portal of Russia with no information, and with portals of China and Turkey scoring below 40 percent and below 60 percent respectively, need a lot of improvement on all the sub factors. Whereas, the portals of Mexico, lacked majorly on information related to food promotion and food search friendliness.

table 3: Weighted score results on website evaluation of the sampled destinations

Sl. No.	Countries	Technical Aspect Perspective (25 Points)	User-friendliness and Site Attractiveness Perspective (25 Points)	Tourism Effectiveness Perspective (25 Points)	Food Tourism Effectiveness Perspective (25 Points)	Total Score (100 Points)
1	France	16.00	21.00	22.14	23.91	**83.05**
2	United States	19.00	22.00	23.57	23.91	**88.48**
3	Spain	17.00	21.00	22.86	19.57	**80.43**
4	China	18.00	20.00	20.71	9.78	**68.49**
5	Italy	11.00	22.00	20.71	17.39	**71.10**
6	Turkey	15.00	21.00	23.57	13.04	**72.61**
7	Germany	17.00	22.00	22.14	21.74	**82.88**
8	United Kingdom	19.00	23.00	23.57	20.65	**86.22**

9	Russian Federation	15.00	15.00	14.29	0.00	**44.29**
10	Mexico	13.00	18.00	22.14	16.30	**69.44**
	Mean Score	**16.00**	**20.50**	**21.57**	**16.63**	

In regard to the aspect of *tourism effectiveness* perspectives, tourism portals of United States, Turkey, United Kingdom and Mexico scored significantly higher rating scores and provide sufficient information to their travelers. Whereas, the portals of France, Spain, Germany, Italy and China scored nearly 80 percent points and were lacking majorly on the management of the website. The portal of Russian Federation with a below average score lacked on both the management of website and the dimensions of communication. Moreover, almost all the portals irrespective of the total scores did not provide information in regard to basic factors like website feedback, e-shop, portal updating, feature of help, information on local products and souvenir.

Almost all the portals provided information and services pertaining to the factors of *user-friendliness and site attractiveness* with portal of United Kingdom being the most informative, followed by portals of United States, Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Turkey and China with all scoring well above 80 per cent. Besides, Mexico also scored more than 70 percent but lost rating points on aspect of ease of contact, whereas portal of Russian Federation with a score of 60 percent missed even on some basic aspects related to site attractiveness.

On the *technical* aspect all the portals faced issues on at least one or more facets. Though, except for the portal of Italy that scored just above 40 percent and portal of Mexico with 50 percent, the rest of the portals secured at least 60 percent or more in technical performance. This is one area where all the portals have a huge scope for improvement in order to provide a hassle free experience to the visitors.

From the inferences, findings and observations above, it is clearly visible that the official tourism websites of most of the top ten destinations fared well on perspective of *tourism effectiveness* and *user-friendliness and site attractiveness*, coped somehow well on food information but failed on technical perspective. All the portals in totality scored above average except for the portal of Russian Federation which was rated low on all the parameters.

Discussions

In accordance to the objectives and purpose of the study and based on the analysis, observations and identified shortcomings, the subsequent section discusses and suggests some country specific recommendations on the analyzed perspectives and parameters. The official portals of the sampled destinations may incorporate the following suggestions, in order to improve the overall performance and become more informative and meaningful from the tourist outlook.

- With top rating points the official tourism portals of United States and United Kingdom have fared excellently on all the perspectives except technical aspect where the major issue was in the HTML check parameter. Further in case of United Kingdom's portal the

factor of food information under food tourism perspective was also a matter of concern. Thus, they may be suggested to improvise on the HTML code errors under technical and some minute aspects of other perspective in order to make their portals more effective.

- The official portals of France, Germany and Spain also scored high rating points on all the perspectives except Technical aspects, with specific issues in HTML codes in case of France and Germany. The France's portal also featured some bad links, whereas Spain's Portal lost scores due to spelling errors. Further, all the three portals of France, Germany and Spain were also not up to the mark on the factor of website management under the tourism effectiveness perspective. Consequently they may be recommended to adlib on the shortcomings to make their portals more technically sound and effective on tourism perspective.

- Turkey's official tourism portal scored significantly high on the perspective of user friendliness and site attractiveness along with the tourism effectiveness. The area of concern includes food promotion where the portal may improve by inculcating information related to food tours, links to their celebrity chefs and other audio/videos promotion features. It may further furnish information in regard to their cuisines, restaurant search, regional dishes and their recipes, under the aspect of food search friendliness and customer orientation and by including discussion forums on food in the food tourism perspective. Turkey's tourism portal also needs to debug the HTML Code errors and other technical aspects to improvise on the technical perspective.

- With significantly low rating points on the perspective of Technical aspects, the portals of Italy and Mexico fared poorly with prolonged load time, spelling errors and bugs in HTML codes. The portal of Italy also exposed some bad web-links under the perspective. Furthermore, the portal of Italy was lacking in the website management whereas Mexico's portal did not provide adequate contact information. The portal of Mexico also lacked on the food tourism perspective and did not focus on food information and food search friendliness and customer orientation. Therefore in order to extemporize the tourist experience the portals of Italy and Mexico, may be suggested to curtail the stated issues and build upon by including the missing information in the stated perspectives.

- The portal of the only top listed Asian member, China, scored reasonably well in almost all the factors under Tourism effectiveness and the user-friendliness and site attractiveness, except for missing information in regard to the website management. The portal also fared well in the Technical perspective apart from some HTML code errors. But alarmingly the portal performed poorly in the food tourism perspective and failed to provide general food information even on ethnic cuisines and their recipes, information on food tours, their celebrity chefs or audio/videos promoting food. The portal also missed out on almost all the aspects of food search and customer orientation. By taking into account the stated deficiencies, the portal of China can review, titivate and offer a better and more comprehensive experience to the visitors specifically under the food tourism perspective.

- The official tourism of Russian federation was observed to be an exception, with significantly low scores and below average rating points. In totality the portal does not contain any information in regard to food tourism, and also fared poorly on all the other perspectives. Issues were noted in the HTML codes and errors in links under the technical perspective and the portal scored feebly on attractiveness with no images or backgrounds. Moreover, website scored very low on communication dimension and the website management with no information on basic needs like transport, accommodation, shopping etc., and except for few initial pages there was no multi-lingual information as well. Thus, there is a huge scope for improvement under all the perspectives and the tourism stakeholders in decision making in Russia, may be suggested to look into these

shortcomings, since the e-tourism support comprise a major part of the tourism and hospitality industry in the current scenario.

By adopting and incorporating the suggested remedial measures, the portals of the sampled tourist destinations shall definitely have all the ingredients of a successful website and thus cater to information needs of tourists striving for a convenient and hassle free tourism experience along with the food tourism; and other important and basic perspectives considerate for the stakeholders.

References

Baggio, R. (2003). A Websites Analysis of European Tourism Organizations. *Anatolia*, *14*(2), 93–106.

Burger, F., Kroiß, P., Pröll, B., Richtsfeld, R., Sighart, H., & Starck, H. (1997). Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 1997: Proceedings of the International Conference in Edinburgh, Scotland, 1997. In A. M. Tjoa (Ed.) (pp. 180–189). Vienna: Springer Vienna.

Clyde, S., & Landfried, T. (1995). Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 1995: Proceedings of the International Conference in Innsbruck, Austria, 1995. In W. Schertler, B. Schmid, A. M. Tjoa, & H. Werthner (Eds.). Wien: Springer-Verlag Wien.

Corigliano, M. A., & Baggio, R. (2006). Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2006: Proceedings of the International Conference in Lausanne, Switzerland, 2006. In M. Hitz, M. Sigala, & J. Murphy (Eds.) (pp. 320–331). Vienna: Springer Vienna.

Dahiya, A., & Duggal, S. (2013). Websites of Hotel Management Institutes (HMIs) in India: An Empirical Study of Central and State Government Institutes. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Systems*, *6*(2), 22–33.

Dahiya, A., & Duggal, S. (2015). Evaluating the Official Websites of SAARC Countries on their Web Information on Food Tourism. *Asia Pacific Journal of Information Systems (APJIS)*, *25*(1), 145–162.

Douglas, A., & Mills, J. E. (2004). Staying Afloat in the Tropics. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *17*(2-3), 269–293.

Evans, J. R., & King, V. E. (1999). Business-to-Business Marketing and the World Wide Web : Planning , Managing , and Assessing Web Sites. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *28*(4), 343–358.

Feng, R., Morrison, A. M., & Ismail, J. A. (2004). East versus West: A comparison of online destination marketing in China and the USA. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *10*(1), 43–56.

Fletcher, P., Poon, A., Pearce, B., & Comber, P. (2002). *Practical web traffic analysis: Standards, privacy, techniques, results.* Birmingham: Glasshaus.

Giannopoulos, A. A., & Mavragani, E. P. (2011). Traveling Through the Web: A First Step Toward a Comparative Analysis of European National Tourism Websites. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *20*(7), 718–739.

Himanshu, & Jeannie. (2015). Evaluation of Oicial Tourism Websites of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) using the Balanced Score-Card Approach. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems*, *8*(2), 64–73.

Horng, J. S., & (Simon) Tsai, C. T. (2010). Government websites for promoting East Asian culinary tourism: A cross-national analysis. *Tourism Management*, *31*(1), 74–85.

International Labor Organization. (2010). *Developments and challenges in the hospitality and tourism sector*. *Global Dialogue Forum for Hotels, Catering, Tourism Sector*.

Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1992). The balanced scorecard--measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, *70*(1), 71–79.

Kim, Y. H., & Kim, M. (2010). A New Approach for Assessment and Comparison of Websites: Using the Modified Balanced Scorecard and Analytical Hierarchy Process. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *19*(6), 676–695.

Kivela, J. (2006). Tourism and Gastronomy: Gastronomy's Influence on How Tourists Experience a Destination. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, *30*(3), 354–377.

Kline, S. F., Morrison, A. M., & John, A. St. (2004). Exploring Bed & Breakfast Websites: A Balanced Scorecard Approach. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *17*(2/3), 269–293.

Law, R., Qi, S., & Buhalis, D. (2010). Progress in tourism management: A review of website evaluation in tourism research. *Tourism Management*.

Lexhagen, M., & Nysveen, H. (2001). An Update on Swedish and Norwegian Tourism Websites - The Importance of Reservation Services and Value-added Services. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, *1*(2), 150–154.

MacKay, K. J., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1997). Pictorial element of destination in image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *24*(3), 537–565.

Morrison, A. M., Taylor, J. S., & Douglas, A. (2004). Website Evaluation in Tourism and Hospitality. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *17*(2-3), 233–251.

Morrison, A. M., Taylor, S., Morrison, A. J., & Morrison, A. D. (1999). Marketing Small Hotels on the World Wide Web. *Information Technology and Tourism*, *2*, 97–113.

Patton, S. (2002). E-Commerce Tools: Web Metrics That Matter. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from http://www.cio.com/article/2440393/metrics/e-commerce-tools--web-metrics-that-matter.html

Rand, G. E. Du, Heath, E., & Alberts, N. (2003). The Role of Local and Regional Food in

Destination Marketing. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *14*(3-4), 97–112.

Schmidt, J. B., & Spreng, R. A. (1996). A Proposed Model of External Consumer Information Search. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *24*(3), 246–256.

Seo, S., Yun, N., & Kim, O. Y. (2014). Destination food image and intention to eat destination foods: a view from Korea. *Current Issues in Tourism*, (November), 1–22.

So, S.-I. A., & Morrison, A. M. (2003). Destination Marketing Organizations' Web stie Users and Nonusers: A Comparison of Actual Visits and Revisit Intentions. *Information Technology & Tourism*, *6*(2), 129–139.

So, S.-I. A., & Morrison, A. M. (2004). Internet Marketing in Tourism in Asia: An Evaluation of the Performance of East Asian National Tourism Organization Websites. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, *11*(4), 93–118.

Statista. (2016). Forecast of Online travel Sales Worldwide. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from http://www.statista.com/statistics/499694/forecast-of-online-travel-sales-worldwide/

Sterne, J. (2003). *Web Metrics: Proven Methods for Measuring Web Site Success*. John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=eXy0eIYzJ48C&pgis=1

Stout, R. (1996). *Web Site Stats: Tracking Hits and Analyzing Web Traffic*. Osborne/McGraw-Hill. Retrieved from http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=541254

Tanrisevdi, A., & Duran, N. (2011). Comparative Evaluation of the Official Destination Websites from the Perspective of Customers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *20*(7), 740–765.

UNWTO. (2013). UNWTO Tourism Highlights. UNWTO.

UNWTO. (2014). UNWTO Tourism Highlights. UNWTO.

UNWTO. (2015). UNWTO Tourism Highlights. UNWTO.

Weeks, P., & Crouch, I. (1999). Sites for Sore Eyes: An Analysis of Australian Tourism and Hospitality Web Sites. *Information Technology and Tourism*, *2*(3-4), 153–172. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/cog/itt/1999/00000002/00000003/art00003

Yeung, W. L., & Lu, M. (2004). Functional characteristics of commercial web sites: a longitudinal study in Hong Kong. *Information & Management*, *41*(4), 483–495.

Annex 1: List of evaluated CSFs under the four perspectives

Technical Aspect Perspective	User-friendliness and Site Attractiveness Perspective	Tourism Effectiveness Perspective	Food Tourism Effectiveness Perspective
Link Check **HTML Check** **Browser Compatibility** **Load Time** **Spell Check**	**Ease of Contact** 1. Telephone Number 2. Mailing Address 3. E-mail 4. Fax Number 5. FAQ 6. Site Map/ Index 7. Follow us **Ease of Navigation** 1. Clear & Effective Navigation Tools on each pages 2. Availability of Home Button on all pages 3. Limited Vertical Scrolling 4. Limited Horizontal Scrolling 5. Availability of a search engine for website content 6. Links to required plug-ins provided **Site Attractiveness** 1. Clear and Readable text 2. Clear and Uncluttered pages 3. Sufficient contrast between background and text 4. Effective and aesthetically appealing	**Information Dimension** 1. Country Geography 2. Country History 3. Country Culture 4. Tourist Attraction information 5. Events/Festivals Information 6. Restaurant/ Accommodation Information 7. Event Calendar 8. Entertainment Information (Festivals/ sports/recreation) 9. Maps and Direction 10. Travel Packages 11. Travel Guides /Brochures 12. Tourist Regulations 13. Transportation Information 14. Links to Tourist Destination 15. Shopping Information 16. Travel Tips & Facilitation 17. Weather Information 18. Special Local products and Souvenir Information **Accessibility** 1. Visa on Arrival 2. List of Embassies	**Food Culture Information Dimension** 1. Traditional Foods/ Drinks Information 2. Representative Cuisines 3. Featured Food & Drinks (seasonal/ festive) 4. Eating Manner / Local/Food Dinning Customs or etiquettes 5. Representative of culinary professionals who have partly contributed to food culture identity of nation **Food Information** 1. Information about representative cuisines 2. International Cuisines (ethnic/ fusion cuisines) 3. Featured food recipes 4. Mobile application 5. Hygiene Standards related information **Food Promotion via Marketing** 1. Texts and Articles for food tourism marketing 2. Photos of people eating at restaurant 3. Photos of food/ Food Wall Papers 4. Articles about promotion of food tour organizers 5. News about food related happenings (food shows/ food festivals etc.) 6. Links to celebrity chefs

	backgrounds	& websites promoting nations culinary assets
	5. Images reinforcing text content	3.Visa Formalities	7.Videos/ Online channels promoting food
	6. Use of color to improve the visual appeal of the site	**Communication Dimension**	**Food Search Friendliness & Customer Orientation**
	7. Effective use of web page space	1.E mail News letter 2.Press Release 3.Announcements 4.Search Function	1. Easy search about type of restaurant
	8. Hyperlin ks Readability	5.Brochure Request Capabilities 6.Share Key	2. Food categories (breakfast, lunch, dinner)
	9. Good Quality pictures	7.Destination Logo/ Slogan 8.Multilingual	3. Hotels and Popular Eateries
	10. Audio 11. Visual / Virtual Tour	9.Links to Social Media	4. Online booking to the food events / shows
	12. Photo Album	**Management of Website**	5. Links to regional dishes
		1. Last update 2. Links to partners	6. Food Discussion Forum
		3. Help 4. E-shop	
		5. Website Feedback form	

Annex 2: Summary table of parameter wise scores

Sl. No.	Countries		France	United States	Spain	China	Italy	Turkey	Germany	United Kingdom	Russian Federation	Mexico
	Technical Aspect Perspective	**25**	**16**	**19**	**17**	**18**	**11**	**15**	**17**	**19**	**15**	**13**
1	Link Check	5	1	5	4	4	1	3	4	5	2	5
2	HTML Check	5	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Browser Compatibility	5	5	4	4	4	5	3	5	5	4	3
4	Load Time	5	5	5	4	5	2	5	3	4	4	2
5	Spell Check	5	4	4	2	4	2	3	4	4	4	2
	User-friendliness and Site Attractiveness Per.	**25**	**21**	**22**	**21**	**20**	**22**	**21**	**22**	**23**	**15**	**18**
1	Ease of Contact	7	5	6	4	7	7	5	7	7	6	4
2	Ease of Navigation	6	4	4	6	5	4	5	4	5	4	4
3	Site Attractiveness	12	12	12	11	8	11	11	11	11	5	10
	Tourism Effectiveness Perspective	**35**	**31**	**33**	**32**	**29**	**29**	**33**	**31**	**33**	**20**	**31**
1	Information Dimension	18	17	18	18	17	16	18	18	17	11	17
2	Accessibility	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3
3	Communication Dimension	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	9	9	4	8
4	Management of Website	5	2	3	2	1	2	4	2	4	2	3
	Food Tourism Effectiveness Perspective	**23**	**22**	**22**	**18**	**9**	**16**	**12**	**20**	**19**	**0**	**15**
1	Food Culture Information Dimension	5	5	5	4	3	4	4	5	5	0	4
2	Food Information	5	4	4	4	1	3	3	3	2	0	2
3	Food Promotion via Marketing	7	7	7	5	4	5	3	7	7	0	6
4	Food Search Friendliness & Customer Orientation	6	6	6	5	1	4	2	5	5	0	3

(☐ **Below average scores: < 60 per cent**)