Rethinking sustainable destination development through social innovations

Cheryl Venan Dias, Venan Bonaventure Dias, Manjeet Singh

Abstract:

Innovation is an inseparable element in the process of curating tourism products that contributes towards creating memorable experiences. Organised mass tourism lags in delivery of such experiences which is based on the contributions of local innovations. The paper tries to document traveller's memories, particularly those that are easily remembered as happy experiences. The study identified the tourist preferences related to international destinations visited, followed by the identification of social innovations that are crucial for the design of tourist experiences. According to the study, a well-planned tourism experience at a place can promote entrepreneurship and create jobs. The decisions made by tourism business owners might be influenced by both the visitor's experiences and the innovations found. The ability to integrate similar experience designs into product innovation systems will allow managers to create destinations with a competitive edge.

Keywords:

_____

Cheryl Venan Dias, P.G. Department of Tourism Studies, S.S. Dempo College of Commerce and Economics, Cujira, Goa 403202, India, e-mail: Cheryl.venandias@dempocollege.edu.in Corresponding author
Orcid ID https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9803-2868; Web of Science ResearcherID: C-1936-2018;
Vidwan ID: https://vidwan.inflibnet.ac.in/profile/302083
Venan Bonaventure Dias, Founder, Antonios Services, Goa, e-mail: venandias@gmail.com
Manjeet Singh, Assistant Professor, Central University of Jammu, e-mail: manjeet1386@gmail.com

Introduction

Value co-creation is the buzz word in tourism and hospitality industries, and it manifests itself during the interaction of tourists with local communities and the tourist systems. Kim, Tang, and Bosselman (2019) identified that tourism businesses engage customers or tourists in the creation of value through the successful delivery of products and services. Social innovation is also a value that addresses the concerns of local communities such as economic status, environmental upkeep, and social needs. Trunfio and Della (2019) associate the local communities to be destination stakeholders and their engagement is essential to make a destination successful. At the ground level, this requires collaboration between destination managers and the destination stakeholders, the innovation generated then become the drivers of solutions. Zach (2016) affirmed that collaboration is the key to successful innovation in the tourism industry. Yaja and Kumar (2021) asserted that community tourism firms lack a long-term branding approach and integrated marketing communication. Ideally, societal problems are solved when there is an intervention of a destination manager who can identify such local tourism innovations. Also a deeper understanding of the barriers to tourism development can also help to smoothen out community participation in tourism (Yaja, Kumar and Swamy, 2023). Coordination at the destination level also improves the destination capability (Sainaghi, De Carlo, and d'Angella, 2019). The networks, cooperation, and co-production or social outcome are the benefits derived by innovation processes, hence it cannot be driven by one actor the entire community has to participate in its success (Mosedale,2016). It is sustainable in its ability to generate employment for communities that provide service to visitors. The entrepreneurship angle also kicks in as Battisti (2012) identified one of the four drivers of dynamic environmental change as the 'living labs', it highlights coping mechanisms of the society and also emerging business opportunities. The theoretical frameworks which encapsulate local innovations in tourism that result in memorable tourism experiences are discussed in the review of the literature.

Tourism, an intangible product mostly based on experiences is created by inputs from different people who are part of the community. For example Homestay services are one of the booming concepts for local community participation in the tourism industry (Yaja, Kumar and Swamy, 2023). Such innovations at the destination can help solve issues related to accommodation. It is evident from the time of Schumpeter and also confirmed by Kearney, C et. al. (2018) that high-tech manufacturing studies have contributed towards limited literature on product innovation management. Breuer and Ludeke-Freund (2016) advocate innovation management as networks and values of actors that can solve urgent societal problems. They emphasized considering the shared values of those engaging in the innovation process. They also believe that the innovation process can lead to the development of new networks and business models. In emerging markets benchmarking model can help to measure and improve performance at a tourist destination (Kozak, 2004). Burr and Mathews (2008), introduced the co-innovation of products and services as a by-product of the collaboration of corporates and consumers, they also contributed to the body of knowledge by introducing participatory innovation or user-driven innovation.

Tourism remains a significant socio-economic activity, it was once a pursuit of a privileged few but now enjoyed by a large number of people (Neto, 2003). This spike in growth is being closely followed by UNTWO through its study of arrivals and departures of tourists around the world with Paris in Europe being the most popular tourist destination with the highest arrivals of 86.9 million arrivals in 2017 (UNWTO, 2017). So this activity does promote social interaction and economic well-being of a destination. Today tourism due to its uncontrolled growth has resulted in social ills, environmental degradation, and economic imbalance that sustainable tourism development became the focus of policymakers. WCED (1987) defined it

as 'Sustainable development is a development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.

Sustainable tourism development requires the management of resources that conforms to the definition of sustainability by fulfilling the needs of the triple bottom line i.e. People, Profit, and Planet. While the objectives of sustainability are met it needs to maintain the cultural integrity of cultural activities, ecological processes, biodiversity, and systems that support life (UN, 2001). All destinations are not suitable for tourism activities. There are erstwhile popular destinations that are ravaged by wars, political unrest, and not environmentally suitable for tourism purposes. These destinations should have a harmonious blend of the triple bottom line to draw tourists towards the area.

Review of literature

The paper reviews the innovations that are associated with tourism, followed by social innovations, its association with sustainable destination development, and memorable tourism experiences.

Innovations in tourism:

Aligning with the study and as Godin (2012) confirmed the etymology of the concept of innovation which is associated with change, novelty, originality, invention, and creativity. The influence of Schumpeter, popularly known as the father of 'Innovation Theory' on the formulation of the concept and research has been far-reaching in tourism studies. Though his concept was oriented towards the production of goods, it can be easily applied to study innovations that are used to create memorable tourism experiences. Material and forces that are within our reach need to be combined to produce goods. If methods and means to combine the materials and forces are different it can result in a different product (Schumpeter 1961:65). In tourism, it is more about *'innovative interactions', 'structural breakthroughs', 'creative destruction', and 'true radical innovations' than the mere production of good or incremental innovations* (Sørensen, 2004:50-51, Schumpeter 1961: 212-255; Coombs et al. 1987: 175-177; Reijnders 1990: 30-33; Rosenberg, 1985). The increased global competitiveness of the tourism industry had resulted in an emphasis on innovation as a way to differentiate tourism products, services, and technology. (Tajeddini, Ratten, and Denisa, 2017). Tourism Local Innovation Systems (TLIS) Model can help to assess the innovation capacity of tourism destinations (Prats, Guia, and Molina, 2008). An interesting feature of innovation is though it cannot be patented as a product they can be protected by Intellectual property rights and thus gain legal protection, the other aspects which can influence innovations exogenously are technological development, legislation, cooperation and standardization, consumer habits, and the price structure (Schrade 2012).

Social innovation and its association with sustainable destination development

The welfare of individuals and communities is the core concern of this concept (Assudani, Khayat, Cunningham, &Kilbourne 2016). The concept also acquired a restrictive meaning as it suggests actions to combat social exclusion and environmental degradation due to innovations in technology (Freire, 2019). Battisti (2013) asserted that companies which are exposed to dynamic conditions are led to explore the option of social innovations. Ideally, these are services that meet the needs of the customer in the long run. Innovations are now creating a new demand for tourism experiences. Schumpeter (1947) claimed that innovation was the stronghold of large firms is also believed to be true for tourism. Size and innovation in tourism can be relative and subjective. There are small and medium enterprises that can innovate and woo the tourists who travel to such destinations. The tourism destination region is fed by tourism generating region, so while managing a destination it is also important to know where

the tourist come from, especially their origin country as tourists tend to stay in transit regions as well. Innovations should not be associated with complex processes while they can be easily contributed by creative entrepreneurs. Innovations can be created through networks between firms than within the firms(Håkansson 1987c; Biemans 1992; Easton 1992b; Ahuja 2000; Gulati 1998). Tourism experiences are supported by the collaboration of various firms linked by networks. The local network is highly localized and cost-effective (Camagni and Capello2000: 119; Lawson and Lorenz 1999: 306)

Memorable tourism experiences

The basic framework of the paper is built on Pine and Gilmore's (1999) '4E model of experience realms and their staging experiences model', which helps to identify the four types of experiences sought by the customer, and also suggests how to stage such experiences at a destination. The 4E realms of experience are Entertainment, Education, Esthetic, and Escapism. There is an overarching approach that further complements Pine and Gilmore's '4E Model'. Tourism depends on the ability of the tourist to recall the experience through memory (Larsen and Jenssen 2004). Kim, Ritchie, and McCormick (2012) defined memorable tourism experience as *"a tourism experience positively remembered and recalled after the event has occurred"*, and they also identified seven dimensions which are associated with memorable tourism experiences, namely hedonism, refreshment, local culture, meaningfulness, knowledge, involvement, and novelty.

Hedonism is the pleasure or enjoyment seeking behaviour in a tourist; other emotions associated with hedonism are positive feelings, happiness, and excitement. It is also been a major determinant of perceived value on a cruise journey (Kim and Ritchie, 2012). *Refreshment*, relaxation, and renewal is considered to the basic component of tourism activities, people need to temporarily reverse their daily activities, which leads to '*no-work, no-care, no-thrift*' situation, the psychological need to escape from boredom and seek solitude or relaxation (Kim and Ritchie, 2012). *Novelty* is another popular motivation for people to travel (Dunman and Mattila 2005; Farber and Hall 2007). They also try to choose destinations that can allow them to experience a different culture and lifestyle (Pearce, 1987). People seek novelty through culture, food, and accommodation (Chandralal and Valenzuela, 2013). *Social Interaction and Local Culture*, it ensures people are involved in tourism experience co-creation through the experience-based situation. It increases understanding and global citizenship, the specific type of tourism such as 'Volunturism' helps tourists to experience unique things such as interaction with local people, their lifestyle, and living environment (Ryan 1998; Brown, 2005; IATA 2019). Hamid, Isa and Kiumarsi (2020), confmed the sustianble destination management practices and promotion of local cuture through the adoption of sixteen associated items.

Knowledge is attributed to tourism experiences that result in learning new things, developing insights and skills, acquisition of new knowledge, and to understand the destinations visited, along with intellectual development (Poria, Reichel, and Brian 2006; Richards 2002; Sharpley and Sundaram 2005; Tung and Ritchie, 2011). Meaningfulness, when people tend to search for meaningful experiences within their tourism activities through physical, emotional, or spiritual fulfillment, the tourist also look for unique and meaningful experiences, some consider it as an inner journey of personal growth and self-development. (Bruner 1991; Callanan and Thomas 2005; Digance 2003; Hall and Weiler 1992; Robinson and Novelli 2005). *Involvement*, Pine and Gilmore (1999) associated this with the aspect of immersion. Tourist finds themselves personally involved in planning in a pre-trip case and take onsite decisions while on the tour, the activities need to be relevant and related to their interest (Kim and Brent, 2013).

METHOD

Problem Identification

The missing link between social innovation and sustainable tourism destination development is the major cause of the fall-off of the relationship between tourism organizations and local communities.

Identification of Gap

The review of literature has identified that though social innovation and sustainable tourism destination development are two different constructs, the missing link among the two is the tourist who seeks memorable tourism experiences (MTE). They are the common link between the two and the development of such MTE's can result in two-way communication between destination managers and the local communities to attain the triple bottom line.

Objectives

The paper tries to identify the memorable tourism experiences (MTE's) which could be recalled by the tourist on their leisure tour, identify the dimensions associated with the MTE's, suggest the methods to design such MTE's using social innovation methods.

Sampling

Data were initially collected from Indian tourists who traveled abroad, and during the study through foreign collaboration, it was possible to collect data from an international tourist as well. The period of data collection was from December 2017 to February 2020. The confidence interval or margin of error is the plus-or-minus figure usually reported, for the current sample size of 248, the confidence interval is 6.38, at a confidence level of 95%. Though the item size is 18, which requires around 180 samples to be collected for this research. This data is now shared with academicians, research scholars as well as industry to conduct further analysis a DOI is provided for further scrutiny of this data.

Measurement

After a thorough review of the instrument developed with the help of language experts, exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the data collected along with a Pattern and Image Analysis. The scale developed explains 55.78% of the total variation of the data.

Data Analysis

1. Data analysis involves descriptive analysis, reliability, and validity. The confirmatory factor analysis was utilized to check if the data conforms to the experiences and its dimensions, this provided supplementary information with regards to the reliability and validity of the scales. SPSS 20 was used to conduct the factor analysis and Warp PLS was used to identify the correlation between dimensions identified.

RESULTS

Demographic and Psychographic Analysis

As indicated earlier, usable data from 248 respondents are analyzed, the demographic and psychographic analysis are: A total of 248 respondents represented 77 males and 171 females, data indicates that the respondents between the age group 21-30 travel frequently, they are single, majority of the respondents were from Area 3/Traffic Conference 3- which belongs includes South Asian Sub Continent, South East Asia, Japan Korea, Australia, and Pacific, followed by Area 2/Traffic Conference 2 which comprises of Europe, Middle East, and Africa, there were fewer participants from Area 1/Traffic Conference1 which consists of North America, Central America, and South America. The respondents have traveled both domestic

and international tours. Maximum respondents preferred not to travel alone on a tour especially females with a representation of 90% and males at 84%. The respondents mainly traveled with their families (41%), followed by friends (15%). The reason for people to travel and what type of experiences they seek during their travels, Entertainment is the major motivator at 17%, Excitement about the tour at 14%, Meaningfulness at 13%, Escape at 12%, Rejuvenate and Education at 10%, Involvement at 9%, Novelty, and Fulfilment of a Fantasy at 8%.

Destination Analysis

IATA has identified the three traffic conferences in which Area 1/Traffic Conference(TC)1 includes the North America, Central America and South America, While Area 2/TC2 includes Europe, Middle East and Africa, and Area 3/TC3 includes South Asian Sub Continent, South East Asia, Japan/Korea and South West Pacific.The respondents selected their most popular preferred destinations, and the origin trends help to identify what are the preferred destinations as per their area of residence. Europe is the popular choice of around 124 respondents, followed by South East Asia at 83, South Asian Sub Continent at 82, and North America at 70, and the Middle East at 66. The 20% of problem areas where visitors drop are captured by Pareto analysis especially North America, South America, and Africa. Respondents from Area 1 or Traffic Conference 1(TC1) prefer to travel within their area with a response rate of 25%, Respondents of TC2 have Europe as a popular choice at 38%, While respondents of TC3 have South East Asia as their preferred destination at 40%.

Factor Analysis

Table 1: Factor Analysis for Memorable Tourism Experiences

Factor Analysis Overall Reliability .894 of the scale, Latent Construct Validity: χ^2=22.305(SChs) p<0.001, KMO Bartlett's Sampling Adequacy at 82.8%, df=275, STDCR=0.779, AVIF=1.510, GOF=0.478, RSCR=1	
Education (Cronbach' α=.725, CR= 0.819,AVE=0.501)	
Observed Variables	FL
E1- It was a unique experience to watch a demo on beekeeping and was thrilled to get the experience of making honey.	0.651
E2- I was provided basic training as a city guide at the place I visited.	0.552
E3- I have slept in a hut built by native people and lived like the ancient settlers.	0.681
E4- It was enriching to watch cultural performances at the destinations visited.	0.631
E5-I have used traditional methods of transport than the use of mechanized motors at the destination visited.	0.645
Escape (Cronbach' α=.766, CR=0.838,AVE=0.573)	
Es1 - I got away from the usual humdrum of city life and got to a serene (peaceful and quiet) place.	0.596
Es2-I have interacted with elderly native hosts and got to know about the true history of a place visited.	0.678
Es-3 I have explored a water body using the ethnic modes of water transport such as Dhow, Gondola, Canoes, House Boats or Shikaras.	0.667
Es4 - I have indulged in nature and cultural spots while I was on a walking tour.	0.566
Es5- I have learned an ethnic folk dance during my tours.	0.672
Es6 -I was relaxed after practicing rejuvenating activities such as Spa, Yoga, Breathing, or Reiki sessions at the destination I visited.	0.511
Novelty (Cronbach' α=.740, CR=, 0.781,AVE=0.521)	
N1- I have learned an ethnic folk dance during my tours.	0.518

N2 - I was impressed by elaborate stage settings during a theatre performance	0.779
N3- I was fascinated with the play of light and sound during the stage performance.	0.771
Meaning (Cronbach' α=.732, CR=0.833, AVE=0.501)	
M1- I liked to gaze at the night sky with my family or companions.	0.688
M2 - It was enriching to watch cultural performances at the destinations visited.	0.695
M3- I have visited museums with different themes and those which give the feeling of time travel.	0.746
M4- I was eager to learn about new ideas and concepts shared by keynote speakers during a conference.	0.698

Source: Primary Data Analysed by Author, 2020

Factor analysis explains 55.78% of the variation in table 1, all factor loading below .3 were dropped (Gaskin, 2018) the resulting matrix revealed four dimensions of memorable tourism experiences namely Education, Escapism, Novelty and Meaning; out of the seven identified by Kim and Brent (2012). Model fit and quality indices are: Standardized threshold difference count ratio (STDCR)=0.779, acceptable if >= 0.7 and ideally = 1, Average path coefficient (APC)=0.271, which is significant at P<0.001, Average R-squared (ARS)=0.95, with explains the formative path towards memorable tourism experiences at P<0.001,Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)=0.974, significant at P<0.001, Average block VIF (AVIF)=1.510, acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3 so it is a good fit, TenenhausGoF (GoF)=0.478 which is large>= 0.36, Sympson's paradox ratio (SPR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1, R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)=1.000, acceptable if >= 0.9; ideally = 1.

Table 2: Correlation Matrix and t-test significance matrix

	E	ES	N	M	MTE	Mean	SD
Education	.848	12.61**	8.79**	18.49**	15.77**	2.48	0.96
Escape	.493**	.887	1.84	8.63**	2.61**	3.24	0.93
Novelty	.314**	.373**	.849	9.89**	0.70	3.12	0.98
Meaning	.323**	.486**	.430**	.861	15.81**	3.75	0.89
MTE	.720**	.788**	.721**	.743**	.887	3.15	0.70

**Correlation is significant at the P<.001 level, Source: Primary Data Analysed by Authors, 2020

The table 2 below the diagonal indicates the coefficient of correlation and the figures are significant at p<0.001, the maximum shared variance (MSV) of the construct is indicated in the diagonal section, which is the square of the highest correlation of that construct with other constructs. while the values above the diagonal indicate the t-stats for paired sample t-test, This revealed a significant relationship between Education and the other constructs at p<0.001, however, there is no significant relationship between Escape and Novelty, Novelty and Memorable Tourism Experiences as per the t-test, conversely they are positively correlated.

Table 3: Model Summary

Model IV<-->DV	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Error
Education<>MTE	.797[a]	.636	.628	.42688
Escape<>MTE	.926[b]	.858	.852	.26953
Novelty<>MTE	.961[c]	.923	.919	.19981
Meaning<>MTE	.990[d]	.980	.979	.10215

Source: Primary Data Analysed by Author, 2020

Regression analysis revealed that .79 of the variances of factors associated with education explain MTE with standard error of .42 indicating a good fit, while .926 of the variances of factors associated with escape explain MTE with a standard error of .269, while the independent variable Novelty explains .961 of variances of MTE with a standard error of .199, and .990 of independent variable meaning explains MTE with .102 of standard error, displaying a very good model fit.

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The respondents were predominantly from the age group of 21-30 who frequently traveled, females had a greater tendency to travel than males, the destination analysis identified there was pique to visit Europe followed by South East Asia, South Asian Sub Continent, North America, and the Middle East after this the visitors drop considerably which is captured as a problem area and be identified through Pareto Analysis, if a destination manager has to identify areas that can be promoted in future they would be Africa, Japan Korea, Australia, and South America. Factor analysis was conducted to identify the experiences linked with 4E's of Pine and Gilmore's experience economy, four prominent factors were derived using pattern and image analysis, and the memorable tourism experiences sought by the respondents were Education, Escape, Novelty, and Meaning confirming four out of seven MTE's identified by (Kim and Brent, 2012)**.**

Though the major motivation can be Hedonism as specified by the tourist the resultant effect of a tour proves that there is something deeper to the memories than just entertainment. It is also observed that refreshment and the local culture has amalgamated in this factor analysis resulting in escapism, indicating that innovative practices can create such experiences for the tourist. The result of the correlation matrix indicated that there is no significant relationship between Escape and Novelty, this is true as new methods of tourism innovations were not yet experienced by the respondents, the maximum shared variances also uphold that there is a highest shared variance among the two constructs.

Managerial Implication

1. Business Model Development and Experience Design: Service innovativeness also results in the design of a service business model (Cheng, 2014). This calls for the type of experiences sought by the tourist and development of a service business model based on such innovations. The theoretical frameworks of experience production within the experience economies highlight the point of view of tourist who has 'experienced' or 'what experience they received' during a tour, this gives us clarity about the 'how to create' or 'offer' the experience thus assisting with the 'design' and 'manage' aspect of the tourism product. This section provides clarity on how to create, and manage the customers' expectations with regards to tourism experiences. The process of experience design is elaborated in the 'Experience design-wheel' model (Ek et al. 2008). The focus of the creative industry is to use 'Experience Design' in an innovative manner. *Experience design is used as a term to describe how producers and consumers design experiences within the experience economy'. 'Experience'* and *'design'* are nouns as well as verbs. This makes it possible to revise the meanings arising from the etymologies of the two concepts in terms of the static (noun) as opposed to dynamic (verb) attributes (Ole KjaerMansfeldt, Ellen Marie Vestager and Marie BaekIversen 2008). Considering the 'Experience Design Wheel' as the base model to create experiences, we can also have an overview of other approaches by use of the 'Total Experience Management

model' (Gelter 2008, 2011) gives the difference between total experience management and total experience measurement.

2. Education-Based Business Model: This experience can be generated by the amalgamation of Absorption and Active Participation is 'Education' as per Pine and Gilmore's experience economy. The manager has to ensure that learning that imparts skills and knowledge is the experience that has to be generated. Sensitivity towards the choice of tourists to accept or ignore the information should be present. The learning experiences should allow the tourist to have the flexibility to engage themselves in authentic activities created by the local networks. The educational content provided in the activities should fulfill the tourist's need to gain additional knowledge and motivate them to gain more during future travels.

3. Escapism-Based Business Model: A tourist is deemed to be indulging in 'Escapism' when there are Involvement and Active Participation in activities which will help them to rewind and relax and experience the movement of time and space. Studies have proved that tourists will have a motive to experience Escapism. Chen, Gau, and Wu (2013) gave three propositions which are part of the grounded theory of escapism, first being relaxation and enjoyment, secondly able to endure long-distance of the journey to be at the destination even at a premium for valuable experience, the third was the values associated with the destination such as detachment, pleasure, wealth and social recognition. The three propositions give a guideline to managers to design experiences suitable for such tourists. When a manager designs such an experience for tourists, the short term goals of the tourist should be borne in mind.

4. Novelty-Based Business Model: While designing Novelty based experiences the tourist have to be exposed to ideas that only the local networks would be well aware of. These should especially the ones generated due to knowledge of topography. Novelty also lies in knowing about the culture of a tribe or community. This confirms that the customs showcased will be unique to a tourist. Accommodation and cuisine provided to the guest can be designed effectively to create this experience. Ideally, these should be locally curated with the help of residents of that network. The tourist can also experience novelty and overlap of other experiences if they volunteer on a farm or help in agriculture. This is true for such tourists who have never ventured into roughing it out while on a tour. This experience also helps a tourist to escape from burnouts and other psychological stress and rejuvenate themselves.

5. Meaning-Based Business Model: Every human being tries to identify meaning through physical, emotional, and spiritual experiences. Providing the ability to understand the physical endurance of a person by designing such tours that can make the tourist feel the risk involved. It could be an elephant ride in the forest under the guidance of a trained mahout. The destination manager could create an emotional connection by arranging for a local musical recital that can stir the emotions of a tourist. An example would be arranging a visit to the local maand(a meeting place for villagers) in Goa, which allows the tourist to listen to traditional music and also participate.

6. Management of Social Inclusiveness: Destination managers should try all possible means to ensure that the destination is developed sustainably by treating the experiences as a catalyst between tourists and locals. This is possible by offering a blend of localized social innovations to tourists. Developing a marketing platform for such innovations at a global level. Use management techniques such as the Delphi method to gain inputs from all the local networks. Design effective tourism networks by also including tourists as co-creators of social value. This can happen during the delivery of the experience.

Visual, verbal, and behavioral feedback should be instantly gathered by the service providers for the co-creation to become effective. Identify the niche business model for a destination by identifying the right type of service innovation to promote the business.

Structural limitations, mitigation of bias, and suggestions for further study

Though utmost care was taken to inculcate all the seven realms of the tourism experiences in the survey, it was observed that the experiences clustered around four major dimensions. This does not mean that other dimensions discussed in the literature review are to be ignored by destination managers. It is clear that in this study there has been an overlap of various experiences, which indicates that variables can tend to cluster around some major dimensions. And a destination manager has to take utmost care to imbibe such experiences by leveraging the social innovation methods especially the 'living labs' which can be the best way forward. In the elimination of proximity bias, the questions were randomly arranged so that the respondents do not give a similar response to related questions or by associating meanings to the consequent questions. Since the questionnaire was administered online it was possible to use the shuffle method and attract proper responses. Further studies are mandated to identify experiences that were not listed in the survey. The responses in this study were also dominated by women travelers their interest may be certainly different from the male members a future study could cover such aspects to identify the gender-based preferences with regards to MTE's. Another suggestion would be to find how the tourist can contribute towards collaborative-innovation towards the creation of MTE's.

CONCLUSION

Every person is a potential tourist who would desire to visit a tourism destination at least once in their lifetime. Social innovations can generate a wealth of creative ideas that can be offered to such tourists. Protection of such ideas under Intellectual Property Rights when a new innovative concept is introduced in the tourism networks is important (Dias and Dias, 2019). Measurement of MTE's and the impact of local innovations is a way forward to get an in-depth understanding of these activities. This paper has tried to identify the missing link which is memorable tourism experiences between social innovations and sustainable tourism destinations which can be designed by a destination manager. For a tourist, the design and innovations translate to post-trip experiences which are recalled by memory, for a tour organizer it's an ongoing process which requires intricate knowledge of 'how to create' or 'design' (verb) an experience that can last for a lifetime and provide value to the tourist. A proper communication channel can be utilized especially by the use of information and communication technology to transmit such information to the tourist by the use of effective destination marketing tools to help them make decisions actively as they become the co-creators of such experiences. While on the other hand social innovations keep the local communities connected with the tourist that arrive at the destination. On the other hand, they tend to economically benefit from such partnerships in the long run.

Disclosure statement

Reference

Ahuja G. (2000).Collaboration Networks, Structural Holes, and Innovation: A Longitudinal Study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 425-455.

Assudani, R., Khayat, I., Cunningham, M., & Kilbourne, L. (2016). Creating and scaling a social innovation: a case study of Support My School. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 4(1), 37. doi:10.1504/ijsei.2016.075640

Buur, J., & Matthews, B. (2008). Participatory innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management,* 12(3), 255–273.

Battisti, S. (2012).Social innovation: the process development of knowledge-intensive companies. *Int. J. Services Technology and Management*, 18(3/4), 224–244.

Battisti, S. (2013). Social innovation in dynamic environments: organizing technology for temporary advantage. *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 2(6), 504. doi:10.1504/ijsei.2013.059952

Biemans W. G. (1992). *Managing Innovations within Networks*. Routledge: London, UK.

Brown, S. (2005). Travelling with a Purpose: Understanding the Motives and Benefits of Volunteer Vacationers. *Current Issues in Tourism*, Vol. 8, No. 6, pp. 479-96.

Bruner, Edward M. (1991).Transformation of Self in Tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 238-50.

Breuer, H., &Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2017). Values-based network and business model innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 21(03), 1750028. doi:10.1142/s1363919617500281

Camagni R. and Capello R. (2000).The Role of Inter-SME Networking and Links in Innovative High-Technology Milieux, in Keeble D. and Williamson F (Ed.), High-Technology Clusters, Networking and Collective Learning in Europe, Ashgate, Aldershot, England, pp. 118-144.

Callanan, Michelle, and Sarah Thomas. (2005).Volunteer Tourism: Deconstructing Volunteer Activities within a Dynamic Environment In Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues and Trends, New York: Elsevier, pp. 183-200.

Chandralal, Lalith, and Fredy Valenzuela. (2013).Exploring Memorable Tourism Experiences: Antecedents and Behavioural Outcomes, *Journal of Economics*, Business and Management, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 177-81.

Chen, T.-L., Gau, L.-S. and Wu, T.-F. (2014).Apply Ground Theory to Interpret Escapist Experiences in Mudanwan Villa, *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 2, pp. 44-47. http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.23009

Cheng, C. C. J., Shiu, E. C. C., & Dawson, J. A. (2014). Service business model and service innovativeness. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 18(02), 1450013. doi:10.1142/s1363919614500133

Coombs R., Saviotti P. and Walsh V. (1987).Economics and technological change, MacMillan Education, London, UK.

Cheryl Dias&Venan Dias (2019). Memorable tourism experience design an effective destination marketing tool, *Anatolia,* 30:4, 626-628, DOI:10.1080/13032917.2019.1668727

Dias, Cheryl. (2020). Data on Memorable Tourism Experiences (Version V1) [Data set]. Zenodo. http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3674276

Digance, Justine. (2003).Pilgrimage at Contested Sites, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 30, No.1, pp.143-59.

Dunman, Teoman, and Anna S. Mattila. (2005).The Role of Affective Factors on Perceived Cruise Vacation Value, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 311-23.

Ek, R., Larsen, J., Hornskov, S. B., &Mansfeldt, O. K. (2008). A Dynamic Framework of Tourist Experiences: Space, Time and Performances in the Experience Economy, *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 122–140.doi:10.1080/15022250802110091

Farber, Mary E., and Troy E. Hall. (2007).Emotion and Environment: Visitor's Extraordinary Experiences along the Dalton Highway in Alaska, *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 248-70.

Ruiz Freire, R., Costa, E., Alves, J.L. and de Souza Brito, C. (2019).A dialectic on innovation and sustainability, *Int. J. Innovation and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 13, Nos. 3/4, pp.246–258.

Gaskin, J. (2018). Causal Modeling in AMOS, *Gaskination's Statistics*. http://youtube.com/Gaskination

Gelter, H. (2008).Interpretation and Total Experience Management (TEM) as Innovative Methods for Sustainable Nature-Based Tourism: A Benchmarking Analysis. Conference paper for the 17th Nordic Symposium in Tourism and Hospitality Research, Lillehammer,

Gelter, H. (2011).Polar tourist experiences – challenges and possibilities for Transmodern tourism, in Grenier, A. A. and Müller, D. K. (Ed.), Polar Tourism: A Tool for Regional Development. Presses de L'Université du Québec, pp.227-250

Godin, B. (2012). Social Innovation: Utopias of Innovation from c. 1830 to the Present, *Project on the intellectual History of innovation*, pp.1–52.

Gulati R. (1998). Alliances and Networks, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 19, pp. 293-317, John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Håkansson H. (1987). Industrial Technological Development. A Network Approach, Croom Helm, London, UK

Hall, Colin M., and Betty Weiler. (1992).Introduction. What's Special about Special Interest Tourism, in Weiler, B. and Hall, C.M., (Ed.), *Special Interest Tourism*, New York: John Wiley, pp. 1-14.

IATA (2019). The tourism product, Foundation in Travel and Tourism, ITDI, Montreal Canada.

Kearney, C., Mccarthy, K. J., &Huizingh, e. K. R. E. (2018). One size (does not) fit all: evidence of similarities and differences between product innovation management in high- and low-tech manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 1950004. doi:10.1142/s136391961950004x

Kim, Jong-Hyeong, J. R. Brent Ritchie, and Bryan M. McCormick. (2012). Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 12-25.

Kim, E., Tang, L. (Rebecca), & Bosselman, R. (2019). Customer Perceptions of Innovativeness: An Accelerator for Value Co-Creation. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 43(6), 807–838. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019836273

Kozak, M. (2004). Introducing Destination Benchmarking: A Conceptual Approach. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 28(3), 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348003256603

Larsen J. and Urry J. (2004). Performing Tourist Places, *Ashgate*, UK

Lawson C. and Lorenz E. (1999). Collective Learning, Tacit Knowledge and Regional Innovative Capacity, *Regional Studies*, No. 4, pp. 305-317

Maisarah Abd Hamid , Salmi Mohd Isa & Shaian Kiumarsi (2020): Sustainable tourism practices and business performance from the tour operators' perspectives, Anatolia, DOI: 10.1080/13032917.2020.1830135

Mosedale, J., &Voll, F. (2016). Social Innovations in Tourism: Social Practices Contributing to Social Development. *Tourism on the Verge*, 101–115. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-46518-0_6

Neto, Frederico (2003). A New Approach to Sustainable Tourism Development: Moving beyond Environmental Protection. *DESA Discussion Paper Series*accessed ib 26th February 2020 accessed from http://www.un.org/esa/papers.htm

Ole KjaerMansfeldt, Ellen Marie Vestager& Marie BaekIversen, (2008). Experience design in city tourism, *Wonderful Copenhagen*, Nordic Innovation Centre, Norway

Pearce, Douglas G, (1987). Tourism Today: A Geographical Analysis. *Harlow*: Longman.

Pine II, B.J. and Gilmore, J.H. (1999). The Experience Economy: Work Is Theatre and Every Business a Stage. *Harvard Business School Press*, Boston.

Poria, Yaniv, ArieReichel, and Avital Brian (2006). Heritage Site Management: Motivations and Expectations, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 33, Iss. 1, pp. 162-78.

Prats, Guia, and Molina (2008). How tourism destinations evolve: The notion of Tourism Local Innovation System, *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 178-191

Reijnders J. (1990).Long Waves in Economic Development, Edward Elgar, Aldershot, UK.

Rosenberg N. (1985). Perspectives on technology, *Armonk*, New York, USA.

Robinson, Mike, and Marina Novelli. (2005).Niche Tourism: An Introduction, In M. Novelli (Ed.) *Niche Tourism: Contemporary Issues, Trends, and Cases*, ButterworthHeinemann, pp. 1-14

Ryan, Chris. (1998).Saltwater Crocodiles as Tourist Attractions: A Pilot Study, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol 6, Iss 4, pp. 314-27

Sainaghi, R., De Carlo, M., & d'Angella, F. (2019). Development of a Tourism Destination: Exploring the Role of Destination Capabilities. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43(4), 517–543. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348018810388

Schneider, S and P Spieth (2013). Business model innovation: Towards an integrated future research agenda, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 17(1), 1340001. doi:10.1142/s136391961340001x

Schumpeter J.A. (1947). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, 2. ed., *Harper & Brothers*, New York.

Schumpeter J.A (1961).The Theory of Economic Development, *Oxford University Press*, New York, USA.

Sharpley, Richard, and PriyaSundaram. (2005). Tourism: A Sacred Journey? The Case of Ashram Tourism, India. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol 7, Iss 3, pp. 61-71.

Schrade, Čimbenicikojiutječunainovacije, (2012).accessedFeb 20, 2020, http://www.europeanpaymentscouncil.eu/index.cfm/newsletter/article/?articles_uuid=A0AD2 BB5-5056-B741-DBC0FE0CC21BD185

Shaw, E. (1998). Social Networks: Their Impact on the Innovative Behaviour of Small Service Firms. *International Journal of Innovation Management,* 02(02), 201–222. doi:10.1142/s1363919698000109

Sørensen, F. (2004). Tourism Experience Innovation Networks: Tourism Experience Innovations and the Role of Geographically Organised Production and Information Innovation Networks. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitet, FS& P Ph.D., Afhandlinger, No. 44.

Tajeddini, K., Ratten, V., and Denisa, M. (2017). Female tourism entrepreneurs in Bali, Indonesia, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Vol. 31 Issue 1, pp.52-58.

Trunfio, M., & Della Lucia, M. (2019). Engaging Destination Stakeholders in the Digital Era: The Best Practice of Italian Regional DMOs. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 43(3), 349–373. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348018807293

Tung, Vincent W. S., and J. R. Brent Ritchie. (2011). Exploring the Essence of Memorable Tourism Experiences, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 38, Iss. 4, pp. 1367-86.

UN (2001). Sustainable development of tourism, *Report of the Secretary-General* (Document No. E/CN.17/2001/ PC/21), New York, UN

UNWTO (2017). UNWTO Tourism Highlights 2017 Edition accessed on 26[th]Feburary 2020 and accessed from https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284419029

WCED (1987). Our Common Future. World Commission on Environment and Development, Oxford University Press, Oxford

Yaja, M., & Kumar, A. (2021). An empirical study of marketing of SMEs in the tourism sector. *Small Enterprise Research*, *28*(3), 314-328.

Yaja, M., Kumar, A., Swamy, G. A., & Rout, H. B. Is homestay service an ideal business opportunity for women?. *International Social Science Journal*.

Yaja, M., Kumar, A., & Swamy, G. A. (2023). Barriers to tourism participation: A case of first-generation local community service providers. *International Social Science Journal*, *73*(247), 103-119.

Zach, F. (2016). Collaboration for Innovation in Tourism Organizations: Leadership Support, Innovation Formality, and Communication. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 40(3), 271–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348013495694