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Abstract

This paper attempts to shed more light on destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs) from the context of rural tourism. Moreover, where national tourism organisations established a liaison office at regional or state levels, their roles seems to have been limited. In this circumstance, they are merely information offices to the visitors rather than local DMMOs responsible for the management and marketing of rural destinations. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to identify the roles of DMMOs, and hence develop a suitable framework for DMMOs in the context of rural tourism. This paper finds that DMMOs has responsibilities for both management and marketing roles. These roles should be performed in collaboration with the rural tourism destination stakeholders in order to achieve mutual benefits which include management of resources, marketing of tourism products, positioning, host community well-being, brand building, and tourist loyalty to the rural destinations.
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1. Introduction

As the tourism industry continues to grow, the marketing and management of tourism destination is increasingly becoming competitive globally (Buhalis, 2000; Balakrishnan, 2008; Tasci, 2011; UNWTO, 2012, 2013). As a result, there is a need to improve our understanding of destination management in terms of how tourism destinations are built and marketed (Blain, Levy & Ritchie, 2005). Tourism destination marketing is often seen as a competitive and complex issue (Wang, 2011). This is particularly so when the tourism industry is becoming more competitive.
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with destination marketing organisations competing to increase their share of the tourist market by developing different destination marketing strategies (Hosany, Ekinci & Uysal, 2007). In order to understand this complexity destination management and marketing requires a comprehensive approach (Wang, 2011). Hence, different tourism destinations such as national, regions, states and cities have established destination management and destination marketing organisations to promote, manage and market these destinations to the target tourist markets (Pike, 2008). As more countries are diversifying into tourism industry, the existing tourism destinations have been forced to develop unique and competitive destination brands due to global competitiveness in tourism sector (Hassan, Hamid & Al Bohairy, 2010). Therefore, tourism destinations now find themselves in a situation where they have to compete directly with other tourism destinations at the international arena, national, regional, state, cities and local levels through the respective destination marketing organisations for the promotion and marketing of the destinations (Presenza, Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005). The formation of destination management organisations and destination marketing organisations in the tourism industry is indispensable, due to its roles and destinations it covers such as town, city, region, state, province, and country (Blain et al., 2005; Pike, 2008).

However, a review of the literature indicates that there is a lack of destination management and destination marketing organisations specifically established for rural tourism destinations; as well as local tourism destinations (Blain et al., 2005; Pike, 2008). This will be discussed in the following research gap section. The purpose of this paper is to identify the combined roles of destination management and destination marketing organisations and how they can be conceptualised to develop a framework for destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs) in the context of rural tourism. It should be noted that both destination management organisations and destination marketing organisations complement each other. There are ample evidences from the literature which indicates these tourism destination organisations have been used interchangeably, separately or combined as one entity in the management and marketing of tourism destinations (Bhat & Gaur, 2012; Wang, 2011). Other extant literature sources are presented in Table 1. Similarly, their functions were also separated as shown or presented in Table 2 and in a framework presented in Figure 1 on the roles of destination marketing organisations respectively adapted from Wang (2008). As a result of this foregoing, this paper will attempt to merge the two terms to develop destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs). This is important in order to achieve the aims of this paper of identifying separately the management roles and marketing roles within the framework of destination management and marketing organisation in the context of rural tourism.

2. Literature review

A review of literature sources on the development of destination management and marketing organisations indicate that the first destinations to have formal promotion and marketing organisations appear to have been at a local destination level (Pike & Page, 2014). According to Laesser (2000), the first regional tourism organisation was established at St. Moritz, Switzerland in 1864. Similarly, Blackpool Municipal Corporation was formed in England in 1879 and was given government approval to collect tax purposely to fund the promotion and advertising of the town’s attractions (Cross & Walton, 2005). Additionally, the first convention and visitors bureau was established in 1896 at Detroit in the USA (Ford & Peeper, 2007). Likewise, the first world’s national tourism organisation was formed in 1901 in New Zealand (McClure, 2004), and in 1903 the first state tourism organisation was established in Hawaii, USA (Choy, 2003). Furthermore, since the end of the world war two the number of destination marketing and management organisations have increased significantly (Laws, 1997); and there are over 10,000 destination and marketing organisations globally (Pike, 2008; Pike & Page, 2014). The rationale for an overview of the evolution of the destination management and marketing organisations is to provide ample evidences that DMMOs is not a new academic topic in tourism research. However, despite these claims it appears DMMOs specifically established to manage and market rural tourism destinations have received less academic interest and destination practitioners’ attention. Hence, this paper will attempt to reduce this gap in the tourism destination organisations literature.

Therefore, it should be noted that destination management and destination marketing organisations are becoming increasingly important in many tourism destinations globally due to growth and reliance by many developing and developed economies on tourism industry (Fyall, 2011; Wang, 2008). Consequently, there is a need for integrative marketing and management strategies based on good understanding of the tourism market for effective destination competitiveness and attractiveness through the activities of destination marketing organisations (Pike, 2008).
Destination marketing organisation can be described as any organisation at any level which is responsible for the marketing of a named or identifiable tourism destination. This excludes the government departments that are responsible for planning and policy issues (Pike & Ryan, 2004). In addition, Wang (2011, p. 2) also follows the destination management association international (DMAI) to suggest that ‘…destination management and marketing can be defined as a proactive, visitor-centred approach to the economic and cultural development of a destination that balances and integrates the interests of visitors, service providers and the community.’ Other authors place the focus on the tourist, for example Zehrer, Pechlaner and Holzl (2005, p. 148) mentioned that destination management and marketing is the consistent orientation of tourist services and service providers towards the needs of potential visitors. A review of past studies indicates that destination management organisation and destination marketing organisation have been used interchangeably. For example, studies that have adopted destination management organisation include (Morgan, Hastings & Pritchard, 2012; Buhalis, 2000; Ritchie & Ritchie, 1998). Other studies have used destination marketing organisation (Fyall, Garrod & Wang, 2012; Pike, 2004, 2009; Hassan, Hamid & Al Bohairy, 2010). However, Bhat and Gaur (2012) adopted national tourism organisation to described both destination management and destination marketing organisations; while Wang (2011) used both terms that is destination marketing and management, but with emphasis on destination marketing organisation. Wang (2011) took a comprehensive approach which identified three themes in addition to destination marketing functions to distinguish destination management organisation from destination marketing organisation. These themes are: (1) strategies and approaches for managing destination stakeholders; (2) principles and strategies for managing competitiveness and sustainability; and (3) principles and strategies for safety, disaster and crisis management (Wang, 2011). Therefore, for a better understanding and for the purpose of this conceptual paper, a chronological order of literature sources on both destination management and destination marketing organisations in the last two decades is presented in Table 1. Furthermore, there are various categories of destination management and destination marketing organisations; this is presented in the following section.

Table 1. Destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearce</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie &amp; Ritchie</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhalis</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie &amp; Crouch</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>2004, 2009</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blain, Levy &amp; Ritchie</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenza, Sheehan &amp; Ritchie</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manente &amp; Minghetti</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Destination management organisations/actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Tourism Organisation</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford &amp; Peeper</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan, Hamid &amp; Al Bohairy</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornhorst, Ritchie &amp; Sheehan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Destination marketing and management Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyall</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhat &amp; Gaur</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>National tourism organisation used for both (destination management and marketing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller &amp; Berger</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fyall, Garrod &amp; Wang</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Hastings &amp; Pritchard</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogger &amp; Pechlaner</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Destination management organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike &amp; Page</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Destination marketing organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Gyrd-Jones &amp; Gardiner</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Destination management organisations and operators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1. Categories of destination management and destination marketing organisations

The UNWTO (2004) categorised the destination marketing organisations into the following perspectives in hierarchical order. These are national tourism organisations or authorities, regional, state, province and local destination marketing organisations. Pike (2008) mentioned there are four levels of destination marketing organisation these include national tourism office, state tourism office, regional tourism organisation, or convention and visitor bureau as referred to in other countries; and local tourism office. These destination marketing organisations performs different functions in the promotion and marketing of tourism destinations within their jurisdictions. These categories of destination management and marketing organisations are discussed in the following sub-sections.

2.2. National tourism organisations

National tourism organisations or authorities are saddled with the responsibility of managing and marketing of tourism, leisure and other recreational activities at a national level (UNWTO, 2004). The national tourism administration was introduced by World Tourism Organisation WTO (1979) as the authorities in the central state management, or other established or recognised organization in charge of tourism development at the national level. According to Pike (2008) the national tourism office is used to represent the organisation with overall responsibility for marketing a country as tourism destination from either destination marketing organisation or from national tourism administration perspectives. There are national tourism organisation in different countries that are responsible for the promotion and marketing of tourism potentials of each country. For example in Malaysia, there is Tourism Malaysia, Singapore Tourism Board (STB) in Singapore (OOi, 2010); and in New Zealand there is also Tourism New Zealand (Ryan & Zahra (2010); and Australian Tourist Commission [ATC] in Australia (Brown, Chalip, Jago & Mules, 2010).

2.3. Regional tourism organisations

Regional tourism organisation can be referred to as organisation saddled with the promotion and marketing of a concentrated tourism destination (UNWTO, 2004; Wang, 2011); and creating awareness of the social and environmental issues associated with tourism (Ryan & Zahra, 2010). The term region includes rural areas, villages, towns, coastal resorts areas and cities (Wang, 2011). Regional tourism organisation is also known as convention and visitor bureau (CVB) in other parts of the world (Wang, 2011). For example it is known as CVB in the USA and is known as regional tourism boards in the United Kingdom. The role of regional tourism organisations in destination branding in some jurisdictions has been very successful which contributed to the overall achievements of national tourism organisation. In New Zealand, the regional tourism organisations played a prominent role in the tourism destination branding of places such as Wellington, Auckland, Christchurch and Rotorua (Ryan & Zahra, 2010).

2.4. State tourism organisations

The state tourism organisations are responsible for the management or marketing of tourism in a state, province or territory (UNWTO, 2004). According to Wang (2011), state regional organisation is an organisation within the destination marketing set-up, and is responsible for promoting and marketing tourism activities in a state. For example in Louisiana State in the USA it is known as the Department of Culture, Recreation and Tourism (Slater, 2010); in Philadelphia State it is called the Philadelphia Convention and Visitor’s Bureau (Smith, 2010). In Malaysia, at the state level there is a state tourism board, for example Selangor Tourism Board, and Sarawak Tourism Board respectively. In Western Australia territory, it is referred to as Western Australian Tourism Commission (Crockett & Wood, 2010). In other jurisdictions, province is used instead of state or territory for example in Canada (Wang, 2011); and in China. Additionally, the role of state tourism organisations is to improve the competitiveness of their destination (Pike & Mason, 2011). However, it is difficult to state that these roles extend to rural tourism destinations in the management and marketing perspectives, hence this is additional justification for this conceptual paper.
2.5. Local tourism organisations

The local tourism organisations are responsible for the management and/or marketing of tourism based on a smaller geographic area, local government, city or town (UNWTO, 2004). Wang (2011) opined that a local tourism office can be involved in the management of tourism at the local level. This can be done through collaboration between the local government and cooperative society of tourism businesses within the destination. However, a review of literature indicates that there is a dearth of academic interest in local DMMOs for rural tourism destinations and in practice. This is because most of the promotion and marketing of rural destinations are managed by regional tourism organisation (Pike, 2008); and state tourism organisations. In this circumstance, tourism development, attractions and awareness especially in destinations that are not popular have not been fully explored.

2.6. The roles of the destination marketing organisations

Wang (2008) developed a framework to support the nine roles of destination marketing organisation in small destinations in Indiana, USA. The following strategic roles of destination marketing organisation emerged from the study. These include ‘information provider, community brand builder, convener, facilitator and liaison of community industry, organizer of destination marketing campaigns, funding agent for collective marketing activities, partner and team builder, and network management organization’ (Wang, 2011 p.17). Additionally, this paper extends these roles to ten with the inclusion of tourism product developer. These roles are depicted in Figure 1.
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**Fig. 1. A framework for the roles of destination marketing organisation (DMO)**

Source: Adapted from Wang (2008).

2.7. Research gap

This section elaborates further on the research gap. For example, studies have shown that there are over 200 countries in the world (Balakrishnan, 2008; Morgan, Hastings & Prichard, 2012); and about 2 million destinations to visit (Balakrishnan, 2008); and almost all of them practice or engage in destination marketing (Balakrishnan, 2008; Morgan, Hastings & Prichard, 2012). Hence, the management and marketing of tourism destinations cannot be underestimated especially in rural tourism destinations. However, despite the important position of destination management and marketing organisation (DMMO), there is a lack of DMMO specifically established for rural tourism destination. In addition, there is also a dearth of academic research on its roles in relation to rural tourism
destination. In most destinations, the existing DMMOs at the national, state and regional levels are responsible for the marketing of rural tourism destination. The rationale for given the responsibility to one of the three DMMOs that is, national tourism organisations, regional tourism organisations and state tourism organisations is the assumption that a common problem of tourism development and marketing in rural destination is its limited drawing power (Cai, 2002). In addition, Cai (2002 p.738) mentioned that “individual rural destinations are often too small to form a critical mass required of a primary destination”. However, recent study revealed that a single rural destination is capable of increasing and maintaining the number of tourist arrivals. For example, a research conducted at the Forest of Dean, a rural tourism destination in the United Kingdom indicates that the forest (destination) has developed a character of its own with a unique culture, traditions and dialect, markedly different from other neighbouring communities, and has been described as one of the memorable rural tourism destinations (Greaves & Skinner, 2010). Likewise, Pike (2008) noted that regional tourism organisations are often responsible for the marketing of destinations such as cities, towns, villages, coastal resorts areas, islands and rural areas. As a result there is a lack of adequate coverage and focus on how these multiple destinations should be marketed and promoted effectively.

Besides, there are factors such as time constraints, human and financial resources that have imposed limitations on the activities of regional tourism organisations in rural destinations. To address these challenges, Pike (2008) suggest the formation of a local tourism office or destination marketing organisation in conjunction with the local government authority and cooperative association of tourism businesses. This view is consistent with the recent studies conducted by Pearce and Schanzel (2013 p.141) that “destinations need to be managed”. The studies were conducted in Rotorua, Wellington and Franz Josef in New Zealand. It was found that Franz Josef – a rural tourism destination is the only study context out of the three destinations “with an explicit destination management plan” (Pearce & Schamzel, 2013 p. 143). The study recommends that future research should be extended to other destinations (including rural destinations) in particular on how tourist experiences influenced by destination management (Pearce & Schamzel, 2013 p.144). This view is shared by Pike and Page (2014 p.217) that there is a need to research into “what extent is the destination marketing organisation is responsible for the competitiveness of the destination?”. This is necessary because the existing destination management organisations and destination marketing organisations at national, state and regional levels have not been able to market, manage and brand rural tourism destinations competitively compared to other urban and well established tourism destinations.

3. Methodology

This study has adopted content analysis of the literature on rural tourism, destination management and destination marketing organisations at different levels which include national tourism organisations, regional tourism organisations and state tourism organisations over the last two decades (1992-2014). The reason for chosen content analysis to analyse literature sources is because content analysis is found to be the appropriate technique or tool that can be used to analyse any kind of text (Esterberg, 2002). This claim is shared by Puvenesvary, Rahim, Naidu, Badis, Nayan, & Aziz (2011) that the use of content analysis is very popular across wide array of studies including written and recorded verbal communication such as novels, journal articles, newspaper articles, interviews, focus groups, observations and world wide web. The following criteria were used for the selection of literature review which includes the title of the literature or article must contain the wordings such as destination management, destination marketing, place management and marketing. Likewise, the content of the literature or paper must be scoped predominantly to the field of tourism and rural tourism destinations. Currently, academic research on destination management and marketing organisations established specifically for rural destinations is evolving; hence there are very few studies in this field. It should be noted that the first academic journal dedicated to destination marketing and management was published in December 2012 (Pike & Page, 2014).

Furthermore, content analysis is also found appropriate in order to rigorously examine the language used by past authors on DMMOs and rural tourism for the purpose of classifying text into certain number of categories that represent similar meaning (Weber, 1990). Similarly, the eight stage model of qualitative content analysis developed by Berg (2004, p.286) was applied to the literature on DMMOs for better analysis of the features emerged. These stages include decide on the level of analysis, the number of characteristics to be investigated and whether to code for occurrence or frequency or both. The selected articles were scrutinized to identify major themes such as destination marketing organisations, national tourism organisations and destination management organisations. This
is presented in Table 1. It is very important to do so in order to identify the extent to which these themes have been covered by the literature. Subsequently, different activities, tasks and functions of these organisations in terms management and marketing were highlighted and presented in Table 2. More importantly, to describe, interprets and explain the themes that have been identified from the functions of DMMOs, a conceptual analysis which is inductive in nature was adopted (Berg, 2004; Carney, 1972). This was done deliberately to identify the roles of DMMOs in the rural tourism context. In conceptual analysis, concepts or themes related to the current study were chosen and examined to ascertain the frequency of occurrences to determine DMMOs functions that are mostly indispensable and relevant to rural destinations.

4. Discussion and findings

4.1. Destination management and marketing organisation’s in rural tourism destinations

The role of DMMOs will continue to draw the attention of tourism researchers and practitioners alike. According to Volgger and Pechlaner (2014), there is a lack of empirical research concerning the role of destination management organisations in establishing the competitiveness of a tourism destination. This is consistent with Pike and Page (2014) that academic literature has limited penetration or impact on destination practitioners. In order words, most of the destination management and marketing organisation research findings have received limited interest from the tourism industry operators. To address these issues, Health (1999) advocated the need for tourism destinations to move from broad based marketing and embrace both targeted and customized positioning. Hence, it is very crucial to focus on conceptual thinking that will lead to a new DMMOs paradigm (Pike & Page 2014). The role of existing local tourism organisation seems to have been limited because in most rural tourism destinations they are merely information offices to the visitors rather than a local destination management and marketing organisation.

Most of the local tourism organisations are established by either the national tourism organisation, regional tourism organisation or state tourism organisation as a liaison office and not necessarily promoting the rural destination. The increased global competition in the tourism industry in both domestic and overseas markets has forced tourism destinations to apply fundamental marketing practices to destinations, notably is the application of destination branding (Hanna & Rowley, 2008). Consequently, even the well-established tourism destinations need to distinguish themselves due to increasingly competitive global tourism market in order to attract more tourists (Baker & Cameron, 2007). Therefore, it becomes imperative to develop a destination management and destination marketing for rural tourism that will be responsible for bringing new or promoting existing tourism business (Wang & Fessenmaier, 2007). In addition, destination marketing and management, tourist decision making in relation to destination, destination image, positioning and communication management, and destination tourism product development must be well positioned (Wang, 2011). Additionally, the destination management and marketing organisation’s responsibilities could include crisis management (Pike, 2004).

4.2. Destination management and marketing organisations – functions, activities and tasks

According to Pike (2004), the destination management and marketing organisation functions among others include the following namely human resources development, politics, policy and destination strategy, finance and budgeting, destination branding, tourism assets and attractions, destination communication, promotions and marketing, monitoring and performance. The core function of destination marketing organisations at all levels is the marketing and sustainability of destination competiveness (Pike & Ryan, 2004). Wang (2008) mentioned that a destination is made up different types of stakeholders who are mainly interested in marketing their products. In addition, tourism organisations at different levels are involved in the marketing of the destinations, but the destination marketing organisations provide a collective platform in marketing the destinations as a whole to the visitors or tourist. Destination marketing organisations functions also include industry coordination and relationship management among the stakeholders. Similarly, improve community relations with the host community through effective communication strategy for the benefits of the people. The host community is regarded as one of the
important stakeholders as the host of the tourism experience. Cooperation and partnership is essential between the host community and destination marketing organisation for a unified vision and delivery of destination experience to the visitors (Bhat & Gaur, 2012).

According to Atorough and Martin (2012), the challenge of a tourism region is to provide economic benefits that will extend to the peripheral communities (rural destinations). This view is shared by Munar (2011) that the destination brand and marketing of a tourism destination has to take into consideration diverse groups of stakeholders’ interest and peculiar nature of the host destination. Moreover, destination marketing organisation should be innovative in creating far-reaching quality system and standard for the destination. Today, destination marketing organisation will face various challenges in an attempt to promote and market tourism destination irrespective of the benefits that can be derived from marketing such destination. This is because in general tourism destinations are seen as ‘high risk and costly’ (Evangelista & Dioko, 2011 p. 317). To market a destination, normally it is built from its culture, history and geography with the assistance of stakeholders including government to make the brand a reality. To achieve this, Buhalis (2000) assert that there are different tourism destinations requiring diverse marketing strategies. Hence the structure of DMMO would be dictated by the unique features of the tourism destination as well as aspirations of all the stakeholders. This point is reinforced by Atorough and Martin (2012) that tourism stakeholders have established destination marketing organisation to manage their destination attractions in other tourism destinations, but this is lacking in smaller tourism destinations. An important task of destination management and marketing organisations is the funding functions and activities. According to WTO (1996), governments have played an important role in the development, promotion and marketing of their countries as a tourist destination. Additionally, provision of infrastructural facilities such as airports, roads, electricity, water and communication are provided by the government.

Today, there is a new dimension to funding of destination marketing organisation. This is due to the decrease in government revenues, the impact of global financial crisis, and coupled with the shift from monetary support by the government to market driven economies (WTO, 1996). Pike (2004) opined that the most common form of funding has become a public-private partnership (PPP) initiative in promoting and marketing of tourism destinations. The main objective of PPP is to develop a strong and well-organised package of tourism products and services to improve the overall destination experience of tourists (Formica & Kothari, 2008). To achieve the goal of engaging PPP in tourism destinations in relation to funding, the government’s contribution to the initiate may be in form of capital investment, concessions or transfer of assets to support the partnership (Formica & Kothari, 2008). Pike (2008) mentioned that the destination management and DMO funding decision processes are influenced by the tourism destination life-cycle stage, industry readiness and economic benefits of tourism to other industries and structure of the destination marketing organisation.

However, in funding local destination marketing organisation, Ritchie and Crouch (2003); Sheehan and Ritchie (1997) outlined sources such as government allocations of public funds, levies of special tourism taxes for example, hotel/room taxes, membership/annual subscription fees paid by tourism organisations, sponsorship and advertising and in-kind contributions to host travel writers and meeting and events planners. Furthermore, it is expedient to collaborate with all the destination stakeholders in rural tourism destinations in order to achieve the goal of having a DMMO responsible for the development and marketing of the rural tourism. The DMMO should recognise destination stakeholders as being important, because they provide funding, tourism superstructure, product and support programmes that influence governance (Sheehan & Ritchie, 2005). More importantly, a detail of DMMO’s functions, tasks and activities is presented in Table 2.
Table 2. Destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs) functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Functions, activities and tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wall</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Formulating strategies, representing stakeholders’ interests, developing products, and marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill &amp; William</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Sustainable resource planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getz, Anderson &amp; Sheehan</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Funding and resources management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie &amp; Crouch</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>External performance (marketing); internal performance (coordination destination stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Human resources development, crisis management, Finance and budgeting, politics, policy and destination strategy, monitoring and performance, destination branding, tourism assets and attractions, destination communication, promotion and marketing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike &amp; Ryan</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Marketing of identifiable tourism destination, sustainability of destination competitiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenza, Sheehan &amp; Ritchie</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Internal destination development activities (visitor’s management, crisis management, human resources development, quality of visitor experience); and external destination marketing activities (web marketing, events, conferences and festivals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainaghi</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Primary processes (operative processes – Management of resources, product development, communication) and support processes (internal marketing, training and research).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Developed nine roles and a framework for destination marketing organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d’Angella &amp; Go</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Intermediation and networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morzano &amp; Scott</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Development, coordination and implementation of the destination network brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Marketing of identifiable tourism destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munar</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Consideration for stakeholders’ interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhat &amp; Gaur</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Delivery of destination experience to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller &amp; Berger</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Evaluation and monitoring of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volgger &amp; Pechlaner</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Networking capability (ability to interact and work or collaborate with destination stakeholders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox, Gyrd-Jones &amp; Gardiner</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Development and marketing of the destination, Communication, leadership and internal brand management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Summary of findings

The summary of the findings indicate that there is a need for the formation of DMMOs in rural tourism destinations and identify its management and marketing roles. These findings are consistent with Pike (2008) that a local DMMO should be established; and for rural tourism destination (Pearce & Schamzel, 2013), to manage its resources and market its tourism products. Based on the literature sources, this paper also finds that destination management organisations and destination marketing organisations performed different tasks, activities and functions as shown in Table 4. For the purpose of achieving the aims of this paper, these functions were critically examined to determine which of them best fit in to the roles of DMMOs in the rural tourism destination. This was achieved through the conceptual analysis adopted for this study as mentioned in the methodology section. Likewise, destination stakeholders’ (participation and involvement strategy) in rural destinations were also considered in the DMMO framework. This is necessary because destination stakeholders have responsibilities to be performed to the rural tourism destination and they also have expectations from the destination such as mutual benefits among others as depicted in the framework. Hence, a summary of management and marketing roles of DMMOs is presented in Table 3 and a framework for DMMO in Figure 2 respectively.
Table 3. Roles of destination management and marketing organisations (DMMOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No.</th>
<th>Destination Management Roles</th>
<th>Destination Marketing Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Human resource development</td>
<td>Destination marketing communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finance and budgeting management</td>
<td>Destination positioning and branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safety, security and crisis</td>
<td>Management of tourism assets, attractions and sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Politics (government, NGOs, community relations and industrial relationship), policy and destination strategy</td>
<td>Service quality, tourist experience and customer’s relationship management (CRM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Monitoring service quality, standards, and destination performance management</td>
<td>Tourism product development and management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the single arrows on the framework indicate the relationship between the main construct while the double way arrows influences and is influenced by other components. For example the destinations stakeholders influence both management and marketing roles of DMMO for mutual benefits to be derived through the formation of a local management and marketing organisation. The stakeholders’ participation, involvement and collaboration with DMMO for the success of rural destinations is indispensable. This view is shared by Bornhorst, Sheehan and Ritchie (2010) that there is an existence of a relationship between the success of tourism destinations and destination management organisations with respect to stakeholders’ involvement and community relations efforts.

4.4. Theoretical and managerial implications

The main theoretical contribution of this paper is that DMMOs’ roles are divided into both destination management and destination marketing roles to conceptualise Destination Management and Marketing Organisation (DMMO) framework for rural tourism destinations. This framework is presented in Figure 2. In addition, this paper has managerial implications which can be used to develop, promote and for the marketing of rural destinations in the
global competitive tourism industry. To achieve this, DMMOs roles should be performed in collaboration with the rural tourism stakeholders in terms of monitoring, managing and maintenance of destination tourist attractions. This collaboration is very important in order to achieve mutual benefits which include management of financial, human and natural resources, marketing of tourism products, positioning, host community well-being, brand building, security and safety assurance, and tourist loyalty to the rural destinations.

5. Conclusion and direction for future studies

Findings from this paper have been able to establish the necessity of having a local destination management and marketing organisation in rural tourism destination. More importantly, the paper identifies the roles of DMMOs and developed a framework for DMMOs in rural destinations. It should be noted that where national tourism organisations established a liaison office at regional or state levels, their roles seems to have been limited. As a result they are merely information offices to the visitors rather than DMMOs responsible for the management, marketing, promotion and branding of rural tourism destinations. This study relies majorly on secondary research and the review of literature in rural tourism, marketing and destination management disciplines. This paper is positioned to fill a gap in the literature on DMMOs for rural tourism destinations. Therefore, this conceptual paper recommends that the future studies should attempt to conduct empirical research among the rural destination stakeholders in order to identify the challenges and complexity of establishing a rural tourism DMMOs.
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