ĐÁNH GIÁ CHẤT LƯỢNG DỊCH VỤ DU LỊCH Ở VỊNH HẠ LONG
TỈNH QUẢNG NINH

Trần Trung Vỹ[1], Nguyễn Xuân Quỳnh[2],
Eriberto Casino[3]

Tóm tắt

Nghiên cứu được thực hiện nhờ vào sự khảo sát nhận thức của các nhà quản lý, các khách du lịch và những người đang sinh sống ở Vịnh Hạ Long, tỉnh Quảng Ninh để đánh giá thực trạng chất lượng du lịch, phân tích những tác động của của du lịch tới sự phát triển kinh tế của tỉnh Quảng Ninh và sự đóng góp của nhà quản lý, của người dân và khách du lịch đối với phát triển du lịch của địa phương. Số liệu thu thập trong năm 2017 thông qua các cuộc phỏng vấn sâu, câu hỏi bán cấu trúc đã được thực hiện với 909 người trả lời bao gồm: 177 người quản lý, 341 giám đốc điều hành doanh nghiệp và 391 lượt khách về vai trò của Vịnh Hạ Long đối với phát triển kinh tế xã hội của tỉnh Quảng Ninh, về chất lượng xử lý rác thải, phân phối nước, an ninh và điều kiện hạ tầng du lịch cũng như khuyến nghị phát triển du lịch ở Vịnh Hạ Long. Kết quả cho thấy, thực trạng xử lý rác thải, phân phối nước, an ninh và trật tự, và hạ tầng du lịch ở tại Vịnh Hạ Long vẫn tồn tại những hạn chế do nhiều nguyên nhân khác nhau. Dựa trên đó, bài báo gợi ý một số ý tưởng và giải pháp để nâng cao chất lượng dịch vụ du lịch tại Vịnh Hạ Long.
Từ khóa: *Vịnh Hạ Long, chất lượng dịch vụ du lịch, phát triển kinh tế - xã hội, tỉnh Quảng Ninh.*

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF TOURISM SERVICES IN HA LONG BAY OF
QUANG NINH PROVINCE

Abstract

A study was conducted on the awareness of managers, tourists and people living in Ha Long Bay, Quang Ninh Province, to assess the quality of tourism services, to analyze the impact of tourism on the economic development of Quang Ninh province and the support of managers, tourist enterprises and tourists to the development of tourism in the locality. Primary data was collected in 2017 through in-depth interviews, structured questionnaire with 909 respondents including: 177 managers, 341 enterprise's CEO and 391 tourists about the role of Ha Long Bay for socio-economic development of Quang Ninh province, the problems of Ha Long Bay in terms of garbage disposal, water distribution, security, and accommodation as well as their recommendation for tourism development in Ha Long Bay, Quang Ninh province. The findings showed that, on the whole, respondents viewed that garbage disposal, water distribution, security and order, and accommodation in Ha Long Bay still existed drawbacks due to many different causes. Based on that, the article suggests a number of solutions and recommendation to enhance the quality of tourism services in Ha Long Bay, Quang Ninh province.
Keyword: *Ha Long Bay, quality of tourism services, socio-economic development, Quang Ninh province.*

1. Introduction

Ha Long Bay is located in Quang Ninh province in Northeast Vietnam, 160 km east of Hanoi. With a total area of 1,553km^2, the bay contains 1,600 islands, 90% of which are monolithic limestone karsts. The site includes 775 islands, 411 of which are name-accredited. Ha Long Bay was first inscribed as a natural property on the World Heritage List in 1994 for its exceptional beauty [3], [4]. This was extended in 2000 to include recognition as an outstanding example of the earth's geology and geomorphology.

Ha Long bay is an ideal place for tourism industry along with the preservation of the unique values of the heritage during the two decades. Tourism to Ha Long Bay has boomed over the past 20 years. The area is a major national, regional and international (65% of visitors are foreign) and core visitor activities include cave visits, sightseeing, swimming, hiking, kayaking and appreciation of nature and culture. Ha Long Bay has been recognized twice, in 1994 and 2000, by UNESCO as a World

Natural Heritage area for its universal value of landscape and geology [8].

However, recent years, the quality of tourism services not meet needs of visitors, affecting negatively the effectiveness of tourism activities, tourists attracting and promotion of the image of Ha Long Bay to the world [8], [7]. With the policy of developing tourism of Quang Ninh province, improving the quality and professionalism of tourism services in the direction of upgrading the class, the tourism services in Ha Long Bay will be prioritized for development.

Tourism resources include components and combinations of natural landscapes and human landscapes that can be used for tourism services and to satisfy the needs of visitors for rest, visit and treatment [9],[4].

The sustainability of tourism is dependent on an adequate water sup-ply of sufficient quality and quantity but there is little research on the significance of water in tourism development (Essex, Kent, & Newnham, 2004) [5]. This paucity of research into the tourism and water nexus has made it difficult for the tourism industry to engage in the policy debate (Crase, O'Keefe, & Horwitz, 2010) [2]. A distinction has to be made between the consumptive and non-consumptive relationship between tourism and water.

Rouse and Ali (2009) discussed the sustainable livelihoods approach in relation to waste pickers (collectors), whose aspirations were ranked into four core concepts. Firstly, "vulnerability context" which is related to environmental conditions affecting waste collectors' activities. Secondly, "asset profiles" which consist of various forms of capital: human capital; social capital (waste pickers' relationships with dealers); physical capital (poor living conditions); and financial capital (low income levels) [10].

Safety and security have always been indispensable condition for travel and tourism. But it is an incontestable fact that safety and security issues gained a much bigger importance in the last two decades in tourism (Anna, 2017).

Accommodation is one of the basic needs for any tourism activity. Travelers and tourists need lodging for rest, while they are on a tour. Accommodation in the form of low budget lodges/hotels to world class luxury hotels is available at all the major tourist destinations to provide the tourist a home away from home (Zhou, 2009)[11].

This paper represents preliminary findings from a study of accessing tourism services quality in Ha Long Bay, Quang Ninh province, Vietnam with two main objectives:

i. To explore managers and visitors' perceptions about the problems of Ha Long Bay in terms of garbage disposal, water distribution, security and order, and accommodation.

ii. To make recommendations promoting the tourism development for the study area.

2. Hypothesis

The are no relationship between the type of respondents and their perception on quality of tourism service of Quang Ninh province in terms of Garbage disposal, Water distribution, Security and Order, and Accommodation.

3. Methodology

3.1. Place of the study

The site selected for this study is Ha Long Bay in Quang Ninh province, which is located in the North-East of Vietnam. It is an area of superlative natural beauty. It is also a treasure house of unusual and unique geomorphic features, ecosystems and bio-diversity. There are many sites of historical significance and archaeological remains in and around the Bay, and it is strongly represented in myths and legends of the Vietnamese people (Galla, 2002) [6]. In addition, it has been recently voted (2011) as one of the new seven natural wonders of the world. Ha Long Bay is an important site both economically and culturally for Vietnam, and has played a significant role in the development for the country as an international tourism destination. It is one of Vietnam's premier tourism destinations (Hien, 2011)[9].

3.2. Sampling technique and sample size

There are 2356 tourism enterprises in the locality and the number of visitors to Ha Long Bay is an average of 2.6 million people per year. Each month average 433.333 turns of visitors (by

the number of tourists to Ha Long about 6 months). The study will be conducted during the week of July (this is the month with the most tourists). The number of visitors in the week of July is expected to be 18.055; the number of tourism managers of Ha Long Bay is 320 people. To find out the limitations of tourism services in Ha Long Bay as well as analyze the factors affecting the quality of these services, thereby propose solutions contributing to improve the quality of services in traveling points in Ha Long Bay, in 2017, the study used the Slovin (1988) formula to select the sample. As follows:

N = N/(1+N*e²)

N = population size; n = sample size; e is level exactly (set e = 5%).

The sample size and the number of respondents, all are working at Ha Long city, in which: 177 respondents are managers, 341 respondents are enterprise's CEO and 391 respondents are visitors. The study employed random sampling for manager and enterprises and convenience sampling techniques (apply for selecting visitors)

3.3. Research instrument

To evaluate perception of respondents on quality of tourism service at Ha Long Bay' in terms of Garbage disposal, Water distribution, Security and Order, and Accommodation, aspects, the research used Likert – scale with 5 range as follow:

Table 1: Scale to measure respondents' perception

Scale	Point Range	Verbal Description	Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Very satisfied (Vs)	It means that the given problem is 81% - 100% and predominant, widespread of rampantly encountered.
4	3.40 – 4.19	Satisfied (Ss)	It means that the given problem is 61% - 80% and always encountered to a certain extent.
3	2.60 – 3.39	Neither satisfied or dissatisfied (Nd)	It means that the given problem is 41% - 60% and sometimes encountered to a certain extent.
2	1.80 – 2.59	Dissatisfied (Sd)	It means that the given problem is 21% - 40% and seldom encountered.
1	1.00 – 1.79	Very dissatisfied (Vd)	It means that the given problem is 0% - 20% or hardly ever encountered.

Source: Survey, 2017

The variables were tested through the One way –ANOVAto analyze and conclude the relationship between the type of respondents and perception of respondents on quality of tourism service at Ha Long Bay' in terms of Garbage disposal , Water distribution, Security and Order, and Accommodation.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Respondents' profile

Table 2 presents the respondents' profile in terms of age, monthly income and nationality among three groups. It is clear that there are majority of respondents who had age from 31 to

40 years old accounted for more than 34.2 percent followed by nearly 25.5% of respondent had age from 41 to 50. Therefore, the distribution of respondents in term of Age might make their responses to the social economic development factors more reliable. The survey also indicates that while the distribution of the age of managers and enterprises belongs to higher age than that of visitors. Specifically, the majority of respondents who are managers had age blanket more than 41 years olds equivalent to more than 50 percent, followed by the age blanket between 31 and 40. While the highest percentage of visitors belongs

to the age blanket from 31 to 40 years old, only nearly 21% of visitors had age blanket more than 51 years old.

The distribution of nationality is significantly different in all three groups that are due to the position of respondents. The distribution of nationality among three groups is similar where the number of Vietnamese people is two times than foreigners.

The table also presented the profile of respondents in terms of monthly income. Data showed that the distribution of monthly income of managers and enterprises is much higher than that of visitors. Most of managers and enterprises have monthly income more than 10 mils VND accounted for more than 50 percent. However, the majority of visitors have monthly income between 4 and 10 mils VND. That is because most of respondent are Vietnamese people, thus the salary quite below than 8 mils VND.

Table 2: Characteristics of respondents

Respondents' profile	Managers		Enterprises		Visitors		Overall	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Monthly income								
1 - 3 Mils VND	0	0.0	0	0.0	43	11.0	43	4.7
4 - 8 Mils VND	25	14.1	11	3.2	115	29.4	151	16.6
8 -10 Mils VND	33	18.6	42	12.3	142	36.3	217	23.9
10-20 Mils VND	92	52.0	172	50.4	55	14.1	319	35.1
More than 20 Mils VND	27	15.3	116	34.0	36	9.2	179	19.7
Nationality								
Vietnam	121	68.4	236	69.2	259	66.2	616	67.8
Foreign	56	31.6	105	30.8	132	33.8	293	32.2
Age								
21-30	27	15.3	63	18.5	104	26.6	194	21.3
31-40	59	33.3	125	36.7	127	32.5	311	34.2
41-50	62	35	94	27.6	61	15.6	217	23.9
51 above	29	16	59	17	99	25	187	21
Total	**177**	**100**	**341**	**100**	**391**	**100**	**909**	**100**

Source: Survey, 2017

4.2. The assessment of respondents related to tourism services of the Ha Long Bay

4.2.1. Garbage disposal

Table 3 shows Assessment of the three groups of respondents on garbage disposal. Overall, repondents give average score in term of garbage disposal at 2.72 mean scores. Among them they rated the highest score in term of " Information is easily available through Product & Service Brochures, leaflets, letters" at 3.11 mean score. While they are somewhat dissatisfied in terms of classification "Classification waste make me fell confortable", "Development integrated with local environment", "Information centre provides relevant information related to garbage disposal", and "Development integrated with local culture" with the averaged mean under 2.6 mean points. There are quite different among three groups in term of garbage disposal. While managers and enterprise rated higher scores in almost items in term of garbage disposal than the other group. Specifically, on average, while enterprise and managers rated at somewhat satisfied in term of garbage disposal, visitors

gave dissatisfied in term of garbage disposal at only 2.4 mean scores. Among these items, managers satisfied in term of ""Adequate transport systems are available for collecting waste"at 3.54 mean scores. However, they rate the lowest score in term of "development integrated with local environment" at only 2.36 mean points. On the other hand, enterprises gave the highest score in term of emphasis on the recycling and reuse of products at 3.48 mean scores, while they rated the lowest score in term

of information centre provides relevant information related to garbage disposal at 2.13 mean points. In contrast, visitors rated the highest mean scores in terms of emphasis on the recycling and reuse of products and development integrated with local environment with similar mean scores at 2.83 mean points. However, they rated the lowest score in term of development integrated with local culture at 1.88 mean points.

Table 3: Assessment of Respondents on garbage disposal

GARBAGE DISPOSAL	Managers		Enterprises		Visitors		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	IV
I am satisfied with the set-up of garbage disposal	2.75	Nd	3.05	Nd	2.61	Nd	2.80	Nd
Classification waste make me fell confortable	2.55	Sd	2.67	Nd	2.54	Sd	2.59	Sd
Emphasis on the recycling and reuse of products	2.99	Nd	3.48	Ss	2.83	Nd	3.10	Nd
Information is easily available through Product & Service Brochures, leaflets, letters	3.26	Nd	3.72	Ss	2.41	Sd	3.13	Nd
Development integrated with local environment	2.36	Sd	2.39	Sd	2.83	Nd	2.53	Sd
Information center provides relevant information related to garbage disposal	2.94	Nd	2.13	Sd	1.96	Sd	2.34	Sd
Adequate transport systems are available for collecting waste	3.54	Ss	3.62	Ss	2.16	Sd	3.11	Nd
Development integrated with local culture	2.38	Sd	2.22	Sd	1.88	Sd	2.16	Sd
Grand Average	2.85	Nd	2.91	Nd	2.40	Sd	2.72	Nd

Source: Survey, 2017

4.2.2. Water distribution

Table 4 shows assessment of the three groups of Respondents on water distribution. Overall, respondents give average score in term of water distribution at 2.80 mean scores. Among them they rated the highest score in term of "Palatable water means the water is Safe for human consumption" at 3.51 mean score. While they are somewhat dissatisfied in terms of quality of drinking water, the employment of

qualified operators for maintenance, make available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure, and provide continuous delivery of sufficient volume of potable and palatable water at adequate pressure with the averaged mean under 2.6 mean points. There are quite different among three groups in term of water distribution. While managers and enterprise rated higher scores in almost items of water distribution than the other group. Specifically, on average, while

enterprise and managers rated at somewhat satisfied in term of water distribution at 3.04 and 2.78 mean scores respectively, visitors gave the lower mean score in term of water distribution at only 2.6 mean scores. Among these items, managers satisfied in terms of " Palatable water means the water is safe for human consumption", available of public water supply and adequate water supply at 3.66, 3.62 and 3.62 respectively mean scores. However, they rate the lowest score in term of "Make available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure" at only 2.08 mean points. On the other hand, enterprises gave the highest score in term of "Palatable water means the water is safe for human consumption" at 3.38 mean scores, while they rated the lowest score in term of "make available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure" at 2.14 mean points. In contrast, visitors rated the highest mean scores in terms of "Palatable water means the water is Safe for human consumption" with the mean scores at 3.51 mean points. However, they dissatisfied in term of in term of "Provide continuous delivery of sufficient volume of potable and palatable water at adequate pressure" at 1.78 mean points.

Table 4: Assessment of Respondents on water distribution

WATER DISTRIBUTION	Managers		Enterprises		Visitors		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI
Adequate water supply	3.62	Ss	2.99	Nd	3.28	Nd	3.30	Nd
Quality of drinking water	2.85	Nd	2.35	Sd	2.01	Sd	2.40	Sd
Available of public water supply	3.62	Ss	3.44	Ss	3.07	Nd	3.38	Nd
The employment of qualified operators for maintenance	2.84	Nd	2.35	Sd	2.18	Sd	2.46	Sd
Palatable water means the water is Safe for human consumption	3.66	Ss	3.38	Nd	3.51	Ss	3.52	Ss
Make available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure	2.08	Sd	2.14	Sd	1.99	Sd	2.07	Sd
Provide continuous delivery of sufficient volume of potable and palatable water at adequate pressure	2.33	Sd	2.15	Sd	1.78	Vd	2.09	Sd
Provide water for fire protection	3.29	Nd	3.41	Ss	2.99	Nd	3.23	Nd
Grand Average	3.04	Nd	2.78	Nd	2.60	Nd	2.80	Nd

Source: Survey, 2017

4.2.3. Security and Order

Table 5 shows Assessment of Respondents in term of Security and Order. Overall, respondents give average score in term of "Security and Order" at 2.93 mean scores. Among them they rated the highest score in term of "The staff provides accurate information" at 3.84 mean score. While they are somewhat dissatisfied in terms of the staff provides tourists with personal attention, the staff understands the specific needs of tourists, the staff provides details regarding services and products offered, and adequate transport systems are available with the averaged mean under 2.6 mean points. Regarding the difference among three groups, it is evident that there are quite different among

three groups in term of Security and Order. While managers and enterprise rated higher scores in almost items in term of Security and Order than the other group. Specifically, on average, while enterprise and managers rated at somewhat satisfied in term of Security and Order at 3.13 and 2.98 mean scores respectively, visitors gave the lower mean score in term of Security and order at only 2.68 mean scores. Among these items, managers satisfied in terms of the staff provides accurate information, The establishment provides adequate safety facilities, and Tourists feel safe and secure at 3.92, 4.03 and 3.58 respectively mean scores. However,

they rate the lowest score in term of the staff provides details regarding services and products offered at only 2.49 mean points. On the other hand, enterprises gave the highest score in term of The staff provides accurate information at 3.88 mean scores, while they rated the lowest score in term of The staff understands the specific needs of tourists at 2.32 mean points. In contrast, visitors rated the highest mean scores in terms of the staff provides accurate information at 3.571 mean points. However, they dissatisfied in term of in term of the staff provides details regarding services and products offered at 1.86 mean points.

Table 5: Assessment of Respondents on Security and Order

SECURITY AND ORDER	Managers		Enterprises		Visitors		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	
The establishment provides adequate safety facilities	4.03	Ss	3.44	Ss	3.47	Ss	3.65	Ss
The staff provides tourists with personal attention	2.38	Sd	2.86	Nd	2.07	Sd	2.44	Sd
The staff understands the specific needs of tourists	2.55	Sd	2.32	Sd	1.93	Sd	2.27	Sd
Tourists feel safe and secure	3.58	Ss	3.42	Ss	3.26	Nd	3.42	Ss
The staff responds to tourists' question(s)	2.93	Nd	2.62	Nd	2.61	Nd	2.72	Nd
The staff provides details regarding services and products offered	2.49	Sd	2.56	Sd	1.86	Sd	2.30	Sd
The staff provides on-time services	3.42	Ss	3.37	Nd	2.93	Nd	3.24	Nd
The staff provides accurate information	3.92	Ss	3.88	Ss	3.71	Ss	3.84	Ss
Adequate transport systems are available	2.85	Nd	2.34	Sd	2.27	Sd	2.49	Sd
Grand Average	3.13	Nd	2.98	Nd	2.68	Nd	2.93	Nd

Source: Survey, 2017

4.2.4. Accommodation

Table 5 shows Assessment of Respondents on Accommodation. Overall, respondents give average score in term of Accommodation at 2.94 mean scores. Among them they rated the highest

score in term of "Bringing vehicles" at 4.15 mean score. While they are somewhat dissatisfied in terms of "Rejecting an offer of accommodation", having a guest to stay, assistance for disabilities or limiting long term

illness, Providing accommodation insurance, and Physical facilities and equipment are visually aligned and in good condition with the averaged mean under 2.6 mean points. Regarding the difference among three groups, it is evident that there are quite different among three groups in term of accommodation. While managers and enterprise rated higher scores in almost items in term of accommodation than the other group. Specifically, on average, while enterprise and managers rated at somewhat satisfied in term of "accommodation" at 3.123 and 2.95 mean scores respectively, visitors gave the lower mean score in term of accommodation at only 2.64 mean scores. Among these items, managers highly satisfied in terms of "Bringing vehicles and

satisfied" in term of "The staff is willing to assist tourists" at 4.31 and 3.95 respectively mean scores. However, they rate the lowest score in term of providing accommodation insurance at only 2.37 mean points. On the other hand, enterprises gave the highest score in term of "Bringing vehicles" at 4.19 mean scores, while they rated the lowest score in term of having a guest to stay at 1.91 mean points. In contrast, visitors rated the highest mean scores in terms of "Bringing vehicles", followed by the item of "The staff is willing to assist tourists" at 3.94 and 3.59 mean point respectively. However, they rated the lowest score in term of in term of having a guest to stay at 1.91 mean points.

Table 6: Assessment of Respondents on accommodation

ACCOMMODATION	Managers		Enterprises		Visitors		Overall	
	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	VI	Mean	
Rejecting an offer of accommodation	2.85	Nd	2.48	Sd	2.24	Sd	2.52	Sd
Arriving a few days earlier	3.61	Ss	3.55	Ss	2.86	Nd	3.34	Nd
Allowing pets in the room	3.01	Nd	2.89	Nd	2.75	Nd	2.88	Nd
Having a guest to stay	2.49	Sd	2.08	Sd	1.91	Sd	2.16	Sd
Extending the contracts	3.92	Ss	3.41	Ss	2.83	Nd	3.39	Nd
Facilities such as TV are equipped in the rooms	3.63	Ss	3.44	Ss	2.81	Nd	3.29	Nd
Bringing vehicles	4.31	Vs	4.19	Ss	3.94	Ss	4.15	Ss
Assistance for disabilities or limiting long term illness	3.07	Nd	2.35	Sd	2.06	Sd	2.49	Sd
The property in the rooms is good	3.08	Nd	2.91	Nd	2.79	Nd	2.93	Nd
Providing accommodation insurance	2.37	Sd	2.26	Sd	1.94	Sd	2.19	Sd
Comfortable facilities	3.06	Nd	2.83	Nd	2.66	Nd	2.85	Nd
The staff is willing to assist tourists	3.95	Ss	3.82	Ss	3.59	Ss	3.79	Ss
Physical facilities and equipment are visually aligned and in good condition	2.64	Nd	2.09	Sd	1.89	Sd	2.21	Sd
Grand Average	3.23	Nd	2.95	Nd	2.64	SA	2.94	Nd

Source: Survey, 2017

4.3. Assessment of respondents related to the problems of the Ha Long Bay

In the study, if any item has mean score less than expected score at 2.6 mean points, it is considered as an issue and lower than expectation. The gap between expected scores and assessment's mean scores is higher it mean that this problems need to intermediately solve. This is also an important to identify the factor that is lower than expected score, in order to find the appropriate solution to meet the requirements. Among the problems in term of garbage disposal, the highest gap between the lowest expected average score and perception score is the term of "development integrated with local culture" which is the lowest mean score. In

term of "Water distribution", the highest gap is the term of makes available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure. In addition, in term of "Security and Order", the highest gap is the item of "The staff understands the specific needs of tourists", followed by the item of "The staff provides details regarding services and products offered". One of the biggest issues in term of "Accommodation" is providing accommodation insurance which is the highest GAP. Therefore, the governments in the Ha Long bay should be applied several policies to improve those problems to assist visitors in quickly accommodated in the new spaces in short run, as well as attract more visitors to visit in the Ha Long bay in long-run

Table 7: Assessment of respondents related to Tourism of the Ha Long Bay

Problems	Mean	IV
Garbage disposal		
Classification waste make me fell confortable	2.59	Sd
Development integrated with local environment	2.53	Sd
Information centre provides relevant information related to garbage disposal	2.34	Sd
Development integrated with local culture	2.16	Sd
Water distribution		
Quality of drinking water	2.40	Sd
The employment of qualified operators for maintenance	2.46	Sd
Make available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure	2.07	Sd
Provide continuous delivery of sufficient volume of potable and palatable water at adequate pressure	2.09	Sd
Security and order		
The staff provides tourists with personal attention	2.44	Sd
The staff understands the specific needs of tourists	2.27	Sd
The staff provides details regarding services and products offered	2.30	Sd
Adequate transport systems are available	2.49	Sd
Accommodation		
Rejecting an offer of accommodation	2.52	Sd
Having a guest to stay	2.61	Sd
Assistance for disabilities or limiting long term illness	2.49	Sd
Providing accommodation insurance	2.19	Sd
Physical facilities and equipment are visually aligned and in good condition	2.21	Sd

Source: Survey, 2017

Table 8: Testing of hypothesis

	Null Hypothesis	**P_value**	**Decisions**
Garbage disposal	There is no significant difference in the respondent's assessment of the quality of the Garbage disposal	0.000	Rejected
Water distribution	There is no significant difference in the respondent's assessment of the quality of the Water distribution	0.000	Rejected
Security and Order	There is no significant difference in the respondent's assessment of the quality of the Security and Order	0.000	Rejected
Accommodation	There is no significant difference in the respondent's assessment of the quality of the Accommodation	0.000	Rejected

Source: Survey, 2017

4.4. Testing of hypothesis

Testing one-way ANOVA statistics of the table provides evidence that there is a significant difference between three groups of respondents and their perception on the problems related to garbage disposal, water distribution, Security and Order, and accommodation.

5. Conclusions and Recommendation

By adopting a qualitative approach, the manager, CEO and visitors' perceptions about the problems of Ha Long Bay in terms of garbage disposal, water distribution, security and order, and accommodation were explored in this study. Overall, the findings revealed that Ha Long Bay manager, CEO in general highly valued Ha Long tourism services in terms of garbage disposal, water distribution, security and order, and accommodation but raised some concerns about classification waste, providing relevant information related to garbage disposal, development integrated with local environment and local culture, quality of drinking water, making available the allocation of water at satisfactory pressure, providing continuous delivery of sufficient volume of potable and palatable water at adequate pressure, providing details regarding services and products offered from staffs, providing accommodation insurance, assistance for disabilities or limiting long term illness, and physical facilities and equipment are visually aligned and in good condition…etc.

To maintain sustainable tourism, Ha Long bay tourism planners and operators should seek to understand manager, CEO and visitors' perceptions and attitudes before commencing development, and keep listening to manager, CEO' thoughts rather than laying down top–down plans and programs. A long–term plan and solutions to improve the drawbacks of tourism services in term of garbage disposal, water distribution, security and order, and accommodation should be taken into account. The results of the study also indicated that it is essential to include local manager, CEO in the decision–making process as well as in tourism activities themselves so that they can voice their opinions and share their active roles in the development of Ha Long Bay tourism.

This study only assesses the quality of tourism infrastructure and conditions in Ha Long Bay through the awareness of managers, tourists and businesses. The study does not analyze the economic contribution of the tourism sector and the efficiency of using tourism resources in Ha Long Bay.

REFERENCES

[1]. Anna Farmaki. (2017). The tourism and peace nexus. *Tourism Management*, vol.217, pp. 52 - 59.

[2] Crase, L., O'Keefe, S., & Horwitz, P. (2010). Australian tourism in a water constrained economy. *CRC for Sustainable Tourism.*

[3]. Decision No. 1418. Decision-People Committee dated 04/7/2014 of Quang Ninh Provincial People's Committee Approving the master plan for tourism development in Quang Ninh province up to 2020 with a vision to 2030.

[4]. Decision No. 1139. Decision-People Committee dated 27/4/2015 of the People's Committee of Quang Ninh Province approving the detailed plan of preserving and promoting the value of Ha Long Bay Heritage until 2020.

[5]. Essex, S., Kent, M., & Newnham, R. (2004). Tourism development in Mallorca: Is water supply a constraint. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12 (1), 4 – 28.

[6]. Galla, A. (2002). Culture and Heritage in Development: Ha Long Ecomuseum, A Case Study from Vietnam. *Humanities Research*, 9 (1), 63 - 76.

[7]. Ha Long Bay Management Board. (2003). *Some legal documents on the management, protection and exploitation of Ha Long Bay*. World Publisher.

[8]. Ha Long Bay Management Board, Ha Long Bay. (2002). *World Natural Heritage.* World Publisher.

[9]. Hien, B. T. T. (2011). Ha Long Bay World Heritage Area - Governance Analysis Governing Marine Protected Areas: Getting the Balance Right. *Technical Report to Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Branch* UNEP, Nairobi, Vol. 2, pp. 136 - 146.

[10]. Rouse, J.; Ali, M. (2009). Waste Pickers in Dhaka: Using the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach—Key Findings and Field Notes. *Water Engineering and Development Centre*. Loughborough University: Leicestershire, UK.

[11]. Zhou, Y., Ap, J. (2009). Manager, CEO' Perceptions towards the Impacts of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48 (1): 78 - 91.

Thông tin tác giả:

1. Trần Trung Vỹ
- Đơn vị công tác: Trường Đại học Hạ Long, tỉnh Quảng Ninh
- NCS tại khoa Quản trị Kinh doanh, trường Đại học Southern Luzon
  – Philippines
- Địa chỉ email: *kttrantrungvy@gmail.com*

2. Nguyễn Xuân Quỳnh
- Đơn vị công tác: Tỉnh Ủy Ninh Bình
- NCS tại khoa Quản trị Kinh doanh, trường Đại học Southern Luzon
  – Philippines
- Địa chỉ email: *quynh.nguyen622@yahoo.com*

3. Eriberto Casino
- Đơn vị công tác: Đại học Southern Luzon – Philippines