

APPLICATION OF SYNTHETIC SCORING METHOD IN TOURIST ATTRACTION ASSESSMENT, CASE STUDY OF AN GIANG PROVINCE

Nguyen Phu Thang^{1*} and Le My Dung²

¹*Faculty of Geography, The University of Da Nang, University of Science and Education*

²*Faculty of Geography, Ha Noi National University of Education*

Abstract. In the tourism industry, tourist attractions (TAs) play a particularly important role, and the assessment of tourist attractions, therefore, is crucial to the planning and growth of the tourism industry since TAs are a fundamental type of territorial organization. Although managers may increase the efficiency of exploitation and promote the benefits of TAs by assessing TAs, there have not been many studies to evaluate TAs in comprehensively on various factors. For the aim of conducting an integrated assessment of TAs, this study was conducted in the province of An Giang, which is in the west of Mekong Delta region and has many attractive TAs. A synthetic scoring method with 8 evaluation criteria together with AHP techniques are used in this study. The findings of the evaluation of An Giang's TAs reveal that the majority of them simply halt at the average level of advantageous utilization.

Keywords: an integrated approach, TAs, assessment, An Giang province.

1. Introduction

In the tourism territorial organization system, a tourist attraction (TA) is the most fundamental type of territorial organization. Numerous scholars and managers have focused on studying and assessing TAs. Pirojnik (1985) discussed the idea of a TA in regard to the interaction between tourism development and spatial dispersion (following Nguyen Minh Tue [1]). Western geographers place a greater emphasis on carrying capacity and space as a criterion in the evaluation of tourist sites, which has a direct impact on how they develop sustainable growth, according to A.M. O'Reilly [2]. Tours with adjacent countries might be planned to limit the amount number of tourists during the busiest times of the year [3]. Colin Michael Hall's (2008) research suggests that spatial considerations can affect how tourism is developed in particular tourist areas [4]. The aforementioned research has stated and demonstrated that evaluating TAs is a crucial step in the tourism's growth industry, and that the spatial development of tourism has strengthened into a fundamental characteristic of the TAs.

In Vietnam, many studies by numerous researchers, including Nguyen Minh Tue, Vu Dinh Hoa et al. [5]; Tran Duc Thanh [6] and so on highlight theoretical questions about the function, qualities, and classification of TAs. Vietnam Tourism Law (2017) stipulates that a TA is a place where tourism resources are invested and exploited to serve tourists (Chapter I, Article 3) [7]. Conditions to recognize TA include (1) the appropriate infrastructure and services to accommodate tourists; (2) data income; Defined Boundaries; and (3) Satisfy the legal requirements for security,

Received September 1, 2022. Revised October 14, 2022. Accepted November 5, 2022.

Contact Nguyen Phu Thang, email address: npthang@ued.udn.vn

order, social safety, and environmental preservation. Numerous studies have developed standards for measuring the degree to which TAs are exploited, including attractiveness, operation hours, visitor capacity, environmental sustainability, site location, infrastructure, and economic efficiency. The links in utilizing the tourism resources of nearby localities, towards developing a specific tourism product of the entire area, allow for the supplementation, diversification, and enhancement of TAs in a locality associated in a locality - associated industry. Many researchers are also interested in the establishment of a scientific basis for the exploitation and development of TAs based on resource considerations, typically ecotourism and craft village tourism. These studies continue to support the idea that diversity is a characteristic of TAs, and that it is from this perspective that TAs should be evaluated in a comprehensive and rational way.

The published works on tourist development in An Giang province concentrate on potential research, operational state, and development goals. In her PhD thesis titled "An Giang tourism development to 2020", Mai Thi Anh Tuyet (2007) provided an overview of An Giang tourism from the years 2000 to 2005 in connection to other economic sectors, and then suggested remedies for the years 2006 to 2010 [8]. A system of interdisciplinary evaluation criteria from various perspectives has been designed for the research topic "Research and development of special types of tourism products of An Giang province," which is led by author Vo Van Sen [9]. The research team has offered suggestions for the current period's development of particular tourism items in An Giang. The research projects in An Giang concentrate on the state of development now and the foundations for creating particular products. The topic of how to evaluate TAs holistically is still unresolved and needs to be improved.

Based on those requirements, the article concentrates on developing an integrated rating scale for TAs and applying it to the province of An Giang with the following goals: (1) Creating a scientific foundation for the evaluation criteria; (2) Clarifying the findings of a specific assessment of tourist spots in An Giang; and (3) Proposing some solutions to capitalize on the tourist spots based on the evaluation results.

2. Content

2.1. Research area

An Giang Province is situated west of the Mekong Delta between the Tien and Hau rivers and shares a 100 km-long northern border with Cambodia. In addition, it shares borders with Kien Giang Province in the southwest, Dong Thap Province in the east, and Cantho City in the southeast. Midland regions and low mountains make up the two main topographical categories in the Province. In the districts of Tinh Bien and Tri Ton, the low mountains are known as Bay Nui (Seven Mountains). The Vinh Te Tunnel, which connects Chau Doc and Ha Tien, follows the province's western boundary. Many artifacts from the Oc Eo Civilization have been unearthed in the An Giang region. Numerous archaeologists have concluded that An Giang was the site of a thriving commercial seaport constructed with numerous significant architectural projects that date back to the first century. This conclusion extols the province as a former center of economic and cultural prosperity.

2.2. Research methods

In the study, the TAs objects are quantified using the synthetic scoring approach. The synthetic scoring system is applied in the following order based on integrating it with other complementary research methods.

Step 1: Compute the number of analyzed TAs

Computing the number of analyzed TAs based on the idea: (1) The number of TAs to be included in the determination is based on the value of resources, the current development status, and the ability to exploit in the future; (2) The TAs must represent the type of tourism resources and products; and (3) TAs must reflect the level of tourism exploitation and development in An Giang province. With these rules, the study is restricted to 46 TAs (table 12), which include a variety of types and rated historical and cultural treasures (including national special level, national level, and provincial level); craft villages; beautiful locales; and ethnographic subjects due to the size of the study area. Based on the following scientific findings: the attractiveness of resources as a key criterion in the evaluation of tourist scores at the provincial level is theoretically one of the key bases. This method will omit TAs with below average attractiveness, which are less likely to be exploited.

Step 2: Establish a set of standards for evaluation criteria

The study employs a synthetic scoring method with 8 evaluation criteria, including (1). Attractiveness (2). Infrastructure and facilities; (3). Management (4). Environment and sustainability; (5). Likability, (6). Location and accessibility; (7). Capacity, and (8). Operating time to assess the TA system in An Giang province.

(1). Attractiveness (coded as C1)

Attractiveness is considered the most important criterion in the evaluation and classification of TAs. A TA's attractiveness is evaluated overall based on qualitative (how tourists and managers rate it) and quantitative factors (fairness recognized and ranked by national and international organizations, specialized journals, etc.). The variety of tourism that a site attracts is another factor in its popularity. A TA's capacity to be exploited depends on how appealing it is to travelers.

Table 1. Attractiveness criteria

TT	Level	For natural tourism resources	For cultural tourism resources
1	Extremely attractive	Beautiful and distinctive topography, with a variety of natural elements, or at least one natural element that has received national recognition (National Park, National Biosphere Reserve...).	Cultural works, historical relics, contemporary works, craft villages, festivals with unique characteristics or having a relic recognized at the national level; can exploit more than 5 types of tourism.
2	Attractive	The landscape and terrain are quite beautiful, quite unique with a variety of natural ingredients.	Cultural works, historical relics, art, contemporary works, craft villages, festivals are quite unique or there is 1 work recognized at the provincial level; can exploit 3-4 types of tourism.
3	Medium	The landscape is quite monotonous with 2-3 natural components.	Cultural works, historical relics, art, contemporary works, craft villages and festivals are quite small in scale and have not been recognized at all levels; can exploit 2-3 types of tourism.
4	Less attractive	Landscape, monotonous terrain with 1-2 natural ingredients.	Cultural works, historical relics, art, contemporary works, craft villages, festivals are small scale, not yet recognized at all levels; can exploit 1-2 types of tourism.
5	Very unattractive	The landscape is very monotonous with a natural composition.	TAs are cultural works, historical relics, art, contemporary works, craft villages, festivals on a tiny scale; can exploit only 1 type of tourism

(2). Infrastructure and facilities (coded as C2)

The term "infrastructure" refers to the supply of electricity, water, and drainage systems, as well as the networks and modes of transportation, communication (such as telephone, internet, television, and so forth), and electricity. The technical infrastructure comprises lodging options

(hotels, resorts, homestays, etc.), entertainment services, and other tourism-related services (shopping, dining, transportation, etc.). Infrastructure and technical facilities allow resources to be converted into goods and support the continuing functioning of tourist sites and transit routes.

Table 2. Infrastructure and facilities criteria

TT	Level	Infrastructure			Facilities		
		Internal traffic	The extent of the access road's destruction	Traffic lanes	Accommodations	Number of Tourists	Communications
1	Extremely good	90 to 100% paved road	No	Highway	Hotel with 3 stars or more	> 500 tourists per day	International
2	Good	70 to 90% paved road	No	Highway	Hotel 2 stars	300 to 500 tourists per day	National
3	Medium	50 to 70 % paved road	Some sections of the road but not much impact	Provincial road	Hotel 1 star	100 to 300 tourists per day	Local
4	Bad	< 50% paved road	Significant damage	Local road	Hostel	50 to 100 tourists per day	Local
5	Very bad	No paved road or building	Severe damage, difficult to access TAs	Local road	motel	<50 tourists per day	Local

(3). Operating time (coded as C3)

Operating time is the period (measured by the number of days in a year) that can perform tourism activities well without being affected by natural disasters, storms, floods, rain, and socioeconomic activities. Time without rain, the absence of natural disasters, odd weather patterns, compatibility with human health, and other factors all affect the regular tourism exploitation period. The season at a TA determines when exploitation occurs. The tourism activity time indicator is divided into the following 5 levels (table 3).

Table 3. Operating time criteria

TT	Level	Operating time	Good time for health (average day temperature 18-270C)
1	Extremely long	> 250 days	>230 days
2	Long	201 to 250 days	180 to 229 days
3	Medium	151 to 200 days	120 to 179 days
4	Short	101 to 150 days	90 to 119 days
5	Very short	< 100 days	<90 days

(4). Location and accessibility (coded as C4)

Distance in kilometers, travel time (hours, minutes), or vehicle number/type from the input source center and the distribution of tourists in the area (often cities, metropolitan areas, tourist centers, border gates, airports, flights, ports, etc.) to the TA...

Table 4. Location and accessibility criteria indicator

TT	Level	Distance from TA to administrative center (km)	Number of vehicles	Approach time
1	Extremely advantage	<10km	>3	<30 minutes
2	Advantage	10 – 30km	3	30–60minutes
3	Medium	31 – 50km	2	60–90minutes
4	Unfavorable	51 – 70km	1 – 2	90–120minutes
5	Very unfavorable	>70km	1	>120minutes

(5). Likability (coded as C5)

Likability is the extent to which the transportation system and the amount of accessibility enable a tourist attraction in an area, a tourism center, and tourism routes. It is difficult to link and take advantage of tourism at a distance, independent TA. In contrast, TAs situated in areas with a high density of TAs are advantageous because they can be easily connected to one another by means of transportation, producing clusters of TAs, which will have a positive impact on development. The basis for identifying clusters and tourism centers is areas with a high density of TAs and a broad scale. On the other hand, the potential to link up with and work with travel providers can also be used to gauge the likelihood of a link.

Table 5. Likability criteria

TT	Level	Number of TAs at least within a radius of 10km	Transport
1	Extremely high	>5 TAs	Highway
2	High	4 TAs	Highway
3	Medium	3 TAs	Provincial
4	Low	2 TAs	Local
5	Very low	1 TAs	Local

(6). Management (coded as C6)

The TA management organization has a deliberate influence on the TA to operate better. In fact, despite having resources, many TAs lack management, making it unlikely that the tourism industry will grow. In addition, many TAs operate inefficiently because they use the wrong management techniques or have no management at all, which results in unpaid visitors.

Table 6. Management criteria

TT	Level	Management board	Management level
1	Extremely complete	A private Management Board/Cooperative/Tourism Management Company is in charge of all relevant departments, including those operators, guides, lodging, meals, and souvenirs and for self-security, resource protection, and environmental cleaning.	Excellent management of tourism and resources, and a healthy environment
2	Complete	There is a management board that is shared by the management boards of monuments, landscapes, and cooperative communes, as well as the management boards of craft villages; these boards keep track of various aspects of tourism-related activities, the preservation of natural resources, and environmental sanitation.	Quite good management of tourism and resources, and a healthy environment
3	Medium	There is no specific Management Board; management agencies at all levels oversee tourist sites and have personnel to monitor on tourism-related activities, environmental sanitation, and natural protection.	Tourism management and resources, environment is not good
4	Incomplete	There is no single Management Board; management agencies at all levels oversee the region's popular tourism destinations.	Safeguarding resources and safety, environmental biology doesn't get much airtime.
5	Very incomplete	There is no specific Management Board, and overall management responsibilities for the territory are handled by management agencies at all levels.	No management activity yet travel. Natural resources, environmental sanitation are recession, deterioration unprotected

(7). Capacity (coded as C7)

The maximum number of visitors the destination can accommodate at once (during a day or year) without adversely affecting the natural, cultural, and social surroundings or the interests of visitors is used to estimate the destination's capacity. The responsiveness of the service system, human resources, the number of residential rooms, the location of the TA, or visitors' opinions of the level of service satisfaction can all be used to gauge how ready a destination is to receive tourists.

Table 7. Capacity criteria

TT	Level	Number of tourists per day	Number of tourists per year
1	Extremely high	>500	>100.000
2	High	301 – 500	50.000-100.000
3	Medium	201 – 300	10.000-50.000
4	Low	101 – 200	5.000-10.000
5	Very low	< 100	<5.000

(8). Environment and sustainability (coded as C8)

Three different environments are included in this factor: (3) Tourism environment (healthy activity, with or without slashing, pulling, or squeezing prices...), prior to the impact of tourism activities. (1) Natural environment (cleanliness/pollution level, sustainability of environmental components,); (2) Socio-cultural environment (socio-cultural activities, healthy customs, and habits, with/without evil society). Three factors are used to determine a factor for sustainable development: (1) the sustainability of the resource before the impact of customers, unfavorable weather, and climate change; time determined by the number of years of existence and the possibility of damage/degradation, a decrease in the attractiveness of tourism resources; (2) The level of sustainability in tourism is reflected in the number of visitors and annual revenue (up and down); (3) the ability to maintain the operation of the TA in the future: stability, rise, or fall, stagnate and cease operations.

Table 8. Environment and sustainability criteria

TT	Level	Environment			Sustainability
		Natural environment	Cultural environment	Tourism environments	
1	Extremely good	Fresh, unpolluted.	Cultural values and customs are preserved intact, and no social evils	There is no situation of pulling, chopping, begging...	Very sustainable tourism resources; a significant increase in visitors or revenue over the previous year; long-term tourism development and exploitation; ongoing tourism activities.
2	Good	Fresh, less polluted.	Cultural values and customs are preserved almost intact, with few social evils,	There is the very little situation of tug-of-war, chopping, begging...	The exploitation period for the development of tourism is relatively long and sustainable; tourism occurs regularly; the number of visitors or income in the following year has increased compared to the previous year.
3	Medium	a risk of contamination.	Some cultural values and customs are lost, social evils increase	Situations of tug-of-war, guillotine, begging... are quite common.	Tourism resources require conservation and enhancement; annual revenue and client numbers rise steadily; tourism development is declared to be long-term and quite sustainable; Travel may be hindered.

4	Bad	Some components (air, water, etc.) are contaminated.	Cultural values and customs are less preserved, social evils increase	Situations of pulling, chopping, begging... are common.	Limited guests and revenue undetermined development time; deteriorated tourism resources need ways to rehabilitate and protect newly exploitable; Travel has been halted.
5	Very bad	Severely contaminated.	Cultural values and customs are almost not preserved, social evils are common	Situations of tug-of-war, guillotine, begging... are very common.	Resources need immediate preservation solutions; the timing of the declaration is unknown.

Step 3: Create scales and coefficients (weights) for each criterion.

The grading factors in the thesis are separated based on the quintile scale (5 steps). The study develops the corresponding weights for the criterion based on combining with the AHP method's outcomes. The study conducted a survey of 8 experts focusing on 2 issues: (1) Rank the priority of the criteria, and 2) Evaluate and score each pair of factors according to Satty (1985). The weight will be multiplied by the indicators to determine the value at each level. The weight vectors of the criteria are rearranged in the manner shown below:

Table 9. The weight of the criteria

TT	Indicators	Code	Weight
1	Attractiveness	C1	0.24
2	Infrastructure and facility	C2	0.20
3	Operating time	C3	0.05
4	Location and accessibility	C4	0.07
5	Likability	C5	0.09
6	Management	C6	0.15
7	Capacity	C7	0.06
8	Environment and sustainability	C8	0.13

Source:[10]

Step 4: Construct the criteria and overall rating scale for TAs

The component evaluation scale comprises eight criteria on a five-step scale (from 1 to 5) with scores ranging from 5, 4, 3, 2, for the highest to the lowest level. The score of the component evaluation is the score of The AHP that creates the order by multiplying the weight (Table 10).

Table 10. The criteria rating scale.

TT	Criteria	Level	Score	Weight	Evaluation scores
1	Attractiveness	Extremely attractive	5	0.24	1.2
		Attractive	4		0.96
		Medium	3		0.72
		Less attractive	2		0.48
		Very unattractive	1		0.24
2	Infrastructure and facility	Extremely good	5	0.20	1
		Good	4		0.8
		Medium	3		0.6

		Bad	2		0.4
		Very bad	1		0.2
3	Management	Extremely complete	5	0.15	0.75
		Complete	4		0.6
		Medium	3		0.45
		Incomplete	2		0.3
		Very incomplete	1		0.15
4	Environment	Extremely good	5	0.13	0.65
		Good	4		0.52
		Medium	3		0.39
		Bad	2		0.26
		Very bad	1		0.13
5	Likability	Extremely high	5	0.09	0.45
		High	4		0.36
		Medium	3		0.27
		Low	2		0.18
		Very low	1		0.09
6	Location and accessibility	Extremely advantage	5	0.07	0.35
		Advantage	4		0.28
		Medium	3		0.21
		Unfavorable	2		0.14
		Very unfavorable	1		0.07
7	Capacity	Extremely large	5	0.06	0.3
		Large	4		0.24
		Medium	3		0.18
		Small	2		0.12
		Very small	1		0.06
8	Operating time	Extremely long	5	0.05	0.25
		Long	4		0.2
		Medium	3		0.15
		Short	2		0.1
		Very short	1		0.05

The study summarizes and categorizes TAs into 5 tiers after assessing the component criteria (from I to V). The following formula will generate the composite score from the criterion component score:

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i * W_i$$

Including: **Wi**: weight of criteria; **Xi**: score of criteria; $i=1 \rightarrow n$; **n**: number of criteria

To evaluate the accessibility of tourist sites, the study applies the following formula from Arman (1975):

$$S = \frac{S_{max} - S_{min}}{B} \quad \text{Source: Arman (1975)}$$

The composite score is the total of the weighted criteria scores, where 1 is the lowest value and 5 is the highest. There is a 0.8 difference between each rank in the composite score. As a result, the overall score will be categorized using Table 11.

Table 11. Advantageous utilization classification of TAs

STT	Evaluation levels		Scores	Rank
1	TAs with very advantage level	*****	4.2 – 5.0	I
2	TAs with advantage level	****	3.4 – 4.2	II
3	TAs with medium level	***	2.6 – 3.4	III
4	TAs with disadvantage level	**	1.8 – 2.6	IV
5	TAs with very disadvantage level	*	1.0 – 1.8	V

2.3. Finding and discussion

The following table displays the findings of the overall evaluation of TAs in the province.

Table 12. The overall evaluation of TAs in An Giang province

T T	TAs	Criteria								Total	Rank
		Attractions	Infrastructure	Management	Environment	Linkability	Location and accessibility	Capacity	Operating time		
I. Historical sites											
1	Temple of Ba Chua Xu Mountain Sam	1.2	1	0.75	0.52	0.45	0.21	0.3	0.25	4.68	I
2	Thoi Ngoc Hau tomb	0.96	1	0.75	0.52	0.45	0.21	0.3	0.25	4.44	I
3	Tay An pagoda	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.52	0.45	0.21	0.24	0.2	4.22	I
4	Hang pagoda	1.2	1	0.75	0.52	0.45	0.21	0.3	0.2	4.63	I
5	Vinh Nguon temple	0.96	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.21	0.18	0.15	3.30	III
6	Chau Phu temple	0.96	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.21	0.18	0.15	3.30	III
7	Historic district Tuc Dup	0.96	0.8	0.75	0.65	0.18	0.14	0.24	0.2	3.91	II
8	Relics of Ba Chuc tomb house	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.18	0.14	0.18	0.15	2.81	III
9	Tam Buu pagoda	0.72	0.6	0.3	0.39	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.1	2.55	IV
10	Phi Lai pagoda	0.72	0.6	0.3	0.39	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.1	2.55	IV
11	O Ta Soc historic moneument	0.72	0.4	0.15	0.14	0.18	0.45	0.12	0.39	2.55	IV
12	Xvayton pagoda	0.96	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.15	2.79	III
13	Ton Duc Thang president memorial area	1.2	0.8	0.75	0.52	0.36	0.28	0.3	0.2	4.41	I
14	My Khanh garden	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.18	0.21	0.12	0.15	2.82	III
15	Van Linh pagoda (Cam mountain)	1.2	1	0.6	0.52	0.36	0.14	0.3	0.2	4.32	I
16	Adilac Buddha Statue (Cam	1.2	1	0.6	0.52	0.36	0.14	0.3	0.2	4.32	I

	mountain)										
17	Phat Lon pagoda (Cam mountain)	1.2	1	0.6	0.52	0.36	0.14	0.3	0.2	4.32	I
18	Bau Muop temple	0.72	0.6	0.6	0.52	0.36	0.14	0.18	0.2	3.32	III
19	Sap Mountain Ecological Area	0.96	0.8	0.6	0.52	0.36	0.28	0.18	0.2	3.90	II
20	Oc Eo art and archeological site	0.96	0.8	0.75	0.52	0.27	0.21	0.24	0.2	3.95	II
21	Thoai Ngoc Hau temple	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.28	0.06	0.15	2.92	III
22	Hoa Hao Buddhist Administration Center	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.18	0.15	2.90	III
23	Phuoc Thanh pagoda	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.21	0.12	0.15	3.00	III
24	Ba Le pagoda	0.96	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.36	0.21	0.12	0.2	3.42	II
25	Dao Nam pagoda	0.96	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.36	0.21	0.18	0.2	3.48	II
26	Mubarak Cathedral	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.27	0.14	0.18	0.15	3.03	III
II. Ethnographic subjects											
27	Long Xuyen Floating Market	0.72	0.6	0.3	0.39	0.36	0.28	0.12	0.15	2.92	III
28	An Giang museum	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.28	0.18	0.15	3.13	III
29	Tinh Bien market	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.26	0.36	0.07	0.24	0.15	2.65	III
30	Cu Lao Gieng Cathedral	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.36	0.21	0.18	0.2	3.24	III
31	Divine Providence Monastery	0.72	0.6	0.3	0.39	0.36	0.21	0.12	0.15	2.85	III
32	Da Phuoc Champa Cultural Village	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.12	0.15	2.64	III
33	Chau Phong Champa Cultural Village	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.12	0.15	2.64	III
III. Craft villages											
34	Chau Doc raft village	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.36	0.14	0.18	0.15	2.99	III
35	Van Giao brocade weaving village	0.72	0.4	0.3	0.39	0.36	0.14	0.12	0.15	2.58	IV
36	Phu My puff pastry village	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.06	0.15	2.58	IV
37	Phu My Blacksmithing Village	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.06	0.15	2.58	IV
38	Long Dien Carpentry Village	0.72	0.4	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.21	0.18	0.15	2.77	III
39	Chau Giang	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.39	0.27	0.14	0.12	0.15	2.84	III

	Brocade Weaving Village										
IV. Landscape, ecology											
40	Tra Su Melaleuca forest	1.2	1	0.75	0.65	0.36	0.21	0.3	0.2	4.67	I
41	Ta Pa lake	0.72	0.4	0.15	0.52	0.18	0.14	0.12	0.1	2.33	IV
42	Soai So lake	0.72	0.6	0.6	0.52	0.27	0.14	0.18	0.15	3.18	III
43	My Khanh Mulberry Garden	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.18	0.21	0.18	0.1	2.96	III
44	Bung Binh Thien lake	0.72	0.4	0.3	0.26	0.09	0.07	0.12	0.1	2.06	IV
45	Thuy Liem lake	0.96	0.8	0.6	0.39	0.36	0.14	0.3	0.15	3.70	II
46	Tan Trung lake	0.72	0.6	0.45	0.52	0.27	0.14	0.18	0.15	3.03	III

The information in the table demonstrates the four levels of classification for the province of An Giang's tourist destinations. Ba Chua Xu Nui Sam temple has the greatest rating (4.68), while Bung Binh Thien has the lowest rating (2.06).

Group I. TAs have an excellent level of exploitation

With a mean value of 4.45, the number of TAs in group I accounted for 19.6% of the total. This includes Tra Su Melaleuca forest, Hang Pagoda, and Ba Chua Xu Temple of Sam Mountain, all of which have average scores greater than or equal to 4.45. These destinations are recognized as the main TAs in the province. The Temple of Ba Chua Xu Nui Sam meets nearly all evaluation criteria, is quite appealing, and satisfies all other requirements. Despite having a high level of attractiveness, the TAs have ratings that are below the group average of 6 points. This is because of their lengthy operating hours and distance from the provincial center.

The majority of these sites are distributed in the tourist areas of Nui Sam (Chau Doc) and Nui Cam (Tri Ton). Additionally, there are locations designated as unique national monuments, including the President Ton Duc Thang memorial, the Tra Su Melaleuca woodland, and the Tay An pagoda. Besides providing spillover effects for territorial directions, integrating various TAs also aids in the development of interesting and appealing tourist routes.

Grade II. TAs have a favorite level of exploitation

Consists of 6 TAs with favorable levels. The group's number of TAs accounts for 13.0 percent of the total points considered. Three TAs had higher index scores than the group's average (3.73), including the historical site on Tuc Dup Hill, the archaeological and artistic site at Oc Eo, and the historical site at Nui Sap. The advantages of these factors include the distinctive, indigenous resources, the infrastructural components, and the management department's high level of completion. The remaining tourist sites received below-average ratings primarily because of their limited accessibility (Ba Le Pagoda, Phuoc Thanh Pagoda, Thuy Liem Lake).

- Distribution: Found in places like Tri Ton, Cho Moi, and Thoai Son.

Grade III. TAs have a medium level of exploitation

With 23 points at a moderately favorable level, this category has the most points overall (representing 50.0% of the total number of tourist sites examined; see figure 7). Tourist destinations with scores above the national average (2.98), such as Chau Phu Community House, Mubarak Mosque, Long Xuyen Floating Market, An Giang Museum, Cu Lao Gieng Cathedral, Chau Doc Rafting Village, Soai So Lake - Golden Stream, and Ecological Tourism Site in Tan Trung Lake Bed. These sites have average resources, but their technological setup, administration, and operational time are constrained. Infrastructure, location, and accessibility

are still somewhat problematic at the remaining points. Distribution: scattered in districts such as Chau Doc, Cho Moi, Tinh Bien, Phu Tan, Tan Chau, and Long Xuyen city.

Grade III. TAs have a less attractive level of exploitation

Eight points, or 17.4% of the overall score, are given to TAs with less positive ratings, including Tam Buu Pagoda, Phi Lai Pagoda, Ta Pa Lake, Bung Binh Thien, Van Giao Brocade Weaving Village, Phu My Blacksmith Craft Village, Phu My Puff Pastry Village, and O. Ta Soc. There are only 2.47 points on average. These TAs are originally taken advantage of for tourism growth even though they are typically still in their infancy. The location's distance from the province's core, monotonous terrain, lack of attention to elements connected to tourism development such as infrastructure and links, and managerial skills that are yet innate are its major drawbacks. Focused distribution in outlying areas, including An Phu, Tri Ton, Tinh Bien, and Phu Tan.

3. Conclusion

Managing and using tourism's strengths requires approaching and analyzing tourist sites based on a variety of criteria. An Giang is a province with great potential and a range of affordable TAs. However, despite their abundance, most of them are TAs in An Giang with ordinary levels of exploitation, according to the results of the assessment of tourist sites. The level of exploitation is excellent, focusing solely on a few TAs such as the President Ton Duc Thang's memorial area, Hang Pagoda, Tra Su Melaleuca forest, and Ba Chua Xu Temple of Nui Sam. This demonstrates that the province of An Giang's tourism development has not kept pace with its potential. In order to increase the quality of tourism, tourist managers and operators must advocate for a range of service – type - related solutions, as well as boost promotion and draw in more infrastructure at destinations. strong management and sustainability scores.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. M. Tue, 2010. *Vietnam tourism geography*. Ha Noi: Publishing House of Education.
- [2] A. M. O'Reilly, Dec. 1986. "Tourism carrying capacity: Concept and issues". *Tourism Management*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 254–258, doi: 10.1016/0261-5177(86)90035-X.
- [3] T.-H. Lee, Nov. 2009. "A structural model for examining how destination image and interpretation services affect future visitation behavior: a case study of Taiwan's Taomi eco-village," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 727–745, doi: 10.1080/09669580902999204.
- [4] C. M. Hall, 2008. *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- [5] N. M. Tue and V. D. Hoa, 2017. *Tourism geography - Theory and practice in Vietnam*. Ha Noi: Publishing House of Education.
- [6] T. D. Thanh, 2017. *Geography of Tourism*. Ha Noi: Hanoi National University Publishing House.
- [7] National Assembly, 2017. *Vietnam Tourism Law*. National Political Publishing House.
- [8] M. T. A. Tuyet, 2007. *Tourism development in An Giang province towards 2020*. The University of Economic, Ho Chi Minh city.
- [9] V. V. Sen, 2017. Developing specific tourism products in An Giang province. Ho Chi Minh city.
- [10] N. P. Thang, 2018. *Application of AHP hierarchical analysis process in evaluating tourist attractions in An Giang province*. Ha Noi University of Education Publishing House.