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The influence of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions on tourism marketing and performance in Zimbabwe
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Abstract: Contemporary tourism marketing requires some innovative ways of addressing the unique needs of new types of tourists who buy packages rather than single types of products, hence the motivation for providing scientific contributions to revitalisation of tourism performance in Zimbabwe. The study focused on determining the influence of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourism resources in terms of marketing on the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe. A positivistic research philosophy using a cross-sectional survey design with a total geographic quota sample size of 411 based on 137 stakeholders and 274 tourists was used, and the data collection was conducted in 2019. The results showed that Victoria Falls, Mana Pools, Matopo Hills and Great Zimbabwe were the four top non-wildlife resources for linking with wildlife attractions. All the eight centres, namely, Victoria Falls, Mana Pools World Heritage Site, Matopo Hills, Great Zimbabwe Monuments, Inyangani Mountains, Hotels and Lodges, Chinhoyi Caves and Chilojo Cliffs, were generally perceived as attractive when linked to wildlife attraction centres.
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Many economies are looking up to improving their tourism performance for meeting national economic development goals and improving the standard of living of their citizens. One way of getting attention of tourist attraction centres from both local and foreign tourists is adopting a collaborative approach of packaging wildlife and non-wildlife tourism resources. In the interest of understanding the ways of linking wildlife tourist attractions to diversify non-wildlife tourist attractions like falls, cultural heritage sites, caves, pools, monuments, dams and rivers, and hills and mountains, this study assessed the congruence of such wildlife and non-wildlife packages. The study revealed some significant positive impact of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attraction centres on the overall tourism performance of Zimbabwe. The study recommended harmonisation, integration and co-ordination of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism polices of Zimbabwe.
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A significant positive correlation for linking non-wildlife and wildlife tourism resources was found between tourists and stakeholders. Wildlife and non-wildlife linkages of tourism attractions had a significant positive impact on the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe. The study recommends that harmonisation and integration of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism centres will improve overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe.
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1. Introduction

Although Zimbabwe was rated number 30 on its worldwide wildlife and biodiversity performance and trailing behind some developed countries (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2017), the actual terrain and profile could be more convincing on the ground as its wild animals are found in natural habitats as opposed to other countries. This scenario is presented by the mega-fauna, mega-flora, small animals, small plants, unique animals, insects, reptiles and unique plants of Zimbabwe (Mutanga et al., 2017). Zimbabwe offers a large variety of scenery, one of the African continent’s finest and largest concentrations of wildlife, a perfect climate for tourists throughout the year (Zimbabwe Tourism Authority, 2018). The Zimbabwean wildlife that is commonly attractive for visitors/tourists includes the Big Five elephant (Loxodonta africana); lion (Panthera leo); leopard (Panthera pardus); buffalo (Syncerus caffer); the white and black rhinoceros (Ceratotherium simum and Diceros bicornis, respectively) and fish, reptiles and birds. Non-wildlife attractions refer to those tourist attractions other than wildlife such as monuments, hills, mountains, pools, caves, cultural diversity, heritage sites, dams and rivers, and hotels and lodges.

The study adopted the theories and models that include the marketing mix theory, comprising the four Ps developed by McCarthy (1964), which are product, place, price and promotion. Product, in this case, refer to wildlife species and associated offerings in the wildlife-based tourism industry. It must provide value to the customers and not be tangible at the same time. Zimbabwe has many private players who operate game parks, and they need their products to be known and consumed by both local and foreign visitors. The place is where the customer can buy the product and how it reaches the place. In this case, it also refers to the tourists’ destinations such as Hwange National Park and Mana Pools National Parks, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe Ruins, Chilojo Cliffs. Price refers to money paid by the tourists to visit these areas and to view wild animals. The pricing must be competitive and profitable. Promotion refers to various ways of communicating with the customers of wildlife tourism what the organisation has to offer and additional three Ps by Booms and Bitner (1981), and these include the people, which refers to the management, customers and employees who interact in the wildlife-based tourism operations. Processes refer to the methods and stages of providing a service in the industry. Physical evidence refers to the experiences of using a product or a service and the surroundings. In the wildlife context, it also touches the animals, vegetation, people and other physical features. Together, they make them seven Ps, which are interlinked to form the tourism product.

Morrison (2013) developed the 10As Model, which includes awareness, attractiveness, availability, access, appearance, activities, assurance, appreciation, action and accountability. Awareness refers to how much knowledge the existing and prospective visitors/tourists have about a place, nation and destination. Destination attractiveness refers to the way biodiversity, monuments and heritage sites, hotels and lodges, falls and other attractions are appealing to current and potential customers. Destination availability refers to the presence of holiday packages on the internet, telephone and agents. Access is portrayed by the ease with which tourist attractions can be visited by various mode of transport including railway, buses, hired vehicles and air travel and private cars. The access aspect enables wildlife tourists to move around Parks and Wildlife Estate,
Conservancies, Private farms and communal areas. The appearance of the destinations like Victoria Falls, Great Zimbabwe, Mana Pools and Matopo Hills had high first-time impressions and a long-lasting appeal to tourists. The use of wildlife-based tourism marketing attractions could improve and rejuvenate the excitement of tourists, hence producing high-impact tourism performance. Tourism activities mean the variety of interactions between tourists and tourism products and resources. Victoria Falls provide many activities that make tourists being entertained in the same place. Assurance is where tourism destinations need to provide visitor protection and safety facilities and infrastructure. Appreciation is measured by the level of welcome and hospitality received from employees, management and facilities of a destination. Action involves the existence of a destination marketing plan awaiting implementation. The action will be carried out by employees, agents, tour operators, regulators and destination managers. Accountability is where unique destinations are capable of continually attracting visitors due to their ability to evaluate and monitor their operations. This can be done through surveys, in-depth interviews and visitor feedback comments.

The Service Quality Model developed by Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry (1985) in their conceptualisation of service quality model started with ten items, namely, tangible, reliability, responsiveness, competence, courtesy, credibility, security, access, communication and understanding customers and reduced these to five dimensions, which are called the RATER model. The RATER model stands for reliability, assurance, tangibles, empathy and responsiveness. Canney (2013) modelled the reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy and tangibles as measures of service quality of both local and foreign tourists that make them satisfied with wildlife and non-wildlife attractions, leading them to recommend to others, talk positively about the destination and make repeat visits to the tourist resort centres.

The significance of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions under the ecotourism conceptualization includes hiking, canoeing, camping and photography and how wildlife observation can contribute to the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe (Isaaccs, 2000; Kabote et al., 2019). Zimbabwe’s potential for developing its wildlife tourism marketing activities could be leveraged by other attractions that will provide complementary and incidental experiences to both local and foreign tourists (George, 2017; Kabote et al., 2019).

Wildlife tourism marketing should not be viewed and analysed in isolation to issues of culture, monuments, mountains and hills, outdoor recreation, eco-tourism, sport tourism and other classifications of tourism marketing systems (Higginbottom, 2004) like Chobe and Okavango Delta that gives the opportunity to experience more visitors if this could be combined with the above non-wildlife tourist attractions (Tourism Sector Recovery Plan, 2020). Wildlife-based tourism marketing may not be sustainable as tourist destination centres in the future unless they can be combined with non-wildlife tourism (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002; Timothy & Boyd, 2006; World Tourism Organization, 2020). Kotler, Bowen and Makens (2006) identified the Grand Canyon located in North America, as one of the seven natural wonders of the world, which has shown a good linkage of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions as tourists can possibly visit the national parks, the forestry areas, the monuments and the Grand Canyon as the natural wonders of the world. This might give tourists an opportunity to stay longer and spend more, and this has a bearing on increasing the revenue and in improving the overall tourism performance of a destination (Stone et al., 2021).

Tourists were fascinated by consuming mountain-related tourism attractions with Mutare National Museums, Cecil Kopje, Nyangembe Falls, Mtarazi Falls, Nyanga National Park, Chimanimani National Park, Bvumba Botanical Garden, Troutbeck Golf Course, and Leopard Rock Hotel in the eastern Zimbabwe as combination of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism, which was noted by Matura and Mapira (2018). In wildlife and non-wildlife tourism marketing, wild animal viewing, bird watching, photographic safaris, fishing and the falls, ruins and monuments, rock paintings, caves, mountains, and hills are all being described as products in which tourists in
a destination pay or buy for (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019). The linking of wildlife tourism products and non-wildlife products to create a packaged tourism service allows the destination and tourism stakeholders to have diversified and net-worked tourism marketing strategies for improving visitor retention, loyalty and satisfaction (Ahebwe & English, 2019; Morrison, 2013). Jobber (2010) highlighted the use of digital marketing as one of the effective strategies used for achieving high revenue, as it connects trophy hunting, photographic safaris and operations in non-wildlife attractions like heritage sites, mountains, cliffs, lakes, monuments, falls, and hotels and lodges on one web site page (Caderwood et al., 2019).

In a similar study, Milohnic and Popadic (2015) found out that a majority of managers in tourist organisations believed much that wildlife tourism could be used as a primary motive by visitors and that wildlife tourism resources improve the quality of a destination. Managing tourism responsibly and giving some sustainable tourism types (Stone et al., 2021) like ethical tourism, eco-tourism, cultural heritage tourism and inclusive tourism could be blended with wildlife tourism marketing for improving the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe (George, 2017).

There is also need for linking different tourist destination attraction centres, and adding others on top of the existing ones is needed for increase tourist’s arrivals (Keyser, 2012). This gives visitors a reason to stay more than one day and return to the destination again and again (World Economic Forum, 2020). Linking wildlife and non-wildlife attractions through packaging and repackaging of tourism activities could be used by tourism industry players as part of customer retention strategies (Jobber, 2010). Linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourism activities under the eco-tourism concept for generating high tourism revenue and improving the livelihood of local communities has been called for (Chiutsi et al., 2011). Thus, it has been highlighted that non-wildlife tourism that entails visiting the monuments, ruins, cultural heritage and visiting the historical sites has the potential to increase tourists if combined with the wildlife tourism that involves tourist visiting attraction centres such as National Parks, Zoos and game parks (Marunda, Marunda and Munyanyiwa, 2014). Accordingly, the current study focuses on analysing the attractiveness of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourism resources and the assessment of the impact of such linkages on the overall tourism marketing and performance in Zimbabwe.

2. Methods

2.1. Study area
The study was conducted in Zimbabwe (Figure 1) focusing on major tourist attractions, both non-wildlife and wildlife attractions, which include natural and cultural sites, archaeological, historical sites, museums, ruins and monuments, dams, rivers, lakes, hills, mountains, hotels and lodges, National Parks and other wildlife centres. Most of these wildlife areas are located in the countryside of Zimbabwe where there are high temperatures and low rainfall patterns. Temperature figures range from 20 to 40 °C and rainfall ranges from 400 mm to 700 mm per annum (Tourism Authority, 2017; Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, 2020). These places are usually not suitable for agriculture basing on natural rainfall and hence were committed for wildlife conservation purposes.

2.2. Data collection and analysis
A positivistic research paradigm, using a cross-sectional survey of 137 stakeholders and 274 tourists and total quota sample of 411, was used in the study. The study considered both wildlife and non-wildlife attraction centres as sampling points for contacting tourists. Positivism was applied in the study as the aim was to establish one true reality, which is independent of and external to the researcher in the context of linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism resort (Saunders et al., 2009). Positivism takes assumptions used by natural scientists and goes on to search for facts and numbers for describing phenomena. The strengths of using positivism in this study are the achievement of observable social reality and generalisation of results to external related contexts and populations (Cohen, Manion and Blumberg et al., 2008; Morrison, 2013). The current study adopted a quantitative
cross-sectional survey for collecting and analysing data on the effects of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions on the tourism marketing and performance in Zimbabwe. Gray (2010) viewed a cross-sectional survey as taking a descriptive or analytical survey structures. Since cross-sectional descriptive surveys are designed to measure the basic characteristics of a particular population at a fixed point in time, the current study applied the surveys to collect data on the attitudes, values and opinions of research subjects. This enabled testing of theories and associations between and among dependent, independent and other types of variables.

The resulting sample sizes in the subgroups and total samples were produced considering the purpose of the study, the geographical spread of the population, accessibility of respondents, expected response rate, number of variables, nature of data analysis and features of respondents (Cohen et al., 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). The study also ensured that major groups like foreign tourists and local tourists had a minimum of 100 elements each, and minor groups like employees and managers surpassed the elements benchmarked in each case. For a population greater than 100,000 subjects, at the ±5% significance level, Israel (1992) citing Yemen (1998) recommended a minimum sample size of 400. Cohen et al. (2011) recommended a sample size of 384 for a population of 250,000 or more for a 5% confidence interval or at a 95% confidence level. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) also accepted a minimum sample size of 384 for large populations. The sample size of 411 for the quantitative strand was therefore considered adequate.

The study applied the quota sampling technique in establishing research subjects for the cross-sectional survey. Quotas were based on the three regions, namely, Southern Region, Western Region and Northern Region showing tourists type and stakeholder classes. A total sample was 137
stakeholders with 55 represented Southern Region, 51 for Western Region and 31 for Northern Region. The 274 tourists were distributed as 108 for Southern Region, 84 for Western Region and 62 for Northern Region. The research classified the sampling frame into three (3) regional geographical areas through adopting the Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority operational regions as shown in Table 1. Region A (Western Region) comprises areas like Matopo National Park, Matopo Hills, Hwange National Park, Khami Ruins, Victoria Falls, Matetsi Safari Area, Binga Field Station and Zambezi National Park, Region B (Northern Region) includes areas such as Mana Pools, Chinhoyi Caves, Lake Kariba, Lion and Cheetah Park, Imire Game Park, Muwanga Lodge, Matusadona National Park, Lake Chivero and Chivero Recreational Park, Mbizi Game Park, Umfurudzi Safari Area, Capital City-Harare, National Museums and Monuments and Nharira Hills and Region C (Southern Region) comprise areas such as Great Zimbabwe, Monuments, Tugwi Mukosi Dam, Masvingo Town, Nyangani Mountains, Gonarezhou National Park, Matarazi Falls, Nyangame Falls and Cholojo Cliffs (Figure 1).

Quota sampling was chosen as it was more practical to interview tourists and stakeholders where there was no stable sampling frame. The technique also allowed willing respondents to be interviewed in an ethical and non-coercive context. Cohen et al. (2011) asserted that quota sampling is a subjective form of stratified sampling applicable to larger populations and hence suitable for quantitative research designs as it also provides a proportional representation of willing respondents. Cooper and Schindler (2010) also supported the application of quota sampling in surveys as long as they maintain the representativeness of major control dimensions of the broader population under study.

The study was carried out using a survey questionnaire that assessed attractiveness of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife tourism resources like Victoria Falls, Great Zimbabwe, Mana Pools, Chilojo Cliffs, Chinhoyi Caves, Hotels and Lodges and Matopo Hills. How the above non-wildlife centres could be packaged with wildlife attractions such as Zambezi National Park, Kyle Recreational Park, Mana Pools National Park, Gonarezhou National Park, Chivero Recreational Park, Matopo National Park and Nyanga National Park was central to the study. The survey questionnaire was structured using the Likert Scale that ranged from “Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree”. Demographic profile respondents were also represented together with some few spaces for open-ended responses. From January 2019 to June 2019 data, were collected using drop and pick methods, e-mails and face to face surveys.

In measuring the relationship between all tourists and stakeholders on their perceptions of the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions of Zimbabwe, a Pearson correlation test was carried out at the 0.05 level of significance between local tourists and foreign tourists, and also for measuring the relationship between local tourists and foreign tourists on their perceptions of the attractiveness of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist centres of Zimbabwe, a Pearson correlation test was also carried out at the 0.05 level of significance between local tourists and foreign tourists.

| Table 1. Selection of survey respondents |
|------------------------------------------|
| Local Tourists | Foreign Tourists | Employees | Managers |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|
| Region A       | 53              | 55        | 20       | 35       |
| Region B       | 53              | 31        | 16       | 35       |
| Region C       | 40              | 20        | 10       | 21       |
| Total          | 168             | 106       | 46       | 91       |

Source: Field Survey (2020)
The study measured whether the given perceptions of the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions by all respondents performed above the average level using a benchmark of 3.00 mean value and the 0.05 significance level in a one sample mean test analysis. A univariate regression analysis taking “linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions” as an independent variable and overall tourism performance as a dependent variable was carried out at the 0.05 level of significance.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21 for Windows was used for carrying quantitative data analysis. This led to the establishment of mean values, percentages, correlation values, t-test values and regression coefficients. The discussion of results on the relationships between wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions was based on the following themes:

- **Relationships of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Tourist Attractions**
- **Relationship Between Local Tourists and Foreign Tourists on the Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Tourist Attractions**
- **Relationship Between Tourists and Stakeholders on the Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Tourist Attractions**
- **Overall Linkages Between Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Attractions for All Respondents**
- **Relationship Between Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Tourist Attraction and Overall Tourism Performance**

In meeting the above themes, the following hypotheses were tested as part of data analysis;

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a strong relationship between local tourists and foreign tourists on their perceptions of the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions of Zimbabwe

H<sub>2</sub>: There is a strong relationship between tourists and stakeholders on their perceptions of the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions of Zimbabwe

H<sub>3</sub>: There is a significant positive perception of the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions of Zimbabwe

H<sub>4</sub>: There is a strong regression relationship between the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions and overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe.

**3. Results and discussion**

**3.1. Relationships of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions**

The ranking of the attractiveness of consuming wildlife visits and non-wildlife visits indicated that Victoria Falls was ranked number 1 followed by Mana Pools (No. 2), Matopo Hills (No. 3), Great Zimbabwe Monuments (No. 4), Inyangani Mountains (No. 5), Hotels and Lodges (No. 6), Chinhoyi Caves No. 7) and Chilojo Cliffs (No. 8). Victoria Falls and wildlife linkages had a mean value of 4.44 (Table 2) of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism resources. For example, visiting Victoria Falls as a non-wildlife attraction can be combined with a visit to Zambezi National Park as a wildlife tourist attraction, where there is a diversity of wild animals. Game drive/viewing, bird watching and photographic safaris are some of the wildlife activities conducted within Zambezi National Park (Ahebwe & English, 2019). Viewing of the David Livingstone’s Statue and seeing different viewing points of the falls are also some of the non-wildlife activities within the rainforest. This can be complimented by tourists visiting Hwange National Park for game viewing, photographic safaris, bird watching and moonlight viewing (Kabote et al., 2019).
### Table 2. Attractiveness of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist resources in Zimbabwe

| Relationships of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Attractions | Tourist Mean Value | Stakeholder Mean | All Respondents |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|
|                                                        | LCL | FRN | ALL | Mean | Rank |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Victoria Falls             | 4.40 | 4.73 | 4.53 | 4.34 | 4.44 | 1 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Mana Pools heritage site   | 3.93 | 4.63 | 4.20 | 3.90 | 4.05 | 2 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Matopo Hills               | 3.92 | 4.19 | 4.03 | 3.81 | 3.92 | 3 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Great Zimbabwe monuments   | 4.07 | 3.47 | 3.84 | 3.87 | 3.86 | 4 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Inyangani Mountains        | 3.84 | 2.87 | 3.46 | 3.67 | 3.57 | 5 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Hotels and Lodges          | 3.29 | 3.67 | 3.44 | 3.72 | 3.58 | 6 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Chinhoyi Caves             | 3.63 | 3.08 | 3.42 | 3.66 | 3.54 | 7 |
| Wildlife tours and visiting Chilojo Cliffs             | 3.00 | 3.40 | 3.15 | 3.74 | 3.45 | 8 |
| Overall Mean                                           | 3.76 | 3.76 | 3.76 | 3.84 | 3.80 | N/A |

Source: Survey Results 2021

Notes. LCL—Local; FRN—Foreign
Mana Pools Heritage Site (mean = 4.05) is a non-wildlife tourist attraction with its uniqueness of the four pools, which Mana Pools National Park derived its name from. It is known as one of the pristine parks within Zimbabwe. There is an abundance of fauna and flora in Mana Pools National Park and hence an opportunity for combining non-wildlife visits with and Mana Pools as wildlife tourism activities. Game viewing, bird watching, photographic safaris and lion tracking are some of the common activities for tourists. Wild animals can be viewed in their natural habitat. Tourists can enjoy seeing some “Big Five” animals.

Matopo Hills (mean = 3.92) is a cultural World Heritage Site under UNESCO and a non-wildlife tourists’ attraction centre situated within the Matopos National Park. The park is of international acclaim, offering a diverse package of tourist attractions and activities, and well known for its unique balancing rock features, the most famous known as the “mother and child” balancing rocks (United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2018). Some wildlife and non-wildlife tourism attractions at Matopos include Rhodes’ Grave viewing, balancing rocks viewing, rock paintings viewing, boating and game viewing, fishing, photographic safaris and bird watching, respectively. Visiting Matopo Hills as a world heritage site has the opportunity to combine and enjoy both the non-wildlife and wildlife tourism activities in Zimbabwe (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019). The proximity of these areas will make it very possible to combine the two as they are within the same park (Tourism Sector Recovery Plan, 2020). The linkage between Matopo Hills as a non-wildlife tourism and Matopo National Park as a wildlife-based tourism will create a very strong package for tourists, which can increase the arrivals and hence boost the tourism performance in Zimbabwe (Antić & Tomic, 2017).

Great Zimbabwe Monuments (mean = 3.86; Table 2) as a non-wildlife tourism are where Zimbabwe derived its name from. By visiting Great Zimbabwe monuments, tourists can be linked to other wildlife tourist attraction centres such as Kyle Recreational Park. Such a relationship will build a very high excitement tourist attraction destination (Matura & Mapira, 2018). At Kyle Recreational Park, there is a variety of wildlife ranging from small game, plain game to big game. Some of the “Big Five” animals can be viewed within the park, which includes the white rhino, black rhino and the buffalo. After visiting Great Zimbabwe Monuments, tourists can also tour Gonarezhou National Park, which is the second largest National Park in Zimbabwe, visit Save Valley Conservancy and Malilangwe Conservancy for game viewing and bird watching (George, 2017).

### Table 3. Linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions

| Paired Variables For Correlations [The Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife Tourism Resources] n = 411 | Correlation R-value | P-value | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| (a) Local tourists (n = 168) and foreign tourists (n = 106) | +0.502 | 0.205 | Weak and non-significant relationship |
| (b) All tourists (n = 274) and stakeholders (n = 137) | +0.850 | 0.008 | Strong and significant relationship |
| One sample t Test | t-value/df | P-value | Comment |
| (c) All respondents (n = 411) on the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourism Resources | +6.78/ 7 | 0.000 | Acceptable highly above average |

Source: Survey Results 2021
“Big Five” animals can be viewed in their natural environment. Accommodation facilities are also available in these areas.

Hotels and Lodges (mean = 3.58; Table 2) as a non-wildlife tourist attraction are situated close to some wildlife areas. For example, Hwange Safari Lodge is close to Hwange National Park, which is the largest of all the national parks in Zimbabwe. Hwange Safari Lodge itself has small Game Park nearby, which tourists can view animals whilst at their lodges. The centrality of Hotels and Lodges in influencing the flow of both wildlife and non-wildlife was covered by Mazhande et al. (2020). All the “Big Five” game can be seen in Hwange National Park. Game viewing, bird watching, moonlight viewing and platform viewing are some of the activities conducted in Hwange National Park. Hotels and Lodges in Harare include Rainbow Towers, Crown Plaza, New International Hotel, Holiday Inn, Cresta Lodge and Jameson Hotel. These are close to Chivero Recreational Park, Snake World, Lion and Cheetah Park and Mbizi Game Park and even some distant parks (Mazhande et al., 2020).

Inyangani Mountains with a mean value of 3.57 (Table 2) is one of the non-wildlife tourist attraction, situated within Nyanga National Park in Manicaland Province in the Eastern Highlands. The Inyangani Mountains is famous to tourists for its mountain hiking and has a historical traditional connotation. Tourists who make a visit to climb the Inyangani Mountains can also conduct game drive/viewing, bird watching and fishing walking safaris in Nyanga National Park and can also enjoy the zipline and skybridge at Mutarazi Falls (ARCOS Network, 2019).

Chinhoyi Caves (mean = 3.54; Table 2) as a non-wildlife tourist attraction is situated 8 km peg from Chinhoyi town along Harare/Chirungu/Kariba highway. The most tourist attraction is the Caves exploration (light and dark caves), the sleeping pool and scuba diving. In the Chinhoyi Caves being a Recreational Park, there is a Lion Park nearby which tourist can enjoy viewing them after touring the dark and the light caves, and after enjoying seeing, the divers dive the blue/sleeping pool (Hoang et al., 2018) This can also be combined by visiting Kariba Recreational Park, Charara Safari area and Mana Pools for wildlife activities such as game viewing, photographic safaris, bird watching and fishing. A combination of these can increase the tourist experiences (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019).

Chilojo Cliffs (mean = 3.45; Table 2), being one of the non-wildlife tourism attraction, is located within Gonarezhou National Park. Big game, including the “Big Five”, and small and plain game are a common sight within the Gonarezhou National Park. The most tourist attraction at Chilojo Cliffs is the viewing of the beautiful scenery of the cliffs. Visiting Chilojo Cliffs can be combined by conducting game viewing, bird watching, walking safaris and fishing within the Runde River. Tourists can combine the two since they are situated in the same park.

3.2. Relationship between local tourists and foreign tourists on the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions

A correlation analysis between local tourists’ (n = 168) and foreign tourists’ (n = 106) mean values on the eight (8) research items, namely, Victoria Falls, Mana Pools World Heritage Site, Matopo Hills, Great Zimbabwe Monuments, Inyangani Mountains, Hotels and Lodges, Chinhoyi Caves and Chilojo Cliffs measuring the value creation capacity of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of $r = +0.502$ and $p = 0.205$, and this showed weak and non—significant relationship, as shown in Table 3, part (a).

The results showed that there were no significant consistency and congruence between the perceptions of local tourists and foreign tourists on the tourism product value addition of linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019). Although their overall mean values are all at 3.76, they show some great divergence and variations in the way they value the attractiveness of various linkages between wildlife tourism resources and non-wildlife tourism resources.
Table 4. Regression analysis of linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions and overall tourism performance

| Model                                      | R    | R²   | AdjR²  | Beta  | Std Error | t-Value | F        | Sig     | DurbanWatson |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------|--------|-------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|
| Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife     | 0.316 | 0.100 | -0.004 | 0.316 | 0.058     | 5.499   | 30.236   | 0.000   | 1.455        |
| and Non-Wildlife Attraction—Tourists      |      |      |        |       |           |         |          |         |              |
| Linkages of Wildlife and Non-Wildlife     | 0.271 | 0.074 | 0.067  | 0.271 | 0.083     | 3.275   | 10.723   | 0.001   | 1.877        |
| and Non-Wildlife Attraction—Stakeholders  |      |      |        |       |           |         |          |         |              |

Source: SPSS Regression Statistical Analysis
3.3. Relationship between tourists and stakeholders on the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions

A correlation analysis between tourists’ (n = 274) and stakeholders’ (n = 137) mean values also on the eight (8) research items: Victoria Falls, Mana Pools World Heritage Site, Matopo Hills, Great Zimbabwe Monuments, Inyangani Mountains, Hotels and Lodges, Chinhoyi Caves and Chilojo Cliffs, also measuring the value creation capacity of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions produced a Pearson correlation coefficient of \( r = +0.850 \) and \( p = 0.008 \) and indicated a strong and significant relationship, as shown in Table 2, part (b). This showed a strong relationship between what tourists view to be compatible and what stakeholders also view to be compatible on the creation of tourist packages that combine wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions (Mazhande et al., 2020; Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019).

3.4. Overall linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions for all respondents

The study measured whether the given perceptions on overall linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions by all respondents, which had a total (n = 411), highly performed above the average level using a benchmark of 3.00 mean value and the 0.05 significance level in one sample mean test analysis. This indicated a significant positive perception of the linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions in Zimbabwe.

The eight (8) possible linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife attractions, which include Victoria Falls, Mana Pools World Heritage Site, Matopo Hills, Great Zimbabwe Monuments, Inyangani Mountains, Hotels and Lodges, Chinhoyi Caves and Chilojo Cliffs, had their mean values subjected to one sample mean test with a test mean value of 3.00 and at a test level of significance of 0.05 for all respondents (n = 411). This tested whether the suggested linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions had a higher mean able to cause improvements in the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe. The analysis produced a p-value of 0.000, which is below 0.05, with a t-value of 6.783 and a df of 7, hence indicating a significant positive difference between the basic performance mean value of 3.00 and the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions mean value of 3.80. This demonstrates that linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions could boost the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019; UNWTO, 2020).

3.5. Relationship between linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attraction and overall tourism performance

The overall tourist’s performance in Zimbabwe was 0.316 on linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife attractions, with a t-value 5.499 and a p = 0.000, and stakeholders’ performance was 0.271 with a t-value of 3.275 and a p = 0.001. Both have p-values less than 0.05 (Table 4). This indicated that there is a strong regression relationship between the linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife attractions and the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe (Ultimate Guide To Safari, 2019; United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2018).

Both the tourists’ (Adj. \( R^2 = 0.097 \)) and stakeholders’ (Adj. \( R^2 = 0.067 \)) adjusted R-Squares were below the 0.1 benchmark and hence reported some poor fit between linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attractions, and overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe is based on smaller coefficients of determination. Tourists’ responses indicated a larger Beta Coefficient of 0.378 for linking trophy hunting interests of tourists to overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe, and that of stakeholders was also large with the value of 0.199. This indicates that the tourists’ responses produced a stronger relationship between attractiveness of non-wildlife centres and overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe based on strong and statistically significant beta values (United Nation World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO), 2018; Mazhande et al., 2020). Both Tourists’ \( p = 0.000 \) and the Stakeholders’ \( p = 0.001 \) were below 0.05 and hence were significant. The large beta coefficients and the significant p-values indicate that linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attraction variables tested in the study were relevant and closely address some needs of general and wildlife-based tourists (Stone et al., 2021). Such areas of linkages need to be included when developing the integrated wildlife-based tourism
marketing systems and service packages for Zimbabwe. Given that both tourists' responses and stakeholders' responses had significant p-values and large beta values, the two regression equations could be adopted for estimating the relationship between linkages of wildlife and non-wildlife tourist attraction performance in Zimbabwe.

4. Conclusion
The study recorded that Victoria Falls, Mana Pools, Matopo Hills, Great Zimbabwe Monuments, Inyangani Mountains, Hotels and Lodges, Chinhoyi Caves and Chilojo Cliffs were non-wildlife tourism attractions to be linked to wildlife attractions in their order of preferences. Local tourists and foreign tourists were found to have different tastes in rating the linkages as there was a weak and non-significant correlation relationship in their ratings of the attractiveness of linkages between wildlife and non-wildlife attractions. The study recorded that all tourists and stakeholders' perceptions were similar in ranking the attractiveness of linking wildlife and non-wildlife tourist resources in Zimbabwe. The study found that all respondents showed some significant overall acceptance that wildlife and non-wildlife linkages will produce an attractive tourist package in Zimbabwe. The study concluded that linking non-wildlife tourist attractions and wildlife tourism resources in terms of marketing can impact positively the overall tourism performance in Zimbabwe. ZPMA is encouraged to naturally link its non-wildlife attractions like Matopo Hills heritage, Victoria Falls, Mana Pools heritage site, Inyangani Mountains and Chinhoyi Caves with surrounding wildlife centres and conservancies. Similarly, it is essential that ZTA’s oversight marketing activities connect tourism processes with accommodation facilities, airports, conference centres and other tourist attractions for improving the overall value of tourism experiences in Zimbabwe.
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