THE INTERNET PROMOTION OF MORAVICA ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT AS A TOURISM DESTINATION

Abstract

Tourism destinations tend to create and represent the integrated product of tourism appropriately. The target market can often be outside the national borders. In such circumstances, modern promotion in tourism requires flexibility, as well as the creation of optimum communication strategy. Such strategies include the combination of the Internet and the traditional forms of promotinal activities. It is necessary to highlight websites and social networks as the basic, often the most important elements of the Internet promotional mix. Each region possesses its own specific tourist features, the Moravica administrative district included (Čačak, Lučani, Gornji Milanovac and Ivanjica), as a part of the Republic of Serbia. According to this, the aim of this paper is to point out the presence of local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies and tourism events in the Moravica administrative district on the Internet, using websites and social networks. An Internet search and a search of social networks were performed in order to determine whether the previously mentioned factors of tourism have a Web site and accounts on the analyzed social networks, whether open accounts on social networks were used in the analyzed period in 2019 and to determine the number of followers. The contribution of this paper is that it provides an overview of the current situation in the area of online promotion of the Moravica administrative district as a tourism destination that has not been researched extensively so far.
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ИНТЕРНЕТ ПРОМОЦИЈА МОР АВИЧКОГ УПР АВНОГ ОКРУГА КАО ТУРИСТИЧКЕ ДЕСТИНАЦИЈЕ

Апстракт

Туристичке дестинације теже да креирају и адекватно представе интегрисани туристички производ. Циљно тржиште често зна бити ван националних
Introduction

The greatest innovations are certainly those that change a man’s life fundamentally. The Internet is definitely one of them. As the most significant representative of information and communication technologies (ICT), the Internet has influenced people, changing their way of thinking, behavior, and other things, but the area of business as well. Tourism competitiveness is a significant factor in national competitiveness (Krstić et al, 2014), and ICT infrastructure is an important factor in tourism competitiveness that needs to be further developed. According to this, some authors have established that ICT has a significant influence on tourism destination competitiveness (Krstić, Stanišić, 2014; Petrović, Milićević, 2015; Petrović et al, 2017). Kostić (2018) observes digital transformation as a competition catalyst, whereas he states that “strong competitive pressure forces companies to adapt the process of digital transition to business conditions and consumer preferences” (p 21). It is very important to possess technological readiness in order to achieve the country’s competitiveness in global proportions. When we speak of Serbia, the indicators related to technological readiness requiring priority in development policies are: Availability of latest technologies, Firm-level technology absorption, FDI and technology transfer, Fixed-broadband Internet subscriptions, Internet bandwidth, Mobile-broadband subscriptions (Rađivojević et al, 2018).

Cooper et al (2008) indicate a large influence of ICT on tourism destination development through the creation of e-destination concept. They state a multidimensional framework for processes in the industry of tourism facilitated by the use of ICT, one of the elements that stand out being the communication of the tourist with the tourism industry. Numerous authors state ICT as the main initiator of changes in tourism (Page, 2009; Štetić et al, 2017; Milićević, Beljić, 2018). ICT require a better tourist operations
management in order to use their potentials (Page, 2009). Štetić et al (2017) offer a new ICT communication model in tourism that involves six elements: DMOs (Destination Marketing Organizations), online intermediaries, tourist industry, the Internet, smart phones and applications, tourists. Vidaković & Vidaković (2019) in the field of digital media and marketing emphasize the importance of creative expression and ethical norms (truthfulness and transparency and the resulting desire to create the highest quality content).

Each tourism destination is specific, and the elements of the marketing mix, as well as promotion, should be adjusted accordingly. The Moravica administrative district is a part of the Republic of Serbia that encompasses the territories of Čačak, Lučani, Gornji Milanovac and Ivanjica. It covers the area of about 3,016 km², and according to the 2011 census results, it has a population of about 212,603 (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2014). The characteristics of Moravica administrative district is a rich offer in the field of event tourism (Guča Trumpet Festival, Nušićijada Festival in Ivanjica, “Cabbage fest” – Kupusijada in Mrčajevci, Flute Players Contest in Prislonica, “Dis Spring” in Čačak, Serbia World Music Festival in Gornji Milanovac, etc), medical/health tourism (Gornja Trepča, etc), winter tourism (Golija), rural tourism (Ivanjica is one of the founders of this type of tourism in Serbia), religious tourism (Ovčar-Kablar Gorge as natural landscape of exceptional beauty, abundant in monasteries and frequently referred to as “Serbian Holy Mountain”) and others. All the aforementioned, as well as many other things, make a tourist offer necessary to present to the existing and potential tourists in the best way, where the Internet can play a very important role.

The subject of this paper is a review of the Internet promotional activities in the Moravica administrative district as a tourism destination. The aim of this paper is to emphasize the existence and promotion of local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies and tourism events in the Moravica administrative district territory on the Internet, using websites and social networks. The analysis of the Moravica district as a tourism destination online representation and promotional activities is presented in the papers by certain authors (e.g. Garabinović, Anđelić, 2019; Garabinović, 2019; Papić et al, 2018; Garabinović, Papić, 2018; Garabinović, 2017). Their research provides the foundation for the comparison to the new data acquired through the research conducted in this paper.

**Theoretical backgrounds**

Local tourism organizations have the most significant place in tourism destination product creation and its promotion. This promotion could be conducted in a traditional way, as well as using modern technologies, the Internet above all else. Websites stand for the basic form of online presence, with the increasing significance of other forms of target market connections (eg. social networks). Noti (2016) used image-based technology evaluation criteria for the national tourism organizations website analysis. Mariani et al (2016) established that Destination Management Organizations’ Facebook engagement in Italy is influenced positively by visual content (namely photos) and moderately long posts, but high post frequency and early daily timing (in the morning) of posts in a negative way. The fact that should be highlighted is that Facebook is the network implemented completely among most local tourism organizations in Serbia (64.3%); they mostly use the number of social network users (47.6%) for promotion effects surveys (Podovac, Petrović, 2019). There certainly are the benefits of social network usage for the promotion purposes. However, it is necessary to improve this part of online promotion additionally, in terms of choosing social networks for the local tourism organizations to present their destination offer, as well as the improvement
of promotion effects measurements through social networks. Garabinović and Papić (2019) state that there are several ways of determining marketing success through social networks, inferring simultaneously that “the success of these activities is very difficult to measure accurately, and therefore “assessment” is much more appropriate term” (p. 153). When we speak of the Moravica administrative district, Facebook also holds the best position among social networks according to the website presence, account existence and use by local tourism organizations (Garabinović, 2019).

Hotels as the basic receptive objects in tourist offer should follow an increasing demand for the Internet usage, as well as tourism organizations. The authors Ladhari and Michaud (2015) researched e-WOM (electronic Word of Mouth) in hotels in Canada, and they reached a conclusion that the more positive comments about a hotel are, the more positive the booking intentions, the more positive the attitude toward it, the higher the trust in it, the more positive the perceived quality of the website will be. On the basis of the above stated, “comments” and “spreading” information on the Internet among the existing and potential tourists play an important role in hotel promotion.

Some authors directed their research towards hotel website quality analysis in some of the world countries, such as Salavati and Hashim (2015), Leung et al (2016), Abou-Shouk and Khalifa (2017), Hung (2017), Lei and Law (2019), Ostovare and Shahraki (2019), Ongsakul et al (2020), Akinçilar and Dagdeviren (2014), Yeung and Law (2006), etc. Similar research of hotel promotion through websites and social networks in Serbia was conducted by Mašić and Milošević (2018), Stanujkic et al (2018), Virijević Jovanović and Piljevac (2018), Kalinić and Vujičić (2019) and other authors. According to the research conducted by Mašić and Kosar (2016), it is established that Facebook is by far the most used social network by hotels in Serbia for their promotion. Therefore, we can reach a conclusion that website and social network use (primarily Facebook) plays an important role in contemporary hotel promotion. Đokić and Milićević (2017) state that in Serbia, attitudes have the greatest influence on the intention to buy hotel accommodation online, followed by subjective norms and perceived behavioural control.

Unlike hotels, travel agencies are agents (intermediaries) in the tourism market. Travel agency website quality and design play an important role for potential users (Dorra and Hassen, 2015; Theodhori and Shkira, 2013; Yang and Chen, 2012). Abou-Shouk and Khalifa (2017) used the example of Egypt to establish the fact that website quality dimensions significantly affect the customer purchasing behavior.

When we speak of tourism events as one of the basic elements of tourism destination offer, the Internet usage should be observed considering mutual diversity of various events. We should particularly emphasize the type of event and target audience it is intended for. For example, most festivals organized in Canada and the USA (99%) used social media for promotion purposes. The most frequently used were Facebook (83%), Instagram (57%), Twitter (66%) and YouTube (42%) (Van Winkle et al, 2018).

When we speak of the Moravica administrative district, the research by Papić et al (2018) shows that 18.37% of tourism events are present online in some form (website or social networks), and all these events (18.37%) have a Facebook account. This situation should be a clear signal for event organizers to take part in the Internet business as soon as possible because it may hold the key position in communication with the potential visitors and participants.

Research methodology

The subject of this paper is the overview of the online promotional activities in the Moravica administrative district as a tourism destination. The aim of the paper is to point
out the presence and promotion of local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies and tourism events in the Moravica administrative district territory online, through website and social network usage. The following hypotheses arise from the topic and aim of the paper:

H1 – Local tourism organizations in the Moravica administrative district territory use their official websites and accounts on social networks as a form of online promotion.

H2 – Hotels in the Moravica administrative district territory use their official websites and accounts on social networks as a form of online promotion.

H3 – Travel agencies in the Moravica administrative district territory use their official websites and accounts on social networks as a form of online promotion.

H4 – Tourism events in the Moravica administrative district territory use their official websites and accounts on social networks as a form of online promotion.

A research was conducted in the Moravica administrative district territory (Čačak, Lučani, Gornji Milanovac and Ivanjica) in November 2019, with the aim of testing the aforementioned hypotheses. The research refers to the establishment of the presence of local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies and tourism events websites, as well as the analysis of their characteristics according to the chosen criteria. The research also includes the analysis of the presence and use of the accounts on chosen social networks (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and YouTube), as well as the number of followers. According to the set up hypotheses, the expression “use” of social networks implies account activity shown through the network posts during the analyzed period in 2019.

The sample for this research consists of 109 factors of tourism in the Moravica administrative district territory: 4 local tourism organizations, 12 hotels (Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications, Republic of Serbia, 2019, 2nd October), 28 active travel agencies – singled out on the basis of the Serbian Business Registers Agency data – Tourism Register (http://pretraga2.apr.gov.rs/PretragaTuristickihAgencija, 23rd November 2019), 65 tourism events featured on the official websites of local tourism organizations – Čačak (http://turizamcacak.org.rs/turisticka-ponuda/manifestacije/, 23rd November 2019), Gornji Milanovac (http://www.togm.org.rs/index.php/sta-raditi/manifestacije, 23rd November 2019), Lučani (http://turizamdragacevo.org/category/manifestacije/, 23rd November 2019) and Ivanjica (https://ivatourism.org/sr/turisticka-ponuda/sta-raditi/manifestacije.html, 23rd November 2019).

Research results and Discussion

The research established the fact that 40 out of 109 factors of tourism in the Moravica administrative district (36.7%) have a website. All the local tourism organizations have a website (100%), as well as most hotels (10 hotels, i.e. 83.33%) and travel agencies (17 travel agencies, i.e. 60.71%). Tourism events show the smallest percent of website possession (9 events, i.e. 13.85%).

On the basis of the criteria applied in Garabinović and Papić (2018), and Garabinović (2019), ten criteria were chosen as common to all four categories of factors in tourism: K1 – available material for download; K2 – in addition to the text, the website contains photos, video and sound effects (at least two criteria); K3 – horizontal scroll is avoided or minimized; K4 – the information describing your position in the site structure appear on each page; K5 – website search appears on the website homepage; K6 – newsletter subscription; K7 – the site connection to social network accounts; K8 – the site offers
interaction with site visitors (comments, messages); K9 – the site has a version in a foreign language; K10 – the site provides the links to similar organizations and partners. The criteria have been chosen in order to establish with certainty whether a website meets them or not. The chosen criteria are presented in Table 1 with the research results.

**Table 1: Criteria fulfillment overview – website**

| Criteria | Local tourism organizations | Hotels | Travel agencies | Tourism events | TOTAL |
|----------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| No. %    | No. %                       | No. %  | No. %           | No. %         | No. % |
| K1       | 2 50.00                     | 1 10.00| 10 58.82        | 5 55.56       | 18 45.00 |
| K2       | 2 50.00                     | 3 30.00| 3 17.65         | 6 66.67       | 14 35.00 |
| K3       | 4 100.00                    | 6 60.00| 11 64.71        | 6 66.67       | 27 67.50 |
| K4       | 0 0.00                      | 0 0.00 | 4 23.53         | 1 11.11       | 5 12.50 |
| K5       | 1 25.00                     | 2 20.00| 3 17.65         | 2 22.22       | 8 20.00 |
| K6       | 1 25.00                     | 2 20.00| 0 0.00          | 1 11.11       | 4 10.00 |
| K7       | 4 100.00                    | 6 60.00| 8 47.06         | 8 88.89       | 26 65.00 |
| K8       | 3 75.00                     | 7 70.00| 12 70.59        | 5 55.56       | 27 67.50 |
| K9       | 4 100.00                    | 9 90.00| 1 5.88          | 7 77.78       | 21 67.50 |
| K10      | 4 100.00                    | 1 10.00| 7 41.18         | 6 66.67       | 18 52.50 |
| Website average | 6.25  | 3.7 | 3.47 | 3.53* | 5.22 | 4.22* |

**NOTE:** % - percentage out of the site numbers; Website average = \( \frac{(K1+K2+K3+K4+K5+K6+K7+K8+K9+K10)}{\text{website number}} \); *social network profiles included (K7 criterion).

**Source: the authors’ research**

The characteristics of websites in all four categories are that horizontal scroll is avoided or minimized, the site is connected to social network accounts and the site provides the possibility of interaction with site visitors (comments, messages). Criteria fulfillment average per analyzed type of tourism factors (Table 1) is the highest in local tourism organizations (6.25) and tourism events (5.22), followed by hotels (3.7) and travel agencies (about 3.5).

Table 2 provides the data on language options offered on the websites of the factors analyzed.

**Table 2: Website multilingualism**

| Criteria (languages) | Local tourism organizations | Hotels | Travel agencies | Tourism events | TOTAL |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| No. %*               | No. %*                      | No. %* | No. %*          | No. %*         | No. %* |
| Serbian (Cyrillic)   | 3 75.00                     | 0 0.00 | 0 0.00          | 4 44.44        | 7 17.50 |
| Serbian (Latin)      | 2 50.00                     | 10 100.00| 16 94.12       | 6 66.67        | 34 85.00 |
| English              | 4 100.00                    | 9 90.00| 1 5.88          | 7 77.78        | 21 52.50 |
| German               | 1 25.00                     | 2 20.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 3 7.50 |
| Russian              | 0 0.00                      | 3 30.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 3 7.50 |
| Dutch                | 0 0.00                      | 1 10.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 1 2.50 |
| French               | 0 0.00                      | 1 10.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 1 2.50 |
| Greek                | 0 0.00                      | 1 10.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 1 2.50 |
| Italian              | 0 0.00                      | 2 20.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 2 5.00 |
| Slovenian            | 0 0.00                      | 1 10.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 1 2.50 |
| Ukrainian            | 0 0.00                      | 1 10.00| 0 0.00          | 0 0.00         | 1 2.50 |
Criteria (languages)

| ANALYZED FACTORS OF TOURISM | Local tourism organizations | Hotels | Travel agencies | Tourism events | TOTAL |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| No.                        | %*                        | No.    | %*              | No.            | %*   |
| Average **                 | 1.25                      | 2.10   | 0.06            | 0.78           | 0.85 |
| NOTE: * - the percentage of tourist factors with a website; ** - the average of foreign languages per website. |

Source: the authors' research

Considering all four categories individually and cumulatively (Table 2), the results show that most (or at least a half) of the websites have the option Serbian language (Latin), as well as English as a foreign language. All three categories provide the website in a foreign language to a great degree, except travel agencies (only one; 5.88%). Hotels have the largest number of foreign languages per website (2.1). Local tourism organizations websites are the only ones among the analyzed categories with a Serbian language Cyrillic option. We should highlight the fact that only two websites (1 local tourism organization and 1 tourism event) have Serbian language options in both Cyrillic and Latin versions.

The overview of the website link numbers to accounts on Facebook and Instagram, the actual number of the accounts open on these social networks, and the number of the accounts (with the posts) used in 2019 (until the research is conducted) is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Facebook and Instagram – link to Websites, account existence and use

| Criterion       | FACEBOOK |                      | INSTAGRAM |                      |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
|                 | WS       | AE (ws)               | AU** (ws) | WS                    | AE (ws)               | AU (ws)               |
| Local tourism organizations | No. | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| %               | 100.00   | 100.00                | 100.00    | 50.00                 | 100.00                |
| Hotels          | No. | 5 | 6* | 10 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 8 |
| %               | 50.00; 60.00* | 83.33 | 75.00 | 90.00                 | 20.00 | 75.00 | 66.67 | 88.89 |
| Travel agencies | No. | 8 | 9* | 22 | 19 | 2 | 17 | 11 |
| %               | 47.06; 52.94* | 78.57 | 67.86 | 86.36                 | 11.76 | 60.71 | 39.29 | 64.71 |
| Tourism events | No. | 8 | 16 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 5 |
| %               | 88.89 | 24.62 | 18.46 | 75.00                 | 22.22 | 10.77 | 7.69 | 71.43 |
| TOTAL           | No. | 25 | 27* | 52 | 53* | 44 | 8 | 37 | 28 |
| %               | 62.50 | 47.71 | 40.37 | 46.62* | 33.94 | 25.69 | 75.68 |

NOTE: WS – website (% - percentage of website numbers); AE – account existence (% - percentage of tourist factor numbers within a category); AU – account use (% - percentage of tourist factor numbers within a category; percentage of account existence numbers within a category; * - Facebook pages and profiles; ** - Facebook pages only.

Source: the authors’ research

The overview of website links, Twitter and YouTube account existence and use, as well as the average for all the social networks analyzed (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter and YouTube) is provided in table 4.
Table 4: Twitter, YouTube, social networks average – website link, account existence and use

|                          | TWITTER |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|--------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
|                          | WS      | AE       | AU       | WS       | AE       | AU       | WS       | AE       | AU       |
| Local tourism organizations | No. | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2.75 | 4 | 3 |
| %                       | 50.00 | 100.00  | 50.00    | 50.00    | 50.00    | 50.00    | 50.00    | 50.00    | 50.00    |
| Hotels                  | No. | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0.9 | 2.00 | 1.58 |
| %                       | 0.00 | 25.00  | 8.33     | 8.33     | 8.33     | 8.33     | 8.33     | 50.00    | 50.00    |
| Travel agencies         | No. | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.47 | 1.5 | 1.11 |
| %                       | 0.00 | 7.14   | 0.00     | 0.00     | 3.57     | 3.57     | 100.00   | 100.00   |
| Tourism events          | No. | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1.22 | 0.48 | 0.34 |
| %                       | 11.11 | 4.62  | 3.08     | 66.67    | 7.69     | 4.62     | 100.00   | 100.00   |
| TOTAL                   | No. | 3 | 12 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.05 | 0.77 |
| %                       | 7.50 | 11.01 | 4.59     | 6.67     | 12.50    | 11.01    | 6.42     | 58.33    |

NOTE: WS – website (% - the percentage out of the website number); AE – account existence (% - the percentage out of the tourist factor numbers within the category); AU – account use (% - the percentage out of the tourist factors within the category; percentage of account existence numbers within a category ); * - Facebook pages and profiles; *** - the average refers to all four social networks.

Source: the authors’ research

Considering the sample as a whole, on the basis of the tables 3 and 4 it is obvious that there is only Facebook link on most websites (62.50%, i.e. 67.50% of websites). Facebook has the maximum utilization (84.62%), followed by Instagram (75.68%), YouTube (58.33%) and Twitter (6.42%).

Table 5 provides the overview for the number of factors per category without an account on any of the social networks, with an account on one, two or all four social networks, as well as the number of social networks currently used (in 2019).

Table 5: Number of the social networks with an account and the number of the social networks in use

|                          | SOCIAL NETWORKS NUMBER |
|--------------------------|------------------------|
|                          | None | One   | Two   | Three | Four |
| Local tourism organizations | No. | 0    | 0     | 0     | 0    | 4    |
| Account existence %      | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00  | 0.00  | 100.00 |
| Account use %            | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 50.00 | 25.00 |
| Hotels                   | No. | 1    | 1     | 8     | 2    | 0    |
| Account existence %      | 8.33 | 8.33 | 66.67 | 16.67 | 0.00 |
| Account use %            | 1   | 4    | 6     | 1     | 0    |
| Travel agencies          | No. | 4    | 8     | 14    | 2    | 0    |
| Account existence %      | 14.29 | 28.57 | 50.00 | 7.14  | 0.00 |
| Account use %            | 7   | 11   | 10    | 0     | 0    |
SOCIAL NETWORKS NUMBER

|                           | None | One | Two | Three | Four |
|---------------------------|------|-----|-----|-------|------|
| **Tourism events**        |      |     |     |       |      |
| Account existence         | 48   | 8   | 6   | 1     | 2    |
| %                         | 73.85| 12.31| 9.23| 1.54  | 3.08 |
| Account use               | 53   | 5   | 5   | 1     | 1    |
| %                         | 81.54| 7.69 | 7.69| 1.54  | 1.54 |
| **TOTAL**                 |      |     |     |       |      |
| Account existence         | 53   | 17  | 28  | 5     | 6    |
| %                         | 48.62| 15.60| 25.69| 4.59  | 5.50 |
| Account use               | 61   | 20  | 22  | 4     | 2    |
| %                         | 55.96| 18.35| 20.18| 3.67  | 1.83 |

NOTE: No. and % stand for the number and percentage of factors in tourism.

Source: the authors’ research

Number of followers can be singled out as a common element for all four social networks. Table 6 provides an overview for the number of followers in the social network accounts used in the period of the analysis in 2019, average number of followers per account in use, as well as maximum number of followers per individual account.

Table 6: The followers in the accounts used on social networks

|                       | Local tourism organizations | Hotels | Travel agencies | Tourism events | Total* |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------------|-------|
| **Facebook**          |                             |        |                 |                |       |
| Number                | 12039                       | 87457  | 22142           | 24422          | 146060|
| Average               | 3009.75                     | 9717.44| 1165.37         | 2035.17        | 3319.55|
| Maximum               | 4937                        | 74943  | 4273            | 5215           | 74943 |
| Minimum               | 747                         | 479    | 55              | 186            | 55    |
| **Instagram**         |                             |        |                 |                |       |
| Number                | 4592                        | 6150   | 10947           | 2502           | 24191 |
| Average               | 1148                        | 768.75 | 995.18          | 500.4          | 863.96|
| Maximum               | 2641                        | 2964   | 5528            | 1115           | 5528  |
| Minimum               | 497                         | 27     | 56              | 64             | 27    |
| **Twitter**           |                             |        |                 |                |       |
| Number                | 48                          | 109    | -               | 247            | 404   |
| Average               | 24                          | 109    | -               | 123.5          | 80.8  |
| Maximum               | 42                          | 109    | -               | 153            | 153   |
| Minimum               | 6                           | 109    | -               | 94             | 6     |
| **YouTube**           |                             |        |                 |                |       |
| Number                | 221                         | 76     | 9               | 92             | 398   |
| Average               | 110.5                       | 76     | 9               | 30.67          | 56.86 |
| Maximum               | 220                         | 76     | 9               | 84             | 220   |
| Minimum               | 1                           | 76     | 9               | 0              | 0     |
| **total**             |                             |        |                 |                |       |
| Number                | 16900                       | 93792  | 33098           | 27263          | 171053|
| Average               | 1408.33                     | 4936.42| 1067.68         | 1239.23        | 2036.35|
| Maximum               | 4937                        | 74943  | 5528            | 5215           | 74943 |
| Minimum               | 1                           | 27     | 9               | 0              | 0     |

NOTE: Total* - cumulative consideration of all used accounts per social network (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, YouTube); Total** - cumulative consideration of all used accounts per type of factors analyzed (local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies, tourism events).

Source: the authors’ research

Total number of accounts used on social networks is 84, whereas the total number of followers in all accounts is 171053; therefore, the average number of followers per account is 2036.35. Maximum number is 74943, while the minimum number is 0.
Facebook takes the first place when we speak of the number of followers, average number of followers, the largest maximum number of followers and the largest minimum number of followers in accounts in all four categories of the analyzed factors of tourism and the whole set (with the exception of the largest maximum and minimum number in travel agencies – Instagram). The comparison among the four categories of the tourist factors analyzed (the criteria referring to the number of followers) allows for an observation that the hotels take the first place according to all the criteria.

Table 7 provides an overview of the number and percentage for the factors in the sample that have/use: a) only social networks, b) only website, c) all four social networks and website, d) use neither one of the social networks from the analysis nor website.

Table 7: Website and social networks existence and use

|                          | Only social networks | Only website | All social networks and website | Neither social networks nor website |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| **Local tourism organizations** |                      |              |                                 |                                     |
| Account existence        | No. 0                | 0            | 4                               | 0                                   |
| %                       | 0.00                 | 0.00         | 100.00                          | 0.00                                |
| Account use              | No. 0                | 0            | 1                               | 0                                   |
| %                       | 0.00                 | 0.00         | 25.00                           | 0.00                                |
| **Hotels**               |                      |              |                                 |                                     |
| Account existence        | No. 2                | 1            | 0                               | 0                                   |
| %                       | 16.67                | 8.33         | 0.00                            | 0.00                                |
| Account use              | No. 2                | 1            | 0                               | 0                                   |
| %                       | 16.67                | 8.33         | 0.00                            | 0.00                                |
| **Travel agencies**      |                      |              |                                 |                                     |
| Account existence        | No. 10               | 4            | 0                               | 1                                   |
| %                       | 35.71                | 14.29        | 0.00                            | 3.57                                |
| Account use              | No. 8                | 5            | 0                               | 3                                   |
| %                       | 28.57                | 17.86        | 0.00                            | 10.71                               |
| **Tourism events**       |                      |              |                                 |                                     |
| Account existence        | No. 9                | 1            | 2                               | 47                                  |
| %                       | 13.85                | 1.54         | 3.08                            | 72.31                               |
| Account use              | No. 4                | 1            | 1                               | 52                                  |
| %                       | 6.15                 | 1.54         | 1.54                            | 80.00                               |
| **TOTAL**                |                      |              |                                 |                                     |
| Account existence        | No. 21               | 6            | 6                               | 48                                  |
| %                       | 19.27                | 5.50         | 5.50                            | 44.04                               |
| Account use              | No. 12               | 7            | 2                               | 55                                  |
| %                       | 12.84                | 6.42         | 1.83                            | 50.46                               |

NOTE: Number and % refer to the number and percentage of tourist factors.

Source: the authors’ research

Table 8 provides a comparative overview of social networks and website usage by the local tourism organizations, hotels, travel agencies and tourism events in the Moravica administrative district.

Table 8 Comparative overview of social networks and website use

|                          | Website | Facebook | Instagram | Twitter | YouTube |
|--------------------------|---------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| **Local tourism organizations** |         |          |           |         |         |
| no.                      | 4       | 4        | 4         | 2       | 2       |
| %                        | 100.00  | 100.00   | 100.00    | 50.00   | 50.00   |
| **Hotels**               |         |          |           |         |         |
| no.                      | 10      | 9        | 8         | 1       | 1       |
| %                        | 83.33   | 75.00    | 66.67     | 8.33    | 8.33    |
Travel agencies

| no.  | 17 | 19 | 11 | 0  | 1  |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| %    | 60.71 | 67.86 | 39.29 | 0.00 | 3.57 |

Tourism events

| no.  | 9  | 12 | 5  | 2  | 3  |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| %    | 13.85 | 18.46 | 7.69 | 3.08 | 4.62 |

TOTAL

| no.  | 40 | 44 | 28 | 5  | 7  |
|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| %    | 36.7 | 40.37 | 25.69 | 4.59 | 6.42 |

NOTE: Number and % refer to the number and percentage of factors in tourism.

Source: the authors’ research

On the basis of the table above, we can reach the following conclusion: in the total number of the analyzed factors, as well as in three out of four categories (with the exception of the hotels), Facebook has the best position according to use, followed by websites (with the exception of hotels – the first place), Instagram, YouTube and Twitter (Twitter shares the third place with YouTube in hotel accounts, while travel agencies do not use it).

Conclusion

Online promotional activities are an important potential in tourism development as a whole, as well as all its factors. Accordingly, this paper provides an overview of online promotional activities in the Moravica administrative district as a tourism destination through the conducted analysis. The results show that all the local tourism organizations use website, Facebook and Instagram, while a half of them use Twitter and YouTube. Most of the hotels use website (83.33%), Facebook (75.00%) and Instagram (66.67%). Most of the travel agencies use Facebook (67.86%) and website (60.71%), while none of the travel agencies uses Twitter. Only tourism events mostly (80%) use neither websites nor social networks. On the basis of all the information, we can draw a conclusion that the hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 have been accepted, while H4 has been rejected.

The contribution of this paper consists in the fact that it provides an overview of the current situation in online promotion in the Moravica administrative district as a tourism destination (not researched extensively so far), mainly through the analysis of significant factors of tourism in this area. All local tourism organizations have been included, all hotels, all travel agencies and tourism events highlighted as the important ones by the local tourism organizations. The results provide the foundation for potential improvement in the Moravica administrative district online promotion as a tourism destination.

Potential deficiencies of the research lie in the fact that it could have included other significant factors in tourism (e. g. other classified and unclassified accommodation facilities according to categories, facilities in the restaurant business, other events that can be considered as tourism events not highlighted by the local tourism organizations, etc), as well as a detailed website and social network use analysis. All the above stated may present directions for possible future research.
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