

**FACTORS DETERMINING COMPETITIVENESS OF BEACH TOURIST  
DESTINATION IN LAGOS, NIGERIA**

**ADELEKE, BOLA OLUSOLA AND OGUNSUSI, KAYODE**

**Department of Transport and Tourism Studies,  
Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria**

**Corresponding author's Email: [adelekeb@run.edu.ng](mailto:adelekeb@run.edu.ng)**

**ABSTRACT**

*The comparative advantage of beach tourism in Nigeria can be exploited using effectiveness of destination management of beach tourism destinations to tourists' needs as key factors in drawing tourists. Structured questionnaire was used to gather data from staff and tourists to Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach. Effectiveness of destination management from staff and responsiveness of tourism destination to tourists needs from tourists was measured. Data were analysed using multiple regression analysis and ANOVA to predict the efficiency of destination management. Results showed that 73% and 35.4% tourists had tertiary education in Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach respectively, with 52% and 53% of the tourists being females in Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach respectively. Most (94%) of the tourists were Nigerians in Lekki Beach, while all tourists to Elegushi Beach also Nigerians. From the perspective of staff, the management of Lekki Beach as a destination was not as effective in taking care of tourists' needs as Elegushi Beach. The response variable predicted the effectiveness of destination management by the educational status of staff better in Elegushi Beach ( $R^2 = 66.9\%$ ) than Lekki Beach ( $R^2 = 33.3\%$ ). From the perception of tourists, none of the two destinations was responsive to the needs of tourists. But, Lekki Beach has the propensity to perform better as the percentage variance of prediction ( $R^2$ ) was explained by 48.4%. The effectiveness of beach tourist destination is a function of the quality of service that can be used to attract local and in particular international tourists.*

**Keywords:** Beach, Competitiveness, Effectiveness, Responsiveness, Tourism

**INTRODUCTION**

Nigeria is blessed with arrays of potentialities such as natural features like beaches and land formations, manmade creativities and artifacts and divergent heterogeneous culture for the development of the tourism industry, but, the industry has not witnessed significant growth (Ndanusa *et al.*, 2014). The investment environment in tourism in any country is influenced by many factors among which are the degree to which government agencies seek to facilitate or inhibit private investment in the industry, and the laws and regulations that impact access to capital and credit. For the political development of tourism, government is the principal actor (Bramwell, 2011). According to Hall (2005) government has seven functions in tourism development: coordination, planning, legislation and regulation, entrepreneurship, stimulation, social tourism, and public interest protection roles. However, the political motives for controlling tourism has been too subtle over the years (Kim *et al.*, 2007), especially with regards to beach tourism in Nigeria. This poor political will can be complimented if the government will allow Foreign Direct Investment in the tourism industry in Nigeria. Davidson and Sahli (2015) provided empirical evidence of the relative benefits of foreign investments, in which poverty alleviation, employment

of more staff, payment of higher wages, and provision of more training have been holding sway. According to Marvell (2011)

“The flow of capital from the foreign country is invested in assets such as land, businesses or the construction of new facilities. This is different to a foreign company investing in the stock market of another country as in times of economic uncertainty the investment can easily be withdrawn. Foreign Direct Investment signifies a more lasting relationship between the foreign country and the host country as new facilities, buildings and land cannot easily be abandoned or removed. FDI provides a foreign company with new market opportunities, cheaper production costs and access to new supplies of labour, products and finance. For a host country it can provide new technologies, capital, products and management skills and as such provide an impetus for economic growth”.

By extending the concept of comparative and competitive advantage to international tourism, comparative advantage relates to primary factors such as natural, cultural and social attractiveness, while competitive advantage relates to secondary factors such as tourism infrastructure, the quality of management, the skills of the workforce, government policy etc (Ritchie and Crouch 1993). The concept of comparative advantage is something that cannot be reproduced with the same attractiveness, but, competitive factors can be produced and even be improved by the tourist firms or governmental policy. “The two factors depend on one another, as the absence of secondary tourism supply will hinder the tourism destination from selling its attractions (Omerzel, 2006)”. Competiveness in the tourism industry is a broad concept, in which many factors among which responsiveness to tourists’ needs, qualities of entrepreneurs, and packaging of tourists’ experiences cannot just wave aside (Adeleke and Ogunsusi, 2018). At the national level, it can be seen from a macro view, while at the firm level it is viewed as micro competitiveness (Omerzel, 2006). At firm level, if beach tourism destination is to be competitive, it must render services that will attract and satisfy its customers, as well as influence tourism related businesses (Tsai *et al.*, 2009). Not only to satisfy customers, but, destination must also be able to perform better than other contemporary destinations in the delivery of goods and services with regards to those aspects of experience considered as important by tourists as satisfaction had indirect influence towards behavioral intention through trust (Dwyer & Kim, 2003; Pujiastuti *et al.*, 2017). In the opinion of Geremew *et al.* (2017) what attracts a tourist to a destination are the development of various local products within inter related and continuing process, and how they are marketed within a destination’s overall development policy for which the destination has to prioritize. Effective destination management has been recognized by Adeleke and Ogunsusi (2019) as an important factor for differentiating any tourism destination by improving the quality of service with special focus on responsiveness of destination to tourists’ needs.

Considering tourism products and tourist satisfaction, service quality is a sine qua non. This owes to the fact that tourists are better satisfied only when the services rendered to them are of good qualities. When the tourists are satisfied, it is a bet that they will definitely seek for revisit to such destination again and again, as well as introduce such destination to their friends (Cronin & Taylor, 1992). Service quality is vital tool for satisfying customers improve profitability and remain in business even in the face of stiff competition (Ghotbabadi *et al.*, 2012). The attitudes of residents towards the visitors may also spark off positively on the tourists’ behavior about satisfaction, decision to make repeat visit, or recommending the destination to others (Thyne *et al.*, 2004; Skipper 2009; Zgolli and Zaiem, 2017). According to McElroy *et al.* (2007) on the attitudes of residents towards beach tourists,

‘Harassment is an increasing problem with global dimensions. Vendor persistence is the main type, followed by drug peddling and sexual harassment with most incidents occurring at the beach and/or shopping areas and the least at hotels.

The desire to stay in a tourist destination, get satisfied and maintain loyalty is also a function of interactions between customers (Zgolli and Zaiem, 2017). For a tourist to recommend a destination to others, the overall image plays a major role as dictated by the emotional experiences on his satisfaction (Prayag *et al.* 2017). The marketing of tourism products and services is an important factor in the face of increasing competitive tourism market if a destination is to gain patronage, generate repeat businesses and have loyal customers (Yuju-Wang, 2007). Many of the beach tourist destinations in Nigeria have operating without the necessary government intervention role as regards regulation and moderation. This has hitherto led to poor service delivery on the part of operators in the frontline of beach tourism in Nigeria. This study therefore is aimed at evaluating the antecedent factors that determine beach destination competitiveness in Lagos state, Nigeria

### **Research objective**

- Comparison of the effectiveness of beach tourism destination management between Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach

### **Hypotheses formulation**

In this study, the following hypotheses were formulated to address the efficiency of management of beach tourism destinations, as well as the responsiveness of the tourism destination to tourists' needs.

- H<sub>1</sub>: Effectiveness of beach tourist destination management on tourists' needs is not significantly predicted by the educational status of staff
- H<sub>2</sub>: Tourists' needs in beach tourism destination is not significantly responsive to destination management
- H<sub>3</sub>: Responsiveness of nature tourism destination to tourists' needs is not significantly predicted by the educational status of tourists

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Data collection**

Structured questionnaire was used to gather data from staff and tourists to Lekki and Elegushi beaches, both in Lagos, Nigeria a week prior to the Easter celebration in 2017. A total of 672 copies of questionnaire were administered among respondents of both destinations. Out of this 564 copies were administered among tourists, while 108 copies were administered among staff of both destinations. A total of 228 copies of questionnaire were administered among tourists in Lekki beach, while 236 copies were administered to tourists in Elegushi beach. A total of 60 copies of questionnaire were attended to by staff of Lekki beach, while 48 copies were responded to by staff of Elegushi beach. Questions on demographic characteristics were included. Questions were asked from staff to address effectiveness of destination management on a five-point rating scale of very good to not good. Also, questions to address responsiveness of tourism destination to tourists were administered on tourists using five-point Likert-type rating scale of very satisfied to very unsatisfied.

### **Data Analysis**

Qualitative descriptive analysis was used to verbally summarize information on demographic profile and Levene's test. Regression analysis was carried out to predict the effectiveness of destination management by the educational status of staff in Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach. One-way analysis of variance was used to measure the factors that made heritage destinations of Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach to be responsive to tourists' needs. In the one-way ANOVA, hypothesis was formulated about the means of the groups on the dependent variable of educational status of tourists. The dependent variable differentiated individual tourists on some quantitative (continuous) dimension. An overall analysis-of-variance test was conducted in multiple regressions to assess whether group means of effectiveness of destination management by staff and responsiveness of destination to tourists' needs were significantly different among the groups. Regression analysis was carried out as a confirmatory test on ANOVA to specify which of the variables were significant discriminators in evaluating the responsiveness of destination to the needs of tourists.

## **RESULTS**

The demographic profile of staff respondents in Lekki Beach revealed that there were 25% males and 75% females amongst the respondents. About 73% had tertiary education, 18% had primary education, while 9% had secondary education. The age distribution of respondents showed that majority (45%) of them were within the age range of 46-55 years, 35% within 56-65 years, 13.3% within 26-35 years, 6.7% were above 65 years in age. The demographic profile of staff respondents in Elegushi Beach revealed that there were 41.7% males and 58.3% females amongst the respondents. About 60.4% had secondary education, 35.4% had tertiary education, while 4.2% had primary education. The age distribution of respondents showed that majority (52.1%) were within age range 26-35 years, while 47.9% of them were within the age range of 18-25 years. The demographic profile of tourists showed that 52% were males and 48% were females in Lekki Beach. About 81% had tertiary education, 13% had secondary education, and 4% had primary education. Also, 40% of the tourists were within age 26-35 years, 29% within 46-55 years, 10% within 18-25 years, 6% within 56-65 years, while 15% were above 65 years of age. Most (94%) of the tourists were Nigerians, while only 6% were foreigners. The demographic profile of tourists showed that 53% were males and 47% females in Elegushi Beach. About 71% had tertiary education, 23% had secondary education, and 6% had primary education. Also, 48% of the tourists were within age 26-35 years, 23% within 46-55 years, 13% within 18-25 years, 13% within 56-65 years, while 3% were above 65 years of age. All of the tourists were Nigerians.

### **Effectiveness of Beach Tourism Destination Management**

The results of multiple regressions used in testing hypotheses for effectiveness of destination management as predicted by educational status of staff in Lekki and Elegushi beaches are presented in Table 1. When all 15 predictors of factors that measured destination responsiveness to tourists' needs were regressed with the dependent variable which was educational status of staff, the  $R^2$  adjusted (0.492) for Elegushi Beach was greater than that of Lekki Beach (0.106). The overall strengths of the relationships was stronger for Elegushi Beach ( $R = 0.818$ ) than Lekki Beach ( $R = 0.577$ ). In Elegushi Beach, the percentage variance of prediction ( $R^2$ ) was explained by 66.9%, while that of Lekki Beach was explained by just 33.3%. The F-value stood at 3.789 and 1.468 respectively for Elegushi Beach and Lekki Beach. The F-test overall showed that the relationship between educational status of staff and effectiveness of destination management was statistically significant only for Elegushi Beach ( $F\text{-sig} = 0.01$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis was

accepted for Lekki Beach, while the alternative was accepted for Elegushi Beach. This implied that the management of Lekki Beach as a destination was not as effective in taking care of tourists' needs as Elegushi Beach.

The constructs of investment in tourism destination by foreign firms ( $B = -0.265$ ;  $\beta = -0.158$ ;  $p = 0.042$ ), investment environment for tourist development ( $B = -0.307$ ;  $\beta = -0.462$ ;  $p = 0.005$ ), tourism training responsive to visitor needs ( $B = -0.259$ ;  $\beta = -0.350$ ;  $p = 0.015$ ), and tourism industry responsive to visitor needs ( $B = -0.348$ ;  $\beta = -0.338$ ;  $p = 0.036$ ) were significant in enhancing the effectiveness of destination management for Elegushi Beach. The relationships were however negative meaning that as the constructs increase in their responsiveness, the effectiveness in destination management decreases. For Lekki beach the constructs of availability of new and local market for local products ( $B = 0.25$ ;  $\beta = 0.46$ ;  $p = 0.01$ ), and links between destination and travel trade for promoting beach tourism ( $B = 0.15$ ;  $\beta = 0.31$ ;  $p = 0.05$ ) were significant in enhancing the effectiveness of destination management.

## **DISCUSSION**

The greater  $R^2$  value in Elegushi Beach implies that the educational statuses of staff have the propensity to predict effectiveness of destination management better than Lekki Beach. The model for Elegushi Beach accounted for more than half of the variation, while it accounted for less than half of the variation in Lekki Beach. This result is in tandem with the finding of Desai *et al.* (2010).  $R^2$ , the coefficient of multiple determinations of the variance of responsiveness of destination management was stronger in Elegushi Beach than Lekki Beach. The coefficient was greater than 50% in Elegushi Beach and is acceptable for any field that attempts to predict human behavior (Morgan, 2018). Finding of Morgan (2018) also indicated that an  $R^2$  of around 30% is also good in most cases. Thus, the  $R^2$  for Lekki Beach is also okay. These findings provide evidence for the predictive validity of the effectiveness of destination management by staff of the two destinations (Ekinici and Hosany, 2006). The present study supports the use of the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) as a reliable predictor of intentions and behaviour over time. It also highlights the need for further research on the relationship between attitudes, perceived behavioural control and their underlying beliefs (Armitage and Conner, 2010).

The negative relationships between the significant predictor and response variables is in agreement with the position of Zimmermann *et al.* (2017) which proves that "the negative correlation has repercussions for predictive validity. The negative correlations diminishes the correlations of each of the predictors with the outcome Y –bringing about a suppressor effect". According to Friedman and Wall (2005) "a suppressor variable is a variable, which increases the predictive validity of another variable (or a set of variables) by its inclusion in a regression equation. The suppressor variable(s) improve(s) predictability by purging some irrelevant variance from other predictors".

Investment in tourism destination by foreign firms as a significant factor for enhancing the effectiveness of Elegushi Beach tourist destination management in this study is consistent with the findings of Alam *et al.* (2017) which showed that there is a positive relationship between tourism receipt and numbers of tourist with Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in the short term and long-term relationship. These investments in tourism destination by foreign firms also have complex advantages to the local community (Davidson and Sahli, 2015). For investment environment for tourist development which was also significant in Elegushi Beach, findings of Nawaz and Hassan (2016) revealed that investments from the public and private sector are vital for the general economic growth as well as the sectoral growth such as tourism sector. Tourism training

responsive to visitor needs as a significant factor in Elegushi Beach also is in agreement with the finding of Weiler and Walker (2014) which revealed that, when informed by theory and research, training can successfully equip guides to engage visitors, impact their understanding and empathy, and enrich their experience. For the beach tourism industry to be responsive to visitor needs. Allahar (2015) posited that for small islands, a diverse complex of attractions existed, including natural attraction of beaches, rivers, and others that makes the tourism industry to be more responsive to the needs of tourists. For Lekki beach the constructs of availability of new and local market for local products that was significant is in line with the finding of McCabe (2014) in which ‘‘tourism is sometimes conceived as essentially pure marketing, as it is often based on packaging existing resources and assets of a destination, and subsequent promotion to new markets’’. On the construct of links between destination and travel trade for promoting tourism that was also significant in Lekki Beach, the findings of Qian *et al.* (2018) delineated the development of research on sustainable tourism in terms of collaboration and impact.

For tourism training to be responsive to visitor needs as a significant factor in destination management, findings of Weiler and Walker (2014) revealed that tourist staff can be equipped better to engage visitors, impact their understanding and empathy, and enrich their experience. The platform for skill training and learning new ideas’ is apt for the effectiveness of destination management as it has been viewed as a key tool for promotion of learning and enhancement of performance on the job in order for organizations to maintain productivity and stay competitive (Zagonari, 2009; Salas *et al.*, 2012; Percival *et al.*, 2013). For the attraction of investment and development projects in tourism, Meyer and Meyer (2015) posited that tourism as a low skilled, labour intensive industry; it has many benefits for local regions including poverty alleviation and a key sector for local economic development. Jaafar *et al.* (2015) posited that most entrepreneurs used their own savings to establish and maintain their tourism businesses, as access to capital by tourism institutions according to Liu *et al.* (2017) is mediated by implementation authorities who are at the frontline to determine access to assets for start-ups and operations. Fletcher *et al.* (2016) has validated policy as a major factor for development of indigenous tourism, especially for the young small and medium scale tourism businesses which are the engine rooms of economic (Banerjee, 2014). So, creating an enabling environment by governments in which new entrants with drive and good ideas can get started in business will help good firm to grow (Nasr, 2010). Communication between tourists contributes a great deal to sharing their travel experiences, and especially with connected others it is seen as a vital tool for a fulfilling holiday experience (Yilmaz, 2016). The interactions between tourists also have influence on desire of stay, satisfaction and loyalty (Zgolli and Zaiem, 2017). Findings from various researchers have also revealed that communication between tourist and residents may bring about both positive and negative attitudes towards tourists. The finding of Chen and Chen (2010) and Zaidan and Kovacs (2017) revealed that for residents of tourism destination where there are significant benefits in terms of job creation; improvements in infrastructure and others, residents tend to be more tolerant of visitors and have positive attitude towards them. Availability of new and local market for local products according to Geremew *et al.* (2017) has to do with the range and scope of tourism products that a destination can offer to attract prospective tourists, which should however not be done in isolation as it forms part of a large, inter related and continuing process.

Investment environment (for tourist development) has also been seen by Paramatiet *al.* (2018) to have a significant positive and negative impact on tourism development and tourism revenue. Tourism destination contacts with major origin markets are a function of adequate marketing. As regards resident support for tourism development, the position of Litheko and Potgieter (2016) is

that residents' awareness and support for tourism can only be if there is consumer information, such that local residents' support and participation will be able to enhance development and sustainability of tourism. On the construct of tourism industry being responsive to tourism needs Postma *et al.* (2017) advocated that for a tourism industry to be sustainable, tourism businesses must develop a proactive attitude and robust strategies for a sustainable yet competitive future.

**Table 1: Regression of Educational Status of Staff with Effectiveness of Destination Management**

S/No	(Constant)	Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Lekki Beach)				Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Elegushi Beach)					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B		Std. Error	Beta			
		3.10	0.48		6.45	0.00	3.94	0.65		6.08	0.00
1	Platform for skill training and learning new ideas	-0.12	0.09	-0.20	-1.24	0.22	0.22	0.16	0.20	1.37	0.18
2	Attraction of investment and development projects	-0.13	0.08	-0.27	-1.77	0.08	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.08	0.94
3	Accessibility to venture capital for starting tourism business	0.03	0.09	0.06	0.36	0.72	-0.18	0.16	-0.19	-1.15	0.26
4	Investment in tourism destination by foreign firms	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.11	0.91	-0.31	0.10	-0.46	-3.00	0.01
5	Communication between tourists	-0.09	0.10	-0.17	-0.98	0.33	-0.21	0.16	-0.25	-1.26	0.22
6	Communication between tourist and residents	-0.15	0.09	-0.30	-1.60	0.12	-0.03	0.11	-0.04	-0.29	0.78
7	Investment environment for tourist development	0.14	0.09	0.23	1.44	0.16	0.27	0.13	0.32	2.12	0.04
8	Tourism destination contacts with major origin markets	0.03	0.09	0.05	0.30	0.77	-0.10	0.11	-0.16	-0.98	0.34
9	International awareness of tourism destination's product	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.14	0.89	0.04	0.13	0.04	0.28	0.79
10	Resident support for tourism development	-0.08	0.12	-0.13	-0.70	0.49	-0.09	0.10	-0.11	-0.90	0.37
11	Attitudes of resident towards tourist	0.09	0.08	0.17	1.08	0.29	0.12	0.10	0.16	1.17	0.25
12	Availability of new and local market for local products	0.25	0.10	0.46	2.61	0.01	-0.10	0.12	-0.12	-0.81	0.43

13	Tourism training responsive to visitor needs	-0.15	0.08	-0.28	-1.83	0.07	-0.26	0.10	-0.35	-2.57	0.02
14	Tourism industry responsive to visitor needs	0.02	0.09	0.04	0.26	0.80	-0.35	0.16	-0.34	-2.19	0.04
15	Links between destination and travel trade for promoting tourism	0.15	0.07	0.31	2.06	0.05	0.14	0.12	0.18	1.14	0.26
R 0.577 R <sup>2</sup> 0.333 R <sup>2</sup> adjusted 0.106 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.483 F-Value 1.468 F-sig 0.160						R 0.818 R <sup>2</sup> 0.669 R <sup>2</sup> adjusted 0.492 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.391 F-Value 3.789 F-sig 0.01					

### **Responsiveness of Beach Tourism Destinations to Tourists' Needs**

Responsiveness of beach tourism destination to tourists' needs is as presented in Table 2. The results showed that for Elegushi Beach and Lekki Beach, all the seven variables considered had p-values greater than 0.05, so their null hypotheses were accepted (none was significant). Generally, the result has proved that the two beach tourist destinations were not in any manner responsive to tourists' needs.

Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs has been analysed variously by Weiler & Kim (2011) and Hu & Wall (2012), with success of individual destinations being found to depend on the development and projection of unique identity that is responsive to the needs of visitors (Opperman, 1999). In the finding of Pujiastutiet *al.* (2017), there was correlation between destination image, satisfaction, and trust; these three had influence towards behavioral intention in the future. According to Ryan *et al.* (2012) entrepreneurs in the tourism business are very important in shaping the fortunes of a destination over time.

On the job training of staff in the tourism industry has been seen by many scholars as a veritable tool for promoting on the job performance (Salas *et al.*, 2012), and for maintaining productivity (Percival *et al.*, 2013). On the responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs, Reitsamer and Brunner-Sperdin (2017) provide empirical evidence that 'tourists perceive destination settings holistically and will report higher levels of psychological well-being if a destination provides an adequate combination of sense making in terms of access and amenities, and exploratory attributes in terms of attractions and activities, entertainment options, and local community.

Visitor satisfaction by tourism firms is very important vis-à-vis their behaviours as it influences future performance of the tourism industry (Anderson *et al.* 1994). Naidoo *et al.* (2011) added credence to the fact that a satisfied visitor will be more loyal. The formulation of expectation by tourists is a function of packaging of tourist experience which determines satisfaction, loyalty and repeat visit (Zeithaml *et al.*, 1993).

The value that tourists to beach tourism attractions will have for their experiences according to Vujko and Gajic (2014) will depend to a large extent on the creation of activities that can improve the touristic offer. According to Chiu *et al.* (2016), the affective image of tourism destination has a significant effect on overall destination satisfaction which predicted tourist loyalty.

Table 2. Responsiveness of Beach Tourist Destination to Tourists' Needs

S/No		(Lekki)						Elegushi				
		Groups	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.
1	Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs	Between	4.62	16	0.29	1.80	0.14	0.93	8	0.12	0.56	0.57
		Within	36.48	228	0.16			48.43	236	0.21		
		Total	41.10	244				49.36	244			
2	Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses	Between	7.47	16	0.47	1.99	0.11	2.66	8	0.33	1.19	0.31
		Within	53.00	228	0.24			65.73	236	0.28		
		Total	15.24	244				68.39	244			
3	Responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs	Between	2.93	16	0.18	0.79	0.54	1.71	8	0.21	0.67	0.52
		Within	52.62	228	0.23			75.26	236	0.32		
		Total	55.55	244				76.97	244			
4	Packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors	Between Groups	1.66	16	0.10	0.40	0.81	4.99	8	0.62	1.67	0.20
		Within Groups	59.82	228	0.26			88.43	236	0.38		
		Total	61.48	244				93.42	61			
5	Tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction	Between Groups	1.36	16	0.09	0.40	0.81	1.65	8	0.21	0.58	0.57
		Within Groups	48.00	228	0.21			84.35	236	0.36		
		Total	49.36	244				86.00	244			
6	Value for money in destination experience	Between Groups	4.50	16	0.28	1.12	0.36	4.08	8	0.51	1.84	0.17
		Within Groups	57.50	228	0.25			65.34	236	0.28		
		Total	62.00	244				69.42	244			
7	overall destination image	Between Groups	2.40	16	0.15	0.45	0.77	3.62	8	0.45	1.38	0.26
		Within Groups	75.28	228	0.33			77.16	236	0.33		
		Total	77.68	244				80.77	244			

### Responsiveness of Beach Tourist Destinations to Tourists' Needs as Predicted by Educational Status of Tourists

Responsiveness of beach tourist destinations to tourists' needs as predicted by educational status of tourists is as presented in Table 3. The results revealed that for the two destinations, none of the constructs was predicted by the educational status of tourists to be responsive to tourists' needs.

The results of multiple regressions used in testing hypotheses for responsiveness of beach tourist destinations to tourists' needs as predicted by educational status of tourists in Lekki and Elegushi beaches are presented in Table 3. When all seven predictors of factors that measured destination responsiveness to tourists' needs were regressed with the dependent variable which was educational status of tourists, the  $R^2$  adjusted (-0.107) for Lekki Beach was greater than that of Elegushi Beach (-0.008). The overall strengths of the relationships was stronger for Lekki Beach ( $R = 0.695$ ) than Elegushi Beach ( $R = 0.328$ ). In Lekki Beach, the percentage variance of prediction ( $R^2$ ) was explained by 48.4%, while that of Elegushi Beach was explained by just 10.8%. The F-value stood at 0.819 and 0.931 respectively for Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach. The F-test overall showed that the relationship between educational status of tourists and responsiveness of beach tourist destinations to tourists' needs was not statistically significant for the two destinations (F-sig = 0.01). Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted for Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach. This implied that the managements of Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach as tourist destinations were not all that effective in taking care of tourists' needs.

The greater  $R^2$  value in Lekki Beach means that the values can predict responsiveness of beach tourism destinations to tourists’ needs better than Elegushi. The model for Lekki Beach accounted for more than half of the variation, while that of Elegushi Beach accounted for less, and they agreed with the finding of Desai *et al.* (2010). The inability of the model for LCC to predict responsiveness of the destination to tourists’ needs is attributed to the extent of misfit of the model for the destination. Even though  $R^2$ , the coefficient of multiple determinations of the variance of destination responsiveness to tourists needs was stronger in Lekki Beach than Elegushi Beach, but none of the variables was significant in predicting the destination responsiveness to tourists’ needs in both destinations. It is worthy of note that none of the coefficients for the two destinations was less than 30%, a value that is acceptable for any field that attempts to predict human behavior (Morgan, 2018). This implies that the educated tourists to Lekki and Elegushi beaches knew their onions with regards to services that they wanted. Meaning that, the managements of the two destinations either as individual enterprises or their collectivity were not in any way responsive to the needs of tourists. Further to confirm this, none of the variables provided evidence for the predictive validity of responsiveness of beach tourism destinations to tourists’ needs which corroborates the finding of (Ekinici and Hosany, 2006). The result of prediction using the educational status of tourists is a further attestation to the poor performance of beach tourist destination in meeting the needs of tourists.

**Table 3.** Responsiveness of Beach Tourist Destinations to Tourists’ Needs as Predicted by Educational Status of Tourists

Model		Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Lekki Beach)				Coefficients <sup>a</sup> (Elegushi Beach)					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta			B	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	10.31	15.86		0.65	0.52	2.48	0.99		2.50	0.02
1	Responsiveness of tourism industry to visitor needs	0.47	1.45	0.08	0.32	0.75	-0.10	0.18	-0.08	-0.56	0.58
2	Qualities of entrepreneurs in local tourism businesses	1.89	1.33	0.38	1.42	0.17	0.26	0.17	0.23	1.52	0.13
3	Responsiveness of tourism training to visitor needs	-0.75	1.37	-0.15	0.55	0.59	-0.03	0.16	-0.03	-0.19	0.85
4	Packaging of tourism destination experiences for visitors	-1.26	1.42	-0.26	0.89	0.38	-0.10	0.14	-0.10	-0.73	0.47
5	Tourism firms ensuring visitor satisfaction	0.04	1.07	0.01	0.04	0.97	-0.13	0.13	-0.12	-0.94	0.35
6	Value for money in destination experience	0.78	0.91	0.16	0.85	0.40	0.22	0.16	0.20	1.38	0.18
7	Overall destination image	0.23	1.07	0.05	0.22	0.83	-0.07	0.15	-0.06	-0.46	0.65
		R 0.695 R <sup>2</sup> 0.484 R <sup>2</sup> adjusted -0.107 Standard Error of the Estimate 2.623 F-Value 0.819 F-sig 0.709				R 0.328 R <sup>2</sup> 0.108 R <sup>2</sup> adjusted -0.008 Standard Error of the Estimate 0.606 F-Value 0.931 F-sig 0.491					

## **CONCLUSION**

Findings of this study revealed that the management of Lekki Beach and Elegushi Beach differ in their approach to taking care of tourists' needs as Elegushi Beach was more effective in this regards. Elegushi Beach has a greater percentage of response variables ( $R^2$ ) in predicting the effectiveness of destination management by the educational statuses of staff than in Lekki Beach. The prediction identified "investment in tourism destination by foreign firms", "investment environment for tourist development", "tourism training responsive to visitor needs", and "tourism industry responsive to visitor needs" as significant factors that enhanced the effectiveness of destination management for Elegushi Beach. For Lekki beach the constructs of "availability of new and local market for local products", and "links between destination and travel trade for promoting beach tourism" were significant in enhancing the effectiveness of destination management for Lekki Beach.

On responsiveness of beach tourism destinations to tourists' needs, the result has proved that the two beach tourist destinations were not in any manner responsive to tourists' needs. In predicting this responsiveness using the educational statuses of tourists, it was further confirmed that none of the constructs was predicted by the educational statuses of tourists to be responsive to tourists' needs. Notwithstanding, Lekki Beach has the propensity to do better in meeting the needs of tourists as responsiveness to tourists' needs was predicted in Lekki Beach better than Elegushi Beach.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Management of beach tourist destinations in Nigeria should overhaul their managerial acumen so as to improve on quality of services delivered. Doing this will make beach tourism to be highly competitive and will also stand tall among its contemporaries in the world market.

## **REFERENCES**

- Adeleke, B. O. and Ogunsusi, K. (2018). Antecedent predictors of service quality in heritage tourism destination. *International Journal of Hospitality, Leisure and Tourism*, 2(1): 33-43. ISSN/2141/6893
- Adeleke, B. O. and Ogunsusi, K. (2019). Evaluation Of Factors Enhancing Effectiveness Of Destination Management Of Nature Based Tourism, Lagos, Nigeria. *International Tourism and Hospitality Journal*, 2(2):1-16. <https://rpajournals.com/ithj>
- Alam, A., Idris, E. A. A., Malik, M. J. and Gadar, K. (2017). and The relationship between tourism, foreign direct investment and economic growth: evidence from Saudi Arabia. *European Academic Research* 4(4):4091 – 4106. <https://www.researchgate.net/project/The-relationship-between-tourism-foreign-direct-investment-and-economic-growth-evidence-from-Saudi-Arabia>
- Aleksandra, M. (2013). Nature-based tourism as an introduction to ecotourism experience- A new approach. *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, 6(1), 75-96.
- Allahar, H. (2015). Small Island Visitor Attractions: A Development Process Framework. *Sage Open*, 5(1): <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2158244015577113>
- Anderson, E. W., Fornell, C., and Lehmann, D. R. (1994). Customer satisfaction, market share, and profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 56–66.
- Armitage, C. J. and Conner, M. T. (2010). The theory of planned behaviour: Assessment of predictive validity and 'perceived control. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(1):35 – 54. DOI: 10.1348/014466699164022

## Journal of Agriculture and Social Research, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2018

- Bramwell, B. (2011): Governance, the state and sustainable tourism: a political economy approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4/5): 459–477.
- Chen, C. and Chen, P. (2010). Resident Attitudes toward Heritage Tourism Development. *An International Journal of Tourism Space, Place and Environment*, 12(4): 525-545.
- Chiu, W., Zeng Philip, S. and Cheng, S. (2106). "The influence of destination image and tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty: a case study of Chinese tourists in Korea". *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10(2): 223 – 234. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-07-2015-0080>
- Cronin, J. J., and Taylor, S. A. (1992), "Measuring Service Quality: A Re- examination and Extension". *The Journal of Marketing*", 56(3): 55-68.
- Davidson, L. and Sahli, M. (2015). Foreign direct investment in tourism, poverty alleviation, and sustainable development: a review of the Gambian hotel sector. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 23(2): 167-187.
- Desai, S. P., Gravallesse, E. M., Shadick, N. A. (2010). Hand bone mineral density is associated with both total hip and lumbar spine bone mineral density in post-menopausal women with RA, *Rheumatology*, 49, 513-519.
- Dwyer, L., and Kim, C. (2003), 'Destination competitiveness: determinants and indicators', *Current Issues in Tourism*, 6(5): 369–414. <https://www.researchgate.net/deref/http%3A%2F%2Fwww.ingentaconnect.com%2Fwww.ingentaconnect.com/abstract/45/2/127>
- Ekinci, Y., and Hosany, S. (2006). Destination personality: an application of brand personality to tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127-139. <http://jtr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/45/2/127>
- Fletcher, C.; Pforr, C.; Brueckner, M. (2016). Factors influencing indigenous engagement in tourism development: An international perspective. *J. Sustain. Tour.* 24, 1100–1120.
- Friedman, L. and Wall, M. (2005). Graphical views of suppression and multicollinearity in multiple linear regression. *Am Stat.* 59(2):127–136. doi: 10.1198/000313005X41337.
- Geremew, Y. M., Alamayehu, H. B., Meskele, A. T. (2017). Tourism marketing challenges and new tourism product development potentials: Practices from the Amhara National Regional State World heritage sites. *Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism*, 8(1): 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.5897/JHMT2016.0206>
- Ghotbabadi, A. R., Baharun, R. and Feiz, S. (2012). A review of service quality models. *2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Management (2<sup>nd</sup> ICM 2012) Proceeding 11th- 12<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2012. Holiday Villa Beach Resort & Spa, Langkawi Kedah, Malaysia ISBN: 978-967-5705-07-6.* [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230669329\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230669329_)
- Hall, C. M. (2005): The role of government in the management of tourism: the public sector and tourism policies, In: L. Pender, R. Sharpley (Eds.). *The management of tourism* (pp. 217–230), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hall, C. M. (2005): The role of government in the management of tourism: the public sector and tourism policies, In: L. Pender, R. Sharpley (Eds.) *The management of tourism* (pp. 217–230), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hu, W., and Wall, G. (2012). Interpretative guiding and sustainable development: a framework. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4, 80-85.
- Jaafar, M., Rasoolimanesh, S. M. and Lonik, K. T. (2015). Tourism growth and entrepreneurship: Empirical analysis of development of rural highlands. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 14: 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.02.001>

## Journal of Agriculture and Social Research, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2018

- Kim, S. S., Timothy, D. J., Han, H. C. (2007): Tourism and political ideologies: a case of tourism in North Korea. *Tourism Management*, 28(4): 1031–1043.
- Kim, S. S., Timothy, D. J., Han, H. C. (2007): Tourism and political ideologies: a case of tourism in North Korea. *Tourism Management*, 28(4): 1031–1043.
- Litheko A. M. and Potgieter, M. (2016). Residents' awareness and support of tourism In Mahikeng, South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(2): 1-17. <http://www.ajhtl.com/>
- Liu, Y., Shi, J. & Jian, M. (2017). Understanding visitors' responses to intelligent transportation system in a tourist city with a mixed ranked logit model. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 1:1-13, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/8652053>
- Marvell, A. (2011) 'Foreign direct investment in tourism', Geography Matters, Post-16 and HE Committee of the Geographical Association, Spring, pp.5-9.
- McCabe, S. (2014). Introduction. In McCabe, S. (Ed). *The Routledge handbook of tourism marketing* (pp 1–12). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- McElroy, J. L., Tarlow, P. and Carlisle, K. (2007) "Tourist harassment: review of the literature and destination responses". *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(4): 305-314. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506180710824190>
- Meyer, N. and Meyer, D. (2015). The role and impact of tourism on local economic development: A comparative study. *African Journal for Physical Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 21(1:1): 197-214.
- Morgan, D. L. (2018). When investigating human behavior for example effect of attitude and norm on buying behavior could r-square be as low as 05 or even less. Department of Sociology, Portland State University, United States. <https://www.researchgate.net/post/>
- Naidoo, P., Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., and Seegoolam, P. (2011). An assessment of visitor satisfaction with nature-based tourism attractions. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 4(1), 87-98.
- Nawaz, M. A. and Hassan, S. (2016). Investment and Tourism: Insights from the Literature. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 10(4): 581-590.
- Ndanusa, M. M. N., Harada, Y. and Md Islam, A. (2014). Challenges to Growth in Tourism Industry of a Developing Country: The Case of Nigeria. *Asian Social Science*, 10(19): 282-290.
- Omerzel, D. G. (2006). Competitiveness of Slovenia as a Tourist Destination. *Managing Global Transitions*, 4(2): 167–189.
- Oppermann, M. (1999). Predicting destination choice – A discussion of destination loyalty. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 5(1), 51-65.
- Paramati, S. R., Alam S. & Lau, C. K. M. (2018). The effect of tourism investment on tourism development and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: empirical evidence from the EU nations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(9): 1587-1606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1489398>
- Percival, J. C., Cozzarin, B. P., and Formanek, S. D. (2013). Return on investment for workplace training: the Canadian experience. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 17(1): 20–32. doi:10.1111/ijtd.12002
- Postma, A., Cavagnaro, E. and Spruyt, E. (2017). "Sustainable tourism 2040". *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 3(1): 13-22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JTF-10-2015-0046>
- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Muskat, B. and Del Chiappa, G. (2017). Understanding the Relationships between Tourists' Emotional Experiences, Perceived Overall Image, Satisfaction, and

## Journal of Agriculture and Social Research, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2018

- Intention to Recommend. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(1): 41-54.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0047287515620567>
- Pujiastuti, E., Suharyono, U. N. and Kusumawati, A. (2017). Study on destination image, satisfaction, trust and behavioral intention. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 1(61): 148-159. DOI:10.18551/rjoas.2017-01.15
- Reitsamer, B. F. and Brunner-Sperdin, A. (2017). Tourist destination perception and well-being: What makes a destination attractive? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 23(1): 55-72.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1356766715615914>
- Ritchie, J. R. and Crouch, G. I. (2010). A model of destination competitiveness/sustainability: Brazilian perspective. *Revista de Administracao Publica*, 44(5): 1049-1066.
- Ryan, T., Mottiar, Z., and Quinn, B. (2012). The Dynamic Role of Entrepreneurs in Destination Development. *The Journal of Tourism Planning & Development*.doi:10.1080/21568316.2011.630747
- Salas, E., Tannenbaum, S. I., Kraiger, K., and Smith-Jentsch, K. A. (2012). The Science of Training and Development in Organizations: What Matters in Practice. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13(2): 74–101.
- Skipper, T. L., (2009). "Understanding Tourist-Host Interactions and their Influence on Quality Tourism Experiences". *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 949.<http://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/949>
- Thyne, M., Lawson, R., and Todd, S. (2006). The use of conjoint analysis to assess the impacts of the cross-cultural exchange between hosts and guests. *TourismManagement*, 27: 201-213.
- Tsai, H., Song, H. and Wong, K. K. F. (2009). Tourism and hotel competitiveness research. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 26(5-6): 522-546.<https://doi.org/10.1080/10548400903163079>
- Vujko, A. and Gajic, T. (2014). Opportunities for tourism development and cooperation in the region by improving the quality of tourism services – the ‘Danube Cycle Route’ case study. *Economic Research*, 27(1): 847-860.<https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2014.975517>
- Weiler, B and Walker, K. (2014). 'Enhancing the visitor experience: reconceptualising the tour guide's communicative role'. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management*, 21: 90-99. DOI: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2014.08.001
- Weiler, B., and Kim, A.K. (2011). Tour guides as agents of sustainability: Rhetoric, reality and implications for research. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 36(2), 113-125.
- Yilmaz, B. S. (2016). Storytelling on Social Media: The Motives for Telling the Tourist Experience to the Connected Others. *AUDC*, 10(2): 135-148.
- Yuju-Wang, B. A. (2007). Effects of integrated marketing communications (IMC) on visitors heritage destination selection. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 10: 132-144.
- Zagonari, F. (2009). Balancing tourism education and training. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(2–9). doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.03.006
- Zaidan, E. and Kovacs, J. F. (2017). Resident Attitudes Towards Tourists and Tourism Growth: A Case Study From the Middle East, Dubai in United Arab Emirates. *European Journal of Sustainable Development*, 6(1): 291-307. Doi: 10.14207/ejsd.2017.v6n1p291
- Zgolli, S. and Zaiem, I. (2017). Customer-to-customer interaction in tourism experience: moderating role of nationality. *Arab Economic and Business Journal*, 12(1): 44-56.

**Journal of Agriculture and Social Research, Vol. 18, No. 1, 2018**

Zimmermann, S., Klusmann, D. and Hampe, W. (2017). Correcting the predictive validity of a selection test for the effect of indirect range restriction. *BMC Med Educ.* 2017; 17: 246. doi: 10.1186/s12909-017-1070-5