DESTINATION ATTRIBUTES AND TOURISTS' CHOICE OF VISITOR ATTRACTIONS IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA

DEEDEE EBIINIMI EDSINTEI[1] and OBIORA JUDIPAT NKIRU[2]
[1]Department of Leisure and Tourism Management, International Institute of Tourism and Hospitality, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
[2]Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Universityof Port Harcourt, Choba, Rivers State, Nigeria

The study investigated the relationship between destination attributes and tourist choice of destination in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The descriptive survey resear generated data from 322 visitors/tourists found within the selected visit attraction sites in Bayelsa, State during the survey with the use of a well-structur questionnaire made. The result of the inferential statistical analysis using SP! showed that the three destination attributes (visitor attraction, accessibility, an affordability) had positive and significant relationship with tourists' destinati choice. The study concluded that though destination attributes is important decision making of tourists when seeking for where to spend their quality time, t level of influence these attributes have is to a high level extent. It was theref recommended that, the local government and community stakeholders shou invest heavily in awareness creation for visitor attraction sites in Bayelsa state this will help showcase the attributes at their disposal, the host community shou be carried along with tourism developmental plans as no tourist want to encount a hostile community during visit, the facilities should be developed and maintain so as to appeal to visiting tourists, the prices for their product and services shou be pocket friendly as most local tourists cannot afford them, and the access to t attraction sites should be developed and maintained.

INTRODUCTION

Tourists are attracted to destinations due to the available attributes at the destination. The attributes are expected to conform to the expectations of the tourists because of the touristic experience being sought by the target market. The implication is that the quality of destination attributes is capable of attracting tourists to destinations for touristic purposes. This is because of the role the attractiveness of the destination plays in the tourists' decision-making process in terms of choice of location for leisure activities.

It is the decision making process that destination marketers are expected to influence to enable tourists make a choice of their destination for their touristic experience through destination marketing communication. It is through destination promotion programmes that the managers of a particular destination seeks to 'pull' their target audience towards their destinations in both domestic and international tourism. Various destinations of the world compete for tourist arrivals from tourism generating regions of the world. This is what defines destination competitiveness.

Destination competitiveness is a function of the attractiveness of the destination in the eyes of the target audience. The attractiveness of destination depends on the destination attributes which makes it possible for tourists to consider certain destinations in their choice list. Such attributes consist of visitor attractions, accessibility, accommodation, affordability, activities and subsidiary services. Destination attributes are expected to contribute to tourists' satisfaction and also enhance memorable touristic experiences of tourists.

Consistent with Das (2013), tourism is the world's biggest enterprise and is unexpectedly increasing in scope. Tourism is turning into a famous leisure activity everywhere in the world with the implication that nations that wants to attract more tourists' should develop and maintain destination attributes that will promote the destination. As a component of the tourism product, destination site attractiveness is of special significance in destination marketing.

Nyong, Linus and Inyang (2018) did an observation on tourism sites and vacationers patronage in Southern district of Cross River state, Nigeria and asserted that tourism attributes can impact vacation spot patronage. Sonja and Ivana (2016) observed attractiveness as a vital causal factor of tourism viability within the countries of Southeast Europe and asserted that locations that provide the need attraction to tourists have greater competitive facet in terms of visitor inflow.

Bello and Bello (2019) performed a study on destination attributes and home vacationer's desire of Obudu Mountain resort Calabar and posited that vacation spot attributes can impact visitor vacation spot preference These findings are proper but won't be applicable or generalized because it pertains to tourist enchantment attraction sites in Bayelsa nation.

In extant literature, there are empirical evidence of studies conducted   in various contexts at the exclusion of Rivers State, Nigeria to prove that destination attributes affects tourists'choice of destinations or visitor attraction sites (Murphy et al., 2000; Hsu et al., 2009; Ahmed, Azam, & Bose 2010; Biswas, Omar, & Rashid-Radha, 2020; Suanmali 2014; Bello & Bello 2019; Zhang & Lam 1999; Virkar & Mallya, 2018; Kim et al. 2012; Hsu et al., 2009; Geoffrey, 2004; Nadarajah, & Ramalu, 2017; Javid & Roma 2016; Lau 2004; Azhar, Prayogi, & Sari, 2018). This current study attempts to fill the gap in literature by investigating the relationship between destination attributes on tourists' choice of visitor attraction sites   in the context of   Port Harcourt, River State, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the relationship between destination attributes and tourist's choice of destination in Bayelsa state, Nigeria.

Specific objectives include:

i.   To establish the relationship between attraction and tourist's choice of of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.
ii.   To confirm the relationship between accessibility and tourist's choice of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.
iii.   To establish the relationship between affordability and tourist's choice of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.

Statement of Hypotheses

Ho_1: There is no positive and significant relationship between attraction and tourist's choice of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.

Ho_2: There is no positive and significant relationship between accessibility and tourist's choice of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.

H_3: There is no positive and significant relationship between affordability and tourist's choice of visitor attraction in Bayelsa state.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Theoretical Foundations
The Push-Pull Theory: The 'pull elements' of a place, according to Dann (1977), are its appeal. According to Dann (1977), pull factors are the attributes of a destination that attracts visitors/tourists to a particular destination for touristic purposes. The notable pull factors include culture, scenery service, pricing, etc. Put differently, it the pull factors in a tourist destination that determines the destination choice by tourists. That means that it draws tourists to a destination of their choice. So, after taking a decision to travel touristically, the pull factors could drive a tourist/visitor to make choice of a destination as a result of the 'pull effect of the destination attributes.

On the other hand, the push factors are endogenous forces which relates to the needs and desires of the tourists such as the need to relax, rest, knowledge, social contact, experience and escape from a dull and uninteresting environment. The application of this theory to the current study was based on the fact that tourists are first pushed by their requirements and desires to decide 'whether to travel,' and then pulled by the attraction of locations to decide 'where to go.' As a result, site attractiveness becomes focal to their choice of destination.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW
Concept of Destination Attributes
Tourist destination could be described as a place visited by a tourist and may be a village, city, region or a country (Dadgostar & Isotato, 1995). In the view of Jani, Jang and Hwang (2009) tourist destination is made up of multi-destination trip attributes such as environmental atmospheric and service attributes. By their nature the attributes encourage tourists to visit a particular destination and possibly stay longer there. The attributes also have the capacity to engender return visits to destinations(Dann, 1997).

As destinations compete globally for tourists' visits, it is natural for destination managers to work towards getting large market share in the international tourism marketplace. However, when considering the competitive global tourism market, no destination can succeed without putting in some effort in the area of enhancing their destinations' attractiveness through the instrumentality of destination attributes. For this current study, the destination attributes of interest are visitor attractions, accessibility and affordability.

Visitor Attractions: In the view of Swarbrooke (1998), attraction is a key and strategic component of tourism, and there are four elements: feature in the natural environment, special events, man-made buildings for attracting visitors, and other purposes. The more destinations offer attractions the easier it will be for the improvement of market in that tourism destination. Most of the attractions of destination are depend on: mountains, beaches, the historical architecture, shopping, entertainment, and atmosphere of a great city (Holloway, et al, 2009).

Each Visitor Attraction has a set of activities for the consumption of visitors. For example, beach tourism offers sun bathing, sightseeing, etc., while mountains offer hiking and skiing. Some other VAs offer festivals, dancing, swimming,

cruising, climbing, etc. Other major activities taking place at visitor attractions include horse riding, canoeing and boating, boat regatta, bungee jumping, zip lining, jet skiing, and sun bathing. beach party and picnicking, ocean viewing, beach soccer and volley and strolling

Accessibility: Accessibility is described as the "relative ease or difficulty with which clients may reach their preferred location" (Kim, 1998). With a view to describing the make up of a destination accessibility, Buhalis (2000), describes it as a combination of transportation system consisting made up of routes, terminals and vehicles. Despite how beautiful a destination might be, it cannot be reached without a good transportation system. To enhance destination attractiveness, it is very important to have comfortable and reliable transportation connections with main urban destinations around the globe. This is expected to enhance smooth mechanism at the destination and sufficient position of business related amenities. So, the convenience of reaching a destination is crucial in travel decision making.

Affordability: The total sum a tourist will spend at a destination in order to satisfy himself touristically is an important determinant in destination selection. This is because the total cost of travel has the capacity to stop a vacation trip. For a typical trip, the price of travel (the sum of costs of travel), is made up of costs of accommodation, food, transportation to and from the destination, attractions, tour services (travel intermediaries) and other additional services on destination (Jafari, 2003). The cost of stay in the destination therefore depends on the type of accommodation, state of the destination's economy, level of accommodation, s cost of production, seasonality as well as the distance of a destination. Gooroochurn and Sugiyarto (2003), are of the view that most essential attractions associated with destination competitiveness is price competitiveness. The foregoing explains why visitors' price sensitivity is considerable in specific areas of tourism studies (Lee et al., 1996).

Empirical Review

Attractions and Tourist Destination Choice

Tourists are encouraged to visit tourist spots. There are natural attractions like waterfalls and beaches, constructed attractions like waterfalls and fauna, and private commercial enterprises like man-made attractions. A study on tourist travel motivation in China conducted by Hsu et al, (2009) found that appealing qualities of a place have a role in the choice of destination. This finding was obtained when the researchers sampled 433 people using a self-structured questionnaire and used regression analysis to assess the association between travel motivation and tourist destination choice. According to the experts' conclusions, for a place to be competitive, it must have appealing features that would encourage travelers, since attractiveness is a key component to consider.

Murphy et al., (2000) investigated the relationship between destination quality and tourist satisfaction. The statistical results showed that the quality a destination is a determinant of tourist satisfaction. The implication being that destinations cannot compete competitively without attractive features. In fact, Hsu et al., (2009) agreed with this assertion by inferring that attractive features of a destination remains the backbone of a destination.

Ahmed, Azam, and Bose (2010) explored nine variables (service quality, natural beauty, known destination, convenient lodging, adventure, security, effective and efficient transportation, safe and quality food, and shopping facility) influencing tour location choices by tourists in Bangladesh. Regression results showed that the destination features accounted for 24.6 percent of the variation in explaining the intention to choose a particular trip location in Bangladesh and they were statistically significant with tourist choice.

In Bangladesh, Biswas, Omar, and Rashid-Radha (2020) examined the influence of tourist accessibility on tourist satisfaction. The study found that accessibility predicted tourist satisfaction significantly and age significantly moderated the relationship between attraction and tourist satisfaction as well as accessibility and tourist satisfaction. Suanmali (2014) did research on the elements that influence visitor satisfaction in Thailand. The findings showed that visitor attractions were the most important element influencing overall satisfaction.

Bello and Bello (2019) performed research on Obudu Mountain Resort Calabar's destination features and domestic tourists' preferences. The article focused on the elements that impact domestic tourists' decision to visit Obudu Mountain Resort Calabar. The study recruited 323 domestic tourists using a standardized questionnaire. Pearson Moment Correlation was employed in the analysis. The findings revealed that all eight of the highest ranked Site Attractiveness of appeal had a favorable and substantial link with domestic tourists' choice of Obudu Mountain Resort, Calabar.

Accessibility and Tourist Destination Choice

Zhang and Lam (1999) performed a research of mainland Chinese visitors' motivation to visit Hong Kong. According to the findings, Hong Kong's accessibility is one of the top three important draw factors that lure mainland Chinese to Hong Kong. Kim et al. (2003) have studied the push pull factors and their effects on tourists, and found 12 pull items are grouped in three dimensions, which are key tourist resources, information and convenience of facilities, and accessibility and transportation. They compared the push and pull factors to the tourists' demographic characteristics. The pull factors differed according to the visitors' age, occupation and, gender.

Virkar and Mallya (2018) provided a review of research on accessibility and tourism in India. The results showed the role of tourist accessibility as a significant variable in tourism development. Kim et al. (2012) performed research on North Korean transportation infrastructure and destination patronage. The study's findings revealed that destination is accessibility influenced the choice of a destination. Studies conducted in Malaysia showed that the accessibility of destination helps to reduce the stress when chosen a destination as tourist want a destination that is easy to locate (Hsu et al., 2009). Similarly, Geoffrey (2004) discovered that there exist a widespread agreement that accessibility has a strong and positive correlation with tourist destination choice.

Affordability and Tourist Destination Choice

_____

In Malaysia, Nadarajah, and Ramalu, (2017) examined the effects of service quality, perceived value and trust on destination loyalty and intention to revisit among international tourists. The quantitative study generated primary data from 385 international tourists in Penang, Malaysia. The results showed service quality, perceived value and trust individually had significant effects on destination loyalty and intention to revisit respectively in the context of festivals that were celebrated every year.

Javid and Roma (2016), found that the local visitors' decision-making when selecting a destination was impacted by the price they are prepared to pay. If a place is unaffordable, it will deter visitors. Lau (2004) did a study on the affordability of tourism products in selected Singapore malls. The study aimed to discover what variables impact tourists' choice of a place. According to the study's findings, affordability ranks first among all qualities. This result was achieved when 125 respondents were asked which trait was most important to them. This research suggested that visitors prioritize less expensive places over more expensive ones, regardless of the complexity of other destinations. This means that even if a site has all of the advantages and desirable attributes, if the price is prohibitively exorbitant, visitors will most likely not consider visiting there.

Azhar, Prayogi, and Sari (2018) investigated the effect of the marketing mix and service quality on tourist satisfaction and loyalty. The results showed that the marketing mix had a positive and significant effect on tourists satisfaction. The service quality had a positive and significant effect on tourists satisfaction in the region of Samosir. Marketing mix had a positive and significant effect on tourists' loyalty. The service quality had a positive and significant effect on tourists loyalty.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design: A quantitative research design is a survey approach used to assess certain attributes from a representative sample using a structured questionnaire so that the results may be extrapolated to the complete population (Salih et al., 2010; Davis, 2000). In the current study, the researcher employed a structured questionnaire to investigate the relationship between visitor attraction sites in Bayelsa state. This approach is utilized in this study because it allows the researcher to collect information from respondents who are thought to be representative of the total population (Creswell, 2010).

Population of the Study: In the context of research, a target population is defined as the population to whom the researcher would ideally like to generalize the study's findings (Gay & Airasian, 2000). It encompasses the bigger group to whom researchers seek to apply the findings of a smaller group study. In terms of the current study, the research population consists of visitors who the following visitor attraction sites:

1) Ox-Bow Lake in Yenegoa city
2) Okpoama Beach in Okpoama
3) Kontiki Amusement Park and Resort Yenegoa
4) Odi Holiday Resort in Odi
5) Efi Crocodile Lake

Sampling Unit: A sampling unit is one of the units selected for the purpose of sampling. Each unit being regarded as independent and indivisible when selection will be made. The sampling unit for this research include tourists that patronize selected sites in Bayelsa state. This implies that the present study focus only on tourists that patronize the listed sites in Bayelsa state

Sampling and Sample Size Determination

Sampling refers to the process of selecting units of observation from the population (Kothari, 1990). Baridam, (2011) also defined sampling as the process of selecting a reasonable portion of a population on which generalization could be made on the basis of the findings derived from the sample.

To determine the exact sample size for the present study, the suggestion in Freund and William (2009) for determining infinite population is upheld. The authors proposed the formula to determining the sample size (n) as follows:

$$n = \frac{(Z_{\alpha/2})^2 PQ}{e^2}$$

Where

P = Probability for positive response.

Q = Probability for negative response.

e = Tolerable error (0.05).

$Z_{\alpha/2}$ = 1.96 from the critical table Z of 0.05 under infinity ∞.

α = 0.05, the significant level

n = Sample size

Applying this formula to the present study, the sample size n is put at 323which is obtained as follows.

$$n = \frac{(Z_{\alpha/2})^2 PQ}{e^2}$$

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 (0.7)(0.3)}{(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{(3.8416)(0.7)(0.3)}{(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{0.806746}{0.0025}$$

$$n = 322.69 \approx 323$$

Data Collection Method

Convenience sampling approach which is a non-probability sampling was adopted for the study. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sample methodology that does not include any criterion prior to selecting tourists from selected visitor attraction sites in Bayelsa state

Operational Measures of Variables

In this study, Destination attributes is the independent variable, while tourist choice of visitor attraction is the dependent variable, destination moderates the relationship between the destination attributes and tourism destination choice. Destination attributes has attractions, accessibility, and affordability as its dimensions. Tourist choice serve as a mono variable. Each variable had 4 items each. The responses to each of the items was rated using a 5-point Likert-scale labelled as follows: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = strongly disagree.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Analysis of Questionnaire

Table 1 and 2 below are used to analyse the questionnaire in terms of distribution and demographic profile of respondents respectively.

Table 1 Questionnaire Distribution and Retrieval

Questionnaire	Frequency	Percent
Distributed	323	100%
Not retrieved	22	6.81%
Retrieved	301	93.19%
Useful response	270	83.59%
Not used	31	9.60%

The table above shows the distribution of questionnaire to respondents and retrieval. Three hundred and twenty three questionnaire were administered, three hundred and one (301) copies (93.19%) were retrieved, 22 (6.18%) copies distributed questionnaire were not retrieved. Two hundred and seventy questionnaires were useful, and 31 (9.60%) questionnaires were not used. Data collected from respondents were statistically treated as indicated on the table below:

Table 2 Demographic profile of respondents

S/No	Demographic variables	No	Percent
1	**Gender**		
	Male	122	45.2
	Female	148	54.8
	Total	270	100.0
2	**Marital Status**		
	Single	100	37.0
	Married	144	53.3
	Divorced	26	9.7
	Total	270	100
3	**Occupation**		
	Civil servant	89	33.0
	Entrepreneur	80	29.6
	Student	101	37.4
	Total	270	100
4	**Age**		
	18 − 25	55	20.3
	26 − 35	95	35.2

36 − 45	82		30.3
46 − 55		30	11.1
		18	3.1
56 & above			
Total	270		100

5	**Educational Background**		
	O'level	20	7.4
	OND/HND	52	19.2
	B.Sc	106	39.2
	M.Sc/MBA	70	26.0
	Ph.D	22	8.2
	Total	270	100

 Section 1 of Table 2 shows the gender of respondents. 122 respondents (45.2%) were male, while 148 respondents (54.8%) were female. This information implies that majority of the respondents were female.

Section 2 of Table 2 shows the marital status of respondents. 100 respondents (37.0%) were single, 144 respondents (53.3%) were married, 26 respondents (9.7%) were divorced. This information implies that majority of the respondents were married

Section 3 of Table 2 above shows the information on occupational status. The table revealed that (89) respondents (33.0%) were civil servant, (80) respondents (29.6%) were entrepreneur, while (101) respondents (37.4%) were students. This implies that students were of the majority.

Section 4 of Table 2 above shows the information on age brackets of the respondents. 55 respondents (20.3%), were within 18-25 years, 95 respondents (35.2%) were within 26–35 years, 82 respondents (30.3%) were within 36–45, 30 respondents (11.1%) were within 46-55 years, while 18 respondents (3.1%) were greater than 56 years. This information shows that majority of the respondents were within the ages of 26 − 35 years.

Section 5 of Table 2 shows the educational background of respondents. O'level (20) (7.4%), OND/HND (52) (19.2%), B.Sc (106) (39.2%), M.Sc/MBA (70) (26.0%), Ph.D (22) (8.2%). From the information it shows that respondents with B.SC are of the majority

TEST OF HYPOTHESES
Simple Regression Analysis
For this study, linear regression analysis was performed to relationship in the hypothesized relationships.
DECISION RULE

If	PV	< 0.05	= Reject Ho
	PV	>0.05	= Accept Ho

Relationship between attraction and tourist choice.
HO_1: There is no positive and significant relationship between attractions and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.
HA_1: There is positive and significant relationship between attractions and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.

Table 3-4 Simple Regression Analysis showing the relationship between attractions and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.

.

Table 3 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.868[a]	.753	.752	.35798

a. Predictors: (Constant), Attraction

Table 4 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	104.618	1	104.618	816.356	.000[b]
	Residual	34.345	268	.128		
	Total	138.963	269			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourist Choice
b. Predictors: (Constant), Attraction

Information in Table 3 shows the model summary result of simple regression analysis. The correlation coefficient (r) = .868. This value shows that a strong positive relationship exist between attraction and tourist choice. The positive sign of the correlation coefficient is an indication that a direct relationship exist between attractions and tourist choice. Furthermore R Square is .753 and adjusted R square = .752. This is an indication that 75.2% of the variance in tourist choice can be explained by the changes in independent variables of visitor attractions in the various communities. As a general rule, this model is considered as a 'good fit' as this, simple regression model is able to explain above 60% (threshold) of variance in the dependent variable: tourist choice (Moosa & Hassan, 2015).

The ANOVA Table 4 also shows that F=816.356; pv= 0.000 < 0.05, indicating significant relationship between attractions and tourist choice. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means therefore that there is a significant relationship between attraction and tourist choice. Accordingly therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Relationship between accessibility and tourist choice
HO_2: There is no significant relationship between accessibility and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.
HA_2: There is significant relationship between accessibility and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.

Table 5 and 6: Simple Regression Analysis showing the relationship between accessibility and tourist choice.

Table 5 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.797[a]	.635	.633	.43519

a. Predictors: (Constant), Accessibility

Table 6 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	88.206	1	88.206	465.737	.000[b]
	Residual	50.757	268	.189		
	Total	138.963	269			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourist Choice
b. Predictors: (Constant), Accessibility

Information in Table 5 shows the model summary result of simple regression analysis. The correlation coefficient (r) = .797. This value shows that a strong positive relationship exist between accessibility and tourist choice. The positive sign of the correlation coefficient is an indication that a direct relationship exist between accessibility and tourist choice. Furthermore R Square is .635 and adjusted R square = .633. This is an indication that 63.3% of the variance in tourist choice can be explained by the changes in independent variables of accessibility. As a general rule, this model is considered as a 'good fit' as this, simple regression model is able to explain above 60% (threshold) of variance in the dependent variable: tourist choice (Moosa & Hassan, 2015).

The ANOVA Table 6 also shows that F=465.737; pv= 0.000 < 0.05, indicating significant relationship between accessibility and tourist choice. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means therefore that there is a significant relationship between accessibility and tourist choice. Accordingly therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

Relationship between affordability and tourist choice
HO_3: There is no significant relationship between affordability and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.
HA_3: There is significant relationship between affordability and tourist choice of visitor attraction in Baylesa State.

Table 7-8: Linear Regression Analysis showing the relationship between affordability and tourist choice

Table 7 Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.778[a]	.606	.604	.45204

a. Predictors: (Constant), Affordability

Table 8 ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	84.199	1	84.199	412.048	.000[b]
	Residual	54.764	268	.204		
	Total	138.963	269			

a. Dependent Variable: Tourist Choice
b. Predictors: (Constant), Affordability

Information in Table 7 and 8 shows the result of   simple regression analysis. The correlation coefficient (r) = .778 . This value shows that a strong positive relationship exist between affordability and tourist choice.   The positive sign of the correlation coefficient is an indication that a direct relationship exist between affordability and tourist choice. Furthermore R Square is .606 and adjusted R square = .604. This is an indication that 60.4% of the variance in tourist choice can be explained by the changes in independent variables of affordability. As a general rule, this model is considered as a 'good fit' as this, simple regression model is able to explain above 60% (threshold) of variance in the dependent variable: residents' quality of life (Moosa & Hassan, 2015).

The ANOVA Table 8 also shows that F=412.048; pv= 0.000 < 0.05, indicating significant relationship between affordability and tourist choice. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected. It means therefore that there is a significant relationship between affordability and tourist choice. Accordingly therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
This section discusses the findings of the study. It indicates how this study and previous studies are related or differ in certain perspectives.

Relationship between attractions and tourist choice
The outcome of analysis in Table 3 and 4 show that the type of attractions had significant relationship with tourist choice   to the visitor attraction sites (r = 0.868, p=0.000 < 0.05). The finding is consistent with, Murphy et al., (2000), Hsu et al., (2009) Ahmed, Azam, and Bose (2010), Biswas, Omar, and Rashid-Radha (2020) Suanmali (2014)   and Bello and Bello (2019).

Morrison (2002) explained the importance of activities in visitor attractions in destination marketing by noting that programming involves developing special activities, events, or programmes to increase tourist spending or to give added appeal to a package or other hospitality/travel service. Activities constitute part of a destination product. It is made up of all activities available and what day visitor and tourists do during their visit to the destination. Morrison (2013) classified all activities under programs which is a component part of the destination product.

Relationship between accessibility and tourist choice
The outcome of analysis in Table 5 and 6 show that accessibility had significant relationship with tourist choice   to the attraction sites (r = 0.797, p=0.000 < 0.05). This result is consistent with Kim et al (2012), Geoffrey (2004), Moore et al., (2012) opined that accessibility is key to tourist destination choice the scholar asserts that destinations that are not accessible will lose a lot of business. The findings of this study affirmed their positions as it revealed that tourist only go to a place that is not difficult to locate. Despite how beautiful an attraction might be, there is no tourist that will desire to go there for touristic purposes if accessing the location proves difficult.

Relationship between affordability and tourist choice
 The outcome of analysis in Table 7 and 8 show that affordability had significant relationship with tourist choice   to the attraction sites (r = 0.779, p=0.000 < 0.05). . The result is consistent with previous studies such Bello and Bello (2019). The finding also   supports earlier findings of Lau (2004) who stated that price is one major factor that encourages or discourages patronage. The finding implies that destinations must be affordable to drive patronage

CONCLUSION
Overall, this study has examined the relationship between destination attributes and tourist choice towards attraction sites in Bayelsa state.   From the tourists behavioral perspective, the results of the empirical analyses have revealed that attraction, accessibility, and affordability   are imporant factors in contributing to choice of a visitor attraction site in a destination. Based on these findings, the researcher concluded that though destination attributes is important in decision making of tourists when seeking for where to spend their quality time, the level of influence these attributes have is to a high level extent.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Based on the findings of this study, the researcher made the following recommendations:
  i.   The local government and community stakeholders should invest heavily in awareness creation for visitor attraction sites in Bayelsa state as this will help showcase the attributes at their disposal.
  ii.   The host community should be carried along with tourism developmental plans as no tourist want to encounter a hostile community during visits
  iii.   The facilities should be developed and maintained so as to appeal to visiting tourists
  iv.   The prices for their product and services should be pocket friendly as most local tourists cannot afford them

v.   The access to the attraction sites should be developed and maintained.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This research was carried out in selected attraction sites in Bayelsa state. Similar study should also be done in other regions of Nigeria.

REFERENCES

1. Adeola, A. (2012). Domestic Airlines in Nigeria Reduces Fares to Win Passengers. Retrieved May 2nd, 2014, from www.bellanija.com.
2. Aksoy, R., & Kiyci, S . (2011). A Destination Image as a type of Image and Measuring Destination   Image in Tourism (Amasra Case). *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, (3), 479–488.
3. Assaf, G.A & Josiansen, 2012. European vs U.S airlines: Performsncecomparison in a dynamic market. *T ourism management, 33 (2):317-326*
4. Assaker, G. (2014). Examining a Hierarchical Model of Australia's Destination Image. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 20, (3), 195-210.
5. Asika, N. (2011). *Research Methodology in Behavioural Sciences*. Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.
6. Baloglu, S.& Uysal, M. (1996). Market Segments of Push and Pull Motivation: A Canonical   Correlation Approach. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 8, 32-38.
7. Bankole, A. S. (2002). Services Trade Policy and the Nigerian Tourism Sector:A Note of Tourism Contribution, Constraints and Opportunities. A Paper Submitted to the African Journal of Economic Policy. Ibadan: Department of Economics; University of Ibadan
8. Bashar, A. A., & Ahmad, P.M.S. (2010). An Analysis of Push and Pull Travel Motivations of Foreign Tourists to Jordan. *International Journal of Business Management*, 5, (12) 41-50.
9. Battour, M., Ismail, M. N., & Battor, M . (2011). The Impact of Destination Attributes on Muslim Tourists Choice. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13:527–540.
10. Beerli, A.,& Martin, J. D. (2004). Factor Influencing Destination Image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 3, (3), 657–681.
11. Bello, Y. O. (2015). Destination Selection process among Higher Education Students in Malaysia .University Putra Malaysia: Doctorate Degree Thesis Submitted to School of Graduate Studies.
12. Bello, Y. O., & Bello, M. B. (2017). *Tourism Planning and Development in an Emerging Economy.* Ondo: Grace Excellent Publishers.
13. Bello, Y. O., Bello, M. B., & Raja, N. R.Y. (2014). Travel and Tourism Business Confidence Index in Nigeria: Issues and Challenges. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 3, (2), 1-15.*
14. Bello, Y. O., Raja, N, R. Y., Yuhanis, A. A., & Khairil, W. A. (2014a). The Framework of Edutourism System; Towards the Definition of Edu-tourism, Edu-tourist, and Edu-tourist Industry. In Hamimah, H, & Hossein, N, Selected Isseues in Hospitality and Toourism Sustainability (pp. 128-152). Selangor: UPM Press, Malaysia.
15. Bello, Y., Raja, N. R. Y., Yuhanis, A. A., & Khairil, W. B. (2015). Modelling the Relationship between Policy Strategies, Instruments, and Attitude of Locals with Sustainable Edu-tourism Industry in Malaysia. In Amer, H. J, Siti, R. H, & Muhammad, S. A, Trends in Hospitality and Tourism (pp. 1-19). Serdang: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
16. Bello, Y.O., & Bello, M.B. (2012). Infrastructure Development: A Strategic Approach for Sustainable Hospitality Business in Edo State. *Continental Journal of Sustainable Development*, 3, (1), 47-54.
17. BGL. (2014). Economic Note: Nigeria Tourism Industry: A revolutionized Tourism Sector as a Panacea for a Thriving Hospitality Business. Retrieved January 26th, 2014, from www.research.bg/group.com
18. Bian, X. (2003). Affecting Factors on Choice of Tourist Destination. Geography and Geo-Information Science, 6, CNKI Journals, China.
19. Bigne, J.E., Sanchez, M.I., & Sanchez, J., 2001. Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviours: inter-relationship. Tourism management, 226: 607-616
20. Bogari, N.B., Crowther, G., & Marr, N. (2003). Motivation for Domestic Tourism: A Case Study of The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Tourism Analysis, 8, (2), 137–141.*
21. Braun, B & Soskin, M. (2003). Competitive Theme Park Strategies: Lessons from Central Florida. In A. G. Fyall, Managing Visitors Attractions: New Direction. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
22. Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the Competitive Destination of Future. *Tourism Management*, 21, 97-116.
23. Bukola, I. (2018). Domestic Tourism to Contribute N3.6bn to Nigeria's GDP In 2018. Retrieved
24. Feburary 23rd , 2019, from https://leadership.ng/2018/07/13/domestic-tourism-to-contributen3-6bn-to-nigerias-gdp-in-2018.
25. Buultjens, J., Ratnayake, I., Gnanapala, A., & Aslam, M. (2005). Tourism and its Implications for Management in Ruhuna National Park (Yala), Sri Lanka. *Tourism Management,* 26, 733–742.
26. Cakici, A. S., & Harman, S. (2007). Importance of Destination Attributes Affecting Destination Choice of Turkish Birdwatchers. *Journal of Commerce Tourism Education Faculty,* 1:131–45
27. Catalan, C. (2003). *Public Policy of Nation Infrastructure; Americans in Ruins*. USA: Daily   Champion, 2011.

28. Chadwick, R. A. (1994). Concepts, Definitions, and Measures Used In Travel and Tourism Research. In J. R. Brent Ritchie, & Goelcher, C. R, Travel Tourism and Hospitality Research; A Handbook for Managers and Researchers (2nd ed.) (pp. pp. 65-80). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

29. Chen, C. H. (2007). Understanding Taiwanese Students' Decision-making Factors Regarding Australian International Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20, (2), 91-100.*

30. Chi, C.G., & Qu, H. (2009). Examining the Relationship between Tourists' Attribute. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 18, (1), 4-25.*

31. Chiu, L. K., & Ananzeh, O. A. (2012). The Role of MICE Destination Attributes on Framing Jordan Tourist Image. *Academic Research International*, 3,(1), 67–77.

32. Crompton, J.L.,1979. An assessment of the image mexico as avaction destination and influence of geographical location upon the image. *Journal of travel research, 184:18-23*

33. Crouch, G.I., & Ritchie,J.R.B. (2005). Application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process to Tourism Choice and Decision Making: A Review and Illustration Applied to Destination Competitiveness. *Tourism Analysis, 10, (1), 17-25.*

34. Crouch, I. G. (2007). Modeling Destination Competitiveness: A Survey and Analysis of the Impact of Competitiveness Attributes. Retrieved December 20th, 2013, from CSR Sustainable Tourism: http://www.sustainabletourismonline.com

35. Debbagh, Z. & Azouaoui, H. (2022). The Mediating Role of Destination Image in the Relationship Between Event Image and Tourists' Behavioural Intentions Towards the Destination: The Case of Music Festivals in Morocco. African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 11(2):754-769. DOI: https://doi.org/10.46222/ajhtl.19770720.255

36. Devesa, M., Laguna, M., & Palacios, A. (2010). The Role of Motivation in Visitor Satisfaction:Empirical Evidence in Rural Tourism. *Tourism Management, 34, (4), 547–552.*

37. Dwyer, L., & Kim, C. (2003). Destination Competitiveness: Determinants and Indicators. *Current Issues in Tourism, 6, (5), 369-414.*

38. Echtner, C.M., & Ritchie, B.J.R. (1993). The Measurement of Destination Image: An Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Travel Research, 31, 3–13.*

39. Ekinci, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination Personality: An Application of Brand Personality to Tourism Destination. *Journal of Travel Research, 45:127–140.*

40. Emma, O. (2017). Nigeria Raked 97% Tourism Revenue from Domestic Travel in 2016. Lagos: Thisday Newspaper, February, 2nd.

41. Enright, M.J., & Newton, J. (2005). Tourism Destination Competitiveness: A Quantitative Research. *Tourism Management, 25: 777-788.*

42. Fornell C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables andmeasurement error. *Journal of Market Research, 18*(1), 39-50.

43. Foo, C. C., Russsayani, I., & Lim, H. E. (2010). Factors Affecting Choice for Education Destination: A Case of International Students at Universiti Utara Malaysia. Third International Conference on International Studies. Kuala Lumpur: Tourism Educators of Malaysia

44. Freneund, J. E., & William, F.J. (2009). Quick Statistics. London: Penguin.

45. Gallarza MG, Saura IG, Gracia HC. Destination image: Towards a conceptual framework. *Annals of Tourism Research. 2002; 29(1):56–78.*

46. Gnoth, J., Andreu, L., & Kozak, M. (2009). Advances in Tourism Marketing Research: Introduction to a Special Issue on Consumer Behaviour in Tourism Destinations. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 3, (2):99–102.*

47. Hair Jr, J. F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J & Anderson, R.E *(2010) Multivariate Data Analysis(7th ed). London: Pearson*

48. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis (6th Ed.*) . Upper Saddle River, NJ : Pearson Prentice Hall.

49. Hakak, A. I. (2013). Perception of Tourists Towards Hospitality of Kashmiris: A Case Study. Asian *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 1,(5), 113–115.*

50. Harikrishna, M., & Rajat, R. (2011). Social and Psychological Factors Influencing Destination Preferences of Domestic Tourists in India. *Leisure Studies, 1–11.*

51. Haxton, P. (2015). "A Review of Effective Policies for Tourism Growth", OECD Tourism Papers, 2015/01. OECD Publishing.

52. Holloway, C., Humphreys, C., & Davidson, R. (2009). *The Business of Tourism. 8th Edition* . Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

53. Hsu, T. K., Tsai, Y. F., & Wu, H. H. (2009). The Preference Analysis for Tourist Choice of Destination: A Case Study of Taiwan. *Tourism Management, 30,(2) 288-297.*

54. Hudson, S., & Ritchie, B. (2002). Understanding the Domestic Market Using Cluster Analysis: A Case Study of the Marketing Efforts of Travel Alberta. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 8, (3), 263– 276.

55. Huybers, T. (2003). Domestic Tourism Destination Choices. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 5, (6), 445–459.*

56. Igbojekwe, P. A., Okoli, C. I., & Ugo-Okoro, C. (2013). Attitude to Recreation: A Hindrance to Development of Tourism Industry in Nigeria. *International Journal of Art and Commerce, 2, (2), 12-23.*

57. Inskeep, E. (1999). *Tourism Planning: An Integrated and Sustainable Development Approach*. New York: Van Nostand Reinhold.

58. Jacqueline, L. (2010). An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Decision of Students to Study at Universiti Sains Malaysia. Kajian Malaysia, 28, (2),107-136.

59. Jani, D., Jang, C., Hwang, Y.H . (2009). Differential Effects of Tourism Resources on the Attractiveness of Destination Bundles. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences, 9, (1), 23–36.*

60. Jason, M. S. L., Ahmad, Azmi, M. A.,& Azhar, Hj. A. (2011). Edu-tourism: Exploring the Push-Pull Factors in Selecting a University. *International Journal of Business and Society, 12, (1), 63-*78.

61. Javid, S., & Roma, A. (2016). Factors Influencing Local Tourists' Decision Making on Choosing a Destination: A Case of Azerbaijan . *Ekonomika, 95, (3), 112-127.*

62. Jennifer, B., & Thea, C. (2013). Travel and Tourism Competitiveness Report: Reducing Barriers to Economic Growth and Job Creation. Geneva: World Economic Forum

63. Jumia Travel. (2017). The Hospitality and Tourism Outlook in Nigeria. Lagos: Jumia Travel Nigeria.

64. Kassean, H & Gassita, R (2013) Exploring tourists push and pull motivations to visit Mauritius as a tourist destination. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 2 (3), 1-13.

65. Kim, J.H. (2014). The Antecedents of Memorable Tourism Experiences: The Development of a Scale to Measure the Destination Attributes Associated with Memorable Experiences. *Tourism Management, 44: 34-45.*

66. Kim, J.H., Ritchie, J.R.B & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a Scale to Measure Memorable Tourism Experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51, (1), 12-25.

67. Kim, K., Hallab, Z., & Kim, J. N. (2012). The Moderating Effect of Travel Experience in a Destination on the Relationship between the Destination Image and the Intention to Revisit. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 21: 486-505.*

68. Kleckley, J. (2008). Economy: NC and its Regions. A Workshop on Climate. Weather and Tourism, November 14-15. East Carolina: East Carolina University.

69. Kotler, P., Bowen, J. T., & Makens, J. C. (2006). Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism 4th (ed.).New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

70. Lam, T., & HSU, C. (2006). Predicting Behavioural Intention of Choosing a Travel Destination. *Tourism Management, 27: 589-599.*

71. Lee, C., Lee., Y, & Lee, B., (2005). Koreas destination image formed by the 2002 world cup. Annals of tourism research, 324: 838-858

72. Lew., A.A (1987). A framework for tourists attraction research, *Annals of tourism research*, 14:553-575.

73. Lin, L.Z., & Hsu, T. H. (2013). The Analysis of Risk Perception with Fuzzy Means-end Approach. *Qual Quant, 47:713–34.*

74. Madhavan, H., & Rastogi, R. (2011). Social and Psychological Factors Influencing Destination. *Leisure Studies,* 1-11.

75. Mazlina, M., Ahmad, S., Sridar, R., & Syamsul, H. M. A. (2015). The Role of Destination Attributes and Memorable Tourism Experience in Understanding Tourist Revisit Intentions. American *Eurasian Journal of Agriculture and Environment Science* , 15, (Tourism & Environment, Social and Management Sciences): 32-39.

76. Mill, R. C. & Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The Tourism System: An Introductory Text*. New Jersey, USA: Prentice Hall International: Englewood Cliffs.

77. Moscardo, G. (2004). Shopping as a Destination Attraction: An Empirical Examination of the Role of Shopping in Tourists' Destination Choice and Experience. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10, (4), 294–307*

78. Moutinho, L. (2005). *Strategic management in Tourism.* Cambridge, Mass: CABI Publishing.

79. Nicolau, J.L., & Más, F.J. (2005). Stochastic Modeling – A Three-stage Tourist Choice Process. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, (1), 49–69.

80. Niyi, A. (2010). Most Expensive Hotels in Lagos Nigeria. Retrieved January 26th, 2014, from www.nigeriafilms.com.

81. Nolan, M. J., & Keller, F.C. (2006). Campfires, Cathedrals, and Casinos: Sociodemographic Variation and Perceptions of Tourist Destinations. 2nd Annual Meetings of the Society for Anthropological Sciences.Savannah, GA: Retrieved July 24, 2006,http//:www.cast.uark.edu/ar_tourism/content/Lastfreelist.pdf

82. Okoli, C. I. (2001). Tourism Development in Nigeria. Enugu: Jee Communication.Open-door Report. (2013). Fast Facts: International Students in the US. Retrieved July 9th, 2014, from www.iie.org/ open-door.

83. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2007). Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators. Retrieved September 11th, 2013, from www. oecd.org/dataoecd/4/55/39313286.pdf

84. Organization, W. T. (2016). UNWTO World Tourism Barometer. Retrieved July 16th , 2017, from Madrid: UNWTO: http://www.unwto.org/facts/eng/barometer.ht

85. Page, J. (1999*). Transport and Tourism*. Essex England: Addison Wesley, Longman.

86. Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS*. McGraw-Hill International.

87. Petruzzellis, L., & Romanazzi, S. (2010). Educational Value: How Students Choose University: Evidence from an Italian University. *International Journal of Educational Management, 24, (2), 139-158.*

88. Pike, S. (2004). Destination Brand Positions of a Competitive set of Near-home Destination. *Journal of Tourism Management, 30: 857–866.*

89. Pikkemaat, B. (2004). The Measurement of Destination Image: The Case of Austria. *The Poznan University of Economics Review, 4, (1), 87-102.*

90. PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2017). African Insights Hotels outlook: 2017–2021. Retrieved August 11, 2018, from www.pwc.co.za/ hospitality-and-leisure.

91. Proshare. (2017). Tourism's Direct Contribution to Nigeria's GDP Yet to Rise in 4th Quarter as

92. Forecast Indicate. Retrieved Feburary 23rd, 2019, from https://www.proshareng.com/news/Travel%20&%20Tours/2017--Tourism's-DirectContribution-to-Nigeria's-GDP-Yet-to-Rise-in-4th-Quarter-as-Forecast-In

93. Qu, H., Kim, L. H., & Im, H. H. (2011). A Model of Destination Branding:Integrating the Concept of the Branding and Destination Image. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 32, (10), 465–476.

94. Ritchie, J.R.B., & Crouch, G. I. (2003). The Competitive Destination: A sustainable tourism perspective. Wallingford, UK: CABI.

95. Roday, S., Biwal, A., & Joshi, V. (2009*). Tourism Operations and Management*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

96. Saini, S., & Arasanmi, C.N. (2021). Attaining digital advocacy behaviour through destination image and satisfaction. *International Journal of Tourism Cities* 7(1), 119-134.

97. Scott, D., & Thipen, J. (2003). Understanding the Birder as Tourist: Segmenting Visitors to the Texas Hummer/Bird Celebration. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife,* 8: 199-218.

98. Sharma, A., Sharma, A., & Kukreja, S. (2012). Economic Contribution of Tourism Industry Toward Society*. International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, 3, (10), 1–19.

99. Siaw, L.P & Ansah, G.O (2015) Tourist destination choice: Motivational factors among social science students association at KNUST. *Research Journal of Hospitality Tourism*, 2(1), 1-13.

100. Sparks, B., & Pan, G. W. (2009). Chinese Outbound Tourists: Understanding their Attitudes, Constraints and use of Information Sources. *Tourism Management*, 30, (4), 483-494.

101. Summers, H., 1999. Tourist destination management. Frankfurt: an imprint of multilingual matters Ltd

102. Sun, C. (2005). A Summary of Domestic Researches on Tourist Informationisation in Recent Years. Tourism Science, 3, CNKI Journals, China, Retrieved October 15, 2011, from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-LUYX200503012.htm.

103. Sun, K., & Lu, L. (2006). Analysis of Domestic Tourist Characteristics and Behaviour of Travellin;g Taking Korean Autonomous Prefecture of Yanbian as an Example. Resource Development and Market, 4, CNKI Journals, China, Retrieved October 15, 2011, from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTAL-ZTKB200604025.htm.

104. Tourism 2025 Growing Value Togethe. (2014). Domestic Tourism – The Backbone of the Industry . Retrieved Feburary 23rd, 2019, from www.tourism2025.org.nz/tourism-2025-archive/domestic-tourism-the-backbone-of-the-industry/

105. Truong, T.H., & King, B. (2009). An Evaluation of Satisfaction Levels among Chinese Tourists in Vietnam*. International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11: 521–535.

106. Turner, L., and Reisinger, Y. 1999. Importance and expectatipns of destination attributesfor Japanese tourist to Huwawii and gold coast cpmpared. *Asia pacific Journal of tourism resesearch, 42:1-18*

107. U.S. Travel Association. (2018). *The Economic Impact of Domestic Travel On Virginia Counties, 2017; Doing Business as Virginia Tourism Corporation*. Washington, D.C: Virginia Tourism Authority.

108. *Ujwary-Gil, A. (2013).* The value added intellectual coefficient – possible indicator of measurement in the knowledge based economy. Retrieved November 5, 2018 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236032541

109. United Nation World Tourism Organisation. (2014). UNWTO World Tourism Barometer. Retrieved Feburary 16th, 2014, from 16, 2014, from Madrid: UNWTO: http://www.unwto.org/

110. Upadhaya, M. (2012). Influence of Destination Image and Destination Personality: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Marketing and Communication, 7*, (3), 40–47.

111. Vanguard Newspaper, July 12th. (2018). Nigeria to Earn N3.63 billion from Domestic Tourism by End of 2018. Retrieved Feburary 23rd, 2019, from https://www.vanguardngr.com/2022/07/nigeriato-earn-n3-63-billion-from-domestic-tourism-by-end-of-2018-hospitality-report-says/

112. Wall, G., & Mathiesom, A. (2006). *Tourism: Change, Impacts and Opportunities*. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.

113. Wang, S., & Qu, H. (2006). A Study of Tourists' Satisfaction Determinants in the Context of the Pearl River Delta Sub-Regional Destinations. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 14, (3), 49-63.

114. Wong, K.M & Musa, G (2011). Branding satisfaction in the Airline Industry: A Comparative Study of Malaysia Airlines and Air Asia*. African Journal of Business Management. 5(8) 3410-3423.*

115. World Travel and Tourism Council. (2018). Domestic Tourism Importance and Economic Impact.Geneva: World Economic Forum.

116.   World Travel and Tourism Council. (2018a). *Travel and Tourism Economic Impact in Africa*. United Kingdom: Rochelle Turner.

117.   Xue, G., Sun, G., & Hou, W. (2008). An Analysis of Domestic Tourism in Xi'an Based on Tourist Preference and Market Competition. Tourism Tribune, 9, CNKI Journals, China, Retrieved October 15, 2022, from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTALLYXK200809010.

118.   Yang, R., Bai, K., & Cai, P. (2007). Factor Analysis of University Student's Tourist Motives –Take Universities Students of Xi'an as an example. *Journal of Baoji University of Arts and*

119.   *Sciences,*   Retrieved   October   15,   2011,   from http://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTOTALBJWX200701025.htm.

120.   Zhang, H. Q., & Lam, T. (1999). An Analysis of Mainland Chinese Visitors' Motivations to Visit Kong. *Tourism Management*, 20, (5), 587-594.