

ASSESSMENT OF THE ROLE OF TOURISM INDUSTRY ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA

By

¹Dr. ADALIKWU ROSE AMOKEYE

¹Centre for General Studies, Cross River University
of Technology, Cross River State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study focused on assessment of the role of tourism industry on the socio-economic development of Cross River State, Nigeria. Two research questions and hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The study adopted the descriptive survey design with a population 2,892,988 people. The sample for this study was made up of 300 respondents. The main procedure that was adopted in this study is purposive sampling method. Purposive sampling technique was used to select five (5) local government areas from the eighteen (18) local government areas of the state. To draw the respondents, purposive sampling technique was employed. This involved the enumeration of the living houses in each sampled community and purposively selecting respondents from them. Thirty (30) respondents were drawn from each of the 10 communities bringing the total number of respondents to three hundred (300). The study used both primary and secondary data. The instrument was designed by the researcher with the assistance of the two supervisors. The questionnaire was a 4-point Likert type scale questionnaire tagged “Tourism Industry and Socio-economic Development Questionnaire (TIASDQ) which was developed on 4-point Likert type scale to measure the role of tourism on the socio-economic development of Cross River State. The face and content validity was used to determine the validity of the instrument. The Cronbach alpha reliability was used to determine the coefficient of internal consistency and the index ranged from 0.78 to 0.85. The finding revealed that tourism industry significantly relate with employment creation in the study area. It was also found that tourism industry does significantly influence infrastructural development (in terms of electricity, roads, pipe borne water, and telecommunication facilities) in Cross River State, Nigeria. It was recommended among others that since tourism’s potential to create employment opportunities is high, the government should encourage the public-private sector partnership especially in the area of hospitality industry and other cultural entertainment

Keywords: Assessment, tourism industry, socio-economic development, Cross River State, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

The tourism industry has been globally regarded as the major catalyst for growing an economy in such a manner that it generates employment opportunities as well as other basic social amenities for the consumption of the people. The trade requires more labour and supports from private enterprise. Under its scope, nations of the world evolve the practice of engaging into risky adventure which forms the basis of development. Tourism offers improved lifestyle for individuals who are engaged in it. Like other business ventures it improves the competitiveness of the economy. This is so because it stimulates local suppliers to match the quality and variety of imported goods. Tourism does so because returning travellers to a destination carry with them the goods and services seen in other countries (Elliot, 2001).

Tourism is a common human activity that accounts for the socio-economic advancement of many economies globally. It has become a trade of international repute with unlimited potentials of developing global economy. Its relevance and significance cut across international borders. Tourism is recognized in most countries of the world as the major source of revenue. In others, it ranks among the top industries. Over the years tourism has been acknowledged as one of the drivers of the world economy (McIntosh, 1995). "Tourism is an economic activity that is imposed, or at least grafted, on a pre-existing set of economic activities and traditional ways of life (Price & Harrison, 1996 pp. 6)". Thus, it is a practice that remarkably influences a range of human activities globally.

Elaborating further, Godfrey and Clarke (2000) stated that tourism induces socio-cultural change that relates to local quality of life and sense of place". Significant adjustment in the standard of living can be as follows: "personal income increases, helps to improve living standards for those more directly involved in the industry, supports the diversity of hospitality service and other cultural entertainment, influences the assortment of goods for commerce that would not be available in the same amount if tourism did not exist to support them, park areas are often improved, street furniture and design criteria introduced, greater care and attention placed on overall environmental quality, new opportunities and so on. Many African states are increasingly becoming aware of the importance of tourism as a variable earner of foreign exchange in addition to its obvious advantages of promoting understanding between peoples of different region and the creation of employment opportunities. Nigeria is not left out of this awareness, more so because of the need to diversify her economy and as part of her globalization policy.

Nigeria is blessed with rich tourism and cultural potentials (Adejuwon&Ekpenyong, 1993). The hospitality of the people, their variety of rich and colourful landscape and vegetation, picturesque, scenery, many historical sites and monuments, treasurable antiquities, enticing African dishes, rich traditional arts and crafts, indigenous songs, music and folklore, all combined with their religion and

environment to make Nigeria an obvious potential tourist attraction. It is important to note that in 1992, the Nigerian government established the Nigerian Tourism Development Corporation (NTDC). The federal government of Nigeria has also created National Parks for the conservation of flora and fauna species mainly for recreation for the present and future generations. In 1976, the Nigerian Tourist Board (NTB) was created to replace the Nigeria Tourist Association. The major responsibilities of the NTB were to: Encourage people living in Nigeria to take their holidays therein and people from abroad to visit Nigeria, encourage the provision and improvement of tourist amenities and facilities in Nigeria including ancillary facilities, provide advisory information on services, promote and undertake research in the field of tourism and grading and classification of hotels in a manner as may be presented (Adejuwon&Ekpenyong, 1993).

The Nigerian Tourism Development Cooperation was later established in 1992. Among other functions, the cooperation was to assist in the provision of expert knowledge on: Museums and historical sites, parks, game reserves, beaches, natural beauty, spots, holiday resorts, souvenir industries, advising appropriate authorities on ways of improving tourist facilities,, carrying on any undertaking which appears to the corporation to be necessary for the promotion and development of the tourism industry and publicizing tourism in Nigeria and do all such things incidental to the foregoing functions in its opinions that are calculated to facilitate the carrying on of the duties of the corporation under the enabling decree (Adejuwon&Ekpenyong, 1993).

According to Overseas Development Institute (2007) the tourism sector can facilitate infrastructure and public service delivery, human resource development, private sector development, changes in the productive structure of the economy and other externalities. Tourism-oriented infrastructure can benefit the non-tourist economy. Report from other tourist destination like Mexico and Kenya reveals that increased movement of people by air into an area can reduce air traffic for the export of agricultural goods (ODI, 2007). To this end, Kunwar (2002) observed that infrastructural potential of tourism has been recognized as a means of improving the living standard of the environment. It is a major vehicle to produce, create and distribute wealth, generate employment, earn foreign exchange and develop infrastructure. Equally, Modi (2000) stated that tourism infrastructural provision in the Philippines has enhanced socio-economic development through the promotion of destination clusters for major island groups. Each cluster is supported by at least one major international gateway and tourism estates/zones connected to a variety of satellite destinations, promotion of history, culture and arts, promotion of mix destinations and products for various tourist segments, establishment and strengthening of linkages and networking to ensure the provision of adequate infrastructure facilities and services in tourism areas, as well as the development, enhancement and promotion of existing and potential tourist attractions.

Godfrey and Clarke (2000) asserted that tourism assets such as hospitality industry, eateries, built attractions, tours and transport provide employment opportunities, increase income earning potentials, and changes in less tangible factors such as increased security, freedom of association and so on. It engenders the development and availability of good airports and roads, access to reasonably priced basic amenities like water, sewage, electricity, telecommunications which together make tourism investments socio-economically viable (Godfrey & Clarke, 2000). Tourism facilitates infrastructural development, which improves socio-economic life. Tourism helps to develop key infrastructural projects for tourism destinations thereby helping to reduce unemployment, poverty, and inequality. This implies that tourism necessities help in the creation of infrastructure utilities and amenities, which are not only used by the visitors but become valuable to the local population as well. The economic importance of tourism in national economy can be appreciated with reference to its contribution in infrastructure development (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). Tourist arrivals in a country increases effective demand for the infrastructure facilities. An attempt must be made to develop infrastructure in a planned manner so as to avoid congestion, overcrowding and damage to the environment. That is where the role of the government is important. The government must encourage the private sector to put up and develop infrastructural facilities for the industry.

In an empirical study by Eja, Ukwayi and Ojong (2012) on success factors determining Nigeria as a Tourist Destination. They discovered that tourism remains one big sector that its input contributes to the social and economic expansion of nations, particularly nations where tourism serves as the main stay of her economy. According to ESCAP (2002) “tourism is also a catalyst for enhancing many countries destination, employment opportunities, foreign exchange, and infrastructural facilities”. Many states in Nigeria have most recently discovered the great potential in the tourism industry and are maximising those potentials in developing the economy of their states. Contingent upon this, part of the effort towards diversifying the economy of the nation has been to harness and develop tourism, the untapped non-oil sector (Ekwere, 2010).Hall (2005), states that “the main reason why governments particularly in developing countries encourage tourism investment is because of the expectations that it will contribute to the socio-economic development in terms of employment creation, income generation and industrial development”.

Wilson (2001) conducted a study on the impact of tourism industry on employment in Cross River State. The author reported that the primary concern of tourism in Cross River State is its ability to generate jobs for the teaming unemployed youths in the state. The level of jobs generated is dependent on the influence of tourism on other sectors of the economy. The influence of tourism is widely felt in the state as tourist facilities such as “camps, lodges, transport, and retail industries were established in the state. It was reported by a study carried out on these camps and lodges that about 1200 were created in

2011. In a related development, it was found out that in a study carried out in 10 camps and lodges different from the first study in Cross River State that 924 people were gainfully employed. This is an indication that out of 25 tourist camps and lodges in the state, about 2124 people had been employed in 2011. Therefore, the number of people supported financially by people employed in tourism related outfits such as hotels, airlines, and transport in Cross River State is estimated to be 24,000 (Government of Cross River State, 2011).

In a study carried out by Mbaiwa (2003) on the socio-economic impact of tourism in terms of infrastructural development in Okavango Delta, North-Western Botswana, he found out that, there has been an expansion of the infrastructure since 1990s to support the growing tourism industry in the area. In the case of Cross River State, some of the specific infrastructural development that had sprung up since 2005 included the following: The road network in northern Cross River State, Ranch Resort, Marina Resort Lodge, TINAPA Business Resort, Margaret Ekpo International Airport, Hotels, motels and restaurants in Calabar metropolis, Ugep, Ikom, Ogoja and Obudu and Nkarasi/Alok monoliths' sites. These mentioned infrastructural developments are all products of tourist attractions.

Amalu and Ajake (2012) affirmed that the existence of sightseeing industry boosted the social and economic development of the state. They maintained that the ranch in the Northern Senatorial District of the state has witnessed in recent times greater number of visitors from all walks of life. The host community (Becheeve Community), hither-to predominantly famers now have developed strong sentiment in tourism-related activities like; “jobs in the hotels, sales of food, drinks, honey, yoghurt, handicraft and other local products, engagement in transportation and tour-guide services”. Tourism in the state has also provided basic amenities like schools, electricity, security, accessible road, financial and communication facilities, among other things.

Studies by Anake (2008), Aniah, Eja, Otu and Ushie (2009), linked the developmental stride of the state to tourism development. This is evident in the provision of basic amenities and infrastructures like; “schools, good road network, health care facilities, electricity, security and financial facilities”. In terms of income generation, Haulot (2001) and Gould (2004) observed that tourism in the state has improved the financial status of families as a result of their engagement in commercial activities that generate money. In their study, they revealed that “there was a steady increase in participation in tourism related activities and this transformed to an increase in household income in the area”. In other words, globally, tourism contributes significantly to a nation’s Gross National Products (GNP). “The industry generated 4.4 per cent of the total GDP, it also contributed to the overall economic development through the provision of roads, telephones, pipe-borne and treated water, disposal and recycling, sewage treatment (WTO, 1999)”. Also, WTTC (2010) estimates showed that “in 2002, travel, tourism and related activities

contributed 11 per cent of the world's GDP, rising to 12 per cent by 2010". Tourism likewise promotes different kind of trade among nations. It is on the basis of this backdrop that the study focused on assessment of the role of tourism industry on the socio-economic development of Cross River State, Nigeria

Statement of the problem

The problem of socio-economic development has been of concern to scholars especially development sociologists, administrators and policy makers. The challenge of socio-economic development manifest in inadequate infrastructure, lack of good road network, a dearth of learning amenities resulting in low level of literacy, insufficient water supply, unimaginable level of joblessness. In addition, it is easy to observe the dilapidated health amenities, inadequate nutrition and in- adequate accommodation. In order to deal with these problems, Nigerian government at all levels has promulgated a number of strategies for addressing these deficiencies.

Some of these programmes were encapsulated in different National Development Plans. In the past and most recently, government have embarked on the following programmes/policies in a bid to address issues of socio-economic development: Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) 1976, the Green Revolution (GR), 1980; the Directorate for Food, Roads, and Rural Information (DFRRI) 1985, Better Life Programme (BLP) 1986, Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) 1988; National Directorate of Employment and so on. In 1999, National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) was established. All these programmes have been ostensibly concerned with improving socio-economic well-being of people particularly in the areas of improved livelihood, self-employment, health, agriculture, literacy, providing alternative means of income, wealth creation, among others.

Although these programmes and policies have had varying degrees of success, they did not translate into improved socio-economic conditions of the people. These macro policies have not translated into reduction in unemployment, inequality, and poverty even though it has improved to an extent the basic services in Cross River State and Nigeria in general. In an attempt to address the issue of poor socio-economic well-being, tourism development has over the past years received immense attention. In Nigeria today, it is acknowledged that tourism is currently the fastest growing sector of the economy. The clamour for a sustainable tourism-based economy has assumed an appreciable perspective in the Nigerian Economic Reform Agenda of government. The industry is to serve as means of income generation, employment creation, infrastructural development, foreign exchange earnings, etc (Egbaji, 2007).

Tourism has also received emphasis in Cross River State as a prime factor for accelerating socio-economic development in the state. While Cross River State is often acknowledged as the tourism destination of Nigeria, little is done empirically to investigate the effect of the industry in socio-economic development of the state. Most of what is read about the advantages of the industry in Cross River State is mere assumptions which may be difficult to concretize. Consequently, government policies in the tourism sector are affected since most decisions are taken based on assumptions. This study is posed, first, to bridge the gap of empirical evidence on the effect of tourism industry on socio-economic advancement of the study area, as well as aid policy decisions in the state.

Objectives of the study

The main purpose of this study was to carry out an assessment on the role of tourism industry on the socio-economic development of Cross River State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study seeks, to:

- (i) Examine whether tourism industry significantly relates to employment creation in Cross River State.
- (ii) Determine whether a relationship exists between tourism industry and infrastructural development (in terms of electricity, roads, pipe-borne water, and telecommunication facilities) in Cross River State.

Research questions

For the purpose of this investigation, four research questions were designed to direct the study:

- (i) To what extent does tourism industry impact on employment creation in Cross River State?
- (ii) To what extent does tourism industry relate to infrastructural development (in terms of electricity, roads, pipe borne water, and telecommunication facilities) in the study area?

Statement of hypotheses

The following research questions were formulated to guide this study

- (i) Tourism industry does not significantly relate with employment creation in the study area.
- (ii) Tourism industry does not significantly influence infrastructural development (in terms of electricity, roads, pipe borne water, and telecommunication facilities) in Cross River State.

RESEARCH METHODS

The study adopted the descriptive survey design. This design is a type of research that studies large and small populations to examine the relative incidence, distribution and interrelations of

sociological and psychological variables (Isangedeghi, Joshua, Asim&Ekuri, 2014). The design was chosen because it allows effective collection of data about social events as well as accurately and objectively describes existing relationship among variables or phenomena. This study is carried out in Cross River State, Nigeria. According to National Population Census (2006), the population of Cross River State stood at 2,892,988 people. This population comprises of self-employed, gainfully employed, students, civil servants, farmers, and industrialists. Others are hotel, motel, bars, restaurants, and other hospitality operators. The sample for the study was drawn from the population. It was assumed that these categories of persons were in a better position to provide dependable information on the role of tourism industry on the socio-economic development of Cross River State. The sample for this study was made up of 300 respondents. This sample comprises people (citizens from all walks of life) ranging from heads of households, managers of hospitality industries, farmers, tourism operators, students, and senior civil servants who were purposefully selected from the study area. One hundred and eighty (180) persons representing 60 per cent of the sample were males, and 120 representing 40 per cent of the total sample were females. The main procedure that was adopted in this study is purposive sampling method. Purposive sampling technique was used to select five (5) local government areas from the eighteen (18) local government areas of the state. These local government areas selected are Obanlikwu, Obudu, Ikom, Etung, and Calabar Municipality. Again, on the basis of the presence of tourism sites in the five (5) selected local governments areas, purposive sampling technique was used to sample two (2) communities each; thus, 10 communities were purposively sampled from the five (5) selected local government areas for the study. To draw the respondents, purposive sampling technique was employed. This involved the enumeration of the living houses in each sampled community and purposively selecting respondents from them. Thirty (30) respondents were drawn from each of the 10 communities bringing the total number of respondents to three hundred (300). The study used both primary and secondary data. The formal were sourced from the field with the aid of structured questionnaire. The secondary source data included journal articles, internet materials, books, and periodic reports from Department of Tourism, Cross River State, Nigeria. The main instrument of this study was a 12-item questionnaire. The instrument was designed by the researcher with the assistance of the two supervisors. The questionnaire was a 4-point Likert type scale questionnaire tagged “Tourism Industry and Socio-economic Development questionnaire (TIASDQ)”. It was designed on 4-point Likert type scale to measure the role of tourism on the socio-economic development of Cross River State. Each item required the respondents to indicate the degree or frequency under “Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The face and content validity was used to determine the validity of the instrument. Face validity refers to the way the questionnaire items appeared to have a reasonable measure of variables under study, while content validity refers to the extent to which the instrument represented the content of interest, or how well the items on the instrument represent or sample the content to be measured. The face and content validity were scrutinised by experts in the department and the thesis supervisors who vetted and screened the items developed. Irrelevant items were dropped, while the relevant ones were retained. A trial testing was conducted with twelve (12) participants selected from the study area who were not given a second chance of taking part in the study. The Cronbach alpha reliability was used to determine the coefficient of internal consistency and the index ranged from 0.78 to 0.85. Therefore, the reliability co-efficient were considered high enough to validate the use of the scale in the study. In analysing the data, each hypothesis was restated as in chapter one. The variables of each hypothesis were identified followed by the statistical tool employed.

Data Presentation

The main independent variable of this study was tourism industry while the dependent variable is socio-economic development. The socio-economic variables include employment creation and infrastructural development. Data for these variables were collected using a 4-point Likert scale type questionnaire. As presented in Table 1 and 2.

TABLE 1

Sample distribution of respondents’ responses on tourism industry and employment creation

S/N	ITEM	RESPONSES	
		POSITIVE (%)	NEGATIVE (%)
1.	Local Enterprise is stipulated.	235 (78.3)	65 (21.7)
2.	It is not possible for local handicrafts and other small-scale industries to develop.	66(22)	234 (78)
3.	Tourism does not disperse development to non-industrial sectors in the economy.	87(29)	213 (71)
4.	Hospitality industry has received a boost.	285 (95)	15 (5)
5.	Tourism encourages the acquisition of small and medium scale enterprise knowledge.	215 (71.7)	85 (28.3)
6.	Acquired skills have not enabled youths to be self-employed.	83(27.7)	217 (72.3)
	Total	971 (53.9)	829 (46.1)

Source: Fieldwork, 2014

Table 1 showed the sample distribution of respondents’ responses on tourism and employment creation. The responses on question number 1 indicated that 235 (78.3 per cent) respondents supported that local enterprise are stipulated while 65(21.7 per cent) respondents did not. The responses on question number 2 showed that 234 (78 per cent) respondents did not support the view that it is not possible for local handicrafts and other small-scale industries to develop while 66(22 per cent) respondents asserted positively. Responses on question number 3 showed that 213(71 per cent) respondents responded negatively that tourism does not disperse development to non-industrial sectors in the economy while 87(29 per cent) respondents asserted positively. In question number 4, 285(95 per cent) respondents agreed that hospitality industry has received a boost in their communities while 15(5 per cent) respondents did not. Responses on question number 5 showed that 215(71.7 per cent) respondents agreed that they have acquired small and medium scale enterprise knowledge through tourism development in Cross River State while 85(28.3 per cent) respondents did not. Finally, the responses on question number 6 showed that 217(72.3 per cent) respondents responded negatively that acquired skills have not enabled youths to be self-employed in their communities while 83(27.7 per cent) respondents asserted positively.

TABLE

Sample Distribution of Respondents’ Responses on Infrastructural Development

S/N	ITEM	RESPONSE	
		POSITIVE (%)	NEGATIVE (%)
1.	My community benefits from electrification projects as a result of tourism development.	227(75.7)	73 (24.3)
2.	Existing electricity lines have been rehabilitated.	268 (89.3)	32 (10.7)
3.	Provision of rural road infrastructure has spread welfare gains to rural areas.	255 (85)	45 (15)
4.	New hotels have been built in my locality.	216 (72)	84 (28)
5.	Basic services such as water have not improved.	88 (29.3)	212 (70.7)
5.	Tourism development has enhanced telecommunications operations in my community.	226 (75.3)	74 (24.7)
	Total	1128 (62.7)	672 (37.3)

Table 2 showed the sample distribution of respondents’ responses on tourism industry and infrastructural development in Cross River State. Responses on question number 1 showed that 227 (75.7 per cent) respondents responded positively that the communities have benefited from electrification projects while 73(24.3 per cent) respondents did not. The responses on question number 2 showed that 268 (89.3 per cent) respondents agreed that existing electricity lines in their communities have been rehabilitated while 32 (10.7 per cent) respondents did not. Responses on question number 3 showed that 255(85 per cent) respondents responded positively that provision of rural road infrastructure has spread welfare gains to rural areas while 45(15 per cent) respondents did not. In question number 4, 216 (72 per cent) respondents responded positively that new hotels have been built in their locality while 84(28 per cent) respondents did not. Responses on question number 5 showed that 212(70.7 per cent) respondents disagree with the fact that basic services such as water has not improved in their communities while 88(29.3 per cent) respondents asserted positively. Finally, the responses on question number 6 showed that 74(24.7 per cent) respondents responded negatively that tourism development in Cross River State led to increase in telecommunications operations; while 226(75.3 per cent) respondents asserted positively.

TEST OF HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis one

Tourism industry does not significantly relate with employment creation in the study area. The predicting variable involved in this hypothesis was tourism industry while dependent variable was employment creation. To test this hypothesis, Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) (rxy) was used. The findings of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Analysis of the relationship between tourism industry and employment creation (n=300)

Variables	$\sum x$	$\sum x^2$		df	LS	$\sum xy$	r-cal
			$\sum y$				
Employment creation (X)	6780	171625		298	0.05		
						144195	0.751
Tourism industry (y)			6120				

Significant at 0.05 level; df = 298, crit-r = 0.196

The result in the Table 3 shows that the calculated r-value of 0.751 is greater than the critical r-value of 0.196 needed at .05 alpha level of significance and 298 degrees of freedom. “With this result, the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is retained”. The interpretation of this result is that tourism industry has a significant relationship with employment creation in the study area.

Hypothesis two

Tourism industry does not significantly influence infrastructural development (in terms of electricity, roads, pipe borne water, and telecommunication facilities) in the study area. The predicting variable involved in this hypothesis was tourism industry while the dependent variable was infrastructural development. To test this hypothesis PPMC analysis (rxy) was used. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Analysis of the Relationship between Tourism Industry and Infrastructural Development (N = 300)

Variables	Σx	Σx^2	Σxy	r-cal
	Σy	Σy^2		
Infrastructural development (X_3)				
$X_{3,1}$ Electricity	6748	171726	144162	0.797
$X_{3,2}$ Roads	6886	171824	144185	0.548
$X_{3,3}$ Pipe borne water	6725	171880	144235	0.840
$X_{3,4}$ Telecommunication	6894	171682	144116	0.523
Tourism industry (y)	6120	128180		

“Significant at 0.05 level; df = 298, crit-r = 0.196

The result of the analysis in table 4 shows that the calculated r-value of 0.797 (Electricity), 0.548 (Roads), 0.840 (Pipe borne water), 0.523 (Telecommunication) were greater than the critical r-value of 0.196 needed at 0.05 alpha level of significance at 298 degrees of freedom”. “With this result, the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is retained”. The interpretation of this result is that there is a significant relationship between tourism industry and infrastructural development in the study area.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Tourism development and employment creation

The finding of hypothesis two revealed that tourism development has a significant relationship with employment creation in Cross River State. From the analysis, the value was positive which indicated that the more tourism is encouraged the more employment would be created for young school leavers. It would also create room for moonlighting or more alternative employment would be available.

This finding is consistent with Ashley (2007) who stated that recent years have seen many declarations of poverty reduction and socio-economic development potentials of the tourist industry by a diverse range of institutions and scholars. Ashley argued that “tourism creates large numbers of jobs (equivalent to around 2-6 per cent of jobs in Africa, depending on definitions) and is labour intensive. These include jobs for women (around 50 per cent of the work force) and unskilled and informal sector workers”.

The finding supports Cooke (1991) that stated that tourism development has impacted positively on developing countries socio-economically in ways such as providing employment often in relatively

remote areas where other forms of paid employment are scarce. The finding agrees with Peters (1999) that tourism development stimulates employment generation, which leads to socio economic development. It creates employment, disperses development to non-industrial regions and promotes general economic development through the multiplier effect.

Egbaji's (2007) findings have been supported. He noted that countries in the Caribbean Island such as Hawaii, Bahamas, Costa Rica and Cuba, whose economies largely depend on tourism, have the largest percentage of her work force employed in the tourism industry. Tourism in these countries is like crude oil in Nigeria. In the Caribbean Islands, tourism development is a substantial employer of labour and a boost to its economy. This finding is in line with Abdullah (2005) and Egbaji (2007) that stated that the tourism industry significantly promotes employment creation. Abdullah stated that tourism has provided thousands of people with paid jobs in Egypt, Tanzania, Morocco, Kenya, and many others. A lot of citizens and non-nationals in Egypt have got jobs as carriers to guide tourists who troop annually to take a glimpse of the architectural wonders of the Egyptian pyramid. In Kenya, thousands are employed as game guards in national parks and other numerous game reserves in the country. Thousands of people are employed in hotels across the different countries and beyond annually by reason of pressure in occupancy rate brought about by the rising tourist traffic to these destinations.

The effect of tourism industry on infrastructural development

The result of statistical analysis of hypothesis three revealed that tourism industry has significant relationship with infrastructural development. From the analysis, the value was positive, which indicated that the more tourism is advanced, the more Cross River State would experience radical infrastructural development. This finding is in support of Overseas Development Institute (2007) that tourism growth can facilitate infrastructure and public service delivery, human resource development, private sector development, changes in the productive sector of the economy and other externalities. The findings support Kunwar (2002) that infrastructural potential of tourism has been recognized as a means of improving the living standard of the host environment. It is a major vehicle to produce, create and distribute wealth, generate employment, earn foreign exchange and develop infrastructure. In Sri Lanka, tourism development has enhanced the development of ecotourism centres, development of tourism properties, luxury tourist train development of a Biotechnology park, among others. Overall, Kunwar stressed that tourism has helped to make life more meaningful to the citizens.

Summary

The study has demonstrated that tourism industry is a viable tool for socio-economic development. Tourism industry has the potentials of generating income for the host communities, promoting employment opportunities, developing and providing a source for foreign exchange earning in

Cross River State. This has multiplier effect, which could translate to socio-economic development especially in the areas of improved household, food security, providing access to basic needs; stimulating local entrepreneurial activities and providing income for government to support its social welfare programmes. Tourism is one of the largest and dynamically developing sectors of economies all over the world. Its high growth and development rates as well as its capacity/potentials of generating exchange earnings, stimulating infrastructure development, and introduction of a new management and educational experience could actively contribute to the socio-economic development of Cross River State, Nigeria if properly developed and managed. It was summarised that

- (i) Tourism industry significantly relates to employment creation in Cross River State. That is, the more tourism is encouraged, the more jobs would be created for the unemployed as well as alternative employment would be made available for moonlighters.
- (ii) Tourism industry has significant relationship between tourism industry and infrastructural development in areas of electricity, roads, pipe-borne water, and telecommunications facilities. The implication is that, the more tourism is developed in Cross River State, the more the citizenry would witness radical infrastructural transformation in the state; and this could stimulate other sectors.

Recommendations

Based on the problem, the objectives and the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made to government and communities benefitting from tourism:

- (i) Since tourism's potential to create employment opportunities is high, the government should encourage the public-private sector partnership especially in the area of hospitality industry and other cultural entertainment.
- (ii) As tourism industry continue to expand in Cross River State, government should invest more resources to the development of social infrastructures such as health facilities, water supply, electricity supply, communication facilities and other physical infrastructures such as transportation facilities. These will help to make tourism investment in the state more socio-economic viable.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, H. (2005). Tourism, economic welfare and efficient pricing. *Journal of tourism research*, 20(4), 613-632.
- Adejuwon, F. J. & Ekpenyong, A. (1993). Overview of tourism industry in Nigeria. *In Nigeria-Giant in the Tropics*, Vol. 1, (Ed.) Adalemo, I. A. & Baba, J. M. Abuja: Gabumo.

- Anake, C. U. (2008). *The Role of Eco-tourism in Rural Development: A Case of Obudu Cattle Ranch, Nigeria*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Geography and Regional Planning, University of Calabar.
- Aniah, E. J., Eja, E. I., Otu, J. E., & Ushie, M. A. (2009). Patronage of eco-tourism potentials as a strategy for sustainable tourism development in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Geography and Geology*, 1(2), 20-27.
- Ashley, C. (2007). Pro-poor tourism work for the poor. *PPT Report*, No.1, London: ODI, IIED and ICRT.
- Cooke, J. (1991). Tourism and its impact on a developing Country. In Ifontenhauer Linda (ed.) *Tourism in Botswana: Proceedings of a Symposium held in Gaborone*, Botswana, 15-19 October, Gaborone, and Botswana Society. 11-17
- Cross River State Tourism Bureau (2010). *Tourism in Cross River: The journey so far*. Calabar: Tempo Project Report
- Egbaji, S. (2007). *Tourism development in Nigeria, the Cross River State experience (1st ed)*. Lagos: Elshaphire Limited.
- Eja, E. I., Ukwayi, J. K. & Ojong, F. E. (2012). Success factors determining Nigeria as a tourist destination. *Journal of Emerging Trends in educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)*, 3(4), 426-432.
- Ekwere, U. (2010). Exploring potentials of tourism for economic development. <http://www.nigerianbestforum.com/blog/?p=42107>. Retrieved 12 October, 2011.
- Elliot, L. (2001). Tourism and Economic Development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 12(1), 4-5.
- ESCAP (2002). *The benefits of tourism*. Chicago: Aldine Publishers.
- Godfrey, K, & Clarke, J. (2000): *The tourism development handbook: A practical approach to planning and marketing*.
- Gould, L. A. (2004). Eco-tourism and sustainable community development. *Journal on Eco-Development*, 2(4), 26-33
- Government of Cross River State (2011). Tourism industry and employment opportunity. *Manual of Tourism Research*.
- Hall, S. (2005). *Modernity and its future*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Haulot, N. (2001). *Tourism and income generation*. Calabar: WUSEN Publishers
- Isangedighi, A. J., Joshua, M. T., Asim, A. E. & Ekuri, E. E. (2004). *Fundamentals of research and statistics in education and social sciences*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.

- Kunwar, R. R. (2002). *Anthropology of tourism: A case study of Sauraha*. India: Adroit Publishers.
- Matheson, H. & Wall, R. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, physical, and social impacts*. Harlow: Longman.
- Mbaiwa, R. (2003). *Tourism and infrastructural development*. Okavango, Delta: Okavango Society.
- McIntosh, R. W. (1995). *Tourism: Principle, practice, philosophies*. Michigan: John Wiley.
- National Population Census (2006). Nigeria 2006 Census Figure (Population). Accessed online at: www.nigeriamasterweb.com/Nigeria06censusFigs.html.
- Overseas Development Institute (2007). *Tourism and infrastructural development*. London: Broadcasting Standards Development Monograph.
- Peter, M. (1999). *International tourism*. Hutchinson.
- Price, M. F. & Harrison, D. (1996). *Fragile environments, fragile communities? An introduction. People and Tourism in Fragile Environments*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Thingan, M. L. (2006). *The economics of development and planning*. Delhi: Vrinda Publications.
- Wilson, S. (2001). *Integrated programme for the eradication of tsetse and typanosomiasis from Ngamiland: Environmental impact assessment, draft Final Report*. Scout Wilson Resource Consultants, Edinburgh. 189.
- WTTC (2010). *The impact of travel and tourism on jobs and economy*. <http://www.wttc.org>. Retrieve June 2014.