

## **Accessibility Of Tourist Destination Among Millennial Tourist**

Irene D. Blanco, Danica L. Nodalo, Aury Lynn T. Jacob, Bea G. Espina  
University of Mindanao  
Matina Davao City, Philippines  
College of Hospitality Education

**ABSTRACT.** This study was conducted to determine the accessibility of millennial to tourist destinations. The proponents conducted a quantitative research. The instrument that the proponents used to conduct the survey was an adapted questionnaire. The research respondents of the study were 400 millennial tourists that ranging to 14-37 yrs. old in Davao International Airport. The statistical tool that was used in the study will be analyzed using Version 0.9 JASP (2018) which is free statistical software. Pearson Correlation Coefficient and Regression Analysis was done in the study with a confidence level of  $\alpha=0.05$ . The study revealed that the accessibility of millennial to tourist destination was on point to what the study should show. Results also showed that there were ways the tourist destination can enhance on how to attract millennial to their location using satisfaction level.

*Keywords: Tourist Destination, Accessibility, Satisfaction*

### **INTRODUCTION**

Being tourism students, we must be creative in finding ways to make tourist destinations more accessible to the public since Filipinos love to travel. One of the groups of people in the country who like to travel is the millennial. The researchers are trying to know how these millennial perceived the accessibility of tourist destinations in order to improve the overall experience of tourists and to boost tourism activities in general. Furthermore, the researchers believed this study is essential due to lack of study being done in Davao City and even to other country.

Tourism is an important economic activity, comprising 9% of GDP worldwide and 6% of the world's exports (UNWTO, 2015). In the Philippines, foreign arrivals increased in 2017, with an all-time high growth of 11% from the previous year (DOT, 2018). The tourism industry contributed 12.2% to the economy in 2017 (Bersales, 2018), with domestic tourism expenditures reaching a total of Php 2,644,833 (PSA, 2018).

Even with these figures, there is little research conducted in the Philippines about millennials as an important tourist demographic. Millennials have become the subject of research in terms of tourism (Loda, 2017). Millennials have been observed to use social media a lot, which meant that tourism organizations that are also active on social media can attract more millennial tourists (Leask, Fyall & Barron, 2013). An article in Forbes noted how much Instagram can influence the tourist destinations that millennials pick (Arnold, 2018). In a study profiling the millennial tourist, Franzidis and Hritz (2014) stated that millennials preferred shorter vacations and conducted online research before going to their selected tourist

destinations. Fyall et al. (2017) noted that an ideal tourist destination should be compelling as well as attractive to share and post about in social media accounts.

Customer satisfaction depends upon several factors. The ability of tourists to reach their target destinations is called accessibility (AlKahtani et al., 2015); the study listed several factors that can be used to measure accessibility of tourist destinations, such as functionality, facility, and the quality of road networks. Improving on accessibility of the tourist areas will also increase their attractiveness. One study determined that millennial tourists preferred meeting people, feeling comfortable and having functional facilities and well-planned designs (Verissimo & Costa, 2018). Tourists are satisfied when their needs are met or surpassed (Teviana et al., 2017).

In Davao City, tourists were reported to have high satisfaction with the city's safety and security, moderate satisfaction with events and food, and satisfaction with public transportation (Casurao and Rebollo, 2014). Middle-aged tourists were more likely to return as a result (85%), followed by 20–30-year olds (63%–65%), and 31–40-year-olds (56%). Even so, there are few studies on millennial tourists in Davao City; thus, this study will attempt to establish perceptions of accessibility of tourist destinations in Davao City with a focus on resorts, in order to provide more information for the tourism industry in this city to improve on necessary infrastructure, functionalities, and facilities to encourage more tourists to visit.

## **METHOD**

The respondents of this research were millennial in Davao International Airport. The researchers were very specific that the result was only millennials was part of the study.

The instrument that was used for this study is an existing questionnaire that was also checked by the advisor before distributed. The existing questionnaire was very efficient in terms of the objective of the study, basically the instrument that was used was able to cover all the objectives of this research. The survey questionnaire was divided into three parts which are: Functionality factors, Facility factors and Quality of road network.

The researcher's utilized quantitative research in this study. Quantitative research was about data gathering, numerical data was gathered in this research to obtain the level of accessibility for the millennials. Quantitative research method reduces the chances of a bias research.

## **RESULTS**

The results and findings that the proponents gathered is discussed in this chapter. As stated in the statement of the problems section, there are three factors that will be discussed in this section which are the functionality factor, facility factor and quality of road network. The three factors has three sub-topics which was part of the survey that the proponents conducted. The survey was approved questions was approved and ready for surveying. The proponents distributed 400 questionnaires, all of which were answered. The results where then tabulated and analyzed for the benefit of this study. Results showed that, overall, respondents rated the accessibility of tourist destinations

at 4.4, with an average of 4.2 for functionality, 4.30 for facility, and the highest average rating of 4.6 for quality of road networks (Table 1)

**Table 1.** Accessibility of tourist destination

Indicators	Mean
<b>FUNCTIONALITY FACTORS</b>	4.2
Management Factor	3.9
Guide Factor	4.4
Information Factor	4.2
<b>FACILITY FACTORS</b>	4.3
Utilization Factor	4.3
Constructional Factor	4.3
Service Factor	4.4
<b>QUALITY OF ROAD NETWORK</b>	4.6
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4.4</b>

The data per demographic group showed significant differences with each other. Table 3.2 tallies the average rating of the respondents according to sex. There were 216 female respondents as compared to 184 male respondents. An independent samples t-test analysis showed that there were no significant differences between male and female respondents per accessibility factor, though both demographics rated quality of road networks the highest among those. Overall, males rated the indicators lower (4.32) than females (4.39). The null hypothesis in terms of sex would thus be accepted. In their study on accessibility, Al-Kahtani et al. (2015) also showed that there were no significant differences among the sexes when it came to functionality, facility, and quality of road networks, and also reported that males had a slightly lower rating compared to females. Among the studies of Baloglu (2014) gender and age generally affect the perceived image of tourist destination but does not show any significant difference in accessibility of the place. Also, according to Shidalwana Omar (2014) female travelers record a higher degree of unemployment compared to male travels but difference in accessing the destination does not affect the roles of both genders.

**Table 2.** Differences in the accessibility of tourist destinations according to sex

Factors	Sex	N	$\bar{x}$
Functionality Factors	Male	184	4.11 <sup>a</sup>
	Female	216	4.20 <sup>a</sup>

Facility Factors	Male	184	4.27 <sup>a</sup>
	Female	216	4.33 <sup>a</sup>
Quality of Road Network	Male	184	4.59 <sup>a</sup>
	Female	216	4.65 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>4.32<sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>4.39<sup>a</sup></b>

$p < 0.05$

Ages were divided into two brackets: 14-22 years old and 23-37 years old, with 178 and 222 respondents, respectively. Table 3.3 shows the difference between age brackets when it came to level of accessibility. Older respondents rated accessibility factors significantly higher (4.44) than younger respondents (4.21). The researchers thus reject the null hypothesis for age. This finding differs from Al-Kahtani et al. (2015), although their respondents' ratings vary from sufficient to good depending on the accessibility factor. In contrast, Ryglova et al. (2015) reported that there were few quality factors where age brackets 18-23, 24-30, and 31-40 had significantly different responses. According to Xia et al. (2009), as cited in Al-Kahtani et al. (2015), there may be differences in spatial cognitive ability between older and younger people. According to Kozak (2002) age can be a factor when it comes to tourist motivation and other aspects such as accessibility of a certain destination and this is due to the location and safety of a specific destination.

**Table 3.** Differences in the accessibility of Tourist destination when analyzed by age

Indicators	Group	N	$\bar{x}$
Functionality Factors	14-22	178	3.91 <sup>a</sup>
	23-37	222	4.20 <sup>b</sup>
Facility Factors	14-22	178	4.19 <sup>a</sup>
	23-37	222	4.41 <sup>b</sup>
Quality of Road Network	14-22	178	4.48 <sup>a</sup>
	23-37	222	4.69 <sup>b</sup>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>14-22</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>4.21<sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>23-37</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>4.44<sup>b</sup></b>

$p < 0.05$

In terms of educational attainment, 168 respondents whose highest educational attainment was high school level, while the bracket with the fewest respondents was the group who were high school graduates. There were significant differences between educational attainments, primarily between high school level-college level,

high school level-college graduate, and college level-college graduate. High school graduate showed no significant difference with any of the other groups. Educational attainment is also a factor when it comes to tourist destination because of the certain aspects that requires proper knowledge and understanding of a specific place.

**Table 4.** Differences in the accessibility of Tourist destination when analyzed by educational attainment

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b><math>\bar{x}</math></b>
Functionality Factors	High school level	100	3.87
	High school graduate	54	4.15
	College level	78	4.39
	College graduate	168	4.58
Facility Factors	High school level	100	3.98
	High school graduate	54	4.27
	College level	78	4.57
	College graduate	168	4.66
Quality of Road Network	High school level	100	4.31
	High school graduate	54	4.67
	College level	78	4.83
	College graduate	168	4.89
<b>Overall</b>	<b>High school level</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.05</b>
	<b>High school graduate</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4.36</b>
	<b>College level</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>4.60</b>
	<b>College graduate</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>4.71</b>

**Table 5.** Multiple comparison (Tukey) for showing the differences in the accessibility of tourist destination when analyzed by educational attainment

<b>Comparisons</b>	<b>Mean Score Difference</b>	<b>lower</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	
			<b>center</b>	<b>upper</b>
High School level vs. College level	-0.0507*	-0.1935	0.0507	0.2949
High School level vs. College graduate	-0.3387*	0.1136	0.3387	0.5638
College level vs. College graduate	0.288*	0.0187	0.2880	0.5573

\*p<0.05

Occupation differences showed no significant difference between all three groups, with averages of 4.01 for Employed, 4.27 for Unemployed, and 4.60 for Still Studying. This may be due because occupation does not affect the decision making of tourist

when it comes to the place or venue. According to Sirakaya and Woodside (2005) tourist will select an alternative that best suits their social and individual needs, this shows that occupation does matter when it comes to tourist destination. Also according to Jansen-Verbeke all destinations has their own elements which all tourist considers

**Table 6.** Differences in the accessibility of Tourist destination when analyzed by occupation

Indicators	Group	N	$\bar{x}$
Functionality Factors	Employed	166	3.73 <sup>a</sup>
	Unemployed	31	4.00 <sup>a</sup>
	Still studying	203	4.36 <sup>a</sup>
Facility Factors	Employed	166	3.97 <sup>a</sup>
	Unemployed	31	4.12 <sup>a</sup>
	Still studying	203	4.61 <sup>a</sup>
Quality of Road Network	Employed	166	4.34 <sup>a</sup>
	Unemployed	31	4.68 <sup>a</sup>
	Still studying	203	4.84 <sup>a</sup>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>Employed</b>	166	<b>4.01<sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>Unemployed</b>	31	<b>4.27<sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>Still studying</b>	203	<b>4.60<sup>a</sup></b>

$p < 0.05$

**Table 7.** Summary of ANOVA showing the differences in the accessibility of Tourist destination when analyzed by occupation

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	2.726	2	1.363	2.76
Within Groups	195.957	397	0.494	
Total	198.684	399		

\* $p < 0.05$

### Conclusion and Recommendation

In the level of accessibility of the tourist destination, the tourists are highly satisfied with the performance of the place. Having a very good rate is very commendable.

The significant difference between ages, sex, and occupation shows good results. The educational attainment section of the data which is shown above, shows a significant difference in accessibility this is because the tourist are travel wise in choosing a particular tourist destination. The difference in accessibility in education attainment shows that the tourists should be knowledge enough to determine which place will be more efficient compared to another place to visit

## REFERENCE

- AlKhatani, S. J. H., Xia, J. C., Veenendaaland, B., Caulfield, C., & Hughes, M. (2015). Building a conceptual framework for determining individual differences of accessibility to tourist attractions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 28-42. doi:10.1016/j.tmp.2015.05.002.
- Altinay, Z., Saner, T., Bahçelerli, N.,M., &Altinay, F. (2016). The role of social media tools: Accessible tourism for disabled citizens. *Journal of Educational Technology& Society*, 19(1), 89-99. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1768612537?accountid=171161>
- Arnold, A. (2018, March 24). Here's How Much Instagram Likes Influence Millennials' Choice Of Travel Destinations. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/andrewarnold/2018/01/24/heres-how-much-instagram-likes-influence-millennials-choice-of-travel-destinations/>
- Bersales, L. S. (2018, June 7). Philippine Statistics Authority | Republic of the Philippines. Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/tourism-satellite-accounts-press-releases>
- Blazeska, D., Milenkovski, A., &Gramatnikovski, S. (2015). The quality of the tourist destinations a key factor for increasing their attractiveness. *UTMS Journal of Economics*, 6(2), 341-353.
- Casurao, G. M. &Rebollo, H. P. (2014). Davao Life is here: Characterizing Inbound Tourists. Retrieved from [globalbizresearch.org/Singapore\\_Conference/pdf/pdf/S485.pdf](http://globalbizresearch.org/Singapore_Conference/pdf/pdf/S485.pdf)
- Chauhan, R. (2015). *Military Supply Chain Management and People's Liberation Army Logistics*. Vij Books India Pvt Ltd.
- Check J., Schutt R. K. Survey research. In: J. Check, R. K. Schutt., editors. *Research methods in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA:: Sage Publications; 2012. pp. 159–185.
- Colina IV, A.L. (2018, June 27). Davao records 975,000 tourists from Jan- May | MindaNews. Retrieved from <http://www.mindanews.com/top-stories/2018/06/davao-records-975000-tourists-from-jan-may/>
- Davis, R.A. (2015). *Demand-Driven Inventory Optimization and Replenishment: Creating a More Efficient Supply Chain*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Dimock, M. (2018, March 1). Defining generations: Where Millennials end and post-Millennials begin. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/01/defining-generations-where-millennials-end-and-post-millennials-begin/DOT:> Tourism arrivals reach all-time high at 6.6M. (2018, January 31). Retrieved from [http://web.tourism.gov.ph/news\\_features/dot\\_high.aspx](http://web.tourism.gov.ph/news_features/dot_high.aspx)
- Eagle, S. (2015). *Demand-Driven Supply Chain Management*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Fischler, A.S. (2013). *Quantitative research methods*. Nova Southeastern University.
- Formica, S., &Uysal, M. (2006). Destination attractiveness based on supply and demand evaluations: An analytical framework. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(4), 418-430.

- Franzidis, A., & Hritz, N. (2014). Profiling the Gen Y tourist. *Turizam: medunarodniznanstveno-stručničasopis*, 62(3), 323-330.
- Fromm, J. (2017, November 8). Why Millennials Are The Most Important Consumer Generation For The Travel Industry. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jefffromm/2017/11/08/why-millennials-are-the-most-important-consumer-generation-for-the-travel-industry/#198575aae1f1>
- Fyall, A., Leask, A., Barron, P., & Ladkin, A. (2017). Managing Asian attractions, Generation Y and face. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 32, 35-44. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.04.006
- Huang, S. & Chen G. (2017). *Tourism Research in China: Themes and Issues*. UK: Channel View Publications.
- JASP Team (2018). JASP (Version 0.9)[Computer software].
- Jeong, C. (2014). Marine tourist motivations comparing push and pull factors. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 15(3), 294-309.
- Johnstone, A. (2018, May 25). This is the difference between Baby Boomers, Gen Z, and millennials. Retrieved from <https://www.thesun.co.uk/fabulous/5505402/millennials-baby-boomers-generation-groups-z-y-x-explained/>
- Kahtani, S. Xia, J. & Veenendaal, B. (2011). *Measuring accessibility to tourist attractions*. School of Mathematical and Geospatial Sciences.
- Leask, A., Fyall, A., & Barron, P. (2013). Generation Y: an agenda for future visitor attraction research. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(5), 462-471. doi:10.1002/jtr.1940
- Lubbe, B. A., Douglas, A., Fairer-Wessels, F., Kruger, E., Geldenhuys, E., & Francis, C. (2016). Matching Tourism Supply and Demand: an analysis of how tourism products meet the needs of emerging domestic market segments in selected regions in South Africa. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1843&context=ttra>
- Mason, P. (2015). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. (3rd ed.). Taylor and Francis.
- Morozov, M. A., & Morozova, N. S. (2016). Attractive tourist destinations as a factor of its development. *Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism*, 7(1), 105-107. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v7.1(13).10
- Nikjoo, A. H., & Ketabi, M. (2015). The role of push and pull factors in the way tourists choose their destination. *Anatolia*, 26(4), 588-597.
- OECD. (2018). Chapter 1: Tourism trends and policy priorities. (2018). Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Retrieved from ProQuest Central Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2051200185?accountid=171161>



- Page, S. J. (2014). *Tourism Management* (5th ed.). Taylor and Francis. Peterson, E.R., McCaffrey C. R. & Sillman, A. (n.d.). Where are the Global Millennials? (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.atkearney.com/web/global-business-policy-council/article?/a/where-are-the-global-millennials->
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2016). Population of Region XI - Davao (Based on the 2015 Census of Population) | Philippine Statistics Authority. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/content/population-region-xi-davao-based-2015-census-population>
- Philippine Statistics Authority. (2018). *Domestic tourism expenditure by products, 2000 - 2017*. Retrieved from <https://psa.gov.ph/tourism-satellite-accounts-press-releases/tables>
- Philippine Statistics Authority and Department of Tourism, 2016 Household Survey on Domestic Visitors
- Rebstock, M. (2017). Economic benefits of improved accessibility to transport systems and the role of transport in fostering tourism for all. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1880695147?accountid=171161>
- Reitsamer, B. F., Brunner-Sperdin, A., & Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2016). Destination attractiveness and destination attachment: The mediating role of tourists' attitude. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 19, 93-101.
- Reitsamer, B. F., & Brunner-Sperdin, A. (2017). Tourist destination perception and well-being: What makes a destination attractive?. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 23(1), 55-72.
- Shimamoto, K. (2018). THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE MARKETS OF COMPETING TOURIST DESTINATIONS. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 24(1), 185-196. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.20867/thm.24.L9>
- Santos, M. C., Ferreira, A. M., & Costa, C. (2014). Influential factors in the competitiveness of mature tourism destinations. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 10(1), 73-81.
- Suddin, S. (2018). Factors and strategy for sustainable tourism in boti village, east nusatenggara. *Journal of Indonesian Tourism and Development Studies* 6(1), 8-16. Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2010916878?accountid=171161>
- Tejano, I. (2017). Davao Region population increases by 424,000. Retrieved from <https://www.sunstar.com.ph/article/402452/>
- Teviana, T., Ginting, P., Lubis, A. N., & Gultom, P. (2017). Antecedents of tourism destination image and customer satisfaction in tourism industry. *European Research Studies*, 20(3A), 435.

- Three in Five Pinoys 15 Years Old and Over Travelled in the Country in 2016 | Philippine Statistics Authority. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://web0.psa.gov.ph/content/three-five-pinoys-15-years-old-and-over-travelled-country-2016>.
- Tourism. (n.d.). Retrieved July 15, 2018, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/tourism>
- United Nations (n.d.) Promoting accessible tourism for all. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/issues/promoting-accessible-tourism-for-all.html>
- UNTWO (2013). Recommendations on Accessible Tourism for all. Retrieved from: <http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/docpdf/recommendationsaccessibletourismforallenok.pdf>
- UNWTO (2016). "Tourism for All - promoting universal accessibility" Good Practices in the Accessible Tourism Supply Chain. Retrieved from: [http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/goodpracticesintheaccessibletourismsupplychain\\_en\\_2016\\_2\\_web\\_20160726122.\\_revisado\\_vfinal\\_2\\_cessupdated\\_on\\_the\\_web.pdf](http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/goodpracticesintheaccessibletourismsupplychain_en_2016_2_web_20160726122._revisado_vfinal_2_cessupdated_on_the_web.pdf)
- Valls, J., Sureda, J., and Valls-Tuñón, G. (2014). Attractiveness analysis of European Tourist cities. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 31:12, pp. 178 – 194.
- Veríssimo, M., & Costa, C. (2018). Do hostels play a role in pleasing Millennial travellers? The Portuguese case. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 4(1), 57-68.
- Vigolo, V. (2015). Investigating the Attractiveness of an Emerging Long-haul Destination: Implications for Loyalty. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(6), 564-576.
- Wienswig, D. (2015, December 21). Travel Retail: A \$60 Billion Business. Retrieved from: <https://www.fbicgroup.com/sites/default/files/Travel%20Retail%20Report%20by%20FBIC%20Global%20Retail%20Tech%20Dec.%202015.pdf>